AMERICAN UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON, DC

JUSTICE PROGRAMS OFFICE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

MEMORANDUM

RE: **COST BENEFITS/COSTS AVOIDED REPORTED BY DRUG COURT PROGRAMS AND DRUG COURT PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORTS** (rev.)

Prepared By: **BJA Drug Court Clearinghouse, a program of the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice**

Date: **April 10, 2009**

This memorandum summarizes the range of cost benefit/cost avoidance findings reported in drug court evaluation reports and related research; the memo provides summaries of the findings of the individual research reports cited, and citations to the underlying research reports for further reference and additional, more detailed information. Unless otherwise noted, the findings reported focus on adult drug courts.

This memorandum is updated periodically to reflect current evaluation report findings.

OVERVIEW

The field of cost analysis, as applied to drug courts, has been developing significantly during the past several years. Initially, most studies focused on savings in jail and prison costs associated with the sanctions that would have been applied to defendants in drug court programs had they proceeded through the traditional adjudication process. More recent studies, however, are increasingly taking into account a variety of other cost factors. These have included:

X overall criminal justice system costs associated with arrests, prosecution, adjudication and disposition of drug cases;

X public health costs associated with drug-related physical illnesses, including costs for emergency room care, hospitalization, outpatient medical services, nursing home care and medications;

X costs relating to lost productivity, including workplace accidents and absences, and unemployment;

X costs relating to drug related mortality and premature death;
X social welfare costs, including foster care and other support of family members;
X costs related to specific impacts of drug use, including fetal alcohol syndrome and drug exposed infants; IVDU-related AIDS, Hepatitis and Drug-Related Tuberculosis; and

X a range of other costs resulting from drug use, including those incurred by crime victims, persons involved in vehicle accidents; and substance abuse detox and other treatment services

The following is a summary of major findings relating to cost benefits and/or costs avoided reported for drug court programs which have been compiled by the BJA Drug Court Clearinghouse at American University as of this date, reflecting information reported for over 150 programs. The summary is organized in the following topic areas:

I. Savings Reported in Jail/Prison Costs
II. General Criminal Justice System Savings Resulting from Recidivism Reductions
III. Estimated Reductions in Criminal Activity
IV. Estimated Rate of Employment for Drug Court Graduates (vs. Estimated Public Assistance Costs)
V. Impact of Parents' Participation in Drug Courts on Their Children and Child Support Obligations
VI. Estimated Savings in Medical and Related Costs
VII. Other System Cost Savings (including accidents, public services, domestic violence, etc.)
VIII. Participant Fees Collected (in addition to insurance, medicaid and other payments)
IX. Cost Savings Specifically Attributable to Juvenile Drug Court Programs

The following is a summary of major findings on the topic as of this date.

I. SAVINGS REPORTED IN JAIL/PRISON COSTS

➢ *Savings reported to the OJP Drug Court Clearinghouse by local programs*

The jurisdictions listed below reported in their response to the Drug Court Clearinghouse Surveys conducted in June 2000 and June 2001 the following savings in jail/prison days as a result of the drug court program:

	Median Reported		**Average reported**	
	2000	**2001**	**2000**	**2001**
! estimated annual per program jail/prison days saved	12,458 days[1]	6,900 days[2]	4,015 days[3]	10,133 days[4]
! estimated annual per program				

[1] Based on responses from 39 adult drug courts in 2000

[2] Based on responses from 49 adult drug courts in 2001

[3] Based on responses from 39 adult drug courts in 2000

[4] Based on responses from 49 adult drug courts in 2001

costs saved	$ 903,700[5]	$ 201,937[6]	$ 330,000[7]	$ 667,694[8]

The specific savings reported by these jurisdictions are as follows:

Jurisdiction	Estimated annual jail/prison Days Saved 2000	Estimated annual jail/prison Days Saved 2001	Estimated Annual jail/prison Costs Saved 2000	Estimated Annual jail/prison Costs Saved 2001
Maricopa Co. (Phoenix), Ariz	17,306 days	14,808 days	$ 657,628.00	$ 593,357.00
Maricopa Co. (Phoenix), Ariz DUI		7,317 days		
Butte Co., Cal		7,770 days		466,200.00
Fresno, Cal.-post -conv.				8,272.00
Kern Co., Cal.		12,167 days		
Los Angeles, Cal.	180 days	28,800.00		
Mendocino Co. (Ukiah), Cal	3,840 days		225,139.00	
Mendocino Co. (Mt. Sanhedrin Mun. Cts.		1,024 days		56,320.00
Nevada Co. (Nevada City), Cal.	1,460 days	1,912 days	118,260.00	154,872.00
Orange Co. (North Justice Center) Cal		11,277 days		
Orange Co. (West Justice Center) Cal.		13,025 days		
San Bernardino Co. (Big Bear), Cal			225,000.00	
San Joaquin Co. (Stockton), Cal	65,238 days	27,493 days	5,073,310.00	2,359.895.00
San Mateo Co. (North San Mateo Co.), Cal		6,900 days		
San Mateo Co. (South San Mateo Co.), Cal		8,500 days		
Santa Barbara Co. Mun. Ct. (Santa Maria) Cal.	10,869 days	24,221 days	699,971.50	
Santa Barbara Co. Sup. Ct. (Santa Maria), Cal.	24,350 days	28,628 days	1,099,614.00	

Estimated annual jail/prison Estimated Annual jail/prison

[5] Based on responses from 43 adult drug courts in 2000

[6] Based on responses from 62 adult drug courts in 2001

[7] Based on responses from 43 adult drug courts in 2000

[8] Based on responses from 62 adult drug courts in 2001

Jurisdiction	Days Saved 2000	Days Saved 2001	Costs Saved 2000	Costs Saved 2001
Santa Clara Co., (San Jose), Cal	23,000 days	28,000 days	1,500,000.00	2,842,400.00
Sonoma Co., Cal.	10,600 days		1,097,980.00	
Stanislaus Co., Cal.		18,398 days		1,508,636.00
New Haven Co. (Waterbury), Conn.	365 days		10,950.00	
Alachua Co. (Gainesville), Fl			250,000.00	
Bay Co., Florida	1,500 days	1,500 days	55,550.00	58, 500.00
Brevard Co. (Rockledge), Fl	11,617 days		4,299,829.00	
Citrus Co., Florida		2,048 days		90,216.00[9]
Duval Co., Florida				25,000.00
Glades/Hendry Co., Florida		16,350 days	$	$ 645,825.00
Monroe Co., Florida				6,439,500.00
Glynn Co./Camden Co. (Brunswick), Ga.	6,000 days		2,920,000.00	
Honolulu, Hawaii			700,000.00	
Polk Co (Des Moines), Iowa	50,874 days		2,543,651.14	
Woodbury (Sioux City), IA		1,350 days		90,000.00
Madison Co., Indiana		2,000 days		100,000.00
Kankakee Co. (Kankakee), Ill	210 days		10,500.00	20,000.00
Madison Co., Ill.		1,000 days		
Peoria Co (Peoria), Ill.	14,976 days		823,680.00	
Allen Co., Indiana		7,260 days		550,500.00
Kenton Co. (Covington), Ky	12,410 days			
Clark Co. (Madison), Ky	200 days	8,700 days		360,000.00
Laurel Co., Ky.				135,000.00
Baton Rouge Par. (Covington), La.	30,240 days		2,154,082.00	
Jefferson Par., La.		365 days		35,000.00
St. Mary Parish (Franklin),La		2,750 days	17,000.00	20,000.00
West Carroll/Franklin Par., La.				250,000.00
Harford Co, (Edgewood), Md.			540,000.00	2,520,000.00
Essex Co. (Haverhill), Mass.	4,015 days		140,525.00	
Berrien Co., Mich				14,600.00
Eaton Co., Mich.		3,450 days		120,750.00
Kalamazoo Co. (Kalamazoo), Mich			1,629,705.00	
Estimated annual jail/prison	**Estimated Annual jail/prison**			

[9] For period: June 14, 2000 - April 2, 2001.

Cost- Benefits/Costs Avoided Reported By Drug Court Programs. OJP Drug Court Clearinghouse, a program of the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice**.** June 21, 2004

Jurisdiction	Days Saved		Costs Saved	
	2000	2001	2000	2001
Kent Co. (Grand Rapids), Mich.	4,400 days	9,000 days	581.,184.00	388,620.00
Macomb Co., Mich				1,875,000.00
Hennepin Co. (Minneapolis), Minn.	3,030 days	3,030 days	259,490.00	259,489.00
Boone Co., Mo.		4,770 days		223,875.00
Franklin Co., Mo.				100,000.00
Mississippi Co. (Charleston), Mo.	480 days		32,160.00	
Madison Co. Mun. Ct. (Ridgeland), Miss.	120 days		765,000.00	
Durham Co. (Durham), N.Car.	3,840 days		200,000.00	
Monmouth Co. (City of Long Branch), NJ	600 days		$ 240,000.00	$
Union Co. (Elizabeth), NJ	18,000 days	25,000 days	1,000,000.00	1,500,000.00
Bernalillo Co (Albuquerque), NM - DWI Court	18,000 days		1,000,000.00	
San Juan Co., New Mex.				733,000.00
Sante Fe Co. (Santa Fe), NM			30,000.00	
Taos Co. (Taos), NM	1,890 days	200 days	122,850.00	390,000.00
Washoe Co. Mun. Ct. (Sparks), Nev	720 days			
Erie Co. (Lackawanna), NY				1,885,000.00
Erie Co., (Town of Amherst), NY		27,720 days		554,400.00
Fulton Co. (Johnstown), NY	4,350 days		300,000.00	476,190.00
Kings Co. (Brooklyn), NY	81,076 days		10,374.944.00	
Tomkins Co. (Ithaca), NY		6,935 days		540,000.00
Westchester Co., (Yonkers), NY				29,000.00
Hamilton Co. (Cincinnati), OH			94,500.00	80,000.00
Mahoning Co. (Youngstown), Oh	7,663 days		409,000.00	
Richland Co. (Mansfield), Oh	10,098 days	10,098 days	561,589.00	561,589.00
Summit Co. (Akron), Oh.				164,000.00
Garvin and McClain Cos. (Purcell), OK	75,555 days		3,148,470.00	
Muscogee Creek Nation, Okmulgee , Ok	180 days			

Cost- Benefits/Costs Avoided Reported By Drug Court Programs. BJA Drug Court Clearinghouse, a program of the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. April 10, 2009

Estimated annual jail/prison Jurisdiction	Estimated Annual jail/prison Days Saved 2000	2001	Costs Saved 2000	2001
Seminole Co., Ok			1,670.400.00	
Crook Co./Jefferson Co., Oregon		180 days		10,000.00
Lane Co. (Eugene), Or.	10,000 days	14,534 days		1,235,000.00
Chester Co. (West Chester), Pa.	651 days	875 days	35,805.00	48,125.00
Lycoming Co. (Williamsport), Pa.	365 days		823,805.00	
Philadelphia Co. Mun. Ct, (Philadelphia), Pa.			1,800,000.00	2,000,000.00
Lexington Co., S. Car.				160,000.00
Richland Co., S. Car.				28,000.00
Davidson Co. (Nashville), Ten			$ 1,971,000.00	$
Knox Co., Tenn.				150,000.00
Rutherford Co., Tenn.		7,665 days		275,940.00
Shelby Co., Tenn.		365 days		11,370.00
Uintah Co., Utah	600 days			28,200.00
Roanoke City, Va.		4,000 days	858,000.00	
Cowlitz Co., Wash.		5,200 days		300,000.00
Skagit Co. (Mt. Vernon), Wash.	365 days		20,075.00	
Snohomish Co., Wash.		1,132 days		
Spokane Co., Wash.				240,000.00
Thurston Co., Wash.		8,542 days		489,140.00
Dane Co., Wis.		2,760 days		179,920.00
Sheridan Co., WY.		3,600 days		180,000.00

This information is provided by courts using estimated costs for the jail/prison days that would have been imposed on drug court participants, based on prevailing statutory provisions and sentencing practices, had their cases been disposed of through the traditional process. Jail/prison day costs are generally calculated at a minimum rate of $ 40.00 per day, but frequently much higher; this daily cost does not include the costs for jail/prison construction.

