1997 Drug Court Survey Report: Justice Agency Perspectives

Volume II

Part II: Perspectives of Prosecutors
Part III: Perspectives of Defense Counsel
Part IV: Perspectives of Law Enforcement Officials
Part V: Perspectives of Corrections Agencies

September 1997

Caroline S. Cooper
Shanie R. Bartlett
Michelle A. Shaw
Kayla K. Yang

This report was prepared by the OJP Drug Court Clearinghouse and Technical Assistance Project which is supported by Grant No. 95-DC-MX-K002 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 United States Department of Justice.

Foreword

The 1997 Drug Court Survey Report provides a comparative profile of ninety-three operating drug court programs and revises our 1996 Drug Court Profile prepared for the State Justice Institute's 1995 National Symposium on the Implementation and Operation of Drug Courts, reflecting the experiences of 45 responding drug courts then in operation. The *1997 Drug Court Survey Report*, focusing on critical operational elements and implementation issues that have emerged, is designed to be updated, periodically, to reflect the continuing evolution of the drug court concept, as new programs emerge and existing programs refine their operations.

The information in the *1997 Drug Court Survey Report* was derived from responses from ninety-three drug courts in operation as of January 1997 to a survey distributed by the Office of Justice Programs/U.S. Department of Justice Office Drug Court Clearinghouse and Technical Assistance Project at American University. The 1997 survey, an expansion of previous drug court surveys, consisted of six sections to be completed by the principal agencies involved in the drug court operations in each of the jurisdictions surveyed: (1) general program information to be completed by the court; and more specific information relating to (2) prosecution activities; (3) defense activities; (4) law enforcement activities; (5) correctional agency activities; and (6) the treatment, rehabilitation and related services provided for the program.

The *1997 Drug Court Survey Report* is presented in four volumes: **Volume One** contains general program information provided primarily by Drug Court judges and judicial staff. **Volume Two** provides information relating to the activities and perspectives of prosecutors, public defenders, law enforcement officials and correctional agency administrators involved with drug courts in their local jurisdictions. **Volume Three** focuses on the treatment and rehabilitation services provided for drug courts programs and reflects the comments of treatment professionals providing services to drug court in their respective jurisdictions. **Volume Four** provides the perspectives of 256 participants in the final phases of 52 drug court programs in 23 different states plus the District of Columbia regarding critical aspects of drug court program operations.

The ninety-three drug courts reflected in the *1997 Drug Court Survey Report* include ninety-one state courts, one tribal court and one federal district court. The reporting programs operate in 31 different states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and one federal district, and represent 72% of the 130 drug courts in operation at the time the survey was distributed. Since the survey's distribution, approximately 30 more drug courts have become operational, with a total of 360 programs now in operation or being planned.

Special appreciation is extended to the following individuals who provided suggestions on issues to capture in the survey and/or reviewed the draft survey instrument and offered valuable suggestions for its improvement:

Steven Belenko, National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse, Columbia University, New York, New York;

John Carver, former Director of the District of Columbia Pretrial Services Agency and now associate with Justice Management Institute, Washington D.C. office;

John Goldkamp, Professor of Criminal Justice at Temple University and President of Crime and Justice Research Institute, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania;

Gabriel Guerrieri, Executive Director of Genesis Counseling Center, Collingswood, New Jersey, which provides treatment services to the Camden, New Jersey Drug Court;

Robin Kimbrough, Associate Director, Institute for Families in Society, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina;

Barry Mahoney, President, Justice Management Institute, Denver, Colorado;

John Marr, Executive Director, Choices, Ltd., of Las Vegas, Nevada, which provides treatment services to the Las Vegas and Reno, Nevada adult and juvenile drug courts;

Judge Tomar Mason, Presiding Judge of the San Francisco, California Municipal Court;

Valerie Moore, Executive Director of InAct, Inc., of Portland, Oregon, which provides treatment services to the Multnomah County, Oregon Drug Court;

Judge John Parnham, Drug Court Judge for the adult and juvenile drug courts in Pensacola, Florida;

Dr. Roger Peters, Professor of Psychology at the University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida;

Marilyn Roberts and staff of the OJP Drug Courts Program Office, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington D.C.;

Dr. Michael Smith, Director of the Substance Abuse Clinic at Lincoln Hospital in New York, New York;

Judge Jeffrey Tauber and staff of the National Association of Drug Court Professionals, Alexandria, Virginia; and

Robin Wright, Drug Court Coordinator for the adult and juvenile drug courts, First Judicial Circuit, Pensacola, Florida.

We also extend our thanks to the staff of National TASC, who assisted in the development of the survey instrument focusing on treatment issues (Volume III), and to the following student interns who painstakingly assisted in the entering of the data which has formed the foundation for this report series: Ximena Marquez, Anne Marie O'Neill, Susan Puckhaber, and Melanie Vasquez. Joseph Trotter's ready willingness to review draft findings and his invaluable insights regarding their interpretation contributed immeasurably to these documents.

It goes without saying that the information contained in the *1997 Drug Court Survey Report* was made possible by the special efforts of the more than 400 drug court officials in the reporting jurisdictions who offered their time and insights to provide the responses upon which this report is based. The names and addresses of many of these officials are listed in the Appendix which follows each section of the report. We extend our deep appreciation to each person who contributed to the survey responses. We are grateful for the insights and experience they have shared and for their considerable -- and enthusiastic -- assistance in advancing the "state of the art" and knowledge regarding drug court operations. Through their efforts, we have been able to develop the "profile" information presented in these volumes and to disseminate it to their colleagues in the field.

Caroline S. Cooper, Director
OJP Drug Court Clearinghouse and
Technical Assistance Project
School of Public Affairs
American University
Washington D.C.

Agencies Responding to Drug Court Clearinghouse 1997 Drug Court Survey

Name of Court	St	Part 1 (Court)	Part 2 (Prosecutor)	Part 3 (Defense)	Part 4 (Law Enf.)	Part 5 (Corrections)	Part 6 (Treatment)	Part 7 (Participant)
Mobile	AL	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y
Tuscaloosa	AL	Y						
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Tucson	AZ	Y		Y	Y	Y		
Little Rock	AR	Y						
Bakersfield	CA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA	Y					Y	Y
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y
Oakland Mun.	CA	Y						
Oakland Sup.	CA	Y						
San Bernardino	CA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Laguna Nigel	CA	Y					Y	
Pasadena	CA	Y					Y	Y
Roseville	CA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
San Francisco	CA						Y	
Salinas	CA	Y	Y				Y	
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Santa Barbara	CA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Santa Maria	CA	Y						
Santa Monica	CA	Y					Y	Y
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Stockton	CA	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y
Woodland/ Yolo	CA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Name of Court	St	Part 1 (Court)	Part 2 (Prosecutor)	Part 3 (Defense)	Part 4 (Law Enf.)	Part 5 (Corrections)	Part 6 (Treatment)	Part 7 (Participant)
Modesto	CA	Y				Y	Y	Y
Richmond	CA	Y					Y	
Santa Ana	CA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Denver	CO	Y					Y	Y
New Haven	CT	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
D.C. Sup.	DC	Y						Y
Dover	DE	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y
Georgetown	DE	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wilmington	DE	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	
Crestview	FL	Y					Y	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Gainesville	FL	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Key West	FL	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Miami	FL	Y	Y	Y			Y	
Tampa	FL	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Bartow	FL	Y				Y	Y	
Jacksonville	FL			Y		Y	Y	Y
Pensacola	FL	Y					Y	
Daytona	FL	Y						
Panama City	FL	Y						
Sarasota	FL	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Macon	GA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Honolulu	HI	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y
Chicago	IL		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Markham	IL	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Edwardsville	IL	Y					Y	Y

Name of Court	St	Part 1 (Court)	Part 2 (Prosecutor)	Part 3 (Defense)	Part 4 (Law Enf.)	Part 5 (Corrections)	Part 6 (Treatment)	Part 7 (Participant)
Rockford	IL	Y						
Lake Co.	IN	Y	Y	Y				Y
Wichita	KS	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Louisville	KY	Y	Y				Y	
Franklin	LA	Y						
Baltimore Dis.	MD	Y						
Boston	MA	Y		Y			Y	Y
Franklin Co.	MA	Y						
Kalamazoo	MI	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Joseph	MI	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y
Kansas City	MO	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y
Las Vegas	NV	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y
Camden	NJ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Newark	NJ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Albuquerque	NM	Y						
Las Cruces	NM	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y
Amherst	NY	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	
Brooklyn	NY	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Buffalo	NY	Y					Y	
Suffolk Co.	NY	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Rochester	NY	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Charlotte	NC	Y					Y	
Warren Co.	NC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Hamilton Co.	OH	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Akron	OH	Y					Y	
Sandusky	OH	Y						Y

Name of Court	St	Part 1 (Court)	Part 2 (Prosecutor)	Part 3 (Defense)	Part 4 (Law Enf.)	Part 5 (Corrections)	Part 6 (Treatment)	Part 7 (Participant)
Muscogee (Creek) Nation	OK	Y						
Logan Co.	OK	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Payne Co.	OK	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Tulsa	OK	Y				Y		
Eugene	OR	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Grants Pass	OR	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Klammath Falls	OR	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Portland	OR	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Roseburg	OR	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Philadelphia	PA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Carolina	PR	Y	Y					
Ponce	PR	Y	Y		Y	Y		
San Juan	PR	Y	Y	Y			Y	
Lexington	SC	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y
Austin	TX	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y
Beaumont	TX	Y					Y	
Ft. Worth	TX	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y
Roanoke	VA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Charlottesville	VA	Y					Y	
Seattle	WA	Y						
Yosemite	Fed	Y						
TOTALS	**97**	**93**	**56**	**55**	**44**	**45**	**73**	**53**

PART II: PERSPECTIVES OF PROSECUTORS

PART II: PERSPECTIVES OF PROSECUTORS

I. Introduction

Survey responses were received from prosecutors involved with 52 different drug courts operating in 25 states. Their responses to issues addressed in the survey are provided below.

II. Program Effectiveness

A. Criteria Being Used to Assess Drug Court Effectiveness

Prosecutors were asked to indicate the criteria they were using to assess the effectiveness of the drug courts in their jurisdictions. Their responses are summarized on Chart II-1 which follows. All prosecutors agreed that the primary criteria for effectiveness of the drug court was the participant's remaining free of any drug related arrests. Approximately 80% of the prosecutors also cited the participant's attendance at treatment and his/her urinalysis results. Approximately 70% of the prosecutors also look to the participant's attendance at scheduled court status hearings; remaining free of arrests for **non-drug** offenses as well, and graduation from the drug court.

B. Impact of Drug Court on Office's Capability to Handle Criminal Caseload/Functions

Chart II-2 describes the impact of the drug courts on prosecutor offices as reported by the respondents. Approximately 45% of the prosecutors reported that more attorneys were available for other cases as a result of the drug court. Approximately 45% of the prosecutors also reported the drug court resulted in greater coordination of their office with other justice agencies and 35% reported the program brought about greater coordination of their offices with community groups.

C. Benefits Prosecutors Have Derived from Drug Court Program

Prosecutors were also asked to identify any benefits the drug court had brought about for their offices. Their responses are provided in Chart II-3 below. Among the benefits cited, 80% of the prosecutors cited the opportunity for treatment and rehabilitation and 65% cited the imposition of swift sanctions in appropriate situations. Half of the respondents also noted that the program promoted more efficient use of their office resources.

Chart II-1: Criteria Being Used by Prosecutors to Assess Drug Court Effectiveness

Name of Court	St.	Attend. in Treatment	Appearance at Court Hearing	Urinalysis Results	New Arrests/ Drug Poss.	New Arrests/ Other Drug Charges	New Arrests/ Non-Drug Charges	Employ-ment Status	% Grad. From Prog.	Other
Mobile	AL	X	X	X	X	X			X	
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ									
Bakersfield	CA									
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Roseville	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Salinas	CA				X	X	X		X	
San Bernardino	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	We are monitoring recidivism rates of graduates.
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Santa Ana	CA	X		X	X	X	X		X	
Santa Barbara	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Decline in "jail days" for non-violent drug offenders
Stockton	CA									(1) Does A complete the drug court program, (2) Does A re-offend

Name of Court	St.	Attend. in Treatment	Appearance at Court Hearing	Urinalysis Results	New Arrests/ Drug Poss.	New Arrests/ Other Drug Charges	New Arrests/ Non-Drug Charges	Employ-ment Status	% Grad. From Prog.	Other
Woodland/ Yolo	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X			
New Haven	CT	X		X	X	X				
Dover	DE	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
Georgetown	DE	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
Wilmington	DE	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL									Number of cases dismissed
Gainesville	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
Key West	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
Miami	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
Sarasota	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Tampa	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
Chicago	IL	X		X	X	X	X	X		
Markham	IL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Lake Co.	IN	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Wichita	KS	X	X	X	X	X			X	
Louisville	KY			X	X			X		
Kalamazoo	MI				X	X	X		X	
St. Joseph	MI				X	X	X		X	
Kansas City	MO	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	

Name of Court	St.	Attend. in Treatment	Appearance at Court Hearing	Urinalysis Results	New Arrests/ Drug Poss.	New Arrests/ Other Drug Charges	New Arrests/ Non-Drug Charges	Employ-ment Status	% Grad. From Prog.	Other
Warren Co.	NC	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Camden	NJ	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Newark	NJ		X	X	X					Violations of probation
Las Cruces	NM	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
Las Vegas	NV									
Brooklyn	NY	X			X	X	X	X	X	Recidivism
Suffolk	NY	X		X	X					
Hamilton	OH				X	X	X		X	
Logan Co.	OK	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Payne Co.	OK	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Grants Pass	OR	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Assessment program still in development. Drug Court has not gone full term yet.
Klammath Falls	OR	X	X						X	
Portland	OR	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Roseburg	OR	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Philadelphia	PA	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
Carolina	PR	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Ponce	PR		X	X	X	X	X			

Name of Court	St.	Attend. in Treatment	Appearance at Court Hearing	Urinalysis Results	New Arrests/ Drug Poss.	New Arrests/ Other Drug Charges	New Arrests/ Non-Drug Charges	Employ-ment Status	% Grad. From Prog.	Other
San Juan	PR	X						X		Participant's ability to avoid relationship with community drug users
Lexington	SC	X	X		X	X	X		X	
Austin	TX	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
Ft. Worth	TX	X	X	X	X				X	
Roanoke City	VA			X	X	X	X	X		
Roanoke County	VA	X			X	X	X			

Chart II-2: Drug Court Program Impact on Prosecutors' Offices

Name of Court	State	Attorneys Available for Other Cases	Greater Coordination with Other Agencies	Greater Coordination with Community Groups	Other
Mobile	AL			X	
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ				
Bakersfield	CA				No significant impact
Los Angeles Mun.	CA		X		
Roseville	CA		X		
Salinas	CA				Gives us another option for drug offenders who don't belong in state prisons
San Bernardino	CA		X	X	It has offered credibility and rehabilitation to a system that could impose little or no sanctions due to jail overcrowding.
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA		X	X	
Santa Ana	CA				N/A-We have not staffed Drug Court Full time until 1-97
Santa Barbara	CA	X			
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA		X	X	
Stockton	CA				By putting users into local programs, we have faced far fewer requests for other offenders to get into those programs
Woodland/Yolo	CA	X	X	X	
New Haven	CT			X	
Dover	DE	X (to limited extent)			
Wilmington	DE	X	X		

Name of Court	State	Attorneys Available for Other Cases	Greater Coordination with Other Agencies	Greater Coordination with Community Groups	Other
Georgetown	DE				
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	X			
Gainesville	FL		X	X	
Key West	FL			X	
Miami	FL	X	X	X	
Sarasota	FL				
Tampa	FL				
Chicago	IL				There has been minimal impact thus far.
Markham	IL				
Lake Co.	IN	X	X		
Wichita	KS		X		
Louisville	KY	X			
Kalamazoo	MI	X			
St. Joseph	MI	X			The time between initial arraignment and disposition has been greatly reduced
Kansas City	MO	X	X	X	
Warren Co.	NC				
Camden	NJ	X		X	
Newark	NJ	X			
Las Cruces	NM	X	X	X	
Las Vegas	NV				

Name of Court	State	Attorneys Available for Other Cases	Greater Coordination with Other Agencies	Greater Coordination with Community Groups	Other
Brooklyn	NY				It is too early to assess.
Suffolk	NY		X		
Hamilton	OH	X		X	
Logan Co.	OK	X	X	X	
Payne Co.	OK	X	X	X	
Grants Pass	OR	X	X		
Klammath Falls	OR	X		X	
Portland	OR	X	X		
Roseburg	OR	X	X		
Philadelphia	PA				Anticipated start date March 1997.
Carolina	PR	X	X	X	
Ponce	PR		X		
San Juan	PR				Enable the prosecutor's office to concentrate on other investigations that may end up on trial
Lexington	SC	X	X	X	
Austin	TX		X		
Ft. Worth	TX	X			
Roanoke City	VA				
Roanoke County	VA		X		

Chart II-3: Drug Court Benefits to Prosecutors

Name of Court	State	Oppor. for Tx &Rehab	Swift Sanc. in App. Cases	"No Tolerance" Policy	Efficient Use of Office Resources	Efficient Use of Comm'ty Resources	General Comm'ty Support	Other
Mobile	AL	X	X		X			
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ	X	X					
Bakersfield	CA							No known benefits
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	X	X		X			
Roseville	CA	X	X			X		
Salinas	CA	X						
San Bernardino	CA	X	X			X	X	Drugs are an element in 80% of all local crime. The program appears to be affecting recidivism rates and to be promoting an overall reduction in crime rates.
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Santa Ana	CA							N/A- We have not staffed the Drug Court full time until 1/97
Santa Barbara	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	X	X			X	X	
Stockton	CA							
Woodland/Yolo	CA	X		X	X	X	X	

Name of Court	State	Oppor. for Tx &Rehab	Swift Sanc. in App. Cases	"No Tolerance" Policy	Efficient Use of Office Resources	Efficient Use of Comm'ty Resources	General Comm'ty Support	Other
New Haven	CT		X			X		
Dover	DE	X	X		X			
Georgetown	DE	X	X	X				
Wilmington	DE	X	X	X	X		X	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL		X		X			
Gainesville	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Key West	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Miami	FL	X	X		X	X		
Sarasota	FL							
Tampa	FL	X			X			
Chicago	IL	X						
Markham	IL	X	X	X				
Lake Co.	IN	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Wichita	KS	X	X					
Louisville	KY	X						
Kalamazoo	MI	X	X		X		X	
St. Joseph	MI	X	X		X			
Kansas City	MO	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Warren Co.	NC							Too soon to tell what benefits will be derived
Camden	NJ	X	X		X	X	X	

Name of Court	State	Oppor. for Tx &Rehab	Swift Sanc. in App. Cases	"No Tolerance" Policy	Efficient Use of Office Resources	Efficient Use of Comm'ty Resources	General Comm'ty Support	Other
Newark	NJ	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Las Cruces	NM	X			X	X	X	
Las Vegas	NV							
Brooklyn	NY	X				X		
Suffolk	NY	X	X	X				
Hamilton	OH	X	X	X			X	
Logan Co.	OK	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Payne Co.	OK	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Grants Pass	OR	X	X	X	X		X	
Klammath Falls	OR	X	X			X	X	
Portland	OR	X			X	X		
Roseburg	OR	X	X	X	X			
Philadelphia	PA							
Carolina	PR	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Ponce	PR							
San Juan	PR			X				
Lexington	SC	X			X		X	
Austin	TX	X	X				X	
Ft. Worth	TX	X			X	X	X	
Roanoke City	VA		X					
Roanoke County	VA	X						

D. Relationship of Drug Court Program with Community Prosecution Activities

Seven (13%) of the responding prosecutors indicated that community prosecution programs had also been implemented in their jurisdictions and that these were coordinated, to varying degrees, with the drug court program. Since some of the respondents indicated they were not fully familiar with the concept of "community prosecution", the following definition was developed by the American Prosecutors Research Institute, which is the research and technical assistance affiliate of the National District Attorneys Association:

> *"Community prosecution focuses on targeted areas and involves a long-term, proactive partnership among the prosecutor's office, law enforcement, the community, and public and private organizations, whereby the authority of the prosecutors office is used to solve problems, improve public safety, and enhance the quality of life in the community."*[1]

E. Drug Caseload Activity Trends Since Drug Court Began

Over 80% of the prosecutors indicated that there did not appear to be any change in trends regarding arrests for drug possession and/or arrests for drug-related offenses since the drug court began. Twelve percent indicated arrests had decreased; six percent indicated they had increased.

III. Costs for Drug Court Program

A. Total Staff Dedicated to Drug Court

Chart II-4 illustrates the prosecutorial staff dedicated to the drug court in the reporting jurisdictions. Approximately one-third of the programs dedicate at least one full-time attorney to the drug court and approximately one third dedicate at least one part-time attorney. Approximately 25% dedicate one full-time support staff and an additional 40% dedicate at least one part-time support person. Two programs also use volunteers.

Chart II-4: Total Staff Dedicated to Drug Court

Name of Court	St.	Attorneys		Support		Volun-teers	Other	Hired for Drug Court Only	If yes: Specify
		FT	PT	FT	PT				
Mobile	AL		2	1					
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ		1					NO	
Bakersfield	CA								

[1] American Prosecutors Research Institute, National District Attorneys Association. *Community Prosecution Implementation Manual.* 1995.

Name of Court	St.	Attorneys		Support		Volun-teers	Other	Hired for Drug Court Only	If yes: Specify
		FT	PT	FT	PT				
Los Angeles Mun.	CA		2		1				
Roseville	CA		2		1	0		NO	
Salinas	CA		2					NO	
San Bernardino	CA		3		2	0		NO	
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA		1		2			NO	
Santa Ana	CA	1			1			NO	
Santa Barbara	CA		2		2				
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA		1	1				NO	
Stockton	CA		12				About 10 people handle cases that reach Drug Court, but it is not an increase in workload; 2 supervisors spend some time on it, over normal workload		
Woodland/ Yolo	CA		X		X			NO	
New Haven	CT		1					NO	
Dover	DE		1		1	0		NO	
Georgetown	DE		1		1	0		NO	
Wilmington	DE	8		7	2			YES	To assist in evaluating cases and witness contact
Ft. Lauderdale	FL		1		1			NO	
Gainesville	FL	1		1		0		NO	
Key West	FL	X						NO	

Name of Court	St.	Attorneys		Support		Volun-teers	Other	Hired for Drug Court Only	If yes: Specify
		FT	PT	FT	PT				
Miami	FL	1		1				NO	
Sarasota	FL							NO	
Tampa	FL	1		1		0		NO	
Chicago	IL		1						
Markham	IL	3		1					
Lake Co.	IN	1	1	2				YES	Yes all
Wichita	KS		1		1	0		YES	
Louisville	KY		1					NO	
Kalamazoo	MI		X					NO	
St. Joseph	MI	2			X				
Kansas City	MO	2		8	1	1		YES	All noted staff were hired especially for drug court
Warren Co.	NC		1						
Camden	NJ		X		X			NO	
Newark	NJ								
Las Cruces	NM	3		1				NO	
Las Vegas	NV								
Brooklyn	NY	1	3	1	1	1		YES	A court clerk position was created specifically for the Drug Court.
Suffolk	NY	1		1				NO	
Hamilton	OH	1		1					
Logan Co.	OK		2		2	0		NO	
Payne Co.	OK		2		2	0		NO	
Grants Pass	OR		1		3				

Name of Court	St.	Attorneys		Support		Volun-teers	Other	Hired for Drug Court Only	If yes: Specify
		FT	PT	FT	PT				
Klammath Falls	OR		1		2	0	Atty's handle a normal caseload in add. to drug court. Not dedic. staff.	NO	
Portland	OR	84		140		70+	Rape Victim Advocates-trained to serve on call to respond to requests to assist victims of sexual assault	YES	Legal intern who currently handles STOP program was hired specifically to do that job.
Roseburg	OR		1		1			NO	
Philadelphia	PA		1					NO	But staff will be hired for the full time court.
Carolina	PR	2			X	0		NO	
Ponce	PR			X		0		NO	
San Juan	PR	1	1				Prosecutors' office does not handle support nor volunteer staff.		
Lexington	SC	1		1				YES	Program Director and Administrative Asst. The Drug Court operates within the prosecutor's office.
Austin	TX		2			0			
Ft. Worth	TX		3		1				

Name of Court	St.	Attorneys		Support		Volun-teers	Other	Hired for Drug Court Only	If yes: Specify
		FT	PT	FT	PT				
Roanoke City	VA						Drug Prosec. assumed the additional duties of the drug court	NO	
Roanoke County	VA	5					All attorneys eval. case for appropriate candidates	NO	

B. Staff Hired Specially for the Drug Court

Six (12%) of the prosecutors' offices hired staff specifically for the drug court; the rest reassigned existing staff.

