

22 Frequently Asked Questions Regarding the Local DWI Program

1. When was the LDWI program started and how does the Local DWI program funding work?

Answer Summary: The Local DWI Grant Program Act was passed in 1993. The 41st Legislature established the Local DWI program to fund “new, innovative or model programs, services or activities of any kind designed to prevent or reduce the incidence of DWI, alcoholism or alcohol abuse... existing community-based programs, services or facilities for prevention, screening and treatment of alcoholism ... a broad range of approaches to prevention, education, screening, treatment or alternative sentencing, including programs that combine incarceration, treatment and aftercare...” Section 11-6A-1 through 11-6A-6 NMSA 1978 provides statutory authority and guidelines for the Department of Finance Administration to allocate funding to local governments.

Funding for the LDWI program comes from the state liquor excise tax. Section 7-1-6.40 NMSA 1978 states, “A distribution pursuant to Section 7-1-6.1 NMSA 1978 shall be made to the local DWI grant fund in an amount equal to thirty-four and fifty-seven hundredths percent of the net receipts attributable to the liquor excise tax.” This amounts to approximately \$13 million annually.

Counties with DWI Planning Councils are eligible to submit applications for funding. Applications are reviewed by DFA/LGD program staff and funding level recommendations are provided to the DWI Grant Council who convenes to make final award decisions.

Additional Information:

- Tab A: New Mexico Local DWI Program Overview
- Tab E: 41st Legislature Laws 1993 Chapter 65
- Tab F: Section 7-1-6.40 NMSA 1978
- Tab G: Section 11-6A-1 through 11-6A-6 NMSA 1978

2. Who sits on the grant council?

Answer Summary: Section 11-6A-4 NMSA 1978 establishes the DWI grant council, its members and duties. Members include:

- The president of the New Mexico Municipal League or designee
- The president of the New Mexico Association of Counties or designee
- The secretary of health or designee
- The secretary of finance and administration or designee

- The chief of the traffic safety bureau
- Two representatives of local governing bodies appointed by the governor so as to provide geographic diversity

Additional Information:

- Tab G: Section 11-6A-4 NMSA 1978

3. How much in-kind match do local governments contribute?

Answer Summary: Every local program receiving funding is required to provide a minimum 10% match. The match provided by counties ranges as high as 150% with the majority coming in the 30% range.

Additional Information: Percentages provided by DFA-LGD.

4. Why is there an unexpended balance from counties that is reverted if the local programs need the money?

Answer Summary: Reverted distribution balances originally funded the 1.5 million drug court transfer. Distribution funding is allocated to counties by a specific formula based on published Taxation and Revenue Department estimates. When the DFA originally received the mandate to support other initiatives from the LDWI fund, such as drug courts and the ignition interlock indigent fund, the DFA-LGD initiated a strict estimate and reversion policy related to distribution funding. The projected distribution budget allocated by the formula and approved by the State in the application process was based on available funds after removing the transfers to drug court.

Counties were allowed only low, conservative estimates in planning budgets and then disallowed from spending funds that came in above the estimate. This resulted in distribution funding allocated to counties by formula that could not be spent at the end of a fiscal year. For several years, programs reverted funds that they would have spent effectively if the funds were not set aside for transfer to drug courts. Even under these conditions however, some counties still reverted money from approved budgets that they could have spent, so reversions were larger than the actual distribution overage. This reverted funding was then used in subsequent years to fund the \$1.8 million deficit.

Beginning in FY05, the \$1.8 million obligation to other entities was paid on the front end, so if distribution comes in over the published estimate from Taxation & Revenue Department, the counties are all able to use it assuming their increased budget is approved by the DFA. Reversions occurring in the previous fiscal year are most likely attributable to budget management on the local level. This process is one of the training elements that has been enhanced by the DFA/LGD.

Additional Information:

- Tab A: New Mexico Local DWI Program Overview – pages 3-4
- Tab C: LDWI Funding Levels & Expenditure Documents

5. What has been done relative to the LFC Audit of the LDWI program?

Answer Summary: All audit findings over which the DFA or local programs have control have been addressed.