Per day costs for drug court program participation and services generally range between $8.00 - $ 14.00[10], depending upon the nature and extent of treatment and ancillary services provided. The specific

[10] Daily per participant costs (including staff time and drug tests) for drug court program participation in

number of days and costs saved is based on the total daily costs for drug court participation compared with the total costs that would have been incurred for probation supervision and incarceration under the traditional disposition process.

In addition to the costs savings relating to incarceration costs achieved through drug court programs, jurisdictions are also reporting that the jail and prison capacity made available through the drug court program is permitting them to utilize this capacity for offenders who are public safety risks.

I. SAVINGS REPORTED IN EVALUATION REPORTS OF LOCAL DRUG COURT PROGRAMS

Robert Jameson and N. Andrew Peterson. ***Jackson County, Missouri- Jackson County Drug Court Diversion Program*****. 1995.**

Analysis of the first 450 cases processed by the Jackson County (Kansas City), Drug Court, established in 1993, found that the 257 active participants at the time of the study would have served an average of 21 days in jail at an average cost of $ 45.55 per inmate day, resulting in 5,400 inmate days saved, totaling $ 246,000.

- **Elisabeth Piper Deschenes and Sam Tores. June 1997.** ***Los Angeles Co., California.: Evaluation Of Los Angeles Municipal Court; Rio Hondo Municipal Court; Pasadena Municipal Court; and Santa Monica Unified Municipal and Superior Court Drug Court Programs.*** :

Evaluation of four of the 14 drug courts operating in Los Angeles County, established during the period of May 1994 - January 1996 found that the annual costs per client in these programs ranged between $ 3,706 - $ 8,924, compared with an average cost of $ 16,500 per year for prison or $ 13,000 for residential treatment.

Robert Granfield and Cindy Eby. ***Denver County, Colorado-Denver Drug Court*****. 1997.**

Analysis of the Denver, Colorado Drug Court, established in 1994, found that savings between $ 360 and 840 in jail costs were being achieved for each participant. Based on the first 3,000 participants in the program, approximately 1.8 - 2.5 million dollars had been saved annually.

Santa Clara County Drug Court. ***Santa Clara Co, California Drug Treatment Court*****. 1998.**

Analysis of 110 Drug Court graduates of the Santa Clara Co., California Drug Court, established in 1995 found that these graduates had served a total of 5,808 days (or 51 days per person), compared with an average of 86 days per person for those defendants who were eligible but chose not to participate in the drug court. These jail days were incurred during pretrial detention prior to drug court admission and through sanctioning during program participation. The average cost for jail days served by Drug Court graduates was $ 3,417 compared with $ 5,762 for non drug court participants. The average cost per jail day is $ 67.

Kentucky is reportedly $ 7.20 compared with $ 48.41 per day for state prison incarceration, according to Joanie Abramson, acting manager for the Kentucky Administrative Office of the Courts, as cited in the *Lexington Herald-Leader*, February 9, 2003.

- ***Multnomah County S.T.O.P. Drug Diversion Program*. Michael Finigan. 1998.**

Evaluation of the Multnomah County (Portland), Oregon Drug Court, established in 1991, over a two year period found that costs per person savings totaled $ 23,235.30 of which $ 4,320 consisted of per person jail cost savings. (The remaining savings related to other justice system and related savings referenced below).

A Detailed Cost Analysis in a Mature Drug Court Setting: A Cost-Benefit Evaluation of the Multnomah County Drug Court. NPC Research, Inc. Shannon Carey, Michael Finigan. July 2003

Study of investment costs and benefits of drug court program; compares use of public resources for drug court clients and for sample of drug court eligible "business as usual" serviced clients.

- Total investment cost per client in drug court was less ($ 1,441.52) than investment cost per client in business as usual process.
  - money saved in outcome costs ($ 2,328.89 per participant) although savings not spread equally among agencies;
  - total savings over 30 –month period, including victimization costs, averaged $ 4,788.88 per drug court participant

Research Questions and Findings;

(1) Does it cost more for drug court than business as usual? No: total investment in drug court averaged $ 5,927.80 per participant compared with $ 7,369.32 for business as usual. Business as usual offender cost $ 1,441.52 more than drug court

(2) Do agencies save money upfront from drug court vs businesses usual? Yes. Law enf /corrections and public defender receive immediate savings. All agencies saved money in outcomes.

(3) Are there cost savings in outcomes due to drug court processing? Yes. When outcomes costs for drug court participants compared with outcome costs for business as usual offenders, drug court saved an average of $ 2,328.89 per year per participant. With victimization costs added, average savings were $ 3,596.92 per participant

(4) What are total cost savings (investment and outcomes) attributed to drug court process? Combining outcome cost savings with investment savings over 30-month period, drug court saved average of 4 4,788.88 per participant including victimization costs. Multiplied by 300 participants who enter each year, this is $ 1,434,000 in cost savings for local tax payers –which is the "bottom line" difference in cost to the system of drug court participants vs cost for nondrug court participants

- money saved in outcome costs ($ 2,328.89 per participant) although savings not spread equally among agencies;
- total savings over 30 –month period, including victimization costs, averaged $ 4,788.88 per drug court participant

- **Dale K. Sechrest and David Shichor. *Evaluation of the Riverside County, California Drug Court Program*. 1999.**

Evaluation of the Riverside Co., California Adult Drug Court, established in 1995 found, found jail/prison cost savings achieved for 102 participants studied $ 2,519,400, based on sentences of 380 days of incarceration @ $ 65/day. Additional costs savings relating to parole supervision that would otherwise have been required were also

cited.

X **Kalamazoo County Substance Abuse Diversion Program.** ***Kalamazoo County, Michigan-Kalamazoo County Substance Abuse Diversion Program-Women and Men's Drug Courts*****. 1999.**

Analysis of Kalamazoo's Women's Drug Court, established in 1992, found that 8,760 jail days were saved, totaling $ 183,960 calculated at the daily cost of $ 21, and that 10,545 prison days were saved, totaling $ 643,245 calculated at the daily cost of $ 65/day for the five year period studied.

O Analysis of Kalamazoo's Men's Drug Court, established in 1997, found that 5,355 jail days were saved, totaling $ 112,455 and 9,670 prison days were saved, totaling $ 628,550 for the eighteen month period studied.

Calculations of incarceration days saved were based on the offense, sentencing guideline score, prior criminal history of each participant, prior incarceration, and probation/parole status.

X **Mitchell Mackinem.** ***Richland County, South Carolina Adult Drug Court Program*****. 2000.**

Evaluation of the Richland Co., South Carolina Drug Court, established in 1996, found that a savings in prison costs of $ 17,000 per graduate per year was achieved, totaling $ 108,000, based on the 44 graduates at the time of the study.

X **Richard Washouski, Recovery Solutions Consulting and Training Inc., and Henry G. Pirowski with Jose Ferrer. City of Buffalo, New York:** ***Buffalo Drug Treatment Court. Process Evaluation.*** **2001.**

Savings in jail bed days alone have been estimated to be at least $ 5,000 per defendant – which does not factor in the value of the added capacity to incarcerate the more serious offenders. These figures compare with the average cost fore the treatment component per participant of between $ 1,200 and $ 3,000.

Evaluation of the Bernalillo County (Albuquerque, New Mexico Metropolitan DWI/Drug Court. 2001 **(with some analysis conducted by the Institute for Social Research).**

Collectively, Metropolitan DWI/Drug Court graduates spent a total of 915 days in jail as a result of the referring offense. Based on daily cost data, Metropolitan DWI/Drug Court graduates cost $61,305 in jail time (based on $67 per day). The average number of days spent in jail per drug court graduate is 5.45 days. Thus, jail costs for Metropolitan DWI/Drug Court are $365.15 per participant.

Many participants were determined to be eligible for the Community Custody Program (CCP). The data show drug court graduates spent a total of 1,483 days in the CCP program. According to jail staff, the CCP costs $32.75 per day, per participant. Thus, the total costs of CCP participation for Metropolitan DWI/Drug Court graduates are $48,568. On average, drug court graduates spend 8.83 days in CCP custody at a cost of $289.18 each.

Table 24: Total CCP/Jail Days Costs Comparison

	Total Metro Graduales	Total Comparison Group	Total Cost Savings	Adjusted* Comparison	Adjusted*

	(*N*=168)	(*N*=154)		Group (*N*=168**)**	Total Cost Savings
Days in Jail	915 days	3,366 days	2,451 days	3,672 days	2,757 days
Costs @ $67/day	$61,305	$225,522	$164,217	$246,024	$184,719
Days in CCP	1,483 days	3,103 days	1,620 days	3,385 days	1,902
Costs @ $32.75/day	$48,568	$101,623	$53,055	$110,859	$62,291
Total Costs/Savings	$109,873	$327,145	$217,272	$356,883	$247,010

**Adjusted figures calculated by multiplying the average number of jail/CCP days of the comparison group by 14 (Graduate N - Comparison N = 14).*

The data show comparison group individuals spent a total of 3,366 days in jail as a result of their referring offense. The total cost of this incarceration is $225,522. Jail sentences range from 0 to 192 days. Comparison group participants spent an average of 21.86 days in jail at an average cost of $1,464.62 per offender. Although not included in this analysis, the number of jail days and the associated costs for offenders given immediate jail sentences would have increased these figures dramatically.

