DWI Tracking System Feasibility Project
Final Report

By:

Troy D. Walden, Ph.D., Research Scientist
Cody Stewart, Assistant Transportation Researcher
Cinthya Roberto Soares, Assistant Transportation Researcher
Paige Ericson-Graber, M.S.

Texas Department of Transportation
9/22/2017

Texas A&M Transportation Institute

Save a Life™
Texas Department of Transportation

Abstract/Executive Summary

Impaired driving is one of the most pressing traffic safety challenges facing federal, state, and local highway and traffic safety programs. A critical element to the planning, management, and evaluation of any highway safety program is the availability of quality traffic records data. Analyzing reliable and accurate data are crucial to identifying the extent of the driving while intoxicated (DWI) problem and designing effective countermeasures to reducing deaths and injuries caused by impaired driving crashes.

Texas does not have an integrated statewide DWI tracking system (DWITS) which is a powerful shared and information management tool that would allow the State to track DWI offenders from arrest through disposition. Texas uses other data systems that can provide some of the data that would be accessible through a DWITS; however, that data is neither complete nor provided in real-time. Without a DWITS, the State's ability to coordinate an effective impaired driving program is limited.

In FY 2017, the Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) received a grant funded by the Department of Transportation (TxDOT) to assess the feasibility of developing a DWITS in Texas. To determine the feasibility of a DWITS in Texas, TTI conducted several activities, including surveying other states that had implemented a DWITS and conducting interviews with DWI stakeholders in Texas identify gaps in the current DWI system.

Texas is missing many components of a fully functioning DWITS and currently lacks the necessary support for a DWITS. Given these constraints, it is currently not feasible for the State to build a DWITS. However, this report provides a framework for the foundation that is needed to support the development of a DWITS in Texas.

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms

Acronym	Definition
CCH	Computerized Criminal History System
CJAD	Community Justice Assistance Division
CJD	Criminal Justice Division
CJIS	Criminal Justice Information System
CMS	Case Management System
CSCD	Community Supervision and Corrections Department
CSTS	Community Supervision Tracking System
DL	Driver License
DUI	Driving Under the Influence
DWI	Driving While Intoxicated
DWITS	Driving While Intoxicated Tracking System
LEA	Law Enforcement Agency
NHTSA	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
OCA	Office of Court Administration
RMS	Records Management System
SID	State Identification Number
TDCAA	Texas District and County Attorneys Association
TDCJ	Texas Department of Criminal Justice
TIDTF	Texas Impaired Driving Task Force
TRN	Incident Tracking Number
TRS	Incident Tracking Number Suffix
TTI	Texas A&M Transportation Institute
TxDOT	Texas Department of Transportation
TxDPS	Texas Department of Public Safety

Acknowledgement
This project resulted from the hard work of many dedicated individuals from a wide variety of disciplines, interest groups, and backgrounds. This project would not have been possible without their knowledge, support, and guidance. Special thanks to Larry Krantz, Traffic Records Program Manager, and Terry Pence, Traffic Safety Section Director, at the Texas Department of Transportation. In addition, special thanks to the DWI stakeholders in Texas and other states who participated in interviews and workshops. Thank you for your time and efforts.

Page Intentionally Left Blank

Introduction

Impaired driving is one of the most pressing traffic safety challenges facing federal, state, and local highway and traffic safety programs. Significant reductions in impaired driving fatalities, injuries, and crashes were achieved throughout the 1980s and 1990s. Since that time, however, significant reductions have been slower to achieve (NHTSA, 2015a). Nationwide there were 10,265 people killed in alcohol-impaired crashes in 2015 alone, which represented a 3.2% increase from 2014 (NHTSA, 2015b). The number of driving while intoxicated (DWI) arrests made each year heightens the impaired driving problem. In 2015, law enforcement made a staggering 833,833 DWI arrests nationwide (NHTSA, 2015c). Finally, the number of drug-impaired driving fatalities, injuries, and crashes will be impacted as more states decriminalize and/or legalize recreational marijuana and as the nation confronts the prescription drug opiate crisis. Solving the impaired driving safety problem will take strong problem identification and data analysis, and implementation of innovative and effective countermeasures.

Texas must continue to prioritize the impaired driving safety challenge in order to affect change. More alcohol-impaired driving deaths occurred in Texas in 2015 than any other state (NHTSA, 2015c). While the majority of the finite number of resources available to states are often directed to enforcement and education strategies to deter impaired driving, a critical element to the planning, management, and evaluation of any highway safety program is the availability of quality traffic records data (TxDOT, 2017). Traffic safety data is the primary source of our knowledge about the traffic safety environment, driver behavior, and vehicle performance. Data that are timely, consistent, complete, accurate, accessible, and integrated are the cornerstones of a successful highway safety program. Analyzing reliable and accurate data are crucial to identifying the extent of the problem and designing effective countermeasures.

Impaired driving data is complex because it directly involves highway safety data from law enforcement, driver licensing agencies, and the courts. Tracking a DWI offense requires a substantial amount of information gathering and sharing between local and state government entities. While Texas has developed components of a powerful tool that could manage DWI arrests and convictions, these components currently exchange or interact very little with each other, if at all.

Texas currently lacks an effective tool for identifying, prosecuting, adjudicating, and tracking DWI cases. Without a DWI tracking system (DWITS), the State's ability to launch an effective impaired driving program is limited. Currently, law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges do not have access to an individual's complete driving and criminal history record in real-time. Without complete and accurate data, gaps in the DWI system are created. A DWITS is a powerful tool that, if developed, would enable Texas to (1) track an individual from arrest through disposition (including historical offenses, charges, and sanction completion in real-time) and (2) assess the impact of passed legislation and policies to determine certain DWI trends (NHTSA, 1997a). A DWITS provides the necessary information to support the processing of a DWI offender.

Background

States primarily bear the responsibility of reducing impaired driving by passing tougher laws with stiffer penalties, conducting high visibility enforcement initiatives, and other countermeasures. However, a critical element influencing the impaired driving safety challenge is the ability to identify the exact extent and nature of the problem. Identifying the extent and nature of the impaired driving problem in Texas is a complex issue as DWI offenders are typically processed by several agencies – law enforcement, driver licensing agencies, and the courts – each of which contains its own records and data systems. In Texas, these sources currently exchange or interact very little with each other, if at all. As a result, law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges in Texas do not have access to an individual's complete driving and criminal history record in real-time.

Without complete and accurate data, gaps in the DWI system are created. The State's inability to track an individual from arrest through sentence completion can result in offenders not being properly prosecuted or offenders "falling through the cracks" of administrative and/or judicial procedures. Texas cannot truly determine the extent of the impaired driving problem without a powerful tool for identifying, prosecuting, adjudicating, and tracking DWI cases. By successfully integrating data from law enforcement, driver licensing agencies, and the courts, Texas will be in a better position to effectively manage and measure the impact of its impaired driving safety programs. A comprehensive DWITS with shared information and data management from these primary sources is essential for identifying repeat DWI offenders and DWI trends.

In 2015, the State of Texas underwent a technical assessment for its Alcohol and Other Drugs Countermeasures Program. The technical assessment was facilitated by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). The technical assessment team provided recommendations for how the State of Texas can improve its impaired driving program. One of the priority recommendations that came out of the assessment is the need for Texas "to develop and fund a DWI tracking system that would link Texas criminal justice agencies' databases in order to create a network containing offenders' criminal history, arrests, warrants, photographs, and fingerprints to ensure access to offenders' previous and/or current DWI history (Ennis et al., 2015)." Impaired driving has long been recognized as a significant problem in Texas, but a critical component to reducing incidences of DWI is effective information management.

In FY 2017, the Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) received a grant to assess the feasibility of developing a statewide, integrated DWITS for Texas. The project was funded and supported through a grant by the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT). The project was intended to provide TxDOT with a better understanding of the gaps created in the current DWI data process, the benefits a DWITS could provide to the State, and a list of recommendations that could be used as a framework for improving the State's future data governance efforts. Providing exact technical requirements and specifications for how to build a DWITS, and conducting a cost-benefit analysis, and identifying were beyond the scope of this project.

