Washington/Baltimore
High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area

Technical Report

The Effect of W/B HIDTA-Funded Substance Abuse Treatment on Arrest Rates of Criminals Entering Treatment in Calendar Years 2004, 2005, and 2006

August 28, 2008

Prepared By
The Institute for Behavior and Health, Inc.
6191 Executive Blvd.
Rockville, Maryland 20852
UMCP Contract No. H107173

Authors:
Robert L. DuPont, M.D., Michael D. Campbell, Ph.D., and Audrey Seymour. Points of view in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of any agency or the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA. Any questions can be forwarded to R. Renee Robinson, MPA, W/B HIDTA Treatment/Criminal Justice Program Manager, 301-489-1700, or rrobinso@wb.hidta.org.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Appendix C

Executive Summary

Overview

The Washington/Baltimore High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (W/B HIDTA) was funded by the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) in order to address the serious public safety threats arising from the distribution of illegal drugs. The purpose of this study was to use existing information to examine the effect of W/B HIDTA-funded substance abuse treatment on the arrest rates of criminals who entered treatment during calendar years 2004, 2005, and 2006. The study initially examined the demographic characteristics, substance abuse patterns, and criminal histories of the treatment participants to determine whether the funded substance abuse treatment programs were serving the hard core, substance-abusing criminals for which they were intended. The study also analyzed variables related to the provision of substance abuse treatment, such as length of time in treatment, program completion rates, and rate of drug use detected through drug testing. Finally, the study compared offenders' arrest rates before and after entering treatment to determine whether W/B HIDTA-funded substance abuse treatment programs have helped reduce crime in the Washington/Baltimore area.

Method

The W/B HIDTA and the Institute for Behavior and Health, Inc. (IBH) received approval from the University of Maryland's Institutional Review Board to conduct an evaluation of ten W/B HIDTA sites using available data on individuals who entered their substance abuse treatment programs in years 2004, 2005 and 2006.

Data on the three annual cohorts were obtained from two sources. The first was a dataset provided by the W/B HIDTA that contained demographic characteristics, substance abuse history, and treatment information that were gathered from client records in the HIDTA Automated Tracking System (HATS). The second consisted of arrest records obtained for each subject from the National Crime Information Center (NCIC). The number of arrests and types of criminal charges recorded in the NCIC records for the year just before treatment and during the one-year follow-up period constitute the critical measures of program outcome for this study. All research data coding occurred at the W/B HIDTA office in Greenbelt, Maryland. Data identifying individuals for this report were never removed from the W/B HIDTA site.

Results

The results of the study indicate that collectively the drug treatment programs funded by the W/B HIDTA reduced drug use and crime among a group of repeat offenders. The groups of individuals who entered W/B HIDTA-funded treatment between 2004 and 2006, like their cohorts in previous years, were composed of long-term criminals with an average age of approximately 36 years who had serious drug problems, limited education, and a weak attachment to the labor force.

On average, clients in all three cohorts were actively involved in some form of drug treatment for five to six months. The programs' flexibility to step up or step down the level of treatment as needed to meet the changing needs of each participant contributed to their ability to keep clients in treatment. In addition, drug testing, the supervision provided to the clients through the parole and probation offices, and the progressive use of stricter sanctions for repeat violations of the terms of their treatment requirements helped ensure that the clients remained drug free.

The pre- and post-treatment comparisons of arrest data clearly indicate that the W/B HIDTA-funded programs as a whole continue to produce the desired effects within the target population. Criminal recidivism in the year following treatment was reduced significantly for each of the three cohorts, regardless of whether the indicator used was the number of people arrested, the number of arrests, or the number of criminal charges filed.

After entering treatment, there was a 40 to 44 percent reduction from the previous year in the number of individuals arrested, a 42 to 52 percent reduction in the total number of arrests, and a 51 to 60 percent reduction in the number of criminal charges filed against cohort members. The effects were most pronounced for drug-related crimes, which were reduced by about 60 to 70 percent across the three years of the study. Property crimes were reduced by 51 to 78 percent in the three cohorts, and violent crimes were also reduced by 39 to 53 percent. These positive findings are consistent with the results found in evaluations of the W/B HIDTA substance abuse treatment programs for the 2000 to 2003 cohorts.

I. Introduction

In 1994, the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) designated the Washington/Baltimore region as a High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA) in order to address serious public safety threats arising in the region from the distribution of illegal drugs. This 12-jurisdiction HIDTA, which includes the cities of Baltimore and Washington, as well as surrounding local jurisdictions, has experienced serious problems with illegal drug use and drug-related crime, especially involving cocaine and heroin.

The W/B HIDTA focuses its efforts on: 1) reducing the number of drug and firearms trafficking organizations through intelligence-driven law enforcement operations, 2) assisting local governments in implementing effective drug treatment programs for hard-core offenders to reduce recidivism, 3) promoting innovative prevention programs involving partnerships between law enforcement agencies, community organizations, and local government, and 4) reducing the levels of drug-related violence and crime within the W/B HIDTA region, thereby protecting the community.

The W/B HIDTA Treatment/Criminal Justice Initiative

Of the 28 HIDTAs in the United States, the W/B HIDTA is the only one that funds substance abuse treatment of criminal offenders. It provides annual funding to criminal justice systems in participating jurisdictions to support locally developed substance abuse treatment programs for hard-core offenders. These programs are based on scientific principles of effective interventions, including the use of the following:

- Clinical assessments to determine appropriate placement in treatment services;
- Cognitive behavioral treatment, social restructuring, and contingency management interventions;
- Compliance-gaining strategies to encourage the offender's completion of treatment and compliance with supervision requirements;
- Procedural justice concepts to deter drug use and criminal behavior;
- Drug testing to monitor program compliance; and

- Treatment interventions that last a minimum of six months and provide a continuum of care comprising at least two levels.

Using these general principles of effective intervention, each local jurisdiction has developed its own unique substance abuse treatment program designed both to meet the needs of the population served and to integrate the treatment program seamlessly with other local substance abuse services. W/B HIDTA funds are used by the jurisdictions to enhance their existing treatment programs, to extend their levels of care, and to support the use of drug testing and progressive sanctions for any continued illegal drug use. Supervision by probation or parole offices is an additional, necessary aspect of the seamless and coerced treatment experience.

Because the W/B HIDTA is unique among HIDTAs in its funding of substance abuse treatment, there is substantial interest in the performance of the program. A primary area of interest is the extent to which the program reduces criminal behavior of those who have received treatment. Three previous studies examined the pre- and post-treatment arrest rates for criminals who entered W/B HIDTA-funded substance abuse treatment programs in calendar years 2000 through 2003 (DuPont et al., 2002; DuPont et al., 2004; DuPont et al., 2007). For each year's cohort, the number of arrests in the year immediately prior to treatment was compared to the number of arrests in the year after they entered treatment. The studies consistently found that for each cohort the number of arrests during the follow-up period was 43 to 51 percent less than in the pretreatment period.

A fourth study was conducted on the three annual cohorts of criminal offenders who entered W/B HIDTA-funded treatment programs in calendar years 2004, 2005, and 2006. The overall purpose of the study was to document whether the substantial reductions in arrest rates found in the previous studies continued to hold in subsequent years.

Washington/Baltimore HIDTA Sites

Ten of the 12 W/B HIDTA jurisdictions operated substance abuse treatment programs during the 2004-2006 period: Alexandria City, Arlington County, Fairfax County, Loudoun County, and Prince William County in Virginia; Baltimore City, Baltimore County, Charles County, and Prince George's County in Maryland; and Washington, D.C. However, the program in Baltimore City was being phased out during this period so that few individuals were served in

2005 and none in 2006. Each jurisdiction used W/B HIDTA funds to provide drug treatment services either directly or through contracts with local substance abuse service providers. In all, scores of public, private, and non-profit providers delivered services in the 10 jurisdictions.

Each jurisdiction developed one or more model substance abuse treatment programs for offenders involving a minimum of six months treatment and at least two levels of care. The 10 sites can be grouped by four different continuum-of-care models as follows: (a) Residential/ Outpatient, (b) Intensive Care Facility/Outpatient, (c) Intensive Outpatient/Outpatient, and (d) Jail-Based Treatment/Outpatient (Taxman, Kubu, DeStefano, 1999). All approaches could also include detoxification and inpatient care. In each model, the offender began treatment in a controlled or relatively structured treatment environment and then moved into one or more outpatient treatment phases. Program staff determined the pace and timing of progress according to individual readiness.

All W/B HIDTA substance abuse treatment interventions included drug testing and graduated sanctions. The frequency of drug testing varied from site to site, by provider, and for individual offenders. Some providers tested monthly, some weekly, and some twice a week. Others conducted tests at random intervals. Each jurisdiction employed graduated sanctions to promote effective responses when participants failed to comply with the conditions of treatment and release. Individuals in treatment received increasingly severe sanctions for each additional infraction, ranging from verbal warnings and increased supervision to incarceration and judicial action. As with the frequency of testing, the type of sanction varied from site to site (Taxman and Cronin, 2000).

Table 1. Treatment Modalities for W/B HIDTA Jurisdictions

Jurisdiction	Treatment Modality Description
Arlington County	Jail-based Treatment
Alexandria City	Phase I – Intensive Outpatient Phase II – Outpatient arranged according to need Additional time spent on probation in the community
Baltimore City	Regimented Offender Treatment Center Re-entry Aftercare Center
Baltimore County	Residential Intensive Outpatient Outpatient
Charles County	Jail-based Treatment (Residential) Outpatient
Fairfax County	Jail-based Treatment Residential Outpatient
Loudoun County	Outpatient
Prince Georges County	Phase I – Jail-based Treatment Phase II – Day Reporting Center Phase III – Health Department
Prince William County	Residential Intensive Outpatient Outpatient Aftercare
Washington, DC	Detox Residential Transitional Outpatient

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to use existing information to examine the effect of W/B HIDTA-funded substance abuse treatment on the arrest rates of criminals who entered treatment during calendar years 2004, 2005, and 2006. The study examined the demographic characteristics, substance abuse patterns, and criminal histories of the treatment participants to determine whether the local programs served the hard core, substance-abusing criminals for whom they were intended. It also examined variables related to the provision of treatment, such as length of time in treatment, program completion rates, and rate of drug use detected through testing. Finally, the study compared offenders' arrest rates before and after entering treatment as a means of determining whether the W/B HIDTA-funded programs helped reduce crime in the Washington/Baltimore area.

II. Method

The W/B HIDTA and the Institute for Behavior and Health, Inc. (IBH) received approval from the University of Maryland's Institutional Review Board to conduct an evaluation of W/B HIDTA sites using available data on individuals who entered their substance abuse treatment programs in calendar years 2004 through 2006. Data on the three annual cohorts were obtained from two sources. The first was a dataset provided by the W/B HIDTA that contained demographic characteristics, substance abuse history, and treatment information that were gathered from client records in the HIDTA Automated Tracking System (HATS).[1] The second consisted of arrest records obtained for each subject from the National Crime Information Center (NCIC).[2] These FBI records contained criminal histories for all subjects in the study beginning with the first adult arrest. The number of arrests and types of criminal charges recorded in the NCIC records for the year just before treatment and during a one-year follow-up period constitute the critical measures of program outcome for this study.[3]

Pre-treatment arrests were recorded for the twelve months immediately preceding the individual's admittance into HIDTA treatment. For community-based programs, the relevant time period for following up on post-treatment arrests was one year from the date of admittance into HIDTA treatment. For programs in which treatment began in a secure facility such as a jail, the follow-up period was one year from the date that the treated individual was returned to the community.[4]

Full criminal histories from NCIC reports on criminals who entered one of the 10 W/B HIDTA-funded programs were coded by arrest and date of arrest. These data were aggregated into a spreadsheet with no individual identifying information attached. All research data coding occurred at the W/B HIDTA office in Greenbelt, Maryland. Data identifying individuals for this

[1] HATTS Users Guide, HATTS and Consents Overview; HATS System Overview, version 3.01. Internal document that is a software database used by HIDTA. Previously known as HIDTA Automated Treatment Tracking System (HATTS), now renamed as HIDTA Automated Tacking System (HATS).

