

**1997 Drug Court Survey Report:  
Treatment Provider Services  
and Perspectives**

**Volume III**

**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 to American University 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.

## Table of Contents

Foreword		<u>Page</u>
<b>I. Introduction</b>		1
<b>II. Description of Treatment Programs of Reporting Drug Courts</b>		1
<b>A. Program Phases</b>		1
1. <i>Duration of Each Phase</i>		1
<b>Chart VI-1: Drug Court Treatment Program Phases and Duration</b> [see page 5]		
2. <i>Services Provided in Each Phase</i>		1
<b>Chart VI-2(a): Treatment Services Provided in Each Phase: Detox, Stabilization, Counseling, Therapy, and Drug Education</b> [see page 9]		
<b>Chart VI-2(b): Treatment Related Services Provided in Each Phase: Job Skills, Education, Personal Development, Employment, Medical, Housing</b> [see page 14]		
3. <i>Criteria Used to Move Participants Among Program Phases</i>		2
<b>Chart VI-3(a): Criteria Used to Move Clients Among Phases</b> [see page 17]		
4. <i>Criteria Used to Decrease/increase the Intensity and Length Of Treatment Services</i>		2
<b>Chart VI-3(t): Criteria Used to Decrease/Increase Intensity and Length of Treatment</b> [see page 21]		
<b>B. Providers of Drug Court Treatment and Related Services</b>		2
1. <i>Substance Abuse Screening</i>		
2. <i>Assessment of Treatment Needs</i>		2
3. <i>Case Management</i>		3
4. <i>Treatment and Rehabilitation Services</i>		3

	<u>Page</u>
<b>Chart VI-4: Providers of Drug Court Screening, Assessment, Treatment and Case Management Services [see page 23]</b>	
<b>III. Screening, Assessment And Case Management</b>	35
<b>A. Screening and Assessment</b>	35
1. <i>Use of Standard Assessment Instrument to Diagnose Addictive Disorders</i>	35
<b>Chart VI-5: Assessment Instruments Used [see page 38]</b>	
2. <i>Assessment of Special Needs</i>	35
<b>Chart VI-6: Assessment Process Used to Diagnose Special Needs [see page 42]</b>	
3. <i>Criteria Used to Screen for Treatment Program Eligibility</i>	35
<b>Chart VI-7: Screening Criteria for Program Eligibility Program [see page 48]</b>	
4. <i>Effect of Mental Disorders on Program Eligibility</i>	35
<b>Chart VI-8: Effect of Mental Disorders on Program Eligibility [see page 52]</b>	
5. <i>Time frame for Determining Eligibility for Treatment Following Determination of Drug Court Eligibility</i>	36
<b>Chart VI-9: Time Elapsed before Determining Treatment Eligibility of Defendants Eligible for Drug Court [see page 57]</b>	
<b>B. Client Treatment Plans</b>	36
<b>Chart VI-10: Development and Updating of Individual Treatment Plans for Drug Court Clients [see page 61]</b>	
<b>C. Client Case Management</b>	36
1. <i>Agency Performing Client Case Management</i>	36
<b>Chart VI-11: Agency Performing Drug Court Client Case Management [see page 66]</b>	

	<u>Page</u>
2. <i>Case Management Functions Performed</i>	36
<b>Chart VI-12: Case Management Functions Performed for Drug Court Clients [see page 74]</b>	
<b>IV. Drug Court Treatment And Rehabilitation Services</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>A. Treatment Services Provided</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>Chart VI-13: Treatment and Rehabilitation Services Provided for Drug Court Clients [see page 82]</b>	
<b>B. Capability to Refer Participant to Inpatient Treatment</b>	<b>78</b>
1. <i>Percentage of Drug Court Participants with Major Mental Disorder</i>	79
<b>Chart VI-14: Drug Court Participants With Major Mental Disorders [see page 86]</b>	
2. <i>Specialized Treatment Services Provided for Persons With Mental Disorders</i>	79
<b>C. Addressing Mental Health Needs</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>D. Medications Permitted</b>	<b>80</b>
1. <i>Prescription Medications (including anti-depressants)</i>	80
2. <i>Use of Pharmacotherapeutic Interventions</i>	80
<b>E. Use of Alcohol by Drug Court Participants</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>Chart VI-15: Use of Pharmacotherapeutic Interventions and Policies on Alcohol Use for Drug Court Participants and Prescription Medicines [see page 89]</b>	
<b>F. Adjuncts to Treatment Used</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>Chart VI-16: Adjuncts to Treatment Used [see page 93]</b>	
<b>G. Provision off Support and Rehabilitation Services</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>Chart VI-17(a): Support and Rehabilitation Services Provided to Drug Court Clients: General Services [see page 98]</b>	

	<u>Page</u>
<b>Chart VI-17(b): Support and Rehabilitation Services Provided to Drug Court Clients: Special Services [see page 102]</b>	
<b>H. Services for Special Populations</b>	81
1. <i>Special Components Developed</i>	81
<b>Chart VI-18(a): Special Treatment Components Developed to Address Needs of Special Populations: Cultural Issues and Other Needs [see page 107]</b>	
<b>Chart VI-18(b): Special Treatment Components Developed to Address Needs of Special Populations: Parents, Women and Victims [see page 111]</b>	
2. <i>Child Care Services for Participants While Attending Treatment Sessions</i>	81
3. <i>Policies Re Permitting Participants to Bring Children to Treatment Sessions</i>	81
<b>V. Urine Testing</b>	117
<b>A. Drugs For Which Tests Are Conducted</b>	117
<b>Chart VI-19: Drugs For Which Tests Are Conducted: Initial and Routine Testing [see page 120]</b>	
<b>B. Costs Per Test (Drug Screen)</b>	117
<b>Chart VI-20: Costs Per Drug Screen [see page 129]</b>	
<b>C. Agency Performing Urinalysis</b>	117
<b>Chart VI-21: Agency Performing Urinalysis [see page 132]</b>	
<b>D. Time frame and Method for Reporting Test Results to Court</b>	118
1. <i>Time Frame</i>	118
2. <i>Method for Reporting Results to Court</i>	118

	<u>Page</u>
<b>Chart VI-22: Time frame and Method for Reporting Drug Test Results to Drug Court Judge [see page 136]</b>	
<b>E. Maintaining Urinalysis Integrity</b>	118
1. <i>Detecting Waterloading</i>	118
2. <i>Detecting Other Adulteration</i>	118
<b>Chart VI-23: Methods for Maintaining Urinalysis Integrity [see page 141]</b>	
<b>F. Judicial Response to Positive Urines</b>	119
<b>Chart VI-24: Judicial Responses to Positive Urinalyses [see page 146]</b>	
<b>VI. Costs/funding For Drug Court Treatment Services</b>	153
<b>A. Number of Agencies and Staff Providing Services to Each Drug Court</b>	153
1. <i>Number of Providers Serving Each Drug Court Program</i>	153
<b>Chart VI-25: Number of Principal Treatment Providers Serving Each Drug Court Program [see page 156]</b>	
2. <i>Number of Dedicated Staff</i>	153
<b>Chart VI-26: Number of Dedicated Treatment Staff Serving Each Drug Court Program [see page 159]</b>	
<b>B. Program Costs</b>	153
1. <i>Average Annual Cost per Client for Treatment Services</i>	153
2. <i>Total Program Capacity Annually</i>	154
<b>Chart VI-27: Drug Court Program Annual Enrollment and Costs [see page 164]</b>	
3. <i>Funding Sources for Treatment Services</i>	154
<b>Chart VI-28: Funding Sources for Treatment Services [see page 168]</b>	

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
4. <i>Impact of Managed Care on Drug Court Treatment Services</i>	154
a. Quantity of Treatment Services Available to Participants	154
b. Quality of Treatment Services Available to Participants	155
c. Entity Authorized to Provide Treatment Services To Participants	155
d. Policies of State Licensing Agency	155
<b>VII. Treatment Provider Contacts With Program Participants</b>	<b>172</b>
<b>A. Nature and Frequency of Contacts with Drug Court Participants</b>	<b>172</b>
<b>Chart VI-29: Nature and Frequency of Treatment Provider                           Contacts with Drug Court Participants</b> [see page 173]	
<b>B. Comparison of Drug Court Treatment Services With Treatment           Services Provided to Typical Drug Court Participant Prior to Instituting           the Drug Court</b>	<b>172</b>
<b>VIII. Treatment Program Requirements And Experience to Date</b>	<b>178</b>
<b>A. Average Length of Time Participants Spend in Treatment</b>	<b>178</b>
<b>Chart VI-30: Length of Time Drug Court Participants are                           Required Spend in Treatment</b> [see page 180]	
<b>B. Point in Time and Situations in Which Relapse Has Been Most           Common</b>	<b>178</b>
<b>Chart VI-31(a): Time/Periods in which Relapse Has                           Been Most Common: Days 1-300</b> [see page 183]	
<b>Chart VI-31(b): Situations in which Relapse Has Been                           Most Common</b> [see page 187]	
<b>IX. Program Follow-up And Aftercare</b>	<b>192</b>
<b>A. Aftercare Services</b>	<b>192</b>
1. <i>Mechanisms for Tracking Relapse by Graduates</i>	192
2. <i>Provision of after Care Services</i>	192

	<u>Page</u>
<b>Chart VI-32: Availability of Aftercare Services [see page 194]</b>	
3. <i>Funding and Provision of Aftercare Services</i>	192
a. Agency Providing Aftercare Services	192
b. Referral Procedures	192
c. Funding	192
B. Follow-up with Participants	193
1. <i>Conduct of Follow-up</i>	193
2. <i>Follow-up Mechanisms</i>	193
3. <i>Information Compiled</i>	193
<b>X. Criteria Used to Assess Effectiveness of The Drug Court Program</b>	200
<b>Chart VI-33: Criteria Used to Assess Effectiveness of Drug Court Program [see page 201]</b>	
<b>XI. Data And Automation</b>	206
A. <b>Agencies Compiling Client Information and Type of Information Compiled</b>	206
<b>Chart VI-34(a): Client Information Compiled by Agencies Involved With Drug Court Program: General Information on Active Participants [see page 207]</b>	
<b>Chart VI-34(b): Client Information Compiled by Agencies Involved With Drug Court Program: Information on Participants Who Have Graduated or Been Terminated [see page 212]</b>	
B. <b>Information Reported by Treatment Provider to Court and Method of Reporting</b>	206
<b>Chart VI-35: Client Information Reported to Drug Court Judge and Method of Reporting [see page 217]</b>	





## 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						
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>53</b>



## I. Introduction

This Volume reflects responses from treatment providers serving seventy-six drug courts in twenty-eight states and Puerto Rico. Information regarding the age of these programs, the size of the jurisdictions in which they operate, and the caseloads handled by the drug courts they serve is provided in Volume I.

## II. Description of Treatment Programs of Reporting Drug Courts

### A. Program Phases

#### 1. *Duration of Each Phase*

Treatment providers responding to the survey indicated that their drug courts generally consist of three phases, the duration of which is described on Chart VI-1. In some instances, judicial system officials describing program phases (See Volume I) also indicated a fourth phase consisting primarily of aftercare-related services.

#### **Chart VI-1: Drug Court Treatment Program Phases and Duration** [see pg. 5]

#### 2. *Services Provided in Each Phase*

Charts VI-2(a) and (b) describe the services provided during each program phase. Detox, stabilization, counseling, drug education and therapy are commonly provided during phases I and II and, in some instances, throughout the program. Other services relating to personal and educational development, job skills, and employment services are most frequently provided during phases II and III, after participants have responded to initial detox and stabilization. Housing, family, and medical services are frequently available throughout the program. Approximately 40% of the reporting programs offer acupuncture services.

**Chart VI-2(a): Treatment Services Provided in Each Phase: Detox, Stabilization, Counseling, Drug Education, and Therapy**  
[see pg. 9]

**Chart VI-2(b): Treatment Services Provided in Each Phase: Acupuncture, Medical Screening, Housing, Personal Development, Employment, Job Skills, Education Development, Health/Wellness Education, Family Services**  
[see pg. 14]

#### 3. *Criteria Used to Move Participants among Program Phases*

Chart VI-3(a) provides the criteria treatment professionals use to recommend movement of participants among program phases. Almost all of the programs rely upon urinalysis results and

participant attendance at treatment sessions. Most also look to the length of time a participant has been participating in the drug court and the degree to which he or she has fulfilled program conditions such as payment of fees, obtaining employment, etc., which are indicia of the individual's assumption of personal responsibility for his/her life.

**Chart VI-3(a): Criteria Used to Move Clients Among Program Phases**  
[see pg. 18]

4. *Criteria Used to Increase/Decrease the Intensity and Length of Treatment Services*

As Chart VI-3(b) indicates, treatment professionals recommend increases and/or decreases in the intensity and length of treatment services based on criteria similar to that used to make recommendations regarding the movement of participants among phases: urinalysis results, attendance at treatment sessions; and length of time in the program.

**Chart VI-3(b): Criteria Used to Increase/Decrease Intensity and Length of Treatment** [see pg. 21]

**B. Providers of Drug Court Treatment and Related Services**

1. *Substance Abuse Screening*

Drug Courts are using a number of agencies to perform substance abuse screening of eligible drug court participants. Among the reporting jurisdictions, substance abuse screening is performed by the following agencies, with 38% of the drug courts using more than one agency for substance abuse screening:

Drug Court Staff:	35%
Pretrial Services Agency:	22%
Probation Department:	31%
TASC Program:	18%
Local public health agency:	17%
Private Treatment Organization:	32%
Drug Courts Using More than One Agency for Substance Abuse Screening:	38%

Several programs also use services provided by local alcohol and drug agencies.

2. *Assessment of Treatment Needs*

Assessment of the treatment needs of drug court participants in the reporting drug courts is generally performed by the following agencies, with some drug courts utilizing two or more agencies in the assessment process:

Drug Court Staff:	26%
Pretrial Services Agency:	6%
Probation Department:	21%
TASC Program:	17%
Local Public Health Agency:	19%
Private Treatment Organization:	51%
Local Alcohol and Drug Agency	6%
Drug Courts Using More than One Agency for Treatment Assessment:	38%

### 3. *Case Management*

Drug courts are using a number of different agencies to provide client case management for drug court participants. Case management functions are being performed by the following agencies in the reporting jurisdictions, with many jurisdictions utilizing multiple agencies to perform client case management:

Drug Court Staff:	31%
Pretrial Service Agency:	11%
Probation Department:	29%
TASC Program:	11%
Local Public Health Agency:	11%
Private Treatment Org.	54%
Drug Courts Using More than One of the above to Perform Substance Abuse Screening:	69%

### 4. *Treatment and Rehabilitation Services*

Treatment and rehabilitation services are provided by the following agencies to participants in the responding drug courts:

Drug Court Staff:	10%
Pretrial Services Agency:	3%
Probation Department:	14%
TASC Program:	7%
Private Treatment Organization:	67%
Local Public Health Agency:	18%

Approximately one-fourth of the reporting programs use two types of agencies to provide treatment and rehabilitation services and 6% use three types. Most drug courts that use private providers for treatment services use one primary provider with some using several additional providers to address special needs. A few programs utilize a large number of providers (Brooklyn, for example, uses 80 providers whose services are paid with Medicaid funds) but the use of a large

number of providers presents special issues, including those relating to coordination, supervision, and maintenance of quality standards.

**Chart VI-4: Providers of Drug Court Screening, Assessment, Treatment and Case Management Services (2 parts) [see pg. 24]**

The charts discussed in this section are presented on the following pages.

**Chart VI-1: Drug Court Treatment Program Phases and Duration**

Name of Court	State	Phase I (days)				Phase II (months)				Phase III (months)																		
		to 30	30-60	60-90	Other	to 2	2-4	4-6	6-8	Other	to 2	2-4	4-6	6-8	Other													
Mobile	AL	x																										
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ			56																	2							
Salinas	CA	x									x											x						
Richmond	CA	x									x												x					
Stockton	CA	x									x											x						
San Francisco	CA		x									x										x						
Woodland/Yolo	CA					x						x																
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA					x																x						
San Bernardino	CA							91																3				
Santa Monica	CA							14-60																	3-4			
Santa Ana	CA					x						x																
Bakersfield	CA		x										x															
Roseville	CA					x						x																
Laguna Nigel	CA					x							x															
Pasadena	CA							120																		4		
El Monte/ Rio Hondo	CA		x										x														x	
Santa Maria	CA		x																								x	
																												60 days.- mos.

Name of Court	State	Phase I (days)				Phase II (months)				Phase III (months)						
		to 30	30-60	60-90	Other	to 2	2-4	4-6	6-8	Other	to 2	2-4	4-6	6-8	Other	
Modesto	CA		x				x					x				
Santa Barbara	CA		x						60 days.- mos.			x				
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA		x							x						
Denver	CO															
New Haven	CT			x				x								
Georgetown	DE															
Dover	DE															
Wilmington	DE															
Ft. Lauderdale	FL		x							x						
Pensacola	FL		x							x				x		
Key West	FL		x							x						
Gainesville	FL														to 4	
Miami	FL	x								x				x		
Jacksonville 2	FL	x												x		
Jacksonville	FL	x												x		
Bartow	FL		x							x						
Tampa	FL	x												x		
Crestview	FL	x													x	
Sarasota	FL															not < 3

Name of Court	State	Phase I (days)				Phase II (months)				Phase III (months)					
		to 30	30-60	60-90	Other	to 2	2-4	4-6	6-8	Other	to 2	2-4	4-6	6-8	Other
Macon	GA			x											
Honolulu	HI	x													
Edwardsville	IL														
Markham	IL														
Chicago	IL	x													
Wichita	KS	x													
Louisville	KY	x													
Boston	MA				90-120										
Kalamazoo	MI	x													
St. Joseph	MI	x													
Kansas City	MO	x													
Charlotte	NC														
Warren Co.	NC	x													
Newark	NJ														
Camden	NJ														
Las Cruces	NM	x													
Reno	NV														
Buffalo	NY														
Suffolk	NY														
Rochester	NY														

Name of Court	State	Phase I (days)				Phase II (months)				Phase III (months)											
		to 30	30-60	60-90	Other	to 2	2-4	4-6	6-8	Other	to 2	2-4	4-6	6-8	Other						
Brooklyn	NY				120																
Akron	OH			x																	
Hamilton	OH			x																	
Logan Co.	OK			x																	
Payne Co.	OK																				
Klamath Falls	OR				60-150																
Grants Pass	OR			x																	
Portland	OR	x																			
Eugene	OR	x																			
Roseburg	OR		x																		
Philadelphia	PA	x																			
San Juan	PR	x																			
Lexington	SC																				
Ft. Worth	TX	x																			
Austin	TX	x																			
Beaumont	TX	x																			
Roanoke	V.A		x																		
Seattle	WA			x																	



**Chart VI-2(a): Treatment Services Provided in Each Phase:  
Detoxification, Stabilization, Counseling, Therapy, and Drug Education**

Name of Court	St.	Detox			Stabilization			Counseling			Drug Education			Therapy		
		Ph. 1	Ph. 2	Ph. 3	Ph. 1	Ph. 2	Ph. 3	Ph. 1	Ph. 2	Ph. 3	Ph. 1	Ph. 2	Ph. 3	Ph. 1	Ph. 2	Ph. 3
Mobile	AL				X			X	X		X		X		X	
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ				X	X		X	X	X		X		X		X
Bakersfield	CA				X			X				X			X	
El Monte/ Rio Hondo	CA	X			X			X	X	X		X				
Laguna Nigel	CA	X			X			X	X	X		X		X		X
Modesto	CA	X			X			X	X	X		X		X		X
Pasadena	CA	X			X			X	X	X		X		X		X
Richmond	CA	X	X		X		X	X	X	X		X				
Roseville	CA	X			X	X		X	X	X		X		X		X
Salinas	CA	X			X			X	X	X		X				X
San Bernardino	CA	X			X			X	X	X		X		X		X
San Francisco	CA	X			X	X		X				X		X		X
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	X	X		X	X		X	X	X		X				
Santa Ana	CA	X			X			X	X	X		X		X		X
Santa Barbara	CA	X			X			X	X	X		X		X		X
Santa Maria	CA	X			X			X	X	X		X		X		X

Name of Court	St.	Detox			Stabilization			Counseling			Drug Education			Therapy		
		Ph. 1	Ph. 2	Ph. 3	Ph. 1	Ph. 2	Ph. 3	Ph. 1	Ph. 2	Ph. 3	Ph. 1	Ph. 2	Ph. 3	Ph. 1	Ph. 2	Ph. 3
Santa Monica	CA	X			X			X	X	X	X					
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	X			X			X	X					X		
Stockton	CA	X			X		X	X	X							
Woodland/Yolo	CA	X			X			X	X							
Denver	CO															
New Haven	CT	X			X			X	X	X	X			X		X
Dover	DE	X			X			X	X	X				X	X	X
Georgetown	DE	X			X			X	X	X				X	X	X
Bartow	FL	X	X			X			X						X	
Crestview	FL	X			X				X	X	X				X	X
Gainesville	FL	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X			X	X	X
Jacksonville	FL								X	X				X	X	X
Jacksonville 2	FL													X	X	X
Key West	FL	X			X				X	X	X			X	X	X
Miami	FL								X	X	X				X	X
Pensacola	FL								X	X	X			X	X	X
Sarasota	FL	X				X				X	X				X	
Tampa	FL				X				X	X	X			X	X	X
Macon	GA													X		

Name of Court	St.	Detox			Stabilization			Counseling			Drug Education			Therapy		
		Ph. 1	Ph. 2	Ph. 3	Ph. 1	Ph. 2	Ph. 3	Ph. 1	Ph. 2	Ph. 3	Ph. 1	Ph. 2	Ph. 3	Ph. 1	Ph. 2	Ph. 3
Honolulu	HI				X			X	X	X			X	X		X
Chicago	IL	X			X			X	X	X			X	X		X
Edwardsville	IL	X	X		X	X		X	X	X			X	X		X
Markham	IL															
Wichita	KS	X			X			X	X	X			X	X		X
Louisville	KY	X			X			X	X	X			X	X		X
Boston	MA	X			X	X		X	X	X			X	X		X
Kalamazoo	MI	X				X				X						X
St. Joseph	MI							X	X	X			X	X		X
Kansas City	MO	X				X		X	X	X			X	X		X
Charlotte	NC	X			X			X	X	X			X	X		X
Warren Co.	NC							X	X	X			X	X		X
Camden	NJ												X	X		X
Newark	NJ															
Las Cruces	NM	X	X		X			X	X	X			X	X		X
Reno	NV	X	X			X		X	X	X			X	X		X
Brooklyn	NY	X				X		X	X	X			X	X		X
Buffalo	NY	X			X			X	X	X			X	X		X
Rochester	NY	X			X			X	X	X			X	X		X
Suffolk	NY				X				X	X			X	X		X

Name of Court	St.	Detox			Stabilization			Counseling			Drug Education			Therapy		
		Ph. 1	Ph. 2	Ph. 3	Ph. 1	Ph. 2	Ph. 3	Ph. 1	Ph. 2	Ph. 3	Ph. 1	Ph. 2	Ph. 3	Ph. 1	Ph. 2	Ph. 3
Akron	OH	X			X			X	X		X		X		X	
Hamilton	OH	X	X		X			X	X		X	X		X		X
Logan Co.	OK	X			X			X	X		X					
Payne Co.	OK															
Eugene	OR	X			X				X			X			X	
Grants Pass	OR	X			X			X	X		X			X		X
Klamath Falls	OR				X	X		X	X		X	X		X	X	
Portland	OR	X			X			X				X				
Roseburg	OR				X	X		X	X		X	X		X	X	
Philadelphia	PA	X				X			X			X			X	
San Juan	PR	X						X	X					X		X
Lexington	SC	X			X			X	X			X			X	
Austin	TX	X			X			X	X			X	X		X	X
Beaumont	TX	X				X		X	X			X				
Ft. Worth	TX	X			X				X						X	
Roanoke	VA	X				X									X	
Seattle	WA	X			X			X	X			X		X		X

**Chart VI-2(b): Treatment Related Services Provided in Each Phase:**

Acupuncture, Medical Screening, Housing, Personal Development, Employment, Job Skills, Educational Development, Health/Wellness Education, Family Services

Name of Court	ST	Acupun.			Med. Screen.			Housing			Per. Dev.			Employ.			Job Skills			Ed. Dev.			H&W Ed.			Fam. Serv.		
		1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3			
Mobile	AL	X	X	X							X			X						X			X			X		
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ										X			X														
Bakersfield	CA								X					X						X						X		
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA	X	X	X						X			X							X					X			
Laguna Nigel	CA							X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Modesto	CA							X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Pasadena	CA	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Richmond	CA	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Roseville	CA							X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Salinas	CA								X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
San Bernardino	CA							X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
San Francisco	CA	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA							X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Santa Ana	CA							X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Santa Barbara	CA	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Santa Maria	CA	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Name of Court	ST	Acupun.			Med. Screen.			Housing			Per. Dev.			Employ.			Job Skills			Ed. Dev.			H&W Ed.			Fam. Serv.		
		1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Santa Monica	CA		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA			X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X
Stockton	CA	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Woodland/Yolo	CA			X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X
Denver	CO																											
New Haven	CT	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Dover	DE			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Georgetown	DE			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Wilmington	DE																											
Bartow	FL			X																								
Crestview	FL			X	X	X																						
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Gainesville	FL	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Jacksonville	FL	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Jacksonville 2	FL				X																							
Key West	FL	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Miami	FL	X	X																									
Pensacola	FL																											
Sarasota	FL	X	X																									
Tampa	FL	X	X		X																							

Name of Court	ST	Acupun.			Med. Screen.			Housing			Per. Dev.			Employ.			Job Skills			Ed. Dev.			H&W Ed.			Fam. Serv.				
		1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3		
Macon	GA																													
Honolulu	HI									X	X	X									X	X	X			X				
Chicago	IL				X					X	X	X									X	X	X			X		X		
Edwardsville	IL				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X									X	X	X			X		X		
Markham	IL																													
Wichita	KS										X											X						X		
Louisville	KY	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X										X	X	X			X		X	
Boston	MA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X										X	X	X			X		X	
Kalamazoo	MI			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X																	X	
St. Joseph	MI	X	X																											
Kansas City	MO				X					X	X	X										X	X				X		X	
Charlotte	NC					X				X	X	X															X		X	
Warren Co.	NC																													
Camden	NJ																										X		X	
Newark	NJ																													
Las Cruces	NM	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X										X	X				X		X	
Reno	NV	X	X		X					X	X	X															X		X	
Brooklyn	NY	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X										X	X							
Buffalo	NY				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X															X		X	
Rochester	NY	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X										X	X				X		X	
Suffolk	NY				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X															X			

Name of Court	ST	Acupun.			Med. Screen.			Housing			Per. Dev.			Employ.			Job Skills			Ed. Dev.			H&W Ed.			Fam. Serv.		
		1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Akron	OH																											
Hamilton	OH				X	X	X	X	X																			
Logan Co.	OK					X			X																			
Payne Co.	OK																											
Eugene	OR				X	X	X																					
Grants Pass	OR				X	X	X	X	X	X																		
Klamath Falls	OR				X	X	X	X	X	X	X																	
Portland	OR	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X																	
Roseburg	OR																											
Philadelphia	PA	X	X	X	X			X																				
San Juan	PR	X	X	X	X																							
Lexington	SC				X	X	X																					
Austin	TX	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X																	
Beaumont	TX	X	X	X																								
Ft. Worth	TX					X	X	X	X	X	X																	
Roanoke	VA																											
Seattle	WA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X																	



**Chart VI-3(a): Criteria Used to Move Clients Among Program Phases**

Name of Court	ST	U/A Results	Attend. @ Treat. Sessions	Time in Prog.	Fulfill Prog. Cond.	Other
Mobile	AL	X	X	X	X	
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ	X	X	X	X	Obtain a 12 Step sponsor, presentation of step 1, to get from Path I to II, presentation of steps 2 & 3 to promote from Path II to III. To graduate must have counseling fees paid off & must have completed all ordered community service hours.
Bakersfield	CA	X	X		X	
El Monte/ Rio Hondo	CA	X	X		X	
Laguna Nigel	CA	X	X	X	X	
Modesto	CA	X	X	X	X	
Pasadena	CA	X	X	X	X	
Richmond	CA	X	X	X	X	
Roseville	CA	X	X	X		Progress in treatment
Salinas	CA	X	X	X	X	
San Bernardino	CA	X	X	X	X	Current on weekly fees
San Francisco	CA	X	X		X	
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	X	X	X	X	
Santa Ana	CA	X	X	X	X	
Santa Barbara	CA	X	X	X	X	Fulfillment of Phase specific developmental goals.
Santa Maria	CA	X	X	X	X	Fulfillment of Phase specific developmental goals.
Santa Monica	CA	X	X	X	X	
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	X	X	X	X	On time participation; court appearances; behavior/attitude; and self- help meeting.
Stockton	CA	X	X	X	X	
Woodland/ Yolo	CA	X	X	X	X	
Denver	CO					
New Haven	CT	X	X	X		

Name of Court	ST	U/A Results	Attend. @ Treat. Sessions	Time in Prog.	Fulfill Prog. Cond.	Other
Dover	DE	X	X		X	Attendance at support group meetings; getting sponsor.
Georgetown	DE	X	X		X	
Wilmington	DE					
Bartow	FL	X	X	X	X	
Crestview	FL	X	X	X	X	AA/NA attendance
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	X	X	X		
Gainesville	FL	X	X	X	X	
Jacksonville	FL	X	X	X	X	
Jacksonville 2	FL	X	X	X		Completion of individualized treatment plan
Key West	FL	X	X	X	X	
Miami	FL	X	X	X	X	
Pensacola	FL	X	X	X	X	
Sarasota	FL	X	X	X	X	
Tampa	FL	X	X	X	X	
Macon	GA	X	X	X		
Honolulu	HI	X	X	X	X	
Chicago	IL	X	X		X	
Edwardsville	IL	X	X	X	X	Support systems and structure in the client's life
Markham	IL	X	X			
Wichita	KS	X	X	X	X	
Louisville	KY	X	X	X	X	
Boston	MA	X	X	X	X	
Kalamazoo	MI	X	X	X	X	12 step meeting attendance, completion of treatment plan, motivational level.
St. Joseph	MI	X	X	X	X	
Kansas City	MO	X	X	X	X	
Charlotte	NC	X	X	X	X	
Warren Co.	NC			X	X	
Camden	NJ	X	X	X		

Name of Court	ST	U/A Results	Attend. @ Treat. Sessions	Time in Prog.	Fulfill Prog. Cond.	Other
Newark	NJ					
Las Cruces	NM	X	X		X	AA/NA attendance ; Drug Court attendance.
Reno	NV	X	X		X	
Brooklyn	NY	X	X	X		
Buffalo	NY	X	X	X	X	Meeting treatment goals
Rochester	NY	X	X	X	X	
Suffolk	NY	X	X	X	X	
Akron	OH		X		X	
Hamilton	OH	X	X	X	X	
Logan Co.	OK	X	X		X	Clients progress at own rate and have certain program criteria to complete at each level depending on his or her own issues.
Payne Co.	OK					
Eugene	OR	X	X	X		Completion of treatment plan activities addressing specific objectives
Grants Pass	OR	X	X	X	X	Efforts towards self sufficiency and personal recovery program
Klamath Falls	OR	X	X			Meeting treatment plan goals.
Portland	OR	X	X	X	X	Accomplishment of Treatment Plan Objectives
Roseburg	OR	X	X	X	X	
Philadelphia	PA	X	X	X	X	
San Juan	PR	X	X		X	
Lexington	SC	X	X	X	X	
Austin	TX	X	X	X	X	
Beaumont	TX	X	X	X	X	Partial payment of fees, completion of written assignments such as 12 month sobriety plan, others.
Ft. Worth	TX	X			X	
Roanoke	VA	X	X		X	Progress and participation level.
Seattle	WA	X	X	X		

**Chart VI-3(b): Criteria Used to Increase/decrease Intensity and Length of Treatment**

Name of Court	St	Urine Results	Att'd at Tx Sessions	Time in Program	Other
Mobile	AL	X	X	X	
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ	X	X	X	
Bakersfield	CA	X	X		
El Monte/ Rio Hondo	CA	X	X		
Laguna Nigel	CA	X	X	X	
Modesto	CA	X	X		Relapse
Pasadena	CA	X	X	X	
Richmond	CA	X	X	X	Court order
Roseville	CA	X	X		
Salinas	CA	X	X	X	
San Bernardino	CA	X	X		
San Francisco	CA	X	X		
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	X	X	X	Case management and supervision by Probation officers and substance abuse treatment counselor.
Santa Ana	CA	X	X	X	
Santa Barbara	CA	X	X	X	Fulfillment of specific individual treatment goals.
Santa Maria	CA	X	X	X	Fulfillment of specific individual treatment goals.
Santa Monica	CA	X	X		
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	X	X	X	
Stockton	CA		X	X	Court order
Woodland/ Yolo	CA	X	X		
Denver	CO				
New Haven	CT	X	X	X	
Dover	DE	X	X		

Name of Court	St	Urine Results	Att'd at Tx Sessions	Time in Program	Other
Georgetown	DE	X	X		
Wilmington	DE	X	X		
Bartow	FL	X	X	X	
Crestview	FL				
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	X	X	X	
Gainesville	FL	X	X	X	
Jacksonville	FL	X	X	X	
Jacksonville 2	FL	X	X	X	Increase length of Tx if objectives not met or if behaviors are inappropriate during Tx sessions (if pattern of inappropriateness occurs).
Key West	FL	X	X	X	Per clients request
Miami	FL	X	X	X	
Pensacola	FL	X	X	X	
Sarasota	FL	X	X	X	
Tampa	FL	X	X	X	Compliance with terms of probation
Macon	GA				
Honolulu	HI	X	X	X	
Chicago	IL	X	X		
Edwardsville	IL	X	X	X	
Markham	IL	X	X		
Wichita	KS	X	X	X	Progress in treatment completion.
Louisville	KY	X	X	X	
Boston	MA	X	X	X	
Kalamazoo	MI	X	X	X	Amount of work completed, motivational level.
St. Joseph	MI	X	X	X	
Kansas City	MO	X	X	X	
Charlotte	NC				
Warren Co.	NC	X	X		
Camden	NJ	X	X		

Name of Court	St	Urine Results	Att'd at Tx Sessions	Time in Program	Other
Newark	NJ				
Las Cruces	NM	X	X	X	Subsequent offenses
Las Vegas	NV	X	X		
Brooklyn	NY	X	X	X	
Buffalo	NY	X	X	X	Meeting Tx goals
Rochester	NY	X	X	X	Participation and progress in treatment sessions
Suffolk	NY	X	X	X	
Akron	OH	X	X		
Hamilton	OH	X	X	X	The client's chemical dependency history
Logan Co.	OK	X	X		Lack of, or rate of progress
Payne Co.	OK				
Eugene	OR	X	X	X	Tx plan assignments ; attendance at community support groups.
Grants Pass	OR	X	X	X	Assessment results
Klamath Falls	OR	X	X	X	
Portland	OR		X		Accomplishment of Treatment Plan Objectives
Roseburg	OR	X	X	X	
Philadelphia	PA	X	X	X	Progress on treatment goals.
San Juan	PR	X	X		
Lexington	SC	X	X		Progress on Tx Plan
Austin	TX	X	X	X	Environmental stability
Beaumont	TX	X	X	X	Full time employment
Ft. Worth	TX	X	X	X	
Roanoke	VA	X	X		Progress and participation.
Seattle	WA				