Probation clients also participate in the Community Custody Program. Comparison group participants spent a total of 3,103 days assigned to the CCP Program. The total cost of this program for these probationers is $101,623. Offenders spent an average of 20.15 days in CCP at a cost of nearly $659.91 per person. See Table 25 for a comparison of the individual offender averages.

Table 25: Individual CCP/Jail Days Costs Comparison

	Individual Averages for Metro Graduates (N=168)	Individual Averages for Comparison Group (N=154)	Cost Savings per Offender
Days in Jail	5.45 days	21.86 days	16.41 days
Costs @ $67/day	$365	$1,465	$1,100
Days in CCP	8.83 days	20.15	11.32
Total Costs/Savings	$654	$2,125	$1,471

Costs Summary

Offenders served in the Metropolitan DWI/Drug Court spend fewer days in jail and fewer days assigned to the Community Custody Program. There is a cost difference between Metropolitan DWI/Drug Court and probation. Comparing these differences show that Metropolitan DWI/Drug Court saved taxpayers over $200,000 in combined jail costs and CCP days for drug court graduates compared to successful probation clients from 03/01/1998 to 09/30/2000, a thirty-two month period. In addition to direct cost savings as a result of fewer jail days and reduced average number of days in the CCP Program, it could be argued the Metropolitan DWI/Drug Court contributed to reduce crowding in the jail and assisted in conserving the resources of the Community Custody Program. Although not collected, we suspect that most of the jail days served by drug court participants occurred around the time of arrest. Therefore, the number of days served by drug court participants is not a reflection on the efficiency of the program. It does however, raise the question if an even greater savings might be realized with earlier intervention.

The comparison group has fourteen fewer individuals, which suggests actual cost figures would be higher. Multiplying these fourteen persons by the average days in jail (21.86) and CCP (20.15) adds an additional $20,504 in jail costs and $9,239 to the costs of the comparison group totals. Adding these costs to the figures shown in Table 25 would make the total cost savings of drug court compared to probation around $247,015.

X ***Bibb County [Georgia] Eight-Year Annual Report: 1994 - 2003. April 15, 2003.***

Estimated cost savings for 394 graduates from 1994 - 2002 were $ 797,850, computed as follows: $ 67.50 per day cost for imprisonment of an individual in the Bibb County Law Enforcement Center x 394 graduates x 30 days average sentence = $ 797,850. Additional cost savings were also noted as a result of drug court defendants' who were detained after arrest being released earlier pretrial to participate in the drug court than they would otherwise have been if their cases were handled in the traditional process.

The study also reported reduced costs for (1) law enforcement for investigation of cases that went in to the drug court; and (2) indigent defense services for time entailed in representing defendants in the drug court.

- *Coconino County (Arizona) DUI/Drug Court Evaluation*. Prepared by Frederic I. Solop, Nancy A. Wonders et al. Social Research Laboratory. Northern Arizona University. May 20003.

DUI/Drug court is more cost effective than the traditional criminal justice process….the average DUI/Drug Court participant costs Coconino County approximately $ 6,408, which takes approximately 12 months, compared with a cost of $ 22,740 for defendants in the traditional process which takes 2-3 years, as computed as follows:

Costs per month

Item	Costs	DUI/Drug Court	Control
Courtroom visits	$ 3.88/minute	$ 19 (2.4	$19 (.5)
Treatment days	$ 199/session	$ 127 (6.7)	$ 23 (1.2)
Probation contacts	$ 35/visit	$ 196 (5.6)	$ 123 (3.5
Jail days	$ 80/day	$ 128 (1.6)	$ 464 (5.8
DOC days	$ 53/day	$ 21 (0.4)	$ 122 (2.3)
Drug tests	$ 7/test	$ 43 (6.1)	$ 7 (1.0)
Total		$ 534	$ 748
Total program cost		$ 6,408	$ 22,740

Coconino County DUI/Drug Court Evaluation. Frederic I. Solop, Nancy A. Wonders, K.K. Hagen, K McCarrier. Social Research Laboratory, Northern Arizona University. May 2003

Data compiled on participants in Co's DUI/Drug Court Program during May 1, 2001 – October 31, 2002 indicated that:(1) average DUI drug court participant costs Coconino Co $ 6,408 vs. $ 22,740 for traditional cjs processing; (2) DUI participant paid average of $ 28.86 monthly to court vs. $ 7.34 paid by control group; (3) therefore traditional cjs process is 3.5 times more costly than Co. DUI Drug Court. Program costs consisted of:

Item	Costs	DUI/Drug Court	Control Group
Courtroom visits	$ 3.88/minute	$ 19 (2.4)	$ 19. (0.5)
Treatment days	$ 19/session	$ 127 (6.7)	$ 23 (1.2)
Probation contacts	$35/visit	$ 196 (5.6)	$ 123 (3.5)
Jail days	$ 80/day	$ 128 (1.6)	$ 464 (5.8)
DOC days	$ 53/day	$ 21 (0.4)	$ 122 (2.3)
Drug tests	$ 7/test	$ 43 (6.1)	$ 7 (1.0)

Cost- Benefits/Costs Avoided Reported By Drug Court Programs. BJA Drug Court Clearinghouse, a program of the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. April 10, 2009

Cost per month	**$ 534**	**$ 758**
Total Program cost	**$ 6,408**	**$ 22,740**

X ***Cost Analysis of Anne Arundel County, Maryland Drug Court*. Prepared by Dave Crumpton, Jodi Brekhus, Judy Weller and Mike Finigan, NPC Research, Inc., Portland, Oregon. January 29, 2004.**

Study of recidivism and other available information for 53 drug court participants four years following program entry in 1998 indicated savings of $ 265,308 for four year period, or 173.5% return on investment. Total savings were derived from: criminal justice system savings ($ 53,148); victimization cost savings (e.g., medical expenses, lost salaries, etc., from reduced recidivism rate of crimes against persons): $ 521,676; and increased state and local income tax revenues from increased employment ($ 158, 528), offset by amount "invested" of $ 362,748. Savings of $ 1.74 results for each dollar spent.

***Cost Analysis of Baltimore City, Maryland Drug Treatment Court: Includes Outcome Findings, Cost Analysis and Summary and Conclusions, Only*. Prepared by Dave Crumpton, Jodi Brekhus, Judy Weller and Mike Finigan, NPC Research, Inc., Portland, Oregon. January 29, 2004.**

Study of recidivism of 60 drug court participants entering the drug court programs in the Baltimore District Court and Baltimore Circuit Court in 2000 for a 3 year period indicated savings of $ 3,791 per participant, or a return of $1.36.for every dollar spent. As a result of immediate reductions in the rate of recidivism for the drug court sample, compared with the comparison sample, immediate savings in criminal justice system costs were realized – approximately $ 3,000 per participant within 12 months of entry. NPC projected a savings for all 758 drug court participants during the study period of $ 2,721,894 in criminal justice system savings.

Cost/Benefit Analysis of the Douglas County, Nebraska Drug Court. R.K.Piper and Cassia Spohn. Univ of Nebraska at Omaha. March 31, 2004.

Sample of 185 drug court participants and 194 traditionally adjudicated offenders studied in a previous Phase II evaluation report, and 279 drug court participants and 309 traditionally adjudicated offenders in a previous Phase III evaluation report resulted in the following findings:

- Average cost for drug court participants is $ 4,803 compared to $ 9,224 for traditionally-adjudicated offenders, or an average benefit/cost difference of $ 4,421 LESS for each drug court participant

- annual investment cost savings for drug court participants compared to traditionally – adjudicated and sentenced offenders is $ 1,326,414. By far the greatest investment cost savings were for jail confinement ($ 622,098) and prison incarceration costs ($ 1,125,642.)

- Lesser "up front" investment cost savings of $ 125,703 were also realized by the Douglas County District Court and the other agencies involved with processing and prosecuting drug offenders at the district court level (not including the costs of the drug court program itself, which is administered by the District Court). The Douglas County Court and agencies involved at the county court level also realized a savings of $ 51,234.

- Drug court participants averaged 1.23 new misdemeanor and felony arrests compared to 1.87 for non-drug court offenders. Those assigned to the drug court accounted for 132 fewer misdemeanor and 60 fewer felony arrests during the follow-up period. The fewer misdemeanor arrests resulted in outcome cost savings of $ 346,129 (-132 x $ 2,622) and the fewer number of felony arrests saved $ 533,468 (-60 x $ 9,224), or a total annual outcome cost savings of $ 899,597 resulted from the reduced recidivism.

- The average annual outcome cost savings per drug court participant is $ 29999. The total annual investment and outcome savings combined are $ 2,226,011.

- Those assigned to the drug court accounted for an estimated 38 fewer violent crimes, 71 fewer property crimes and 83 fewer drug or other "victimless' crimes during the 24-fmonth follow up period. The annu8al victimization cost savings due to the lower rates of recidivism of drug court participants are $ 1,120,886 for violent crimes (-38 x $ 29,497) and $ 64,823 (-71 x $ 913) for property rimes, or a total societal impact/victimization cost savings of $ 1,174,809.

- Total annual cost savings (investment, outcome and societal impact/victimization costs) resulting from the Douglas County Drug Court are $ 3,400,820 or $ 11,336 per drug court participant.

A Cost-Benefit Analysis of the St. Louis City Adult Felony Drug Court. City of St. Louis. 22nd Circuit. Institute of Applied Research. St. Louis, Missouri 2004.

Comparison of 219 drug court graduates before 2001 with carefully matched control group of 219 defendants convicted of drug crime who successfully completed probation resulted in the following findings:

(1) overall costs of the drug court (e.g., administration, supervision, drug and alcohol treatment, court hearings, urinalysis and pretrial detention) were $ 7,793 per graduate compared with $ 6,344 for successful probationer. The average per person drug court costs therefore exceeded those for probation by $1,449. ("The control group contained no individuals who were sentenced to prison. For this reason, the estimates of the study are conservative since drug court graduates with class A and class B felonies and those who are prior and persistent offenders would most likely have been sentenced to prison terms had they not been accepted into the Drug Court".) However, when costs of participation in later programs (e.g., food stamps, later drug and alcohol treatment services, prison terms for later offenses, etc.) were added for each group were added, and offsets were made to reflect the total dollars accrued from payment of taxes and FICA associated with post program employment, a net savings of $ 4,064 per drug court participant resulted;

(2) Various cost savings were noted for drug court graduates compared with probationers during and after drug court and probation, including:

X costs of jail time were less overall for drug court graduates
X costs of pretrial detention were dramatically less for drug court graduates
X wages of drug court graduates were higher during and after drug court.
X Drug court graduates also averaged significantly more months working than probationers, resulting in (1) higher taxes and FICA payments by drug court graduates; and (2) lower TANF and food stamps utilized by drug court graduates.
X Health care costs and mental health services were significantly lower for drug court graduates after drug court
X costs to the criminal justice system and costs to victims of crime were lower for drug court

graduates compared to probation completers

(3) Comparing the excess costs of drug court with the benefits after the drug court

X a net savings of $ 2,615 per graduate was found during the first 24 months after drug court or probation

X a total of $ 2.80 in outcome savings was realized for Missouri citizens for every $ 1.00 in additional costs of drug court during the first 24 months after drug court over probation

(4) Overall costs and Benefits for a four year period;
By projecting all follow-up costs and benefits for an additional 24 month period, the following calculations of costs and benefits were possible over a four year period:

X Net savings over four years after drug court or probation amounted to $ 7,707 per drug court participant (representing the expenses that would have been incurred by the taxpayer had these drug court clients attended regular probation)

X For every dollar in additional costs for drug court for the 219 drug court graduates, taxpayers realized a savings of $ 6.32 over the four-year period.