[2] Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Information System. A New Record for NCIC Transactions, FBI press release, March 23, 2002, www.fas.org.

[3] While some subjects were incarcerated for part or all of the year prior to entering treatment, reliable records regarding which subjects were incarcerated and their dates of incarceration were not available for this study. Nor was this information available for the previous W/B HIDTA cohort studies. The limitations that this lack of information places on the interpretation of findings is discussed in the Limitations section of the report.

[4] If the release date was unknown, follow up began at the point the individual completed jail-based treatment.

report were never removed from the HIDTA site. All data presented in this report are aggregated data only. No names are linked to any reported data.

Data from the W/B HIDTA dataset and NCIC records was analyzed using SPSS statistical software. The analyses included: frequency distributions of demographic, drug use, and other variables; cross tabulations by jurisdiction on these variables; and before-and-after comparisons of arrest rates. A detailed description of the study methodology, discussing data issues and how they were resolved, appears in Appendix A.

III. Findings

Table 2 lists for each jurisdiction the numbers of individuals who entered W/B HIDTA-funded substance abuse treatment programs in calendar years 2004 to 2006. Overall, the size of the annual cohorts declined each year – from 507 in 2004 to 327 in 2006. This was due in part to the phasing out of the treatment component in Baltimore City, which in 2004 had one of the largest programs. In addition, because the annual amount of funding for substance abuse treatment through W/B HIDTA remained constant during this period, while treatment costs increased, fewer people could be treated each year. Only two jurisdictions, Alexandria and Arlington, increased the number of new participants each year.

Table 2 also indicates the percentage of clients in each cohort who were treated in a particular jurisdiction. Examination of these percentages reveals a geographic shift regarding where the majority of clients were treated each year. In 2004, 45 percent of the cohort entered treatment in a Maryland jurisdiction while 37 percent were treated in Virginia and 19 percent in the District of Columbia. By 2006, two-thirds of the annual cohort (66 percent) were in Virginia-based programs, 26 percent were in Maryland programs, and just 8 percent were in the Washington program. A similar, but less dramatic, shift occurred in regard to the type of setting in which treatment was delivered: 58 percent of the 2004 cohort received initial treatment in a jail-based program, but 51 percent of the 2006 cohort began treatment in a community-based program.

Table 2. Cohorts for 2004, 2005 and 2006 W/B HIDTA Study

Jurisdiction	2004 Cohort		2005 Cohort		2006 Cohort	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Alexandria	11	2.2%	26	6.7%	44	13.5%
Arlington	53	10.5%	81	20.8%	88	26.9%
Baltimore City	81	16.0%	7	1.8%	-	-
Baltimore County	13	2.6%	31	8.0%	12	3.7%
Charles County	32	6.3%	16	4.1%	20	6.1%
Fairfax/Falls Church	70	13.8%	63	16.2%	41	12.5%
Loudoun County	11	2.2%	16	2.2%	17	5.2%
Prince George's County	100	19.7%	88	22.6%	54	16.5%
Prince William County	42	8.3%	23	5.9%	25	7.6%
Washington, DC	94	18.5%	38	9.8%	26	8.0%
TOTAL	**507**	**100%**	**389**	**100%**	**327**	**100%**

Source: W/B HIDTA dataset

Characteristics of the 2004, 2005, and 2006 W/B HIDTA Cohorts

Age, Gender, and Race. The average age of offenders beginning W/B HIDTA-funded treatment was about 36 years for all three cohorts. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 72 years. The overwhelming majority of participants were male, and African Americans constituted the largest racial/ethnic group each year. However, Table 3 indicates that over the three years, the percentage of males in each cohort increased and the percentage of cohort members who were African American decreased. The phasing out of the Baltimore City treatment program, which in 2004 had a client base that was 93 percent African American and 37 percent female, largely contributed to these changes in the demographic composition of the later cohorts.

Table 3. Gender, Race, and Age of the 2004, 2005 and 2006 W/B HIDTA Cohorts

Demographic		2004 Cohort (n=507)	2005 Cohort (n=389)	2006 Cohort (n=327)
Gender	Male	75.7%	79.4%	82.0%
	Female	24.3%	20.6%	18.0%
Race	African American	75.5%	63.5%	62.4%
	Caucasian	21.7%	32.6%	32.7%
	American Indian	0.6%	0.0%	0.3%
	Asian/Pacific Islander	0.6%	0.8%	1.5%
	Other	1.4%	3.1%	3.1%
	Unknown	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Age	Mean Age	36.7 years	35.6 years	36.2 years

Source: W/B HIDTA dataset

Education and Employment. Information was available from all jurisdictions on the educational level and employment status for offenders entering W/B HIDTA-funded treatment in the three years. Table 4 indicates that, on the whole, the 2004 cohort was not as well educated as members of the other cohorts. Again, this was due largely to the high percentage of 2004 clients from Baltimore City who lacked a high school education (73 percent). Table 5, which summarizes the available employment data, shows that less than 20 percent of the subjects in each cohort were employed either full-time or part-time when they entered treatment. Of the remaining subjects, the majority in each group was unemployed and approximately 25 percent were incarcerated at the start of treatment.

Table 4. Educational Attainment of the 2004, 2005 and 2006 W/B HIDTA Cohorts

Highest Education Level Completed	2004 Cohort (n=507)	2005 Cohort (n=389)	2006 Cohort (n=326)
Did Not Graduate from High School	45.5%	39.4%	35.6%
Graduated from High School	43.6%	40.4%	49.7%
Some College Completed	9.5%	15.5%	12.9%
College Degree and Beyond	1.4%	4.7%	1.8%

Source: W/B HIDTA dataset

Table 5. Employment Status of the 2004, 2005 and 2006 W/B HIDTA Cohorts

Employment Status	2004 Cohort (n=507)	2005 Cohort (n=389)	2006 Cohort (n=327)
Employed	18.4%	13.9%	15.0%
Unemployed	56.3%	58.8%	60.2%
Incarcerated	25.1%	27.0%	22.6%
Disabled	0.2%	0.3%	2.1%

Source: W/B HIDTA dataset

Appendix B, Data by Jurisdiction, contains a breakdown of the demographic data for each of the jurisdictions in this study. It also presents available data on substance abuse patterns and criminal history by jurisdiction.

Comparison to Cohorts from Previous Years. Table 6 indicates that each year the treatment population was predominantly male and African American, averaging around 34 to 36 years of age, with low rates of employment. A high percentage of clients in each cohort had not completed high school, although this percentage fell to less than 40 percent in the last two years studied. The most notable change over the years was the steady decline in the percentage of

participants who were employed at the time they enrolled in a W/B HIDTA-funded substance abuse treatment program. By 2005 and 2006, the percentage of cohort members who were employed (14 to 15 percent) was less than half the rate for those in the 2001 and 2002 cohorts (32 to 33 percent).

Table 6. Demographic Comparisons of W/B HIDTA Cohorts

	W/B HIDTA Cohorts						
	2000 (n=1,060)	**2001 (n=1,014)**	**2002 (n=946)**	**2003 (n=663)**	**2004 (n=507)**	**2005 (n=389)**	**2006 (n=327)**
Mean Age (years)	34.0	35.3	34.3	34.7	36.7	35.6	36.2
Male	82.1%	79.4%	78.6%	74.3%	75.7%	79.4%	82.0%
African American	60.4%	77.3%	73.0%	70.0%	75.5%	63.5%	62.4%
Caucasian	31.2%	21.3%	23.9%	28.1%	21.7%	32.6%	32.7%
Less Than HS Educ.	49.4%	45.6%	43.7%	40.4%	45.5%	39.4%	35.6%
Employed	31.6%	33.1%	23.0%	22.6%	18.4%	13.9%	15.0%

Sources: W/B HIDTA dataset for 2004-2006 data; DuPont et al. (2002) for 2000 data; DuPont et al. (2004) for 2001 data; DuPont et al. (2007) for 2002-2003 data

Substance Abuse and Criminal History of the 2004-2006 W/B HIDTA Cohorts

Substance Abuse. Tables 7 through 9 below summarize the self-reported substance abuse behavior of individuals when they entered W/B HIDTA-funded treatment programs in 2004, 2005, and 2006. While the 2004 and 2005 cohorts had consistently similar patterns on all measures (frequency of use, type of substance, and mode of consumption), the statistics for the 2006 cohort revealed a number of differences in drug use compared to the other two cohorts. In regard to frequency of drug use (see Table 7), over half of those in the 2004 and 2005 cohorts had not used drugs in the month prior to entering treatment, compared to 42 percent of the 2006 cohort. In addition, 39 percent of the 2006 enrollees reported using drugs at least daily, which was higher than the 28 to 30 percent for the other two cohorts. These results contrast sharply with usage patterns for the 2002 and 2003 cohorts (see DuPont et al. 2007), which reported much lower rates of daily use (21 to 23 percent) and had higher percentages of clients who had not used drugs in the past month (63 to 65 percent). The differences may be due to the fact that three quarters of people in the 2002 and 2003 cohorts either entered treatment in jail-based programs or (as in the case of Baltimore City, the then-largest program) were referred to W/B HIDTA-funded treatment directly after release from incarceration. By 2006, the majority of people in the

cohort entered community-based programs and therefore probably had greater access to drugs in the month prior to treatment.

Table 7. Frequency of Drug Use Prior to Entering Treatment for 2004, 2005 and 2006 Cohorts

Frequency of Drug Use Prior To Treatment	2004 Cohort (n=493)	2005 Cohort (n=389)	2006 Cohort (n=326)
Daily or more than daily	29.6%	28.1%	38.7%
1-6 times per week	12.0%	15.2%	7.1%
1-3 times per month	5.3%	5.0%	12.0%
No usage in past month	53.1%	51.7%	42.3%
Total	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

Source: W/B HIDTA dataset

In terms of drug of choice, the percentage of cohort members using heroin in 2006 (14 percent) was substantially lower than for the previous two years (25 to 29 percent). As shown in Table 8, the decrease in heroin use was offset by increases in the use of crack/cocaine (46 percent in 2006) and PCP (7 percent). The decline in heroin use directly reflects the geographic shift in the composition of the cohorts that occurred over the three years of the study. Because the large Baltimore City program – where 65 percent of the 2004 enrollees said heroin was their drug of choice – was phased out in 2005, the majority of the 2006 cohort members came from jurisdictions where other drugs were more commonly used. Over all years of study (2000 to 2006), marijuana/hashish has been the primary drug of choice for 20 to 23 percent of each cohort.

Table 8. Primary Drug of Choice Prior to Entering Treatment for 2004, 2005 and 2006 Cohorts

Drug of Choice	2004 Cohort (n=507)	2005 Cohort (n=389)	2006 Cohort (n=326)
Heroin	29.4%	25.2%	14.1%
Crack/Cocaine	36.3%	38.3%	46.3%
Marijuana/Hashish	20.5%	22.9%	19.9%
PCP	3.2%	1.8%	7.1%
Alcohol	5.5%	2.8%	2.8%
Other	5.1%	9.1%	9.8%
Total	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

Source: W/B HIDTA dataset

Table 9 shows that because the percentage of clients who reported heroin as their primary drug of choice declined over the three years, so did the portion of clients that reported injecting

drugs – down to less than 10 percent by 2006. However, the percentage reporting that they smoked drugs increased to 64 percent during this period.

Table 9. Primary Mode of Drug Consumption Prior to Treatment for 2004, 2005 and 2006 Cohorts

Mode of Consumption	2004 Cohort (n=502)	2005 Cohort (n=389)	2006 Cohort (n=325)
Smoking	46.4%	49.4%	64.3%
Inhalation	11.4%	15.5%	13.8%
Injection	17.7%	12.1%	9.5%
Oral	19.3%	19.6%	11.4%
Other	5.2%	3.4%	0.9%
Total	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

Source: W/B HIDTA dataset

Criminal History. Table 10 provides data on the Instant Arrest Offense, which was the offense that resulted in individuals being referred to W/B HIDTA-funded treatment programs in 2004 through 2006. The table indicates that each year 42 to 52 percent of the cohort members entered treatment due to a drug arrest. This is lower than the 55 to 58 percent rate found in the study of the 2002 and 2003 cohorts (DuPont et al. 2007), but comparable to the rates from the 2000 and 2001 cohort studies (DuPont et al. 2002; Dupont et al. 2004). As in the previous studies, the most common type of charge for a non-drug instant offense was for property crime. This ranged from 20 to 30 percent for the three cohorts in this study and was comparable to rates found in the previous cohort studies. From 2000 through 2005, the percentage of individuals referred to treatment as the result of an arrest for a crime of violence remained steady at about 10 percent per cohort; however, there was a slight drop to about 8 percent for the 2006 cohort.