On January 20, 2003, an audit of the local DWI programs pursuant to House Joint Memorial 93 (HJM 93) was transmitted by the audit team to the Department of Finance Administration. This Executive Summary noted eighteen (18) “Results” and eleven (11) “Recommendations.” Following are the recommendations made by the LFC auditors with an update of DFA-LGD and local program response:

- *“Establish a long term strategic plan that clearly identifies milestones and time-lines.”* The DFA-LGD staff has implemented a strategic plan. The DWI coordinators affiliate also began a process of identifying pressing priorities in preparation for long range strategic planning.
- *“Develop an effective grant proposal scoring mechanism that objectively rates and ranks each proposal.”* The grant application review process now utilizes specific goal and objective driven program requirements. The “Grant Distribution Application Summary and Staff Funding Recommendation” form is presented to the grant council and includes the following evaluative components: statistical analysis, project focus, cost justification, measure of past program performance, community involvement, in-kind match leveraging, and the extent to which programming is new, innovative, or model.
- *“Strengthen the Administrative Handbook to provide better guidance to local DWI Coordinators and establish orientation and on-going training curricula for DFA/LGD program managers and local program coordinators.”* The Administrative Handbook has been updated and is readily available from both the DFA/LGD and is available for reference or download on the DWI affiliate website (<http://www.nmdwi.org/dwi-manual-r3.pdf>). Annual mandatory implementation workshops are offered by the DFA/LGD staff covering priority issues. The DFA/LGD staff has worked with the coordinators affiliate in identifying gaps and needs in training curricula. Technical assistance is available from DFA/LGD program staff.
- *“More closely monitor program expenditures; develop a formal process for approving budget adjustments; and implement a standard file management system.”* Internal controls at the local level and increased monitoring by DFA/LGD program managers has been implemented. Additional quarterly report forms have been instituted, increased site visits have been conducted, and budget adjustments are requested and approved in writing.
- *“Establish a site visit schedule that provides sufficient time for program managers to visit each local program at least once during each fiscal year.”*

All county programs were audited by a certified auditor before the end of FY2005. A regular audit schedule has been developed by the DFA/LGD.

- *“Work with other state agencies and local law enforcement to solve problems related to poor attendance by local law enforcement officials at license revocation hearings.”* Neither the DFA/LGD nor the local DWI coordinators have the ability to impact the license revocation process. This is far beyond the scope of the local program’s responsibility and authority.
- *“Continue efforts to overcome the problems related to the high percentage of unscreened and/or unreported screening of DWI offenders.”* The DFA/LGD staff and local DWI program coordinators have continued to respond to the needs of the local courts in implementing screening initiatives. Again, short of making screening available and as convenient as possible, neither the DFA/LGD nor the local program coordinators have the ability to impact the judiciary’s decision to mandate screening for DWI offenders.

Screening compliance has greatly improved in large part due to the clarification of state statute governing screening; however, there remains a weakness in the statute in directly assigning responsibility for providing the screening. The law states only that screening must be completed using the DFA approved instrument. Nowhere does the statute indicate who is to provide the screening.

With the implementation of the web based ADE data system, counties are able to screen offenders and track compliance on a common database.

- *“Increase funding to the DFA/LGD for program management and oversight.”* A \$500,000 increase in funding to the DFA/LGD has been utilized for enhanced oversight, evaluation, and program development. The DFA/LGD also contracted with a program evaluator who has worked with local programs to implement a statewide data set updated quarterly for aggregate and disaggregate reporting of DWI activities.
- *“Develop guidelines that establish standardized written policies and controls of administrative and fiscal procedures.”* The Administrative Manual addresses issues of program management and policy. The DWI affiliate has also been working on a continuity manual to assist with new coordinator transition.
- *“Perform a cost-benefit analysis on the San Juan County Treatment Facility to determine efficiency and economy of program.”* A defensible cost-benefit analysis would require resources in excess of both the local San Juan County program and the DFA/LGD. The UNM-CASAA research team recognizes the value of such an audit and has requested funding from the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse & Alcoholism for such a follow-up study.

