



## MEMORANDUM

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

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

**Date:** **December 9, 2003**

This memorandum summarizes the range of cost benefit/cost avoidance findings emerging from drug court evaluation reports and related research, 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 findings.

### **I. Overview**

The field of cost analysis, as applied to drug courts, has been developing significantly during the past several years. Most studies focused initially 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:

- C overall criminal justice system costs associated with arrests, prosecution, adjudication and disposition of drug cases;
- C public health costs associated with drug-related physical illnesses, including costs for emergency room care, hospitalization, outpatient medical services, nursing home care and medications;
- C costs relating to lost productivity, including workplace accidents and absences, and unemployment;
- C costs relating to drug related mortality and premature death;
- C social welfare costs, including foster care and other support of family members;
- C 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

- C 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 on the topic as of this date.

## II Savings reported in jail/prison costs

### (a) 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:

	<u>Median Reported</u>		<u>Average reported</u>	
	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>
● estimated annual per program jail/prison days saved	12,458 days <sup>1</sup>	6,900 days <sup>2</sup>	4,015 days <sup>3</sup>	10,133 days <sup>4</sup>
● estimated annual per program costs saved	\$ 903,700 <sup>5</sup>	\$ 201,937 <sup>6</sup>	\$ 330,000 <sup>7</sup>	\$ 667,694 <sup>8</sup>

The specific savings reported by these jurisdictions are as follows:

<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Estimated annual jail/prison Days Saved</u>		<u>Estimated Annual jail/prison Costs Saved</u>	
	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>
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		

<sup>1</sup> Based on responses from 39 adult drug courts in 2000

<sup>2</sup> Based on responses from 49 adult drug courts in 2001

<sup>3</sup> Based on responses from 39 adult drug courts in 2000

<sup>4</sup> Based on responses from 49 adult drug courts in 2001

<sup>5</sup> Based on responses from 43 adult drug courts in 2000

<sup>6</sup> Based on responses from 62 adult drug courts in 2001

<sup>7</sup> Based on responses from 43 adult drug courts in 2000

<sup>8</sup> Based on responses from 62 adult drug courts in 2001

<u>Estimated annual jail/prison Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Estimated Annual jail/prison Days Saved</u>		<u>Costs Saved</u>	
	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>
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	
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 <sup>9</sup>
Duval Co., Florida				25,000.00
Glades/Hendry Co., Florida		16,350 days	\$	\$ 645,825.00
Monroe Co., Florida				6,439,500.00

<sup>9</sup> For period: June 14, 2000 - April 2, 2001.

<u>Estimated annual jail/prison Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Estimated Annual jail/prison Days Saved</u>		<u>Costs Saved</u>	
	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>
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	
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

*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. December 9, 2003

<u>Estimated annual jail/prison Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Estimated Annual jail/prison Days Saved</u>		<u>Costs Saved</u>	
	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>
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			
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	

**Estimated annual jail/prison**                      **Estimated Annual jail/prison**

*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. December 9, 2003

<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Days Saved</u>		<u>Costs Saved</u>	
	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>
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<sup>10</sup>, depending upon the nature and extent of treatment and ancillary services provided. The specific 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.

*(b) Savings reported in evaluations of local drug court programs*

**C 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.

**C Elisabeth Piper Deschenes and Sam Tores. June 1997. Los Angeles Co., California.: Evaluation Of Los Angeles Municipal Court; Rio Hondo Municipal Court; Pasadena**

---

<sup>10</sup> Daily per participant costs (including staff time and drug tests) for drug court program participation in 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.

---

*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. December 9, 2003

***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.

**C 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.

**C 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.

**o 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.

**C 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.

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.

**C 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

---

*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. December 9, 2003

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.

- C **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. . .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. The BDTC 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.

- o ***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.

- C ***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:

- C 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.

---

*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. December 9, 2003

- C 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:

- C *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.

- (c) *Savings reported in state-wide program evaluations*

***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:

- (a) avoided overall criminal justice system costs averaged approximately \$ 200,000 annually per

---

*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. December 9, 2003

- court for each 100 participants;
- (b) 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.
- (c) 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.

**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.**

- C A total of 425,014 jail days were avoided, with an averted cost of approximately \$ 26 million.
- C A total of 227,894 prison days were avoided, with an averted cost of approximately \$ 16 million.

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

- C 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);
- C 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)
- C participant incarceration rates 83 % lower in the two years after entering drug court than in the two years prior to entering drug court
- C 96% of drug tests of participants during drug court were negative;
- C \$ 1 million in fees/fines collected form participants completing drug court
- C 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)
- C 70% of the participants were employed when completing drug courts whereas 62% were unemployed at time of program entry (based in reports from 28 counties)
- C 20% of the participants obtained dr4ivers licenses and car insurance (based on reports from 28 counties)
- C 12% transitioned out of homelessness and acquired housing

**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.

### **III. General Criminal Justice System Savings Resulting from Recidivism 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

---

*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. December 9, 2003

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)”***

<i>Agency</i>	<i>Investment</i>	<i>Cost Avoidance</i>
<i>Superior Court</i>	<i>\$ 99,353</i>	<i>\$ 1,166</i>
<i>District Attorney</i>	<i>\$ 36,550</i>	<i>-\$ 579</i>
<i>Public Defender</i>	<i>-\$ 7,644</i>	<i>-\$2,050</i>
<i>Probation</i>	<i>\$ 109,865</i>	<i>\$ 24,174</i>
<i>Law Enforcement</i>	<i>\$ 141,060`</i>	<i>\$ 100,281</i>
<i>Cal. Department of Corrections</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$ 584,945</i>
<i>Victimization Costs</i>		<i>\$ 695,000<sup>11</sup></i>

<sup>11</sup> 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 motor vehicle theft were averaged for an estimated property crime cost. National Institute of Justice Research Report,

<i>Total Criminal Justice System</i>	<i>\$ 379,184</i>	<i>\$ 1,399,187</i>
--------------------------------------	-------------------	---------------------

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 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. . . “

**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.

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

**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.

---

*Victim Costs and Consequences: A New Look* (January 1996).

---

*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. December 9, 2003

#### **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:

C 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.

C 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.

#### **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.)

**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.

---

*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. December 9, 2003

## **VI. Parental Regaining of custody of minor children/Currency in Child Support Payments**

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).

**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 medical and related costs**

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

### **C birth of drug free babies**

Well over 2000 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.

The Buffalo Drug Court conducted a study, in conjunction with the Erie County Division of Social Services, of 236 graduates as of January 200, and noted, among other savings, the following:

- C 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;
- C 68 children who were in foster care were returned to their parents;
- C 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.

---

*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. December 9, 2003

- C 38 Child Protective Services cases were closed;
- C 81 children involved with Child Protective Services were allowed to return to their homes;
- C 9 children were removed from social service rolls due to increased child support from their parent (who was a drug court graduate); and
- C 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.

C referral to treatment for infectious diseases

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. Other System Cost Savings**

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

C savings in probation supervision costs

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 \$ 4,700.00 per year.<sup>12</sup> Per person cost for drug court participation is generally less than the cost for probation, with significantly enhanced services and supervision provided.

C Other criminal justice system savings

A comprehensive analysis of the impact of 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.<sup>13</sup>

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:

---

<sup>12</sup>National Institute of Justice. Joan Petersilia and Susan Turner. "Evaluating Intensive Supervision Probation/Parole: Results of a Nationwide Experiment. May 1993

<sup>13</sup>Michael Finigan. *Multnomah County S.T.O.P. Drug Diversion Program*. 1998.

---

*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. December 9, 2003

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

C     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.

C     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.