Phase II Douglas County [Nebraska] Drug Court Evaluation Report. Thomas J. Martin, Cassia C. Spohn, R.K. Piper, and Jill Robinson. 2004.

Findings from a recidivism and cost benefit study comparing criminal justice outcomes of offenders in drug court with offenders in County Attorney's pre-trial diversion program and offenders in traditional adjudication included:

Drug court results in average savings of over $ 4,000 per felony drug-related case compared with traditional adjudication and sentencing; savings mainly attributable to reduced jail confinement, prison incarceration costs, and county and district court processing costs (e.g., police overtime costs for court testimony).

***Malheur County, Oregon Adult Drug Court (S.A.F.E. Court) Cost Evaluation*. Final Report. NPC Research. July 2005.**

Average costs for females 2 years prior to drug court were $ 2,312.34 compared with $ 1,679.30 two years following drug court entry; average costs for ALL male participants two years prior to entry were lower (1,205.36 vs 2,612.84) than following program entry but mainly due to terminated participants and jail costs entailed. Costs for male graduates were reduced from $ 643.08 2 years prior to program entry to $ 261.80 2 years following program entry.

California Drug Courts: A Methodology for Determining Costs and Benefits: Phase II: Testing the Methodology. NPC Research. Shannon Carey, Dave Crumpton, Michael Finigan and Mark Waller. April 2006.

Eight of the nine sites showed outcome cost benefits ranging from $ 3,200 to over $ 20,000 saved per participant; Monterey Co: showed no cost benefit over time; "actually loses money on drug court participants".
Stanislaus and El Monte produce very high returns on investment (1: 16 and 1:36) in part because of low investment costs. San Joaquin saves money immediately by having lower investment costs than standard court processing. Only Monterey has no positive return on investment because drug court did not produce positive outcome results, likely due to operational problems.

Specific Findings: Average cost per participant
El Monte: $ 5,542.37 ($ 2,275.50 for treatment, jail sanction next) vs $ 5,283.51 traditional case process

Monterey: $ 8,173.93 (largest cost is treatment, then jail day sanctions) vs. $ 5,340.27
Orange Co.-Laguna Niguel: $ 19,799.59 (jail days pre or post DC, then case management highest costs) vs. $ 13,195.62- every dollar invested yields $ 1.50 return
Orange Co. – Santa Ana: $ 15,613.12 vs. 15,173.10; each $ invested produced $ 7.30 savings (in correctional costs)
San Joaquin Co.: $ 12,214.76 vs. 12,701.34. (72% of cost is jail days)- drug court approach produces 25% reduction in standard case processing);$4,801,427 saved each year at rate of 307 new participants annually)
Stanislaus Co.: $ 5,455.20 (treatment is largest cost) vs. $ 4,518.24 (court costs and jail costs); greatest savings were in probation costs (-77%), victimization costs (-63%), bookings (-44%) and jail days (-42%); every $ spent produced savings of $ 16.00

Clackamas County Juvenile Drug Court Enhancement: Process, Outcome/Impact and Cost Evaluation. Final Report. NPC Research. April 2006.

- Cost of program per day was less than most other referral options commonly used for high-risk youth in the county. ($ 66.26 for juvenile drug court compared to up to $ 183..65 per day for detention.
- in 2 years following entry, participants cost $ 961 less per participant than for similar individuals not in drug court. Terminated participants cost taxpayer $ 6,037 more than comparison group (due to detention costs) and graduates cost $ 10,958 less than comparison group.
- average cost for program was $ 23,656 per participant; savings for graduates were $ 10,958 per participant; and savings for all participants averaged $ 1000 per participants, taking into account increased costs for terminated participants

***Outcome Evaluation of the Jackson County Drug Court*. Williams Consulting. Silver Spring, MD. May 20, 2006.**

Comparing cost of drug court at $ 4,000 per participant and cost of eighteen months of incarceration for nondrug court participants @ $ 38/day, or $ 248,520, total cost for 12 graduates was $ 44,400 (taking into account fees paid by participants) compared with $ 248,520 for incarceration, results in a saving of $ 204,120.

***Kalamazoo County, Michigan Adult Drug Treatment Court. Outcome and Cost Evaluation.* Final Report. NPC Research. September 2006.**

Substantial cost savings/avoided costs resulting from fewer re-arrests, less probation time and fewer new court cases. Combined programs saved total of $ 593,154 over a two year period for persons entering the program during two year study period (2002-3). Savings can be anticipated to accrue over additional years.

***Barry County, Michigan Adult Drug Court. Outcome and Cost Evaluation.* Final Report. NPC Research. September 2006**

Cost savings for drug court participants of over $ 3,000 per participant over 2 year period as a result of fewer re-arrests, less probation time and fewer new court cases. Multiplying cost savings by 108 participants since program implementation, total savings have been $ 353,160. for first two years sine program entry. Can expect cost savings to continue following 2 year study period.

Superior Court of San Francisco County. California Drug Courts: Costs and Benefits. Shannon M. Carey.NPC Research. September 2008.

Average cost per drug court participant: $ 9,757; average cost per drug court graduate: $ 18,295 broken down as follows:

Arrest/booking:	$ 395
Drug court appearances:	$ 197.74 x 17.43 (graduates) or 14.02 (per participant)

Case management:	$ 3.82 x 218.49 days
Individual treatment:	$ 46.70 x 89.21 (or 40.59 per participant)
Group treatment:	$ 58.04 x 31.07 (or 11.29 average per participant)
Residential treatment per day:	$ 88.00 x 78.29 per graduate (or 32. 57 per average participant
Drug tests:	$ 8.75 x 86.84 per graduate (or 38.77 per average participant
Jail days as sanction:	$ 150 per day

Agency costs for drug court vs. traditional case process resulted in savings of $ 6,622.:

Superior Court:	$	339 vs. 1,294
District Attorney:		283 vs. 395
Defense Attorney:		485 vs. 601
Treatment agencies:		7,673 vs. 1.724
Probation:		583 vs 1, 855
Law enforcement:		394 vs. 10,510
Total:		$ 9,757 vs. 16,379

II. SAVINGS REPORTED IN STATE-WIDE PROGRAM EVALUATIONS AND RELATED REPORTS

Drug Court Partnership Act of 1998, Chapter 1007, Statutes of 1998.Final Report. Prepared by The California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs and Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts. March 2002.

A total of 425,014 jail days were avoided, with an averted cost of approximately $ 26 million.

A total of 227,894 prison days were avoided, with an averted cost of approximately $ 16 million.

T.K. Logan*, William Hoyt, and Carl Leukefeld. Kentucky Drug Court Outcome Evaluation: Behavior, Costs and Avoided Costs to Society. (Outcome Evaluation of Three Kentucky Drug Courts* (Jefferson, Fayette and Warren Counties). Center on Drug and Alcohol Research, University of Kentucky. October 2001.

Cost savings to the state of 586 graduates equals $ 7,060,900 (586 graduates x $ 14,691 [year in prison] = $ 8,609,100; 586 graduates x $ 2,642 [1 year in drug court] = $ 1,548,200.

Kentucky Drug Court Outcome Evaluation: Behaviors, Costs, and Avoided Costs to Society. Prepared by TK Logan, William Hoyt and Carl Leukefeld. Center on Drug and Alcohol Research. University of Kentucky. October 2001.

- Annual cost of a drug court graduate ($ 2,642 accounting cost and $ 4,140 accounting and opportunity (e.g., judge, police, jail, etc.) costs is much less than the annual cost of housing an individual in jail ($ 9,600) or prison ($ 14,691) and not much higher than the annual cost of supervising an individual on probation ($ 1,237) in Kentucky; total avoided costs of "benefits" for graduates is estimated to be $ 4,364,114 when earnings are considered, and $ 2,584,562 without the earnings for a one year period…

- For every dollar spent on a drug court graduate, there was an avoided cost savings of $ 3.30 to $ 5.58 per graduate in a one yea period when only accounting costs were considered, and a cost savings of $ 2.11 to $ 3.546 per graduate in a one yea period when opportunity costs were included;
- When both graduates and terminators were included there is an estimated savings of $ 6,199 per client when earnings were included, and a savings of$3,059 in a one year period without the earnings per client using accounting costs. When the opportunity costs for Drug Court program graduates and terminators combined were used, there was an estimated savings of $ 4,826 per participant when earnings were included, and a savings of $ 1,686 per participant without the earnings in a one year period.
- For every dollar spent on a drug court participant (graduates and terminators) there was an avoided cost savings of $ 2.26 to $ 3.56 per participant in a one year period when only accounting costs were considered, and a cost savings of $ 1.44 to $ 2.27 per participant in a one yea period when opportunity costs were included.
- Results for terminators were less pronounced than for the graduates. However, for most outcome measures, there does seem to be a gain…reductions in undesirable behavior and increases in desirable behavior, except for time in prison and child support deficits.

.

