

# Minnesota Motor Vehicle Impaired Driving Facts 06 - 0287 2003

FABRICA concept/image: Eric Ravelo

HE 5620 .D72 M56 2003 This document is made available electronically by the Minnesota Legislative Reference Library as part of an ongoing digital archiving project. http://www.leg.state.mn.us/lrl/lrl.asp

# MINN IMPAIRE FAC

Pr Office of Minnesota Dep 444 Ceda St. Paul, Phone [TTY of < http://www.d

© 2004, Office of Traffic Safety

This document is available from the Office of Traffic



## **Office of Traffic Safety**

December, 2004

444 Cedar Street, Suite 150, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-5150 FAX #651.297.4844 TTY: 651/282-6555 Internet: http://www.dps.state.mn.us

Alcohol & Gambling Enforcement

Bureau of Criminal Apprehension

**Capitol Security** 

Driver & Vehicle Services

Emergency Management / Emergency Response Commission

State Fire Marshal / Pipeline Safety

State Patrol

Traffic Safety

In 2003, 655 people died in traffic crashes in Minnesota; 255 of those deaths were attributed to impaired driving. Each year over the last half-decade officers have cited drinking and driving, or drug-impaired driving, as a factor in over 2,500 injury crashes in which over 4,000 people were injured. The State invests significant resources in the effort to stop impaired driving. There were over 32,000 arrests in 2003. This figure is just the tip of the iceberg, though. For each arrest made, there may be 100 or more impaired driving episodes that do not result in arrest. Each episode has the potential to result in crashes, fatalities, or injuries.

This report is intended to be a source of reliable statistics to help quantify the nature of the problem. Additionally, there is information about impaired driving law and practice in Minnesota. Although there was a prior edition, this report is still new and under development. Suggestions from users are always welcomed. Changes and other features this year include:

- The Office of Traffic Safety is pleased that James Cleary and Joseph Cox of the Minnesota House of Representative Research Department have permitted the reproduction here of their article, "A Brief Overview of Minnesota's DWI Laws" (see pages 5-11). Minnesota's DWI law is notably complex, but this article provides a brilliant, concise overview.
- Some tables show statistics for every year since 1990. In other tables, statistics for the oldest year (1990) are kept but some intervening years are deleted.
- All statistics for all prior years are updated in this report. (Driver license records are updated even for incidents that are years old; hence, there are small changes in statistics for prior years.)
- Several new tables are added, including one (2.01) showing conviction rates, as of late November, 2004, by county over the latest four years, and another (5.02) showing the cost of alcohol-related crashes by county.
- This year, Table 5.01, showing alcohol-related crashes, fatalities and injuries by county, is repeated for every year since 1990. Future editions will then only report these statistics for years after 2003.

The Legislature continues making important reforms to impaired driving law. The felony law for fourth-time offenders went into effect August 1, 2002. The historic change from a ".10" to a ".08" *per se* illegal blood-alcohol level was passed in 2004 and will take effect August 1, 2005. It is hoped this report will help us to see the impact of such laws and reflect on how to deal with the impaired driving problem in Minnesota.

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

INTRODUCTION		1
DEFINITIONS		3
A BRIEF OVERVIE	W OF MINNESOTA'S DWI LAWS: Minnesota Statutes	
-	A and Related Laws	
	permission of James Cleary and Joseph Cox,	_
Minnesota Ho	ouse of Representatives Research Department)	5
I: IMPAIRED DRIV	VING INCIDENTS ON RECORD	
Table 1.01:	Overview of Impaired Driving Incidents in Minnesota	
	on Record, 1990, 1993-2001	13
Table 1.02:	Incidents in Minnesota on Record, by Month Incident Occurred,	
	1990, 1993-2001	15
Table 1.03:	Incidents in Minnesota on Record, by Day of Week Incident	
	Occurred, 1990, 1993-2001	15
Table 1.04:	Incidents in Minnesota on Record, by Gender of Violator, 1990, 1993-2001	16
Table 1.05:	Incidents in Minnesota on Record, by Age of Violator at	10
1 able 1.05.	Time of Incident, 1990, 1993-2001	16
Table 1.06:	Incidents in Minnesota on Record, by Location Where	10
10010 1.000	Incident Occurred, 1990-1999	
Table 1.07:	Incident in Minnesota on Record, by County Where	
	Incident Occurred, 1990, 1993-2001	17
Table 1.08	Incidents in Minnesota on Record, by Total Number	
	of Incidents on Violator's Record	20
II. IMPAIRED DRI	VING CRIMINAL CONVICTION RATES	22
Table 2.01	Conviction Rate (as of late November, 2004) by Judicial	
	Judicial District and County in Minnesota, 2000-2003	24
Table 2.02	Incidents in Year 2003 Conviction Rate (as of late	
	November, 2004), by Offense Level and by Judicial	
	District and County in Minnesota	27
III DEDGANG WITT	H IMPAIRED DRIVING INCIDENTS ON RECORD	20
Table 3.01:	Population of Minnesota by Age and Gender	
Table 3.02:	Licensed Drivers in Minnesota by Age, 1990, 1993-2001	
Table 3.02:	Minnesota Residents with Impaired Driving Incidents on	
1 auto 5.05.	Record by Age at Date of Last Incident and Age at End	
	of Year 2003	

Table 3.04:	Population of Minnesota and Number of Residents	
	with Impaired Driving Incidents on Record as of	
	End of 2003, by County	
Table 3.05:	Persons with Impaired Driving Incidents on Record	
	by Area of Residence, Gender, and Number of	
	Incidents on Record at End of 2003	
IV. IMPAIRED DRIV	VING RECIDIVISM IN MINNESOTA	
Table 4.01:	Incidents that Occurred in Minnesota in 2003	
	Based on Number of Incidents on Violator's Record	
Table 4.02:	Persons Who Incurred Incidents in Minnesota in 2003	
	Based on Number of Incidents on Violator's Record	
V. ALCOHOL-RELA	ATED CRASH STATISTICS BY COUNTY	
Table 5.01:	Traffic Crashes, Fatalities, and Injuries Total and	
	Alcohol-Related, by County in Minnesota, 1990-2003	
Table 5.02:	Cost of Alcohol-Related Traffic Crashes, Fatalities,	
	and Injuries by County, 1990-2003	70

# **MINNESOTA IMPAIRED DRIVING FACTS, 2003**

# **INTRODUCTION**

This report is produced by the Office of Traffic Safety in the Minnesota Department of Public Safety and provides information about impaired driving in the state. The report is meant to aid in describing the parameters of a significant public health threat, but there are problems in reporting the statistics in a clear way. The problems are mainly due to (1) the lack of a clear terminology and (2) the complexity of Minnesota's impaired driving laws.

There is no clearly defined set of terms to describe impaired driving situations. For traffic crashes, Minnesota follows the American National Standards Institute's "Manual on Classification of Motor Vehicle Traffic Accidents," which has been in use nationwide since the 1940s. There is no similar manual for describing impaired driving incidents.

In this report, the term "impaired driving" is used, but even it has problems. For example, if an officer arrests a person for DWI, and the person refuses to take the alcohol test and then plea-bargains the DWI charge to speeding, the incident is still classified as an impaired driving incident since the test refusal violates the Implied Consent Law which is part of the Impaired Driving Code. But the fact of impairment was not actually established. Definitions of terms are shown below, but these definitions are subject to change in the future.

The second obstacle to clear statistical reporting is the complexity of the law. Minnesota enacted its first DWI law in 1911. There are now more than 30,000 DWI arrests annually -- more than for any other criminal offense in the state. For nearly a century, defense attorneys have found loopholes in the law, while the state has sought to tighten the law.

Apart from the DWI laws themselves, there is an important distinction between criminal offenses and civil law violations. Minnesota Statute (MS) 609.02 defines "crime" as "conduct ... for which the actor may be sentenced to imprisonment..." Therefore, a crime is committed if a person performs a behavior the law defines as criminal, regardless of whether the person is detected, arrested, prosecuted, found guilty, and sentenced to jail or prison.

In contrast, a civil law violation cannot lead to incarceration.<sup>\*</sup> In impaired driving cases under civil law, when a person refuses or fails an alcohol or drug test, the police officer acts as agent of the Commissioner of Public Safety and issues the driver license revocation form. In some cases the Commissioner may impose additional requirements (e.g. treatment), but the Commissioner cannot impose a jail sentence.

This report uses the following conventions: The terms "crime," "offense," and "criminal offense" are used to describe violations of the criminal impaired driving law. The term "violation" is used to describe a breaking of the civil Implied Consent law. "Violation" and "violator" are general terms though. Thus, a crime is a type of violation, and "violator" refers to a person who breaks a criminal law, a civil law, or both.

Minnesota's first DWI law consisted of a single sentence: "Whoever operates a motor vehicle while in an intoxicated condition shall be guilty of a misdemeanor." The current law takes an entire chapter (MS 169A) and defines it to be a crime for a person to "drive, operate, or be in physical control of any motor vehicle within this state..." when the person is under the influence of alcohol, or under the influence of any of a large number of impairing substances, or when the person has an alcohol concentration of 0.10 or more, and so on.

In 1961, Minnesota passed the civil "Implied Consent" law, defining the principle that by driving on a public roadway, a person by implication gives consent to a test for alcohol upon being stopped by an officer having probable cause to suspect impairment. If the driver refused the test, the State would revoke the person's driving license.

<sup>\*</sup> Also, a person is not considered to have violated a civil law unless it is so determined through a legal process. Thus, a person can sue another for breach of contract, but the other person's behavior is not a violation unless a court determines that it is. The defendant might then be ordered to make restitution, or pay a fine, but cannot be incarcerated.

In 1971, the criminal law was amended to stipulate that having an alcohol concentration of 0.10 or higher was no longer just *prima facie* evidence of intoxication, but was in itself ("*per se*") a crime.<sup>†</sup> Thus, Minnesota's "criminal *per se*" law dates from 1971.

In 1976, Minnesota became the first state to pass an "administrative *per se*" law, authorizing the Commissioner of Public Safety to revoke a person's driver's license upon refusal to take the alcohol test or upon taking and "failing" the test. The Commissioner imposes this revocation independently of whatever happens in the criminal DWI case, and without the need to prove guilt to the higher level required in the criminal case. Almost all states now have an "administrative *per se*" law.

Thus Minnesota pioneered the "two-track system." The Commissioner of Public Safety revokes the driver's license if a person fails or refuses the test, even if the person is found not guilty of the criminal DWI charge. Likewise a court can find a person guilty of impaired driving even in the absence of a test failure or refusal.

The complexity of the law often causes more than one violation to be recorded on a person's driving record for a single incident. To make up an extreme example: Suppose a 20-year-old commercial vehicle driver is driving while impaired by a combination of alcohol and marijuana and has a crash killing another driver and injuring two passengers. Upon arrest, the driver refuses a urine test for drugs, but takes and fails the breath test, with an alcohol concentration of 0.15%.

The driver potentially could incur the following violations. The alcohol test failure is a criminal offense under MS 169A.20(1) and a civil law violation under MS 169A.52(4). The drug test refusal is a criminal offense under MS 169A.20(2) and a civil law violation under MS 169A.52(3). Since the driver was under age 21, he violated MS 169A.33(2). As a commercial vehicle driver with an AC over .04, he violated MS 169A.20(6) and MS 169A.52(2). Since the incident caused a death and two injuries, a felony conviction for criminal vehicular operation resulting in a fatality is possible under MS 609.21(1), and two separate felony convictions for criminal vehicular

operation resulting in an injury are possible under MS 609.21(2). Each of the above violations could cause an entry to the person's driver record, although there can be only one offense under MS169A.20.

Since a single incident may lead to multiple violations, a circumstance such as the following could occur: In a year, there are 35,000 impaired driving arrests. Five-hundred of those never get recorded as an impaired driving incident. Among the remaining 34,500 arrests that do lead to an impaired driving incident on record, there are 34,000 civil Implied Consent law violations, and 27,000 impaired-driving criminal convictions, for a total of 61,000 violations. In addition, Minnesotans may incur violations in other states and those will be placed on their Minnesota driving record. Also, non-Minnesotans incur violations in Minnesota, and the Department of Public Safety creates a record in the state's driver license file to keep track of those violations.

For all these reasons, it is useful to distinguish between incidents, violations, and violators. The number of incidents on record in a year should show a close correspondence to the number of arrests in a year. Violations will be more numerous, and the types of violations incurred will help to characterize an incident. For example, did the incident involve test failure or test refusal? Was an injury or fatality involved? It is also useful to think about incidents separately from the persons who committed them. A person may go through an irresponsible phase in his or her life and incur several incidents in a year or two, and then reform. Thus, in a year, there may be 34,500 incidents on record, but if 1,500 persons were arrested twice, and 500 were arrested three times in the year, then 32,000 persons accounted for the 34,500 incidents.

In this report, Section I deals with impaired driving incidents -- when and where they occurred, what types of violations were involved, and so on. Section II shows the criminal conviction rates for the incidents. Section III deals with persons -- How many have DWI incidents on record? How many prior incidents do they have? and so on. Section IV focuses more specifically on recidivism. It tabulates incidents that occurred in a year, based on the total number of incidents on the violators' records. Section V reports statistics on crashes and their costs. For each county, it shows total crashes, fatalities, and injuries, and the number and percentage of them of them that were classified as alcohol-related.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup> In 2004 the Legislature reduced the *per se* level to .08%, effective August 1, 2005.

#### Disqualification

A "disqualification" is the action taken by the Commissioner of Public Safety on a person's commercial vehicle driver's license upon being notified that the person was operating a commercial vehicle while having an alcohol concentration of .04% or higher. The Commissioner "disqualifies" the driver from operating commercial vehicles. This action is mandated under the Implied Consent Law, MS 169A.52. (MS 169A.20 makes it a crime for a person to operate a commercial vehicle while having an alcohol concentration over .04% and provides for separate actions upon conviction.)

A disqualification is not counted as an impaired driving incident unless the driver also had a regular implied consent law violation or impaired driving conviction.

#### DWI

"DWI" appears to be the historic and classic term to designate impaired driving. It may not have a precise definition. It could stand for driving while intoxicated, driving while under the influence, driving while impaired.

In Minnesota, a usage evolved to some extent that the term "DWI" refers to an actual conviction under the criminal statute while the term "implied consent" or "administrative license revocation" refers to the revocation by the Commissioner of Public Safety under the Implied Consent law.

Thus, if John Doe got convicted in court under MS169A.20, it would be said that he "got a DWI." If he did not get convicted but did get revoked under the Implied Consent law (169A.50 to 169A.53), then it would *not* be said that he got a DWI, but that he "got an implied consent."

Throughout this report, the term "impaired driving incident [on record]" (or merely "incident") is used as a collective term to designate a "DWI," or an implied consent revocation, or a single incident that resulted in both an administrative license revocation and a criminal conviction for an offense specified in the impaired driving code.

#### **DWI Law**

In 2000, the Legislature completely recodified Minnesota's DWI law. The changes mostly took effect January 1, 2001. The law up through year 2000 had become gradually more complex. The

main criminal law was contained in MS 169.121. Other DWI criminal laws were 169.1211 and 169.129. These laws contained many references to other laws which had to be consulted to fully understand the main law. The Implied Consent law was MS 169.123, and there were many references between it and the criminal DWI laws.

The 2000 recodification combined all of these into a new chapter MS 169A, and specified that "this chapter may be cited as the Minnesota Impaired Driving Code."

Thus, the term "DWI law" increasingly appears obsolete and the preferred term increasingly appears to be "impaired driving law."

#### **Implied Consent Law**

Minnesota Statutes, sections 169A.50 to 169A.53, make up the "Implied Consent" law -- the civil law stating that by implication a person who drives in Minnesota gives his or her consent to a chemical test for purposes of gathering evidence as to whether or not an offense under Minnesota's impaired driving law has occurred. The chemical test can be of a person's blood, breath, or urine, and the test can be for alcohol or for any other substance specified in MS 169A.20. Under the Implied Consent Law, the Commissioner of Public Safety imposes a one-year license revocation for test refusal, or a ninety-day to one-year revocation (depending on the prior record) for a test failure.

#### Incident

An episode of impaired driving, regardless of whether it is detected and prosecuted.

#### **Incident on Record**

An incident on record is an episode of impaired driving or an episode in which the Implied Consent law was violated and the following also occurred: The incident was detected and a stop was made and the driver was found in court to have violated the criminal impaired driving law 169A.20, or it was established that the driver violated the Implied Consent law either (1) by taking a chemical test and "failing" it, or (2) by refusing to take the required test. Furthermore, the fact of this criminal offense and/or civil law violation has been recorded on the person's Minnesota driving record.

#### Minnesota Resident

As used in this report, a person for whom records maintained by the Department of Public Safety show to be a current resident of Minnesota. Note that the Department of Public Safety may not be promptly notified that a person died, or (as may especially be true of multiple DWI offenders) that a person moved from the state.

#### Non-Minnesota Resident

As used in this report, a person for whom records maintained by the Department of Public Safety show as not being a current resident of Minnesota. The person may have been a resident and moved away, or may never have been a resident.

#### Not-a-drop

Minnesota Statute 169A.33 is sometimes referred to as the "not a drop" law. It provides that a person under the age of 21 who drives with any amount of alcohol shall have his or her license revoked by the Commissioner of Public Safety. In this report, a nota-drop violation is not counted as an impaired driving incident unless the driver also had a regular implied consent law violation or impaired driving conviction.

#### Offender

A person who has committed a petty misdemeanor, misdemeanor, gross misdemeanor, or felony, regardless of whether it is detected and prosecuted.

#### Offense

A petty misdemeanor, misdemeanor, gross misdemeanor, or felony. (All DWI offenses are misdemeanor or higher.) An offense may or may not be detected and prosecuted.

#### Violation

A breaking of one of Minnesota's criminal or civil laws.

#### Violator

A person who breaks a criminal or civil law in Minnesota.

The article below, "A Brief Overview of Minnesota's DWI Laws; Minnesota Statutes Chapter 169A and Related Laws" (on pages 5-11), is reprinted by permission of the authors, James Cleary and Joseph Cox, of the Minnesota House of Representatives Research Department. Although the DWI Law recodification (enacted in 2000, and mostly taking effect January 1, 2001) substantially simplified the law, it is still complex to those not already familiar with it. The article below is brilliant in the way it provides a concise explanation of the law in clear language. (Note that the 2004 amendment changing the *per se* illegal blood alcohol level from .10% to .08%, effective August 1, 2005, is not included in the following review.)

# A Brief Overview of Minnesota's DWI Laws Minnesota Statutes Chapter 169A and Related Laws

#### by James Cleary and Joseph Cox Minnesota House of Representatives Research Department

#### **Prohibited Behaviors.**

Minnesota's DWI law stipulates that it is a crime: 1) to drive, operate or be in control of any motor vehicle anywhere in the state while:

- under the influence of alcohol, a controlled substance, or (knowingly) a hazardous substance, or any combination of these;
- having an alcohol concentration (AC) of .10 or more at the time, or within two hours, of doing so;
- having any amount of a schedule I or II controlled substance, other than marijuana, in the body; or
- if the vehicle is a commercial motor vehicle, having an alcohol concentration of .04 or more at the time, or within two hours of the time, of doing so; or
- 2) to refuse to submit to a chemical test of the person's blood, breath, or urine under section 169A.52 (implied consent law).

#### **Criminal Penalty Enhancement**

Is based on the number of aggravating factors present when the crime was committed:

- none 4<sup>th</sup> degree DWI misdemeanor; (maximum penalties: \$1,000 fine, 90 days jail)
- one 3<sup>rd</sup> degree DWI gross misdemeanor; (maximum penalties: \$3,000 fine, 1 year jail)
- two 2<sup>nd</sup> degree DWI gross misdemeanor; (same)
- three 1<sup>st</sup> degree DWI felony; (maximum penalties: 7 years incarceration in prison, and \$14,000 fine; See a later section for detailed description.)

#### **Aggravating Factor:**

This term includes:

- a qualified prior impaired driving incident within the preceding 10 years;
- an alcohol concentration of .20 or more upon arrest; and
- presence of a child under age 16 in the vehicle, if more than 36 months younger than the offender.

# Qualified Prior Impaired Driving Incident

Includes both:

- prior impaired driving convictions; and
- prior impaired driving-related losses of license (implied consent revocations) or operating privileges

for separate driving incidents within the preceding 10 years involving any kind of motor vehicle, including:

 passenger motor vehicle, schoolbus or head start bus, commercial motor vehicle, airplane, snowmobile, all terrain vehicle, off-road recreational vehicle, or motorboat in operation.

#### **Chemical Testing**

Minnesota's implied consent law assumes that a person who drives, operates or is in control of any type of motor vehicle anywhere in the state has consented to a chemical test of breath, blood or urine for the purpose of determining the presence of alcohol or controlled or hazardous substances in the person's body. The testing is administered at the direction of a law enforcement officer when there is probable cause that the person has committed a DWI violation and the person:

- has been arrested for a DWI violation;
- has been involved in a motor vehicle crash;
- has refused to take the DWI screening test; or

• has taken the screening test and it shows AC of .10 or more.

To build probable cause, the officer generally, though not always, proceeds as follows:

- observes the impaired driving behavior and forms a reasonable suspicion of an impaired driving violation;
- stops and questions the driver;
- administers a standardized field sobriety test (SFST); and
- administers a preliminary breath test (PBT).

If, based on these screening tests, the officer has probable cause to believe that a DWI crime has occurred, he or she may arrest the person and demand a more rigorous evidentiary test of the person's breath, blood or urine. Before administering the evidentiary test, the officer must read the implied consent advisory statement to the person, explaining that testing is mandatory, test refusal is a crime, and the person has the right to consult an attorney before taking the test. If the evidentiary test is requested without the advisory being given, then the person may be charged and prosecuted criminally following test failure or refusal, but the various administrative sanctions cannot be applied.

If the person is unconscious, consent is deemed not to have been withdrawn, and the test may be administered.

The officer chooses whether the test will be of the person's breath, blood or urine. A person who refuses a blood or urine test must be offered another type of test (breath, blood or urine). Blood and urine tests are analyzed by the state crime lab (BCA), with results available within about 10 days.

#### **Administrative Sanctions**

Apart from any criminal penalties that may result from an arrest for DWI, the law provides for three administrative sanctions, which can commence immediately upon arrest:

#### 1) Administrative License Revocation (ALR)

Whenever the implied consent law can be invoked during the arrest process, the person's driver's license can be withdrawn immediately following any test failure or test refusal. The person is given a 7-day temporary license to drive before the withdrawal becomes effective. The period of license withdrawal is as follows:

 90 days for a person with no qualified prior impaired driving incident within the past 10 years and no other aggravating factor was present in the current incident (reducible to 30 days upon conviction);

- six months, if violator is under age 21;
- 180 days, if person has had a qualified prior impaired driving incident within 10 years;
- double the applicable period above, if the person was arrested with an alcohol concentration of .20 or more or while having a child under age 16 in the vehicle;
- **one year**, if the person has refused to submit to the chemical test of blood, breath or urine.

The person may appeal the administrative license revocation, whether administratively to the DPS, and/or judicially through the court.

#### 2) Administrative License Plate Impoundment

A plate impoundment violation is an impaired driving violation involving an aggravating factor, such as any of the following:

- occurring within 10 years of a qualified prior impaired driving violation by that person;
- involving an alcohol concentration of .20 or more;
- having a child under age 16 present in the vehicle; or
- occurring while the person's license has been cancelled for the person being inimical to public safety.

Plate impoundment applies to:

- the vehicle used in the plate impoundment violation;
- as well as any vehicle owned, registered or leased in the name of the violator, whether alone or jointly.

A plate impoundment order is issued by the arresting officer at the time of arrest and is effective immediately. The officer also seizes the plates and issues a temporary vehicle permit valid for 7 days (or 45 days if the violator is not the owner).

The minimum term of plate impoundment is one year, during which time the violator may not drive any motor vehicle unless the vehicle displays specially coded plates and the person has been validly re-licensed to drive. The violator is also subject to certain restrictions when selling or acquiring a vehicle during the impoundment period.

Specially coded license plates – signifying to law enforcement that the regular plates have been impounded for an impaired driving violation – may be issued for the vehicle(s), provided that:

- the violator has a properly licensed substitute driver;
- a member of the violator's household is validly licensed;
- the violator has been validly re-licensed; or
- the owner is not the violator and is validly licensed.

Law enforcement is authorized to stop any vehicle bearing the special plates to check whether the driver is properly licensed.

It is a crime for a driver whose plates have been impounded to attempt to evade the plate impoundment law in certain specified ways, or for another person to enable such evasion.

#### 3) Administrative Vehicle Forfeiture

Minnesota's DWI law provides for vehicle forfeiture for a designated license revocation or designated offense, which is typically the third DWI violation within a ten-year period, though with one or more enhancing factors a person's second-time or even first-time violation might qualify, as well.

DWI law defines "designated license revocation" as a license revocation or commercial license disqualification for an implied consent violation within 10 years of two or more qualified prior impaired driving incidents. The term "designated offense" includes a DWI violation in the first or second-degree or involving a person whose driver's license is cancelled as inimical to public safety or subject to B-card (no alcohol) restrictions.

The law provides that the arresting officer may seize the vehicle, and requires that the prosecuting authority serve notice to the owner(s) of the intent to forfeit. The forfeiture is conducted administratively, unless within 30 days the owner appeals the forfeiture action by filing for a judicial determination of the forfeiture.

A vehicle is subject to forfeiture under this law only if:

- it was used in the commission of a designated offense and the driver was convicted of that offense or failed to appear at trial on it, or
- it was used in conduct resulting in a designated license revocation and the driver either fails to seek administrative or judicial review of the revocation in a timely manner or the revocation is sustained upon review.

Other vehicles owned by the offender are not subject to forfeiture. As a protection for an owner who is not the offender, the law states that a motor vehicle is subject to forfeiture only if its owner knew or should have known of the unlawful or intended use of the vehicle.

Following completion of forfeiture, the arresting agency may keep the vehicle for its own official use. However, the security interest or lease of the financial institution, if any, is protected, and the lienholder may choose to sell the vehicle at its own foreclosure sale or agree to a sale by the arresting agency. A proportionate share of the proceeds, after deduction of certain expenses, goes to the financial institution. The law provides similar protection to any innocent co-owner, as well.

#### **Charging the Crime**

DWI violations may be charged by:

- citation (very rarely done, and only if a misdemeanor);
- tab charge when booking the person into jail; and/or
- complaint prepared by the prosecutor subsequent to arrest.

In the case of a blood or urine evidentiary test, the officer typically tab charges the violator at the time of arrest for driving under the influence, which is one category of DWI crime. Then, at the person's first court appearance, the prosecutor requests continuation of the charges, pending return of the test results from the state crime lab. If the test results indicate an alcohol concentration of 0.10 percent or more, the prosecutor is allowed to add additional charges orally at the person's next court hearing. Any charging complaint that is subsequently prepared would include all relevant charges.

# Mandatory Hold & Conditional Release Pretrial

When a person is arrested for a first-degree (felony) or second-degree DWI crime, the person must be taken into custody and detained until the person's first court appearance, at which time the court generally sets bail and specifies conditions of release. Unless maximum bail (\$12,000 for gross misdemeanor DWI) is imposed, a person charged with any of the following offenses may be granted pretrial release from detention only if the person agrees to abstain from alcohol and to submit to remote electronic alcohol monitoring involving at least daily breath-alcohol measurements:

- a 3<sup>rd</sup>-time implied consent or DWI violation within 10 years;
- a 2<sup>nd</sup>-time violation, if under 19 years of age;
- a violation while already cancelled as inimical to public safety for a prior violation; or

• a violation involving an alcohol concentration of .20 or more.

Further conditions apply to a person charged with a 4<sup>th</sup>-time or more violation within 10 years, including:

- impoundment of the vehicle registration plates, or impoundment of the off-road recreational vehicle or motorboat itself, if one was being driven;
- a requirement for reporting at least weekly to a probation officer, involving random breath alcohol testing and/or urinalysis; and
- a requirement to reimburse the court for these services upon conviction for the crime.

#### **Chemical Dependency Assessment**

Every person convicted of DWI or a reduced charge must submit to a chemical use assessment administered by the county.(\$125 fee, plus \$5 surcharge) prior to sentencing. The court must order the person to submit to the level of care recommended by the assessment, if the conviction is for a repeat offense within ten years or the conviction was for DWI with an AC of .20 or more.

#### **Mandatory Minimum Sentences**

Upon conviction for DWI, repeat offenders are subject to the following mandatory minimum criminal penalties:

- 2<sup>nd</sup> **DWI offense within 10 years:** 30 days incarceration, at least 48 hours of which must be served in jail/workhouse, with 8 hours of community work service for each day less than 30 so served;
- 3<sup>rd</sup> DWI offense within 10 years: 90 days incarceration, at least 30 days of which must be served consecutively in a local jail/workhouse;
- 4<sup>th</sup> DWI offense within 10 years: 180 days of incarceration, at least 30 days of which must be served consecutively in a local jail/workhouse;
- 5<sup>th</sup> DWI offense within 10 years: one-year of incarceration, at least 60 days of which must be served consecutively in a local jail/workhouse.

#### For all repeat offenders:

the court may order that the person spend the remainder (non-jail portion) of the mandatory minimum sentence under remote electronic alcohol monitoring (REAM) or on home detention.

# As an alternative to the mandatory minimum period of incarceration:

the court may sentence the offender to a program of intensive probation for repeat DWI offenders that

requires the person to consecutively serve at least six days in jail/workhouse; and may order that the remainder of the minimum sentence be served on home detention.

#### **Long-Term Monitoring Required:**

applies to most 3<sup>rd</sup> time DWI offenders and all those under age 19 – when the court stays part or all of a jail sentence, it must order the offender to submit to remote electronic alcohol monitoring for at least 30days each year of probation.

#### Felony DWI penalties:

are discussed separately in a following section. However, if a person is convicted of felony DWI and given a stayed prison sentence, then that person must be sentenced in accordance with the local sentencing provisions described in this section.

#### **Intermediate Sanctions and Probation**

When sentencing a DWI offender, the court may impose and execute a sentence to incarceration, or it may stay imposition or execution of sentence and:

- order intermediate sanctions without probation; or
- place the person on probation with or without supervision and under terms the court prescribes, including intermediate sanctions if prescribed.

The term "intermediate sanction" includes but is not limited to jail, home detention, electronic monitoring, intensive supervision, sentencing to service, day reporting, chemical dependency and mental health treatment, restitution, fines, day fines, community work service, restorative justice work, and work in lieu of fines or restitution.

For DWI convictions, the maximum period of the stay of sentence, is

- 2 years, for a misdemeanor conviction;
- 6 years, for a gross misdemeanor conviction; and
- 7 years, for a felony DWI conviction.

#### Felony DWI (effective August 1, 2002)

Minnesota criminal law defines the term felony to mean any crime for which incarceration of more than one year may be imposed. Under Minnesota's new felony DWI law, a person who commits first-degree DWI is guilty of a felony and may be sentenced to:

- imprisonment for not more than seven years; or
- a fine of not more than \$14,000; or both.

A person is guilty of 1<sup>st</sup> degree DWI if the person violates DWI law:

 within 10 years of three or more qualified prior impaired driving incidents (defined as prior convictions or license revocations for separate impaired driving incidents); or

 has previously been convicted of a felony DWI crime (i.e., once a felon, always a felon).

Unlike non-felony DWI crimes, being arrested with a high alcohol concentration (.20 or more) and child endangerment are not defined as aggravating factors for felony DWI; instead, only qualified prior impaired driving incidents are considered.

When sentencing a person for a felony DWI offense, the court:

- must impose a sentence to imprisonment for not less than 3 years; and
- may stay execution of this mandatory sentence, but may not stay imposition of this sentence or sentence the person to less than three years imprisonment.

A person sentenced to incarceration in prison for felony DWI is not eligible for early release unless the person has successfully completed a chemical dependency treatment program while in prison.

The court must also order that after a felony DWI offender is released from prison, the person must be placed on conditional release for 5 years, under any conditions that the commissioner opts to impose, including an intensive probation program for repeat DWI offenders. If the person fails to comply with the conditions of release, the commissioner may revoke it and return the person to prison.

If the court stays execution of the mandatory prison sentence, then it must apply the mandatory penalties for non-felony DWI offenses (jail and/or intensive probation, as described in a preceding section) and must order as well that the person submit to longterm alcohol monitoring and the level of treatment prescribed in the chemical dependency assessment. If the person violates any condition of probation, the court may order that the stayed prison sentence be executed.

The Minnesota sentencing guidelines recommend a stayed sentence of 36 months, 42 months and 48 months for a felony DWI conviction for a person with zero, one or two criminal history points respectively, and they specify a presumptive commit to prison for a person with a criminal history score of three or more.

To illustrate, a person convicted of felony DWI who has had seven qualified prior impaired driving incidents within the past 10 years, but no other criminal convictions, would likely reach the threshold for a presumptive commit, as follows:

- three of those priors are used to establish the basis for enhancing the current DWI offense to a felony level crime (but these cannot also be used to determine the person's criminal history score);
- the other four priors provided they involved DWI convictions – count as ½ criminal history point each, for a total of two points; and
- one criminal history point a custody status point – would result from the current impaired driving incident occurring while the person is on probation for a prior impaired driving incident, as would almost certainly be the case in this example.

Thus, this hypothetical offender would have a criminal history score of 3 when facing sentencing on the current felony level DWI offense; the person's presumptive sentence under the guidelines would be commit to prison for 54 months. With one less qualified prior incident during the preceding 10 years, the guidelines would call for a presumptive stayed sentence of 48 months.

#### Limited Driver's License – Work Permit

A person whose driver's license has been revoked for an implied consent violation or DWI conviction may apply for a limited license to drive:

- to and from a job, or for a job;
- to chemical dependency treatment;
- to provide for the educational, medical or nutritional needs of the family; and/or
- for attendance at a post-secondary educational institution.

However, the law requires a waiting period -i.e., hard revocation - before a suspended or revoked driver may apply for a limited license:

- 15 days for a first-time implied consent or DWI violator:
- 90 days for a second-time or subsequent violator who complied with the AC test;
- 180 days for a second or subsequent time violator who refused the test;
- one year for a person revoked for manslaughter or criminal vehicular homicide;
- if under the age of 18, for twice the applicable period above, with a minimum of 90 days;
- for twice the applicable period above, if person's AC was .20 or more at the time of violation; and
- an additional 60 days, if the license withdrawal involved use of the vehicle in commission of a felony crime or an injury accident involving failure to stop and disclose identity.

Under a seldom-used program, a person whose driver's license has been cancelled and denied for a third or more impaired driving incident (as inimical to public safety), may also apply for a limited license if:

- at least one-half the person's required abstinence period has expired;
- the person has completed chemical dependency treatment and is regularly participating in a recognized abstinence-based support group; and
- the person agrees to drive only a motor vehicle equipped with a certified ignition interlock device.

#### **Restricted Driver's License – The B-Card**

Driver's licensing law empowers the DPS to impose restrictions on a person's license to "assure safe operation." Under DPS rules, a person whose driver's license has been cancelled and denied for a third or subsequent impaired driving violation, and who has successfully completed treatment and rehabilitation, may apply for a restricted driver's license – called a B-Card – provided that the person sign a sworn statement to never again consume any alcohol whatsoever (not even in a religious service, or in medication, or in any other manner or amount, irrespective of whether the act involves driving).

Any violation of this no alcohol restriction of the B-Card results in immediate cancellation of the driver's license.

Under DPS rules, the minimum period of time for establishing rehabilitation, for which the person must prove total alcohol abstinence, is one-year for the first rehabilitation, 3 years for the second rehabilitation, and 6 years for the third or subsequent rehabilitation. It is only following such rehabilitation that the offender may apply for a B-Card license.

#### **Driver's License Reinstatement Fees**

Before becoming re-licensed to drive after the period of license withdrawal stemming from an implied consent violation or DWI conviction, a person must pass the license examination and re-apply for a driver's license, and pay the following fees:

- \$250 driver's license (DL) reinstatement fee (basic fee);
- \$145 surcharge on the DL reinstatement fee (will increase to \$380 after July 1, 2003); and
- \$18.50 DL application fee.

The \$250 driver's license reinstatement fee and \$145 surcharge apply to alcohol-related withdrawals only; the standard reinstatement fee of \$30 applies following loss of license for other reasons.

# First-Time DWI violator using an off-road recreational vehicle or motorboat

A violator who has no qualified prior impaired driving incident, is subject only to the criminal penalty (a misdemeanor) and the loss of operating privileges for that type of vehicle.

The person is not subject to driver's license revocation, mandatory chemical dependency assessment and treatment, mandatory conditions of release; long-term monitoring, the penalty assessment fee, or license plate impoundment.

Any person arrested for a DWI violation involving an off-road recreational vehicle or motorboat and who has a qualified prior impaired driving incident on record is subject to the same administrative sanctions and criminal penalties as the person would be if arrested while driving a regular motor vehicle.

#### **Commercial Vehicle Driving**

DWI law sets a lower per se alcohol concentration limit for driving commercial motor vehicles -0.04, instead of 0.10 – and implied consent law allows for a chemical test upon probable cause that the commercial vehicle driver has consumed any amount of alcohol whatsoever, also a stricter standard.

A person who violates the 0.04 standard while driving a commercial motor vehicle is subject to a period of disqualification (one year for the first violation, and 10 years for any subsequent violation) from commercial motor vehicle driving, though the person would remain validly licensed to drive regular motor vehicles unless he or she also has violated regular DWI law by exceeding the 0.10 per se standard or by driving while impaired or with any amount of certain controlled substances in the body, in which case the person would be subject to the full range of applicable penalties and sanctions of regular DWI law.

In addition, a commercial motor vehicle driver who incurs license revocation or cancellation for an impaired driving violation in a personal passenger vehicle receives no special dispensations from the sanctions and penalties that apply to other drivers – the person is prohibited from driving any type of vehicle until becoming validly relicensed to drive.

#### **School Bus Driving**

DWI law provides an even stricter standard – zero tolerance – for school bus driving, by making it unlawful to drive a school bus when there is physical evidence in the person's body of the consumption of any amount of alcohol. In addition to criminal penalties, such a violation also triggers cancellation of the person's school bus driving endorsement and, upon conviction, disqualification of the person's commercial driving privileges. However, as with other non-bus commercial vehicle DWI violations, the person would remain validly licensed to drive regular motor vehicles unless he or she also has violated the higher standards of regular DWI law.

#### **Flying Airplanes**

A special DWI law establishes a 0.04 per se standard for alcohol concentration while flying and also criminalizes test refusal. Violation is always a gross misdemeanor.

It also is unlawful to fly within 8 hours of any alcohol consumption – a zero-tolerance standard, but time limited. Violation is a misdemeanor.

#### **Special Laws for Youth**

DWI laws apply equally to drivers of all ages. DWI violations require either evidence of impaired driving or an alcohol concentration of 0.10 percent or higher, or the presence of certain illegal substances in the person's body, during or within two hours of the time of driving, operating or being in control of a motor vehicle, broadly defined. However, two additional alcohol-related laws apply to youth under age 21. Drivers aged 16 and 17 years old who violate the DWI laws are under the jurisdiction of the adult court - not the juvenile court. As such, they are subject to the full range of adult penalties and consequences.

The drinking age law prohibits a person who is under the age of 21 from:

- consuming alcohol without parental permission and supervision;
- purchasing or attempting to purchase alcohol;
- possessing alcohol with intent to consume;
- entering a liquor store or bar for the purpose of purchasing or consuming alcohol; or
- misrepresenting one's age for the purpose of purchasing alcohol.

A violation of this statute is a misdemeanor and carries a mandatory minimum fine of \$100. However, it does not result in suspension of the driver's license unless the person has used a driver's license, Minnesota ID card, or any type of false identification to purchase or attempt to purchase alcohol (90 days suspension).

#### **Underage Drinking Driving – Zero Tolerance**

Minnesota's DWI law provides misdemeanor penalties and driver's license suspension for any

driver under age 21 who is convicted of driving a motor vehicle anywhere in the state while consuming alcohol or while there is physical evidence of such consumption present in the person's body. (This law applies only to the driver, and not to any passengers.)