Additional Information:

- Tab H: HJM 93 and Fiscal Impact Report

- Tab I: LFC Audit Executive Summary
- Tab R: DFA-LGD Strategic Plan
- Tab J: “Grant Distribution Application Summary and Staff Funding Recommendation” – San Juan County Example

6. Where, specifically is drug court money coming from and where is it going?

Answer Summary: The \$1.5 million removed from the LDWI fund is taken off the top of monies otherwise available for distribution by formula to counties. The affiliate position is that drug court is a program worthy of support; the issue is the funding source. The LDWI grant fund was established to provide counties the opportunity to address local identified gaps and needs in their battle against DWI. The drug court funding is not under local control and rarely addresses the DWI issue.

Distribution to Courts

2 nd Judicial District	42,400
3 rd Judicial District	73,100
4 th Judicial District	107,300
5 th Judicial District	63,900
6 th Judicial District	26,000
11 th Judicial District	68,500
12 th Judicial District	83,500
13 th Judicial District	133,800
Metro Court	823,600
Magistrate Court	<u>77,900</u>
Total	1,500,000

The distribution to the various courts is noted in the box at right.

Additional Information: AOC distribution information provided by DFA/LGD.

7. “In layman’s terms,” where is funding previously used for court clerks now being spent?

Answer Summary: Local DWI Grant Funds previously budgeted for court clerks through the LDWI program helped fund the 1.5 million transfer to Drug Courts. When \$1.8 million was expunged from the local DWI grant fund and transferred to the Administrative Office of the Courts and the ignition interlock indigent fund, many local programs were forced to make difficult program cuts. Eliminating court clerk positions were among the many and varied downsizing and cost saving measures initiated by local programs.

8. Why did total allocation drop between FY03-04 and FY05?

Answer Summary: Though the overall fund was reduced by \$2.3 million annually beginning in FY2004, the DFA/LGD was able to mitigate the impact in the initial years through the process described in question #4, that is, creating large sums of reverted money by allowing only low, conservative estimates of distribution revenue in the budget planning process and then disallowing counties from spending funds that came in above the estimate. As the amount of reverted

funds has decreased so has the “cushion” to buffer against the \$2.3 million annual drain on the fund. One result was the drop from FY04 to FY05. The reader may note that the unexpended balance – the “cushion” – in FY04 was \$1,048,293.77 whereas in FY05 it was only \$491,056.08.

Additionally, the FY05 program year distribution was based upon eleven months of distribution transfers rather than twelve due to payment date changes in the legislation. The first quarter distribution reflected only two months worth of liquor excise tax revenue transferred from Taxation & Revenue.

Additional Information:

- Tab C: Local DWI Distribution, Grant, and Detoxification Program Total Funding Levels
- Tab L: Memo to LDWI Coordinators, County Managers & Finance Directors dated March 18, 2004 from Joyce Johnson regarding “Approval of Distribution Budgets Higher than Initial Budget Amount Not Allowed”
- Tab M: Memo to LDWI Coordinators, and Finance Directors from David Hanna regarding “Returning of LDWI monies”
- Tab K: Memo to DWI Coordinators & Fiscal Agents dated August 30, 2004 from Joyce Johnson regarding “FY 05 – 1st Quarter Distribution”

9. How is compliance monitoring component used throughout the state?

Answer Summary: Local DWI programs implement compliance monitoring in various ways. From weekly contacts with offenders involving random drug and alcohol tests, to tracking offender compliance through the New Mexico Courts website (www.nmcourts.com), programs are often unique to county size and resources. All counties receiving funding from the DFA/LGD LDWI grant fund are required to maintain a screening and tracking component to program operations.