***Washington State's Drug Courts for Adult Defendants: Outcome Evaluation and Cost-Benefit Analysis.* Washington State Institute for Public Policy. March 2003**

Analyzed costs of five drug court programs in Thurston, Kitsap, Pierce, Skagit, Spokane, and Thurston Counties during 1997 and 1998 in thee categories: court-related processing costs associated with court operations (judge, staff, clerk, prosecutor and Public defender); direct costs associated with drug court administrator and drug court funds for treatment, urinalysis and other costs associated with the drug court; and "sanctions-related costs associated with disposition of the charge that made defendant eligible for drug court". Findings included:

X Superior Court Processing Costs: costs per drug court defendant were $ 3,206 compared with $ 1,717 for traditional processing;
X Drug Court specific costs: Costs per drug court defendant were $ 4,427.
X Sanctions related costs per defendant were $ 5,618 (jail and community supervision differences); drug court participants used an average of 57 jail days compared with 90 days for "opt outs"

Drug court defendant therefore costs $ 7,633 compared to $ 1,717 for traditional processing. Drug court therefore costs an additional $ 5,916 additional for average drug court participant. This cost was then measured against benefits of reduced recidivism, calculated as follows:

X	criminal justice costs avoided per drug court participant:	$ 3,759
X	crime victim costs avoided per drug court participant:	$ 3,020
	Total crime-related costs avoided per drug court participant:	$ 6,779
	Costs of the drug court (total added cost per participant):	$ 3,891
	Net gain(loss) per drug court participant:	$ 2,888
	Benefit-to-cost ratio:	$ 1.74

Study conclusions included: Drug courts are more expensive to operate than regular criminal courts (e.g., $ 3,891 more per participant); overall, drug courts produce more benefits than costs:..."We found that the five adult drug

courts generate $ 1.74 in benefits for each dollar of costs. . . As with any business, however, a key to profitability is keeping costs under control–drug courts must control operating costs in order to provide a positive cost-benefit return for taxpayers"

Oklahoma Drug Courts: Fiscal Years 2002 and 2003. **Report Prepared by: The Oklahoma Criminal Justice Resource Center. January 2004.**

If all 1,666 drug court participants [in 19 drug courts operating in 21 counties] studied would have otherwise served their sentence in prison, the overall 4-year cost savings of drug court vs. prison was: $ 45,552,798; if all 1,666 drug court participants would have otherwise served standard probation sentences (@ $ 725 per person per year), the 4-year costs of drug court were $ 4,334,599 more than the costs for standard probation.

Average monthly income of drug court 247 drug court graduates during July 2001-June 2003 (in 19 drug courts operating in 21 counties) increased 50.4% (from $ 949.14 to $ 1,426.55).

Yearly cost per person of drug court was $ 2,325; total first year cost for 1,666 drug court participants was: $ 3,873.450;

Yearly cost per inmate of prison was: $ 16,482.; annual costs for 1,666 drug court participants in prison for first year would have been: $ 27,459,012; savings resulting from drug court for first year was: $ 23,585,562

Drug Courts in the State of Wyoming: A Process and Outcome Evaluation. Report to the Wyoming Department of Health, Substance Abuse Division. **Laurel Parker West, Ph.D., Tiffany Comer Cook., Wyoming Survey and Analysis Center. University of Wyoming. October 2004**

Study of state's nine adult, six juvenile and two tribal drug courts found that Drug courts are less costly alternative to traditional incarceration; average cost per day for drug court client is $ 18.59-25.63; average cost for incarceration for adults is $ 85.99 and $ 149.52 for juveniles

Analysis of Oklahoma Drug Courts: Fiscal Years 2002 – 2004**. Oklahoma Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services. March 2005**.

Analyzed data from 25 adult drug and DUI courts operating in 30 counties in Oklahoma, including participants who were active July 1, 2001 – June 30, 2004, totaling 2,307 participants If all 2,307 offenders would have serviced their sentence in prison, overall 4-year cost savings of drug court vs. prison is $ 64,805,293; ODMHSAS has now requested funding to increase drug court capacity in state from 1,575 by 3,229 to total 4,804 drug court slots and projects cumulative cost savings of $ 314,250,347 over 4 years; [annual cost per drug court participant = $ 2,325; annual cost for prison = $ 16,842.

California Drug Courts: Outcomes, Costs and Promising Practices: An Overview of Phase II Study Results. *NPC Research, Shannon M. Carey, Michael W. Finigan, David Crumpton, Mark Waller,Francine Byrne.* September 2005 (interim). Review of costs for graduates and all participants in 9 California courts:

(1) Investment costs per participant not always much more than traditional court processing

Cost- Benefits/Costs Avoided Reported By Drug Court Programs BJA Drug Court Clearinghouse, a program of the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice**. April 10**, 2009

CJ	Invstmt/DC partic	Invstmnt/nonDC	Cost Ben
Arrest	192.91	192.91	0
Booking	284.34	284.34	0
Court	681.54	678.50	+ $3
Treatment	2,713.32	2,009.18	+704
Jail	1,610.89	2,782.55	-1,171
Probation:	513.64	1,421.84	- 908
Total cost	**5,927.80**	**7,369.32**	**-1,442**

(2) Average net investment cost per participant: $ 1392

agency	invst/per partic	range
sup ct	464	(79) –(898)
DA	235	103-(523)
Pub D	279	(76) –(448)
Prob	697	2,143-(632)
Treat	1918	706-3808
La Enf	44	1060-(1033)
Corrs.	0	0

(3) Net outcome benefits: $ 11,000 per participant ($ 3200 – 15,200 range)

agency	avg net outcome benef/partic	range
Sup. Ct	(46)	342-(277)
DA	(12)	148-(106)
Pub Def	(19)	171 – (103)
Prob	(53)	474 – (650)
Trmt	637	336- (59)
Law Enf	(1,525)	620 – (3,619)
Corrects	(3,292)	(541) – (5377)

-

(4) overall cost- benefits combined for all 9 sites: $ 9,032,626

***Assembly Bill 29 "Specialty Court Funding": 2005 Report to the Legislative Counsel Bureau.* Prepared by the Administrative Office of the Courts.**

"…. Specialty Courts now have over 2,000 participants. If just one-third of those clients were to be incarcerated in state facilities the cost would be over twelve and one half million dollars per year. Other advantage to the state and local governments include less people under state care, the workload for family and child services is reduced and increases in then tax paying work force as former clients become employed."

***Evaluation of Ohio's Drug Courts: A Cost Benefit Analysis.* Deborah Koetzle Shaffer Kristin Bechtel and Edward J. Latessa. Center for Criminal Justice Research. University of Cincinnati. December 2005.**

Study conducted under contract with Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services to assess whether drug courts save taxpayer dollars as either a less expensive sentencing option or through reductions in recidivism. Population studied consisted of: 496 drug court/probation participants; 386 drug court/parole participants; 356 drug court/halfway house participants; and 488 drug court/"CBCF" participants. Drug Court/treatment group selected from five felony level drug courts and comparison group consisted of probationers and parolees in Ohio, selected/matched according to selected characteristics: county of conviction; presence of substance abuse problem; and felony level charges;

then matched on gender, race and age; Drug Court participants selected from 5 drug courts: Butler County, Hamilton County, Mahoning County, Richland County and Stark County (selected because included in previous U of C outcome evaluations and were among oldest drug courts in Ohio).

Comparison group consisted of probationers and parolees in Ohio, selected/matched according to selected characteristics: county of conviction; presence of substance abuse problem; and felony level charges; then matched on gender, race and age; probationers included those who received outpatient treatment services and those who received community based services (CBCF), and parolees who had been in halfway house.

Principal Findings: Felony level drug courts in Ohio are generally effective (in terms of recidivism two years following termination) and cost less than alternative sanctions that involve placing offenders into residential facilities. Drug Court were not significantly more effective than probation, particularly if treatment services were provided to probationers.

Indiana Drug Courts: A Summary of Evaluation Findings in Five Adult Programs. NPC Research. April 2007. [evaluation of impact of five [unnamed] adult drug courts operating during January 2002 – June 2004]

All five programs showed cost savings showed cost savings due to reduced recidivism for drug court participants. The average cost savings over the 2-year follow-up period to the local agencies and state ranged from $ 314 to $ 7,040 per participant. These savings are due to positive drug court participant outcomes including fewer re-arrests, fewer court cases, less probation time, less jail time, and less prison time relative to the comparison group. Other less tangible but important savings that were not factored into these costs include an increase in the number of drug-free babies born, a decrease in health care expenses, and drug court participants working and paying taxes. Overall, across all five courts and based n the number of clients served to date, the outcome savings to local agencies and to the state of Indiana was greater than seven million dollars (this translates to 3.5 million saved per year.).

Andrew Ferguson et al. Department of Sociology. University of Southern Maine. A Process and Site-Specific Outcome Evaluation of Maine's Adult Drug Treatment Court Programs August 1, 2006

(1) Adult drug court has generated net correctional savings of $ 11,243,726 in cost savings based on incarceration costs that would have been incurred

(2) For every dollar spent in drug court, overall net correctional savings of $ 3.30

Paul A. Anton. Wilder Research. ***Benefit-Cost Calculations for Three Adult Drug Courts in Minnesota. A repot to the Office of Justice Programs. August 2007.***

Review of adult drug courts in Stearns, Dodge, and St. Louis counties indicated: $ 5.08 of benefit for every dollar of operating cost; total benefits for the study period estimated to be $ 6.8 million; and total costs for the program were approximately $ 1.3 million. Benefits generated are from (1) saved costs from processing an incarcerating drug court participants; (2) reduced law enforcement cost and crime victim costs; and (3) reduced public costs from fewer subsequent convictions for other crimes.

III. GENERAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM SAVINGS RESULTING FROM RECIDIVISM AND OTHER REDUCTIONS

Additional findings regarding, prosecution, jail and prison cost savings achieved through drug court programs and associated recidivism reductions are presented in independent evaluations conducted of drug court programs, including the following:

NPC Research, Inc. and Administrative Office of the Courts. Judicial Council of California. *California Drug Courts: A Methodology for Determining Costs and Avoided Costs. Phase I: Building the Methodology. Final Report.* October 2002.

Case studies of three adult drug courts (first phase of a three phased statewide study) indicated the following:

"(1) Total avoided system costs:. . .

Court One: . . . Negative avoided costs experienced in Year 1 due to large initial investment in the drug court ($ 667,800) which was not outweighed by the $ 129,493 in net avoided costs realized in the first year (not including victimization costs). However, Court One realizes avoided costs in Years 2-4 of approximately $ 200,000 per year and, by Year 4, the court has paid off the initial investment and is realizing costs savings. if the trend in avoided costs continues, Court One will recognize additional avoided costs each subsequent year of approximately $ 200,000 per year for every 100 participants) and, by the ninth year, Court One would realize $ 1,000,000 saved for every 100 drug court participants. . . .

(2) Investments and Avoided Costs of Drug Court By Agency. . .