**Chart VI-4 (a): Providers of Drug Court Screening, Assessment, Treatment and Case Management Services**

Name of Court	St	Court Staff				Pretrial Services Agency				Probation Department				TASC			
		Screening	Assessment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screening	Assessment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screening	Assessment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screening	Assessment	Case Mgt.	Tx
Mobile	AL	X	X	X	X												
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ			X	X												X
Bakersfield	CA	X	X	X	X												
El Monte	CA	X	X			X											
Laguna Nigel	CA									X	X	X	X				
Modesto	CA									X		X					
Pasadena	CA	X															
Richmond	CA	X															
Roseville	CA																
Salinas	CA	X	X							X							
San Bernardino	CA	X*	X*														X
San Francisco	CA														X		
San Jose	CA														X		
Santa Ana	CA														X	X	
Santa Barbara	CA									X					X		
Santa Maria	CA									X					X		
Santa Monica	CA	X															
Santa Rosa/	CA	X	X														

Name of Court	St	Court Staff				Pretrial Services Agency				Probation Department				TASC			
		Screen- ing	Assess- ment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screen- ing	Assess- ment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screen- ing	Assess- ment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screen- ing	Assess- ment	Case Mgt.	Tx
Stockton	CA		X	X		X				X							
Woodland/Yolo	CA	X															
Denver	CO																
New Haven	CT		X	X		X*				X							
Dover	DE													X	X		
Georgetown	DE												X	X	X		
Wilmington	DE												X	X	X		
Bartow	FL	X	X	X	X	X						X					
Crestview	FL																X
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	X				X											
Gainesville	FL	X				X		X				X					
Jacksonville	FL					X								X	X		
Jacksonville 2	FL	X				X				X		X		X	X		
Key West	FL	X	X	X	X												
Miami	FL													X	X	X	X
Pensacola	FL	X				X											
Sarasota	FL					X		X							X		
Tampa	FL	X								X							
Macon	GA	X			X												



Name of Court	St	Court Staff				Pretrial Services Agency				Probation Department				TASC			
		Screen- ing	Assess- ment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screen- ing	Assess- ment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screen- ing	Assess- ment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screen- ing	Assess- ment	Case Mgt.	Tx
Honolulu	HI	X	X	X	X												
Chicago	IL	X							X			X		X			
Edwardsville	IL	X		X								X		X		X	
Markham	IL										X		X	X		X	X
Wichita	KS																
Louisville	KY																
Boston	MA										X						
Kalamazoo	MI	X	X	X													
St. Joseph	MI	X	X	X													
Kansas City	MO							X									
Charlotte	NC																
Warren Co.	NC									X		X		X		X	X
Camden	NJ						X			X		X		X		X	X
Newark	NJ													X			
Las Cruces	NM																
Reno	NV																
Brooklyn	NY	X	X	X	X												
Buffalo	NY	X	X	X													
Rochester	NY																

Name of Court	St	Court Staff				Pretrial Services Agency				Probation Department				TASC			
		Screening	Assessment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screening	Assessment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screening	Assessment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screening	Assessment	Case Mgt.	Tx
Suffolk	NY									X		X				X	
Akron	OH																
Hamilton	OH					X	X	X		X		X					
Logan Co.	OK		X									X					
Payne Co.	OK																
Eugene	OR																
Grants Pass	OR		X	X								X					
Klamath Falls	OR																
Portland	OR																
Roseburg	OR																
Philadelphia	PA			X	X			X		X							
San Juan	PR									X		X		X		X	
Lexington	SC		X	X													
Austin	TX					X		X								X*	
Beaumont	TX					X						X*		X*		X*	
Ft. Worth	TX	X	X	X						X		X					
Roanoke	VA									X						X	
Seattle	WA																

**Chart VI-4(b): Providers of Drug Court Screening, Assessment, Treatment And Case Management Services**

Name of Court	St.	Private Treatment Provider				County Public Health Agency				Other			
		Screening	Assessment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screening	Assessment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screening	Assessment	Case Management	Treatment
Mobile	AL												
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ												
Bakersfield	CA			X	X	X							
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA	X	X	X	X								
Laguna Nigel	CA					X	X	X	X				
Modesto	CA								X*	Dept. of Mental Health Substance Abuse Counselors	Substance Abuse Counselors		* Substance abuse counselors.
Pasadena	CA	X	X	X	X				X	DA etc.			
Richmond	CA					X	X	X	X				
Roseville	CA				X	X*	X*	X*		* Health and Human Services	* Health and Human Services		
Salinas	CA			X		X	X	X					
San Bernardino	CA	X	X	X	X					*"Probation" staff supervised by the "D/C Judge"	* "Probation" staff supervised by the "D/C Judge"		

Name of Court	St.	Private Treatment Provider				County Public Health Agency				Other			
		Screening	Assessment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screening	Assessment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screening	Assessment	Case Management	Treatment
San Francisco	CA			X	X	X			X				
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA				X	X*	X*		X				Managed Care Private Providers
Santa Ana	CA					X	X		X				
Santa Barbara	CA		X	X	X								
Santa Maria	CA		X	X	X								
Santa Monica	CA	X	X	X	X								
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA		X	X	X								
Stockton	CA							X					
Woodland/ Yolo	CA		X	X	X						Yolo County ADD		
Denver	CO												
New Haven	CT			X								* pretrial services/ agency/ "bail"	
Dover	DE			X									
Georgetown	DE			X									
Wilmington	DE	X	X	X	X								
Bartow	FL												
Crestview	FL	X	X	X	X								

Name of Court	St.	Private Treatment Provider				County Public Health Agency				Other			
		Screening	Assessment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screening	Assessment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screening	Assessment	Case Management	Treatment
Ft. Lauderdale	FL						X					X	
Gainesville	FL	X	X	X	X								
Jacksonville	FL		X	X	X								
Jacksonville 2	FL	X	X	X	X								
Key West	FL												
Miami	FL									Metro-Dade County Agency	Metro-Dade County Agency	Metro-Dade County Agency	
Pensacola	FL	X	X	X	X								
Sarasota	FL		X		X								Drug Court and Treatment Program Coordinator /Acupuncturist
Tampa	FL					X		X		DACCO	ACTS, DACCO, Goodwill, Tampa Crossroads, Center for Women	ACTS Goodwill, Tampa Crossroads, Center for Women	DACCO ACTS Goodwill Tampa crossroads Center for Women
Macon	GA								X				

Name of Court	St.	Private Treatment Provider				County Public Health Agency				Other			
		Screening	Assessment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screening	Assessment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screening	Assessment	Case Management	Treatment
Honolulu	HI												1) Court-based outpatient/in-tensive outpatient. 2) Referral to inpatient treatment.
Chicago	IL		X	X									
Edwardsville	IL		X	X	X								
Markham	IL								X				
Wichita	KS	X*	X	X	X								
Louisville	KY												

Name of Court	St.	Private Treatment Provider					County Public Health Agency					Other			
		Screening	Assessment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screening	Assessment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screening	Assessment	Case Management	Treatment		
Boston	MA		X		X								More if special needs client	Boston Coalition	
Kalamazoo	MI		X	X											
St. Joseph	MI			X				X							
Kansas City	MO		X		X								Local Laboratory	Staff supervised by Prosecutor's Office.	
Charlotte	NC	X	X	X	X								Case Managers		
Warren Co.	NC		X		X									Director	
Camden	NJ	X		X	X					X					
Newark	NJ			X	X										
Las Cruces	NM	X	X	X	X										
Reno	NV		X	X	X								Screening by Public Defender and District Attorney		
Brooklyn	NY	X	X	X	X										

Name of Court	St.	Private Treatment Provider				County Public Health Agency				Other			
		Screening	Assessment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screening	Assessment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screening	Assessment	Case Management	Treatment
Buffalo	NY									Court Outreach Program, Division of Substance Abuse, City of Buffalo. Treatment providers develop treatment plan on an individual basis.	Treatment Providers develop treatment plan on an individual basis.	Courts Program	Treatment consortium
Rochester	NY	X		X	X								
Suffolk	NY	X	X		X	X			X				
Akron	OH	X	X	X	X					Community Corrections Agency - Oriana House	Community Corrections Agency - Oriana House	Community Corrections Agency - Oriana House	Community Corrections Agency - Oriana House
Hamilton	OH		X	X	X								
Logan Co.	OK	X	X	X	X								Clients are referred out for residential and mental health treatment.
Payne Co.	OK												





Name of Court	St.	Private Treatment Provider				County Public Health Agency				Other			
		Screening	Assessment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screening	Assessment	Case Mgt.	Tx	Screening	Assessment	Case Management	Treatment
Beaumont	TX												* Services provided by 2 LCD's, acupuncturist, drug screening tech.
Ft. Worth	TX												* Licensed Chemical Dependency Counselor - member of Drug Court staff which is a unit of Probation Dept.
Roanoke	V/A		X	X	X								
Seattle	W A			X	X								Community Treatment Providers

**Maricopa/Phoenix-** The Drug Court Team is composed of the D.C. Judge, 1 prosecutor, 1 public defender, 3 PO's and 2 counselors. Decisions are made by the team with the judge casting the deciding vote when opinions differ.

**Dover-** Different agencies as needed--community mental health, vocational rehabilitation, etc.

**Georgetown-** Different agencies if necessary--community mental health, vocational rehabilitation, etc.

### III. Screening, Assessment And Case Management

#### A. Screening and Assessment

##### 1. *Use of Standard Assessment Instrument to Diagnose Addictive Disorders*

Chart VI-5 describes the assessment instruments used to identify treatment needs of drug court participants. Approximately seventy-five percent of the treatment professionals responding indicate that a standard assessment instrument is used.

#### **Chart VI-5: Assessment Instruments Used** [see page 38]

##### 2. *Assessment of Special Needs*

The assessment process of most programs is designed to identify special needs presented by the drug court population. For most programs, these include identifying participants who: are dually diagnosed; present evidence of HIV/AIDS infection, sexually transmitted disease, tuberculosis, hepatitis or other physical problems; have learning disabilities; have employment and housing needs; and may be victims of domestic or other violence.

#### **Chart VI-6: Assessment Process Used to Diagnose Special Needs** [see page 42]

##### 3. *Criteria Used to Screen for Treatment Program Eligibility*

Chart VI-7 summarizes the criteria treatment programs are using to screen individuals deemed eligible for the drug court by justice system officials for eligibility in the drug court's treatment component. The major goal of this screening process is to assure that individuals accepted for the drug court do, in fact, present significant substance abuse problems to warrant the application of drug court treatment and rehabilitation services. Most programs rely upon participants' history of drug use and self-reporting at the time of screening, with 60% also relying upon urinalysis results.

#### **Chart VI-7: Screening Criteria for Program Eligibility** [see page 48]

##### 4. *Effect of Mental Disorders on Program Eligibility*

Most programs appear to be accommodating individuals with mental disorders who are otherwise eligible for the drug court program by providing them special services. Approximately 10% of the reporting programs disqualify participants who present psychoses.

#### **Chart VI-8: Effect of Mental Disorders on Program Eligibility** [see page 52]

[See also chart VI-14 for percentage of participants in the reporting programs with major mental disorders]

5. *Time frame for Determining Eligibility for Treatment Following Determination Of Drug Court Eligibility*

Once an individual has met the justice system criteria for drug court eligibility, the reporting programs indicate that determination of treatment program eligibility appears to occur promptly in most programs. The reported time frames are as follows:

automatically:	33%
within 24 hours:	33%
within one to three days:	18%
within three days to one week:	16%

**Chart VI-9: Time Elapsed Before Determining Treatment Eligibility of Defendants Eligible for Drug Court [see page 57]**

**B. Client Treatment Plans**

All but four of the reporting programs indicate the use of individualized client treatment plans for drug court participants. Approximately 40% of the programs update these plans every 30 days; 10 percent update them every 60 days; and the remaining programs update them every 90 days. Approximately half of the programs provide copies of these plans to the court; the others provide them only upon request.

**Chart VI-10: Development and Updating of Individual Treatment Plans for Drug Court Clients [see page 61]**

**C. Client Case Management**

1. *Agency Performing Client Case Management*

As noted in Section II-B3, a variety of agencies are performing case management functions for drug court participants, as illustrated in Chart VI-11 which follows:

**Chart VI-11: Agency Performing Drug Court Client Case Management [see page 66]**

2. *Case Management Functions Performed*

Case management functions being performed for drug court participants in the reporting programs include:

Substance Abuse Screening and Assessment:	85%
Client Orientation:	88%
Referral to Dedicated Treatment Services Providers	68%
Referral to Non-dedicated Treatment Providers	56%

Referral for Ancillary Rehabilitation	90%
Preparing Court Reports	82%
Presenting Court Reports	78%
Appearing at Court Status Hearings	86%
Urine Monitoring	83%
Client Supervision	89%
Counseling On-site	65%
Counseling Off-site	72%
Data Entry/Data Base Management	69%
Treatment Plan Development	83%
Treatment Program Visiting and Monitoring	60%

**Chart VI-12: Case Management Functions Performed for Drug Court Clients [see page 74]**

The charts discussed in this section are presented on the following pages.

**Chart VI-5: Assessment Instruments Used**

Name of Court	St.	Stand. Assess. Instru.	ASI	SASSI	OPI	MAST	Other
Mobile	AL	Yes					Patient self assessment
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ	No					
Bakersfield	CA	Yes	X				
El Monte/ Rio Hondo	CA	No					
Laguna Nigel	CA	Yes					Orange County Health Care Agency alcohol and drug abuse psycho-social
Modesto	CA	Yes					Advised by drug court staff
Pasadena	CA						Impact uses its own. Developed years ago and refined over the years.
Richmond	CA	Yes	X			X	ASI Game Boy
Roseville	CA	Yes		X			
Salinas	CA	Yes		X			
San Bernardino	CA	Yes	X				
San Francisco	CA	Yes	X				We also use a standardized assessment instrument developed by S.F. Target Criteria.
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	Yes	X				Appropriate clients who are Dual Diagnosed are referred to psych. screening and stabilization.
Santa Ana	CA	Yes					Orange County Health Care Agency alcohol and drug abuse psychosocial.
Santa Barbara	CA	Yes	X				
Santa Maria	CA	Yes	X				
Santa Monica	CA	No					
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	Yes	X	X			

Name of Court	St.	Stand. Assess. Instru.	ASI	SASSI	OPI	MAST	Other
Stockton	CA	No					
Woodland/ Yolo	CA	Yes		X			
Denver	CO						
New Haven	CT	Yes		X		X*	*DSM IV. Psychosocial Assessment form devised by Treatment Clinician
Dover	DE	Yes	X		X	X	
Georgetown	DE	Yes	X		X	X	
Wilmington	DE		X		X		
Bartow	FL						
Crestview	FL	No					
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Yes				X	
Gainesville	FL	Yes				X	
Jacksonville	FL	Yes					ASAM Placement Criteria II, Clinical Instrument Withdrawal Assessment.
Jacksonville 2	FL	Yes	X	X			
Key West	FL	No					Created by treatment staff - includes detailed drug history.
Miami	FL	No					Psychosocial Assessment
Pensacola	FL	Yes					Agency specific comprehensive psychosocial assessment with 5 axis diagnosis, GAF and initial treatment plan.
Sarasota	FL	Yes		X			
Tampa	FL	No					DACCO is moving to ASAM placement criteria during F/98. This is main reason for not adopting standardized instrument at this time.
Macon	GA	Yes	X				
Honolulu	HI	Yes	X				

Name of Court	St.	Stand. Assess. Instru.	ASI	SASSI	OPI	MAST	Other
Chicago	IL	Yes				X	AS AM Pt. Placement PPC-2
Edwardsville	IL	Yes	X				Global Appraisal of Individual Needs (GAIN)
Markham	IL	Yes	X	X			
Wichita	KS	Yes	X*	X			* ASI - Available and used as needed Other: Kansas Client Placement Criteria (KCPC) screening instrument (a modification of ASAM)
Louisville	KY	No					
Boston	MA	Yes	X				
Kalamazoo	MI	Yes	X				DSM - Diagnosis criteria
St. Joseph	MI	Yes		X			
Kansas City	MO	Yes	X				
Charlotte	NC	Yes		X			
Warren Co.	NC	Yes		X			
Camden	NJ	Yes	X			X	
Newark	NJ	Yes				X	Assessment developed by Target Cities project.
Las Cruces	NM	Yes		X		X	
Reno	NV	Yes	X				Substance Abuse Questionnaire (SAQ) Adults Adolescent Chemical Dependency Inventory (ACDI) Youth
Brooklyn	NY	No					ADI, SASSI and OPI were combined and modified to create BTC's own assessment instrument
Buffalo	NY						TADD - (Standard Instrument or Wahman Hoffman)
Rochester	NY	No					
Suffolk	NY	Yes	X				
Akron	OH	Yes	X	X		X	
Hamilton	OH	Yes		X	X	X	OPI = pretrial



Name of Court	St.	Stand. Assess. Instru.	ASI	SASSI	OPI	MAST	Other
Logan Co.	OK	Yes		X			
Payne Co.	OK						
Eugene	OR	No					ASAM/OSAM DSMIV
Grants Pass	OR	No					DSM IV
Klamath Falls	OR	Yes				X	Placement criteria (ASAM)
Portland	OR	Yes					Multnomah County Assessment (MCA)
Roseburg	OR	No					
Philadelphia	PA	Yes	X				Comprehensive Assessment Instrument developed by the ISC Unit.
San Juan	PR	Yes	X				
Lexington	SC	Yes	X	X			
Austin	TX	Yes	X	X		X	Drug Abuse Screening Tool (DAST) Numerical Drinking Profile Mortimer Filkins Questionnaire
Beaumont	TX	Yes	X				
Ft. Worth	TX	Yes		X			
Roanoke	VA	No					
Seattle	WA	Yes				X	Drug and alcohol screening test.

**Chart VI-6: Assessment Process Used to Diagnose Special Needs**

Name of Court	St.	Dually Diag.	HIV/AIDS	T.B.	Hepatitis	STDs	Physical/Medic. Problems	Victims of Domes. Violen	Learning Disabl./Ed. Lim.	Empoly. Needs	Hous. Needs	Non-Engl. Speaking	Oth. Spec. Needs	Extra Explanation
Mobile	AL	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X			
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ													
Bakersfield	CA	X					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA													
Laguna Nigel	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Modesto	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Pasadena	CA		X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	Identify Spanish speaking
Richmond	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Roseville	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Salinas	CA		X				X		X		X	X		
San Bernardino	CA													
San Francisco	CA	X	X	X		X		X						
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Identify Gay and lesbian.
Santa Ana	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Santa Barbara	CA	X		X			X		X	X	X	X	X	

Name of Court	St.	Dually Diag.	HIV/AIDS	T.B.	Hepatitis	STDs	Physical/Medic. Problems	Victims of Domes. Violen	Learning Disabl./Ed. Lim.	Empoly. Needs	Hous. Needs	Non-Engl. Speaking	Oth. Spec. Needs	Extra Explanation
Santa Maria	CA	X		X			X		X	X	X	X		
Santa Monica	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Stockton	CA													
Woodland/Yolo	CA	X						X	X	X	X	X		
Denver	CO	X							X	X	X	X		
New Haven	CT	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Dover	DE	X	X					X		X	X	X		
Georgetown	DE	X	X					X		X	X	X		
Bartow	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X							
Crestview	FL	X	X				X	X	X	X	X			
Gainesville	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Jacksonville	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X							
Jacksonville 2	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		Individual assessment problem list and treatment plan.
Key West	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Miami	FL	X	X				X		X	X	X			

Name of Court	St.	Dually Diag.	HIV/AIDS	T.B.	Hepatitis	STDs	Physical/Medic. Problems	Victims of Domes. Violen	Learning Disabl./Ed. Lim.	Empoly. Needs	Hous. Needs	Non-Engl. Speaking	Oth. Spec. Needs	Extra Explanation
Pensacola	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		All by client self-report. Medical testing (HIV, Tuberculosis, Hepatitis, STD's) available.
Sarasota	FL								X	X				
Tampa	FL	X	X	X			X	X		X	X	X		
Macon	GA													
Honolulu	HI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		
Chicago	IL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Hearin g Impair	
Edwardsville	IL	X	X*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			* Client may receive anonymous testing - Results are not shared with treatment provider or the courts.
Markham	IL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Wichita	KS	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X		Part of KCPC
Louisville	KY	X	X				X	X	X	X	X			
Boston	MA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		
Kalamazoo	MI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		

Name of Court	St.	Dually Diag.	HIV/AIDS	T.B.	Hepatitis	STDs	Physical/Medic. Problems	Victims of Domes. Violen	Learning Disabl./Ed. Lim.	Empoly. Needs	Hous. Needs	Non-Engl. Speaking	Oth. Spec. Needs	Extra Explanation
St. Joseph	MI	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X			
Kansas City	MO	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		
Charlotte	NC		X	X	X	X	X			X	X			
Warren Co.	NC						X		X	X	X	X	X	Identify transportation needs.
Camden	NJ	X	X		X	X	X		X	X				
Newark	NJ	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X			
Las Cruces	NM	X										X		
Reno	NV	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Marital/Family	
Brooklyn	NY		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		
Buffalo	NY	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Rochester	NY	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Suffolk	NY	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Akron	OH	X					X		X	X				
Hamilton	OH	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		

Name of Court	St.	Dually Diag.	HIV/AIDS	T.B.	Hepatitis	STDs	Physical/Medic. Problems	Victims of Domes. Violen	Learning Disabl./Ed. Lim.	Empoly. Needs	Hous. Needs	Non-Engl. Speaking	Oth. Spec. Needs	Extra Explanation
Logan Co.	OK	X	X*	X*	X*	X*	X	X	X	X	X			* Offered but not required; identify learning disabled or have other educational limitations - reading level
Payne Co.	OK													
Eugene	OR	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Grants Pass	OR	X						X		X	X	X		Referral: HIV/AIDS; Tuberculosis; Hepatitis; STD's; Phys./Med. Problems
Klamath Falls	OR	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Family of origin, cultural, sexual orientation, ethnicity.
Portland	OR	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Roseburg	OR	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Philadelphia	PA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
San Juan	PR	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	N/A			
Lexington	SC	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Austin	TX	X					X	X	X	X	X	X		
Beaumont	TX	X												

Name of Court	St.	Dually Diag.	HIV/AIDS	T.B.	Hepatitis	STDs	Physical/Medic. Problems	Victims of Domes. Violen	Learning Disabl./Ed. Lim.	Empoly. Needs	Hous. Needs	Non-Engl. Speaking	Oth. Spec. Needs	Extra Explanation
Ft. Worth	TX													Referrals are made to community agencies
Roanoke	VA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Other: The social Tx and Assessment process covers all the above plus other psychosocial areas.
Seattle	WA	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X		

**Maricopa/Phoenix-**

New participants complete a written intake questionnaire and an autobiography to discern areas that need to be targeted. Where appropriate, we can refer clients to other agencies for needed services. RE: individuals who are dually diagnosed or have other mental health or psychological disorders=would be exclude via our initial screening process. RE: individuals who have other physical/medical problems may be exclude via screening depending on nature of problem

**Chart VI-7: Screening Criteria for Program Eligibility**

Name of Court	State	History of Drug Use	Urine Screen Results	Admission of Drug Use	History of Drug-Re. Offenses	Appl. of ASAM criteria	Referral from other Tx. Program	Other
Mobile	AL	X		X	X		X	Felony charge (drug related)
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	X			X			
Bakersfield	CA	X	X	X	X		X	
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA	X		X	X			
Laguna Nigel	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Modesto	CA	X		X	X			History of treatment
Pasadena	CA	X		X	X			
Richmond	CA	X		X	X			Jail referral, Pub. defendant referral, ct. order by judge.
Roseville	CA	X		X	X			
Salinas	CA	X		X	X			
San Bernardino	CA	X	X	X	X			
San Francisco	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	X			X			District Attorney determines eligibility.
Santa Ana	CA	X	X	X	X		X	
Santa Barbara	CA	X	X	X	X			
Santa Maria	CA	X	X	X	X			
Santa Monica	CA	X		X				
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	X	X	X	X			



Name of Court	State	History of Drug Use	Urine Screen Results	Admission of Drug Use	History of Drug-Re. Offenses	Appl. of ASAM criteria	Referral from other Tx. Program	Other
Stockton	CA	X	X	X	X			
Woodland/Yolo	CA	X					X	
Denver	CO							
New Haven	CT	X		X	X	X		
Dover	DE	X	X	X	X	X		
Georgetown	DE							
Wilmington	DE	X	X	X				
Bartow	FL	X	X	X	X		X	
Crestview	FL	X		X	X	X	X	referral from another treatment program - or drug court program.
Ft. Lauderdale	FL							legal eligibility
Gainesville	FL	X			X			
Jacksonville	FL	X	X	X	X	X		
Jacksonville 2	FL	X		X	X			
Key West	FL	X		X	X			Eligibility under the Florida Diversion Statute.
Miami	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Pensacola	FL	X			X			
Sarasota	FL	X	X	X				
Tampa	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	

Name of Court	State	History of Drug Use	Urine Screen Results	Admission of Drug Use	History of Drug-Re. Offenses	Appl. of ASAM criteria	Referral from other Tx. Program	Other
Macon	GA	X		X	X			Subjects enter program on a voluntary basis.
Honolulu	HI	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Chicago	IL	X	X	X	X	X	X	Failure of State's Attorney First Offender's program.
Edwardsville	IL	X	X	X	X	X		
Markham	IL	X	X	X	X	X		
Wichita	KS	X	X	X	X	X*		KCPC (Kansas Client Placement Criteria)
Louisville	KY	X	X	X	X	X		
Boston	MA	X		X	X			
Kalamazoo	MI	X	X	X	X	X	X	Job jeopardy, DUI, Court referrals.
St. Joseph	MI	X	X	X	X	X		
Kansas City	MO	X	X	X	X	X		
Charlotte	NC	X	X	X	X			
Warren Co.	NC	X	X	X	X			
Camden	NJ	X			X	X		
Newark	NJ	X	X	X	X	X		
Las Cruces	NM	X		X	X			Number of offenses
Reno	NV	X	X	X	X			Current arrest
Brooklyn	NY	X	X	X	X			
Buffalo	NY	X	X	X	X	X		

Name of Court	State	History of Drug Use	Urine Screen Results	Admission of Drug Use	History of Drug-Re. Offenses	Appl. of ASAM criteria	Referral from other Tx. Program	Other
Rochester	NY	X	X	X	X	X		
Suffolk	NY	X	X	X	X			
Akron	OH	X		X	X			
Hamilton	OH	X	X	X	X	X		
Logan Co.	OK	X		X	X			
Payne Co.	OK							
Eugene	OR							Felony Possession Charge
Grants Pass	OR	X	X	X	X	X		
Klamath Falls	OR	X	X	X	X	X		
Portland	OR			X				
Roseburg	OR	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Philadelphia	PA	X	X	X	X	X		
San Juan	PR	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Lexington	SC	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Austin	TX	X		X	X	X		
Beaumont	TX	X	X	X	X			
Ft. Worth	TX	X	X	X	X			
Roanoke	VA	X	X	X	X	X	X	Bio/Psycho/Social assessment including Development history.
Seattle	WA	X	X	X	X			Application of ASAM criteria - in process, being integrated in 1997.

**Chart VI-8: Effect of Mental Disorders on Program Eligibility**

<b>Name of Court</b>	<b>St</b>	<b>Depression</b>	<b>Bi-polar Disorder</b>	<b>Anxiety Disorder</b>	<b>Psychosis</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Mobile	AL	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Disqualifies	
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ					
Bakersfield	CA	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
El Monte/ Rio Hondo	CA					
Laguna Nigel	CA	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Disqualifies	
Modesto	CA	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Disqualifies	
Pasadena	CA					Through referral
Richmond	CA	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Roseville	CA	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Disqualifies	
Salinas	CA	Special Services				
San Bernardino	CA	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
San Francisco	CA					There is no separate track for the mentally ill and we attempt to use existing Services for the dually diagnosed client.
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Santa Ana	CA	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Santa Barbara	CA	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Santa Maria	CA	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Santa Monica	CA	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services		

Name of Court	St	Depression	Bi-polar Disorder	Anxiety Disorder	Psychosis	Comments
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Stockton	CA					
Woodland/Yolo	CA	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Denver	CO	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
New Haven	CT	Disqualifies	Disqualifies	Special Services	Disqualifies	
Dover	DE	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Georgetown	DE	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Wilmington	DE	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Bartow	FL	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Disqualifies	
Crestview	FL	Disqualifies /Special Serv	Special Services*	Special Services	Disqualifies	* We have tried working with these offenders but have not been successful.
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Gainesville	FL	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Disqualifies	
Jacksonville	FL	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Jacksonville 2	FL	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Key West	FL	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Miami	FL	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Disqualifies	
Pensacola	FL	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Disqualifies	
Sarasota	FL					

Name of Court	St	Depression	Bi-polar Disorder	Anxiety Disorder	Psychosis	Comments
Tampa	FL	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Macon	GA					
Honolulu	HI	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Chicago	IL	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Edwardsville	IL	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Markham	IL	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Wichita	KS	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Disqualifies	
Louisville	KY	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Boston	MA	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Maybe Disqualifies	
Kalamazoo	MI	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
St. Joseph	MI	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Kansas City	MO	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Disqualifies	
Charlotte	NC					
Warren Co.	NC	Special Services				
Camden	NJ	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Disqualifies	
Newark	NJ	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Las Cruces	NM	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Disqualifies	
Reno	NV	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Disqualifies*	* Possibly - after mental health evaluation
Brooklyn	NY	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	

<b>Name of Court</b>	<b>St</b>	<b>Depression</b>	<b>Bi-polar Disorder</b>	<b>Anxiety Disorder</b>	<b>Psychosis</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Buffalo	NY	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Rochester	NY	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Suffolk	NY					
Akron	OH	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Hamilton	OH	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Disqualifies	
Logan Co.	OK	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Payne Co.	OK					
Eugene	OR	need for Spec. Services	need for Spec. Services	need for Spec. Services	need for Spec. Services	
Grants Pass	OR	need for Spec. Services	need for Spec. Services	need for Spec. Services	need for Spec. Services	
Klamath Falls	OR	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Portland	OR					
Roseburg	OR	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Philadelphia	PA					
San Juan	PR	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Disqualifies	
Lexington	SC	need for Spec. Services	need for Spec. Services	need for Spec. Services	need for Spec. Services	
Austin	TX	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Disqualifies	
Beaumont	TX	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	
Ft. Worth	TX					

<b>Name of Court</b>	<b>St</b>	<b>Depression</b>	<b>Bi-polar Disorder</b>	<b>Anxiety Disorder</b>	<b>Psychosis</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Roanoke	VA	Special Services	Special Services	Special Services	Disqualifies*	*Depending on medication stabilization and ability to function in a group environment.
Seattle	WA	Special Services*	Special Services	Special Services	Disqualifies	* These may not be available; resources are very limited.