In summary, data on the individuals who entered W/B HIDTA-funded treatment in 2004, 2005, and 2006 showed that this population, like the cohorts in previous years, was composed of offenders with serious drug problems, limited education, and very little attachment to the labor force. Without a strong intervention – such as the W/B HIDTA treatment protocol that combined coerced treatment, testing and supervision, and graduated sanctions – it is likely that these individuals would continue to commit frequent crimes to support their drug habits and/or be involved in violent acts toward others.

Table 10. Instant Arrest Offense Resulting in Placement in Drug Treatment for 2004, 2005 and 2006 Cohorts

Instant Arrest Offense	2004 Cohort (n=502)	2005 Cohort (n=389)	2006 Cohort (n=327)
Drug Charges:			
Distribution	8.1%	7.8%	7.3%
Misc. Drug	17.8%	11.6%	15.6%
Possession	15.6%	17.3%	18.3%
PWID	10.0%	4.9%	7.0%
Subtotal	**51.5%**	**41.6%**	**48.3%**
Crimes with No Drug Charges Attached:			
Violent	10.1%	9.6%	7.6%
Property	19.5%	29.5%	27.2%
Public Order	7.9%	8.3%	4.6%
Technical	3.7%	7.0%	7.6%
Other	7.3%	4.1%	4.6%
Subtotal	**48.5%**	**58.4%**	**51.7%**
Total	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

Source: W/B HIDTA dataset

Drug Treatment Program Assessment

The W/B HIDTA approach to drug treatment was designed to increase duration of treatment, which is considered to be the best predictor of success regardless of treatment modality (Taxman and Cronin, 2000; DuPont et al., 2002). The continuum of care model used in the Washington/Baltimore region provides a range of treatment modalities that enable providers to step up or step down the intensity of substance abuse treatment as needed. In addition, performing drug tests while offenders are in treatment helps identify clients who relapse so that they can be mandated to participate in more stringent and intensive treatment activities. This study used data from the W/B HIDTA dataset to examine the duration of treatment and the use of drug testing and sanctions while offenders were in substance abuse treatment.

Duration of Treatment and Completion Rates. All of the W/B HIDTA sites divide W/B HIDTA-funded treatment into multiple phases. Treatment usually begins with intensive treatment in a residential facility, jail, or group home (Phase I) followed by subsequent treatment phases in one or more outpatient programs. Table 11 shows that 59 percent of offenders entering a W/B HIDTA-funded drug treatment program in 2004 were recorded in the HATS database as having successfully completed Phase I of treatment. For the 2005 cohort, this rate was 66 percent

(see Table 12), and for the 2006 cohort it was 40 percent (Table 13). For the 2001 to 2003 cohorts these rates ranged from 44 to 50 percent.[5]

Table 11. Successful Completion of Treatment for 2004 Cohort

Jurisdiction	Start Phase I N	Successful Completions		Start Phase II N	Successful Completions		Mean Length of Stay In Treatment (Days)
		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Alexandria	11	4	36.3%	-	-	-	288
Arlington County	53	48	90.6%	-	-	-	263
Baltimore City	81	18	22.2%	-	-	-	180
Baltimore County	13	1	7.7%	2	0	0.0%	116
Charles County	32	27	84.4%	27	15	55.6%	222
Fairfax County	70	39	55.7%	-	-	-	93
Loudoun County	11	4	36.4%	5	2	40.0%	234
Prince George's Co.	100	77	77.0%	43	33	76.7%	135
Prince William Co.	42	21	50.0%	24	5	20.8%	126
Washington, DC	94	62	53.3%	14	7	50.0%	97
Overall	**507**	**301**	**59.4%**	**115**	**62**	**53.9%**	**152**

Source: W/B HIDTA dataset

Table 12. Successful Completion of Treatment for 2005 Cohort

Jurisdiction	Start Phase I N	Successful Completions		Start Phase II N	Successful Completions		Mean Length of Stay In Treatment (Days)
		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Alexandria	26	7	26.9%	-	-	-	196
Arlington County	81	69	85.2%	-	-	-	182
Baltimore City	7	2	28.6%	-	-	-	104
Baltimore County	31	22	71.0%	8	4	50.0%	100
Charles County	16	16	100.0%	15	9	60.0%	270
Fairfax County	63	35	55.6%	-	-	-	92
Loudoun County	16	10	62.5%	11	10	90.9%	272
Prince George's Co.	88	69	78.4%	45	27	60.0%	154
Prince William Co.	23	5	21.7%	10	6	60.0%	150
Washington, DC	38	23	60.5%	4	1	25.0%	83
Overall	**389**	**258**	**66.3%**	**93**	**57**	**61.3%**	**150**

Source: W/B HIDTA dataset

[5] A substantially higher completion rate (77 percent) was found for the 2000 cohort, but this may have been an artifact of measurement since other data sources besides HATS were used in the calculation (Dupont et al. 2002).

Table 13. Successful Completion of Treatment for 2006 Cohort

Jurisdiction	Start Phase I N	Successful Completions		Start Phase II N	Successful Completions		Mean Length of Stay In Treatment (Days)
		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Alexandria	44	0	0.0%	-	-	-	92
Arlington County	88	0	0.0%	88	30	34.0	147
Baltimore City	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Baltimore County	12	3	25.0%	-	-	-	109
Charles County	20	16	80.0%	20	11	55.0%	204
Fairfax County	41	23	56.1%	22	20	90.9%	220
Loudoun County	17	3	17.6%	3	1	33.3%	272
Prince George's Co.	54	51	94.4%	27	17	63.0%	226
Prince William Co.	25	14	56.0%	15	5	33.3%	156
Washington, DC	26	21	80.8%	7	6	85.7%	109
Overall	**327**	**131**	**40.1%**	**182**	**90**	**49.5%**	**172**

Source: W/B HIDTA dataset

Because the jurisdictions did not consistently report admission and completion dates along with the termination status for subjects in subsequent phases of treatment, it was not possible to compute overall estimates of the percentage of clients who successfully completed later phases. However, Tables 11 to 13 provide some partial information by jurisdiction on successful completions in the subsequent phases. The tables also indicate that the overall average duration of treatment ranged from about 150 to170 days for each cohort. This was longer than the 90 to 120 days that is typical for outpatient treatment. It was also comparable to the 150- to 180-day averages found in the previous W/B HIDTA cohort studies.

Drug Testing During Treatment. Drug testing information that included number of drug tests per individual, number of failures to appear for testing (FTAs), and number of tests that were positive for drugs was available in HATS. Tables 14, 15, and 16 summarize the available drug test data for the 2004, 2005, and 2006 cohorts respectively. These tables indicate that although the average number of drug tests administered per individual varied greatly among the sites, the overall average for each cohort was about 16 or 17 tests per person. This was the same as for the 2003 cohort.[6]

[6] The average number of drug tests administered for the 2002 cohort was higher at 30 per person; however, this was due to the large proportion of cohort members from Baltimore City who were tested an average of 50 times each. Comparable drug testing data were not available for the 2000 and 2001 cohorts because in those years most sites did not routinely record this information in HATS.

The average number of times an individual failed to appear for a drug test also varied greatly among the sites and was related to the average number of tests required. Sites that tested participants more frequently had more FTAs. For each of the three cohorts as a whole, the average number of FTAs was about three per person. The average number of urine tests per individual that were positive for drugs was in the range of one or two for each of the three cohorts in this study, which was consistent with the findings for the 2002 and 2003 cohorts.

Table 14. Drug Testing Results for the 2004 Cohort

	Subjects	Drug Tests Administered		Failures to Appear		Positive Urines		Percent Tests Positive
		Tot.	Avg.	Tot.	Avg.	Tot.	Avg.	
Alexandria	11	-	-	50	4.5	52	4.7	-
Arlington	9	11	1	2	0.2	2	0.2	18.2%
Baltimore City	76	1,798	24	856	11.3	44	0.6	2.4%
Baltimore County	12	99	8	28	2.3	7	0.6	7.1%
Charles County	24	516	22	151	6.3	92	3.8	17.8%
Fairfax County	12	69	6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0%
Loudoun County	11	92	8	0	0.0	22	2.0	23.9%
Prince George's Co.	100	1,602	16	56	0.6	176	1.8	11.0%
Prince William Co.	42	640	15	44	1.0	63	1.5	9.8%
Washington, DC	84	1,457	17	4	0.5	90	1.1	6.2%
Overall	**381**	**6,284**	**17**	**1,191**	**3.1**	**548**	**1.4**	**8.7%**

Source: W/B HIDTA dataset

Table 15. Drug Testing Results for the 2005 Cohort

	Subjects	Drug Tests Administered		Failures to Appear		Positive Urines		Percent Tests Positive
		Tot.	Avg.	Tot.	Avg.	Tot.	Avg.	
Alexandria	26	398	15	189	7.3	133	5.1	33.4%
Arlington	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Baltimore City	7	387	55	336	48.0	-	-	-
Baltimore County	10	80	8	66	6.6	51	5.1	63.8%
Charles County	12	265	22	88	7.3	110	9.2	41.5%
Fairfax County	11	78	7	0	0.0	-	-	-
Loudoun County	16	160	10	-	-	29	1.8	18.1%
Prince George's Co.	82	1,596	19	21	0.3	109	1.3	6.8%
Prince William Co.	23	189	9	0	0.0	28	1.2	14.8%
Washington, DC	37	538	15	28	0.8	28	0.8	5.2%
Overall	**224**	**3,691**	**16**	**728**	**3.5**	**488**	**2.4**	**13.2%**

Source: W/B HIDTA dataset

Table 16. Drug Testing Results for the 2006 Cohort

	Subjects	Drug Tests Administered		Failures to Appear		Positive Urines		Percent Tests Positive
		Tot.	Avg.	Tot.	Avg.	Tot.	Avg.	
Alexandria	43	615	14	276	6.4	167	3.9	27.2%
Arlington	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Baltimore City	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Baltimore County	5	32	6	64	12.8	4	0.8	12.5%
Charles County	16	284	18	149	9.3	75	4.7	26.4%
Fairfax County	40	572	14	9	0.2	61	1.5	10.7%
Loudoun County	15	119	8	-	-	32	2.1	26.9%
Prince George's Co.	54	1,470	27	83	1.5	99	1.8	6.7%
Prince William Co.	22	340	15	0	0.0	14	0.6	4.1%
Washington, DC	26	341	13	5	0.2	3	0.1	0.1%
Overall	**221**	**3,773**	**17**	**586**	**2.8**	**455**	**2.1**	**12.1%**

Source: W/B HIDTA dataset

The percentage of drug tests that were positive at each site is also displayed in Tables 14 to 16. For the three cohorts, the overall average was from 9 to 13 percent. This was consistent with the overall findings for the 2002 and 2003 cohorts, where the range was 7 to 11 percent.

Use of Sanctions. Tables 17 to 19 present for each cohort the numbers of subjects who were sanctioned a first, second, and third time for behaviors that violated the requirements of their treatment program. The most commonly reported problems for each cohort were negative behavior, failure to appear, and positive urine test. The two latter problems were the primary causes for a second or third sanction.