C. Program Costs

Approximately 20% of the reporting prosecutors indicated their offices had incurred additional costs to implement the drug court, ranging between $ 20,000 and $ 100,000 annually, primarily for dedicated attorneys and staff. Many noted, however, that these additional costs were offset by savings in other areas (see Section D below).

Chart II-5: Additional Costs Incurred by Prosecutors' Offices for Drug Court

Name of Court	State	Incur add $ to supp DC	App. $ to off. for Prog.	Purp. of $
Mobile	AL	NO		
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	YES	20,000	
Bakersfield	CA	NO		
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	NO		
Roseville	CA	NO		
Salinas	CA	NO		
San Bernardino	CA	NO		
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	YES	100,000	Attorney=$50,000 Two Clerks=$50,000
Santa Ana	CA			Hard to say-clearly a reallocation of resources
Santa Barbara	CA	YES	100,000	Staff shifted from other responsibilities. The $ figure is cost of redirected staff

Name of Court	State	Incur add $ to supp DC	App. $ to off. for Prog.	Purp. of $
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	NO		
Stockton	CA	NO		
Woodland/Yolo	CA	YES		Increases the number of court appearances.
New Haven	CT	NO		
Dover	DE	NO		
Georgetown	DE	NO		
Wilmington	DE	YES		
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	NO		
Gainesville	FL	NO		
Key West	FL	NO		
Miami	FL	NO		
Sarasota	FL			
Tampa	FL	NO		
Chicago	IL	NO		
Markham	IL	NO		
Lake Co.	IN	YES	168,779	
Wichita	KS	YES	40,000	Prosecutor salary, staff time and supplies.
Louisville	KY	YES	4,000	Part time prosecutor
Kalamazoo	MI	NO		
St. Joseph	MI	YES	63,000	Mostly salaries
Kansas City	MO	YES	1,000,000	staff, and all Tx services
Warren Co.	NC	NO		
Camden	NJ	YES	35,000	Salary for attorney and support staff
Newark	NJ	NO		
Las Cruces	NM	NO		
Reno	NV			
Brooklyn	NY	NO		
Suffolk	NY			
Hamilton	OH	YES	29,000	Salary and Benefits

Name of Court	State	Incur add $ to supp DC	App. $ to off. for Prog.	Purp. of $
Logan Co.	OK	NO		
Payne Co.	OK	NO		
Grants Pass	OR	NO		
Klammath Falls	OR	NO		
Portland	OR	YES	20,000	Salary for legal intern for STOP.
Roseburg	OR	NO		
Philadelphia	PA			
Carolina	PR	YES		
Ponce	PR	NO		
San Juan	PR	NO		
Lexington	SC	YES	70,000	Salaries
Austin	TX	NO		
Ft. Worth	TX	NO		
Roanoke City	VA	NO		
Roanoke County	VA	NO		

D. Savings Achieved

Prosecutors were asked to indicate any cost savings achieved as a result of the drug court. Their responses are summarized on Chart II-6 below. Over half of the respondents cited cost savings in terms of case preparation time for attorneys and over one-third cited savings in court appearance time for attorneys. Approximately 25% also cited savings in police overtime costs and grand jury costs. Several respondents noted that, because their programs were post-conviction, no significant savings accrued to the prosecutors' office. However, several also noted that, regardless of whether their programs were pre- or post-adjudication, savings were anticipated from reduced re-arrests of participants.

Chart II-6: Savings Achieved by Prosecutors' Offices as a Result of Drug Court

Name of Court	St	Attorney Case Prep. Time	Attorney Court App. Time	Police Overtime Costs	Grand Jury Costs	Other Costs	Other
Mobile	AL	X			X	X	
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ						No savings, all post filing

Name of Court	St	Attorney Case Prep. Time	Attorney Court App. Time	Police Overtime Costs	Grand Jury Costs	Other Costs	Other
Bakersfield	CA						No significant savings
Los Angeles Mun.	CA						
Roseville	CA			X		X	
Salinas	CA						
San Bernardino	CA	X		X		X	
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA			X		X	Cost of prosecuting the def. for re-arrests.
Santa Ana	CA						Too early to tell
Santa Barbara	CA	X					
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	X				X	
Stockton	CA						NO SAVINGS
Woodland/ Yolo	CA	X				X	
New Haven	CT						
Dover	DE	X	X				
Georgetown	DE						
Wilmington	DE	X	X	X		X	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL						Two attorney's salaries were eliminated.
Gainesville	FL	X	X			X	
Key West	FL	X	X	X		X	
Miami	FL						
Sarasota	FL						
Tampa	FL	X					

Name of Court	St	Attorney Case Prep. Time	Attorney Court App. Time	Police Overtime Costs	Grand Jury Costs	Other Costs	Other
Chicago	IL						Savings have been very minimal thus far based on number of cases currently in prog.
Markham	IL						None
Lake Co.	IN	X	X				
Wichita	KS						
Louisville	KY						
Kalamazoo	MI	X	X				
St. Joseph	MI	X					
Kansas City	MO	X	X		X	X	
Warren Co.	NC						No. The prog. just started- too soon to tell. Our prog. is post plea. The treatment prog. has not induced anyone to plead guilty who might otherwise want a trial.
Camden	NJ			X	X	X	
Newark	NJ		X				
Las Cruces	NM	X	X	X	X		
Las Vegas	NV						
Brooklyn	NY	X			X		
Suffolk	NY	X	X	X	X	X	
Hamilton	OH				X		Cases in Court Proceed by Info.
Logan Co.	OK	X	X	X		X	
Payne Co.	OK	X	X	X		X	
Grants Pass	OR	X	X	X	X	X	
Klammath Falls	OR	X	X		X		

Name of Court	St	Attorney Case Prep. Time	Attorney Court App. Time	Police Overtime Costs	Grand Jury Costs	Other Costs	Other
Portland	OR	X	X	X	X	X	
Roseburg	OR	X	X	X	X	X	
Philadelphia	PA						
Carolina	PR	X	X	X	X	X	
Ponce	PR						
San Juan	PR	X					
Lexington	SC						
Austin	TX	X	X		X		
Ft. Worth	TX	X	X				
Roanoke City	VA						No savings noted
Roanoke Co.	VA	X	X				

IV. Program Implementation/operational Issues

A. Most Serious Problems Encountered as a Result of Drug Court and Strategies Used to Resolve Them

Prosecutors were asked to identify the most serious problems they had encountered in designing or implementing the drug court and to describe the strategies used to resolve these problems. Their responses follow:

Name of Court	St.	Serious Problems	Resolution
Mobile	AL	Initial police reluctance & some judicial reluctance	Police now generally pleased with results
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	There has been no great resource saving because its post filing	We are looking at pre-filing
Bakersfield	CA		
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	If a participant fails in the drug court program and the case is set for preliminary hearing, then the case is already old; jeopardizing memory of the incident by the witnesses	
Roseville	CA	Concern about outcomes Concern about number of persons not completing	Discussion about tracking Discussion about definitions

Name of Court	St.	Serious Problems	Resolution
Salinas	CA	Time commitment for court proceedings	Ongoing discussion
San Bernardino	CA	Convincing law enforcement and our own staff of the efficacy of the program.	Participation in setting up the program. Letting the program prove itself and getting the word out.
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	Quality and availability of the treatment programs.	We make selective referrals and are in the process of requiring minimum standards, criminal background checks and intensive monitoring of all programs.
Santa Ana	CA	Eligibility criteria as it relates to residency requirements	Strict adherence to the requirements
Santa Barbara	CA	Determining eligibility	Discussions at core meetings or by consulting staff in Washington, D.C.
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	The implementation of the Drug Court program reduced by one the number of courts available to handle misdemeanor prosecutions. As a result, the remaining courts felt an increased misdemeanor case-load as a result of the creation of this program.	Not completely resolved
Stockton	CA	1) Ineligible defendants sent to program, 2) Judges not imposing suspended time for failures (i.e., re-referred defendant's)	In both cases talked with involved people (including our own staffers). These problems were minor and rare
Woodland/Yolo	CA	Staffing additional court appearances.	Consolidate all calendars to reduce the number of attorneys appearing at one time.
New Haven	CT	Time management to allow attorney to deal with staff	
Dover	DE	We have not had any major problems in implementing the program.	
Georgetown	DE		
Wilmington	DE	M.E.'s turn around time, scheduling witnesses; paperwork; and cases that are "closed" at ongoing times in the process	Yes
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	None	
Gainesville	FL	1) Funding 2) Acceptance	Funding is an on going issue however through exposure and results acceptance has been forthcoming.

Name of Court	St.	Serious Problems	Resolution
Key West	FL	Unsuccessful candidates are being placed back on the docket, months to a year after the arrest, making cases more difficult to prove by the state.	No way to resolve
Miami	FL	I think the most serious problem is to not go with an adversarial attitude.	One has to realize that if the defendants get clean they don't get re-arrested.
Sarasota	FL		
Tampa	FL	The age of cases that have come back to the regular court system that have been terminated from PTI after 6 months or longer.	Still working to resolve.
Chicago	IL	Less probation officers are available to handle other types of cases where supervision is needed.	We have requested more staff.
Markham	IL	No significant problems.	
Lake Co.	IN	Programs just implemented September 18, 1996. Yet to face serious problems.	
Wichita	KS	Trying to track progress of participants.	We are attempting to purchase data management software.
Louisville	KY	Reluctance of police to participate in referrals of defendants	We asked that they recommend the least promising candidates
Kalamazoo	MI	Lack of acceptance by law enforcement	Time and education about the program have helped.
St. Joseph	MI	Due to the "fast track" procedure, judges are loathe to adjourn case. This hurts when dets are willing to cooperate with the police. Also, complicated cases (multi dets conspiracies etc.) throw the system off track.	
Kansas City	MO		
Warren Co.	NC	Getting the program started was very difficult because our original program manager could not get things organized. The problem was resolved by hiring another manager. Our most serious problem since we have (finally) started is that we cannot drug test clients frequently enough, and we cannot test them on the right days (immediately after pay day).	Problem not resolved yet

Name of Court	St.	Serious Problems	Resolution
Camden	NJ	Identifying the appropriate target population of defendants to allow into the program.	It is still an ongoing and evolving process
Newark	NJ		
Las Cruces	NM	Lack of communication between DA and Drug Court	New DA who fully supports this program
Las Vegas	NV		
Brooklyn	NY		
Suffolk	NY	N/A	
Hamilton	OH		
Logan Co.	OK	Making sure attorneys utilize it when plea bargaining	
Payne Co.	OK	[See note above] Payne County and Logan County share Drug Courts.	
Grants Pass	OR	Developing procedures to handle different paper flow	
Klammath Falls	OR	Communication between treatment providers and the DA's Office.	Simply talked about problem at a group meeting and arranged a method to exchange info.
Portland	OR	Money problems with Tx provider	
Roseburg	OR	We did not encounter any significant problems.	
Philadelphia	PA		
Carolina	PR	Convincing defense attorneys about the scope of benefits of the Drug Court Program as opposed to the benefits offered by others programs (i.e. TASC)	By holding follow-up meetings
Ponce	PR		
San Juan	PR	Although police department is not a Drug Court component in our jurisdiction, their policies regarding drug use intervention affects the resources destined to participants.	Drug related intervention should be controlled or coordinated with prosecutor's offices in order to impact effectively different consumer groups.
Lexington	SC		
Austin	TX	Not able to engage the target population -- under representation of minority offenders. Lack of coordination between court and treatment.	Ongoing issue

Name of Court	St.	Serious Problems	Resolution
Ft. Worth	TX	Our Office has not encountered any problems as a result of the implementation of our program.	
Roanoke City	VA	The Roanoke Valley may not be large enough to supply a sufficient number of addicted, non-violent offenders	The issue is being studied
Roanoke County	VA	Finding suitable candidates for the program	The eligibility criteria has been relaxed somewhat

B. Most Significant Benefits to Prosecutors' Offices Resulting from Drug Court

Prosecutors were asked to identify the most significant benefits that had resulted for their offices as a result of the drug court. Their responses follow:

Name of Court	State	Significant Benefits
Mobile	AL	reduction of circuit court trials, reduction of Grand Jury resources
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	None for our office but there are benefits to probation department and defendants
Bakersfield	CA	
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	Fewer number of drug cases to prosecute
Roseville	CA	If successful, we will reduce recidivism
Salinas	CA	Nothing noteworthy
San Bernardino	CA	Both our Drug Diversion and Non State Prison Prosecutions had little or no rehabilitation component. Nor did the system have the ability to impose any meaningful sanctions. It cave the system credibility.
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	The high rate of success by the defendants remaining drug and crime free for one year. Not only the savings from re-arrests, but the hope that the person will continue to lead a crime free life style.
Santa Ana	CA	Too early to tell
Santa Barbara	CA	Faster sanctions improve the incentive for defendants to stay off drugs
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	Enhanced public esteem, better communication with jail custodial staff, and an increased likelihood that Drug Court graduates will not re-offend.
Stockton	CA	Reduction in requests by defense for programs for thieves, sellers, etc.
Woodland/Yolo	CA	Court provides a credible local drug program
New Haven	CT	Swift resolution and disposition on cases.
Dover	DE	Removal from the ordinary trial track of numerous misdemeanor drug cases which tended to "clog" the system.

Name of Court	State	Significant Benefits
Georgetown	DE	The ability to provide intensive treatment to the addicted.
Wilmington	DE	Case load reduction; expediting case resolutions; enhancing treatment-w/greater sanctions
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	1. Reduction in salary costs 2. Removal of simple drug cases from other Judges allows those Judge to have more time for trials
Gainesville	FL	1) Flexibility to handle drug related cases more efficiently. 2) Lower jail population. 3) Filling an important need in the community.
Key West	FL	reduction in cases that have been successfully completed, reduction in recidivism
Miami	FL	To lower the recidivism rate of arrests
Sarasota	FL	
Tampa	FL	The ability to resolve Drug Court cases in a short period of time.
Chicago	IL	Getting juveniles off drug and into positive activities.
Markham	IL	We were able to track repeat offenders more closely and when they are violated, they are dealt with quickly.
Lake Co.	IN	We anticipate that drug and drug related crime will decrease as participants are rehabilitated and the cycle of drug abuse and the crime which supports it is broken. In turn, this should decrease new arrests and charges.
Wichita	KS	Drug case dealt with as more serious.
Louisville	KY	Seeing addicts graduate into productive members of our community
Kalamazoo	MI	Fewer cases going through regular court docket
St. Joseph	MI	All drug cases have been centralized in the hands of two APA's with prior drug court experience. Spotting issues and potential problems is therefore easier.
Kansas City	MO	
Warren Co.	NC	There has been no significant benefit to my office yet.
Camden	NJ	Too early in the program to determine
Newark	NJ	There are apparent results.
Las Cruces	NM	Willingness of court, public defender, and drug court staff to schedule time on the docket to hear these cases on one or two days/month
Las Vegas	NV	
Brooklyn	NY	
Suffolk	NY	Alternative method of prosecution where warranted

Name of Court	State	Significant Benefits
Hamilton	OH	We are helping those who want treatment- gaining jail space for those who should be incarcerated.
Logan Co.	OK	It has offered an alternative sentencing that has proven results in rehabilitation.
Payne Co.	OK	
Grants Pass	OR	Attorney time savings in areas of Grand Jury, court appearances and file work-up
Klammath Falls	OR	Reduction in time spent on Grand Jury and "traditional" court appearances.
Portland	OR	By using one legal intern to oversee the program and the hundreds of cases in the program, it frees up a DA to handle other cases.
Roseburg	OR	Savings...in time and money. Drug Court has eliminated the need for grand jury, motions to suppress atrial for Drug Court cases.
Philadelphia	PA	
Carolina	PR	Prosecutors have more time to prepare for other cases; it has become easier to assess the rehabilitation of the individual who has been accepted into the program; court costs and appearances have decreased.
Ponce	PR	
San Juan	PR	Creates a better environment of understanding of prosecutors role. Soften public opinion on traditional procedural approach to felony charges related to drug abuse.
Lexington	SC	
Austin	TX	Success of individuals now living drug free; prosecutors able to obtain a new perspective on significant issues.
Ft. Worth	TX	Better and more immediate treatment and rehabilitation for drug-abusing offenders
Roanoke City	VA	Drug Court participants appear to find and maintain employment at a higher rate than regular probationers.
Roanoke County	VA	No direct benefits- it is too early to tell if the recidivism rate is a success

C. Unanticipated Issues Arising for Prosecutors' Offices and Strategies Used to Resolve Them

Prosecutors were asked to identify the unanticipated issues that have arisen since the drug court became operational and the strategies used to address these issues. Their responses follow:

Name of Court	St.	Unanticipated Issues	Resolution
Mobile	AL		
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	none	
Bakersfield	CA		
Los Angeles Mun.	CA		
Roseville	CA	Issue of UA tests not being witnessed	Agreement from treatment/case managers to witness all tests
Salinas	CA		
San Bernardino	CA	It was more attorney intensive than we had anticipated. Lots of court time. Little prep time.	Reduced appearances. Found that attendance at progress reviews not necessary.
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	Time consuming for attorney and clerical because we take hard core defendants with multiple cases. We monitor the criminal histories to include all outstanding cases and assure the defendant has not been re-arrested.	Assigned additional staff time.
Santa Ana	CA	Change in the Drug Diversion Statutes that took effect 1-97	The reconfiguration of forms, procedures to deal with the new statute
Santa Barbara	CA	The amount of time spent to run the program	Afternoon custodies passed to another court- thus another D.A. must handle
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	Time management. Our office under-estimated the amount of time that would be required to participate in Drug Court. For a prosecutor, it is more labor-intensive than it appears.	Spend the time to do the job
Stockton	CA	No	
Woodland/Yolo	CA		
New Haven	CT	Increased number of files in other courts requesting transfers.	Set policy to encourage dispositions without transfer of files.
Dover	DE	We have not had any major prob.	
Georgetown	DE		
Wilmington	DE	Coordinating flow of cover; assuring witness availability; closing cases at appropriate points	Yes
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	none	

Name of Court	St.	Unanticipated Issues	Resolution
Gainesville	FL	When we started we did not know how the Public Defender and the Defense Bar would react to the concept but we knew we would need their support to be effective.	We presented the concept as a viable alternative to traditional prosecution and they were able to see the benefits to their clients.
Key West	FL	none to mention. Authority taken away from state in that their approval was not required for program placement	hasn't been resolved
Miami	FL		
Sarasota	FL		
Tampa	FL		
Chicago	IL	Minors lying about drug use in order to get into the program if they are in jeopardy of jail time if convicted.	It hasn't yet been resolved.
Markham	IL	None.	
Lake Co.	IN		
Wichita	KS		
Louisville	KY	hiring and firing of staff for drug court was difficult because of labor relations questions when Drug court was under umbrella of previous agency	Our governing body (fiscal court) transferred Drug Court County Attorney's Office
Kalamazoo	MI	N/A	
St. Joseph	MI		
Kansas City	MO		
Warren Co.	NC	Program includes misdemeanants. I am having some trouble weeding out the district court cases because of scheduling conflicts and the nature of District Court	Problem has not been resolved but I am trying to look at District Court calender ahead of time.
Camden	NJ	None	
Newark	NJ		
Las Cruces	NM	Difficulties Drug Court had with their fiscal agent (the county) hindered continuity of the program-county having no knowledge of Drug Court Concepts	We continue, through the Drug Court, and Public Defender, to provide data and information to the County

Name of Court	St.	Unanticipated Issues	Resolution
Las Vegas	NV		
Brooklyn	NY		
Suffolk	NY	N/A	
Hamilton	OH	N/A	
Logan Co.	OK	That the defendants' attorneys would resist it because of the discipline it mandates from the clients.	The Defense Attorneys have seen the value and good results from the program.
Payne Co.	OK		
Grants Pass	OR	Glitches in paper flow & procedure	
Klammath Falls	OR		
Portland	OR	Disputes over policies re: eligibility criteria	
Roseburg	OR	Issues which have arisen tend to be either philosophical or procedural.	We meet as a team and attempt to reach consensus.
Philadelphia	PA		
Carolina	PR	Integrating some of the benefits of the Drug Court Program into existing applicable statutes. For example, whether a participant of the Program who abandons the court directed rehabilitation appointments should be charged with Flight and, thus, incarcerated without additional opportunity in participating in the Program.	By conducting follow-up meetings
Ponce	PR		
San Juan	PR	Criticism among defense lawyers related to prosecutors inflexibility to work out plea bargain to reduce the offence charged to a lesser offence when both offences qualify to the rehabilitation program. Defenders want to benefit their clients of a lesser sentence in the event a participant leave the rehabilitation program and choose to be sentenced.	A uniform Department of Justice policy have been solicited to the Justice Secretary regarding this issue
Lexington	SC		

Name of Court	St.	Unanticipated Issues	Resolution
Austin	TX	Clerical time necessary, frustration in maintaining consistency. Now people with prior criminal histories and addiction get cases dismissed. Defs. who are not addicted yet have no criminal history are convicted.	Still unresolved
Ft. Worth	TX	No unanticipated issues have arisen	
Roanoke City	VA		
Roanoke County	VA		

D. Advice to Colleagues

Prosecutors were asked to indicate any guidance they might offer to prosecutorial colleagues in other jurisdictions whose jurisdictions were contemplating the implementation of a drug court. The following are their responses:

Name of Court	State	Advice
Mobile	AL	Careful coordination with law enforcement re benefits to them from defendant's's participation
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	Look to Pretrial diversion as opposed to post-filing
Bakersfield	CA	
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	
Roseville	CA	
Salinas	CA	Enter plea at commencement of drug court
San Bernardino	CA	Involve and maintain participation of law enforcement in planning and implementation. It is critical to employ only the best people available for treatment and monitoring. They make or break the program.
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	Fully support and participate in the planning process and have regular meetings after implementation.
Santa Ana	CA	Proceed slowly, devote ample times to work out procedures and polices that will allow the program
Santa Barbara	CA	Be prepared- it's very time consuming
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	Find a prosecutor and a public defender who can get along. Ego-heavy trial jocks need not apply. Cooperation is the name of the game
Stockton	CA	Want to make program simple and efficient
Woodland/Yolo	CA	Meet with the court, defense and service providers to describe and plan for the court. Continue to meet to work out problems

Name of Court	State	Advice
New Haven	CT	Set clear guidelines and follow them closely.
Dover	DE	Go ahead and do it. The only caveat I have is that no one, as far as I know, has yet attempted any follow-u[to evaluate the long-term substantive effectiveness of the program - - i.e., rates of recidivism.
Georgetown	DE	
Wilmington	DE	Proper modeling will ensure general acceptance among prosecutor and police
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Begin by limiting program to first-time simple possession offenders
Gainesville	FL	1) Observe other drug courts already up and running. 2) Put together a team that believes in the concept and one that can be flexible. 3) Consistency of staff.
Key West	FL	Would recommend the cooperation with the implementation. The DC program allows the state to channel resources to spend more time prosecuting violent offenses.
Miami	FL	As a prosecutor, one has to realize the purpose of Drug Court is to get the defendants off drugs so they don't commit more crimes.
Sarasota	FL	
Tampa	FL	Staff the program with personnel that will remain with the program for 1 year or more for continuity.
Chicago	IL	Make sure it is properly staffed. It is critical to have a job training component to the program.
Markham	IL	Pre-trial service screening at initial court appearance/bond hearing provides drug court with necessary information concerning the defendant's fitness for the program.
Lake Co.	IN	Dedicate one person who will attend all meetings & prosecute all calls.
Wichita	KS	Have data management program in place at onset.
Louisville	KY	DO IT
Kalamazoo	MI	Involve ALL parts of justice system to increase chances of support
St. Joseph	MI	If possible, get a strong judge who doesn't nit pick, and defense attorneys who are cooperative (e.g. one's who realize that some clients' interests may be best served by focusing on rehabilitation rather than taking every case to trial).
Kansas City	MO	
Warren Co.	NC	Hire an ORGANIZED program manager
Camden	NJ	Prior to starting the program have both in-patient and out-patient treatment providers on board and a well-defined criteria for success or failure of participants.

