

2024 • Issue 3

from the desk of the **SJOL**

JUDGE JOHN W. GRINSTEINER (RETIRED)



Welcome to the JOL Newsletter for North Dakota 2024, Issue 3:

In North Dakota, we wait for summer and try to hang on to it, but when you see school supplies in the aisles of stores, you know that it's only a matter of time until the season changes once again. Often, it's during those season changes when we get some of those "that's why we live here" days. You know the ones: not too hot, not too cold, and with no wind. I hope one finds you soon and that you get outside to enjoy it.

As if the school supplies in the aisles weren't enough, I'm bringing you the third quarter JOL newsletter as another sign that we have entered the second half of the year. After bringing you some information on cannabis and detection in the first half of the year, I'm switching gears or maybe just taking you down the system continuum a little farther and bringing you an issue on sentencing. Effective sentencing is not something you may read or hear about very frequently. I am not speaking of sentencing reform, which can be a controversial topic, but rather, sentencing that is effective.

What are some words that come to mind when you think of sentencing? Maybe words like: "accountability," "punishment," "fines," "court fees," "treatment," and "deterrence"? If you dig a little deeper, maybe concepts like "prevention," "protection of the public," "consistency," and "setting or mirroring community standards" may also come to mind. Make no mistake, all of those can play a role in sentencing. What about "anger," "frustration," or "retribution"? While that question should be rhetorical, I think you will agree that those words should have no place in sentencing.

Notice how the word "effective" may not have come to the top of your mind, yet it is a description that may go farther than any of the others in reducing recidivism. Ultimately, not every sentence is going to be effective (as the defendant gets a vote), but we can take steps to increase the chances our sentences will, in fact, be effective. More on this in the articles that follow. If you have ideas, don't be afraid to share them!

In this issue of the newsletter you will find an article about the changing judicial response to sentencing, a piece on plea agreements, and a promising sentencing practice called staggered sentencing. The usual crash statistics, case law, resources, and training sections are also included. As always, I appreciate your feedback and the positive conversations that result.

As the State's JOL, John brings you access to current and evidence-based practices that will assist you in your work and help promote more effective outcomes in impaired driving and other traffic related cases. With the help of the ABA's Judicial Division and its partnerships with various organizations (NHTSA, National Judicial College, NCSC, AllRise), John works to provide education, training, and technical assistance to judges and court staff throughout ND.

Issue highlights

- 2** Sentencing and the Changing Judicial Response
- 4** Plea Agreements: Should the Judge Accept?
- 6** Staggered Sentencing
- 7** ND 2024 Fatal Crash Statistics
- 8** Recent Court Opinions of Note
- 9** Upcoming Trainings / Events / Webinars
- 10** Useful Resources and Links

Contact Info:

Judge John W. Grinsteiner (Retired)

Judicial Outreach Liaison for North Dakota
Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute
418 Quentin Burdick Building, Dept. 2880
Fargo, ND 58102

NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY
O: (701) 231-7767 C: (701) 390.0299

www.ugpti.org | www.ndsu.edu

NDSU NORTH DAKOTA
STATE UNIVERSITY

Sentencing and the Changing Judicial Response

Judge John Grinsteiner (retired), SJOL for North Dakota

The research supports what I think we intuitively already knew, that there is an opportunity to be seized with every interaction.

“An encounter with the criminal justice system provides a valuable opportunity to intervene in an individual’s life by identifying the clinical needs of substance abusers and then confronting them with the consequences of their own drug and alcohol use.” *Responding to Substance Abuse: The Role We All Play, 1999.*

Approximately two-thirds of the people who enter the criminal justice system simply self-correct and are not seen again. This is obviously a good thing. However, one-third remains and these are the people who, unfortunately, become repeat offenders, filling our calendars with Orders to Show Cause; Petitions to Revoke; and new charges. While accountability is still a key factor, we know that we can’t arrest or incarcerate our way out of this dilemma. Instead, we have to adjust our approach. The two-thirds who self-correct are not the problem; the system seems to work for them. The problem, then, is the one-third who fail or reoffend.

