

# Looking at a Decade of Drug Courts

Rev. 1999

*Prepared by the Drug Court Clearinghouse and Technical Assistance Project*

*The Office of Justice Programs Drug Court Clearinghouse and Technical Assistance Project (DCCTAP) at American University, sponsored by the Drug Courts Program Office of the Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, compiles operational and evaluative information on adult, juvenile, family and tribal drug court programs throughout the United States. Summary reports of drug court activities are published and updated periodically by the DCCTAP, reflecting current developments, emerging issues, experiences reported by local drug court officials, and staff observations during the course of providing technical assistance to local jurisdictions. This report reflects information provided by drug courts operating throughout the United States as of June 1999.*

*This report was prepared by the Office of Justice Programs Drug Court Clearinghouse and Technical Assistance Project at American University, Washington D.C. This project is supported by Grant Nos. 95-DC-MX-KOO2 and 98-NU-VX-K018, awarded by the Drug Courts Program Office, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.*

## **Table of Contents**

Introduction

Background

Effectiveness of the Approach

Reduction in Drug Use

Reduction in Recidivism

Intensive Supervision

Capacity to Promptly Address Relapse and its Consequences

Integration of Drug Treatment with Other Rehabilitation Services

Summary Results: The First Decade

Retention Rates

The Nature and Extent of Addiction Being Addressed

Judicial Supervision

Cost-Effectiveness

Benefits for Families and Children

Criminal Justice Resources

Benefits to Prosecutors and Police

Adult Model Being Adapted for Juvenile and Family Matters

Highlights of National Drug Court Survey Findings

Program Growth

Primary Services Being Provided

Comprehensive, Individualized Treatment Services

Physical and Mental Health Services

Education, Job Training, Employment, and Other Rehabilitation Services

Offenders Targeted: Focus on Long-Term Drug Users

Who is the Drug Court Client?

Participant Enrollment and Performance

Participant Demographics

Drug Usage of Participants

Educational Status of Participants

Children of Participants

Participant Retention

Impacts Being Achieved

Recidivism

Drug Use

Justice System Cost Savings

Employment for Participants

Long-Term Sobriety

Alumni Groups

Family Reunification and Other Family Services

Birth of Drug-Free Babies

Other Justice System Benefits

Support from Law Enforcement Agencies

Adaptation of the Drug Court Model to Other Justice System Initiatives

## **Introduction**

What began in 1989 as an experiment by the Dade County (FL) Circuit Court to call upon the authority of a sitting judge to devise-- and proactively oversee--an intensive, community-based treatment, rehabilitation, and supervision program for felony drug defendants in an effort to halt rapidly increasing

recidivism rates has become a national movement during the decade that has followed. "Drug court" activity is now underway in 49 of the 50 states, as well as in the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, a number of Native American Tribal Courts, and two federal district courts.

The appeal of the drug court lies in many sectors: more effective supervision of offenders in the community; more credibility to the law enforcement function (arrests of drug offenders are, indeed, taken seriously, even by court systems that are inundated with cases); greater accountability of defendants for complying with conditions of release and/or probation; greater coordination and accountability of public services provided, including reduced duplication of services and costs to the taxpayer; and more efficiency for the court system through removal of a class of cases that places significant resource demands for processing, both initially and with probation violations and new offenses that otherwise would undoubtedly occur. Dramatic as these benefits may be, however, they do not explain the tremendous personal impact that drug courts have on all who have been involved with them--even the casual observer of a drug court session.

What has made the drug court movement so powerful and infectious is its human element. Close to 140,000 drug-dependent offenders have entered drug court programs since their inception and more than 70 percent are either still enrolled or have graduated--more than double the rate of traditional treatment program retention rates. Drug court participants reflect all segments of the community. Approximately two-thirds are parents of minor children. Approximately 10 percent are veterans. Men participate at more than twice the rate of women, although the percentage of female participants is rising. Most drug court participants have been using drugs for many, many years; many are polydrug users. Most have never been exposed to treatment, although a large majority have already served jail or prison time for drug-related offenses.

Unlike traditional treatment programs, becoming "clean and sober" is only the first step toward graduating from drug court. Almost all drug courts require participants (after they have become clean and sober) to obtain a high school or GED certificate, maintain employment, be current in all financial obligations--including drug court fees and child support payments, if applicable--and have a sponsor in the community. Many programs also require participants to perform community service hours--to "give back" to the community that is supporting them through the drug court program. One drug court requires prospective graduates to prepare a 2-year "life plan" following drug court graduation for discussion with a community board to assure the court that the participant has developed the "tools" to lead a drug-free and crime-free life.

The original goals for drug courts--reductions in recidivism and drug usage--are being achieved, with recidivism rates substantially reduced for graduates and, to a lesser but significant degree, for participants who do not graduate as well. Drug-usage rates for defendants while they are participating in the drug court, as measured by the frequent, random urinalysis required of all participants, are also substantially reduced, generally to well under 10 percent, dramatically below the rate observed for non-drug court offenders.

The "outcomes" that drug courts are achieving go far beyond these original goals, however: the birth of

more than 750 drug-free babies to drug court participants; the reunification of hundreds of families, as parents regain or are able to retain custody of their children; education and vocational training and job placements for participants, to name a few. Most significantly, many of the judges who have served as "drug court judges" have requested an extension of their assignment, and many have taken on the drug court duty in addition to their other docket responsibilities.

The following sections of this publication highlight the background of the drug court "movement," the major areas in which drug courts differ from traditional adjudication processes, and salient accomplishments to date.

## **Background**

Since the mid-1980's, many state and local criminal justice systems have been inundated with felony drug cases. Court dockets became overloaded with drug cases and drug-involved offenders, leaving fewer resources available to adjudicate serious, violent felonies. During this same period, it became increasingly clear that: (1) incarceration in and of itself does little to break the cycle of illegal drug use and crime, and offenders sentenced to incarceration for substance-related offenses exhibit a high rate of recidivism once they are released; and (2) drug abuse treatment is demonstrably effective in reducing both drug addiction and drug-related crime if participants remain in treatment for an adequate period of time.

In the early 1990's, a number of jurisdictions began to rethink their approach to handling defendants charged with drug and drug-related offenses and explored ways of adapting the "drug court" concept introduced by Dade County in 1989. Defendants targeted for the "drug court" have generally been nonviolent offenders whose current involvement with the criminal justice system is due, primarily, to their substance addiction. Defendants eligible for the drug court are identified as soon as possible after arrest and, if accepted, are referred immediately to a multiphase outpatient treatment program entailing multiple weekly (often daily) contacts with the treatment provider for counseling, therapy, and education; frequent urinalysis (usually at least weekly); frequent status hearings before the drug court judge (biweekly or more often at first); and a rehabilitation program entailing vocational, educational, family, medical, and other support services.

Drug court programs are currently operating in 42 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and one federal district, and programs are planned or about to be implemented in Guam, one additional federal district, and seven additional states, including several Native American Tribal Courts. Over 350 programs have been implemented, and 225 additional programs are about to start or are being planned. In addition, since 1995, 14 states have either enacted or have under consideration legislation dealing with the establishment of or funding for drug courts, and one state (Delaware) has implemented a

statewide drug court program. The scope of drug court activity underway extends to state, local, Native American tribal courts, and federal districts.

Initially most drug courts focused on first offenders, but, increasingly, jurisdictions are targeting more serious offenders for several reasons: (1) recognition of the apparent futility of traditional probation and/or incarceration sentences that have already been imposed on many of these defendants and have failed to prevent continued drug use and criminal activity; and (2) a policy decision to use the limited resources available to the drug court for persons with serious substance addiction problems, rather than those with less severe problems who might be served through other programs.

## **Effectiveness of the Approach**

### **Reduction in Drug Use**

#### **Traditional Adjudication Process**

Drug Use Forecasting (DUF) data collected on defendants in 35 cities indicate that 36 to 78 percent of arrested males and 20 to 67 percent of arrested females were under the influence of at least one illicit drug<sup>(1)</sup> at the time of arrest. Defendants convicted of drug offenses are either sentenced to a period of incarceration or referred for probation supervision, with few jurisdictions requiring frequent drug testing to monitor drug use *after* conviction. Jurisdictions that do have the capacity to monitor defendants on pretrial release or probation generally note significant drug usage rates, but are unable to respond promptly to positive tests. Few jails or prisons provide any comprehensive treatment services for inmates, and none provide long-term rehabilitation support once the defendant is released. In jurisdictions that require, as a condition of probation, completion of a treatment program, there is generally no follow-up monitoring of whether defendants who complete such programs actually cease or reduce their use of drugs. This situation, coupled with available recidivism data (see below), has led many justice system officials to conclude that the traditional case disposition process lacks the capacity to bring about any significant reduction in drug usage and criminal activity by persons convicted of drug offenses.

#### **Drug Court Experience**

Because drug court programs test defendants for drug use on a regular basis (usually at least weekly), information regarding drug use by defendants under drug court supervision is available and known to the court on an ongoing basis, and is responded to promptly with appropriate sanctions. Consequently, the drug use of defendants participating in drug court programs is substantially reduced and significantly lower than that reported for non-drug court defendants, and for participants who graduate from the programs (ranging from 50 to 65 percent) is eliminated altogether for most participants. Recidivism

among graduates also appears to be very low (see below).

## **Reduction in Recidivism**

### **Traditional Adjudication Process**

Most criminal justice system professionals estimate that well over 50 percent of defendants convicted of drug possession will recidivate with a similar offense within 2 to 3 years.<sup>(2)</sup> The more frequently a defendant has been arrested for a drug offense, the more likely he or she is to recidivate. A high percentage of defendants convicted of drug possession are also arrested for property offenses during the period when they are using illicit substances, and a substantial percentage have either committed violent offenses or are considered likely to do so, particularly as their addictions progress. Defendants in drug court programs report spending at least \$50 - \$ 100 per day on drugs before entering the drug court, and many report spending considerably more. The money to maintain their drug habits is usually derived from theft and other criminal activity, whether reported or not.

### **Drug Court Experience**

In comparison, drug court programs are experiencing a significant reduction in recidivism among participants. Depending upon the characteristics of the population targeted and the degree of social dysfunction and other problems they present (employment status, family situation, medical condition, etc.), recidivism among all drug court participants has ranged between 5 and 28 percent and less than 4 percent for graduates. The drastic reduction in drug use by drug court participants, and the consequent criminal activity associated with drug use, is confirmed by urinalysis reports for drug court defendants, usually well over 90 percent negative.

## **Intensive Supervision**

*Intensive supervision is provided where little existed before.*

### **Traditional Adjudication Process**

Under the traditional adjudication process, supervision of defendants released before trial usually consists of a weekly call-in and periodic reporting to a pretrial service agency during the pretrial period (usually 60 to 120 or more days following arrest); after conviction, supervision usually consists of monthly reporting to a probation officer. Urinalysis is generally conducted only periodically, and treatment services provided only if available. The court's involvement occurs only when probation violations are reported--generally when new crimes are committed. Bench warrants may be issued for defendants who fail to appear for court hearings, but their actual execution (e.g., the defendant's arrest) may not occur for months and is often triggered only by a new arrest.

## Drug Court Experience

Defendant supervision and monitoring--as well as treatment services--in all of the drug court programs are significantly more immediate and intensive than would have been provided to the typical drug court defendant before the program began. Drug court defendants come under the court's supervision very shortly after arrest, and throughout a typical 12- to 15-month period are required to attend treatment sessions, undergo frequent and random urinalysis, and appear before the drug court judge on a regular and frequent basis. Almost all of the drug courts have instituted procedures for immediate execution of bench warrants (often within hours) for defendants who fail to appear at any court hearing.