Name of Court	State	Advice
Newark	NJ	
Las Cruces	NM	All key stakeholders have input and communication remain strong and continuous
Las Vegas	NV	
Brooklyn	NY	
Suffolk	NY	Careful screening of eligible participants
Hamilton	OH	Carefully select and secure funding for treatment before you become operational
Logan Co.	OK	To review, study and attend a program that has been successful.
Payne Co.	OK	
Grants Pass	OR	You cannot anticipate everything. At some point (sooner than later) you just have to start
Klammath Falls	OR	Devote one or two attorneys to be heavily involved, rather than rotate an "attorney du jour".
Portland	OR	Limit program to possession cases. Have defendant plead guilty and defer sentencing as condition of entry into program. Have specific eligibility criteria.
Roseburg	OR	Just Start! Don't worry about the maintenance of setting up a program. Once you begin, the faults resolve themselves.
Philadelphia	PA	
Carolina	PR	Coordinate efforts among the different government agencies and com'ty groups in order to establish an effective Drug Court Program.
Ponce	PR	
San Juan	PR	Watch participants that may be using the program as a way to avoid non-ambulatory rehabilitation programs.
Lexington	SC	
Austin	TX	Pay for an infrastructure, staff support is crucial.
Ft. Worth	TX	Prosecutors should actively participate in the implementation and operation of the drug court programs
Roanoke City	VA	Prevent the Drug Court from becoming the program of last resort when defendants fail other programs
Roanoke County	VA	start small

E. Improvements Suggested

Prosecutors were also asked to offer suggestions for improving the drug court program. Their responses follow:

Name of Court	State	Improvements Suggested
Mobile	AL	additional availability of in-patient treatment options alternative interim punishment options such as community service better managed
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	have program prefiling
Bakersfield	CA	
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	Change it to a post-plea program or at least have participants waive preliminary hearing to be admitted to the program. All parties should get copies of progress reports, not just defense and the judge.
Roseville	CA	
Salinas	CA	New deferred entry of judgement statute is helpful
San Bernardino	CA	Due to frequent meetings of the team, I believe we are in close agreement as to procedures and program content.
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	
Santa Ana	CA	to early to tell
Santa Barbara	CA	Implement Post Plea program and ease some of the eligibility requirements (i.e. allow some flexibility with decade old 242 criminal history)
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	Part of the District Attorney's responsibility has been record-keeping. I have developed a Macintosh based data base which can provide statistics on short notice. A comparable system might be used in the Windows world, if a similar program exists there.
Stockton	CA	Drug Court personnel tend to try to (a) make program more elaborate & (b) get involved in programming *'s rather than staying within bureaucratic mandate
Woodland/Yolo	CA	Provide funds to maintain and expand drug court and to prevent the loss of resources to other prosecution needs.
New Haven	CT	Be selective and hold firm to sentencing agreements.
Dover	DE	
Georgetown	DE	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	We need increased funding for the probation departments to allow them to purchase a urine testing machine

Name of Court	State	Improvements Suggested
Gainesville	FL	I would like to see our program expand to include drug related cases in county court for example, 1) prostitution, 2) possession of cannabis - 20 grams.
Key West	FL	Statute change to include State Attorney approval of all cases
Miami	FL	More residential beds, preferably secure where the defendants can't walk away
Sarasota	FL	
Tampa	FL	None at this time.
Chicago	IL	Add more staff and a job training component.
Markham	IL	More probation officers to monitor the drug court participants more closely.
Lake Co.	IN	Program too new to comment.
Wichita	KS	
Louisville	KY	More vocational/educational component
Kalamazoo	MI	Some small logistics have been changed. Nothing of any substance or importance
St. Joseph	MI	
Kansas City	MO	
Warren Co.	NC	Too soon to tell-
Camden	NJ	Must streamline application procedures, must more clearly define what a success or a failure is, must clarify procedures whereby the terms and conditions of the program are explained to participants.
Newark	NJ	
Las Cruces	NM	Funding for this program should be provided at a state level, preferably through the courts
Las Vegas	NV	
Brooklyn	NY	
Suffolk	NY	If a defendant fails to appear for court or treatment a warrant is issued, the need for immediate execution of that warrant is required to keep defendants off the street
Hamilton	OH	Proceed slowly- also keep local media up to speed- this is always greeted favorably by news people.
Logan Co.	OK	NONE
Payne Co.	OK	
Grants Pass	OR	

Name of Court	State	Improvements Suggested
Klammath Falls	OR	
Portland	OR	(see "advice" above)
Roseburg	OR	As clients progress in treatment dealing with addiction issues their lives become more stable. At this point they could benefit from educational and vocational opportunities. As they become more "stable" citizens (ie: with a stable job) I believe they have a greater chance of remaining sober. Unfortunately, we do not have the resources for such programs.
Philadelphia	PA	
Carolina	PR	Increase the sanctions in those cases where the defendant voluntarily incurs in violations of the conditions imposed by the Drug Court Judge.
Ponce	PR	
San Juan	PR	Intern rehabilitation programs should be created to treat participants with severe drug dependence. Actual rehabilitation approach may not be effective to those groups and may affect resources of the program.
Lexington	SC	
Austin	TX	Written procedures and regular mandatory board or team meetings.
Ft. Worth	TX	none
Roanoke City	VA	
Roanoke County	VA	The court needs to develop a mechanism to encourage more defense attorneys to refer their clients

APPENDIX

Individuals to Contact for Further Information

Name of Court	St	Name	Agency	Address	Telephone	Fax
Mobile	AL	Nicki E. Patterson	District Attorneys Office	Suite C-501, 205 Government Street Mobile, AL 36644-2501	334-690-8400	334-694-3311
Scottsdale	AZ	James Blake	Maricopa Co Attorney's Office	301 West Jefferson, 7th Floor Phoenix, AZ 85003	602-506-1159	602-506-8103
Bakersfield	CA	T. Daniel Sparks	Kern County District Attorney	1215 Truxtun Ave Bakersfield, CA 93301		
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	Debra Starr	Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office	210 West Temple Street Los Angeles, CA 90012	213-974-3856	
Roseville	CA	Scott Owen	Placer County District Attorney	11562 B Avenue Auburn, CA 95603	916-889-7000	916-889-7129
Salinas	CA	Carolyn Keeley	Monterey County District Attorney	Box 1369 Salinas, CA 93902	408-755-5070	408-755-5068
San Bernardino	CA	James B. Hackleman	San Bernardino County District Attorney	316 N. Mountain View Avenue San Bernardino, CA 92415	909-387-6454	909-387-6444
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	Janet Cartwright	District Attorney's Office, Santa Clara County	70 W. Hedding Street, West Wing San Jose, California 95110	408-299-3169	408-286-5437
Santa Ana	CA	Joe Nedza	Orange County District Attorney	700 Civic Center Drive West Santa Ana, CA 92701	714-834-3648	714-834-3962
Santa Barbara	CA	Jerald F. McBeth DDA	Santa Barbara D.A's Office: Santa Maria Office	312 E. Cook Street, #D Santa Maria, CA 93454	805-346-7523	805-346-788
Santa Maria	CA	Lee Carter	Santa Barbara District Attorney's Office	1105 Santa Barbara Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101	805-568-2300	

Name of Court	St	Name	Agency	Address	Telephone	Fax
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	Bruce G. Enos, Deputy District Attorney	Sonoma County District Attorney's Office	Hall of Justice, Room 212-J, 600 Administration Drive Santa Rosa, CA 95403	707-522-6137	707-527-2762
Stockton	CA	David Wellenbrock	San Joaquin County District Attorney's Office	222 E. Weber, #200 Stockton, CA 95202	209-468-2317	209-465-0371
Woodland/ Yolo	CA	Robert L. Day	Yolo County District Attorney	204 Fourth Street Woodland, CA 95695	916-666-8180	916-666-8185
New Haven	CT	Robyn Stewart Johnson	State Attorney's Office	121 Elm Street New Haven, CT 06510	203-789-7455	203-789-7871
Dover	DE	Stephen Welch, Deputy A.G.	Delaware Department of Justice, Kent County	45 The Green Sykes Building Dover, DE 19901	302-739-4211	302-739-6727
Georgetown	DE	Stephanie Tsantes	Department of Justice, State of Delaware	114 E. Market Street Georgetown, DE 19947	302-856-5353	302-856-5369
Wilmington	DE	Peter N. Letaig Esq.	Department of Justice Carvel State Office Building	9th and French Streets Wilmington, DE	302-577-8805	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	James M. DeHart	Office of the State Attorney	201 S.E. 6th Street, Court House Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301	954-831-7979	954-831-7321
Gainesville	FL	Walter M. Green	State Attorneys Office	120 W. University Avenue Gainesville, FL 32601	352-374-3670	352-491-4553
Key West	FL	Manuel Madruiga	Monroe County State Attorney's Office	3023 Flemming Street Key West, FL 33040	305-292-3400	
Miami	FL	Blanca Torrents Greenwood	State Attorney's Office	1350 NW 12 Avenue Miami, FL 33136	305-547-0690	305-547-0144
Sarasota	FL	Earl Moreland	State Attorney	2071 Ringling Blvd. 4th Floor Sarasota, FL 34237	941-951-5400	941-951-5449
Tampa	FL	Robert Shimberg	State Attorneys Office	800 E. Kennedy Blvd. Tampa, FL 33602	813-272-5400	

Name of Court	St	Name	Agency	Address	Telephone	Fax
Macon	GA	Kimberly S. Schwartz	Office of the District Attorney, Macon Judicial Circuit-Narcotics Division	3rd Floor, Grand Building, 661 Mulberry Street Macon, GA 31201	912-749-6626	912-749-6418
Chicago	IL	Lori Woefson	Cook County State's Attorney's Office	1100 South Hamilton, 6th Floor Chicago, IL 60612		
Markham	IL	Charles A. Boskey	Cook County State's Attorney's Office	16501 S. Kedzie Parkway Markham, IL 60426	708-210-4060	708-210-4053
Lake Co.	IN	Bernard A. Carter	Lake County Prosecutor's Office	2293 North Main Street Crown Point, IN 46307	219-755-3720	219-755-3860
Wichita	KS	Bruce Brown	City Attorneys Office	455 N. Main Wichita, KS 67202	316-268-4569	
Louisville	KY	Larry Osterhage	Jefferson County Attorney's Office	10th Floor Fiscal Court Building, 531 Court Place Louisville, KY 40202	502-589-1252	502-585-7177
Kalamazoo	MI	Carrie L. Klein	Prosecutor's Office	227 W. Michigan Ave. Kalamazoo, MI 49007	616-383-8900	616-383
St. Joseph	MI	Mark Sanford	Berrien Country Prosecutors Office	811 Port Street St. Joseph, MI 49085	616-983-7111	616-983-5757
Warren Co.	NC	Susan M. Thompson	District Attorney's Office	P.O. 333 Warrenton, NC 27589		
Camden	NJ	Sally M. Smith, Asst. Prosecutor	Camden County Prosecutor's Office	25 North 5th Street Camden, NJ 08103	609-225-8400	609-963-0010
Las Cruces	NM	Susana Martinez	Third Judicial District Attorney	201 W. Picacho, Suite B Las Cruces, NM 88005	505-524-6370	505-524-6379
Las Vegas	NV	Barter G. Pale	Clark County District Attorney	200 S. Third Street, P.O. Box 552212 Las Vegas, NV 89155-2212	702-455-4799	702-455-5597

Name of Court	St	Name	Agency	Address	Telephone	Fax
Brooklyn	NY	A.D.A. Erica Perel	Kings County District Attorney's Office	210 Joralemon Street, 3rd Floor Brooklyn, NY 11201	718-250-2187	
Suffolk	NY	James M. Cattersen, Jr.	Suffolk County District Attorney	North Complex, Veterans Memorial Highway Hauppaiye, NY 11788	516-853-4170	
Hamilton	OH	Tom Kelly	Hamilton County Prosecutor's Office	Room 411, 1000 Main Street Cincinnati, OH 45202	513-632-7323	513-632-2229
Logan Co.	OK	Robert L. Hudson	District Attorney - Ninth Judicial District	606 South Husband, Room 214 Stillwater, OK 74074	405-372-4883	405-372-4590
Grants Pass	OR	Scott Titzler	Josephine Co. District Attorney's office	Josephine County Courthouse Grants Pass, OR 97526	541-474-5200	541-474-5201
Klammath Falls	OR	Michael A. Frome	Klammath Co. District Attorney's Office	3300 Vanderberg Rd. Klammath Falls, OR 97603	541-883-5147	541-883-5107
Portland	OR	Gary Meabe	Multnomah Co. District Attorney's Office	1021 SW Fourth Avenue, Room 600 Portland, OR 97204-1193	503-248-5028	503-248-3947
Roseburg	OR	Rick Wesenberg	Douglas Co. District Attorney's Office	P.O. Box 1006 Roseburg, OR 97470	541-440-4388	541-440-4403
Philadelphia	PA	George D. Mosee, Jr. Dep. D.A.	Philadelphia District Attorney's Office	1421 Arch Street Philadelphia, PA 19102	215-686-5801	215-686-5859
San Juan	PR	Obdulio Melendez Ramos, District Attorney, Carlos M. Calderon Garnier, Assistant District Attorney	District Attorney Office of Arecibo, Department of Justice	P.O. Box 1236 Arecibo, PR 00613	787-878-0554	787-880-4144

Name of Court	St	Name	Agency	Address	Telephone	Fax
Austin	TX	LaRu Woody	Travis County D.A.		512-473-9400	512-473-9695
Ft. Worth	TX	Bill Koos	T.C.N.I.C.U.	300 West Belknap, Fourth Floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196-0255		
City of Salem	VA	M. Fredrick King	Salem Commonwealth's Attorney's Office	2 East Calhoun St. Salem, VA 24153	540-375-3041	540-375-4041
Roanoke City	VA	Dennis E. Nagel	Special Drug Prosecutor, Roanoke City's Commonwealth's Attorneys Office	315 Church Avenue Roanoke, VA 24016	540-981-2626	540-224-3045
Roanoke County	VA	Frands W. Burkant III	Roanoke County Commonwealth Attorney	305 East Main Street Salem, VA 24153	540-387-6174	540-387-6065

PART III: PERSPECTIVES OF DEFENSE COUNSEL

PART III: PERSPECTIVES OF DEFENSE COUNSEL

I. Introduction

Survey responses were received from defense attorneys associated with 48 different drug courts in 22 states and Puerto Rico. All of these attorneys were either public defenders or private attorneys performing contract defense services for the local drug court. Their responses are presented in the following sections of this report.

II. Program Effectiveness

A. Criteria Being Used to Assess Effectiveness of Drug Court

Defense counsel were requested to indicate the criteria they are using to assess the effectiveness of the drug court in their jurisdictions. As Chart III-I illustrates, respondents were in very close agreement that all of the following criteria were important indicia of the effectiveness of the drug court:

- the degree to which defendants were afforded adequate opportunity to consult with counsel regarding the implications of program participation
- the degree to which defendants have their legal rights protected
- the degree to which attorneys have adequate opportunity to provide effective legal counsel to their clients
- participants' attendance at treatment sessions
- participants' attendance at court status hearings
- urinalysis results
- recidivism, both drug and non-drug related
- employment status of participants

Chart III-1: Criteria Being Used to Assess Drug Court Effectiveness

Name of Court	St.	Counsel Provide Effective Legal Assistance	Defendants Make Informed Decision Regarding Program Entry	Defendants Rights are not Jeopardized
Mobile	AL	X	X	X
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	X		X
Bakersfield	CA	X	X	X
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA			
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	X	X	X
Roseville	CA	X	X	

Name of Court	St.	Counsel Provide Effective Legal Assistance	Defendants Make Informed Decision Regarding Program Entry	Defendants Rights are not Jeopardized
San Bernardino	CA			
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	X	X	X
Santa Ana	CA	X	X	X
Santa Barbara	CA	X	X	X
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	X	X	X
Stockton	CA		X	X
Woodland/Yolo	CA			
Georgetown	DE	X	X	X
Wilmington	DE	X	X	X
Gainesville	FL	X	X	X
Jacksonville	FL	X	X	X
Key West	FL	X	X	X
Miami	FL	X	X	X
Sarasota	FL	X	X	X
Tampa	FL	X	X	X
Honolulu	HI	X	X	X
Chicago	IL		X	
Markham	IL			X
Lake Co.	IN	X	X	X
Wichita	KS		X	
Boston	MA			
Kalamazoo	MI			X
St. Joseph	MI		X	
Warren Co.	NC	X	X	X
Camden	NJ	X	X	X
Newark	NJ		X	X
Las Cruces	NM	X	X	X
Las Vegas	NV			
Brooklyn	NY	X	X	X

Name of Court	St.	Counsel Provide Effective Legal Assistance	Defendants Make Informed Decision Regarding Program Entry	Defendants Rights are not Jeopardized
Rochester	NY		X	X
Suffolk	NY	X	X	X
Hamilton	OH	X	X	X
Logan Co.	OK	X	X	X
Payne Co.	OK	X	X	X
Eugene	OR	X	X	X
Grants Pass	OR	X	X	
Klammath Falls	OR	X	X	X
Portland	OR	X	X	X
Roseburg	OR	X	X	X
Philadelphia	PA			
San Juan	PR	X	X	
Lexington	SC	X	X	X
Austin	TX	X	X	X
Ft. Worth	TX			
Roanoke	VA	X		

B. Impact of Drug Court on Indigent Defense Office's Capability to Handle Criminal Caseload/Functions

Defense counsel were asked to indicate the impact of the drug court on their office's capability to handle its criminal caseload. Over half of the attorneys cited the benefits of increased contact which their offices had with other justice agencies. Twenty-five percent also cited the benefit of coordination between their office and community groups. Twenty percent also noted that the program had freed up attorneys to handle other cases. Several also noted increased familiarity of staff about substance abuse and its impact on their clients.

Chart III-2: Impact of Drug Court on Indigent Defense Office's Capability to Handle Criminal Caseload/Functions

Name of Court	ST	Attorneys Avail. for Other Cases	Contact w/Other Criminal Justice Agencies	Coord. w/ Comm'ty Groups	Other
Mobile	AL		X	X	
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ				
Bakersfield	CA	X			
El Monte/ Rio Hondo	CA				
Los Angeles Mun.	CA		X		
Roseville	CA		X		
San Bernardino	CA		X	X	
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA		X		
Santa Ana	CA		X		
Santa Barbara	CA		X	X	
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA		X		
Stockton	CA		X		
Woodland/Yolo	CA				
Georgetown	DE		X		
Wilmington	DE		X		
Gainesville	FL		X		
Jacksonville	FL		X		
Key West	FL		X	X	
Miami	FL	X			
Sarasota	FL	X		X	
Tampa	FL		X	X	
Honolulu	HI		X	X	P.D.'s office has made contact w/other agencies, in conjunction with court program, to discuss drug court

Name of Court	ST	Attorneys Avail. for Other Cases	Contact w/Other Criminal Justice Agencies	Coord. w/ Comm'ty Groups	Other
Chicago	IL	X			
Markham	IL				
Lake Co.	IN				
Wichita	KS	X			
Boston	MA				Don't know
Kalamazoo	MI		X	X	
St. Joseph	MI				
Warren Co.	NC				N/A
Camden	NJ		X		We have not yet had a high enough number of clients benefitting from Drug Court to determine its impact, but we believe we are headed in this direction
Newark	NJ		X		
Las Cruces	NM	X	X	X	Yes Def. less likely to reoffend
Las Vegas	NV				
Brooklyn	NY				
Rochester	NY			X	
Suffolk	NY			X	
Hamilton	OH	X			
Logan Co.	OK				
Payne Co.	OK				
Eugene	OR	X	X	X	Increased education and sophistication for attorneys and staff on drug treatment issues and procedures
Grants Pass	OR		X	X	
Klammath Falls	OR		X	X	
Portland	OR		X		

Name of Court	ST	Attorneys Avail. for Other Cases	Contact w/Other Criminal Justice Agencies	Coord. w/ Comm'ty Groups	Other
Roseburg	OR		X		
Philadelphia	PA				
San Juan	PR	X	X		
Lexington	SC	X			
Austin	TX		X		
Ft. Worth	TX				
Roanoke	VA		X		

C. Benefits Derived from Program

Defense counsel were asked to identify benefits the drug court had brought about in their jurisdiction. Eighty percent noted that the drug court provides a more appropriate response to cases involving substance abusing defendants by permitting an opportunity for treatment and rehabilitation. Fifty-six percent noted that the drug court promotes more efficient use of community resources; and 40% felt the drug court generated community support as well as promoted more efficient use of office resources.