**Chart VI-9: Time Elapsed Before Determining Treatment Eligibility of Defendants Eligible for Drug Court**

Name of Court	State	Within 24 hrs.	1-3 days	3 days - 1 week	1 - 2 weeks	2 - 4 weeks	Automatically	Other
Mobile	AL	X						
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ						X	
Bakersfield	CA	X	X	X				
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA		X					
Laguna Nigel	CA				X			
Modesto	CA			X				
Pasadena	CA	X						Occasionally up to two weeks to verify arrest histories.
Richmond	CA			X	X			
Roseville	CA			X				
Salinas	CA			X				
San Bernardino	CA	X						
San Francisco	CA	X						
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA			X				
Santa Ana	CA				X			
Santa Barbara	CA						X	
Santa Maria	CA						X	
Santa Monica	CA	X						
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA				X			
Stockton	CA	X						

Name of Court	State	Within 24 hrs.	1-3 days	3 days - 1 week	1 - 2 weeks	2 - 4 weeks	Automatically	Other
Woodland/Yolo	CA						X	
Denver	CO						X	
New Haven	CT						X	
Dover	DE						X	
Georgetown	DE						X	
Wilmington	DE						X	
Barrow	FL				X			
Crestview	FL		X					
Ft. Lauderdale	FL						X	
Gainesville	FL	X					X	
Jacksonville	FL		X					
Jacksonville 2	FL	X					X	
Key West	FL						X	
Miami	FL	X					X	
Pensacola	FL	X						
Sarasota	FL						X	
Tampa	FL	X						
Macon	GA						X	
Honolulu	HI	X					X	
Chicago	IL	X						
Edwardsville	IL		X					

Name of Court	State	Within 24 hrs.	1-3 days	3 days - 1 week	1 - 2 weeks	2 - 4 weeks	Automatically	Other
Markham	IL	X						
Wichita	KS			X				
Louisville	KY			X				
Boston	MA	X						
Kalamazoo	MI		X					
St. Joseph	MI		X					
Kansas City	MO						X	
Charlotte	NC						X	Starts day defendant accepted into program.
Warren Co.	NC		X					
Camden	NJ			X				
Newark	NJ	X						
Las Cruces	NM	X						
Reno	NV						X	
Brooklyn	NY	X	X					
Buffalo	NY	X					X	
Rochester	NY	X						
Suffolk	NY		X					
Akron	OH			X				
Hamilton	OH					X		
Logan Co.	OK			X				

Name of Court	State	Within 24 hrs.	1-3 days	3 days - 1 week	1 - 2 weeks	2 - 4 weeks	Automatically	Other
Payne Co.	OK							
Eugene	OR	X	X					
Grants Pass	OR						X	automatically: few exceptions
Klamath Falls	OR	X						
Portland	OR						X	
Roseburg	OR			X				
Philadelphia	PA				X			
San Juan	PR		X					
Lexington	SC			X				
Austin	TX				X			
Beaumont	TX						X	
Ft. Worth	TX						X	
Roanoke	VA						X	
Seattle	WA	X (usually)	X (usually)					

**Chart VI-10: Development And Updating of Individual Treatment Plans For Drug Court Clients**

Name of Court	St	Indiv. Treat.	Updated Every:		Other	Ct. Rec'd A Summary	Explanation
			30 days	60 days 90days			
Mobile	AL	Yes		X		No	
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	Yes	X			Yes	F=Yes, in the form of "contracts" issued by judge. F1=every 30 days; during pre-TX and Path I F2=yes, Counselors prepare written reports consisting of an evaluation of clients performance during most recent contract interval and recommendations for next contract.
Bakersfield	CA	Yes			X	No	
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA	Yes		X		No	
Laguna Nigel	CA	Yes			X	No	Court reports indicate progress in treatment, but do not include treatment plan.
Modesto	CA	Yes	X			Yes	
Pasadena	CA	Yes	X			Yes	
Richmond	CA	Yes	X	X		Yes	
Roseville	CA	Yes			Depends on phase and level of treatment	Yes	
Salinas	CA	Yes	X			Yes	
San Bernardino	CA	Yes				No	
San Francisco	CA	Yes				Yes	
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	Yes	X	X		Yes	
Santa Ana	CA	Yes				No	
Santa Barbara	CA	Yes				No	

Name of Court	St	Indiv. Treat.	Updated Every:		Other	Ct. Rec'd A Summary	Explanation
			30 days	60 days 90days			
Santa Maria	CA	Yes		X		No	
Santa Monica	CA	Yes		X		No	
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	Yes			Every court date the plan may be updated or revised.	Yes	
Stockton	CA	Yes			As needed	Yes	
Woodland/Yolo	CA	Yes	X			Yes	
Denver	CO	Yes			By provider, court order	No	Unless requested
New Haven	CT	Yes		X*	* Or as needed	Yes	
Dover	DE	Yes	X			No	
Georgetown	DE	Yes	X			No	
Wilmington	DE						
Bartow	FL	Yes	X			No	
Crestview	FL	No	X			Yes	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Yes	X			Yes	
Gainesville	FL	Yes	X			No	
Jacksonville	FL	Yes	X			Yes	
Jacksonville 2	FL	Yes	X			No	
Key West	FL	Yes			If no release or noncompliance. Program plans updated I to II in 60 days, II to III in 90-120 days, or per clients needs!	Yes	
Miami	FL	Yes	X			No	

Name of Court	St	Indiv. Treat.	Updated Every:			Other	Ct. Rec'd A Summary	Explanation
			30 days	60 days	90 days			
Pensacola	FL	Yes	X			Yes		
Sarasota	FL	No				No		
Tampa	FL	Yes	X			Yes		
Macon	GA	No				No		
Honolulu	HI	Yes	X			Yes		
Chicago	IL	Yes			OP-30 days IOP-14 days Res-7 days	Yes		
Edwardsville	IL	Yes			Weekly in Phase I, Monthly in Phase II and III.	Yes		
Markham	IL	Yes	X			Yes		
Wichita	KS	Yes		X	As needed especially in phase changes.	No		
Louisville	KY	Yes			Every 6 months	No		
Boston	MA	Yes			Min. 90 days but more as needed	Yes	During Court Reviews	
Kalamazoo	MI	Yes			Individualized and based on estimate length of stay.	No		
St. Joseph	MI	Yes		X		Yes	Monthly meetings with court staff.	
Kansas City	MO	Yes	X	X	Updated every 30-90 days: prior to court.	Yes		
Charlotte	NC	Yes	X			Yes		
Warren Co.	NC	Yes			Too early to determine.	Yes		

Name of Court	St	Indiv. Treat.	Updated Every:		Other	Ct. Rec'd A Summary	Explanation
			30 days	60 days 90days			
Camden	NJ	Yes	X			No	
Newark	NJ	Yes			Info. not available	No	
Las Cruces	NM	Yes			Upon advancement to each phase.	No	
Las Vegas	NV	Yes	X			No	
Brooklyn	NY	Yes	X			Yes	
Buffalo	NY	Yes		X		Yes	
Rochester	NY	Yes			Varies with each agency.	No	
Suffolk	NY	Yes		X		Yes	
Akron	OH	Yes	X			Yes	
Hamilton	OH	Yes	X			Yes	
Logan Co.	OK	Yes		X	At least every 90 days, or when something changes.	Yes	
Payne Co.	OK						
Eugene	OR	Yes		X		No	
Grants Pass	OR	Yes	X			No	
Klamath Falls	OR	Yes			Intervals of 80 days, then 45 days, then 90 days, then every 90 days thereafter.	No	
Portland	OR	Yes		X	18th within 30 days then thereafter according to Oregon Administrative Rule	No	
Roseburg	OR	Yes	X				
Philadelphia	PA	Yes	X		When clinically needed.	Yes	



Name of Court	St	Indiv. Treat.	Updated Every:		Other	Ct. Rec'd A Summary	Explanation
			30 days	60 days 90days			
San Juan	PR	Yes		X		No	
Lexington	SC			X		No	
Austin	TX	Yes			With change of phase	No	
Beaumont	TX	No*			* Not as a general rule	No	
Ft. Worth	TX				As needed and with phase completion	Yes	
Roanoke	VA	Yes		X*	*Every 90 days (maximum).	No	
Seattle	WA	Yes	X			No	

**Chart VI-11: Agency Performing Drug Court Client Case Management**

Name of Court	State	Drug Ct. Coord.	Pretrial Svs. Agency	Probation Dept.	TASC	Treat. Provider.	Co. Pub. Health Ag.	Other
Mobile	AL							Case managers who are supervised by the court system.
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ			X	X			
Bakersfield	CA	X				X	X	
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA	X	X			X		
Laguna Nigel	CA			X			X	
Modesto	CA			X				Substance Abuse Counselor
Pasadena	CA					X		
Richmond	CA	X				X		
Roseville	CA	X*						* Health and Humans Services Staff
Salinas	CA	X		X			X	
San Bernardino	CA	X		X*		X		* Under C/C Judge supervision.
San Francisco	CA						X	
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA			X			X	
Santa Ana	CA			X			X	
Santa Barbara	CA			X		X		Treatment provider and Probation work very closely together.
Santa Maria	CA			X		X		Treatment provider and Probation work very closely together.

Name of Court	State	Drug Ct. Coord.	Pretrial Svs. Agency	Probation Dept.	TASC	Treat. Provider.	Co. Pub. Health Ag.	Other
Santa Monica	CA					X		
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	X				X		
Stockton	CA							Drug Court case monitor
Woodland/Yolo	CA	X				X		
Denver	CO			X		X		Drug Court coordinator office
New Haven	CT							Drug Court Tx Coordinator/Substance Abuse Counselor
Dover	DE					X		
Georgetown	DE			X				
Wilmington	DE				X	X		
Bartow	FL			X		X	X	
Crestview	FL					X		
Ft. Lauderdale	FL					X		
Gainesville	FL	X	X			X		
Jacksonville	FL					X		
Jacksonville 2	FL					X		Treatment Provider with expansion grant dollars.
Key West	FL	X						
Miami	FL				X	X*		*Metro-Dade County Agency
Pensacola	FL					X		
Sarasota	FL		X	X				

Name of Court	State	Drug Ct. Coord.	Pretrial Sys. Agency	Probation Dept.	TASC	Treat. Provider.	Co. Pub. Health Ag.	Other
Tampa	FL		X		X			Pretrial Services Agency = Tx team
Macon	GA	X						
Honolulu	HI							Court-based (dedicated) drug-court unit.
Chicago	IL			X				
Edwardsville	IL	X			X	X		
Markham	IL			X	X			
Wichita	KS					X		
Louisville	KY	X						
Boston	MA							Boston Coalition
Kalamazoo	MI	X				X		
St. Joseph	MI	X					X	
Kansas City	MO							Prosecutor Staff
Charlotte	NC							Case managers contracted through Private Non-Profit Organization.
Warren Co.	NC	X			X			
Camden	NJ			X	X	X		
Newark	NJ					X		
Las Cruces	NM					X		
Las Vegas	NV					X		
Brooklyn	NY							Case managers employed by Drug Court in collab. with comm. based Tx provider.

Name of Court	State	Drug Ct. Coord.	Pretrial Svs. Agency	Probation Dept.	TASC	Treat. Provider.	Co. Pub. Health Ag.	Other
Buffalo	NY	X				X		Courts Program
Rochester	NY					X		
Suffolk	NY			X	X			
Akron	OH							Community Corrections Agency - Oriana House
Hamilton	OH		X	X		X		Community case managers.
Logan Co.	OK	X		X		X		
Payne Co.	OK							
Eugene	OR					X		
Grants Pass	OR					X		
Klamath Falls	OR					X		
Portland	OR					X		
Roseburg	OR	X				X		
Philadelphia	PA		X					Court ISC staff.
San Juan	PR	X*				X*		* MHAASA
Lexington	SC					X		
Austin	TX	X	X			X		
Beaumont	TX			X*				* Drug Interven. Court Liaison Officer
Ft. Worth	TX	X*						*Case manager
Roanoke	VA			X		X		
Seattle	WA							

**Chart VI-12(a): Case Management Functions Performed For Drug Court Clients**

Name of Court	ST	Assess	Client Orient.	Referral-dedic.	Referral-not dedicat.	Preparing Ct Rpts.	Appear. at Status Hearing	Presenting Ct. Rpts.	Referral to Ancil. Rehab.	Urine Monitoring	Client Supervision	Couns. Off-site	Data base Mngt.	Tx Plan Dev.	Tx Program Visit/Monitor.	Counsel. On-site
Mobile	AL	X		X			X		X		X		X			
Maricopa	AZ	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X
Bakersfield	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
El Monte	CA	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X
Laguna Nigel	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Modesto	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Pasadena	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Richmond	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X			X	X		X
Roseville	CA	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X			X	X	
Salinas	CA	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
San Bernard.	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
San Francisco	CA								X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
San Jose	CA					X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	
Santa Ana	CA	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Santa Barbara	CA	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X
Santa Maria	CA	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X
Santa Monica	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Santa Rosa	CA	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Stockton	CA	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X				X	
Woodland	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Denver	CO	X	X	X	X	X					X		X		X	
New Haven	CT	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X		X	X	

Name of Court	ST	Assess	Client Orient.	Referral-dedic.	Referral-not dedicat.	Preparing Ct Rpts.	Appear. at Status Hearing	Presenting Ct. Rpts.	Referral to Ancil. Rehab.	Urine Monitoring	Client Supervision	Couns. Off-site	Data base Mngt.	Tx Plan Dev.	Tx Program Visit/Monitor.	Counsel. On-site
Dover	DE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	
Georgetown	DE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	
Wilmington	DE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						
Bartow	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Crestview	FL	X	X				X		X	X	X					
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Gainesville	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Jacksonville	FL		X			X	X	X	X	X	X					
Jacksonville 2	FL								X		X			X		
Key West	FL	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Miami	FL	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Pensacola	FL								X					X		
Sarasota	FL						X		X		X					
Tampa	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Macon	GA	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
Honolulu	HI		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Chicago	IL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Edwardsville	IL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Markham	IL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Wichita	KS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Louisville	KY	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Boston	MA	X	X			X	X		X	X	X			X		
Kalamazoo	MI	X	X	X			X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Name of Court	ST	Assess	Client Orient.	Referral-dedic.	Referral-not dedicat.	Preparing Ct Rpts.	Appear. at Status Hearing	Presenting Ct. Rpts.	Referral to Ancil. Rehab.	Urine Monitoring	Client Supervision	Couns. Off-site	Data base Mngt.	Tx Plan Dev.	Tx Program Visit/Monitor.	Counsel. On-site
St. Joseph	MI	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X			X		X
Kansas City	MO	X	X	X					X	X				X		X
Charlotte	NC	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Warren Co.	NC	X	X	X	X			X	X		X		X	X	X	X
Camden	NJ	X	X	X		X	X	X		X			X	X	X	X
Newark	NJ	X	X	X						X			X	X		X
Las Cruces	NM	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Las Vegas	NV	X	X	X	X*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Brooklyn	NY	X	X	X	X	X	X*	X*	X	X	X		X	X		X
Buffalo	NY	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Rochester	NY	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X
Suffolk	NY		X			X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		
Akron	OH	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Hamilton	OH	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Logan Co.	OK	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Payne Co.	OK															
Eugene	OR	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X		X
Grants Pass	OR	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Klamath Falls	OR	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X
Portland	OR	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Roseburg	OR	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Philadelphia	PA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	
San Juan	PR	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X



Name of Court	ST	Assess	Client Orient.	Referral-dedic.	Referral-not dedicat.	Preparing Ct Rpts.	Appear. at Status Hearing	Presenting Ct. Rpts.	Referral to Ancil. Rehab.	Urine Monitoring	Client Supervision	Couns. Off-site	Data base Mngt.	Tx Plan Dev.	Tx Program Visit/Monitor.	Counsel. On-site
Lexington	SC	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Austin	TX	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Beaumont	TX		X	X		X	X	X	X	X*	X					
Ft. Worth	TX	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	
Roanoke	VA	X*	X*	X	X	X	X	X	X*	X	X	X*	X	X*	X	X*
Seattle	WA															

**Chart VI-12(b): Case Management Functions Performed For Drug Court Clients**

Name of Court	State	Counseling- Off-site	Data entry/data base mgt.	Treat. Plan Dev.	Treat. Prgm Visit/Monitor.	Other
Mobile	AL		X			
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ		X	X		
Bakersfield	CA	X	X	X	X	Pre-screening
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA		X	X		
Laguna Nigel	CA	X	X	X	X	
Modesto	CA		X	X	X	Preparing court reports - probation officer only counseling on-site - substance abuse counselor - only
Pasadena	CA		X	X	X	
Richmond	CA		X	X		
Roseville	CA				X	
Salinas	CA	X	X	X	X	
San Bernardino	CA	X	X	X	X	
San Francisco	CA	X		X	X	
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA		X	X	X	Case management for dually diagnosed clients.
Santa Ana	CA	X	X	X	X	
Santa Barbara	CA		X	X		
Santa Maria	CA		X	X		
Santa Monica	CA		X	X	X	
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	X		X		

Name of Court	State	Counseling. Off-site	Data entry/ data base mgt.	Treat. Plan Dev.	Treat. Prgm Visit/Monitor.	Other
Stockton	CA				X	
Woodland/Yolo	CA		X	X	X	
Denver	CO		X		X	
New Haven	CT	X		X	X	
Dover	DE		X		X	
Georgetown	DE		X	X	X	
Wilmington	DE		X		X	
Bartow	FL	X	X	X		
Crestview	FL					
Ft. Lauderdale	FL		X	X		
Gainesville	FL	X	X	X	X	
Jacksonville	FL	X		X		
Jacksonville 2	FL			X	X	Treatment plan development = service plans.
Key West	FL	X	X	X		
Miami	FL		X	X	X	
Pensacola	FL			X		Fully integrated into treatment team.
Sarasota	FL					
Tampa	FL		X	X		
Macon	GA		X		X	

Name of Court	State	Counseling. Off-site	Data entry/ data base mgt.	Treat. Plan Dev.	Treat. Prgm Visit/Monitor.	Other
Honolulu	HI		X	X	X	Assessment= done by trained intake workers under the same unit. Counseling on-site= some by Tx staff under same unit.
Chicago	IL		X	X		
Edwardsville	IL	X	X	X	X	
Markham	IL	X		X	X	
Wichita	KS		X	X		
Louisville	KY		X	X	X	
Boston	MA			X		
Kalamazoo	MI	X		X		
St. Joseph	MI			X		
Kansas City	MO			X		
Charlotte	NC	X	X	X	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	X	X	X	X	* Ancillary providers
Brooklyn	NY		X	X		* Through 1 designated court liaison.
Buffalo	NY	X	X		X	
Rochester	NY	X		X	X	

Name of Court	State	Counseling. Off-site	Data entry/ data base mgt.	Treat. Plan Dev.	Treat. Prgm Visit/Monitor.	Other
Suffolk	NY		X	X	X	
Akron	OH	X		X	X	
Hamilton	OH		X	X	X	
Logan Co.	OK	X	X	X	X	
Payne Co.	OK					
Eugene	OR		X	X		
Grants Pass	OR	X	X	X	X	
Klamath Falls	OR			X		
Portland	OR		X	X	X	
Roseburg	OR	X	X	X	X	
Philadelphia	PA		X	X	X	
San Juan	PR	X	X	X	X	
Lexington	SC	X	X	X	X	
Austin	TX	X	X	X	X	
Beaumont	TX					Other: field visits - vocational/Ed. preparation classes. * sometimes
Ft. Worth	TX			X	X	
Roanoke	VA	X*	X	X*	X	* Treatment provider only performs those items.
Seattle	WA					

## IV. Drug Court Treatment And Rehabilitation Services

### A. Treatment Services Provided

Chart VI-13 provides a summary of the range of treatment services available to participants in the reporting drug courts and the degree to which these are available to **all** participants, **most** participants, **some** participants, **very few** participants, or not available to any. An indication of the availability of jail-based treatment services is also provided. The frequency of the availability of the following types of services for **all** clients were reported as follows:

Outpatient Counseling:	
up to 3 hours/week:	55%
3 or more hours/week	45%
Outpatient Therapy/up to 3 Hours/week:	24%
Intensive Therapy/3 or More Hours/week:	21%
Acupuncture:	21%
Relapse Prevention	72%
Residential Treatment:	
up to 30 days:	3%
30-60 days:	3%
61-90 days:	1%
over 90 days:	1%

Fifty-six percent of the responding programs indicated that treatment services in the local jail were available for some detainees.

**Chart VI-13: Treatment and Rehabilitation Services Provided or Drug Court Clients [see page 82]**

### B. Capability to Refer Participant to Inpatient Substance Abuse Treatment

As Chart VI-13 indicates, very few drug courts maintain the capability for referring individuals to inpatient substance abuse treatment for more than 30 days. Of the respondents, approximately 75% indicate at least some capability to refer individuals for inpatient services. The following is a summary of their capabilities:

programs which can provide <b>some</b> residential services:	
for up to 30 days:	
for all participants:	6%
for most participants:	4%
for some participants:	53%
for very few participants:	23%
for no participants:	14%

for 31 to 60 days:	
for all participants:	3%
for most participants:	4%
for some participants:	26%
for very few participants:	19%
for no participants:	34%
for 61-90 days:	
for all participants:	1%
for most participants:	2%
for some participants:	13%
for very few participants:	22%
for no participants:	62%
for over 90 days:	
for all participants:	1%
for most participants:	-
for some participants:	8%
for very few participants:	28%
for no participants:	63%

**C. Addressing Mental Health Needs**

*1. Percentage of Drug Court Participants with Major Mental Disorder*

Respondents were asked to indicate the percentage of drug court participants with the following mental disorders: depression; bipolar disorders; anxiety disorders; psychosis. As Chart VI-14 indicates, 60% of the reporting programs indicated the prevalence of individuals with these problems. An additional 14% indicated that no data was available on this topic. (Reference should also be made to Chart VI-8 of this volume relating to the frequency with which dually diagnosed individuals are disqualified from participating in the drug court program.)

**Chart VI-14: Drug Court Participants With Major Mental Disorders**  
[see page 86]

*2. Specialized Treatment Services Provided for Persons with Mental Disorder*

Fifty-eight percent of the responding drug court treatment providers indicated they provide “special services” to drug court participants with mental health needs. A number of programs have special in-house components to address the needs of dually diagnosed participants. Most rely on referrals to other, specialized agencies. (See Table VI-8)

## **D. Medications Permitted**

### *1. Prescription Medications (including anti-depressants)*

Only one program prohibits prescription medications; two programs indicated that the issue of whether to permit their use has not yet been raised.

### *2. Use of Pharmacotherapeutic Interventions*

Approximately 20% of the reporting programs have specific policies prohibiting the use of any pharmacological interventions. An additional 18% indicate that the issue as to whether to permit these interventions has not yet been raised. Those programs permitting pharmacological interventions usually limit these to specific interventions such as antabuse, naltrexone, or require that the individuals withdraw from their usage upon program admission.

## **E. Use of Alcohol by Drug Court Participants**

Over 75% of the reporting programs prohibit the use of alcohol and an additional 15% strongly discourage its use.

**Chart VI-15: Use of Pharmacotherapeutic Interventions and Policies on Use of Alcohol and Prescription Medicines for Drug Court Participants [see page 89]**

## **F. Adjuncts to Treatment**

Reporting programs use a variety of adjuncts to support the treatment services provided. The following are the most frequently noted:

acupuncture:	40%
12-step programs on premises:	46%
12- step programs off premises:	88%
cognitive restructuring:	60%
community mentors:	42%
relapse prevention:	96%

**Chart VI-16: Adjuncts to Treatment [see page 93]**

## **G. Provision of Support and Rehabilitation Services**

Charts VI-17(a) and (b) provide an overview of the range of general and special support and rehabilitation services provided by the responding drug court treatment programs to drug court participants.



**Chart VI-17(a): Support and Rehabilitation Services Provided to Drug Court Clients: General Services** [see page 98]

**Chart VI-17(b): Support and Rehabilitation Services Provided to Drug Court Clients: Special Services** [see page 102]

## **H. Services for Special Populations**

### *1. Special Components Developed*

Among the most commonly provided special components include those for Native Americans, Hispanics, deaf participants, physically disabled, gay participants, females, males and parents. As chart VI-18(a) & (b) indicate, approximately 65% of the responding treatment programs have developed special program components to address specialized needs presented by their drug court populations.

**Chart VI-18(a): Special Treatment Components Developed to Address Needs of Special Populations: Ethnic, Cultural and Other Needs** [see page 107]

**Chart VI-18(b): Special Treatment Components Developed to Address Needs of Special Populations: Parents, Women and Victims** [see page 111]

### *2. Child Care Services for Participants While Attending Treatment Sessions*

As Chart VI-18(b) indicates, approximately 20% of the reporting programs provide child care services for participants while attending treatment sessions.

### *3. Policies re: Permitting Participants to Bring Children to Treatment Sessions*

Approximately one third of the reporting programs permit participants to bring children to the treatment sessions. In some instances, only participants who are pregnant or post-partum are permitted to bring their children to the treatment sessions.

The charts discussed in this section are presented in the following pages.

**Chart VI-13: Treatment And Rehabilitation Services Provided For Drug Court Clients**

Name of Court	St.	Output Coun. (3+ hrs.)	Intensiv. Therapy (3+ hrs.)	Output. Counsel (<3 hrs)	Output. Therapy (<3 hrs.)	Acup	Relap. Prev.	Resid. (<30dys)	Resident. t. (30-60 dys)	Resident. (61-90 dys)	Resident. (<90 dys)	Treatment in Jail
Mobile	AL	N/A	SOME	FEW	FEW	ALL	ALL	SOME	SOME	SOME		NO
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ			ALL	ALL		ALL		N/A			SOME
Bakersfield	CA	SOME	SOME	ALL	FEW	N/A	ALL	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	SOME
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA	ALL	ALL			ALL	ALL	SOME	FEW	FEW	FEW	SOME
Laguna Nigel	CA	SOME	SOME	ALL	SOME	FEW	ALL	SOME	SOME	N/A	N/A	NO
Modesto	CA	ALL		ALL		N/A	ALL	ALL				SOME
Pasadena	CA	ALL	ALL			SOME	MOST	MOST	MOST	MOST		SOME
Richmond	CA	SOME	N/A	SOME	MOST	ALL	MOST	MOST	SOME			SOME
Roseville	CA	MOST	N/A	MOST	SOME	N/A	ALL	FEW	FEW			NO
Salinas	CA	SOME	FEW	SOME	FEW	N/A	ALL	N/A	SOME			SOME
San Bernardino	CA	ALL	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	ALL	ALL	ALL	N/A	N/A	SOME
San Francisco	CA	ALL	MOST	ALL	SOME	ALL	ALL	SOME	SOME			SOME
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	SOME	SOME	SOME	SOME	0	SOME	0	SOME	N/A	N/A	SOME
Santa Ana	CA	SOME	SOME	ALL	SOME	FEW	ALL	SOME				NO
Santa Barbara	CA	ALL	SOME	ALL	MOST	ALL	ALL	FEW	SOME	FEW	FEW	SOME

Name of Court	St.	Output Coun. (3+ hrs.)	Intensiv. Therapy (3+ hrs.)	Output. Counsel (<3 hrs)	Output. Therapy (<3 hrs.)	Acup	Relap. Prev.	Resid. (<30dys)	Resident. (30-60 dys)	Resident. (61-90 dys)	Resident. (<90 dys)	Treatment in Jail
Santa Maria	CA	ALL	SOME	ALL	MOST	ALL	ALL	FEW	SOME	FEW	FEW	SOME
Santa Monica	CA	MOST		MOST		N/A	ALL	FEW	SOME	SOME	SOME	SOME
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	ALL	SOME	ALL	SOME	N/A	ALL	FEW				SOME
Stockton	CA	ALL				ALL	ALL	SOME		SOME	SOME	NO
Woodland/Yolo	CA	SOME	SOME	SOME	SOME	N/A	ALL	SOME	FEW	FEW	FEW	NO
Denver	CO	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL	SOME
New Haven	CT	ALL	FEW			MOST	ALL	SOME				NO
Dover	DE	SOME	SOME	MOST	MOST	N/A	MOST	SOME	FEW	FEW	FEW	SOME
Georgetown	DE	SOME	SOME	MOST	MOST	N/A	MOST	SOME	FEW	FEW	FEW	SOME
Bartow	FL	FEW	FEW	ALL	ALL	N/A	ALL	FEW				SOME
Crestview	FL	ALL	ALL	ALL	SOME	N/A	ALL	SOME			N/A	NO
Gainesville	FL	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL	SOME	SOME	SOME	SOME	NO
Jacksonville	FL	ALL	FEW	ALL	SOME	N/A	ALL	SOME	SOME			SOME
Jacksonville 2	FL	MOST	MOST	SOME		N/A	ALL	FEW				SOME
Key West	FL	SOME	FEW	ALL	ALL	SOME	MOST	FEW	FEW	FEW	FEW	NO
Miami	FL	ALL				X	X					SOME
Pensacola	FL	ALL				X	X	MOST	MOST	MOST		NO
Sarasota	FL	FEW		FEW	FEW	ALL	ALL	FEW				NO

Name of Court	St.	Output Coun. (3+ hrs.)	Intensiv. Therapy (3+ hrs.)	Output. Counsel (<3 hrs)	Output. Therapy (<3 hrs.)	Acup	Relap. Prev.	Resid. (<30dys)	Residen t. (30-60 dys)	Resident. (61-90 dys)	Resident. (<90 dys)	Treatment in Jail
Tampa	FL	FEW	FEW	ALL	N/A	MOST	ALL	N/A			FEW	SOME
Macon	GA											NO
Honolulu	HI	SOME	SOME	SOME	SOME		SOME	SOME	SOME	SOME	SOME	NO
Chicago	IL	MOST	MOST	ALL	ALL	N/A	ALL	SOME	FEW	FEW	FEW	SOME
Edwards-ville	IL	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL	N/A	ALL	SOME*	FEW	FEW	FEW	NO
Markham	IL	ALL	N/A	ALL	N/A	Pend.	ALL	ALL		FEW		SOME
Wichita	KS	MOST		ALL			MOST	SOME				NO
Louisville	KY	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL	SOME	SOME	SOME	SOME	NO
Boston	Ma	ALL		ALL		SOME	ALL	SOME	SOME	FEW	SOME	SOME
Kalamazoo	MI	MOST	MOST	FEW	FEW	SOME	SOME	SOME	SOME	FEW	FEW	NO
St. Joseph	MI	MOST		SOME		MOST	ALL					NO
Kansas City	Mo	SOME	SOME	ALL	ALL	N/A	ALL	FEW	SOME	FEW	N/A	SOME
Charlotte	NC	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL	N/A	SOME	N/A				SOME
Warren Co.	NC	ALL	ALL	ALL			ALL	SOME				NO
Camden	NJ	MOST	FEW	SOME	N/A	N/A	ALL	N/A				SOME
Newark	NJ	MOST	MOST	SOME	SOME	N/A	SOME	SOME				NO
Las Cruces	Nm	ALL	FEW	ALL	FEW	N/A	ALL	N/A				SOME
Las Vegas	NV	ALL	SOME	ALL		ALL	ALL	FEW		FEW		NO
Brooklyn	NY	SOME	SOME	SOME		MOST	MOST	SOME				SOME
Buffalo	NY	ALL	SOME	ALL	ALL		ALL	SOME			N/A	

Name of Court	St.	Output Coun. (3+ hrs.)	Intensiv. Therapy (3+ hrs.)	Output. Counsel (<3 hrs)	Output. Therapy (<3 hrs.)	Acup	Relap. Prev.	Resid. (<30dys)	Resident. t. (30-60 dys)	Resident. (61-90 dys)	Resident. (<90 dys)	Treatment in Jail
Rochester	NY	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL	FEW	ALL	SOME	FEW	FEW	FEW	NO
Suffolk	NY	ALL		FEW		N/A	ALL	SOME			X	SOME
Akron	OH	MOST		SOME	SOME	N/A	N/A	FEW	FEW	SOME	FEW	SOME
Hamilton	OH	ALL	ALL	ALL	SOME	N/A	ALL	N/A		N/A		SOME
Logan Co.	OK	ALL	FEW	ALL	SOME	N/A	ALL	SOME	SOME	SOME	FEW	SOME
Payne Co.	OK											
Eugene	OR	ALL	N/A	N/A	ALL		ALL	N/A				SOME
Grants Pass	OR	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL	N/A	ALL	SOME	SOME	FEW	FEW	SOME
Klammath Falls	OR	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL	N/A	ALL	N/A				NO
Portland	OR	MOST	MOST	SOME	SOME	ALL	ALL	SOME			FEW	SOME
Roseburg	OR	MOST	MOST	MOST	MOST	N/A	SOME	SOME	FEW		FEW	NO
Philadelphia	PA	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL	SOME	FEW			SOME
San Juan	PR	SOME	SOME	SOME	SOME	SOME	ALL	FEW				NO
Lexington	SC	ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL		ALL					NO
Austin	TX	ALL	SOME	ALL	SOME	N/A	ALL	FEW	FEW	FEW	FEW	SOME
Beaumont	TX					ALL	ALL	SOME				NO
Ft. Worth	TX	SOME	SOME	MOST	MOST		ALL	SOME	FEW			NO
Roanoke	VA	MOST		MOST			MOST		SOME		FEW	SOME
Seattle	WA											NO

**Chart VI-14: Drug Court Participants with Major Mental Disorders**

Name of Court	St.	% with Depress.	% with Bipolar Disorder	% with Anxiety Disorder	% with Psychosis	Comments
Mobile	AL	30%	10%	20%	0%	
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ				0%	
Bakersfield	CA	30%	15%	15%	30%	
El Monte/ Rio Hondo	CA					
Laguna Nigel	CA	1%	1%	1%	0%	
Modesto	CA	15%		5%		
Pasadena	CA	5%	5%			
Richmond	CA	UN <sup>1</sup>	UN	UN	UN	
Roseville	CA	8%	2%	2%	0%	
Salinas	CA	70%	5%	10%	10%	
San Bernardino	CA	15%	5%	55	2%	Note: estimates
San Francisco	CA	25%	10%	10%	7%	
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	2%	8%	0%	2%	
Santa Ana	CA	1%	1%	1%	0%	
Santa Barbara	CA	15%	6%	8%	3%	
Santa Maria	CA	15%	6%	8%	3%	
Santa Monica	CA	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	7%	1%	1%	1%	
Stockton	CA					
Woodland/Yolo	CA					
Denver	CO	UN	UN	UN	UN	
New Haven	CT	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Dover	DE	5%				

<sup>1</sup>UN=Unknown

Name of Court	St.	% with Depress.	% with Bipolar Disorder	% with Anxiety Disorder	% with Psychosis	Comments
Georgetown	DE	5%	1%			
Wilmington	DE					
Bartow	FL	5%	2%	3%	0%	
Crestview	FL	25%	5%	70%	0%	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	20%	3%	3%	.5%	
Gainesville	FL	1%	1%	2%	0%	
Jacksonville	FL					
Jacksonville 2	FL					
Key West	FL	1%	1%	.01%	.01%	
Miami	FL	20%	5%	10%	1%	
Pensacola	FL	2%		5%	2%	
Sarasota	FL	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Tampa	FL					Diagnosis not made in program.
Macon	GA	UN	UN	UN	UN	
Honolulu	HI					The overall rate for clients with dual/co-existing disorders is approximately 24%
Chicago	IL	15%	3%	15%	1%	
Edwardsville	IL					
Markham	IL	25%	10%	1%	0%	
Wichita	KS					Unknown - we are not tracking this.
Louisville	KY					
Boston	MA	20%	2%	5%		
Kalamazoo	MI	18%	3%	9%	1%	
St. Joseph	MI	5%	0%	5%	0%	
Kansas City	MO	5%	1%	1%	1%	
Charlotte	NC					
Warren Co.	NC	2%		2%		

Name of Court	St.	% with Depress.	% with Bipolar Disorder	% with Anxiety Disorder	% with Psychosis	Comments
Camden	NJ	10%	0%	0%	0%	
Newark	NJ					
Las Cruces	NM	5%	52%	15%	20%	
Reno	NV					Unknown
Brooklyn	NY	20%	1-5%	15%	1-5%	
Buffalo	NY	20%				
Rochester	NY					Data not collected.
Suffolk	NY					N/A
Akron	OH	1%	1%	1%	1%	
Hamilton	OH	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Logan Co.	OK	10%	3%	2%	0%	
Payne Co.	OK					
Eugene	OR					
Grants Pass	OR	80%	5%	5%	3%	
Klamath Falls	OR	5%	5%	10%	0%	
Portland	OR					
Roseburg	OR	20%	2%	5%	2%	
Philadelphia	PA					Unknown.
San Juan	PR					Information not available now.
Lexington	SC	2%		1%		
Austin	TX	25%	3%	5%	0%	
Beaumont	TX					Statistics not available
Ft. Worth	TX	6%	1%	1%	1%	
Roanoke	VA					Small percentage with d/o diagnosed - depression, bipolar disorder, anxiety disorder.
Seattle	WA					



**Chart VI-15: Use of Pharmacotherapeutic Interventions And Policies on Use of Alcohol And Prescription Medications For Drug Court Participants**

Name of Court	State	Use Pharmaco. Interventions	Comments on Pharmacol. Intervention	Take Prescription Medication	Alcohol Permitted	Comments on Alcohol Use
Mobile	AL	No	Antabuse would be exception	Yes	No	
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	No		Yes	No	
Bakersfield	CA	Yes		Yes	Discouraged	
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA	Not raised		Yes	No	strongly discouraged.
Laguna Nigel	CA	Yes		Yes	No	
Modesto	CA	No		Yes	No	
Pasadena	CA	Yes	But with the condition that detox withdrawal is a condition of admission.	No	No	Strongly discouraged.
Richmond	CA	Yes		Yes	No	
Roseville	CA	Yes		Yes	No	
Salinas	CA	Yes		Yes	No	
San Bernardino	CA	Yes		Yes	No	
San Francisco	CA	Yes		Yes	No	
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	Not raised		Yes	No	
Santa Ana	CA	Yes		Yes	Discouraged	Residential programs strictly prohibit use.
Santa Barbara	CA	Yes		Yes	No	

Name of Court	State	Use Pharmaco. Interventions	Comments on Pharmacol. Intervention	Take Prescription Medication	Alcohol Permitted	Comments on Alcohol Use
Santa Maria	CA	Yes		Yes	No	
Santa Monica	CA	No		Yes	No	
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	Yes		Yes	No	
Stockton	CA	Yes		Yes	Discouraged	
Woodland/Yolo	CA	Yes		Yes	Discouraged	
Denver	CO					
New Haven	CT	Yes	Naltrexone	Yes	No	
Dover	DE	Yes		Yes	No	
Georgetown	DE	Yes		Yes	No	
Wilmington	DE	Yes		Yes	No	
Bartow	FL	Not Raised		Yes	No	
Crestview	FL	No		Yes	No	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Yes		Yes	No	
Gainesville	FL	Yes		Yes	Discouraged	
Jacksonville	FL	No		Yes	No	
Jacksonville 2	FL	Yes		Yes	Discouraged	
Key West	FL	Not Raised		Yes	Yes	Strongly discouraged.
Miami	FL	Yes		Yes/No	No	
Pensacola	FL	No		Yes	No	
Sarasota	FL	Not Raised		Not Raised	Discouraged	
Tampa	FL	Yes		Yes	No	

Name of Court	State	Use Pharmacol. Interventions	Comments on Pharmacol. Intervention	Take Prescription Medication	Alcohol Permitted	Comments on Alcohol Use
Macon	GA	Yes		Yes	No	
Honolulu	HI	Not Raised		Yes	No	
Chicago	IL	Not Raised		Yes	No	
Edwardsville	IL	Yes		Yes	No	
Markham	IL	Yes		Yes	No	
Wichita	KS	Not Raised		Yes	No/ Discouraged	
Louisville	KY	Yes		Yes	No	
Boston	MA	No		Yes	No	
Kalamazoo	MI	Yes		Yes	No	
St. Joseph	MI	Yes		Yes	No	
Kansas City	MO	No		Yes	No	
Charlotte	NC	Yes		Yes	Discouraged	
Warren Co.	NC	Not raised		Yes	Discouraged	
Camden	NJ	Yes		Yes	No	
Newark	NJ	Yes		Not raised	Discouraged	
Las Cruces	NM	Yes		Yes	No	
Reno	NV	Yes	We require detox within 2 months	Yes	No	
Brooklyn	NY	Yes	Methadone to abstinence. To abstinence only.	Yes	Discouraged	
Buffalo	NY					

Name of Court	State	Use Pharmaco. Interventions	Comments on Pharmacol. Intervention	Take Prescription Medication	Alcohol Permitted	Comments on Alcohol Use
Rochester	NY	Yes		Yes	No	
Suffolk	NY	Yes		Yes	Discouraged	Not raised.
Akron	OH	Yes		Yes	No	
Hamilton	OH	Yes		Yes	No	
Logan Co.	OK	Not raised		Yes	No	
Payne Co.	OK					
Eugene	OR	Yes		Yes	Discouraged	abstinence required
Grants Pass	OR	Yes		Yes	No	
Klamath Falls	OR	Not raised		Yes	No	
Portland	OR	Yes	But they must have Dr.'s agreement to detox in 6 months and agree do it themselves.	Yes	No	
Roseburg	OR	Yes		Yes	No	
Philadelphia	PA	Not raised		Not raised	No	
San Juan	PR	Yes	Naltrexone	Yes	Not Raised	
Lexington	SC	No		Yes	No	
Austin	TX	Yes		Yes	Discouraged	
Beaumont	TX	Yes		Yes	No	
Ft. Worth	TX	Yes		Yes	Yes	
Roanoke	VA	Not Raised		Yes	No/ Discouraged	
Seattle	WA					

**Chart VI-16: Adjuncts to Treatment**

Name of Court	St	Acup	12 Step Prog on Premises	12 Step Prog off Premises	Cogniti. Restruct.	Community Mentors	Relapse Prevention	Other
Mobile	AL	X		X	X	X	X	Short term residential 2-4 weeks (contracted beds).
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ			X	X		X	"Financial group"=mandatory instruction on budgetary/money management for def's who are delinquent (>=\$50 in counseling fees).
Bakersfield	CA		X	X	X	X	X	Family wellness course work. All in one group.
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA	X	X		X	X	X	
Laguna Nigel	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	Clients encouraged to use churches if affiliated and community colleges.
Modesto	CA			X	X		X	
Pasadena	CA	X	X	X			X	
Richmond	CA	X		X		X	X	
Roseville	CA			X	X		X	
Salinas	CA			X			X	
San Bernardino	CA			X		X	X	
San Francisco	CA	X	X		X	X	X	
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA		X	X	X	X	X	Relapse/intervention class held during court hearings before appearance.