According to the “Local DWI Distribution, Grant, and Detoxification Program: Total Funding Expenditures – Fiscal Year ‘05” provided by the DFA/LGD, the LDWI grant fund directly supports compliance monitoring / tracking programs in twenty-nine (29) counties across the state. Additional counties operate compliance programs, but do not use DFA/LGD funding for program operations. In FY05, DFA/LGD funded compliance monitoring / tracking in the amount of \$1,086,858.44.

Recent collaboration involving the DWI Affiliate, the Administrative Office of the Courts, and the DFA/LGD promises a level of cooperation and standardization that has not been experienced heretofore in New Mexico compliance programs.

Additional Information:

- Tab C: “Local DWI Distribution, Grant, and Detoxification Program: Total Funding Expenditures – Fiscal Year ‘05”

10. How is Coordination, Planning & Evaluation used throughout the state?

Answer Summary: In the DWI Administrative Manual, Appendix C – Page 3, it states, “The grant supports Coordination, Planning and Evaluation, administered by a DWI professional responsible for oversight of all DWI project efforts: monitoring all grant activities; planning and funding requests; development, maintenance and reporting of the offender profile and tracking system; evaluation of the grant project progress and impact; submission of all required financial and program reports regarding grant activities; staffing the Local DWI Planning Council; and public information, awareness and other such activities.”

In many counties, it is essential that the DWI professional coordinate the leveraging of funds from a variety of sources to implement a single program or even a single DWI related activity. All programs, as indicated above, are required to employ a coordinator who is responsible to attend all DFA/LGD mandated implementation meetings and workshops, complete quarterly and final reports and manage the LDWI funding allocated to his or her county.

Additional Information:

- Tab Q: DWI Administrative Manual, Appendix C – Page 3.

11. Why do some counties spend all funding on a single component and not support all components?

Answer Summary: From its origin, the intent of the LDWI grant fund was to provide resources for counties to implement programs unique to their gaps and needs. Local DWI Planning Councils collaborate in an assessment of the DWI issue in their community and apply for funding to address initiatives they believe will reduce the incidence of DWI. Components are funded through a process in which the local planning council submits an application to the DFA/LGD through their county commission.

12. What is the total being spent on DWI in the state by counties from all sources (local, state & federal)?

Answer Summary: This question is too far outside the scope of the DWI affiliate to suggest an answer. We do know that programs leverage resources from Community DWI (CDWI) funding, local law enforcement agencies, joint power agreements, etc. to ensure program operation. The total amount expended on DWI would require information from agencies and programs outside the DFA/LGD. . This information is available through the Governor’s DWI Strategic Planning process. The question is better directed to Rachel O’Connor, the Governor’s DWI Czar.

13. Who decides how & where checkpoints are operated?

Answer Summary: The LDWI program does not select checkpoint sites or participate in their management. Checkpoints are a function of law enforcement agencies; however, the LDWI grant program may fund “Overtime for officers to

support sobriety checkpoints...” Operation Superblitz is implemented by Traffic Safety Bureau (TSB), DOT, through a contract with Safer New Mexico. LDWI enforcement activities are coordinated with TSB.

Safety, location, and other general requirements related to New Mexico checkpoints are governed by case law established in *Betan Court v. City of Las Cruces*.

According to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) website, “A written sobriety checkpoint plan outlining procedures for the activity is required under current judicial guidelines (*Stitz v. Michigan Department of Public Safety*) in order to minimize intrusion and officer discretion, as well as establish site selection and publicity. A major issue for the courts is site selection for the checkpoints. Law enforcement officials must consider arrest rates and impaired driver crash rates for that area and time of day. A key element to site selection is safety to both law enforcement officers and motorists.”
(<http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov/people/outreach/safesobr/16qp/checkpoint.html>).

Additional Information:

- Tab O: “Use of Sobriety Checkpoints for Effective Impaired Driving Enforcement”

14. Why did some counties experience such a large reduction?

Answer Summary: With the advent of new application scoring and review initiatives, some counties failed to meet basic requirements for funding. This was attributed to a lack of communication, training and technical assistance from the DFA/LGD (which has since been addressed) and to the turnover of DWI coordinators in some counties.