It is important to note that, while a violation of the zero tolerance – underage drinking driving law does not in itself constitute a DWI/impaired driving violation, it nevertheless (technically) appears to be an enhancing factor for any subsequent DWI violation within 10 years. (Some prosecutors disagree and, thus, refuse to count such a violation as an enhancing factor.)

#### **Criminal Vehicular Homicide and Injury**

Criminal law defines 6 levels of criminal vehicular operation – all but one constituting felony offenses – depending on the level of injury inflicted:

- criminal vehicular homicide (causing death, but not constituting murder or manslaughter);
- great bodily harm (serious permanent injury);
- substantial bodily harm (temporary substantial injury);
- bodily harm (pain or injury a gross misdemeanor);
- death to an unborn child; and
- injury to an unborn child.

A common element to each of these CVO crimes is that the person causes the specified harm to another person as a result of operating a motor vehicle under any of the following conditions:

- in a grossly negligent manner;
- in violation of any of the elements of regular DWI law; or
- where the driver who causes the accident leaves the scene in violation of Minnesota's felony fleeing law.

In practice, most CVO prosecutions involve simultaneous violation of DWI law.

Under the sentencing guidelines, conviction for criminal vehicular homicide or death to an unborn child carries a presumptive commit to prison for 48 months, for an offender with no other criminal history points.

#### In General...

There were 32,266 impaired driving incidents that occurred in Minnesota in 2003 and got entered onto people's driving records. That's down 3% from the prior year. Eighty-four percent of the incidents involved taking a test for alcohol or drugs<sup>1</sup> and 14% involved a test refusal.<sup>2</sup> (Failure versus refusal was not reported for the remaining 1%.) A small number (282) of the total incidents included a conviction for "criminal vehicular operation" resulting in a fatality (20 such incidents) or injury (262 such incidents).

#### "Not-a-Drop" and "Disqual" violations

Two types of incidents are reported in Table 1.01 but not otherwise considered as "impaired driving incidents" in this report. First, there are "not-a-drop" violations. (The Not-A-Drop law was passed in 1993 and applies to persons under age 21, making it illegal for them to drive while having any amount of alcohol in their blood.) The number of such violations rose steadily from 1,386, in 1994, to close to 3,700 in 1999 and 2000, but then dropped rather sharply over the next years to 2,737 in 2003.

The second violation type has the jargon-like name "disqual." This refers to an incident where a commercial vehicle driver is tested and found to have an alcohol concentration of .04% or higher. Such a driver will then be disqualified from operating a commercial vehicle. These incidents are very rare -only about a dozen per year. There were 9 in 2003. (Note however that if the commercial vehicle driver has an alcohol concentration of .10 or higher, the incident will be counted as a conviction or an implied consent violation, and will not be counted here as a "disqual.")

#### WHEN incidents occur (weekends)

There is high consistency year after year with respect to when drinking and driving occurs in terms of days of the week: Mondays and Tuesdays each account for 7 or 8 percent of all incidents, Wednesdays for 9 or 10 percent, Thursdays for 11 or 12 percent, Fridays for 16 or 17 percent, Saturdays for about 25%, and Sundays for about 20%. The months of the year are similar to one another.

#### WHO are the violators?

Driver license files provide only limited data on who the drinking drivers are. There is an exceedingly strong relationship between age and impaired driving, and between gender and impaired driving. Most succinctly put, the problem is concentrated in the young adult male population. In 2001, males committed 71% of the incidents. Twenty-to-thirtynine year-olds accounted for 66% of incidents.

#### Recidivism: Almost 60%, we never see again

Section III will look at recidivism more closely. In general, though, just over 40% of the incidents are committed by persons who have prior violations on record and almost 60% are committed by first-time violators. Twenty-five years ago driver license staff would generalize "70% we never see again." Now, that generalization would have to be revised to something like: "almost 60% we never see again." However, the increase in the percentage of repeat violators does not necessarily mean "recidivism is increasing." For example, it could mean instead that both groups have gone down in number, but first-time violators.

Among the violators we do see again (the recidivists), an interesting pattern emerges: About half of those who incur a second incident go on to incur a third. About half of those who incur a third go on to incur a fourth, and so on.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The tests are almost always tests for alcohol, but they might be for controlled substances. In 2003, there were 528 convictions for driving while impaired by controlled substances.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Test refusals used to be higher. For example in 1990, 22% of all incidents involved a test refusal.

# OVERVIEW OF IMPAIRED DRIVING INCIDENTS IN MINNESOTA ON RECORD, Part 1: 1990 -- 1996

	Type of Incident	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
A	Incidents that included criminal DWI offenses and/or civil Implied Consent law violations	36,847	32,430	30,841	30,088	29,748	30,402	30,923
1	Of A, number and percent that included an Implied Consent Violation	36,032 97.8%	31,673 97.7%	30,101 97.6%	29,334 97.5%	28,855 97.0%	29,249 96.2	29,687 96.0%
2	Of A, number and percent that included a criminal conviction in court for DWI	29,069 78.9%	25,860 79.7%	25,338 82.2%	25,107 83.4%	24,834 83.5	25,139 82.7%	25,718 83.2
3a	Of A, number and percent that involved taking a test for alcohol or drugs	27,943 75.8%	24,505 75.6%	23,679 76.8%	23,857 79.3%	23,664 79.6%	23,772 78.2%	24,316 78.6
3b	Of A, number and percent that involved refusal to take test for alcohol or drugs	8,088 22.0%	7,174 22.1%	6,423 20.8%	5,489 18.2%	5,208 17.5%	5,507 18.1	5,405 17.5%
3c 3d	Of A, number that involved both taking a test and test refusal Of A, number for which it is not known if incident involved taking test or test refusal	7 809	5 746	11 728	13 729	16 860	26 1,097	6 1,196
4 4a	Of A, number that included a conviction in court for criminal vehicular operation (CVO) CVO resulting in a fatality	16	24	34	42	44	41	43
4b 5	CVO resulting in an injury Of A, number that included a conviction in	48	53	79	101	92	86	144
	court for driving while under the influence of a controlled substance ("drugs")	5	6	10	10	14	25	50
B	Incidents similar to impaired driving incid	lents						
1	"Not-a-drop" violations				587	1,386	1,611	2,181
2	Commercial vehicle driver license			• •		• •		10

Notes:

(1) The "Not-a-drop" law went into effect 8-1-93, so there are no violations prior to that.

disqualifications

(2) Regarding rows 3a-3d, an incident may involve both taking a test and refusing a test. For example, a person might take a test for alcohol but refuse to take a test for drugs.

(3) The number of incidents where testing versus refusal was unknown decreased abruptly in 1998 when the blood alcohol test result started being entered on the record.

15

20

17

18

16

9

20

# OVERVIEW OF IMPAIRED DRIVING INCIDENTS IN MINNESOTA ON RECORD, Part 2: 1997 -- 2003

	Type of Incident	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Α	Incidents that included criminal DWI offenses and/or civil Implied Consent law violations	31,380	32,422	34,575	35,034	33,532	33,163	32,266
1	Of A, number and percent that included an Implied Consent Violation	29,940 95.4%	30,888 95.3%	32,800 94.9%	33,329 95.1%	32,074 95.6%	31,911 96.2%	30,991 96.1%
2	Of A, number and percent that included a criminal conviction in court for DWI	26,269 83.7%	27,136 83.7%	29,314 84.8%	29,292 83.6%	27,981 83.4%	27,447 82.7%	26,210 80.9%
3a	Of A, number and percent that involved taking a test for alcohol or drugs	24,940 79.5%	27,135 83.7%	29,180 84.4%	29,567 84.4%	28,210 84.1%	27,883 84.1	27,184 84.3%
3b	Of A, number and percent that involved refusal to take test for alcohol or drugs	5,024 16.0%	4,774 14.7%	4,875 14.1%	4,886 14.0%	4,839 14.4%	4,767 14.4%	4,489 13.9%
3c 3d	Of A, number that involved both taking a test and test refusal Of A, number for which it is not known if	26	165	119	141	82	88	186
50	incident involved taking test or test refusal	1,390	348	401	440	401	425	407
4a	Of A, number that included a conviction in court for criminal vehicular operation (CVO)							
4b 4c	CVO resulting in a fatality CVO resulting in an injury	22 209	40 209	27 250	38 250	15 146	29 182	20 262
5	Of A, number that included a conviction in court for driving while under the influence of a controlled substance	128	218	207	334	397	404	528
В	Incidents similar to impaired driving incid	ents						
1	"Not-a-drop" violations	2,865	3,245	3,691	3,607	3,287	3,162	2,737
2	Commercial vehicle driver license disqualifications	15	21	12	15	14	14	9

Notes:

(1) The "Not-a-drop" law went into effect 8-1-93, so there are no violations prior to that.

(2) Regarding rows 3a-3d, an incident may involve both taking a test and refusing a test. For example, a person might take a test for alcohol but refuse to take a test for drugs.

(3) The number of incidents where testing versus refusal was unknown decreased abruptly in 1998 when the blood alcohol test result started being entered on the record.

						Year				
Month	1990	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
January	2,821	2,176	2,120	2,289	2,434	2,617	2,883	2,822	2,722	2,464
February	2,631	2,190	2,207	2,437	2,391	2,497	2,724	2,426	2,460	2,321
March	3,275	2,441	2,625	2,654	2,448	2,780	3,015	2,989	2,796	2,747
April	3,051	2,744	2,448	2,586	2,500	2,746	2,918	2,600	2,582	2,469
May	3,415	2,582	2,875	2,948	2,993	3,194	2,960	2,869	2,812	2,645
June	3,274	2,393	2,772	2,610	2,658	2,765	2,904	2,795	2,806	2,714
July	3,369	2,732	2,753	2,735	2,937	3,029	3,184	2,892	2,910	3,104
August	3,281	2,647	2,909	3,033	2,951	2,936	2,838	2,798	3,045	2,933
September	3,272	2,815	2,632	2,353	2,782	2,974	2,995	2,806	2,741	2,635
October	3,069	2,579	2,581	2,454	2,857	3,131	2,997	2,793	2,648	2,863
November	2,756	2,213	2,420	2,608	2,663	2,798	2,559	2,616	2,693	2,738
December	2,633	2,890	2,581	2,673	2,808	3,108	3,057	3,126	2,948	2,633
Total	36,847	30,402	30,923	31,380	32,422	34,575	35,034	33,532	33,163	32,266

# INCIDENTS IN MINNESOTA ON RECORD, BY MONTH INCIDENT OCCURRED, 1990 and 1995-2003

#### **TABLE 1.03**

# INCIDENTS IN MINNESOTA ON RECORD, BY DAY OF WEEK INCIDENT OCCURRED, 1990 and 1995-2003

Day of					Yea	ar				
Week	1990	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Sunday	7,721	6,600	6,413	6,488	6,909	7,470	7,640	7,316	7,098	6,803
Monday	2,887	2,274	2,490	2,331	2,384	2,446	2,375	2,566	2,451	2,391
Tuesday	2,958	2,476	2,505	2,436	2,490	2,540	2,623	2,564	2,736	2,564
Wednesday	3,555	2,717	2,799	3,111	2,942	3,116	3,138	3,002	3,116	3,311
Thursday	4,279	3,436	3,571	3,426	3,961	3,992	3,872	3,893	3,912	3,607
Friday	5,861	4,977	5,131	5,339	5,398	6,017	5,774	5,558	5,492	5,319
Saturday	9,586	7,922	8,014	8,249	8,338	8,994	9,612	8,633	8,358	8,271
Total	36,847	30,402	30,923	31,380	32,422	34,575	35,034	33,532	33,163	32,266

Note: Some incidents occur close to midnight, with the result that, for example, the arrest and criminal offense occurs prior to midnight on one day, while the civil law violation occurs just after midnight, the following day. In these cases, the date of the incident is assigned to the earlier of the two days.

# INCIDENTS IN MINNESOTA ON RECORD, BY GENDER OF VIOLATOR, 1990 and 1995-2003

	Year of Incident									
Gender	1990	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Female	6,146	5,447	5,444	5,812	6,125	6,504	6,788	6,539	6,568	6,515
Male	29,353	23,321	23,858	23,978	24,497	25,932	25,864	24,566	23,954	23,004
Not Stated	1,348	1,634	1,621	1,590	1,800	2,139	2,382	2,427	2,641	2,747
Total	36,847	30,402	30,923	31,380	32,422	34,575	35,034	33,532	33,163	32,266

Note: (1) The above table corrects an error in the prior version of this report that overcounted the number of females. (2) The above table makes it appear that the number of violators for whom gender is not stated is increasing over time. This is not so. If a person arrested for DWI does not have a Minnesota driving record, one is

created showing name and date of birth, but not gender. As years pass, many such persons do subsequently obtain a Minnesota driver license, causing gender to eventually be entered on record. The above table merely takes advantage of information available in 2004 to categorize the gender of persons arrested since 1990.

#### **TABLE 1.05**

# INCIDENTS IN MINNESOTA ON RECORD, BY AGE OF VIOLATOR AT TIME OF INCIDENT, 1990 and 1995-2003

					Year of I	ncident				
Age	1990	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
0-14	4	1	3	4	2	4	4	1	7	3
15	19	20	11	18	17	18	10	15	12	21
16	183	115	138	106	105	116	127	121	123	117
17	454	241	304	279	301	290	330	276	306	280
18	986	518	617	639	679	744	710	643	659	692
19	1,342	724	800	768	890	1,002	991	924	862	914
20	1,480	813	833	894	929	1,046	1,116	1,042	1,100	1,069
0-20	4,468	2432	2706	2708	2923	3,220	3,288	3,022	3,069	3,096
0-14	4	1	3	4	2	4	4	1	7	3
15-19	2,984	1,618	1,870	1,810	1,992	2,170	2,168	1,979	1,962	2,024
20-24	8,280	5,877	5,806	5,816	6,256	7,403	7,776	7,912	8,148	8,209
25-29	8,543	5,549	5,593	5,727	5,600	5,853	5,859	5,457	5,287	5,411
30-34	6,406	5,844	5,459	5,082	4,905	4,915	4,831	4,573	4,374	4,004
35-39	4,073	4,554	4,791	4,974	5,224	5,254	5,116	4,438	4,054	3,632
40-44	2,627	3,046	3,180	3,355	3,637	3,853	3,944	3,910	3,880	3,650
45-49	1,489	1,742	1,927	2,112	2,258	2,370	2,485	2,462	2,502	2,465
50-54	993	956	1,010	1,169	1,155	1,330	1,399	1,457	1,454	1,378
55-59	591	553	595	621	676	671	694	651	752	754
60-64	422	324	318	341	339	404	372	338	358	381
65-69	239	185	214	206	195	192	194	192	197	188
70-74	126	92	97	97	103	96	119	100	105	97
75-79	52	43	43	50	56	45	54	43	60	47
80-84	15	17	16	14	18	12	18	14	18	19
85 +	3	00	1	1	1	3	00	4	5	1
Not Stated	0	1	0	1	5	0	1	1	0	3
Total	36,847	30,402	30,923	31,380	32,422	34,575	35,034	33,532	33,163	32,266

# INCIDENTS IN MINNESOTA ON RECORD, BY LOCATION WHERE INCIDENT OCCURRED, 1990 and 1995-2003

	Year of Incident									
Area of State	1990	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Twin City Metro Area	20,685	15,716	15,952	16,153	16,722	17,144	16,821	16,347	16,208	16,000
Minn Non-Metro Area	16,162	14,686	14,971	15,227	15,700	17,431	18,213	17,185	16,955	16,266
Total	36,847	30,402	30,923	31,380	32,422	34,575	35,034	33,532	33,163	32,266

#### **TABLE 1.07**

# INCIDENTS IN MINNESOTA ON RECORD, BY COUNTY WHERE INCIDENT OCCURRED, 1990 and 1995-2003

					Ye	ar				
County	1990	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Aitkin	59	106	88	121	204	205	222	233	245	199
Anoka	2,454	1,660	1,590	1,522	1,661	2,080	2,172	1,867	1,711	1,708
Becker	266	375	341	336	349	412	541	418	465	334
Beltrami	377	342	277	295	340	337	383	403	447	432
Benton	158	185	191	183	176	249	259	242	266	273
Big Stone	23	20	27	21	23	19	15	31	40	40
Blue Earth	456	322	412	467	501	464	552	592	596	595
Brown	173	122	131	120	106	151	168	139	151	192
Carlton	178	235	266	284	263	237	271	301	307	312
Carver	379	312	311	276	315	289	255	308	337	341
Cass	146	160	181	195	230	266	250	235	245	193
Chippewa	41	41	38	31	47	70	68	80	97	107
Chisago	353	225	275	318	321	353	312	367	301	321
Clay	618	657	608	506	547	528	608	534	564	615
Clearwater	84	91	88	105	133	145	101	85	72	66
Cook	40	53	66	38	64	72	74	72	64	62
Cottonwood	68	46	40	46	42	56	53	41	61	57
Crow Wing	496	509	541	514	525	466	519	468	414	431
Dakota	2,744	2,184	2,264	2,297	2,646	2,543	2,635	2,756	2,775	2,522
Dodge	93	62	107	72	80	88	120	168	149	98
Douglas	202	199	230	209	185	219	254	254	231	213
Faribault	91	45	57	69	108	107	109	100	106	67
Fillmore	175	137	110	131	123	127	141	142	145	103
Freeborn	300	218	269	265	293	300	285	303	279	224
Goodhue	515	341	318	322	235	314	350	344	298	298
Grant	48	24	26	23	28	28	27	22	32	46

# TABLE 1.07, Continued

# INCIDENTS IN MINNESOTA ON RECORD, BY COUNTY WHERE INCIDENT OCCURRED, 1990 and 1995-2003

					Y	ear				
County	1990	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Hennepin	9,608	7,317	7,281	7,399	7,207	7,332	6,857	6,439	6,669	7,086
Houston	214	122	111	114	103	174	181	208	162	136
Hubbard	134	75	107	95	113	158	154	121	142	139
Isanti	168	209	205	190	180	276	194	172	162	158
Itasca	301	290	297	334	326	359	366	293	272	236
Jackson	53	63	58	54	49	64	69	63	47	43
Kanabec	145	105	121	94	84	108	170	112	103	101
Kandiyohi	414	236	283	281	229	264	274	275	286	245
Kittson	44	26	25	20	33	34	21	11	11	21
Koochiching	218	94	97	98	131	127	106	87	124	96
Lac Qui Parle	22	7	6	14	10	25	33	18	32	27
Lake	50	40	35	56	49	55	66	40	49	43
Lake of the Woods	29	30	23	20	29	52	30	32	26	75
Le Sueur	132	138	102	123	110	141	176	141	156	133
Lincoln	15	17	14	14	36	23	11	10	13	8
Lyon	231	213	210	169	157	217	186	233	174	182
McLeod	296	316	284	346	271	286	265	276	256	268
Mahnomen	83	81	77	137	136	150	122	121	129	108
Marshall	34	32	27	29	33	29	33	34	36	38
Martin	111	96	101	127	131	130	150	135	150	142
Meeker	182	156	143	144	161	172	131	91	115	86
Mille Lacs	161	229	301	257	256	320	411	354	302	251
Morrison	251	197	191	206	212	204	249	219	195	182
Mower	219	208	197	225	304	384	376	352	344	345
Murray	90	47	44	61	67	43	29	35	41	39
Nicollet	143	145	159	177	175	206	263	307	351	287
Nobles	143	206	161	161	141	153	186	150	182	183
Norman	49	48	52	29	41	47	26	27	49	23
Olmsted	753	502	448	569	667	831	855	828	802	695
Otter Tail	301	288	342	296	270	349	321	343	322	342
Pennington	110	131	129	127	98	103	118	116	117	89
Pine	141	220	295	327	245	207	253	283	234	250
Pipestone	109	64	69	58	87	59	74	71	46	42
Polk	325	299	306	301	342	330	316	310	298	309
Pope	74	70	67	49	46	83	79	95	79	67
Ramsey	3,364	2,377	2,451	2,734	2,791	2,656	2,867	2,856	2,659	2,330
Red Lake	37	15	2,131	2,731	23	34	36	46	43	41
Redwood	84	71	105	69	82	85	50 79	72	83	79
Renville	76	172	139	112	106	114	87	83	101	108
Rice	476	363	372	400	430	460	532	451	415	418
Rock	41 154	29 06	47	35	31	39	45 129	27	42	59 115
Roseau		96	98	92	100	88		111	128	115
St. Louis	1,067	1,258	1,225	1,333	1,446	1,659	1,661	1,465	1,447	1,330
Scott	769	531	539	542	604	776	698	745	664	683

# TABLE 1.07, Continued

# INCIDENTS IN MINNESOTA ON RECORD, BY COUNTY WHERE INCIDENT OCCURRED, 1990 and 1995-2003

	Year									
County	1990	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Sherburne	461	473	418	391	424	448	471	372	396	386
Sibley	70	112	127	108	118	123	107	136	121	100
Stearns	1,006	807	874	832	763	802	1,033	893	773	937
Steele	191	177	163	212	214	282	251	220	175	191
Stevens	66	45	31	36	30	30	40	31	37	52
Swift	49	49	53	70	83	61	48	53	44	59
Todd	180	159	151	188	184	149	158	144	153	112
Traverse	16	22	26	19	27	20	24	35	33	19
Wabasha	141	110	131	162	165	207	216	151	163	186
Wadena	76	62	72	85	84	88	81	90	71	105
Waseca	149	117	126	130	107	148	116	129	123	143
Washington	1,367	1,335	1,516	1,383	1,498	1,468	1,337	1,376	1,393	1,330
Watonwan	79	94	124	95	87	70	52	98	87	76
Wilkin	37	52	40	59	29	68	66	80	71	71
Winona	337	343	321	305	325	409	385	329	406	360
Wright	600	443	452	415	507	563	525	545	580	570
Yellow Medicine	64	102	94	83	90	108	95	87	81	82
Total	36,847	30,402	30,923	31,380	32,422	34,575	35,034	33,532	33,163	32,266

## INCIDENTS IN MINNESOTA ON RECORD, BY TOTAL NUMBER OF INCIDENTS ON VIOLATOR'S RECORD Part I: 1990 - 1996

	<u>1990</u>		<u>1991</u>		<u>1992</u>		<u>1993</u>		<u>1994</u>		<u>1995</u>		<u>1996</u>	
Number														
on	Num-	Per-												
Record	ber	cent												
1	20,967	56.9	17,910	55.2	16,640	54.0	16,089	53.5	15,931	53.6	16,512	54.3	16,858	54.5
2	7,793	21.1	6,984	21.5	6,734	21.8	6,487	21.6	6,464	21.7	6,598	21.7	6,550	21.8
3	4,085	11.1	3,831	11.8	3,654	11.8	3,584	11.9	3,519	11.8	3,529	11.6	3,657	11.8
4	1,926	5.2	1,786	5.5	1,799	5.8	1,882	6.3	1,826	6.1	1,763	5.8	1,750	5.7
5	970	2.6	866	2.7	887	2.9	887	2.9	898	3.0	867	2.9	916	3.0
6	455	1.2	450	1.4	480	1.6	473	1.6	467	1.6	474	1.6	498	0.8
7	291	0.8	244	0.8	262	0.8	270	0.9	277	0.9	257	0.8	259	0.6
8	137	0.4	135	0.4	146	0.5	157	0.5	135	0.5	162	0.5	176	0.3
9	101	0.3	88	0.3	99	0.3	111	0.4	73	0.2	85	0.3	93	0.2
10	47	0.1	49	0.2	50	0.2	59	0.2	66	0.2	58	0.2	51	0.1
11	33	0.1	26	0.1	35	0.1	32	0.1	26	0.1	31	0.1	47	*
12	18	*	20	0.1	20	0.1	16	0.1	26	0.1	17	0.1	29	*
13	12	*	18	0.1	12	*	11	*	14	*	12	*	14	*
14	2	*	12	*	10	*	8	*	11	*	10	*	7	*
15	5	*	4	*	7	*	14	*	6	*	6	*	5	*
16	2	*	5	*	3	*	5	*	4	*	11	*	2	*
17	3	*	2	*	1	*	2	*	3	*	5	*	5	*
18	0	*	0	*	1	*	1	*	2	*	2	*	4	*
19	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	1	*	2	*
20	0	*	0	*	1	*	0	*	0	*	1	*	0	*
21	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	1	*	0	*
22	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*
23	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*
-														
Total	36,847	100.0	32,430	100.0	30,841	100.0	30,089	100.0	29,748	100.0	30,402	100.0	30,923	100.0

Note: This table above tabulates incidents, not persons. Thus, for example, a single driver who incurred a first incident in January 1992, a second incident in June 1992, and then a third in December 1993, will be counted twice in the 1992 column (once in the first row and once in the second row) and then once in the 1993 column (in the third row). Also note that prior incidents may have beenn other states. For example, a person counted in row 5 of the 1990 column incurred a fifth incident in Minnesota in 1990, but the prior four incidents may have been in any state. An asterisk (\*) indicates a percentage value of less than one-tenth of one percent.

#### TABLE 1.08 (Continued)

### INCIDENTS IN MINNESOTA ON RECORD, BY TOTAL NUMBER OF INCIDENTS ON VIOLATOR'S RECORD Part II: 1997 – 2003

	<u>1997</u> <u>199</u>		<u>998 1999</u>			<u>200</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2001</u>		<u>200</u>	2	<u>200</u>	<u>3</u>	
Number														
on	Num-	Per-	Num-	Per-	Num-	Per-	Num-	Per-	Num-	Per-	Num-	Per-	Num-	Per-
Record	ber	cent	ber	cent	ber	cent	ber	cent	ber	cent	ber	cent	ber	cent
1	17,258	55.0	18,232	56.2	19,684	56.9	20,304	58.0	19,473		19,580	59.0	· ·	59.5
2	6,713	21.4	6,764	20.9	7,455	21.6	7,445	21.3	7,117	21.2	7,035	21.2	6,886	21.3
3	3,554	11.3	3,505	10.8	3,668	10.6	3,566	10.2	3,438	10.3	3,249	9.8	3,134	9.7
4	1,799	5.7	1,861	5.7	1,782	5.2	1,727	4.9	1,670	5.0	1,574	4.7	1,494	4.6
5	885	2.8	891	2.7	848	2.5	870	2.5	789	2.4	733	2.2	630	2.0
6	470	1.5	474	1.5	444	1.3	449	1.3	422	1.3	393	1.2	395	1.2
7	267	0.9	274	0.8	252	0.7	241	0.7	246	0.7	235	0.7	218	0.7
8	153	0.5	177	0.5	171	0.5	158	0.5	119	0.4	111	0.3	127	0.4
9	108	0.3	89	0.3	101	0.3	95	0.3	81	0.2	89	0.3	68	0.2
10	63	0.2	57	0.2	57	0.2	60	0.2	70	0.2	46	0.1	33	0.1
11	43	0.1	31	0.1	42	0.1	39	0.1	38	0.1	34	0.1	30	0.1
12	18	0.1	22	0.1	27	0.1	31	0.1	18	0.1	25	0.1	26	0.1
13	22	0.1	5	*	13	*	15	*	19	0.1	23	0.1	9	*
14	8	*	19	0.1	10	*	6	*	12	*	12	*	9	*
15	6	*	6	*	11	*	7	*	6	*	11	*	8	*
16	4	*	6	*	4	*	8	*	5	*	3	*	3	*
17	2	*	3	*	4	*	3	*	3	*	6	*	3	*
18	3	*	2	*	1	*	3	*	2	*	1	*	1	*
19	1	*	1	*	1	*	4	*	0	*	0	*	0	*
20	2	*	1	*	0	*	1	*	3	*	0	*	1	*
21	1	*	1	*	0	*	2	*	0	*	1	*	1	*
22	0	*	1	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	2	*	0	*
23	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	1	*	0	*	1	*
Total	31,380	100.0	32,422	100.0	34,575	100.0	35,034	100.0	33,532	100.0	33,163	100.0	32,266	100.0

Note: This table above tabulates incidents, not persons. Thus, for example, a single driver who incurred a first incident in January 1992, a second incident in June 1992, and then a third in December 1993, will be counted twice in the 1992 column (once in the first row and once in the second row) and then once in the 1993 column (in the third row). Also note

that prior incidents may have been in other states. For example, a person counted in row 5 of the 1990 column incurred a fifth incident in Minnesota in 1990, but the prior four incidents may have been in any state. An asterisk (\*) indicates a percentage value of less than one-tenth of one percent.

### **II. IMPAIRED DRIVING CRIMINAL CONVICTION RATES**

There are reasons to be cautious in taking the statistics reported in this section at face value. An offense might lead to a conviction but *not be counted* as such. In general, this could be due either to (1) reporting errors, or (2) the conviction having occurred after the date when the data used to compile these statistics were extracted from the state driver license files.

#### **Timing of conviction**

To take the second issue first: Conviction rates for 2003 were calculated using data available on November 24, 2004 -- almost 11months after the end of the 2003 calendar year. However, it sometimes takes longer than that to adjudicate the criminal charge. This is more true for the more serious charges, such as the higher level impaired driving offenses.

#### **Reporting errors**

The second reason a conviction might not get counted is because errors occur. The court clerk may fail to accurately record a plea, or a verdict, or a judge's sentence. The Court Administrator's office may not accurately transmit notice of the conviction to the Department of Public Safety. The Department of Public Safety may not accurately record the conviction on the person's driving record. The procedures that underlie the charging, prosecuting, adjudicating, and recording of impaired driving offenses are complex enough that there are numerous opportunities for failures throughout the system. The objective in reporting the statistics here is to assist in identifying possible failures so they can be corrected.

# Examples of why a conviction may not get counted

Hypothetically, if a county had 21 incidents committed by fourth-or-subsequent-time violators in 2003 and driving records show that only 10 of the incidents resulted in a conviction for some type of impaired driving offense, then the conviction rate is 10 out of 21, or 47.6%. There was no conviction recorded on the driver license files for 11 of the incidents. Imagine that John Smith committed one of those 11 incidents. This means that Smith was stopped. He took and failed, or he refused to take, the implied consent test, thus incurring an implied consent violation and triggering the impaired driving incident to be posted on his driving record.

Here are some reasons why a conviction might be *not* reported.

(1) Smith got convicted on an impaired driving charge, but not until after the November 24 date on which statistics were based.

(2) Smith was convicted, but the judge stayed adjudication of the conviction on condition that Smith conform to various requirements. Since adjudication was stayed, the conviction is held in abeyance and not transmitted to the Department of Public Safety.

(3) In addition to impaired driving, John Smith had a felony charge for transporting methamphetamines. He pled guilty to the felony offense and was sentenced to five years in prison and a fine of \$5,000. The county attorney waived the DWI misdemeanor offense.

(4) John Smith failed to make his court appearance. A warrant is issued for his arrest. He has not been convicted, but he almost certainly will be, once he is picked up.

(5) The judge stayed imposition of the sentence on condition that John Smith conform to various requirements. The court clerk accidentally recorded the stay of imposition as a stay of adjudication, causing the Court Administrator's office to not forward the conviction notice to the Department of Public Safety.

(6) John Smith was convicted of some impaired driving offense, but the Court Administrator's office did not report the conviction to the Department of Public Safety, or reported it in an incorrect manner that caused the report to be rejected.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Department of Public Safety returns incomplete or incorrect reports to the Court Administrator's Office with a request for a completed or corrected report.

(7) John Smith was convicted and the Department of Public Safety was properly notified of the conviction but mistakenly entered the impaired driving conviction as a conviction for some other type of violation (e.g., use of vehicle for purposes of prostitution).

#### How the Conviction Rate is Calculated

The conviction rate is expressed merely as a percent: out of 100 incidents, what number resulted in a conviction for any type of impaired driving offense. Two issues require explanation: (1) how prior violations are counted, and (2) the circumstance that the conviction rate is not a measure of how much plea bargaining may be occurring.

#### **1.** Counting prior violations

Table 5.02 has separate columns for firstthrough fourth-or-subsequent-time violators. The violators who committed the incidents were put into these categories based on a *lifetime* lookback period,<sup>2</sup> not a *ten-year* lookback period. The current statute MS169A defines impaired driving offense levels in terms of certain aggravating factors. Prior incidents *in the last ten years* is one type of aggravating factor.<sup>3</sup> (Each prior incident augments the count of aggravating factors.) If a ten-year lookback period had been used, there would have been slightly more incidents counted into the "first-time violators" column and slightly fewer counted into the secondthrough fourth-or-subsequent-time columns.

#### 2. Not measuring plea-bargaining

People are concerned with how much plea bargaining takes place in impaired driving cases. The conviction rates are not good measures of plea bargaining, however. Plea bargains take two forms. First, as an example, a prosecutor initially charges the violator with an offense at one level (e.g., firstdegree impaired driving) and then accepts a guilty plea to a lesser offense (e.g., second-, third-, or fourth-degree impaired driving, or reckless driving, or speeding, etc.). The second form of bargaining is actually sentence-bargaining: the prosecutor agrees to accept a sentence less than the one normally imposed for the offense on which the violator was convicted. For example, John Smith pleads guilty to gross misdemeanor impaired driving but gets a misdemeanor impaired driving sentence.

The conviction rates do not measure the extent of plea bargaining or sentence bargaining. They only tell, for all the incidents that occurred, how many of them resulted in *some* kind of impaired driving conviction. It cannot be known from the driver license files (1) if the conviction was for a lesser offense than the one initially charged, or (2) what the sentence was.

# Conviction rates vary more by county than by judicial district

The state is divided into ten judicial districts. Ramsey County is District 2, Hennepin County is District 4. The other 8 districts encompass from 7 to 17 counties that are geographically close together. Conviction rates vary less by district than by county. Across districts, the range in 2003 for incidents at all levels was from 74% to 87%. For counties, the range was 70% (setting aside Lincoln County which had only 4 convictions, but there were 8 incidents) to 90%. In all, in 2003, seven counties had conviction rates below 75%: Freeborn and Mower, in District 3, Hennepin (District 4), Cottonwood and Lincoln (in District 5), and Pine and Washington (in District 10).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The term "lifetime" lookback period may be misleading. Currently, if a second impaired driving incident occurs, then all impaired driving incidents are kept on record permanently. A single incident may be deleted from a driving record if fifteen years pass without a second incident. However, driver license records are not systematically purged, causing many one-time incidents to be kept longer than 15 years. (For practical purposes, this means that if a person is in their forties, for example, and had a single impaired driving incident when they were in their teens or twenties, then that incident may or may not be purged from their driving record.)

 $<sup>^{3}</sup>$  The other two aggravating factors are (1) presence of children in the vehicle, and (2) having an alcohol concentration of .20 or higher.