## Capacity to Promptly Address Relapse and Its Consequences

### Traditional Adjudication Process

It is particularly common for defendants on probation for drug offenses to fail to comply with probation conditions entailing attendance at treatment programs or abstinence from drug use. Frequently, their failure to comply is evidenced by a new arrest for a drug or drug-related offense, generally becoming known to the justice system months after the defendant's drug use has resumed -- if it ever ceased in the first place. This new arrest usually triggers: (1) a probation violation hearing, which generally results in imposition of the original sentence suspended when the defendant was placed on probation, and (2) conviction for the new offense, often resulting in an additional sentence of incarceration. It is common for this *cycle* to continue indefinitely once the defendant is released, with an enhanced incarceration sentence imposed each time to reflect the defendant's lengthening criminal history. At least 60 percent of offenders incarcerated in 1997 were imprisoned for drug or drug related offenses and more than 75 percent of the correctional population had substance abuse problems.<sup>(3)</sup>

### Drug Court Experience

Recognizing that substance addiction is a chronic and recurring disorder, the drug court program maintains continuous supervision over the recovery process of each participant, through frequent court status hearings, urinalysis, and reports from the treatment providers to the supervising judge. Drug usage or failures to comply with other conditions of the drug court program are detected and responded to promptly. Immediate responses--such as enhanced treatment services, more frequent urinalysis (daily, if necessary), imposition of community service requirements, and "shock" incarceration--are some of the options drug court judges use to respond to program noncompliance. In appropriate situations, particularly where public safety is at issue or participants willfully fail to comply with program conditions, they are terminated from the drug court and referred for traditional adjudication, with standard penalties are applied. Data reported by the 200 oldest drug courts indicate that drug use is being reduced for most participants, not just drug court graduates.

## Integration of Drug Treatment with Other Rehabilitation Services

*Integration of services is promoting long-term recovery.*

### Traditional Adjudication Process



Although there are strong correlations between drug abuse and other attributes of social dysfunction exhibited by drug users, such as poor reading skills, dysfunctional family relationships, and low self esteem, most courts do not address these problems when sentencing drug-using offenders. At best, they refer them to a treatment program and/or a special skills class, with no regular follow-up monitoring of their participation or its results, absent a violation of probation filed by the probation officer (see above).

### Drug Court Experience

In contrast, a fundamental premise of the drug court approach is that cessation of drug abuse requires not only well-structured treatment services but coordinated and comprehensive programs of other rehabilitation services to address the underlying personal problems of the drug user, and promote his or her long-term reentry into society. While sobriety is a primary objective of the drug court program, no participant can successfully complete the program without also addressing needs relating to his/her long-term rehabilitation. In addition to sobriety, most drug courts require participants to obtain a high school or GED certificate; obtain or maintain employment; and develop mentor relationships within the community to sustain them after they leave the drug court program.

## Summary Results: The First Decade

### Retention Rates

*Programs report high participant retention rates.*

Despite their rigorous requirements, drug court programs are retaining a significant percentage of the defendants enrolled, and consequently, are having a more significant impact on participants' lives than traditional pretrial and/or probation supervision. Data from the 200 oldest drug courts (confirmed by a 1997 U.S. General Accounting Office study) reflect an average retention rate of more than 70 percent (the total of graduates plus active participants), despite the difficult populations that most programs target. These retention rates can be contrasted with the significantly lower rates generally acknowledged for traditional drug treatment programs dealing with criminal defendants, with slightly higher rates for individuals not involved with the criminal justice process. It has also been noted that, in many cases, defendants may be terminated from a drug court program because they fail to meet the stringent requirements imposed by the court but have nevertheless made significant progress in terms of reducing drug use and improving their employment status, educational development, and family relationships. These people often eventually succeed in subsequent treatment programs in which they enroll.

## **The Nature and Extent of Addiction Being Addressed**

*The nature and extent of addiction among drug court participants varies widely but generally tends to be severe.*

Most drug court participants, even first offenders, appear to have significant histories of substance addiction, frequently 15 or more years. Based on information provided by the 200 oldest drug courts, the primary drug used most frequently by drug court participants is crack/cocaine, although many are polydrug users. Sixty percent of the drug courts also report heroin use among participants and more than one-half report methamphetamine addiction, notably in the central and eastern regions of the country as well as the West, where it had previously appeared to be concentrated. Marijuana and alcohol use, in conjunction with other substances, was also reported by most of the programs. Increasing prevalence of the abuse of prescription drugs and, among juveniles, toxic inhalants is also being reported.

## **Judicial Supervision**

*Participants note judges' supervision, coupled with drug court treatment services and strict monitoring, is key to their success.*

Responses from two recent surveys of 400 drug court participants in the final phases of participation in more than 50 different programs<sup>(4)</sup> indicated that the close supervision--and encouragement--provided by the drug court judge, coupled with the programs' intensive treatment and rehabilitation services and ongoing monitoring, were critical in promoting their success in the program. More than one-fourth of the respondents had been in at least one treatment program during the previous 3 years which they had left unsuccessfully.

## **Cost-Effectiveness**

The average cost for the treatment component of a drug court program ranges between \$1,200 and \$3,500 per participant, depending upon the range of services provided and whether any of these services are provided by existing agencies. Savings in jail bed days alone have been estimated to be at least \$5,000 per defendant--which does not factor in the value of the added capability (see below) to incarcerate the more serious offenders that many jurisdictions are also deriving from these programs. Similarly, prosecutors are reporting that the drug court programs have reduced police overtime and other witness costs, as well as grand jury expenses for those jurisdictions with an indictment process, that would otherwise be required if these cases proceeded in the traditional manner. Most programs also report that a substantial percentage of the participants who came into the program unemployed and on public assistance have become employed while in the program and are now self-supporting. In addition, many participants who are employed at the time of program entry are able to maintain their

employment, despite their arrest, because of their program participation.

## **Benefits for Families and Children**

Approximately two-thirds of the drug court participants are parents of minor children. Many of these parents have lost or are in danger of losing custody of their children because of their drug use. Drug court participation has resulted in many of these litigants' retaining or regaining custody upon completing the drug court. More than 750 drug-free babies have been reported born to female drug court participants while enrolled in drug court programs, thus obviating the substantial medical and social service costs (estimated at a minimum of \$250,000 per baby) required to care for a drug-addicted infant, let alone the resultant societal impact. Almost all drug courts provide family counseling and parenting services, and at least half provide aid with housing, food, and clothing. An increasing number are providing child care services and facilities while parents attend drug court treatment sessions and hearings.

## **Criminal Justice Resources**

*Criminal justice resources are freed up for violent and other serious criminal cases.*

In addition to cost savings, all components of the justice system report that the drug court programs are enabling their agencies to allocate criminal justice resources more efficiently. Staff and services, which had heretofore been consumed by the less serious but time-consuming drug cases now targeted for drug court assignment, can be directed to more serious cases and to those offenders who present greater risks to community safety. Some prosecutors and indigent defense counsel report that the case preparation and court appearance time freed up by drug court programs is equivalent to one or more FTE attorney positions. The caseloads assumed by the drug court judges have also freed up other judges' docket time for other criminal matters as well as civil cases which, in many jurisdictions, have been given secondary priority because of the drug caseload. In jurisdictions where jail space has been freed up, this space is now being used to house more serious offenders and/or to assure that they serve their full sentences.

## **Benefits to Prosecutors and Police**

Prosecutors and police in many jurisdictions report that the drug court has significantly enhanced the credibility of the law enforcement function, provides their agencies with a more effective response to substance abuse, and is a significant alternative to the "revolving door" syndrome that frequently results from the traditional case process. Defendants are no longer released back into the community--and back to using drugs--shortly after arrest but, rather, placed in a rigorous, court-supervised treatment program that carries an important message to the community regarding the seriousness of illegal drug use. A recent poll of 318 police chiefs found that almost 60 percent advocate court-supervised treatment

programs over other justice system options for drug users.<sup>(5)</sup> In a number of jurisdictions, prosecutor and/or police agencies have contributed asset forfeiture funds to the local drug court and have campaigned with the judiciary for community support.

## **Adult Model Being Adapted for Juvenile and Family Matters**

Over 80 juvenile drug courts, addressing both delinquency and dependency matters, have been implemented and 50 more are being planned in both state courts and Native American Tribal Courts. Juvenile drug courts use the rigorous and ongoing judicial supervision, treatment and community resources of their adult counterparts, but in addition, shape the program's treatment and rehabilitation services to also focus on the juvenile's developmental needs, family situation, and peer environment as well as the *juvenile*.

## **Highlights of National Drug Court Survey Findings**

The 1997 *Drug Court Survey Report*, recently published by the Office of Justice Programs Drug Court Clearinghouse and Technical Assistance Project at American University, provides a comparative profile of the 95 oldest drug court programs and includes operational information and comments from drug court judges, prosecutors, defender offices, law enforcement agencies, corrections departments, and treatment providers involved with the operation of the drug courts in their respective jurisdictions. The *Survey Report* also includes comments from 256 participants in the final phases of 55 drug court programs in 23 states and the District of Columbia.

The following are the most salient observations that emerge from the survey and subsequent follow-up data.

### **Program Growth**

*The number of drug courts, in both the planning and operational stages of development, has tripled during the past year.*

As of June 1, 1999, there were more than 575 drug courts in the following stages of development:

Drug courts operating for at least 2 years	164
Drug courts more recently implemented	193
Drug courts being planned	217
Jurisdictions exploring the feasibility of a drug court program	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>577</b>

Drug courts are now operating or being planned in 49 states plus the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, and two federal jurisdictions, including more than 30 Native American Tribal Courts.

## **Primary Services Being Provided**

### **Comprehensive, Individualized Treatment Services**

Many drug courts are diversifying the treatment services being provided to address the multitude of needs and backgrounds of participants.

Many of the treatment program components, for example, are developing differentiated "tracks" to address the diversity of treatment needs presented by drug court clients. Special components are also being developed for the special ethnic and/or cultural groups represented, and other "special populations", including pregnant women, mothers, fathers, persons who have been sexually abused, and others.

### **Physical and Mental Health Services**

Drug courts are providing a range of physical and mental health services to participants, as well as substance-abuse treatment.

Almost all of the drug courts provide public health services, including HIV and TB screening and referral. An increasing number of programs are also developing special services to address the needs of dually diagnosed participants who have mental health problems, frequently as a result of their substance abuse, and, in many jurisdictions, comprise a significant percentage of the drug court-eligible populations. A number of drug courts routinely utilize the services of a physician and/or nurse.

### **Education, Job Training, Employment, and Other Rehabilitation Services**

The range of support and rehabilitation services being delivered by drug courts is expanding significantly.

Many of the early drug courts focused primarily upon treatment services, with ancillary support for education, job training, and placement. Most of these early drug courts, and their numerous progeny, have expanded their treatment and rehabilitation services significantly, recognizing the diversity of both treatment and other needs presented by the drug court populations. The expanded services being developed also reflect, in large part, a growing recognition that the drug court must treat not only the participant's addiction but the numerous associated personal problems most participants encounter--physical, mental, housing, family, employment, self-esteem, etc.--if long-term sobriety and rehabilitation is to be achieved and future criminal activity is to be significantly reduced.

### **Offenders Targeted: Focus on Long-Term Drug Users**

Drug courts are increasingly targeting the chronic recidivists as well as first offenders.

Many drug courts that began as pretrial diversion programs are expanding their focus to target individuals with more extensive criminal histories who require the rigid supervision and monitoring of the drug court and can benefit from the treatment and rehabilitation services provided. Less than 20 percent of presently operating drug courts restrict their services to first offenders. Although generally not eligible for diversion because of their more extensive criminal history, defendants with more extensive criminal histories are generally offered some incentive to complete the drug court, such as suspension of a jail or prison term, or a reduction in the period of their probation.

Most programs report that participants are presenting moderate to severe crack/cocaine addiction with other drug usage and alcohol addiction as well.

Crack/cocaine addiction is prevalent among most drug court participants. In addition, approximately 75 percent of the drug courts report moderate to severe marijuana addiction and 53 percent of the programs report moderate to severe heroin addiction. Approximately one-third of the programs also report moderate to severe methamphetamine addiction presented by participants. Since the first comprehensive Drug Court Survey in 1995, a notable prevalence of methamphetamine has been reported by programs in the central and eastern regions of the country, as well as in the West, where it had previously appeared to be concentrated. Two-thirds of the responding programs also report moderate to severe alcoholism presented by their clients. Over 60 percent of the programs routinely test for alcohol consumption as well as illegal drug use. All of the drug courts either prohibit or strongly discourage the use of alcohol by drug court participants. For juvenile drug courts, the most prevalent drugs reported had, until recently, been alcohol and marijuana. However, increasing prevalence of crack/cocaine, methamphetamine, and toxic inhalants is being noted. The average age at first use in juvenile drug courts is 10 to 12 years, and some programs report usage as early as 8 years.