Name of Court	St	Acup	12 Step Prog on Premises	12 Step Prog off Premises	Cogniti. Restruct.	Community Mentors	Relapse Prevention	Other
Santa Ana	CA	X		X	X	X	X	Clients encouraged to use churches, if affiliated, and community colleges.
Santa Barbara	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Santa Maria	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Santa Monica	CA		X	X			X	
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA			X			X	Prenatal and parenting programs
Stockton	CA	X	X	X			X	
Woodland/Yolo	CA		X	X			X	
Denver	CO	X	X		X		X	
New Haven	CT	X	X	X			X	
Dover	DE		X	X			X	
Georgetown	DE			X			X	
Wilmington	DE		X	X				Therapeutic Communities- jail based
Bartow	FL			X		X	X	
Crestview	FL		X	X	X		X	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	X	X	X	X		X	
Gainesville	FL	X		X	X	X	X	
Jacksonville	FL		X	X			X	

Name of Court	St	Acup	12 Step Prog on Premises	12 Step Prog off Premises	Cogniti. Restruct.	Community Mentors	Relapse Prevention	Other
Jacksonville 2	FL		X	X			X	
Key West	FL	X		X	X		X	Individual and group therapy
Miami	FL	X	X				X	
Pensacola	FL		X	X	X	X	X	
Sarasota	FL	X		X		X	X	
Tampa	FL	X	X	X			X	
Macon	GA		X				X	
Honolulu	HI			X	X	X	X	Specialized men's, women's & transsexual/transgender groups.
Chicago	IL			X	X	X	X	Transportation, Family Therapy, Psych. Cons. Outdoor Adventures in Recovery, Psychotropic Meds.
Edwardsville	IL		X	X			X	
Markham	IL		X	X			X	
Wichita	KS		X	X	X	X	X	Brief Therapist Model
Louisville	KY	X		X	X	X	X	
Boston	MA	X		X			X	
Kalamazoo	MI	X		X			X	Day Treatment, Early Recovery, Outpatient Counseling, IOP
St. Joseph	MI	X	X	X	X		X	
Kansas City	MO		X	X	X		X	
Charlotte	NC		X	X	X	X	X	

Name of Court	St	Acup	12 Step Prog on Premises	12 Step Prog off Premises	Cogniti. Restruct.	Community Mentors	Relapse Prevention	Other
Warren Co.	NC		X	X		X	X	
Camden	NJ			X	X		X	
Newark	NJ		X	X	X		X	
Las Cruces	NM			X	X	X	X	
Las Vegas	NV	X		X	X	X	X	
Brooklyn	NY	X*	X*	X*	X*	X*	X*	* Off site. All "drug" treatment is off-site - BTC provides many services which are ancillary to Tx.  Methadone to abstinence
Buffalo	NY							
Rochester	NY	X		X	X	X	X	
Suffolk	NY			X			X	
Akron	OH			X	X*		X*	Aftercare * Implement 1997
Hamilton	OH		X	X	X	X	X	
Logan Co.	OK			X	X		X	
Payne Co.	OK							
Eugene	OR	X		X	X		X	Program Mentors
Grants Pass	OR			X	X		X	
Klamath Falls	OR			X	X		X	
Portland	OR	X		X	X		X	



Name of Court	St	Acup	12 Step Prog on Premises	12 Step Prog off Premises	Cogniti. Restruct.	Community Mentors	Relapse Prevention	Other
Roseburg	OR			X	X	X	X	
Philadelphia	PA	X		X		X	X	Ancillary services on-site at the assessment/referral unit
San Juan	PR	X	X		X		X	
Lexington	SC			X	X	X	X	
Austin	TX			X	X	X	X	Biofeedback and ROPES Courses
Beaumont	TX	X		X	X		X	Other: 12 step orientation (Phase 1) methadone: contract out naltrexone or other opiate blocker: have considered acupuncture: in-house on premises: working on this
Ft. Worth	TX			X			X	
Roanoke	VA		X	X	X*		X	*A group technique.
Seattle	WA							

**Chart VI-17(a): Support And Rehabilitation Services Provided to Drug Court Clients: General Services**

Name of Court	St	Pub. Health	Edu./GED	Primary Health Care	Referral to 12 Step Prg	Vocation Training	Job Dev.	Family Couns.	Housing	Food/Cloth.	Life Skills	Anger Mgmt.
Mobile	AL		X		X		X	X			X	X
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ				X						X	X
Bakersfield	CA	X	X	X	X	X		X			X	X
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA		X		X	X	X	X			X	X
Laguna Nigel	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Modesto	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Pasadena	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Richmond	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Roseville	CA	X	X		X	X	X		X			X
Salinas	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
San Bernardino	CA	X	X		X	X	X		X*	X	X	X
San Francisco	CA		X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	X			X						X	X
Santa Ana	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Santa Barbara	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
Santa Maria	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
Santa Monica	CA	X*	X*	X*	X*	X*	X*	X	X	X	X	X

Name of Court	St	Pub. Health	Edu./GED	Primary Health Care	Referral to 12 Step Prg	Vocation Training	Job Dev.	Family Couns.	Housing	Food/Cloth.	Life Skills	Anger Mgmt.
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA				X	X		X				X
Stockton	CA	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X
Woodland/Yolo	CA		X		X	X	X	X	X			X
Denver	CO											
New Haven	CT		X	X	X	X	X	X				X
Dover	DE	X	X		X	X	X		X	X		X
Georgetown	DE	X	X		X	X	X		X	X		X
Wilmington	DE		X	X	X	X						
Bartow	FL	X	X		X	X		X			X	X
Crestview	FL	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Ft. Lauderdale	FL				X	X		X	X		X	X
Gainesville	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Jacksonville	FL		X		X	X		X	X		X	X
Jacksonville 2	FL	X	X	X	X			X				
Key West	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Miami	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X
Pensacola	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X*	X	X	X	X
Sarasota	FL				X							
Tampa	FL				X			X			X	X

Name of Court	St	Pub. Health	Edu./GED	Primary Health Care	Referral to 12 Step Prg	Vocation Training	Job Dev.	Family Couns.	Housing	Food/Cloth.	Life Skills	Anger Mgmt.
Macon	GA				X							X
Honolulu	HI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Chicago	IL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Edwardsville	IL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Markham	IL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Wichita	KS				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Louisville	KY	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Boston	MA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Kalamazoo	MI	X	X		X	X			X	X	X	X
St. Joseph	MI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Kansas City	MO	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Charlotte	NC	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Warren Co.	NC	X	X		X	X	X					X
Camden	NJ	X	X		X	X		X			X	X
Newark	NJ	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
Las Cruces	NM	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Reno	NV	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Brooklyn	NY	X*	X	X*	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Buffalo	NY											
Rochester	NY		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Name of Court	St	Pub. Health	Edu./GED	Primary Health Care	Referral to 12 Step Prg	Vocation Training	Job Dev.	Family Couns.	Housing	Food/Cloth.	Life Skills	Anger Mgmt.
Suffolk	NY	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Akron	OH		X		X		X			X	X	X
Hamilton	OH	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Logan Co.	OK	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Payne Co.	OK											
Eugene	OR				X			X			X	X
Grants Pass	OR	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Klammath Falls	OR	X	X		X			X				
Portland	OR	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X*	X*	X	X
Roseburg	OR	X			X		X	X	X		X	X
Philadelphia	PA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
San Juan	PR	X	X	X	X	X		X				X
Lexington	SC	X			X	X		X			X	X
Austin	TX	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Beaumont	TX	X	X		X	X	X					X
Ft. Worth	TX	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
Roanoke	VA		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Seattle	WA											

**Chart VI-17 (b): Support and Rehabilitation Services Provided to Drug Court Clients: Special Services**

Name of Court	St.	Relapse Prevent.	Parenting	Child Care	Transport. Allowance Bus Tokens	Dually Diagnosed Services	Service for Special Populations	Service for Cultural/Ethnic Groups	Comments
Mobile	AL	X	X						
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	X			X				
Bakersfield	CA	X	X			X	X	X	
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA	X	X		X		X	X	
Laguna Nigel	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Modesto	CA	X	X	X	X				Referral made for all
Pasadena	CA	X	X		X	X	X	X	
Richmond	CA	X					X		
Roseville	CA	X		X	X	X			
Salinas	CA	X	X	X			X	X	
San Bernardino	CA	X	X		X	X			Housing - referrals Child Care - pending
San Francisco	CA	X		X	X	X	X	X	Limited - programs to deal with dually diagnosed offender.
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	X	X			X	X	X	
Santa Ana	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Santa Barbara	CA	X	X			X	X	X	

Name of Court	St.	Relapse Prevent.	Parenting	Child Care	Transport. Allowance Bus Tokens	Dually Diagnosed Services	Service for Special Populations	Service for Cultural/Ethnic Groups	Comments
Santa Maria	CA	X	X			X	X	X	
Santa Monica	CA	X	X*		X				* = By referral
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	X	X			X			
Stockton	CA	X	X		X				
Woodland/Yolo	CA	X		X	X	X	X		
Denver	CO								
New Haven	CT	X	X	X			X	X	
Dover	DE	X	X						
Georgetown	DE	X	X				X		
Wilmington	DE	X							
Bartow	FL	X							
Crestview	FL	X	X*	X*	X				* = by referral
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	X			X		X	X	
Gainesville	FL	X	X	X	X		X	X	
Jacksonville	FL	X			X	X			
Jacksonville 2	FL	X		X					Public health - referral. Education/GED and Primary health care - residential. Relapse prevention - part of program. Child care - parenting/post partnum

Name of Court	St.	Relapse Prevent.	Parenting	Child Care	Transport. Allowance Bus Tokens	Dually Diagnosed Services	Service for Special Populations	Service for Cultural/Ethnic Groups	Comments
Key West	FL	X	X		X	X			
Miami	FL	X	X		X	X	X	X	
Pensacola	FL	X*	X*			X	X*	X*	* = on site. All other services by referral
Sarasota	FL	X							
Tampa	FL	X			X				
Macon	GA	X			X				
Honolulu	HI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Chicago	IL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Edwardsville	IL	X	X	X	X	X			
Markham	IL	X	X	X		X	X		
Wichita	KS	X				X	X	X	Public health referral education/GED referral primary health care referral parenting referral
Louisville	KY	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Boston	MA	X	X		X	X	X	X	
Kalamazoo	MI	X		X	X	X			
St. Joseph	MI	X	X	X	X	X			
Kansas City	MO	X	X		X		X	X	
Charlotte	NC	X	X	X	X				
Warren Co.	NC	X			X				



Name of Court	St.	Relapse Prevent.	Parenting	Child Care	Transport. Allowance Bus Tokens	Dually Diagnosed Services	Service for Special Populations	Service for Cultural/Ethnic Groups	Comments
Camden	NJ	X	X			X	X		
Newark	NJ	X	X		X		X	X	
Las Cruces	NM	X	X				X	X	
Reno	NV	X	X	X	X		X	X	
Brooklyn	NY	X	X			X	X	X	* On site Services provided off site are as follows: education/GED, vocational training, job development/placement, family counseling, programs to deal with the dually diagnosed offender, segments for special ethnic or other special populations, segments to deal with culturally sensitive issues.
Buffalo	NY								
Rochester	NY	X	X		X	X	X	X	
Suffolk	NY	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Akron	OH	X	X		X	X		X	
Hamilton	OH	X	X	X	X		X	X	
Logan Co.	OK	X	X						
Payne Co.	OK								
Eugene	OR	X					X	X	
Grants Pass	OR	X	X	X		X	X	X	
Klammath Falls	OR	X						X	
Portland	OR	X			X	X	X		* Referral

Name of Court	St.	Relapse Prevent.	Parenting	Child Care	Transport. Allowance Bus Tokens	Dually Diagnosed Services	Service for Special Populations	Service for Cultural/Ethnic Groups	Comments
Roseburg	OR	X		X		X			
Philadelphia	PA	X	X			X	X	X	
San Juan	PR	X							
Lexington	SC	X						X	
Austin	TX	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Beaumont	TX	X			X				All referred out, but monitored: job development/placement: job preparation classes (in-house) stress management: in-house - Individual Counselors relapse prevention: in-house transportation allowance/bus tokens: Program provides transportation. (Program van. Bus passes when needed) Programs to deal with the dually diagnosed offender: referrals made
Ft. Worth	TX	X	X		X	X	X	X	
Roanoke	VA	X	X						
Seattle	WA								

**Chart VI-18(a): Special Treatment Components Development to Address Needs of Special Populations: Ethnic, Cultural & Other Needs**

Name of Court	ST	Cultural & Other Issues	Special Pop.	HIV Positive	Dually Diagnosed	Special/Ethnic Populations	Ethnic Population/ Explanation	Cultural Issues
Mobile	AL		X	X	X			
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ							
Bakersfield	CA	American Indian & Hispanic programs.	X		X	X	American Indian & Hispanic prog.	X
El Monte/ Rio Hondo	CA			X				
Laguna Nigel	CA	Homosexuals, deaf & physical disabled		X	X	X		X
Modesto	CA				X			
Pasadena	CA			X	X	X		
Richmond	CA					X	Spanish speaking services	
Roseville	CA				X			
Salinas	CA							
San Bernardino	CA				X			
San Francisco	CA			X	X			
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA							
Santa Ana	CA	Guys, lesbians, deaf, physically disabled		X	X	X		X
Santa Barbara	CA					X	Spanish speaking services	
Santa Maria	CA					X	Spanish speaking services	
Santa Monica	CA							

Name of Court	ST	Cultural & Other Issues	Special Pop.	HIV Positive	Dually Diagnosed	Special/Ethnic Populations	Ethnic Population/ Explanation	Cultural Issues
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA			X	X			
Stockton	CA							
Woodland/Yolo	CA				X	X	Spanish speaking groups	
Denver	CO		X	X				
New Haven	CT							
Dover	DE							
Georgetown	DE					X		
Wilmington	DE							
Bartow	FL							
Crestview	FL							
Ft. Lauderdale	FL					X	Clients in need of change of lifestyles skills.	X
Gainesville	FL		X	X		X		X
Jacksonville	FL		X		X			
Jacksonville 2	FL				X			
Key West	FL							
Miami	FL					X	Spanish & Black male groups	
Pensacola	FL	Gender/ethnic issues groups		X	X	X	Gender/ethnic issues groups	X
Sarasota	FL							
Tampa	FL			X				

Name of Court	ST	Cultural & Other Issues	Special Pop.	HIV Positive	Dually Diagnosed	Special/Ethnic Populations	Ethnic Population/ Explanation	Cultural Issues
Macon	GA							
Honolulu	HI	Integrated into entire program.	X	X	X	X		X
Chicago	IL	All staff are expected to demonstrate competence in area & experience at working w/drug involved adolescents in an urban area. Service prov. are indigenous to area.	X	X	X	X	Monolingual, bilingual, African Violence Interrupt Gang Involved Youth	X
Edwardsville	IL				X			
Markham	IL		X	X	X*			
Wichita	KS	No - part of system					No - part of system	
Louisville	KY							
Boston	MA	Refer to appropriate agency to then work with court.	X		X			X
Kalamazoo	MI							
St. Joseph	MI							
Kansas City	MO					X	African American Male group	
Charlotte	NC							
Warren Co.	NC							
Camden	NJ							
Newark	NJ							
Las Cruces	NM	Spanish speaking counselors & have training in culturally sensitive issues.				X	Spanish speaking counselors & have training in cultural issues.	X
Reno	NV					X	Hispanic programs	
Brooklyn	NY			X				

Name of Court	ST	Cultural & Other Issues	Special Pop.	HIV Positive	Dually Diagnosed	Special/Ethnic Populations	Ethnic Population/ Explanation	Cultural Issues
Buffalo	NY							
Rochester	NY		X	X	X	X		X
Suffolk	NY			X	X			
Akron	OH							
Hamilton	OH							X
Logan Co.	OK							
Payne Co.	OK							
Eugene	OR	Spanish Speaking				X	Spanish speaking	X
Grants Pass	OR	Hardly ever need special programs	X	X	X	X		X
Klamath Falls	OR					X	Native American	
Portland	OR			X	X			
Roseburg	OR			X	X			
Philadelphia	PA			X	X	X	Specialized Tx providers serve the Hispanic/Latino community.	
San Juan	PR			X				
Lexington	SC			X	X	X		X
Austin	TX					X		X
Beaumont	TX							
Ft. Worth	TX							
Roanoke	VA							
Seattle	WA							

**Chart VI-18(b): Special Treatment Components Developed to Address Needs of Special Populations: Parents, Women, & Victims**

Name of Court	ST	Women- generally	Women- (preg. or post-part.)	Victims of Dom. Viol.	Child- hood Trauma	Parents	Other Special Populations	Child- care Service	Bring Children to Sess.	Comments
Mobile	AL	X		X	X		Male batterers	No	No	Children not permitted unless it is a family group and the children are 6 and up.
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ							No	No	
Bakersfield	CA	X	X	X			Dual diagnosed offenders	Yes	Yes	The program provides childcare services for participants while attending Tx sessions & has comm'ty connection for childcare. Participants are permitted to bring their children to some TX programs.
El Monte/ Rio Hondo	CA	X	X	X	X	X		No		Participants are permitted to bring their children to Tx sessions on individual basis.
Laguna Nigel	CA	X	X	X	X	X		Yes	No	
Modesto	CA	X	X	X	X	X		No	No	As of yet we have not had an HIV positive participant, but services are available. Referrals are made for childcare services to outside services. Children are only permitted to attend Tx w/aftercare clients
Pasadena	CA	X	X			X		No	Yes	
Richmond	CA		X					No	Yes	Unable to afford/liability issues; children are permitted to come to some sessions, depends - is not encouraged.
Roseville	CA	X	X					Yes	No	
Salinas	CA							No		Some children are permitted
San Bernardino	CA	X				X		No*	Yes	*Pending - very soon; Parti. are permitted to bring their children to Tx sessions on Fridays

Name of Court	ST	Women- generally	Women- (preg. or post-part.)	Victims of Dom. Viol.	Child- hood Trauma	Parents	Other Special Populations	Child- care Service	Bring Children to Sess.	Comments
San Francisco	CA		X					Yes	Yes	Partic. are permitted to bring their children to Tx sessions on a limited basis until child care can be arranged. Several programs have child care on-site. Female therapeutic comm'y that accepts children under 3 years.
San Jose/Santa Cl.	CA							No	No	
Santa Ana	CA	X	X	X	X	X		Yes	No	
Santa Barbara	CA							No	No	
Santa Maria	CA							No	No	
Santa Monica	CA	X	X					No	Yes	
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	X	X					No		
Stockton	CA									
Woodland/Yolo	CA		X	X	X			Yes	No*	* Except at perinatal day treatment.
Denver	CO	X					Mental Health, low functional employment	No	No	
New Haven	CT							No	*	* Depends on facility
Dover	DE		X					No	Yes	Women who are pregnant/post-partum have access to residential program with this specialty; Children permitted individually
Georgetown	DE		X					No	Yes	
Wilmington	DE									



Name of Court	ST	Women- generally	Women- (preg. or post-part.)	Victims of Dom. Viol.	Child- hood Trauma	Parents	Other Special Populations	Child- care Service	Bring Children to Sess.	Comments
Bartow	FL							No	Yes	Children are permitted in Tx sessions at times, but it is not encouraged.
Crestview	FL							No	No	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	X								
Gainesville	FL	X	X	X	X	X		Yes	Yes	
Jacksonville	FL						Ref. to court provided psych services.	No	No	
Jacksonville 2	FL		X			X		Yes	No	Childcare services are limited for those women in preg/post partum program.
Key West	FL		X					No	Yes	Participants are only allowed to bring their children to individual sessions - not group.
Miami	FL	X						No	No	
Pensacola	FL	X	X	X	X	X		No	No	
Sarasota	FL							No	No	
Tampa	FL	X	X					No	No	
Macon	GA							No	No	

Name of Court	ST	Women- generally	Women- (preg. or post-part.)	Victims of Dom. Viol.	Child- hood Trauma	Parents	Other Special Populations	Child- care Service	Bring Children to Sess.	Comments
Honolulu	HI	X	X	X	X	X		No	Yes	Women who are pregnant or post-partum are referred to residential/auxiliary services; victims of domestic violence are referred out; childhood trauma of participants get referrals to private therapist; parents are referred to comm'ny resources; HIV positive are referred to outside resources; services coming soon for dually diagnosed
Chicago	IL	X	X	X	X	X	MISA	Yes	Yes	Children are can come to Tx sessions if interaction is a part of the Tx plan (court system interfaces with protective services).
Edwardsville	IL	X				X		Yes	Yes	
Markham	IL		X				Bilingual prog.	Yes	No	dually diagnosed persons are referred
Wichita	KS							No	No	
Louisville	KY	X						No	No	
Boston	MA	X	X	X	X	X	Gays	No	No	
Kalamazoo	MI	X						Yes	No	Participants are reimbursed for childcare services while attending Tx sessions.
St. Joseph	MI							No	No	Referrals for women to Women's Program Case Manager.
Kansas City	MO							No	Yes	Children can come to Tx sessions, but not all of the time
Charlotte	NC							No	No	
Warren Co.	NC							No	Yes	

Name of Court	ST	Women- generally	Women- (preg. or post-part.)	Victims of Dom. Viol.	Child- hood Trauma	Parents	Other Special Populations	Child- care Service	Bring Children to Sess.	Comments
Camden	NJ							No	No	
Newark	NJ							No	No	
Las Cruces	NM				X			No	Yes	
Reno	NV	X				X		No*	Yes	*This will begin as a children's program in February 1997; Children can come to Tx under special arrangement with counselor
Brooklyn	NY	X	X					No	Yes	There are comm'ity based providers which offer childcare; children can come to Tx sessions by appointment
Buffalo	NY									
Rochester	NY	X	X	X	X	X		No	No	Most agencies address all of these issues
Suffolk	NY	X	X	X				No	No	
Akron	OH							No	Yes	Children can come to Case Management sessions only
Hamilton	OH	X	X			X		Yes	No	
Logan Co.	OK							No	Yes	Children can come to session if necessary
Payne Co.	OK									
Eugene	OR					X		No	No	
Grants Pass	OR	X	X	X	X	X	dual diagnosed	No	No	We network with other agencies to get support; designed Tx plans to meet needs
Klamath Falls	OR	X						No	No	
Portland	OR	X	X		X	X		No	No	

Name of Court	ST	Women- generally	Women- (preg. or post-part.)	Victims of Dom. Viol.	Child- hood Trauma	Parents	Other Special Populations	Child- care Service	Bring Children to Sess.	Comments
Roseburg	OR	X	X	X				Yes	Yes	
Philadelphia	PA	X	X	X	X	X		No	No	
San Juan	PR	X	X					No	No	
Lexington	SC			X	X			No	No	
Austin	TX	X						No	No	
Beaumont	TX							No	No*	* Strongly discouraged Pre-Trial Diversion. (Batterer's Program Uses Services of Drug Program when needed.)
Ft. Worth	TX							No*	No	* Is available at 1 comm'ity resource agency
Roanoke	VA					X*		No	No	*Parenting class
Seattle	WA								No	

## V. Urine Testing

### A. Drugs For Which Tests Are Conducted

Chart VI-19 provides a synopsis of the drug testing practices of the reporting courts regarding the drugs for which initial testing is conducted and those for which routine testing is performed. They are, in summary, as follows:

<u>Drug Test Performed</u>	<u>Initial</u>	<u>Routine</u>
Alcohol	58%	60%
Marijuana	90%	92%
Crack/Cocaine	89%	88%
Heroin	79%	72%
PCP	44%	35%
Methamphetamine	76%	71%
Barbiturate	56%	43%
LSD/Hallucinogen	22%	15%

Eight programs also test for benzodiazopenes.

**Chart VI-19: Drugs For Which Tests Are Conducted: Initial and Routine Testing** [see page 120]

### B. Costs Per Test (Drug Screen)

Chart VI-20 illustrates the costs incurred by the reporting drug courts for each drug screen. Costs are between \$ 1- \$3 for almost 40% of the programs, \$ 3-5 for 8%, and \$ 5-7 for 11% of the programs. Approximately 34% are spending in excess of \$7.00 for each drug screen. Five programs (7%) did not have cost information.

**Chart VI-20: Costs Per Drug Screen** [see page 129]

### C. Agency Performing Urinalysis

As Chart VI-21 illustrates, the reporting drug court treatment programs are using a variety of agencies to perform urinalysis for drug court participants. The following is a summary of the information presented in the chart:

Pretrial Services Agency:	9%
Probation Department:	22%
Local Corrections Agency:	2%
TASC Program:	14%
Private Treatment Agency:	38%
Local Health Department:	15%

Approximately one-quarter of the reporting programs use two or more different agencies to perform urinalysis.

**Chart VI-21: Agency Performing Urinalysis** [see page 132]

**D. Time frame and Method for Reporting Test Results to Court**

*1. Time frame*

As Chart VI-22 indicates, over 40% of the reporting drug court treatment programs can provide urinalysis reports to the drug court judge within 24 hours, with 30% of the reporting programs able to provide reports within 1-2 hours.

*2. Method for Reporting Results to Court*

Most programs provide written urinalysis reports to the drug court judge, frequently accompanied by oral reporting in court. Approximately 20% of the programs report the capability of electronically transmitting the urinalysis report; approximately one-third also fax the report.

**Chart VI-22: Time frame and Method for Reporting Drug Test Results to Drug Court Judge** [see page 136]

**E. Maintaining Urinalysis Integrity**

*1. Detecting Waterloading*

Approximately 45% of the reporting programs indicate an awareness of potential waterloading by drug court defendants in an effort to skew urinalysis results. An additional 15% indicate they are not aware of a problem in this area; the remaining 40% indicate waterloading is not a concern. Most programs, even those which did not cite waterloading as a concern, have in place methods to detect such adulteration.

*2. Detecting Other Adulteration*

Fifty-three percent of the reporting programs note a concern regarding other adulteration, although none indicated that adulteration was common. Most of these programs have established procedures and policies to address adulteration, including use of temperature gauges, random "surprise" observations, and strict policies for dealing with individuals involved with urine tampering.

**Chart VI-23: Methods for Maintaining Urinalysis Integrity** [see page 141]

## **F. Judicial Response to Positive Urines**

As Chart VI-24 indicates, the drug court judges for all of the reporting programs have established responses for positive urinalyses of participants. These responses include: assignment to the courtroom jury box for a stated period; increasing the frequency of urinalysis, treatment sessions, and/or court status hearings; and, commonly, some level of short-term detention. Depending upon the circumstances of the positive urinalysis, the drug court judge also may refer the participant to more intensive in-patient treatment for a specified period.

### **Chart VI-24: Judicial Responses to Positive Urinalyses [see page 146]**

The charts referenced in this section are presented on the following pages.