# **TABLE 2.01**

# CONVICTION RATE (as of late November, 2004), BY JUDICIAL DISTRICT,

		2000			2001		2002			2003			
	All	Con-	Con	All	Con-	Con	All	Con-	Con	All	Con-	Con	
District	Inci-	vic-	vict.	Inci-	vic-	vict.	Inci-	vic-	vict.	Inci-	vic-	vict.	
and County	dents	tions	Rate	dents	tions	Rate	dents	tions	Rate	dents	tions	Rate	
Judicial Dist 1	255	226	00 (0)	200	071	00.00/	227	265	70 (0)	241	275	20 60/	
CARVER	255	226	88.6%	308	271	88.0%	337	265	78.6%	341	275	80.6%	
DAKOTA	2,635	2,045	77.6%	2,756	2,135	77.5%	2,775	2,178	78.5%	2,522	1,953	77.4%	
GOODHUE	350	289	82.6%	344	278	80.8%	298	255	85.6%	298	261	87.6%	
LESUEUR	176	153	86.9%	141	121	85.8%	156	124	79.5%	133	105	78.9%	
MCLEOD	265	215 635	81.1%	276 745	223 664	80.8%	256 664	221 590	86.3%	268	232 583	86.6%	
SCOTT	698 107	99	91.0% 92.5%		124	89.1%	121	107	88.9% 88.4%	683	385 83	85.4%	
SIBLEY SUBTOTAL		3,662	92.5% 81.6%	136 4,706	3,816	91.2% 81.1%	4,607	3,740	88.4% 81.2%	100		83.0% 80.4%	
SUBIUIAL	4,486	5,002	81.0%	4,700	5,810	01.1%	4,007	5,740	01.2%	4,345	3,492	80.4%	
Judicial Dist 2													
RAMSEY	2,867	2,264	79.0%	2,856	2,278	79.8%	2,659	2,116	79.6%	2,330	1,868	80.2%	
Judicial Dist 3													
Dodge	120	104	86.7%	168	150	89.3%	149	128	85.9%	98	78	79.6%	
FILLMORE	141	121	85.8%	142	132	93.0%	145	133	91.7%	103	84	81.6%	
FREEBORN	285	236	82.8%	303	243	80.2%	279	224	80.3%	224	157	70.1%	
HOUSTON	181	153	84.5%	208	182	87.5%	162	139	85.8%	136	121	89.0%	
MOWER	376	309	82.2%	352	265	75.3%	344	245	71.2%	345	250	72.5%	
Olmsted	855	795	93.0%	828	767	92.6%	802	749	93.4%	695	633	91.1%	
RICE	532	435	81.8%	451	370	82.0%	415	328	79.0%	418	346	82.8%	
STEELE	251	217	86.5%	220	179	81.4%	175	126	72.0%	191	157	82.2%	
WABASHA	216	185	85.6%	151	141	93.4%	163	152	93.3%	186	160	86.0%	
WASECA	116	106	91.4%	129	115	89.1%	123	107	87.0%	143	117	81.8%	
WINONA	385	343	89.1%	329	301	91.5%	406	357	87.9%	360	300	83.3%	
SUBTOTAL	3,458	3,004	86.9%	3,281	2,845	86.7%	3,163	2,688	85.0%	2,899	2,403	82.9%	
Judicial Dist 4													
HENNEPIN	6,857	5,257	76.7%	6,439	4,993	77.5%	6,669	5,147	77.2%	7,086	5,252	74.1%	
	ŕ	,		,	ŗ		,	,			,		
Judicial Dist 5													
BLUE EARTH	552	470	85.1%	592	484	81.8%	596	500	83.9%	595	488	82.0%	
BROWN	168	162	96.4%	139	130	93.5%	151	139	92.1%	192	167	87.0%	
COTTONWOOD	53	48	90.6%	41	35	85.4%	61	51	83.6%	57	42	73.7%	
Faribault	109	87	79.8%	100	87	87.0%	106	82	77.4%	67	51	76.1%	
JACKSON	69	58	84.1%	63	51	81.0%	47	37	78.7%	43	30	69.8%	
LINCOLN	11	10	90.9%	10	9	90.0%	13	10	76.9%	8	4	50.0%	
LYON	186	163	87.6%	233	203	87.1%	174	149	85.6%	182	151	83.0%	
MARTIN	150	132	88.0%	135	116	85.9%	150	130	86.7%	142	127	89.4%	
MURRAY	29	22	75.9%	35	27	77.1%	41	36	87.8%	39	34	87.2%	
NICOLLET	263	236	89.7%	307	252	82.1%	351	269	76.6%	287	222	77.4%	
NOBLES	186	146	78.5%	150	118	78.7%	182	154	84.6%	183	144	78.7%	
PIPESTONE	74	58	78.4%	71	55	77.5%	46	41	89.1%	42	33	78.6%	
Redwood	79	67	84.8%	72	68	94.4%	83	73	88.0%	79	69	87.3%	
Rock	45	41	91.1%	27	25	92.6%	42	33	78.6%	59	52	88.1%	
WATONWAN	52	46	88.5%	98	82	83.7%	87	74	85.1%	76	64	84.2%	
SUBTOTAL	2,026	1,746	86.2%	2,073	1,742	84.0%	2,130	1,778	83.5%	2,051	1,678	81.8%	

# AND COUNTY IN MINNESOTA, 2000-2004

# TABLE 2.01 (Continued)

# CONVICTION RATE (as of late November, 2004), BY JUDICIAL DISTRICT,

		2000			2001		2002			2003			
	All	Con-	Con	All	Con-	Con	All	Con-	Con	All	Con-	Con	
District	Inci-	vic-	vict.	Inci-	vic-	vict.	Inci-	vic-	vict.	Inci-	vic-	vict.	
and County	dents	tions	Rate	dents	tions	Rate	dents	tions	Rate	dents	tions	Rate	
Judicial Dist 6	071	240	01 50/	201	270	00 40/	207	074	00.20	212	0.00	04.00/	
CARLTON	271	248	91.5%	301	278	92.4%	307	274	89.3%	312	263	84.3%	
Соок	74	65	87.8%	72	64	88.9%	64	58	90.6%	62	54	87.1%	
LAKE	66	61	92.4%	40	38	95.0%	49	43	87.8%	43	37	86.0%	
ST. LOUIS	1,661	1,421	85.6%	1,465	1,282	87.5%	1,447	1,247	86.2%	1,330	1172	88.1%	
SUBTOTAL	2,072	1,795	86.6%	1,878	1,662	88.5%	1,867	1,622	86.9%	1,747	1526	87.3%	
Judicial Dist 7													
BECKER	541	503	93.0%	418	378	90.4%	465	416	89.5%	334	293	87.7%	
BENTON	259	228	88.0%	242	203	83.9%	266	238	89.5%	273	235	86.1%	
CLAY	608	556	91.4%	534	485	90.8%	564	501	88.8%	615	542	88.1%	
DOUGLAS	254	240	94.5%	254	237	93.3%	231	218	94.4%	213	185	86.9%	
MILLE LACS	411	364	88.6%	354	312	88.1%	302	266	88.1%	251	207	82.5%	
MORRISON	249	212	85.1%	219	190	86.8%	195	168	86.2%	182	146	80.2%	
OTTER TAIL	321	295	91.9%	343	314	91.5%	322	292	90.7%	342	300	87.7%	
STEARNS	1,033	889	86.1%	893	779	87.2%	773	691	89.4%	937	803	85.7%	
Todd	158	142	89.9%	144	126	87.5%	153	129	84.3%	112	95	84.8%	
WADENA	81	70	86.4%	90	84	93.3%	71	62	87.3%	105	94	89.5%	
SUBTOTAL	3,915	3,499	89.5%	3,491	3,108	89.0%	3,342	2,981	89.2%	3,364	2900	86.2%	
Judicial Dist 8													
BIG STONE	15	15	100%	31	29	93.5%	40	31	77.5%	40	36	90.0%	
CHIPPEWA	68	63	92.6%	80	29 75	93.3% 93.8%	40 97	88	90.7%	107	96	90.0% 89.7%	
GRANT	27	25	92.6%	22	22	100%	32	30	93.8%	46	39	84.8%	
KANDIYOHI	274	232	84.7%	275	237	86.2%	286	245	85.7%	245	202	82.4%	
LAC QUI PARLE	33	31	93.9%	18	15	83.3%	32	245	81.3%	243	202	82.4 <i>%</i> 77.8%	
MEEKER	131	121	92.4%	91	82	90.1%	115	102	88.7%	86	78	90.7%	
POPE	79	70	88.6%	95	84	88.4%	79	72	91.1%	67	61	91.0%	
Renville	87	78	89.7%	83	72	86.7%	101	87	86.1%	108	89	82.4%	
STEVENS	40	37	92.5%	31	25	80.6%	37	36	97.3%	52	47	90.4%	
SWIFT	48	38	79.2%	53	43	81.1%	44	35	79.5%	59	51	86.4%	
TRAVERSE	24	17	70.8%	35	33	94.3%	33	25	75.8%	19	16	84.2%	
WILKIN	66	64	97.0%	80	70	87.5%	71	65	91.5%	71	62	87.3%	
YELLOW MED	95	89	93.7%	87	84	96.6%	81	71	87.7%	82	74	90.2%	
SUBTOTAL	987	880	89.2%	981	871	88.8%	1048	913	87.1%	1,009	872	86.4%	
Indicial Dist 0													
Judicial Dist 9	222	198	89.2%	233	206	88.4%	245	222	90.6%	199	172	86.4%	
Aitkin Beltrami	383	357	93.2%	403	200 379	88.4 <i>%</i> 94.0%	243 447	409	90.0% 91.5%	432	397	80.4% 91.9%	
CASS	250	213	85.2%	235	206	87.7%	245	224	91.4%	193	170	88.1%	
CLEARWATER	101	92	91.1%	85	200	94.1%	72	63	87.5%	66	61	92.4%	
CROW WING	519	92 457	91.1% 88.1%	468	398	94.1% 85.0%	414	353	87.3%	431	365	92.4% 84.7%	
HUBBARD	154	136	88.3%	121	398 97	80.2%	142	116	83.3% 81.7%	139	303 97	69.8%	
ITASCA	366	347	94.8%	293	284	96.9%	272	255	93.8%	236	221	93.6%	
KITTSON	21	17	94.8% 81.0%	11	204 10	90.9% 90.9%	11	233 7	93.8% 63.6%	230	18	93.0% 85.7%	
KOOCHICHING	106	97	91.5%		73	83.9%	11	105	84.7%	21 96	77	80.2%	
ROOCHICHING	100	)	1.570	07	15	05.770	124	105	0-1.770	70	//	00.270	
							I						

# AND COUNTY IN MINNESOTA, 2000-2004

## TABLE 2.01

# CONVICTION RATE (as of late November, 2004), BY JUDICIAL DISTRICT,

		2000			2001			2002		2003		
	All	Con-	Con									
District	Inci-	vic-	vict.									
and County	dents	tions	Rate									
Judicial Dist. 9												
(Cont.inued)												
LAKE OF WDS	30	27	90.0%	32	26	81.3%	26	23	88.5%	75	67	89.3%
MAHNOMEN	122	97	79.5%	121	105	86.8%	129	113	87.6%	108	84	77.8%
MARSHALL	33	32	97.0%	34	30	88.2%	36	35	97.2%	38	34	89.5%
NORMAN	26	22	84.6%	27	23	85.2%	49	42	85.7%	23	21	91.3%
PENNINGTON	118	107	90.7%	116	108	93.1%	117	96	82.1%	89	75	84.3%
Polk	316	300	94.9%	310	284	91.6%	298	268	89.9%	309	277	89.6%
RED LAKE	36	33	91.7%	46	44	95.7%	43	37	86.0%	41	38	92.7%
ROSEAU	129	116	89.9%	111	97	87.4%	128	102	79.7%	115	94	81.7%
SUBTOTAL	2,932	2,648	90.3%	2,733	2,450	89.6%	2,798	2,470	88.3%	2,611	2,268	86.9%
Judicial Dist 10												
Anoka	2,172	1832	84.3%	1,867	1,604	85.9%	1,711	1,450	84.7%	1,708	1,451	85.0%
CHISAGO	312	277	88.8%	367	311	84.7%	301	265	88.0%	321	276	86.0%
ISANTI	194	179	92.3%	172	159	92.4%	162	137	84.6%	158	134	84.8%
KANABEC	170	149	87.6%	112	100	89.3%	103	88	85.4%	101	92	91.1%
Pine	253	193	76.3%	283	215	76.0%	234	177	75.6%	250	180	72.0%
Sherburne	471	433	91.9%	372	340	91.4%	396	357	90.2%	386	346	89.6%
WASHINGTON	1,337	1,013	75.8%	1,376	1,028	74.7%	1,393	1,027	73.7%	1,330	980	73.7%
WRIGHT	525	461	87.8%	545	459	84.2%	580	491	84.7%	570	492	86.3%
SUBTOTAL	5,434	4,537	83.5%	5,094	4,216	82.8%	4,880	3,992	81.8%	4,824	3,951	81.9%
Total For												
Minnesota	35,034	29,292	83.6%	33,532	27,981	83.4%	33,163	27,447	82.8%	32,266	26,210	81.2%

# AND COUNTY IN MINNESOTA, 2000-2004

#### NOTE:

(1) There is no restriction on the "lookback" period in counting prior violations. For example, a second-time violator could have incurred his or her first violation 12 years, or 1 week, prior to the second violation.

(2) Caution regarding interpreting table: The data compiled here reflect convictions received as of November 24,2004.

However, new information is constantly added to driver license records. Also, as offense level increases, violators face stiffer penalties and have more incentive to fight conviction through legal procedures. The conviction rates will therefore increase as time passes.