Table 17. Behaviors Prompting Sanctions for 2004 Cohort

Behavior	First (n = 236)	Second (n = 64)	Third (n = 30)
Arrest	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Failure to Appear	24.2%	43.8%	46.7%
Negative Behavior	32.2%	3.1%	3.3%
Positive Urine	27.5%	40.6%	40.0%
Supervision Violation	5.1%	7.8%	6.7%
Treatment/Jail Violation	3.0%	3.1%	0.0%
Other	5.9%	1.6%	3.3%
TOTAL	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

Source: W/B HIDTA dataset

Table 18. Behaviors Prompting Sanctions for 2005 Cohort

Behavior	First (n = 190)	Second (n = 92)	Third (n = 65)
Arrest	0.5%	3.3%	1.5%
Failure to Appear	18.9%	32.6%	41.5%
Negative Behavior	34.2%	6.5%	4.6%
Positive Urine	20.5%	37.0%	26.2%
Supervision Violation	8.9%	13.0%	20.0%
Treatment/Jail Violation	7.9%	2.2%	1.5%
Other	8.4%	5.4%	4.6%
TOTAL	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

Source: W/B HIDTA dataset

Table 19. Behaviors Prompting Sanctions for 2006 Cohort

Behavior	First (n = 144)	Second (n = 62)	Third (n = 31)
Arrest	1.4%	3.2%	3.2%
Failure to Appear	31.9%	38.7%	48.4%
Negative Behavior	20.8%	16.1%	6.5%
Positive Urine	22.9%	32.3%	29.0%
Supervision Violation	6.3%	6.5%	3.2%
Treatment/Jail Violation	14.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Other	2.1%	3.2%	9.7%
TOTAL	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

Source: W/B HIDTA dataset

As shown in Tables 20 to 22, it appears that the severity of the sanctions was increased when an offender violated a second or third time. In the first instance of these types of problems, the most common solutions were reprimands and supervisor meetings. For subsequent infractions, stricter treatment requirements were implemented, and arrest or other criminal justice solutions were used more often.

Table 20. Response to Behaviors for 2004 Cohort

Response	First (n = 235)	Second (n = 63)	Third (n = 30)
Increase/Change Requirements	41.7%	14.3%	23.3%
Arrest/Court Action	8.5%	7.9%	10.0%
Jail/Other CJ Program	3.0%	3.2%	0.0%
Reprimands/Meetings	32.8%	34.9%	23.3%
Restrictions	1.3%	4.8%	0.0%
Treatment Transfer/ Referral	6.4%	9.5%	10.0%
Removed/Discharged	1.3%	3.2%	3.3%
Other	5.1%	22.2%	30.0%
TOTAL	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

Source: W/B HIDTA dataset

Table 21. Response to Behaviors for 2005 Cohort

Response	First (n = 190)	Second (n = 92)	Third (n = 65)
Increase/Change Requirements	43.2%	17.4%	20.0%
Arrest/Court Action	5.2%	12.0%	10.8%
Jail/Other CJ Prog.	0.5%	4.3%	4.6%
Reprimands/Meetings	31.8%	38.0%	43.1%
Restrictions	2.6%	3.3%	1.5%
Treatment Transfer/ Referral	2.6%	13.0%	9.2%
Removed/Discharged	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Other	10.4%	12.0%	10.8%
TOTAL	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

Source: W/B HIDTA dataset

Table 22. Response to Behaviors for 2006 Cohort

Response	First (n = 144)	Second (n = 92)	Third (n = 31)
Increase/Change Requirements	27.1%	29.3%	32.3%
Arrest/Court Action	6.9%	13.8%	16.1%
Jail/Other CJ Prog.	0.7%	1.7%	3.2%
Reprimands/Meetings	45.8%	46.6%	35.5%
Restrictions	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Treatment Transfer/ Referral	4.2%	1.7%	9.7%
Removed/Discharged	1.4%	1.7%	0.0%
Other	13.2%	5.2%	3.2%
TOTAL	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

Source: W/B HIDTA dataset

Recidivism

Three types of criminal recidivism indicators were examined in this study: 1) the numbers of individuals in each cohort arrested before and after treatment; 2) their total numbers of pre- and post-treatment arrests; and 3) the total number of criminal charges filed against these individuals during the two periods. Pre- and post-treatment arrest data are presented separately for each cohort, with a cross-cohort summary provided at the end of this section.

2004 Cohort

At the ten sites that had substance abuse treatment programs in calendar year 2004, a total of 507 people entered W/B HIDTA-funded treatment (see Table 23). Sixty-two percent of these individuals (315) had been arrested at least once during the year before entering treatment. During the one-year follow-up period, only 37 percent of the cohort members (188) were arrested. The overall reduction in the number of individuals arrested before and after treatment was 40.3 percent.

Table 23: 2004 Cohort. Comparison of the number of ***individuals arrested*** at each site, and total for all sites, in the year before and the year after treatment at ten W/B HIDTA treatment sites.

2004 COHORT SITE	N	Number of Individuals Arrested in the Year Prior to W/B HIDTA Treatment	Number of Individuals Arrested in the Year After W/B HIDTA Treatment	Percent Change in Number of Individuals Arrested[7]
Alexandria City	11	6	2	-66.7%
Arlington County	53	32	17	-46.9%
Baltimore City	81	28	37	32.1%
Baltimore County	13	7	2	-71.4%
Charles County	32	25	10	-60.0%
Fairfax County	70	58	26	-55.2%
Loudoun County	11	5	5	0.0%
Prince George's County	100	83	39	-53.0%
Prince William County	42	19	13	-31.6%
Washington, DC	94	52	37	-28.8%
TOTAL	**507**	**315**	**188**	**-40.3%**

Source: NCIC arrest records

[7] Percent change is calculated in this and subsequent tables by subtracting the number for the year prior to treatment from the number for the year after treatment and dividing the result by the number for the year prior to treatment. The fractional result is multiplied by 100 to obtain a percentage (Fox et al. 1999).

While the overall results of treatment in the ten jurisdictions were positive, there was wide variation in outcome among the W/B HIDTA sites. The number of people arrested declined significantly following treatment in eight of the ten jurisdictions. This ranged from a 28.8 percent reduction in Washington to a 71.4 percent reduction in Baltimore County. In Baltimore City, however, the number arrested was actually higher by 32.1 percent during the follow-up period. This was due to the fact that, as a jail-based program, participants were incarcerated for some or all of the pretreatment period and therefore had less opportunity to be arrested during this time, as they were not at large in the community.

Table 24 shows that the 507 individuals in the 2004 cohort had a total of 532 arrests in the year before entering treatment, an average of 1.05 arrests per person. During the one-year follow-up period, these same individuals had a total of 309 arrests, an average of 0.61 arrests per client, and a 41.9 percent reduction in arrests compared to the pre-treatment period.

Table 24: 2004 Cohort. Comparison of the number of ***arrests*** for each site, and total for all sites, in the year before and the year after treatment at ten W/B HIDTA treatment sites.

2004 COHORT SITE	N	Number of Arrests in the Year Prior to W/B HIDTA Treatment	Number of Arrests in the Year After W/B HIDTA Treatment	Percent Change in Arrests
Alexandria City	11	8	4	-50.0%
Arlington County	53	47	36	-23.4%
Baltimore City	81	39	58	48.7%
Baltimore County	13	21	2	-90.5%
Charles County	32	46	23	-50.0%
Fairfax County	70	117	41	-65.0%
Loudoun County	11	9	8	-11.1%
Prince George's County	100	136	58	-57.4%
Prince William County	42	28	24	-14.3%
Washington, DC	94	81	55	-32.1%
TOTAL	**507**	**532**	**309**	**-41.9%**

Source: NCIC arrest records

Table 25 indicates that after treatment began the total number of charges per year brought against the subjects was cut in half, a 51 percent reduction. Moreover, this number represents a

total of 563 fewer crimes committed in the community than would have been expected without treatment. The greatest absolute changes were in criminal charges for drug-related crimes, which were down by 60 percent. Violent crimes and property crimes (including burglary, grand larceny, and auto theft) were down by 50 percent. Charges for public order crimes, such as disturbing the peace and gambling, and other miscellaneous crimes, including credit card offenses and begging, were reduced by about 60 percent. Charges for technical crimes such as violation of parole were down 18 percent.

Table 25. 2004 Cohort. Frequency of ***charges*** by offense before and after treatment.

Offense Type	Pre-Treatment	One-Year Follow-up	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Violent Crimes	77	39	-38	-49.4%
Property Crimes	288	142	-146	-50.7%
Public Order	148	60	-88	-59.5%
Technical	156	128	-28	-18.0%
Other	50	19	-31	-62.0%
Drug Crimes	385	153	-232	-60.3%
TOTAL	**1,104**	**541**	**-563**	**-51.0%**

Source: NCIC arrest records

2005 Cohort

In calendar year 2005, a total of 389 people entered W/B HIDTA-funded treatment at the ten sites that had substance abuse treatment programs (see Table 26). Seventy percent of these individuals (274) had been arrested at least once during the year before entering treatment. During the one-year follow-up period, 39 percent of the cohort members (153) were arrested. The overall reduction in the number of individuals arrested before and after treatment was 44.2 percent.

Table 26: 2005 Cohort. Comparison of the number of ***individuals arrested*** at each site, and total for all sites, in the year before and the year after treatment at ten W/B HIDTA treatment sites.

2005 COHORT SITE	N	Number of Individuals Arrested in the Year Prior to W/B HIDTA Treatment	Number of Individuals Arrested in the Year After W/B HIDTA Treatment	Percent Change in Number of Individuals Arrested
Alexandria City	26	9	13	44.4%
Arlington County	81	62	23	-62.9%
Baltimore City	7	3	4	33.3%
Baltimore County	31	26	11	-57.7%
Charles County	16	15	7	-53.3%
Fairfax County	63	50	19	-62.0%
Loudoun County	16	9	4	-55.6%
Prince George's County	88	68	37	-45.6%
Prince William County	23	8	16	100.0%
Washington, DC	38	24	19	-20.8%
TOTAL	**389**	**274**	**153**	**-44.2%**

Source: NCIC arrest records

As shown in Table 27, these 389 individuals had a total of 490 arrests in the year before entering treatment, an average of 1.26 arrests per person. During the one-year follow-up period, these same individuals had a total of 249 arrests, an average of 0.64 arrests per person, and a 49.2 percent reduction in arrests compared to the pre-treatment period.

Examination of the arrest data by site in Tables 26 and 27 shows that in seven of the ten sites the number of individuals arrested and the total number of arrests were substantially lower during the follow up period. For the three sites where arrests increased following treatment (Alexandria, Baltimore City, and Prince William County), fewer than half of the individuals in the cohort (35 to 43 percent) had been arrested in the year prior to treatment, possibly due to incarceration. With so few individuals arrested in these sites during the pre-treatment period, it is not surprising that arrest rates rose during the follow-up period.

Table 27: 2005 Cohort. Comparison of the number of ***arrests*** for each site, and total for all sites, in the year before and the year after treatment at ten W/B HIDTA treatment sites.

2005 COHORT SITE	N	Number of Arrests in the Year Prior to W/B HIDTA Treatment	Number of Arrests in the Year After W/B HIDTA Treatment	Percent Change in Arrests
Alexandria City	26	13	20	53.8%
Arlington County	81	105	36	-65.7%
Baltimore City	7	5	7	40.0%
Baltimore County	31	52	18	-65.4%
Charles County	16	35	12	-65.7%
Fairfax County	63	103	30	-70.9%
Loudoun County	16	10	6	-40.0%
Prince George's County	88	122	64	-47.5%
Prince William County	23	12	25	108.3%
Washington, DC	38	33	31	-6.1%
TOTAL	**389**	**490**	**249**	**-49.2%**

Source: NCIC arrest records

Table 28 shows that, as with the 2004 cohort, the biggest reductions in the types of crimes that individuals were charged with following treatment were drug crimes, which were down 66 percent. Charges for property crimes and other miscellaneous crimes were reduced by more than 50 percent. All other crime categories declined 34 to 39 percent. Overall, cohort members were charged with 517 fewer crimes during the follow-up period, a 53 percent reduction.

Table 28. 2005 Cohort. Frequency of ***charges*** by offense before and after treatment.