What is a DWI tracking system?

Impaired driving directly involves data from three separate agencies: arrest information from law enforcement, driver license and vehicle data from State driver licensing agencies, and prosecution and adjudication information from the courts. A DWITS is a comprehensive shared information and data management tool. It is an online, centralized system that contains integrated data from law enforcement, driver licensing agencies, the courts, and other sources. A DWITS would enable Texas to

(1) track historical offenses, charges, and sanction completion in real time, and (2) assess the impact of passed legislation and policies to determine certain DWI trends (NHTSA, 1997b).

As defined by NHTSA, a DWITS has the following components:

- Statewide coverage
- Real-time electronic access
- An electronic citation system
- Electronic transmission of data
- Electronic reports to the courts and the State licensing agency
- Linkage of information
- Timely access
- Flexibility
- Conformity with national standards such as the American National Standards Institute and National Information Exchange Model (MIDRIS, 2011).

Why build a DWI tracking system?

Traffic safety stakeholders and the law enforcement, prosecutors, and judges who regularly deal with DWI offenders have long recognized the need for more effective DWI data management. A lack of timely, consistent, complete, accurate, accessible, and integrated data can beleaguer the impaired driving community, creating gaps in the DWI process system. These gaps create the potential for DWI offenders to "fall through the cracks" of the administrative and judicial procedures. As a result, repeat DWI offenders, for example, may be tried inaccurately as first time offenders.

A DWITS not only enables the State to track on a case-by-case basis the record of a repeat DWI offender, it also helps the courts ensure fines are paid and penalties are being completed. A DWITS would automatically track fines, fees, and time payment status for the offense, and would update court and licensing files upon failure to comply or completion. In addition, fiscal accountability could be improved through the system design (NHTSA, 1997a). Law enforcement officers would benefit from a DWITS because they would be able to quickly determine a driver's past alcohol and or drug-related offenses. Prosecutors and judges also benefit from the system by receiving accurate and complete offender records prior to disposition. With more complete and accurate information, prosecutors and courts can enhance charges and sentences accordingly and better ensure offender compliance with previous sanctions and treatment (NASCIO, 2005).

Finally, a DWITS enables the State to more accurately identify DWI trends through improved quality of data. A DWITS can provide aggregate DWI data on a variety of demographic groups, allowing legislators, policymakers, and treatment professionals to evaluate the current DWI environment, countermeasure programs, and laws designed to reduce DWI or rehabilitate DWI offenders. Some of the data a DWITS could provide include information on arrests, convictions, fines assessed and paid, pleas, sanctions, sentences, and treatment effectiveness by age, sex, county, or court (NHTSA, 1997a).

Historical Summary

The idea of a system that could track a DWI offender's record from arrest to disposition is not a new one. More than 35 years ago, NHTSA began holding traffic safety summits with stakeholders to address gaps in the DWI data process. To address the issue, NHTSA published Driving While Intoxicated Tracking Systems in 1997, which laid the foundation for a comprehensive approach and cited the importance of

law enforcement agencies, driver-licensing agencies, and the courts to the overall success of the system (NHTSA, 1997a).

In an effort to determine the extent to which States maintained DWI tracking systems, NHTSA conducted a study in the 1990s. Seven states were selected for further study and a report documenting their approach was published (NHTSA, 1997b). Since that time, most states have implemented some of the components of a comprehensive DWITS, but few have connected the dots and linked critical data from the three key sources.

In 2001, NHTSA joined with states and with other federal agencies to expand the framework of the DWITS and provide additional management and evaluation tools. NHTSA solicited participation in a demonstration project to document how States could further improve and expand existing systems to monitor impaired drivers. The demonstration project assumed there would never be sufficient funding to build a DWITS from the ground-up, therefore, it was critical to identify how existing systems could be utilized to achieve a model DWITS. Four States were selected in 2002 for the demonstration – Alabama, Iowa, Nebraska, and Wisconsin; Connecticut was added in 2004. This is known as the Model Impaired Driving Records Information System (MIDRIS) report and was published in 2011. The report provides examples of how these States made system-wide improvements in areas that appear too costly or complicated to implement (NHTSA, 2011).

Methods

TTI completed several tasks to inform the feasibility of developing a DWITS in Texas. This section outlines the activities completed as part of the DWITS feasibility assessment. Following completion of each (except after contacting MIDRIS report author), a technical memorandum was developed and submitted to TxDOT for feedback and approval.

Developed data collection plan

TTI developed a data collection plan that provided the blueprints for how the project would be completed. The data collection plan identified proposed activities and rationale for completion, described steps toward activity completion, provided performance measures, and identified target completion dates.

Conducted environmental scan of literature

An environmental scan of literature was completed to identify standards and guidelines, data elements and functional requirements, and benefits associated with developing a DWITS. The literature scan involved searching national guidelines as well as documents published by other States. The literature scan also served to identify other states' progress toward implementing a comprehensive DWITS, as well as to identify potential State experts to interview at a later point.

TTI conducted the environmental scan by searching a variety of electronic traffic safety databases, including the Transportation Research Information Services, National Cooperative Highway Research Program, National Technical Information Service, Legal Information Resource Center, and EBSCO databases. Commonly searched keywords were *alcohol driving*, *drunk driving*, *DUI, DWI, tracking, database*, *laws*, *reporting*, and *Traffic Records Assessment*. These keywords were searched both individually and in various combinations.

Contacted MIDRIS report author

In 2011, NHTSA published Model Impaired Driving Records Information Systems - Tying Together Data Systems to Manage Impaired Drivers (NHTSA, 2011). This report documented the progress in four states toward developing a DWITS. Because the MIDRIS report was the most recent piece of literature published that focused attention on DWITS implementation efforts in states, TTI contacted its author to identify (1) if further research and evaluation had occurred, (2) additional national and state online resources, and (3) potential out-of-state stakeholders who could speak to their state's DWITS status. The MIDRIS author, Pamela Beer, directed TTI to additional federal guidelines and resources, as well as out-of-state contacts that aided the process.

Developed online survey

TTI created an online survey (Appendix A) that was distributed to representatives from all 50 states via email (excluding Texas). The purpose of the online survey was to identify states that had a comprehensive DWITS and how their system process functioned. Occasionally, the initial point of contact referred TTI to another stakeholder who had more knowledge of DWI tracking in his or her respective state. TTI contacted each state and sent a reminder email at least once during a 2-month period to encourage completion.

Surveyed other states and conducted follow-up interviews with selected states

During the environmental scan of literature process, TTI began compiling a list of out-of-state contacts that could be used to disseminate the online survey and set-up subsequent interviews. Additionally, TTI searched through Departments of Transportation (DOTs), Traffic Records Coordinating Committees

(TRCCs), impaired driving task forces, and other relevant online sources to identify subject matter experts for each of the states.

Based on the survey results and additional materials received, TTI conducted follow-up interviews with representatives from states who responded that they had developed a DWITS. All states that had participated in the initial online survey provided additional resources or were available for a follow-up interview.

Follow-up interviews were conducted by phone. Interview questions included asking for further clarification, and requesting additional information on their system's performance specifications, data elements, procedures, and processes. As part of this activity, TTI developed a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis for DWITSs that was included in the environmental scan of literature report.

Identified data elements and functional requirements
Using information and knowledge gained through the environmental scan of literature, online survey results, and follow-up discussions with experts from other states, TTI began identifying and compiling a list of data elements and functional requirements characteristic of a DWITS. The list of data elements can be found as Appendix B.

Identified and conducted workshops with Texas impaired driving experts
TTI simultaneously began identifying potential Texas impaired driving stakeholders to participate in workshops focused on assessing DWI data needs in the State. Texas is fortunate to have an active impaired driving stakeholder community, many of whom are represented on the state-level Texas Impaired Driving Task Force (TIDTF). TTI drew many of the potential participants from the TIDTF and sought additional participants through recommendations. TTI worked in conjunction with TxDOT to identify potential stakeholders for workshop participation.