# **TABLE 2.02**

# YEAR 2003 CONVICTION RATE (as of late November, 2004)

# BY OFFENSE LEVEL, JUDICIAL DISTRICT, AND COUNTY IN MINNESOTA

	ALL			1 <sup>st</sup> -time			2 <sup>nd</sup> -TIME			3 <sup>rd</sup> -TIME			4 <sup>TH</sup> + TIME		1E
	VIC	OLATOI	RS	VIOLATORS				OLATO			OLATO			DLATO	
	All	Con-	Con-	All	Con-	Con-	All	Con-	Con-	All	Con-	Con-	All	Con-	Con-
District	Inci-	vic-	vict.	Inci-	vic-	vict.	Inci-	vic-	vict.	Inci-	vic-	vict.	Inci-	vic-	vict.
and County	dents	tions	Rate	dents	tions	Rate	dents	tions	Rate	dents	tions	Rate	dents	tions	Rate
Judicial Dist 1															
CARVER	341	275	80.6%	208	171	82.2%	82	67	81.7%	26	20	76.9%	25	17	68.0%
Дакота	2,522		77.4%	1,559		71.8%	561		85.7%	218		91.3%	184		83.7%
GOODHUE	298		87.6%	175		86.3%	58		91.4%	37		94.6%	28		78.6%
LeSueur	133		78.9%	74		77.0%	27		88.9%	18		83.3%	14		64.3%
MCLEOD	268	232	86.6%	164	139	84.8%	50	44	88.0%	32	29	90.6%	22	20	90.9%
SCOTT	683	583	85.4%	400	327	81.8%	142	127	89.4%	74	69	93.2%	67	60	89.6%
SIBLEY	100	83	83.0%	56	44	78.6%	25	23	92.0%	12	9	75.0%	7	7	100%
SUBTOTAL	4,345	3,492	80.4%	2,636	2,008	76.2%	945	819	86.7%	417	376	90.2%	347	289	83.3%
Judicial Dist 2															
RAMSEY	2,330	1,868	80.2%	1,394	1,036	74.3%	484	425	87.8%	242	219	90.5%	210	188	89.5%
L															
Judicial Dist 3	09	70	70.60/	50	15	77 (0)	17	10	70 (0)	0	0	1000/	14	10	95 70/
DODGE	98		79.6%	58		77.6%	17		70.6%	9 12			14 16		85.7%
FILLMORE	103 224		81.6% 70.1%	55 145		81.8% 68.3%	20 36	27	85.0% 75.0%	12		75.0% 73.3%	28		81.3% 71.4%
FREEBORN HOUSTON	136		89.0%	86		87.2%	26		96.2%	13		85.7%	10		90.0%
MOWER	345		72.5%	211		73.5%	65		90.2% 69.2%	37		73.0%	32		90.0% 71.9%
OLMSTED	695		91.1%	425		90.8%	151		91.4%	57		96.5%	62		87.1%
RICE	418		82.8%	248		78.6%	90		85.6%	43		95.3%	37		89.2%
STEELE	191		82.2%	104		79.8%	51		86.3%	20		85.0%	16		81.3%
WABASHA	186		86.0%	114		84.2%	31		83.9%	20	21	100%	20		85.0%
WASECA	143		81.8%	77		81.8%	35		80.0%	20		75.0%	11		100%
WINONA	360		83.3%	250		81.2%	63		87.3%	29		89.7%	18		88.9%
SUBTOTAL	2,899		82.9%	1,773		81.5%	585		84.4%	277		87.8%	264		83.7%
	,	,		,	,										
Judicial Dist 4															
HENEPIN	7,086	5,252	74.1%	4,476	3,029	67.7%	1,430	1,233	86.2%	608	511	84.0%	572	479	83.7%
Judicial Dist 5															
BLUE EARTH	595		82.0%	376		81.6%	137		80.3%	47		89.4%	35		82.9%
BROWN	192		87.0%	122		91.0%	42		76.2%	20		85.0%	8		87.5%
COTTONWOOD	57		73.7%	38		81.6%	14		57.1%	2	1		3		66.7%
FARIBAULT	67		76.1%	40		72.5%	15		73.3%	6	6	100%	6		83.3%
JACKSON	43		69.8%	28		67.9%	11		72.7%	2		100%	2		50.0%
LINCOLN	192		50.0%	4		50.0%	4		50.0%	0	0		0	0	
LYON	182		83.0%	136		83.8%	29		82.8%	10		80.0%	7		71.4%
Martin Murray	142 39		89.4% 87.2%	91 24		87.9% 87.5%	30 10	10	90.0% 100%	11 2		90.9% 50.0%	10 3		100% 66.7%
	287		77.4%	192		71.4%	58		86.2%	24		95.8%	13		92.3%
Nicollet Nobles	183		78.7%	192		75.4%	30		90.0%	15		95.8% 86.7%	4		92.3% 75.0%
PIPESTONE	42		78.6%	27		77.8%	6		83.3%	13		50.0%	7		85.7%
REDWOOD	79		87.3%	43		93.0%	19		89.5%	7		57.1%	10		80.0%
ROCK	59		88.1%	43		85.4%	9		100%	5		100%	4		75.0%
WATONWAN	76		84.2%	40		85.0%	19		73.7%	11		90.9%	6		100%
SUBTOTAL	2,051			1,336		81.0%			81.8%			87.2%	118		83.9%
~~~~~	,001	-,5.5	22.075	-,225	-,502	22.075		201	22.075		0	<b>_</b> ,5			

# TABLE 2.02 (Continued)

# YEAR 2003 CONVICTION RATE (as of late November, 2004)

# BY OFFENSE LEVEL, JUDICIAL DISTRICT, AND COUNTY IN MINNESOTA

	ALL			1 <sup>st</sup> -TIME			2 <sup>nd</sup> -TIME			3 <sup>rd</sup> -time			4 <sup>TH</sup> + TIME		ſE
	VIOLATORS		VIOLATORS				OLATO			OLATO			OLATC		
	All	Con-	Con-	All	Con-	Con-	All	Con-	Con-	All	Con-	Con-	All	Con-	Con-
District	Inci-	vic-	vict.	Inci-	vic-	vict.	Inci-	vic-	vict.	Inci-	vic-	vict.	Inci-	vic-	vict.
and County	dents	tions	Rate	dents	tions	Rate	dents	tions	Rate	dents	tions	Rate	dents	tions	Rate
Judicial Dist 6															
CARLTON	312	263	84.3%	153	124	81.0%	73	66	90.4%	41	36	87.8%	45	37	82.2%
Соок	62		87.1%	42		88.1%	11	9		3	3	100%	-5		83.3%
LAKE	43		86.0%	24		87.5%	11		72.7%	7	7	100%	1		100%
ST. LOUIS	1,330		88.1%	748		86.6%	292		92.5%	137	123	89.8%	153		85.6%
SUBTOTAL	1,747		87.3%	967		85.8%	387		91.2%	188	169		205		84.9%
Judicial Dist 7															
BECKER	334	293	87.7%	182	164	90.1%	65	56	86.2%	43	36	83.7%	44	37	84.1%
BENTON	273	235	86.1%	153	125	81.7%	57	53	93.0%	30	30	100%	33	27	81.8%
CLAY	615	542	88.1%	417	371	89.0%	117	104	88.9%	38	33	86.8%	43	34	79.1%
DOUGLAS	213		86.9%	122		91.0%	44	37	84.1%	20	18	90.0%	27	19	70.4%
MILLE LACS	251		82.5%	115		83.5%	44		77.3%	37		81.1%	55	47	85.5%
MORRISON	182		80.2%	94		79.8%	47		87.2%	19		84.2%	22		63.6%
OTTER TAIL	342		87.7%	188	167	88.8%	73	65	89.0%	35		97.1%	46		73.9%
STEARNS	937		85.7%	575		85.6%	201		87.6%	86		86.0%	75		81.3%
Todd	112		84.8%	61		80.3%	30		96.7%	6		83.3%	15		80.0%
WADENA	105		89.5%	56		83.9%	30	30	100%	7	7	100%	12		83.3%
SUBTOTAL	3,364	2,900	86.2%	1,963	1,697	86.4%	708	625	88.3%	321	283	88.2%	372	295	79.3%
Judicial Dist 8															
BIG STONE	40	36	90.0%	24	22	91.7%	9	7	77.8%	5	5	100%	2	2	100%
CHIPPEWA	107		89.7%	60	52	86.7%	28	27	96.4%	11	10	90.9%	8	7	87.5%
GRANT	46	39	84.8%	30	25	83.3%	8	6	75.0%	3	3	100%	5	5	100%
KANDIYOHI	245		82.4%	155		80.0%	52		82.7%	16	15	93.8%	22		90.9%
LAC QUI PARLE	27		77.8%	19		78.9%	4		50.0%	1	1	100%	3		100%
MEEKER	86		90.7%	43		86.0%	19	19	100%	15		93.3%	9		88.9%
POPE	67		91.0%	36		91.7%	13	13	100%	6	6	100%	12		75.0%
RENVILLE	108		82.4%	49		87.8%	31		77.4%	13		84.6%	15		73.3%
STEVENS	52		90.4%	40		90.0%	10		90.0%	1	1	100%	1		100%
SWIFT	59		86.4%	31		80.6%	13	11		8	8	100%	7		100%
TRAVERSE	19		84.2% 87.3%	11		81.8%	3		66.7%	3	3	100%	2		100%
WILKIN Vel Low Med	71 82		87.3% 90.2%	47 57		85.1% 94.7%	15 13	15	100% 92.3%	4	4 5	100% 55.6%	5 3		60.0% 100%
YELLOW MED SUBTOTAL	1,009		90.2% 86.4%	602		94.7% 85.5%	218		92.3% 87.2%	95		90.5%	94		86.2%
Sebient	1,007	072	00.470	002	515	05.570	210	170	07.270	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	00	10.570	74	01	00.270
Judicial Dist 9	100	170	06 40/	102	00	07 40/	47	41	07.00/	24	0.1	07.50	25	20	00.00/
AITKIN	199		86.4%	103		87.4%	47		87.2%	24		87.5%	25		80.0%
BELTRAMI	432		91.9%	233		93.1%	94		93.6%	56		87.5%	49		87.8%
CASS	193		88.1%	81		91.4%	55		87.3%	17		88.2%	40		82.5%
CLEARWATER	66		92.4%	23		91.3%	16		87.5%	10	10	100%	17		94.1%
CROW WING	431		84.7%	221		86.0%	107		82.2%	45		84.4%	58		84.5%
HUBBARD	139		69.8% 93.6%	68		80.9%	32		71.9%	21		52.4%	18		44.4%
ITASCA KITTSON	236 21		93.6% 85.7%	131		95.4% 84.6%	47 4		91.5% 100%	20 1	16 0	80.0% 0.0%	38 3		97.4% 100%
KITISON KOOCHICHING	96		83.7% 80.2%	13 58		84.0% 79.3%			83.3%			0.0% 85.7%	13		76.9%
NUUCHICHING	90	//	00.270	50	40	17.570	10	15	05.570	/	0	05.170	15	10	10.970

# TABLE 2.02 (Continued)

# YEAR 2003 CONVICTION RATE (as of late November, 2004)

### BY OFFENSE LEVEL, JUDICIAL DISTRICT, AND COUNTY IN MINNESOTA

	ALL			1 <sup>st</sup> -time			2 <sup>nd</sup> -TIME			3 <sup>rd</sup> -TIME			4 <sup>th</sup> + TIME		1E
	VIC	OLATO	RS	VIC	OLATO	RS	VI	OLATO	RS	VI	OLATO	RS	VIC	<b>DLATO</b>	RS
	All	Con-	Con-	All	Con-	Con-	All	Con-	Con-	All	Con-	Con-	All	Con-	Con-
District	Inci-	vic-	vict.	Inci-	vic-	vict.	Inci-	vic-	vict.	Inci-	vic-	vict.	Inci-	vic-	vict.
and County	dents	tions	Rate	dents	tions	Rate	dents	tions	Rate	dents	tions	Rate	dents	tions	Rate
Judicial Dist 9															
(Continued)															
LAKE OF WDS	75		89.3%	42		88.1%	14		92.9%	7	7	100%	12	10	83.3%
MAHNOMEN	108		77.8%	31		74.2%	29	26	89.7%	19	15	78.9%	29	20	69.0%
MARSHALL	38	34	89.5%	15	14	93.3%	8	7	87.5%	4	3	75.0%	11	10	90.9%
Norman	23	21	91.3%	14	12	85.7%	4	4	100%	3	3	100%	2	2	100%
PENNINGTON	89	75	84.3%	42	34	81.0%	21	19	90.5%	7	5	71.4%	19	17	89.5%
Polk	309	277	89.6%	173	151	87.3%	70	67	95.7%	30	28	93.3%	36	31	86.1%
RED LAKE	41	38	92.7%	27	26	96.3%	6	6	100%	4	4	100%	4	2	50.0%
Roseau	115	94	81.7%	71	53	74.6%	25	24	96.0%	8	6	75.0%	11	11	100%
SUBTOTAL	2,611	2,268	86.9%	1,346	1,179	87.6%	597	530	88.8%	283	237	83.4%	385	322	83.6%
Judicial Dist 10															
Anoka	1,708	1,451	85.0%	963	761	79.0%	380	357	93.9%	190	176	92.6%	175	157	89.7%
CHISAGO	321	276	86.0%	171	151	88.3%	58	47	81.0%	54	44	81.5%	38	34	89.5%
ISANTI	158	134	84.8%	77	68	88.3%	40	36	90.0%	15	12	80.0%	26	18	69.2%
KANABEC	101	92	91.1%	51	47	92.2%	19	17	89.5%	12	11	91.7%	19	17	89.5%
Pine	250	180	72.0%	117	83	70.9%	72	56	77.8%	29	16	55.2%	32	25	78.1%
Sherburne	386	346	89.6%	201	182	90.5%	83	74	89.2%	50	45	90.0%	52	45	86.5%
WASHINGTON	1,330	980	73.7%	795	528	66.4%	304	259	85.2%	135	118	87.4%	96	75	78.1%
WRIGHT	570	492	86.3%	321	270	84.1%	143	131	91.6%	54	48	88.9%	52	43	82.7%
SUBTOTAL	4,824	3,951	81.9%	2,696	2,090	77.5%	1,099	977	88.9%	539	470	87.2%	490	414	84.5%
Total for Minnesota	32,266	26,210	81.2%	19,189	14,911	77.7%	6,886	6,000	87.1%	3,134	2,737	87.3%	3,057	2,562	83.8%

#### NOTE:

(1) There is no restriction on the "lookback" period in counting prior violations. For example, a second-time violator could have incurred his or her first violation 12 years, or 1 week, prior to the second violation.

(2) Caution regarding interpreting table: The data compiled here reflect convictions received as of November 24,2004.

However, new information is constantly added to driver license records. Also, as offense level increases, violators face stiffer penalties and have more incentive to fight conviction through legal procedures. The conviction rates will therefore increase as time passes.

# **III. PERSONS WITH IMPAIRED DRIVING INCIDENTS ON RECORD**

This section reports statistics on Minnesota's total population, the population of licensed drivers, and the number of drivers who have impaired driving incidents on record.

#### A single incident may be deleted after 15 years

Currently, if a person incurs a second incident while a first is still on record, then all incidents are kept permanently on record. Thus, if a person has one and only one incident, that incident may be purged from the record. The rules for when it may be purged have changed over time. The current practice is to keep a single incident for at least 15 years. The practical effect of the purging process is that the number of persons shown to have two or more incidents on record will be close to the true number of people who ever accumulated two or more incidents, while the number shown to have only one incident will understate the true number of people who ever incurred a single incident. For example, there are probably many people who incurred a single incident when they were young, but never incurred a second one, causing the single one to be purged from their driving record.

#### Baby boom and baby-boom echo

Persons in their twenties are the most likely to drink and drive. The large baby boom generation is now well beyond this high-offender age group: In 2000, Minnesota had 14% fewer 20-to-34 year-olds, but 43% more 40-to-54 year-olds, than in 1990. However, the children of the baby boom generation (the baby-boom echo) are entering the high-risk age group. There were almost 84,000 (28%) more 15-to-19 year-olds in 2000 than in 1990. Thus, the demographic structure of the population makes an increase in the number of young, first-time impaired driving offenders predictable.

#### 1 in 10 drivers have an incident on record

In all, 427,849 Minnesota residents have one or more impaired driving incidents on their driving record. On average, that's 8.4%, or 1 in 12, of the state's

residents (using 2003 estimated population). Many residents are too young to drive, of course. Out of the population of persons on whom there is a driving record, 1 in 9 (11.3%) have one or more incidents on record; 1 in 20 (4.9%) have two or more, and 1 in 43 (2.3%) have three or more.

#### **Counties vary**

As noted, 8.4% of the population have an incident on record. There is variation by county. The ten counties with the highest percentages are: Aitkin, Becker, Beltrami, Cass, Clearwater, Kanabec, Mahnomen, Mille Lacs, Pennington, and Pine -mostly north and west of the Twin Cities. The ten counties with the lowest percentages are Big Stone, Cottonwood, Carver, Lac Qui Parle, Lincoln, Murray, Olmsted, Rock, and Stevens -- mostly south and west of the Twin Cities. Reasons for the variation might include: prevalence of chemical dependency problems in the population, strictness of enforcement of DWI laws, whether the county is in a vacation, or recreational, area of the state.

#### Most offenders have one incident

There is a perception that so much of the drinkingdriving problem is concentrated in a fairly small subset of the population whose members are chemically dependent and who drink and drive over and over again. There is definitely evidence to support such a perception. Forty-three percent of the 427,849 people in the state with incidents on record have two or more incidents on record. Some have an amazing number of incidents: 1,030 people have ten or more. The record is now 23 incidents. Still, it is possible the perception distracts attention from the reality that most violators do not have prior incidents on record. Fifty-seven percent have only one incident. (As noted earlier, this understates the true number since a single incident may be purged from the record after 15 years.)

#### **TABLE 3.01**

	1	990 Census		20	00 Census		2005 Projected					
Age	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total			
0-4	172,055	164,745	336,800	168,829	160,765	329,594	172,800	165,100	337,900			
5-9	177,049	168,791	345,840	182,912	172,982	355,894	179,600	171,100	350,700			
10-14	160,702	152,595	313,297	192,118	182,877	374,995	189,500	179,400	368,900			
15-19	151,359	146,250	297,609	191,534	182,828	374,362	195,700	186,400	382,100			
20-24	157,244	158,802	316,046	164,038	158,445	322,483	190,900	187,400	378,300			
25-29	190,480	191,279	381,759	162,132	157,694	319,826	179,400	171,100	350,500			
30-34	199,447	198,537	397,984	178,502	174,810	353,312	175,300	167,600	342,900			
35-39	182,163	179,111	361,274	207,962	204,528	412,490	185,800	180,200	366,000			
40-44	152,870	151,940	304,810	207,355	204,337	411,692	210,700	205,900	416,600			
45-49	118,342	118,708	237,050	183,801	180,446	364,247	206,500	204,000	410,500			
50-54	94,635	96,775	191,410	150,750	150,699	301,449	181,400	179,100	360,500			
55-59	85,014	88,052	173,066	112,203	114,654	226,857	147,200	147,700	294,900			
60-64	82,224	88,996	171,220	86,648	91,364	178,012	106,500	110,400	216,900			
65-69	74,123	85,913	160,036	72,707	80,462	153,169	79,300	86,900	166,200			
70-74	58,161	76,325	134,486	64,646	78,010	142,656	63,900	74,900	138,800			
75-79	43,312	65,121	108,433	51,709	70,968	122,677	53,100	69,800	122,900			
80-84	26,525	48,619	75,144	33,477	56,686	90,163	37,700	59,300	97,000			
85+	19,478	49,357	68,835	24,308	61,293	85,601	28,100	67,300	95,400			
Total	2,145,183	2,229,916	4,375,099	2,435,631	2,483,848	4,919,479	2,583,400	2,613,600	5,197,000			

# POPULATION OF MINNESOTA BY AGE AND GENDER

Source: United State Census and Office of Minnesota State Demographer (for 2005 projected population).

Age	1990	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
15	12,832	20,660	24,783	27,514	24,610	23,483	28,479	27,878	28,880	29,800
16	42,885	52,205	54,657	55,564	50,028	21,981	55,792	56,361	55,286	55,614
17	48,496	57,426	60,864	61,052	60,389	38,214	60,724	62,068	63,011	61,329
18	52,070	58,307	61,788	63,711	64,337	60,177	65,830	64,963	66,876	67,491
19	58,230	57,139	61,058	63,460	66,023	67,779	68,697	69,232	68,609	69,792
20	63,375	56,902	58,964	61,875	64,484	67,816	69,306	70,351	70,985	69,385
Under 21	277,888	302,639	322,114	333,176	329,871	279,450	348,828	350,853	353,647	353,411
15 - 19	214,513	245,737	263,150	271,301	265,387	211,634	279,522	280,502	282,662	284,026
20 - 24	316,504	283,027	284,532	291,004	302,019	316,452	327,545	339,486	352,022	352,818
25 - 29	372,178	331,259	330,844	325,020	318,360	316,642	310,399	309,079	320,420	326,355
30 - 34	398,645	381,403	368,340	356,278	347,382	346,159	347,932	344,952	343,933	333,363
35 - 39	364,385	402,366	407,794	407,334	405,914	401,755	391,515	377,905	366,661	354,509
40 - 44	316,265	364,629	373,405	381,214	389,126	398,519	405,043	408,621	411,413	408,428
45 - 49	234,494	313,384	323,114	330,259	340,673	352,585	362,105	368,930	379,702	386,086
50 - 54	189,266	230,114	248,979	260,406	273,059	290,428	306,566	316,321	325,664	335,331
55 - 59	164,023	183,763	191,853	201,963	210,483	218,555	222,828	238,022	252,631	264,204
60 - 64	159,799	156,652	158,537	160,789	165,519	170,263	174,735	180,723	192,074	200,322
65 - 69	148,161	149,004	148,228	146,590	144,903	145,284	145,334	146,107	149,272	154,103
70 - 74	122,965	132,842	134,127	133,750	134,081	134,225	133,774	133,205	132,368	131,255
75 - 79	92,378	103,558	107,144	107,838	108,977	111,888	112,404	111,876	113,370	114,350
80 - 84	55,000	68,506	71,501	71,267	73,848	76,147	76,888	78,351	80,361	82,681
85 +	29,915	42,107	44,957	42,757	46,310	51,903	52,854	51,419	54,940	60,348

Total 3,178,491 3,388,351 3,456,505 3,487,770 3,526,041 3,542,439 3,649,444 3,685,499 3,757,493 3,788,179

Source: Department of Public Safety, Driver and Vehicle Service Division. Note: Counts of licensed drivers include drivers who hold learner's permits.

# MINNESOTA RESIDENTS WITH IMPAIRED DRIVING INCIDENTS ON RECORD BY AGE AT DATE OF LAST INCIDENT AND AGE AT END OF YEAR 2003

Age	Age at D	ate of Last I	ncident Inc	urred	A	ge at End of	f Year 2003	
Group			Not				Not	
	Female	Male	Stated	Total	Female	Male	Stated	Total
0-14	13	20	15	48	0	1	6	7
15-19	5,773	19,344	652	25,769	504	1,764	179	2,447
20-24	18,312	72,695	2,080	93,087	4,902	17,719	1,132	23,753
25-29	15,054	63,031	1,751	79,836	7,397	29,943	1,502	38,842
30-34	13,564	50,132	1,316	65,012	10,564	39,150	1,469	51,183
35-39	11,906	41,489	1,032	54,427	14,641	49,338	1,166	65,145
40-44	8,721	31,780	708	41,209	17,398	58,521	1,169	77,088
45-49	5,170	21,776	388	27,334	11,630	45,977	751	58,358
50-54	2,632	14,121	184	16,937	6,865	31,794	433	39,092
55-59	1,430	9,054	94	10,578	4,100	20,627	226	24,953
60-64	831	5,800	67	6,698	2,530	13,216	136	15,882
65-69	401	3,459	33	3,893	1,459	8,968	72	10,499
70-74	205	1,722	16	1,943	942	6,610	47	7,599
75-79	73	703	5	781	596	5,130	37	5,763
80-84	18	227	4	249	349	3,344	12	3,705
85 +	4	36	2	42	230	3,287	10	3,527
Unknown	0	1	5	6	0	1	5	6
Total	84,107	335,390	8,352	427,849	84,107	335,390	8,352	427,849

Note:

Gender is not stated for many persons. When a person applies for a driver license, gender is entered on the record. If a person is arrested for impaired

driving and does not have a driver license, then a record is created but gender is not entered on that record.

# POPULATION OF MINNESOTA AND NUMBER OF RESIDENTS WITH IMPAIRED DRIVING INCIDENTS ON RECORD AS OF END OF 2003, BY COUNTY

	<u>Popul</u> 2000	<u>ation</u> 2003	Any In	nts with cidents <u>ecord</u> as % of	1 In	ents with cident <u>Record</u> as % of	2 Inc	nts with cidents <u>Record</u> as % of	Residen or Mor <u>dents or</u> Num-	re Inci-
County	Census	Estimate	ber	2003 Est	ber	2003 Est	ber	2003 Est	ber	2003 Est
Aitkin	15,301	15,810	1,729		936		386	2.4	407	
Anoka	298,084	313,197	28,615		15,582		6,709	2.1	6,324	
Becker	30,000	31,159	3,588		1,827		815	2.6	946	
Beltrami	39,650	41,607	4,481	10.8	2,440		1,034	2.5	1,007	
Benton	34,226	36,970	3,205	8.7	1,798		705	1.9	702	
Big Stone	5,820	5,648	370		209		101	1.8	60	
Blue Earth	55,941	57,435	5,023		2,798		1,215	2.1	1,010	
Brown	26,911	26,832	2,083	7.8	1,206		466	1.7	411	
Carlton	31,671	33,154	3,162		1,713		744	2.2	705	
Carver	70,205	78,444	5,752		3,441	4.4	1,302	1.7	1,009	
Cass	27,150	28,191	3,067		1,609		719	2.6	739	
Chippewa	13,088	12,827	996		579		211	1.6	206	
Chisago	41,101	46,472	4,844		2,647		1,180	2.5	1,017	
Clay Clearwater	51,229 8,423	51,934 8,390	4,634 1,013		2,702 476		1,064 237	2.0 2.8	868 300	
	,		,		277			2.8		
Cook Cottonwood	5,168	5,280	498 804		476		116 195		105 133	
Crow Wing	12,167 55,099	11,999 58,391	5,414		3,001	4.0 5.1	1,259	1.6 2.2	1,154	
Dakota	355,904	375,642	29,190		17,175		6,602	1.8	5,413	
Dodge	17,731	19,015	1,623		915		357	1.8	351	
Douglas	32,821	34,112	2,792		1,537		641	1.9	614	
Faribault	16,181	15,723	1,312		752		292	1.9	268	
Fillmore	21,122	21,294	1,765		970		424	2.0	371	
Freeborn	32,584	32,035	3,161	9.9	1,704		754	2.4	703	
Goodhue	44,127	45,183	4,061	9.0	2,261		995	2.2	805	
Grant	6,289	6,241	530		295		137	2.2	98	
Hennepin	1,116,200	1139,837	94,209		54,810		20,743	1.8	18,656	
Houston	19,718	19,965	1,750		1,034		381	1.9	335	
Hubbard	18,376	18,635	1,578		850		390	2.1	338	
Isanti	31,287	35,321	3,290		1,705		839	2.4	746	
Itasca	43,992	44,198	4,458		2,369		1,063	2.4	1,026	
Jackson	11,268	11,168	831	7.4	483		196	1.8	152	
Kanabec	14,996	15,831	1,676	10.6	817	5.2	400	2.5	459	2.9
Kandiyohi	41,203	41,288	3,594	8.7	1,979	4.8	883	2.1	732	
Kittson	5,285	4,958	369		188		90	1.8	91	1.8
Koochiching	14,355	13,986	1,335	9.5	723		331	2.4	281	
Lac Qui Parle	8,067	7,879	516		288		135	1.7	93	
Lake	11,058	11,160	826	7.4	450	4.0	228	2.0	148	1.3
Lake of theWoods	4,522	4,387	425	9.7	220	5.0	108	2.5	97	2.2
LeSeuer	25,426	26,664	2,586	9.7	1,445	5.4	577	2.2	564	2.1
Lincoln	6,429	6,171	377		223		85	1.4	69	
Lyon	25,425	25,000	2,063		1,234		440	1.8	389	
McLeod	34,898	35,872	3,363		1,930		764	2.1	669	
Mahnomen	5,190	5,108	815		380			3.8	243	
mannonnen	5,170	5,108	015	10.0	500	/.4	172	5.0	243	4.0

# TABLE 3.04 (Continued)

## POPULATION OF MINNESOTA AND NUMBER OF RESIDENTS WITH IMPAIRED DRIVING INCIDENTS ON RECORD AS OF END OF 2003, BY COUNTY

	<u>Popul</u> 2000	<u>ation</u> 2003	Any In	nts with cidents <u>ecord</u> as % of	1 In	ents with cident <u>Record</u> as % of	2 Inc	nts with idents <u>ecord</u> as % of	or Mo	nts with 3 ore Inci- <u>n Record</u> as % of
County	Census	Estimate	ber	2003 Est	ber	2003 Est	ber	2003 Est	ber	2003 Est
County	Census	Estimate	ber	2005 ESt	ber	2005 Est	ber	2005 ESt	ber	2003 Est
Marshall	10,155	9,979	784	7.9	425	4.3	183	1.8	176	1.8
Martin	21,802	21,228	1,773		425 995		408	1.8	370	1.8
Meeker	22,644	23,182	2,079		1,078		500	2.2	501	2.2
Mille Lacs	22,330	23,162	2,875		1,078		700	2.2	752	3.1
Morrison	31,712	32,618	2,937		1,615		682	2.1	640	2.0
Mower	38,603	38,909	3,489		1,870		866	2.2	753	1.9
Murray	9,165	8,995	617		382		126	1.4	109	1.2
Nicollet	29,771	30,881	2,368		1,373		566	1.8	429	1.4
Nobles	20,832	20,646	1,800		1,201		376	1.8	223	1.1
Norman	7,442	7,223	634		357		147	2.0	130	1.8
Olmsted	124,277	132,013	9,196		5,278		2,066	1.6	1,852	1.4
Otter Tail	57,159	58,785	4,829		2,587			2.0	1,075	1.8
Pennington	13,584	13,654	1,438		733		336	2.5	369	2.7
Pine	26,530	27,734	2,902		1,502		704	2.5	696	2.5
Pipestone	9,895	9,675	763		415		197	2.0	151	1.6
Polk	31,369	31,025	3,267		1,680			2.6	789	2.5
Pope	11,236	11,246	922		495		223	2.0	204	1.8
Ramsey	511,035	515,274	38,847	7.5	22,502		8,537	1.7	7,808	1.5
Red Lake	4,299	4,317	387		202		88	2.0	97	2.2
Redwood	16,815	16,317	1,223	7.5	727		257	1.6	239	1.5
Renville	17,154	16,864	1,544		876		378	2.2	290	1.7
Rice	56,665	59,749	5,166	8.6	2,912	4.9	1,152	1.9	1,102	1.8
Rock	9,721	9,651	543	5.6	344	3.6	115	1.2	84	0.9
Roseau	16,338	16,323	1,449	8.9	775	4.7	365	2.2	309	1.9
St. Louis	200,528	198,721	17,890	9.0	9,958	5.0	4,208	2.1	3,724	1.9
Scott	89,498	105,196	8,864	8.4	5,225	5.0	1,971	1.9	1,668	1.6
Sherburne	64,417	74,763	6,486	8.7	3,684	4.9	1,547	2.1	1,255	1.7
Sibley	15,356	15,366	1,391	9.1	784	5.1	330	2.1	277	1.8
Stearns	133,166	137,777	11,099	8.1	6,530	4.7	2,414	1.8	2,155	1.6
Steele	33,680	34,691	2,915		1,581		713	2.1	621	1.8
Stevens	10,053	9,957	523		301		119	1.2	103	1.0
Swift	11,956	11,698	908		499		219	1.9	190	1.6
Todd	24,426	24,315	2,049		1,131		503	2.1	415	1.7
Traverse	4,134	3,912	325		194		82	2.1	49	1.3
Wabasha	21,610	22,108	1,960		1,117		460	2.1	383	1.7
Wadena	13,713	13,619	1,180		626		286	2.1	268	2.0
Waseca	19,526	19,451	1,659		947		389	2.0	323	1.7
Washington	201,130	213,395	15,291	7.2	9,073		3,437	1.6	2,781	1.3
Watonwan	11,876	11,683	1,036		590		251	2.1	195	1.7
Wilkin	7,138	6,951	586		334		153	2.2	99	1.4
Winona	49,985	49,674	3,733		2,275		863	1.7	595	1.2
Wright	89,986	103,010	9,403		5,190		2,216	2.2	1,997	1.9
Yellow Med	11,080	10,764	946	8.8	532	4.9	223	2.1	191	1.8
Minnesota	4,919,479	5,088,006	427,849	8.4	242,772	4.8	97,826	1.9	87,251	1.7

#### PERSONS WITH IMPAIRED DRIVING INCIDENTS ON RECORD, BY AREA OF RESIDENCE, GENDER, AND NUMBER OF INCIDENTS ON RECORD AT END OF 2003

No. of Incidents	<u>Twi</u>	n CityN	Ietro A	rea	<u>N</u>	on- Me	tro Are	a	Total Minn.	<u>Oı</u>	ıtside N	/linneso	<u>ota</u>	Total
on	Fe-		Not	Sub	Fe-		Not	Sub-	Resi-	Fe-		Not		
Record	male	Male S	Stated	total	male	Male	Stated	total	dents	male	Male	Stated	Total	
1	32,924	88,427	3,477	124,828	25,527	83,002	3,586	112,115	· ·	7,880	· ·	16,754	51,673	288,616
2	9,168	41,352	354	50,874	7,418	42,046	528	49,992	100,866	1,565	8,793	'	11,970	112,836
3	3,266	21,098	103	24,467	2,621	21,676	141	24,438	48,905	435	3,682	342	4,459	53,364
4	1,144	9,823	29	10,996	974	10,111	53	11,138	22,134	111	1,459	108	1,678	23,812
5	367	4,313	14	4,694	310	4,300	24	4,634	9,328	33	582	29	644	9,972
6	141	2,048	5	2,194	100	2,092	9	2,201	4,395	17	243	18	278	4,673
7	54	1,115	1	1,170	37	1,088	8	1,133	2,303	3	125	7	135	2,438
8	18	613	4	635	11	578	4	593	1,228	1	63	3	67	1,295
9	6	353	2	361	11	345	3	359	720	0	37	2	39	759
10	2	219	2	223	2	170	3	175	398	1	16	3	20	418
11	2	117	0	119	1	108	0	109	228	0	12	1	13	241
12	1	78	0	79	1	61	0	62	141	1	12	0	13	154
13	0	46	0	46	1	38	1	40	86	0	5	1	6	92
14	0	27	0	27	0	29	0	29	56	0	0	0	0	56
15	0	19	0	19	0	20	0	20	39	0	4	0	4	43
16	0	15	1	16	0	10	0	10	26	0	0	1	1	27
17	0	9	0	9	0	16	0	16	25	0	0	0	0	25
18	0	5	0	5	0	8	0	8	13	0	0	0	0	13
19	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	3	4	0	1	0	1	5
20	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	2					2
21	0	2	0	2	0	4	0	4	6					6
22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					0
23	0	2	0	2	0	1	0	1	3					3
Total	47,093	169,683	3,992	220,768	37,014	165,707	4,360	207,081	427,849	10,047	42,073	18,881	71,001	498,850

Note:

(1)The above table classifies violators on current residence, as known at the time data are compiled from the drivers license files. Residence may be inaccurate since persons with impaired driving incidents may avoid notifying the Department of Public Safety of address changes.

(2) Incidents counted may have occurred in Minnesota or elsewhere. If a person moves to Minnesota from another state and applies for a driver license here, he or she will be included, and incidents incurred in Minnesota or elsewhere will be included.

(3) Gender is not stated for many persons. When a person applies for a driver license, gender is entered on the record. If a person is arrested for impaired driving and does not have a driver license, then a record is created but gender is not entered on that record.

# **IV. IMPAIRED DRIVING RECIDIVISM IN MINNESOTA**

Is it the case that a fairly small number of chronic, chemically-dependent offenders account for almost all the impaired driving violations that occur in a year? Or, are most of the offenders "firsttimers?" How many first-time violators are there? How many repeat violators (recidivists) are there? Among the repeat offenders, how many have one, two, three, and so on, prior violations?

This section answers these questions. But to be precise, three issues have to be dealt with: (1) what definition of "impaired driving incident" is used? (2) what is the "lookback period" over which prior incidents are counted? and (3) what is being counted - impaired driving incidents, or the persons who commit them?

#### (1) Defining an incident

An incident may be defined in a broader way as *either* an implied consent violation *or* an impaired driving conviction, or it may be defined in a narrower way, requiring that the incident must include a criminal conviction for impaired driving. The *ratio* of first-time violations to repeat violations is almost identical, but the number of incidents in 2003 is about 6,000 smaller when the narrower definition is used.

#### (2) Length of lookback period

The Minnesota Impaired Driving Code (MS 169A) defines impaired driving offenses as misdemeanors, gross misdemeanors, or felonies based in part on the number of prior incidents the person had over the preceding *ten-year* period. But a person may have had incidents before the ten-year time period.

Tables 4.01 and 4.02 show how many first-time and repeat violators there were under both a lifetime lookback period and a nine-to-ten-year lookback period.<sup>1</sup> The *total* numbers are the same, but there is a higher number and percentage of *first-time* violators when only the nine-to-ten-year lookback period is used.

#### (3) Counting incidents versus counting persons

Sometimes a person incurs more than one incident in a year. Table 4.01 counts *incidents* based on the total number of incidents on the person's record. Thus, if John Smith incurred his first-ever incident in January 2003, that incident will be counted in the row labeled "1." If he incurred a second one in February, 2003, that incident will be counted in the row labeled "2."