### **Who is the Drug Court Client?**

Close to 140,000 individuals have enrolled in drug courts to date, and approximately 70 percent have

graduated or are still participating. A profile of 256 drug court participants in the final phases of 55 drug courts in 23 states and other data reported by operating programs indicates the following:

### Participant Enrollment and Performance

Significantly more males than females are enrolling in drug court programs; in some programs, females who participate in drug courts are more heavily involved with drugs than males by the time they become involved in the criminal court process.

Where day care, special women's groups, and other special services are offered, females are graduating at a higher rate than their male counterparts.

For voluntary programs, a high percentage of defendants offered the opportunity to participate in the drug court accept it despite its more rigorous requirements compared with the traditional sanction to which they are exposed.

### Participant Demographics

The average age of drug court participants is generally over 30; the average age of *graduates* in individual programs is often older than the average age for all *participants* in the program.

In a number of programs, the average age for female participants is younger than for male participants.

Most participants who responded to the 1997 survey were single, divorced, or widowed. Twenty-five percent were currently married. Men were more frequently single or never married (56% vs. 41%). More women were currently married (28% vs. 21%). The marital status of the respondents was as follows:

#### Marital Status of Responding Participants:

##### Marital Status by Gender

Gender	Female	Male
Single	41%	56%
Divorced	28%	22%
Married	28%	21%
Widowed	3%	1%

This data set is consistent with 1999 data reported by 200+ drug courts.

Approximately 16 percent of the 256 participants surveyed in 1997 were either veterans (13%) or in the

active military (3%). The percentage of veterans participating in drug courts in 1999 was approximately 10%, with almost no participants in the active military.

### **Drug Usage of Participants**

Most drug court participants have been using drugs for at least 15 years, and generally much longer. Most are using multiple illegal drugs at the time of program entry, and are also using alcohol. Some have also abused prescription drugs.

Approximately one-fourth of drug court participants have participated unsuccessfully in at least one--and often more--prior treatment programs.

Many drug court participants have served time in prison for prior drug offenses.

### **Educational Status of Participants**

Almost all of the drug court programs require a high school or GED certificate in order to graduate. The educational profile of the 256 participants surveyed in 1997 revealed that 5 percent had less than an eighth grade education, 25 percent had some high school, 36 percent were high school graduates or had a GED certificate, 9 percent had post high school technical training, 15 percent had 2 years of college, 6 percent had 3 to 4 years of college, 2 percent held an undergraduate college degree, and 3 percent had completed some postgraduate study.

### **Children of Participants**

Many drug court participants are parents. About 60 percent of the 256 drug court participants surveyed were parents of minor children, many of whom were in foster care at the time the parent entered the drug court. More recent information from 100+ drug courts indicates that a similar percentage of participants in these programs are parents of minor children, with an estimated 50,000 children represented among drug court parents.

### **Participant Retention**

*The retention rates for drug courts remain high, generally between 65 and 85 percent, despite the difficult populations most programs are targeting, the rigid participation requirements of these programs, the rapid proliferation of drug courts nationally, and their expansion to more complex caseloads.*

The rapid proliferation of drug courts does not appear to have had a negative impact on the high retention rates (total graduates plus active participants divided by total number ever enrolled) experienced by early programs. Moreover, retention rates do not appear to be decreasing over time. Retention rates for programs begun during the period of 1989-92 are similar to those of the more



recently implemented programs.

The retention rates also do not appear to be influenced by the population size of the jurisdiction served. Drug courts in large metropolitan areas (e.g., with populations over 750,000) appear to retain participants at a rate similar to drug courts in smaller jurisdictions with populations under 200,000 and in rural areas.

## **Impacts Being Achieved**

### **Recidivism**

*Recidivism rates continue to be significantly reduced for graduates as well as for participants who do not complete the program.*

Recidivism rates reported by drug courts continue to range between 2 and 20 percent, depending upon the characteristics of the population targeted. In almost all jurisdictions, recidivism is substantially reduced for participants who complete the drug court program and to a considerable, although generally lesser, degree for those who do not complete the program as well.

Less than 3 percent of the recidivism rates for drug court graduates involve violent offenses, and almost all of the small number of violent offenses reported have been misdemeanors. Most of the recidivism reported involves new drug possession charges or traffic violations arising out of driving license suspensions resulting from the initial drug court charge

### **Drug Use**

*Drug usage, as measured by the percent of negative urine samples for drug court participants during the frequent, random urinalyses conducted, is being reduced for most participants, not just graduates, despite the substantial drug usage of these defendants when entering the drug court.*

Examples of the rate of clean urine samples reported for participants while in the drug court are:

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>No. of Tests</b>	<b>Percent Clean</b>
Albuquerque, NM Met. Ct.	5,477	97%
Beaumont, Tex	10,130	88%
Iberia Par., La	4,392	98%
Panama City, Fl	5,156	96%
Riverside, CA	5,911	97%
San Diego, CA-Mun	49,969	98%
San Jose, CA	4,742	95%
Peoria, Il	1,500	91%
Kalamazoo, MI-male	9,066	84%
Kalamazoo, MI-female	5,373	84%
Roanoke, VA	6,988	89%
Sandusky, OH	3,891	95%
Toledo, OH	1,902	95%
Tuscaloosa, AL	9,767	95%

**Justice System Cost Savings**

*Drug courts are continuing to achieve cost savings for the justice system, particularly in the use of jail space and probation services*

A number of jurisdictions report reducing and/or more efficiently using jail space and probation services as a result of the drug court, which frees up these resources so that they can focus on other offenders who present greater public safety risks. Savings are also reported in prosecutor and law enforcement functions, particularly in regard to court appearance costs. All sectors of the justice system have also noted "cost avoidance" results from the reduced recidivism of drug court participants and graduates. Among the jurisdictions reporting specific

annual justice system cost savings as a result of the drug court are:

Albuquerque, NM-Met \$ 612,000/yr based on 90 day jail sentences @ \$ 68/ day.

Kalamazoo, MI-male \$ 100,485/yr. Based on 4,785 jail days @ \$ 21/day

Pittsburgh, PA. \$ 2,073,643 based on 33,120 jail days saved @ \$ 62.61 per day

Los Angeles, CA-Mun \$ 2.5 million (jail/prison costs saved based on 2 yr. aver. sentence @ \$ 25,000 per year)

Philadelphia, PA. \$ 2,835,000 based on 1,350 months saved @ \$ 70/day

San Joaquin Co., CA \$ 1,834, 950 (based on 28,230 jail days saved plus \$ 1,220,000 (based on 12,200 prison days saved)

Washington DC: \$4,065-\$8,845 per client in jail costs (amount fluctuates, depending upon use of jail as a sanction while the defendant is enrolled in the drug court); and \$102,000 in prosecution costs.

### **Employment for Participants**

*Many individuals participating in the drug court are able either to retain their jobs or to obtain employment as a result of drug court participation.*

While a small percentage of drug court participants have steady jobs at the time of program entry, a substantial number (generally more than 65%) are unemployed or employed only on a sporadic basis. Many of the individuals who are employed at the time of program entry report that they were able to retain employment by demonstrating participation in the drug court, and a high proportion of unemployed individuals obtain employment while enrolled.

A number of drug courts (Portland and Las Vegas, for example), have a job counselor on site dedicated to working with drug court participants. Almost all of the drug courts provide vocational training and job development services. Many judges also work with local employers to personally guarantee daily supervision of persons they employ in order for them to either *retain* or *obtain* employment. The following chart illustrates the experiences of drug court participants in being able to retain or obtain employment in the programs listed below:

Austin, TX: 74% retained/obtained

Bakersfield, CA: 47% retained/obtained

Birmingham, AL: 53% retained; 39% obtained

Erie Co., OH: 46% retained; 23% obtained

Fort Worth, TX: 98% retained/obtained

Greenfield, MA: 33% retained; 19% obtained

Kalamazoo, MI: everyone who leaves program has to be either employed or in school full-time

Laguna Niguel, CA: 52% retained; 22% obtained

Los Angeles (Mun.), CA: 66% obtained/retained

Marathon, FL: 90% retained/obtained

Panama City, FL: 61% retained; 28% obtained

Pensacola, FL: 50-60% have obtained employment; in addition, local maintenance service regularly

employs at least 20 drug court participants at any one time

Portland, OR: 65-70% are unemployed when they enter the drug court; all are sent to a job referral service, which has had an office on site at the drug court, and at least 70-80% are employed by the time they leave the drug court

Rochester, NY: 80+% retained/obtained (GED & jobs required of all graduates)

St. Mary's Parish, LA: 32% retained; 20% obtained

San Bernardino, CA: 77% obtained/retained

San Diego, CA: 30% obtained

Santa Clara Co., CA: 16% retained; 33% obtained

Visalia, CA: 60% retained/obtained (work force preparation component is required for all participants)

Worcester, MA: 40% retained; 50% obtained

Yosemite (Federal District), CA: 100% obtained/retained

### **Long-Term Sobriety**

*Drug courts are developing close working relationships with a broad base of community organizations to promote the long-term sobriety and rehabilitation of participants.*

Almost all drug courts are working closely with community groups to provide support services for participants, both during and following drug court participation. Through both community networks and involvement with local AA and NA groups, participants are often linked with community mentors shortly after entering the drug court. Drug courts are also developing close working relationships with local chambers of commerce, medical providers, community service organizations, the local educational system, the faith community, and other local institutions to provide a broad-based network of essential services that can be drawn upon to serve the needs of drug court participants.

### **Alumni Groups**

*Drug court graduates are forming alumni groups and serving as mentors for new participants in many jurisdictions.*

In many of the older programs, particularly (Jacksonville, Las Vegas, Portland, Rochester, and San Bernardino, for example), drug court graduates are, at their own initiative, forming alumni groups, continuing the network of support they developed during drug court participation, as well as serving as mentors for new participants. Several alumni groups (Rochester, Grants Pass, Oregon, and Tulare Co, California/juvenile) publish periodic newsletters.

## **Family Reunification and Other Family Services**

*Drug courts are resulting in family reunification in many instances.*

In many programs, parents who have lost custody or may lose custody of their children because of their drug use have regained it upon completion of the drug court program.

In Pensacola, for example, the first two graduates of the family (dependency) drug court established in early 1996 illustrate the impact of the drug court on the families of these women: one of the women had four minor children, the other had five minor children. Both had a long history of drug usage; one had been in state prison for 3 years, having been sent to prison by the drug court judge when he presided over her previous case. She was a long-term crack addict; the other was primarily alcohol- and marijuana-addicted. Neither had any permanent residence or work history. Their cumulative total of 9 children were living in foster care. Both now have a home (one rents; one owns); one is working; both families are reunited; neither mother currently uses drugs, and both have been clean for over one year.

In Portland, almost all of the more than 100 female participants who lost custody of their minor children due to their substance abuse regained custody of their children at the conclusion of their participation in the drug court.

In Kalamazoo, at least 15-20 percent of the women in the female drug court program at any one time are also involved with probate court proceedings regarding loss of custody of their children; almost all of them regain custody of their children following completion of the drug court. Participants in the newly established male drug court, while not as extensively involved with the loss of *custody* of their children, have brought in letters from their children and wives expressing their gratitude at having their fathers and husbands "back" from drugs.

In Las Vegas, at least 40 women who have lost custody of their children have regained them after completing the drug court program.

*Drug courts are providing a wide array of family services*

Almost all of the drug courts provide family counseling, and at least half provide assistance with housing, food, and clothing. Most of the programs also provide parenting classes, including special segments on stress and anger management.