DWI data assessment needs were conducted in one of three ways. TTI conducted one workshop with the TIDTF, five in-person focus groups with primary DWITS stakeholders, and five subsequent interviews via email and/or phone with additional personnel, as needed. To ensure participants had ample time to reflect on and develop responses, TTI distributed discussion questions ahead of each meeting when possible. Each stakeholder group was provided with background information on DWITSs as well as progress other states have made toward developing DWITSs when relevant. Each set of participants were asked a series of questions to better understand the current needs, challenges, strengths, and weaknesses a DWITS would address and potentially create. Appendix C is the list of questions each focus group was asked to address.

For the workshop with the TIDTF, members were assigned to several breakout groups according to their background expertise: prevention/education, law enforcement, prosecution and judicial, and treatment and probation. Each group was assigned facilitator as well as a note-taker. Once each working group had concluded their individual discussions, each group chose a representative to report to the larger TIDTF about their group's findings and conclusions.

The five in-person focus groups were separately conducted. A focus group was held with judges, the Office of Court Administration (OCA), Texas Department of Public Safety (TxDPS) Toxicology Department (breath and blood laboratories), Community Justice Assistance Division (CJAD), and TxDPS Licensing. The majority of these focus groups took place in Austin, TX, where many state agencies are headquartered.

Interviews with TxDPS Crime Records and clerks were conducted via email. Interviews with probation, law enforcement, and prosecutors were conducted via phone.

After conducting the workshop with the TIDTF and the five in-person focus groups, it became apparent that additional stakeholders should be part of the DWITS conversation. Referral contacts directed TTI to these stakeholders, and subsequent interviews were scheduled. Since interviews with these stakeholders were not originally anticipated, some interviews were conducted via phone or email.

Completed DWITS final report

This report serves as the final activity in the DWITS feasibility assessment for Texas. This report is a comprehensive review of project activities and findings. The report describes key DWITS characteristics, discusses the importance of DWI tracking, identifies gaps in the current DWI system in Texas, and determines the feasibility of developing a DWITS in the State. This report includes recommendations that are intended to provide the framework for building a DWITS in Texas.

Results and Findings

The purpose of this project is to assess the feasibility of developing a statewide, integrated DWITS in Texas. As part of this feasibility study, TTI attempted to survey representatives from all states (except Texas) regarding their progress in developing a DWITS. As Texas does not have a DWITS, TTI conducted workshops, focus groups, and subsequent phone and email interviews with DWI stakeholders to identify the State's DWI data process needs. This includes an assessment of where data are robust and where data are lacking. This section is categorized into two subsections: findings from other states and findings from Texas.

Findings from Other States

TTI distributed the online survey to all states (excluding Texas) via email. TTI received 16 responses from states and did not receive responses from 33 states. Of the 16 states that responded to the online survey:

- 6 states had a comprehensive DWITS – IA, KS, MO, NC, NY, TN
- 10 states did not have a comprehensive DWITS – AL, HI, IL, NV, MI, MT, WI

For the purposes of this report, states were categorized as either having a comprehensive DWITS or not having a comprehensive DWITS. It should be noted, that several states had components of a comprehensive DWITS (NE) and other states were currently pursuing a DWITS (WA, WV). However, each of these states was categorized as not having a comprehensive DWITS because it was not fully functioning.

With a limited number of states participating in the online survey, it is difficult to make meaningful conclusions about the status of states developing DWITSs. However, there are a few conclusions that can be made.

Other states are building DWITSs

Of the states that responded to the online survey, 37.5% (6 of 16) were identified as having a comprehensive DWITS. However, the development of a DWITS is often seen as too complex or costly to implement, some states – Kansas, Missouri, Tennessee – have found success.

To build its DWITS, Kansas, for example, leveraged existing repositories and resources already provided by the Kansas Criminal Justice Information System (KCJIS) data center to help ensure that DUI offenders were appropriately charged and sentenced. As a result, Kansas developed the Report and Police Impaired Drivers (RAPID) system, which provides:

- Electronic submission of DUI filings and dispositions from courts to the Kansas Bureau of Investigation (KBI) central repository
- Courts and prosecutors one-stop access to search across disparate data systems, such as the KBI criminal history and incident/arrest repositories, the Kansas Department of Revenue driver and vehicle data, and the Kansas Department of Transportation crash repository, thereby providing a complete picture of an offender's DUI history;
- Notification to courts and prosecutors when new information regarding an offender becomes available
- Tools for managing data errors and data reporting deficiencies; and
- Augmentation of the KBI central repository to include additional information needed to support DUI prosecution and sentencing (Kansas EPMO, 2016).

Before implementing the RAPID system, Kansas had approximately 18,000 dispositions per month that were entered and submitted manually. After implementing the RAPID system, those dispositions were reported and accessed electronically. Dispositions that once could take 3.5-6.5 years were now taking an average of just over 2 months. In just 30 days, Kansas saw a 7.2% drop in disposition processing time (NIEM, 2015).

Other states have integrated traffic records systems

Some states have developed an integrated core traffic records system that collect and process data gathered at the scene of a crash. Data integration refers to the establishment of connections between the six core traffic records system components: crash, vehicle, driver, roadway, citation/adjudication, and emergency medical services (EMS)/injury surveillance (USDOT, 2014). Each of these traffic records system components may have multiple sub-systems that can also be integrated for analytical purposes.

Integrated datasets enable users to conduct analyses and generate insights that would be impossible to achieve if they were based on the contents of one singular data system. Linked systems provide additional detail to the understanding of the crash, the roadway environment, and the individuals and vehicles involved. Integrated datasets increase the amount of information available to highway traffic safety decision-makers and can reduce the delay, cost, and duplication of effort that are associated with collecting the same information separately (NHTSA, 2012).

DWI data is just one part of the larger traffic records picture. A DWITS can and should process more than just DWI data. DWITSs are associated with other information needs, such as routine traffic citations, criminal activity and convictions, and tax and revenue information. Consideration must be given to a system that administratively manages more than DWIs. A system could be designed solely around DWI; however, given operational and procedural changes, funding requirements, software development, and system implementation, the contributing economies of scale would likely dictate a broader system design.

Statutory changes may be necessary

Developing a DWITS is challenging for many reasons – chief among them are legislative constraints. Although not required, statutory changes are often a prerequisite in the development of a DWITS. The passage of key legislative mandates “enable the raising of funds to install and operate” a DWITS and “ensures uniformity statewide of reporting and access procedures, and increase the likelihood of statewide implementation” (NHTSA, 1997a). Legislators or prominent public figures who have a personal relationship with a victim of an impaired driving crash will often champion the cause.

Legislators in Kansas, for example, were able to successfully pass SB 6 in 2011, which among other things, created a central repository that gave law enforcement, prosecutors, and judges access to drivers’ records, making it easier to track repeat offenders. SB 6 required district courts to electronically report to the central information repository the filing of any case alleging a charge for DUI or commercial DUI. These statutory changes were set into motion after a drunk driver killed a mother and daughter who were crossing a street to school. The driver had 11 previous convictions for DUI, however, because of gaps in reporting, the state driver’s license database showed only two of those convictions (Joint Committee on Kansas Security, 2017). This led to questions about how effective the State’s DUI laws were if law enforcement, prosecutors, and judges do not know how many times a driver has gotten behind the wheel while under the influence (Gruver, 2011).

Any consideration of changes to legislation must first include a review and comparison against evidence of current requirements that are not being met but could be better addressed with a DWITS. The passage of key laws "mandate minimum requirements, regulate statewide standards, and allocate state funds or permits the collection of user fees to ensure consistency throughout the state" (NHTSA, 1997a).