Table 4.02 counts *persons* who incurred incidents. In this table, if John Smith incurred his first incident in January and his second in February, he is counted just once in this table - based on the last incident - in the row labeled "2."

# Depending on the definitions used, 31% to 41% of violations are committed by recidivists

If a person arrested for a second or subsequent offense is a defined as a chronic offender, then, depending on other definitions used, 31% to 41% of incidents are committed by chronic offenders. Under the broader definition and using a lifetime look-back period, 41% (13,077) were committed by chronic offenders. Under the narrower definition and the 9-to-10 year lookback period, 31% (8,159) were committed by chronic offenders.

Taking a step back, one could say that well over half of all the impaired driving violations are committed by persons who do not have prior incidents on their record; that is, by novices. Since the repeat DWI offenders get so much attention, due to sometimes accumulating so many arrests and convictions, it is worthwhile to remember that the novice is the more typical offender.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> As an example of using a "nine-to-ten-year lookback period," the records of all violators who incurred incidents in 2003 were examined for the period from 1-1-1994 through 12-31-2003. Thus, the lookback period could be as short as 9 years and 1 day for a violator who incurred an incident on 1-1-2003, or as long as 10 years for a violator who incurred an incident on 12-31-2003.

### **TABLE 4.01**

### INCIDENTS THAT OCCURRED IN MINNESTOA IN 2003 BASED ON NUMBER OF INCIDENTS ON VIOLATOR'S RECORD

		0	n Incident Conviction		Defining an Incident as a DWI Con- viction or Implied Consent Violation									
	No Limit Look-Back		Nine-to-Ter Look-Back (Defined 1-1-9412-32	Period 1 as	No Limi Look-Back		Nine-to-Ten-Year Look-Back Period (Defined as 1-1-9412-31-2003)							
Number of Inci- dents on Record	number of inci- dents in 2003	Per- cent	number of inci- dents in 2003	Per cent	number of inci- dents in 2003	Per- cent	number of inci- dents in 2003	Per- cent						
1 2	16,068 5,689	61.3 21.7	18,051 5,836	68.9 22.3	19,189 6,886	59.5 21.3	21,727 7,263	67.3 22.5						
3	2,432	9.3	1,730	6.6	3,134	9.7	2,365	7.3						
4 5	1,014 424	3.9 1.6	427 107	1.6 0.4	1,494 630	4.6 2.0	614 185	1.9 0.6						
6	267	1.0	43	0.2	395	1.2	75	0.2						
7 8	146 66	0.6 0.3	13 2	0.1	218 127	0.7 0.4	23 10	0.1						
9	38	0.1	1	*	68	0.4	3	*						
10	20	0.1			33	0.1	1	*						
11	16	*			30	0.1								
12	9	*			26	0.1								
13	10	*			9	*								
14	3	*			9	*								
15	5	*			8	*								
16	2	*			3	*								
17	1	*			3	*								
18					1	*								
19					0									
20					1	*								
21					1	*		<u> </u>						
22 23					0 1	*								
Total incidents	26,210	100.0	26,210	100.0	32,266	100.0	32,266	100.0						

\* An asterisk is used for a percentage that is greater than zero but that, if shown, would round to 0.0%.

#### **TABLE 4.02**

## PERSONS WHO INCURRED INCIDENTS IN MINNESTOA IN 2003 BASED ON NUMBER OF INCIDENTS ON VIOLATOR'S RECORD

		0	n Incident Conviction		Defining an Incident as a DWI Corviction or Implied Consent Violation							
	No Limit Look-Back		Nine-to-Ter Look-Back (Defined 1-1-9412-31	Period 1 as	No Limi Look-Back	t on	Nine-to-Ter Look-Back (Defined 1-1-9412-3	n-Year Period I as				
Number of Inci- dents on	Persons who Incurred Incidents	Per-	Persons who Incurred Incidents	Per	Persons who Incurred Incidents	Per-	Persons who Incurred Incidents	Per-				
Record	in 2003	cent	in 2003	cent	in 2003	cent	in 2003	cent				
1 2	15,650 5,541	61.3 21.7	17,584 5,684	68.8 22.3	18,602 6,673	59.5 21.3	21,066 7,032	67.45 22.5				
3	2,386	9.3	1,699	6.7	3,050	9.8	2,303	7.4				
4	990	3.9	418	1.6	1,452	4.4	592	1.9				
5	414	1.6	105	0.4	613	2.0	179	0.6				
6	259	1.0	40	0.2	376	1.2	71	0.2				
7	144	0.6	13	0.1	209	0.7	20	0.1				
8	63	0.3	2	*	123	0.4	10	*				
9	36	0.1	0		65	0.2	3	*				
10	18	0.1	1	*	29	0.1	1	*				
11	16	0.1			26	0.1						
12	8	*			23	0.1						
13	10	*			9	*						
14	3	*			9	*						
15	5	*			8	*						
16	2	*			3	*						
17	1	*			3	*						
18					1	*						
19					0							
20					1	*						
21					1	*						
22					0							
23					1	*						
Total Persons	25,546	100.0	25,546	100.0	31,277	100.0	31,277	100.0				

\* An asterisk is used for a percentage that is greater than zero but that, if shown, would round to 0.0%.

# V. ALCOHOL-RELATED CRASH STATISTICS BY COUNTY

#### Crash statistics summarized for 1990 to 2003

In Minnesota, there is strong interest in crash statistics by county. This year, this section reports total and alcohol-related crash statistics by county for every year from 1990 through 2003.<sup>1</sup> In the future, statistics will only be provided for the most recent year.

#### Defining a traffic crash

State law requires that a crash be reported to the Department of Public Safety if it involved a death or injury, or if there was \$1,000 or more in property damage. Though it is not the normal case, the property damage involved doesn't have to be to vehicles. It might be to a road sign or to shrubbery, for example. It is unknown how many crashes occur that should be reported, but are not. Less severe crashes are easy to conceal; it is easy to speculate that there may be as many crashes that should be reported, but are not, as there are that do get reported.

#### Estimating alcohol involvement in crashes

This section uses a broader definition of "alcoholrelated" than might at first be assumed. In particular, an "alcohol-related" crash might not have involved a drunk driver. The definition used here is that if a pedestrian, bicyclist, or motor vehicle driver appeared to have any alcohol, then the crash is classified as "alcohol-related," and anyone who died or got injured in the crash is counted as an alcohol-related death or injury. So, if a pedestrian with only a .01% alcohol concentration stumbles in front of a sober driver and is struck and killed, the crash is defined to be alcoholrelated, and the death is an alcohol-related traffic fatality. However, such cases are not the rule. Most crashes classified as alcohol-related do involve motor vehicles drivers who consumed a considerable amount of alcohol.

# Alcohol involvement in less severe crashes is underestimated

Some numbers cited in this section represent conservative estimates. This is more true for non-fatal crashes. For fatal crashes, much effort is made to test as many drivers as possible for alcohol. The test results are used to supplement the officer's perception of possible alcohol involvement. For non-fatal crashes, the officer's judgment, noted on the crash report, is the only basis available to classify the crash as alcohol-related or not.

To test the effect of using only officer perception, compared to also having test result data available, fatal crashes in 2003 were classified as alcohol-related or not using both techniques. Using officer perception alone, 139 (21%) of the 655 fatalities were classified as alcohol-related. Using officer perception and test results together, 255 (39%) of the 655 fatalities were classified as alcohol-related.<sup>2</sup>

#### Crash numbers have stable magnitudes

The number of crashes that get reported has been stable, at around 100,00 per year, since 1980. About two-thirds involve only property damage and about one-third involve non-fatal injuries to one or more persons. About one-half of one percent (i.e., 500 to 600) of all reported crashes are fatal, causing death to one or more persons, and perhaps injury to other persons, as well.

# As crash severity increases, impairment is more likely to have played a role

Even allowing that alcohol involvement is underestimated in the less severe crashes, there is still a strong relationship between crash severity and impairment. In 2002, 4% of property damage crashes,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For the year 2003, however, crash statistics are only for fatal crashes. Information on non-fatal crashes is not available for year 2003.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> It would be incorrect though to infer that if alcohol test data were also available for non-fatal crashes then about twice as many of them would be classified as alcohol-related. That might be so. However, reporting and record-keeping on fatal crashes are handled differently than they are for non-fatal crashes. Thus, the patterns found in data on fatal crashes may not obtain for the non-fatal crashes.

10% of injury crashes, and 36% of fatal crashes were alcohol-related.

#### **County variation**

On average for the whole state in 2002, 6.0% of all crashes were alcohol-related. Counties in the northern and western part of the state (for example, Becker, Big Stone, Cass, Koochiching, Lake of the Woods, Marshall, Mahnomen, Pope, Red Lake, and Traverse) had a higher-than-average percentage, while counties in the metro and southern part (for example, Big Stone, Brown, Douglas, Hennepin, Lyon, Nicollet, Olmsted, Pipestone, and Steele) had a lower-thanaverage percentage. Kittson and Koochiching, in northern-most tier of counties, also had low percentages.

#### Cost of alcohol-related traffic crashes

This year, for the first time, this section includes a table (5.02) reporting the cost of alcohol-related crashes for each county for every year from 1990 through 2003. (In the future only the most recent year will be reported.) The figures reported are based on the estimated costs of traffic crashes, as provided annually by the National Safety Council.

There are two approaches to estimating traffic crash costs. The one used here attempts to quantify the direct economic costs. It has five components, as explained by the National Safety Council: (1) wage and productivity losses, including wages, fringe benefits, household production, (2) medical expenses, (3) administrative expenses, including insurance, police, and legal costs, (4) motor vehicle damage, and (5) employer costs for crashes involving workers.<sup>3</sup>

Using this approach, for example, the National Safety Council estimates costs for the 2002 calendar year as follows:

Death	\$1,090,000
Incapacitating (severe) injury	\$52,100
Non-incapacitating (moderate) injury	\$17,200
Possible (minor) injury	\$9,800
Property damage crash	\$6,200

The other approach estimates the "comprehensive costs" and attempts to include "a measure of the value of lost quality of life associated with the deaths and injuries, that is, what society is willing to pay to prevent them."<sup>4</sup> Using that approach yields the following cost estimates for the 2001 year:

Death	\$3,340,000
Incapacitating (severe) injury	\$165,000
Non-incapacitating (moderate) injury	\$42,500
Possible (minor) injury	\$20,200

As noted, Table 5.02 uses the more narrowly defined estimates based just on economic costs. The cost estimates are also quite conservative in another respect: they make no effort to include costs of crashes and injuries that were reported but that were not classified as alcohol-related, even though they were, and they make no attempt to estimate costs from alcohol-related crashes that were never reported at all. As noted earlier, crashes and injuries reported as alcohol-related are certain to underrepresent the true number, perhaps by as much as half.

For the 2002 calendar year, the total estimated cost of the crashes classified as alcohol-related was \$344,237,400.

page 41

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> National Safety Council, 2002: *Injury Facts*, 2002 *Edition*: page 91.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Ibid

TD A FE	TABLE 5.01 (For Year 1990) TRAFFIC CRASHES, FATALITIES, AND INJURIES TOTAL AND ALCOHOL-RELATED																					
	IC (	_NA5	пео	, ГАТ			UNTY :								HOL-	INCLA						
		TRAFFIC CRASHES													PERSONS KILLED OR INJURED							
	FAT	AL CRA	SHES	INJUR	Y CRAS	HES	PROPER ONLY	TY DA		TOTAI	CRAS	HES	]	KILLEI	D	IN	JURED	)				
COUNTY	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)				
AITKIN	3	2	66.7	86	17	19.8	171	12	7.0	260	31	11.9	3	2	66.7	121	23	19.0				
ANOKA	27	13	48.1	1693	247	14.6	-	188	5.8	4,938	448	9.1	30	15	50.0	2,576	384	14.9				
BECKER	5		80.0	179	43	24.0		21	7.5	465	68	14.6		4	80.0	267	73	27.3				
BELTRAMI	3		100.0	216	46	21.3		33	7.1	684	82	12.0	3	3	100.0	330	76	23.0				
BENTON BIG STONE	9 2		77.8 50.0	222 23	33 10	14.9 43.5	-	24 5	5.0 7.6	712 91	64 16	9.0 17.6	12 2	9 1	75.0 50.0	334 34	50 15	$15.0 \\ 44.1$				
BLUE EARTH	9		0.0	376	56	14.9		58	5.3	1,489	114	7.7	12	0	0.0	514	75	14.6				
BROWN	3		33.3	145	16	11.0	317	12	3.8	465	29	6.2			50.0	235	34	14.5				
CARLTON	7	4	57.1	163	35	21.5		23	6.3	535	62	11.6		5	62.5	249	56	22.5				
CARVER CASS	7	3	42.9	358	66	18.4		41	5.9	1,056	110	10.4	_	4	50.0	591	106	17.9				
CHIPPEWA	8 3		50.0 66.7	163 83	49 13	30.1 15.7	234 108	26 9	11.1 8.3	405 194	79 24	19.5 12.4	8	4 2	50.0 66.7	260 145	84 27	32.3 18.6				
CHISAGO	8		25.0	202	42	20.8		30	6.5	674	74	11.0		2	20.0	325	68	20.9				
CLAY	7	3	42.9	279	43	15.4	-	34	4.9	984	80	8.1	-	3	37.5	428	61	14.3				
CLEARWATE	1	0	0.0	47	10	21.3		7	10.8	113	17	15.0	2	0	0.0	74	17	23.0				
COOK COTTONWOOD	2		50.0	54	9	16.7		5	3.6	193	15	7.8		1	50.0	89	11	12.4				
CROW WING	1 10	1 2	100.0 20.0	77 333	12 57	15.6 17.1	94 642	3 51	3.2 7.9	172 985	16 110	9.3 11.2		1 4	100.0 30.8	110 535	14 84	12.7 15.7				
DAKOTA	22	11	50.0	1391	166	11.9	-	194	5.9	4,675	371	7.9		12	50.0	2.009	256	12.7				
DODGE	1	0	0.0	69	14	20.3		6	3.4	249	20	8.0		0	0.0	106	23	21.7				
DOUGLAS	8		25.0	240	32	13.3		20	3.7	795	54	6.8		2	22.2	377	51	13.5				
FARIBAULT FILLMORE	2		0.0	80	11	13.8		10	7.5	215	21	9.8		0 0	0.0	113	17 23	15.0				
FREEBORN	3		0.0 0.0	119 173	19 21	16.0 12.1	258 464	17 12	6.6 2.6	380 639	36 33	9.5 5.2		0	$\begin{array}{c} 0.0 \\ 0.0 \end{array}$	188 236	23 28	12.2 11.9				
GOODHUE	10	•	0.0	301	39	13.0	-	23	3.6	949	62	6.5		0	0.0	490	64	13.1				
GRANT	1	ŏ	0.0	24	6	25.0		2	3.1	90	8	8.9		Ő	0.0	38	7	18.4				
HENNEPIN	65		30.8	9236	1029	11.1	19,988	1,001	5.0	29,289	2050	7.0		21	31.3	12,638	1511	12.0				
HOUSTON HUBBARD	3		66.7	86	23	26.7		10	5.2	281	35	12.5	_	2	66.7	131	34	26.0				
ISANTI	4	3 1	75.0 50.0	113 173	30 31	26.5 17.9		19 23	12.2 5.9	273 563	52 55	19.0 9.8		3 1	75.0 50.0	180 277	54 50	$\begin{array}{c} 30.0\\ 18.1 \end{array}$				
ITASCA	13	4	30.8		61	20.9		40	9.7	719	105	14.6		6	31.6	450	96	21.3				
JACKSON	2	1	50.0			17.2		6	4.2	204	17	8.3			50.0	108	21	19.4				
KANABEC	3		66.7	87	16	18.4		13	8.7	239	31	13.0		2	66.7	151	28	18.5				
KANDIYOHING KITTSON	10		40.0	270	38	14.1		27	5.2	797	69	8.7		4	40.0	427	67	15.7				
KOOCHICHING	1	0 3	0.0 100.0	25 136	3 45	12.0 33.1	62 241	3 23	4.8 9.5	88 380	6 71	6.8 18.7		0 3	$\begin{array}{c} 0.0\\ 100.0\end{array}$	42 215	6 67	14.3 31.2				
LAC QUI PARLE	4		75.0	32	7	21.9		4	6.7	96	14	14.6			83.3	57	11	19.3				
LAKE	2	1	50.0	59	8	13.6	172	6	3.5	233	15	6.4	2	1	50.0	97	10	10.3				
LAKE OF THE W	0	-		22	1	4.5		1	1.4	92	2	2.2	0			36	4	11.1				
LE SUEUR LINCOLN	1 2	0 0	$\begin{array}{c} 0.0 \\ 0.0 \end{array}$	144 16	32 0	22.2 0.0		28 4	7.3 5.5	529 91	60 4	11.3 4.4		0 0	$\begin{array}{c} 0.0 \\ 0.0 \end{array}$	194 28	47 0	$24.2 \\ 0.0$				
LYON	2		50.0	10	20	16.7		4	5.5 1.7	364	25	4.4 6.9		1	50.0	172	31	18.0				
MCLEOD	2		50.0	196	38	19.4		17	3.5	679	56	8.2			66.7	327	67	20.5				
MAHNOMEN	2	1	50.0	30	11	36.7	29	3	10.3	61	15	24.6	2	1	50.0	61	18	29.5				
MARSHALL	3		66.7	59	15	25.4		6	6.2	159	23	14.5			66.7	90	23	25.6				
MARTIN MEEKER	1 0	$\begin{array}{c} 0\\ 0\end{array}$	0.0	145 130	18 20	12.4 15.4		20 15	8.0 4.5	397 463	38 35	9.6 7.6		0 0	0.0	220 183	22 32	$10.0 \\ 17.5$				
MILLE LACS	6		33.3	130	20 28	15.4		15	4.5 6.4	463	35 45	11.7		4	50.0	241	52 53	22.0				
MORRISON	10		60.0	163	31	19.0		35	11.5	478	72	15.1		6	54.5	264	54	20.5				
MOWER	3		66.7		27	14.3		24	4.6	716	53	7.4			66.7		38	13.4				

TRAFFIC (	FRAFFIC CRASHES, FATALITIES, AND INJURIES TOTAL AND ALCOHOL-RELATED BY COUNTY IN MINNESOTA, 1990																				
							UNTY ] C CRAS		INNI	ESOTA	A, 199	90	PERSONS KILLED OR INJURED								
	E A TE A		GUEG				PROPER			TOTAL	CDAG	HEG			D						
		AL CRA		INJURY				CRASI			L CRAS			KILLE			JURED				
COUNTY	All	Alco-	%	All	Alco-	%	All	Alco-	%	All	Alco-	%	All	Alco-	%	All	Alco-	%			
0001111		hol	Alc		hol	Alc		hol	Alc		hol	Alc		hol	Alc		hol	Alc			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)			
MURRAY	1	0	0.0	32	6	18.8	3 73	3	4.1	106	9	8.5	1	0	0.0	46	9	19.6			
NICOLLET	2	Ő	0.0	119	22	18.5		18	4.5	519	40	7.7	2		0.0	177	32	18.1			
NOBLES	2	0 0	0.0	92	10	10.9		13	5.3	338	23	6.8	2		0.0	143	14	9.8			
NORMAN	0	0		25	2	8.0		4	7.1	81	6	7.4	0			36	2	5.6			
OLMSTED	11	5	45.5	746	92	12.3		89	5.1	2,487	186	7.5	11		45.5	1,071	147	13.7			
OTTER TAIL	10	5	50.0	271	47	17.3	550	26	4.7	831	78	9.4	11	5	45.5	414	77	18.6			
PENNINGTON	0	0		114	18	15.8	174	5	2.9	288	23	8.0	0	0		149	24	16.1			
PINE	5	3	60.0	165	38	23.0		25	7.9	485	66	13.6			60.0	271	72	26.6			
PIPESTONE	2	0	0.0	55	12	21.8	3 126	5	4.0	183	17	9.3	3	-	0.0	82	18	22.0			
POLK	6	3	50.0	171	35	20.5		20	5.9	517	58	11.2	8		37.5	281	67	23.8			
POPE	2	1	50.0	39	14	35.9		5	4.9	144	20	13.9			50.0	59	17	28.8			
RAMSEY	29	17	58.6	3,998	4,59	11.5		561	5.4	14,494	1037	7.2	31		61.3	5,511	673	12.2			
RED LAKE REDWOOD	0	0	0.0	17 70	4	23.5	-	4	9.3	60	8 22	13.3	02		0.0	31	9 14	29.0			
RENVILLE	2 5	0	20.0	98	6 18	8.6 18.4		16 10	12.0 6.8	205 251	22 29	10.7 11.6	6		33.3	115 156	28	12.2 17.9			
RICE	7	2	20.0	326	51	15.6	-	37	5.0	1.068	<u></u> 90	8.4	9		33.3	484	72	17.9			
ROCK	2		28.0	49	9	18.4		3	2.0	200	12	6.0	2		0.0	484 68	10	14.9			
ROSEAU	3	1	33.3	68	10	14.7		1	0.6	230	12	5.2	3		33.3	99	10	12.1			
ST. LOUIS	19	6	31.6	1.144	2.12	18.5		176	7.2	3,620	394	10.9	19		31.6	1,657	327	19.7			
SCOTT	11	4	36.4	392	79	20.2		44	5.3	1,233	127	10.3	12		33.3	579	121	20.9			
SHERBURNE	7	4	57.1	283	48	17.0	526	26	4.9	816	78	9.6	8	5	62.5	484	79	16.3			
SIBLEY	3	1	33.3	55	9	16.4	167	10	6.0	225	20	8.9	4	2	50.0	90	13	14.4			
STEARNS	10	2	20.0	913	151	16.5	1,946	98	5.0	2,869	251	8.7	12	2	16.7	1,311	226	17.2			
STEELE	7	3	42.9	180	20	11.1	576	35	6.1	763	58	7.6	8		50.0	265	30	11.3			
STEVENS	0	0		40	4	10.0		4	3.7	147	8	5.4	0			68	9	13.2			
SWIFT	1	0	0.0	39	7	17.9		7	9.5	114	14	12.3	1		0.0	47	10	21.3			
TODD	5	4	80.0	143	28	19.6		16	6.6	392	48	12.2	5		80.0	246	41	16.7			
TRAVERSE WABASHA	0	0		12	1	8.3		1	3.0	45	2	4.4	0			15	3	20.0			
WADENA	5	2	40.0		26	24.5		16	6.9	343	44	12.8			25.0	167	47	28.1			
WASECA	03	0	33.3	103 92	<u>18</u> 14	<u>17.5</u> 15.2		<u>11</u> 5	<u>6.7</u> 1.9	<u>267</u> 361	<u>29</u> 20	<u>10.9</u> 5.5	0	v	60.0	<u>156</u> 126	<u>23</u> 17	14.7			
WASECA	18	1 6	33.3 33.3	-	14 117	15.2		5 126	1.9 6.6	2,692	20 249	5.5 9.2	5 26		60.0 34.6	1,175	17	13.5 15.3			
WATONWAN	10	0	55.5	61	11/	13.4		120	0.0 7.8	2,092	249	9.2	20		54.0	87	14	15.5			
WILKIN	1	0	0.0	48	8	16.7		2	2.0	147	10	6.8	-	0	0.0	71	9	12.7			
WINONA	4	1	25.0	348	77	22.1		58	7.0	1,183	136	11.5	4	0	25.0	512	125	24.4			
WRIGHT	11	6	54.5	443	80	18.1		63	7.9	1,255	149	11.9		6	54.5	674	110	16.3			
YELLOW MED	1	1	100.0	45	8	17.8		7	9.5	120	16	13.3	1	1	100.0	65	11	16.9			
MINNESOTA	503	204	40.1	30,684	4,425	14.4	68,049	3,772	5.6	99,236	8,401	8.5	568	234	4.2	44,634	6,763	15.2			

# TABLE 5.01, (For Year1990, Continued)

# Minnesota Impaired Driving Facts, 2003 page 43 Department of Public Safety, Office of Traffic Safety

						TA	BLE 5.	01 (F	or Ye	ar 199	1)							
TRAFFIC C	CRAS	SHES	<b>, FA</b>	FALI									LCO	HOL	-REI	LATE	)	
					BY	COU	JNTY :	IN M	INNI	ESOT	A, 199	91	n					
					TRA	FFIC	C CRAS	HES					PER	SONS	S KILI	LED OF	R INJU	RED
	FATA	AL CRA	SHES	INJUR	Y CRAS		PROPER ONLY	TY DA		τοται	L CRAS	HES		KILLE	D	IN	JUREI	)
COUNTY		Alco-	%	All	Alco-	%	All	Alco-	%	All	Alco-	%		Alco-	%	All	Alco-	%
(1)	(2)	hol (3)	Alc (4)	(5)	hol (6)	Alc (7)	(8)	hol (9)	Alc (10)	(11)	hol (12)	Alc (13)	(14)	hol (15)	Alc (16)	(17)	hol (18)	Alc (19)
						. ,			. ,		. ,				. ,			
AITKIN ANOKA	2 13	1	50.0 30.8	75 1,631	16 196	21.3 12.0	153 3,297	9 164	5.9 5.0	230 4,941	26 364	11.3 7.4	4		25.0 31.3		26 329	19.8 13.0
BECKER	2	1	50.0	1,031	41	24.0	271	16	5.9	444	58	13.1	2		50.0		69	25.2
BELTRAMI	6	4	66.7	192	37	19.3	553	34	6.1	751	75	10.0	-		50.0		54	17.7
BENTON BIG STONE	6	0	0.0 0.0	222 22	41 3	18.5 13.6	491 61	30 3	6.1 4.9	719 84	71 6	9.9 7.1	6		0.0 0.0		64 3	18.7 11.1
BLUE EARTH	5	3	60.0	416	45	10.8	1,231	62	4.9	1,652	110	6.7	5		60.0		<u> </u>	11.1
BROWN	3	2	66.7	150	11	7.3	345	17	4.9	498	30	6.0	3	3 2	66.7	216	18	8.3
CARLTON	7	3	42.9	151	31	20.5	377	19	5.0	535	53	9.9			50.0		47	21.1
CARVER CASS	9 12	4 7	44.4 58.3	328 139	41 37	12.5 26.6	773 267	28 20	3.6 7.5	1,110 418	73 64	6.6 15.3			44.4 46.7		72 60	13.8 27.3
CHIPPEWA	3	1	33.3	53	5	20.0 9.4	148	12	8.1	204	18	8.8	-		25.0		7	8.8
CHISAGO	3	0	0.0	185	22	11.9	470	25	5.3	658	47	7.1	3	3 0	0.0	291	31	10.7
CLAY	6	2	33.3		35	13.3	769	29	3.8	1,039	66	6.4			25.0		55	12.7
CLEARWATE COOK	0	0	0.0	40	<u>9</u> 5	22.5 14.3	80 146		$\frac{10.0}{2.1}$	<u>120</u> 182	<u>17</u> 8	<u>14.2</u> 4.4			0.0	57 62	<u>11</u> 7	<u>    19.3</u> 11.3
COTTONWOOD	3	2	66.7	65	6	9.2	106		2.1	174	11	6.3			66.7		13	12.5
CROW WING	9	6	66.7	346	55	15.9	695	27	3.9	1,050	88	8.4			70.0		97	17.7
DAKOTA DODGE	14 4	8 0	57.1	1,520 90	146 12	9.6 13.3	3,574 202	148 7	4.1 3.5	5,108 296	302 19	5.9			50.0		236 19	10.3 13.6
DOUGLAS	4	3	0.0 42.9	223	27	13.5	202 664	24	3.6	290 894	54	6.4 6.0	8		0.0 50.0		47	13.0
FARIBAULT	3	1	33.3	74	7	9.5	168	12	7.1	245	20	8.2	3		33.3		11	9.2
FILLMORE	2	1	50.0	113	26	23.0	239	10	4.2	354	37	10.5			50.0		42	24.0
FREEBORN GOODHUE	<u>7</u> 9	$\frac{2}{2}$	<u>28.6</u> 22.2	193 298	<u>22</u> 31	11.4	521 707	<u>15</u> 23	2.9 3.3	721 1,014	<u>39</u> 56	<u>5.4</u> 5.5	7		<u>28.6</u> 20.0		<u>33</u> 39	<u>10.9</u> 8.7
GRANT	9	1	100.0		2	10.4 9.5	73	25 1	5.5 1.4	95	30 4	3.3 4.2			100.0		39	8.7 9.7
HENNEPIN	49	14	28.6	8,343	777	9.3	20,503	824	4.0	28,895	1615	5.6			28.8		1,164	10.0
HOUSTON	2	2	100.0	94	19	20.2	231	12	5.2	327	33	10.1	3		100.0		30	21.3
HUBBARD ISANTI	1 7	1 2	100.0 28.6	86 154	19 22	22.1 14.3	183 370	15 22	8.2 5.9	270 531	35 46	13.0 8.7	1 9		100.0 44.4	131 257	25 29	19.1 11.3
ITASCA	11	5	45.5	243	57	23.5	420	30	7.1	674	92	13.6	/		45.5		81	20.9
JACKSON	2	0	0.0			14.5		3	2.0	217		5.5			0.0		14	14.4
KANABEC KANDIYOHI	<u>1</u> 9	<u>1</u> 3	100.0			19.0	164		6.7	244		11.1		1	100.0		24	18.5
KITTSON	2	5 1	33.3 50.0	256 13		10.9 23.1	530 72		$4.0 \\ 0.0$	795 87	52 4				27.3 50.0		52 4	12.7 17.4
KOOCHICHING	4	1	25.0		16		186		15.6	261	46				25.0		25	23.1
LAC QUI PAR	1	0	0.0		4	18.2	61	3	4.9	84	7	8.3			0.0		9	25.0
LAKE LAKE OF THE W	4	4	100.0 0.0	68 22	10	14.7 9.1	177 48	7 0	$4.0 \\ 0.0$	249 71	21 2	8.4 2.8			100.0 0.0		22 2	20.2 6.5
LE SUEUR	4	3	75.0		27	19.9	357	24	6.7	497		10.9			75.0		40	21.6
LINCOLN	4	0	0.0	30	4	13.3	84	2	2.4	118	6	5.1	4	0	0.0	52	10	19.2
LYON	7	1	14.3	125	17		318		4.4	450		7.1			14.3		27	13.6
MCLEOD MAHNOMEN	4 1	1	25.0 100.0		31 7	14.6 31.8		21 3	4.5 11.1	678 50		7.8 22.0			20.0 100.0		51 15	14.6 35.7
MARSHALL	2	1	50.0		10		96		4.2	140		10.7	2		50.0		13	27.3
MARTIN	6	3	50.0	123	16	13.0	338		1.8	467	25	5.4			42.9	203	22	10.8
MEEKER	7	1	14.3	92		14.1	244		3.7	343		6.7			14.3		16	11.7
MILLE LACS MORRISON	<u>3</u> 12	4	<u>33.3</u> 33.3		<u>29</u> 26	20.7	234 328		7.7 4.9	<u>377</u> 501	<u>48</u> 46	<u>12.7</u> 9.2			<u>33.3</u> 35.7		<u>59</u> 48	<u>24.5</u> 17.0
MOWER	5	0	0.0			10.1			5.8			6.9			0.0			9.5

#### Minnesota Impaired Driving Facts, 2003 page 44

TRAFFIC (				TATI			.01, (Fa					,			DEI		•	
IKAFFIC	JKA:	SHES	<b>, г</b> а	IALI	,		UNTY 1						LCO	HUL	-KEI	LAIEI	)	
							C CRAS				_, _, ,		PER	SONS	KILL	ED OR	INJU	RED
	FATA	AL CRA	SHES	INJUR	Y CRAS	SHES	PROPER ONLY	TY DA CRASI	HES	TOTAI	CRAS	HES		KILLE			JURED	
COUNTY	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
MURRAY	0	0		40	11	27.5	89	7	7.9	129	18	14.0	0 0	0		63	15	23.8
NICOLLET	3	0	0.0		16	13.2	410	17	4.1	534	33	6.2	-		0.0	186	21	11.3
NOBLES	1	0	0.0	100	12	12.0	293	8	2.7	394	20	5.1		0	0.0	158	17	10.8
NORMAN	1	1	100.0	34	9	26.5	61	3	4.9	96	13	13.5			100.0	49	20	40.8
OLMSTED	8	3	37.5	695	85	12.2	1,787	72	4.0	2,490	160	6.4	-		37.5	1,059	127	12.0
OTTER TAIL	7	3	42.9	285	49	17.2	622	28	4.5	914	80	8.8	-		42.9	468	82	17.5
PENNINGTON PINE	1 5	1 4	100.0 80.0	-	8 22	9.8	175 281	12 14	6.9	258 435	21 40	8.1 9.2			$100.0 \\ 80.0$	116 216	15 32	12.9
PIPESTONE	0	4	80.0	52	8	14.8 15.4	119	14	5.0 5.9	433	40 15	9.2 8.8			80.0	210 86	52 14	14.8 16.3
POLK	3	1	33.3	150	20	13.3	369	25	6.8	522	46	8.8	-		20.0	228	29	10.3
POPE	1	1	100.0		20	15.5	104	23	2.9	144	10	6.9	_		100.0	61	14	23.0
RAMSEY	24	11	45.8	3,774	380	10.1	11,335	524	4.6	15,133	915	6.0			44.0	5,267	551	10.5
RED LAKE	0	0		10	6	60.0	48	6	12.5	58	12	20.7				17	8	47.1
REDWOOD	2	1	50.0	111	17	15.3	170	8	4.7	283	26	9.2	2 2	1	50.0	185	31	16.8
RENVILLE	4	2	50.0	86	15	17.4	145	8	5.5	235	25	10.6			40.0	142	34	23.9
RICE	9	2	22.2		30	9.9		28	3.6	1,086	60	5.5			36.4	450	44	9.8
ROCK	0	0		53	8	15.1	169	6	3.6	222	14	6.3	-			92	13	14.1
ROSEAU	2	10	50.0	67	102	10.4	191	159	2.6	260	251	5.0			50.0	101	13	12.9
ST. LOUIS SCOTT	23 7	10 3	43.5 42.9	1,065 368	183 42	17.2 11.4	2,562 905	158 45	6.2 5.0	3,650 1280	351 90	9.6 7.0	-		42.3 42.9	1,563 586	295 76	18.9 13.0
SHERBURNE	5	2	42.9	263	42 49	11.4	903 541	43 25	5.0 4.6	809	90 76	9.4			42.9 33.3	402	73	18.2
SIBLEY	2	0	0.0		9	15.3	200	13	6.5	261	22	8.4			0.0	81	12	14.8
STEARNS	14	5	35.7	836		12.8	2,086	91	4.4	2,936	203	6.9			35.7	1,285	178	13.9
STEELE	7	2	28.6		28	15.7	594	25	4.2	779	55	7.1			25.0	270	45	16.7
STEVENS	2	2	100.0	33	10	30.3	102	6	5.9	137	18	13.1	3	3	100.0	43	15	34.9
SWIFT	0	0		43	6	14.0		4	4.8	126	10	7.9	-			65	7	10.8
TODD	3	1	33.3	107	22	20.6	295	12	4.1	405	35	8.6			33.3	189	42	22.2
TRAVERSE	1	1	100.0		1	8.3	23	3	13.0	36	5	13.9			100.0	18	3	16.7
WABASHA	3	2	66.7	96	19	19.8		18	6.5	377	39	10.3	-		66.7	129	25	19.4
WADENA WASECA	1	0	$\frac{0.0}{100.0}$	77 93	11	<u>14.3</u> 11.8	216 245	<u>11</u> 8	<u>5.1</u> 3.3	<u>294</u> 339	$\frac{22}{20}$	<u>7.5</u> 5.9		0	$\frac{0.0}{100.0}$	125 124	<u>16</u> 17	<u>12.8</u> 13.7
WASHINGTON	11	1	100.0 9.1		11 95	11.8		8 113	3.3 5.7	2,750	20 209	5.9 7.6		-	100.0 9.1	1,155	158	13.7
WATONWAN	3	3	100.0		95			7	5.7	183	16	8.7			9.1	1,155 91	138	14.3
WILKIN	2	1	50.0		10			5	4.9	159	16	10.1			50.0	89	15	16.9
WINONA	6	3	50.0			14.8		49	6.0	1094	92	8.4			45.5		67	17.4
WRIGHT	17	9	52.9			15.3		48	5.7	1251	117	9.4			45.0		107	17.1
YELLOW MED	3	1	33.3	43	6	14.0	81	6	7.4	127	13	10.2	4	2	50.0	84	7	8.3
	0	0		119	19	16.0	315	15	4.8	434	34	7.8	8 0	0		163	27	16.6
MINNESOTA	469	186	39.7	28,890	3534	12.2	72,060	3318	4.6	101,419	7,038	6.9	531	204	38.4	42,748	5,556	13.0

						TA	BLE 5	.01 (fe	or Yea	ar1992	?)							
TRAFF	TIC C	CRAS	HES	, FAT			, AND Unty 1						ID A	LCO	HOL-	RELA	ATED	•
	<u> </u>						C CRAS		111111	25017	A, 193	92	PER	SONS	KILL	ED OR	R INJU	RED
	FATA	AL CRA	SHES	INJUR	Y CRAS	SHES	DAMA	OPERT AGE ON ASHES	NLY	ΤΟΤΑΙ	L CRAS	HES		KILLE	D	IN	JURED	)
COUNTY	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
AITKIN ANOKA BECKER	8 13 7	5 4 3	62.5 30.8 42.9	79 1,639 171	17 201 37	21.5 12.3 21.6	178 2,977 282	17 145 22	9.6 4.9 7.8	265 4,629 460	39 350 62	14.7 7.6 13.5	9 14 12	6 5 6	66.7 35.7 50.0	114 2,495 290	29 321 69	25.4 12.9 23.8
BELTRAMI BENTON BIG STONE	6 7 0	6 3 0	42.9 100.0 42.9	200 226 22	37 36 3	18.5 15.9 13.6	523 465 85	21 34 6	4.0 7.3 7.1	729 698 107	64 73 9	8.8 10.5 8.4	6	6 3	100.0 42.9	302 342 31	57 53 6	<u> </u>
BLUE EARTH BROWN CARLTON	4 2 6	1 1 1	25.0 50.0 16.7	446 118 151	49 21 26	13.0 11.0 17.8 17.2	1,144 315 344	47 21 22	4.1 6.7 6.4	1,594 435 501	97 43 49	6.1 9.9 9.8	4	1 2 1	25.0 66.7 14.3	635 180 272	76 29 38	19.4 12.0 16.1 14.0
CARVER CASS CHIPPEWA	6 6 6	1 2 3	16.7 33.3 50.0	361 132 67	56 29 13	15.5 22.0 19.4	690 260 163	33 31 9	4.8 11.9 5.5	1,057 398 236	90 62 25	8.5 15.6 10.6	10 7	1 2	10.0 28.6 50.0	529 215 113	73 40 24	13.8 18.6 21.2
CHISAGO CLAY CLEARWATER	4 5 2	0 1 1	0.0 20.0 50.0	197 272 36	37 29 16	18.8 10.7 44.4	486 724 75	24 34 6	4.9 4.7 8.0	687 1,001 113	61 64 23	8.9 6.4 20.4		0 1	0.0 20.0 50.0	338 407 59	53 43 26	15.7 10.6 44.1
COOK COTTONWOOD CROW WING	3 5 8	1 1 3	33.3 20.0 37.5	41 56 348	5 6 58	12.2 10.7 16.7	137 123 714	2 5 46	1.5 4.1 6.4	181 184 1,070	8 12 107	4.4 6.5 10.0		1 1 3	33.3 14.3 37.5	63 96 552	6 11 92	9.5 11.5 16.7
DAKOTA DODGE DOUGLAS	15 6 4	9 3 1	60.0 50.0 25.0	1,567 59 202	170 8 26	10.8 13.6 12.9	3,512 165 603	179 4 28	5.1 2.4 4.6	5,094 230 809	358 15 55	7.0 6.5 6.8	11	9 4 1	56.3 50.0 25.0	2,396 102 301	261 14 37	10.9 13.7 12.3
FARIBAULT FILLMORE FREEBORN	3 2 3	1 2 1	33.3 100.0 33.3	63 107 201	12 16 20	19.0 15.0 10.0	135 245 522	3 12 12	2.2 4.9 2.3	201 354 726	16 30 33	8.0 8.5 <u>4.5</u>	3		20.0 100.0 25.0	106 179 326	19 27 36	17.9 15.1 11.0