15. How does prevention work? How does giving out brochures reduce DWI?

Answer Summary: Local DWI Grant funded prevention components must be 60% evidence based programming. The Department of Health in partnership with LGD provides successful program models that are proven to change behavior of the participants, prevention specialist training and a database to track and measure the success of prevention programs. Extensive evidence based technical support is available to LDWI grant programs.

Evidence based prevention has the greatest degree of success when it addresses the entire community, among all populations, using a multitude of different delivery vehicles with a relentless repeat modality and intensity. For example, we know that just handing out pamphlets and brochures in and of itself has a very low degree of success; however, if it is just one of a multitude of prevention approaches and part of a more comprehensive strategy then it is certainly of value.

LDWI program requirements limit expenditures for hand-outs, brochures, giveaways to 1% of local program’s budgets.

Regardless of what types of prevention programs are in use, the local DWI programs agree that there must be an evaluation component in each one along with an evaluator. The evaluator's role is to ensure programs are doing what we say they are doing and to guide programs in choosing, adopting, assessing and modifying, if needed, evidence based prevention programs in local communities.

Additional Information:

- Tab N: New Mexico DWI Programs Value of Prevention by Frank G. Magourilos, SCPS

16. Are you using data to support decisions about where funding goes and how it is used?

Answer Summary: Best practices and use of empirically supported protocols are encouraged by both the DWI Affiliate and the DFA/LGD. An annual symposium hosted by the DWI Affiliate brings together DWI professionals in related components of service delivery for collaboration and training. The DFA/LGD hosts annual implementation workshops where training and updates are offered.

The DFA/LGD requires that 60% of prevention activities be evidence-based and that a Certified Prevention Specialist or someone working toward certification must direct the prevention component.

The DWI Administrative Manual encourages use of treatment funding for empirically supported interventions such as motivational interviewing, risk modification, self-monitoring techniques, and community reinforcement approach.

Any Teen Court funded must be a member in good standing with the New Mexico Teen Court Association and conform to state guidelines.

Any innovative or model approaches must be evidence-based and supported with research and evaluation.

Additional Information:

- Tab P: DWI Administrative Manual, Section 1 – Page 4
- Tab Q: DWI Administrative Manual, Appendix C

17. If good things are happening, why are not the DWI programs more visible?

Answer Summary: DWI programs spend most of their time providing or coordinating services and spend little time marketing themselves.

This issue has been discussed at length by the coordinators of the DWI Affiliate. Part of the reason has to do with so many programs providing direct services that they do not have time for program promotion and part of the answer relates to funding conservation. For example, the DWI Affiliate was recently approached by

an organization offering to market local programs. The strategy was to implement a marketing plan to draw awareness to the local DWI programs statewide. This initiative would have cost in excess of \$30,000. The Affiliate rejected this offer in favor of funding direct program services.

Local DWI programs invite legislators to visit their local programs, meet their county coordinator and ask questions about program activities.

Additional Information:

- Tab S: “Local DWI Grant Program County Coordinators” roster

18. What specific increased responsibilities have local DWI program coordinators experienced in the climate of decreased funding?

Answer Summary: Specific examples of increased coordinator responsibilities include:

- Continuous gathering and reporting of data for new Managerial Data Set instituted pursuant to the increased DFA administrative initiatives.
- Increased quarterly report forms (Fees Collected Summary; Contract Services Evaluation; new and additional enforcement reporting forms) instituted pursuant to the increased DFA administrative initiatives.
- Increased Ignition Interlock-related compliance monitoring concurrent with legislative changes.
- Increased provision of direct services by coordinators due to elimination of contracted services.
- Increased prevention-related efforts including certifying prevention specialists and using primarily evidence based programming.
- Increased responsibilities pursuant to additional allowable components and initiatives, such as, Domestic Violence, Minor in Possession monitoring, etc.
- Increased time commitment in fulfilling DFA/LGD-mandated obligations for additional audits, training workshops and other meetings.
- Increased commitment to restore, protect and increase funding of local community services directly related to the reduction of DWI.