Since the establishment of treatment courts there is an ever-increasing view of the judge as a problem solver. While most judicial officers embrace this role, many challenges remain, including obtaining enough information to make an informed decision (especially in plea agreements), identifying who is at high risk, determining what intervention/treatment is appropriate, and finally, imposing a sentence that will most likely lead to success.

Good questions to ask might be how can we identify the one-third before they recidivate and how do we make their sentences as effective as possible so they don’t recidivate?

One avenue in identifying the one-third can be through proper screenings and assessments. Ideally, these should be completed before sentencing, so the judge can have as many pieces to the puzzle as possible before crafting a sentence with referrals to address specific risk and needs.

Why worry about risk and need? Evidence shows putting defendants in the wrong programming (sentence) can actually make them worse! To be as effective as possible, implementing comprehensive screening and assessment, preferably before sentencing, is necessary to identify offenders who have behaviors or disorders that require further specific intervention. Without the accurate identification of these behaviors and/or disorders, we likely miss an opportunity to address an underlying cause of offending and reduce future recidivism.

Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral to Treatment (SBIRT) is an example of an early intervention designed to screen individuals for problematic substance use. It identifies people at risk for developing substance use disorders (SUDs), providing brief intervention to those at-risk people. SBIRT is designed to raise awareness of the risks and consequences associated with substance use, providing motivation for change, and to help set healthier goals. Finally, the process aides in access and coordination to treatment services.

There are similar validated screening and assessment tools out there, such as the Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS) (used by our state pretrial program), that assess risk and need. Impaired driving specific assessments such as the Computerized Assessment and Referral System (CARS), the Impaired Driver Assessment (IDA), the DUI Risk and Needs Triage (DUI-RANT), and the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT) are also very useful in identifying risk and need in our impaired driving populations.

It is easy to see how screenings and assessments can help lead to more effective sentencing, but with ever-increasing dockets (not to mention time standards) and often-shrinking resources, do we have the time or ability? A very wise treatment court judge once told me, “Take time now, or take time later.” Getting it right on the front end will almost certainly lead to time saved on the back end and handing down more effective sentences will almost certainly lead to less recidivism.

However, achieving effective sentencing does not begin nor end with the judge. All of the professionals working in the criminal justice system should be viewed as problem solvers. We all should be working to identify those likely to reoffend. We all should be working to get them properly screened and assessed with referrals to services that are needed. We all should monitor for compliance with close supervision and we all should assume an active role in incentivizing good behavior and holding people accountable. This requires better coordination and understanding all along the system from education to law enforcement; to prosecution and defense; to courts; to supervision and corrections; to treatment providers; and back again. Judges can and should be leaders in this area.

Our communities, families, and the people that we serve are too important to simply do it the way we have always done it. My hope is that all of us begin to see that there is an opportunity to be seized with every interaction.

The Risk-Needs-Responsivity (RNR) model (Andrews & Bonta, 2007), consists of three principles:

Risk principle – Supervision and treatment levels should match the offender’s level of risk, or likelihood to re-offend or fail to adhere to release conditions. Low-risk offenders should not be placed in the same interventions as high-risk offenders as this typically produces poor outcomes.

Need principle – Treatment services should target an offender’s needs that, if unaddressed, could cause further criminal behavior. The largest factors here are history of anti-social behavior; anti-social cognitions; anti-social personality pattern; and anti-social associates. Other factors include family/marital discord; leisure/recreation; substance abuse; and school/work. While mental health and trauma are not identified as criminogenic needs, their presence can have a profound impact on the other factors and should not be ignored.

Responsivity principle – Treatment interventions should be tailored to an individual offender’s specific characteristics—cognitive abilities and gender, for example—that may affect program outcomes. Sometimes finding the right program or approach involves trial and error. The more information we have about individuals, the better we can target treatment referrals.

Risk and need assessments are actuarial-based tools used to classify offenders into levels of risk and to identify and target interventions to address needs that are linked to recidivism. Risk assessments are most commonly used to make release and supervision decisions. Risk and needs assessments are used to develop sentencing, supervision, and treatment plans as they provide more information to practitioners.