Significant funding and support are necessary
It is evident that significant funding and support are necessary for the successful design, implementation, and maintenance of a DWITS. Kansas, for example, deferred funding on other projects in order to prioritize the development of a central repository. Kansas spent $2.9 million from April 2013 to January 2016 developing and implementing its DWITS (Kansas EPMO, 2016).

Estimating costs include both tangible and intangible costs, and "best and worst" case scenarios. Tangible costs include hardware purchases and upgrades; software purchases or development; communications infrastructure; and hiring personnel who will design and develop the system, who will implement the system, and who will provide training and system support. Intangible costs include operational restructuring, recruiting stakeholder support (buy-in), and legislative initiatives. Best and worst case scenarios include assessing what design and implementation efforts can be produced with existing personnel, with the addition of personnel, or with expert consultants. Each scenario must include cost and time estimates, as well as outline the benefits to each approach (NHTSA, 1997a).

Findings from Texas

To better understand the needs, challenges, strengths, and weaknesses associated with the current DWI data process in Texas, TTI held one workshop with the TIDTF, a series of focus groups with primary DWI data stakeholders, and conducted follow-up phone and email interviews as necessary. The following section contains results from discussion with all Texas DWI stakeholders.

The Computerized Criminal History System (CCH) is the closest system in place that mimics components of a DWITS. However, relying upon the CCH to accurately identify the "critical path" of a DWI offender from arrest to disposition is problematic because it is neither comprehensive nor capable of performing in real-time.
While Texas does not have a DWITS – as characterized by standards set forth by NHTSA – it does have a system in place that attempts to track arrests and convictions for Class B misdemeanors and higher. This system is known as the Computerized Criminal History System (CCH). CCH is the statewide repository of criminal history data reported to TxDPS by local criminal justice agencies in Texas. While not required by statute, CCH has traditionally included limited supervision data reported to TxDPS from the Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ) (TxDPS, 2016). Criminal justice agencies access CCH for a variety of reasons, including identifying decisions on investigations, arrests, criminal charges, plea bargains, convictions, probation, and placement in correctional facilities.

To solve the problem of finding a way to track an arrest and "find out what happened" after the arrest, an incident number for the arrest and a state identification number (SID) for the person arrested are assigned in CCH. The incident tracking number (TRN) and incident tracking number suffix (TRS) are the numbers used to link a charged offense from arrest through disposition. The TRN is the number assigned to the arrest, and the TRS numbers are used if the individual has multiple offenses that can be charged during an arrest. Prosecutors use TRS numbers to refile or add/enhance charges. The SID keeps all criminal history for a person and are based on fingerprints. Each reporting entity must be extremely careful in its management of cases to include and pass along the TRN and TRS.

TxDPS also generates and maintains offense codes that are associated with criminal offenses of a Misdemeanor B and higher (that are not fine only). These offense codes are 8 digits long: the first four digits consist of the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) classification of the offense and the last four digits are the Texas specific identifier of the offense. Each offense code is associated with the specific Texas statute and citation where the level and degree of the offense is stated. The offense codes are updated every legislative session with some additional updates released in between (TxDPS, 2017). Offense codes can be helpful in identifying the number of cases with a specific crime involved if an agency has a computer software program that can pull data using an offense code. However, unless the law enforcement, prosecutor, and court personnel who enter the data have a solid, working knowledge of which codes should be used for a specific offense, offense codes can be incorrectly assigned. Some offenses have several options depending upon the degree of the offense, the mental state required, or both (McCown, 2012). When the incorrect offense code is used, it is more difficult to accurately determine what happened in a specific case. Offense codes are also complicated to track because they are updated after every legislative session.

The accuracy and completeness of the information in CCH depends upon the data that arresting agencies, prosecutors, and clerks are inputting. These issues are especially complicated within the CCH because the system is reliant upon each involved agency passing along the TRN and TRS to the succeeding agency. The arresting agency must begin the process with the fingerprint submission, and it must be reported to TxDPS and to the prosecutor. The TxDPS Criminal History Reporting Form (CR-43) contains all the required information – except the State Identification Number –, which must be received back by the arresting agency from TxDPS after the arrest is reported. The arresting agency and the prosecutor must agree on a process for the efficient flow of information via the CR-43 or other appropriate method. Likewise, the prosecutor must report his/her action (decision to accept, reject, change, or add to the charge for trial) to TxDPS *and* to the court. This information may also be exchanged via the CR-43, but it is often exchanged via an intra-county system. The prosecutor must also include the TRN, as received from the arresting agency. Clerks are dependent upon receiving the TRN and TRS from the prior reporting agency. Each agency must fulfill its responsibility of passing along the TRN or the succeeding agency may not be able to accurately report the next step in the process (TxDPS, 2016).

In 2002, the Criminal Justice Policy Counsel estimated that only 60% of dispositions in local courts were present in CCH. Although TxDPS was mandated the responsibility of collecting data to maintain these systems, the agency at the time had no ability to discipline any of the reporting agencies for non-compliance (McCown, 2012). In 2011, the Governor's Office Criminal Justice Division (CJD) mandated that "each county must comply with Chapter 60 reporting requirements in order for the county or any political subdivision within that county to be eligible for grants under CJD's Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) program. Since that time, reporting has significantly improved, increasing to 95%. TxDPS attributes the missing 5% to (1) cases where the corresponding arrest are not reported and (2) cases where the offense has not been disposed of. In the former scenario, when a disposition is reported but it cannot be matched to an arrest via TRN and TRS, then the case is placed in a DPS "suspense file" to await the receipt of the arrest report. If the arrest report never arrives, then the disposition will never be entered into CCH (TxDPS, 2016).

Texas does not have standardized procedures to report or track conditions of bond.
When Texas last updated its laws related to conditions of bond, recommendations were modeled after bond conditions set forth in other states. Texas, however, did not adopt a uniform procedure for reporting bond conditions, as was standard in other states.

A lack of standardized procedures for reporting bond conditions created a unique DWI data gap in Texas. For example, when an officer in Texas pulls an individual over on suspicion of DWI, the officer will attempt to determine if that individual has any prior arrests or convictions. The officer will determine prior arrests or convictions by searching two databases: Texas Driver License (DL) and the CCH. While the arresting officer can search DL and CCH to identify previous arrests and convictions, the officer has no way of identifying whether the individual may be in violation of bond conditions set for a previous offense. Bond conditions are not reported or tracked statewide, and thus, that information cannot be generated in the DL or CCH.

There are no standardization or formal procedures for sharing case files across jurisdictions.
Many times the only way to be completely certain of what happened in a specific DWI case is for prosecutors to obtain copies of the actual charging instruments and court documents from the county or counties where previous DWI offense(s) occurred. Without a statewide DWITS, prosecutors must rely upon their professional network of peers, such as the Texas District and County Attorneys Association (TDCAA), to facilitate partnerships with prosecutors in other counties where previous DWI arrests are thought to have occurred. If the prosecutor in a county where the previous DWI arrest occurred is willing to assist, then case files are exchanged. The process of exchanging case files can range from allowing complete access to a county's records management system (RMS), to emailing PDFs, mailing hardcopies, or burning CDs. Because of the labor-intensive process, if the arrested individual is in violation of bond conditions, it may not be found and charged by a prosecutor until several weeks later. Many offense enhancements are dependent upon the ability to determine the defendant's previous history.

Furthermore, if prosecutors deem that the elements of a DWI arrest are not enough to proceed with prosecution, then the DWI arrest will not appear in CCH when it is searched. Instead, the case remains in an internal agency system tied to a case number. Without the ability to accurately and completely identify the defendant's previous history, the DWI stakeholder community will be plagued by the same data gaps.

There is no standardization of guidelines or rules that regulate the way DWI pre-trial intervention/diversion programs are implemented, operated, or applied.
Texas does not offer deferred adjudication for DWI offenses; however, some counties offer pre-trial diversion/intervention programs for DWI, which are designed to educate, rehabilitate, and divert prosecution of certain offenders. Upon satisfactory completion, these programs result in either a dismissal of the DWI charge or a reduction to a non-alcohol-related offense (such as obstruction of highway) – without resulting in a DWI conviction. District and county attorney offices offer DWI pre-trial intervention/diversion programs at their discretion. These programs are generally only available to first offenders; however, anecdotal evidence indicates these programs have been available to repeat offenders, including in DWI felony cases.