Chart II-3: Benefits of Drug Courts for Indigent Defense Counsel

Name of Court	ST	Approp. Response to Tx	Efficient Use of Office Resources	Efficient Use of Comm'ty Resources	General Comm'ty Support	Other
Mobile	AL	X	X			
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ	X				Beneficial for clients. No impact on caseloads.
Bakersfield	CA	X	X	X	X	Is in the best interest of the client
El Monte/Rio Hon	CA					
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	X	X	X	X	
Roseville	CA	X		X		
San Bernardino	CA	X	X	X	X	Fewer trials and motions to suppress evidence.
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	X		X	X	

Name of Court	ST	Approp. Response to Tx	Efficient Use of Office Resources	Efficient Use of Comm'ty Resources	General Comm'ty Support	Other
Santa Ana	CA	X				
Santa Barbara	CA	X	X	X	X	Client appreciation of commit. to their cause
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	X			X	
Stockton	CA	X		X		
Woodland/Yolo	CA					
Georgetown	DE	X				Has educ. office personnel on Tx avail.
Wilmington	DE	X				
Gainesville	FL	X		X		
Jacksonville	FL			X		
Key West	FL	X	X	X	X	
Miami	FL	X	X	X		
Sarasota	FL	X	X	X	X	
Tampa	FL	X	X	X	X	
Honolulu	HI	X		X		(the extent to which comm'ty support may have been generated would be beneficial to the drug court program; not yet a direct benefit to PD's office)
Chicago	IL	X				
Markham	IL					
Lake Co.	IN	X	X	X	X	
Wichita	KS	X				
Boston	MA	X	X	X	X	
Kalamazoo	MI	X	X	X	X	
St. Joseph	MI					
Warren Co.	NC	X		X		

Name of Court	ST	Approp. Response to Tx	Efficient Use of Office Resources	Efficient Use of Comm'ty Resources	General Comm'ty Support	Other
Camden	NJ	X		X		Our attorneys do not have to duplicate effort-reinventing the wheel every time they seek Tx alternatives for clients or feel compelled to monitor placement success
Newark	NJ	X				
Las Cruces	NM	X	X	X	X	
Las Vegas	NV					
Brooklyn	NY	X				
Rochester	NY	X		X	X	
Suffolk	NY	X		X		
Hamilton	OH	X	X	X	X	
Logan Co.	OK	X	X	X	X	
Payne Co.	OK	X	X	X	X	
Eugene	OR	X	X	X	X	More positive relationship b/w court & client base. Clients for other cases now request involvement with Drug Court.
Grants Pass	OR	X		X	X	
Klammath Falls	OR	X	X	X	X	
Portland	OR	X		X	X	From local government leaders and media.
Roseburg	OR	X				
Philadelphia	PA					
San Juan	PR	X				
Lexington	SC	X	X			
Austin	TX	X		X	X	
Ft. Worth	TX					
Roanoke	VA					Has made prior offenders eligible for Tx

III. Costs to Indigent Defense Office for Drug Court

A. Total Staff Dedicated to Drug Court

Approximately 40% of the defenders dedicate at least one full-time attorney to the drug court; approximately 45% dedicate at least one part-time attorney. Fifteen percent of the defender offices dedicate at least one full-time support staff person for the program and over one third dedicate at least one part-time support staff person.

Chart III-4: Total Staff Dedicated to Drug Court

Name of Court	State	Attorneys		Support		Volun-teers	Other
		FT	PT	FT	PT		
Mobile	AL	1			1	1	
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ		1			1	1 secretary that I share w/5 other attorneys
Bakersfield	CA		1		1		
El Monte/ Rio Hondo	CA						
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	1	3				
Roseville	CA		1		1		
San Bernardino	CA	4		1			This is a full service drug court which handles all of the divisions felony drug cases- whether on a penal or treatment track. It also handles misdemeanor diversion cases which are slightly different than traditional drug court treatment cases.
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA		2		1		
Santa Ana	CA		1		2		
Santa Barbara	CA						
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	1					
Stockton	CA		1				
Woodland/Yolo	CA						
Georgetown	DE		2		1		
Wilmington	DE	4		2	1		
Gainesville	FL		X				

Name of Court	State	Attorneys		Support		Volun-teers	Other
		FT	PT	FT	PT		
Jacksonville	FL	.5		1.2			
Key West	FL		X		X		
Miami	FL	1		1			
Sarasota	FL		X	X			
Tampa	FL	4	3				The provision of office space to various drug offender treatment program evaluations to assist in the identification of clients eligible for drug treatment.
Honolulu	HI	1	0	0	1		
Chicago	IL		2				
Markham	IL	2					
Lake Co.	IN		1		1		
Wichita	KS		2				
Boston	MA		1		1		
Kalamazoo	MI						0, There are no staff that are solely "dedicated" to the Drug Court Program
St. Joseph	MI	2			2		
Warren Co.	NC						N/A, This jurisdiction does not have a public defender's office Private attorneys are appointed to indigent defendants
Camden	NJ		1		1		
Newark	NJ	1		1			
Las Cruces	NM	X		X			
Las Vegas	NV						
Brooklyn	NY	1					
Rochester	NY	1			1		
Suffolk	NY	1					
Hamilton	OH	X					
Logan Co.	OK					X	Court appointed private counsel
Payne Co.	OK					X	Court appointer private counsel
Eugene	OR	1	1		4		

Name of Court	State	Attorneys		Support		Volun-teers	Other
		FT	PT	FT	PT		
Grants Pass	OR		X		X		
Klammath Falls	OR		X		X		
Portland	OR	1		1.5			
Roseburg	OR		X		X		
Philadelphia	PA						
San Juan	PR	3		3			
Lexington	SC		1				
Austin	TX	0	3	0	0	0	
Ft. Worth	TX						
Roanoke	VA						

B. Approximate Annual Cost to Indigent Defense Office as a Result of Drug Court

Approximately two thirds of the responding defenders indicated that the drug court had not imposed any additional costs on their offices or, to the extent any special costs were incurred these were offset by savings in attorney time. One third of the responding defense counsel reported the approximate annual cost of the drug court to their office. As Chart I-5 indicates, these costs ranged between $ 3,700 to $ 140,000, generally reflecting the volume of participants handled and the nature of services provided by the defender office. The items covered by these costs commonly entailed: attorney's salaries (frequently offset by savings in staff time to handle these cases); social service coordinators; and staff to assist in related areas of client case management.

Chart III-5: Additional Costs to Indigent Defense Offices to Implement Drug Court

Name of Court	St.	Annual Cost	Expense			
			Attorney	Paralegal	Clerical	Other
Mobile	AL	35,000	30,000		5,000	
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	3,744	3,744			
Bakersfield	CA	35,000	25,000		10,000	
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA					
Los Angeles Mun.	CA		169,970			[4 Atty's] 1FT, 3PT (at 20%)
Roseville	CA	0				using existing staff
San Bernardino	CA	61,300		13,000		

Name of Court	St.	Annual Cost	Expense			
			Attorney	Paralegal	Clerical	Other
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA					
Santa Ana	CA	50,000	30,000		20,000	
Santa Barbara	CA	0*	0	0	0	* No new staff added
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	0				
Stockton	CA	0				
Woodland/Yolo	CA					
Georgetown	DE					
Wilmington	DE		287,200		105,700	and evaluator
Gainesville	FL					
Jacksonville	FL	50,000	30,000	15,000	5,000	
Key West	FL	0	0	0	0	
Miami	FL	0				
Sarasota	FL	0	0		0	None b/c using existing staff
Tampa	FL	140,000			23,000	social services coordinators $25,000 X 2
Honolulu	HI	73,500	63,500	0	10,000	
Chicago	IL	0				The attorneys handling the Drug Program cases were already on staff. In that sense, there is no add. cost. The attorney involved with these cases spends roughly 20% of his time on them. 20% of his salary is $9,000.
Markham	IL					
Lake Co.	IN	0	40,000			
Wichita	KS	0				
Boston	MA	0				
Kalamazoo	MI	0				
St. Joseph	MI					N/A
Warren Co.	NC					N/A

Name of Court	St.	Annual Cost	Expense			
			Attorney	Paralegal	Clerical	Other
Camden	NJ		60,000+	20,000+	15,000+	Supplies/equipment [at some cost we have not specifically measured so far we are absorbing addition costs. However, if our Court continues we anticipate that a "1/2 Team" is necessary, with there estimated costs
Newark	NJ		30,000+		20,000+	
Las Cruces	NM					
Las Vegas	NV					
Brooklyn	NY	25,000	25,000			Balance of salary for attny not funded under the grant
Rochester	NY	0				
Suffolk	NY					N/A
Hamilton	OH	30,000	30,000			
Logan Co.	OK					
Payne Co.	OK					
Eugene	OR					
Grants Pass	OR	22,000				Our office agreed to accept these cases at ½ the standard rate-this amount actually translates to the amount saved by the state
Klammath Falls	OR	0	0			
Portland	OR	118,600	50,802	36,800		
Roseburg	OR		15,000	5,000		
Philadelphia	PA					
San Juan	PR	125,000	75,000		28,500	
Lexington	SC					None at present which are quantifiable
Austin	TX	20,000	20,000			Medals for grads $400.00
Ft. Worth	TX					
Roanoke	VA					Some addnl. hearings & client contact; Min. cost.

C. Savings Achieved

As Chart III-5 illustrates, approximately one-third of the defenders noted cost savings resulting from the drug court for their offices. These savings were generally in the following areas:

case preparation time for attorneys: 30%
court appearance time for attorneys: 22%
witness costs: 14%

Other savings cited included: reduced number of jury trials and motions; and potential investigative costs.

Chart III-6: Savings Achieved by Indigent Defense Offices as a Result of Drug Court

Name of Court	St.	Case Prep. Time for Attorneys	Court Apper. Time for Attorneys	Witness Cost	Other
Mobile	AL		X		
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ				
Bakersfield	CA	50,000	50,000	5,000	
El Monte/ Rio Hondo	CA				
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	X			
Roseville	CA				
San Bernardino	CA	X		X	Reduced # jury trials and motions
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA				
Santa Ana	CA				
Santa Barbara	CA	NO	NO	NO	
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA				
Stockton	CA				No
Woodland/Yolo	CA				
Georgetown	DE				No Savings; in most cases, Drug Court takes more time.
Wilmington	DE				
Gainesville	FL	X			
Jacksonville	FL	NO	NO	NO	

Name of Court	St.	Case Prep. Time for Attorneys	Court Apper. Time for Attorneys	Witness Cost	Other
Key West	FL	X	X	X	
Miami	FL				
Sarasota	FL	X	X	X	
Tampa	FL				
Honolulu	HI				In those cases which have been accepted into drug court, we have saved the attorney preparation time & actual trial time. However, these costs have been offset somewhat by the cost of assigning a trial deputy full time to drug court.
Chicago	IL	X	X	X	
Markham	IL				
Lake Co.	IN	X	X		
Wichita	KS		X		
Boston	MA	X	X	X	
Kalamazoo	MI				
St. Joseph	MI				N/A
Warren Co.	NC				N/A
Camden	NJ				Efficient and effective reallocation of attorney time and cost of staff education
Newark	NJ	X			
Las Cruces	NM	X	X		
Las Vegas	NV				
Brooklyn	NY				Too early to assess
Rochester	NY				None
Suffolk	NY	0			
Hamilton	OH				

Name of Court	St.	Case Prep. Time for Attorneys	Court Apper. Time for Attorneys	Witness Cost	Other
Logan Co.	OK	X	X		
Payne Co.	OK	X	X		
Eugene	OR				
Grants Pass	OR				
Klammath Falls	OR	X	X		
Portland	OR				
Roseburg	OR				
Philadelphia	PA				
San Juan	PR	X			
Lexington	SC	X		X	Potential Investigative Costs
Austin	TX				
Ft. Worth	TX				
Roanoke	VA				

IV. Program Implementation/operational Issues

A. Most Serious Problems Encountered as a Result of Implementing Drug Court and Strategies Used to Resolve Them

Defenders were asked to identify the most serious problems they had encountered in designing or implementing the drug court and to describe the strategies used to resolve these problems. Their responses follow:

Name of Court	St.	Serious Problems	Resolution
Mobile	AL	Proper and adequate utilization of time	By experience in being involved in program for 3 years
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ	Whether clients are entitled to a lawyer and imped of voter changes in law	no
Bakersfield	CA	None	Yes
El Monte/ Rio Hondo	CA		

Name of Court	St.	Serious Problems	Resolution
Los Angeles Mun.	CA		The L.A. Drug Court Program provides an additional alternative for our lawyers who are seeking to resolve their client's felony matters in the most beneficial method possible. Public Defender clients are provided with low cost/effective treatment which hopefully will keep them out of the criminal just. system
Roseville	CA	Misuse of search and seizure waivers	Pending
San Bernardino	CA	1. Coordination with the D.A. as to what categories of defendants will be eligible for program. 2.Need fiscal support through grants.	1. Policies differ with staff changes. 2. Unresolved
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	None	
Santa Ana	CA	Limitation on entry requirements	Entry limitations have not yet been expanded
Santa Barbara	CA	Substantially increased demand on Atty.. time, substantially increased demand on secty/data entry	Social worker position allocated to assist Atty., work harder
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	None	
Stockton	CA	adequate funding for the program	still pending- grant funding has helped
Woodland/ Yolo	CA		
Georgetown	DE	Scheduling	Work longer schedules. More ct appearances
Wilmington	DE		
Gainesville	FL	No problems	
Jacksonville	FL	Timely identification and acceptance of incarcerated clients	They have not been completely resolved
Key West	FL	uncooperativeness of State's Atty's Off.	Has not been resolved
Miami	FL	no serious problems, because it is strictly a voluntary program	
Sarasota	FL	Limited funding for treatment also timely identification and acceptance of incarcerated clients	Neither prob. has been fully resolved

Name of Court	St.	Serious Problems	Resolution
Tampa	FL	1. Reducing the waiting period for client transition from County jail to treatment facility. 2. Unilateral rejection by State Attorney of clients who clearly qualify for the program.	1. The foregoing (A)(1) has been resolved through cooperative efforts of the court, treatment facilities, Sheriff and P.D. 2. The foregoing continues to be a problem which can not be resolved without giving the Cts full discretion to override the State Atty decision.
Honolulu	HI	There has continued to be a gap between the types of cases we propose and those that the State will approve.	Both sides have made varying efforts to bridge that gap. The judge has been very helpful in mediating these differences; however, we believe the limitations placed by the State have been more stringent than those in the original proposal.
Chicago	IL	We have not had serious problems with the program. Our concern was that information provided during screening would be used against the minor. that has not happened to this point.	
Markham	IL	Increased restrictions on defendants. Defendants status as drug addicts not sufficiently factored in on violation.	They have not been resolved.
Lake Co.	IN		
Wichita	KS	none	
Boston	MA	Implementation of unfamiliar procedure	YES
Kalamazoo	MI	None	
St. Joseph	MI	Case overload during "raids"	They haven't been resolved as this problem hasn't occurred very often
Warren Co.	NC	Educating private attorneys about the drug court so that they will refer appropriate clients to the drug court.	Written materials have been supplied to the attorneys about drug courts. May need to have a bar meeting.
Camden	NJ	Lack of cooperation of trial team (other) judges, lack of continuity of history of evolution of SHARED mission due to personnel changes; especially shared philosophy	Ongoing improvement
Newark	NJ	No serious problems	
Las Cruces	NM	State Program, county serving as fiscal agent, county has "no knowledge" of Drug Court operation etc.	Educate
Las Vegas	NV		

Name of Court	St.	Serious Problems	Resolution
Brooklyn	NY	Extra cost of staffing an att'y in the courtroom full-time and only being partially compensated. Having an atty act as a member of a Tx team	Partial compensation. I act as a member of the team when it is in my clients best interest, when it is not I'm not a member of the team
Rochester	NY	The defense atty's role is non-adversarial and is very different from how we generally do our job.	Training and communication
Suffolk	NY		
Hamilton	OH		
Logan Co.	OK	None	
Payne Co.	OK	None	
Eugene	OR	Expensive & inadequate public transport., no child care. "Tough on Crime" mentality reduced funds available. Not enough $. Dual diagnosis (i.e. mental health) issues difficult to address in drug treatment.	Do more with less. Place burden on clients and label it "personal responsibility". Some support from LTD with bus passes for indigent clients. Referral by drug treatment provider to program life skills component.
Grants Pass	OR	Dealing cooperatively w/D.A.'s's office to protect rights of defendants and allow for complete dismissals with successful completion.	Continuous negotiations
Klammath Falls	OR	Getting discovery quickly.	Working with DA and police more closely.
Portland	OR	Has made other attorney's caseloads harder (fewer light cases)	This was one of the causes of a recent office-wide reorganization.
Roseburg	OR		
Philadelphia	PA		
San Juan	PR	The attitude of some prosecutors regarding the bargaining of the offenses in order to benefit the clients in their decisions for treatment	Demanding the Justice Department orientation and instructions to the prosecutors toward the primary goal of the program, which is treatment and rehabilitation.
Lexington	SC		
Austin	TX	Coordination with the prosecution staff (re: indictments and dismissals), making all the judges aware of program, and convincing them to not interfere too much and trust our judgement regarding treatment.	Ongoing issue
Ft. Worth	TX		

Name of Court	St.	Serious Problems	Resolution
Roanoke	VA	Prosecution control of entry and of benefit to be "earned". No standards or guidelines issued and used	Not yet resolved

B. Most Significant Benefits to Indigent Defense Offices Resulting from Drug Court

Defenders were asked to identify the most significant benefits that had resulted for their offices as a result of the drug court. Their responses follow:

Name of Court	State	Significant Benefits
Mobile	AL	proper usage of the time
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	benefits for clients
Bakersfield	CA	1. Reduction in recidivism rate 2. Remarkable client appearance rate 3. Conservation of resources
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA	
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	A uniquely satisfactory experience of positively affecting life outcomes which constitute a more permanent accomplishment than the traditional mode of handling cases.
Roseville	CA	Provides help & meaningful alternatives for our clients. Cuts recidivism
San Bernardino	CA	Reduced recidivism by our clients. Problem solving approach to crime is effective. Good morale for staff.
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	Having our clients in recovery so that they do not continue to re-offend. They are out of the criminal justice system.
Santa Ana	CA	Having a program that is willing to work with clients and a Judge who understands the hardships and mistakes clients make in recovery
Santa Barbara	CA	Clients get treatment
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	More appropriate treatment of our clients. Better relationship with other criminal justice agencies and county departments.
Stockton	CA	client satisfaction in being able to begin Tx at an early stage of their case
Woodland/Yolo	CA	
Georgetown	DE	Satisfaction of seeing people get treatment.
Wilmington	DE	
Gainesville	FL	Drug Court has gotten drug addicts out of the criminal justice system and has gotten clients off drugs.
Jacksonville	FL	Diversion of Drug Cases out of regular court system on a small scale

Name of Court	State	Significant Benefits
Key West	FL	Appropriate just resolution of cases, pardons treatment rather than punishment with realist, well tailored program plants clients
Miami	FL	simply the benefit to our clients- our clients get help not jail
Sarasota	FL	Clients needing treatment to break the drug cycle are finally getting help
Tampa	FL	The most significant benefit is the early identification of client's whose drug problem is their primary cause of being in the criminal justice system. Through concerted efforts of this court recidivism has decreased, as well as the addiction which plagued those clients.
Honolulu	HI	The benefit to our clients who would otherwise be incarcerated - to receive treatment, intense supervision, educational/employment assistance, and emotional support and have a real opportunity to change.
Chicago	IL	Our clients have the opportunity to address their drug problems without a finding of delinquency being made against them.
Markham	IL	
Lake Co.	IN	
Wichita	KS	reduced trial settings
Boston	MA	Important and successful new disposition
Kalamazoo	MI	Less recidivism and a decrease in caseload
St. Joseph	MI	
Warren Co.	NC	N/A
Camden	NJ	Helping sick people get treatment instead of incarceration; i.e. the chief benefit has been to our clients. A secondary but significant benefit to our staff has been a sense of relief that experts more suited to seeking and obtaining and monitoring treatment services are on board.
Newark	NJ	The most significant benefit has been treating clients for their addiction and not simply punishing them for the offense committed
Las Cruces	NM	Restoration of dignity to clients so they can be a member of society
Las Vegas	NV	
Brooklyn	NY	That defendants in need of substance abuse treatment are getting it at least, those sent to this courtroom
Rochester	NY	The benefits have really been for the clients who receive the treatment the need for their addiction.
Suffolk	NY	
Hamilton	OH	
Logan Co.	OK	Reduction in time spent per case

Name of Court	State	Significant Benefits
Payne Co.	OK	Reduction in time spent per case
Eugene	OR	Broadening of horizons for attorneys in issues of drug use, abuse and treatment. One attorney can handle a large docket of court appearances.
Grants Pass	OR	Having a program truly directed at rehabilitation
Klammath Falls	OR	Clients receive effective treatment quicker.
Portland	OR	Has involved the judge in hands on treatment lending to a better understanding by the judge of our addicted clients.
Roseburg	OR	
Philadelphia	PA	
San Juan	PR	Be able to hire additional defenders to handle drug and drug related cases of program participants. That gives other defenders more time and attention to violent felony cases.
Lexington	SC	
Austin	TX	Meeting with the Judges and explaining the program showing positive results, persistence in trying to work with the DA, unrelenting efforts to make the needs of the clients known, tenacious pursuit of the original goals.
Ft. Worth	TX	
Roanoke	VA	Education of the Criminal System on the issue of relapse. Availability of program to prior offenders.

C. Unanticipated Issues and Strategies to Resolve Them

Defenders were asked to identify the unanticipated issues that have arisen since the drug court became operational and the strategies used to address these issues. Their responses follow:

Name of Court	State	Unanticipated Issues	Resolution
Mobile	AL	The amount of time that has been expended on Drug Court	The resolution of these problems improve through experience with every Drug Court participant
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	none	
Bakersfield	CA	None	
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA		
Los Angeles Mun.	CA		
Roseville	CA	Varying prosecutorial polices depending on personal	Improving, but still pending

Name of Court	State	Unanticipated Issues	Resolution
San Bernardino	CA	Because there is intense supervision by the judge count appearances for defendants recur often and calendars are heavy coordination with other court difficult.	Resolution? Work to smooth out the administrative problems of scheduling coordination.
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	The Program has been very successful and is rapidly increasing in size. This requires more time from our attorneys.	
Santa Ana	CA	Developing a new office system for processing these Drug Court cases. In addition establishing different ways for clients to get into Drug Court at both the Municipal and Superior Court level.	Our office stamps each Drug Court file so clerical staff are aware of these files and the Drug Court attorney is listed in our office computer under municipal and Superior Court. Both Superior Court and Municipal Court have worked with our office to establish methods for clients to get into Drug Court at both the Municipal and Superior Court level.
Santa Barbara	CA	Did not anticipate demand on Atty. time and volume of business	
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	None	
Stockton	CA	none	
Woodland/Yolo	CA		
Georgetown	DE		
Wilmington	DE		
Gainesville	FL	None	
Jacksonville	FL	Personnel problems. Staff educ.	Still in the process of resolving
Key West	FL	Lack of State Cooperation	not yet resolved
Miami	FL	none	
Sarasota	FL	How to deal w/the non-drug related cases a drug ct. client also has	They must resolve it on their own.

