

The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:

Document Title: Nevada Reentry Drug Court Demonstration

Author(s): John S. Goldkamp ; Michael D. White

Document No.: 202559

Date Received: 11/14/2003

Award Number: 2000-DC-VX-0031

This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant final report available electronically in addition to traditional paper copies.

Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

202559



CRIME AND JUSTICE RESEARCH INSTITUTE

The Nevada Reentry Drug Court Demonstration

John S. Goldkamp
Temple University

Michael D. White
University of North Florida

FINAL REPORT

January 2003

Approved By: M Battle

Date: July 3, 2003

The research described in this report was supported by grant #2000-DC-VX-0031 from the National Institute of Justice, United States Department of Justice. The points of view expressed in the document do not represent the official positions of the National Institute of Justice, the local justice agencies in Clark County and Washoe County, nor the Federal Government.

520 N. Columbus Blvd., Suite 600 Philadelphia, PA 19123
215-627-3766 FAX: 215-627-7810 email: info@cjri.com
www.cjri.com

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

The Nevada Reentry Drug Court Demonstration

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	v
I. The Emergence of Reentry Drug Courts: Background	1
II. Methodology: An Implementation Evaluation of the Nevada Reentry Drug Court Demonstration	5
III. The Nevada Reentry Drug Court Demonstration	6
IV. Reentry Drug Court in Context	11
Defining and Reaching an Appropriate (and Useful) Target Population of State Inmates	12
Special Adaptations of the Drug Court Model for Reentry Court Purposes.....	17
V. Reentry Drug Court Procedure in Clark and Washoe Counties	19
The Screening and Enrollment Process	20
The Reentry Drug Court Regimen	24
VI. The Pre-implementation Period (Phase I)	29
Catch 22: Funding the Reentry Courts from Prison Savings.....	30
Estimating Costs and Savings: Shifting Assumptions.....	31
Competition with Existing Treatment Programs Not Paid from Corrections Budget	33
Department of Justice Funding and Matching Funds from the State.....	34
VII. First Stages of Operation (Phase II): Finding the Target Population	34
Court Approaches	34
Supervision, Housing, and Employment	36
Establishing an Efficient Screening and Enrollment Process: Reaching the Target Population	38
Other Factors Affecting Enrollment of Candidates from the Prisons.....	40
Recent Change in Drug Laws	40
Increased Capacity in the State Prison System	42
Overlap with the 305 and 317 Early Prison Release Options.....	42
Candidates in the Conservation Camps versus Prison Setting.....	44
Restrictive Statutory Criteria	45
Non-Residency of Eligible Inmates	46
Management Information Difficulties	47
VIII. Finding the Rhythm (Phase III): A New Law and Change in Corrections Leadership	48
Revision of the Nevada Law Establishing the Demonstration Reentry Drug Courts (2001)	49
Changes in Corrections	50
IX. The First Participants: Processing and Progress in Clark and Washoe Counties ..	52
Early Stages of Operation: Clark County	52
Early Stages of Operation: Washoe County	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Comparing the Early Experiences in Clark and Washoe Counties.....	62
IX. Implementation of Nevada’s Reentry Drug Courts: Issues and Implications 66	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Identifying and Enrolling Candidates.....67
 Layered Discretion and Jurisdiction.....69
 Participant Behavior: Incentives and Sanctions in the Reentry Drug Court Process.....71
 Assessing Impact: The Longer-Term Contribution of the Nevada Reentry Drug Courts.73
REFERENCES..... Error! Bookmark not defined.
APPENDIX.....Error! Bookmark not defined.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful for the cooperation and patience of the many individuals in Clark and Washoe Counties who shared freely of their time, information, and critical thinking to describe the development and implementation of their respective reentry drug courts. In Clark County, we are especially thankful for the input of the Honorable Jack Lehman of the Eighth Judicial District, John Marr and his staff at Choices Unlimited, Inc., Kendis Stake, Drug Court Manager, David Gibson, Deputy Chief Public Defender, Arthur Noxon, Deputy District Attorney, Chuck Short, Court Administrator, and his staff, as well as Amy Baker and Brian Zana of the Division of Probation and Parole (of the Department of Motor Vehicles and Public Safety). In Washoe County, we are particularly appreciative of the cooperation and input of the Honorable Peter Breen of the Second Judicial District, Defense Attorney David Spitzer, and Terry Gilmartin, Integrated Case Manager for Specialty Courts. We consider ourselves fortunate to have had the opportunity to observe and learn from two of the nation's most accomplished drug court jurisdictions as they extended the drug court model to its most challenging population yet.