Because pre-trial diversion/intervention programs are discretionary and not statutory, it is possible that a defendant who successfully completes a program – thus eschewing a DWI conviction – could commit a second DWI in a separate jurisdiction and qualify as a first offender in the subsequent case. For this reason, other states have established by statute previous diversion/intervention program completion will count as a prior conviction if the driver is convicted of a subsequent DWI. Because Texas does not have a DWITS, judges and prosecutors cannot accurately determine whether a DWI defendant has previously benefitted from one or more DWI diversion/intervention programs. Since reducing DWI

charges to non-alcohol-related offenses and case dismissals are often counted as convictions in Texas, it is impossible to accurately determine conviction rates.

Courts use multiple case management systems (CMSs) to report data to OCA. The use of multiple systems instead of one statewide CMS that is utilized by every court system has resulted in data that is not uniformly collected or reported. Additionally, there is no CMS for specialty court data.
OCA is a state agency that operates under the direction and supervision of the Supreme Court of Texas and the Chief Justice (OCA, 2017). OCA collects information about the number of trials courts hold, disposition types, time to disposition, number of adjudicated cases, and some financial obligation information. Courts are required to report this data to OCA within a certain time. To report this data to OCA and to share data between offices, courts have utilized multiple CMSs. Courts enter data into a CMS and then the vendor uploads the data to OCA's system. There are approximately 30 court CMSs used throughout the State, but the majority of courts use one of five systems. However, even among one of the most popular CMSs – Odyssey – data quality can differ among agencies depending upon which software modules were purchased from and installed by the vendor.

Court data from specialty courts – such as drug and DWI courts – cannot accurately be accounted for by the State because there is no repository for specialty courts to transmit or store their data. Additionally, OCA lacks some data from these specialty courts because not all specialty courts receive funding from the Governor's Office and are instead funded locally. Because some of these courts do not receive funding from the Governor's Office, they are not mandated to report data to OCA. Without a CMS for these specialty courts to report data, the State cannot accurately assess or measure the impact or practices of specialty courts. A CMS must be built to collect specialty court data. As of August 2017, OCA and CJD are currently exploring the opportunity to create a CMS for specialty courts.

The quality of data reported by courts is heavily reliant upon clerks knowing if the information being sent is accurate. Although courts are mandated to report data to OCA within certain timeframes, they often hold data until the end of the year, increasing the chances of sending inaccurate data.
The court data received by OCA is aggregated by county. When data are received from courts, OCA staff reviews the data for clerical errors. The quality of data being sent to OCA heavily relies on clerks knowing if what is being sent is correct. Data quality also suffers when it is not a priority for local level courts. One of the reasons data quality has been called into question is that court clerks are responsible for setting up the coding for their CMS. OCA often receives calls from clerks for technical support even though OCA is not responsible for such training.

It is the responsibility of court clerks to report court data to OCA, but some clerks hold their court data until the end of the year to report. OCA has found that the longer the courts wait to send their data, the greater the likelihood the data is inaccurate. Even though there is a mandate that stipulates loss of indigent defense funding if the courts do not follow the reporting rules, reporting can still be held by the county for a year before the threat of pulling funding is made. Furthermore, courts are often granted several more months of leeway to become compliant.

OCA desires to collect individual court data to determine how individual courts are performing. OCA is currently working towards collecting case level data.
OCA has expressed the need for individual court data. Individual court data would allow OCA to understand how each court is performing and implement changes that may be needed to improve the operation of each court. Among other data, individual court data would include tracking charges and linking dispositions, information about a defendant's release from jail prior to trial, and the types of

bonds issued. Acquiring case level data can lead to better information about convictions and identification of the types of offenses that receive convictions. Currently, to obtain conviction and non-conviction data, a request must be made to the county or city levels. Non-conviction data is at the county level and are reported as dismissals in aggregate. Therefore, OCA cannot identify or breakdown the various non-conviction verdicts. In order to have that data, it would be necessary for OCA to contact each court clerk. Individual court data can lead to improvements in governance and increased transparency.

Data from CSCDs do not link or interface with OCA court data.
CJAD requires Community Supervision and Corrections Departments (CSCDs) to submit data to address legislative and agency accountability requirements. Chapter 60 of the Code of Criminal Procedure in Texas mandated the creation of a comprehensive incident-based tracking system for all offenders in the Texas criminal justice system. The Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) is the tracking system that contains information on all offenders. CJIS has two components: the CCH and the Corrections Tracking System (CTS), which is maintained by TDCJ. CTS contains information on all offenders under the supervision of state corrections agencies and CSCDs in Texas. The Community Supervision Tracking System (CSTS) is the community supervision (adult probation and parole) portion of CTS. CSTS contains detailed information on offenders under community supervision in Texas (TDCJ CJAD, 2017).

CJAD can provide data about an individual's program completion from a particular program, but no data exists about whether the program completed is a DWI-specific program. CJAD tracks the programs using classification codes. The codes are specific to the different types of programs that probation departments can offer, but they are not specific to the conviction. Classification codes generally indicate that an individual is placed, for example, in a substance abuse program. Additionally, smaller CSCDs do not typically have the resources larger CSCDs have access to, and thus, may not be able to offer the same range of treatment programs.

CJAD does not lack data but rather lacks the connections to link the data that is currently being collected. First, CSCD data that are reported to CJAD do not link or interface with OCA court data. If the two types of data were linked it would enable the ability to effectively and accurately evaluate rehabilitation services. CSCD resources could also be reallocated based on the effectiveness of certain treatment programs. Additionally, none of the systems at the State or county level interface to one another. Detailed information about offenders are stored at the county level, and although CJAD collects a few of these data elements, there is no central repository to send probation information. A prosecutor, for example, would be unaware if a defendant was on conditions of probation in another county unless that county's system used the same system as the originating county. Finally, CSCDs administer the same risk assessment tool, however, no central repository exists for that information to be transmitted and stored statewide.

Liability and privacy concerns must be addressed in the development of a DWITS.
Some law enforcement agencies (LEAs) expressed concern about agency liability and the defendant's privacy. For instance, if an individual's DWI record is expunged and the arresting LEA removes the record from its system, how can the LEA be assured that the record will be permanently removed from the DWITS? Would the LEA be liable if the expunged record still existed in the DWITS? Secondly, LEAs emphasized the need for uniform procedures to be developed that will specify who will be granted access to the DWITS and what information they are permitted to access. As a DWITS will contain sensitive information, it is necessary that the managing authority -- in conjunction with primary DWI stakeholders -- establish and agree upon roles and accessibility guidelines/protocol.

Limitations

The purpose of this project is to understand the framework of a DWITS, describe key system characteristics, discuss the importance of DWI tracking, identify gaps in the current DWI system, and determine the feasibility of developing a DWITS in Texas. These aspects were accomplished through an environmental scan of literature, survey distribution and interviews with other states, and workshop facilitation and interviews with DWI stakeholders in Texas. While this project accomplished each of the above objectives, several limitations constrain the project findings and must be addressed.

First, findings is this report are constrained by the limited number of states who responded to the distributed survey. While TTI contacted and attempted to distribute the survey to all states (except Texas), only 16 states responded to and participated in follow-up interviews. Only states that responded to the survey are accounted for in this report. While states such as California, Virginia, and Florida are reported to be excellent examples of states with integrated data systems, they are not included in this report. Additionally, the representatives in other States who responded to the survey and/or interviews held various positions/titles. While each representative had knowledge regarding the status of their state's DWITS, the scope and depth of knowledge varied. For instance, TTI spoke to the Director of IT in Iowa and the Highway Safety Specialist in Hawaii. Furthermore, some of the contacts given to TTI from other experts who had working knowledge of their State's DWITS had either retired or moved on.