Name of Court	State	Unanticipated Issues	Resolution
Tampa	FL	The sheer volume was unanticipated as was reluctance by the State Attorney and law enforcement to the use of this program. Needing more personnel with intervention expertise was not fully anticipated.	Through the concerted efforts of the Court and Tx facilities, the value of this program has been made clear to those opposing it. As they say, seeing is believing and time has allowed the resistance to decrease. The P.D. has increased the Social Services section of the office and has insured training for attorney on the intervention value and process.
Honolulu	HI	While not entirely unanticipated, the amount of time required for the Drug Court attorney to confer with assigned deputy, complete Drug Court referral (including interviewing client, arranging for initial assessment, conferring with State) was expensive.	Assigned senior deputy full time.
Chicago	IL	None to this point. Most potential problem areas were addressed prior to the inception of the program.	
Markham	IL	Increase in violations.	
Lake Co.	IN		
Wichita	KS	none	
Boston	MA	Newness of the approach to dealing with drug addicted offenders	Making great progress
Kalamazoo	MI	None	
St. Joseph	MI		
Warren Co.	NC	N/A	
Camden	NJ	In the zeal to make a drug court happen, we have had to be one of- and at times the only- voices advocating for the maintenance of due process rights for clients	Ongoing dialogue, mutual education in group process, increased mutual trust and understanding
Newark	NJ	None	
Las Cruces	NM	Interference by county (Politics)	"still edifying county"
Las Vegas	NV		
Brooklyn	NY	Coverage of the courtroom when the one full time attorney is sick, on vacation, etc.	It hasn't yet been resolved
Rochester	NY	Political Concerns	The remain unresolved

Name of Court	State	Unanticipated Issues	Resolution
Suffolk	NY		
Hamilton	OH		
Logan Co.	OK	None	
Payne Co.	OK	None	
Eugene	OR	1) Amount of time to keep potentially significant statistics for program continuation funds; 2)Obtaining discovery from the D.A. in time for Drug Court orientations at PD's Office	Drug Court attorney and one secretary have shared the additional statistics workload. We continue to ask D.A. to have discovery available at arraignment, but so far no procedure has been implemented.
Grants Pass	OR		
Klammath Falls	OR	Resistance from clients; the need to expedite disposition.	Quick discovery and client contact.
Portland	OR	The level of dependance on administrative support on the Defender's Office	We continue to abuse "Robert"
Roseburg	OR		
Philadelphia	PA		
San Juan	PR	None.	
Lexington	SC		
Austin	TX	Representation in other cases and matters that arise during treatment, promotion of the program in community as well as criminal justice system, educating private defense attorneys.	Ongoing
Ft. Worth	TX		
Roanoke	VA		

D. Advice Colleagues

Defenders were asked to indicate any guidance they might offer to defender colleagues in other jurisdictions whose jurisdictions were contemplating the implementation of a drug court. The following are their responses:

Name of Court	State	Advice
Mobile	AL	To meet with your counterpart in an established program to discuss issues that may be confronted & experiences & pitfalls that may be avoided
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	
Bakersfield	CA	Visit Kern County Program
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA	
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	Do it! It works! Urge and insist, if possible, on a pre-adjudication Drug Court Program
Roseville	CA	Ensure consistency of personnel from all key offices. Consistent rules for participants. Agree on major points, but don't wait until minor details are resolved use experience.
San Bernardino	CA	Work toward a team effort with court probation, treatment team and district attorney. Put aside traditional advocacy role and work for treatment solutions.
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	
Santa Ana	CA	Make sure the Judge and assigned probation officers are willing to work and understand that addicts won't be cured without making mistakes.
Santa Barbara	CA	Get a "social worker" position early in program any, have that person take major route in handling clients
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	Start one now
Stockton	CA	push very strongly for a diversion- type program rather than a post-plea program
Woodland/Yolo	CA	
Georgetown	DE	Keep working with the program - it will succeed w/ effort.
Wilmington	DE	
Gainesville	FL	Support this program.
Jacksonville	FL	Do it
Key West	FL	Partnership with State Attorney's Office. Take advantage, more effective than probation saves $
Miami	FL	1. Make sure client can got out at anytime. 2. Make sure you pick a compassionate yet stern judge
Sarasota	FL	Visit other drug cts to see how they work. START SMALL. Get state and chief judge on board first.
Tampa	FL	Ensure that guidelines for creation of program are very specific giving wide discretion to Court. Ensure judges assigned have treatment oriented background.

Name of Court	State	Advice
Honolulu	HI	Examine programs in other jurisdictions before settling on plan for your jurisdiction. Basic components of plan significantly affect time required of attorneys.
Chicago	IL	Any public defender's office needs assurance that information obtained during screening or participation in the program will not be used against the client.
Markham	IL	Make sure there is a clear understanding of the clients needs and anticipate limited "failure" before incarceration as an option on violation.
Lake Co.	IN	
Wichita	KS	
Boston	MA	Do it. Understand that the role of prosecutor and defense counsel is different in the drug court. Take the trouble to evaluate the new role.
Kalamazoo	MI	Go to a Drug Court seminar and speak to other Drug Court personnel.
St. Joseph	MI	Make sure the emphasis on treatment, not punishment, for appropriate offenders.
Warren Co.	NC	N/A
Camden	NJ	Dump the punitive orientation, be open to being educated by the treatment community, work with (or 1st develop and then work with) an established consortium of professional, licensed treatment providers, work toward working as a team but come to understand the individual agendas of program participants, reduce agreed measures to writing
Newark	NJ	I would advise another jurisdiction to implement strict procedures with regard to urine screening monitoring
Las Cruces	NM	All parties (Judge, DA, PD, Provider "client" etc.) have input
Las Vegas	NV	
Brooklyn	NY	To early to assess
Rochester	NY	Take the time to individually CREATE your own program (don't copy someone else) Beware of POLITICAL consequences
Suffolk	NY	
Hamilton	OH	
Logan Co.	OK	
Payne Co.	OK	
Eugene	OR	Rely less on technical lawyering skills and more on counseling skills to get clients to level of commitment required as early as possible in proses. Commitment to program reduces anxiety and relapse stress.
Grants Pass	OR	Don't give up

Name of Court	State	Advice
Klammath Falls	OR	Be open to new approaches to handling drug cases.
Portland	OR	Make sure that there is an ongoing, working relationship between the key players in the system and the agreement on policy, method and philosophy of the program.
Roseburg	OR	
Philadelphia	PA	Become involved in the Treatment Court planning process as early on as possible and make your concerns known
San Juan	PR	Before implementing the program, there should be meetings with all components of the criminal justice system to design uniform standard and procedures in all drug courts room courts.
Lexington	SC	
Austin	TX	Plan to meet resistance at all levels: (1) money, (2) assistance, (3) education -Do lots of informing and promoting in the very beginning. -Have regular planning sessions -Ask for help.
Ft. Worth	TX	
Roanoke	VA	Do not give control of the program to the prosecution just to get the program

E. Improvements Suggested

Defenders were also asked to offer suggestions for improving the drug court program. Their responses follow:

Name of Court	State	Improvements Suggested
Mobile	AL	None
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	Clarification on right to attorney in post conviction programs
Bakersfield	CA	Keep up the good work
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA	
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	1. Expansion of legal eligibility criteria, 2. Increased availability of treatment beds across the board, 3. Development of treatment module inside the female County Jail facility. Expansion of existing male module for treatment in Central Jail, 4. Further development of Phase III/Aftercare, 5. Development of tracking/maintaining system for graduate to further assess long term success
Roseville	CA	Get law enforcement more emphatically on board. Open program to appropriate felony charged defendants

Name of Court	State	Improvements Suggested
San Bernardino	CA	Expand into classes of cases where drug addiction is the motivating problem, but drug offenses are not the presenting offenses e.g. petty theft, some burglaries, auto theft
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	
Santa Ana	CA	Expand residence requirements to the entire county so more clients will have an opportunity to apply for Drug Court.
Santa Barbara	CA	1)expand eligible list of clients, esp. minor violence and sales/possession for sale if minor amount associated with use, 2) residential treatment a priority! , 3) child care for clients
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	More treatment options
Stockton	CA	a) the program be run as a diversion program rather than a post-plea program, b) if it continues as a post-plea program successful participants have the charges dismissed at a specified period- i.e. 2 yrs. or 3 yrs. after completion
Woodland/Yolo	CA	
Georgetown	DE	Open program to those committing offenses that are drug related.
Wilmington	DE	
Gainesville	FL	None
Jacksonville	FL	Obtain dedicated ongoing funding, add staff to permanently handle
Key West	FL	1. Early Placement. 2. Change law for sellers to be admitted
Miami	FL	We would like an expansion of the criteria for admission but otherwise we're pretty happy with it.
Sarasota	FL	Allow all unrelated cases to be disposed of in drug court along w/drug charges. Screen clients well so you only get people w/true drug problem.
Tampa	FL	Court to become more proactive in plea negotiations to ensure early identification of drug treatment necessity. Ensure early production of discovery materials, reasonable plea offers, no posturing by parties.
Honolulu	HI	Contact is good; additionally, content isn't really within expertise of attorneys. Would like to see more cases considered in pre-charge stage as that would target clients early in their criminal court involvement and would be a savings in time for our non-Drug Court deputies. Most of all, would like to expand Drug Court to include greater variety/number of clients.
Chicago	IL	I am somewhat concerned that the State's Attorney's Office will unilaterally decide that some minors are not appropriate for the program even though the screening analysis indicated that they were acceptably. I believe there should be clear objective standard regarding who qualifies.
Markham	IL	There has to be a greater knowledge of the clients' problem. The program has increasingly become more restrictive and less flexible.
Lake Co.	IN	

Name of Court	State	Improvements Suggested
Wichita	KS	
Boston	MA	1. Improve the communication with referring courts 2. Educate bar counsel to the requirements of the program.
Kalamazoo	MI	Expand-more participation and greater crime eligibility.
St. Joseph	MI	More emphasis on treatment of persons obviously suffering from substance abuse problem.
Warren Co.	NC	
Camden	NJ	Procedures and content as far as they go are good as long as all participants REMAIN committed to the shared concept and educated about how it was arrived at; but more than anything else, INCREASE FUNDING, RESOURCES, NUMBERS OF AVAILABLE SLOTS, COMMUNITY, JUSTICE, POLITICAL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT SUPPORT
Newark	NJ	I believe the Drug Court program should be expanded to target individuals with alcohol related problems as well
Las Cruces	NM	Keep the county out of the operations of Drug Court; Office of Court should handle funding
Las Vegas	NV	
Brooklyn	NY	Too early to assess
Rochester	NY	None at this time. We really try to deal with problems when they occur. Lines of communication are very open and I believe that has led to a successful program.
Suffolk	NY	
Hamilton	OH	
Logan Co.	OK	
Payne Co.	OK	
Eugene	OR	Less pressure to enroll ASAP- more emphasis on enroll when appropriate. Earlier detox, insurance issue resolution. More individualized treatment. All start at Level 2 (out-patient) clients at level 1,2 and 3. Eliminate or reduce costs of transportation and child care as barrier reduction.
Grants Pass	OR	
Klammath Falls	OR	Slightly better communication among drug court components. It works very well.
Portland	OR	Expansion to other crimes. Better administrative staffing.
Roseburg	OR	
Philadelphia	PA	We have no suggestions at this stage that have not already been implemented

Name of Court	State	Improvements Suggested
San Juan	PR	1. Establish job programs to participants, 2. Establish family assistance programs for participants relatives, 3. Review criminal procedures rules to temper them to the drug courts objectives.
Lexington	SC	
Austin	TX	More up front planning and community involvement (i.e. churches, mentors, support groups; stay flexible in how the program is handled
Ft. Worth	TX	
Roanoke	VA	Establishment of new/real/specific treatment program(s)

APPENDIX:

Individuals to Contact for Further Information

Name of Court	St.	Name	Agency	Address	Telephone	Fax
Mobile	AL	Norman H. Davis, Jr.	Attorney-at-law	3662-B Dauphin St. Mobile, AL 36608	334-344-5800	334-344-5801
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ	Norm Greer	Maricopa County Public Defender	11 West Jefferson, Suite 5 Phoenix, AZ 85003	602-506-5722	
Bakersfield	CA	Mark A. Arnold	Kern County Public Defender	1315 Truxtun Ave Bakersfield, CA 93301	805-634-4799	805-631-9727
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	Kathy Cantella	Los Angeles Public Defender	210 West Temple Street, 19-145 Los Angeles, CA 90012	213-974-2904	213-617-0614
Roseville	CA		Placer Co. P.D.	2422 Lindbergh Street Auburn, CA 95602	916-885-2422	916-885-3299
San Bernardino	CA	Jane A. Lawrence	Public Defender's Office	364 N. Mountain View Ave. San Bernardino, CA 92415	909-387-8373	909-387-4414
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	Melinda Hall	Office of the Public Defender	120 W. Mission Street San Jose, CA 95110	408-299-7738	408-998-8265
Santa Ana	CA	Samatha Silverstone	Public Defender's Office	901 Civic Center Drive, Suite 200 Santa Ana, CA 92701	714-541-7660	714-834-2144
Santa Barbara	CA	Guen Mowrer	Public Defender	Courthouse, 3rd Floor Santa Barbara, CA 93101	805-568-3456	805-568-3536
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	John R. Abrahams	Sonoma County Public Defenders Office	Hall of Justice Rm. -111-J, 600 Administration Dr. Santa Rosa, CA 95403	707-527-2791	707-527-3357
Stockton	CA	James Larsen	San Joaquin Co. Pub -lic Defenders Office	102 S. San Joaquin Street, Room 1 Stockton, CA 95202	209-468-2746	209-468-2267
Wilmington	DE	Timothy J. Weiler	Office of the Public Defender	1020 N. King Street Wilmington, DE 19801	302-577-2800 x214	302-577-3246
Gainesville	FL	Jodi Cason & Susan Ohnstad	Public Defender's Office	35 N. Main Street Gainesville, FL 32601	338-7372	

Name of Court	St.	Name	Agency	Address	Telephone	Fax
Jacksonville	FL	W.P. White, Chief Assistant	Office of the Public Defender	25 Market Street Jacksonville, FL 32202	904-630-1501	904-630-1592
Key West	FL	Nancy Bossell, Chief	Public Defender's Office	16th Judicial Circuit, P.O. Box 4127 Key West, FL 33040	305-294-2501	305-296-5206
Miami	FL	Dalit Melzer Moskona	Dade County Public Defender		305-545-1704	305-545-1992
Sarasota	FL	Elliot Metcalfe	Public Defender	2071 Ringling Blvd., 5th FLR. Sarasota, FL 34237	941-951-5500	941-951-4219
Tampa	FL	Julianne M. Holt	Hillsborough Co. P.D., 13th Circuit	801 E. Twiggs Street Tampa, Florida 33602	813-272-5980	813-272-5588
Honolulu	HI	Susan L. Arnett	Office of the Public Defender	1130 No. Nimitz Hwy., Suite A-135 Honolulu, HI 96817	808-586-2200	808-586-2222
Chicago	IL	Chief Michael McInerney	Cook Co. Public Defender, Juv. Div.	2245 W. Ogden, 7th Floor Chicago, IL 60612	312-433-7046	312-433-4268
Markham	IL	Joseph P. McEllogott	Public Defender's Office	16501 S. Kedzie Parkway Markham, IL 60426	708-210-4360	708-210-4264
Lake Co.	IN	Attorney Samuel Cappas		2546 45th Street Highland, IN 46322	219-924-4101	219-924-4104
Wichita	KS	Jeff Syrios	attorney	455 North Main Street Wichita, KS 67202	316-268-4600	
Boston	MA	Catherine Clement	Boston Bar Advocate	50 Union Street Newton Centre, MA 02159	969-6339	969-6517
Kalamazoo	MI	Kathy Brickley		707 Academy Street Kalamazoo, MI 49007	616-345-4127	
Warren Co.	NC	Garey M. Ballance	Defense Attorney	P.O. Box 616 Warrenton, NC 27589	919-257-1012	919-257-2640
Camden	NJ	Leah M. Garry Morris, Esq.	Camden Public Defender's Office	101 S. Hadden Ave Camden, NJ 08103	609-757-2626	609-757-4663
Newark	NJ	Dion J. Williams	Municipal Public Defender's Office	31 Geen Street Newark, NJ 07102	201-733-6547	

Name of Court	St.	Name	Agency	Address	Telephone	Fax
Las Cruces	NM	Rory L. Rank	Public Defender New Mexico	203 N. Main Dowtown Mall Las Cruces, NM 88001	505-524-6200	505-524-6209
Brooklyn	NY	Justin Barry	Legal Aid Society	175 Reinsen Street Brooklyn, NY 11209	718-243-6812	
Rochester	NY	Edward J. Nowak	Monroe County Public Defender	10 N. Fitzhugh Street Rochester, NY 14614	716-428-5531	716-428-2234
Suffolk	NY	Robert Mitchell	Legal Aid Society	Union Blvd Bayshore, NY 11980		
Hamilton	OH	Charles Bretz	Hamilton County Public Defender	1000 Main Street, Room 211 Cincinnati, OH 45202	513-632-8601	
Logan Co.	OK	Glen R. Winters	Attorney	P.O. Box 2684 Stillwater, OK 74074	405-377-9025	405-377-8189
Eugene	OR	John Bennington	P.D. Services of Lane Co., Inc.	1143 Oak Street Eugene, OR 97401	451-484-2611	541-484-5068
Grants Pass	OR	Gary Berlant	Southern Oregon Public Defenders	215 S.E. 6th Street, 4th Floor Grants Pass, OR 97526	541-471-3363	541-471-3365
Klammath Falls	OR	Phil Studenberg	Klammath Defender Services	110N. 7th Klammath Falls, OR 97601	541-884-0333	541-884-0959
Portland	OR	James Hennings	Metropolitan Public Defender	630 SW 5th Ave. Portland, OR 97204	503-225-9100	503-295-0316
Roseburg	OR	Bruce Tower		RM 301, Justice Building Roseburg, OR 97470	541-440-4484	
Philadelphia	PA	Mary De Fusco	Defender Assoc. of Philadelphia	70 North 17th Street Philadelphia, PA 19103	215-568-3190	215-557-4935
San Juan	PR	Enrique Riverea Mendoza	Puerto Rico Legal Aid Society	P.O. Box 21186 Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico 00928	787-765-3875	787-765-0136
Austin	TX	Thomas Gates	Defense Counsel	700 San Antonio Street Austin, Texas 78701	512-472-9503	512-478-9780
Roanoke	VA	Raymond F. Leven	Office of the Public Defender	209 First Street, S.W. Roanoke, VA 24011	540-857-7111	540-857-7096

PART IV: PERSPECTIVES OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS

PART IV: Perspectives of Law Enforcement Officials

I. Introduction

Survey responses were received from officials associated with law enforcement agencies in forty jurisdictions with drug court programs, operating in 21 states and Puerto Rico. Their responses are reported in the following sections.

II. Program Effectiveness

A. Criteria Being Used to Assess Effectiveness of the Drug Court

Law enforcement officials were asked to indicate the criteria they are using to measure the effectiveness of the drug court in their jurisdictions. Their responses, reported in Chart IV-1 below, indicate the following:

frequency of participant arrests:	
on new drug possession charges	45%
on other drug charges	35%
on nondrug charges	20%
percent of participants who graduate from the drug court	18%
participants attendance in treatment programs	18%
participants' appearances at court status hearings	15%
urinalysis results	15%
participants' employment status	10%

Chart IV-1: Criteria Being Used to Assess Effectiveness of Drug Court

Name of Court	ST	App. @ Status Hearing	U/A Results	Drug Possess. Charges	Att'd in Tx Prog.	Other Drug Charges	Non-drug (non-traff.)	Employ-ment Status	% Grad.	Other
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ									
Tucson	AZ			X		X	X			Because Pima County's Drug Court program has not yet started, the responses to this survey reflect only how we intend to operate and the results we anticipate.
Bakersfield	CA									Evaluation of Sentencing Court.
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	X	X		X					
Roseville	CA	X	X	X	X	X		X		
San Bernardino	CA									
Santa Ana	CA			X		X			X	
Santa Barbara	CA									
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA			X		X	X			
Woodland/Yolo	CA									
New Haven	CT	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Dover	DE		X	X	X	X		X	X	
Georgetown	DE			X		X				
Wilmington	DE	X	X		X	X	X			

Name of Court	ST	App. @ Status Hearing	U/A Results	Drug Possess. Charges	Att'd in Tx Prog.	Other Drug Charges	Non-drug (non-traff.)	Employ-ment Status	% Grad.	Other
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	X	X	X	X	X			X	
Gainesville	FL								X	
Key West	FL									
Sarasota	FL									
Macon	GA			X						
Honolulu	HI			X		X	X			
Chicago	IL			X		X	X			
Markham	IL									
Wichita	KS									
Kalamazoo	MI									
Warren Co.	NC	X								
Camden	NJ									
Newark	NJ									
Las Vegas	NV								X	
Brooklyn	NY									
Rochester	NY									
Suffolk	NY			X						
Hamilton	OH									
Logan Co.	OK									Word of mouth regarding the success of the program.

Name of Court	ST	App. @ Status Hearing	U/A Results	Drug Possess. Charges	Att'd in Tx Prog.	Other Drug Charges	Non-drug (non-traff.)	Employ-ment Status	% Grad.	Other
Payne Co.	OK									Word of mouth regarding the success of the program.
Grants Pass	OR									N/A
Portland	OR									
Philadelphia	PA									
Ponce	PR			X						
Lexington	SC	X		X		X	X			
Austin	TX			X		X	X		X	
Ft. Worth	TX			X	X	X				
Roanoke	VA		X		X					

B. Impact of Drug Court on Agency's Capability to Respond to Criminal Activity and/or Carry Out its Functions

Respondents were asked to indicate the impact which the drug court has had on the agency's capability to respond to criminal activity or otherwise carry out its functions. Responses, summarized on Chart IV-2 below, indicate the following impact:

has encouraged greater coordination with other justice system agencies	35%
has promoted new relationships with the justice system and other agencies in the community	32%
has permitted additional officers to be available for other cases	20%
has provided a more effective response to arrests of substance abusers	20%
provides law enforcement with an additional tool to enforce "no tolerance" policy	18%

Chart IV-2: Impact of Drug Court on Agency's Capability to Respond to Criminal Activity/Carry out its Functions

Name of Court	ST	Add'l Officers Avail.	Greater Justice System Coord.	Effectively Respond to Arrests	New Relations w/Justice System	Enforces No Tolerance Policy
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ					
Tucson	AZ		X	X	X	
Bakersfield	CA		X			
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	X	X			
Roseville	CA	X	X		X	
San Bernardino	CA					
Santa Ana	CA		X		X	
Santa Barbara	CA					
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA		X			
Woodland/Yolo	CA					
New Haven	CT		X	X	X	
Dover	DE	X				X
Georgetown	DE	X				

Name of Court	ST	Add'l Officers Avail.	Greater Justice System Coord.	Effectively Respond to Arrests	New Relations w/Justice System	Enforces No Tolerance Policy
Wilmington	DE	X	X		X	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL				X	
Gainesville	FL					X
Key West	FL					
Sarasota	FL					
Macon	GA			X		
Honolulu	HI		X		X	
Chicago	IL		X		X	
Markham	IL					
Wichita	KS					
Kalamazoo	MI					
Warren Co.	NC					
Camden	NJ					
Newark	NJ					
Las Vegas	NV			X		
Brooklyn	NY					
Rochester	NY					
Suffolk	NY		X		X	
Hamilton	OH					
Logan Co.	OK					X
Payne Co.	OK					X
Grants Pass	OR					
Portland	OR					
Philadelphia	PA					
Ponce	PR	X		X	X	X
Lexington	SC			X	X	X
Austin	TX	X	X	X	X	
Ft. Worth	TX		X		X	
Roanoke	VA	X	X			

C. Impact of Program on Other Aspects of Agency Operations

1. Arrest Policies and Procedures

Respondents were asked to indicate the impact, if any, of the drug court on arrest policies and procedures in their jurisdictions. All of the respondents indicated that the drug court had no impact on arrest policies. However, four (10%) of the agencies cited an impact on arrest procedures, as described on Chart VI-3 below.