Risk & Needs Matrix		
	High Risk	Low Risk
High Needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supervision Treatment Pro-social habilitation Adaptive habilitation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treatment (Pro-social habilitation) Adaptive habilitation
Low Needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supervision Pro-social habilitation Adaptive habilitation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secondary prevention Diversion

Risk & Needs Matrix		
	High Risk	Low Risk
High Needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treatment courts (e.g., drug courts) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treatment diversion
Low Needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intensive probation (ISP, HOPE) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deflection; banked probation

Plea Agreements: Should the Judge Accept?

Judge John Grinsteiner (retired), SJOL for North Dakota

According to the Bureau of Justice statistics, 90-95% of all state and federal criminal cases are resolved by plea agreement. That number may seem high, especially given the attention given to high-profile trials, but it is accurate. It should follow then that extra care would be taken to make sure these plea agreement resolutions are effective.

There are many working parts to a plea agreement with several people affected by them, including victims and even law enforcement. Marcy's Law took dead aim at how victims are affected and law enforcement can't help but wonder sometimes if the end result justifies the effort and risk. Even the general public can be affected by plea agreements, especially when it comes to impaired driving cases. Good plea agreements can help with that. While plea agreements can be an efficient tool in bringing cases to conclusion, great care should be taken by the lawyers and especially judges, to make sure they are effective and that justice is being done.

The following happens regularly and the story sounds hauntingly familiar. The prosecutor announces a plea agreement where the defendant will plead as charged to DUI. The prosecutor recommends a fine, court fees, and unsupervised probation, since technically this is the defendant's first DUI conviction (the defendant has two prior DUI arrests that were reduced and resulted in reckless driving convictions) and he is already attending a 6-week alcohol education program recommended from an already completed evaluation. Frequently, in fact, almost always, the judge either accepts the plea on the record or signs off on the plea agreement disposing of the case. While this may be efficient justice, was this effective justice?

What does the judge typically know about the case-specific facts?

Probably not as much as people may think. The judge may have some information from a bond hearing (if they actually were the one who held the bond hearing) or pre-trial report (if there are pretrial services in that district). The complaint includes a police report that may or may not be well written (or not at all, if charged on a citation). But the judge likely does not know a complete traffic and criminal

history, charges that did not result in a conviction nor the reasons why, or other relevant details. The judge certainly doesn't have the results of the drug and alcohol evaluation, which may actually be the most important piece of information in crafting an effective sentence. It is a little like trying to assess a patient upon their entry into the emergency department. The doctor doesn't have access yet to the patient's history nor the results of any scans or blood work – all things that would be helpful in getting the right diagnosis and most effective treatment protocol.

What does the judge want to know?

As much as you can tell me! It could include case-specific details, information on any testing limitations (defendant had a .17 BAC) and traffic history. That traffic history should include any speeding, distracted driving, reckless driving, and criminal history with emphasis on impaired driving history, including any dismissals, reductions, and deferrals. I would like to know substance use/abuse history and any diagnosis and/or recommendations from a screening and any evaluations. Finally, I would want to see any past pre-trial and post-sentencing supervision compliance issues and whether the defendant has been successful or not in previous treatment. There may be other relevant information. Think about what else you would want to know if you were in the judge's seat.

What is lurking beneath the surface of the plea agreement?

Again, let's assume the same limited facts from the beginning. The prosecutor announces a plea agreement where the defendant will plead as charged to DUI. The defendant has two prior DUI arrests that resulted in reckless driving convictions. The prosecutor recommends a fine, court fees, and unsupervised probation, because technically this is the defendant's first DUI conviction and he is already attending a 6-week alcohol education program recommended from an already completed evaluation.

continued on pg. 5 

After obtaining additional information from counsel, the judge learns that the defendant was driving 90 mph in a 45-mph zone when first observed by the arresting officer, who also noticed the strong smell of burnt marijuana coming from the vehicle. In addition, in his two prior DUI arrests resulting in reckless driving convictions, also by plea agreements, the defendant failed to complete a court-ordered evaluation for treatment. The seemingly benign plea agreement just became an entirely different story and case.