Secondly, TTI conducted an environmental scan of literature on all states (excluding Texas), however, only those states who responded to the distributed survey are included in this report. Some states have a large "digital footprint," publishing strategic plans, strategic committee meeting minutes, and progress toward long-term projects online in an effort to be transparent. Other states have a smaller "digital footprint," where little to no information was found online regarding DWITS status. It is possible that states with a functioning DWITS were overlooked for this report because they did not respond to the online survey, they had a small "digital footprint," or there was a combination of the two conditions.

Third, this project assessed common features of a DWITS. However, elements such as functional requirements information (data warehouse storage capacity, effectiveness metrics, query features, process lineage for integration, architectural and technical specifications) should better inform and paint a more holistic picture of what an ideal DWI tracking system should resemble.

Finally, Texas DWI stakeholders who participated in workshops and interviews were based on a convenience sample. The TIDTF is comprised of a diverse group of DWI stakeholders, representing nearly every aspect of the impaired driving challenge – from advocacy to treatment. The TIDTF was utilized in the general workshop to gain an understanding of the general data needs from certain groups. Although interviews with additional stakeholders were held, some TIDTF members were utilized again during subsequent interviews with specific agency organizations. Future research should include feedback from primary stakeholders not currently represented on the TIDTF.

Conclusions

A DWITS is a powerful shared and information data management tool that would provide centralized access to DWI data collected statewide. A DWITS provides DWI stakeholders access to accurate and complete information on DWI offenders and each DWI event. The accurate identification of DWI offenders is important so that "swift and certain" punishment can be imposed.

As the MIDRIS report recommends, there are several features common to a fully functioning DWITS. These include:

- Statewide usage of all stakeholders
- Real-time access for law enforcement of relevant records (driver's license, vehicle registration, criminal history, warrant, and bond status)
- Electronic citation system
- Electronic data transmission within members of criminal justice system (law enforcement, courts, licensing)
- Electronic data transmission to the courts and licensing from probation, treatment, and correctional agencies
- Linkage of information from cases to offenders including treatment and probation
- Timely access by all stakeholders to provide information of current trends and effectiveness of countermeasures (MIDRIS, 2011).

In Texas, the CCH is the closest data system in place that allows law enforcement, prosecutors, and courts to track arrests and convictions of DWI offenders. However, the CCH cannot currently be characterized by any of the above recommended features.

Based on interviews with DWI stakeholders in Texas, it is clear there is a need for more effective management of DWI data. While some DWI stakeholders do not have as large a need for a DWITS as others do, all stakeholders would benefit from a system that allows real-time tracking of DWI offenders from arrest to disposition.

An integrated database would allow a unique identifier to be placed to an individual that could be utilized statewide. When a new case is started, a case number would be associated with the unique identifier of the person. All case files – from documents generated at the time of arrest, to toxicology, to licensing; documents generated from prosecution and the court system; and documents generated by probation and treatment – would be uploaded to the system, either directly or through their respective existing systems. This system would enable the State to track on a case-by-case basis the record of a DWI offender.

The benefits of having a centralized system do not end at a single case level. Other states, such as Kansas, have incorporated flagging systems that notify existing prosecution or probation departments if an offender is subsequently arrested or there is a status change in the offender's case. Beyond that, a centralized system allows the State to review DWI data on an aggregate level. DWI data can be pulled by various elements – including by city, county, regionally, or statewide – and then can be analyzed to determine emerging trends in different areas. The State can assess the types of court systems, treatment programs, and sanctions that have been effective and reduced recidivism.

Recommendations

While the benefits of a DWITS are widespread, the challenges facing such a large-scale project are also burdensome. Identifying the need for a DWITS is one thing; it is an entirely different thing to transition that solution to design and implementation. Designating a centralized host agency, identifying sustainable funding, and instituting possible statutory changes are chief among the list of challenges that must be addressed before development of a DWITS begins.

This section is designed to provide a framework for the foundation that must be laid before the development of a DWITS. The primary foundation must involve active leadership and general participation from key agency stakeholders. Agency stakeholders must be united by the common goal of reducing DWI fatalities, injuries, and crashes through more effective DWI management.

Establish leadership and obtain buy-in

A stakeholder representative should be selected to lead the effort in developing the DWITS. The selected stakeholder will represent the State's efforts to develop a DWITS and must serve as a leader, liaison, and promoter. At the same time, the agency that the stakeholder represents will also serve as the organization that most aggressively promotes or "champions" the project. Focused leadership is integral to the development of a comprehensive DWITS. The leader must promote the system and provide enough information so that not just consensus – but prioritization – is obtained from all involved stakeholders.

Identify repository host

The primary consequences of a DWI are created by judicial actions and legally mandated sanctions. Because the judiciary requires the most extensive and varied scope of data and information to support adjudication and disposition activities, it is recommended that the DWITS should be hosted by OCA since courts already submit some data. However, OCA is not currently in a position to host a DWITS. OCA would require significant funding for hardware and software purchasing, as well as funding to hire or contract with personnel who would design, implement, and maintain the system.

Conduct environmental assessment of technological infrastructure and data information needs

The State should conduct an environmental assessment of current technological infrastructure that law enforcement, prosecutors, courts, and other primary stakeholders are using. This will allow the State to identify whether a DWITS can be developed utilizing the infrastructure currently available to stakeholders or whether additional infrastructure will need to be developed. Infrastructure may include the willingness of stakeholders to modify their operations and procedures to create consistent operations, procedures, and data centralization.

Develop conceptual model

The environmental assessment should be used to develop a conceptual model that will address system goals and objectives. The conceptual model should also include information about the resources each agency stakeholder is willing to spend in support of the development of a DWITS. Based on these aspects, each agency should outline perceived resources required, hardware/software requirements, and operational/procedural changes. The conceptual model and environmental assessment are not meant to be used as the overall design of the DWITS but rather used to obtain necessary support.

Conduct cost-benefit analysis

A cost-benefit analysis is a systematic approach that allows the State to identify anticipated costs and benefits associated with designing, implementing, and maintaining a DWITS. Benefits include those to

the State, stakeholders, and the public. Costs include both tangible (such as hardware and software purchases) and intangible (such as legislative initiatives). Many of the benefits associated with a DWITS are abstract, but a well-executed cost-benefit analysis will help make those benefits more perceptible to legislators, stakeholders, and the public.

Obtain legislative support

Although not required in all states, legislative support will facilitate adoption of a statewide DWITS. Advocacy by state and local legislators and the passage of key laws mandate minimum requirements, regulate statewide standards, and allocate state funds or permit the collection of user fees help to ensure consistency throughout the state.

However, due to the limitations in the current DWI system in Texas, statutory changes would be necessary in Texas. Localization of records in all parts of a DWI case – from the point of arrest to disposition – puts the State at a large disadvantage compared to other states that were interviewed. It is the primary reason statutory authority would be necessary for development and adoption of a DWITS in Texas.

Develop and adopt statewide e-Citation system or create interface that integrates with software programs currently utilized by entities

Ideally, Texas must move toward developing and adopting a statewide electronic citation (e-Citation) system. However, Texas is a large, diverse state with 254 counties that have already adopted procedures and internal systems for reporting citations to the State. Many LEAs utilize e-Citation, but they are not limited to using one system across the State. As a result, some LEAs use vendors – such as Tyler Technologies – to submit their citation data electronically, while others have created customized systems specific to their LEA's needs and specifications. Because significant time and resources have been dedicated to electronically submitting citations to the State, the likelihood of the State being able to adopt a statewide e-Citation system is limited.

A more plausible solution is to create an interface that integrates with the larger software programs and require all criminal justice agencies to use one of a select few programs specific to their branch of the criminal justice system. If Texas were able to exercise its economies of scale, this approach would drive down costs and allow smaller agencies to have access to the same software that large agencies do.