Chart IV-3: Impact of Drug Court on Arrest Policies and Procedures

Name of Court	ST	Arrest			Explanation (Arr. Pro.)
		Policies	Explanation	Procedures	
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ				
Tucson	AZ	No		Yes	Officers will be required to provide Pretrial Services and jail intake personnel with a sound estimate of the amount and type of drug for each person arrested.
Bakersfield	CA	No		No	
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	No		No	
Roseville	CA	No		No	
San Bernardino	CA				
Santa Ana	CA	No		No	
Santa Barbara	CA				
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	No		Yes	Arresting officers expedite filing of crime reports to the D.A. to get the offender into Drug Court ASAP.
Woodland/Yolo	CA				
New Haven	CT	No		Yes	All arrest involving drug court clients are submitted to the drug court liaison.
Dover	DE	No		No	
Georgetown	DE	No		No	
Wilmington	DE	No		No	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	No		No	
Gainesville	FL	No		No	
Key West	FL				

Name of Court	ST	Arrest			Explanation (Arr. Pro.)
		Policies	Explanation	Procedures	
Sarasota	FL				
Macon	GA	No		No	
Honolulu	HI	No		No	
Chicago	IL	No		No	
Markham	IL	No		No	
Wichita	KS				
Kalamazoo	MI	No		No	
Warren Co.	NC		Too early to determine		Too early to determine
Camden	NJ				
Newark	NJ				
Las Vegas	NV	No		No	
Brooklyn	NY				
Rochester	NY				
Suffolk	NY	No		No	
Hamilton	OH				
Logan Co.	OK	No		No	
Payne Co.	OK	No		No	
Grants Pass	OR	No		No	
Portland	OR	No		No	
Philadelphia	PA				
Ponce	PR	No		No	
Lexington	SC	Yes	New policies in our det. center so that potential candidates for court can be identified	No	
Austin	TX	No		No	
Ft. Worth	TX	No		No	
Roanoke	VA	No		No	

2. Orientation/training programs for officers

Respondents were also asked whether the drug court had any impact on the orientation and/or training programs conducted for line officers. As depicted on Chart IV-4 below, six (15%) of the responding agencies indicated that an explanation of the drug court program was now part of the orientation of line officers so that they are aware of the program and the services offered. Additional training is also provided regarding completion of reports.

3. Relationships with community groups

Law enforcement officials were asked whether the drug court had any impact on their agency's relationship with community group. As Chart IV-4 illustrates, 20% of the responding agencies cited greater interaction with local service providers and community groups representing neighborhoods with drug-related problems.

Chart IV-4: Impact of Drug Court on Officer Training and Community Relations

Name of Court	St.	Orient./ Training Program	Explanation (Orientation/Training)	Relationship w/ Comm'ty Groups	Explanation (of Relationship)
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ				
Tucson	AZ	Yes	A training/orientation video will be prepared to explain the program to officers. Additionally, a photo layout is being developed to help officers estimate the quantity of drugs seized from persons arrested.	Yes	We anticipate greater interaction with service providers and community groups representing problem neighborhoods.
Bakersfield	CA	No		No	
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	No		Yes	Greater understanding and cooperation with treatment providers.
Roseville	CA	Yes	Only in the jail where shift sgts are trained to look for arrestee's that could be referred to drug court.	Yes	
San Bernardino	CA				
Santa Ana	CA	No		Yes	

Name of Court	St.	Orient./ Training Program	Explanation (Orientation/Training)	Relationship w/ Comm'ty Groups	Explanation (of Relationship)
Santa Barbara	CA				
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	Yes	The immediacy of Drug Court is critical to the participants acceptance of the program. Reports must be filed in an expedient manner.	Yes	The Sheriff's Department works closely with community groups and agencies through Community Orientation and Drug Court program.
Woodland/ Yolo	CA				
New Haven	CT	Yes	Drug Court liaison officers has attended orientation involving other drug courts.	Yes	The drug court liaison officer maintains contact with community organizations to enhance community service sanctions.
Dover	DE	No		No	
Georgetown	DE	No		No	
Wilmington	DE	Yes	Police agencies have been instructed in the Drug Court operational Policies	No	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	No			
Gainesville	FL	No		No	
Key West	FL				
Sarasota	FL				
Honolulu	HI	No		No	
Chicago	IL	No		No	
Markham	IL	No		No	
Wichita	KS				
Kalamazoo	MI	No		No	
Warren Co.	NC		Too early to determine		Too early to determine
Camden	NJ				
Newark	NJ				
Las Cruces	N M				

Name of Court	St.	Orient./ Training Program	Explanation (Orientation/Training)	Relationship w/ Comm'ty Groups	Explanation (of Relationship)
Las Vegas	NV	Yes	Programs is explained, so officers know that rehab program is available.	No	
Reno	NV				
Rochester	NY				
Suffolk	NY	No		No	
Hamilton	OH				
Logan Co.	OK	No		No	
Payne Co.	OK	No		No	
Grants Pass	OR	No		No	
Portland	OR	No		No	
Philadelphia	PA				
Ponce	PR	No		No	
Lexington	SC	Yes	Officers have been made aware of the program.	No	
Austin	TX	Yes		Yes	
Ft. Worth	TX	No		No	
Roanoke	VA	No		No	

4. Community Policing Activities

Law enforcement officials in the drug court jurisdictions were asked whether their agency's had a community policing program and, if so, whether the drug court had provided any support for these activities. Sixty-five percent of the respondents indicated their agencies had established a community policing function. Only one agency (New Haven, Connecticut) indicated that the community police activities and the drug court were coordinated.[1] Fourteen agencies (35%) indicated that the drug court provides support, indirectly, to the community policing function. Twenty-five percent of the respondents indicated that the community police activities had not been coordinated with the drug court program.

[1] The New Haven Police Department has dedicated one police officer to the drug court to assist the court in supervision and monitoring of drug court participants.

Chart IV-5: Impact of Drug Court on Community Policing Activities

Name of Court	St.	Community Policing	Both Prgms are Coord.	Only Indirectly	No Support	Comments
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ					
Tucson	AZ	Yes				We anticipate that the drug court will have minimal effect on our existing community policing.
Bakersfield	CA	Yes			X	
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	Yes		X		
Roseville	CA	Yes			X	
San Bernardino	CA					
Santa Ana	CA	Yes		X		
Santa Barbara	CA					
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	Yes		X		
Woodland/ Yolo	CA					
New Haven	CT	Yes	X			
Dover	DE	Yes			X	
Georgetown	DE	Yes			X	
Wilmington	DE	Yes			X	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Yes			X	
Gainesville	FL	Yes		X		
Key West	FL					
Sarasota	FL					
Macon	GA	Yes			X	
Honolulu	HI	Yes			X	
Chicago	IL	Yes		X		
Markham	IL	Yes			X	

Name of Court	St.	Community Policing	Both Prgms are Coord.	Only Indirectly	No Support	Comments
Wichita	KS					
Kalamazoo	MI	Yes			X	
Warren Co.	NC	No				
Camden	NJ					
Newark	NJ					
Las Vegas	NV	Yes		X		
Brooklyn	NY					
Rochester	NY					
Suffolk	NY	Yes			X	
Hamilton	OH					
Logan Co.	OK	Yes		X		
Payne Co.	OK	Yes		X		
Grants Pass	OR	Yes			X	
Portland	OR	Yes		X		
Philadelphia	PA					
Ponce	PR	Yes		X		
Lexington	SC	Yes		X		
Austin	TX	Yes		X		
Ft. Worth	TX	Yes		X		
Roanoke	VA	No				

D. Changes in Drug-Related Arrests Since Drug Court Began

Approximately 18% of the responding law enforcement officials indicated that drug-related arrests had increased since the drug court began. The remainder indicated there had been no significant change in arrest trends. None indicated that drug-related arrests had decreased.

Chart IV-6: Changes in Drug-Related Arrests Since Drug Court Began

Name of Court	St.	Number of Drug Possession Arrests	Number of Drug Related Arrests	Comments
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ			
Tucson	AZ	No Significant Change		2. Drug related arrests (theft etc.): We are hopeful that we will see a decrease in these types of arrests.
Bakersfield	CA	No Significant Change	No Significant Change	
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	No Significant Change	No Significant Change	
Roseville	CA	No Significant Change	No Significant Change	
San Bernardino	CA			
Santa Ana	CA	No Significant Change	No Significant Change	
Santa Barbara	CA			
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA			
Woodland/ Yolo	CA			
New Haven	CT	No Significant Change	No Significant Change	
Dover	DE	No Significant Change	No Significant Change	
Georgetown	DE	No Significant Change	No Significant Change	
Wilmington	DE	No Significant Change	No Significant Change	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Increased	Unsure	
Gainesville	FL	Increased	Increased	
Key West	FL			
Sarasota	FL			
Macon	GA	No Significant change	No Significant change	
Honolulu	HI	No Significant change	No Significant change	
Chicago	IL	No Significant Change	No Significant Change	
Markham	IL	No Significant change	No Significant change	
Wichita	KS			
Kalamazoo	MI	No Significant Change	No Significant Change	

Name of Court	St.	Number of Drug Possession Arrests	Number of Drug Related Arrests	Comments
Warren Co.	NC	Too early to determine	Too early to determine	
Camden	NJ			
Newark	NJ			
Las Vegas	NV	Increased	Decreased	
Brooklyn	NY			
Rochester	NY			
Suffolk	NY	No Significant change	No Significant change	
Hamilton	OH			
Logan Co.	OK	Increased	Increased	
Payne Co.	OK	Increased	Increased	
Grants Pass	OR	Too early to determine	Too early to determine	
Portland	OR	Increased	Unknown	
Philadelphia	PA			
Ponce	PR	Increased	Decreased	
Lexington	SC	No Significant change	No Significant Change	It really is too early in our jurisdiction to have any meaningful statistics on arrests.
Austin	TX	Increased	No Significant Change	
Ft. Worth	TX	No Significant Change	Decreased	
Roanoke	VA	No Significant change	No Significant change	

III. Costs Incurred For Drug Court Program

A. Total Staff Dedicated To Drug Court

Four (10%) of the agencies dedicate at least one full-time officer to the drug court and 3 (8%) dedicate at least one part-time officer. In some instances, staff were hired specifically for the drug court or transferred from other assignments. None of the agencies dedicate any support staff.

Chart IV-7(a): Staff Dedicated to Drug Court

Name of Court	State	FT Officers	PT Officers	FT Support	PT Support	Volunteers
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ					
Tucson	AZ	No additional staff will be dedicated to this program.				
Bakersfield	CA					
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	1	4	0	3	0
Roseville	CA	0	2	0		
San Bernardino	CA					
Santa Ana	CA					
Santa Barbara	CA					
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA					
Woodland/Yolo	CA					
New Haven	CT	X				
Dover	DE	6	0	0	0	0
Georgetown	DE		1			
Wilmington	DE	N/A		16	2	0
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Pretrial Services has one employee (employed by Broward County) whose only function is to qualify potential candidates for this program and supervise defendants released to this program from jail.				
Gainesville	FL	0		0		0
Key West	FL					
Sarasota	FL					
Macon	GA	None	None	None	None	None
Honolulu	HI					
Chicago	IL					
Markham	IL	None	None	None	None	None
Wichita	KS					
Kalamazoo	MI					
Warren Co.	NC					None
Camden	NJ					
Newark	NJ					
Las Vegas	NV					

Name of Court	State	FT Officers	PT Officers	FT Support	PT Support	Volunteers
Brooklyn	NY					
Rochester	NY					
Suffolk	NY					
Hamilton	OH					
Logan Co.	OK	0	0	0	0	0
Payne Co.	OK	0	0	0	0	0
Grants Pass	OR					
Portland	OR	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Philadelphia	PA					
Ponce	PR	X				
Lexington	SC	We have no personnel dedicated solely to drug court.				
Austin	TX	1				
Ft. Worth	TX					
Roanoke	VA					

Chart IV-7(b): Staff Hired Specifically for the Drug Court

Name of Court	State	Hired Specifically for Drug Court
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	
Tucson	AZ	
Bakersfield	CA	
Los Angeles Munic.	CA	Yes; 1 FT officer in custody component.
Roseville	CA	No
San Bernardino	CA	
Santa Ana	CA	No
Santa Barbara	CA	
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	
Woodland/Yolo	CA	
New Haven	CT	The liaison officer was transferred from patrol and reassigned to the drug court full-time.
Dover	DE	N/A
Georgetown	DE	No
Wilmington	DE	Yes
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	
Gainesville	FL	Yes
Key West	FL	
Sarasota	FL	
Macon	GA	No
Honolulu	HI	
Chicago	IL	
Markham	IL	No
Wichita	KS	

Name of Court	State	Hired Specifically for Drug Court
Kalamazoo	MI	
Warren Co.	NC	No
Camden	NJ	
Newark	NJ	
Las Vegas	NV	
Brooklyn	NY	
Rochester	NY	
Suffolk	NY	No
Hamilton	OH	
Logan Co.	OK	No
Payne Co.	OK	No
Grants Pass	OR	No
Portland	OR	N/A
Philadelphia	PA	
Ponce	PR	No
Lexington	SC	No
Austin	TX	No
Ft. Worth	TX	
Roanoke	VA	No

B. Costs Incurred to Support Drug Court

Five programs indicated they had incurred additional costs to implement the drug court, primarily for custody supervision and treatment services. In one instance, asset forfeiture funds were used to absorb these costs.

C. Savings Achieved

One agency (Dover, Delaware) noted cost savings derived from the drug court, primarily from court appearance hours saved.

IV. Program Implementation/planning Issues

A. Most Serious Problems Encountered as a Result of the Drug Court and Strategies Used to Resolve Them

Law enforcement officials were asked to identify the most serious problems they had encountered in designing or implementing the drug court and to describe the strategies used to resolve these problems. Their responses follow:

Name of Court	State	Problems	Resolution
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ		
Tucson	AZ	N/A	
Bakersfield	CA	No significant problems	
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	Frequent inability to coordinate effort between this agency treatment providers, courts, specifically inability to always deliver inmate participants to treatment site promptly.	On-going effort/procedural changes
Roseville	CA	Getting officers to understand the program. The officers want to see offenders behind bars.	Being 1 year old, we don't have a long history. I have been to the graduation of drug court. If those persons don't come back into the system its a success.
San Bernardino	CA		
Santa Ana	CA	No real "serious" problems.	
Santa Barbara	CA		
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	No serious problems have been identified.	
Woodland/Yolo	CA		

Name of Court	State	Problems	Resolution
New Haven	CT		
Dover	DE	No problems encountered as of January 1997.	
Georgetown	DE	None	
Wilmington	DE	Scheduling and officer availability/ reallocation of prosecutors responsibilities for managing cases/M.E.'s turn around time	Yes
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Failure to appear rate	We're working on a failure to appear unit as well as the hiring of additional staff so we can implement field supervision.
Gainesville	FL	No real problems associated with drug court.	
Key West	FL		
Sarasota	FL		
Macon	GA		
Honolulu	HI	None	
Chicago	IL	The juveniles are arrested for possession of controlled substance, but are found to have marijuana in their system. There is no nexus between the arrest and the treatment. The problem with these juveniles is that they are hired drug sellers for the gang. Anti-gang intervention would be more useful in deterring future PCS charges.	Assurances have been made that treatment will include life skills useful in deterring future gang activity.
Markham	IL		
Wichita	KS		
Kalamazoo	MI	None	
Warren Co.	NC	Too early to determine.	
Camden	NJ		
Newark	NJ		
Las Vegas	NV	None	
Brooklyn	NY		
Rochester	NY		

Name of Court	State	Problems	Resolution
Suffolk	NY		
Hamilton	OH		
Logan Co.	OK	No problems experienced, program not utilized!	
Payne Co.	OK	No problems experienced, program not utilized!	
Grants Pass	OR	Use of jail bed space for drug offenders has increased.	Has not been resolved.
Portland	OR		
Philadelphia	PA		
Ponce	PR	None	
Lexington	SC	The coordination of starting up a new program.	Many were resolved with the hiring of a full-time drug court coordinator.
Austin	TX	Acceptance of the drug court concept by hard line enforcement types (officers and administrators)	Not fully resolved. Time and results will tell.
Ft. Worth	TX		
Roanoke	VA		

B. Most Significant Benefits to Agency Resulting From Drug Court

Law enforcement officers were asked to identify the most significant benefits that had resulted for their agencies as a result of the drug court. Their responses follow:

Name of Court	State	Benefits
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	
Tucson	AZ	
Bakersfield	CA	
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	
Roseville	CA	
San Bernardino	CA	
Santa Ana	CA	The Orange County Drug Court has done an outstanding job. The Court has remained true to its policies and is always seeking input from stakeholders.
Santa Barbara	CA	

Name of Court	State	Benefits
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	The Court must have the necessary financial resources for treatment, counseling and other tools to ensure the success of the participant.
Woodland/Yolo	CA	
New Haven	CT	
Dover	DE	
Georgetown	DE	
Wilmington	DE	Reduction in cases due to earlier disposition-mandatary counseling-Tried- judge supervision in rehab responsibilities-no education in those cases where incarceration is sought-fewer trials
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Reduction of jail population.
Gainesville	FL	We need a national strategy which would address the drug seller or dealers. The drug courts is primarily designed for the user.
Key West	FL	
Sarasota	FL	
Macon	GA	
Honolulu	HI	Training could be provided to new recruits on the subject of the functions of the Drug Court.
Chicago	IL	
Markham	IL	As far as I can determine, our department hasn't been impacted one way or the other by the Drug Court Program, nor is there much information available or known to our department.
Wichita	KS	
Kalamazoo	MI	N/A
Warren Co.	NC	Too early to determine.
Camden	NJ	
Newark	NJ	
Las Vegas	NV	None
Brooklyn	NY	
Rochester	NY	
Suffolk	NY	Open the scope of cases that are accepted into the Drug Court.
Hamilton	OH	
Logan Co.	OK	No improvements.
Payne Co.	OK	No Improvements.

Name of Court	State	Benefits
Grants Pass	OR	
Portland	OR	We have not participated in a program evaluation or received information from the Drug Court regarding program effectiveness. If the courts have documented success we can be an effective advocate for the program.
Philadelphia	PA	
Ponce	PR	Increase Drug Courts in P.R.
Lexington	SC	
Austin	TX	As with all public sector programs, more personnel, and funds are needed by the drug court to maintain accountability of clients and credibility of the program.
Ft. Worth	TX	
Roanoke	VA	

C. Unanticipated Issues That Have Arising and Strategies Used to Resolve Them

Law enforcement officials were asked to identify any unanticipated issues that have arisen since the drug court became operational and the strategies used to address these issues. Their responses follow:

Name of Court	State	Unanticipated Issues	Resolution
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ		
Tucson	AZ	N/A	
Bakersfield	CA		
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	Custody environment space issues/competition with other confinement needs	
Roseville	CA		
San Bernardino	CA		
Santa Ana	CA	None	
Santa Barbara	CA		
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	None	
Woodland/Yolo	CA		
New Haven	CT		
Dover	DE	None noted as of January 1997,	

Name of Court	State	Unanticipated Issues	Resolution
Georgetown	DE	Pleas being accepted by attorney general's office past final case review.	Problems still ongoing
Wilmington	DE	Case trading and deposition recording for various "tracks" all of which produce "closed cases" at differing intervals	Dedication of staff to resolve the above
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	The volume of potential candidates to be qualified and supervised on Pretrial release	The director has requested funding for additional staff to meet the needs of program.
Gainesville	FL		
Key West	FL		
Sarasota	FL		
Macon	GA		
Honolulu	HI	None	
Chicago	IL	We recognized the need to broaden the arrest parameters to include property offenses committed to support a drug habit. A mechanism to properly identify these offenders must be established. It must be fair, objective, and accurate.	This has not been resolved.
Markham	IL	None	
Wichita	KS		
Kalamazoo	MI	None	
Warren Co.	NC	None at this time.	
Camden	NJ		
Newark	NJ		
Las Vegas	NV	None	None
Brooklyn	NY		
Rochester	NY		
Suffolk	NY		
Hamilton	OH		
Logan Co.	OK		
Payne Co.	OK		

Name of Court	State	Unanticipated Issues	Resolution
Grants Pass	OR	Escorting in-custody offenders to court.	
Portland	OR		
Philadelphia	PA		
Ponce	PR	None	
Lexington	SC		
Austin	TX	Controversies over which cases are acceptable drug court cases and which need full prosecutions.	Interagency committees resolved these problems (P.D., D.A.'s's office, Court systems, etc.)
Ft. Worth	TX		
Roanoke	VA		

D. Advice to Counterpart Agencies in Other Jurisdictions

Law enforcement officials were asked to indicate any guidance they might offer to law enforcement colleagues in other jurisdictions that were contemplating the implementation of a drug court. The following are their responses:

Name of Court	State	Advice
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	
Tucson	AZ	
Bakersfield	CA	
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	Program demand will increase/resource demand will increase/organizational commitment is essential from top down.
Roseville	CA	
San Bernardino	CA	
Santa Ana	CA	Local law enforcement should be involved in the early planning stages, working with the Court, Probation, Health Care, etc.
Santa Barbara	CA	
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	We would advise them to strongly support Drug Court. We expect a long-term benefit and impact on repeat offenders as well as redirecting first-time offenders away from the criminal justice system.
Woodland/Yolo	CA	
New Haven	CT	Having a police officer assigned to drug court is valuable to success of the drug court.

Name of Court	State	Advice
Dover	DE	To get better acquainted with the system and what it is designed to accomplish from the inception of the program.
Georgetown	DE	
Wilmington	DE	With proper monitoring, uniform acceptance among police, prosecution, and correction. Judges must believe in program and must maintain continued ********.
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Ensure funding and positions for the anticipated volume of graduates.
Gainesville	FL	Try to designed funds for the programs on a annual basis.
Key West	FL	
Sarasota	FL	
Macon	GA	
Honolulu	HI	The Drug Court Program is worth supporting if implemented in their jurisdiction.
Chicago	IL	
Markham	IL	
Wichita	KS	
Kalamazoo	MI	N/A
Warren Co.	NC	
Camden	NJ	
Newark	NJ	
Las Vegas	NV	Support it--educate inmates on its function and availability--talk it up to community leaders and the public.
Brooklyn	NY	
Rochester	NY	
Suffolk	NY	
Hamilton	OH	
Logan Co.	OK	
Payne Co.	OK	
Grants Pass	OR	If there is sufficient jail space, there should be no issues.
Portland	OR	
Philadelphia	PA	
Ponce	PR	Give all support

Name of Court	State	Advice
Lexington	SC	Have a drug court coordinator--someone dedicated solely to establishing drug court.
Austin	TX	To make sure to include anyone impacted, but especially law enforcement, from the beginning.
Ft. Worth	TX	Be flexible
Roanoke	VA	Participate.