Where is Paul Harvey with the “rest of the story” when you need it?

There are many barriers, challenges and obstacles in our courts and system. Heavy caseloads are the first thing that comes to mind. This is not limited to the courts, with prosecution and defense experiencing the same caseloads and lack of resources. Incomplete information is another reason (as evidenced by the example above). Sometimes the incomplete information is by design and sometimes it is not. There is a lack of system coordination with many of the people and data systems used by the criminal justice system being unwilling or unable to speak to each other. There might be inadequate pretrial and/or post-sentence supervision – what happens when they walk out the door? There might be inadequate treatment services – what happens when they walk in the door? These are just some of the challenges we face and I am sure you can think of more. All can affect efficient and effective outcomes.

Where does that leave us?

I hope it leaves you wanting more and I really hope it leaves you wanting better. Remember, you don't have to blindly accept the plea agreement and you don't have to blindly follow the sentencing recommendation.

What can you do?

Ask questions. It's your courtroom, it's your case, and ultimately, it's your sentence that will be put in the court documents (order) for the defendant to complete. Having the right information to form a good plea agreement/sentence can change the trajectory, from just efficient, to both efficient and effective. Asking questions can ensure that there is a solid basis for the plea agreement that is based on a complete case assessment, including all of the information listed above.

While this may seem like more work up front, and may even derail a plea agreement or two, it will almost certainly give time back in the form of less order to show cause hearings, revocations, and less recidivism. Establishing how you handle cases will allow the attorneys to have certainty and clarity with the charges and their clients. Ask, why this case, and why this defendant, when considering a plea agreement. Is the defendant and public safety served by the plea agreement or case disposition? If not, how can they be? This will only benefit the defendant in the long run. Good plea agreements/sentences help everyone.



This quarter's issue centered around sentencing and the effectiveness in what you hand down. What is it that you are trying to accomplish in sentencing a defendant? What sentencing techniques do you employ? Do you know if there is a correlation between what you want to accomplish and the techniques you employ? Our communities deserve more than simply getting through your docket. I stand as a resource for each of you, so don't hesitate to reach out. If you have an issue that is somehow connected to impaired driving (think seven degrees of Kevin Bacon), I'll do my best to help. If it's not, I'm still happy to listen and help if I can. I know how isolating the position can be at times, so you have a friend in me. I hope to bring you value and some informative articles in upcoming issues of the newsletter. Until next time, peace on your heart and strength for your fight, no matter how big or small!

Staggered Sentencing: An Innovative and Effective Sentencing Practice

Judge John Grinsteiner (retired), SJOL for North Dakota

The first treatment court in the United States went into operation in Miami, Florida, in the summer of 1989, under the supervision of Judge Stanley Goldstein, the nation's first drug court judge. By all accounts, treatment courts are an effective sentencing strategy. According to the National Treatment Court Resource Center (NTCRC), as of December 31, 2023, there were 4,255 of these innovative courts in operation across the United States (See locations: [Interactive Maps \(ntcrc.org\)](https://www.ntcrc.org/interactive-maps)). Heavy caseloads, the ever-increasing cost of incarceration, the lack of resources in many of our communities, and repeat offenders/recidivism continue to push our courts and judges to find innovative and effective sentencing practices.

Courts lacking the resources to develop a treatment court might consider another proven, judge-driven program, created in the early 2000s by Judge James E. Dehn, an Isanti County District Judge who sat in multiple rural Minnesota counties. Judge Dehn retired in 2017 but still serves as a senior judge and adjunct faculty at the National Judicial College. His idea of staggered sentencing was codified and lives on in Minnesota statute, providing an innovative alternative to longer jail time for repeat DWI/DUI defendants. While the example is specific to impaired driving, staggered sentencing has broader application with other chemically involved defendants who are arrested for other types of crimes, such as low-level drug offenses or even domestic violence.