GOODHUE GRANT HENNEPIN	8 1 50	3 1 18	37.5 100.0 <u>36.0</u>	326 25 8,114	35 6 <u>849</u>	10.7 24.0 10.5	814 63 18,514	28 4 742	3.4 6.3 4.0	1148 89 26,678	66 11 1,609	5.7 12.4 <u>6.0</u>	9 1 55	3 1 18	33.3 100.0 32.7	503 41 11,577	66 7 1,280	13.1 17.1 11.1
HOUSTON HUBBARD ISANTI	6 1 7	2 1 1	33.3 100.0 14.3	92 97 181	20 16 24	21.7 16.5 13.3	258 158 345	12 9 15	4.7 5.7 4.3	356 256 533	34 26 40	9.6 10.2 7.5	1 7	2 1 1	33.3 100.0 14.3	133 155 292	23 24 50	17.3 15.5 17.1
ITASCA JACKSON KANABEC	5 3 2	3 0 0	60.0 0.0 0.0	197 68 65	40 11 12	20.3 16.2 18.5	458 147 176	34 6 13	7.4 4.1 7.4	660 218 243	77 17 25	11.7 7.8 10.3	3 2	3 0 0	42.9 0.0 0.0	291 99 108	59 18 18	20.3 18.2 16.7
KANDIYOHI KITTSON KOOCHICHING	17 0 3	7 0 2	41.2 66.7	294 19 97	33 0 11	11.2 0.0 11.3	574 55 178	24 2 15	4.2 3.6 8.4	885 74 278	64 2 28	7.2 2.7 10.1	5	4	42.9 80.0	442 24 158	57 0 22	12.9 0.0 13.9
LAC QUI PAR LAKE LAKE OF THE	3 2 1	3 0 0	100.0 0.0 0.0	38 54 17	1	13.2 18.5 5.9	68 170 49	5 7 3	7.4 4.1 6.1	109 226 67	13 17 4	11.9 7.5 6.0	2 1	0 0	100.0 0.0 0.0	62 85 32	12 14 1	19.4 16.5 3.1
LE SUEUR LINCOLN LYON	8 3 5	2 1 2	25.0 33.3 40.0	119 27 149	18 4 19	15.1 14.8 12.8	322 86 377	11 5 14	3.4 5.8 3.7	449 116 531	31 10 35	6.9 8.6 <u>6.6</u>	3 5	1 2	25.0 33.3 40.0	193 54 243	35 7 37	18.1 13.0 15.2
MCLEOD MAHNOMEN MARSHALL	4 1 3	1 1 1	25.0 100.0 33.3	192 36 51	29 10 10	19.6	457 41 101	16 5 10	3.5 12.2 9.9	653 78 155	46 16 21	7.0 20.5 <u>13.5</u>	1 3	1 1	14.3 100.0 33.3	292 56 81	53 18 17	18.2 32.1 21.0
MARTIN MEEKER MILLE LACS	$2 \\ 4 \\ 4 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ $		0.0 75.0 25.0	92 102 144	12 9 36	13.0 8.8 25.0	271 235 250	11 3 18	4.1 1.3 7.2	365 341 <u>398</u>	23 15 55	6.3 4.4 <u>13.8</u>	4 7	3 2	0.0 75.0 28.6	136 135 253	14 17 <u>69</u>	10.3 12.6 27.3
MORRISON MOWER	3 5	$\frac{1}{2}$	33.3 40.0	166 196	35 15	21.1 7.7	342 545	24 23	7.0 4.2	511 746	60 40	11.7 5.4			25.0 40.0	255 286	54 19	21.2 6.6

COUNTY	All (2) 2 6 3 2 10 9 2 6 1	AL CRA Alco- hol (3) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2	%           Alc           (4)           0.0           0.0           0.0           0.0           0.0           7.0	INJUR All (5) 34 118 94 31 762	TRA Y CRAS Alco- hol (6) 4 20 3	FFIC	DAM		Y NLY		C CRASI Alco- hol		]	SONS KILLEI Alco- hol (15)		ED OR IN All (17)	A INJU NJUREI Alco- hol (18)	
COUNTY (1) (1) (URRAY UCOLLET (OBLES ORMAN OLMSTED OTTER TAIL ENNINGTON INE IPESTONE OLK OPE CAMSEY EED LAKE EEDWOOD	All (2) 2 6 3 2 10 9 2 6 1	Alco- hol (3) (3) 0 0 0 0 0 3 7 1	%           Alc           (4)           0.0           0.0           0.0           0.0           0.0           7.0	All (5) 34 118 94 31	Alco- hol (6) 4 20 3	%           Alc           (7)           11.8	DAMA CF All (8)	AGE ON RASHES Alco- hol	NLY 5 % Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	%
COUNTY (1) (1) (URRAY UCOLLET OBLES ORMAN OLMSTED OTTER TAIL ENNINGTON INE IPESTONE OLK OPE CAMSEY ED LAKE EDWOOD	(2) 2 6 3 2 10 9 2 6 1	hol (3) 0 0 0 0 3 7 1	Alc (4) 0.0 0.0 0.0 30.0 77.8	(5) 34 118 94 31	hol (6) 4 20 3	Alc (7) 11.8	(8)	hol	Alc		hol	Alc		hol	Alc		hol	
MURRAY NICOLLET OBLES NORMAN DLMSTED DITER TAIL ENNINGTON INE IPESTONE OLK OPE AMSEY ED LAKE EDWOOD	$ \begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 6 \\ 3 \\ 2 \\ 10 \\ 9 \\ 2 \\ 6 \\ 1 \end{array} $	$ \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 3 \\ 7 \\ 1 \end{array} $	0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 30.0 77.8	34 118 94 31	4 20 3	11.8		(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	
IICOLLET IOBLES IORMAN DLMSTED DTTER TAIL ENNINGTON INE IPESTONE OLK OPE CAMSEY ED LAKE EDWOOD		$\begin{array}{r} 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ 3\\ 7\\ 1 \end{array}$	0.0 0.0 0.0 30.0 77.8	118 94 31	20 3		96					( - )	(14)	(15)	(10)	(1)	(10)	(19)
IICOLLET IOBLES IORMAN DLMSTED DTTER TAIL ENNINGTON INE IPESTONE OLK OPE CAMSEY ED LAKE EDWOOD		$\begin{array}{r} 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ 3\\ 7\\ 1 \end{array}$	0.0 0.0 0.0 30.0 77.8	118 94 31	20 3		20	4	4.2	132	8	6.1	2	0	0.0	89	5	5.
IOBLES IORMAN DLMSTED DTTER TAIL ENNINGTON INE IPESTONE OLK OPE CAMSEY ED LAKE EDWOOD		$ \begin{array}{r} 0\\ 0\\ 3\\ 7\\ 1 \end{array} $	0.0 0.0 30.0 77.8	94 31	3	10.71	345	16	4.6	469	36	7.7	6	0	0.0	189	28	14.
IORMAN DLMSTED DTTER TAIL ENNINGTON INE IPESTONE OLK OPE CAMSEY ED LAKE ED LAKE EDWOOD	2 10 9 2 6 1	0 3 7 1	0.0 30.0 77.8	31		3.2	270	10	5.2	367	17	4.6	3	0	0.0	136	3	2.
DITTER TAIL ENNINGTON INE IPESTONE OLK OPE AMSEY ED LAKE ED WOOD	9 2 6 1	7	77.8		9	29.0	63	3	4.8	96	12	12.5	3	0	0.0	38	10	26
ENNINGTON INE IPESTONE OLK OPE AMSEY ED LAKE EDWOOD	2 6 1	1		,02	77	10.1	1,759	66	3.8	2,531	146	5.8	12	3	25.0	1,105	123	11.
INE IPESTONE OLK OPE AMSEY ED LAKE EDWOOD	6 1			292	45	15.4	648	32	4.9	949	84	8.9	13	10	76.9	432	71	16
DIPESTONE OLK OPE AMSEY ED LAKE EDWOOD	1	<b>^</b>	50.0	92	11	12.0	172	6	3.5	266	18	6.8	3	2	66.7	125	16	12
OLK OPE AMSEY ED LAKE EDWOOD	1		33.3	150		27.3	292	18	6.2	448	61	13.6		3	37.5	243	75	30
AMSEY ED LAKE EDWOOD		0	0.0	54		13.0	93	3	3.2	148	10	6.8	1	0	0.0	75	14	18
AMSEY RED LAKE REDWOOD	7 3	5 2	71.4 66.7	148 33	22 6	14.9 18.2	353 93	21 5	5.9 5.4	508 129	48 13	9.4 10.1	83	6 2	75.0 66.7	206 52	34 12	16. 23.
ED LAKE EDWOOD	18	2 7	38.9	3,876		10.2	9.895	427	4.3	13,789	825	6.0	20	8	40.0	5,502	569	10.
EDWOOD	0	0	50.7	13	3	23.1	52	3	5.8	65	6	9.2	0	0	+0.0	22	5	22.
ENVILLE	3	1	33.3	77	10	13.0	200	15	7.5	280	26	9.3	-	1	33.3	117	22	18.
EINVILLE	4	1	25.0	89	20	22.5	167	8	4.8	260	29	11.2	5	1	20.0	150	39	26.
RICE	9	4	44.4	295	45	15.3	736	33	4.5	1,040	82	7.9	10	4	40.0	445	73	16.
ROCK	2	2	100.0	59		11.9	189	7	3.7	250	16	6.4	2	2	100.0	86	20	23.
OSEAU	4	3	75.0	50	-	10.0	163	8	4.9	217	16	7.4	5	4	80.0	79	8	10.
T. LOUIS COTT	20 14	9	45.0 21.4	1,047	207	19.8	2,361	126 55	5.3	3,428 1,339	342 120	10.0 9.0	24	11	45.8	1,561	328	21.
HERBURNE	14 9	3	11.1	422 239	62 39	14.7 16.3	903 535	33 34	6.1 6.4	783	74	9.0	18 12	3	16.7 25.0	681 385	97 65	14. 16.
IBLEY	4	1	25.0	66		28.8	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	5.2	244	29	<u> </u>	4	1	25.0	93	26	28
TEARNS	20	6	30.0	911	113	12.4	1,975	113	5.7	2,906	232	8.0	29	8	27.6	1,385	164	11
TEELE	1	1	100.0	187	36	19.3	552	24	4.3	740	61	8.2	1	1	100.0	277	54	19
TEVENS	2	0	0.0	31	2	6.5	72	2	2.8	105	4	3.8	2	0	0.0	47	4	8
WIFT	3	2	66.7	37	6	16.2	84	11	13.1	124	19	15.3	3	2	66.7	67	8	11.
ODD	3	2	66.7	103	25	24.3	259	15	5.8	365	42	11.5	4	3	75.0	135	40	29
'RAVERSE VABASHA	1	0	0.0	17	3	17.6	29	3	10.3	47	6	12.8	2	0	0.0	29	7	24
VADENA	4	2 0	50.0	110 82	24 17	21.8 20.7	257 181	15 4	5.8 2.2	371 263	41 21	11.1 8.0	5 0	3 0	60.0	165 129	32 25	19. 19.
VASECA				87		17.2	229			317	25	7.9						
VASHINGTON	1 11	0 5	0.0 45.5	795		14.3	1,948	10 96	4.4 4.9	2,754	215	7.9	1 11	0 5	0.0 45.5	116 1,164	25 176	21 15
VATONWAN	4	0	0.0	54		11.1	1,940	4	3.0	192	10	5.2	6	0	0.0	82	8	9
VILKIN	2	1	50.0	47		12.8	103	6	5.8	152	13	8.6		1	50.0	82	7	8
VINONA	6	0	0.0	323		15.2	772	51	6.6	1,101	100	9.1	6	0	0.0	451	78	17
VRIGHT	15	5	33.3	434		16.6	789	49	6.2	1,238	126	10.2	17	7	41.2	670	105	15
YELLOW MED JNKNOWN	1 0	1 0	100.0	33 106		15.2 15.1	85 248	5 17	5.9 6.9	119 354	11 33	9.2 9.3		1 0	100.0	53 157	9 21	17 13

							BLE 5.	Ψ.			<i>`</i>							
TRAFF	TIC C	CRAS	HES	, FAT			, AND UNTY I						D A	LCO	HOL	RELA	ATED	)
							C CRAS				4, 193	75	PER	SONS	KILL	ED OF	R INJU	RED
	FATA	AL CRA	SHES	INJUR	Y CRAS	SHES	DAMA	OPERT AGE ON ASHES	NLY	ΤΟΤΑΙ	CRAS	HES		KILLE	D	I	JURED	)
COUNTY	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
AITKIN	2	1	50.0	90	19	21.1	174	8	4.6	266	28	10.5	2	1	50.0	131	24	18.3
ANOKA BECKER	11	7	63.6	1,695	185	10.9	3,395	138	4.1	5,101	330	6.5		8	66.7	2,541	302	11.9
BELTRAMI	4	3	<u>75.0</u> 66.7	170 181	<u>38</u> 29	22.4 16.0	<u>284</u> 554	<u>17</u> 34	<u>6.0</u> 6.1	<u>458</u> 741	<u>58</u> 67	<u>12.7</u> 9.0	47	<u>3</u> 5	<u>75.0</u> 71.4	274 283	<u>72</u> 65	<u>26.3</u> 23.0
BENTON	5	3	60.0	266	27	10.0	478	32	6.7	749	62	8.3		3	50.0	428	42	23.0 9.8
BIG STONE	1	0	0.0	26	7	26.9	83	3	3.6	110	10	9.1	1	0	0.0	37	7	18.9
BLUE EARTH BROWN	14 2	5 1	35.7 50.0	421 155	41 13	9.7 8.4	1,076 318	49 16	4.6 5.0	1,511 475	95 30	6.3 6.3	15 2	6 1	40.0 50.0	624 214	60 18	9.6 8.4
CARLTON	4	2	50.0	143	33	23.1	254	14	5.5	401	49	12.2	4	2	50.0	229	48	21.0
CARVER	9	4	44.4	315	38	12.1	753	36	4.8	1,077	78	7.2	10	5	50.0	549	57	10.4
CASS CHIPPEWA	10 4	4 2	40.0 50.0	149 74	45 8	30.2 10.8	232 115	19 11	8.2 9.6	391 193	68 21	17.4 10.9	11 4	5 2	45.5 50.0	264 122	84 13	31.8 10.7
CHIFFEWA	3	<u></u> 1	33.3	201	34	16.9	474	21	<u>9.0</u> 4.4	678	56	8.3	3	<u> </u>	33.3	304	42	13.8
CLAY	3	0	0.0	321	46	14.3	817	44	5.4	1,141	90	7.9	3	0	0.0	513	80	15.6
CLEARWATER	2	0	0.0	33	13	39.4	66	5	7.6	101	18	17.8	2	-	0.0	53	19	35.8
COOK COTTONWOOD	$\begin{array}{c} 0\\ 2\end{array}$	0 1	50.0	31 49	5 5	16.1 10.2	122 97	4 5	3.3 5.2	153 148	9 11	5.9 7.4	$\begin{array}{c} 0\\ 4\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0\\ 1\end{array}$	25.0	49 87	8 9	16.3 10.3
CROW WING	12	3	25.0	355	55	15.5	738	38	5.1	1,105	96	8.7	15	4	26.7	563	87	15.5
DAKOTA	14	2	14.3	1,677	143	8.5	3,450	135	3.9	5,141	280	5.4	15	2	13.3	2,493	205	8.2
DODGE DOUGLAS	3 4	2 3	66.7 75.0	81 224	17 30	21.0 13.4	197 714	4 28	2.0 3.9	281 942	23 61	8.2 6.5	6 5	2 4	33.3 80.0	136 354	26 50	19.1 14.1
FARIBAULT	4	1	25.0	61	8	13.4	178	6	3.4	243	15	6.2	5	1	20.0	89	12	13.5
FILLMORE	5	3	60.0	110	13	11.8	271	19	7.0	386	35	9.1	5	3	60.0	171	18	10.5
FREEBORN	5	1	20.0	243	22	9.1	593	22	3.7	841	45	5.4	7	3	42.9	352	35	9.9
GOODHUE GRANT	14 1	5 1	35.7 100.0	341 29	37 7	10.9 24.1	904 95	30 2	3.3 2.1	1,259 125	72 10	5.7 8.0	15 1	5 1	33.3 100.0	499 48	56 18	11.2 37.5
HENNEPIN	59	19	32.2	8,644	, 752	8.7	19,667	743	3.8	28,370	1,514	5.3	60	19	31.7	12,308	1,138	9.2
HOUSTON	4	2	50.0	89	19	21.3	241	6	2.5	334	27	8.1	4	2	50.0	119	25	21.0
HUBBARD ISANTI	3 8	2 2	66.7 25.0	97 152	22 25	22.7 16.4	145 346	9 20	6.2 5.8	245 506	33 47	13.5 9.3	3	2 2	66.7 22.2	176 259	36 40	20.5 15.4
ITASCA	10	7	70.0	244	51	20.9	472	31	6.6	726	89	12.3		8	72.7	388	91	23.5
JACKSON	3	0	0.0	64	10	15.6	177	7	4.0	244	17	7.0	4	0	0.0	122	19	15.6
KANABEC KANDIYOHI	2	0 5	0.0	204	13	16.9	141	3	2.1	220	<u>16</u> 69	7.3		0 5	0.0	126	24	19.0
KITTSON	11 1	5 0	45.5 0.0	304 19	31 2	10.2 10.5	563 61	33 1	5.9 1.6	878 81	69 3	7.9 3.7		5 0	41.7 0.0	504 25	51 2	10.1 8.0
KOOCHICHING	4	3	75.0	60	15	25.0	172	11	6.4	236	29	12.3			75.0	101	31	30.7
LAC QUI PAR	1	0	0.0	34	8	23.5	60	7	11.7	95	15	15.8		0	0.0	47	12	25.5
LAKE LAKE OF THE	2	1	50.0	59 20	10	16.9 20.0	189 49	4 5	2.1 10.2	250 69	15 9	6.0 13.0			25.0	92 38	14 13	15.2 34.2
LE SUEUR	9	3	33.3	117	22	18.8	403	18	4.5	529	43	8.1	12		33.3	190	40	21.1
LINCOLN	3	0	0.0	24	3		73	3	4.1	100	6	6.0			0.0	29	3	10.3
LYON MCLEOD	5	0	$\frac{0.0}{20.0}$	145 198	<u>18</u> 19	12.4 9.6	<u>382</u> 487	$\frac{7}{20}$	<u>1.8</u> 4.1	532 690	$\frac{25}{40}$	<u>4.7</u> 5.8	9 5	0	$\frac{0.0}{20.0}$	223 324	<u>25</u> 31	<u>11.2</u> 9.6
MAHNOMEN	3	2	20.0 66.7	43	19		487 44	20 5	4.1	90	40 20	22.2	-		20.0 75.0	80	29	36.3
MARSHALL	1	0	0.0	44	10	22.7	81	6	7.4	126	16	12.7	1	0	0.0	64	18	28.1
MARTIN	2	1	50.0	119	17		322	13	4.0	443	31	7.0			50.0	195	24	12.3
MEEKER MILLE LACS	43	0 0	0.0 0.0	100 141	11 30	11.0 21.3	229 264	9 16	3.9 6.1	333 408	20 46	6.0 11.3		0 0	0.0 0.0	152 247	14 48	9.2 19.4
MORRISON	8	3	37.5	173	33	19.1	330	23	7.0	511	59	11.5			33.3	276	55	19.9
MOWER	4	2	50.0	212	28	13.2	581	19	3.3	797	49	6.1	4		50.0	314	37	11.8

	i				BY	COI	JNTY	IN M	INN	ESOTA	<b>A</b> , 199	93	ir					
					TRA	FFIC	C CRAS	HES					PER	SONS	KILL	ED OF	R INJU	JRED
	FAT	AL CRA	SHES	INJUR	Y CRAS	SHES	DAM	OPERT AGE ON RASHES	ILY	ΤΟΤΑΙ	CRAS	HES	]	KILLEI	D	IN	JUREI	)
COUNTY	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
MURRAY	2	0	0.0	31	5	16.1	100	3	3.0	133	8	6.0	3	0	0.0	51	9	17.
NICOLLET	6	1	16.7	111	10	9.0	390	20	5.1	507	31	6.1	8	1	12.5	166	12	7.
NOBLES	3	1	33.3	110	2	1.8	342	4	1.2	455	7	1.5	3	1	33.3	157	5	3.
NORMAN	2	0	0.0	42	10	23.8	77	3	3.9	121	13	10.7	3	0	0.0	71	19	26.
OLMSTED	7	4	57.1	693	70	10.1	1,753	68	3.9	2,453	142	5.8	9	4	44.4	1,000	95	9.
OTTER TAIL PENNINGTON	8	<u>6</u> 0	75.0	300	<u>45</u> 9	15.0	680	<u>18</u> 14	2.6	<u>988</u> 263	<u>69</u> 23	7.0	8	<u>6</u> 0	75.0	437 122	<u>80</u> 17	18.
PINE	4	0	0.0 25.0	87 162	24	10.3 14.8	173 302	14 19	8.1 6.3	263 468	23 44	8.7 9.4	4 4	1	$\begin{array}{c} 0.0\\ 25.0\end{array}$	274	48	13. 17.
PIPESTONE	1	0	0.0	48	9	18.8	127	5	3.9	176	14	8.0	1	0	0.0	64	16	25.
POLK	3	1	33.3	166	29	17.5	352	16	4.5	521	46	8.8	3	1	33.3	234	42	17.
POPE	2	1	50.0	58	6	10.3	118	8	6.8	178	15	8.4	2	1	50.0	89	7	7.
RAMSEY	16	8	50.0	3,932	362	9.2	10,060	426	4.2	14,008	796	5.7	16	8	50.0	5,609	558	9.
RED LAKE	2	0	0.0	13	2	15.4	49	2	4.1	64	4	6.3	2	0	0.0	23	3	13.
REDWOOD RENVILLE	35	$\begin{array}{c} 0\\ 2\end{array}$	0.0 40.0	98 89	9 11	9.2 12.4	166 181	6 5	3.6 2.8	267 275	15 18	5.6 6.5	36	$\begin{array}{c} 0\\ 2\end{array}$	0.0 33.3	150 139	12 17	8. 12.
RICE	10	3	30.0	316	42	13.3	719	23	3.2	1,045	68	6.5		3	23.1	468	60	12
ROCK	10	1	100.0	58	7	12.1	181	23	1.1	240	10	4.2	13	1	100.0	82	8	9.
ROSEAU	3	1	33.3	56	9	16.1	172	10	5.8	231	20	8.7	5	1	20.0	103	16	15.
ST. LOUIS	19	7	36.8	1,068	155	14.5	2,308	115	5.0	3,395	277	8.2	21	7	33.3	1,589	249	15.
SCOTT	4	3	75.0	427	43	10.1	1,008	39	3.9	1439	85	5.9	4	3	75.0	654	72	11.
SHERBURNE	5	1	20.0	261	41	15.7	566	23	4.1	832	65	7.8	5	1	20.0	424	69	16.
SIBLEY STEARNS	5 12	1 5	20.0 41.7	74 925	12 125	16.2 13.5	214 2,094	14 87	6.5 4.2	293 3,031	27 217	9.2 7.2	6 13	1 5	16.7 38.5	110 1,339	16 196	14. 14.
STEELE	3	1	33.3	194	20	10.3	585	17	2.9	782	38	4.9	3	1	33.3	301	33	11.
STEVENS	1	1	100.0	36	1	2.8	87	3	3.4	124	5	4.0	1	1	100.0	52	2	3.
SWIFT	2	0	0.0	43	7	16.3	88	5	5.7	133	12	9.0	2	0	0.0	77	8	10.
FODD	2	1	50.0	117	22	18.8	335	6	1.8	454	29	6.4	3	2	66.7	204	41	20.
FRAVERSE	1	0	0.0	13	3	23.1	31	0	0.0	45	3	6.7	1	0	0.0	16	4	25.
WABASHA WADENA	1 2	0	0.0 50.0	112 73	15 15	13.4 20.5	268 187	16 8	6.0 4.3	381 262	31 24	8.1 9.2	1 2	0	0.0 50.0	168 102	21 19	12. 18.
WASECA	2	1	50.0	73		10.8	238	8	3.4	314	17	<u>9.2</u> 5.4		2	50.0	102	<u>19</u> 9	<u> </u>
WASHINGTON	11	1 6	50.0 54.5	885		10.8	2,130	93	5.4 4.4	3,026	204	5.4 6.7		2 7	53.8	1,339	180	13
WATONWAN	2	Ő	0.0	53	10	18.9	154	5	3.2	209	15	7.2	2	0	0.0	81	18	22
VILKIN	2	0	0.0	69	8	11.6	154	5	3.2	225	13	5.8		0	0.0	114	13	11
WINONA	6	0	0.0	344	47	13.7	854	53	6.2	1,204	100	8.3		0	0.0	472	64	13
WRIGHT	15	5	33.3	420		16.0	875	40	4.6	1,310	112	8.5		5	29.4	668	107	16
YELLOW MED	2	0	0.0	59 20	13 4		102 42		2.9 2.4	163 62	16 5	9.8 8.1	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 0\end{array}$	0 0	0.0	93 27	18 5	19 18

Department of Public Safety, Office of Traffic Safety

							BLE 5.	v			<i>´</i>							
TRAFF	IC (	CRAS	HES	, FAT			, AND JNTY						D A	LCO	HOL	RELA	ATED	)
							C CRAS		11111	25017	A, 193	74	PER	SONS	KILL	ED OF	R INJU	RED
	FATA	AL CRA	SHES	INJUR	Y CRAS	SHES	DAMA	OPERT AGE ON RASHES	ILY	TOTA	L CRAS	HES		KILLE	D	I	JURED	)
COUNTY	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
AITKIN ANOKA	5 27	3 10	60.0 37.0	89 1,741	19 172	21.3 9.9	169 3,292	10 141	5.9 4.3	263 5,060	32 323	12.2 6.4	5 31	3 11	60.0 35.5	146 2,612	30 269	20.5 10.3
BECKER BELTRAMI	<u>11</u> 4	<u>6</u> 2	<u>54.5</u> 50.0	181 207	<u>43</u> 37	23.8 17.9	248 544	<u>20</u> 27	<u>8.1</u> 5.0	440 755	<u>69</u> 66	<u>15.7</u> 8.7	14 7	<u>9</u> 2	<u>64.3</u> 28.6	289 310	<u>67</u> 54	<u>23.2</u> 17.4
BENTON BIG STONE	2	1 0	50.0	261 17	33 2	12.6 11.8	477	25 1	5.2 1.5	740 82	59 3	8.0 3.7	3	1	33.3	409 32	62 2	15.2 6.3
BLUE EARTH BROWN	4 4	1 2	25.0 50.0	468 180	62 21	13.2 11.7	1,083 336	41 14	3.8 4.2	1,555 520	104 37	6.7 7.1	6 4	1	16.7 50.0	658 251	85 29	12.9 11.6
CARLTON	6	3	50.0	139	26	18.7	272	12	4.4	417	41	9.8	8	4	50.0	225	44	19.6
CARVER CASS	7 11	3 5	42.9 45.5	388 148	47 44	12.1 29.7	745 258	41 26	5.5 10.1	1,140 417	91 75	8.0 18.0	7 11		42.9 45.5	582 292	64 94	11.0 32.2
CHIPPEWA CHISAGO	5	0	0.0	62 177	5 25	8.1	149 465	2	1.3	216	7 57	3.2	5 12		0.0	103	<u>8</u> 43	7.8
CLAY	6	6 2	66.7 33.3	302	29	14.1 9.6	904	26 38	5.6 4.2	651 1,212	57 69	8.8 5.7	6	2	66.7 33.3	264 446	43 47	16.3 10.5
CLEARWATER COOK	<u>5</u> 0	$\frac{3}{0}$	60.0	37 44	8	21.6 20.5	70 99	<u>6</u> 1	8.6 1.0	112 143	<u>17</u> 10	<u>15.2</u> 7.0	5		60.0	72 70	<u>18</u> 15	25.0 21.4
COTTONWOOD	2	1	50.0	71	5	7.0	115	5	4.3	188	11	5.9	3	2	66.7	119	7	5.9
CROW WING DAKOTA	<u>8</u> 17	<u>6</u> 2	75.0 11.8	400	<u>56</u> 147	14.0 8.6	783	<u>36</u> 152	4.6 4.5	1,191 5,140	<u>98</u> 301	<u>8.2</u> 5.9	8 19	-	75.0	681 2,551	<u>103</u> 224	<u>15.1</u> 8.8
DODGE DOUGLAS	3	0 5	0.0 45.5	75 226	10 31	13.3 13.7	187 680	7 16	3.7 2.4	265 917	17 52	6.4 5.7	4 17		0.0 29.4	118 382	15 52	12.7 13.6
FARIBAULT	1	0	<u>43.5</u> 0.0	72	10	13.7	156	4	2.4	229	14	6.1	1	0	0.0	111	21	18.9
FILLMORE FREEBORN	4 4	1	25.0 25.0	119 204	15 18	12.6 8.8	204 507	11 17	5.4 3.4	327 715	27 36	8.3 5.0	5 4		20.0 25.0	179 291	19 26	10.6 8.9
GOODHUE	8	2	25.0	314	33	10.5	780	34	4.4	1,102	69	6.3	8	2	25.0	477	51	10.7
GRANT HENNEPIN	0 59	0 16	27.1	39 9,271	8 808	20.5 8.7	64 19,241	4 730	6.3 3.8	103 28,571	12 1,554	11.7 5.4	0 65		27.7	52 13,239	10 1,163	19.2 8.8
HOUSTON HUBBARD	2 5	02	0.0 40.0	74 95	14 17	18.9 17.9	226 140	3	1.3 6.4	302 240	17 28	5.6 11.7	35	0	0.0 40.0	115 170	21 40	18.3 23.5
ISANTI	3	0	0.0	184	27	14.7	340	17	5.0	527	44	8.3	5		0.0	302	43	14.2
ITASCA JACKSON	5 7	$2 \\ 2$	40.0 28.6	230 57	41	17.8 14.0	459 150	29 1	6.3 0.7	694 214	72 11	10.4 5.1			33.3 37.5	355 87	53 14	14.9 16.1
KANABEC	2	0	0.0	86	15	17.4	135	7	5.2	223	22	9.9	2	0	0.0	145	25	17.2
KANDIYOHI KITTSON	10 0	$2 \\ 0$	20.0	267 27	30 7		536 52	19 2	3.5 3.8	813 79	51 9	6.3 11.4	18 0		22.2	447 35	41 12	9.2 34.3
KOOCHICHING	3	1	33.3	96	20	20.8	134	9	6.7	233	30	12.9	6	4	66.7	163	37	22.7
LAC QUI PARL LAKE	2 1	1 1	50.0 100.0	29 57	6 11	20.7 19.3	85 148	9 7	10.6 4.7	116 206	16 19	13.8 9.2	4		25.0 100.0	48 85	13 13	27.1 15.3
LAKE OF THE LE SUEUR	2	0	0.0	22	4	18.2	46	0	0.0	70	4	5.7	2		0.0	32	5	15.6
LINCOLN	5 0	3 0	60.0	137 29	28 4	20.4 13.8	366 90	19 5	5.2 5.6	508 119	50 9	9.8 7.6	7 0		42.9	227 46	52 11	22.9 23.9
LYON MCLEOD	4 13	<u>1</u> 5	25.0 38.5	141 221	16 15	11.3 6.8	<u>384</u> 445	<u>11</u> 18	<u>2.9</u> 4.0	<u>529</u> 679	28 38	<u>5.3</u> 5.6	6 14		<u>16.7</u> 35.7	210 361	<u>29</u> 30	<u>13.8</u> 8.3
MAHNOMEN	5	2	40.0	38	18	47.4	31	2	6.5	74	22	29.7	6	2	33.3	80	35	43.8
MARSHALL MARTIN	4	$\frac{2}{0}$	<u>50.0</u> 0.0	49 108	<u>9</u> 16	18.4 14.8	70 304	<u> </u>	<u>11.4</u> 5.3	<u>123</u> 416	<u>19</u> 32	<u>15.4</u> 7.7	4		<u>50.0</u> 0.0	75 159	<u>13</u> 22	<u>17.3</u> 13.8
MEEKER	2	Õ	0.0	109	14	12.8	227	8	3.5	338	22	6.5	2	Õ	0.0	174	19	10.9
MILLE LACS MORRISON	<u>6</u> 4	2	<u>33.3</u> 25.0	141 159	22		207 339	<u>13</u> 19	6.3 5.6	354 502	<u>42</u> 42	<u>11.9</u> 8.4	6 4		<u>33.3</u> 25.0	225 271	<u>55</u> 40	<u>24.4</u> 14.8
MOWER	2	0	0.0		30	15.1	535	29	5.4		59	8.0			0.0		43	14.3

TRAFF	IC (	CRAS	HES	. FAT			.01, (F			, ,			D A	LCO	HOL·	RELA	TED	)
				,			JNTY											
					TRA	FFIC	C CRAS	HES					PER	SONS	KILL	ED OR	R INJU	RED
	FAT	AL CRA	SHES	INJUR	Y CRAS	SHES	DAMA	OPERT AGE ON RASHES	NLY	TOTAI	CRAS	HES		KILLE	D	IN	JURED	)
COUNTY	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
MURRAY	0	0		33	7	21.2	77	0	0.0	110	7	6.4	0	0		44	10	22.7
NICOLLET	4	1	25.0	137	15	10.9	379	18	4.7	520	34	6.5	4	1	25.0	212	22	10.4
NOBLES	3	1	33.3	124	10	8.1	356	11	3.1	483	22	4.6		1	33.3	187	21	11.2
NORMAN	5	4	80.0	33	6	18.2	69	4	5.8	107	14	13.1	5	4	80.0	55	14	25.5
OLMSTED	10	3	30.0	703	55	7.8	1,635	60	3.7	2,348	118	5.0	11	3	27.3	1,026	81	7.9
OTTER TAIL	13	4	30.8	266	33	12.4	667	29	4.3	946	66	7.0	13	4	30.8	423	56	13.2
PENNINGTON	5	3	60.0	-	17	13.0	154	4	2.6	290	24	8.3	6	3	50.0	192	26	13.5
PINE	3	2	66.7	187	28	15.0	337	19	5.6	527	49	9.3		4	80.0	301	45	15.0
PIPESTONE	2	1	50.0	46	3	6.5	96	5	5.2	144	9	6.3	2	1	50.0	63	4	6.3
POLK	6	1	16.7	173	26	15.0	405	16	4.0	584	43	7.4	7	2	28.6	281	43	15.3
POPE	3	0	0.0		9	20.0	106	3	2.8	154	12	7.8		0	0.0	63	14	22.2
RAMSEY	24	10	41.7	4,010	318	7.9	9,901	379	3.8	13,935	707	5.1	28	12	42.9	5,697	472	8.3
RED LAKE	4	1	25.0	19	2	10.5	54	3	5.6	77	6	7.8	6	1	16.7	29	6	20.7
REDWOOD	3	2	66.7	92	10	10.9	162	8	4.9	257	20	7.8		2	66.7	132	16	12.1
RENVILLE	8	1	12.5	94	16	17.0	172	13	7.6	274	30	10.9	-	2	20.0	151	24	15.9
RICE ROCK	5 1	$2 \\ 0$	40.0	310 54	30 8	9.7	712 165	28 3	3.9 1.8	1,027 220	60	5.8		$2 \\ 0$	25.0	464	42	9.1
ROSEAU	1	0	0.0	53	10	14.8 18.9	165	5	1.8 0.7	220	11 11	5.0 5.3	1	0	0.0 0.0	80 81	11 20	13.8 24.7
ST. LOUIS	27	17	63.0		156	15.1	2,096	116	5.5	3,153	289	<u> </u>	32	19	59.4	1,534	244	15.9
SCOTT	13	2	15.4		58	13.1	2,090	46	5.5 4.8	1397	106	9.2 7.6	-	2	15.4	624	244 80	13.9
SHERBURNE	10	3	30.0	265	36	13.4	571	30	5.3	846	69	8.2	12	3	25.0	424	60	14.2
SIBLEY	3	1	33.3	65	8	12.3	152	<u> </u>	4.6	220	16	7.3	3	1	33.3	98	10	10.2
STEARNS	17	6	35.3	990	102	10.3	1,961	85	4.3	2,968	193	6.5	-	8	38.1	1,475	162	11.0
STEELE	6	2	33.3	195	26	13.3	590	26	4.4	791	54	6.8	6	2	33.3	279	41	14.7
STEVENS	1	1	100.0	46	6	13.0	89	1	1.1	136	8	5.9	1	1	100.0	62	6	9.7
SWIFT	4	2	50.0		9	18.4	83	2	2.4	136	13	9.6		2	40.0	79	14	17.7
TODD	3	0	0.0	129	26	20.2	289	15	5.2	421	41	9.7	4	0	0.0	206	46	22.3
TRAVERSE	0	0		14	1	7.1	24	1	4.2	38	2	5.3	0	0		18	1	5.6
WABASHA	7	2	28.6	112	14	12.5	257	12	4.7	376	28	7.4	7	2	28.6	179	22	12.3
WADENA	3	2	66.7	76	12	15.8	158	8	5.1	237	22	9.3	5	2	40.0	115	19	16.5
WASECA	2	1	50.0	79	6	7.6	242	13	5.4	323	20	6.2	3	1	33.3	115	8	7.0
WASHINGTON	11	5	45.5		86	9.9	1,987	81	4.1	2,867	172	6.0		7		,	135	10.6
WATONWAN	4	1	25.0			16.7	140	7	5.0	192	16	8.3		1	25.0	74	13	17.6
WILKIN	1	0	0.0		8	13.6	126	5	4.0	186	13	7.0		0	0.0	82	11	13.4
WINONA	9	3	33.3		24	7.3	841	32	3.8	1,179	59	5.0		3	33.3	433	34	7.9
WRIGHT	14	5	35.7		59	13.1	822	42	5.1	1,287	106	8.2		5	33.3	686	84	12.2
YELLOW MED	1	1	100.0	58	13	22.4	108	1	0.9	167	15	9.0		1	100.0	87	18	20.7
UNKNOWN	0	0		1	0	0.0	5	0	0.0	6	0	0.0	0	0		1	0	0.0
MINNESOTA	550	198	36.0	31,307	3,383	10.8	67,844	2,841	4.2	99,701	6,422	6.4	644	226	35.1	46,403	5,223	11.3

							BLE 5.				,							
TRAFF	IC (	CRAS	HES	, FAT			, AND JNTY I						D A	LCO	HOL	RELA	ATED	)
							C CRAS		11111		<b>A</b> , 172		PER	SONS	KILL	ED OF	R INJU	RED
	FATA	AL CRA	SHES	INJUR	Y CRAS	SHES	DAMA	OPERT AGE ON ASHES	ILY	TOTAI	L CRAS	HES		KILLEI	D	IP	JURED	)
COUNTY	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
AITKIN ANOKA BECKER	7 25 7	4 11 2	57.1 44.0 28.6	109 1,710	31 190 43	28.4 11.1 25.0	183 2,865 251	12 139	6.6 4.9	299 4,600	47 340	15.7 7.4 13.7	7 25 11	4 11 4	57.1 44.0	183 2,613 273	55 327	30.1 12.5
BELTRAMI BENTON	9 9	3 3	33.3 33.3	166 173 253	20 19	25.9 11.6 7.5	537 493	$\frac{13}{25}$	5.2 4.7 4.1	<u>424</u> 719 755	58 48 42	6.7 5.6	9 10	3 3	<u>36.4</u> 33.3 30.0	266 404	65 31 34	23.8 11.7 8.4
BIG STONE BLUE EARTH BROWN	1 6 7	0 4 3	0.0 66.7 42.9	25 455 157	0 54 13	0.0 11.9 8.3	84 914 303	1 43 19	1.2 4.7 6.3	<u>110</u> 1,375 467	$\frac{1}{101}$	0.9 7.3 7.5	3 10 7	0 7 3	0.0 70.0 42.9	29 644 249	0 81 32	0.0 12.6 12.9
CARLTON CARVER CASS	<u>5</u> 11 9	3 4 4	60.0 36.4 44.4	152 366 159	26 48 46	17.1 13.1 28.9	281 713 257	30 22	1.1 4.2 8.6	438 1,090 425	32 82 72	7.3 7.5 16.9	6 16 10	4 6 5	<u>66.7</u> 37.5 50.0	233 546 254	42 73 70	18.0 13.4 27.6
CHIPPEWA CHISAGO CLAY	<u>3</u> 6 7	$\frac{1}{2}$	33.3 33.3 57.1	78 189 293	11 25 33	14.1 13.2 11.3	<u>144</u> 482 786	8 24 31	5.6 5.0 3.9	225 677 1,086	20 51 68	<u>8.9</u> 7.5 6.3	3 6 12	1 2 6	33.3 33.3 50.0	144 321 428	21 36 44	<u>14.6</u> 11.2 10.3
CLEARWATER COOK COTTONWOOD	5 0 2	3 0 0	60.0 0.0	32 47 57	5 10 9	15.6 21.3 15.8	58 101 104	<u>6</u> 9 5	10.3 8.9 4.8	95 148 163	<u>14</u> 19 14	14.7 12.8 8.6	5 0 3	3 0 0	<u>60.0</u> 0.0	50 71 99	5 11 19	10.0 15.5 19.2
CROW WING DAKOTA DODGE	8 24 5	$\frac{3}{10}$	37.5 41.7 40.0	399 1,654 78	53 143 18	13.3 8.6 23.1	794 3,365 150	<u>39</u> 150 6	4.9 4.5 4.0	1,201 5,043 233	95 303 26	7.9 6.0 11.2	8 26 5	$\frac{3}{10}$	37.5 38.5 40.0	612 2,463 120	83 241 26	<u>13.6</u> 9.8 21.7
DOUGLAS FARIBAULT FILLMORE	<u>6</u> 4 4	$\frac{3}{2}$	50.0 50.0 50.0	232 52 101	28 7 14	12.1 13.5 13.9	644 105 192	22 9 13	3.4 8.6 6.8	882 161 297	53 18 29	6.0 11.2 9.8	6 6 4		50.0 33.3 50.0	363 87 148	<u>47</u> 11 20	12.9 12.6 13.5
FREEBORN GOODHUE GRANT	9 5 1	$\frac{-3}{1}$	<u>33.3</u> 20.0 0.0	177 321 36	<u>16</u> 41 3	9.0 12.8 8.3	<u>384</u> 691 52	$\frac{9}{20}$	2.3 2.9 3.8	<u>570</u> 1,017 89	28 62 5	4.9 6.1 5.6	10 6 1		<u>30.0</u> 16.7 0.0	252 514 48	20 55 3	7.9 10.7 6.3
HENNEPIN HOUSTON HUBBARD	$\frac{48}{4}$	$\frac{15}{1}$	<u>31.3</u> 25.0 0.0	9,275 93 112	<u>796</u> 23 23	8.6 24.7 20.5	<u>18,732</u> 210 139	729 12 5	3.9 3.7 3.6	<u>28,055</u> 307 253	<u>1,540</u> 36 28	<u>5.5</u> 11.7 11.1	54 4 2		<u>35.2</u> 25.0 0.0	13,308 180 171	<u>1,192</u> 49 35	9.0 9.0 27.2 20.5
ISANTI ITASCA JACKSON	2 3 5 2	1	0.0 33.3 0.0 50.0	112 162 262 52	<u>15</u> 49	9.3 18.7	<u>339</u> 437 120	25 19 4	7.4 4.3 3.3	<u>504</u> 704	41 68 15	<u>8.1</u> 9.7 8.6	3 7	1	0.0 33.3 0.0 50.0	246 424 86	<u>18</u> 69 13	7.3 16.3
KANABEC KANDIYOHI	<u>6</u> 9	$\frac{1}{3}$	<u>50.0</u> 33.3	86 321	<u>21</u> 38	19.2 24.4 11.8	<u>140</u> 549	<u>5</u> 23	3.6 4.2	174 232 879	<u>29</u> 64	<u>12.5</u> 7.3	6 12	3	<u>50.0</u> 25.0	155 530	<u>32</u> 66	15.1 20.6 12.5
KITTSON KOOCHICHING LAC QUI PAR	$\frac{1}{2}$	0 0 0	0.0 0.0	25 79 16	6 15 0	24.0 19.0 0.0	73 136 51	1 9 1	1.4 6.6 2.0	99 <u>217</u> 67		7.1 <u>11.1</u> 1.5	3 0	0	0.0 0.0	29 122 36	8 <u>30</u> 0	27.6 24.6 0.0
LAKE LAKE OF THE LE SUEUR			50.0 0.0	79 10 139		8.9 10.0 18.0	163 40 299	$\frac{4}{1}$	2.5 2.5 7.4	244 51 438	12 2 47	4.9 <u>3.9</u> 10.7	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 1\\ 0\end{array}$	0	50.0 0.0	108 14 210	9 1 33	8.3 7.1 15.7
LINCOLN LYON MCLEOD	2 6 5	0 1 2	0.0 16.7 40.0	23 138 213	5 15 31	21.7 10.9 14.6	65 279 410	0 8 12	0.0 2.9 2.9	90 423 628	5 24 45	5.6 <u>5.7</u> 7.2	2 8 6	2	0.0 25.0 33.3	32 205 342	5 22 52	15.6 10.7 15.2
MAHNOMEN MARSHALL MARTIN	2 0 3	1 0 2	50.0	40 34 121	10 5 13	25.0 14.7 10.7	28 73 238	2 8 12	7.1 11.0 5.0	70 107 362	13 13 27	18.6 <u>12.1</u> 7.5	0		50.0 	75 53 199	15 9 20	20.0 <u>17.0</u> 10.1
MEEKER MILLE LACS MORRISON	4 2 8	$\frac{\frac{1}{3}}{4}$	75.0 50.0 50.0	111 180 169		14.4 20.0 17.8	205 273 388	2 15 26	1.0 5.5 6.7	320 455 565	21 52 60	6.6 <u>11.4</u> 10.6	4 2	3 1	75.0 50.0 69.2	188 308 251	27 56 55	14.4 18.2 21.9
MOWER	7	3	42.9		20	10.7	476	15	3.2	670	38	5.7			42.9		26	9.7

COUNTY All All h	L CRA Alco- hol (3) 1 2 1 0 2 6 1 4	Alc           0)         (4)           1         33.3	INJUR All (5)	Y CRAS			HES					PER	SONS	KILL	ED OR	INJU	REL
AllAllAll(1)(2)(1)(1)(2)(1)MURRAY3NICOLLET2NOBLES1NORMAN0OLMSTED8OTTER TAIL9PENNINGTON1PINE9PIPESTONE2POLK6POPE1RAMSEY25RED LAKE0RED WOOD0RED LAKE1ROCK1RICE7ROCK1ST. LOUIS22SCOTT14STEARNS18STEELE9STEVENS0SWIFT2SWIFT2SWIFT2WABASHA3WADENA6	Alco- hol (3) 1 2 1 0 2 6 1	co-         %           bl         Alc           i)         (4)           1         33.3	All	Alco-	SHES		<b>)PERT</b>										
COUNTYh(1)(2)(MURRAY3NICOLLET2NOBLES1NORMAN0OLMSTED8OTTER TAIL9PENNINGTON1PINE9PIPESTONE2POLK6POPE1RAMSEY25RED LAKE0RED VILLE1RICE7ROCK1ROSEAU1ST. LOUIS22SCOTT14SHERBURNE7SIBLEY5STEARNS18STEELE9STEVENS0SWIFT2TODD4TRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6	hol (3) 1 2 1 0 2 6 1	Alc           0)         (4)           1         33.3				CR	GE ON ASHES	LY	TOTAL	CRAS	HES	l	KILLEI	)	IN	JURED	)
MURRAY3NICOLLET2NOBLES1NORMAN0OLMSTED8OTTER TAIL9PENNINGTON1PINE9PIPESTONE2POLK6POPE1RAMSEY25RED LAKE0RED VODD0RENVILLE1RICE7ROCK1ROSEAU1ST. LOUIS22SCOTT14SHERBURNE7SIBLEY5STEARNS18STEELE9STEVENS0ATRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6	1 2 1 0 2 6 1	1 33.3	(5)	hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc
NICOLLET2NOBLES1NORMAN0OLMSTED8OTTER TAIL9PENNINGTON1PINE9PIPESTONE2POLK6POPE1RAMSEY25RED LAKE0RED LAKE1RICE7ROCK1ROSEAU1ST. LOUIS22SCOTT14SHERBURNE7SIBLEY5STEARNS18STEELE9STEVENS0SWIFT2TODD4IRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6	2 1 0 2 6 1		(2)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
NOBLES1NORMAN0DLMSTED8DTTER TAIL9PENNINGTON1PINE9PIPESTONE2POLK6POPE1RAMSEY25RED LAKE0RED LAKE0RED LAKE1RICE7ROCK1ROSEAU1ST. LOUIS22SCOTT14SHERBURNE7SIBLEY5STEARNS18STEELE9STEVENS0SWIFT2FODD4FRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6			36	8	22.2	70	4	5.7	109	13	11.9	4	2	50.0	55	10	18
NORMAN0DLMSTED8DTTER TAIL9PENNINGTON1PINE9PESTONE2POLK6POPE1RAMSEY25RED LAKE0RED LAKE0RED VILLE1RICE7ROCK1ROSEAU1STE LOUIS22SCOTT14SHERBURNE7SIBLEY5STEARNS18STEELE9STEVENS0SWIFT2TODD4CRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6	0 2 6 1	2 100.0	129	19	14.7	312	19	6.1	443	40	9.0	2	2	100.0	191	33	17
DLMSTED8DTTER TAIL9PENNINGTON1PINE9PIPESTONE2POLK6POPE1RAMSEY25RED LAKE0RED LAKE0RED VILLE1RICE7ROCK1ROSEAU1ST. LOUIS22GCOTT14HERBURNE7SIBLEY5STEARNS18STEELE9STEVENS0SWIFT2TODD4TRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6	2 6 1	1 100.0	102	10	9.8	275	8	2.9	378	19	5.0	1	1	100.0	157	20	12
DTTER TAIL9PENNINGTON1PINE9PIPESTONE2POLK6POPE1RAMSEY25RED LAKE0REDWOOD0RENVILLE1RICE7ROCK1ROSEAU1ST. LOUIS22SCOTT14SHERBURNE7SIBLEY5STEARNS18STEELE9STEVENS0SWIFT2FODD4FRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6	<u>6</u> 1	• •	38	8	21.1	60	_4	6.7	98	12	12.2	0	0		80	15	18