## **Birth of Drug-Free Babies**

*Birth of drug-free babies is an unplanned program impact.*

Well over 750 drug-free babies have been reported born to drug court participants, including one set of

twins in Rochester; a number of pregnant women are currently participating in drug court programs across the country.

## **Other Justice System Benefits**

### **Support from Law Enforcement Agencies**

*Increased collaboration is developing among drug courts and law enforcement agencies.*

Many drug courts are developing close relationships with local law enforcement agencies and community policing activities. Much effort is being made by drug court judges to explain the drug court process to line officers who are generally the arresting officers in many drug court cases. The police departments in several drug court jurisdictions (New Haven and San Diego, for example), have assigned an officer full-time to the drug court to assist with monitoring and supervising participants and to immediately execute bench warrants for any participants who fail to appear in court or are otherwise noncompliant with drug court orders. A number of drug courts provide arresting officers with updated information on the progress of their arrestees in the drug court, and many drug courts invite the arresting officer to participants' graduation ceremonies.

### **Adaptation of the Drug Court Model to Other Justice System Initiatives**

*Many jurisdictions are adapting the adult drug court model to juvenile populations and family matters.*

More than 80 juvenile and/or family drug courts have been implemented and another 50 are being planned. Using the adult drug court model of intensive, ongoing judicial supervision and the development of a structured system of sanctions and rewards, juvenile and family drug courts are focusing on both delinquency cases and dependency matters. There is also increasing recognition among the adult drug court judges that children and other family members who live with an adult substance abuser are at particular risk for becoming substance-involved. Consequently, a number of adult drug courts are developing special prevention-oriented components for children and other family members of adult drug court participants, whether or not they are already involved with the adult or juvenile justice system.

*The drug court experience appears to be providing a model for other community-based justice system initiatives that focus on chronic repeat offenders whose criminal activity is aggravated by coexisting substance abuse and/or related problems.*

A number of jurisdictions are developing special dockets, modeled after the drug court approach, to handle other classes of chronic criminal offenders whose criminal activity is aggravated by coexisting substance abuse and/or related problems and for whom the conventional sanctions available to the criminal justice system are inadequate. Domestic violence matters, for example, with their special offender supervision, coordination, and follow-up needs, and the multiple ramifications that these cases often generate for the "system" (custody, support, medical, housing, etc.) are considered particularly

2. See also *Corrections Facts at a Glance: Criminal Offender Statistics, 1997*. U.S. Dept. of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
3. U.S. Dept. of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Special Report: Substance Abuse and Treatment: State and Federal Prisoners, 1997. 1999.
4. State Justice Institute. 1995 National Symposium on the Implementation and Operation of Drug Courts. *Drug Courts: Participant Comments*. OJP Drug Court Clearinghouse and Technical Assistance Project at American University. *1997 Drug Court Survey: Participant Perspectives*.
5. Police Foundation and Drug Strategies. *Drugs and Crime Across America: Police Chiefs Speak Out*. 1996.

June 1999 Statistical Update

Return to JPO Webpage

appropriate for the drug court approach. Many jurisdictions are also looking to the drug court "model" to apply to the high volume of "quality of life" crimes (ordinance violations, loitering, etc.) which, although less serious in terms of criminal sanction, can seriously erode the life of many communities.

The drug court experience is evolving daily, from both a national perspective and the local perspectives of the 575+ communities in which drug court activity is underway or being planned. While the full impact of drug courts probably will not be evident for some time, the experience of the first decade demonstrates the remarkable achievements drug courts have spurred in all segments of the justice system and the community. While we may not have a definitive assessment of drug court impact over the long term, the short-term impact is significant and touches many segments of the community: public safety, criminal activity, drug use, public health, child welfare, employment, education, to name a few. Unequivocally, judges involved with drug court programs during this first decade maintain that the drug court approach is far more effective than the traditional criminal case process for the significant number of offenders who seriously desire to address their substance addiction and turn their lives around. Most of the judges who take this position have been dealing with criminal caseloads for many years, and many of them are former prosecutors.

---

For Further Information Contact:

Marilyn M. Roberts, Director  
OJP Drug Courts Programs Office  
U.S. Department of Justice  
810 Seventh Street N.W., Eighth Floor  
Washington, DC 20531  
202/616-5001; fax - 202/514-6452  
Web site - <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/dcpo>

Caroline S. Cooper, Director  
OJP Drug Court Clearinghouse & Technical Assistance Project  
American University  
4400 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20016-8159  
202/885-2875; fax - 202/885-2885  
Web site - <http://www.american.edu/justice>  
e-mail: [justice@american.edu](mailto:justice@american.edu)

1. U.S. Dept. of Justice, National Institute of Justice. *1997 Drug Use Forecasting: Annual Report on Adult and Juvenile Arrestees*. 1997.



# **OJP DRUG COURT CLEARINGHOUSE AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT**

## **Drug Court Activity Update: Summary Information**

**June 1999**

### **I. Drug Court Activity Underway**

No. of Programs Currently Operating: 381<sup>(1)</sup> (includes 11 Tribal Drug Courts)

No. of Programs Planned: 276<sup>(2)</sup> (includes 33 Tribal Drug Courts)

No. of Drug Courts with Alumni Groups: 50+

No. of States with Adult Drug Court Programs (operating or being planned):

All 50 (including Native American Tribal Courts), plus the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and two federal districts

No. of Judges Who Have Served as Drug Court Judges:

575+ (includes 62% former prosecutors; 24% former defense attorneys)

States That Have Enacted Legislation Relating to the Planning and/or Funding of Drug Courts: 14

### **Adult Drug Court Activity<sup>(3)</sup>**

### **II. Summary Program Information**

Estimated Total No. of Individuals Who Have Enrolled in Adult Drug Court Programs: 140,000

Estimated No. of Graduates and Current Participants: 98,000

Participant Retention Rates: 70%+

(Based on number of graduates and current participants compared with total number of participants enrolled)

Average Rate of Positive Urinalyses for All Participants While in Drug Court Program 10% (compared with significantly higher (at least 30%+) positive urinalyses reported for nondrug court participants, with significantly fewer urinalyses conducted)

### **III. Summary Participant Information**

#### **Age Range (years):**

18-19: 7%

20-25: 18%

26-35: 39%

36-45: 29%

46-55: 6%

over 55: 1%

<b>Gender:</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
Graduates:	74%	26%
Current Participants.:	73%	27%

#### **Marital Status:**

Single: 56%

Married: 14%

Divorced: 14%

Separated: 6%

Widowed: 2%

Living with Significant Other: 8%

**Parental Status:**

73% of participants were parents of minor children

Mothers: 39%

Fathers: 61%

Total no. of minor children of drug court participants: 50,000+

**Veterans: 10%**

**Prior Felony Convictions:**

No prior felonies: 25%

1-3 prior felonies: 65%

4 or more prior felonies: 10%

**Prior Treatment:**

No prior treatment: 79%

1-2 prior treatments: 17%

3+ prior treatment programs: 4%

**Previously Incarcerated: 75%**

**Average daily cost participants reported spending for drugs prior to drug court program entry:  
\$50.00-\$100.00**

**IV. Outcomes Reported**

No. of drug-free babies born to participants: 750+

No. of parents who:

regained custody: 3,500+

became current in child support payments: 4,500+

**Employment:**

retained/obtained employment: 73%

**V. Participant Enrollment and Retention Information Reported by Adult Drug Courts**

*Note: Retention rates among reporting programs vary as a result of the range of eligibility criteria used by drug court programs and the nature and extent of substance abuse and other problems presented by participants. Comparisons among programs should therefore be made with great caution.*

State	Jurisdiction	Impl. Date	Enrollment To Date	Retention Rate
AL	Cullman Co. (Cullman)	January 1999	26	96%
AL	Jefferson Co. (Birmingham)	January 1996	798	86%
AL	Mobile Co. (Mobile)	February 1993	947	62%
AL	Poarch Creek Tribal Drug Court/ (Atmore)	August 1998	5	NA
AL	Tuscaloosa Co. (Tuscaloosa)	March 1997	200	87%
AR	Pulaski Co. (Little Rock-pretrial)	June 1994	969	69%
AR	Pulaski Co. (Little Rock-post adjud.)	November 1998	79	82%
AZ	Maricopa Co. (Phoenix/Sup. Ct.)	October 1992	973	65%
AZ	Maricopa Co. (Phoenix/DWI)	March 1998	126	100%
AZ	Pima Co. (Tuscon)	February 1997	313	(62%)
AZ	Yuma Co. (Yuma)	March 1998	41	88%
CA	Alameda Co. (Hayward)	March 1998	23+	100%+
CA	Alameda Co. (Oakland Mun.)	January 1991	5,564*	50%*
CA	Alameda Co. (Oakland Sup)	January 1995	1,879*	84%*
CA	Butte Co. (Chico)	May 1995	662	53%
CA	Contra Costa Co. (Martinez)	January 1997	202	63%
CA	Kern Co. (Bakersfield)	August 1993	2,284	64%

CA	Los Angeles Co. (Compton)	April 1998	115	53%
CA	Los Angeles Co. (El Monte)	July 1994	191	76%
CA	Los Angeles Co. (Inglewood)	April 1997	21+	91%
CA	Los Angeles Co. (Los Angeles)	May 1994	980	58%
CA	Los Angeles Co. (Pasadena)	May 1995	38*	66%*
CA	Los Angeles Co. (Santa Monica)	January 1996	199	70%
CA	Los Angeles Co. (Van Nuys)	June 1997	113	67%
CA	Mendocino Co. (Ukiah)	August 1996	110	68%
CA	Modesto Co. (Stanislaus)	June 1995	379	88%+
CA	Monterey Co. (Salinas)	June 1995	650	40%
CA	Orange Co. (Santa Ana)	March 1995	359	65%
CA	Placer Co. (Auburn)	September 1995	238	87%
CA	Riverside Co. (Riverside)	September 1995	256	64%
CA	Sacramento Co. (Sacramento)	March 1996	790	42%
CA	San Bernardino Co. (Redlands)	April 1997	142	82%
CA	San Bernardino Co. (San Bernardino)	November 1994	634	75%
CA	San Diego Co. (Chula Vista)	September 1997	196	64%
CA	San Diego Co. (El Cajon)	August 1997	133	62%
CA	San Diego Co. (San Diego)	March 1997	189	75%
CA	San Diego Co. (Vista)	January 1997	268	64%
CA	San Francisco Co. (San Francisco)	March 1995	420+	N/A
CA	San Joaquin Co. (Stockton)	July 1995	872	46%
CA	Santa Barbara Co. (Santa Barbara)	March 1996	358	63%
CA	Santa Clara Co. (San Jose)	September 1995	601	92%
CA	Santa Cruz Co. (Santa Cruz)	January 1999	27	85%
CA	Shasta Co. (Redding)	January 1995	153	54%
CA	Solano Co. (Fairfield)	March 1997	386 (combines Fairfield & Valejo)	67%
CA	Solano Co. (Valejo)	November 1997	(see Fairfield above)	(see Fairfield above)

CA	Sonoma Co. (Santa Rosa)	February 1996	73+	87%+
CA	South Orange Co. (Laguna Nigel)	January 1997	231	(91%)
CA	Tulare Co. (Porterville)	March 1996	852+	84%
CA	Ventura Co. (Ventura)	April 1993	235	N/A
CA	Yolo Co. (Woodland)	January 1995	992	65%
CA	Yuba Co. (Marysville)	February 1994	19	68%
CO	Denver	July 1994	7,658	69%*
CT	Fairfield Co. (Bridgeport)	November 1997	78	80%
CT	New Haven Co. (New Haven)	July 1996	497	85%
CT	New Haven Co. (Waterbury)	October 1997	25	92%
DC	District of Columbia	October 1994	968	85%
DE	Kent Co. (Dover)/Pretr. Divers	April 1996	333	69%
DE	Kent Co. (Dover)/VOP	April 1996	2,290	80%
			combines Kent, New Castle & Sussex Cos.	
DE	Sussex Co. (Georgetown)/Pretr. Divers.	April 1996	318	78%
DE	Sussex Co. (Georgetown)/VOP.	April 1996	2,290	80%
			combines Kent, New Castle & Sussex Cos.	
DE	New Castle Co. (Wilmington)/Pretr. Divers.	April 1994	1,286	78%
DE	New Castle Co. (Wilmington) (VOP)	April 1994	2,290	80%
			combines Kent, New Castle & Sussex Cos.	
FED	Yosemite National Park	January 1995	44	68%
FL	Alachua Co. (Gainesville)	March 1993	566	34%
FL	Bay Co. (Panama City )	January 1997	136	65%
FL	Brevard Co., (Viera)	September 1994	649	59%