The Nevada Reentry Drug Court Demonstration

John S. Goldkamp
Temple University

Michael D. White
University of North Florida

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

This report describes the development and implementation of the nation's first "reentry" drug courts, in Clark County (Las Vegas) and Washoe County (Reno) Nevada. Effective July 1, 1999, Nevada Senate Bill 184 authorized funding for a two-court reentry demonstration for an initial two-year period designed to provide for the release to drug court treatment of 150 prison inmates within two years of their expected parole dates. The two-site Nevada reentry drug court demonstration was intended to relieve the prison population by releasing eligible offenders to the community under intensive treatment and judicial supervision required to help them make the transition to the community successfully and to avoid return to the criminal justice system.

The researchers collected data during site visits to both jurisdictions, using a variety of methods including in-person and phone interviews of key court, treatment and corrections officials, and review of treatment and court files.

Phases of Development and Implementation

This report describes three specific phases in the development and implementation of the Nevada reentry drug court demonstration. In Phase I, the pre-implementation period, the researchers describe initial problems with funding, overcoming budget concerns, and the securing of Department of Justice funding. In particular, initial funding for the demonstration was to come from prison savings produced by moving prisoners from the prison setting to treatment in the community under supervision of the reentry court. This arrangement placed the reentry court pilots in a "catch-22" situation, as it was logically impossible to produce the required savings in advance of operating the reentry court program. The reentry demonstration also had to overcome a number of obstacles associated with the Department of Prisons (later, Corrections) budget, including the fact that the savings generated from the program would be deducted from the Prisons budget (and from the Prisons perspective, might be viewed as a cost, not savings), and that the program was competing with other, similar treatment programs that were not paid from the Prisons budget. Last, officials from the two demonstration sites overcame these budgetary issues by securing funding (\$415,250) from the Drug Court Program Office of the Office of Justice Programs, US Department of Justice, and matching funds from the state of Nevada (\$138,750).

In Phase II, first stages of operation, the researchers describe how each demonstration site developed their programs and constructed approaches to identify appropriate target populations,

and to reach them through effective screening and enrollment procedures. Though similar in aims and based on a drug court model, the two site courts adopted different versions of the reentry court model. Logistical issues necessitated some of these differences, which are described in detail in the full report, while others were more philosophical in nature. However, both reentry courts placed strong emphasis on a number of basic issues thought to be related to program success, including intensive supervision, securing and maintaining appropriate housing, stable employment, and regular participation in an enhanced drug court treatment regimen.

This phase of operation was also characterized by officials being faced with a host of barriers and obstacles. In particular, the reentry demonstrations required the cooperation of a host of local and state agencies to develop a multi-agency, multi-level candidate identification process. The initial screening process simply failed to produce sufficient numbers of acceptable candidates, and when candidates were identified, the process took too long to move them from prisons to the reentry programs. A number of factors affected the availability and accessibility of an appropriate reentry court population, such as recent changes in drug laws (reducing likelihood of prison sentences for drug offenders), increased capacity of the state correctional system, competition with other treatment programs, restrictive statutory eligibility criteria, state and county residency requirements, and the state of management information in the participating justice agencies. The combination of these factors severely limited the implementation of the reentry demonstrations in both sites, resulting in only a trickle of eligible candidates being identified, screened, and enrolled in the programs.

In Phase III, finding the rhythm, the researchers describe how changes to the original legislation and a change in Department of Corrections leadership allowed both programs to become fully implemented, with efficient screening and enrollment mechanisms and strong inter-agency cooperation. More specifically, officials successfully lobbied the Nevada legislature to make a number of important amendments to the original 1999 law. First, the demonstration period was extended through June 2003 to account for initial start-up delays. Second, the one prior felony limitation in the original legislation was changed to allow inmates with up to four prior felony convictions (in addition to the current case) to enroll in the program. The 2001 amendments also allowed persons with consecutive sentences to be considered, as well as those serving sentences for probation revocation (both were previously not eligible).