19. What reduction in services has actually been realized relative to the reduction in funding?

Answer Summary: Some examples of how the decrease in funding has impacted direct services to your constituents include:

- **Bernalillo County:** Elimination of four contracts providing substance abuse prevention services, reduction in services in the state’s only year-round Safe

- Ride program, reduction in ability to provide electronic monitoring for DWI offenders with a corresponding increase in costs to local government, reduction in ability to provide jail-based treatment services.
- **Catron County:** Decrease in law enforcement overtime funds. Reduction of prevention activities
 - **Chaves County:** Chaves County was forced to cut its Jail Based Intensive Intervention program by 50%. This was an innovative program offered to jail detainees that involved an evidenced based alcohol abuse training syllabus along with group/individual alcohol abuse counseling by certified counselors (LADAC). Because of this cut the JBII program has since been dissolved completely. We are having problems finding contractors who will provide a similar service for less than the original cost. The contractors cite problems such as added liability insurance for employees working in a Detention facility. We are attempting to restore this program in our Juvenile Detention Center but do not anticipate ever being able to bring it back to our Adult Detention Center without additional funding.
 - **Cibola County:** In November 2004, a compliance officer was let go and has not yet been replaced.
 - **Colfax County:** Due to decrease in funding, Colfax County was forced (last FY) to reduce prevention and do away with our Intensive Supervision Program.
 - **DeBaca County:** Most recently, prevention activities have been cut. Previous reductions included treatment and law enforcement overtime for special operations.
 - **Harding County:** Reduction in prevention services available to the community.
 - **Lea County:** Elimination of substance abuse prevention services to the Hispanic community, reduction in substance abuse prevention services in public schools, and reduction in capacity to provide enforcement activities (DWI checkpoints).
 - **Luna County:** Reduced law enforcement capacity – including the area of the Columbus/Palomas border, reduction in treatment services, reduction in teen court program services, and a decrease in substance abuse prevention services (methamphetamine & underage drinking initiatives).
 - **Quay County:** Each program component has been reduced. Prevention, treatment, and intensive supervision / compliance monitoring have all been cut. Just covering the basics with available resources has eliminated opportunities for innovation. One of our local police departments was eliminated completely two other entities and have been reduced.

- **Rio Arriba County:** Reduction in substance abuse treatment services to 80 DWI offenders; reduction in funding for prevention specialist working with youth in county school system, closing of office in northern area of county meaning DWI offenders now must travel over 70 miles to attend treatment—increasing the likelihood of recidivism or driving on a suspended or revoked license.
- **Roosevelt County:** Teen Court program has been reduced to ¾ time as well as about half of our alcohol and substance abuse prevention activities, which is the heart of our program. There is no money this year for media messages and we feel it is important to keep our message in the public eye consistently.
- **San Juan County:** Elimination of treatment staff at the San Juan County DWI Detention Treatment Facility resulting in reduction of direct clinical services and other substance abuse educational services to clients, as well as family/support system programming. Limits have also been placed on compliance monitoring, prevention, and DWI-related domestic violence initiatives.
- **San Miguel County:** Reduced treatment services and prevention activities.
- **Santa Fe County:** Reduction in treatment services for DWI offenders.
- **Sierra County:** Reduction in prevention services due to increased cost of trainings, changes in prevention protocol, turn-over in personnel, and cost of evidence based programs. Additionally, a reduction in treatment services has occurred.
- **Torrance County:** All eight components funded in Torrance County encountered a reduction in services due to manpower loss. In addition to other reductions, the DWI clerk position was eliminated.

20. Are local programs receiving funding from various sources for operation of duplicated services (overlap) or for the same initiatives (double-dipping)?

Answer Summary: Each local DWI program, in order to receive *any* funding from the local DWI grant fund, is required to work with a local DWI planning council comprised of a diverse group of community volunteers. An annual gaps and needs survey is required as part of the grant application process and this exposes potential duplication of services, identifies areas of need and reveals deficiencies in overall DWI initiatives. With these requirements in place, duplicated services, if occurring, are rare.