FL	Broward Co. (Fort Lauderdale)	July 1991	5,665	72%
FL	Dade Co. (Miami)	June 1989	15,885	74%
FL	Duval Co. (Jacksonville)	September 1994	709	63%
FL	Escambia Co. (Pensacola)	June 1993	646	60%
FL	Hillsborough Co. (Tampa-pretrial)	June 1992	215	100%
FL	Leon Co. (Tallahassee)	January 1994	200**	60%**
FL	Manatee Co. (Bradenton)	March 1998	116	76%
FL	Monroe Co. (Key West/Marathon/Plantation programs)	October 1993	243	72%
FL	Okaloosa Co. (Crestview)	October 1993	305	60%
FL	Polk Co. (Bartow)	October 1994	297*	93%*
FL	Sarasota Co. (Sarasota)	January 1997	180	62%
FL	Volusia Co. (Daytona)	July 1997	168	93%
GA	Bibb Co. (Macon)	January 1994	375	83%
GA	Fulton Co. (Atlanta)	March 1997	745	58%
GA	Glynn Co. (Camden)	November 1998	60	100%
HI	Honolulu	January 1996	280	77%
ID	Ada Co. (Boise)	February 1999	15	93%
IL	Cook Co. (Chicago-Crim. Div.; 4 <sup>th</sup> Dist.)	March 1998	295	73%
IL	Cook Co./ Markham (Fel.)	March 1995	1,325+	72%
IL	Cook Co./ Markham (Mis.)	October 1997	97	83%
IL	Kankakee Co. (Kankakee)	January 1997	96+	77%+
IL	Macon Co. (Decatur)	November 1998	22	82%
IL	Madison Co. (Edwardsville)	March 1996	227	60%
IL	Marion Co. (Indianapolis)	October 1998	64	99%
IL	Peoria Co. (Peoria)	December 1997	98	8%
IL	Winnebago Co. (Rockford)	January 1996	448	87%
IN	Allan Co. (Fort Wayne)	January 1997	45+	94%+
IN	Lake Co. (Crown Point)	Sept. 1996	140	75%

IN	Lake Co. (Gary)	September 1996	43*	54%*
IN	Marion Co. (Indianapolis)	October 1998	64	99%
IN	Vigo Co. (Terre Haute)	September 1996	174	70%
KS	Wichita	August 1995	4**	100%**
KY	Bowling Green	April 1997	82+	80%+
KY	Fayette Co. (Lexington)	August 1996	301	57%
KY	Jefferson Co. (Louisville)	July 1993	281	66%
KY	Kenton Co. (Covington)	April 1998	37	73%
LA	Calcasieu Par. (Lake Charles)	February 1997	228+	N/A
LA	East Baton Rouge Par. (Baton Rouge)	January 1993	97	82%
LA	Iberia Par. (New Iberia)	January 1998	149	86%
LA	Jefferson Par. (Gretna)	August 1997	237	73%
LA	Livingston Par. (Livingston)	July 1998	23	87%
LA	Orleans Par. (New Orleans)	October 1997	168	92%
LA	Ouachita Par. (Monroe)	June 1998	67	82%
LA	Rapides Par. ( Alexandria)	October 1997	99	84%
LA	St. Mary's Parish (Franklin)	January 1997	256	74%
LA	St. Tammany/Washington Parishes (Covington)	January 1998	97	82%
MA	Essex Co. (Haverhill)	February 1998	54	53%
MA	Franklin Co. (Orange)	January 1997	138	61%
MA	Suffolk Co. (Dorchester/reg. progr)	June 1995-Feb. 99 (cont. in local Suffolk Co. juris)	285	93%
MA	Suffolk Co. (Roxbury)	Feb. 1999	58	100%
MA	Suffolk Co. (West Roxbury)	Feb. 1999	20	85%
MA	Suffolk Co. (Dorchester)	Feb. 1999	40	95%
MA	Suffolk Co. (South Boston)	Feb. 1999	26	100%
MA	Worcester Co. (Worcester)	January 1996	471	61%
MD	Anne Arundel Co. (Annapolis)	November 1996	78+	36%+
MD	Baltimore City - Circuit Ct.	October 1994	3,334 (combines	75%



			Circuit and District Court)	
MD	Baltimore City - District Ct.	March 1994	3,334 (combines Circuit and District Court)	75%
ME	Cumberland Co. (Portland)	January 1998	49	69%
MI	Berrien Co. (St. Joseph)	October 1991	648	69%
MI	Eaton Co. (Charlotte)	October 1997	602	80%
MI	Kalamazoo Co. (Kalamazoo-female)	June 1992	398	53%
MI	Kalamazoo Co. (Kalamazoo-male)	January 1997	219	68%
MI	Wayne Co. (Detroit- Dist. Ct.)	July 1997	61	64%
MN	Hennepin Co. (Minneapolis)	January 1997	2,951	94%
MO	Christian Co. (Ozark)	February 1998	27	80%
MO	Cole Co. (Jefferson City)	January 1999	14	93%
MO	Kansas City	October 1993	1,964*	43%*
MO	St. Louis City	April 1997	531	66%
MS	Madison Co. (Ridgeland)	October 1997	68	88%
NE	Douglas Co. (Omaha)	April 1997	507	88%
NC	Mecklenburg Co. (Charlotte)	February 1995	427	60%
NC	New Hanover Co. (Wilmington)	May 1997	27	70%
NC	Person/Casewell Cos. (Roxboro/Yanceyville)	July 1996	27	75%
NC	Wake Co. (Raleigh)	May 1996	328	89%
NC	Warren Co. (Warrenton)	December 1996	26	58%
NJ	Camden	April 1996	443	90%
NJ	Essex Co. (Newark)	February 1998	99	75%
NJ	Passaic Co. (Patterson)	October 1997	104	73%
NJ	Union Co. (Elizabeth)-Dep of Cor	October 1998	11	90%
NJ	Union Co. (Elizabeth)-postadj.	April 1999	1	100%
NM	Bernalillo Co. (Albuquerque-Dist Ct.)	September 1995	83*	62%*

NM	Bernalillo Co. (Albuquerque-DWI)	July 1997	160	79%
NM	Dona Ana Co. (Las Cruces-DWI)	February 1995	370	71%
NM	San Juan Co. (Aztec)	October 1997	54	100%
NM	Santa Fe Co. (Santa Fe Mun.)	April 1996	190	59%
NV	Clark Co. (Las Vegas)	September 1992	4,351	65%
NV	Clark Co. (Laughlin)	February 1998	14+	100%
NV	Clark Co. (North Valley)	March 1998	20	85%
NV	Duckwater Tribal	October 1997	8	100%
NV	Washoe Co. (Reno)	July 1995	901	84%
NY	Bronx Co. (Bronx Drug Treatment Court)	March 1999	80	97%
NY	Buffalo	January 1996	705	82%
NY	Erie Co. (Amherst)	September 1996	280	92%
NY	Erie Co. (Cheektowaga)	August 1997	346	89%
NY	Erie Co. (Lackawana)	January 1996	174	85%
NY	Erie Co. (Tonawanda)	April 1998	77	94%
NY	Kings Co. (Brooklyn)	June 1996	1,176	75%
NY	Manhattan Co. (Manhattan Treatment Court)	September 1998	89	92%
NY	Monroe Co. (Rochester)	January 1995	1,912	75%
NY	Niagara Co. (Niagara Falls)	January 1998	425	81%
NY	Onondaga Co. (Syracuse)	January 1997	167	76%
NY	Queens Co. (Queens)	May 1998	92	89%
NY	Rensselaer Co. (Renssalaer Co. Ct.)	November 1997	70 (combines Renssalaer Co. Ct. And Troy Police Ct.)	85%
NY	Renssalaer Co. (Troy Police Ct.)	October 1997	(see Renssalaer Co. Ct. above)	(see Renssalaer Co. Ct. above)
NY	Rockland Co. (Clarkstown)	January 1998	19	77%
NY	Suffolk Co. (Central Islip)	September 1996	314	70%
NY	Tompkins Co. (Ithaca)	November 1997	76	93%

OH	Butler Co. (Hamilton)	September 1996	217	53%
OH	Cuyahoga Co. (Cleveland)	March 1998	387	100%
OH	Erie Co. (Sandusky)	April 1996	36	78%
OH	Hamilton Co. (Cincinnati)	March 1996	1,178	55%
OH	Lucas Co. (Toledo)	August 1997	53	80%
OH	Mahoning Co. (Youngstown)	June 1998	23	70%
OH	Montgomery Co. (Dayton)	September 1997	79+	99%+
OH	Richland Co. (Mansfield)	April 1997	94	80%
OH	Stark Co. (Canton)	July 1998	52	73%
OH	Summit Co. (Akron)	June 1995	662	81%
OK	Creek Co. (Sapulpa)	May 1997	185+	N/A
OK	McClain Co. (Purcell)	May 1998	7	100%
OK	Payne Co. (Stillwater)	March 1995	213+	59%+
OK	Seminole Co. (Seminole)	September 1997	50	84%
OK	Tulsa Co. (Tulsa)	May 1996	155	79%
OR	Crook Co. (Prineville)	September 1997	18	56%
OR	Douglas Co. (Roseburg)	January 1996	346	63%
OR	Josephine Co. (Grants Pass)	March 1996	197	66%
OR	Klamath Co. (Klamath Falls)	March 1996	37	82%
OR	Lane Co. (Eugene)	October 1994	630+	64%+
OR	Multnomah Co. (Portland)	August 1991	4,087	54%
PA	Allegheny Co. (Pittsburgh)	January 1998	107	95%
PA	Chester Co. (West Chester)	October 1997	189	88%
PA	Lycoming Co. (Williamsport)	July 1997	14	100%
PA	Philadelphia	April 1997	239	98%
PA	York Co. (York)	October 1997	56	83%
PR	Arecibo	April 1996	245+	N/A
PR	Carolina	April 1996	145+	87%
PR	Ponce	April 1996	249+	88%
PR	San Juan	May 1997	151+	N/A

SC	Lexington	July 1996	32*	60%*
SC	Richland Co. (Columbia)	October 1997	70	90%
SD	Sisseton Wahpeton-Trial	November 1997	7	100%
TN	Davidson Co. (Nashville)	October 1996	242	80%
TN	Shelby Co. (Memphis)	February 1997	228	73%
TX	Dallas Co. (Dallas)	January 1998	91	92%
TX	Jefferson Co. (Beaumont)	March 1993	540	55%
TX	Tarrant Co. (Fort Worth)	September 1996	230	67%
TX	Travis Co. (Austin)	August 1993	936	66%
UT	Salt Lake Co. (Salt Lake City)	June 1996	335	83%
UT	Uinta Co. (Vernal)	September 1998	13	100%
VA	Albemarle Co. (Charlottesville)	August 1997	47+	83%
VA	City of Fredericksburg	September 1998	15	94%
VA	City of Newport News	November 1998	21	100%
VA	City of Roanoke	September 1995	272	85%
WA	King Co. (Seattle)	August 1994	1,216	52%
WA	Pierce Co. (Tacoma)	October 1996	361+	N/A
WA	Skagit Co. (Mt. Vernon)	January 1998	56	67%
WA	Spokane Co. (Spokane)	January 1996	151	59%
WY	Sheridan Co. (Sheridan)	August 1998	13	100%
WY	Uinta Co. (Evanston)	November 1997	28	100%

Note: Unless otherwise specified, data is derived from June 1999 information.