Standardize DWI pre-trial intervention/diversion programs; acceptance into a pre-trial intervention/diversion program for DWI should be sufficient to consider the event a first time DUI; expungement should have similar consequences

Texas must standardize DWI pre-trial diversion/intervention programs so that the same rules govern program implementation, operation, and applicability. Judges and prosecutors cannot accurately determine whether a DWI defendant has previously benefitted from one or more DWI diversion/intervention programs in the current system. Because pre-trial diversion/intervention programs are discretionary and not statutory, it's possible that a defendant who successfully completes a program – thus eschewing a DWI conviction – could commit a second DWI in a separate jurisdiction and qualify as a first offender in the subsequent case. For this reason, other states have established by statute that previous diversion/intervention program completion will count as a prior conviction if the driver is convicted of a subsequent DWI.

Expungement should have similar consequences. In Texas, convictions cannot be expunged following a DWI arrest, but many times judges will allow an arrest to be expunged after the successful completion of

a probation program in lieu of a conviction. If expungement is part of a pre-trial diversion program, Texas should make expunged records available to prosecution in the event the offender is arrested for a subsequent DWI. This allows the offender to be subjected to enhanced penalties that are associated with subsequent offenses.

Establish unique personal identifier

A unique personal identifier is a key factor the State must establish in development of a DWITS. Identifiers like names, driver license numbers, and social security numbers are not appropriate since they are either not unique or not universal. Texas does assign State Identification Numbers (SID) to every individual recorded in the criminal justice system. However, because there is not a centralized program for tracking, state level databases such as CJIS do not integrate with databases at the county. Further research is needed to determine if SID is an appropriate unique personal identifier.

Develop and pilot-test DWITS in pre-determined county

Once the design of a DWITS has been completed, the program should be pilot-tested in a pre-determined county before being rolled out statewide. TxDOT has followed this method of pilot-testing programs such as the Crash Record Information System Crash Reporting and Analysis for Safer Highways (CRIS CRASH) before statewide rollout. Pilot testing allows for feedback and adjustments to be made before the system is adopted statewide.

References

Ennis, D.W., Grube, K.B., Lillis, R.P., Stout, M. R., & Vecchi, J. (2015). State of Texas Impaired Driving Program Assessment August 17 – August 21, 2015. Retrieved from https://www.txdot.gov/apps/eGrants/eGrantsHelp/Reports/TexasImpairedDrivingAssessment.pdf.

Gruver, Deb. (2011). Statewide DUI Tracking System to Be Funded. *The Wichita Eagle.* Retrieved from http://www.kansas.com/news/politics-government/election/article1062703.html.

Joint Committee on Kansas Security. (2017). Report of the Joint Committee on Kansas Security to the 2017 Kansas Legislature. Retrieved from http://www.kslegresearch.org/KLRD-web/Publications/CommitteeReports/2016CommitteeReports/jt_ks_sec-cr.pdf.

Kansas Enterprise Project Management Office. (2016). Post Implementation Evaluation Report – Kansas DUI Tracking System (Record and Police Impaired Drivers RAPID III). Retrieved from https://oits.ks.gov/docs/default-source/kitodocumentlibrary/PIER-Summaries/kbi-rapid-iii-pier-overview.pdf?sfvrsn=0.

McCown, J. K. (2012). CJIS Made Simple. *The Prosecutor, 42*(5). Retrieved from https://www.tdcaa.com/journal/cjis-made-simple.

National Association of State Chief Information Officers. (2005). Digital Government: G to G – NASCIO Recognition Awards Nomination Missouri State Highway Patrol's Traffic Arrest System/Driving While Intoxicated Tracking System (TAS/DWITS). Retrieved from https://www.nascio.org/portals/0/awards/nominations2005/2005/2005Missouri4.pdf.

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (1997a). Driving While Intoxicated Tracking Systems Volume I, Design and Operation. Retrieved from http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/25000/25900/25941/DOT-HS-808-520.pdf.

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (1997b). Driving While Intoxicated Tracking Systems. Volume 2, State Tracking System Descriptions. Retrieved from https://ntl.bts.gov/lib/5000/5800/5883/DOT-HS-808-521.pdf.

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (2011). Model Impaired Driving Records Information Systems. Retrieved from https://www.nhtsa.gov/sites/nhtsa.dot.gov/files/811489.pdf.

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (2012). Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory. Retrieved from https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/ViewPublication/811644.

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (2015a). Traffic Fatalities Up Sharply in 2015. Retrieved from https://www.nhtsa.gov/press-releases/traffic-fatalities-sharply-2015.

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (2015b). 2015 Motor Vehicle Crashes: Overview. Retrieved from https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/ViewPublication/812318.

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (2015c). 2015 Data: Alcohol-Impaired Driving. Retrieved from https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/Publication/812350.

National Information Exchange Model. (2015). Kansas Criminal Justice Information System (KCJIS): Electronic Disposition Reporting for DUIs and Traffic Safety. Retrieved from https://www.niem.gov/about-niem/success-stories/kansas-criminal-justice-information-system-kcjis-electronic-disposition.

Office of Court Administration. (2017). Office of Court Administration. Website. Retrieved from http://www.txcourts.gov/oca/.

Texas Department of Criminal Justice Community Justice Assistance Division. (2017). TDCJ-CJAD Data Manual. Retrieved from https://www.tdcj.state.tx.us/documents/cjad/CJAD_Data_Manual.pdf.

Texas Department of Public Safety. (2016). A Brief Guide to the Texas Computerized Criminal History System (CCH). Retrieved from https://www.dps.texas.gov/administration/crime_records/docs/GuideToCCHSystem.pdf.

Texas Department of Public Safety. (2017). Appendix K – Offense Codes. Website. Retrieved from https://www.dps.texas.gov/administration/crime_records/pages/appndxKOffenseCodes.htm.

Texas Department of Transportation. (2017). Highway Safety Plan FY 2017. Retrieved from https://www.txdot.gov/apps/egrants/egrantsHelp/Reports/HSP_FY17.pdf.

U.S. Department of Transportation. (2014). Traffic Records Assessment. Website. Retrieved from https://www.transportation.gov/government/traffic-records/traffic-records-assessments.

Appendix A

The following survey was distributed to representatives from all states (excluding Texas) to identify the status implementation of DWITS in each state.

1. Does your state have a DWI tracking system?
2. Can you track DWI offenders from arrest until disposition?
3. Can you walk me through what the process looks like in your state from an officer stopping a car until the criminal charge is added to a person's record?
4. How is the information from law enforcement sent to the courts?
5. How do the courts communicate the information to the DMV / Department of Public Safety (DPS)?
6. Which agency hosts the DWI tracking system or DWI data?
7. What types of data do you collect from the system?
8. What is the purpose of collecting such data?
9. What are the outcomes from collecting the data?

Appendix B

Data Elements & Performance Measures

An integrated DWITS will be able to provide the data that is timely, accurate, complete, uniform, integrated, and accessible. Below is a list of performance measures and data elements common to DWITSs.