*"**Court 1 Investments and Avoided Costs by Agency over Four Years (Per 100 participants)**"*

Agency	***Investment***	***Cost Avoidance***
Superior Court	*$ 99,353*	*$ 1,166*
District Attorney	*$ 36,550*	*-$ 579*
Public Defender	*-$ 7,644*	*-$2,050*

Agency	***Investment***	***Cost Avoidance***
Probation	*$ 109,865*	*$ 24,174*
Law Enforcement	*$ 141,060`*	*$ 100,281*
Cal. Department of Corrections	*$0*	*$ 584,945*
Victimization Costs		*$ 695,000*[11]
Total Criminal Justice System	***$ 379,184***	***$ 1,399,187***

When the investment of the criminal justice system in Court I in drug court is taken as a whole and compared to costs avoided (and victimization costs to the taxpayer are included), the return is well worth the

[11] This figure assumes that an average of four crimes of these types were committed for every one that resulted in an arrest (based on the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics *National Crime Victimization Survey*). The National Institute of Justice's *Victim Costs and Consequences: A New Look* documents losses per criminal victimization, including attempts, in a number of categories, including fatal crimes, child abuse, rape and sexual assault, other assaults, robbery, drunk driving, arson, larceny, burglary, and motor vehicle theft. The reported costs include lost productivity, medical care, mental health care, police and fire services, victim services, property loss and damage, and quality of life. In our study, re-arrest charges (i.e, charges incurred after the initial drug court eligible charge) were tracked and categorized as either violent or property crimes. Costs from the victimization study were averaged for rape and sexual assault, other assaults, and robbery and attempted robbery to create an estimated cost for violent crimes. Arson, larceny and attempted larceny, burglary and attempted burglary, and moor vehicle theft were averaged for an estimated property crime cost. National Institute of Justice Research Report, *Victim Costs and Consequences: A New Look* (January 1996).

investment. Yet, an examination of the specific criminal justice agencies reveals an uneven picture. Superior court, probation and law enforcement experienced some cost avoidance after four years but do not recoup their initial investments. Law enforcement almost recovers its investment and probably would have if the study time frame had been longer. It is clear that the biggest beneficiary due to drug court is the California Department of Corrections, which has no investment costs in drug courts, but saves more than half a million dollars for every 100 individuals who enter drug court.. . Although the system as a whole is experiencing a savings, the individual agencies that invest the most in drug court are not the agencies that experience the cost savings. . . "

Judicial Council of California. Administrative Office of the Courts. Report. Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee. Progress Report. February 7, 2003.

Key findings of Phase I of statewide cost study of adult drug courts included:

X avoided criminal justice costs averaged approximately $ 200,000 annually per court for each 100 participants;

X all drug courts in study showed cost avoidance for trial courts after the first year of operation; two of the three courts studied showed reduced trial court costs beginning in first year and conservatively estimated for each court to be approximately $ 50,000 over the course of the study;

X with 90 adult drug courts operating statewide as of 2002, and drug court caseloads conservatively estimated at 100 participants per year, annual statewide cost savings for adult drug courts suggested by the data is $ 18 million per year

Okamoto Consulting Group. ***First Circuit Court, State of Hawaii-Hawaii Drug Court Program***.

Analysis of the cost benefits achieved as a result of the first 40 graduates of the Honolulu, Hawaii Drug Court, established in 1996, found that 43% of them would have been incarcerated for periods ranging between 1 year 11 months and two years six months had they not entered the drug court. The estimated cost for their incarceration was over $ 945,160.00, based on an annual cost for incarceration of $ 27,740 per inmate. The remaining 57% would have been referred to probation. The monthly cost for providing services to each drug court client was $ 484.61, or a total of $ 6,784.54 for an average of 14 months of services.

Richard Washouski, Recovery Solutions Consulting and Training Inc., and Henry G. Pirowski with Jose Ferrer. City of Buffalo, New York: ***Buffalo Drug Treatment Court. Process Evaluation.*** **2001.**

The Buffalo City Court District Attorneys Bureau Chief has indicated that it appears that the BDTC has reduced police overtime, witness costs, as well as grand jury expenses that would otherwise be r4equired if these cases proceeded in the traditional manner.

Thomas B. Fomby and Vasudha Rangaprasad. Divert Court of Dallas County: Cost Benefit Analysis. August 31, 2002

Evaluation of the Dallas County "Divert" (Drug Court) Program indicated a benefit-cost ration of 9.43-1 – e.g., on average, every additional dollar spent on drug treatment in Divert Court resulted in a reduction of $ 9.43 in costs to society over a 40-month period.

T.K. Logan, ***William Hoyt, and Carl Leukefeld. Kentucky Drug Court Outcome Evaluation: Behavior, Costs and Avoided Costs to Society. (Outcome Evaluation of Three Kentucky Drug Courts*** **(Jefferson, Fayette and Warren Counties). Center on Drug and Alcohol Research, University of Kentucky. October 2001.**

Avoided criminal justice costs (savings) for each dollar spent for drug court graduates (total of 586 graduates studied) were $ 2.56.

Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee: Annual Progress Report. **Judicial Council of California. February 7, 2003.**

The report reviews recent data regarding cost-benefit analysis of collaborative justice courts conducted by the Administrative Office of the Courts. Findings from the initial Phase I of drug courts operating in three counties (Los Angeles, San Diego, and Butte Counties), conducted by Northwest Professional Consortium included:

X avoided overall criminal justice system costs averaged approximately $ 200,000 annually per court for each 100 participants;

- all drug courts in the study demonstrated cost avoidance for trial courts, specifically, after the first year of operation. Two of the three courts studied also showed reduced trial court costs that began in the first year and were estimated for each court to be approximately $ 50,000 over the course of the study.
- With 90 adult drug courts operating in California as of 2002, and the drug court caseloads conservatively estimated at 100 participants per year, the annual statewide cost savings for adult drug courts are projected to be $ 18 million per year based on the results of the study.

- *Coconino County (Arizona) DUI/Drug Court Evaluation*. Prepared by Frederic I. Solop, Nancy A. Wonders et al. Social Research Laboratory. Northern Arizona University. May 20003.

DUI/Drug court is more cost effective than the traditional criminal justice process….the average DUI/Drug Court participant costs Coconino County approximately $ 6,408, which takes approximately 12 months, compared with a cost of $ 22,740 for defendants in the traditional process which takes 2-3 years [see section I above for more detailed computation on which this finding is based]

A Detailed Cost Analysis in a Mature Drug Court Setting: A Cost-Benefit Evaluation of the Multnomah County Drug Court**. NPC Research, Shannon Carey, Ph.D., and Michael Finigan, Ph.D. Inc. July 2003.**

The study collected highly detailed data on a small, randomly selected sample of individuals eligible for the drug court. These individuals (some of whom participated in the drug court and some who received traditional court processing) were tracked intensively through both the criminal justice and drug court treatment system. The detailed data was collected by tracking drug court eligible offenders into court sessions, attorney visits and treatment sessions. This detailed information was then used to supplement the administrative data gathered on a larger sample consisting of 1,167 individuals who were eligible for the drug court (594 actually participated) and 573 non-drug ++court participants. These two groups were matched on demographics and criminal history. Data was collected on the use of resources for each individual in each agency involved in the drug court, including the court, the public defender, the district attorney, law enforcement, probation, drug court treatment, and treatment received by both groups outside of the drug court. Total costs to the system/taxpayer were calculated, including "investment" and outcome costs for both the drug court and" business-as-usual" process, for 30 months after the drug court eligible arrest.

The overall results of the study were:

X The "total investment cost per client of the drug court was $ 1,441.52 less than the funds expended

per client for the "business as usual" process. Savings also resulted in outcome costs ($ 2,328.89 per participant) although these savings were not spread equally among the agencies. Total cost savings over a 30-month period, including victimization costs, averaged $ 5,071.57 per drug court participant.

X The study also noted that, during the 30 months after the drug court eligible arrest, the public defender, law enforcement, and probation agencies experienced cost savings; the court, the District Attorney, and the treatment agency did not recoup their investment although the loss to the court and the district attorney was quite small and these agencies would likely have recouped their investments if the participants had been followed through the system longer and the outcome trends continued so that they would begin to see cost savings. However, in the short term, these agencies are excellent candidates for financial support from local county government or state and federal grants in order to offset the higher investment costs.

The study also addressed the following questions commonly asked by policy makers:

X *Does it cost more for drug court than for "business as usual"?*

No. The total investment cost by the agencies involved in the drug court (e.g., the court, district attorney's office, the public defender, law enforcement, corrections, and treatment) averaged $ 5,927.80 per participant compared with $ 7,369.32 per participant for "business as usual – $ 1,441.53 more. Thus, the drug court approach actually saved the taxpayer money in investment costs. This was in a large part due to the use of jail and probation time for "business-as-usual" processing and is also due to significant use of treatment and court resources.

! *Do agencies save money up-front from drug court vs. "business as usual"?*

Yes. Law enforcement/corrections and the public defender's office received an immediate savings from the drug court approach. All agencies saved money in outcomes.

! *Are there cost savings in outcomes due to drug court processing?*

Yes. When the outcome costs for drug court participants are compared to the outcome costs for "business as usual", the drug court saved an average of $ 2,328.89 per year for each participant. With victimization costs added, the average savings were $ 3,596.92 per participant.

! *What are the total cost savings (investment and outcomes) that can be attributed to the drug court process?*

Combining the outcome cost savings with the investment savings, over a 30-month period, the drug court was found to have saved an average of $ 5,071.57 per participant including victimization costs. Multiplied by the 300 participants who enter the Multnomah County drug court each year, this is a $ 1,521,471 cost saving for the local taxpayers each year. ...These savings relate to local taxpayer costs only and exclude any state or federal costs that might be saved by lessened welfare payments or Medicaid or by increased tax revenue from increased employment.

Adult Drug Courts: Evidence Indicates Recidivism Reductions and Mixed Results for Other Outcomes. U.S Government Accountability Office. February 2005

Cost- Benefits/Costs Avoided Reported By Drug Court Programs. BJA Drug Court Clearinghouse, a program of the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. April 10, 2009

Based on a review of 27 drug court evaluation reports for 39 drug courts, selected by GAO staff for their methodological soundness and other factors, four of seven adult drug court program evaluations provided sufficient cost and benefit data to estimate net benefits. Although cost of six of the programs was greater than costs to provide criminal justice services to comparison group., all seven programs yielded positive net benefits, primarily from reductions in recidivism affecting judicial system costs and avoided costs to potential victims. Financial cost savings for the criminal justice system (taking into account recidivism reductions) were found in two of the seven programs.

IV ESTIMATED REDUCTIONS IN CRIMINAL ACTIVITY

Substantial reductions in recidivism are being reported by jurisdictions which have implemented drug court programs, based on various measures, most notably the following:

X significantly lower arrest and conviction rates for both drug court participants and graduates

Recidivism rates for graduates continue to be significantly reduced, ranging between 1 - 20 percent for graduates, with additional (though lesser) with reductions for defendants who participated but did not complete the programs. (See Drug Court Statistical "update". December 2000). In December 1999, Columbia University's National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse (CASA) released findings from their second major academic review and analysis of evaluations of drug court programs. Based on a review of over 75 programs, the CASA report found that recidivism for participants while in the drug court program continues to remain low for graduates. The *Multnomah County, Oregon Regional Drug Impact Index*, July 2000, found that half of the arrestees eligible for drug court but never attended treatment were re-arrested after one year. The Oregon Judicial Department reported that the Lane County (Eugene), Oregon Drug Court resulted in an overall decrease of over 82% in rearrests for drug court program graduates, reflecting a decrease of over 95% in felony arrests, over 86% in misdemeanor arrests, and over 90% in DUI arrests and traffic charges.