E. Suggested Improvements

Law enforcement officials were also asked to offer suggestions for improving the drug court program. Their responses follow:

Name of Court	State	Improvements Suggested
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	
Tucson	AZ	
Bakersfield	CA	
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	
Roseville	CA	
San Bernardino	CA	
Santa Ana	CA	The Orange County Drug Court has done an outstanding job. The Court has remained true to its policies and is always seeking input from stakeholders.
Santa Barbara	CA	
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	The Court must have the necessary financial resources for treatment, counseling and other tools to ensure the success of the participant.
Woodland/Yolo	CA	
New Haven	CT	
Dover	DE	
Georgetown	DE	
Gainesville	FL	We need a national strategy which would address the drug seller or dealers. The drug courts is primarily designed for the user.
Key West	FL	
Sarasota	FL	
Macon	GA	

Name of Court	State	Improvements Suggested
Honolulu	HI	Training could be provided to new recruits on the subject of the functions of the Drug Court.
Chicago	IL	
Markham	IL	As far as I can determine, our department hasn't been impacted one way or the other by the Drug Court Program, nor is there much information available or known to our department.
Wichita	KS	
Kalamazoo	MI	N/A
Warren Co.	NC	Too early to determine.
Camden	NJ	
Newark	NJ	
Las Vegas	NV	None
Brooklyn	NY	
Rochester	NY	
Suffolk	NY	Open the scope of cases that are accepted into the Drug Court.
Hamilton	OH	
Logan Co.	OK	No improvements.
Payne Co.	OK	No Improvements.
Grants Pass	OR	
Portland	OR	We have not participated in a program evaluation or received information from the Drug Court regarding program effectiveness. If the courts have documented success we can be an effective advocate for the program.
Philadelphia	PA	
Ponce	PR	Increase Drug Courts in P.R.
Lexington	SC	
Austin	TX	As with all public sector programs, more personnel, and funds are needed by the drug court to maintain accountability of clients and credibility of the program.
Ft. Worth	TX	
Roanoke	VA	

APPENDIX

Individuals to Contact for Further Information

Name of Court	State	Last Name	First Name	Agency	Address	Telephone	Fax
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ						
Tucson	AZ	Miller	Kermit	Tucson	Tucson Police Department 270 S. Stone Avenue Tucson, AZ 85701	520/791-5296	520/791-4184
Bakersfield	CA	Smithson	Dennis	Kern County Sheriff's	Kern County Sheriff's Department 1350 Norris Road Bakersfield, CA 93308	805/391-7863	805/391-7922
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	Burt	Daniel	L.A. Co. Sheriff's Dept.	Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department 441 Bauchet Street Los Angeles, CA 90012	213/974-4158	
Roseville	CA						
San Bernardino	CA						
Santa Ana	CA	McCoy	Daniel G.	Santa Ana Police Dept.	P.O. Box 1981 60 Civic Center Plaza Santa Ana, CA 92702		
Santa Barbara	CA						
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	Zanolini	Gary A.	Sonoma Co. Sheriff's Dept	Sonoma County Sheriff's Department 600 Administration Drive, Room 103-3 Santa Rosa, CA 95403	707/527-2781	707/522-6061

Name of Court	State	Last Name	First Name	Agency	Address	Telephone	Fax
Woodland/Yolo	CA						
New Haven	CT	Simmons	Susie	New Haven Police Dept.	New Haven Police Department 1 Union Avenue New Haven, CT 06511	203/946-6304	203/946-6293
Dover	DE	Kent	William	Dover City Police Dept.	Dover City Police Department 400 S. Queen Street Dover, DE 19901	302/736-7140	302/736-7157
Georgetown	DE	Romanelli	James	DE State Police	Delaware State Police--Special Investigations Unit P.O. Box 430 Dover, DE 19947	302/577-3055	302/378-5211
Wilmington	DE	Letang	Peter N.	Office of the Attorney General	Carvel State Office Building 9th and French Streets Wilmington, DE 19801	302/577-8805	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Poole	Julie	Broward County Pretrial Services	560 SE 3rd Avenue, Suite 201 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301	954-765-4775	954-765-4848
Gainesville	FL	Jones	Tony	Gainesville Police Dept	Chief Donald Shinnamon, Sr. Gainesville Police Department P.O. Box 1250 Gainesville, FL 32601	352/334-2411	352/334-2345
Key West	FL						
Sarasota	FL						
Macon	GA	Richardson	George	Macon Police Dept.	700 Poplar Street Macon, GA 31201	912/751-7575	912/751-7540
Honolulu	HI	Moses	Michael K. S.	Honolulu Police Dept.	801 S. Beretania Street Honolulu, HI 96813	808/529-3012	808/529-3476

Name of Court	State	Last Name	First Name	Agency	Address	Telephone	Fax
Chicago	IL	Bartik	Roberta M.	Chicago Police Department	Youth Division 1121 So.. State Street Chicago, IL 60605	312/747-5595	312/747-1106
Markham	IL	O'Brien	Edward	Hazel Crest Police Dept.	3700 W. 170th Place Hazel Crest, IL 60429	708/335-9640	708/335-9648
Wichita	KS						
Kalamazoo	MI	Lirot	Kit	Portage Police	7810 Shaver Portage, MI 49002	616/329-4564	616/329-4569
Warren Co.	NC	Williams	Johnny M.	Warren Co. Sheriff's Dept	P.O. Box 185 Warrenton, NC 27589	919/257-3364	919/257-3936
Camden	NJ						
Newark	NJ						
Las Vegas	NV	Winget	Richard	Las Vegas Metropolitan PD	Las Vegas Metropolitan PD 400 Stewart Avenue Las Vegas, NV 89101	702/229-3438	702/382-2904
Brooklyn	NY						
Rochester	NY						
Suffolk	NY	Donnelly	Thomas	Suffolk Co. Police Dept.	30 Yaphank Avenue Yaphank, NY 11980	516/852-6000	
Hamilton	OH						
Logan Co.	OK	McNickle	Norman	Stillwater Police Dept.	P.O. Box 1725 Stillwater, OK 74076	405/372-4171	405/377-1029
Payne Co.	OK	McNickle	Norman	Stillwater Police Dept.	P.O. Box 1725 Stillwater, OK 74076	405/372-4171	405/377-1029

Name of Court	State	Last Name	First Name	Agency	Address	Telephone	Fax
Grants Pass	OR	Dickson	Mark	Josephine Co. Sheriff's	Justice Building Josephine County Courthouse 97526	541/474-5112	
Portland	OR	Berg	Lynnae C.	Portland Police Bureau	1111 SW 2nd Avenue Portland, OR 97204	503/823-0240	
Philadelphia	PA						
Ponce	PR	Davila	Pedro A. Toledo	Puerto Rican State Police	Puerto Rican State Police P.O. Box 70166 San Juan, Puerto Rico 00936-8166	787/781-0080	
Lexington	SC	Haymond	Ester	Lexington Co. Sheriff's	P.O. Box 639 Lexington, S.C. 29071	8039512404	8039512410
Austin	TX	Barrington	Gary E.	Austin Police Dept.	Austin Police Department, Organized Crime Division 1106 Clayton Lane Suite 350 W Austin, Texas 78701	512/458-0401	512/458-0405
Ft. Worth	TX	Garrett	DE	Fort Worth Police Dept.	Fort Worth Police Department 350 West Belknap Fort Worth, TX 76102	817/877-8067	817/887-8270
Roanoke	VA	Ewers	H.W.	Raonoke County Police Dep	3568 Peters Creek Road Roanoke, VA 24019	540/561-8097	540/561-8114

PART V: PERSPECTIVES OF CORRECTIONS AGENCIES

PART V: PERSPECTIVES OF CORRECTIONS AGENCIES

I. Introduction

Responses were received from officials affiliated with correctional agencies in 42 jurisdictions with operating drug courts, representing 18 states and Puerto Rico. Their responses regarding the involvement of their agencies with the local drug court are provided in the following sections.

II. CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING DRUG COURT EFFECTIVENESS

A. Criteria Being Used to Assess Effectiveness of Drug Court

As Chart V-I indicates, responding correctional agency officials cited the following criteria which they are using to assess the effectiveness of the drug court in their jurisdiction:

percentage of participants remaining in program	54%
percentage of participants graduating from program	45%
frequency of contact between participants and:	
court	45%
treatment provider	45%
participant urinalysis results	50%
new arrests for participants involving:	
drug possession	50%
other drug charges	49%
nondrug charges	38%
participant employment status	37%

Chart V-1: Criteria Being Used to Assess Effectiveness of Drug Court

Name of Court	St.	% Still in Program	% Grad.	Freq. of Court Contact	Freq. of Tx Contact	U/A Results	New Charges			Participant Employment Status	Other
							Drug Poss.	Other Drug	Non-drug		
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ										
Tucson	AZ										Not yet implemented
Bakersfield	CA										Evaluation by sentencing court.
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	X			X						
Modesto	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Roseville	CA										
San Bernardino	CA	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		We are currently working towards a plan designed to transition inmates into jobs upon release.
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Santa Ana	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Santa Barbara	CA	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Woodland/ Yolo	CA										This section, not yet applicable to our program - this information not tracked.
New Haven	CT										

Name of Court	St.	% Still in Program	% Grad.	Freq. of Court Contact	Freq. of Tx Contact	U/A Results	New Charges			Participant Employment Status	Other
							Drug Poss.	Other Drug	Non-drug		
Georgetown	DE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Other areas of assessment done by TASC
Bartow	FL	X	X			X	X				
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	X	X				X	X	X		
Gainesville	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Jacksonville	FL		X				X	X	X	X	
Key West	FL										
Sarasota	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Tampa	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Compliance with conditions of PTI contract.
Chicago	IL										
Markham	IL			X	X	X	X	X			
Wichita	KS										
Kalamazoo	MI										
Kansas City	MO										
Warren Co.	NC										
Camden	NJ	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	We are still in our 1st yr. of operation & are trying to determine *effectiveness*. We keep stats on all categories marked. A State Researcher is now compiling our stats & researching *effectiveness*.

Name of Court	St.	% Still in Program	% Grad.	Freq. of Court Contact	Freq. of Tx Contact	U/A Results	New Charges			Participant Employment Status	Other
							Drug Poss.	Other Drug	Non-drug		
Newark	NJ	X	X		X	X	X	X			
Las Cruces	NM										
Rochester	NY										
Suffolk	NY										
Hamilton	OH										
Logan Co.	OK	X	X			X	X	X			Overall effectiveness of the program in reducing the recidivism rate (re-offending rate) for all offenses.
Payne Co.	OK	X	X			X	X	X			Overall effectiveness of the Program in reducing the recidivism rate (re-offending rate) for all offenses.
Tulsa	OK										Not done by this office.
Grants Pass	OR	X		X	X	X	X	X			
Klammath Falls	OR	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Progress in Tx, general behavior in the community.
Portland	OR	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Days incarcerated, use of public assistance and medical claims through Medicaid.

Name of Court	St.	% Still in Program	% Grad.	Freq. of Court Contact	Freq. of Tx Contact	U/A Results	New Charges			Participant Employment Status	Other
							Drug Poss.	Other Drug	Non-drug		
Roseburg	OR	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	In order of significance: 1) Clean urinalysis; 2) Compliance with treatment and Court appearance requirements - We just started 4/96 so grad. has not occurred yet.
Philadelphia	PA										
Ponce	PR	X		X	X	X				X	Explanation: % remaining=101 clients; % graduating=not yet in treatment and supervision; Freq. of contact; by court=twice a month; Tx prov.=individualize; U/A= monthly; Employ.=must have a job or must be in school
Roanoke	VA	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	We are presently negotiating with a local university for an evaluation of Drug Court.

III. Impact of Drug Court

A. Impact of Drug Court on Agency's Capability to Respond to Criminal Activity and/or to Carry Out its Functions

Respondents were asked to indicate the impact, if any, of the drug court on their agency's capability to respond to criminal activity and/or to carry out its functions. As Chart V-2 depicts, responding correctional agency officials identified the impact of the drug court on their agencies in the following areas:

resulted in more jail space for pretrial defendants	48%
resulted in more jail space for sentenced defendants	48%
reduced the number of early releases due to lack of jail space	38%
reduced the number of substance dependent detainees	40%

Chart V-2: Impact of Drug Court on Agency's Capability to Respond to Criminal Activity/Carry Out its Functions

Name of Court	ST	More Bed Space for Pretrial Defends.	More Bed Space for Sentenced Defends.	Reduce # of Early Releases	Reduced # of Substance Dependent Inmates	Other
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ					
Tucson	AZ	X			X	
Bakersfield	CA	X	X	X	X	
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	X	X	X		Because of size of custody population in this jurisdiction impact is negligible, however theoretically likely.
Modesto	CA	X	X	X		
Roseville	CA	X	X	X		
San Bernardino	CA	X	X	X		The majority of our inmates are drug dep. Drug Court does a great job of selecting participants. However, as one person is released to Drug Court, many more drug dependent inmates are detained. Drugs are a huge problem in our county.

Name of Court	ST	More Bed Space for Pretrial Defends.	More Bed Space for Sentenced Defends.	Reduce # of Early Releases	Reduced # of Substance Dependent Inmates	Other
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	X	X	X	X	
Santa Ana	CA	X	X	X	X	
Santa Barbara	CA	UN	UN	UN	UN	
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	X	X			
Woodland/ Yolo	CA					
New Haven	CT					
Georgetown	DE					
Bartow	FL	X	X	X	X	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL					
Gainesville	FL	X			X	
Jacksonville	FL				X	
Key West	FL					
Sarasota	FL					
Tampa	FL	X			X	
Chicago	IL					
Markham	IL					
Wichita	KS					
Kalamazoo	MI	X	X	X	X	
Kansas City	MO					
Warren Co.	NC					
Camden	NJ		X		X	
Newark	NJ	X	X	X	X	
Las Cruces	NM					
Rochester	NY					
Suffolk	NY	X	X	X		
Hamilton	OH					

Name of Court	ST	More Bed Space for Pretrial Defends.	More Bed Space for Sentenced Defends.	Reduce # of Early Releases	Reduced # of Substance Dependent Inmates	Other
Logan Co.	OK		X			The program provides probation and parole officer's with an additional tool to use to deal with minor violations, without resulting in institutional incarceration.
Payne Co.	OK		X			The program provides probation and parole officer's with an additional tool to use to deal with minor violations, without resulting in institutional incarceration.
Tulsa	OK				X	
Grants Pass	OR				X	
Klammath Falls	OR					The Sheriff operates the jail but I do not believe the program has much impact
Portland	OR	X	X	X	X	Because of early entry into the program (within 3 days of arrest).
Roseburg	OR			X	X	
Philadelphia	PA					
Ponce	PR	X	X	X	X	In this Program we provide Tx & super-vision to the clients, and we also work in the relapse prevention of the clients.
Roanoke	VA		X			It certainly has reduced the number of pre-sentence reports required by probation and parole. It has enabled probation and parole to provide better treatment for drug dependent offenders.

IV. Costs for Drug Court

A. Total Staff Agency Dedicates to Drug court

Approximately 18% of the responding agencies dedicate at least one full-time staff person to perform drug court functions. As Chart V-3 indicates, these functions generally relate to supervision functions associated with community corrections agencies and those which perform probation-related functions. Approximately 10% of the responding agencies dedicate at least one part-time staff member.

Chart V-3: Staff Dedicated to Drug Court

Name of Court	ST	Full-Time Staff		Part-Time Staff		Other Staff
		#	Description	#	Description	
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ					
Tucson	AZ	0		0		
Bakersfield	CA					
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	1	Custody staff member	1	Custody staff	3--clerical/support-PT
Modesto	CA	2	1 Supervising PO 1 DPO II			3-FT substance abuse counselors from the Tx component
Roseville	CA					
San Bernardino	CA				Inmate Programs Coordinator: One responsibility of the inmate programs coordinator is to be a liaison between Judge Morris & the inmate. This includes attending Drug Court as needed--informing the Judge of the progress being made by the inmate, & reporting any disciplines that may have resulted in removing the inmate from classes.	
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA				Approximately 13 hs/wk out of a 40 hr week (8 hrs in Court, the other 5 hs spent giving orientations to Tx) Court inmates re: programs; giving instructions, & evaluations to instructors of Substance Abuse classes; interviewing clients prior to each court review, & writing court reports for the Drug Tx Court.1/3 of a 40 hour week.	

Name of Court	ST	Full-Time Staff		Part-Time Staff		Other Staff
		#	Description	#	Description	
Santa Ana	CA	3	Deputy Probation Officers		Supervisor; Director; Deputy Chief; Clerical	Volunteer Prob. Officer (VPO)
Santa Barbara	CA				Attend periodic drug court meetings	
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	0		0		
Woodland/ Yolo	CA					
New Haven	CT					
Georgetown	DE		Drug court offenders are in all Probation caseloads.			
Bartow	FL	8	Full time probation officers			
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	10	(1)Supervisor (9)Officers			
Gainesville	FL	2	1 Program Supervisor, 1 Senior Pretrial Release Counselor	.5	Drug counselor aide	Contract Substance Abuse Counselor(s) and contract Acupuncturist
Jacksonville	FL			2	Program Coordinator and Court liaison.	
Key West	FL					
Sarasota	FL					
Tampa	FL	3	2 certified correctional probation officers, 1 supervisor III			Support staff
Chicago	IL					
Markham	IL					
Wichita	KS					
Kalamazoo	MI					

Name of Court	ST	Full-Time Staff		Part-Time Staff		Other Staff
		#	Description	#	Description	
Kansas City	MO					
Warren Co.	NC					
Camden	NJ					
Newark	NJ					
Las Cruces	NM					
Rochester	NY					
Suffolk	NY					
Hamilton	OH					
Logan Co.	OK					
Payne Co.	OK					
Tulsa	OK					I have accepted a role in drug court as my daily activities.
Grants Pass	OR				TE Probation Officer who participates as part of the Drug Court Team and supervises offenders who are Drug Court participants.	
Klammath Falls	OR		About 1/3 FTE of assigned probation officer's time.		Administrative	Treatment contractors incorporate most drug court clients into our current "CAT" program. Drug Court = about 1/3 of total. Total program about 2.5 FTE.
Portland	OR	0		0		
Roseburg	OR			1	Probation Officer	
Philadelphia	PA					
Ponce	PR					

Name of Court	ST	Full-Time Staff		Part-Time Staff		Other Staff
		#	Description	#	Description	
Roanoke	VA		Director, Assist Director (both probation and parole officers), 2 prob. & par. officers, 3 surveillance officers (assist prob. & par. officers), a support services supervisor (handles urine testing equipment, home electronic monitoring, transportation officer, supervisor of comm'ty service) and a senior secretary (all positions full time).			

B. Program Costs

Approximately 30% of the responding agencies indicated that the drug court had imposed additional costs on their agencies, most of which related to the various supervision, monitoring, and treatment service functions they had assumed in relation to their community-based service activities.

Chart V-4: Additional Costs to Agency for Drug Court

Name of Court	State	Add'l Cost	Amount	Purposes
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ			
Tucson	AZ			
Bakersfield	CA	No		
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	Yes	40,000	Part time activity of a variety of personnel in clerical effort, problem solving, program coordination, etc.
Modesto	CA	Yes	140,000	For personnel and expenses.
Roseville	CA	No		

Name of Court	State	Add'l Cost	Amount	Purposes
San Bernardino	CA	No		
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	Yes		Part time staff to monitor participants. Transportation of specific inmates to specific programs.
Santa Ana	CA	Yes		Increased Drug Tests
Santa Barbara	CA	No		
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	No		
Woodland/Yolo	CA			
New Haven	CT			
Georgetown	DE	No		
Bartow	FL	No		
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Unknown		
Gainesville	FL	Yes	180,400	Total budget
Jacksonville	FL	No		
Key West	FL			
Sarasota	FL			
Tampa	FL	No		
Chicago	IL			
Markham	IL			
Wichita	KS			
Kalamazoo	MI	No		
Kansas City	MO			
Warren Co.	NC			
Camden	NJ	Yes		Not sure of amount but due to hiring freeze, job currently held by Sr. Probation Officer with Extra Duties is being distributed to other supervisors so she can maintain Drug Court.
Newark	NJ	No		
Las Cruces	NM			
Rochester	NY			
Suffolk	NY	No		
Hamilton	OH			

Name of Court	State	Add'l Cost	Amount	Purposes
Logan Co.	OK	Yes	10,000	Due to the high cost of the program and the offenders ability to pay both program fees and probation fees, D.O.C. has waived fees on program participants.
Payne Co.	OK	Yes	10,000	Due to the high cost of the program and the offenders ability to pay both program fees and probation fees, D.O.C. has waived fees on Program participants.
Tulsa	OK	No		
Grants Pass	OR	No		
Klammath Falls	OR	Yes	1,500	$1500 per month for treatment contract.
Portland	OR	Yes	780,000	$780,000 per year for contract with treatment provider.
Roseburg	OR	No		This is a new program which started 4/96. We have been utilizing existing staff and resources (treatment agency and $ for UA's)
Philadelphia	PA			
Ponce	PR	Yes	982,684	$232,171 (25%) of the total cost of the programs is provided by the agency. $696,513 provided by federal budget.
Roanoke	VA	Yes	565,547	The previous figure is the 1996/97 FY Budget. About $269,000 of this is for treatment programs.

C. Savings Achieved:

As Chart V-5 indicates, approximately 30% of the responding agencies also indicated that the drug court had resulted in cost savings for their agencies. The most frequently cited areas of savings were: availability of correctional bed space and detox costs.

Chart V-5: Savings Achieved from Drug Court

Name of Court	ST	Bed Space	Other Oper. Functions
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ		
Tucson	AZ	Yes	Detox costs med- ical/mental health
Bakersfield	CA		
Los Angeles	CA	Yes	
Modesto	CA	Yes	
Roseville	CA	N/A	
San Bernardino	CA	Yes	
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA		Has made add'l space in classrooms when Tx Court participants are released.
Santa Ana	CA	No	
Santa Barbara	CA		
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	Yes	
Woodland	CA		
New Haven	CT		We do not have formal relationship with Corrections
Georgetown	DE		
Bartow	FL	Yes	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	UN	
Gainesville	FL	Yes	Some red. recid., intensity super- vision of offenders who would have remained in jail
Key West	FL		
Sarasota	FL		
Tampa	FL		Offens. haven't been placed in prison; thus saving tax payers $
Chicago	IL		
Markham	IL		
Wichita	KS		
Kalamazoo	MI	Yes	
Kansas City	Mo		
Warren Co.	NC		
Camden	NJ		
Newark	NJ		
Las Cruces	Nm		
Rochester	NY		
Suffolk	NY		
Hamilton	OH		
Logan Co.	OK	X	
Payne Co.	OK	X	
Tulsa	OK	No	Undetermined at this time.
Grants Pass	OR	No	
Klammath Falls	OR	No	Expect some *down stream* reduction as a result of effective diversion.

Name of Court	ST	Bed Space	Other Oper. Functions
Portland	OR	No	Approx. 2 caseloads of probs. are avoided per year.
Roseburg	OR	No	
Philadelphia	PA	No	
Ponce	PR	X	
Roanoke	VA	X	There certainly has been a reduced no. of presentence reports, but also there has been savings to the courts in red. docket time for Dr. Ct. offs. Decreased incarceration is a savings, too

IV. Program Implementation And Planning Issues

A. Most Serous Problems Agency Has Encountered as a Result of the Drug Court and Strategies Used to Resolve Them

Correctional agency officials were asked to identify the most serious problems they had encountered in designing or implementing the drug court and to describe the strategies used to resolve these problems. Their responses follow:

Name of Court	State	Problems	Resolution
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ		
Tucson	AZ		
Bakersfield	CA	No major problems	
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	Frequent inability to coordinate effort between this agency, treatment providers, courts, specifically inability to always delivery inmate participants to treatment site promptly.	On-going effort/procedural changes

Name of Court	State	Problems	Resolution
Modesto	CA	Space to hold group treatment sessions.	Still pending
Roseville	CA	Mostly philosophical--getting beyond punishing all drug offenders.	It is a slow process--need to educate everyone in law enforcement about drug court
San Bernardino	CA	Inmates who were awaiting trial remained pre-sentenced. This prevented them from enrollment in the INROADS Program.	Working together with Judge Morris and his staff, the inmate is now sentenced with a court date. They are then sent to the INROADS Program immediately. We also provide red ink stamps that say "DRUG COURT" so that during Classification the inmate is immediately placed into classes.
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	Transportation of inmates to programs and providing staff to work with the team, instructors, classifications officers, and drug treatment court participants on limited resources.	Department is committed to work in a coordinated effort with Drug Treatment Court.
Santa Ana	CA	Staff shortages	Pending
Santa Barbara	CA	No serious problems.	
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA		
Woodland/Yolo	CA		
New Haven	CT		
Georgetown	DE	Program start-up, roles and responsibilities	Yes
Bartow	FL		
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Volume of offenders, (case load size) as well as conducting urinalysis as result of volume	Correctional Agency no longer does the urinalysis
Gainesville	FL	Our program is voluntary and at first, most 1st-time offenders were not interested in participation because the program was so intense.	We learned to be successful with offenders who had significant prior history.
Jacksonville	FL	Keeping drug court persons in a secure drug treatment facility when day/night treatment fails.	Somewhat resolved.
Key West	FL		

Name of Court	State	Problems	Resolution
Sarasota	FL	Unknown	
Tampa	FL	Bedspace (residential) for females.	Place on waiting list immediately at time of evaluation.
Chicago	IL		
Markham	IL		
Witchita	KS		
Kalamazoo	MI		
Kansas City	MO		
Warren Co.	NC		
Camden	NJ	Motivating interest in the program, payment for treatment, and needed probation officers for additional supervision as we enlarge program.	Educating our participating agencies, application for Grants through local and state government.
Newark	NJ		
Las Cruces	NM		
Rochester	NY		
Suffolk	NY	Mostly procedural problems in regards to the movement of prisoners.	We are working on it.
Hamilton	OH		
Logan Co.	OK	Some lack of communication and coordination. Failure to receive adequate reports of participants behavior or non compliance. Two, the overlapping of resource use, ie. dual supervision of offenders, double UA's.	Met with coordinator and drug court personnel and corrected the reporting of problems with participants.
Payne Co.	OK	Some lack of communication and coordination. Failure to receive adequate reports of participants behavior or non compliance. Two, the overlapping of resource use, ie. dual supervision of offenders, double UA's.	Met with coordinator and drug court personnel and corrected the reporting of problems with participants.
Tulsa	OK	Streamlining the selection process of candidates and making a formal treatment - sanctioning process.	Through memorandums of understanding between agencies and some hard work.