In addition, changes in the state prison system greatly affected the functioning of the reentry demonstrations. First, the legislature renamed (and reorganized) the Department of Prisons, which became the Nevada Department of Corrections. Second, the Governor replaced former Director of Prisons Robert Bayer with a new Director of Corrections, Jackie Crawford. Shortly after these changes occurred, the relationship between the Department of Corrections and the two reentry courts began to improve considerably, most notably the classification staff greatly improved their ability to identify potential candidates and provide their files to reentry court staff.

The First Participants in Each Demonstration Site

The report describes the reentry procedure in both jurisdictions, including screening and enrollment, and the treatment regimen. The report also includes a review of the processing and

progress of initial participants in each court, including several case studies. The researchers characterize and present initial progress for the first 38 participants in Clark County and the first 16 participants in Washoe County, including demographics, housing, skills development status, employment, substance abuse and prior treatment history, family ties, residence, conviction offense, prior criminal history, and time and experiences in the program. Clark County reentry court participants are typically:

- White (66 percent), female (63 percent)
- Living with family upon release (61 percent)
- Employed full-time as of their latest case status (73 percent)
- Methamphetamine users (66 percent as primary drug of choice), with a history of polydrug use (91 percent)
- Single (59 percent), with children (71 percent)
- Serving convictions for drug offenses (71 percent)
- Well-experienced in the system (median number of prior arrests is six)
- In good standing in the program (median days in treatment is 155; 77 percent active and in good standing; 66 percent not yet sanctioned)
- Not rearrested (one person rearrested; 3 percent recidivism rate)

Washoe County participants are typically:

- White (77 percent), female (63 percent)
- Living in the required transitional housing for the first four months, then moving out on their own
- Employed full-time as of their latest case status (100 percent)
- Serving convictions for drug offenses (75 percent)
- Well-experienced in the system (median number of prior arrests is six)
- In good standing in the program (median days in treatment is 150; 88 percent active and in good standing)
- Not rearrested (no one rearrested; 0 percent recidivism rate)

To sum up, despite the different developmental experiences in the two demonstration sites, the respective reentry programs have enrolled participants with similar backgrounds and have witnessed similarly positive early outcomes.

The report ends with a discussion of important issues and implications, including the difficulties associated with identifying and enrolling candidates, layered discretion and jurisdiction, applying the use of sanctions and incentives to the reentry population, and assessing the longer-term contribution of the Nevada reentry drug courts. The descriptive examination of the reentry court initiatives in Clark and Washoe Counties finds strong support for the feasibility of the approach in Nevada. The “proof” of the feasibility of this strategy is found not only in the establishment of new procedures where none had existed previously, and the multi-agency cooperation on both local and state levels, but also in the growing numbers of candidates forwarded from the Department of Corrections for consideration by the local advisory committees and, not incidentally, in the fact that the Nevada reentry drug court demonstration has produced its first successful inmate graduates. The question of longer-term impact will await more formal, in-depth evaluation.

The Nevada Reentry Drug Court Demonstration

By
John S. Goldkamp
Michael D. White

I. The Emergence of Reentry Drug Courts: Background

In roughly the last decade of the 20th century the drug court movement grew in number from a handful of early courts to over six hundred. With increased support from local, state, and Federal funding as well as increased acceptance from justice and other government agencies, drug courts not only grew in number, but they have diversified in substance and form and contributed to a larger climate of change within traditional criminal courts. Although, at first drug courts focused either on pretrial or post-conviction populations, at the turn of the century many drug courts enrolled participants from multiple stages of entry in the justice process, mixing diversion, plea, sentence, and probation revocation candidates into the drug court caseload with different conditions and requirements attaching to the different statuses. Different types of target populations have also been the focus of recent drug courts as the model has been broadened and applied to different drug-related categories of offenders at the juvenile and adult levels. The original Miami diversion model drug court has been adapted and adjusted in many other applications across the nation and provided a major impetus of experimentation with other problem-solving courts in state court systems in the form of community courts, family courts, domestic violence courts, juvenile courts, mental health courts, and other areas.