X significantly reduced — and, in most cases, eliminated -- drug use, indicated by drug test results

Results of drug tests — weekly or more often — indicate substantial reductions in drug usage by drug court participants. Positive tests are generally 18% overall, decreasing as the period of program participation increases. Positive drug tests for defendants under probation supervision -- much less frequent if conducted at all -- are reported to be at least three times higher.

Drug Court Partnership Act of 1998, Chapter 1007, Statutes of 1998.Final Report. Prepared by The California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs and Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts. March 2002.

In addition to justice system cost savings, the report also noted other benefits resulting which have cost implications, including:

X participant arrest rates 85% lower in the two years after entering drug court than in the two years prior to entering the drug court (based on reports from 17 counties);

X participant conviction rate 77% lower in the two years after entering drug court than in the two years prior to entering drug court (based on reports from 17 counties)

X participant incarceration rates 83 % lower in the two years after entering drug court than in the two years prior to entering drug court

X 96% of drug tests of participants during drug court were negative;

Washington State's Drug Courts for Adult Defendants: Outcome Evaluation and Cost-Benefit Analysis. Washington State Institute for Public Policy. March 2003

Analyzed costs of five drug court programs in Thurston, Kitsap, Pierce, Skagit, Spokane, and Thurston Counties during 1997 and 1998 in thee categories: court-related processing costs associated with court operations (judge, staff, clerk, prosecutor and Public defender); direct costs associated with drug court administrator and drug court funds for treatment, urinalysis and other costs associated with the drug court; and "sanctions-related costs associated with disposition of the charge that made defendant eligible for drug court". Findings included overall reduction in recidivism for three year period, starting at time of program entry, was 13%, with cost benefits calculated as follows:

X	criminal justice costs avoided per drug court participant:	$ 3,759
X	crime victim costs avoided per drug court participant:	$ 3,020
	Total crime-related costs avoided per drug court participant:	$ 6,779
	Costs of the drug court (total added cost per participant):	$ 3,891
	Net gain(loss) per drug court participant:	$ 2,888
	Benefit-to-cost ratio:	$ 1.74

V. ESTIMATED RATE OF EMPLOYMENT FOR DRUG COURT GRADUATES (vs. Public Assistance)

Less than half of drug court participants were employed either full or part-time at the time of program entry. Many were on public assistance. Most drug courts require participants to be employed or engaged in fulltime study as a condition of graduation and report that over 90% were employed by the time of graduation.

Drug Court Partnership Act of 1998, Chapter 1007, Statutes of 1998.Final Report. Prepared by The California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs and Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts. March 2002.

Seventy percent of drug court graduates were employed when they completed the drug court (compared with 62% unemployment rate at time of program entry.) based on reports from 28 counties.

Richard Washouski, Recovery Solutions Consulting and Training Inc., and Henry G. Pirowski with Jose Ferrer. City of Buffalo, New York: *Buffalo Drug Treatment Court. Process Evaluation.* 2001.

The Buffalo Drug Treatment Court also reports that a substantial percentage of the participants who came into the program unemployed and on public assistance have become employed while in the program and are now self supporting. In addition, many participants who are employed at the time of program entry are able to maintain their employment, despite their arrest, because of their program participation.

T.K. Logan*, William Hoyt, and Carl Leukefeld. Kentucky Drug Court Outcome Evaluation: Behavior, Costs and Avoided Costs to Society. (Outcome Evaluation of Three Kentucky Drug Courts* (Jefferson, Fayette and Warren Counties). Center on Drug and Alcohol Research, University of Kentucky. October 2001.

Avoided costs (savings) for each dollar spent for drug court graduates (586 graduates studied) resulting from the earnings of these graduates were $ 5.58.

VI. IMPACT OF PARENTS' PARTICIPATION IN DRUG COURT ON THEIR CHILDREN AND CHILD SUPPORT OBLIGATIONS

Over 3,500 drug court participants who were parents of minor children were able to regain custody of their minor children as a result of participating in the drug court. These children had previously been cared for by relatives or in foster care. Over 4,500 additional drug court participants who were in arrears for child support payments at the time of program entry have become current in these payments.

In February 1999, the Buffalo City Drug Court estimated that the financial benefits derived from foster care savings for 30 children of 143 drug court graduates who were returned to their parents totaled $ 488,010. In addition, child support arrearage payments for 16 children of the 143 graduates studied totaled $ 96,000.00.

Drug Court Partnership Act of 1998, Chapter 1007, Statutes of 1998.Final Report. Prepared by The California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs and Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts. March 2002.

Twenty-eight percent of graduates retained or regained custody of their children; 7% gained visitation rights with them; and 8% of graduates became current in their child support payments. (information not available regarding universe of those graduates who fell into these categories).

95% (132) of the babies born to drug court participants while in the drug court were born drug free (based on reports from 28 counties)

T.K. Logan, *William Hoyt, and Carl Leukefeld. Kentucky Drug Court Outcome Evaluation: Behavior, Costs and Avoided Costs to Society. (Outcome Evaluation of Three Kentucky Drug Courts* (Jefferson, Fayette and Warren Counties). Center on Drug and Alcohol Research, University of Kentucky. October 2001.

Cost savings realized from each dollar spent for drug court graduates (total of 586 graduates) in regard to child support payments made were $ 3.30.

VII. ESTIMATED SAVINGS IN MEDICAL AND RELATED COSTS

Reductions in medical and related costs resulting from drug court programs evident through several indicators, most notably:

X birth of drug free babies

Well over 3,000 drug free babies have been reported born to drug court participants. Experts estimate that the care and treatment for each child born addicted to drugs costs at a minimum of $ 250,000 for the first year of life, with additional medical and related costs accruing in subsequent years and estimated to be as high as $ 750,000

per child by age 18.[12]

The Buffalo City Drug Court conducted a study, in conjunction with the Erie County Division of Social Services, of 236 graduates as of January 2001, and noted, among other savings, the following:

X out of 156 participants who had open social service cases (Medicaid, food stamps, and /or public assistance) when they enrolled in the drug court, 75 (involving 61 individuals) had such cases closed;

X 68 children who were in foster care were returned to their parents;

X 47 crack free babies were born to drug court participants, estimated to represent a cost saving of $ 20,000 per birth costs-only that would otherwise have been expended for a drug addicted baby.

X 38 Child Protective Services cases were closed;

X 81 children involved with Child Protective Services were allowed to return to their homes;

X 9 children were removed from social service rolls due to increased child support from their parent (who was a drug court graduate); and

X more than $ 48,000 was collected in back child support payments

The gross costs Erie County will avoid over the next five years are estimated at over $ 5,000,000.

A Cost-Benefit Analysis of the St. Louis City Adult Felony Drug Court. City of St. Louis. 22nd Circuit. Institute of Applied Research. St. Louis, Missouri 2004.

"...The costs associated with infants who were born drug-exposed were greater for [traditional probation] completers than [drug court] graduates. Among babies born to probation completers in the control group, six were identified as drug exposed leading to an average 24-month cost of $ 789 per completer. One drug-exposed infant was found among graduates for an average 24-month cost of $ 132."

X <u>referral to treatment for infectious diseases</u>

Data is just beginning to be compiled on the frequency with which drug court participants are being referred for treatment of infectious diseases identified during drug court screening. The public health savings accrued through these referrals should be substantial.

VIII. <u>OTHER SYSTEM COST SAVINGS</u>

Drug courts are achieving substantial cost savings in a number of other areas, including:

X <u>savings in probation supervision costs</u>

Costs for intensive probation for supervision services only (i.e., no treatment or other support services) have been estimated at $ 7,200.00. Costs for routine probation (i.e., less frequent contacts) have averaged $

---

[12] See *INFORMATION RELEVANT TO FEMALE PARTICIPANTS IN DRUG COURTS: Summary Overview* .BJA Drug Court Clearinghouse Project . February 14, 2004.

4,700.00 per year.[13] Per person cost for drug court participation is generally less than the cost for probation, with significantly enhanced services and supervision provided.

X Other criminal justice system savings

A comprehensive analysis of the impact oaf the Multnomah County (Portland), Oregon Drug Court found that for every $ 1 spent on the drug court resulted in a savings of $ 2.50 in criminal justice system costs. In addition to jail savings, the Finigan report calculated the resultant criminal justice system cost savings from the drug court program and the associated recidivism reductions as follows: arrest costs: $ 1,850 per arrest; adjudication costs: $ 1,192; and supervision costs: $ 2,117. When broader cost savings (including victimization and theft costs) were considered, Finigan calculated the savings to be at least $ 10 for every $ 1 expended, based on the costs of increased police protection, victimization, medical assistance, food stamps and other public assistance that would have been needed. [14]

Multnomah County's *Drug Impact Index*, July 2000, noted that direct savings from the drug court, including theft and costs to victims, totaled $ 5.60 per dollar spent.

The Oregon Judicial Department reports a total annual judicial process savings of $ 2,344,946 (in addition to jail/prison days saved) as a result of the Lane County (Eugene), Oregon Drug Court, including of the following:

Crime Lab Testing Savings	$ 27,000.00
Grand Jury Savings	57,999.00
Court Process Time Savings:	
Motions to Suppress Evidence Savings:	111,000.00
Trial Savings (including juror costs)	71,400.00
Parole and Probation Cost Avoidance	1,226,947.00

Further cost benefit findings from a 2003 study were as follows:

A Detailed Cost Analysis in a Mature Drug Court Setting: A Cost-Benefit Evaluation of the Multnomah County Drug Court. NPC Research, Inc. Shannon Carey, Michael Finigan. July 2003

Study of investment costs and benefits of drug court program; compares use of public resources for drug court clients and for sample of drug court eligible "business as usual" serviced clients.

- Total investment cost per client in drug court was less ($ 1,441.52) than investment cost per client in business as usual process.
  - money saved in outcome costs ($ 2,328.89 per participant) although savings not spread equally among agencies;

---

[13]National Institute of Justice. Joan Petersilia and Susan Turner. "Evaluating Intensive Supervision Probation/Parole: Results of a Nationwide Experiment. May 1993

[14]Michael Finigan. *Multnomah County S.T.O.P. Drug Diversion Program*. 1998**.**

- total savings over 30 –month period, including victimization costs, averaged $ 4,788.88 per drug court participant

Research Questions and Findings;

(1) Does it cost more for drug court than business as usual? No: total investment in drug court averaged $ 5,927.80 per participant compared with $ 7,369.32 for business as usual. Business as usual offender cost $ 1,441.52 more than drug court

(2) Do agencies save money upfront from drug court vs businesses usual? Yes. Law enf /corrections and public defender receive immediate savings. All agencies saved money in outcomes.