Offense Type	Pre-Treatment	One-Year Follow-up	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Violent Crimes	52	32	-20	-38.5%
Property Crimes	310	142	-168	-54.2%
Public Order	96	58	-38	-39.6%
Technical	141	93	-48	-34.0%
Other	51	22	-29	-56.9%
Drug Crimes	323	109	-214	-66.3%
TOTAL	**973**	**456**	**-517**	**-53.1%**

Source: NCIC arrest records

2006 Cohort

By 2006, the treatment program in Baltimore City had been phased out, leaving nine jurisdictions with active W/B HIDTA-funded substance abuse treatment programs. In that calendar year, a total of 327 people entered one of these programs (see Table 29). Seventy-two percent of these individuals (236) had been arrested at least once during the year before entering treatment. During the one-year follow-up period, 41 percent of the cohort members (133) were arrested. The overall reduction in the number of individuals arrested before and after treatment was 43.6 percent. Seven of the nine jurisdictions showed reductions in the number of cohort members arrested following treatment, ranging from 13 to 81 percent, and one was unchanged. Only Loudoun County showed a slight increase in the number of individuals arrested with one additional person arrested in the follow-up period.

Table 29: **2006 Cohort.** Comparison of the number of ***individuals arrested*** at each site, and total for all sites, in the year before and the year after treatment at nine W/B HIDTA treatment sites.

2006 COHORT SITE	N	Number of Individuals Arrested in the Year Prior to W/B HIDTA Treatment	Number of Individuals Arrested in the Year After W/B HIDTA Treatment	Percent Change in Number of Individuals Arrested
Alexandria City	44	25	25	0.0%
Arlington County	88	71	13	-81.7%
Baltimore City	-	-	-	-
Baltimore County	12	8	7	-12.5%
Charles County	20	17	6	-64.7%
Fairfax County	41	27	22	-18.5%
Loudoun County	17	9	10	11.1%
Prince George's County	54	43	24	-44.2%
Prince William County	25	16	11	-31.3%
Washington, DC	26	20	15	-25.0%
TOTAL	**327**	**236**	**133**	**-43.6%**

Source: NCIC arrest records

The 327 individuals in the 2006 cohort had a total of 434 arrests in the year before entering treatment, an average of 1.33 arrests per person (see Table 30). During the one-year follow-up period, these same individuals had a total of 210 arrests, an average of 0.64 arrests per person, and a 51.6 percent reduction in arrests compared to the pre-treatment period. Seven of

the nine jurisdictions had substantially fewer arrests during the follow-up period with reductions ranging from 31 percent in Baltimore County to 87 percent in Arlington County.

Table 30: **2006 Cohort.** Comparison of the number of ***arrests*** for each site, and total for all sites, in the year before and the year after treatment at nine W/B HIDTA treatment sites.

2006 COHORT SITE	N	Number of Arrests in the Year Prior to W/B HIDTA Treatment	Number of Arrests in the Year After W/B HIDTA Treatment	Percent Change in Arrests**
Alexandria City	44	37	44	18.9%
Arlington County	88	137	18	-86.9%
Baltimore City	-	-	-	-
Baltimore County	12	16	11	-31.3%
Charles County	20	30	13	-56.7%
Fairfax County	41	51	31	-39.2%
Loudoun County	17	21	12	-42.9%
Prince George's County	54	86	38	-55.8%
Prince William County	25	26	12	-53.8%
Washington, DC	26	30	31	3.3%
TOTAL	**327**	**434**	**210**	**-51.6%**

Source: NCIC arrest records

Table 31 shows that for the 2006 cohort the greatest reductions in criminal charges following W/B HIDTA-funded treatment were in the areas of property crimes and drug crimes, which were both down by 70 percent or more. Charges for other types of crimes (violent, public order, and miscellaneous) were down more than 50 percent. Technical crimes, such as parole violation and failure to pay child support, fell by 27 percent. Overall, cohort members were charged with 510 fewer crimes during the follow-up period, a 60 percent reduction.

Table 31. 2006 Cohort. Frequency of ***charges*** by offense before and after treatment.

Offense Type	Pre-Treatment	One-Year Follow-up	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Violent Crimes	55	26	-29	-52.7%
Property Crimes	231	51	-180	-77.9%
Public Order	94	41	-53	-56.3%
Technical	169	123	-46	-27.2%
Other	43	18	-25	-58.1%
Drug Crimes	254	77	-177	-69.7%
TOTAL	**846**	**336**	**-510**	**-60.3%**

Source: NCIC arrest records

Summary of Recidivism Findings

Table 32 summarizes the criminal recidivism data for the three annual cohorts of participants in W/B HIDTA-funded substance abuse treatment programs. Despite the declining enrollment in the treatment programs from year to year (from 507 in 2004 to 327 in 2006), the annual results were remarkably consistent:

- At least 100 fewer cohort members were arrested during the follow-up period than in the year before treatment;
- There were at least 220 fewer arrests during follow up for each cohort; and
- Each year cohort members were charged with at least 500 fewer crimes after they had received substance abuse treatment.

Table 32. All Cohorts. Summary of reductions in numbers of individuals arrested and total numbers of arrests and criminal charges before and after treatment.

COHORTS	Pre-Treatment	One-Year Follow-up	Absolute Change	Percent Change
2004 Cohort (n=507)				
Individuals Arrested	315	188	-127	-40.3%
Number of Arrests	532	309	-223	-41.9%
Number of Charges	1,104	541	-563	-51.0%
2005 Cohort (n=389)				
Individuals Arrested	274	153	-121	-44.2%
Number of Arrests	490	249	-241	-49.2%
Number of Charges	973	456	-517	-53.1%
2006 Cohort (n=327)				
Individuals Arrested	236	133	-103	-43.6%
Number of Arrests	434	210	-224	-51.6%
Number of Charges	846	336	-510	-60.3%

Source: NCIC arrest records

The study results replicate and expand the findings from the three previous annual-cohort studies of W/B HIDTA effectiveness, which were conducted when treatment programs operated in all 12 W/B HIDTA sites. It was previously found each year from 2000 to 2003 that the overall number of arrests went down substantially for criminal offenders once they enrolled in substance abuse treatment programs funded by the W/B HIDTA. For all 12 sites combined, the overall rate of reduction each year was between 43 and 52 percent. In these earlier cohorts, the average number of arrests per person fell from an average of 1.19 arrests in the year prior to treatment to 0.64 arrests in the year after enrollment.

Nearly identical results were obtained in the current study when the arrest data for the three cohorts (2004-2006) were combined. The 1,223 individuals in these three cohorts were arrested 1,456 times in the year prior to treatment (an average of 1.19 times each) and 768 times in the year after enrolling in treatment (an average of 0.63 times each). This represents a 47 percent reduction in the rate of arrests, which is consistent with the 43 to 52 percent reductions found in previous years.

The current study was the first one in which it was possible to compare the number of individuals in each cohort who were arrested during the pre- and post-treatment periods. By this measure of recidivism, the crime rate for each cohort was reduced by the rate of 40 to 44 percent during the follow up period. This is slightly lower than the 47 percent reduction in number of arrests described above, but understandable since some individuals were arrested multiple times.

This study also confirmed the findings from the previous annual-cohort studies that found that cohort members committed at least 50 percent fewer crimes during the follow up period, as indicated by the number of charges filed against them before and after treatment. In this study, the range was from a 51 percent reduction in 2004 to a 60 percent reduction in 2006. As in the previous studies, the greatest areas of reduction were in drug-related crimes, which were reduced 60 to 70 percent for the three cohorts in this study.

IV. Conclusions

The results of the study indicate that collectively the drug treatment programs funded by the W/B HIDTA reduced drug use and crime among a group of long-term, repeat offenders. The

groups of individuals who entered W/B HIDTA-funded treatment in the years 2004 to 2006, like their cohorts in previous years, were composed of long-term criminals with an average age of around 36 years who had serious drug problems, limited education, and a weak attachment to the labor force. These are precisely the types of individuals that the drug treatment programs were designed to serve.

Once the individuals were in W/B HIDTA-funded substance abuse treatment, the programs did a good job of keeping them in treatment long enough to have an impact on their criminal behavior and drug use. On average, clients in all three cohorts were actively involved in some form of drug treatment for five to six months. The programs' flexibility to step up or step down the level of treatment as needed to meet the changing needs of each participant contributed to their ability to keep clients in treatment. In addition, drug testing, the supervision provided to the clients through the parole and probation offices, and the progressive use of stricter sanctions for repeat violations of the terms of their treatment requirements helped ensure that the clients remained drug free.

The pre- and post-treatment comparisons of arrest data clearly indicate that the W/B HIDTA-funded programs as a whole continue to produce the desired effects within the target population. Criminal recidivism in the year following treatment was reduced significantly for each of the three cohorts, regardless of whether the indicator used was the number of people arrested, the number of arrests, or the number of criminal charges filed.

After entering treatment, there was a 40 to 44 percent reduction from the previous year in the number of individuals arrested; a 42 to 52 percent reduction in the total number of arrests; and a 51 to 60 percent reduction in the number of criminal charges filed against cohort members. The effects were most pronounced for drug-related crimes, which were reduced by about 60 to 70 percent across the three years of the study. Property crimes were reduced by 51 to 78 percent in the three cohorts, and violent crimes were also reduced by 39 to 53 percent. These positive findings are consistent with the results found in evaluations of the W/B HIDTA substance abuse treatment programs for the 2000 to 2003 cohorts.

V. Limitations

The primary limitation of this study was with missing data. It was found that client records in the HATS dataset were sometimes incomplete. At times whole categories of data, such as the number of positive drug tests, were not available for a particular jurisdiction. However, over the years that these programs have been studied, the sites have become progressively better at recording client data in the HATS database. Consequently, there was relatively little missing data in the current study.

Other potential limitations that may affect the interpretation of findings are the changes in cohort demographics and drug use patterns that were documented in this study. As the large Baltimore City program was phased out, the cohorts' overall demographics changed so that by 2006 there were proportionally fewer women and African Americans than in previous years, and a greater proportion of this cohort had at least completed high school. Similarly, the percentage of individuals in each cohort using heroin and injecting drugs fell dramatically by 2006 since there were no longer any members from Baltimore City where such use is prevalent.

Finally, over the three years studied, the composition of the cohorts changed so that the majority of clients entered treatment in community-based programs rather than in jail-based programs. It is uncertain what effects, if any, this change – in conjunction with the demographic and drug use changes across cohorts – had on the overall success of the W/B HIDTA-funded substance abuse treatment programs.

VI. References

DuPont RL, Campbell MD, Sherman AK, Hasting JC, Aronson L, McAneny D, Guyton T, Mazza JJ: *The Effect of the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA Treatment on Substance Abusing Criminals at Twelve W/B HIDTA Sites During Calendar Year 2000*. Greenbelt, MD: Washington/Baltimore HIDTA, 2002.

DuPont RL, Campbell MD, Mazza JJ, Bumanis A, Guyton T, Flot S: *The Effect of the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA Treatment on Substance Abusing Criminals at Twelve W/B HIDTA Sites During Calendar Year 2001*. Greenbelt, MD: Washington/Baltimore HIDTA, 2004.

DuPont RL, Campbell MD, Seymour A: *The Effect of Washington/Baltimore HIDTA-Funded Substance Abuse Treatment on Arrest Rates of Criminals Entering Treatment in Calendar Years 2002 and 2003*. Greenbelt, MD: Washington/Baltimore HIDTA, 2007.

Fox J.A., J. Levin, M. Shively, 1999. *Elementary Statistics In Criminal Justice Research*. New York, NY: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Taxman, F.S., Kubu, B. & DeStefano, C. (1999). *Treatment as Crime Control: Impact of Substance Abuse Treatment on the Individual Offending Rates of Hard-Core Substance Abusing Offenders*. Greenbelt, MD: Washington/Baltimore HIDTA Project.

Taxman, F.S. & Cronin, J. (2000). *Technical Report on Treatment As Crime Control: Update on 1997 Sample and 1998 Cohort*. College Park, MD: University of Maryland, College Park.

Appendix A

Detailed Methodology

Data Sources
Coding of Arrest Data
Calculation of Arrest Rates
Missing Data

Data Sources

Data on the 2004, 2005, and 2006 W/B HIDTA cohorts were obtained from two primary sources. The first was a dataset provided by the W/B HIDTA that contained demographic characteristics, substance abuse history, and treatment information that were gathered from client records in the HIDTA Automated Tracking System (HATS).