**Chart VI-19(a): Drugs for Which Tests Are Conducted:**  
 [The following drugs are tested for, either initially or routinely]

Name of Court	St.	Alcohol		Marijuana		Crack/Cocaine		Heroin		PCP		Methamp.		Barbiturate		LSD/Hallucin	
		Ini.	Rou.	Ini.	Rou.	Ini.	Rou.	Ini.	Rou.	Ini.	Rou.	Ini.	Rou.	Ini.	Rou.	Ini.	Rou.
Mobile	AL		X	X	X	X	X		X		X		X		X		X
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ			X	X	X	X					X	X				
Bakersfield	CA																
El Monte/ Rio Hondo	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Laguna Nigel	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Modesto	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Pasadena	CA					X	X	X	X			X	X				
Richmond	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Roseville	CA	X		X	X			X	X			X	X				
Salinas	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
San Bernardino	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
San Francisco	CA	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
Santa Ana	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Santa Barbara	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		
Santa Maria	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		
Santa Monica	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				



Name of Court	St.	Alcohol		Marijuana		Crack/Cocaine		Heroin		PCP		Methamp.		Barbiturate		LSD/Hallucin	
		Ini.	Rou.	Ini.	Rou.	Ini.	Rou.	Ini.	Rou.	Ini.	Rou.	Ini.	Rou.	Ini.	Rou.	Ini.	Rou.
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA		X	X	X	X	X	X				X					
Stockton	CA			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Woodland/Yolo	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X		X	X	X	
Denver	CO																
New Haven	CT				X		X		X		X		X		X		X
Dover	DE		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Georgetown	DE		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Wilmington	DE			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X		
Bartow	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X					
Crestview	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X			X		X					
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	X		X	X	X	X	X	X								
Gainesville	FL	X		X	X	X	X			X		X		X			
Jacksonville	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X
Jacksonville 2	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X								
Key West	FL			X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X		
Miami	FL			X	X							X		X			
Pensacola	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sarasota	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Tampa	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
Macon	GA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Name of Court	St.	Alcohol		Marijuana		Crack/Cocaine		Heroin		PCP		Methamp.		Barbiturate		LSD/Hallucin	
		Ini.	Rout.	Ini.	Rou.	Ini.	Rou.	Ini.	Rout.	Ini.	Rout.	Ini.	Rout.	Ini.	Rout.	Ini.	Rout.
Honolulu	HI	X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X			
Chicago	IL		X		X	X		X			X						
Edwardsville	IL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Markham	IL			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Wichita	KS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		
Louisville	KY			X	X	X	X	X				X		X			
Boston	MA	X		X		X		X				X		X			
Kalamazoo	MI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		
St. Joseph	MI	X*		X	X	X	X										
Kansas City	MO			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Charlotte	NC	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X								
Warren Co.	NC			X	X	X	X			X	X						
Camden	NJ	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Newark	NJ		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Las Cruces	NM	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Reno	NV	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X*	
Brooklyn	NY			X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X				
Buffalo	NY																
Rochester	NY	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X		
Suffolk	NY		X	X	X	X	X	X	X								
Akron	OH			X	X	X	X	X	X			X		X			X

Name of Court	St.	Alcohol		Marijuana		Crack/Cocaine		Heroin		PCP		Methamp.		Barbiturate		LSD/Hallucin	
		Ini.	Rou.	Ini.	Rou.	Ini.	Rou.	Ini.	Rou.	Ini.	Rou.	Ini.	Rou.	Ini.	Rou.	Ini.	Rou.
Hamilton	OH	X	X	X	X	X	X										
Logan Co.	OK	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X	X	X		
Payne Co.	OK																
Eugene	OR			X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		
Grants Pass	OR			X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		
Klamath Falls	OR	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		X
Portland	OR	X		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	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
San Juan	PR			X	X	X	X	X	X								
Lexington	SC	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X				
Austin	TX	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		
Beaumont	TX	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Ft. Worth	TX			X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X				
Roanoke	VA		X*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Seattle	WA			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

**Chart VI-19(b): Drugs For Which Tests Are Conducted: Initial And Routine Testing:  
Comments**

Name of Court	State	Other		Extra Explanations	
		Initially	Routinely	Initially	Routinely
Mobile	AL		Opiates in general		
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ				
Bakersfield	CA	Full Screen	Drug of Choice		
El Monte/ Rio Hondo	CA				
Laguna Nigel	CA				
Modesto	CA				
Pasadena	CA	All others not checked, on as identified/needed basis	All others not checked, on as identified/needed basis		
Richmond	CA				
Roseville	CA				
Salinas	CA				
San Bernardino	CA				
San Francisco	CA				
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA				
Santa Ana	CA				
Santa Barbara	CA				
Santa Maria	CA				

Name of Court	State	Other		Extra Explanations	
		Initially	Routinely	Initially	Routinely
Santa Monica	CA				
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA				
Stockton	CA				
Woodland/Yolo	CA				
Denver	CO			Any that apply; LSD=no; too costly	Any that apply; LSD=no; too costly
New Haven	CT		Alcohol: breathalyser		
Dover	DE	benzodiazepines	benzodiazepines		
Georgetown	DE	benzodiazepines	benzodiazepines		
Wilmington	DE	Methadone, Amphetamine, Propoxyphene, Benzodiazepenes, Methacholine	Methadone, Amphetamine, Propoxyphene, Benzodiazepenes, Methacholine		
Bartow	FL				
Crestview	FL	Full 10 screen panel			
Ft. Lauderdale	FL				
Gainesville	FL				
Jacksonville	FL	Benzodiazepenes	Benzodiazepenes.		
Jacksonville 2	FL				
Key West	FL				
Miami	FL	Opiates	Opiates		

Name of Court	State	Other		Extra Explanations	
		Initially	Routinely	Initially	Routinely
Pensacola	FL				
Sarasota	FL				
Tampa	FL			Barbiturates = on order LSD or other hallucinogens = on order	Drug of choice periodic "6 panel" administered + (Drug of choice).
Macon	GA	Opiates			
Honolulu	HI				
Chicago	IL				
Edwardsville	IL				
Markham	IL				
Wichita	KS				
Louisville	KY				
Boston	MA				
Kalamazoo	MI				
St. Joseph	MI	Opiates.	Opiates.	Alcohol - when requested.	
Kansas City	MO				
Charlotte	NC				
Warren Co.	NC				
Camden	NJ				
Newark	NJ				
Las Cruces	NM				

Name of Court	State	Other		Extra Explanations	
		Initially	Routinely	Initially	Routinely
Reno	NV			*Sometimes under trials	Based on primary and secondary drugs of choice.
Brooklyn	NY	Benzodiazepines	Benzodiazepines		
Buffalo	NY				
Rochester	NY			Urine testing done routinely by each treatment agency. Also, Drug Court uses Day Reporting which is a county funded agency.	
Suffolk	NY				
Akron	OH	Benzodiazepine			
Hamilton	OH				
Logan Co.	OK				
Payne Co.	OK				
Eugene	OR				
Grants Pass	OR				
Klamath Falls	OR	Benzodiazepines	Benzodiazepines		
Portland	OR				
Roseburg	OR				Alcohol at times.
Philadelphia	PA				
San Juan	PR				
Lexington	SC				

Name of Court	State	Other		Extra Explanations	
		Initially	Routinely	Initially	Routinely
Austin	TX	Benzodiazepines	Benzodiazepine		
Beaumont	TX			Barbiturates - Benzo's	Random color coded system- color code assignment depends on drugs of choice and retention in system - Usually tested 2x week.  Barbiturates - benzo's
Ft. Worth	TX				
Roanoke	VA	LSD or other hallucinogens - don't know.			*When need identified. Don't know if all drugs are routinely tested.
Seattle	WA		Benzodiazepine		



**Chart VI-20: Costs Per Drug Screen**

Name of Court	State	Costs Per Screen	Costs/Explanation
Mobile	AL	\$3-\$5	Over \$15, less than \$18.00 (2 types of onsite and emit 10 test)
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	\$5.00	
Bakersfield	CA		Drug of Choice=\$8.00 Full Screen=\$15.00
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA	\$1-\$3	
Laguna Nigel	CA	\$5-\$7	
Modesto	CA	\$7-\$9	
Pasadena	CA	\$5-\$7	
Richmond	CA	\$1-\$3	
Roseville	CA	\$1-\$3	
Salinas	CA	\$1-\$3	
San Bernardino	CA	\$1-\$3	
San Francisco	CA	\$1-\$3	
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	\$1-\$3	
Santa Ana	CA	\$5-\$7	
Santa Barbara	CA	\$1-\$3	
Santa Maria	CA	\$1-\$3	
Santa Monica	CA	\$1-\$3	
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	\$7-\$9	
Stockton	CA	\$5-\$7	
Woodland/Yolo	CA	\$7-\$9	
Denver	CO	\$9-\$12	
New Haven	CT		In-house testing
Dover	DE	\$9-\$12	Instant test done @ initial assessment \$19.00.
Georgetown	DE	\$9-\$12	Instant test done @ initial assessment \$19.00.
Wilmington	DE	\$7-\$9(five panel) \$15-\$18(ten panel)	

Name of Court	State	Costs Per Screen	Costs/Explanation
Bartow	FL	\$7-\$9	
Crestview	FL	\$1-\$3	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	\$1-\$3	
Gainesville	FL	\$3-\$18	The following dollar amounts were marked: \$3-\$5, \$9-\$12, \$12-\$15, \$15-\$18 and over \$18. No further explanation was supplied.
Jacksonville	FL	\$3-\$5	
Jacksonville 2	FL		Provided by drug court
Key West	FL	\$1-\$3	
Miami	FL	\$5-\$7	
Pensacola	FL	\$1-\$3	
Sarasota	FL	\$1-\$3	
Tampa	FL	\$9-\$12	
Macon	GA	\$1-\$3	
Honolulu	HI	\$1-\$3	Full screen panel = \$8.00
Chicago	IL	\$1-\$3	
Edwardsville	IL	\$9-\$12	
Markham	IL	\$12-\$15	
Wichita	KS	\$5-\$7	
Louisville	KY	\$1-\$3	
Boston	MA	\$3-\$5	
Kalamazoo	MI	\$9-\$12	
St. Joseph	MI	\$7-\$9	
Kansas City	MO	\$1-\$3	
Charlotte	NC	\$12-\$15	
Warren Co.	NC		No cost - State Lab - by Probation Department.
Camden	NJ	\$9-\$12	
Newark	NJ	\$7-\$9	
Las Cruces	NM	\$12-\$15	Comprehensive drug screen \$12.00.
Reno	NV	\$1-\$3	

Name of Court	State	Costs Per Screen	Costs/Explanation
Brooklyn	NY	\$1-\$3	
Buffalo	NY		
Rochester	NY		Treatment agencies bill directly for urinalysis. County pays for Drug Court tests.
Suffolk	NY	\$5-\$7	
Akron	OH	\$1-\$3	
Hamilton	OH	\$3-\$5	
Logan Co.	OK	\$9-\$12	
Payne Co.	OK		
Eugene	OR	\$9-\$12	
Grants Pass	OR	\$1-\$3	
Klamath Falls	OR	\$15-\$18	
Portland	OR	\$1-\$3	
Roseburg	OR	\$15-\$18	
Philadelphia	PA	\$3-\$5	
San Juan	PR	\$7-\$9	
Lexington	SC	\$7-\$9	
Austin	TX	\$12-\$15	Costs Per Test (each drug screened).
Beaumont	TX	\$1-\$3	
Ft. Worth	TX	\$1-\$3	
Roanoke	VA		Do not know.
Seattle	WA	\$1-\$3	7 Drug panel cost is \$6.85

**Chart VI-21: Agency Performing Urinalysis**

Name of Court	St.	Pretrial Services Agency	Probation Dept.	Local Corrections	TASC	Private Trtmt	Crim. Justice Agency	Local Health Dept.	Other
Mobile	AL			X					
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ				X				
Bakersfield	CA								
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA					X			
Laguna Nigel	CA		X					X	Probation - administers test Local Health Dept - administers test Private Lab - performs analysis of specimen
Modesto	CA								
Pasadena	CA					X			
Richmond	CA							X	Staff using test kits.
Roseville	CA							X	
Salinas	CA		X						
San Bernardino	CA					X			
San Francisco	CA								
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA		X						Private providers
Santa Ana	CA		X					X	
Santa Barbara	CA					X			
Santa Maria	CA					X			

Name of Court	St.	Pretrial Services Agency	Probation Dept.	Local Corrections	TASC	Private Trtmnt	Crim. Justice Agency	Local Health Dept.	Other
Santa Monica	CA					X			
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA				X				
Stockton	CA							X	
Woodland/Yolo	CA								
Denver	CO					X			
New Haven	CT								Outpatient Drug Court Treatment Unit
Dover	DE				X	X			
Georgetown	DE				X	X			
Wilmington	DE				X	X			
Bartow	FL		X						In house treatment team
Crestview	FL	X*				X			* At jail
Ft. Lauderdale	FL		X						Tx program
Gainesville	FL	X				X			
Jacksonville	FL		X			X			
Jacksonville 2	FL					X			
Key West	FL	X							
Miami	FL								
Pensacola	FL					X			
Sarasota	FL								Program Staff

Name of Court	St.	Pretrial Services Agency	Probation Dept.	Local Corrections	TASC	Private Trtmnt	Crim. Justice Agency	Local Health Dept.	Other
Tampa	FL		X			X			
Macon	GA								
Honolulu	HI								On-site
Chicago	IL								
Edwardsville	IL				X				
Markham	IL				X				
Wichita	KS					X*			* Send some to lab
Louisville	KY							X	
Boston	MA					X			
Kalamazoo	MI					X			
St. Joseph	MI							X*	On-site.
Kansas City	MO								
Charlotte	NC		X						
Warren Co.	NC		X						
Camden	NJ		X		X				
Newark	NJ		X		X	X			
Las Cruces	NM								
Reno	NV					X			
Brooklyn	NY								Lab staffed/supported by Drug Court on site
Buffalo	NY								

Name of Court	St.	Pretrial Services Agency	Probation Dept.	Local Corrections	TASC	Private Trtmnt	Crim. Justice Agency	Local Health Dept.	Other
Rochester	NY	X*							*For drug court or individual agencies.
Suffolk	NY		X		X			X	
Akron	OH					X			Community Corrections Agency - Oriana House
Hamilton	OH					X			
Logan Co.	OK								
Payne Co.	OK								
Eugene	OR								
Grants Pass	OR					X			
Klamath Falls	OR								
Portland	OR				X				
Roseburg	OR		X			X			
Philadelphia	PA					X	X		Random in-court.
San Juan	PR							X*	* MHAASA
Lexington	SC					X			
Austin	TX								
Beaumont	TX		X*						* Drug Intervention - Court/Program staff (drug screening technician).
Ft. Worth	TX								
Roanoke	VA		X						
Seattle	WA								

**Chart VI-22: Time-frame and Method for Reporting Drug Test Results to Drug Court Judge**

Name of Court	St	Results Available	Comments/Results	Results Transmitted	Comments/Transmit.
Mobile	AL	1-2 hr.	48 hours for lab test.	Mailed/Fax	Results transmitted=hard copy report mailed and faxed
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ		TASC provides written results 4-7 days after specimens are collected. Results can be obtained by phone usually 2 days after sample is collected.		Prior to weekly held status review hearings written reports are prepared for judge. Hard copy faxed--all results. Some telephone report made to get updates
Bakersfield	CA	8-24 hr.		Faxed	
El Monte/ Rio Hondo	CA	8-24 hr.		Mailed	and phoned too.
Laguna Nigel	CA	over 24 hr	24-72 hours	Phoned	Hard copy hand carried
Modesto	CA	over 24 hr	3-5 days	Other	Written in report for client's monthly court review
Pasadena	CA	1-2 hr.		Faxed/d-base	Results transmitted: hard copy faxed; entered in computerized database
Richmond	CA	1-2 hr.	1-2 hours (w/test kit immediately. 10 min); 8-24 hours (using private lab/phar. chem)	Telephone	Telephone report made; entered in computerized database; and provider report and clients review date
Roseville	CA	1 week	All tests from previous week - results available by Tuesday morning (Drug Court is the priority in the lab).		Returned to Drug Court Coordinator (Health and Human Services staff) who reports the result to the court and provides the D.A. with a hard copy and gives treatment verbal results.
Salinas	CA	1-2 hr.		Telephone	Telephone and computerized database
San Bernardino	CA	1-2 hr.		Mailed/data	



Name of Court	St	Results Available	Comments/Results	Results Transmitted	Comments/Transmit.
San Francisco	CA	8-24 hr.		Mailed/faxed	Daily report - take the faxed info. into account for presentation to drug court team.
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	2-4 hr.	2-4 hours for Probation. Private providers use mail service - 5 days.		
Santa Ana	CA	24-72 hr.		Telephone	Hard copy hand carried
Santa Barbara	CA	1-2 hr.		Mailed	
Santa Maria	CA	1-2 hr.		Mailed	
Santa Monica	CA	4-8 hr.		Faxed/Phoned	Reported at Drug Court status hearings.
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	8-24 hr.		Faxed	Hard copy faxed and telephone report made
Stockton	CA	3-5 hr.		Mailed/fax	Hard copy report mailed and hard copy faxed.
Woodland/Yolo	CA	8-24 hr.		Faxed	
Denver	CO	1-2 hr.	dependant on screen used (8-24 hrs.)	Faxed/dBASE	Hard copy faxed and entered in computerized database
New Haven	CT	4-8 hr.		Faxed/phoned	
Dover	DE		At monthly status conference		Written report in court
Georgetown	DE		At monthly status conference		Written report in court
Wilmington	DE	24-48hr			Results included in status report
Bartow	FL	1-2 hr.		Other	Hand delivered
Crestview	FL	8-24 hr.		Faxed	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	48hr			Verbally by in-court liaison

Name of Court	St	Results Available	Comments/Results	Results Transmitted	Comments/Transmit.
Gainesville	FL	1-2 hr.	8-24 hours marked too. Comment under over 24 hours: if sample sent to lab.	Database	
Jacksonville	FL	1-2 hr.		Faxed/Phoned	
Jacksonville2	FL	1-2 hr.	1-2 hours - Accu-Sign-4 (withing minutes). Over 24 hours for labs.	Other	Brought with routine report weekly to court.
Key West	FL	1-2 hr.		Other	Picked up by counselor.
Miami	FL	8-24 hr.		Database	Court reports
Pensacola	FL	2-4 hr.		Phoned/Data	
Sarasota	FL	2-4 hr.		Database	
Tampa	FL	8-24 hr.	Results back within 24hrs. from the lab.	Other	Court Report.
Macon	GA	8-24 hr.		Hard Copy	
Honolulu	HI	1-2 hr.		Other	Walked over.
Chicago	IL	8-24 hr.		All	
Edwardsville	IL	8-24 hr.		Faxed	
Markham	IL	over 24 hr			Hard copy hand delivered.
Wichita	KS	8-24 hr.		Phoned/data	
Louisville	KY	over 24 hr	1-2 days	Mailed	
Boston	MA		3-5 minutes		orally and hard copy
Kalamazoo	MI	over 24 hr	24-48 hours.	Mailed/faxed	Results are faxed on a daily basis.
St. Joseph	MI	1-2 hr.		Faxed*	*or e-mailed
Kansas City	MO	8-24 hr.			Cornier

Name of Court	St	Results Available	Comments/Results	Results Transmitted	Comments/Transmit.
Charlotte	NC	over 24 hr	48 hours	Mailed	
Warren Co.	NC	over 24 hr	3-5 days	Mailed	
Camden	NJ	8-24 hr.		Faxed	
Newark	NJ	1-2 hr.		Phoned	Handwritten too
Las Cruces	NM	8-24 hr.		Faxed	
Reno	NV	1-2 hr.		Database	Hard copy and telephone results available
Brooklyn	NY	1-2 hr.		Database	
Buffalo	NY				
Rochester	NY	1-2 hr.*	*If done for Drug Court in day reporting. Over 24 hours if done by treatment agencies.	Phoned/data	Telephone report made if done in court. Case managers also report verbally.
Suffolk	NY	4-8 hr.		Mailed/data	
Akron	OH	over 24 hr	24-48 hours	Faxed/data	
Hamilton	OH	8-24 hr.		Faxed/phoned	and database
Logan Co.	OK	8-24 hr.	We can run a test on site when requested.	Faxed	
Payne Co.	OK				
Eugene	OR	2-3 days			reported as part of status report
Grants Pass	OR	2-3 days			transmitted: documented on progress reports
Klamath Falls	OR	over 24 hr	1 week	Other	Weekly report.
Portland	OR	over 24 hr	48 hours	Database	
Roseburg	OR	8-24 hr.	2-3 days for Non-Probationers, 7 days for Probation Clients.	Database	

Name of Court	St	Results Available	Comments/Results	Results Transmitted	Comments/Transmit.
Philadelphia	PA	8-24 hr.		Faxed/data	faxed and database
San Juan	PR	1-2 hr.	1-2 hours for (FAST TEST), 4-8 hours was also marked.	Mailed/faxed	Database in process
Lexington	SC	1-2 hr.		Tel. Rpt.	
Austin	TX	over 24 hr			Reported by Treatment in hard copy report
Beaumont	TX		Immediately - Use on trak in house		Written report to court Judge
Ft. Worth	TX	8-24 hr.		Mailed/faxed	
Roanoke	VA		Don't know.		Don't know.
Seattle	WA	8-24 hr.		Other	Enclosed with treatment reports.

**Chart VI-23: Methods for Maintaining Urinalysis Integrity**

Name of Court	St.	WL a Concern	Comments/ W.L.	Procedures to Detect. WL	Explain. - Procedure	Adulteration- a Concern	Comments/ Adulteration	Procedures to Detect.- Ad.	Explanation- Adult.
Mobile	AL	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ	Yes	Any tests that show a "negative-diluted" result are considered positives by Judge.	Yes		Yes	The D.C. Judge puts defendants in jail for tampering with results. We do not have a high incidence to it, though--it's a relatively rare occurrence.	Yes	TASC staff observe all U/As through 2-way glass.
Bakersfield	CA	Yes	U/A are tested for gravity	Yes		Yes		Yes	
El Monte/ Rio Hondo	CA	No				No			
Laguna Nigel	CA	No		No		No		No	
Modesto	CA	No		Yes		No		Yes	
Pasadena	CA	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Richmond	CA	UN	Uncertain	Yes	Feeling, suspicion; company will report	Yes	Client will be terminated	Yes	
Roseville	CA	UN		No		No			
Salinas	CA	No		No		No		No	

Name of Court	St.	WL a Concern	Comments/ W.L.	Procedures to Detect. WL	Explain. - Procedure	Adulteration- a Concern	Comments/ Adulteration	Procedures to Detect.- Ad.	Explanation- Adult.
San Bernardino	CA	No		Yes		UN	Some concern but equipment detects it	Yes	
San Francisco	CA	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Santa Ana	CA	No				No			
Santa Barbara	CA	Yes		Yes	Specific gravity dipstick	Yes		Yes	
Santa Maria	CA	Yes		Yes	Specific gravity dipstick	Yes		Yes	
Santa Monica	CA	Yes		UN		Yes		UN	
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	No				No			
Stockton	CA	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Woodland/ Yolo	CA	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Denver	CO	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
New Haven	CT	No		No		Yes	Some concern	UN	
Dover	DE	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Georgetown	DE	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Bartow	FL	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	

Name of Court	St.	WL a Concern	Comments/ W.L.	Procedures to Detect. WL	Explain. - Procedure	Adulteration- a Concern	Comments/ Adulteration	Procedures to Detect.- Ad.	Explanation- Adult.
Crestview	FL	Yes		No		Yes		No	
Gainesville	FL	No		No		No		Yes	
Jacksonville	FL	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Jacksonville2	FL	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Key West	FL	No		Yes		No		Yes	
Miami	FL	No				No			
Pensacola	FL	No				No			
Sarasota	FL	UN		UN		UN		UN	
Tampa	FL	No		Yes		No		Yes	
Macon	GA	UN		UN		No		Yes	
Honolulu	HI	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Chicago	IL	No		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Edwardsville	IL	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Markham	IL	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Wichita	KS	Yes	Teaing	Yes		Yes	Teaing	Yes	
Louisville	KY	No		Yes		No		Yes	
Boston	MA	No		No		Yes		Yes	
Kalamazoo	MI	No		Yes		No		Yes	
St. Joseph	MI	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Kansas City	MO	No		No		No		Yes	

Name of Court	St.	WL a Concern	Comments/ W.L.	Procedures to Detect. WL	Explain. - Procedure	Adulteration- a Concern	Comments/ Adulteration	Procedures to Detect.- Ad.	Explanation- Adult.
Charlotte	NC	No				No			
Warren Co.	NC	UN		UN		No		No	
Camden	NJ	UN				No			
Newark	NJ	No		No		No			
Las Cruces	NM	No		Yes	Although not a significant concern	No		Yes	Although not a significant concern
Reno	NV	Yes		Yes	As well as we can	Yes		Yes	
Brooklyn	NY	UN		No		Yes		Yes	
Buffalo	NY								
Rochester	NY	No		Yes		No		Yes	Supervised urines.
Suffolk	NY	No		No		Yes		Yes	
Akron	OH	No		No		No		No	
Hamilton	OH	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Logan Co.	OK	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Payne Co.	OK								
Eugene	OR	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Grants Pass	OR	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Klamath Falls	OR	No		No		No		No	



Name of Court	St.	WL a Concern	Comments/ W.L.	Procedures to Detect. WL	Explain. - Procedure	Adulteration- a Concern	Comments/ Adulteration	Procedures to Detect.- Ad.	Explanation- Adult.
Portland	OR		Small percentage of attempt on regular basis.	Yes			Small percentage attempt on regular basis but it really messes up the testing so they are caught.	Yes	
Roseburg	OR	Yes		UN		Yes		UN	
Philadelphia	PA	UN		UN		UN		Yes	
San Juan	PR	UN		UN		UN			
Lexington	SC	UN		UN		UN		UN	
Austin	TX	No				No			
Beaumont	TX	Yes		No		Yes		Yes	1. Temperature gauge used in all using samples 2. Random "surprise" observations
Ft. Worth	TX	No				No			
Roanoke	VA	UN		UN		Yes		UN	
Seattle	WA	No		No		Yes		Yes	

**Chart VI-24: Judicial Responses to Positive Urinalysis**

Name of Court	St.	Assign. to Ct. Rm./ Jury Box	Judge's Statement of Concern	More Frequent Urinalysis	Contact w/ Treatment Provider	Frequent Status Hearings	Detention	Other	Comments
Mobile	AL	X	X	X	X	X	5-10 days	Residential short-term.	
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ		X		X				The court does not jail defendants for positive U/As per se. Other aspects of performance would have to be negative as well.
Bakersfield	CA	X					5-10 days		
El Monte/ Rio Hondo	CA		X	X	X		to 5 days	Over 10 days	
Laguna Nigel	CA	X	X	X	X	X	to 5 days	Over 10 days	Essay assignments, comm' ty service and additional 12 step meetings.
Modesto	CA		X				5-10 days		
Pasadena	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X		All of these have been used as judicial response to positive urinalyses
Richmond	CA		X	X	X	X	to 5 days		

Name of Court	St.	Assign. to Ct. Rm./ Jury Box	Judge's Statement of Concern	More Frequent Urinalysis	Contact w/ Treatment Provider	Frequent Status Hearings	Detention	Other	Comments
Roseville	CA		X					Detention: 3 days - 2nd positive ○○7 days - 3rd positive ○○14 days - 4th positive ○○	
Salinas	CA		X	X		X			
San Bernardino	CA						to 5 days		
San Francisco	CA				X	X	to 5 days	Over 10 days. Graduated sanctions.	
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	X	X	X	X	X	5-10 days		Depending on client need.
Santa Ana	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	Essay assignments, community service, additional 12-step meetings.	Detention (all choices apply)
Santa Barbara	CA		X	X	X	X	to 10+days	Progressive sanctions	
Santa Maria	CA		X	X	X	X	to 10+days	Progressive sanctions	
Santa Monica	CA		X			X	> 10 days		
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	X	X	X	X	X	to 5 days		
Stockton	CA	X	X	X	X	X	to 5 days		

Name of Court	St.	Assign. to Ct. Rm./ Jury Box	Judge's Statement of Concern	More Frequent Urinalysis	Contact w/ Treatment Provider	Frequent Status Hearings	Detention	Other	Comments
Woodland/ Yolo	CA	X	X	X	X	X	to 5 days	Over 10 days - treatment referral	
Denver	CO			X	X	X			Order more frequent status hearings; detention up to five days; five-ten days, over ten days=graduated sanction
New Haven	CT		X		X	X	to 5 days		
Dover	DE		X	X	X	X		Termination if positive urine is repeated and other factors indicate no improvement	
Georgetown	DE		X	X	X	X		Termination if positive urine is repeated and other factors indicate no improvement	
Wilmington	DE								
Bartow	FL		X	X	X		5-10		
Crestview	FL		X	X	X	X	To 10+*	Community service	* Depends on history
Ft. Lauderdale	FL							May be detained for 30 days	

Name of Court	St.	Assign. to Ct. Rm./ Jury Box	Judge's Statement of Concern	More Frequent Urinalysis	Contact w/ Treatment Provider	Frequent Status Hearings	Detention	Other	Comments
Gainesville	FL		X		X	X	10>	Attendance in support groups/sponsorship, screening for residential tx.	
Jacksonville	FL	X	X	X	X	X	to 5 days		
Jacksonville 2	FL		X		X		to 5 days	Detention to 5 days - sometimes.	
Key West	FL	X	X	X	X	X			
Miami	FL		X						
Pensacola	FL		X					Graduated sanctions applied in conjunction with clinical sanctions and recommendation.	
Sarasota	FL		X	X	X	X			
Tampa	FL		X	X		X		More intense treatment (ie: residential) may be included. Client could be terminated from program if positive trend continues.	
Macon	GA	X	X	X		X	To 5 days		
Honolulu	HI		X	X	X	X	To 5 days	Over 10 days.	

Name of Court	St.	Assign. to Ct. Rm./ Jury Box	Judge's Statement of Concern	More Frequent Urinalysis	Contact w/ Treatment Provider	Frequent Status Hearings	Detention	Other	Comments
Chicago	IL				X	X			
Edwardsville	IL		X						
Markham	IL					X	To 5 days		
Wichita	KS		X	X	X	X	To 10 days		
Louisville	KY		X		X	X			
Boston	MA		X	X	X		over 10		
Kalamazoo	MI			X	X				
St. Joseph	MI		X				to 5 days		
Kansas City	MO							Depends on other clinical factors.	
Charlotte	NC		X	X	X	X	to 5 days		
Warren Co.	NC		X			X	to 5 days		
Camden	NJ		X	X	X	X	to 10 days		
Newark	NJ		X	X				Incarceration - mandatory drug program	
Las Cruces	NM		X	X	X		5-10 days		
Las Vegas	NV		X	X	X	X	to 5 days		
Brooklyn	NY	X*	X*				to 5 days*	*Positive urinalysis 3X	

Name of Court	St.	Assign. to Ct. Rm./ Jury Box	Judge's Statement of Concern	More Frequent Urinalysis	Contact w/ Treatment Provider	Frequent Status Hearings	Detention	Other	Comments
Buffalo	NY								
Rochester	NY	X	X	X	X	X	to 5 days		
Suffolk	NY	X	X	X	X	X	to 5 days*	*Not to exceed 10 days	
Akron	OH	X					10>	Graduated Sanction after first positive urinalysis.	
Hamilton	OH	X	X	X	X	X			
Logan Co.	OK		X	X	X	X			
Payne Co.	OK								
Eugene	OR			X		X	to 5 days		detention: only sometimes
Grants Pass	OR		X	X	X	X	to 5 days	Community Service, Home Detention	
Klamath Falls	OR		X				to 5 days	Community Service.	
Portland	OR		X	X	X	X			
Roseburg	OR		X	X	X	X	to 5 days	Detention is at times.	
Philadelphia	PA	X	X	X	X	X	to 5 days	Over 10 days.	
San Juan	PR			X	X	X	10 + days		
Lexington	SC			X	X	X	to 5 days		

Name of Court	St.	Assign. to Ct. Rm./ Jury Box	Judge's Statement of Concern	More Frequent Urinalysis	Contact w/ Treatment Provider	Frequent Status Hearings	Detention	Other	Comments
Austin	TX		X	X	X	X			
Beaumont	TX		X	X	X	X	to 10+days		
Ft. Worth	TX	X		X	X	X			
Roanoke	VA		X	X	X	X	to 5 days		
Seattle	W A		X	X	X		5-10	Detention of 5-10 days sometimes.	



## VI. Costs/funding for Drug Court Treatment Services

### A. Number of Agencies and Staff Providing Services to Each Drug Court

#### 1. *Number of Providers Serving Each Drug Court Program*

Chart VI-25 provides an overview of the number of treatment providers serving the reporting drug court programs. The following is a summary of the information presented in the chart:

one principal provider:	60%
two principal providers:	11%
3-5 principal providers:	11%
6-8 principal providers:	2%
8+ principal Providers:	15%

Those programs with eight or more providers are: Bakersfield, California (86); Salinas, California (12); San Francisco, California (12); Santa Clara County, California (varies, depending on managed care provisions); Denver, Colorado (13); New Haven, Connecticut (14); Camden, New Jersey (10); Brooklyn, New York (80); Rochester, New York (12); Suffolk County, New York (15); and Akron, Ohio (12).

#### **Chart VI-25: Number of Principal Treatment Providers Serving Each Drug Court Program [see page 156]**

#### 2. *Number of Dedicated Staff*

As Chart VI-26 illustrates, the level and type of dedicated staff servicing the drug court treatment programs varies considerably among programs. Many programs use the part-time medical services of physicians and nurses. Many also use volunteers for such functions as assisting with relapse prevention services, clerical work, transportation, and residence verification. A number of programs also use student interns.

#### **Chart VI-26: Number of Dedicated Treatment Staff Serving Each Drug Court Program [see page 159]**

### B. Program Costs

#### 1. *Average Annual Cost per Client for Treatment Services*

Fifty (70%) of the reporting programs provided information relating to costs per client for drug court treatment services. This information, summarized on Chart VI-27, ranged as follows:

under \$ 900:	20%	\$ 2,101 - 2,500:	6%
\$ 901 - \$ 1,200:	25%	\$ 2,501 - 3000:	6%
\$ 1,201 - \$ 1,500:	16%	\$ 3,001 - 3,500:	6%
\$ 1,501 - 1,800:	5%	\$ 3,501 - 4,500:	6%
\$ 1,801 - 2,100:	10%		

2. *Total Program Capacity Annually*

The total annual capacity for most of the reporting programs generally ranges between 100 to 500 participants, with some of the larger programs (Kansas City, Miami, Las Vegas, and Portland, for example) handling significantly higher volume. The following is an overview of the annual enrollment capacities of the reporting programs:

under 100:	11%
100 - 200:	36%
201 - 300:	23%
301 - 400:	12%
401 - 500:	10%
over 500:	8%

**Chart VI-27: Drug Court Program Annual Enrollment and Costs** [see page 164]

3. *Funding Sources for Treatment Services*

Chart VI-28 depicts the variety of funding sources reported by drug court treatment providers to be used to support drug court treatment services. (Percentage allocations for one third of the responding programs did not total 100%) The following is a summary of the sources of funding and the frequency with which the reporting programs reported using them:<sup>1</sup>

Federal Funds:	38%	Third Party Insurance	
State Funds, Including BJA and		Reimbursements:	11%
CSAT Block Grant Funds:	28%	Medicaid Reimbursements:	22%
Local Funds:	34%	Other Public Funding:	18%
Participant Fees:	32%	Private Foundations:	4%

**Chart VI-28: Funding Sources for Treatment Services** [see page 168]

4. *Impact of Managed Care on Drug Court Treatment Services*

a. Quantity of treatment services available to participants

Drug Court treatment providers were asked to identify the impact of managed care on several aspects of drug court treatment services. The first question related to its impact on the quantity of treatment services available. Their responses were as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup>Reference also should be made to Volume I for judicial officials reporting of Drug Court program funding sources.

great effect:	16%
some effect:	32%
no effect	52%

b. Quality of treatment services available to participants

The second question related to the impact of managed care on the quality of services available. Drug court treatment providers' responses were as follows:

great effect:	29%
some effect:	23%
no effect:	58%

c. Entity authorized to provide treatment services to participants

The third area of potential impact of managed care related to the entity authorized to provide treatment services to drug court participants. The responses were as follows:

great effect:	11%
some effect:	30%
no effect:	59%

As noted in Volume I, the varying responses of the drug courts to the survey questions regarding managed care appears to be directly related to the funding sources of these programs. Many of the programs that are primarily grant funded have not had to deal with managed care provisions that most likely apply to services that are paid by health-care dedicated funds.

d. Policies of state licensing agency

Respondents were also asked whether the state licensing agency in their state had promulgated any special policies regarding the application of managed care provisions for drug court clients. Respondents from the following states indicated that the state licensing agency had at least initiated policy in this area: Florida, which is working on an "access management" system; Illinois, which has encouraged the use of a standardized assessment process; Kansas; New York, which is working on a "carve out" for mandated treatment; Oregon, which has already established standards for managed care to follow; Pennsylvania, which has implemented mandatory managed care for Medicaid clients and provided the City of Philadelphia with the ability to develop a managed care organization to manage, provide and monitor treatment services; and Puerto Rico, which indicated that drug court participants receive all of the services required.

The charts discussed in this section are presented on the following pages.

**Chart VI-25: Number of Principal Treatment Providers Serving Each Drug Court Program**

Name of Court	State	1 Principal Provider	2 Principal Providers	3-5 Principal Providers	6-8 Principal Providers	8+ Principal Providers
Mobile	AL	X				
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	X				
Bakersfield	CA					86
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA	X				
Laguna Nigel	CA				X	
Modesto	CA					
Pasadena	CA	X				
Richmond	CA	X				
Roseville	CA	X				
Salinas	CA					12
San Bernardino	CA	X				
San Francisco	CA					12
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA					X
Santa Ana	CA				X	
Santa Barbara	CA	X				
Santa Maria	CA	X				
Santa Monica	CA	X				
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	X				
Stockton	CA			X		
Woodland/Yolo	CA		X			
Denver	CO					13
New Haven	CT					14
Dover	DE		X			
Georgetown	DE		X			
Wilmington	DE			X		
Bartow	FL	X				
Crestview	FL	X				

Name of Court	State	1 Principal Provider	2 Principal Providers	3-5 Principal Providers	6-8 Principal Providers	8+ Principal Providers
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	X				
Gainesville	FL	X				
Jacksonville	FL		X			
Jacksonville 2	FL			X		
Key West	FL	X				
Miami	FL	X				
Pensacola	FL	X				
Sarasota	FL	X				
Tampa	FL	X				
Macon	GA	X				
Honolulu	HI	X				
Chicago	IL			X		
Edwardsville	IL	X				
Markham	IL			X		
Wichita	KS	X				
Louisville	KY	X				
Boston	MA	X				
Kalamazoo	MI		X			
St. Joseph	MI	X				
Kansas City	MO	X				
Charlotte	NC		X			
Warren Co.	NC	X				
Camden	NJ					10
Newark	NJ		X			
Las Cruces	NM	X				
Reno	NV	X				
Brooklyn	NY					80
Buffalo	NY					
Rochester	NY					12

Name of Court	State	1 Principal Provider	2 Principal Providers	3-5 Principal Providers	6-8 Principal Providers	8+ Principal Providers
Suffolk	NY					15
Akron	OH					12
Hamilton	OH	X				
Logan Co.	OK	X				
Payne Co.	OK					
Eugene	OR	X				
Grants Pass	OR	X				
Klamath Falls	OR	X				
Portland	OR	X				
Roseburg	OR	X				
Philadelphia	PA			X		
San Juan	PR	X				
Lexington	SC	X				
Austin	TX			X		
Beaumont	TX			X*		
Ft. Worth	TX			X		
Roanoke	VA		X			
Seattle	WA			X		

**Chart VI-26: Number of Dedicated Treatment Staff Servicing Each Drug Court Program**

Name of Court	St.	Counselors		Support Staff		Acupuncture		Volunteers	Other
		FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT		
Mobile	AL	3	4			1			
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	2		1		0	0	0	
Bakersfield	CA	2	1	1	1	0	0		Program Director, M.D., 1/4 time; LPT, 1/10 time
El Monte/ Rio Hondo	CA	2			1		1		
Laguna Nigel	CA		2		2				Numbers includes County Health Care Staff who perform services. They do not include residential treatment staff.
Modesto	CA	2		1		0		0	1 Full-time probation officer 1 Full-time probation supervisor
Pasadena	CA	2		1			1	1	On Court Liaison (volunteer)
Richmond	CA	5	1	1	1		1	1	Volunteers: urinalysis light and case management
Roseville	CA		10		3				
Salinas	CA								
San Bernardino	CA	3		2				1-4	Support staff - full-time 2, coordinator and secretary. Volunteers: 1-4, varies. Co-facilitate groups, help in drug testing and some file keep up
San Francisco	CA	4	1			1		0	
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA							1	Volunteer provides relapse prevention.
Santa Ana	CA	1	3		4				Numbers above include county health care staff who perform services; they do not include residential treatment staff.