PENNINGTON1PINE9PIPESTONE2POLK6POPE1RAMSEY25RED LAKE0REDWOOD0RENVILLE1RICE7ROCK1ROCK1ST. LOUIS22SCOTT14SHERBURNE7SIBLEY5STEARNS18STEELE9STEVENS0KWIFT2FODD4FRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6	1		813	70	8.6	1,451	73	5.0	2,272	145	6.4	11	2	18.2	1,211	103	8
PINE9PIPESTONE2POLK6POPE1RAMSEY25RED LAKE0REDWOOD0RENVILLE1RICE7ROCK1ROCK1ST. LOUIS22SCOTT14SHERBURNE7SIBLEY5STEARNS18STEELE9STEVENS0SWIFT2FODD4IRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6			295	48	16.3	533	20	3.8	837	74	8.8	10	7	70.0	429	67	15
PIPESTONE2POLK6POPE1RAMSEY25RED LAKE0REDWOOD0RENVILLE1RICE7ROCK1ROSEAU1ST. LOUIS22SCOTT14SHERBURNE7SIBLEY5STEARNS18STEELE9STEVENS0SWIFT2FODD4FRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6			108 179	10 30	9.3 16.8	134 350	9 24	6.7 6.9	243 538	20 58	8.2 10.8	1 10	1 4	$100.0 \\ 40.0$	184 300	18 50	9 16
POLK6POPE1RAMSEY25RED LAKE0REDWOOD0RENVILLE1RICE7ROCK1ST. LOUIS22SCOTT14SHERBURNE7SIBLEY5STEARNS18STEVENS0SWIFT2FODD4IRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6	2		45	50	13.3	83	3	3.6	130	11	8.5	2	2	100.0	57	50	12
POPE1RAMSEY25RED LAKE0REDWOOD0REDWOOD0RENVILLE1RICE7ROCK1ROSEAU1ST. LOUIS22SCOTT14SHERBURNE7SIBLEY5STEARNS18STEELE9STEVENS0SWIFT2FODD4FRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6	3	= = = = = = = =		33	18.0	346	20	5.8	535	56	10.5	7	4	57.1	280	41	14
RAMSEY25RED LAKE0REDWOOD0REDWOLLE1RICE7ROCK1ROSEAU1ST. LOUIS22SCOTT14SHERBURNE7SIBLEY5STEARNS18STEELE9STEVENS0SWIFT2FODD4FRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6	Ő		32	3	9.4	99	8	8.1	132	11	8.3	1	0	0.0	42	3	7
REDWOOD0REDWILLE1RICE7ROCK1ROSEAU1ST. LOUIS22SCOTT14SHERBURNE7SIBLEY5STEARNS18STEELE9STEVENS0SWIFT2FODD4FRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6	11		-	366	9.1	9,424	354	3.8	13,478	731	5.4	28	13	46.4	5,677	537	9
RENVILLE1RICE7ROCK1ROSEAU1ST. LOUIS22SCOTT14SHERBURNE7SIBLEY5STEARNS18STEELE9STEVENS0SWIFT2TODD4TRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6	0	0.	14	3	21.4	33	3	9.1	47	6	12.8	0	0		28	4	14
RICE7ROCK1ROSEAU1ST. LOUIS22SCOTT14SHERBURNE7SIBLEY5STEARNS18STEELE9STEVENS0SWIFT2FODD4FRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6	0		97	8	8.2	128	6	4.7	225	14	6.2	0	0		154	16	10
ROCK1ROSEAU1ST. LOUIS22SCOTT14SHERBURNE7SIBLEY5STEARNS18STEELE9STEVENS0SWIFT2FODD4IRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6	0			15	24.2	139	8	5.8	202	23	11.4	1	0	0.0	99	19	19
ROSEAU1ST. LOUIS22SCOTT14SHERBURNE7SIBLEY5STEARNS18STEELE9STEVENS0SWIFT2FODD4TRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6	1		326	41	12.6	634	24	3.8	967	66	6.8	8	1	12.5	487	65	13
ST. LOUIS22SCOTT14SHERBURNE7SIBLEY5STEARNS18STEELE9STEVENS0SWIFT2TODD4TRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6	0			8	12.1	151	3	2.0	218	11	5.0	1	0	0.0	96	9	9
SCOTT14SHERBURNE7SIBLEY5STEARNS18STEELE9STEVENS0SWIFT2FODD4TRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6	<u>1</u> 15		62 1.192	$\frac{10}{160}$	16.1 13.4	$\frac{171}{2.050}$	<u>3</u> 123	1.8 6.0	<u>234</u> 3,264	$\frac{14}{298}$	<u>6.0</u> 9.1	$\frac{1}{26}$	<u>1</u> 17	100.0 65.4	$\frac{102}{1.769}$	<u>18</u> 259	<u>17</u> 14
SHERBURNE7SIBLEY5STEARNS18STEELE9STEVENS0SWIFT2TODD4TRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6	15		427	57	13.4	2,030	50	5.6	1,341	112	9.1 8.4	14	5	35.7	640	239 77	14
SIBLEY5STEARNS18STEELE9STEVENS0SWIFT2FODD4FRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6	3		286	35	12.2	496	24	4.8	789	62	7.9	7	3	42.9	464	55	11
STEARNS18STEELE9STEVENS0SWIFT2FODD4TRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6	0		78	17	21.8	148	6	4.1	231	23	10.0	6	0	0.0	120	27	22
STEVENS0SWIFT2FODD4FRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6	10			91	9.2	1,896	82	4.3	2,905	183	6.3	22	14	63.6	1,525	153	10
SWIFT2FODD4FRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6	3	3 33.3	189	28	14.8	438	14	3.2	636	45	7.1	10	4	40.0	298	37	12
FODD4IRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6	0		45	7	15.6	86	2	2.3	131	9	6.9	0	0		79	18	22
IRAVERSE1WABASHA3WADENA6	0		42	4	9.5	81	5	6.2	125	9	7.2	2	0	0.0	61	4	6
WABASHA 3 WADENA 6	2		-	20	19.8	242	10	4.1	347	32	9.2	4	2	50.0	153	26	17
WADENA 6	0	0 010	22	21	4.5	210	12	5.9	40	2	5.0	3	0	0.0	38	1	2
0	1 2			21 18	18.6 19.6	210 186	13 7	6.2 3.8	326 284	35 27	10.7 9.5	4 6	$\frac{2}{2}$	50.0 33.3	188 144	34 27	18 18
	$\overset{2}{0}$				19.0	180	7	3.8 3.8	284 272	17	9.3 6.3		$\overset{2}{0}$	55.5 0.0	144	16	13
WASHINGTON 13	3		969	104	10.7	1.948	91	4.7	2,930	198	6.8		4	25.0	1,476	155	10
WATONWAN 2	0			4	7.1	94	3	3.2	152	7	4.6		0	0.0	94	10	10
WILKIN 1	0		59	9	15.3	137	10	7.3	197	19	9.6		Õ	0.0	102	18	17
WINONA 7	1	1 14.3	322	49	15.2	720	40	5.6	1,049	90	8.6	7	1	14.3	470	67	14
WRIGHT 13 YELLOW MED 1	-	8 61.5 0 0.0		63 12	13.3 23.5	782 92	32 5	4.1 5.4	1,270 144	103	8.1 11.8	14	8 0	57.1	753	96	12 18

							BLE 5.	Ψ.			, ,							
TRAFF	FIC C	CRAS	HES	, FAT			, AND UNTY I						<b>D</b> A	LCO	HOL	-RELA	<b>ATED</b>	)
							C CRAS			25012	A, 17:	20	PER	SONS	KILL	ED OF	R INJU	RED
	FATA	AL CRA	SHES	INJUR	Y CRAS	SHES	DAMA	OPERT AGE ON ASHES	NLY	ΤΟΤΑΙ	L CRAS	HES		KILLE	D	r	NJURED	)
COUNTY	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
AITKIN	2	0	0.0	76	11	14.5	205	12	5.9	283	23	8.1	2	0	0.0	106	15	14.2
ANOKA BECKER	21	9	42.9	1,819	180	9.9	3,296	135	4.1	5,136	324	6.3			42.9	2,771	276	10.0
BELTRAMI	3	$\frac{3}{2}$	<u>100.0</u> 33.3	158 233	<u>30</u> 29	<u>19.0</u> 12.4	209 624	<u>8</u> 23	<u>3.8</u> 3.7	<u>370</u> 863	<u>41</u> 54	<u>11.1</u> 6.3	3	-	$\frac{100.0}{42.9}$	232 351	<u>42</u> 41	<u>18.1</u> 11.7
BENTON	11	6	54.5	233	29	8.9	522	26	5.0	770	53	6.9			46.7	406	34	8.4
BIG STONE	1	0	0.0	25	6	24.0	73	4	5.5	99	10	10.1	1	0	0.0	41	6	14.6
BLUE EARTH BROWN	12 2	3 0	25.0 0.0	470 176	46 20	9.8 11.4	1,072 352	46 10	4.3 2.8	1,554 530	95 30	6.1 5.7	12 2		25.0 0.0	657 272	65 31	9.9 11.4
CARLTON	4	3	75.0	160	25	15.6	297	13	4.4	461	41	8.9			75.0	244	35	14.3
CARVER	5	0	0.0	395	45	11.4	799	31	3.9	1,199	76	6.3			0.0	593	67	11.3
CASS CHIPPEWA	6 6	3	50.0 16.7	141 79	39 10	27.7 12.7	295 150	26 6	$\begin{array}{c} 8.8\\ 4.0\end{array}$	442 235	68 17	15.4 7.2	6 8		50.0 12.5	224 146	63 20	28.1 13.7
CHISAGO	12	5	41.7	245	27	11.0	506	23	4.5	763	55	7.2	13		38.5	389	46	11.8
CLAY	4	1	25.0	298	33	11.1	947	39	4.1	1,249	73	5.8	4	1	25.0	440	48	10.9
CLEARWATER COOK	3	0	$\frac{0.0}{0.0}$	32 54	<u>11</u> 16	34.4 29.6	69 110	35	4.3	104 166	<u>14</u> 21	<u>13.5</u> 12.7		-	$\frac{0.0}{0.0}$	48 86	<u>15</u> 19	<u>31.3</u> 22.1
COTTONWOOD	$\overset{2}{0}$	0	0.0	46	10	29.0 6.5	110	5	4.5 5.0	166	21 9	5.4			0.0	80 76		3.9
CROW WING	7	3	42.9	372	38	10.2	775	34	4.4	1,154	75	6.5		-	23.1	561	65	11.6
DAKOTA DODGE	23 4	9 1	39.1 25.0	1,781 84	161 15	9.0 17.9	3,739 183	148 3	4.0 1.6	5,543 271	318 19	5.7 7.0			37.5 25.0	2,616 144	253 20	9.7 13.9
DOUGLAS	2	1	50.0	261	36	17.9	649	19	2.9	912	56	6.1	2		50.0	392	20 47	12.0
FARIBAULT	3	1	33.3	70	14	20.0	137	8	5.8	210	23	11.0	_		33.3	102	25	24.5
FILLMORE FREEBORN	3 5	0	0.0 20.0	112 211	18 28	16.1 13.3	240 582	10 14	4.2 2.4	355 798	28	7.9 5.4			0.0 14.3	165 290	22 42	13.3 14.5
GOODHUE	3	1	33.3	349	<u></u> 37	10.6	759	22	2.4	1.111	<u>43</u> 60	<u> </u>	3	-	33.3	526	52	<u>14.3</u> 9.9
GRANT	0	0		21	2	9.5	68	2	2.9	89	4	4.5	0	0		29	2	6.9
HENNEPIN	50	23	46.0	9,669	783	8.1	20,506	721	3.5	30,225	1,527	5.1	55		47.3	13,739		8.8
HOUSTON HUBBARD	47	2 3	50.0 42.9	111 96	14 19	12.6 19.8	249 177	10 13	4.0 7.3	364 280	26 35	7.1 12.5			50.0 42.9	170 144	30 31	17.6 21.5
ISANTI	4	2	50.0	187		18.7	386	18	4.7	577	55	9.5	5	2	40.0	291	47	16.2
ITASCA	5	4	80.0	264	46	17.4	540	35	6.5	809	85	10.5			80.0	410	78	19.0
JACKSON KANABEC	2 3	$\begin{array}{c} 0\\ 2\end{array}$	0.0 66.7	75 94	6 13	8.0 13.8	167 146	11 8	6.6 5.5	244 243	17 23	7.0 9.5			0.0 50.0	105 152	7 21	6.7 13.8
KANDIYOHI	9	2	22.2	318	32		544	21	3.9	871	55	6.3			27.3	489	58	11.9
KITTSON	1	1	100.0	28	3		69	1	1.4	98	5	5.1	2		100.0	39	4	10.3
KOOCHICHING LAC QUI PAR	2	$\frac{2}{0}$	100.0	89 39	<u>13</u> 5	14.6 12.8	172 65	<u>10</u> 0	5.8 0.0	263 106	<u>25</u> 5	<u>9.5</u> 4.7			100.0	123 60	<u>18</u> 8	<u>14.6</u> 13.3
LAKE	2	1	50.0	65	8	12.3	164	10	6.1	231	19	8.2	2	1	50.0	98	10	10.2
LAKE OF THE	5	3	60.0	19	3	15.8	41	0	0.0	65	6	9.2		-	60.0	37	5	13.5
LE SUEUR LINCOLN	4	1	25.0 100.0	147 23	26 0	17.7 0.0	377 82	19 3	5.0 3.7	528 106	46 4	8.7 3.8			25.0 100.0	241 32	37 1	15.4 3.1
LYON	4	3	75.0	155	8	5.2	381	16	4.2	540	27	5.0	7	4	57.1	218	15	6.9
MCLEOD	11	1	9.1	210	22	10.5	478	15	3.1	699	38	5.4			6.7	325	30	9.2
MAHNOMEN MARSHALL	4	2 2	50.0 50.0	36 49	10 10	27.8 20.4	34 70	2 0	5.9 0.0	74 123	14 12	18.9 9.8			50.0 50.0	66 82	25 17	37.9 20.7
MARTIN	5	1	20.0	118	13	11.0	321	9	2.8	444	23	5.2			20.0	183	18	9.8
MEEKER	5	1	20.0		12	8.6	201	10	5.0	345	23	6.7	6		16.7	230		10.0
MILLE LACS MORRISON	3	03	$\frac{0.0}{42.9}$	159 206	<u>26</u> 31	16.4 15.0	272 342	<u>15</u> 23	5.5 6.7	434 555	<u>41</u> 57	<u>9.4</u> 10.3		-	<u>0.0</u> 50.0	264 330	<u>44</u> 39	<u>16.7</u> 11.8
MOWER	5	5 1	42.9 20.0		20	10.5		23 16	0.7 3.3		37	10.5 5.5			20.0			11.8 9.8

	1				BY	ιυι	JINIX.	IN M	INN	ESOTA	4, 195	90	ir					
					TRA	FFIC	C CRAS	HES					PER	SONS	KILL	ED OR	INJU	JREI
	FAT	AL CRA	SHES	INJUR	Y CRAS	SHES	DAMA	OPERT AGE ON RASHES	ILY	ΤΟΤΑΙ	CRAS	HES	:	KILLEI	D	IN	JUREI	)
COUNTY	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
MURRAY	2	0	0.0	31	6	19.4	90	2	2.2	123	8	6.5	3	0	0.0	47	12	25.
VICOLLET	3	0	0.0	142	15	10.6	343	15	4.4	488	30	6.1	3	0	0.0	209	29	13.
NOBLES	1	0	0.0	125	13	10.4	359	7	1.9	485	20	4.1	1	0	0.0	182	21	11.
NORMAN	2	1	50.0	53	5	9.4	83	3	3.6	138	9	6.5	3	2	66.7	76	6	7.
DLMSTED	12	2	16.7	832	69	8.3	1,643	51	3.1	2,487	122	4.9	14	3	21.4	1,224	106	8.
OTTER TAIL	10	3	30.0	338	44	13.0	616	21	3.4	964	68	7.1	12	5	41.7	516	57	11.
PENNINGTON	1	0	0.0	108	13	12.0	169	6	3.6	278	19	6.8	2	0	0.0	151	17	11.
PINE	5	2	40.0	194	32	16.5	326	14	4.3	525	48	9.1	6	3	50.0	317	54	17
PIPESTONE	2	0	0.0	43	7	16.3	85	5	5.9	130	12	9.2	2	0	0.0	61	11	18.
POLK	5	2	40.0	195	24	12.3	369	12	3.3	569	38	6.7	5	2	40.0	302	38	12.
POPE	2	1	50.0	43	1	2.3	77	1	1.3	122	3	2.5	5	3	60.0	62	1	1.
RAMSEY	26	8	30.8	4,282	376	8.8	10,698	398	3.7	15,006	782	5.2	26	8	30.8	6,057	580	9.
RED LAKE	2	0	0.0	16	5	31.3	49	3	6.1	67	8	11.9	2	0	0.0	26	7	26.
REDWOOD	10	3	30.0	97	17	17.5	177	8	4.5	284	28	9.9	12	4	33.3	164	26	15.
RENVILLE	4	0	0.0	96	17	17.7	200	13	6.5	300	30	10.0		0	0.0	152	22	14.
RICE ROCK	3	1	33.3	342	50	14.6	765	36	4.7	1,110	87	7.8	3	1	33.3	528	81	15.
ROSEAU	2 4	$0 \\ 2$	0.0 50.0	75 68	7 9	9.3 13.2	188 133	3	1.6 2.3	265 205	10 14	3.8 6.8	2 6	0 3	$\begin{array}{c} 0.0\\ 50.0\end{array}$	106 108	11 10	10. 9.
ST. LOUIS	21	11	<u> </u>	1,166	177	15.2	2.212	131	<u>2.5</u> 5.9	3,399	319	<u> </u>	24	12	50.0	1,732	284	<u> </u>
SCOTT	10	5	50.0	498	66	13.2	1,048	48	4.6	1,556	119	9.4 7.6		5	38.5	745	284 98	13.
HERBURNE	11	2	18.2	302	30	9.9	595	18	3.0	908	50	5.5	12	2	16.7	470	45	- 15. 9.
SIBLEY	3	2	66.7	83	22	26.5	228	16	7.0	314	40	12.7	3	2	66.7	124	34	27.
STEARNS	16	7	43.8	1,060	91	8.6	1,912	72	3.8	2,988	170	5.7	17	8	47.1	1,581	142	- 27.
STEELE	4	Ó	0.0	215	23	10.7	618	15	2.4	837	38	4.5	4	Õ	0.0	318	40	12
STEVENS	1	0	0.0	31	4	12.9	97	2	2.1	129	6	4.7	1	0	0.0	38	6	15.
SWIFT	2	0	0.0	48	6	12.5	96	3	3.1	146	9	6.2	2	0	0.0	75	6	8
TODD	6	2	33.3	102	22	21.6	292	11	3.8	400	35	8.8	7	2	28.6	169	34	20
TRAVERSE	0	0		24	5	20.8	29	2	6.9	53	7	13.2	0	0		33	7	21.
WABASHA	2	2	100.0	114	17	14.9	263	18	6.8	379	37	9.8	2	2	100.0	172	29	16
VADENA	1	0	0.0	88	15	17.0	184	6	3.3	273	21	7.7	1	0	0.0	127	17	13.
WASECA	3	2	66.7	96	9	9.4	261	10	3.8	360	21	5.8		2	50.0	148	14	9
WASHINGTON	8	2	25.0	927	87	9.4	2,247	107	4.8	3,182	196	6.2		2	25.0	1,380	130	9
WATONWAN	0	0	•	51	7	13.7	101	7	6.9	152	14	9.2	0	0	•	70	9	12
WILKIN	4	2	50.0	75	14	18.7	142	8	5.6	221	24	10.9		2	40.0	113	22	19
WINONA	5	2	40.0	296	44	14.9	825	31	3.8	1,126	77	6.8		2	40.0	408	65	15
WRIGHT YELLOW MED	10	4 0	40.0 0.0	583 53		10.8 11.3	891 92	33 3	3.7 3.3	1,484 146	100 9	6.7 6.2		5 0	41.7 0.0	876 96	95 7	10 7

							BLE 5.	Ψ.			<i>´</i>							
TRAFF	IC (	CRAS	HES	, FAT			, AND JNTY I						DA	LCO	HOL	RELA	ATED	)
							C CRAS		11111	25012	4, 193	91	PER	SONS	KILL	ED OF	R INJU	RED
	FATA	AL CRA	SHES	INJUR	Y CRAS	SHES	DAMA	OPERT AGE ON ASHES	ILY	ΤΟΤΑΙ	CRAS	HES		KILLE	D	ľ	IJURED	•
COUNTY	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
AITKIN ANOKA	5 16	1 5	20.0 31.3	105 1,806	10 169	9.5 9.4	193 3,024	10 136	5.2 4.5	303 4,846	21 310	6.9 6.4	5 18	5	20.0 27.8	172 2,769	13 296	7.6 10.7
BECKER BELTRAMI BENTON	<u>11</u> 8 5	8 3 3	72.7 37.5 60.0	144 222 231	<u>30</u> 29 25	20.8 13.1 10.8	249 550 401	<u>12</u> 32 11	4.8 5.8 2.7	404 780 637	50 64 39	<u>12.4</u> 8.2 6.1	13 8 6	3	<u>69.2</u> 37.5 50.0	234 379 376	50 44 45	21.4 11.6 12.0
BIG STONE BLUE EARTH BROWN	0 5 4	0 0 1	0.0 25.0	22 358 148	1 29 17	4.5 8.1 11.5	80 997 307	1 37 7	1.2 3.7 2.3	<u>102</u> 1,360 459	2 66 25	<u>2.0</u> 4.9 5.4	-	0	0.0 0.0 16.7	34 521 216	1 42 27	2.9 8.1 12.5
CARLTON CARVER CASS	5 12 11	1 6 4	20.0 50.0 36.4	137 357 163	$\frac{17}{39}$ 40	12.4 10.9 24.5	270 716 280	12 36 21	4.4 5.0 7.5	412 1,085 454	30 81 65	7.3 7.5 14.3	5 15 11	1 6 4	20.0 40.0 36.4	200 552 259	22 66 62	11.0 12.0 23.9
CHIPPEWA CHISAGO CLAY	4 4 6	0 1 1	0.0 25.0 16.7	76 230 298	9 38 28	11.8 16.5 9.4	141 523 1,006	6 19 28	4.3 3.6 2.8	221 757 1,310	15 58 57	<u>6.8</u> 7.7 4.4	5 5 7	1	0.0 20.0 14.3	118 331 428	10 54 40	8.5 16.3 9.3
CLEARWATER COOK COTTONWOOD	$\frac{2}{2}$	1	50.0 50.0	37 34	5 4	13.5 11.8	<u>54</u> 99	5 5	9.3 5.1	<u>93</u> 135	11 10	<u>11.8</u> 7.4	2	1	50.0 50.0	57 53	10 6	<u>17.5</u> 11.3
CROW WING DAKOTA	9 24	0 3 5	0.0 33.3 20.8	59 <u>374</u> 1,727	7 42 151	11.9 11.2 8.7	99 846 3,380		5.1 <u>3.8</u> 3.6	161 <u>1,229</u> 5131	12 77 279	7.5 <u>6.3</u> 5.4	9 24	<u>3</u> 5	0.0 33.3 20.8	99 595 2,548	8 81 227	8.1 <u>13.6</u> 8.9
DODGE DOUGLAS FARIBAULT	$     \frac{3}{4}     0 $	0 1 0	0.0 25.0 0	87 232 78	11 <u>17</u> 6	12.6 7.3 7.7	182 684 120	$ \begin{array}{r} 5 \\ 22 \\ 2 \end{array} $	2.7 <u>3.2</u> 1.7	272 920 198	16 40 8	5.9 <u>4.3</u> 4.0	4 0	1	$\begin{array}{r} 0.0 \\ \underline{25.0} \\ 0 \end{array}$	134 363 125	11 33 7	8.2 9.1 5.6
FILLMORE FREEBORN GOODHUE	2 3 9	$     \frac{2}{1}     3 $	100.0 33.3 33.3	90 227 328	20 23 47	22.2 10.1 14.3	215 528 713	4 18 27	1.9 <u>3.4</u> 3.8	307 758 1050	26 42 77	8.5 <u>5.5</u> 7.3		1	100.0 33.3 40.0	129 350 479	22 40 76	17.1 <u>11.4</u> 15.9
GRANT HENNEPIN HOUSTON	$\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 55 \\ 2 \end{array}$		0 <u>32.7</u> 0.0	46 <u>8,927</u> 106	5 <u>699</u> 13	10.9 7.8 12.3	71 <u>19,447</u> 213	2 <u>693</u> 11	2.8 3.6 5.2	117 28,429 321	7 <u>1,410</u> 24	6.0 <u>5.0</u> 7.5	57	19	0 <u>33.3</u> 0.0	56 <u>12,596</u> 146	6 <u>1,007</u> 25	10.7 <u>8.0</u> 17.1
HUBBARD ISANTI ITASCA	4 9 7	1 5	25.0 55.6	105 213	20 29	19.0 13.6	145 393 484	12 16 19	8.3 4.1 3.9	254 615 732	33 50	13.0 8.1	4 10	1 6	25.0 60.0 18.2	163 334 378	27 48	16.6 14.4 21.7
JACKSON KANABEC	2 3	2 0 1	28.6 0.0 <u>33.3</u>	241 70 77	48 9 <u>16</u>	19.9 12.9 20.8	154 131	1 6	0.6 4.6	226 211	69 10 23	9.4 4.4 <u>10.9</u>	2 3	1	0.0 33.3	122 114	82 14 22	11.5 19.3
KANDIYOHI KITTSON KOOCHICHING	4 2 2	1 0 0	25.0 0.0 0.0	313 25 83	21	8.0 12.0 25.3	582 61 147	22 4 12	3.8 6.6 8.2	899 88 232	48 7 33	5.3 8.0 14.2	2 3	0 0	25.0 0.0 0.0	489 33 122	39 3 30	8.0 9.1 24.6
LAC QUI PAR LAKE LAKE OF THE	2 2 3	0 1 2	0.0 50.0 66.7	33 62 11	5 10 2	15.2 16.1 18.2	68 149 36	3 5 1	4.4 3.4 2.8	103 213 50	8 16 5	7.8 7.5 10.0	2	1	0.0 50.0 75.0	53 82 23	12 12 4	22.6 14.6 17.4
LE SUEUR LINCOLN LYON	$\begin{array}{c}1\\0\\2\end{array}$	0 0 1	0.0 0 50.0	144 26 127	15 3 15		365 52 342	15 1 18	4.1 1.9 5.3	510 78 471	30 4 34	5.9 5.1 7.2		0	0.0 0 75.0	215 33 199	21 4 18	9.8 12.1 9.0
MCLEOD MAHNOMEN MARSHALL	5 1 2	2 0 2	40.0 0.0 100.0	216 32 25	22 8 6	10.2 25.0 24.0	480 33 72	26 2 2	5.4 6.1 2.8	701 66 99	50 10 10	7.1 15.2 10.1	6	3 0	50.0 0.0 100.0	317 54 40	34 17 6	10.7 31.5 15.0
MARTIN MEEKER MILLE LACS	5 3 5	0 0 2	$0.0 \\ 0.0 \\ 40.0$	119 130 131	15 14	12.6 10.8 11.5	275 201 261	9 4 18	2.8 3.3 2.0 6.9	399 334 397	24 18 35	6.0 5.4 8.8	5 3	0 0	0.0 0.0 42.9	188 210 217	18 16 23	9.6 7.6 10.6
MORRISON MOWER	9 4	2 2 1	22.2 25.0	170	36 26	21.2 13.3	316	18 11 14	3.5 2.9	495	49 41	<u>8.8</u> 9.9 6.0	9	2	22.2 25.0	270	64 37	23.7 12.8

	ı				BY	COU	JNTY	IN M	INN	ESOTA	A, 199	97	h					
					TRA	FFIC	C CRAS	HES					PER	SONS	KILL	ED OF	R INJU	JREI
	FAT	AL CRA	SHES	INJUR	Y CRAS	SHES	DAMA	OPERT AGE ON RASHES	ILY	TOTAI	CRAS	HES		KILLEI	D	IP	JUREI	)
COUNTY	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
MURRAY	3	0	0.0	32	2	6.3	88	5	5.7	123	7	5.7	3	0	0.0	55	3	5.
NICOLLET	4	1	25.0	128	14	10.9	317	7	2.2	449	22	4.9	4	1	25.0	187	23	12
NOBLES	3	1	33.3	137	10	7.3	317	7	2.2	457	18	3.9	4	1	25.0	217	26	12
NORMAN	1	0	0.0	33	5	15.2	94	6	6.4	128	11	8.6	1	0	0.0	43	6	14
OLMSTED	13	2	15.4	751	68	9.1	1,550	55	3.5	2,314	125	5.4	16	2	12.5	1,087	102	9
OTTER TAIL	11	3	27.3	328	34	10.4	657	21	3.2	996	58	5.8	11	3	27.3	491	51	10
PENNINGTON	0	0	0	111	17	15.3	144	2	1.4	255	19	7.5	0	0	0	160	23	14
PINE PIPESTONE	22	2 0	100.0	171 39	33 3	19.3	398	18	4.5	571	53	9.3		2 0	100.0	245 57	44	18
POLK	3	2	<u>0.0</u> 66.7	188	32	7.7	<u>105</u> 368	<u>4</u> 13	<u>3.8</u> 3.5	146 559	<u>7</u> 47	<u>4.8</u> 8.4	3	2	0.0 66.7	272	<u>5</u>	<u>8</u> 19
POPE	3 4	$\frac{2}{2}$	50.0	188 36	52 8	22.2	308 102	13	3.5 2.0	559 142	47	8.4 8.5	5 4	$\frac{2}{2}$	50.0	51	55 14	27
RAMSEY	30	8	26.7	3.935	335	8.5	9.714	353	3.6	13,679	696	5.1	32	8	25.0	5,514	510	- 27
RED LAKE	1	0	0.0	26	8	30.8	46	1	2.2	73	9	12.3	1	0	0.0	41	14	34.
REDWOOD	2	1	50.0	- <u>20</u> 99	10	10.1	134	7	5.2	235	18	7.7	2	1	50.0	150	11	7
RENVILLE	3	1	33.3	79	11	13.9	179	7	3.9	261	19	7.3	3	1	33.3	120	20	16
RICE	5	2	40.0	364	30	8.2	750	21	2.8	1119	53	4.7	7	4	57.1	546	49	9
ROCK	0	0	0	64	2	3.1	185	7	3.8	249	9	3.6	0	0	0	98	4	4
ROSEAU	3	2	66.7	48	6	12.5	125	4	3.2	176	12	6.8	5	2	40.0	80	12	15.
ST. LOUIS	28	11	39.3	1,064	169	15.9	1,939	102	5.3	3,031	282	9.3	30	11	36.7	1,593	240	15
SCOTT	16	3	18.8	457	43	9.4	869	35	4.0	1342	81	6.0		3	14.3	766	68	8
SHERBURNE	11	3	27.3	321	42	13.1	621	16	2.6	953	61	6.4	12	3	25.0	473	64	13
SIBLEY STEARNS	4 10	3 3	75.0 30.0	70 984	6 95	8.6 9.7	132 1,524	3 63	2.3 4.1	206 2,518	12 161	5.8	5 10	4 3	80.0 30.0	94 1,462	7 137	7. 9.
STEELE	6	3	50.0	224	21	9.7 9.4	633	22	4.1 3.5	2,318	46	6.4 5.3	10	4	36.4	325	32	9
STEVENS	1	1	100.0	49	4	8.2	117	22	1.7	167	7	4.2	1	1	100.0	71	8	11
SWIFT	3	2	66.7	47	8	17.0	106	3	2.8	156	13	8.3	4	2	50.0	71	8	11
FODD	3	2	66.7	139	26	18.7	285	15	5.3	427	43	10.1	3	2	66.7	204	40	19
TRAVERSE	1	0	0.0	17	2	11.8	29	0	0.0	47	2	4.3	1	0	0.0	29	3	10
WABASHA	6	1	16.7	98	17	17.3	228	16	7.0	332	34	10.2	7	1	14.3	171	33	19
WADENA	3	1	33.3	82	12	14.6	161	9	5.6	246	22	8.9	3	1	33.3	124	21	16
WASECA	5	0	0.0	97		15.5	190	8	4.2	292	23	7.9	8	0	0.0	153	18	11
WASHINGTON	12	5	41.7	832	76	9.1	2,026	81	4.0	2,870	162	5.6		6	46.2	1,264	118	9
WATONWAN	4	0	0.0	53	7	13.2	95	3	3.2	152	10	6.6	4	0	0.0	93	26	28
WILKIN WINONA	3	1	33.3	62	9 27	14.5	126	8	6.3	191	18	9.4		1	33.3	90 403	12	13
WRIGHT	8 20	3	37.5 5.0	342 537	37	10.8 13.0	810 930	40 37	4.9 4.0	$1,160 \\ 1,487$	80 108	6.9 7.3	13 25	3 1	23.1	493 842	54 111	11 13
	20	1	33.3	48		15.0	930 94	3/	4.0 3.2	1,487	108	8.3		1	4.0 33.3	842 67	111	13

						TA	BLE 5.	01 (fa	or Yec	ar 1998	3)							
TRAFF	IC C	CRAS	HES	, FAT			, AND Unty 1						ID A	LCO	HOL	RELA	ATED	)
							C CRAS			25017	4, 193	90	PER	SONS	KILL	ED OF	R INJU	RED
	FATA	AL CRA	SHES	INJUR	Y CRAS	SHES	DAMA	OPERT AGE ON RASHES	NLY	ΤΟΤΑΙ	CRAS	HES		KILLE	D	I	JURED	)
COUNTY	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
AITKIN ANOKA	6 28	2 11	33.3 39.3	103 1,760	20 142	19.4 8.1	219 2,830	18 126	8.2 4.5	328 4,618	40 279	12.2 6.0	6 31	2 14	33.3 45.2	138 2,681	33 223	23.9 8.3
BECKER BELTRAMI	<u>9</u> 5	2	<u>22.2</u> 40.0	140 217	<u>28</u> 30	20.0	252 538	<u>15</u> 17	<u>6.0</u> 3.2	401 760	<u>45</u> 49	<u>11.2</u> 6.4	11 5	3	<u>27.3</u> 40.0	213 329	<u>36</u> 50	<u>16.9</u> 15.2
BENTON BIG STONE	10 2	1 1	10.0 50.0	261 27	27 5	10.3 18.5	360 50	21 4	5.8 8.0	631 79	49 10	7.8 12.7	11 2	1 1	9.1 50.0	442 38	47 8	10.6 21.1
BLUE EARTH BROWN	11 0	4 0	36.4	367 117	47 14	12.8 12.0	853 289	36 12	4.2 4.2	1,231 406	87 26	7.1 6.4	19 0	9 0	47.4	533 170	76 21	14.3 12.4
CARLTON	5	1	20.0	152	24	15.8	259	11	4.2	416	36	8.7	6	2	33.3	238	44	18.5
CARVER CASS	8 6	4 3	50.0 50.0	342 176	26 49	7.6 27.8	620 290	29 25	4.7 8.6	970 472	59 77	6.1 16.3	9 6	4 3	44.4 50.0	516 275	37 72	7.2 26.2
CHIPPEWA	3	1	33.3	56	6	10.7	95	3	3.2	154	10	6.5	3	1	33.3	89	10	11.2
CHISAGO CLAY	10 8	4 1	40.0 12.5	246 258	35 25	14.2 9.7	545 673	17 30	3.1 4.5	801 939	56 56	7.0 6.0		4 2	40.0 20.0	409 403	55 44	13.4 10.9
CLEARWATER	5	3	60.0	55	14	25.5	52	4	7.7	112	21	18.8	7	4	57.1	84	23	27.4
COOK COTTONWOOD	1 3	1 0	100.0 0.0	63 67	10 7	15.9 10.4	84 112	4 4	4.8 3.6	148 182	15 11	10.1 6.0	1 3	1 0	100.0 0.0	87 101	14 9	16.1 8.9
CROW WING	17	7	41.2	377	44	11.7	717	29	4.0	1,111	80	7.2	18	8	44.4	602	73	12.1
DAKOTA DODGE	24 5	13 4	54.2 80.0	1,682 87	149 18	8.9 20.7	3,436 146	148 5	4.3 3.4	5,142 238	310 27	6.0 11.3		15 5	57.7 83.3	2,506 167	217 37	8.7 22.2
DOUGLAS	4	1	25.0	246	28	11.4	579	17	2.9	829	46	5.5	4	1	25.0	357	33	9.2
FARIBAULT FILLMORE	1 6	1 3	100.0 50.0	68 97	9 6	13.2 6.2	91 215	6 4	6.6 1.9	160 318	16 13	10.0 4.1	1 6	1 3	100.0 50.0	98 149	19 8	19.4 5.4
FREEBORN	2	1	50.0	191	17	8.9	519	19	3.7	712	37	5.2	3	1	33.3	297	22	7.4
GOODHUE GRANT	12 1	6 1	50.0 100.0	291 29	31 2	10.7 6.9	720 67	30 1	4.2 1.5	1,023 97	67 4	6.5 4.1	12 1	6 1	50.0 100.0	429 43	43 2	10.0 4.7
HENNEPIN	65	22	33.8	8,591	695	8.1	18,411	615	3.3	27,067	1,332	4.9	70	24	34.3	12,247	1,052	8.6
HOUSTON HUBBARD	3 4	2 2	66.7 50.0	115 99	16 25	13.9 25.3	228 114	7 3	3.1 2.6	346 217	25 30	7.2 13.8		$2 \\ 2$	66.7 40.0	181 154	23 38	12.7 24.7
ISANTI	3	1	33.3	206	28	13.6	386	16	4.1	595	45	7.6	3	1	33.3	344	38	11.0
ITASCA JACKSON	6 4	5 1	83.3 25.0	252 53	36 8	14.3 15.1	473 130	21 5	4.4 3.8	731 187	62 14	8.5 7.5		6 1	85.7 20.0	377 83	50 10	13.3 12.0
KANABEC	4	2	50.0	75	14	18.7	148	17	11.5	227	33	14.5	4	2	50.0	127	23	18.1
KANDIYOHI KITTSON	6 1	$2 \\ 0$	33.3 0.0	335 16	29 6	8.7 37.5	467 82	17 2	3.6 2.4	808 99	48 8	5.9 8.1		$2 \\ 0$	28.6 0.0	513 27	43 10	8.4 37.0
KOOCHICHING	0	0		80	15	18.8	99	6	6.1	179	21	11.7	0	0		130	31	23.8
LAC QUI PAR LAKE	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0\\ 0\end{array}$	0.0 0.0	35 42	5 5	14.3 11.9	42 143	1 5	2.4 3.5	78 187	6 10	7.7 5.3	$1 \\ 2$	0 0	0.0 0.0	60 73	9 19	$15.0 \\ 26.0$
LAKE OF THE	1	1	100.0	13	2	15.4	26	0	0.0	40	3	7.5	2	2	100.0	26	3	11.5
LE SUEUR LINCOLN	8 1	3 0	37.5 0.0	153 30	19 10		300 69	17 2	5.7 2.9	461 100	39 12	8.5 12.0			37.5 0.0	262 34	32 10	12.2 29.4
LYON	1	0	0.0	129	14	10.9	262	5	1.9	392	19	4.8	1	0	0.0	205	26	12.7
MCLEOD MAHNOMEN	6 0	3 0	50.0	212 27	18 10	8.5 37.0	414 30	8 3	1.9 10.0	632 57	29 13	4.6 22.8			50.0	351 43	30 15	8.5 34.9
MARSHALL	3	3	100.0	32	7	21.9	60	3	5.0	95	13	13.7	4	4	100.0	50	14	28.0
MARTIN MEEKER	4 4	$\begin{array}{c} 0\\ 1\end{array}$	0.0 25.0	112 129	13 11	11.6 8.5	229 163	5 3	2.2 1.8	345 296	18 15	5.2 5.1	5 4	$\begin{array}{c} 0\\ 1\end{array}$	0.0 25.0	177 202	17 19	9.6 9.4
MILLE LACS	7	3	42.9	152	24	15.8	242	17	7.0	401	44	11.0	9	3	33.3	256	47	18.4
MORRISON MOWER	6 5	5 2	83.3 40.0	184 187	31 26	16.8 13.9		11 16	3.8 3.7	477 629	47 44	9.9 7.0			83.3 42.9	274 272	49 37	17.9 13.6

	<del></del>				BY	COU	JNTY	IN M	INN	ESOTA	4, 199	98	iı —					
					TRA	FFIC	C CRAS	HES					PER	SONS	KILL	ED OR	R INJU	IREL
	FAT	AL CRA	SHES	INJUR	Y CRAS	SHES	DAMA	OPERT AGE ON RASHES	ILY	TOTAI	L CRAS	HES	]	KILLEI	D	IN	JUREI	)
COUNTY	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
MURRAY	0	0		41	10	24.4	70	1	1.4	111	11	9.9	0	0		65	16	24.
NICOLLET	3	2	66.7	110	8	7.3	305	13	4.3	418	23	5.5	4	3	75.0	177	16	9.
NOBLES	5	1	20.0	106	15	14.2	250	5	2.0	361	21	5.8	7	1	14.3	192	27	14.
NORMAN	0	0		30	4	13.3	52	3	5.8	82	7	8.5	0	0		45	5	11.
OLMSTED	16	6	37.5	776	67	8.6	1,420	61	4.3	2,212	134	6.1	19	6	31.6	1,123	96	8.
OTTER TAIL	4	2	50.0	313	42	13.4	591	28	4.7	908	72	7.9	4	2	50.0	498	70	14.
PENNINGTON	2	0	0.0	115	8	7.0	126	7	5.6	243	15	6.2	2	0	0.0	167	17	10.
PINE	8	5	62.5	200	23	11.5	382	16	4.2	590	44	7.5	8	5	62.5	313	45	14.
PIPESTONE POLK	4	2	50.0	49	7	14.3	118	1	0.8	171	10	5.8	5	3	60.0	73	9	12.
POPE	53	3 3	60.0 100.0	137 42	24 8	17.5 19.0	278 97	5 1	$1.8 \\ 1.0$	420 142	32 12	7.6 8.5	6 3	3 3	50.0 100.0	226 74	39 19	17. 25.
RAMSEY	23	11	47.8	3,814	292	7.7	9,039	356	3.9	12,876	659	8.5 5.1	26	12	46.2	5,233	406	23. 7.
RED LAKE	23	1	50.0	19	7	36.8	38	5	13.2	<u>12,870</u> 59	13	22.0	20	12	50.0	25	10	40.
REDWOOD	3	0	0.0	77	7	9.1	108	7	6.5	188	13	7.4	$\frac{2}{3}$	0	0.0	113	10	40. 8.
RENVILLE	7	1	14.3	77	10	13.0	121	2	1.7	205	13	6.3	12	4	33.3	121	14	11.
RICE	9	3	33.3	378	40	10.6	665	23	3.5	1,052	66	6.3	10	4	40.0	584	60	10.
ROCK	3	2	66.7	57	7	12.3	154	3	1.9	214	12	5.6		2	66.7	93	14	15.
ROSEAU	0	0		51	7	13.7	125	4	3.2	176	11	6.3	0	0		69	7	10.
ST. LOUIS	26	9	34.6	1,085	153	14.1	1,649	91	5.5	2,760	253	9.2	28	10	35.7	1,598	217	13.
SCOTT	17	11	64.7	419	54	12.9	808	37	4.6	1244	102	8.2		15	71.4	651	90	13.
SHERBURNE	13	5	38.5	339	38	11.2	596	18	3.0	948	61	6.4	16	6	37.5	521	52	10.
SIBLEY STEARNS	1	0	0.0	57	9	15.8	135	7	5.2	193	16	8.3	1	0	0.0	91	11	12.
STEELE	18 8	8 4	44.4 50.0	972 155	103 9	10.6 5.8	1,364 537	69 10	5.1 1.9	2,354 700	180 23	7.6 3.3	20 10	9 5	45.0 50.0	1,446 221	155 14	10. 6.
STEVENS	2	0	0.0	46	3	6.5	87	2	2.3	135	<u></u> 5	3.7	2	0	0.0	62	4	6.
SWIFT	1	0	0.0	40	11	23.9	68	6	8.8	115	17	14.8	1	0	0.0	68	14	20.
TODD	5	2	40.0	140	24	17.1	302	13	4.3	447	39	8.7	5	2	40.0	204	39	19.
TRAVERSE	0	0		11	2	18.2	23	0	0.0	34	2	5.9	0	0		16	3	18.
WABASHA	6	4	66.7	110	29	26.4	255	9	3.5	371	42	11.3	6	4	66.7	158	39	24.
WADENA	4	1	25.0	82	15	18.3	159	6	3.8	245	22	9.0	5	1	20.0	129	21	16.
WASECA	3	2	66.7	94	10	10.6	170	5	2.9	267	17	6.4		2	66.7	138	15	10.
WASHINGTON	11	4	36.4	903	89	9.9	1,979	79	4.0	2,893	172	5.9		4	36.4	1,326	136	10
WATONWAN	1	0	0.0	39	1	2.6	94	4	4.3	134	5	3.7	1	0	0.0	65	2	3
WILKIN WINONA	2	1	50.0	45	7	15.6	103	6	5.8	150	14	9.3		1	50.0	62	10	16
WINONA WRIGHT	8	1	12.5	317	37		781	44 25	5.6	1,106	82	7.4	11	3	27.3	434	48	11
YELLOW MED	11	2 2	18.2 50.0	523 61	58 16	11.1 26.2	778 100	35 2	4.5 2.0	1,312 165	95 20	7.2 12.1	11 4	2 2	18.2 50.0	779 91	89 21	11 23

						TA	BLE 5.	01 (fa	or Ye	ar 1999	<b>)</b> )							
TRAFF	TIC C	CRAS	SHES	, FAT			, AND JNTY						ID A	LCO	HOL-	RELA	ATED	)
							C CRAS			<u>ESU1</u>	A, 193	99	PER	SONS	KILL	ED OR	R INJU	RED
	FATA	AL CR	ASHES	INJUR	Y CRAS	SHES	DAMA	OPERT AGE ON ASHES	NLY	ΤΟΤΑΙ	L CRAS	HES		KILLE	D	IN	IJUREL	)
COUNTY	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
AITKIN ANOKA	4 22	2 7	50.0 31.8	82 1,806	14 164	17.1 9.1	231 3,092	12 133	5.2 4.3	317 4,920	28 304	8.8 6.2	5 24	2 8	40.0 33.3	139 2,653	18 244	12.9 9.2
BECKER BELTRAMI	8	2	<u>25.0</u> 44.4	138 220	<u>25</u> 39	18.1 17.7	231 534	<u>17</u> 21	<u>7.4</u> 3.9	377 763	<u>44</u> 64	<u>11.7</u> 8.4	9 12	25	<u>22.2</u> 41.7	209 354	<u> </u>	<u>18.7</u> 17.5
BENTON BIG STONE	6 1	2 0	33.3 0.0	199 29	26 3	17.7 13.1 10.3	415 62	20 4	4.8 6.5	620 92	48 7	7.7 7.6	7	3 0	41.7 42.9 0.0	311 40	54 4	17.3 17.4 10.0
BLUE EARTH BROWN	4 6	1 3	25.0 50.0	354 146	30 19	8.5 13.0	898 307	29 11	3.2 3.6	1.256 459	60 33	4.8 7.2	5 6	2 3	40.0 50.0	494 210	45 26	9.1 12.4
CARLTON	7	2	28.6	152	15	9.9	276	10	3.6	435	27	6.2	7	2	28.6	222	19	8.6
CARVER CASS	11 6	2 2	18.2 33.3	320 182	36 46	11.3 25.3	753 255	26 16	3.5 6.3	1084 443	64 64	5.9 14.4	11 7	2 2	18.2 28.6	479 310	57 88	11.9 28.4
CHIPPEWA	2	0	0.0	64	9	14.1	104	9	8.7	170	18	10.6	2	0	0.0	99	12	12.1
CHISAGO CLAY	9 9	5 5	55.6 55.6	253 234	34 21	13.4 9.0	530 709	26 27	4.9 3.8	792 952	65 53	8.2 5.6	11 10	6 6	54.5 60.0	389 359	60 34	15.4 9.5
CLEARWATER	4	3	75.0	36	8	22.2	69	4	5.8	109	15	13.8	5	4	80.0	59	14	23.7
COOK COTTONWOOD	2 7	1 0	50.0 0.0	39 53	8 5	20.5 9.4	95 119	8 6	8.4 5.0	136 179	17 11	12.5 6.1	2 7	1 0	50.0 0.0	54 99	9 5	16.7 5.1
CROW WING DAKOTA	10	3	30.0	407	43	10.6	803	32	4.0	1,220	78	6.4	12	4	33.3	616	66	10.7
DODGE	21 5	5 3	23.8 60.0	1.798 78	152 9	8.5 11.5	3.634 162	150 6	4.1 3.7	5.453 245	307 18	5.6 7.3		5 3	22.7 60.0	2.557 118	203 15	7.9 12.7
DOUGLAS FARIBAULT	7	2	<u>28.6</u> 0.0	210 60	<u>27</u> 3	<u>12.9</u> 5.0	606 120	<u>20</u> 8	<u>3.3</u> 6.7	823 183	<u>49</u> 11	<u>6.0</u> 6.0		2	25.0 0.0	<u>316</u> 95	<u>38</u> 6	<u>12.0</u> 6.3
FILLMORE	5 4	1	25.0	94	13	13.8	222	10	0.7 4.5	320	24	7.5	5	2	40.0	153	17	11.1
FREEBORN GOODHUE	5	<u>1</u> 4	20.0	222	27	12.2	487	12	2.5	714	40	5.6	6 13	<u>1</u> 4	16.7	353	30	8.5
GRANT	11 1	4 0	36.4 0.0	277 29	26 4	9.4 13.8	715 63	33 3	4.6 4.8	1.003 93	63 7	6.3 7.5		$4 \\ 0$	30.8 0.0	445 42	40 $4$	9.0 9.5
HENNEPIN	38	11	28.9	8,521	599	7.0	19,737	670	3.4	28,296	1,280	4.5		13	32.5	12,136	827	6.8
HOUSTON HUBBARD	1 6	0 2	0.0 33.3	98 114	14 22	14.3 19.3	228 160	6 5	2.6 3.1	327 280	20 29	6.1 10.4	1 6	$\begin{array}{c} 0\\ 2\end{array}$	0.0 33.3	150 173	28 38	18.7 22.0
ISANTI	4	3	75.0	192	21	10.9	367	11	3.0	563	35	6.2	5	3	60.0	293	33	11.3
ITASCA JACKSON	6 4	5 1	83.3 25.0	267 55		19.5 18.2	465 116	32 3	6.9 2.6	738 175	89 14	12.1 8.0		5 1	83.3 25.0	407 89	84 13	20.6 14.6
KANABEC KANDIYOHI	4	0	0.0	87	<u>11</u> 24	12.6	185	7	3.8	276	<u>18</u> 45	6.5	5		0.0	145	16	<u>11.0</u> 7.5
KITTSON	11 1	1 1	9.1 100.0	275 13	24 4	8.7 30.8	472 69	$20 \\ 2$	4.2 2.9	758 83	45 7	5.9 8.4		1 1	8.3 100.0	465 18	35 7	7.5 38.9