From the perspective of court innovation, the emergence of “reentry” drug courts represents yet another extension and adaptation of the methodology pioneered in drug courts to meet challenges and conditions never anticipated by early advocates. Specifically, the application of the drug court model to prisoner reentry represents an effort by several

jurisdictions to address the new and more complex issues facing both inmates being released from prisons and the communities to which they return. Petersilia (2001: 360) notes that, when combining releases from state prisons, federal prisons, and secure juvenile facilities, “nearly 600,000 inmates – about 1,600 a day- arrive on the doorsteps of communities throughout the country each year.” Moreover, Petersilia (2001) notes that very little is known about the factors that increase or decrease the likelihood of reintegration failure (or success). Recently released data from the Bureau of Justice Statistics, indicating a recidivism or prison return rate of over 70 percent, highlight the scope of the problem and its potential impact on community safety, governmental resources (financial and otherwise), and inmate well-being.

Although reintegration of released inmates is certainly not a new issue, Travis and Petersilia (2001: 291) argue that the issue has been transformed by three recent policy developments, and now “has taken on critical importance as we enter the new century.” First, Travis and Petersilia (2001) note that, since the early 1970s, the rate of imprisonment in the United States has grown steadily, resulting in a fourfold increase in the last quarter-century (from 110 per 100,000 residents in 1973 to 476 per 100,000 in 2000 (see also Beck 2000)). By the end of 1998, 1.8 million people were in jail or prison in the United States (MacKenzie, 2001; Beck and Mumola, 1999). Lynch and Sabol (2001) note that the prison growth occurred primarily as a result of increases in length of stay in prison.

The growth in the prison population has predictably increased the number of inmates being released, and “the burden on the formal and informal processes that work together to support successful reintegration of prisoners has increased enormously (Travis and Petersilia, 2001: 293). In particular, longer stays in prison are associated with “declining frequency of

contact with family members, and contact with family members is believed to facilitate reintegration into the community (Lynch and Sabol, 2001: 2).”

Second, the absence of a clear, unifying sentencing philosophy, termed the “fragmentation of sentencing philosophy” by Travis and Petersilia (2001), poses special problems for prisoner reintegration. Indeterminate sentencing, characterized by broad judicial discretion in sentencing, release decisions by parole boards, post-release parole supervision, and a rehabilitative philosophy, was consistently employed by most jurisdictions in the United States during the mid-20th century (Tonry, 1999). However, both conservatives and liberals attacked indeterminate sentencing during the early 1970s, for vastly different reasons¹, and Tonry (1996: 4) states that by the mid-1990s, “nearly every state has in some way repudiated indeterminate sentencing.” Travis and Petersilia (2001: 295) argue that the shift to mandatory minimum sentences, three-strikes laws, and truth-in-sentencing laws has raised a number of difficult questions regarding issues related to prisoner reintegration, including “the timing of the release decision, the procedures for making the release decision, the preparation of the prisoner for release, the preparation of the prisoner’s family and community for his or her release, supervision after release, and the linkages between in-prison and postrelease activities.” At a minimum, the shift away from indeterminate sentencing has reduced a parole board’s ability to individualize an inmate’s sentence, based either on positive progress that has been made or the need to deal with the psychological effects of long-term imprisonment (i.e., depression, mental illness) (Petersilia, 2001).

Last, Travis and Petersilia (2001) argue that the weakening of parole in recent years has consequences for prisoner reintegration. The breakdown of parole can be illustrated on two

¹ Liberals attacked indeterminate sentencing because of problems with equity; most notably, different sentences for the same offense. Conservatives attacked the philosophy because of its leniency and inherently rehabilitative aims and argued for a return to a “just desserts” philosophy.

levels. First, the move toward determinate sentencing models has all but eliminated the use of parole boards in some jurisdictions. The second level involves parole supervision. "The increase in prison populations has had the predictable impact on parole caseloads without proportionate increases in resources (Travis and Petersilia, 2001: 297)." Rottman et al. (2000) state that the average caseload for parole officers has nearly doubled since the mid-1970s, from 45 to 70 offenders (see also Travis and Petersilia, 2001). Moreover, Lynch and Sabol (2001) find that per capita spending on parolees has dropped notably, from over \$11,000 per year (per parolee) in 1985 to \$9,500 in 1998 (see also Travis and Petersilia, 2001).