- Measure the number of individuals convicted of DWI/DUI offense
- Measure the number of DWI offenders on their first, second, third, fourth conviction
- Measure the number of DWI cases that did not display any confirming conviction on DMV records
- Measure the median blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of individuals convicted of a DWI offense
- Measure the number of under the age of 21 DUI arrests
- Measure DUI arrest for a number of licensed drivers
- Track DUI license actions such as pre-conviction numbers involving zero tolerance suspensions, first-offender suspensions, repeat-offender suspensions, commercial driver actions, chemical test refusal actions
- Track post-conviction DWI suspensions related to first-offender suspensions on misdemeanor or felonies, second, third, fourth revocations, and total post-convictions
- Calculate DWI court sanctions by county and offender status: first, second, third, fourth offense, probation, jail, ignition interlock, etc.
- Compute basic demographics about DWI arrestees, as well as the number of alcohol-involved fatalities, and crash percentages.
- Compute the percentage of DWI arrests not filed by the District Attorney
- Compute the percentage of DWI arrest cases dismissed
- Compute the percentage of DWI arrests resulting in conviction for lesser charge
- Compute the percentage of DWI arrestees found not guilty
- Compute the percentage of DWI Percent of DWI arrests resulting in inappropriate sanction
- Compute the percentage of distributions of sanctions and sanction combinations
- Locate counties with the highest BAC cases
- Locate counties with most DWI arrests
- Locate areas with most alcohol-related crashes and its different types (Injury, at-fault) crashes
- Locate areas and courts which have most DWI convictions
- Locate areas and courts which have more acquittals
- Locate areas which have most refusals
- Locate areas which have most DWI arrests from crashes
- Locate courts with most jail time/fines for DWI cases
- Track court compliance with mandatory minimum sentencing for DWI repeat offenders
- Track courts that have drivers with DWI arrests or crashes while waiting for court action
- Track court actions on DWI arrests while a prior DWI arrest is pending
- Variations in court delays and outcomes depending on attorney representation
- Locate drivers with most DWI arrests that lack court dispositions
- Pinpoint courts with the most DWI arrests that lack court dispositions
- Compare and contrast recidivism rate variations by court, disposition, and sentencing provisions
- Locate worst counties in which drivers with crashes or repeat arrests during revocation periods
- Locate areas in which driving records or drivers whose citations vanish from state records

- Locate Highest/lowest convictions rates
- Identify time lag from adjudication to court to reporting to DMV
- Identify time lag from DMV to license action
- Identify time lag from DWI arrest to court adjudication
- Repeat offender cases in limited jurisdiction courts
- Highest guilty plea rates
- DWI citations nullified after issuance without court action
- Drivers with crashes or repeat arrests while awaiting license hearings
- Variations in hearing results depending on attorney representation
- Calculate the percentage of first-DWI and repeat DWI offenders license suspended/revoked
- Calculate the percentage of first-time offender program dropouts reported to court and DMV

Appendix C

The following are interview questions asked of each DWI stakeholder group.

TxDPS and Law Enforcement

Introductory

1. As an officer, how would Texas benefit from a DWI tracking system?
2. What functions would a realistic DWI system have? (e.g. auto-populate reports, send final report automatically to other agencies, provide you updates on changes in a person's file, etc.)
3. Please, detail the process flow from arrest through court testimony from your perspective.

Information Acquisition

4. What types of DWI data would benefit you as a law enforcement agent? (What outputs are we looking for?)
5. How do you receive DWI data from other agencies? (e.g.: by email, automatic data transfer, paper delivery, online programs/databases)
6. Where are each of these pieces of information stored? (list database/program names)
7. How would you like to receive DWI data from other agencies, if different from how you receive it now?

Functionality

8. What types of DWI data does your agency send to other agencies or entities?
    a. List the agencies you send data to. (Prosecutors, Courts, TxDPS, etc.)
9. How do you report to these other agencies? (who inputs the data into what program/database)
10. How would like to report to these agencies, if different from how you report it now?
11. What statistical reports does law enforcement normally use?
    a. What shortfalls do those reports have?
    b. If none, which entity performs statistical findings on aggregate data on criminal history and driver history, arrest rates, etc.? (list agency)
    c. What reports would you like to have that you don't have currently?
12. What barriers do you foresee when sharing your data with other entities? How can they be overcome?
13. Do you think legislative change is necessary to increase reporting? If so, what type of legislative change?

Extra

14. Please provide a paperwork process flow of a DWI case processing under your agency. Please include information about how data is reported to TxDPS and other agencies after your case file is closed)
15. Data elements
16. Performance measures
17. Functional requirement sources
18. Any additional challenges/comments/questions?

Judges and Prosecutors

Introductory

1. As a judge/prosecutor, how would Texas benefit from a DWI tracking system?
2. What functions would a realistic DWI system have? (e.g. auto-populate reports, send final report automatically to other agencies, provide you updates on changes in a person's file, etc.)
3. Please, detail the process flow from prosecution through disposition from your perspective.

Information Acquisition

4. What types of DWI data would benefit you as a judge/prosecutor? (What outputs are we looking for?)
5. How do you receive DWI data from other agencies? (e.g.: by email, automatic data transfer, paper delivery, online programs/databases)
    a. Where are each of these pieces of information stored? (list database/program names)
6. How would you like to receive DWI data from other agencies, if different from how you receive it now?
7. How do you interact with DPS?
8. How do you interact with DMW?
9. How do you interact with Probation Officers?

Functionality

10. What types of DWI data do you send to other agencies or entities?
    a. List the agencies you send data to. (Law Enforcement, Probation, DPS, etc.)
11. How do you report to these other agencies? (who inputs the data into what program/database)
12. How would like to report to these agencies, if different from how you report it now?
13. What types of DWI adjudication data are not sent to the CCH?
14. Where is non-conviction data stored? (list database)
15. What statistical reports do judges/prosecutors normally use?
    a. What shortfalls do those reports have?
    b. If none, which entity performs statistical findings on aggregate data on disposition rates, types offenders per type of sentence, amount of cases accepted by prosecution, etc.)
    c. What reports would you like to have that you don't have currently?
16. What barriers do you foresee when sharing your data with other entities? How can they be overcome?
17. Do you think legislative change is necessary to increase reporting? If so, what type of legislative change?
18. Are there any changes (process or otherwise, excluding changes in punishment) for repeat offenders?

Extra

1. Please provide a paperwork process flow of a DWI case processing under your agency. Please include information about sentence dismissal, plea bargains, sentence reduction, and sentence completion.
2. Data elements
3. Performance measures
4. Functional requirement sources
5. Any additional challenges/comments/questions?

Treatment and Probation

Introductory

1. As a probation officer/treatment agent, how would Texas benefit from a DWI tracking system?
2. What functions would a realistic DWI system have? (e.g. auto-populate reports, send final report automatically to other agencies, provide you updates on changes in a person's file, etc.)
3. Please, detail the process flow from court sentencing through treatment/probation completion from your perspective.

Information Acquisition

4. What types of DWI data would benefit you as an officer/agent? (What outputs are we looking for?)
5. How do you receive DWI data from other agencies? (e.g.: by email, automatic data transfer, paper delivery, online programs/databases)
    a. Where are each of these pieces of information stored? (list database/program names)
6. How would you like to receive DWI data from other agencies, if different from how you receive it now?

Functionality

7. What types of DWI data do you send to other agencies or entities?
    a. List the agencies you send data to. (Prosecutors, Courts, TxDPS, etc.)
8. How do you report to these other agencies? (who inputs the data into what program/database)
9. How would like to report to these agencies, if different from how you report it now?
10. What statistical reports do you normally have?
    a. What shortfalls do those reports have?
    b. If none, which entity performs statistical findings on the efficacy of various treatment options, recidivism rates, probation outcomes, etc.? (list agency)
    c. What reports would you like to have that you don't have currently?
11. What barriers do you foresee when sharing your data with other entities? How can they be overcome?
12. Do you think legislative change is necessary to increase reporting? If so, what type of legislative change?

Extra

13. Are there any changes (process or otherwise, excluding changes in punishment) for repeat offenders?
14. Please provide a paperwork process flow of a DWI case processing under your agency. Please include information about cases of sentence completion, non-completion and any other outcomes.
15. Data elements
16. Performance measures
17. Functional requirement sources
18. Any additional challenges/comments/questions?

Communications and Prevention/Advocacy Groups

1. As a researcher/educator how would Texas benefit from a DWI tracking system?
2. What functions would a realistic DWI system have?
3. Are you aware of the arrest through disposition process? Does your entity play any active role in that process?
4. What types of impaired driving statistics analysis does your entity report?
5. Where do you get your data from?
6. How do you get data from agencies?
7. What are some of the barriers you currently face when trying to collect data?
8. How would like to get that data? (ideal scenario)
9. What types of partnerships are necessary for your entity to perform your job?
10. Any additional challenges/comments/questions?