The second primary dataset consisted of arrest records obtained from the National Crime Information Center (NCIC). These records contained criminal histories as reported to the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI) for all subjects in the study, beginning with the first adult arrest through the present time. The number of arrests and type of criminal charges recorded in the NCIC records for the year just before treatment and during the one-year follow-up period constituted the critical measures of program outcome for this study.

The evaluators combined information from the W/B HIDTA dataset and the NCIC arrest records into a master data file for analysis using SPSS statistical software.

Coding of Arrest Data

NCIC arrest records were provided to IBH staff by the W/B HIDTA Watch Center. The arrest records were verified against FBI identification numbers and by client rosters (excel spreadsheets) provided by the W/B HIDTA staff. Client's names were checked against names listed on the roster, and further checked against social security numbers as well as date of birth. Aliases were noted. The information gathered included: the date and charges for all offenses committed by a client 365 days prior to the date of admittance into W/B HIDTA treatment (prior arrests); the total number of these prior arrests; and similar information for all arrests made within 365 days from the date that the client was exposed to the community after admittance into W/B HIDTA treatment (post arrests).

It was possible to have more than one charge on an arrest date (arrest event). All charges associated with those individual arrest events were coded according to the *Crime Categories for HIDTA Evaluation* (DuPont et al, 2004, Appendix C), which was based on the Uniformed Crime Report. Primary crimes were categorized by type of offense (Drug, Violent, Property, Public Order, Technical, and Other) and assigned a primary code. Drug charges associated with the primary crime were grouped by type of drug crime (Distribution, Possession, etc.) and assigned a secondary code. Prior arrests, post arrests, and the instant offenses that caused the individual to be referred to W/B HIDTA treatment were all coded in the same manner.

The date and type of offense were then entered into an Excel spreadsheet with no individual identifying information attached. All research data coding and analysis occurred at the W/B HIDTA office in Greenbelt, MD. No data identifying individuals for this report ever left the W/B HIDTA site.

Calculation of Arrest Rates

The research design used a pretest/posttest comparison that evaluates the effect of treatment on reducing crime by participants. Arrest rates were compared for periods before and after onset of W/B HIDTA-funded treatment within and between sites/jurisdictions to examine

effectiveness in reducing re-arrest rates overall as well as technical, violent and/or drug offenses specifically.

The method of calculating the arrest rate involved using the following formula (Fox et al., 1999):

$$\frac{(\text{Number of Arrests Post} - \text{Number of Arrests Prior})(100)}{\text{Number of Arrests Prior to Treatment}}$$

Calculation of the ***total*** % change in arrest: $-47.3\% = \frac{(595 - 1128)\,(100)}{1128}$

The same method was used to calculate the percent change in the number of cohort members arrested before and after treatment and the percent change in the number of criminal charges filed against these individuals.

Missing Data

Initial examination of the data records revealed minor problems regarding missing data in the W/B HIDTA dataset. Although all jurisdictions gathered information on basic demographics and phases of treatment for the clients they served, the various jurisdictions did not consistently and completely report all client information in HATS in 2004, 2005, and 2006. These areas of inconsistency included demographic information, criminal history, pre-treatment drug use pattern, and results of drug testing while in treatment. W/B HIDTA staff followed up with treatment staff in each jurisdiction in 2007-2008 and worked with them to ensure that as much of the missing data as possible was recovered and entered into HATS. As a result, the amount of missing client information was substantially less than in the three previous cohort studies.

The issue of missing data was handled as it was in the previous two studies: all available data were included in the analyses and the total number of subjects was noted for each calculation. Missing data points were not replaced with averages or other estimates based on the characteristics of those for whom data was available.

Appendix B

HATS Data by Jurisdiction

Table B.1.a. Demographic Data by Jurisdiction for 2004 Cohort

	Alexandria (n = 11)	Arlington County (n = 53)	Baltimore City (n = 81)	Baltimore County (n=13)	Charles County (n = 32)	Fairfax County (n=70)	Loudoun County (n = 11)	Prince George's County (n = 100)	Prince William County (n = 42)	Washington DC (n = 94)	TOTAL COHORT (n = 507)
Age:											
Mean Years	35.3	39.9	40.0	28.6	35.2	33.0	32.7	32.5	33.9	42.9	36.7
Gender:											
Male	63.6%	69.8%	63.0%	84.6%	65.6%	68.6%	72.7%	85.0%	69.0%	92.6%	75.7%
Female	36.4%	30.2%	37.0%	15.4%	34.4%	31.4%	27.3%	15.0%	31.0%	7.4%	24.3%
Race:											
American Indian	0	0	0	0	0	4.3%	0	0	0	0.8%	0.6%
Asian Pacific	0	0	0	0	3.1%	1.4%	0	0	0	0	0.6%
African American	63.6%	77.4%	92.6%	7.7%	43.8%	54.3%	27.3%	92.0%	45.2%	98.3%	75.5%
Caucasian	27.3%	20.8%	6.2%	92.3%	53.1%	37.1%	63.6%	7.0%	52.4%	0.8%	21.7%
Other	9.1%	1.9%	1.2%	0	0	2.9%	9.1%	1.0%	2.4%	0	1.6%
Education:											
Less than HS	18.2%	37.7%	72.8%	23.1%	40.6%	45.7%	36.4%	36.0%	38.1%	48.9%	45.4%
HS Graduate	54.5%	56.6%	23.5%	53.8%	46.9%	31.4%	54.5%	55.0%	52.4%	41.5%	43.6%
Some College	27.3%	5.7%	3.7%	23.1%	9.4%	20.0%		7.0%	9.5%	8.5%	9.5%
College Degree					3.1%	2.9%	9.1%	2.0%		1.1%	1.4%
Other											
Unknown											
Employment:											
Employed (F/T)	45.5%	0	40.7%	7.7%	6.3%	1.4%	36.4%	0	52.4%	14.9%	16.2%
Employed (P/T)	9.0%	0	0	7.7%	0	0	0	0	21.4%	0	2.2%
Unemployed	45.5%	100.0%	59.3%	84.6%	6.3%	98.6%	63.6%	0	26.2%	85.1%	56.3%
Incarcerated	0	0	0	0	84.4%	0	0	100.0%	0	0	25.1%
Inc./Work Release	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Institutionalized	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disabled	0	0	0	0	3.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0.2%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table B.1.b. Demographic Data by Jurisdiction for 2005 Cohort

	Alexandria (n = 26)	Arlington County (n = 81)	Baltimore City (n = 7)	Baltimore County (n=31)	Charles County (n = 16)	Fairfax County (n=63)	Loudoun County (n = 16)	Prince George's County (n = 88)	Prince William County (n = 23)	Washington DC (n = 38)	TOTAL COHORT (n = 389)
Age:											
Mean Years	39.7	38.2	34.9	28.5	35.3	35.1	34.1	32.3	35.2	42.8	35.6
Gender:											
Male	88.5%	61.7%	85.7%	67.7%	75.0%	87.3%	62.5%	87.5%	78.3%	97.4%	79.4%
Female	11.5%	38.3%	14.3%	32.3%	25.0%	12.7%	37.5%	12.5%	21.7%	2.6%	20.6%
Race:											
American Indian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian Pacific	0	3.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.8%
African American	96.2%	49.4%	100.0%	6.5%	68.8%	41.3%	37.5%	89.8%	56.5%	100.0%	63.5%
Caucasian	3.8%	39.5%	0	90.3%	31.3%	58.7%	43.8%	8.0%	43.5%	0	32.6%
Other	0	7.4%	0	3.2%	0	0	18.8%	2.3%	0	0	3.1%
Education:											
Less than HS	36.0%	24.7%	71.4%	38.7%	37.5%	38.1%	18.8%	46.5%	47.8%	57.9%	39.4%
HS Graduate	44.0%	60.5%	28.6%	35.5%	43.8%	33.3%	31.3%	43.0%	52.2%	2.6%	40.4%
Some College	12.0%	6.2%		19.4%	6.3%	23.8%	43.8%	9.3%		39.5%	15.5%
College Degree	8.0%	8.6%		6.5%	12.5%	4.8%	6.3%	1.2%			4.7%
Other											
Unknown											
Employment:											
Employed (F/T)	26.9%	2.5%	42.9%	3.2%	0	0	26.7%	0	52.4%	69.6%	11.3%
Employed (P/T)	15.4%	0	0	0	0	0	26.7%	0	21.4%	4.3%	2.6%
Unemployed	53.8%	97.5%	42.9%	96.8%	6.3%	100.0%	40.0%	0	26.2%	26.1%	58.8%
Incarcerated	0	0	0	0	93.8%	0	0	100.0%	0	0	26.5%
Inc./Work Release	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Institutionalized	3.8%	0	0	0	0	0	6.7%	0	0	0	0.5%
Disabled	0	0	14.3%	0	3.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0.3%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table B.1.c. Demographic Data by Jurisdiction for 2006 Cohort

	Alexandria (n = 44)	Arlington County (n = 88)	Baltimore City (n = 0)	Baltimore County (n=12)	Charles County (n = 20)	Fairfax County (n=41)	Loudoun County (n = 17)	Prince George's County (n = 54)	Prince William County (n = 25)	Washington DC (n = 26)	TOTAL COHORT (n = 327)
Age:											
Mean Years	37.8	38.1		33.3	35.6	34.5	32.2	32.2	35.4	43.5	36.2
Gender:											
Male	97.7%	72.7%		75.0%	70.0%	87.8%	52.9%	88.9%	80.0%	96.2%	82.0%
Female	2.3%	27.3%		25.0%	30.0%	12.2%	47.1%	11.1%	20.0%	3.8%	18.0%
Race:											
American Indian	0	0		0	0	2.4%	0	0	0	0	0.3%
Asian Pacific	2.3%	3.4%		0	0	2.4%	0	0	0	0	1.5%
African American	81.8%	56.8%		8.3%	60.0%	39.0%	35.3%	96.3%	24.0%	96.2%	64.2%
Caucasian	11.4%	33.0%		91.7%	40.0%	56.1%	64.7%	1.9%	72.0%	3.8%	32.7%
Other	4.5%	6.8%		0	0	0	0	1.9%	4.0%	0	3.1%
Education:											
Less than HS	34.1%	28.4%		63.6%	65.0%	14.6%	23.5%	29.6%	44.0%	73.1%	35.6%
HS Graduate	50.0%	63.6%		36.4%	30.0%	58.5%	35.3%	53.7%	36.0%	23.1%	49.7%
Some College	13.6%	3.4%			5.0%	26.8%	41.2%	14.8%	20.0%	3.8%	12.9%
College Degree	2.3%	4.5%						1.9%			1.8%
Other											
Unknown											
Employment:											
Employed (F/T)	34.1%	0		8.3%	0	29.3%	29.4%	0	52.0%	3.8%	14.4%
Employed (P/T)	0	0		0	0	0	5.9%	0	4.0%	0	.6%
Unemployed	63.6%	100.0%		66.7%	0	70.7%	41.2%	1.9%	44.0%	96.2%	60.2%
Incarcerated	2.3%	0		0	90.0%	0	0	98.1%	0	0	22.0%
Inc./Work Release	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Institutionalized	0	0		0	0	0	11.8%	0	0	0	0.6%
Disabled	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0		25.0%	10.0%	0	11.8%	0	0	0	2.1%

Table B.2.a. Offender Drug Behavior at Program Intake by Jurisdiction for 2004 Cohort