+ Data derived from 1998 information

\* Data derived from 1997 information

\*\* Data derived from 1996 information

**VI. Recidivism Rates Reported by Adult Drug Courts: Percentage of Drug Court Program Participants and Graduates Arrested and/or Convicted Since Program**

## Inception

Note: Because programs vary widely in terms of the extent of prior criminal offenses permitted for program eligibility, comparisons of recidivism rates among programs should be made with great caution. A more accurate comparison is between the drug court participants and comparable non-drug court defendants in the local jurisdiction.

### A. Recidivism: Drug, Drug-Related and Other Nonviolent Offenses: Participants and Graduates

Jurisdiction	Drug Possession				Drug-Related				Other No.	
	Arrests		Convictions		Arrests		Convictions		Arrests	
	Part.	Grad.	Part.	Grad.	Part.	Grad.	Part	Grad.	Part.	Grad.
AL, Cullman Co. (Cullman)	0		0		0		0	0	0	0
AL, Mobile Co. (Mobile)		4%		2%		1%		1%		
AL, Tusca-loosa Co. (Tuscaloosa)	2%+		1%+						2%+	
AL, Poarch Creek Tribal Drug Court/ (Atmore)	0		0		0		0		0	
AZ, Yuma Co. (Yuma)	0		0		0		0		0	
AZ, Maricopa Co. (Phoenix)	3%+				1%+				4%+	
CA, Butte Co. (Chico)	3.3%	4.2%	3.3%	4.2%	1.3%	.7%	1.3%	.7%	3.3%	.7%
CA, Kern Co. (Bakersfield)		1%		1%		.9%		.9%		1.6%
CA, Los Ang. Co. (Compton)	0		0						2.4%	
CA, Los Ang.Co. (Inglewood)		0+		0+		0+		0+	10%+	0+
CA, Los Ang. Co. (Rio Hondo)	3.7%	2.1%	3.7%	2.1%	2.1%	1%	0	0	5.5%	3.2%
CA, Mendocino Co.	6.4%	9%	4.8%	9%	0	0	0	0	1.6%	0

(Ukiah)										
CA, Monterey Co. (Salinas)		7.5%		2.5%		15%		5%		
CA, Placer Co. (Auburn)	1%+	2%+		2%+	3%+					
CA, Riverside Co. (Riverside)	0.5%+	0.5%+		0+	0+	0+		0+	1%+	1%+
CA, Sacramento Co. (Sacramento)			3%+					1%+		
CA, San Bernardino Co. (Redlands)	0	5%	0		1.5%	9.8%	0	5%	1.5%	0
CA, San Bernardino Co. (San Bernardino)	0.2%+	3.3%+		3.3%+	0.2%+				0.2%+	2.5%+
CA, San Diego Co. (El Cajon)	0	6.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CA, San Diego Co. (San Diego)		9.3%		9.3%		0		0		0
CA, San Diego Co. (Vista)	0	0	0		2.4%	2.4%			8%	0
CA, San Joaquin Co. (Stockton)		.6%		4.2%		2.4%		2.4%		4.2%
CA, Santa Barbara Co. (Santa Barbara)		0+		0+		0+		0+		0+
CA, Santa Clara Co. (San Jose)	1%+	3%+	0+			1%+				
CA, Santa Cruz Co. (Santa Cruz)	0		0		11%		0		0	
CA, Solano Co. (Fairfield)	17%	0	17%		15%	0	15%		4.2%	0
CA, Sonoma Co. (Santa Rosa)	0+	4%+	0+	3%+	0+	0+	0+	0+	1%+	2%+
CA, South Orange Co. (Laguna Nigel)	1.1%	7.1%		7.1%					1.1%	
CA, Stanislaus Co. (Modesto)		0+		0+		0+		0+		0+
CA, Tulare Co.		0+		0+		0.2%+		0.2%+		

(Porterville)											
CA, Yuba Co. (Marysville)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT, Fairfield Co. (Bridgeport)	0+		0+		0+		0+			3%+	
CT, New Haven Co. (New Haven)	2%+		0+		0+		0+			4%+	
DC, Washington	.4%					.1%				.2%	
FE, Yosemite		3.7%		3.7%							
FL Alachua Co. (Gainesville)		2.4%					3.2%				0
FL, Bay (Panama City)							3.7%		3.7%		3.7%
FL, Brevard Co. (Viera)	0	1.6%	0	.9%	2.7%	.6%	2.7%	.3%	1.3%	1.6%	
FL, Duval Co. (Jacksonville)	6.25%	.7%			4.1%						1.4%
FL, Escambia Co.(Pensa-cola)	9%		5%		5%		5%				
FL, Okaloosa Co. (Crestview)	6%	6%	0	6%	0	0		0			
FL, Manatee Co. (Bradenton)		2%		2%						3%	4%
FL, Sarasota Co. (Sarasota)		5%		5%						5%	5%
FL, Volusia Co. (Daytona)+	6%		3%		2%		0				
GA, Bibb Co. (Macon)	2%	2%	2%	.7%	6%	0	3%	0	0	0	1%
GA, Fulton Co. (Atlanta)	5.9%	0	0	0	1.9%	0	0	0	0	4.6%	0
GA, Glynn Co. (Camden)	5%				5%		1%				
HI, Honolulu Co., Honolulu	.8%	0	0	0	0	5%	0	1%	3%	3%	2%
ID, Ada Co. (Boise)	0		0		0		0			0	

IL, Cook Co. (Chicago)	1.3%		0		1.3%		0		9%	
IL, Cook Co. (Markham)	6.8%		2.2%		0		0		6.8%	
IL, Macon Co. Decatur	0		0		0		0		11%	
IL, Madison Co.(Edwards- ville)	14%		0		0		0		9.7%	
IL, Kankakee Co. (Kankakee)		0		0	1%	0	0	0	4%	0
IL, Peoria Co. (Peoria)	0	0	0	0	0	14%	0	0	0	0
IL, Winne-bago Co. (Rockford)	3%+								6%+	
IN, Allen Co. (Fort Wayne)	0+	0+	0+	0+	2%+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+
IN, Lake Co. (Crown Point)	5%	0			5%	0			5%	0
IN, Vigo Co. (Terre Haute)	4.3%									
KY, Fayette Co. (Lexington)	9%	4.1%	0	1.3%	6.9%	4.1%	4.9%	4.1%	9.9%	4.1%
KY, Kenton Co. (Covington)	7.4%		7.4%		18%		18%		3.7%	
KY, Warren Co. (Bowling Green)	0+	0+	0+	0+	6%+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+
LA, East Baton Rouge Par. (Baton Rouge)	2.5%	0	0	0	0		0		1.2%	0
LA, Iberia Par. (New Iberia)	0	0	0	0	1.5%	0	0	0	1.5%	0
LA, Jefferson Par. (Gretna)	2.5%	0	.6%	0	.6%	0	.6%	0	2.5%	0
LA, Orleans Par. (New Orleans)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.7%	0
LA, Ouachita Par.(Monroe)	1.8%	0	0	0	1.8%	0	0	0	1.8%	0



LA, Rapides Par. (Alexandria)	0		0		0		0			3%
LA, St. Mary's Par. (Franklin)	5.8%	0	5.8%	0	0	0	0	0	21%	0
MA, Essex Co.(Haver-hill)	5.5%	0	0	0	5.5%	0	0	0	0	0
MA, Franklin Co. (Orange)	2%		0		0		0		0	
MA, Orange Co.(Green-field)	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+
MA, Worcester Co. (Worcester)	6%	0	3%	0	6%	2%	6%	2%	0	2%
MD,Balti-more Co. (Baltimore-Circuit)		3.6%		1%		0		0		7.3%
MD,Balti-more Co. (Baltimore-Dist.)		1%+		0.5%+		0+		0+		1%+
ME.,Cumb-erland Co. (Portland)	0	0	0	0	10%	0	10%	0	17%	0
MI, Berrien Co. (St. Joseph)	0	1.5%	0	1.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0
MI, Eaton Co. (Charlotte)					7%		7%			
MI, Kalama-zoo Co. (Kalamazoo-female)			0	3%			0	.7%		
MI, Kalama-zoo Co. (Kalamazoo-male)			0	0			2.8%	0		
MI, Wayne Co. (Detroit)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MN,Henne-pin Co. (Mnneapolis)			8.2%							
MO, Buchanan Co., (St. Joseph)										0.1%+
MO, Christian Co. (Ozark)	0		0		0		0		5.5%	
MO, St. Louis City	0	2.4%	0		0	0	0	0	0	0
NC, Wake Co. (Raleigh)	40%	33%	34%	33%	25%	45%	10%	45%	25%	34%

NC, Warren Co. (Warrenton)	10%	0		0	10%	0		0	20%	0
NJ, Essex Co. (Newark)	1.4%		1.4%		7.4%		7.4%		4.4%	
NJ, Union Co. (Elizabeth-DCI)	0		0		0		0		0	
Nevada, Duckwater Tribal Drug Court	20%									
NM, Bernalilo Co. (Albuquerque-NM)	0	0	0	0	0	2.8%	0	0	5.3%	5.7%
NM, San Juan Co. (Aztec)	1.8%	0	0	0	1.8%	0	0	0	1.8%	0
NM, Santa Fe Co. (Santa Fe)	12%	0	12%	0	9.7%	4.2%	9.7%	4.2%	7.3%	0
NY, Bronx Co. (Bronx Drug Treatment Court)	3%		3%							
NY, Erie Co. (Buffalo)	15%	5%	0	3%	9%	2%	1%	0		
NY, Erie Co. (Lackawanna)	1.4%	1.2%	0		2.8%	1.2%	0		2.8%	
NY, Monroe Co. (Rochester)		3.6%				1%				5%
NY, Onon-daga Co. (Syracuse)	9.8%	2.8%							11%	5.7%
NY, Queens Co. (Queens)	1.2%		0		0		0		3.6%	
NY, Rockland Co.(Clarks-town)	0		0		0		0		7.1%	
NY, Suffolk Co. (Central Islip)	13%	6.4%		3.8%	3.4%	3.8%		2.5%	24%	10%
NY, Tompkins Co. (Ithaca)									4%+	
OH, Cuyahga Co. (Cleveland)	1.8%								2%	
OH, Erie Co. (Sandusky)	6.6%		6.6%		13%		6.6%		0	

OH, Hamilton Co. (Cincinnati)	3%	3.6%	2.3%	3.1%	1.9%	2.5%	1.9%	2	1.9%	3.8%
OH, Lucas Co. (Toledo)	2.5%		0		0		0		7.6%	
OH, Montgomery Co. (Dayton)	1%+		1%+		0+		0+		0+	
OH, Richland Co. (Mansfield)	10%	0	10%	0	55%	0	55%	0	10%	0
OH, Stark Co. (Canton)	0		0		8.3%				0	
OH, Summit Co. (Akron)	1.7%	7.5%	1.1%	1.5%	1.1%		1.1%		.5%	6.3%
OK, Creek Co. (Sapulpa)		0+		0+		0+		0+		0+
OK, Seminole Co. (Seminole)	0	0	0	0	7%	0	7%	0	0	0
OR, Josephine Co. (Grants Pass)		0+		0+		0+		0+		0+
OR, Klamath Co. (Klamath Falls)	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+
PA, Allegheny Co. (Pittsburgh)	3.4%		1.1%		3.4%				12%	
PA, Lycoming Co. (Williamsport)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35%	0
PA, Philadelphia Co. (Philadelphia)	18%	3.8%	3.6%	0	0	0	0	0	2.5%	0
PA, York Co. (York)	0	0	0	0	5.2%	0	2.6%	0	5.2%	0
PR, Arecibo	41%+				22%+				16%+	
PR, Carolina	5%+		5%+		20%+		20%+		5%+	
PR, Ponce	1%+		1%+						0.8%+	
PR, San Juan	1%+		1%+							
SC, Richland Co. (Columbia)	0	4.1%	0	0		0		0	0	8.3%
TN, Shelby Co. (Memphis)	5.4%	1.4%	2.7%	1.4%	2.7%	0	1.3%	0	2.7%	1.4%
TX, Tarrant Co.	0	0	0	0	1%	0	1%	0		0