Staggered sentencing consists of four key components:

1. A Staggered Incarceration Period. Generally, when a court sentences an offender of a repeat DWI/DUI, the court orders that the incarceration begin immediately or on a given date and the time is to run continuously until it is completed. With staggered sentencing, the court places the offender on probation for a specified time period, one year for example, and orders incarceration to be served in two or more blocks of time occurring during the probation

period. These time blocks are spaced several months to one year apart. The defendant must serve the minimum mandatory first, and is advised by the court of the dates on which the defendant must begin serving the subsequent incarceration blocks.¹

2. Active Participation by the Defendant. If the defendant can maintain sobriety, as shown through reports from the probation officer, treatment provider, family, friends, and/or employer, the defendant may request a waiver of the next time block of incarceration by filing a motion with the court after a set number of days. This motion may only be brought before the sentencing judge. This one judge/one defendant model enables the judge to develop a consistency and rapport not only with the defendant, but also with the defendant's support system, similar to the treatment court model. The program gives the defendant responsibility and a chance to alter the course of future consequences. A defendant who does not file the required motion must report to serve the next scheduled time block of incarceration. A failure to appear is a probation violation, resulting in the court imposing additional sanctions.

3. Home Electronic/Alcohol Monitoring. At the initial sentencing hearing, the court also orders Home Electronic/Alcohol Monitoring (24-7/Drug Patch Monitoring in the case of North Dakota). This is a non-house-arrest program allowing the defendant to carry on normal daily activities. Any violation requires the defendant to be brought before the sentencing judge immediately. The staggered sentencing model allows for adjustments to be made in the monitoring, such as closer monitoring during holidays or periods of unemployment. In considering the motion to waive the next time block of incarceration, the court places heavy reliance on the monitoring results.

4. Clearly Articulated Consequences for Violations. At the initial sentencing hearing, the court (similar to the treatment court model) advises the defendant of the rewards to be gained by sobriety but also warns of the penalties. The court typically informs

¹While 23 U.S.C. §164 allows for non-continuous imprisonment, the mandatory minimum term of imprisonment must be served. Otherwise, the State risks losing Federal highway funding.

continued on pg. 7 

the defendant that any violation of the conditions of probation – such as alcohol/drug use, failure to complete treatment requirements, or payment of fines and fees – will result in the execution of the next time block of incarceration that the defendant has already been ordered to serve. Similar to treatment court, this approach has been very effective for participants, as they leave the courtroom with a clear message and understanding.

Effectiveness. In summation, the Minnesota Legislature House Research Department has evaluated the effectiveness of staggered sentencing in reducing recidivism and found positive results. As direct evidence, the practice was codified into Minnesota law. In addition to the direct and indirect cost savings associated with the reduced recidivism, the research report showed a substantial direct cost savings associated with reduced incarceration terms. Defendants got healthier and the system got healthier. Now that is effective sentencing!

I would encourage any judge considering this model to use a team approach and visit with probation and others to set up a realistic time schedule and program in which defendants can accomplish screenings/ evaluations and treatment, effectively working their program so as not to set people up for failure, but rather set them up for success. Invite prosecutors, defense counsel, probation, treatment, and other interested people to help identify guidelines and individuals suitable for a staggered sentencing program.

* Source: Strategies for Addressing The DWI Offender: 10 PROMISING SENTENCING PRACTICES. A compendium of promising sentencing practices proposed at the NHTSA National DWI Sentencing Summit at The National Judicial College March 15-16, 2004; William Brunson and Pat Knighten, Editors.

Judge James E. Dehn: [Minnesota Judicial Branch - Home](#) | [Minnesota Judicial Branch \(mncourts.gov\)](#)