Name of Court	State	Problems	Resolution
Grants Pass	OR	Difference in the way violations of supervision are handled with the Drug Court participants vs. standard supervision cases.	Design and implementation of a Drug Court violation report that meets our requirements to notify the court of violations and still allows for the flexibility that Drug Court allows for.
Klammath Falls	OR	No particular problems. There was significant commmitment of time and energy to develop the program and test/develop procedures.	Regular meetings, collaboration.
Portland	OR	Funding.	County General Fund support; Oregon Health Plan; client fees; collaborative effort to manage participant flow.
Roseburg	OR	More court time. Working "low" risk offenders who would normally receive a lot less time. Hish case loads usually require less time with "low" risk offenders.	New program - no resolution to date. Perhaps if we had a higher number of cases in Drug Courty, staff time would be used more effectively.
Philadelphia	PA		
Ponce	PR	The most serious problem the agency has encountered in the implementation is the integration of the programs with the agencies that are the responsible of the programs development.	Meeting--feedback--good communications skills.
Roanoke	VA	Two major problems have been getting construction done to the day reporting center and implementation of a Drug Court grant.	They basically have been resolved over time by phone calls and patience needed to deal with governmental bureacracies. It was a slow process taking over 15 months to get a contract awarded for construction, and other 7 months following approval of the grant to obtain permission to spend the funds.

B. Most significant Benefits to Agency from Drug Court

Correctional agency officials were asked to identify the most significant benefits that had resulted for their agencies as a result of the drug court. Their responses are on the following page:

Name of Court	St.	Benefits
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ	
Tuscon	AZ	Anticipate more bed space less detox/medical/mental health related issues
Bakersfield	CA	Allowed incarceration of other, more violent inmates.
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	Morale builder for custody personnel involved in supervision of program.
Modesto	CA	Successful, drug-free participants
Roseville	CA	
San Bernadino	CA	Most important has been the relationship we have developed with the staff. In addition, the participants are motivated and less likely to resist education. Learning is "ordered" by the Judge and he accepts nothing less.
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	1) More motivation from these participants as they complete their programs. It helps to motivate others and these participants have a high success rate of not being re-arrested and of completing a 1 year probation period. 2) Bed space is made available upon their release after only 2-3 months. 3) Inmates are more solid in their recovery. 4) More inmates obtain and maintain jobs.
Santa Ana	CA	Allows closer supervision of drug offenders
Santa Barbara	CA	...we are aware that a significant number of serious drug offenders who have been in and out of our jail system have been participants in the Drug Court Program. No doubt this has had positive impact on the jail with regard to bed space and other costs. At some point, if the Court, District Attorney, and the Public Defender wish to conduct an evaluation, jail staff will cooperate.
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	Immedicate bed space and a slight reduction in the number of housed, sentenced inmates awaiting bed space in a treatment program.
Woodland/ Yolo	CA	
New Haven	CT	
Georgetown	DE	Fewer low level "probation" cases - consolidation of criminal charges.
Bartow	FL	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Diverting "First Time" offenders from prosecution
Gainesville	FL	This is a more effective approach than typical probation, violation, jail revolving door.
Jacksonville	FL	It makes available bed space and inmates benefit from having "no record".
Key West	FL	
Sarasota	FL	Unknown

Name of Court	St.	Benefits
Tampa	FL	(1) Positive media response and community support. (2) Freeing up bed-space. (3) Better interagency cooperation.
Chicago	IL	
Markham	IL	Stricter Controls, Recedivism
Witchita	KS	
Kalamazoo	MI	Substance abuse treatments.
Kansas City	MO	
Warren Co.	NC	
Camden	NJ	It has been easier to get people into treatment through Drug Court.
Newark	NJ	Closer monitoring
Las Cruces	NM	
Rochester	NY	
Suffolk	NY	
Hamilton	OH	
Logan Co.	OK	Participants who comply with the Program requirement of the Drug Court, and successfully complete, appear to have improved attitude and behavior.
Payne Co.	OK	Participants who comply with the program requirment of the Drug court, and successfully complete, appear to have improved attitude and behavior.
Tulsa	OK	Seeing people change for the better. The program is too new to give you numbers.
Grants Pass	OR	Quality and intensive treatment for Drug Court offenders
Klammath Falls	OR	Offender accountability especially in engaging offenders immediately in program, effectively screens low risk cases.
Portland	OR	Expansion of treatment capacity; diversion of drug users from formal probation supervision; positive experience of participants; collaboration between court, DA, Public Defendent, Comminity Corrections, and treatment.
Roseburg	OR	Alternatives to jail sanctions. Opportunity for offenders to participate in mroe intensive treatment and high accountability in terms of reporting and uninalysis.
Philadelphia	PA	
Ponce	PR	The most significant benefits that the agency has from the implementation of the program providing treatment and supervision to drug clients. We also reduce new lack of space in the correctional instititutions and we created new jobs to work in the program.
Roanoke	VA	It is anticipated that the most significant benefit will be reduced recidivism with the Drug Court population, but it has also resulted in the Department of Corrections becoming more pro treatment as seen in the creation of the day reporting center.

C. Unanticipated Issues Arising and Strategies to Resolve Them

Correctional agency officials were also asked to identify any unanticipated issues that have arisen since the drug court became operational and the strategies used to address these issues. Their responses follow:

Name of Court	St.	Unanticipated Issues	Resolution
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ		
Tuscon	AZ		
Bakersfield	CA		
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	Custody environment space issues/ competition with other confinement needs	
Modesto	CA	Finding qualified treatment staff	Still pending
Roseville	CA		
San Bernadino	CA	None to date	
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	When Managed Care went into effect, there was no transportation to programs use by drug treatment court. DOC was asked if they would perform this function.	D.O.C. is presently providing transportation for the Drug Treatment Court participants when requested by a Court Order.
Santa Ana	CA	Lack of adquate funding. Pressure to expand too rapidly.	Pending
Santa Barbara	CA	Manner of detox	Meetings and negotiations
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	None	
Woodland/Yolo	CA		
New Haven	CT		
Georgetown	DE	None	
Bartow	FL		
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	No funding available for increase in staff, equipment, (etc.)	They were/are not solved
Gainesville	FL	We expected 1st offender, but we got people with 8-10 years addictions. Our 1st 17 graduates had 214 prior arrests between them.	More casework/supervision, more referrals to residential treatment, structure use of minor sanctions (community service, 24 hrs in jail.)
Jacksonville	FL	1. The short time line when dealing with admitting persons into secure drug treatment. 2. Aftercare program arrangements.	1. Resolving the short time line for admittance. 2. Resolving aftercare program arrangement through probation.

Name of Court	St.	Unanticipated Issues	Resolution
Key West	FL		
Sarasota	FL	Unknown	
Tampa	FL	(1) Decrease in growth due to effectiveness of the program. (2) Volume of work and nature of work - are comparable to a higher level probation officer; thereby, present drug court staff need to be upgraded to a senior officer level.	
Chicago	IL		
Markham	IL		
Witchita	KS		
Kalamazoo	MI	None	
Kansas City	MO		
Warren Co.	NC		
Camden	NJ	We found that some people are inappropriate for Drug Court because their behavior is criminal rather than addictive.	We have learned to look more closely at prior record and treatment experience.
Newark	NJ		
Las Cruces	NM		
Rochester	NY		
Suffolk	NY	Lack of communication	
Hamilton	OH		
Logan Co.	OK	Problems in dual supervision. Referrals to the program from Probation and Parole for technical violations had to participate in the entire program rather than individualized components to meet the need.	
Payne Co.	OK	Problems in dual supervision; Referrals to the program from Probation and parole for technical violations and to participate in the entire program rather than individualized components to meet the need.	
Tulsa	OK	Treatment and sanctioning issues. Also drug test - no money.	Again through hard work and memorandums of understanding. We are still having money issues.

Name of Court	St.	Unanticipated Issues	Resolution
Grants Pass	OR	The large number of Drug Court participants already on supervision for other offenses	Assigned a P.O. to Drug Court
Klammath Falls	OR	Most of the issues between probation offices and therapists roles were resolved in the evolution of our Corrections Annex Treatment Program in 1993-94.	We incorporated Drug Court into an existing partnership between our agency and contracted treatment providers.
Portland	OR	Difficulty collecting fees and third party payments.	Fee collection made part of routine court procedure and emphasized by the judge. On-going discussions with health insurance providers.
Roseburg	OR	The referral process had been time consuming and cumbersome. Referrals have been slow due to above. It has been difficult to motivate staff to refer to Drug Court.	New program. Still working on it.
Philadelphia	PA		
Ponce	PR	N/A	N/A
Roanoke	VA	The Department of Corrections took the day reporting center from the local probation and parole office and in essence made it a seperate district answerable to the Regional Office. It's future role will include drug treatment for probation and parole offices in the region as well as drug court.	The regional concept will not begin until construction is completed to the center, but it is anticipated that 15% or more of the offenders in the center will be from outside of Roanoke. Staff will be required to bus some in by a van the center owns.

D. Advice to Counterpart Agencies in Other Jurisdictions

Responding correctional agency officials offered the following advice to colleagues in other jurisdictions that were contemplating the implementation of a drug court:

Name of Court	State	Advice
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	
Tuscon	AZ	Recommend a systems approach with an in jail treatment component.
Bakersfield	CA	Be flexible
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	Program demand will increase/resource demand will increase/organizational commitment is essential from top down.
Modesto	CA	Visit lots of current programs and steal as many ideas as you can

Name of Court	State	Advice
Roseville	CA	Every agency that drug court impacts should be involved in the planning and implementation.
San Bernadino	CA	Get to know the Correctional Education staff and work with them closely.
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	1) The coordinated effort between the Courts, the jail, the probation dept., D.A., P.D., Mental Health and Health Dept. is an important concept. The assessment is a valuable tool and team decision making is very effective.
Santa Ana	CA	Arrange adequate funding. Interagency co-operation.
Santa Barbara	CA	None
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	Be sure the planning effort is complete. Have funding secured. Work collaboratively with all affected agencies. Be patient.
Woodland/Yolo	CA	
New Haven	CT	
Georgetown	DE	Planning and communication, definition of roles and responsibilities are critical before start-up.
Bartow	FL	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Plan for volume
Gainesville	FL	Try to identify when and how you lose people and change your procedures as needed. Do what the clients need, not what is convenient.
Jacksonville	FL	Liaison between facilities must be constant and of good quality.
Key West	FL	
Sarasota	FL	
Tampa	FL	They need to develop a good relationship with the treatment providers.
Chicago	IL	
Markham	IL	Organized communication between courts, treatment providers, probation officers
Witchita	KS	
Kalamazoo	MI	Have a preincarceration "level" substance Abuse Treatment Program.
Kansas City	MO	
Warren Co.	NC	
Camden	NJ	To have a treatment team that can offer various types of treatment.
Newark	NJ	
Las Cruces	NM	
Rochester	NY	

Name of Court	State	Advice
Suffolk	NY	
Hamilton	OH	
Logan Co.	OK	Overall, the program is a good one that provides a mechanism of responsibility, accountability, and treatment. The costs' are too high, avoid dual use of resources, and implement a good info. sharing device.
Payne Co.	OK	Overall, the program is a good one that provides a mechanism of responsiblity, accountability, and treatment. The costs' are too high, avoid dual use of resources, and implement a good info sharing device.
Tulsa	OK	Develop good understandings between agencies and superiors.
Grants Pass	OR	Allow for flexibility in program design, be as client specific as possible, have a multi-agency approach
Klammath Falls	OR	Believe there are mutual gains for all agencies, offenders and the community if program is well designed.
Portland	OR	Develop planning process that includes all stakeholders; active case-management role for Drug Court judge is critical.
Roseburg	OR	1) Clear referral process 2) Mechanism to insure appropriate referrals.
Philadelphia	PA	
Ponce	PR	Three government agencies are in charge of the Drug Court Program in P.R. interactions and feedback between agencies are the keys of out come in the program.
Roanoke	VA	I would advise all agencies that have anything to do with law enforcement, courts, corrections and treatment to be involved in the creation of drug court. The prosecutor's office is particularly critical to this.

E. Suggestions for Improvement

Corrections agency officials were also asked to offer suggestions for improving the drug court program. Their responses follow:

Name of Court	State	Improvements Suggested
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	
Tuscon	AZ	
Bakersfield	CA	
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	
Modesto	CA	
Roseville	CA	

Name of Court	State	Improvements Suggested
San Bernadino	CA	We are working with all phases of Drug Court to improve our services on an on-going basis, specifically to improve the quality of life for the inmate/Drug Court participant.
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	1) It would be helpful if classification has a code in CJIC that would readily identify the Treatment Court participants, their housing and programs in which they are involved.
Santa Ana	CA	More expeditious processing of initial case set-up documents.
Santa Barbara	CA	No opinion
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	None at this time.
Woodland/Yolo	CA	
New Haven	CT	
Georgetown	DE	
Bartow	FL	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Sanctions for failure to comply with the Corrections Agency
Gainesville	FL	We have an "A" team and a "B" team (and those who didn't make either) "A" team is called up together in court and then the "B" team. Clients seem to like it and strive to be an "A" team member.
Jacksonville	FL	None.
Key West	FL	
Sarasota	FL	
Tampa	FL	(1) Upgrade present staff due to volume and nature of work. (2) Develop more treatment providers. (3) Develop and aftercare program. (4) Provide sufficient staff for aftercare program.
Chicago	IL	
Markham	IL	Ceritified Drug Counselors or certified recovery specialists involvement in day to day operations
Witchita	KS	
Kalamazoo	MI	Have a preincarceration "level" substance Abuse Treatment program.
Kansas City	MO	
Warren Co.	NC	
Camden	NJ	As we expand of course, we need more staffing, possibly more days of Court or night Court. It is also nice to vary from our regular courtroom routine and deal with general issues rather than individual issues.
Newark	NJ	

Name of Court	State	Improvements Suggested
Las Cruces	NM	
Rochester	NY	
Suffolk	NY	
Hamilton	OH	
Logan Co.	OK	1. Abilility to program offender's to individualize components of the program. 2. Reduce overall costs to the Offender 3. Seek out other agency input as to the needed information needed on program participant reports.
Payne Co.	OK	1. Ability to program offender's to individualize components of the program. 2. Reduce overall costs to the Offender 3. Seek out other agency input as to the needed information needed on program participant reports.
Tulsa	OK	The sanctioning process is unclear. Developing more info. as to when to give sanctions, etc.
Grants Pass	OR	None, we resolve issues as they arise.
Klammath Falls	OR	None, except expansion and incorporate MIS. women and minorities.
Portland	OR	
Roseburg	OR	None at present.
Philadelphia	PA	
Ponce	PR	
Roanoke	VA	I do not believe that a minor assault should prohibit one from participating in Drug Court (presently not allowed under Federal grants including arrests for assaults where there is no conviction). Also, planning is extremely important, but don't get bogged down in it.

APPENDIX

Individuals to Contact for Further Information

Name of Court	St.	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Address	Tel/Fax
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ					
Tucson	AZ	Corrections	Hechi	Frank	Pima County Sheriff's Department Corrections 1750 E. Benson Highway Tucson, AZ 85714	Tel: not available
Bakersfield	CA	Kern County Sheriff	Smithson	Dennis	1350 Norris Road Bakersfield, CA 93308	Tel: 805/391-7863 Fax: 805/391-7922
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	L.A. Co. Sheriff's Dept.	Burt	Daniel	Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department 441 Bauchet Street Los Angeles, CA 90012	Tel: 213/974-4158
Modesto	CA	Stanislaus Co. Probation	Meiselman	Barrett	Stanislaus County Probation Department 947 10th Street Modesto, CA 95354	Tel: 209/558-8250 Fax: 209/558-8250
Roseville	CA	Placer Co. Probation	Franchimore	Terry	Placer Co. Probation 11564 C. Avenue Auburn, CA 95603	Tel: 889-7916 Fax: 889-7950
San Bernardino	CA	San Bern. Sheriff's Dept.	Dalton	Karen S.	San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department, INROADS Education Program P.O. Box 9490 San Bernardino, CA 92427	Tel: 909/880-2688 Fax: 909/880-2552
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	Dept. of Correction	Story	Jessie	Department of Correction, Santa Clara County 180 West Hedding Street San Jose, CA 95110	Tel: 408/299-4005 Fax: 408/262-5104

Name of Court	St.	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Address	Tel/Fax
Santa Ana	CA	Orange Co. Probation Dept	Hard	Clifford	909 N. Main Street Santa Ana, CA 92701	Tel: 714/569-2245 Fax: 714/569-3797
Santa Barbara	CA	Santa Barbara Sheriff's	Dafor	John	Santa Barbara Sheriff's Department 4434 Calle Real Santa Barbara, CA 93110	Tel: 805/881-4246 Fax: 805/881-4216
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	Sonoma County Sheriff	McDermott	Sean	2777 Ventura Avenue Santa Rosa, CA 95404	Tel: 707/527-1668? Fax: 707/527-1442
Woodland/ Yolo	CA					
New Haven	CT					
Georgetown	DE	Probation and Parole	McCarthy	Deborah	Probation and Parole 546 S. Bedford St. Georgetown, DE 19947	Tel: 302-856-5243 (McCarthy) Tel: 302/577-3443 (McCarthy)
Bartow	FL	Dept. of Corrections	Landren	J. Stacy	Dept. of Corrections (Polk County Drug Court) P.O. Box 9000 Drawer J13A Bartow, FL 33831	Tel: 941/534-4614 Fax: 941/534-7703
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Dept. of Corrections	Giumenta	James	10 W. Las Olas Blvd. Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301	Tel: 954/467-4645
Gainesville	FL	Court Alt. Division	Morton	Cynthia	Alachua County Criminal Justice Services, Court Alt. Division 26 East University Avenue Gainesville, Florida 32601	Tel: 352/338-7390 Fax: 352/338-7364
Jacksonville	FL	Community Corrections	Sloan-Butler	S.J.	Jacksonville Sheriff's Office 451 Catherine St. Jacksonville, FL 32202	Tel: 904/630-2873 Fax: 904/630-1120
Key West	FL					

Name of Court	St.	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Address	Tel/Fax
Sarasota	FL	Dept. of Correction	Jacoby	Leroy	2074 Ringling Blvd. Suite 30 Sarasota, FL 34237-7008	Tel: 941/361-6322 Fax: 941/361-6331
Tampa	FL	Dept. of Corrections	Waldron	Donald	Department of Corrections Probation and Parole Services 2807 W. Busch Blvd. #201 Tampa, Florida 33618	Tel: 813/272-3561 Fax: 813/276-5517
Chicago	IL					
Markham	IL	Sixth District	Lee	Joy L.	16501 S. Kedzie Parkway Markham, IL 60426	Tel: 708/210-4170 Fax: 708/210-4441
Wichita	KS					
Kalamazoo	MI	Sheriff Dept.	Lisk	Timothy	Kalamazoo County Sheriff Department 1500 Lamont St. Kalamazoo, MI 49001	Tel: 616/383-8734 Fax: 616/385-6136
Kansas City	MO					
Warren Co.	NC					
Camden	NJ	Camden Co. Prob.	Milsted	Edwina	Camden County Probation Division 40 North 5th Street Camden, NJ 08101	Tel: 609/225-8727 Fax: 609/225-7694
Newark	NJ					
Las Cruces	NM					
Rochester	NY					
Suffolk	NY	Dept. of Corrections	Sheriff Mahoney		Department of Corrections 100 Center Drive Suffolk, NY 11980	Tel: 516/852-2200
Hamilton	OH					

Name of Court	St.	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Address	Tel/Fax
Logan Co.	OK	Oklahoma Dept. of Corr.	Hamilton	David L.	Oklahoma Department of Corrections Probation and Parole 211 N. Perkins Road Suite 23 Stillwater, Oklahoma 74075	Tel: 405/377-3418 Fax: 405/377-3533
Payne Co.	OK	Oklahoma Dept. of Corr.	Hamilton	David L.	Oklahoma Dept. of Corrections/Probation and Parole 211 N. Perkins Road Suite 23 Stillwater, OK 74075	Tel: 405/377-3418 Fax: 405/377-3533
Tulsa	OK	Tulsa Co. Comm. Service	Long	Floyd	Tulsa County Community Service-B-# 500 S. Denver Tulsa, OK 74106	Tel: 918/596-5797 Fax: 918/596-5792
Grants Pass	OR	Josephine Co. Comm. Corre.	Goodpasture	Marie	Josephine County Community Corrections 500 NW 6th Street Grants Pass, OR 97526	Tel: 541/474-5165 ext. 201 Fax: 541/474-5171
Klammath Falls	OR	Klammath Co. Comm. Corre.	Edson	Charles	Klammath County Community Corrections 220 Main Street Klammath Falls, OR 97601	Tel: ?/883-5608 Fax: ?/883-5733
Portland	OR	Juv. & Ad. Comm. Justice	Harkaway	Cary	Multnomah Co. Juvenile & Adult Community Justice 421 S.W. 5th Ave., Suite 600 Portland, OR 97204	Tel: 503/248-3039 Fax: 503/248-3990
Roseburg	OR	Parole and Probation	Gibson	Rita	Douglas County Parole and Probation 1036 SE Dougles #206 Roseburg, OR 97470	Tel: 541/957-8148 Fax: 541/957-8149
Philadelphia	PA	Prison Pop. Mgt. Control	Granlund	Dianne	Director of Prison Population Management Control 1600 Arch Street - Roome 547 Philadelphia, PA 19102	Tel: 215/686-7120 or 7121 Fax: 215/686-8693

Name of Court	St.	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Address	Tel/Fax
Ponce	PR	Adm. of Corrections	Machado	Jose J.	Administration of Corrections P.O. Box 71308 San Juan, Puerto Rico 00936-8408	Tel: 787/273-6464 ext. 2305 Fax: 809/781-5042
Roanoke	VA	Roanoke Day Reporting Ctr.	Berkeley	Norborne	Commonwealth of Virginia Building, Rm B-50 210 Church Ave., S.W. Roanoke, VA 24011	Tel: 540/857-6198 Fax: 540/857-6395