(Fort Worth)										
VA,Albe-marle Co. (Chrlttesville)									2%+	
VA, City of Newport News	0		0		0		0		0	
VA, City of (Fredericks-burg)	0		0		0		0		15%	
VA, City of Roanoke	5%+		5%+		5%+		5%+	1.8%+	10%+	
WA, Skagit Co. (Mount Vernon)	24%	0	13%	0	24%	0	13%	0	29%	0
WA, Spokane Co. (Spokane)	0	1.9%	0	1.9%	0	1.9%	0	1.9%	0	
WY, Sheridan Co. (Sheridan)	0				0				16%	
WY, Uinta Co. (Evanston)	0+		0+		0+		0+		0+	

**B. Recidivism: Traffic, Violent Felony and Violent Misdemeanor by Participants and Graduates**

Jurisdiction	Traffic				Violent Felony				Violent Mi	
	Arrests		Convictions		Arrests		Convictions		Arrests	
	Part	Grad	Part.	Grad.	Part.	Grad.	Part	Grad	Part.	Grad
AL, Cullman Co. (Cullman)	0		0		0		0		0	
AL, Mobile Co. (Mobile)		4%								2%
AL, Poarch Creek Tribal Drug Court (Atmore)	0		0		0		0		0	
AL, Tusca-loosa Co. (Tuscaloosa)	0+		0+		0+		0+		0+	
AZ, Maricopa Co.	1.5%		1.5%						.7%	

(Phoenix-DWI)										
AZ, Yuma Co. (Yuma)									5.5%	
CA, Butte Co. (Chico)	9.9%	2.8%	9.9%	2.8%	0	0	0	0	0	2.1%
CA, Kern Co.(Bakers-field)		.8%		.8%		.1%		.1%		.3%
CA, Los Ang. Co. (Compton)					0				2.4%	
CA, Los Ang. Co. (El Monte)	0	7.6%	5.5%	7.6%	0	0	2.5%	1%	2.5%	0
CA, Los Ang. Co. (Inglewood)	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+
CA, Mendocino Co. (Ukiah)	1.6%	0	1.6%	0	1.6%	0	1.6%	0	0	0
CA, Modesto Co. (Stanislaus)		0+		0+	0.4%+	0+		0+	0.4%+	0+
CA, Placer Co. (Auburn)	5%+									
CA,River-side Co. (Riverside)	1%+	0+	1%+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+
CA,Sacra-mento Co. (Sacramento)						0+		0+		0.6%+
CA, San Bernardino Co. (Redlands)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.8%
CA, San Bernardino Co. (San Bernardino)	0+	.7%+	0+	.7%+	0+	1%+	0+	1%+	0.2%+	
CA, San Diego Co. (El Cajon)		0		0	0	0	0	0	1.4%	0
CA, San Diego Co. (San Diego)	0	0	0	0	1.1%	2.3%	1.1%	2.3%	3.3%	6.9%
CA, San Diego Co. (Vista)	0+	0+			0+	0+			.8%+	2.4%+
CA, San Joaquin Co. (Stockton)			1.7%	5.4%		.6%	.8%	.6%		1.29%
CA, Santa Clara Co.	1%+								0	

(San Jose)										
CA, Santa Barbara Co. (Santa Barbara)		0+		0+		0+		0+		0+
CA, Santa Cruz Co. (Santa Cruz)	0		0		0		0		0	
CA, Solano Co. (Fairfield)	47%	0	47%		.8%		.8%	0	.8%	0
CA, Sonoma Co. (Santa Rosa)	5%+	5%+	0+	4%+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+
CA, Tulare Co. (Porterville)						0.1%+		0.1%+		0.1%+
CA, Yuba Co. (Marysville)	.08%	0	.08%	0	0	0	0	0	.08%	0
CT, Fairfield Co. (Bridgeport)	0+		0+		0+		0+		0+	
CT, New Haven Co. (New Haven)					2%+				2%+	
DC, Washing-ton	.1%		.1%		.2%		.1%		0	
FED- Yosemite		5%+		5%+						2%+
FL, Alachua Co. (Gainesville)		8%					0			4%
FL, Bay Co. (Panama City)	3.4%		1.7%							
FL, Brevard Co. (Viera)	0	1.2%	0	.6%	0	.6%	0	.3%	0	.6%
FL, Duval Co. (Jacksonville)		.7%		.7%						
FL, Escambia Co. (Pensacola)	19%				.5%		.5%			
FL, Okaloosa Co. (Crestview)	0	6%	0	6%	0	0	0	0	0	
FL, Manatee Co. (Bradenton)	1.5%		1.5%							
FL, Sarasota Co. (Sarasota)	0		0		0		0		0	
FL, Volusia Co. (Daytona)+	3%		1%		0		0		0	

GA, Bibb Co. (Macon)	1%	2%	1%	.7%	0	0	0	0	0	1%
GA, Fulton Co. (Atlanta)	4.6%	0	4.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	
HI, Honolulu Co., (Honolulu)	3%	0	3%	0	0	5%	0	3%	1%	1%
ID, Ada Co. (Boise)	0		0		0		0		0	
IL, Cook Co. (Chicago)	0		0		0		0		9%	
IL, Cook Co. (Markham)	0		0		0		0		0	
IL, Kankakee Co. (Kankakee)	1%+	0+	0+	0+	1%+	0+	0+	0+	5%+	0+
IL, Macon Co. (Decatur)	5.5%		5.5%		0		0		0	
IL, Madison Co.(Edwards-ville)	19%		6.7%		1.9%		1.9%	0		0
IL, Peoria Co. (Peoria)	6.3%	0	3.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IL, Winne-bago Co. (Rockford)	1%+								0.6%+	
IN, Allan Co. (Fort Wayne)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IN, Lake Co. (Crown Point)	0				0				8%	
IN, Vigo Co. (Terre Haute)									2.8%	4.2%
KY, Fayette Co. (Lexington)	1.9%	1.4%	1.9%	1.3%	.9%	0	0	0	2.9%	1.3%
KY, Kenton Co. (Covington)	0		0		0		0		0	
KY, Warren Co. (Bowling Green)	7%+	0+	2%+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0.8%+	0+
LA, East Baton Rouge Par. (Baton Rouge)	7.7%	0	3.8%	0	0	0	0	0	3.8%	0
LA, Iberia Par. (New)	3.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Iberia)										
LA, Jefferson Par. (Gretna)	1.2%	0	.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LA, Orleans Par. (New Orleans)	.7%	0	0	0	.7%	0	0	0	1.4%	0
LA, Ouachita Par. (Monroe)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LA, Rapides Par. (Alexandria)	0+		0+		3%+		0+		0+	
LA, St. Mary's Par. (Franklin)	.6%	0	.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MA, Essex Co. (Haverhill)	5.5%	0	0	0	0	.33%	0	0	0	0
MA, Franklin Co. (Orange)								0		3%
MA, Orange Co. (Greenfield)	1%+	0+	0+	0+	0+		0+		0+	
MA, Worcester Co. (Worcester)	3%	0	0	0	3%	0	0	0	7%	0
MD, Balti-more Co. (Baltimore-Circuit)						2.3%		1.3%		7.7%
MD, Balti-more Co. (Baltimore-District)		0+		0+		1%+		0.4%+		
ME, Cumber-land Co. (Portland)	17%	0	17%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MI, Berrien Co. (St. Joseph)	0	4.7%	0	4.7%	0		0		0	1.5%
MI, Kala-mazoo Co. (Kalamazoo-female)						0	0			
MI, Kala-mazoo Co. (Kalamazoo-male)+						0				
MI, Wayne Co. (Detroit)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MO, Christian Co. (Ozark)	0		0							
MO, Buch-anan Co. (St. Joseph)		0.7%+		0.7%+						



MO, St. Louis City	0		0		0	0	0	0	0	
NC, Wake Co. (Raleigh)	0	0	0	0	2%	4%		0		0
NC, Warren Co. (Warrenton)	10%	0	10%	0	0	0	0	0	20%	0
Nevada, Duckwater Tribal Court	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ, Union Co. (Elizabeth-DCI)	0		0		0		0		0	
NM, Bernalilo Co. (Albuquerque DWI)	5.3%	2.8%	3.5%	2.8%	0	0	0	1.4%	0	4.2%
NM, San Juan Co. (Aztec)	11%	0	11%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NM, Santa Fe Co. (Santa Fe)	36%	4.2%	36%	4.2%	0		0		2.9%	0
NY, Bronx Co. (Bronx Drug Treatment Court)					1.2%		1.2%		1.2%	
NY, Erie Co. (Buffalo)					0	0		0	0	0
NY, Erie Co. (Lacka-wanna)	7.2%	2.5%	7.2%	2.5%	1.4%		1.4%		0	1.2%
NY, Monroe Co.(Roch-ester)								0		0
NY, Onondaga Co. (Syracuse)					5.6%					
NY, Queens Co. (Queens)	0		0		0		0		1.2%	
NY, Rockland Co. (Clarkstown)	0		0		7.1%		0		0	
NY, Suffolk Co. (Central Islip)	27%	7.6%		0	2.7%	0		0	0	1.2%
OH, Cuyahoga Co. (Cleveland)					1%					
OH, Erie Co. (Sandusky)	0		0		0		0		0	
OH, Hamilton Co.	9.7%	9.0%	9.3%	8.3%	.3%	.2%	.3%	.2%	.7%	.7%

(Butler)										
OH, Lucas Co. (Toledo)	12%		5.1%		2.5%				2.5%	
OH, Mont-gomery Co. (Dayton)	12%+		12%+		2%+		0+		2%+	
OH, Richland Co. (Mansfield)	0	0	0	0	5%	0	5%	2.0%	5%	0
OH, Seminole Co. (Seminole)	5%		5%		0		0		1.5%	
OH, Stark Co. (Canton)	0		0		0		0		2.7%	
OH, Summit Co. (Akron)	3.5%	2.1%	3.5%	.5%	1.1%	1%	.5%	1%	1.7%	4.2%
OK, Creek Co. (Sapulpa)		0+		0+		0+		0+		0+
OK, Seminole Co. (Seminole)		0+		0+	6%+	0+			1%+	0+
OR, Josephine Co. (Grants Pass)		0+		0+		0+		0+		0+
OR, Klamath Co. (Klamath Falls)	0+	4%+	0+	4%+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+
OR, Crook Co. (Prineville)	0+		0+		0+		0+		0+	
PA, Alle-gheny Co. (Pittsburgh)					1.1%				2.2%	
PA, Lycoming Co. (Wil-liamsport)	42%	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA, Philadelphia Co. (Philadelphia)		0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA, York Co. (York)	5.2%	0	5.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PR, Arecibo	0+									
PR, Carolina	0+		0+		0+		0+		0+	
PR, Ponce					1%+		1%+		0.4%+	
SC, Richland Co. (Columbia)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
TN, Shelby Co.	9.4%	.7%	6.7%	.7%	1.3%	0	1.3%	0	2.7%	.7%

(Memphis)											
TX, Jefferson Co. (Beaumont)						3%+					2%+
TX, Tarrant Co. (Fort Worth)	1%	0	1%	0	0	0	0	0	1%	1.7%	
UT, Salt Lake Co. (Salt Lake City)	0.7%+										
VA,Albe-marle Co. (Charlottesville)							2%+				
VA, City of Roanoke					0+		0+		0+		
VA, City of Newport News	0		0		0		0		5%		
VA, City of Fredericks-burg	7.6%		7.6%		0		0		7.6%		
WA, Skagit Co. (Spokane)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
WA, Spokane Co. (Spokane)						1.9%					
WI, Dane Co. (Madison)		0		0		0		0			
WY, Sheridan Co. (Sheridan)	0				0				0		
WY, Uinta Co. (Evanston)		20%+		20%+	0+	0+	0+	0+	0+	1%+	

**Other:**

Miami, FL 9.7% (12 months); 13.2% (18 months); 24% (5 years following graduation)\*

Pensacola, FL 2% (estimated reduction of 75%-85%)\*

Las Vegas, NV 6% (graduates)\*

Portland, OR 9 % (graduates)\*

Austin, Tex 25% [1 yr. following graduation (e.g. 2 years following arrest), compared with 59% for control group 1 year following arrest]\*