The confluence of these factors occurs at a time when prisons are offering fewer rehabilitative and treatment programs to their inmates, and, as a consequence of the abandonment of indeterminate sentencing, prisoners are serving longer sentences. Three-strikes legislation, habitual offender laws, and truth-in-sentencing all served to increase prison sentences and increase the proportion of sentences offenders would serve before release (MacKenzie, 2001). In 1998, the Office of National Drug Control Policy reported that although between 70 and 85 percent of state prison inmates need substance abuse treatment, only 13 percent receive it (McCaffrey, 1998). Lynch and Sabol (2000a and 2000b) discovered that participation in both vocational and educational programs decreased from 1991 to 1997. "Moreover, participation in programs in prison decreased during this prison expansion, so a large number of released prisoners reenter society not having participated in educational, vocational or pre-release programs (Lynch and Sabol, 2001: 2)."

As the consequences of these events were becoming apparent during the 1990s, the drug court model was spreading across the United States, and a growing body of research began to document its effectiveness in reducing drug use and crime. Building on success with adult drug

offenders, many jurisdictions applied the drug court model to other target problems, creating juvenile drug courts, family dependency courts, community courts, domestic violence courts, mental health courts, and DUI courts. Given the widespread adoption of the model to address a host of different problem populations and the range of problems facing inmates released from state prison, particularly substance abuse problems (see McCaffrey, 1998), the application of the drug court model to prisoner reintegration represented a natural and logical extension of a successful justice and treatment paradigm to a complex, pressing justice problem. This report describes the implementation of a state reentry court system, with programs operating in Las Vegas and Reno, Nevada. While related reentry initiatives are being pursued in California, Florida, Oklahoma, Missouri, New York, and other locations, the Nevada reentry drug court demonstration, with the Clark County (Las Vegas) and Washoe County (Reno) drug courts as simultaneous primary sites, poses a special challenge for the underlying drug court—or problem-solving court—methodology.

II. Methodology: An Implementation Evaluation of the Nevada Reentry Drug Court Demonstration

This illustrative implementation report describes the evolution of reentry drug courts in two Nevada cities, Las Vegas and Reno. Data were collected during site visits by the researchers to both jurisdictions, using a variety of methods. Researchers interviewed the reentry team in each site. In Clark County, this included the Honorable Jack Lehman of the Eighth Judicial District, John Marr and his staff at Choices Unlimited, Inc., Kendis Stake, Drug Court Manager, David Gibson, Deputy Chief Public Defender, Arthur Noxon, Deputy District Attorney, Chuck Short, Court Administrator, and his staff, as well as Amy Baker and Brian Zana of the Division of Probation and Parole (of the Department of Motor Vehicles and Public Safety). In Washoe

County, we interviewed the Honorable Peter Breen of the Second Judicial District, Defense Attorney David Spitzer, Terry Gilmartin, Integrated Case Manager for Specialty Courts, and Sheila Leslie, Specialty Court Coordinator.

The researchers also conducted phone interviews of officials, most notably state prison and corrections officials in Carson City, Nevada, including Robert Bayer, former Director of Prisons, Jackie Crawford, Director of Corrections, and Glen Whorton, Classification and Planning. Last, the researchers spent considerable time reviewing and summarizing treatment and court files, both hard copy and computerized, for the first wave of participants in each court.

III. The Nevada Reentry Drug Court Demonstration

Like many other jurisdictions in the United States, Nevada has long had to deal with difficult crime problems, some tied to the particular urban and rural mix of its population, and some linked to the large tourist and transient populations that are attracted to or pass through Reno and Las Vegas. Partly because of its geography and its location as a crossroads between the Southwest and California, Nevada has not escaped the impact of the drug trade and epidemic drug use among its population. The development of the Clark County Drug Court in Nevada's Eighth Judicial District (Las Vegas) in 1992 and the subsequent efforts to develop related drug courts in rural locations (Moapa Valley, Laughlin), in family, dependency, and juvenile court, as well as the establishment of the Washoe County Family Drug Court in 1994 and the adult Drug Court in 1995 in the Second Judicial District (Reno) represent a significant commitment on the part of the court system to respond to drug-related crime by providing court-supervised treatment to large numbers of substance-abuse involved felony and other offenders.²