Name of Court	St.	Counselors		Support Staff		Acupuncture		Volunteers	Other
		FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT		
Santa Barbara	CA	7	4	2			3	2	Volunteer services: student interns
Santa Maria	CA	7	4	2			3	2	Volunteer services: student interns
Santa Monica	CA	3			2			2*	Volunteer services = answer phones, clerical and other misc. duties.
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	2		1					Interns; Paid
Stockton	CA								
Woodland/Yolo	CA	2							
Denver	CO								
New Haven	CT	2		0	0		1	1	Noted: Court Unit 1.5 outpatient. Volunteers: 1 student intern substance abuse counselor. Other: 13 other facilities residential
Dover	DE	1	1	1				5	Volunteers: transportation to residential treatment and appointments if needed. Other: Residential staff aren't designated for Drug Court but are available
Georgetown	DE	1	1						Residential staff aren't dedicated to drug court but are available
Wilmington	DE								
Bartow	FL	4		3					
Crestview	FL	4	4			0	0	0	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	16		5			2	0	
Gainesville	FL							1	
Jacksonville	FL	2							



Name of Court	St.	Counselors		Support Staff		Acupuncture		Volunteers	Other
		FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT		
Jacksonville 2	FL	8							
Key West	FL	3	1	0	0		1		
Miami	FL	20		5			3	0	
Pensacola	FL	5		X					
Sarasota	FL	1				1			
Tampa	FL	4		1.75			1		1, Coordinator
Macon	GA		5	1				1	Residence verification, monitoring fr sample adulteration.
Honolulu	HI	6		7					
Chicago	IL								
Edwardsville	IL	6			1				
Markham	IL								
Wichita	KS	2	5	2	1	N/A	N/A	0	
Louisville	KY	5		1		1		0	
Boston	MA	2	2				1		
Kalamazoo	MI				1		1		Counselors: There are no treatment staff who are "dedicated" to provide treatment services to the Drug Court clients. Treatment is received via contract.
St. Joseph	MI	2	2	1			2	0	
Kansas City	MO	6	5	3		0	0		
Charlotte	NC	2							
Warren Co.	NC							3	Part-time counselors - actual number not indicated. Full-time support staff - actual number not indicated.

Name of Court	St.	Counselors		Support Staff		Acupuncture		Volunteers	Other
		FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT		
Camden	NJ	10	3						
Newark	NJ	X		X					
Las Cruces	NM	2	3	1	2	0	0	4	Volunteer services: Social work interns, counseling interns, Psychology interns and volunteer counselor.
Reno	NV	6	3	3	1	1	4	8	Volunteer services: mentoring, Phase I orientation groups.
Brooklyn	NY	5		3					
Buffalo	NY								
Rochester	NY								No treatment is done by Drug Court. Counselors are loaned for varying hours by treatment agencies.
Suffolk	NY								N/A. All treatment is done by agencies in the community.
Akron	OH	1		5	1				Support staff: Full-time = 1 program mgr., 1 coordinator and 3 caseworkers Part-time = 1 screener (FT screener - part of job)
Hamilton	OH	22	4	3	2	0	0	5	Other: Administrative/Support Staff Group and Individual counseling and CD Education.
Logan Co.	OK	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	
Payne Co.	OK								
Eugene	OR	3			75				1 Court Liaison - Full Time
Grants Pass	OR	4	1	2	1	0		5	Practician students get credit for working with counselors and helping with case management.
Klamath Falls	OR	2	1						
Portland	OR	12	4	12	1	1	4	0	

Name of Court	St.	Counselors		Support Staff		Acupuncture		Volunteers	Other
		FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT		
Roseburg	OR	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	
Philadelphia	PA	3				1			Support staff = uncertain.
San Juan	PR	X		X			X		
Lexington	SC	X	X	X				3	
Austin	TX	5	1	2	1	0	0	0	
Beaumont	TX	3			2		1	0	
Ft. Worth	TX								Participants are referred to community treatment providers.
Roanoke	VA								Counselors: 2 staff 3 hrs/week each direct service. 4 staff up to 6 hrs./week direct service All are full time CSB employees.
Seattle	WA						1	0	Counselors: full-time 3 (lead agency - CSRG) o part-time 11 (includes counselors in 4 agency consortium) Support Staff: full-time 2 (lead agency) o part-time 1.5 (consortium agencies)

**Chart VI-27: Drug Court Program Annual Enrollment and Costs**

Name of Court	St.	Total Prog Capacity	Cost--Treat. (min.)	Cost--Treat. (max.)	Explanation
Mobile	AL	400	901	1200	
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	180			
Bakersfield	CA	100		500	
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA	40	1501	1800	
Laguna Nigel	CA	100	3001	3500	Numbers of clients served include those who did not complete the program.
Modesto	CA	60	1201	1500	
Pasadena	CA	40	2501	3000	Total Capacity annually: 160 (LA) + 40 Average total annual cost per client: Total: 200
Richmond	CA	250	1201	1500	
Roseville	CA	100	1801	2100	
Salinas	CA	250			
San Bernardino	CA	100	2501	3000	
San Francisco	CA	136	901	1200	
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA				
Santa Ana	CA	100	3001	3500	Numbers of clients served include those who did not complete the program.
Santa Barbara	CA	300	1201	1500	
Santa Maria	CA	300	1201	1500	
Santa Monica	CA	60	2501	3000	
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	150	901	1200	
Stockton	CA				

Name of Court	St.	Total Prog Capacity	Cost--Treat. (min.)	Cost--Treat. (max.)	Explanation
Woodland/Yolo	CA		901	1200	Treatment costs for level one services.
Denver	CO				
New Haven	CT				
Dover	DE	200	1501	1800	
Georgetown	DE	200	1501	1800	
Wilmington	DE	1,000			
Bartow	FL	300		900	Approximate annual cost to provide treatment services for the program: \$250,000 - 300,000.
Crestview	FL	50	1801	2100	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	800	1501	1800	
Gainesville	FL	100		500	
Jacksonville	FL				
Jacksonville2	FL				
Key West	FL		1801	2100	
Miami	FL	1200	2101	2500	
Pensacola	FL	200	4500	4500	
Sarasota	FL	100*			50/county = 100 total
Tampa	FL	175		0	
Macon	GA	180	501	900	
Honolulu	HI	150			Approximate annual cost to provide treatment: \$14.68/day.
Chicago	IL	300	1201	1500	
Edwardsville	IL				Information unavailable
Markham	IL	500			
Wichita	KS	500	501	900	
Louisville	KY	240	2101	2500	
Boston	MA		2101	2500	
Kalamazoo	MI	100	1801	2100	

Name of Court	St.	Total Prog Capacity	Cost--Treat. (min.)	Cost--Treat. (max.)	Explanation
St. Joseph	MI	250-300	501	900	
Kansas City	MO	500-600	1201	1500	
Charlotte	NC	200	901	1200	
Warren Co.	NC	35	901	1200	
Camden	NJ		501	900	
Newark	NJ				
Las Cruces	NM	150	1801	2100	
Las Vegas	NV	840	901	1200	2. Total program capacity annually - open-budgeted for 840
Brooklyn	NY				All treatment is paid for through Medicaid (or P.A.) - No program \$ have been spent on tx slots.  3. Average total cost per client - depends on modality of tx.
Buffalo	NY				
Rochester	NY				Varies with each agency.
Suffolk	NY				
Akron	OH	250	901	1200	
Hamilton	OH	446	0	4574	
Logan Co.	OK	100	1201	1500	\$115,000 for 2 offices ~ 100 (no cap set at this time)
Payne Co.	OK				
Eugene	OR	200	901	1200	
Grants Pass	OR	100		4000	1 yr of Tx cost well over \$10,000.
Klamath Falls	OR	50	501	900	
Portland	OR	750	1501	1800	
Roseburg	OR	100	3001	3500	1. Not sure yet.

Name of Court	St.	Total Prog Capacity	Cost--Treat. (min.)	Cost--Treat. (max.)	Explanation
Philadelphia	PA	1. Yet to be determined. 2. 300-500 First Year 800-1000 Second Year Full time operation 3. Uncertain			
San Juan	PR				
Lexington	SC	150	901	1200	
Austin	TX	220	1201	1500	
Beaumont	TX	200	2101	2500	
Ft. Worth	TX	120	500	500	
Roanoke	VA	72	901	1200	Cost of annual services - \$79,000 for site-based services at DRC Total program capacity - 72 - does not include clients who are assessed but fail to begin services.
Seattle	WA	to 350			Approximate annual cost to provide treatment: Jan-Dec. 1996

**Chart VI-28: Funding Sources for Treatment Services**

Name of Court	State	Fed. Funds	State Funds	Local Funds	Partic. Fees	3rd Party-Insur. Reimb.	Medicaid Reimb.	Other Public Fund.	Private Foundat.	Other	Extra Comments
Mobile	AL										Funding Sources: specially dedicated local funds for the drug court prog. and participant fees: % not stated.
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ										
Bakersfield	CA		20%	20%	10%		30%	30%			
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA	50%	20%	20%	10%						
Laguna Nigel	CA	1%	1%					99%			
Modesto	CA	60%		40%							
Pasadena	CA										Federal substance abuse block grants funds allocated to the Court and distributed at the discretion of Court. Department of Health Services 100%.
Richmond	CA	12%	0%		50%		5%	18%		County	
Roseville	CA	25%					15%	10%		50%*	*Substance abuse block grant funds - 50%
Salinas	CA										
San Bernardino	CA			60%	20%		20%				
San Francisco	CA	66%									
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	0%	0%	0%	1%	5%	0%	0%	0%		
Santa Ana	CA	1%	1%					99%			



Name of Court	State	Fed. Funds	State Funds	Local Funds	Partic. Fees	3rd Party- Insur. Reimb.	Medicaid Reimb.	Other Public Fund.	Private Foundat.	Other	Extra Comments
Santa Barbara	CA	100%									
Santa Maria	CA	100%									
Santa Monica	CA	96%	0%	0%	3.1%	0%	0%	0%	.9%		
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA			65%	35%						
Stockton	CA										
Woodland/Yolo	CA			50%	50%						
Denver	CO										
New Haven	CT										
Dover	DE	100%									
Georgetown	DE	100%									
Bartow	FL		75%	25%							
Crestview	FL	95%					5%				
Gainesville	FL			23%	2%			75%			
Jacksonville	FL										
Jacksonville 2	FL										
Key West	FL	30%	30%	30%	10%	0%	0%	0%			
Miami	FL			100%							
Pensacola	FL	X	X	X							
Sarasota	FL	90%		10%	0-1%						
Tampa	FL	34%		8%				58%			

Name of Court	State	Fed. Funds	State Funds	Local Funds	Partic. Fees	3rd Party- Insur. Reimb.	Medicaid Reimb.	Other Public Fund.	Private Foundat.	Other	Extra Comments
Macon	GA	75%		25%							
Honolulu	HI	35%	60%					5%			
Chicago	IL										
Edwardsville	IL										
Markham	IL										
Wichita	KS	11%			78%			11%			
Louisville	KY	40%						60%			
Boston	MA	95%			.5%			45%			
Kalamazoo	MI	60%	15%	0%	2%	2%	19%	2%	0%		
St. Joseph	MI				5%					95%	Other = millage.
Kansas City	MO			100%							
Charlotte	NC		91%					9%			
Warren Co.	NC		100%								
Camden	NJ										
Newark	NJ										
Las Cruces	NM	11%	89%								
Las Vegas	NV	0%	15%	70%	13%	0%	0%	0%	2%		This will change in FY '97.
Brooklyn	NY						100%				Grants support case management components and on site services. All treatment paid for by Medicaid and/or public assistance (or .01% put insurance at this point).
Buffalo	NY										

Name of Court	State	Fed. Funds	State Funds	Local Funds	Partic. Fees	3rd Party- Insur. Reimb.	Medicaid Reimb.	Other Public Fund.	Private Foundat.	Other	Extra Comments
Rochester	NY		100%								
Suffolk	NY										
Akron	OH	60%		20%						20%*	Comm. Correction Agency - Oriana House
Hamilton	OH		22%	73%	3%		2%				
Logan Co.	OK				25%				75%	Byrne Grant Fund	
Payne Co.	OK										
Eugene	OR										
Grants Pass	OR			70%		3%	80%				
Klamath Falls	OR			95%	5%						
Portland	OR			100%							
Roseburg	OR				15%	25%	60%				
Philadelphia	PA	65%	10%				25%*				Medicaid reimbursement=2.5%.
San Juan	PR	X	X								
Lexington	SC				100%						
Austin	TX			80%	5%	15%	5%				
Beaumont	TX		98%		2%						Texas Criminal Justice Assistance Division funds. Diversion Target Funds approx. 98%
Ft. Worth	TX										
Roanoke	VA										CSB does not charge full fee for services.
Seattle	WA										for 1994-1996

## **VII. Treatment Provider Contacts With Program Participants**

### **A. Nature and Frequency of Contacts with Drug Court Participants**

Chart VI-29 summarizes the nature and frequency of contact between drug court participants and their treatment provider during the duration of the drug court program. See also Volume I, regarding additional contacts by the drug court judge and other justice system officials with drug court participants.

**Chart VI-29: Nature and Frequency of Treatment Provider Contacts with Drug Court Participants** [see page 173]

### **B. Comparison of Drug Court Treatment Services With Treatment Services Provided to Typical Drug Court Participant Prior to Instituting the Drug Court**

Respondents were asked to compare the drug court treatment services with those that would have been provided to the typical drug court participant prior to implementing the drug court. Almost all responded that the drug court treatment program provided significantly more contact with participants, and much greater supervision and case management. Several respondents indicated there was no comparison with prior available treatment in terms of client attendance, quality of participation, maintenance of abstinence (as documented by drug screen results) and length of time involved in treatment. In addition, many noted that the availability of treatment services prior to the drug court was uncertain, with clients frequently required to access treatment on their own.

**Chart VI-29: Nature And Frequency of Treatment Provider Contacts With Drug Court Participants**

Name of Court	St.	Treat./ Counsel. Phase 1	Treat./ Counsel Phase 2	Treat./ Counsel Phase 3	Urinalysis Phase 1	Urinalysis Phase 2	Urinalysis Phase 3	Acupuncture Phase 1	Acupuncture Phase 2	Acupuncture Phase 3
Mobile	AL	3-4	2	Weekly	2 Per Week	At Least Weekly	At Least Weekly	Daily		
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	Weekly	Weekly	Weekly				Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Bakersfield	CA	2	Weekly		At Least Weekly	At Least Weekly		Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA	3-4	3-4	2	Daily	Daily	2	2-5	2-5	2-5
Laguna Nigel	CA	2	Weekly	Weekly	2	At Least Weekly	Every Other Wk.			
Modesto	CA	3-4	2	Weekly	2	2	Weekly	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Pasadena	CA	4+	3-4	2-4	5	5	2-3	Daily	3	3
Richmond	CA	3-4	3-4	2	At Least Weekly	Every Other Wk.	Monthly	Daily	2-5	2-5/as needed
Roseville	CA	3-4	2	Weekly	2	At Least Weekly	Every other wk.			
Salinas	CA	2	3-4+	2		At Least Weekly	Monthly	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
San Bernardino	CA	4+	3-4	3-4	2	2	At Least Weekly	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
San Francisco	CA	3-4	4+/ Weekly	4+/ Weekly	3	3	3	Daily	Other	Other
San Jose	CA	2	Weekly	As needed	At Least Weekly	Every Other Wk.	Every Other Wk.		Not Provided	Not Provided

Name of Court	St.	Treat./ Counsel. Phase 1	Treat./ Counsel Phase 2	Treat./ Counsel Phase 3	Urinalysis Phase 1	Urinalysis Phase 2	Urinalysis Phase 3	Acupuncture Phase 1	Acupuncture Phase 2	Acupuncture Phase 3
Santa Ana	CA	2	Weekly	Weekly	2	At Least Weekly	Every Other Wk.	Not Routine	Not Routine	Not Routine
Santa Barbara	CA	4+	3-4	2	Daily	2	At Least Weekly	2-5	2-5	Not Provided
Santa Maria	CA	4+	3-4	2	Daily	2	At Least Weekly	2-5	2-5	Not Provided
Santa Monica	CA	3-4	2	2	Daily	2	2	Not Provided	Not Provided	
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	3-4	3-4	Weekly	2	At Least Weekly	Every Other Wk.	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Stockton	CA							2-5	2-5	2-5
Woodland	CA	4+/ Weekly	2/ Monthly	Weekly	Every Other Wk.	Every Other Wk.		Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Denver	CO									
New Haven	CT	4+	3-4	3-4	2	2	2	2-5	2-5	2-5
Dover	DE	As Needed	As Needed	As Needed	As Needed	As Needed	As Needed	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Georgetown	DE	As Needed	As Needed	As Needed	As Needed	As Needed	As Needed	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Wilmington	DE									
Bartow	FL	3-4	2	Weekly	At Least Weekly	Every Other Wk.	Weekly	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Crestview	FL	4+	3-3	2	2	2	Weekly	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	4+	3-4	2	2	At Least Weekly	At Least Weekly	2-5	2-5	2-5

Name of Court	St.	Treat./ Counsel. Phase 1	Treat./ Counsel Phase 2	Treat./ Counsel Phase 3	Urinalysis Phase 1	Urinalysis Phase 2	Urinalysis Phase 3	Acupuncture Phase 1	Acupuncture Phase 2	Acupuncture Phase 3
Gainesville	FL	4+	3-4	Weekly	2	2		Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Jacksonville	FL	4+	3-4	Weekly	At Least Weekly	At Least Weekly	At Least Weekly	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Jacksonville 2	FL	3-4	3-4	Weekly	At Least Weekly	At Least Weekly	At Least Weekly	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Key West	FL	2	2	2	3	2	1	3	2	1
Miami	FL	4+	3-4	2	Daily	3	2	Daily	2-5	2-5
Pensacola	FL	3-4	2	2	2	2	2			
Sarasota	FL	2	Weekly		At Least Weekly	At Least Weekly	At Least Weekly	2-5	2-5	As needed
Tampa	FL	3-4	3-4	2	2	2	2	Daily	2-5	Not Provided
Macon	GA	2	Weekly		2	At Least Weekly	Monthly			
Honolulu	HI				3	2	Monthly	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Chicago	IL	4+	2-4+	Weekly-2	At Least Weekly	At Least Weekly	Monthly	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Edwardsville	IL	3-4+*	2-4	Weekly	At Least Weekly	Every other wk.	Every other wk.	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Markham	IL		2 x month	3-4	Random	At Least Weekly	At Least Weekly			
Wichita	KS	3-4*	3-4*	Weekly	Monthly**	Monthly**	Monthly**	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Louisville	KY	4+	3-4	Weekly	2	2	Weekly	Daily	Daily	Daily
Boston	MA	3-4	3-4	2	Daily	2	Weekly	As needed	As needed	As needed

Name of Court	St.	Treat./ Counsel. Phase 1	Treat./ Counsel Phase 2	Treat./ Counsel Phase 3	Urinalysis Phase 1	Urinalysis Phase 2	Urinalysis Phase 3	Acupuncture Phase 1	Acupuncture Phase 2	Acupuncture Phase 3
Kalamazoo	MI	3-4	2	Weekly	Daily	Other	Other	Daily	2-5	
St. Joseph	MI	4+	Weekly	Weekly*	2	Weekly**	Other	Daily	Other	Other
Kansas City	MO	4+	3-4	2	3	2	Weekly	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Charlotte	NC									
Warren Co.	NC	3-4*	3-4*	3-4*	Weekly	Weekly	Weekly	Not provided	Not provided	Not provided
Camden	NJ	3-4	Weekly		Monthly/as need	Monthly				
Newark	NJ									
Las Cruces	NM	3-4	2	2	Every Other Wk.	Monthly	Monthly	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Reno	NV	4+	3-4	2	Every Other Day	Every Other Day	2	Daily	as requested	As Requested
Brooklyn	NY									
Buffalo	NY									
Rochester	NY	4+	2	Weekly	At Least Weekly	Every Other Wk.	Every Other Wk.	Daily		
Suffolk	NY	3-4+			2			Not Provided		
Akron	OH	4+	3-4	2	At Least Weekly	At Least Weekly	At Least Weekly	Not provided	Not provided	Not provided
Hamilton	OH	4+	3-4	2	Weekly	2	Weekly	Not provided	Not provided	Not provided
Logan Co.	OK	3-4	3-4	2	At Least Weekly	At Least Weekly	Every Other Wk.	Not provided	Not provided	Not provided
Payne Co.	OK									



Name of Court	St.	Treat./ Counsel. Phase 1	Treat./ Counsel Phase 2	Treat./ Counsel Phase 3	Urinalysis Phase 1	Urinalysis Phase 2	Urinalysis Phase 3	Acupuncture Phase 1	Acupuncture Phase 2	Acupuncture Phase 3
Eugene	OR	2	2	Weekly	Every Other Wk.	Every Other Wk.	Every Other Wk.	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Grants Pass	OR	4+	3-4	3-4	At least 2/wk.	Weekly	Every Other Wk.	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Klamath Falls	OR	2	3-4	Weekly	Other	Other	Other	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Portland	OR	3-4	3-4	2	2x/mos.*	2x/mos.*	2x/mos.*	Daily	Volun/1-2 wk.	Volun/1-2 wk.
Roseburg	OR	2	2	Weekly	At least 2/wk*	At least weekly	At least weekly	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Philadelphia	PA		3-4	2	At least weekly	At least weekly	At least weekly	Other	Other	Other
San Juan	PR	4+	3-4	Weekly	2	At least weekly	Every Other Wk.	Daily	2-5	Daily/2-5
Lexington	SC	3-4	2	Weekly	At Least Weekly	Every Other Wk.	Every Other Wk.	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Austin	TX	3-4	2	Weekly	At least weekly	Every other wk.	Every other wk.	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Beaumont	TX	4+	3-4	2	2	2	At least weekly	2-5*	2-5*	Optional
Ft. Worth	TX	Weekly	Weekly	Weekly	2	2	Every other wk.	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Roanoke	VA	2	3-4	Weekly	Other	Other	Other	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Seattle	WA	3-4	2	Weekly	2	Weekly	Monthly			

## VIII. Treatment Program Requirements And Experience to Date

### A. Average Length of Time Participants Spend in Treatment

Chart VI-30 indicates the length of time drug court participants are required to spend in treatment and whether they are required to participate in treatment for the full duration of their drug court enrollment period. Below is a summary of the information provided in the chart:

#### Required Period for Treatment Enrollment

3-5 months:	1%
6-9 months:	13%
10 months - 11 months:	18%
12 months:	40%
13-15 months:	22%
16-18 months:	6%

Although not specifically documented in the survey response, a number of drug court programs are developing multiple treatment tracks to address the diversity of treatment needs presented by drug court participants. Almost all programs noted that in the event less than 12 months of treatment was required, a variety of other conditions related to participant rehabilitation were imposed and supervised by the drug court judge for a substantial follow-on period after formal treatment services terminated.

**Chart VI-30: Length of Time Drug Court Participants are Required to Spend in Treatment** [see page 180]

### B. Point in Time and Situations in Which Relapse Has Been Most Common

Charts VI-31(a) and (b) illustrate the most frequent time frames in which relapse has most commonly occurred within the reporting drug courts and common situations that appear to be associated with relapse episodes. Below is a synopsis of the information provided in the charts:

#### Time frames for Relapse

1-30 days:	72%	181-210 days:	8%
31-60 days:	42%	210-240 days:	5%
61-90 days:	44%	241-270 days:	4%
91-120 days:	13%	271-300 days:	5%
121-150 days:	10%	301-330 days:	1%
151-180 days:	11%	over 300 days:	3%

### Situations Triggering Relapse

upon release:	19%
upon movement to another phase:	35%
upon treatment discharge:	18%
pending graduation:	14%

Many drug courts have used this information to develop special relapse prevention components at these time intervals or for these situations. Several drug courts, concerned with the frequency of relapse occurring around the time of graduation, are also modifying the “graduation” ceremony to portray it more as a **milestone** than as completion of the treatment process.

**Chart VI-31(a): Time/Periods in which Relapse Has Been Most Common:  
Days 1-300 [see page 183]**

**Chart VI-31(b): Situations in which Relapse Has Been Most Common:  
[see page 187]**

The chart discussed in the section follow.

**Chart VI-30: Length of Time Drug Court Participants Are Required to Spend in Treatment**

Name of Court	State	Length of Time in Treat.	Requir. to Part. in Treat for Full Dr. Ct. Period	Explanation
Mobile	AL	14 mos.	Yes	
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	10 mos.	Yes	
Bakersfield	CA	10 mos.	Yes	
El Monte/ Rio Hondo	CA	12 mos.	Yes	
Laguna Nigel	CA	14 mos.	Yes	
Modesto	CA	12 mos	Yes	
Pasadena	CA	12 mos.	Yes	
Richmond	CA	10 mos.	Yes	
Roseville	CA	12 mos.	Yes	
Salinas	CA	10 mos.	Yes	
San Bernardino	CA	12 mos.	Yes	
San Francisco	CA	12 mos.	Yes	
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	< 10 mos.	No	Managed care limits this.
Santa Ana	CA	14 mos.	Yes	
Santa Barbara	CA		Yes	
Santa Maria	CA		Yes	
Santa Monica	CA	10 mos.	Yes	
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	<10 mos.	Yes	
Stockton	CA		No	
Woodland/Yolo	CA	10 mos.	Yes	
Denver	CO			
New Haven	CT	N/A	Yes	At least one year of treatment is required
Dover	DE	6 mos.	No	Can be in a urine monitoring only phase
Georgetown	DE	6 mos.	No	Can be in a urine monitoring only phase
Wilmington	DE	9 mos.	Yes	
Bartow	FL	18 mos.	Yes	

Name of Court	State	Length of Time in Treat.	Requir. to Part. in Treat for Full Dr. Ct. Period	Explanation
Crestview	FL	14 mos.	Yes	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	12 mos.	Yes	
Gainesville	FL	12 mos.	Yes	
Jacksonville	FL	6-8 mos.	No	
Jacksonville 2	FL	10 mos.	No	9 months of it
Key West	FL	12 mos.	Yes	
Miami	FL	12 mos.	Yes	
Pensacola	FL	14 mos.	Yes	
Sarasota	FL		Yes	
Tampa	FL	12 mos.	Yes	
Macon	GA	12 mos.	Yes	Treatment provided for first six months, followed by 6 months of random urinalysis.
Honolulu	HI	10 mos.	yes	
Chicago	IL	10 mos.	Yes	
Edwardsville	IL	12-18 mos. Exp.	Yes	
Markham	IL	10 mos.	Yes	
Wichita	KS	12 mos.	Yes	Usually
Louisville	KY	16-18 mos.	Yes	
Boston	MA	13 months	Yes	
Kalamazoo	MI	3-6 mos.	No	They are only required to participate in treatment during the first phase of the program, which lasts approximately 3-6 months.
St. Joseph	MI	> than 10 mos.	No	Varies by client - as needed and indicated and agreed upon with judge.
Kansas City	MO	18 mos.	Yes	
Charlotte	NC	> than 10 mos.	No	Our Drug Court monitors/supports client up to one year after treatment is successfully completed.
Warren Co.	NC	12 mos.	Yes	
Camden	NJ	18 mos.	Yes	

Name of Court	State	Length of Time in Treat.	Requir. to Part. in Treat for Full Dr. Ct. Period	Explanation
Newark	NJ	> than 10 mos.	No	
Las Cruces	NM	12 mos.	Yes	
Reno	NV	14 mos.	Yes	
Brooklyn	NY	> than 10 mos.*	No	(Follow-up period) 2 or 3 month monitoring period by BTC - participation in program is not required. * less than 10 months for misdemeanors only. 15 months for felonies.
Buffalo	NY			
Rochester	NY	15 mos.	Yes	
Suffolk	NY	12 mos.	Yes	
Akron	OH	12 mos.	Yes	
Hamilton	OH	15 mos.	Yes	
Logan Co.	OK	12 mos.	Yes	
Payne Co.	OK			
Eugene	OR	12 mos.	Yes	
Grants Pass	OR	12 mos.	Yes	No less than 2 groups per week through out program.
Klamath Falls	OR	11-12 mos.	Yes	
Portland	OR	14 mos.	Yes	
Roseburg	OR	12 mos.	Yes	
Philadelphia	PA	12 mos.	Yes	
San Juan	PR	12 mos.	Yes	
Lexington	SC	12 mos.	Yes	
Austin	TX	15 mos.	Yes	
Beaumont	TX	12 mos.*	Yes	* minimum time for felonies. Approx. 15 to 18 months (average time)
Ft. Worth	TX			
Roanoke	VA	12 mos.	No	They may participate in Ancillary Skill Development or Educational Services.
Seattle	WA	14/15 mos.	Yes	

**Chart VI-31(a): Time/periods in Which Relapse Has Been Most Common: Days 1-300**

Name of Court	St.	First 30 days	31-60 days	61-90 days	91-120 days	121-150 days	151-180 days	181-210 days	210-240 days	241-270 days	271-300 days	300+ days
Mobile	AL	Common										
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	Common	Common	Not Common								
Bakersfield	CA		Common	Common								
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA	Common	Common		Common		Common					Common
Laguna Nigel	CA	Common										
Modesto	CA											
Pasadena	CA											
Richmond	CA	Common		Common		Common						
Roseville	CA	Common			Common			Common				
Salinas	CA	Common		Common					Common			
San Bernardino	CA	Common	Common			Common		Common			Common	
San Francisco	CA			Common		Common						
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	Common										Common
Santa Ana	CA	Common										
Santa Barbara	CA	Common		Common								
Santa Maria	CA	Common		Common								

Name of Court	St.	First 30 days	31-60 days	61-90 days	91-120 days	121-150 days	151-180 days	181-210 days	210-240 days	241-270 days	271-300 days	300+ days
Santa Monica	CA	Common	Common									
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	Common										
Stockton	CA											
Woodland/Yolo	CA	Common		Common	Common							
Denver	CO											
New Haven	CT	Common	Common	Common								
Dover	DE	Common	Common	Common								
Georgetown	DE	Common	Common	Common								
Wilmington	DE											
Bartow	FL		Common									
Crestview	FL	Common	Common	Common	Common	Common	Common	Common	Common	Common	Common	Common
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Common	Common	Common								
Gainesville	FL	Common			Common			Common				
Jacksonville	FL		Common									
Jacksonville2	FL	Common									Common	
Key West	FL	Common		Common			Common					
Miami	FL		Common									
Pensacola	FL	Common		Common						Common		
Sarasota	FL											



Name of Court	St.	First 30 days	31-60 days	61-90 days	91-120 days	121-150 days	151-180 days	181-210 days	210-240 days	241-270 days	271-300 days	300+ days
Tampa	FL	Common	Common									
Macon	GA	Common										
Honolulu	HI	Common	Common	Common								
Chicago	IL	Common	Common	Common								
Edwardsville	IL											
Markham	IL	Common		Common								
Wichita	KS	Common *	Common	Common								
Louisville	KY	Common		Common								
Boston	MA	Common		Common	Common	Common				Common	Common	
Kalamazoo	MI	Common			Common							
St. Joseph	MI			Common								
Kansas City	MO						Common					
Charlotte	NC		Common									
Warren Co.	NC	Common										
Camden	NJ	Common	Common	Common								
Newark	NJ		Common									
Las Cruces	NM	Common						Common				
Las Vegas	NV	Common	Common	Common								
Brooklyn	NY	Common	Common				Common					
Buffalo	NY											

Name of Court	St.	First 30 days	31-60 days	61-90 days	91-120 days	121-150 days	151-180 days	181-210 days	210-240 days	241-270 days	271-300 days	300+ days
Rochester	NY	Common			Common							
Suffolk	NY	Common	Common									
Akron	OH		Common						Common			
Hamilton	OH				Common							
Logan Co.	OK	Common	Common	Common								
Payne Co.	OK											
Eugene	OR	Common	Common	Common								
Grants Pass	OR	Common		Common			Common					
Klammath Falls	OR	Common	Common	Common								
Portland	OR	Common		Common			Common					
Roseburg	OR	Common	Common	Common								
Philadelphia	PA	Common										
San Juan	PR			Common								
Lexington	SC	Common	Common	Common	Common	Common	Common	Common				
Austin	TX	Common		Common		Common						
Beaumont	TX	Common	Common									
Ft. Worth	TX											
Roanoke	VA	Common		Common								
Seattle	WA	Common	Common									

**Chart VI-31 (b): Situations in Which Relapse Has Been Most Common**

Name of Court	St.	Upon movement	Treat. Discharge	Graduat. pending	Extra Explanation	Graduation	Other
Mobile	AL	Common					
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ				Other specific events seem to trigger relapse-if a counselor or PO leaves the program and a new one comes in, they drop like flies. Also, a small % decide to celebrate promotion to higher path by using. One woman celebrated her promotion to Path III by getting arrested for DUI, which caused her unsuccessful termination from program. If no new charges result, and there is simply a positive U/A, we keep them and mandate relapse group.	<5%	
Bakersfield	CA						Holidays, family crisis
El Monte/ Rio Hondo	CA	Common	Common	Common		4%	
Laguna Nigel	CA					1-2%	
Modesto	CA						
Pasadena	CA						
Richmond	CA	Common					Too early to determine the percentage.
Roseville	CA						
Salinas	CA						
San Bernardino	CA						* estimate
San Francisco	CA		Common	Common		5%	
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA						

Name of Court	St.	Upon movement	Treat. Discharge	Graduat. pending	Extra Explanation	Graduation	Other
Santa Ana	CA					1%-2%	
Santa Barbara	CA	Common					
Santa Maria	CA	Common					
Santa Monica	CA						
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	Common					
Stockton	CA						
Woodland/Yolo	CA		Common				
Denver	CO						
New Haven	CT	Common					
Dover	DE	Common	Common	Common			
Georgetown	DE	Common	Common	Common			
Wilmington	DE						
Bartow	FL				When successful treatment discharge is pending=90 days When drug court graduation is impending= 18 months		
Crestview	FL						
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Common	Common	Common			
Gainesville	FL	Common	Common	Common		5%	
Jacksonville	FL		Common	Common			
Jacksonville 2	FL	Common			Relapses common upon movement from Phase 2 to 3, 60-90 day period.		
Key West	FL					.01%	

Name of Court	St.	Upon movement	Treat. Discharge	Graduat. pending	Extra Explanation	Graduation	Other
Miami	FL	Common	Common	Common		10%	
Pensacola	FL						
Sarasota	FL				N/A		N/A
Tampa	FL	Common					
Macon	GA						
Honolulu	HI						
Chicago	IL						
Edwardsville	IL		N/A	N/A			* Note: Reports for 1st 30 days, 31-60 days and 61-90 days only include data for clients who entered program July 1996 thru December 1996. The rest are from the beginning of the program thru December 1996.  181-210 days - No data available due to limited operational time of the program.
Markham	IL		Common	Common		10%	
Wichita	KS	Common			* Often continue to use.		
Louisville	KY	Common					
Boston	MA	Common	Common				
Kalamazoo	MI	Common	Common				
St. Joseph	MI						?