	Alexandria (n =11)	Arlington County (n =53)	Baltimore City (n =81)	Baltimore County (n=13)	Charles County (n=32)	Fairfax County (n=70)	Loudoun County (n =11)	Prince George's County (n =100)	Prince William County (n = 42)	Washington DC (n =94)	TOTAL COHORT (n = 507)
Previous treatment:											
Yes	81.8%	100%	45.7%	76.9%	90.6%	61.4%	72.7%	33.0%	92.9%	26.6%	34.5%
No	18.2%	0	54.3%	23.1%	9.4%	35.7%	27.3%	67.0%	7.1%	73.4%	65.1%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	2.9%	0	0	0	0	0.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Drug of Choice:*											
Alcohol	9.1%	0	7.4%	7.7%	21.9%	0	0	12.0%	0	1.1%	5.5%
Crack/cocaine	27.3%	58.5%	17.3%	15.4%	53.1%	34.3%	27.3%	34.0%	45.2%	39.4%	36.3%
Heroin	18.2%	20.8%	65.4%	69.2%	3.1%	17.1%	9.1%	6.0%	21.4%	47.9%	29.4%
Marijuana/Hash	36.4%	11.3%	9.9%	0	15.6%	38.6%	54.5%	37.0%	16.7%	4.3%	20.5%
PCP	9.1%	0	0	0	0	2.9%	0	5.0%	2.4%	7.4%	3.2%
Other**	0	5.7%	0	7.7%	6.3%	5.7%	9.1%	6.0%	14.3%	0	4.9%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	1.4%	0	0	0	0	0.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Mode of Consumption:											
Injection	9.1%	22.6%	42.0%	69.2%	0	1.4%	9.1%	2.0%	21.4%	21.3%	17.6%
Smoking	0	69.8%	23.5%	15.4%	59.4%	10.0%	18.2%	79.0%	57.1%	46.8%	46.0%
Oral	9.1%	3.8%	7.4%	15.4%	31.3%	72.9%	63.6%	13.0%	9.5%	1.1%	19.1%
Inhalation	72.7%	0	0	0	9.3%	14.3%	9.1%	6.0%	9.5%	26.6%	11.2%
Other	9.1%	3.8%	27.2%	0	0	0	0	0	2.4%	0	5.1%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	1.4%	0	0	0	4.3%	1.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Frequency of use:											
Daily or More	18.2%	84.9%	8.6%	15.4%	9.4%	70.0%	45.5%	0	26.2%	23.4%	28.8%
1-6x week	36.4%	15.1%	8.6%	38.5%	9.4%	4.3%	18.2%	0	23.8%	18.1%	11.6%
2-3x week	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1-2x week	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1-3x monthly	6.1%	0	0	23.1%	9.4%	5.7%	0	0	23.8%	5.3%	5.1%
None in past month	18.2%	0	82.7%	23.1%	71.9%	18.6%	0	100%	26.2%	45.7%	51.7%
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	18.2%	0	0	0	0	1.4%	36.4%	0	0	7.4%	2.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

*Primary drug of choice, may include combinations of other drugs listed with the primary drug.
** Other includes benzodiazepines, amphetamines, hallucinogens, other opiates, and other.

Table B.2.b. Offender Drug Behavior at Program Intake by Jurisdiction for 2005 Cohort

	Alexandria (n = 26)	Arlington County (n = 81)	Baltimore City (n = 7)	Baltimore County (n=31)	Charles County (n = 16)	Fairfax County (n=63)	Loudoun County (n = 16)	Prince George's County (n = 88)	Prince William County (n = 23)	Washington DC (n = 38)	TOTAL COHORT (n = 389)
Previous treatment:											
Yes	100%	100%	100%	71.0%	81.3%	52.4%	72.7%	42.0%	73.9%	100%	74.4%
No	0	0	0	29.0%	18.8%	47.6%	27.3%	58.0%	26.1%	0	25.6%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Drug of Choice:*											
Alcohol	0	0	14.3%	6.5%	25.0%	0	0	4.5%	0	0	2.8%
Crack/cocaine	65.4%	53.1%	14.3%	22.6%	31.3%	25.4%	37.5%	30.7%	56.5%	36.8%	38.3%
Heroin	3.8%	27.2%	42.9%	67.7%	6.3%	19.0%	0	2.3%	21.7%	55.3%	22.6%
Marijuana/Hash	15.4%	6.2%	14.3%	0	25.0%	33.3%	56.3%	45.5%	8.7%	5.7%	22.9%
PCP	3.8%	0	0	0	0	4.8%	0	1.1%	8.7%	0	1.8%
Other**	7.7%	13.6%	14.3%	3.2%	12.5%	17.5%	6.3%	15.9%	4.3%	0	11.3%
Unknown	3.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Mode of Consumption:											
Injection	0	23.5%	0	61.3%	6.3%	0	0	1.1%	17.4%	8.1%	12.1%
Smoking	16.0%	51.9%	57.1%	19.4%	56.3%	14.3%	31.3%	90.9%	69.6%	43.2%	49.4%
Oral	4.0%	9.9%	14.3%	9.7%	37.5%	61.9%	68.8%	6.8%	4.3%	0	19.6%
Inhalation	76.0%	0	28.6%	9.7%	0	23.8%	0	1.1%	8.7%	48.6%	15.5%
Other	4.0%	14.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.4%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Frequency of use:											
Daily or More	8.0%	84.0%	0	22.6%	6.3%	3.2%	27.3%	0	39.1%	41.7%	28.1%
1-6x week	40.0%	16.0%	42.9%	38.7%	0	1.6%	36.4%	0	26.1%	25.0%	15.2%
2-3x week	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1-2x week	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1-3x monthly	24.0%	0	14.3%	0	0	1.6%	36.4%	0	4.3%	16.7%	5.0%
None in past month	28.0%	0	42.9%	38.7%	93.8%	93.7%	0	100%	30.4%	16.7%	51.7%
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

*Primary drug of choice, may include combinations of other drugs listed with the primary drug.
** Other includes benzodiazepines, amphetamines, hallucinogens, other opiates, and other.

Table B.2.c. Offender Drug Behavior at Program Intake by Jurisdiction for 2006 Cohort

	Alexandria (n =44)	Arlington County (n =88)	Baltimore City (n =0)	Baltimore County (n=12)	Charles County (n=20)	Fairfax County (n=41)	Loudoun County (n =17)	Prince George's County (n =54)	Prince William County (n = 25)	Washington DC (n =26)	TOTAL COHORT (n = 327)
Previous treatment:											
Yes	81.8%	100%		83.3%	80.0%	90.2%	100%	38.9%	80.0%	100%	82.9%
No	18.2%	0		16.7%	20.0%	9.8%	0	61.1%	20.0%	0	17.1%
Unknown	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Drug of Choice:*											
Alcohol	4.7%	1.1%		8.3%	20.0%	2.4%	0	0	0	0	2.8%
Crack/cocaine	53.5%	60.2%		16.7%	45.0%	39.0%	47.1%	29.6%	48.0%	46.2%	46.3%
Heroin	11.6%	9.1%		58.3%	15.0%	12.2%	0	5.6%	12.0%	46.2%	14.1%
Marijuana/Hash	27.9%	9.1%		8.3%	15.0%	36.6%	35.3%	29.6%	16.0%	0	19.9%
PCP	0	0		0	0	2.4%	0	35.2%	4.0%	7.7%	7.1%
Other**	2.3%	20.5%		8.3%	5.0%	7.3%	17.6%	0	20.0%	0	9.8%
Unknown	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Mode of Consumption:											
Injection	11.6%	9.1%		50.0%	0	12.2%	0	3.7%	8.0%	12.0%	9.5%
Smoking	27.9%	76.1%		16.7%	55.0%	75.6%	29.4%	92.6%	72.0%	52.0%	64.3%
Oral	4.7%	14.8%		8.3%	30.0%	4.9%	64.7%	0	8.0%	0	11.4%
Inhalation	55.8%	0		16.7%	10.0%	7.3%	5.9%	3.7%	8.0%	36.0%	13.8%
Other	0	0		8.3%	5.0%	0	0	0	4.0%	0	0.9%
Unknown	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Frequency of use:											
Daily or More	0	97.7%		33.3%	0	2.4%	17.6%	0	48.0%	79.6%	38.7%
1-6x week	11.6%	2.3%		8.3%	5.0%	7.3%	17.6%	0	20.0%	11.5%	7.1%
2-3x week	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1-2x week	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1-3x monthly	37.2%	0		0	15.0%	19.5%	41.2%	0	16.0%	3.8%	12.0%
None in past month	51.2%	0		58.3%	80.0%	70.7%	23.5%	100%	16.0%	7.7%	42.3%
Other	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

*Primary drug of choice, may include combinations of other drugs listed with the primary drug.
** Other includes benzodiazepines, amphetamines, hallucinogens, other opiates, and other.

Appendix C

Arrest Data by Jurisdiction

Table C.1.a. Instant Arrest Offenses per Jurisdiction 2004 Cohort

Jurisdiction: / Instant Arrest Offense	Alexandria (n = 11)	Arlington County (n = 53)	Baltimore City (n = 81)	Baltimore County (n = 13)	Charles County (n = 32)	Fairfax County (n = 70)	Loudoun County (n = 11)	Prince George's County (n = 100)	Prince William County (n = 42)	Washington DC (n = 94)	Totals (n = 507)
Drug Charges:	**36.4%**	**52.8%**	**77.8%**	**30.8%**	**50.0%**	**24.3%**	**45.5%**	**44.0%**	**59.5%**	**58.5%**	**51.5%**
Distribution	0	0	13.6%	0	3.1%	2.9%	9.1%	5.0%	11.9%	17.0%	8.1%
Misc. Drug	9.1%	52.8%	34.6%	7.7%	25.0%	0	0	9.0%	2.4%	14.9%	17.8%
Possession	27.3%	0	6.2%	23.1%	21.9%	8.6%	36.4%	25.0%	33.3%	12.8%	15.6%
PWID	0	0	23.5%	0	0	12.9%	0	5.0%	11.9%	13.8%	10.1%
Crimes With No Drug Charges Attached:	**63.6%**	**47.2%**	**22.2%**	**69.2%**	**50.0%**	**75.7%**	**54.5%**	**56.0%**	**40.5%**	**41.5%**	**48.5%**
Violent Crimes	9.1%	1.9%	2.5%	0	6.3%	8.6%	0	20.0%	2.4%	19.1%	10.1%
Property Crimes	18.2%	39.6%	3.7%	38.5%	28.1%	17.1%	18.2%	22.0%	28.6%	11.7%	19.5%
Public Order	9.1%	5.7%	0	23.1%	12.5%	12.9%	36.4%	11.0%	2.4%	4.3%	7.9%
Technical	0	0	12.3%	0	0	1.4%	0	1.0%	4.8%	5.3%	3.7%
Other	27.3%	0	3.7%	7.7%	3.1%	35.7%	0	2.0%	2.4%	1.1%	7.3%

Table C.1.b. Instant Arrest Offenses per Jurisdiction 2005 Cohort

Jurisdiction: / Instant Arrest Offense	Alexandria (n = 26)	Arlington County (n = 81)	Baltimore City (n = 7)	Baltimore County (n = 30)	Charles County (n = 16)	Fairfax County (n = 63)	Loudoun County (n = 16)	Prince George's County (n = 87)	Prince William County (n = 23)	Washington DC (n = 46)	Totals (n = 387)
Drug Charges:	**53.8%**	**44.4%**	**100%**	**40.0%**	**12.5%**	**23.8%**	**62.5%**	**35.6%**	**43.5%**	**63.2%**	**41.6%**
Distribution	19.2%	0	28.6%	0	0	3.2%	6.3%	5.7%	13.0%	31.6%	7.8%
Misc. Drug	0	43.2%	28.6%	0	12.5%	0	0	3.4%	0	7.9%	11.6%
Possession	30.8%	1.2%	14.3%	33.3%	0	11.1%	37.5%	23.0%	30.4%	18.4%	17.3%
PWID	3.8%	0	28.6%	6.7%	0	9.5%	18.8%	3.4%	0	5.3%	4.9%
Crimes With No Drug Charges Attached:	**46.2%**	**55.6%**	**0%**	**60.0%**	**87.5%**	**76.2%**	**37.5%**	**64.4%**	**56.5%**	**36.8%**	**58.4%**
Violent Crimes	15.4%	1.2%	0	0	12.5%	0	6.3%	25.3%	8.7%	13.2%	9.6%
Property Crimes	19.2%	43.2%	0	40.0%	50.0%	28.6%	18.8%	25.3%	34.8%	7.9%	29.5%
Public Order	7.7%	8.6%	0	13.3%	0	11.1%	0	11.5%	0	5.3%	8.3%
Technical	0	0	0	0	18.8%	28.6%	6.3%	1.1%	8.7%	5.3%	7.0%
Other	3.8%	2.5%	0	6.7%	6.3%	7.9%	6.3%	1.1%	4.3%	5.3%	4.1%