As the Nevada drug courts were demonstrating their effectiveness and durability in responding to the large numbers of drug offenders entering the system, offering felony offenders

² See Goldkamp et al. (2001a) for an in-depth evaluation of the Clark County Drug Court.

an alternative to incarceration in a state known for one of the highest rates of incarceration per capita in the United States, the Nevada prison population grew and struggled with institutional overcrowding as the 20th century came to a close. In May 1999, the Nevada legislature passed and the governor signed Nevada Senate Bill 184 into law, thus establishing the nation's first "reentry" drug courts.³ Nevada's Governor, the Honorable Kenny C. Guinn, had been concerned both about crowding in state prison facilities and about a reported 80 percent reoffending rate among persons released from the Nevada prisons. Effective July 1, 1999, the new law authorized funding for a two-court reentry court demonstration for an initial two-year period⁴ designed to provide for the release to drug court treatment of 150 prison inmates within two years of their expected parole release dates. The original legislation provided funding for the Reno court to accept 25 inmates per year and for the Las Vegas court to accept 50 inmates per year during this trial period.

The two-site Nevada "reentry" drug court demonstration program was intended to relieve the prison population by releasing eligible offenders to the community under the intensive treatment and judicial supervision required to help them make the transition to the community successfully and to avoid return to the criminal justice system. Under the statute, eligible offenders are required to participate in the reentry drug court program for a minimum of one year, but for no longer than the remainder of their sentences. (This requirement would later be interpreted to include parole, if offenders were eligible for parole release before completing the year in treatment.) Successful participation in the reentry drug court treatment program not only allows inmates who would otherwise remain confined to complete their sentences while residing in the community but also generates good time on a monthly basis, which is credited against the

³ The legislation does not refer to the demonstration as a reentry drug court, but rather as court programs "for abuse of alcohol or drugs by certain persons."

⁴ The two-year period derives from the fact that the Nevada legislature meets once every two years.

offender's maximum term.⁵ The reentry drug court legislation stated that the "assignment of an [incarcerated] offender to the custody of the division [of Probation and Parole for the purposes of participation in the reentry drug court program]...shall be deemed a continuation of confinement and not a release on parole." Failure to meet the expectations of the program can result not only in the return of participants to confinement to serve out the remainder of their sentences, but also loss of all good-time credit earned to date toward reduction of the offender's maximum sentence.

Although at the time the law was passed precise programmatic details remained to be worked out, the legislation outlined several of the ingredients of the reentry drug court approach structuring the Reno and Las Vegas-based initiatives.⁶ First, the Nevada reentry approach would be premised on cooperation and coordination among a number of agencies, including the state prison system (Department of Corrections),⁷ the Division of Parole and Probation (of the Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles and Public Safety), the two courts, the defense⁸, prosecution, law enforcement, treatment providers, and local judicially chaired advisory boards in each of the two judicial districts involved. In addition, the local board would play a critical role in selecting participants, operating the program, and interacting with the state agencies. Each advisory board would be made up of "one judge of the court that established the advisory board who has experience related to a program of treatment," a representative of the district attorney's office, an

⁵ There is a difference of understanding in the two sites regarding the rate at which good time is earned. In Washoe County, we were informed that good time in reentry court was earned at the highest rate available in a correctional setting in Nevada. (It compared favorably to that earned by residents at restitution centers, for example.) The understanding among Clark County officials was different. They believed that participants in the reentry court earned good time at a slower rate than in other correctional settings, thus lengthening the time until the expected release date over what would have been the case if the offender had been in other settings.

⁶ See Nevada Senate Bill No. 184 appended.

⁷ The Nevada Department of Prisons was renamed Department of Corrections in 2001 (2001 NRS Special Session, Senate Bill No. 4, Chapter 209, pp. 192-200.)

⁸ In Clark County, the Public Defender has responsibility for indigent defense for the majority of drug court participants. In Washoe County, with the exception of small numbers of defendants who have private counsel, representation for the drug court populations (regular adult drug court, juvenile drug court, and reentry drug court) is provided under special contract with a private firm led by David Spitzer, a former public defender who served in the adult drug court.