Name of Court	St.	Upon movement	Treat. Discharge	Graduat. pending	Extra Explanation	Graduation	Other
Kansas City	MO						
Charlotte	NC	Common					
Warren Co.	NC				Program has not been in operation long enough to determine.		Program has not been in operation long enough to determine.
Camden	NJ	Common					
Newark	NJ		Common				
Las Cruces	NM						
Las Vegas	NV	Common			Must complete a minimum of 12 months of treatment. Last 90 days must have 100% attendance and all clean UA's. Ave Los 14.2 mos.		*Guesstimates Must complete a minimum of 12 months of treatment. Last 90 days must have 100% attendance and all clean UA's. Ave Los 14.2 mos.
Brooklyn	NY						
Buffalo	NY						
Rochester	NY	Common					
Suffolk	NY	Common					
Akron	OH						
Hamilton	OH						

Name of Court	St.	Upon movement	Treat. Discharge	Graduat. pending	Extra Explanation	Graduation	Other
Logan Co.	OK						First 30 days - 45% - for outpatient We have found in our program that if we can get them past 90 days (Phase I) that there is a significant increase in success. But likely times to relapse vary from person to person.
Payne Co.	OK						
Eugene	OR						
Grants Pass	OR	Common			have not had any completions		have not had any completions
Klamath Falls	OR						
Portland	OR						
Roseburg	OR	Common					
Philadelphia	PA						
San Juan	PR						
Lexington	SC		Common	Common		5%	
Austin	TX				* to 9 months		
Beaumont	TX	Common		Common*	*rare		
Ft. Worth	TX						
Roanoke	VA						
Seattle	WA						

## IX. Program Follow-up And Aftercare

### A. Aftercare Services

#### 1. *Mechanisms for Tracking Relapse by Graduates*

Many programs report the development of hot lines or emergency services for individuals who have been terminated from the drug court, either as graduates or otherwise. Approximately one third of the programs are also undertaking formal follow-up activities to identify the status of participants who have left the program. See, also, Volume I regarding justice system follow-up with drug court participants.

#### 2. *Provision of After Care Services*

Chart VI-32 documents the aftercare services provided by the reporting drug court programs. Approximately 70% of the treatment providers report that aftercare services are provided, with half of them limiting services to drug court graduates and the other half providing aftercare services to any participant. Aftercare services include relapse prevention, mentoring assistance with current participants, emergency hotlines, and other support services. Alumni groups are developing in over one-third of the reporting programs.

#### **Chart VI-32: Availability of Aftercare Services**

[see page 194]

#### 3. *Funding and Provision of Aftercare Services*

##### a. Agency providing aftercare services

In almost all programs providing aftercare services, these services are provided by the treatment provider.

##### b. Referral Procedures

Most programs permit participants to enroll voluntarily. They can also be referred by the Drug Court judge or treatment provider.

##### c. Funding

Most programs indicated that no special funding allocation was used to provide aftercare services. Client fees are applied by a number of programs.



## **B. Follow-up with Participants**

### *1. Conduct of Follow-up*

Approximately one-half of the responding programs conduct follow-up with participants after they have left the drug court. The follow-up period ranges between six months to two years.

### *2. Follow-up Mechanisms*

Three common mechanisms are being used to obtain follow-up information, often in combination with each other: telephone interviews (33%); written surveys (20%); and focus group meetings (10%).

### *3. Information Compiled*

The follow-up information reported to be compiled through these efforts includes: recidivism; drug usage, employment status, family and housing status, welfare status, education activities and information relating to the physical and mental health of the participant.

The charts presented on the following pages document these observations.

**Chart VI-32: Availability of Aftercare Services**

Name of Court	St	Have an Aftercare Comp.	Partic. in Aftercare Services	Aftercare Prov.- Counsel.	AA/NA Meeting	Referral	Alumni/ Support Group	Mentor Prgm	Emerg./ Hotline Service	Relapse Prevent.	Support Service	Other
Mobile	AL	No	N/A									
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ	Yes	Graduates Only	X	X	X		X		X	X	Only rarely do our clients participate in aftercare following graduation. Most seem to want to leave this chapter of their lives behind, and get on with their future.
Bakersfield	CA	Yes	Any Participant						X			
El Monte/ Rto Hondo	CA	Yes	Any Participant	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Laguna Nigel	CA	Yes	Graduates Only	X	On/Off	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Modesto	CA	Yes	Graduates Only*	X	Off*					X	X	AA/NA meetings - still required a minimum of 2 times a week alumni - in the future
Pasadena	CA	No	N/A									
Richmond	CA	Yes	Graduates Only		X	X	X		X	X		
Roseville	CA	No*	Graduates Only			X	X	X		X	X	* Being planned
Salinas	CA	Yes	Grad./Part.	X	Off	X				X		
San Bernardino	CA	Yes	Graduates Only	X	On	X	X	X	X	X	X	

Name of Court	St	Have an Aftercare Comp.	Partic. in Aftercare Services	Aftercare Prov.- Counsel.	AA/NA Meeting	Referral	Alumni/ Support Group	Mentor Prgm	Emerg./ Hotline Service	Relapse Prevent.	Support Service	Other
San Francisco	CA	Yes	Graduates Only		X	X	X			X		
San Jose	CA	No										Pending
Santa Ana	CA	Yes	Graduates Only		X							
Santa Barbara	CA	Yes	Graduates Only	X	X					X		
Santa Maria	CA	Yes	Graduates Only	X	X					X		
Santa Monica	CA	Yes	Any Participant	X	X	X					X	
Santa Rosa	CA	Yes	Any Participant		X	X	X			X		
Stockton	CA											
Woodland	CA	No										
Denver	CO											
New Haven	CT											Not at this point yet
Dover	DE	Yes	Graduates Only	X	Off/On	X	X					
Georgetown	DE	Yes	Graduates Only	X	Off/On	X	X					
Wilmington	DE											
Bartow	FL	Yes	Any Participant	X	Off/On	X			X	X	X	

Name of Court	St	Have an Aftercare Comp.	Partic. in Aftercare Services	Aftercare Prov.- Counsel.	AA/NA Meeting	Referral	Alumni/ Support Group	Mentor Prgm	Emerg./ Hotline Service	Relapse Prevent.	Support Service	Other
Crestview	FL	No										
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	No			X		X					
Gainesville	FL	Yes	Graduates Only	X	X		X	X		X	X	
Jacksonville	FL	No										
Jacksonville 2	FL	Yes	Any Participant		Off/On	X	X		X	X		Case management. Aftercare component is not a formal program but alumni service.
Key West	FL	Yes	Any Participant		X	X						
Miami	FL	No										
Pensacola	FL	Yes	Graduates Only	X						X	X	
Sarasota	FL	No										
Tampa	FL	Yes	Any Participant	X	X					X		
Macon	GA	No										
Honolulu	HI	Yes	Graduates	X	X	X				X	X	
Chicago	IL	Yes	Both	X	Off	X	X	X	X	X	X	

Name of Court	St	Have an Aftercare Comp.	Partic. in Aftercare Services	Aftercare Prov.- Counsel.	AA/NA Meeting	Referral	Alumni/ Support Group	Mentor Prgm	Emerg./ Hotline Service	Relapse Prevent.	Support Service	Other
Edwards-ville	IL	Yes	Not determined	X	X	P	P	P	P	P	P	Planning to provide: alumni/support group ○ referrals to other services ○ mentor program for new drug court participants ○ relapse prevention groups ○ support services to address new problems that occur
Markham	IL	Yes	Graduates		X	X					X	alumni/support group, pending mentor program for new drug court participants pending relapse prevention groups pending
Wichita	KS	Yes	Any Participant	X	Off	X			X	X	X	Looking at developing: mentor program for new drug court participants
Louisville	KY	No										
Boston	MA	Yes	Graduates Only	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	
Kalama-zoo	MI	Yes	Any Participant	X	X	X				X		
St. Joseph	MI	Yes	Any Participant	X	On/Off	X						

Name of Court	St	Have an Aftercare Comp.	Partic. in Aftercare Services	Aftercare Prov.- Counsel.	AA/NA Meeting	Referral	Alumni/ Support Group	Mentor Prgm	Emerg./ Hotline Service	Relapse Prevent.	Support Service	Other
Kansas City	MO	Yes	Any Participant				X	X				
Charlotte	NC	Yes	Any Participant		Off					X		
Warren Co.	NC	Yes	Any Participant	X	X			X		X		
Camden	NJ	Yes	As treat. lessn	X	Off	X			X	X		
Newark	NJ	Yes	Any Participant	X	X	X				X		
Las Cruces	NM	Yes	Graduates Only	X	Off	X				X	X	
Reno	NV	Yes	Any Participant	X		X	X	X			X	
Brooklyn	NY	Yes	Graduates Only		Off	X	X					Aftercare component is voluntary
Buffalo	NY											
Rochester	NY											We use treatment agency resources.
Suffolk	NY											
Akron	OH	No										
Hamilton	OH	Yes	Graduates				X	X				
Logan Co.	OK	Yes	Graduates*		On/Off		X					Alumni/support group - working on implementation

Name of Court	St	Have an Aftercare Comp.	Partic. in Aftercare Services	Aftercare Prov.- Counsel.	AA/NA Meeting	Referral	Alumni/ Support Group	Mentor Prgm	Emerg./ Hotline Service	Relapse Prevent.	Support Service	Other
Payne Co.	OK											
Eugene	OR	Yes	Any Participant	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Grants Pass	OR	Yes/No			X	X	X		X	X	X	Discharge plans will include those things.
Klamath Falls	OR	Yes	Other	X	On	X				X	X	
Portland	OR	Yes	Graduates Only	X			X				X	
Roseburg	OR	No										
Philadelphia	PA	Yes	Any Participant	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
San Juan	PR	Yes	Graduates Only		X							
Lexington	SC	Yes	Graduates Only	X	X	X	X			X	X	
Austin	TX	Yes	Both		On/Off		X					
Beaumont	TX	No										See part I.
Ft. Worth	TX	Yes	Any Participant	X	X	X			X	X	X	
Roanoke	V/A	Yes	Any Participant	X	On/Off	X	X			X	X	CSB programs available to all residents in our catchment area.
Seattle	W/A	No										No formal program for drug court only, but there is general aftercare.

## **X. Criteria Used to Assess Effectiveness of The Drug Court Program**

Chart VI-33 illustrates the criteria being used to assess the effectiveness of drug courts by the drug court treatment providers. The following is a summary of these criteria and the relative frequency with which these criteria were noted:

treatment program attendance:	85%
appearance at court status hearings:	76%
urinalysis results:	83%
new arrests drug charges:	76%
new arrests non-drug charges:	46%
employment status:	65%
percent graduating:	80%

**Chart VI-33: Criteria Used to Assess Effectiveness of Drug Court Program**  
[see page 201]



**Chart VI-33: Criteria Used to Assess Effectiveness of Drug Court Program**

Name of Court	St	Trtmnt. Prog./ Att'd	Appear. at Status Hearing	Urinalysis	N. Arrest./ Drug Possess.	Other Drug charges	Non-drug Charges	Employ. Status	% who Graduate	Other
Mobile	AL				X				X	
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Bakersfield	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA	X	X	X	X			X	X	
Laguna Nigel	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Modesto	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
Pasadena	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Richmond	CA	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
Roseville	CA	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Salinas	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
San Bernardino	CA								X	
San Francisco	CA	X	X	X	X	X			X	
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Santa Ana	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Santa Barbara	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	

Name of Court	St	Trtmnt. Prog./ Att'd	Appear. at Status Hearing	Urinalysis	N. Arrest./ Drug Possess.	Other Drug charges	Non-drug Charges	Employ. Status	% who Graduate	Other
Santa Maria	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Santa Monica	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Stockton	CA									
Woodland/Yolo	CA	X	X	X					X	
Denver	CO									
New Haven	CT									
Dover	DE	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
Georgetown	DE	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
Wilmington	DE									
Bartow	FL	X	X	X	X				X	
Crestview	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Gainesville	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Jacksonville	FL	X	X	X					X	
Jacksonville2	FL	X		X	X				X	
Key West	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Miami	FL	X	X	X		X	X	X		

Name of Court	St	Trtmnt. Prog./ Att'd	Appear. at Status Hearing	Urinalysis	N. Arrest./ Drug Possess.	Other Drug charges	Non-drug Charges	Employ. Status	% who Graduate	Other
Pensacola	FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Sarasota	FL									
Tampa	FL	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
Macon	GA	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
Honolulu	HI	X	X	X	X			X	X	
Chicago	IL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Edwardsville	IL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Markham	IL	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
Wichita	KS	X	X	X					X	
Louisville	KY	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Boston	MA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Family development
Kalamazoo	MI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
St. Joseph	MI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Kansas City	MO	X	X	X	X	X		X		
Charlotte	NC	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Warren Co.	NC	X		X				X		
Camden	NJ								X	Future involvement with legal system
Newark	NJ	X	X	X	X					

Name of Court	St	Trtmt. Prog./ Att'd	Appear. at Status Hearing	Urinalysis	N. Arrest./ Drug Possess.	Other Drug charges	Non-drug Charges	Employ. Status	% who Graduate	Other
Las Cruces	N M	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	Recidivism rates
Las Vegas	NV	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
Brooklyn	NY	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Buffalo	NY									
Rochester	NY	X	X	X				X		
Suffolk	NY	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Akron	OH								X	Retention and successful completion
Hamilton	OH	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
Logan Co.	OK	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Payne Co.	OK									
Eugene	OR	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
Grants Pass	OR	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Klamath Falls	OR	X	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	
San Juan	PR	X		X					X	
Lexington	SC	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Austin	TX	X	X	X	X	X			X	

Name of Court	St	Trtmt. Prog./ Att'd	Appear. at Status Hearing	Urinalysis	N. Arrest./ Drug Possess.	Other Drug charges	Non-drug Charges	Employ. Status	% who Graduate	Other
Beaumont	TX				X	X	X		X	Retention rate
Ft. Worth	TX	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
Roanoke	VA	X		X				X		Client progress in achieving goals and developing recovery and relapse prevention plans that are successful.
Seattle	WA	X	X	X	X				X	

## **XI. Data And Automation**

### **A. Agencies Compiling Client Information and Type of Information Compiled**

Charts VI-34(a) and (b) provide a synopsis of the client information being compiled by agencies involved in providing treatment, case management and supervision services for active drug court participants and graduates.

**Chart VI-34(a): Client Information Compiled by Agencies Involved With Drug Court Program: General Information on Active Participants** [see page 207]

**Chart VI-34(b): Client Information Compiled by Agencies Involved With Drug Court Program: Information on Participants Who Have Graduated or Been Terminated** [see page 212]

### **B. Information Reported by Treatment Provider to Court and Method of Reporting**

Chart VI-35 summarizes information routinely provided by the drug court treatment provider to the drug court judge in three categories: urinalysis results; missed treatment appointments; and progress report information. The comments section summarizes additional information provided, including fee payment status; educational activities and employment status.

**Chart VI-35: Client Information Reported to Drug Court Judge and Method of Reporting** [see page 217]

**Chart VI-34(a): Client Information Compiled by Agencies Involved with Drug Court  
Program Information on Active Participants**

Name of Court	St.	Participant Profile Information			Explanation	Client Outcome Evaluation			Explanation				
		Treat.	Prov.	Cse Mnger.		Court	OtherEnt.	Treat.		Prov.	Cse Mnger.	Court	OtherEnt.
Mobile	AL	X		X			X						
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ				Not Routinely		X						
Bakersfield	CA	X	X	X	KCMH Dept. Case Manager	X	X	X	X		X		KCMH Dept. Case Manager
El Monte/ Rio Hondo	CA	X	X	X			X	X					
Laguna Niguel	CA	X	X	X		X							In development as part of evaluation process.
Modesto	CA	X	X	X	By case manager = probation officer							Clients	
Pasadena	CA				Will done by court in the next 90 days.	X			X				
Richmond	CA	X						X				X	We will have independ. evaluation activities
Roseville	CA		X					X					
Salinas	CA			X					X				
San Bernardino	CA	X						X					
San Francisco	CA	X	X	X					X				
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA				Probation	X							To be developed.

Name of Court	St.	Participant Profile Information				Explanation	Client Outcome Evaluation				Explanation	
		Treat. Prov.	Cse Mnger.	Court	Other Ent.		Treat. Prov.	Cse Mnger.	Court	Other Ent.		
Santa Ana	CA	X	X	X								
Santa Barbara	CA				X	University of California evaluator				U. of C. Evaluator		
Santa Maria	CA				X	University of California evaluator				U. of C. Evaluator		
Santa Monica	CA	X					X					
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA		X					X				
Stockton	CA											
Woodland/Yolo	CA	X					X					
Denver	CO											
New Haven	CT	X		X					X			By June 1997
Dover	DE										TASC	
Georgetown	DE										TASC	
Bartow	FL										In House Treatment	
Crestview	FL	X									SJI Grant	
Gainesville	FL		X							X		
Jacksonville	FL											
Jacksonville2	FL											



Name of Court	St.	Participant Profile Information				Explanation	Client Outcome Evaluation				Explanation	
		Treat. Prov.	Cse Mnger.	Court	Other Ent.		Treat. Prov.	Cse Mnger.	Court	Other Ent.		
Key West	FL	X					X					
Miami	FL			X	Other entity: State				State			
Pensacola	FL	X					X		Amer. University			
Sarasota	FL			X				X				
Tampa	FL	X					X					
Macon	GA			X			X					
Honolulu	HI											C. Yes-but does not check by whom
Chicago	IL	X					X					
Edwardsville	IL	X					X					
Markham	IL			X	After "yes" is TASC			X				After "by court" is TASC
Wichita	KS	X							City			
Louisville	KY				Yes, compiled - see survey				University			
Boston	MA											
Kalamazoo	MI							X				
St. Joseph	MI				Not compiled - not really, this is being developed.		X					
Kansas City	MO	X	X	X					Contract for eval.			

Name of Court	St.	Participant Profile Information				Explanation	Client Outcome Evaluation				Explanation					
		Treat.	Prov.	Cse	Mnger.		Court	Other	Ent.	Treat.		Prov.	Cse	Mnger.	Court	Other
Charlotte	NC			X					X	Other entity = Drug Court Program Administrator.					D.C. Prog. Admin.	
Warren Co.	NC			X							X					
Camden	NJ		X								X				Probation	
Newark	NJ								X	Other entity = target cities						
Las Cruces	NM		X												State epidemiology	
Las Vegas	NV		X						X							
Brooklyn	NY						X						X		Indep. evaluator	
Buffalo	NY															
Rochester	NY						X			As of 1/1/97 we are gathering information.			X			
Suffolk	NY								X							
Akron	OH					X						X				
Hamilton	OH		X								X					
Logan Co.	OK		X						X	Other entity = D.A.			X		D.A.	
Payne Co.	OK															
Eugene	OR															

Name of Court	St.	Participant Profile Information				Explanation	Client Outcome Evaluation				Explanation	
		Treat.	Prov.	Cse Mnger.	Court		Other Ent.	Treat.	Prov.	Cse Mnger.		Court
Grants Pass	OR	X					X					
Klamath Falls	OR	X					X					
Portland	OR	X								Evaluation expert		
Roseburg	OR	X	X		X		X					
Philadelphia	PA	X	X		X		X	X				
San Juan	PR	X	X				X	X				
Lexington	SC	X			X		X					
Austin	TX				X					Private Evaluator		
Beaumont	TX				X						X	By court = Drug Court Staff/Coordinator
Ft. Worth	TX								X			
Roanoke	VA											
Seattle	WA	X				X						State

**Chart VI-34 (b): Client Information Compiled by Agencies Involved With Drug Court Program  
Information on Participants Who Have Graduated or Been Terminated**

Name of Court	St.	Follow-Up with Unsuccessful Partici.			Explanations	Follow-Up with Graduates			Explanations
		Treat. Prov.	Cse Mngt.	OtherEnt.		Treat. Prov.	Cse Mngt.	OtherEnt.	
Mobile	AL			X					
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ			X				X	
Bakersfield	CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	KCMH Dept. Case Manager
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA				X	X	X		
Laguna Nigel	CA				This may be addressed in future evaluation process development.	X	X	X	
Modesto	CA				Yes = but doesn't indicate who specifically provides the service.				
Pasadena	CA		X					X	
Richmond	CA	X						Evaluator	
Roseville	CA				*Evaluator			X*	* Evaluator
Salinas	CA		X				X		
San Bernardino	CA	X					X		

Name of Court	St.	Follow-Up with Unsuccessful Partici.				Explanations	Follow-Up with Graduates				Explanations		
		Treat.	Prov.	Cse Mngt.	OtherEnt.		Treat.	Prov.	Cse Mngt.	OtherEnt.			
San Francisco	CA			X					X				
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA					To be developed.							To be developed
Santa Ana	CA								X				
Santa Barbara	CA				X								To be determined.
Santa Maria	CA				X								To be determined.
Santa Monica	CA	X							X				
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA				X								
Stockton	CA												
Woodland/Yolo	CA								X				
Denver	CO												
New Haven	CT												
Dover	DE					TASC						TASC	
Georgetown	DE					TASC						TASC	
Bartow	FL												In House Treat.
Crestview	FL												
Gainesville	FL			X							X		

Name of Court	St.	Follow-Up with Unsuccessful Partici.			Explanations	Follow-Up with Graduates			Explanations
		Treat.	Cse Mngt.	Court OtherEnt.		Treat.	Cse Mngt.	Court OtherEnt.	
Jacksonville	FL								
Jacksonville2	FL								
Key West	FL	X				X			
Miami	FL								
Pensacola	FL								
Sarasota	FL		X						
Tampa	FL							X	
Macon	GA						X		
Honolulu	HI				Yes, there is follow-up of participants who are terminated unsuccessfully.				
Chicago	IL	X		X		X			
Edwardsville	IL	X				X			
Markham	IL			X	After "by court" is written TASC		X		
Wichita	KS							State agency	
Louisville	KY							X	
Boston	MA								
Kalamazoo	MI						X		

Name of Court	St.	Follow-Up with Unsuccessful Partici.				Explanations	Follow-Up with Graduates				Explanations	
		Treat.	Prov.	Cse Mngt.	Court OtherEnt.		Treat.	Prov.	Cse Mngt.	Court OtherEnt.		
St. Joseph	MI											
Kansas City	MO							X				
Charlotte	NC				D.C. Prog. Admin.						D.C Prog. Admin.	
Warren Co.	NC					N/A						N/A
Camden	NJ	X		X	Probation		X			X		
Newark	NJ											
Las Cruces	NM										State epidemiology	
Reno	NV						X					
Brooklyn	NY									X		
Buffalo	NY											
Rochester	NY											N/A
Suffolk	NY											
Akron	OH								X			
Hamilton	OH											
Logan Co.	OK						X					
Payne Co.	OK											
Eugene	OR											
Grants Pass	OR	X					X				X	
Klamath Falls	OR	X					X					

Name of Court	St.	Follow-Up with Unsuccessful Partici.				Explanations	Follow-Up with Graduates				Explanations
		Treat. Prov.	Cse Mngt.	Court	OtherEnt.		Treat. Prov.	Cse Mngt.	Court	OtherEnt.	
Portland	OR				Part of evaluation					Part of evaluation	
Roseburg	OR	X		X							
Philadelphia	PA	X	X			X	X			X	
San Juan	PR										
Lexington	SC					X					
Austin	TX							X			
Beaumont	TX			X						X	
Ft. Worth	TX							X	X		
Roanoke	VA										
Seattle	WA										



**Chart VI-35: Client Information Reported to Drug Court Judge And Method of Reporting**

Name of Court	State	Info./Urine Results	Info./Missed Appt.	Info./Prog Rpts	Other	Elecontron Rept'ing.
Mobile	AL	X	X	X	12 Step Meetings; attendance	No
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	X	X	X	Any unexpected and/or significant events during the contract period that lead the P.O to make a recommendation that seems inconsistent with the client's performance eg., not recommending jail for a performance that is poor enough to, under normal circumstances, result in jail. In recent months it's come to light that one woman who's been on the brink of unsuccessful discharge, has been routinely physically and emotionally abused by her boyfriend. Now we feel he has probably kept her from complying with requirements at times (e.g., won't let her leave the house on a day she needs to UA-test). We intend to have one-on-one sessions with and her and facilitate her acquisition of additional services (help with housing etc.)--she finally left the abuser.	No
Bakersfield	CA	X	X	X		Yes
El Monte/ Rio Hondo	CA			X		Yes
Laguna Nigel	CA	X	X	X		No
Modesto	CA	X	X	X	AA/NA attendance and participation in counseling activities.	No
Pasadena	CA	X	X	X	Reporting electronically will be available in the next 90 days	No
Richmond	CA	X	X	X		No
Roseville	CA		X	X		No
Salinas	CA		X	X		No
San Bernardino	CA	X	X	X	Payment status	No
San Francisco	CA	X	X	X		Yes

Name of Court	State	Info./Urine Results	Info./Missed Appt.	Info./Prog Rpts	Other	Elecontron Rept'ing.
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	X	X	X	Care management decisions.	No
Santa Ana	CA	X	X	X	uses E-mail	Yes
Santa Barbara	CA	X	X	X		No
Santa Maria	CA	X	X	X		No
Santa Monica	CA	X	X	X	* Soon to be reported electronically.	No*
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	X	X	X		No
Stockton	CA					
Woodland/Yolo	CA					No
Denver	CO					
New Haven	CT	X	X	X		No
Dover	DE	X	X	X	Job/School	No
Georgetown	DE	X	X	X	Job/School	No
Bartow	FL	X	X			No
Crestview	FL					
Gainesville	FL	X	X	X		Yes
Jacksonville	FL					No
Jacksonville2	FL					No
Key West	FL	X	X	X		No
Miami	FL	X	X	X		Yes
Pensacola	FL	X	X	X		No

Name of Court	State	Info./ Urine Results	Info./ Missed Appt.	Info./Prog Rpts	Other	Elelectron Rept'ing.
Sarasota	FL	X	X	X		No
Tampa	FL	X	X	X		No
Macon	GA	X	X	X		No
Honolulu	HI	X	X	X		No
Chicago	IL	X	X	X		No
Edwardsville	IL	X	X	X	* In process of implementing electronic monitoring.	No*
Markham	IL	X	X	X		No
Wichita	KS	X	X	X	Review for all court hearings.	No
Louisville	KY	X	X	X		No
Boston	MA	X	X	X		No
Kalamazoo	MI	X	X	X		No
St. Joseph	MI	X	X	X	Info. is also reported manually.	Yes
Kansas City	MO	X	X	X		Yes
Charlotte	NC	X	X	X	Treatment progress.	No
Warren Co.	NC	X	X	X		No
Camden	NJ	X	X	X		No
Newark	NJ		X			Yes
Las Cruces	NM	X	X	X	Misses AA	Yes
Reno	NV	X	X	X	* As of 1-1-97, a computer generated, hard copy report is submitted. As of March or April, this will become totally electronic. 2. Other: Counselor observations and recommended date for return to court.	No*

Name of Court	State	Info./Urine Results	Info./Missed Appt.	Info./Prog Rpts	Other	Elecontron Rept'ing.
Brooklyn	NY	X	X	X		Yes
Buffalo	NY					
Rochester	NY	X	X	X		No
Suffolk	NY	X	X	X		No
Akron	OH	X	X	X		No
Hamilton	OH	X	X	X		No
Logan Co.	OK	X	X	X	Payments	No
Payne Co.	OK					
Eugene	OR	X	X	X		No
Grants Pass	OR	X	X	X		No
Klamath Falls	OR	X	X	X		No
Portland	OR	X	X	X		No
Roseburg	OR	X	X	X	12 step meeting compliance, Tx. plan compliance, attitude	Yes
Philadelphia	PA	X	X	X		Yes
San Juan	PR	X	X	X	* Not yet.	No*
Lexington	SC	X	X	X		No
Austin	TX	X	X	X		No
Beaumont	TX	X	X	X		No
Ft. Worth	TX		X	X		No
Roanoke	VA		X	X	I am not familiar with the specifics of all items asked for in this section.	
Seattle	WA	X	X	X		No

## **XII. Program Operational/planning Issues**

### **A. Most Serious Problems Treatment Providers Have Encountered as a Result of Implementing the Treatment Component of the Drug Court and Strategies Used To Resolve Them**

Respondents 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 are presented in Chart VI-36.

**Chart VI-36: Most Serious Problems Treatment Providers Have Encountered and Strategies for Resolving Them** [see page 222]

### **B. Unanticipated Issues and Strategies Used to Resolve Them**

Respondents 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 are presented in Chart VI-37.

**Chart VI-37: Unanticipated Issues and Strategies Used to Resolve Them** [see page 228]

### **C. Improvements Suggested**

Respondents were also asked to indicate any improvements they could suggest for their drug court program. Their responses are presented in Chart VI-38.

**Chart VI-38: Improvement Suggestions** [see page 234]

### **D. Advice to Colleagues**

Responding drug court treatment providers were asked to indicate any guidance they might offer to judicial colleagues in other jurisdictions who were contemplating the implementation of a drug court. Their responses are presented in Chart VI-39.

**Chart VI-39: Advice to Colleagues** [see page 238]

**Chart VI-36: Most Serious Problems Treatment Providers Have Encountered and Strategies For Resolving Them**

Name of Court	State	Problems	Resolutions
Mobile	AL	Clients who are drug dealers (unknown to treatment staff) and who are involved in gangs. Two clients have been shot and killed.	Screening carefully for drug dealers.
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	Acquiring enough staff to handle the workload. Also, originally counseling was provided by private agency. This resulted in communication gaps that clients took advantage of.	Now that counselors are on-site/in-house, communication of info. is immediate. The therapist's loyalty is to the probation department and court, not to the client.
Bakersfield	CA	Inability to charge for field services during drug court contacts.	8 hours per week clinician time contributed
El Monte/ Rio Hondo	CA	Probation Officer, other court not having knowledge of drug court program.	
Laguna Nigel	CA		
Modesto	CA	Finding childcare services.	Have utilized county agency services available but more services are needed.
Pasadena	CA	Funding	No
Richmond	CA	Generating sufficient funding to operate treatment at an appropriate level.	We hope that client fees will generate at least half of our revenue. We have an OJP grant pending.
Roseville	CA	Communication between the treatment staff and case management staff	On going dialogue
Salinas	CA		
San Bernardino	CA	Funding for program - to have ample staff!	Pending!
San Francisco	CA	Monitoring information between drug court professionals and allowing for rules of the drug court team to be independent but still integrated.	More frequent meetings and less reporting of lengthy treatment histories of drug court participants.
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	Lack of treatment for women and aftercare services. Managed care.	On-going departmental discussions.
Santa Ana	CA	Obtaining funding	Collaborating agencies have contributed; redirected resources.

Name of Court	State	Problems	Resolutions
Santa Barbara	CA	Need for residential level of care to stabilize homeless clients or those in unhealthy living situations, or high acuity addictions.	Not get successfully resolved. Some progress has been made in creative placement.
Santa Monica	CA	Many of our clients are homeless.	Utilization of all our own and other community housing resources.
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	Not enough dollars for sufficient treatment options esp. residential.	Made best use possible with limited resources with priority given to drug court clients.
Stockton	CA		
Woodland/Yolo	CA	Heroin dependant clients; male clients in the age range of 18-22; making inpatient treatment available to indigent clients.	Plans are in place for some resolution, a teen component is in place presently for that one issue.
Denver	CO		
New Haven	CT		
Dover	DE	Getting all the key players to see the benefits of drug court.	Working on getting some cross-training scheduled. Want to tour similar drug courts.
Georgetown	DE	Lack of transportation in a rural setting was making it difficult for clients to attend counseling.	A bus system has started running but it is still challenging.
Wilmington	DE	Integrating the services targeted for drug court clients with the public service delivery system.	New contracts are being developed that should provide short term solutions. Comprehensive planning will be on going.
Bartow	FL	Finding inpatient treatment facilities	
Crestview	FL		
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Allowing the program to become a true diversionary program (dropped charges) from a post adjudication format	achieved through legislation
Gainesville	FL	Within 2 years, we had a high turn over of the drug court management-- Two managers and the vacant position was open for a long period of time-- impacting the decision making and the direction of the program.	Position has been filled with a Tx oriented person, management decisions are no longer counter productive to Tx goals.
Jacksonville	FL		

Name of Court	State	Problems	Resolutions
Key West	FL	The State Attorney's office has refused to automatically divert first time felony drug offenders. They continue to place defendants on the pretrial intervention program under DOC. PTI usually does not include treatment and scheduled urinalysis.	This issue has still not been resolved. Previously the drug court judge was refusing to admit drug offenders into PTI.
Miami	FL	None.	
Pensacola	FL	Low reimbursement for services provided.	Not resolved.
Sarasota	FL		
Tampa	FL	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Early diagnosis and treatment of dually diagnosed clients</li> <li>2. Case management requirements are extensive when we consider the court and client support</li> <li>3. Support from State Attorney Component concerning the non-punishment aspect of the court.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A limited contract by Department of Corrections is available for referral.</li> <li>2. Emphasize educational, employment, housing, support and client special needs</li> <li>3. Close coordination and demonstration of benefits in treatment and Drug Court model. Today, they are strong supporters.</li> </ol>
Honolulu	HI	None	
Chicago	IL	Capacity to deal with number of referrals that quickly accumulated--homeless minor with baby-need opiate detoxification in to provider.	Meetings with providers and emergency tactical support.
Edwardsville	IL	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. More clients needing services than the treatment agency has capacity to serve. As a result, Drug Court clients get priority and referrals from other sources and self referrals often have to wait or find alternative treatment agencies.</li> <li>2. At times, clients are court ordered into Drug Court prior to the completion of assessment to determine their appropriateness for the treatment services available.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clients are referred to other providers.</li> <li>2. Continues to be a problem.</li> </ol>
Markham	IL	Identifying funding responsibilities. Clarity in delegating responsibilities between departments.	Monthly meeting - improved our communication with all parties involved.