KOOCHICHING LAC QUI PAR	1	0	0.0	74	<u>14</u> 5		97	7	7.2	172	21	12.2		0	0.0	105	<u>19</u> 9	18.1
LAKE	3 1		66.7 0.0	29 68		17.2 16.2	48 157	6 6	12.5 3.8	80 226	13 17	16.2 7.5			66.7 0.0	46 98	9 16	19.6 16.3
LAKE OF THE LE SUEUR	3	$\frac{1}{2}$	<u>33.3</u> 66.7	13 134	<u>2</u> 19	15.4 14.2	36 302	0	<u>0.0</u> 5.3	52 439	<u>3</u> 37	<u>5.8</u> 8.4			<u>33.3</u> 66.7	23 198	7	<u>30.4</u> 13.1
LINCOLN	3	0	0.0	20	3	15.0	64	2	3.1	439 87	5	5.7	3	0	0.0	31	3	9.7
LYON MCLEOD	<u>6</u> 10	3	50.0 30.0	145 208	-	11.0 11.5	263 399	<u>10</u> 22	<u>3.8</u> 5.5	414 617	<u>29</u> 49	<u>7.0</u> 7.9		<u>4</u> 5	50.0 41.7	<u>242</u> 331	<u>27</u> 35	<u>11.2</u> 10.6
MAHNOMEN	3		100.0	31	9	29.0	26	2	7.7	60	14	23.3		4	100.0	57	22	38.6
MARSHALL MARTIN	1	1	100.0 100.0	27 95	4	14.8 15.8	54 266		<u>1.9</u> 3.8	82 363		7.3 7.4	$\frac{1}{2}$		100.0 100.0	<u>39</u> 136		10.3 14.7
MEEKER	6	1	16.7	111	11	9.9	148	4	2.7	265	16	6.0	2 7	1	14.3	178	19	10.7
MILLE LACS MORRISON	7		28.6	143		17.5	233		4.3	383		9.7	7		28.6	241		16.6
MOWER	5 5		40.0 20.0	155 159		17.4 9.4	290 444		8.6 3.8	450 608		12.0 5.4	7 5		28.6 20.0	250 230		17.2 9.6

	i				BY	COL	JNTY I	IN M	INN	ESOTA	A, 199	99	'n					
					TRA	FFIC	C CRAS	HES					PER	SONS	KILL	ED OR	R INJU	RED
	FAT	AL CRA	SHES	INJUR	Y CRAS	SHES	DAMA	OPERT GE ON ASHES	ILY	TOTAI	CRAS	HES		KILLEI	D	IN	JUREI	)
COUNTY	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
MURRAY NICOLLET	2 3	$\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.0 \\ 0.0 \end{array}$	29 128	7 13	24.1 10.2	101 351	8 10	7.9 2.8	132 482	15 23	11.4 4.8	2 3	0 0	$0.0 \\ 0.0$	45 191	8 16	17. 8.4
NOBLES	4	1	25.0	131	11	8.4	283	7	2.5	418	19	4.5	4	1	25.0	189	18	9.
NORMAN OLMSTED	1	0	0.0	25	5	20.0	67	5	7.5	93	10	10.8	1 24	0	0.0	42	5	11. 9.
OTTER TAIL	22 12	6 8	27.3 66.7	822 290	73 53	8.9 18.3	1,470 570	54 32	3.7 5.6	2,314 872	133 93	5.7 10.7	24 13	6 8	25.0 61.5	1,221 427	111 75	9. 17.
PENNINGTON	12	0	0.0	87	4	4.6	137	6	4.4	225	10	4.4	13	0	0.0	128	8	6.
PINE	10	3	30.0	186	27	14.5	332	9	2.7	528	39	7.4	10	3	30.0	274	38	13.
PIPESTONE	2	0	0.0	45	2	4.4	75	3	4.0	122	5	4.1	3	0	0.0	77	2	2.
POLK	3	0	0.0	151	23	15.2	311	15	4.8	465	38	8.2	6	0	0.0	233	33	14.
POPE	2	1	50.0	53	14	26.4	98	6	6.1	153	21	13.7	2	1	50.0	81	22	27.
RAMSEY RED LAKE	27	8	29.6	3,779	<u>294</u> 4	7.8	10,093	338	3.3	13,899	640	<u>4.6</u> 14.7	30	<u>8</u> 5	26.7	5,312	415	7.
REDWOOD	4	4 2	100.0 33.3	17 73	4 14	23.5 19.2	47 116	2 4	4.3 3.4	68 195	10 20	14.7	5 6	2	100.0 33.3	26 123	26	26. 21.
RENVILLE	1	0	0.0	95	11	11.6	135	5	3.7	231	16	6.9	1	$\tilde{0}$	0.0	150	18	12.
RICE	8	1	12.5	332	27	8.1	722	22	3.0	1.062	50	4.7	8	1	12.5	492	40	8.
ROCK	2	0	0.0	59	8	13.6	171	3	1.8	232	11	4.7	2	0	0.0	101	10	9.
ROSEAU	2	0	0.0	54	8	14.8	130	3	2.3	186	11	5.9	3	0	0.0	76	11	14.
ST. LOUIS	24	8	33.3	1.086	159	14.6	1.688	97	5.7	2.798	264	9.4		8	33.3	1.576	251	15.
SCOTT	9	5	55.6	479	52	10.9	949	40	4.2	1437	97	6.8		7	53.8	675	76	11.
SHERBURNE SIBLEY	7	0	0.0	345 76	<u>38</u> 12	11.0 15.8	<u>645</u> 163	<u>31</u> 2	4.8	<u>997</u> 240	<u>69</u> 14	<u>6.9</u> 5.8	7	0	$\frac{0.0}{0.0}$	<u>528</u> 113	<u>56</u> 19	10.
STEARNS	17	4	23.5	954	106	15.8	1,482	74	1.2 5.0	2,453	14	5.8 7.5	19	4	21.1	1,481	162	16. 10.
STEELE	6	1	16.7	164	13	7.9	545	12	2.2	715	26	3.6		1	12.5	240	102	7.
STEVENS	1	1	100.0	40	6	15.0	73	3	4.1	114	10	8.8	1	1	100.0	58	10	17.
SWIFT	2	1	50.0	37	6	16.2	54	2	3.7	93	9	9.7	2	1	50.0	61	7	11.
FODD	7	1	14.3	109	16	14.7	269	16	5.9	385	33	8.6	8	1	12.5	181	27	14.
FRAVERSE	0	0	<u>.</u>	13	3	23.1	20	1	5.0	33	4	12.1	0	0		16	4	25.
WABASHA WADENA	9 2	3 0	33.3	112 79	20 17	17.9 21.5	219	14 5	6.4 3.7	340 217	37 22	10.9 10.1	9 2	3	33.3	178	31 22	17.
WASECA	3	1	0.0 33.3	94	17	13.8	<u>136</u> 194	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	217	22	8.6	3	1	0.0 33.3	<u>116</u> 134	18	<u>19.</u> 13.
WASHINGTON	10	3	30.0	880	78	8.9	2,260	73	3.2	3,150	154	8.0 4.9		3	27.3	1,284	111	13. 8.
WATONWAN	10	0	0.0	48	4	8.3	130	2	1.5	179	6	3.4	1	0	0.0	82	5	6.
WILKIN	1	0	0.0	41	5	12.2	95	5	5.3	137	10	7.3	1	0	0.0	60	7	11.
WINONA	16	5	31.3	311	30	9.6	739	35	4.7	1,066	70	6.6	16	5	31.3	448	48	10
WRIGHT YELLOW MED	16 5		12.5 20.0	488 51		11.1 13.7	889 89	40	4.5 4.5	1,393 145	96 12	6.9 8.3		2	12.5 16.7	786 77	87 8	11 10

						TA	BLE 5.	.01 (fa	or Ye	ar 2000	))							
TRAFF	TC (	CRAS	SHES	, FAT			·						ID A	LCO	HOL	RELA	ATED	
							UNTY		INN	ESOTA	A, 200	00	DED	SONS	KII I	ED OR		PFD
	FAT	AL CRA	SHES	INJUR			PR	OPERT		τοται	L CRAS	HES		KILLE			JURED	
		Alco-	%	All	Alco-	%		ASHES Alco-		All	Alco-	%	All	Alco-	%	All	Alco-	%
COUNTY		hol	Alc		hol	Alc		hol	Alc		hol	Alc		hol	Alc		hol	Alc
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
AITKIN ANOKA	5 23	3 9	60.0 39.1	106 1,744	19 165	17.9 9.5	216 3,187	9 129	4.2 4.0	327 4,954	31 303	9.5 6.1	5 23	3 9	60.0 39.1	159 2,611	29 236	18.2 9.0
BECKER BELTRAMI	10 7	5	50.0 28.6	149 227	<u>29</u> 42	19.5 18.5	209 613	11	<u>5.3</u> 4.2	368	<u>45</u> 70	12.2	11	5	<u>45.5</u> 25.0	235 359	<u>51</u> 79	<u>21.7</u> 22.0
BENTON BIG STONE	7 6 1	2 2 1	28.0 33.3 100.0	201 201	42 22 2	18.3 10.9 9.1	412 63	26 19 1	4.2 4.6 1.6	847 619 86	43 4	8.3 6.9 4.7			23.0 37.5 100.0	296 26	79 38 2	12.0 12.8 7.7
BLUE EARTH	6	1	16.7	391	31	7.9	1,055	36	3.4	1,452	68	4.7	7		14.3	570	46	8.1
BROWN CARLTON	4 6	3 1	75.0 16.7	151 153	9 24	6.0 15.7	327 302	11 11	3.4 3.6	482 461	23 36	4.8 7.8	5 6		60.0 16.7	235 232	24 35	10.2 15.1
CARVER CASS	11	6 9	54.5 52.9	357 197	27	7.6 23.4	834 269	40 13	4.8 4.8	1,202 483	73	6.1	11	6	54.5	520 323	40	7.7
CHIPPEWA	17 1	9	0.0	197 69	46 10	25.4 14.5	209 106	15 4	4.8 3.8	483	68 14	14.1 8.0	18 1	$10 \\ 0$	55.6 0.0	525 116	86 15	26.6 12.9
CHISAGO CLAY	9	2 2	22.2	290	33	11.4	579	26	4.5	878	61	6.9			22.2	429	41	9.6
CLEARWATER	6 3	2	33.3 66.7	244 36	14 7	5.7 19.4	668 82	23 0	3.4 0.0	918 121	39 9	4.2 7.4	83		25.0 66.7	356 50	29 10	8.1 20.0
COOK COTTONWOOD	3	2	66.7	43	7	16.3	103	1	1.0	149	10	6.7	3		66.7	76	10	13.2
CROW WING	1 13	1 6	100.0 46.2	50 417	7 42	14.0 10.1	108 815	8 29	7.4 3.6	159 1,245	16 77	10.1 6.2	1 17	1 8	100.0 47.1	78 641	9 68	11.5 10.6
DAKOTA DODGE	29	8	27.6	1,779	144	8.1	4,218	161	3.8	6,026	313	5.2	35	9	25.7	2,552	209	8.2
DOUGLAS	4 6	5 1	75.0 16.7	89 220	9 27	10.1 12.3	211 681	7 24	3.3 3.5	304 907	19 52	6.3 5.7	4 6		75.0 16.7	132 351	10 38	7.6 10.8
FARIBAULT	2	2	100.0	58	7	12.1	111	3	2.7	171	12	7.0	2		100.0	95	9	9.5
FILLMORE FREEBORN	4 5	2 2	50.0 40.0	94 221	13 24	13.8 10.9	227 616	10 18	4.4 2.9	325 842	25 44	7.7 5.2	4 5	_	50.0 40.0	136 336	14 33	10.3 9.8
GOODHUE	5	2	40.0	315	24	7.6	786	36	4.6	1,106	62	5.6		3	42.9	459	36	7.8
GRANT HENNEPIN	2 47	0 21	0.0 44.7	34 8.782	6 587	17.6 6.7	71 21.990	3 680	4.2 3.1	107 30.819	9 1,288	8.4 4.2	2 51	0 24	0.0 47.1	45 12,267	6 864	13.3 7.0
HOUSTON	2	1	50.0	94	16	17.0	232	10	4.3	328	27	8.2			50.0	128	22	17.2
HUBBARD ISANTI	3 4	0 1	$\begin{array}{c} 0.0\\ 25.0\end{array}$	107 184	18 20	16.8 10.9	165 408	8 15	4.8 3.7	275 596	26 36	9.5 6.0			0.0 25.0	150 275	22 33	14.7 12.0
ITASCA	11	6	54.5	230	32	13.9	487	36	7.4	728	74	10.2	11	6	54.5	331	40	12.1
JACKSON KANABEC	3 7	1 4	33.3 57.1	69 86	6 11	8.7 12.8	130 167	0 9	0.0 5.4	202 260	7 24	3.5 9.2			33.3 57.1	110 158	8 20	7.3 12.7
KANDIYOHI	6	2	33.3	244	16	6.6	510	21	4.1	760	39	5.1	7		28.6	369	22	6.0
KITTSON KOOCHICHING	1	0	$\begin{array}{c} 0.0\\ 0.0 \end{array}$	14 74	5 11	35.7 14.9	57 94	0 9	0.0 9.6	72 169	5 20	6.9 11.8		0 0	0.0 0.0	24 116	10 13	41.7 11.2
LAC QUI PAR	1	0	0.0	23	5		31	1	3.2	55	6	10.9			0.0	32	5	15.6
LAKE LAKE OF THE	4	1	25.0 100.0	69 16	9 7	13.0 43.8	169 47	5 3	3.0 6.4	242 64	15 11	6.2 17.2		2 1	40.0 100.0	117 24	15 11	12.8 45.8
LE SUEUR	4	2	50.0	161	22	13.7	340	17	5.0	505	41	8.1	4	2	50.0	242	37	15.3
LINCOLN LYON	2 3	1	50.0 0.0	19 136	0 13	0.0 9.6	93 287	3 9	3.2 3.1	114 426	4 22	3.5 5.2			33.3 0.0	28 206	$\begin{array}{c} 0\\ 24 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.0\\ 11.7\end{array}$
MCLEOD	3	1	33.3	195	13	6.7	424	17	4.0	622	31	5.0	3	1	33.3	285	19	6.7
MAHNOMEN MARSHALL	32	2 1	66.7 50.0	28 36	12 8	42.9 22.2	42 46	3	7.1 6.5	73 84		23.3 14.3	6 2		83.3 50.0	61 50	30 10	49.2 20.0
MARTIN	2		50.0	107	18	16.8	223	12	5.4	332	31	9.3	2	1	50.0	163	27	16.6
MEEKER MILLE LACS	7		14.3 33.3	108 152	6 20	5.6 13.2	187 262		4.3 4.6	302 417		5.0 7.9	73		14.3 33.3	156 264		4.5 13.6
MORRISON	11	5	45.5	167	26	15.6	322	24	7.5	500	55	11.0	13	6	46.2	275	47	17.1
MOWER	7	1	14.3	192	16	8.3	558	28	5.0	757	45	5.9	7	1	14.3	274	26	9.5

		SUL	5, ГА	IALI		·				ΓΟΤΑ			LCO	HOL	-KEI		U	
	1				BY	COU	JNTY	IN M	INN	ESOTA	<b>A</b> , 200	)0	ir					
					TRA	FFI	C CRAS	HES					PER	SONS	KILL	ED OR	R INJU	IREI
	FAT	AL CRA	SHES	INJUR	Y CRAS	SHES	PROPER ONLY	TY DA	-	ΤΟΤΑΙ	CRAS	HES		KILLE	D	IN	JUREI	)
COUNTY	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
	1	1	100.0	26	2		07		4.1	124	-	5.0	1	1	100.0		2	2
MURRAY			100.0	36	2	5.6	97	4	4.1	134	7	5.2	1	1	100.0	56	2	3.0
NICOLLET	1	0	0.0	128	9	7.0	372	15	4.0	501	24	4.8	1	0	0.0	182	13	7.
NOBLES	2	2		122	9	7.4	275	9	3.3	399	20	5.0	3	3	100.0	179	12	6.
NORMAN	2	0		27	9	33.3	64	1	1.6	93	10	10.8	2	0	0.0	36	11	30.
OLMSTED	18	6		809	52	6.4	1,657	54	3.3	2,484	112	4.5	25	7	28.0	1,171	91	7.
OTTER TAIL	15	8		276	38	13.8	671	23	3.4	962	69	7.2	18	9	50.0	416	54	13.
PENNINGTON	4	3	75.0	98	8	8.2	117	4	3.4	219	15	6.8	5	3	60.0	136	12	8.
PINE	4		100.0	212	43	20.3	322	18	5.6	538	65	12.1	4	4	100.0	332	81	24.
PIPESTONE	3		100.0	46	5	10.9	71	2	2.8	120	10	8.3	3	3	100.0	57	5	8.
POLK	3	2		135	28	20.7	300	18	6.0	438	48	11.0	-	2	66.7	202	39	19.
POPE	0	0		59	11	18.6	106	2	1.9	165	13	7.9		0	•	82	14	17.
RAMSEY	33	9	27.3	3,749	304	8.1	11,112	384	3.5	14,894	697	4.7	33	9	27.3	5,218	461	8.
RED LAKE	1	0	0.0	13	4	30.8	36	3	8.3	50	7	14.0	1	0	0.0	18	6	33.3
REDWOOD	3	0		72	13	18.1	124	6	4.8	199	19	9.5	3	0	0.0	119	20	16.
RENVILLE	7	1	14.3	87	13	14.9	126	5	4.0	220	19	8.6		2	18.2	142	16	11.
RICE	18	10		406	43	10.6	770	21	2.7	1,194	74	6.2	20	11	55.0	623	76	12.
ROCK	1	1		48	8	16.7	187	6	3.2	236	15	6.4	4	4	100.0	75	12	16.0
ROSEAU	6	3		52	11	21.2	106	3	2.8	164	17	10.4	6	3	50.0	79	17	21.
ST. LOUIS	22	13	59.1	1,048	152	14.5	1,742	95	5.5	2,812	260	9.2	26	16	61.5	1,503	219	14.
SCOTT	10	1		506	50	9.9	1,052	32	3.0	1,568	83	5.3		2	18.2	824	93	11.
SHERBURNE	4	1	25.0	353	31	8.8	823	30	3.6	1,180	62	5.3	4	1	25.0	517	48	9.
SIBLEY	6	0	0.0	66	10	15.2	164	11	6.7	236	21	8.9		0	0.0	95	14	14.'
STEARNS	16	4		931	99	10.6	1,594	61	3.8	2,541	164	6.5		4	23.5	1,348	145	10.
STEELE	3	1	33.3	180	22	12.2	605	19	3.1	788	42	5.3	4	2	50.0	257	30	11.
STEVENS	0	0	-	37	4	10.8	80	3	3.8	117	7	6.0	-	0		48	4	8.
SWIFT	1	0		36	3	8.3	60	2	3.3	97	5	5.2	1	0	0.0	44	5	11.
FODD	5	1	20.0	116	18	15.5	297	13	4.4	418	32	7.7	6	1	16.7	181	23	12.
FRAVERSE	0	0	•	10	2	20.0	27	1	3.7	37	3	8.1	0		•	11	2	18.
WABASHA	4	3	75.0	103	12	11.7	240	9	3.8	347	24	6.9		3	75.0	166	19	11.
WADENA	3	1	33.3	69	11	15.9	144	4	2.8	216	16	7.4	3	1	33.3	99	16	16.
WASECA	2	1	50.0	107	11	10.3		2	1.0	315	14	4.4		1	50.0	173	25	14.
WASHINGTON	14	2		974	84	8.6	-	87	3.7	3,346	173	5.2		2	12.5	1,436	138	9.
WATONWAN	0	0		31	3	9.7	135	2	1.5	166	5	3.0		, v		47	3	6.
WILKIN	1	0	0.0	36	3	8.3	112	7	6.3	149	10	6.7		0	0.0	58	5	8.
WINONA	6	1		335	29	8.7	860	39		1,201	69	5.7		1	16.7	458	37	8
WRIGHT	7		42.9	507		10.8	950	42		1,464	100		8		50.0		74	10
YELLOW MED	4	1	25.0	60	5	8.3	101	2	3.0	165	0	5.5	4	1	25.0	86	9	10

							BLE 5.	Ψ.			,							
TRAFF	IC C	CRAS	HES	, FAT			, AND JNTY						D A	LCO	HOL	RELA	ATED	)
							C CRAS		11111		A, 200	<b>J1</b>	PER	SONS	KILL	ED OR	R INJU	RED
	FATA	AL CRA	SHES	INJUR	Y CRAS	SHES	DAMA	OPERT AGE ON RASHES	ILY	ΤΟΤΑΙ	L CRAS	HES		KILLE	D	IN	JURED	)
COUNTY	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
AITKIN	5	1	20.0	73	12	16.4	236	13	5.5	314	26	8.3	5	1	20.0	104	16	15.4
ANOKA BECKER	24 2	8 2	33.3	1,568	147	9.4	3,005	130	4.3	4,597	285	6.2	26		30.8	2,323	221	9.5
BELTRAMI	<u></u> 1	2	<u>100.0</u> 0.0	150 214	<u>22</u> 32	14.7 15.0	213 538	<u>14</u> 12	6.6 2.2	<u>365</u> 753	<u>38</u> 44	<u>10.4</u> 5.8	2		<u>100.0</u> 0.0	<u>222</u> 307	<u>35</u> 47	<u>15.8</u> 15.3
BENTON	9	2	22.2	218	17	7.8	431	20	4.6	658	39	5.9	9	2	22.2	330	23	7.0
BIG STONE BLUE EARTH	1	<u>1</u> 1	<u>100.0</u> 33.3	31 353	$\frac{7}{28}$	22.6 7.9	63 1,067	$\frac{2}{32}$	<u>3.2</u> 3.0	95 1,423	<u>10</u> 61	<u>10.5</u> 4.3	1	<u>1</u> 1	<u>100.0</u> 33.3	47 506	<u>10</u> 38	<u>21.3</u> 7.5
BROWN	0	0		136	28	6.6	345	14	4.1	481	23	4.3				170	10	5.9
CARLTON	3	1	33.3	136	12	8.8	246	15	6.1	385	28	7.3	3		33.3	189	13	6.9
CARVER CASS	12 12	8 9	66.7 75.0	367 148	37 32	10.1 21.6	852 272	25 15	2.9 5.5	1,231 432	70 56	5.7 13.0	14 14		71.4 71.4	566 268	76 66	13.4 24.6
CHIPPEWA	0	0		61	9	14.8	121	6	5.0	182	15	8.2	0		, 1.4	99	13	13.1
CHISAGO	1	0	0.0	262	29	11.1	560	19	3.4	823	48	5.8	2		0.0	405	46	11.4
CLAY CLEARWATER	9 2	3	33.3 50.0	250 25	24 2	9.6 8.0	646 59	21 3	3.3 5.1	905 86	48 6	5.3 7.0	9 4		33.3 75.0	360 42	47 4	13.1 9.5
COOK	1	0	0.0	32	7	21.9	86	4	4.7	119	11	9.2			0.0	45	7	15.6
COTTONWOOD	2	1	50.0	42	4	9.5	125	4	3.2	169	9	5.3	11		50.0	65	9	13.8
CROW WING DAKOTA	<u>11</u> 27	<u>6</u> 13	<u>54.5</u> 48.1	395 1,797	<u>49</u> 117	12.4 6.5	816 3,971	<u>35</u> 142	4.3	1,222 5,795	<u>90</u> 272	<u>7.4</u> 4.7	12 30		<u>58.3</u> 46.7	635 2,533	<u>87</u> 172	<u>13.7</u> 6.8
DODGE	5	13	20.0	89	9	10.1	181	5	2.8	275	15	5.5			20.0	150	14	9.3
DOUGLAS	4	0	0.0	256	28	10.9	759	20	2.6	1,019	48	4.7	4	Ŷ	0.0	389	38	9.8
FARIBAULT FILLMORE	2 1	$2 \\ 0$	100.0	76 95	9 14	11.8 14.7	153 205	8 7	5.2 3.4	231 301	19 21	8.2 7.0			100.0 0.0	117 141	12 22	10.3 15.6
FREEBORN	5	2	40.0	198	16	8.1	619	15	2.4	822	33	4.0			33.3	267	30	11.2
GOODHUE	9	2	22.2	295	34	11.5	651	27	4.1	955	63	6.6			25.0	451	48	10.6
GRANT HENNEPIN	1 62	1 16	100.0 25.8	35 7,884	5 561	14.3 7.1	80 20.569	1 666	1.2 3.2	116 28,515	7 1,243	6.0 4.4	1 67		100.0 26.9	47 10.879	6 784	12.8 7.2
HOUSTON	3	10	33.3	74	15	20.3	213	10	4.7	20,313	26	9.0			33.3	10,079	25	22.9
HUBBARD	10	4	40.0	82	10	12.2	140	2	1.4	232	16	6.9			40.0	124	17	13.7
ISANTI ITASCA	3	0 5	<u>0.0</u> 62.5	197 224	<u>16</u> 39	8.1 17.4	434 420	<u>17</u> 20	3.9 4.8	634 652	<u>33</u> 64	<u>5.2</u> 9.8			0.0 70.0	302 352	<u>25</u> 58	<u>8.3</u> 16.5
JACKSON	1	0	0.0	61	7	11.5	134	5	3.7	196	12	6.1			0.0	90	14	15.6
KANABEC	4	1	25.0	75	11	14.7	153	5	3.3	232	17	7.3			20.0	118	13	11.0
KANDIYOHI KITTSON	6 1	$\begin{array}{c} 0\\ 0\end{array}$	0.0 0.0	262 9	19 2	7.3 22.2	508 69	14 0	2.8 0.0	776 79	33 2	4.3 2.5	6 1		0.0 0.0	417 15	32 2	7.7 13.3
KOOCHICHING	4	2	50.0	77	12	15.6	91	6	6.6	172	20	11.6		2	50.0	110	20	18.2
LAC QUI PAR	1	0	0.0	21	1	4.8	45	1	2.2	67	2	3.0			0.0	24	1	4.2
LAKE LAKE OF THE	1	$\begin{array}{c} 0\\ 0\end{array}$	0.0	72 9	12	16.7 11.1	118 25	3 3	2.5 12.0	191 35	15 4	7.9 11.4	1	0 0	0.0 0.0	105 12	19 1	18.1 8.3
LE SUEUR	8	3	37.5	136	20	14.7	298	14	4.7	442	37	8.4		4	40.0	208	31	14.9
LINCOLN LYON	1	0	0.0	26	2	7.7	74	1	1.4	101	3	3.0	11		0.0	33	2	6.1
MCLEOD	<u>5</u> 2	<u>1</u> 0	20.0	120 198	<u>11</u> 20	<u>9.2</u> 10.1	283 477	$\frac{10}{10}$	<u>3.5</u> 2.1	<u>408</u> 677	<u>22</u> 30	<u>5.4</u> 4.4	5		20.0	183 292	<u>12</u> 23	<u>6.6</u> 7.9
MAHNOMEN	1	1	100.0	28	8	28.6	42	3	7.1	71	12	16.9	1	1	100.0	43	14	32.6
MARSHALL	2	2	100.0	28	7	25.0	60	2	3.3	90	11	12.2		-	100.0	39	11	28.2
MARTIN MEEKER	6 2	1 1	16.7 50.0	116 141	10 11	8.6 7.8	260 224	9 6	3.5 2.7	382 367	20 18	5.2 4.9	11		16.7 66.7	178 216	19 14	10.7 6.5
MILLE LACS	6	2	33.3	153	17	11.1	275	7	2.5	434	26	6.0	6	2	33.3	294	40	13.6
MORRISON	7	1	14.3	154	20	13.0	329	25	7.6	490	46	9.4			14.3	247	26	10.5
MOWER	2	1	50.0	211	23	10.9	554	21	3.8	767	45	5.9	2	1	50.0	301	36	12.0

					RV	COI	JNTY	IN M	INNI	TOR	A 200	11						
							C CRAS			25017	1, 200	<u> </u>	PER	SONS	KILL	ED OF	R INJU	JRED
	FAT	AL CRA	SHES	INJUR	Y CRAS	SHES	DAM	OPERT AGE ON RASHES	NLY	TOTAI	L CRAS	HES	]	KILLEI	D	I	JUREI	)
COUNTY	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
MURRAY	1	1	100.0	51	5	9.8	88	1	1.1	140	7	5.0	1	1	100.0	75	5	6.
NICOLLET	7	1	14.3	166	16	9.6	419	11	2.6	592	28	4.7	7	1	14.3	231	19	8.
ICOLLET	6	1	14.5	94	6	9.0 6.4	312	8	2.6	412	15	3.6	6	1	14.5	154	19	6
NORMAN	1	0	0.0	29	5	17.2	64	2	3.1	94	7	7.4	2	0	0.0	33	5	15
DLMSTED	11	3	27.3	799	48	6.0	1,530	46	3.0	2,340	97	4.1	12	3	25.0	1,222	89	7
OTTER TAIL	12	6	50.0	323	47	14.6	680	36	5.3	1,015	89	8.8	14	8	57.1	483	88	18
PENNINGTON	1	0	0.0	77	11	14.3	92	3	3.3	170	14	8.2	1	0	0.0	110	13	11
PINE	6	1	16.7	159	25	15.7	350	14	4.0	515	40	7.8	7	1	14.3	245	36	14
PIPESTONE	1	0	0.0	39	2	5.1	75	1	1.3	115	3	2.6	1	0	0.0	64	6	9
POLK POPE	43	$2 \\ 2$	50.0 66.7	133 28	18 2	13.5 7.1	309 117	15 11	4.9 9.4	446	35 15	7.8 10.1	43	2 2	50.0 66.7	190 49	23 8	12 16
RAMSEY	25	11	44.0	3,601	284	7.1 7.9	10,440	386	9.4 3.7	148 14,066	681	4.8	27	13	48.1	4,938	438	10
RED LAKE	0	0	44.0	10	3	30.0	38	2	5.3	48	5	10.4	0	0	40.1	12	438	33.
REDWOOD	3	1	33.3	98	14	14.3	142	$\tilde{0}$	0.0	243	15	6.2	3	1	33.3	137	16	11.
RENVILLE	1	1	100.0	90	5	5.6	172	12	7.0	263	18	6.8	1	1	100.0	130	6	4
RICE	11	4	36.4	368	38	10.3	762	37	4.9	1,141	79	6.9	13	5	38.5	531	58	10
ROCK	1	0	0.0	55	5	9.1	201	4	2.0	257	9	3.5	2	0	0.0	76	6	7.
ROSEAU	5	2	40.0	70	11	15.7	160	8	5.0	235	21	8.9	6	2	33.3	110	17	15
ST. LOUIS	22	9	40.9	957	116	12.1	1,533	74	4.8	2,512	199	7.9	27	12	44.4	1,389	169	12
SCOTT SHERBURNE	11 10	5 1	45.5 10.0	494 402	54 40	10.9 10.0	1,115 830	63 25	5.7 3.0	1,620 1,242	122 66	7.5 5.3	15 10	8 1	53.3 10.0	750 626	89 67	11. 10.
SIBLEY	10	0	0.0	402 66	40	6.1	147	6	4.1	214	10	4.7	10	0	0.0	101	4	4
STEARNS	18	8	44.4	875	85	9.7	1,477	68	4.6	2,370	161	6.8	19	9	47.4	1,232	98	8
STEELE	2	0	0.0	161	16	9.9	637	12	1.9	800	28	3.5	2	0	0.0	221	22	10
STEVENS	0	0		45	4	8.9	75	2	2.7	120	6	5.0	0	0		61	4	6
SWIFT	3	2	66.7	47	2	4.3	69	4	5.8	119	8	6.7	3	2	66.7	.74	3	4
TODD	4	3	75.0	112	15	13.4	282	11	3.9	398	29	7.3	5	3	60.0	175	21	12
FRAVERSE WABASHA	1	1	100.0	14	2	14.3	28	1 9	3.6	43 322	4	9.3	1	1 0	100.0	23	4 23	17
WADASHA	2 5	1	0.0 20.0	99 71	14 6	14.1 8.5	221 134	2	4.1 1.5	210	23 9	7.1 4.3	5 5	1	$\begin{array}{c} 0.0\\ 20.0\end{array}$	154 101	25	14 7
WASECA	2	0	0.0	110	13	11.8	213	12	5.6	325	25	7.7		0	0.0	159	16	10
WASHINGTON	9	2	22.2	928	86	9.3	2,244		3.4	3,181	165	5.2	13	5	38.5	1,400	144	10
VATONWAN	1	1	100.0	56	3	5.4	135	4	3.0	192	8	4.2	1	1	100.0	70	4	5
VILKIN	3	0	0.0	50	8	16.0	87	6	6.9	140	14	10.0	3	0	0.0	74	12	16
VINONA	7	2	28.6	308	32	10.4	719	31	4.3	1,034	65	6.3		2	25.0	418	45	10
WRIGHT	8	3	37.5	558		10.8	1,088	44	4.0	1,654	107	6.5	8	3	37.5	824	85	10
YELLOW MED JNKNOWN	1 0	0	0.0	59	9 2	15.3 18.2	99	2	2.0	159	11 4	6.9	1	0 0	0.0	90 22	14	15 27

							BLE 5.	Ψ.			,							
TRAFF	IC C	CRAS	HES	, FAT			, AND UNTY I						ID A	LCO	HOL	RELA	ATED	)
							C CRAS				<u>, 200</u>		PER	SONS	KILL	ED OR	R INJU	RED
	FATA	AL CRA	SHES	INJUR	Y CRAS	SHES	DAMA	OPERT AGE ON ASHES	ILY	ΤΟΤΑΙ	L CRAS	HES		KILLE	D	IN	JURED	)
COUNTY	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
AITKIN ANOKA	5 19	1 8	20.0 42.1	74 1,527	10 153	13.5	226 2,965	12 134	5.3 4.5	305	23 295	7.5 6.5		1 8	20.0 33.3	115 2,243	14 238	12.2
BECKER	19	o 4	42.1	1,527	36	10.0 22.8	2,963	154	4.5 6.9	4,511 381	295 55	0.3 14.4	6		83.3	2,243	238 51	10.6 19.2
BELTRAMI	5	1	20.0	246	33	13.4	536	22	4.1	787	56	7.1	5	1	20.0	413	63	15.3
BENTON BIG STONE	12	3	25.0	221	32	14.5	488	21	4.3	721	56	7.8			30.8	376	48	12.8
BLUE EARTH	4	0	$\frac{0.0}{25.0}$	18 360	<u>2</u> 31	11.1 8.6	<u>62</u> 987	$\frac{2}{43}$	<u>3.2</u> 4.4	81 1,351	<u>4</u> 75	<u>4.9</u> 5.6		0	$\frac{0.0}{20.0}$	<u>26</u> 482	<u>2</u> 45	<u>7.7</u> 9.3
BROWN	3	0	0.0	146	9	6.2	272	9	3.3	421	18	4.3			0.0	209	12	5.7
CARLTON	9	3	33.3	109	19	17.4	203	10	4.9	321	32	10.0		4	36.4	160	32	20.0
CARVER CASS	11 16	2 9	18.2 56.3	370 160	31 40	8.4 25.0	830 255	38 15	4.6 5.9	1,211 431	71 64	5.9 14.8			21.4 52.6	550 272	52 79	9.5 29.0
CHIPPEWA	2	1	50.0	58	11	19.0	103	4	3.9	163	16	9.8		4	80.0	92	18	19.6
CHISAGO	10	0	0.0	277	36	13.0	547	17	3.1	834	53	6.4	11	0	0.0	433	63	14.5
CLAY CLEARWATER	12 4	6 1	50.0 25.0	234 30	20 5	8.5 16.7	601 51	29 2	4.8 3.9	847 85	55 8	6.5 9.4	13 4		53.8 25.0	336 48	28 15	8.3 31.3
COOK	2	1	50.0	39	8	20.5	93	6	6.5	134	15	11.2			50.0	61	15	18.0
COTTONWOOD	0	0		40	6	15.0	111	6	5.4	151	12	7.9	0	0	•	66	13	19.7
CROW WING	8	6	75.0	355	42	11.8	789	32	4.1	1,152	80	6.9			75.0	562	62	11.0
DAKOTA DODGE	21 3	6 1	28.6 33.3	1,681 62	128 6	7.6 9.7	4,015 173	167 7	4.2 4.0	5,717 238	301 14	5.3 5.9			27.3 33.3	2,431 101	206 9	8.5 8.9
DOUGLAS	1	0	0.0	203	23	11.3	618	13	2.1	822	36	4.4	1	0	0.0	278	28	10.1
FARIBAULT	3	0	0.0	53	9	17.0	87	3	3.4	143	12	8.4	3		0.0	83	11	13.3
FILLMORE FREEBORN	2 6	1 2	50.0 33.3	101 216	16 25	15.8 11.6	182 490	6 24	3.3 4.9	285 712	23 51	8.1 7.2	28		50.0 37.5	145 305	20 37	13.8 12.1
GOODHUE	7	1	14.3	304	26	8.6	697	24	3.7	1.008	53	5.3		-	14.3	421	31	7.4
GRANT	4	2	50.0	38	8	21.1	62	1	1.6	104	11	10.6			50.0	57	11	19.3
HENNEPIN	56	16	28.6	7,409	577	7.8	19,299	646	3.3	26,764	1,239	4.6		17	27.9	10,167	817	8.0
HOUSTON HUBBARD	2 7	0 5	0.0 71.4	83 116	16 20	19.3 17.2	245 151	15 12	6.1 7.9	330 274	31 37	9.4 13.5	4		0.0 62.5	123 184	25 31	20.3 16.8
ISANTI	8	3	37.5	195	20	10.3	378	13	3.4	581	36	6.2	9		44.4	305	31	10.2
ITASCA	5	2	40.0	213	31	14.6	453	32	7.1	671	65	9.7			40.0	300	44	14.7
JACKSON KANABEC	28	$\begin{array}{c} 0\\ 4\end{array}$	0.0 50.0	66 80	11 11	16.7 13.8	109 154	3 3	2.8 1.9	177 242	14 18	7.9 7.4			0.0 50.0	96 149	16 24	16.7 16.1
KANDIYOHI	7	0	0.0	288	23	8.0	526	25	4.8	821	48	5.8			0.0	471	38	8.1
KITTSON	3	2	66.7	14	2	14.3	79	0	0.0	96	4	4.2			66.7	22	4	18.2
KOOCHICHING LAC QUI PAR	0	0	. 0.0	54 28	4	7.4	89 51	$\frac{3}{2}$	<u>3.4</u> 3.9	143 80	<u>7</u> 5	<u>4.9</u> 6.3			. 0.0	81 42	<u>6</u> 4	<u>7.4</u> 9.5
LAC QUITAK	3	1	33.3	28 56	5 7	10.7	153	2 9	5.9 5.9	212	17	8.0			33.3	42 84	4	9.5 9.5
LAKE OF THE	4	2	50.0	16	8	50.0	42	1	2.4	62	11	17.7	4	2	50.0	20	11	55.0
LE SUEUR LINCOLN	6 3	2 2	33.3 66.7	121 38	14	11.6 13.2	324 71	17 1	5.2 1.4	451 112	33 8	7.3 7.1			33.3 66.7	198 55	21 8	10.6 14.5
LYON	1	$\overset{2}{0}$	0.0	113	8	7.1	280	11	1.4 3.9	394	8 19	4.8	_		0.0	173	10	5.8
MCLEOD	6	0	0.0	174	18	10.3	423	14	3.3	603	32	5.3	7	0	0.0	289	30	10.4
MAHNOMEN	2	1	50.0	40	12		53	4	7.5	95	17	17.9			50.0	58	18	31.0
MARSHALL MARTIN	3	0	33.3	31 108	<u>11</u> 9	35.5 8.3	55 244	<u>5</u> 9	<u>9.1</u> 3.7	89 355	<u>17</u> 18	<u>19.1</u> 5.1	3		33.3	46 164	<u>15</u> 12	<u>32.6</u> 7.3
MEEKER	5	3	60.0	107	18	16.8	219	7	3.2	331	28	8.5	5	3	60.0	172	31	18.0
MILLE LACS	6	2	33.3	137		10.9	273	13	4.8	416	30	7.2			28.6	232	28	12.1
MORRISON MOWER	12 6	$10 \\ 2$	83.3 33.3	184 202	32 22			18 23	5.8 4.4	505 732	60 47	11.9 6.4			73.3 28.6	299 305	45 35	15.1 11.5

	i				В	YC	OUNT	Y IN	MIN	NESO	DTA,		h					
					TRA	FFIC	C CRAS	HES					PER	SONS	KILL	ED OR	INJU	RED
	FAT	AL CRA	SHES	INJUR	Y CRAS	SHES	DAMA	OPERT AGE ON ASHES	ILY	TOTAI	CRAS	HES		KILLE	D	IN	JURED	)
COUNTY	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc	All	Alco- hol	% Alc
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
MURRAY	2	1	50.0	28	3	10.7	79	3	3.8	109	7	6.4	2	1	50.0	40	4	10.0
NICOLLET	0	0		111	12	10.8	369	10	2.7	480	22	4.6		0		157	15	9.6
NOBLES	3	1	33.3	85	6	7.1	260	11	4.2	348	18	5.2	4	1	25.0	118	10	8.5
NORMAN	4	2	50.0	34	5	14.7	52	2	3.8	90	9	10.0	4	2	50.0	54	6	11.1
OLMSTED	13	6	46.2	806	48	6.0	1443	49	3.4	2,262	103	4.6		8	53.3	1,181	89	7.5
OTTER TAIL	11	3	27.3	307	43	14.0	592	30	5.1	910	76	8.4	11	3	27.3	452	61	13.5
PENNINGTON	4	0	0.0	68	8	11.8	94	3	3.2	166	11	6.6	4	0	0.0	97	8	8.2
PINE	8	4	50.0	191	25	13.1	293	15	5.1	492	44	8.9		5	55.6	293	41	14.0
PIPESTONE	2	1	50.0	38	2	5.3	63	1	1.6	103	4	3.9	3	2	66.7	58	5	8.6
POLK	6	1	16.7	128	18	14.1	306	22	7.2	440	41	9.3	6	1	16.7	190	26	13.7
POPE	4	2	50.0	36	7	19.4	82	6	7.3	122	15	12.3	4	2	50.0	46	9	19.6
RAMSEY	31	15	48.4	3,295	284	8.6	10,053	385	3.8	13,379	684	5.1	36	20	55.6	4,519	419	9.3
RED LAKE REDWOOD	$2 \\ 0$	$2 \\ 0$	100.0	16 78	4 20	25.0 25.6	46 128	1 7	2.2 5.5	64 206	7 27	10.9	3	3 0	100.0	18 114	4 27	22.2 23.7
RENVILLE	4	1	25.0	91	20 6	23.0 6.6	128	7	3.3 4.9	200	14	13.1 5.9	5	1	20.0	114	27	25.7 5.5
RICE	14	3	21.4	390	50	12.8	776	22	2.8	1,180	75	6.4	14	3	20.0	569	72	12.7
ROCK	1	1	100.0	43		11.6	169	8	4.7	213	14	6.6		1	100.0	63	7	11.1
ROSEAU	2	1	50.0	65	8	12.3	147	7	4.8	214	16	7.5	3	2	66.7	108	12	11.1
ST. LOUIS	31	12	38.7	963	128	13.3	1,513	97	6.4	2,507	237	9.5	32	12	37.5	1,453	192	13.2
SCOTT	19	8	42.1	529	71	13.4	1,038	47	4.5	1,586	126	7.9	19	8	42.1	812	103	12.7
SHERBURNE	15	5	33.3	424	40	9.4	930	40	4.3	1,369	85	6.2	15	5	33.3	639	56	8.8
SIBLEY	0	0		74	11	14.9	112	7	6.3	186	18	9.7	0	0		116	21	18.1
STEARNS	14	3	21.4	861	83	9.6	1,471	58	3.9	2,346	144	6.1	16	4	25.0	1,243	117	9.4
STEELE	3	1	33.3	183	19	10.4	591	15	2.5	777	35	4.5	3	1	33.3	242	21	8.7
STEVENS	2	1	50.0	34	4	11.8	64	1	1.6	100	6	6.0		1	33.3	57	7	12.3
SWIFT TODD	2	1	50.0 100.0	31 107	3 13	9.7 12.1	47 260	2 12	4.3 4.6	80 368	6 26	7.5 7.1	2	1	50.0 100.0	41 147	3 18	7.3 12.2
TRAVERSE	1	0	0.0	7	2	28.6	14	3	21.4	22	<u></u> 5	22.7	3	0	0.0	7	2	28.6
WABASHA	4	1	25.0	94	12		217	8	3.7	315	21	6.7	5	1	20.0	146	19	13.0
WADENA	2	1	50.0	75	8	10.7	124	7	5.6	201	16	8.0		1	50.0	113	11	9.7
WASECA	4	1	25.0	102	10	9.8	182	9	4.9	288	20	6.9		1	25.0	155	13	8.4
WASHINGTON	14	3	21.4	962	96		2,270	78	3.4	3,246	177	5.5		3	18.8	1,391	147	10.6
WATONWAN	2	0	0.0	48	10	20.8	104	3	2.9	154	13	8.4		0	0.0	66	13	19.7
WILKIN	3	1	33.3	52	9	17.3	108	4	3.7	163	14	8.6	3	1	33.3	72	11	15.3
WINONA	8	3	37.5	243	19	7.8	771	37	4.8	1,022	59	5.8		6	54.5	342	34	9.9
WRIGHT	17	5	29.4	530		12.1	1,015	43	4.2	1,562	112	7.2		5	29.4	781	87	11.1
YELLOW MED	3	2	66.7	43	7	16.3	100	3	3.0	146	12	8.2		2	66.7	66	11	16.7
UNKNOWN	0	0		15	2	13.3	49	1	2.0	64	3	4.7	0	0		19	2	10.5
MINNESOTA	590	211	35.8	28,140	2 827	10.0	66,239	2 614	3.0	94,969	5 652	6.0	657	239	36.4	40,677	4221	10.4

TABLE 5.01, (For Year 2002, Continued)

TABLE 5.01 (for Year 2003)									
FATAL CRASHES AND PERSONS KILLED TOTAL AND ALCOHOL-RELATED BY COUNTY IN MINNESOTA, 2003 *									
COUNTY	FATAL CRASHES All Alcohol % Alcohol			PERSONS KILLED All Alcohol % Alcohol					
			0 Alconor			o Alconor			
AITKIN	4	2	50.0	4	2	50.0			
ANOKA	27	8	29.6	32	9	28.1			
BECKER	7	5	71.4	8	6	75.0			
BELTRAMI	5	3	60.0	6	4	66.7			
BENTON	3	0	0.0	3	0	0.0			
BIG STONE	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0			
BLUE EARTH	12	6	50.0	14	7	50.0			
BROWN	3	1	33.3	3	1	33.3			
CARLTON	4	2	50.0	6	3	50.0			
CARVER	8	4	50.0	10	5	50.0			
CASS	11	6	54.5	10	6	54.5			
CHIPPEWA	0	0	0	0	0	0			
CHISAGO	10	5	50.0	10	5	50.0			
CLAY	8	4	50.0	8	4	50.0			
CLEARWATER	2	2	100.0	2	2	100.0			
COOK	1	0	0.0	1	0	0.0			
COTTONWOOD	2	0	0.0	2	0	0.0			
CROW WING	11	6	54.5	11	6	54.5			
DAKOTA	11	5	35.7	11	5	34.3			
DODGE	3	5 1	33.3	14	1	33.3			
DOUGLAS	6	1	33.3 16.7	6	1	33.3 16.7			
FARIBAULT	5	3	60.0	5	3				
FILLMORE	2	5 0	0.0	3	0	60.0			
FREEBORN	7	4	57.1	5 7	4	0.0 57.1			
GOODHUE									
GRANT	11	2	18.2	11	2	18.2			
	1	1	100.0	1	1	100.0			
HENNEPIN	58	21	36.2	62	23	37.1			
HOUSTON	3	0	0.0	3	0	0.0			
HUBBARD ISANTI	6	2	33.3	6	2	33.3			
	9	2	22.2	12	2	16.7			
ITASCA	12	8	66.7	14	10	71.4			
JACKSON	2	1	50.0	3	1	33.3			
KANABEC	1	1	100.0	1	1	100.0			
KANDIYOHI	10	2	20.0	11	2	18.2			
KITTSON	2	1	50.0	3	1	33.3			
KOOCHICHING	3	3	100.0	3	3	100.0			
LAC QUI PAR	2	1	50.0	2	1	50.0			
LAKE	3	1	33.3	3	1	33.3			
LAKE OF THE W	1	0	0.0	1	0	0.0			
LE SUEUR	2	0	0.0	2	0	0.0			
LINCOLN	3	1	33.3	5	3	60.0			
LYON	2	1	50.0	3	1	33.3			
MCLEOD	4	3	75.0	4	3	75.0			
MAHNOMEN	5	4	80.0	5	4	80.0			
MARSHALL	0	0	0	0	0	0			

\* Information on non-fatal crashes is not available for year 2003.

TABLE 5.01 (for Year 2003) FATAL CRASHES AND PERSONS KILLED TOTAL AND										
ALCOHOL-RELATED BY COUNTY IN MINNESOTA, 2003 *										
COUNTY	FAT	AL CRASI	HES	PER	PERSONS KILLED					
	All	Alcohol	% Alcohol	All	Alcohol	% Alcohol				
MARTIN	2	0	0.0	2	0	0.0				
MEEKER	6	1	16.7	7	0	14.3				
MILLE LACS	5	2	40.0	5	2	40.0				
MORRISON	8	1	12.5	10	1	10.0				
MOWER	4	1	25.0	4	1	25.0				
MURRAY	2	1	50.0	3	1	33.3				
NICOLLET	5	2	40.0	11	5	45.5				
NOBLES	1	0	40.0	1	0	0.0				
NORMAN	2	1	50.0	3	1	33.3				
OLMSTED	13	3	23.1	15	3	20.0				
OTTER-TAIL	10	2	20.0	10	2	20.0				
PENNINGTON	10	1	100.0	10	1	100.0				
PINE	0			0	0					
PIPESTONE	11	0 5	0 45.5	12	0 6	0 50.0				
POLK		2	43.3 50.0	4	2	50.0				
POPE	4	0		3	0					
RAMSEY		÷	0.0			0.0				
RED LAKE	27	8	29.6	31	8	25.8				
	0	0	0	0	0	0				
REDWOOD	1	0	0.0	1	0	0.0				
RENVILLE RICE	6	0	0.0	7	0	0.0				
-	11	5	45.5	11	5	45.5				
ROCK	0	0	0	0	0	0				
ROSSEAU	2	0	0.0	3	0	0.0				
ST. LOUIS	29	12	41.4	29	12	41.4				
SCOTT	14	9	64.3	18	12	66.7				
SHERBURNE	14	5	35.7	15	5	33.3				
SIBLEY	4	0	0.0	4	0	0.0				
STEARNS	19	10	52.6	21	12	57.1				
STEELE	7	3	42.9	7	3	42.9				
STEVENS	2	1	50.0	2	1	50.0				
SWIFT	1	0	0.0	2	0	0.0				
TODD	6	1	16.7	6	1	16.7				
TRAVERSE	0	0	0	0	0	0				
WABASHA	6	3	50.0	8	5	62.5				
WADENA	3	1	33.3	4	2	50.0				
WASECA	2	1	50.0	2	1	50.0				
WASHINGTON	18	8	44.4	24	9	37.5				
WATONWAN	3	0	0.0	3	0	0.0				
WILKIN	2	1	50.0	2	1	50.0				
WINONA	12	5	41.7	15	7	46.7				
WRIGHT	19	10	52.6	20	10	50.0				
YELLOW MED	4	0	0.0	5	0	0.0				
MINNESOTA	583	228	39.1	655	255	38.9x				

\* Information on non-fatal crashes is not available for year 2003.



Minnesota Department of Public Safety Office of Traffic Safety 444 Cedar Street, Suite 150 St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-5150

Pre-Sorted Standard U.S. Postage PAID St. Paul, MN Permit No. 171