(3) Are there cost savings in outcomes due to drug court processing? Yes. When outcomes costs for drug court participants compared with outcome costs for business as usual offenders, drug court saved an average of $ 2,328.89 per year per participant. With victimization costs added, average savings were $ 3,596.92 per participant

(4) What are total cost savings (investment and outcomes) attributed to drug court process? Combining outcome cost savings with investment savings over 30-month period, drug court saved average of 4 4,788.88 per participant including victimization costs. Multiplied by 300 participants who enter each year, this is $ 1,434,000 in cost savings for local tax payers –which is the "bottom line" difference in cost to the system of drug court participants vs cost for nondrug court participants

- money saved in outcome costs ($ 2,328.89 per participant) although savings not spread equally among agencies;
- total savings over 30 –month period, including victimization costs, averaged $ 4,788.88 per drug court participant

X Domestic Violence

T.K. Logan, *William Hoyt, and Carl Leukefeld. Kentucky Drug Court Outcome Evaluation: Behavior, Costs and Avoided Costs to Society. (Outcome Evaluation of Three Kentucky Drug Courts* (Jefferson, Fayette and Warren Counties). Center on Drug and Alcohol Research, University of Kentucky. October 2001.

Avoided costs (savings) in the area of domestic violence for each dollar spent for drug court graduates (total of 586 graduates studied) were $ 2.72.

X Accidents

T.K. Logan, *William Hoyt, and Carl Leukefeld. Kentucky Drug Court Outcome Evaluation: Behavior, Costs and Avoided Costs to Society. (Outcome Evaluation of Three Kentucky Drug Courts* (Jefferson, Fayette and Warren Counties). Center on Drug and Alcohol Research, University of Kentucky. October 2001.

Avoided costs (savings) in regard to accidents for each dollar spent for drug court graduates (total of 586 graduates studied) were $ 2.72.

o Other public services

Drug Court Partnership Act of 1998, Chapter 1007, Statutes of 1998.Final Report. Prepared by The California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs and Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts. March 2002.

In addition to justice system cost savings, the report also noted other benefits resulting which have cost implications, including:

X 20% of the participants obtained drivers licenses and car insurance (based on reports from 28 counties)

X 12% transitioned out of homelessness and acquired housing

IX PARTICIPANT FEES COLLECTED (in addition to insurance, medicaid and/or other funds received for drug court services)

***2000 Drug Court Survey Report; Program Operations, Services and Participant Perspectives.*. OJP Drug Court Clearinghouse and Technical Assistance Project. American University. November 2001. Final Draft**

The percentage of assessed drug court fees collected by drug court programs has increased from 67% in 1997 to 75% in 2000. The total fees collected by the 45 programs which reported this information [in the survey] was almost $ 3,000,000.

Drug Court Partnership Act of 1998, Chapter 1007, Statutes of 1998.Final Report. Prepared by The California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs and Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts. March 2002.

In addition to justice system cost savings, the report also noted other benefits resulting which have cost implications, including. . . $ 1 million in fees/fines collected form participants completing drug court

- *Coconino County (Arizona) DUI/Drug Court Evaluation*. Prepared by Frederic I. Solop, Nancy A. Wonders et al. Social Research Laboratory. Northern Arizona University. May 20003.

DUI/Drug court participants paid an average of $ 28.86/month to court compared with $ 7.34 for control group.

X. COST SAVINGS SPECIFICALLY ATTRIBUTABLE TO JUVENILE DRUG COURT PROGRAMS

***A Cost-Benefit Analysis of North Dakota's Juvenile Drug Court: Youth Correctional Center, Group Residential Facility, and Community Supervision Cost Savings*. Kevin M. Thompson. Department of Sociology. North Dakota Sate University. Fargo, North Dakota. December 2002.**

Compared costs of North Dakota's juvenile drug courts to administer drug court services to 20 substance abusing juveniles per court at a daily cost of $ 14.73, compared with placing a juvenile in (1) the North Dakota Youth Correctional Center at a cost of $ 120 per day; (2) out-of-home placement in a group residential facility at a cost of $ 100 per day or (3) community supervision a t a cost of $ 11 per day. 77 juveniles were studied who participated in the juvenile drug court for a minimum of three months during the period from May 2000 to August 2002.. . . Many of the juveniles admitted to drug court ". . .are on the cusp of coming under the car, custody and

control of the division lf Juvenile Services. Drug court represents a last ditch effort to provide these youths with intensive treatment and accountability care to avert the possibility of more costly programming. And, in fact, 14 of the 77 drug court juveniles were transferred to DJS as a result of noncompliance with drug court objectives during the period of this evaluation. . . These juveniles had accumulated a fairly lengthy arrest history study. On average, these juveniles had been arrested over five times prior to being admitted to the drug court.. . Juveniles spent an average of 219 days in drug court or roughly 7.3 months. . .. . At $ 14.73 per day, . . .it costs roughly $ 3,226 per juvenile to operate a juvenile drug court in North Dakota.. . . If instead of admitting these 20 juveniles to drug court, these juveniles were placed with the NDYCC for 7.3 months, we estimate annual gross costs at $ 525,600 for 20 juveniles. Subtracting the annual cost of operating a drug court, this amounts to an annual gross cost savings of $ 461,100. The cost of placing 20 juveniles for 7.3 months in a group residential facility would run roughly $ 438,000 annually....[resulting] in a gross cost savings of $ 373,500. . . . [Costs for] aftercare supervision are cheaper [$ 16,320 annually] because juveniles are receiving fewer state services (e.g., do not appear weekly in front of a judge; are drug tested less frequently, may not be in treatment, and are not tracked by a research evaluator). [Taking into account the two juvenile drug courts operating in North Dakota for more than two years, the cost savings resulted in roughly $ 800,520 compared to placement in NDYCC and $ 606,500 compared to out-of-home placement in group residential facility. Compared to aftercare community supervision, drug court was more costly by $ 28, 856. Study limitations include: the cost savings compared with NDYCC commitment would be reduced if more youth were terminated from drug court and sent to NDYCC; cost savings may change if lengths of stay change; and the study doesn't address other possible benefits that might result (e.g., recidivism reduction and/or other program benefits.

A Cost-Benefit Estimate of North Dakota's Juvenile Drug Court: Recidivism Cost Savings. **Kevin M. Thompson. Department of Sociology. North Dakota State University. Fargo, North Dakota. December 2002**

Data was gathered ion 56 juveniles who participated in the juvenile drug court from May 2000 to January 2002 and 44 comparison juveniles who underwent standard treatment and probation. [Drug court participants recorded lengthier court histories than the comparison group (5.39 referrals per v child vs. 4.23 referrals per child).[Comparison group Recidivism for drug court participants was 36% compared with 68% for the 44 comparison group. . . Using an accepted cost savings formula currently being used in criminology (see "The Monetary Value of Saving a High-Risk Youth." Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 14:5-33), the data reveals that the reduced recidivism rate among the drug court juveniles produced a court and victim cost savings of $ 62,400. Over a five year period, we estimate that drug court has the potential to provide a cost savings of reduced court resources and victim harm of $ 311,000. . . . . Restricting the timeframe to one year after last referral, the drug court group recorded a recidivism rate of 27.3% while the comparison group recorded a rate of 54.5%.

- ***Richmond, Virginia Juvenile Drug Court Evaluation*. Conducted by the Office of the Executive Secretary, Supreme Court of Virginia and reported in *Summary Report on Virginia's Drug Court Programs*. March 2003**

Based on a finding that the total costs for 55 participants for services while enrolled in the juvenile drug court was $ 753,665 and the estimated institutionalization costs avoided for these participants during that period were $ 1,703,348, the estimated savings from avoided institutional costs for these participants were $ 949,683.

A Process and Site-Specific Outcome Evaluation of Maine's Juvenile Drug Treatment Court Programs. **Andrew Ferguson et al. .U. of Southern Maine. March 22, 2006**.

Total operational costs for 219 participants vs costs for comparison group under traditional probationary supervision estimated to have saved $ 41,189 in criminal justice related expenditures (jail, criminal case processing, etc.)

Clackamas County Juvenile Drug Court Enhancement: Process, Outcome/Impact and Cost Evaluation. Final Report. NPC Research. April 2006.

- Cost of program per day was less than most other referral options commonly used for high-risk youth in the county. ($ 66.26 for juvenile drug court compared to up to $ 183..65 per day for detention.
- in 2 years following entry, participants cost $ 961 less per participant than for similar individuals not in drug court. Terminated participants cost taxpayer $ 6,037 more than comparison group (due to detention costs) and graduates cost $ 10,958 less than comparison group.
- average cost for program was $ 23,656 per participant; savings for graduates were $ 10,958 per participant; and savings for all participants averaged $ 1000 per participants, taking into account increased costs for terminated participants

Maryland Drug Treatment Courts: Interim Report of the Effectiveness of Juvenile Drug Courts. Submitted by: **NPC Research** to Drug Treatment Court Commission of Maryland. February 2006.

Cost analysis of drug courts and youth centers clearly illustrates the cost savings of attempting to serve this population of youth in the community when possible. There was a 71% reduction in the number of juvenile drug court participants in Maryland with new convictions in the year after drug court, compared to the year prior to drug court. There was a 75% reduction in the rate of chronic offenders (youth with 3 or more new convictions) in the year after drug court, compared to the year prior to drug court. Reductions in juvenile crime save the judicial system money and increase public safety.

Cost per day for juvenile drug court participant (including court, public defender, prosecutor, services) was $ 48.96 for 285.5 average days, totaling $ 13,901.00 per participant compared with $ 226.93 per day for non-secure residential detention for 192.1 average days per period, totaling $ 43, 593.25.

Harford County Juvenile Drug Court Performance Evaluation. Final Report. NPC Research. October 2006.

Study of participants entering juvenile drug court between January 1, 2001 and December 31, 2004 indicated that participant outcomes cost 60% less per juvenile than for non-participants; average cost of criminal justice system (re-arrests, incarceration, probation) for drug court in year following program involvement was $ 5,072 (60%) less than the cost for individuals who were eligible but didn't participant ($ 3,409 vs. 8,481); 72% in outcome cost savings were for Md. Div. of Corrections; Harford Co. Sheriff's Office had 44% savings and Md. Div of Prob and Parole had 24% savings.