Name of Court	State	Problems	Resolutions
Wichita	KS	<p>Two people responded to all of the questions in this section. 1 = one set of responses. 2 = the other set of responses.</p> <p>1. Lack of organization prior to implementation. Not having D.C. software and court + provider systems linked together.</p> <p>2. Tracking clients in the program, clients unwillingness to pay for services, clients tampering with U.A.'s, and follow up on sanctions that are imposed.</p>	<p>Two people responded. 1 = 1st response and 2 = 2nd response.</p> <p>1. This has not been resolved.</p> <p>2. Our data system has been able to assist us with most of this but nothing has been "resolved."</p>
Louisville	KY	Funding; getting public officers to cooperate.	Kept working at it.
Boston	MA	Resources: \$-staff	
Kalamazoo	MI	Criminal Justice offender's participation increased which negatively effected the treatment milieu.	More groups were established.
St. Joseph	MI	A good data and evaluation system.	Still being worked on - not resolved.
Kansas City	MO	Treatment accountability.	Contracted with a single, primary, treatment provider.
Charlotte	NC	Politics -- Turf battles within treatment agencies.	Education, Communication and Honesty.
Warren Co.	NC	Continue drug use of participants and failure to report to all session of treatment.	No, still working on problem area.
Camden	NJ	Time constraints	As best possible
Newark	NJ	Bed space in inpatient treatment.	No
Las Cruces	NM	Getting judges together from different courts - consistent sanction with courts, getting DA's office "on board."	Yes
Las Vegas	NV		
Reno	NV	Stable referrals. Fluctuates from 15-60 admissions per month. Ancillary services for housing, employment and child care.	Have recently solidified the screening process and placed it closer to the front end of the system. Received grant money to provide the ancillary services internally.

Name of Court	State	Problems	Resolutions
Brooklyn	NY		
Buffalo	NY		
Rochester	NY	Agencies are loaning case managers, we are burdened with regular caseloads in addition to their Drug Court case management duties.	
Suffolk	NY	Having the treatment programs adjust to drug court protocols.	
Akron	OH	See Court response	
Hamilton	OH		
Logan Co.	OK	Lack of support from the state Dept. of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services: They have offered no assistance at all to the treatment provider. Also, clients' transportation has been a problem. We're in a rural area with no system of mass transit and many indigent clients, and reliable transportation to and from the facility is sometimes a challenge.	Resolutions for transportation dilemmas have come about by working with clients to explore all options available to them (i.e. rides from friends or family members). To date, there is no resolution regarding the Dept. of Mental Health. This facility has attempted to initiate a collaborative approach with them, and has been met with resistance. We remain committed to resolving this, and strengthening this relationship.
Payne Co.	OK		
Eugene	OR	Adequate funding - # of counselors to client	Ongoing - state gave \$ for bi-lingual counselor for 1 year.
Grants Pass	OR	1. The cost of providing care at the levels needed for this population. 2. Serious need for residential Tx and transitional housing.	We have worked with Oregon Health Plan but find that most clients have 0 resources.
Klamath Falls	OR	Communication and expectations between Tx and judicial system.	Regular weekly or monthly meetings.
Portland	OR	Discussions between clinicians and court. Management of program.	Policy meetings and clear communication of policies.
Roseburg	OR	Finding support from other agencies, funding issues, lack of public transportation in the County - i.e. who live in rural areas without transportation.	Educating and meeting with other agencies, applying for grants.

Name of Court	State	Problems	Resolutions
Philadelphia	PA	1) Coordination of all criminal justice participants in conjunction with Treatment Provider in adopting/finalizing procedures. 2) Welfare Reform and mandatory Medicaid managed care affecting who gets treatment and access to treatment.	Continued dialogue.
San Juan	PR	Lack of human resources and physical facilities.	
Lexington	SC	Transportation, limited resources	Not solved
Austin	TX	Funding, special needs resources, lack of planning for long term goals of program.	The County has funded positions for treatment and grants are continuously being sought.
Beaumont	TX	See Part I	
Ft. Worth	TX		
Roanoke	VA	Coordination mechanism to provide individuals' services, esp. when moving from one program to another space to provide services.	Bi-weekly meeting to staff difficult cases. Renovations planned but not yet started.
Seattle	WA	1. In-patient funding. 2. Dual disorders. 3. Spanish speaking treatment (too few for ongoing special prog., but hard to retain otherwise.)	1. Use State funded beds wherever possible. Special state grant. 2. We are in the process of developing a D/D prog. and seeking license. 3. Not resolved at this time (Spanish speaking patients only 2% of total referrals.)

**Chart VI-37: Unanticipated Issues And Strategies Used to Resolve Them**

Name of Court	State	Unanticipated Issues	Resolution
Mobile	AL	Dual diagnosis	Treatment supervisor assesses and refers these clients to appropriate agencies.
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	Passage of "proposition 200" by voters in Nov. 1996, which mandates treatment rather than incarceration for 1st-2nd time drug offenders. This may significantly increase our caseload size.	We are developing a fast-track sentencing procedure to get the cases through the system, quickly. Also, we anticipate funding to add staff positions.
Bakersfield	CA	Personal relationship between staff and court participant.	Client transferral.
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA	Housing for some clients.	
Laguna Niguel	CA		
Modesto	CA	Conflicts between couples who are both program offenders.	Separate court dates and counselors. Good communication between all staff.
Pasadena	CA		
Richmond	CA	We anticipated the ability to complete an assessment as soon as the defendant was ordered to court, however, due to high volume of patients it may take between 1-4 days to get an appointment for an assessment.	We are in the process of hiring additional staff to help. We have been included in a ASI (Pen Based computer) research project that will help us accomplish our assessment goals.
Roseville	CA	Issue of witnessed UA's.	Staff are conducting witnessed UA's with assistance from case management staff
Salinas	CA		
San Bernardino	CA	Use of methadone, relapse in latter stages of program, guidelines for graduation, custody guidelines.	Tx team monthly meeting!
San Francisco	CA	The need to have one dedicated program responsible for urinalysis.	Hiring one full-time program.
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	Need for strong case management; transportation for in-custody clients.	Case management staffings with two post treatment counselors; transportation unresolved.
Santa Ana	CA	N/A	N/A

Name of Court	State	Unanticipated Issues	Resolution
Santa Barbara	CA	Differing views on frequency of drug testing, philosophy of treatment in terms of sanctions and continuance within the program.	Some resolution in directly addressing the issue within the "CORE Committee."
Santa Monica	CA	We had planned for 25 clients, we now have 43 and anticipate up to 60.	
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	Higher % of dual diagnosis clients and domestic violence and parenting issues.	Best use of existing resources possible.
Stockton	CA		
Woodland/Yolo	CA	The high percentage of indigent clients unable to contribute to program's cost.	Some resolution through job training and employment seeking aid.
Denver	CO		
New Haven	CT		
Dover	DE	One of our target populations was people who were on probation who were re-arrested for drug charges. We have not reached our target numbers with this group.	We are looking into redefining the population to increase the numbers.
Georgetown	DE	Of our target populations was people who were on probation who were re-arrested for drug charges. We have not reached our target numbers with this group.	We are looking into redefining the population to increase the numbers.
Wilmington	DE	Change by the Legislature regarding TASC affiliation in state government.	TASC is now an agency within the states Department of Health and Social Services, Division of Alcoholism Drug Abuse and Mental Health.
Bartow	FL		
Crestview	FL		
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Software-that aggregates all the necessary data to run an accountable program.	We now have APD and other system support
Gainesville	FL		
Jacksonville	FL		

Name of Court	State	Unanticipated Issues	Resolution
Key West	FL	Initially we were expecting clients to have a much less severe substance abuse history than actually is the case. As the program has grown, space has been a major issue.	The counselors are spending more time and effort supplying clients with much needed services. Our program is now awaiting approval of new leases for additional space.
Miami	FL	1. Expansion of the program to include second and third time defendants. 2. Major national disaster (Hurricane Andrew) in 1992 severely damaged South Dade facilities.	1. Hired additional counseling staff. 2. Temporary trailers were secured for the South Dade sites.
Pensacola	FL	Funding related; caseloads are too high - non-compliance issue.	Not resolved.
Sarasota	FL		
Tampa	FL	The rapid expansion of the program exceeded projections.	The program has expanded to meet the needs of the community. Additional funding was identified due to the success of the program, pressing need in the community and strong support by criminal justice leaders.
Honolulu	HI	Managed care and the need for day Tx services	Applied for Enhancement Grant
Chicago	IL	None	
Edwardsville	IL	1. More female referral than anticipated. 2. More need for psychiatric services than anticipated. 3. Increased lengths of stay. 4. More need for residential services.	1. Increased the Women's Program. 2. In process of expanding psychiatric services, just hired new M.D. 3. None necessary. 4. Worked to improve transfer procedures to residential.
Markham	IL	Managed care issues, withdrawal of using drops by provider, reduction of funding availability.	New vendor for using drops, continue working on funding resources, utilize jail based treatment.

Name of Court	State	Unanticipated Issues	Resolution
Wichita	KS	Two people responded. 1 = 1st response. 2 = 2nd response.  1. The number of clients, the cost to provider services.  2. The number of clients entering the program and tampering with U.A.'s.	Two people responded. 1 = 1st response. 2 = 2nd response.  1. Contract counselors. Sanctions fee.  2. By hiring more staff for issue #1. For tampering with U.A. an attempt has been made to make U.A.'s more random and frequent.
Louisville	KY	Lack of education on chemical dependency in criminal justice system.	Keep working to educate people at every opportunity.
Boston	MA	Pregnancy; Dual Diagnosis; Trans.; Eating Disordered; Authorize.	
Kalamazoo	MI	We began collecting and testing more urine specimens than originally anticipated.	Appointment times were set up for urine drops.
St. Joseph	MI	Complexity of client situations which impair full participation in treatment (e.g. job conflicts, geographic issues, etc.)	Still being worked on - program must remain flexible.
Kansas City	MO	Special needs of dual diagnosis clients.	Have not been resolved adequately.
Charlotte	NC	Untold detail in formalizing the Program's Operations; Integrating the Program into the Criminal Justice and Human Services Systems.	Strategic planning and goal setting. Written policies/procedures and identification of participants (roles and boundaries). Education.
Warren Co.	NC	Crowded lock-up facility - unable to activate jail or lock-up sanction.	Delay "dipping" or use other sanctions.
Camden	NJ	Cross provider team approach. "He's mine I know what is best." ("EGOs")	Yes
Newark	NJ	Need for Early Intervention Program	Started Early Intervention Program.
Las Cruces	NM	State funds go to County manager who is fiscal agent. County has no concept of program, but wants say in how funds are expended without including input from treatment provider or judges.	Still working on it.

Name of Court	State	Unanticipated Issues	Resolution
Las Vegas	NV		
Reno	NV	Total change in the type of client being referred. More severe addiction and longer criminal records.	Program was modified to meet the more intense needs of this population.
Brooklyn	NY		
Buffalo	NY		
Rochester	NY		
Suffolk	NY	Not enough cases.	
Akron	OH	See page 28; Court response	
Hamilton	OH		
Logan Co.	OK	Unexpected was the extent of client's unwillingness or inability to pay for services rendered. No client is denied services due to inability to pay; however, client fees are important to the operation of this facility. also, our first method of drug screen urine analysis was found to be weaker in result reliability than the District Court wished to place confidence in.	Payment issues were resolved when the Drug Court Judge began entering orders for payment schedules, based on clients' ability to pay. Drug screen result reliability was resolved by mailing samples to an outside lab and submitting an extensive chain of custody form with each sample.
Payne Co.	OK		
Eugene	OR	Having to eliminate an evaluation component and acupuncture from the budget.	Ongoing - still want to bring these back
Grants Pass	OR	We thought we would provide standard care and random UA's. We quickly found that we must provide much more than we thought.	We increased treatment contact & # of UA's.
Klamath Falls	OR	Increased the need for additional counselors in existing corrections programs.	Corrections increased funding.
Portland	OR	Major shift in funding - unstable. Change in judicial leadership.	Keep focused on vision and mission of Drug Court.
Roseburg	OR	Computer Problems!!! U.A. turn around time - clients no showing for treatment and not having a court date for a number of weeks and inability to contact to cite them.	New computer upgrades, new U.A. system and D.A. able to file for warrants based on statement of treatment provider for non compliance in treatment.
Philadelphia	PA	Anticipated start date March 1997. Unknown at this time.	



<b>Name of Court</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Unanticipated Issues</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
San Juan	PR		
Lexington	SC	None	
Austin	TX	Unresolved administrative changes.	Ongoing
Beaumont	TX	See Part I	
Ft. Worth	TX		
Roanoke	VA	Greater appreciation of how professional diversity and different role perspectives (legal and treatment systems) can compliment each other toward promoting recovery for our clients	
Seattle	WA	Client base was late stage, not early stage as anticipated.	Still working on the solution.

**Chart VI-38: Improvement Suggestions**

Name of Court	State	Improvement Suggestions
Mobile	AL	More staff (counselors); a residential facility and a contract with a mental health center to treat clients who are dual diagnosis.
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	
Bakersfield	CA	Increase funding for field services.
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA	
Laguna Niguel	CA	
Modesto	CA	
Pasadena	CA	
Richmond	CA	
Roseville	CA	
Salinas	CA	
San Bernardino	CA	More money for Drug Court treatment!!
San Francisco	CA	More services for dually diagnosed court, with formal linkages to community mental health using a blended model of services.
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	Resolve managed care limitations; Services for women; increase staff.
Santa Ana	CA	
Santa Barbara	CA	
Santa Monica	CA	
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	Better computer networking; better service provider; more treatment options; transportation; and housing options.
Stockton	CA	
Woodland/Yolo	CA	Greater initial contact.
Denver	CO	
New Haven	CT	Still in beginning stages of Drug Court Program. Too early to answer.
Dover	DE	
Georgetown	DE	
Wilmington	DE	Clarify the prohibition and participation of offenders with violent crimes in their history. Various funding sources have conflicting regulations.

Name of Court	State	Improvement Suggestions
Bartow	FL	
Crestview	FL	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	
Gainesville	FL	1) Addressing unmet needs a. employment ; b. housing; c. medical issues; d. educational; e. parenting
Jacksonville	FL	
Key West	FL	We need the state attorney's office and the public defender's office involved in our drug court process.
Miami	FL	Residential treatment should be readily available to defendants who are unable to benefit from outpatient treatment.
Pensacola	FL	Plan to increase per admission funding or reduce court expectations.
Sarasota	FL	
Tampa	FL	1. Well defined MIS system 2. Clearly defined outcome measures at the start of the program with evaluation methodology agreed upon and in place.
Honolulu	HI	
Chicago	IL	Communication between effective program and new start up program should be facilitated at program level.
Edwardsville	IL	1. Every one involved in the program should develop and follow procedures. 2. Clinical evaluations should be completed prior to a client being court ordered into the Drug court program if recommendations are not going to be followed the case should be staffed by all involved prior to sending a client to treatment.
Markham	IL	We need to continue working to improve communication.
Wichita	KS	Two people responded. 1 = 1st response. 2 = 2nd response.  1. Computer and software.  2. Adequate staffing for courts and treatment providers.
Louisville	KY	
Boston	MA	Transportation; Acupuncture of site; NA/AA meeting on premises; Drug Court Hotline; Consist w/ communication of roles - territorial
Kalamazoo	MI	
St. Joseph	MI	

Name of Court	State	Improvement Suggestions
Kansas City	MO	I believe we are addressing that by adding a day report component and developing levels of treatment based on assessment. We do need to improve services for clients with co-existing disorders.
Charlotte	NC	
Warren Co.	NC	Would prefer to have a pre-plea program. It would be more of a leverage.
Camden	NJ	
Newark	NJ	Contract with job referrals and actual companies in the area.
Las Cruces	NM	More funding to hire additional counselors to accommodate more clients. Funding for additional treatment modalities, e.g. acupuncture. Work more to hook into additional community resources. Keep working well with courts - it is crucial. Work more with public defender's office - they are a great asset and resource.
Las Vegas	NV	
Reno	NV	We need to continue to develop an integrated MIS system. Screening and admission needs to keep emphasizing immediacy.
Brooklyn	NY	
Buffalo	NY	
Rochester	NY	
Suffolk	NY	
Akron	OH	The development and maintenance of an automated data base to connect the Drug Court judge to the case management and treatment components. The ability to provide relapse prevention treatment aftercare, employment, education, and cognitive skills programming to further support the client's sobriety.  We will also add relapse prevention education, employment, and cognitive skills programming. Additionally, a coordinated case management and management information system will be developed.
Hamilton	OH	
Logan Co.	OK	With respect to our drug program, improvements in sanctions are in order. Expanding immediate sanctions to include community service, for example, would expand the opportunity to keep a client in the program, and for the treatment provider to work with the client.
Payne Co.	OK	

Name of Court	State	Improvement Suggestions
Eugene	OR	\$ for electronic v sharing of information/ tracking. Evaluation!! equipment/computers outcome study!!
Grants Pass	OR	1. computer tracking system 2. more funding 3. coordinated outside of Tx provider
Klamath Falls	OR	Expand, include more specific on women's issues as resources provided.
Portland	OR	
Roseburg	OR	
Philadelphia	PA	None at this time. Implementation plan to begin March 1997.
San Juan	PR	
Lexington	SC	
Austin	TX	Development of Peer Program and Follow-up, Data Collection/Evaluation, Volunteer Coordinator, Full-time research position.
Beaumont	TX	Mix populations of hard-core drug users and beginners for more enriched program in which clients can learn more from each other.
Ft. Worth	TX	
Roanoke	VA	We are planning to provide acupuncture. Availability of Naltrexone for chronic alcoholics could be perused.
Seattle	WA	

**Chart VI - 39: Advice to Colleagues**

<b>Name of Court</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Advice</b>
Mobile	AL	To have a contract or affiliation with a mental health center that is supervised by a psychiatrist who understands addiction.
Maricopa/Phoenix	AZ	Just do it!
Bakersfield	CA	Invest all time and effort required to staff progress requirements.
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA	
Laguna Nigel	CA	
Modesto	CA	Have a merger between Probation and Substance Abuse counselors to provide services. Find dedicated, mature, responsible and cohesive staff to work as a team. We have this and everyone benefits.
Pasadena	CA	Plan to address the demographics of the jurisdiction, in a clinical or treatment oriented fashion.
Richmond	CA	Think "small" at first. Identify your desired outcome and work toward that end. Drug Court is not a panacea.
Roseville	CA	
Salinas	CA	
San Bernardino	CA	Be flexible, have a "team" effort in all area's of Drug Court.
San Francisco	CA	To plan all components or phases of treatment prior to implementation. They should be flexible to change design or self-correct through consensus by drug court team.
San Jose/Santa Clara	CA	Encourage visit to other Drug Treatment Courts.
Santa Ana	CA	Emphasize importance of collaboration among entities which are usually adversarial and publicly promote the societal benefits of drug court.
Santa Barbara	CA	To be able to provide needed resources for high acuity clients, i.e. housing, detox, etc.
Santa Monica	CA	Get technical assistance from another treatment provider with Drug Court experience.
Santa Rosa/Sonoma	CA	Network; flexible; need the full support of the Courts (All judges).
Stockton	CA	
Woodland/Yolo	CA	Implement a program that has frequent client contact initially, frequent testing, 2 times per week.
Denver	CO	

<b>Name of Court</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Advice</b>
New Haven	CT	
Dover	DE	Make sure there is support from all levels.
Georgetown	DE	Tailor the drug court to the specific jurisdiction.
Wilmington	DE	Clearly establish collaborative arrangements and forging formal agreements prior to commenting projects.
Bartow	FL	
Crestview	FL	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Start with low enrollment; accept input from other programs.
Gainesville	FL	Cooperation, communication and collaboration. The state attorney, chief judge, P.D., pretrial, Tx procedure must be willing to work toward the benefit of the program.
Jacksonville	FL	
Key West	FL	Visit some of the more successful jurisdictions already existing drug courts and attempt to model specifics, with the understanding that new programs need to flex programs around area needs.
Miami	FL	A Drug Court Program can be very beneficial to any Criminal Justice System that is overburdened with drug possession cases.
Pensacola	FL	Evaluate cost of providing full service.
Sarasota	FL	
Tampa	FL	Coordination with all parties involved; Dept of Corrections, Judicial, Treatment Agency'. Also have a well grounded, structured program level. Access to different treatment modalities to provide comprehensive substance abuse services with linkages to mental and physical health services.
Honolulu	HI	
Chicago	IL	Treatment process from punitive process develop comprehensive assessment document.
Edwardsville	IL	Develop close working relationship with treatment providers and the courts, make provisions for space.
Markham	IL	Commitment by judiciary, cooperation from State's Attorney's office/funding/resources I. D.

Name of Court	State	Advice
Wichita	KS	Two people responded. 1 = 1st response. 2 = 2nd response.  1. Prepare and organize prior to implementation.  2. Research already existing programs prior to implementing a program of their own.
Louisville	KY	Be prepared.
Boston	MA	Pro-treatment judge/probation; includes everyone; do the homework
Kalamazoo	MI	Provide treatment education to criminal justice representatives involved with Drug Court clients - education with regard to relapse is a must.
St. Joseph	MI	Build in data and evaluation from the start.
Kansas City	MO	Communication and collaboration is the key. Also players must be willing to step out of traditional roles.
Charlotte	NC	Establish a model; learn that model; educate systems and community about the concept; show results or methodology for results.
Warren Co.	NC	Have a lock-up facility available to assure presence of participants treatment and counseling.
Camden	NJ	Work as a team, the clients are all of yours.
Newark	NJ	Do lots of planning and meetings with all involved parties'.
Las Cruces	NM	Attempt funding at the State or federal level. Be sure to include key stakeholders and work hard at effective communication among judges and treatment. One treatment provider.
Las Vegas	NV	
Reno	NV	Do all the pre-planning you can, but just start. No matter how well you plan, you will make changes as you go along.
Brooklyn	NY	
Buffalo	NY	
Rochester	NY	
Suffolk	NY	
Akron	OH	See Court response.
Hamilton	OH	



Name of Court	State	Advice
Logan Co.	OK	Have a good plan, but don't over plan. No matter how much you plan it is never going to look the same on paper as it actually works out. Always provide structure and consistency for clients but maintain flexibility that will enable your court to develop into a program that meets the individual needs of your community. Communicate with all team members.
Payne Co.	OK	
Eugene	OR	Do it - it helps people - work it out - be creative.
Grants Pass	OR	Remember that this population require all resources.
Klamath Falls	OR	Get all interested agencies, judicial, corrections and D.A.'s Office in sync at meetings.
Portland	OR	
Roseburg	OR	Leave ego out and play as a team. Communicate on a regular basis with all team members!
Philadelphia	PA	In planning as early as possible and get your concerns known.
San Juan	PR	Needs assessment, criminality profile, services inventory, more training to the personnel, identify the gaps area in the collaborative effort.
Lexington	SC	Go Slow
Austin	TX	Plan in advance.
Beaumont	TX	See Part I
Ft. Worth	TX	
Roanoke	VA	Start the process as a "team," with delineation of mutual roles and responsibilities.
Seattle	WA	Plan for chronic, late-stage drug users with multiple life problems. Have adequate funds for residential Tx. If funds very limited, screen carefully for those who have some skills and connections to main society.

**APPENDIX: Contact List**

Name of Court	St	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Address	Zip Code	Tel./Fax
Mobile	AL	Mobile City Drug Court	Neverdahl	Jan	120 C. Palmetto Street Mobile, AL 36603	36603	Tel: 334-405-5656 Fax: 334-694-6463
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ	Adult Probation Dept.	Whitaker	Lisa	201 W. Jefferson, 7th Floor Phoenix, AZ 85003	85003	Tel: 602-506-3820 Fax: 602-506-5951
Bakersfield	CA	Substance Abuse Altern.	Goodwin	Steve	Substance Abuse Alternatives 335 Claifornia Avenue Bakersfield, CA 93304	93304	Fax: 805-631-8665
El Monte/ Rio Hondo	CA						
Laguna Nigel	CA	Orange County Health Care	Edelman	William	Orange County Health Care Agency Alcohol & Drug Abuse Services 405 W. 5th St., Ste. 212 Santa Ana, CA 92701	92701	tel: 714-834-2011 fax: 714-667-3968
Modesto	CA	Stanislaus Dept. of Prob.	Hagen	Beverly	947 10th St. Modesto, CA 95354	95354	tel: 209-558-6539 fax: 209-558-8250
Pasadena	CA	Impact Drug & Alco. Treat	Hayes	Vann	Impact Drug and Alcohol Treatment Ctr 1680 N. Fairoaks Avenue Pasadena, CA 91103	91103	Tel: 213-681-2575 Fax: 818-789-6970
Richmond	CA	Community Subst. Abuse	Mickle	Aminta	Community Substance Abuse Services 597 Center Avenue, Suite 320 Martinez, CA 94553-4639	94553	Tel: 510-313-6386; Fax: 510-313-6307;
Roseville	CA	Sierra Family Services	Farrelly/ Bauman	Joe/ Maureen	424 Vernon St. Auburn, CA 95603	95603	tel: 916-783-5207 fax: 916-783-9145 - Joe tel: 916-889-7224 fax: 916-889-7275 - Maureen

Name of Court	St	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Address	Zip Code	Tel./Fax
Salinas	CA	Monterey County Municipal	Shirk	Beth	Monterey County Municipal Court P.O. Box 1051 Salinas, CA 93902	93902	Tel: 408-759-6631 Fax: 408/-759-6681
San Bernardino	CA	Mental Health Systems	Smith	Tim	595 N. Arrowhead Ave. San Bernardino, CA 92401	92401	tel: 901-381-6333 fax: 901-381-6550
San Francisco	CA	Mission Mental Health	Morales	Carlos	111 Partner Ave. San Francisco, CA 94103	94103	tel: 415/554-9980 ext. 44 fax: 415/554-9701
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	Probation Department					
Santa Ana	CA	Orange Co. Health Care	Edelman	William	Orange County Health Care Agency/Alcohol and Drug Abuse Service 405 W. 5th Street Suite 212 Santa Ana, CA 92701	92701	Tel: 714-834-2011 Fax: 714/-667-3968
Santa Barbara	CA	S.B. Cottage Care Center	Park	Craig	2415 De La Vina Santa Barbara, CA 93105	93105	tel: 805-569-7815 fax: 805-569-8314
Santa Monica	CA	Clare Found. Drug Ct.			1871 9th St. Santa Monica, CA 90404	90404	tel: 310-314-6207 fax: 310-314-6257
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	Sonoma City Dept. of Health and Human Services	Giannavola	Gino	2759 Bennett Valley Road Santa Rosa, CA 95404	95404	Tel: 707-527-3110 Fax: 707-525-0942
Stockton	CA	A.D.A.P	Stephens	James	P.O. Box 1020 Stockton, CA 95201	95201	Tel: 209-468-4089 Fax: 209-468-4088
Woodland/ Yolo	CA	Yolo City Dept. of Alcohol and Drugs	Sale	Michael	178 W. Beamer St. Woodland, CA 95695	95695	tel: 916-666-8658 fax: 916-666-8663
Denver	CO						
New Haven	CT	New Haven Drug Court	Vetrosky	Pat	121 Elm St. New Haven, CT 06510	06510	tel: 203-624-8161 fax: 203-624-8342

Name of Court	St	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Address	Zip Code	Tel./Fax
Dover	DE	TASC	Brooks	Amy	TASC 11-13 N. Church Street Milford, DE 19963	19963	Tel: 302-424-2929 Fax: 302-424-2926
Georgetown	DE	TASC	Brooks	Amy	Treatment Center (TASC) 11-13 N. Church Street Milford, DE 19963	19963	Tel: 302-424-2929 Fax: 302-424-2926
Wilmington	DE	TASC	Holland	Gertrude	TASC 1602-B Jessup St. Wilmington, DE	19802	Tel: 302-577-2711 Fax 302-577-2828
Bartow	FL	Polk City Drug Court Treatment	Edmund	Andrew	P.O. Box 9000 Drawer J138 Bartow, FL 33831-9000	33831-9000	Tel: 941-534-4612 Fax: 941-534-7703
Crestview	FL	Budgeway Center, Inc.	Burnette	Milton	205 Shell Ave. Fort Walton Beach, FL 32548	32548	Tel: 904-833-9191 Fax: 904-833-7470
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Broward County Addiction Center	Wheeler	Guy	601 S. Andrews Avenue Fort Lauderdale, FL	33301	Tel: 954/765-5107 Fax: 954/765-5120
Gainesville	FL	Corner Drug Store Inc.	Vickers	Peggy	Corner Drug Store, Inc. 1300 NW 6th Street Gainesville, FL 32601	32601	Tel: 352-334-3800
Jacksonville	FL						
Key West	FL		Nuir-Isberwood	Jan	323 Fleming Street Keywest, FL 33040	33040	Tel: 305-295-3644 Fax: 305-292-3515
Miami	FL	Office of Rehab. Services	Montoya	Carolina	111 N.W. 1 Street, Suite 2150 Miami, FL		tel: 305-375-5750 fax: 305-375-5760
Pensacola	FL	Pathway	Carloni	Joseph	9851 University Parkway Pensacola, FL 32514	32514	tel: 904-479-7806 fax: 904-484-5111
Sarasota	FL	Drug Court	Toomim	Rachel	P.O. Box 48927 Sarasota, FL 34230	34230	tel: 941-951-5700 fax: 941-364-4367

Name of Court	St	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Address	Zip Code	Tel./Fax
Tampa	FL	DACCO Drug Court	Studstill	Mark	DACCO Drug Court 7402 North 56th Street Suite 600 Tampa, FL 33617	33617	Tel: 813-984-0909 ext. 241 Fax: 813/1602
Honolulu	HI	Hawaii Drug Court	Kamaroe	Darin	Hawaii Drug Court Program 850 Richards Street, 2nd Floor Honolulu, HI	96813	Tel: 808/599-3809 Fax: 808/599-3635
Chicago	IL	Encounter Med. Group	Barthwell	Andrea	P.O. Box 5021	60305	Tel: 708-366-6988 Fax: 708-366-6804
Edwardsville	IL	Chestnut Health Systems	Jones	Terri	1639 Main Alton, IL 62002	62002	tel: 618-465-0100 fax: 618-465-7581
Markham	IL	Sixth Municipal District	Lee	Joy	16501 S Kedzie Parkway Markham, IL 60426	60426	tel: 708-210-4170 fax: 708-210-4441
Wichita	KS	Valcuine					
Louisville	KY	Jefferson City Drug Court	Weis	Linda	2516 W. Madison Louisville, KY 40211	40211	tel: 502-574-5505 fax: 502-574-5622
Boston	MA						
Kalamazoo	MI	Gateway Services	Glassman	Richard	333 Turwill Lane Kalamazoo, MI 49006	49006	tel: 616-382-9823 fax: 616-342-6440
St. Joseph	MI	Berrien Co. Health Dept.	Foster	Joseph	769 Pipestone P.O. Box 706 Benton Harbor, MI 49023	49023	tel: 616-927-5607 fax: 616-926-8129
Kansas City	MO	Kansas City Drug Court	Boyd	Vicki	415 E. 12th St., 11 fl. Kansas City, MO 64106	64106	tel: 816-881-3108 fax: 816-881-3810
Charlotte	NC	Mecklenburg Community Corrections Inc.	Ritch	Edward	229 South Brevard St., Suite 300 Charlotte, NC 28202	28202	tel: 704-342-3031 ext. 21 fax: 704-342-3322

Name of Court	St	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Address	Zip Code	Tel./Fax
Warren Co.	NC	Warren Co. Drug Treatment Court	Somerville	Mary	720 Ridgeway St. Warrenton, N.C. 27589	27589	Tel: 919-257-5172 Fax: 919-257-1000
Camden	NJ	Reality House			1 Alpha Ave., Suite 43 Voorhees, NJ 08043	08043	tel: 609-428-5688 fax: 609-428-0949
Newark	NJ	Newark Municipal Ct. Prob	Byrd	Adrien	31 Green St. Newark, NJ 07102	07102	tel: 201-621-5297 fax: 201-642-3250
Las Cruces	NM	Drug Court Program	Wallace	Ann	642 S. Alameda Las Cruces, NM 88005	88005	tel: 505-526-1942 fax: 505-647-1106
Las Vegas	NV						
Reno	NV		Marr	John	4850 W. Flamingo, Ste 39 Las Vegas, NV 89103	89103	tel: 701-252-8342 fax: 702-252-8349
Brooklyn	NY	Brooklyn Treatment Court	Barbieri	Raye	360 Adams St. Brooklyn, NY 11201	11201	tel: 718-643-5446 fax: 718-643-5666
Buffalo	NY						
Rochester	NY	Drug Treatment Court	Lintz	Sherry	Hall of Justice, Room 1 Rochester, NY 14614	14614	tel: 716-458-4130 fax: 716-428-2737
Suffolk	NY	DASAS	Abrems	Barbara	1767-6 Veterans Highway Central Islip, NY 11722	11722	tel: 516-853-3215 fax: 516-853-3216
Akron	OH	Oriana House	Lawrence	James	P.O. Box 1501 Akron, OH 44309	44309	tel: 330-535-8116 fax: 330-996-2233
Hamilton	OH	Talbert House ADAPT Program	Brooks	Deborah	3009 Burnet Cincinnati, OH 45219	45219	Tel: 513-872-8870
Logan Co.	OK	Payne/Logan City Drug Court	Cooper	Janna	720 S. Husband, Ste. 13 Stillwater, OK 74074	74074	tel: 405-743-1968 fax: 405-743-1595
Payne Co.	OK						

Name of Court	St	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Address	Zip Code	Tel./Fax
Eugene	OR	ACES - Add. Coun. & Edu.	Harris	June	84 Centennial Loop, Eugene, OR	97401	tel: 541-431-1347; 541-344-2237 fax: 541-344-0754
Grants Pass	OR		Jones	Rick	1038 NW 6th Grants Pass, OR	97526	tel: 541-476-2309 fax: 541-471-2679
Klammath Falls	OR	C.A.T Program Corrections Annex Treatment	Havert	Steven	220 Main St. Klammath Falls, OR 97601	97601	tel: 541-883-5608 ext. 222 fax: 541-883-5733
Portland	OR	In Act, Inc.	Moore	Val	310 SW 4th Ave. Suite 700 Portland, OR 97204	97204	tel: 503-228-9229 fax: 503-228-9558
Roseburg	OR	CADC II, CCJS	Hooley	Christine	1215 Court St. Roseburg, OR 97470	97470	tel: 541-672-1761 fax: 541-672-1688
Philadelphia	PA	Focus Network	De Riggi	Laura Anne	121 North Broad Street - Room 507 Philadelphia, PA 19107	19107	tel: 215-686-9514 fax: 215-686-9515
San Juan	PR	Mental Health Anti-Addict	Manfredo	Ursula	Mental Health Anti-Addiction Services Administration P.O. Box 21414 San Juan, P.R. 00928  Carmen Capella and Genoveva Rios.	00928	tel: 787-758-7155 fax: 809-765-7104
Lexington	SC						
Austin	TX	S.H.O.R.T Program (Criminal Courts)	Greenspan	Patricia	411 West 13th St. Austin, TX 78710  Marcia Jones Solutions Out Patient Counseling Services 2800 S. IH 35, Ste 275 Austin, TX	78710	tel: 512-708-4646 fax: 512-708-4647

Name of Court	St	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Address	Zip Code	Tel./Fax
Beaumont	TX	Jefferson City Community Corrections	Davis	Cheryl	1310 Pennsylvania Beaumont, TX 77706	77706	tel: 409-839-8014 fax: 409-835-4209
Ft. Worth	TX						
Roanoke	VA	New Direction Blue Ridge Comm. Services	Carroll	Kathleen	1345 Clarke Ave. SW Roanoke, VA 24016	24016	tel: 540-342-2915 fax: 540-343-9543
Seattle	WA		Dofferty	Raone	1401 E. Jefferson, Suite 300 Seattle, WA 98122	98122	tel: 208/322-2970 fax: 208/324-8915