Table C.1.c. Instant Arrest Offenses per Jurisdiction 2006 Cohort

Jurisdiction: / Instant Arrest Offense	Alexandria (n = 44)	Arlington County (n = 88)	Baltimore City (n = 0)	Baltimore County (n = 12)	Charles County (n = 20)	Fairfax County (n = 41)	Loudoun County (n = 17)	Prince George's County (n = 54)	Prince William County (n = 25)	Washington DC (n = 26)	Totals (n = 327)
Drug Charges:	**50.0%**	**40.9%**		**33.3%**	**40.0%**	**51.2%**	**64.7%**	**53.7%**	**44.0%**	**61.5%**	**48.3%**
Distribution	18.2%	0		0	0	4.9%	0	9.3%	8.0%	34.6%	8.0%
Misc. Drug	4.5%	39.8%		0	10.0%	4.9%	23.5%	9.3%	0	3.8%	15.6%
Possession	18.2%	1.1%		33.3%	15.0%	31.7%	29.4%	24.1%	36.0%	11.5%	18.0%
PWID	9.1%	0		0	15.0%	9.8%	11.8%	11.1%	0	11.5%	6.7%
Crimes With No Drug Charges Attached:	**50.0%**	**59.1%**		**66.7%**	**60.0%**	**48.8%**	**32.3%**	**46.3%**	**56.0%**	**38.5%**	**51.7%**
Violent Crimes	9.1%	1.1%		0	10.0%	4.9%	0	22.2%	4.0%	11.5%	7.6%
Property Crimes	36.4%	25.0%		58.3%	35.0%	24.4%	23.5%	16.7%	40.0%	15.4%	27.2%
Public Order	2.3%	8.0%		0	0	4.9%	0	5.6%	8.0%	0	4.6%
Technical	0	17.0%		8.3%	10.0%	4.9%	11.8%	1.9%	0	7.7%	7.6%
Other	2.3%	8.0%		0	5.0%	9.8%	0	0	4.0%	3.8%	4.6%

Table C.2.a. Total Arrests and Number of Charges per Jurisdiction for the 2004 Cohort

Jurisdiction	Alexandria	Arlington County	Baltimore City	Baltimore County	Charles County	Fairfax County	Loudoun County	Prince George's County	Prince William County	Washington DC	Totals
Pre-Tx Arrests	**(n = 8)**	**(n = 47)**	**(n = 39)**	**(n = 21)**	**(n = 46)**	**(n = 117)**	**(n = 9)**	**(n = 136)**	**(n = 28)**	**(n = 81)**	**(n = 532)**
Drug Crimes (all)	3	15	31	5	26	53	4	169	9	70	385
Violent Crimes	2	0	3	2	11	12	0	31	1	15	77
Property Crimes	4	36	7	18	57	54	13	60	20	19	288
Public Order	1	9	1	3	11	49	0	67	3	4	148
Technical	3	17	12	1	6	56	3	24	14	20	156
Other	2	5	1	3	12	13	7	3	2	2	50
Total Charges:	**15**	**82**	**55**	**32**	**123**	**237**	**27**	**354**	**49**	**130**	**1104**
Post-Tx Arrests	**(n = 4)**	**(n = 36)**	**(n = 58)**	**(n = 2)**	**(n = 23)**	**(n = 41)**	**(n = 8)**	**(n = 58)**	**(n = 24)**	**(n = 55)**	**(n = 309)**
Drug Crimes (all)	0	5	46	3	9	8	2	46	15	19	153
Violent Crimes	0	10	5	0	2	6	0	13	0	3	39
Property Crimes	1	26	12	0	29	18	0	35	5	16	142
Public Order	0	8	10	0	3	7	3	21	0	8	60
Technical	3	17	22	0	6	24	6	10	15	25	128
Other	0	3	0	0	2	2	2	2	5	3	19
Total Charges:	**4**	**69**	**95**	**3**	**51**	**65**	**13**	**127**	**40**	**74**	**541**

Table C.2.b. Total Arrests and Number of Charges per Jurisdiction for the 2005 Cohort

Jurisdiction	Alexandria	Arlington County	Baltimore City	Baltimore County	Charles County	Fairfax County	Loudoun County	Prince George's County	Prince William County	Washington DC	Totals
Pre-Tx Arrests	**(n = 13)**	**(n = 105)**	**(n = 5)**	**(n = 52)**	**(n = 35)**	**(n = 103)**	**(n = 10)**	**(n = 122)**	**(n = 12)**	**(n = 33)**	**(n = 490)**
Drug Crimes (all)	2	39	8	36	23	25	3	165	3	19	323
Violent Crimes	0	7	0	5	8	3	1	25	2	1	52
Property Crimes	6	90	5	42	21	76	3	60	3	4	310
Public Order	2	13	0	11	6	23	3	35	0	3	96
Technical	7	48	0	3	7	52	2	6	4	12	141
Other	2	18	0	2	4	18	1	2	3	1	51
Total Charges:	**19**	**215**	**13**	**99**	**69**	**197**	**13**	**293**	**15**	**40**	**973**
Post-Tx Arrests	**(n = 20)**	**(n = 36)**	**(n = 7)**	**(n = 18)**	**(n = 12)**	**(n = 30)**	**(n = 6)**	**(n = 64)**	**(n = 25)**	**(n = 31)**	**(n = 249)**
Drug Crimes (all)	5	16	6	7	5	7	0	46	6	11	109
Violent Crimes	2	5	3	2	2	2	1	11	0	4	32
Property Crimes	2	12	2	17	13	10	5	39	33	9	142
Public Order	3	3	3	5	5	3	0	15	19	2	58
Technical	13	16	3	1	6	13	3	7	16	15	93
Other	2	10	0	1	0	1	0	4	3	1	22
Total Charges:	**27**	**62**	**17**	**33**	**31**	**36**	**9**	**122**	**77**	**42**	**456**

Table C.2.c. Total Arrests and Number of Charges per Jurisdiction for the 2006 Cohort

Jurisdiction	Alexandria	Arlington County	Baltimore City	Baltimore County	Charles County	Fairfax County	Loudoun County	Prince George's County	Prince William County	Washington DC	Totals
Pre-Tx Arrests	**(n = 37)**	**(n = 137)**	**(n = 0)**	**(n = 16)**	**(n = 30)**	**(n = 51)**	**(n = 21)**	**(n = 86)**	**(n = 26)**	**(n = 30)**	**(n = 434)**
Drug Crimes (all)	6	51		7	7	15	19	131	11	7	254
Violent Crimes	8	16		5	5	7	2	10	2	0	55
Property Crimes	23	92		21	40	18	4	23	4	6	231
Public Order	7	32		7	3	5	4	27	9	0	94
Technical	20	73		3	5	24	4	14	7	19	169
Other	7	26		3	0	1	1	2	3	0	43
Total Charges:	**71**	**290**		**46**	**60**	**70**	**34**	**207**	**36**	**32**	**846**
Post-Tx Arrests	**(n = 44)**	**(n = 18)**	**(n = 0)**	**(n = 11)**	**(n = 13)**	**(n = 31)**	**(n = 12)**	**(n = 38**	**(n = 12)**	**(n = 31)**	**(n = 210)**
Drug Crimes (all)	3	13		7	2	5	2	36	2	7	77
Violent Crimes	11	1		0	3	2	0	7	0	2	26
Property Crimes	3	5		2	5	5	0	23	1	7	51
Public Order	1	6		3	1	5	1	18	5	1	41
Technical	36	13		12	3	22	9	4	5	19	123
Other	4	0		1	1	1	2	6	0	3	18
Total Charges:	**58**	**38**		**25**	**15**	**40**	**14**	**94**	**13**	**39**	**336**

Table C.3.a. Pre- and Post-Treatment Drug Charges for 2004 Cohort

Jurisdiction	Alexandria	Arlington County	Baltimore City	Baltimore County	Charles County	Fairfax County	Loudoun County	Prince George's County	Prince William County	Washington DC	Totals
Pre-Treatment Charges											
Distribution (Selling Manufacturing)	1	4	10	0	1	16	2	30	4	14	82
Miscellaneous Drugs	0	2	0	0	11	6	0	13	0	14	46
Possession	2	8	8	5	13	28	2	61	5	13	145
PWID	0	1	11	0	1	3	0	58	0	29	103
PWIU	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trafficking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transporting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Use	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Conspiracy to Distribute	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	9
Total Drug Charges:	**3**	**15**	**31**	**5**	**26**	**53**	**4**	**169**	**9**	**70**	**385**
Post-Treatment Charges											
Distribution (Selling Manufacturing)	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	8	3	6	30
Miscellaneous Drugs	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	2	0	3	11
Possession	0	3	22	2	4	6	2	21	11	2	73
PWID	0	0	13	0	0	2	0	15	1	8	39
PWIU	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trafficking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transporting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Use	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Conspiracy to Distribute	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Drug Charges:	**0**	**5**	**46**	**3**	**9**	**8**	**2**	**46**	**15**	**19**	**153**

Table C.3.b. Pre- and Post-Treatment Drug Charges for 2005 Cohort

Jurisdiction	Alexandria	Arlington County	Baltimore City	Baltimore County	Charles County	Fairfax County	Loudoun County	Prince George's County	Prince William County	Washington DC	Totals
Pre-Treatment Charges											
Distribution (Selling Manufacturing)	2	4	0	1	0	10	2	34	0	7	60
Miscellaneous Drugs	0	13	1	9	12	5	0	13	0	3	56
Possession	0	21	1	24	9	9	1	70	3	7	145
PWID	0	1	3	2	1	1	0	46	0	2	56
PWIU	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trafficking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transporting	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Use	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Conspiracy to Distribute	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	5
Total Drug Charges:	**2**	**39**	**8**	**36**	**23**	**25**	**3**	**165**	**3**	**19**	**385**
Post-Treatment Charges											
Distribution (Selling Manufacturing)	4	2	1	0	1	2	0	12	1	2	25
Miscellaneous Drugs	0	5	1	1	2	0	0	6	1	2	18
Possession	1	9	3	6	1	5	0	14	4	6	49
PWID	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	13	0	1	16
PWIU	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trafficking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transporting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Use	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Conspiracy to Distribute	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Total Drug Charges:	**5**	**16**	**6**	**7**	**5**	**7**	**0**	**46**	**6**	**11**	**109**

Table C.3.c. Pre- and Post-Treatment Drug Charges for 2006 Cohort

Jurisdiction	Alexandria	Arlington County	Baltimore City	Baltimore County	Charles County	Fairfax County	Loudoun County	Prince George's County	Prince William County	Washington DC	Totals
Pre-Treatment Charges											
Distribution (Selling Manufacturing)	1	19		1	0	6	1	16	2	5	51
Miscellaneous Drugs	0	6		2	2	2	15	14	1	1	43
Possession	5	25		4	4	4	3	57	8	1	111
PWID	0	1		0	1	0	0	39	0	0	41
PWIU	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trafficking	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transporting	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Use	0	0		0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Conspiracy to Distribute	0	0		0	0	0	0	5	0	0	5
Total Drug Charges:	**6**	**51**		**7**	**7**	**15**	**19**	**131**	**11**	**7**	**254**
Post-Treatment Charges											
Distribution (Selling Manufacturing)	0	0		0	1	0	0	7	1	5	14
Miscellaneous Drugs	0	4		5	1	1	1	3	0	1	16
Possession	3	6		2	0	4	1	17	1	1	35
PWID	0	3		0	0	0	0	9	0	0	12
PWIU	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trafficking	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transporting	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Use	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Conspiracy to Distribute	0	0		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Total Drug Charges:	**3**	**13**		**7**	**2**	**5**	**2**	**36**	**2**	**7**	**77**