Double-dipping is illegal, contrary to DFA/LGD standards and, therefore, monitored through the current DFA audit and application review process. The application review process includes state level program managers from the Traffic Safety Bureau, the Department of Health (treatment and prevention disciplines) and Children, Youth & Family.

Leveraging of funding sources is required for operation of most local DWI programs. For example, the Los Alamos program coordinated two enforcement efforts during the Labor Day weekend leveraging resources from five different sources: LAPD for the “buy money,” CDWI funding for LAPD overtime, CYFD grant for the operatives, the state general fund for the presence of a SID officer out of Taos, and the LDWI fund for advertisement and the coordination services of the paid local coordinator.

Additional Information:

- Tab P: DWI Administrative Manual, Section 1 – Pages 2-3

21. How much funding is going to individual counties and how is it being spent?

Answer Summary: A breakdown of the total amount of allocation to counties as well as the components on which the funding is spent is available in the DFA/LGD documents identified below.

Additional Information:

- Tab D: Local DWI Distribution, Grant, and Detoxification Program Total Funding Levels and Total Funding Expenditures for fiscal years 2002-2005

22. What would the local DWI programs do with increased funding?

Answer Summary: Programs would continue to develop strategies unique to their communities based on gaps & needs analyses initiated by their local planning councils. Some initiatives closely linked with statewide DWI priorities might include:

- Restoration of program services reduced or eliminated when the initial 2.3 million cut occurred (See question #19).
- Establishment or expansion of monitoring programs to help ensure convicted offenders are following court-ordered mandates. As best practices are established and benchmarks are set, counties will have increased responsibility to train and coordinate monitoring services.
- Collaboration with jail-based treatment initiatives. Costs associated with access to jail-based services for first and subsequent offenders in local or out-of-county facilities.
- Establishing or enhancing local access to treatment providers.
- Increased prevention efforts in schools and other community venues.
- Increased assistance to law enforcement agencies for checkpoints and saturation patrols.

- More support for programs that target alcohol related domestic violence issues.
- Development of new alternative sentencing initiatives or model programs such as the San Juan County Detention, Treatment, and Aftercare concept created with LDWI grant fund money more than ten years ago.

Resource Appendix



- A. New Mexico Local DWI Grant Program Overview
- B. Handouts previously submitted to interim committees
- C. Local DWI Distribution, Grant, and Detoxification Program Total Funding Levels and Total Funding Expenditures for fiscal years 2002-2005.
- D. Local DWI Grant & Distribution Program Actual Expenditures Project Year 05
- E. 41st Legislature Laws 1993 Chapter 65
- F. Section 7-1-6.40 NMSA 1978
- G. Article 6A Local DWI Program including Sections 11-6A-1 through 11-6A-6
- H. House Joint Memorial 93 as introduced and adopted (with Fiscal Impact Report)
- I. "Audit of Local DWI Grant Program" – Executive Summary – January 20, 2003
- J. Grant Distribution Application Summary and Staff Funding Recommendation – San Juan County example
- K. "FY 05 – 1st Quarter Distribution" Memo – August 30, 2004
- L. "Approval of Distribution Budgets Higher than Initial Budget Amount Not Allowed" Memo – March 18, 2004
- M. "Returning of LDWI monies" Memo – August 2003
- N. New Mexico DWI Programs Value of Prevention by Frank G. Magourilos, SCPS
- O. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration – "Use of Sobriety Checkpoints for Effective Impaired Driving Enforcement"
- P. DFA/LGD-DWI Local DWI Coordinator Administrative Manual October 2004 (Revision #1) Section 1, "Overview"
- Q. DFA/LGD-DWI Local DWI Coordinator Administrative Manual October 2004 (Revision #1) Appendix C, "Service Component Definitions"
- R. DFA/LGD-LDWI Program 5 Year Strategic Plan
- S. DWI Coordinators Roster