County-Agency		Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н		J	K	L	М	N
County/Agency	-							-	•	_					
County/Agency									per 31, 201	17	Day w	ant Ordered		1	
Countriblegery	3					Insta	lilea by (Liass			Paym				
County/Agency Rock Debt Sept County Found															% Waived
Company Report Proprietti			# Ordoro	IID Not	Total % Not					Total 9/			Waived	Total	on Installed
Part Professor 99	4	County/Agency				1	2	3	*		Full Payment				Only
Abstract Provided	_				62%	89			221		213	1			3%
Benezic Protection								0				0	0		#DIV/0!
Bosses Petros Ast. & STOP-OVID. 162 68 6975 64 0 0 0 66 4056 52 2 10 44 12	7	Allegany Probation			79%			0							0%
Comparing Problems															11%
Control Production															16% 15%
Contract Contraction		Ü													0%
Contemporary Content S2 E7 S20 0 15 2 15 15 15 0 0 15 15 15	_												1		3%
Telephone Telephone SS 56 56 57 0 7 115 7 0 0 7 7 115 7 0 0 7 7 7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	13			38		0		0		16%	7	0	0	7	0%
Commany STOP-DAVI															0%
Contemp Procession															0%
Columbia Probations															0% 0%
Contrain Probation	-														12%
20 Decision Probation	_														9%
22 Duthons Priceation	20	Cortland Probation			79%			0		21%			2		11%
Description	-														18%
20	-														#DIV/0!
Section 190 183 188 0 27 0 27 147 27 0 0 27 27 28 28 28 28 28 28	_														1%
Tensor Protection															0%
Particular Pockation STOP-OWI 43 39 915 0 4 0 1 4 975 3 0 1 4 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	26				62%										1%
The process of the Procession	-														0%
20 Genesse Pictolation	-														25%
10 Geneen Potation															38% 0%
20 Chemic Probation 29 28 275% 0 1 0 1 37% 1 0 0 1 3 3 3 3 9 3 Harimate Probation 5 5 1029 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0															9%
Section Sect	32	Greene Probation	29	28	97%	0	1	0	1	3%	1	0	0	1	0%
Statement Probation	-														33%
Soliderson Probation 179 107 60% 25 47 0 72 40% 63 4 5 72 72 72 72 73 Lower Probation 38 27 77% 0 11 0 11 20% 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0															#DIV/0!
27															7% 7%
Solution Description Des	_														0%
Texas	-														#DIV/0!
11 Modison District Aft.															0%
Age															0%
13 Morros TASC															0% 0%
Montgomery Probation															3%
18 Nassau Probation	-														0%
AP NPC Probation 488 444 918 0 45															9%
18 NYC Probation															1%
149 NC DistAst (Queens) 1,424 1,124 799, 156 144 0 300 21% 291 1 8 300															#DIV/0!
50 Niagara Probation 262 202 27% 65 1 0 52 27% 45 6 1 52															3%
S2 Conordaga Probation 225 199 88% 0 26 0 28 12% 24 1 1 26 1 25 25 26 183 270% 77 0 0 77 25 27 27 28 28 28 27 28 28															2%
S3 Onondaga STOP-DWI 280 183 70% 77 0 0 77 30% 77 0 0 77 30% 57 0 0 77 30% 57 0 0 77 30% 57 0 0 77 30% 57 0 0 77 30% 57 0 0 77 30% 57 0 0 128 43% 115 9 4 128 55 50 20 20 20 20 20 20	51	Oneida Probation		202		0	60	0		23%		3	2		3%
Second Probation STOP-DWI 299															4%
SS Carage Probation S43 456 71% 0 187 0 187 29% 172 4 11 187 185 Gleans Probation 59 38 64% 6 15 0 21 35% 10 8 3 21 175 25 22 2 0 24 24 24 24 24															0%
F86 Orleans Probation 59 38 64% 6 15 0 21 36% 10 8 3 21															3% 6%
ST Oswego Probation 148 124 84% 0 24 0 24 16% 22 2 0 24 25 25 25 25 25 25 25															14%
Second	57	Oswego Probation	148	124	84%	0	24		24	16%	22	2	0	24	0%
EO Putmam Probation 125 98 78% 0 27 0 27 22% 25 1 1 27															0%
61 Renselater Probation &STOP-DW 197 174 88% 0 23 0 23 12% 23 0 0 23 0 0 23 0 0 23 0<	_														#DIV/0! 4%
E2 Rockland Probation 297 226 76% 0 70 1 71 24% 68 0 3 71 63 St Lawrence Probation 31 31 31 100% 0 14 68 Saratoga Probation 306 197 64% 0 109 0 109 36% 102 4 3 109 68 Scheharie Probation 25 20 80% 0 5 0 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0															0%
83 St Lawrence Probation 31 31 31 009 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0															4%
65 Saratoga Probation 306 197 64% 0 109 0 109 36% 102 4 3 109 66 Schenectady Probation 133 78 59% 0 55 0 55 10 0 5 68 Schoharie Probation 25 20 80% 0 5 20% 5 0 0 5 68 Schoharie Probation 45 28 62% 0 3 14 17 38% 12 1 4 17 70 Seneca Probation 45 28 62% 0 3 14 17 38% 12 1 4 17 70 Seneca Probation 45 28 62% 0 3 14 17 38% 12 1 4 17 71 Subsens Probation 75 66 88% 0 9 0 9 12% 8	-														#DIV/0!
66 Schenetady Probation 133 78 59% 0 55 0 55 41% 51 2 2 55 67 Schoharie Probation 25 20 80% 0 5 0 5 20% 5 0 0 5 8 6	_														0%