\*1997 data; +1998 data

### VII. Drug Usage Patterns Reported by Operating Adult Drug Courts

State	Jurisdiction	Alcohol	Meth	Crack/Cocaine	Heroin	Marijuana	Prescript.	Inha
AL	Cullman Co. (Cullman)		X	X		X	X	
AL	Mobile Co. (Mobile)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
AL	Tuscaloosa Co. (Tuscaloosa)	X	X	X		X	X	
AZ	Maricopa Co. (Phoenix)	X	X	X	X	X	X	
AZ	Pima Co. (Tucson)	X	X	X	X	X	X	
AZ	Yuma Co. (Yuma)	X	X	X	X	X		
CA	Alameda Co. (Hayward)	X	X	X		X		
CA	Butte Co. (Chico)	X	X	X	X	X	X	
CA	Kern Co. (Bakersfield)	X	X	X	X	X	X	
CA	L.A. Co. (Compton)	X	X	X	X	X		
CA	L.A. Co. (El Monte)		X	X	X	X		
CA	L.A. Co. (Inglewood)	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+	
CA	L.A. Co. (Los Angeles)	X	X	X	X	X		
CA	L.A. Co. (Santa Monica)	X	X	X	X	X		X
CA	L.A. Co. (Van Nuys)	X	X	X	X	X	X	
CA	Mendocino Co. (Ukiah)	X	X	X	X	X		
CA	Modesto Co.		X		X	X		

	(Stanislaus)							
CA	Monterey Co. (Salinas)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
CA	Orange Co. (Santa Ana)		X	X	X	X		
CA	Placer Co. (Auburn)	X+	X+		X+	X+	X+	
CA	Riverside Co. (Riverside)		X	X				
CA	Sacramento Co. (Sacramento)	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+	
CA	San Bernardino Co. (Redlands)	X	X	X	X	X		
CA	San Bernardino Co. (San Bernardino)		X	X	X	X		
CA	San Diego Co. (Chula Vista)	X	X	X	X	X		
CA	San Diego Co. (El Cajon)	X	X	X	X	X	X	
CA	San Diego Co. (San Diego)		X	X	X	X		
CA	San Diego Co. (Vista)	X	X	X	X	X	X	
CA	San Francisco Co. (San Francisco)	X	X	X	X	X	X	
CA	San Joaquin Co. (Stockton)	X	X	X	X	X	X	
CA	Santa Clara Co. (San Jose)	X	X	X	X	X		
CA	Santa Cruz Co. (Santa Cruz)		X		X			
CA	Solano Co. (Fairfield)	X	X	X	X	X	X	
CA	Solano Co. (Valejo)	X	X	X	X	X	X	

CA	South Orange Co. (Laguna Nigel)	X	X	X	X	X	X	
CA	Sonoma Co. (Santa Rosa)	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+	
CA	Stanislaus Co. (Modesto)		X		X	X		
CA	Tulare Co. (Porterville)	X+	X+			X+		
CA	Ventura Co. (Ventura)		X	X	X			
CA	Yolo Co. (Woodland)	X	X	X	X	X	X	
CA	Yuba Co. (Marysville)	X	X	X	X			
CT	Fairfield Co. (Bridgeport)	X		X		X		
CT	New Haven Co. (New Haven)	X+		X+	X+	X+	X+	
DC	Washington, DC	X		X	X	X	X	
FL	Alachua Co. (Gainesville)	X		X	X	X	X	
FL	Bay Co. (Panama City)	X	X	X		X	X	
FL	Brevard Co. (Viera)	X	X	X	X	X	X	
FL	Broward Co. (Fort Lauderdale)	X		X	X	X	X	
FL	Dade Co. (Miami)	X		X	X	X		
FL	Duval Co. (Jacksonville)	X		X	X	X	X	
FL	Escambia Co. (Pensacola)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
FL	Hillsborough Co. (Tampa-pretrial)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

FL	Hillsborough Co. (Tampa-postadj)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
FL	Okaloosa Co. (Crestview)	X		X	X	X	X	X
FL	Manatee Co. (Bradenton)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
FL	Sarasota Co. (Sarasota)	X	X	X		X	X	
FL	Volusia Co. (Daytona)	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+	
GA	Bibb Co. (Macon)	X	X	X		X	X	
GA	Fulton Co. (Atlanta)	X	X	X	X	X	X	
GA	Glynn Co. (Camden)	X		X		X	X	
HI	Honolulu Co. (Honolulu)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
ID	Ada Co. (Boise)	X	X	X	X	X		
IL	Cook Co. (Chicago)	X		X	X	X		
IL	Cook Co. (Markham)	X		X	X	X	X	X
IL	Kankakee Co. (Kankakee)+	X	X	X	X	X	X	
IL	Madison Co. (Edwardsville)	X		X	X	X		X
IL	Peoria Co. (Peoria)	X		X		X	X	
IL	Winnebago Co. (Rockford)	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+		
IN	Allan Co. (Fort Wayne)	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+	
IN	Lake Co. (Crown Point)	X		X	X	X	X	
IN	Vigo Co. (Terre Haute)	X	X	X		X	X	
KY	Fayette Co. (Lexington)	X		X		X	X	

KY	Kenton Co. (Covington)	X	X	X		X		
KY	Warren Co. (Bowling Green)	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+	
LA	East Baton Rouge Par. (Baton Rouge)	X	X	X		X	X	
LA	Iberia Par. (New Iberia)	X	X	X		X		X
LA	Jefferson Par. (Gretna)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
LA	Orleans Par. (New Orleans)	X		X	X	X	X	
LA	Ouachita Par. (Monroe)	X	X	X	X	X	X	
LA	Rapides Par. (Alexandria)	X	X	X		X	X	
LA	St Mary's Par. (Franklin)	X	X	X		X	X	
LA	St. Tammany/ Washington Par. (Covington)	X	X	X		X	X	
MA	Essex Co. (Haverhill)	X		X	X	X		
MA	Orange Co. (Greenfield)	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+	
MA	Worcester Co. (Worcester)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
MD	Anne Arundel Co. (Annapolis)	X+		X+	X+	X+	X+	
MD	Baltimore Co. (Baltimore-Dist.)	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+		
ME	Cumberland Co. (Portland)	X		X	X	X	X	
MI	Eaton Co.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X



	(Charlotte)						
MI	Kalamazoo Co. (Kalamazoo-male)	X	X		X	X	X
MI	Kalamazoo Co. (Kalamazoo-female)	X	X			X	X
MI	Wayne Co. (Detroit)	X		X	X	X	
MO	Christian Co. (Ozark)		X	X		X	
MO	Cole Co. (Jefferson City)	X	X	X		X	
MO	St. Louis City	X		X	X	X	
NE	Douglas County (Omaha)	X	X	X		X	
NC	New Hanover Co. (Wilmington)	X		X	X	X	X
NC	Person/ Casewell Cos. (Roxboro / Yanceyville)			X		X	X
NC	Wake Co. (Raleigh)+	X	X	X	X	X	X
NC	Warren Co. (Warrenton)	X+		X+		X+	
NJ	Camden Co. (Camden)	X		X	X	X	
NJ	Essex Co. (Newark)	X		X	X	X	X
NJ	Passaic Co. (Patterson)	X		X	X	X	X
NJ	Union Co. (Elizabeth-DCI)	X		X	X	X	X
NJ	Union Co. (Elizabeth -OJP)	X		X			
NM	Bernalillo Co. (Albuquerque; DWI)	X	X	X	X		
NM	Dona Ana Co.	X		X		X	

	(Las Cruces)							
NM	San Juan Co. (Aztec)	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+	
NM	Santa Fe Co. (Santa Fe)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
NV	Clark Co. (Las Vegas)		X+					
NV	Clark Co. (Laughlin)		X+			X+		
NV	Clark Co. (North Valley)	X	X			X		
NV	Duckwater Tribal Drug Court	X						X
NV	Washoe Co. (Reno)		X	X	X	X		
NY	Bronx Co. (Bronx Drug Treatment Court)	X		X	X	X		
NY	Erie Co. (Buffalo)	X		X	X	X	X	
NY	Erie Co. (Cheektowaga)	X		X	X	X	X	
NY	Erie Co. (Lackawana)	X+		X+	X+	X+	X+	
NY	Erie Co. (Tonawanda)	X		X	X	X	X	
NY	Kings Co. (Brooklyn)	X		X	X	X		
NY	Manhattan Co. (Manhattan Treatment Court)			X	X	X		
NY	Monroe Co. (Rochester)	X		X	X	X		
NY	Niagara Falls/Tonawanda Cos. (Niagara Falls)	X		X	X	X	X	
NY	Onondaga Co.	X		X	X	X	X	

	(Syracuse)						
NY	Queens Co. (Queens)	X		X	X	X	
NY	Rensselaer Co. (Rensselaer Co. Ct.)	X		X	X	X	
NY	Rensselaer Co. (Troy Police Ct.)	X		X	X	X	
NY	Rockland Co. (Clarkstown)	X		X	X	X	
NY	Suffolk Co. (Central Islip)	X		X	X	X	X
NY	Tompkins Co. (Ithaca)	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+
OH	Erie Co. (Sandusky)	X		X	X	X	X
OH	Hamilton Co. (Cincinnati)	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+
OH	Lucas Co. (Toledo)	X		X	X	X	X
OH	Montgomery Co. (Dayton)	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+
OH	Richland Co. (Mansfield)	X		X		X	X
OH	Stark Co. (Canton)	X		X		X	X
OH	Summit Co. (Akron)			X		X	
OK	Creek Co. (Sapulpa)	X+	X+	X+		X+	
OR	Crook Co. (Prineville)	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+
OK	Payne Co. (Stillwater)	X+	X+	X+		X+	X+
OK	Seminole Co. (Seminole)	X	X	X		X	X
OR	Crook Co. (Prineville)		X	X		X	
OR	Josephine Co. (Grants Pass)		X		X	X	
OR	Lane Co. (Eugene)	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+

OR	Klamath Co. (Klamath Falls)		X				X	
OR	Multnomah Co. (Portland)	X	X	X		X	X	
PA	Allegheny Co. (Pittsburgh)	X	X	X		X	X	X
PA	Chester Co. (West Chester)	X		X		X	X	X
PA	Lycoming Co. (Williamsport)	X		X		X	X	X
PA	Philadelphia Co. (Philadelphia)	X		X		X	X	X
PR	Arecibo Co. (Arecibo)	X+		X+		X+	X+	
PR	Carolina Co. (Carolina)+	X	X	X		X	X	X
PR	Ponce Co.(Ponce)					X+		
PR	San Juan Co. (San Juan)	X+	X+	X+		X+	X+	X+
SC	Richland Co. (Columbia)	X	X	X		X	X	X
SC	Sisseton Wahpeton Tribal Drug Court	X						
TN	Shelby Co. (Memphis)	X	X	X			X	X
TX	Jefferson Co. (Beaumont)	X		X		X	X	X
TX	Tarrant Co. (Fort Worth)	X	X	X		X	X	X
UT	Salt Lake Co. (Salt Lake City)	X+	X+	X+		X+	X+	X+
VA	Albemarle Co. (Charlottesville)	X+		X+			X+	X+
VA	City of Fredericksburg	X		X			X	X

VA	City of Roanoke	X	X	X	X	X	X
WA	King Co.(Seattle)			X	X	X	
WA	Skagit Co. (Mount Vernon)	X	X	X	X	X	X
WA	Spokane Co. (Spokane)	X	X	X		X	
WY	Sheridan Co. (Sheridan)	X	X			X	
WY	Uinta Co. (Evanston)	X+	X+	X+		X+	X+

+ 1998 information

1. Includes 279 adult drug courts; 69 juvenile drug courts; 10 family drug courts; and 3 combination adult/juvenile/family drug courts.
2. Includes 164 adult drug courts; 48 juvenile drug courts; 7 family drug courts and 1 combination adult/juvenile/family drug court.
3. Information on juvenile, family and tribal drug courts are reported in separate summary reports.