North Dakota 2024 Fatal Crash Statistics as of 8/6/2024



Fatalities: 49

Crashes: 45

Operators Tested Positive BAC: 7

Operators Tested Negative BAC: 9

Operators Not Tested: 1

Fatalities from Alcohol Crashes: 7

No Seat belt (for seat belt eligible vehicles) 12

Speed-related fatalities: 7

Pedestrian fatalities: 2

Motorcycle fatalities: 11

Fatal Crash Involved Lane Departure: 29

Fatal Crash Involved a Younger Driver(s) 14-20 years old: 6

Fatal Crash Involved an Older Driver(s) 65+ years old: 15

Fatal Crash Involved a Train: 0

Fatal Crash Involved a Commercial Motor Vehicle(s): 13

Holiday Fatalities: 2

For a full look at the Fatal Crash Stat Board and how the numbers compare to 2023 and 2022, visit: [2024 Fatality Spreadsheet.xlsx \(nd.gov\)](#). It should be noted that there are currently 29 crashes that are under investigation and not yet categorized. Click to view the [NDDOT 2022 Crash Summary](#).

Recent Court Opinions of Note

("A little late-night reading") – Alexander J. Bott, UND School of Law

The court opinions are a special contribution of my friend and colleague Earl G. Penrod, Senior Judge, Indiana Judicial Outreach Liaison, and Judge in Residence, National Judicial College

Fourth Amendment violation in entering defendant's garage

The North Dakota Supreme Court reversed and remanded the case by finding that based on the United States Supreme Court case of *Lange v. California*, 594 U.S. ____ (2021), the police can no longer use the fleeing misdemeanor rule to enter the home/garage absent a showing of exigent circumstances. In this case, the officer did not attempt to make a traffic stop of the defendant and walked up to the garage and talked to the defendant about having a suspended license. The defendant was unwilling to come out of the garage and was eventually charged with impaired driving based on the interactions inside the garage. Potential exigent circumstances include dissipation, destruction or discarding of evidence or imminent harm or violence or escape, none of which the State demonstrated in this case. Interestingly, the dissipation of evidence as an exigent circumstance was not available here because at the time he entered the garage, the officer was only investigating a potential driving while suspended charge and there was nothing in the record to suggest the officer suspected impaired driving.

State v. Fuglesten, 2024 N.D. LEXIS 69 (April 19, 2024)

Reasonable suspicion to stop based on identified citizen informant

The Ohio Court of Appeals affirmed the trial court's decision to deny the Motion to Suppress in which the defense argued that the officer did not have sufficient reasonable suspicion to stop the defendant. The defendant had been reported to have tried to drive around the highway work zone and had some issues with highway workers. It was also noted by highway personnel that the defendant may have been drinking. Police were notified that defendant was again in the area and seemed to want to go back to the female highway flagger with whom he had the initial contact. The police followed the defendant who parked at a business, and addressed the issue, even though the officer did not observe any erratic driving. Whether there is reasonable suspicion to make a stop is determined on the totality of the circumstances but (quoting from prior cases): " a tip from an identified citizen informant who is a victim or witnesses a crime is presumed reliable, particularly if the citizen relates his or her basis of knowledge."

State v. Clymer, 2024-Ohio-1877, 2024 Ohio App. LEXIS 1771 (May 16, 2024)

Upcoming Trainings/Events/Webinars

*This is not an exhaustive list and is geared toward impaired driving

September 4, 2024 1:30 PM CST Implementing RNR Strategies in Drug Courts and Reentry Programs: Lessons Learned from a SAMHSA's GAINS Center Learning Collaborative

This webinar will share the outcomes and insights from the "Implementing RNR Strategies in Drug Courts and Reentry Programs" learning collaborative. Participants will have the opportunity to hear directly from the involved sites, who will share their experiences navigating the implementation of RNR principles in their drug court and reentry programs.

Register Here: [Webinar Registration - Zoom](#)

September 7-11, 2024

[Governors Highway Safety Association \(GHSA\) Annual Meeting](#) to be held in Indianapolis, Indiana. Registration is open.

September 12, 2024 at 1-2:30 p.m. (Eastern) FREE ABA-JOL CLE Webinar (1 CLE credit hour)

Title: "But It's Just Weed! Understanding the Effects of Cannabis Use on Justice-Involved Adults and Adolescents." Speaker: Dr. Kara Marciani, Moderator: Hon. Kate Huffman

Description: With recreational marijuana now legal in more than half of the states, attorneys, judges and court staffs may want to learn more, beyond common perceptions, about cannabis and its effect on the brain and body. This webinar will provide an overview of the differences in the various strains of cannabis, the properties of cannabis, its impact on the body and brain of both adolescents and adults, and how it could impact the day-to-day work of attorneys and courts.