67 Schoharie Probation 25 20 80% 0 5 0 5 20% 5 0 0 5 0 0 5 0 0 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0															3% 4%
Schohyler Probation															0%
To Seneca Probation Seneca Probation Seneca Probation To Seneca Pr	_	Schoharie CASA	0	0	#DIV/0!		0		0	#DIV/0!	0			0	#DIV/0!
Till Steuben Probation 75 66 88% 0 9 0 9 12% 8 1 0 9 12 12 12 12 13 14 14 15 14 15 14 16 15 14 16 15 14 16 15 14 16 15 14 16 15 14 16 15 14 16 15 14 16 15 14 16 16 15 14 16 16 16 16 16 16 16															24%
T2 Steuben Sheriff 92 55 60% 0 37 0 37 40% 32 2 3 37															7%
73 Suffolk Probation	-														0% 8%
The number and percent of IID devices installed represents only those IIDs installed within the quarter that the operator is ordered by the court to do so, and does not depict IID's installed vibre quarter that the operator is ordered by the court to do so, and does not depict IID's installed vibre quarter that the operator is ordered by the court to do so, and does not depict IID's installed vibrequent. 11															0%
Title Titl	_														0%
Trigga Sheriff 30 19 63% 0 11 0 11 37% 9 0 2 11 178 Tompkins Probation & STOP-DWI 129 80 62% 44 5 0 49 38% 40 7 2 49 49 105 107 108 107 108 107 108 107 108 107 108 107 108 108 107 108 10		Sullivan District Att.	54	33	61%		21		21			2		21	0%
Tompkins Probation & STOP-DWI 129	_														25%
The number and percent of IID devices installed represents only those IIDs installed within the quarter that the operator is ordered by the court to do so, and does not depict IID's installed subsequent 107	-														18% 4%
80 Warren Probation	-														4% 6%
81 Warren District Att. 60 35 58% 0 25 0 25 42% 25 0 0 25	_														0%
83 Wayne Probation 190 118 62% 1 71 0 72 38% 42 18 12 72 84 Westchester Probation 930 584 63% 72 274 0 346 37% 339 0 7 346 85 Wyoming Probation 30 22 73% 8 0 0 8 27% 8 0 0 8 8 86 Yates Probation 63 24 38% 0 39 0 39 61.9% 29 4 6 39 87 TOTALS 16,152 11,984 74.2% 1,374 2,309 485 4,168 25.8% 3,819 181 168 4,168 88 89 90 89 161.9% 181 168 4,168 8 16 16,152 11,984 16,168 85% 14.3% 3.0% 4,168 8 16 16,152 11,984 16,168	81	Warren District Att.	60	35	58%	0	25	0	25	42%	25	0	0	25	0%
84 Westchester Probation 930 584 63% 72 274 0 346 37% 339 0 7 346 85 Wyoming Probation 30 22 73% 8 0 0 8 27% 8 0 0 8 8 8 8 9 9 91.6% 4.3% 4.168 8 9 91.6% 4.3% 4.168 8 9 91.6% 4.3% 4.168 8 9 91.6% 4.3% 4.168 8 9 91.6% 4.3% 4.168 8 9 91.6% 4.3% 4.168 8 9 91.6% 4.3% 4.168 8 9 91.6% 4.3% 4.168 8 9 91.6% 4.3% 4.168 8 9 91.6% 4.3% 4.168 90 91.6% 4.168 90 91.6% 4.3% 4.168 90 91.6%	_														16%
85 Wyoming Probation 30 22 73% 8 0 0 8 27% 8 0 0 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	_														17% 2%
86 Yates Probation 63 24 38% 0 39 0 39 61.9% 29 4 6 39 87 TOTALS 16,152 11,984 74.2% 1,374 2,309 485 4,168 25.8% 3,819 181 168 4,168 88 8 8 8 9 9 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90	_														2% 0%
87 TOTALS 16,152 11,984 74.2% 1,374 2,309 485 4,168 25.8% 3,819 181 168 4,168 88 8.5% 14.3% 3.0% 4,168 Total 25.8% Installed 90 4.168 Total 25.8% Installed within the quarter that the operator is ordered by the court to do so, and does not depict IID's installed subsequent of IID devices installed represents only those IIDs installed within the quarter that the operator is ordered by the court to do so, and does not depict IID's installed subsequent															15%
88 8.5% 14.3% 3.0% 91.6% 4.3% 4.0% 89 91.6% 4.168 Total 4.168 Tota	-										•				4.03%
89 4,168 Total 25.8% Installed 25.8% Installed 25.8% ordered by the court to do so, and does not depict IID's installed subsequent of IID devices installed represents only those IIDs installed within the quarter that the operator is ordered by the court to do so, and does not depict IID's installed subsequent	88						14.3%	3.0%					4.0%		
* The number and percent of IID devices installed represents only those IIDs installed within the quarter that the operator is ordered by the court to do so, and does not depict IID's installed subsequents.												4,168			
* The number and percent of IID devices installed represents only those IIDs installed within the quarter that the operator is ordered by the court to do so, and does not depict IID's installed subsequer					L		∠5.8%	installed	U						
following relicensing and other common occurrences in DWI cases.	Ħ					alled within	n the quai	rter that the	e operator is	s ordered by	the court to do so	, and does no	t depict IID's	s installed sub	sequently,

ollowing relicensing and other common occurrences in DWI cases.

County/Agency = The monitoring authority submitting the Quarterly Report. In some counties, both monitors report on the same form.

Orders Rec'd = The number of pre-sentence/sentencing orders requiring IID installation received by the monitoring authority.

95 # IID Class = The OPCA Class of IID that is required to be installed by the offender.
96 # Full Pay Units = The number of devices for which the offender was ordered to pay all IID fees.

97 # Payment Plan Units = The number of devices for which the court ordered the offender to pay a portion of the IID fees.

98 # Cost Waived = The number of devices for which the court ordered that IID fees be waived by the manufacturer.

The total number of all Payment Types Ordered may not match the total number of IID Class 1, 2, and 3 assignments because there may be multiple vehicles on one order.

100 Note: The following counties have had changes to their county plans since implementation: Albany, Delaware, Niagara, Otsego, Schoharie, and Ontario.

101 Albany Probation-effective April 19, 2011 assumed responsibility of CD cases; Delaware Probation-effective April 1, 2012 assumed responsibility of CD cases; Otsego Probation-effective July 1, 2012 transferred monitoring responsibilities of CD cases to Catholic Charities; Schoharie Probation- effective January 1, 2014 assumed responsibility of CD cases; Otsego Probation- effective October 1, 2014 transferring monitoring responsibilities of CD cases to STOP-DWI. Lewis Probation- effective January 12, 2017 assumed responsibility of CD cases; Otsego Probation- effective March 1, 2017 assumed responsibility of CD cases; Otsego Probation- effective March 1, 2017 assumed responsibility of CD cases; Otsego Probation- effective March 1, 2017 assumed responsibility of CD cases; Otsego Probation- effective March 1, 2017 assumed responsibility of CD cases; Otsego Probation- effective March 1, 2017 assumed responsibility of CD cases; Otsego Probation- effective March 1, 2017 assumed responsibility of CD cases; Otsego Probation- effective March 1, 2017 assumed responsibility of CD cases; Otsego Probation- effective March 1, 2017 assumed responsibility of CD cases; Otsego Probation- effective March 1, 2017 assumed responsibility of CD cases; Otsego Probation- effective March 1, 2017 assumed responsibility of CD cases; Otsego Probation- effective March 1, 2017 assumed responsibility of CD cases; Otsego Probation- effective March 1, 2017 assumed responsibility of CD cases; Otsego Probation- effective March 1, 2017 assumed responsibility of CD cases; Otsego Probation- effective March 1, 2017 assumed responsibility of CD cases; Otsego Probation- effective March 1, 2017 assumed responsibility of CD cases; Otseg