Register here: <https://www.americanbar.org/events-cle/mtg/web/444312638/>

September 27-29, 2024

[2024 National Interdisciplinary Cannabis Symposium](#) to be held at the New York Law School, New York, New York. Registration is open.

October 29-31, 2024

Upper Midwest Drug Court Conference to be held in Fargo, North Dakota. Registration is open, contact Program Manager Jess Throlson, North Dakota Supreme Court, 701-328-2198 JThrolson@ndcourts.gov

November 18-20, 2024

National Alliance to Stop Impaired Driving (NASID) Conference 2024 to be held in Arlington, Virginia. [NASID Conference 2024 - National Alliance to Stop Impaired Driving](#). Registration is open.

2024 National Judicial College Courses - Registration is open for most of the 2024 courses. Check [online calendar](#) to see everything happening at the NJC.

The National Judicial College (NJC) Recorded Webinars and Programs on impaired driving issues going back to 2018 can be found here: [Webinars & Programs | Traffic Resources](#)

2024 NJC – Webinar Series

Sep 18 - 11 a.m. Pacific / 2 p.m. Eastern • [All the Reasons You Have Against Allowing Medications for Opioid Use Disorder \(MOUD\) in Your Court Are Wrong](#)

Dec 4 - Noon Pacific / 3 p.m. Eastern • [Impaired Driving 2024: What's New?](#)

Useful Resources and Links

1. Impaired Driving Solutions – A Division of All Rise (formerly NADCP)

Impaired Driving Solutions leads a comprehensive approach to solve one of the greatest threats to public safety in the United States by implementing evidence-based and promising legal and clinical interventions. Formerly known as the National Center for DWI Courts, Impaired Driving Solutions partners with federal agencies, state highway safety offices, and leaders in the private sector to provide cutting-edge training and targeted support to communities to implement, expand, and improve impaired driving treatment court programs (i.e., DWI courts) and other interventions that provide treatment and accountability based on research-driven best practices.

Click here for access: [Impaired Driving Solutions – All Rise](#)

2. The National Judicial College (NJC)

The NJC serves state trial court judges, administrative law judges, limited jurisdiction judges, military judges, tribal judges, even commissioners of licensing bodies.

Click here for access: [The National Judicial College | NJC \(judges.org\)](#)

3. ABA Publication Tribal Traffic Safety Bulletin

The Tribal Traffic Safety Bulletin is produced by the ABA Judicial Division through a project funded by a grant from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. This newsletter will be shared twice a year, and will feature pieces written by Judicial Outreach Liaisons, Judicial Fellows, judges, and other program stakeholders. The newsletter will be focusing on highway safety matters in native lands.

Click here for access: [Tribal Traffic Safety Bulletin \(americanbar.org\)](#)

4. ABA Publication Highway to Justice

Highway to Justice is produced through a joint project with the American Bar Association Judicial Division and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. This complimentary publication is designed to be a source for updates on national traffic safety news.

Click here for all issues: [Highway to Justice \(americanbar.org\)](#)

5. Countermeasures That Work for Rural Communities: NHTSA

This report is an introduction to behavioral traffic safety countermeasures for rural stakeholders who want to build capacity, form partnerships, and address problems in their communities.

Click here: [Countermeasures That Work: An Introductory Resource For Rural Communities \(bts.gov\)](#)



AMERICAN **BAR** ASSOCIATION

Judicial Division

UNSUBSCRIBE

NDSU does not discriminate in its programs and activities on the basis of age, color, gender expression/identity, genetic information, marital status, national origin, participation in lawful off-campus activity, physical or mental disability, pregnancy, public assistance status, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, spousal relationship to current employee, or veteran status, as applicable. Direct inquiries to Vice Provost, Title IX/ADA Coordinator, Old Main 201, (701) 231-7708, ndsuoaa@ndsu.edu.