“attorney regularly assigned to represent offenders who are participating in a program of treatment,” a “representative of a local law enforcement agency,” and a “person who has professional experience in the treatment of abuse of alcohol or drugs.” In short, the legislative language provided for inclusion of the drug court judge, district attorney, defender, treatment provider, and a law enforcement person familiar with drug court—as well as a representative of state Probation and Parole. The screening process to be carried out through interaction of these agencies would produce recommendations to the judge in each case, who would make the final decision over who would be accepted into the program (and later, who would be terminated).

Under the Nevada legislation establishing the reentry court demonstration, the state system (Department of Corrections), through its director, is responsible for identifying candidates for early release from prison to the reentry drug court treatment program and for submitting applications for release to the local advisory board for its review and acceptance. Submission of candidates occurs “if the director believes that the offender would participate successfully in and benefit from a program of treatment” and if the offender has met a number of fairly narrow criteria. The criteria for admission to the reentry drug court treatment program suggested in the original legislation were to be further refined by the Corrections director and the local advisory committee as they gained operational experience.

The original legislative criteria included requirements that the candidate offender:

- has employment in the community or that the drug court will assist the offender in finding employment;
- has demonstrated an ability to pay “for all or part of the costs of his participation in the program,” or a “judge...will assist the offender to ensure that the offender has the ability to pay such costs;”
- is “within two years of his probable release from prison as determined by the director;”⁹

⁹ The reentry courts then added as a matter of policy that candidates would have to have served at least six months before being accepted into the program. This policy was adopted for a number of reasons. First, it was felt that acceptance of any shorter minimum period of confinement would have the effect of undermining the sentences

- may be “imprisoned for having had probation and parole revoked” but only if “for a reason other than committing a new crime while on probation or parole;”
- is serving a sentence for a non-violent offense;
- has a substance abuse problem;
- has ties to and plans to live in the two counties involved;¹⁰
- can demonstrate acceptable housing;
- does not have more than two felony convictions (including the current conviction).

The Corrections director was instructed in the legislation to “adopt, by regulation, standards providing which offenders are eligible....The standards adopted...must provide that” offenders will also be ineligible who have committed recent infractions in the institution, who have not “performed the duties assigned,” or have been convicted of crimes involving force or threat of force or a sexual offense, or who have been convicted of more than one felony, have escaped or attempted to escape, or have not made “good faith efforts” to participate in institutional programs.¹¹

With the passage of the reentry drug court legislation by the Nevada legislature in the spring of 1999, the relevant Clark and Washoe County officials had anticipated an intensive planning process to be followed by a start date of October 1999. To accept the first candidates by that date, procedures for screening and selecting candidates would have had to been in place by the preceding August. Given the many issues, including funding, that would have to be addressed before reentry courts could begin to function in the two locations, that schedule proved to be optimistic.

decided by the original sentencing judges. A second concern was that this period would allow the inmate to move through classification and other stages of prison processing and allow for sufficient review of the inmate’s record and candidacy.

¹⁰ As a matter of policy, Clark County officials not only emphasized the requirement that participants were from Clark County or would plan to live there, but also that they would reside in an appropriate setting (drug and weapon-free) within reasonable proximity to the court. Given the size of the county, the court was concerned that participants have convenient access to the court and treatment locations. In Washoe County, the reentry court agreed to consider inmates from other northern counties, although they would have to agree to live in Washoe County (in fact would reside in transitional housing in Reno for the first four months).

¹¹ These policies from the Department of Corrections were under revision at the time of this report.

IV. Reentry Drug Court in Context

In their objectives, the Nevada and other reentry drug court initiatives nationally have anticipated the recent focus on prisoner reentry into the community. (Petersilia, 2000; Travis, Solomon, & Waul, 2001). The most recent data published in the *Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics* (Maguire & Pastore, 2000: Table 6.60, 534) shows that in 1997, 386,076 inmates were released from prisons across the United States. Estimates of the numbers of prisoners currently returning to localities after serving prison terms vary, but may be as high as 500,000 per year in the United States. The math of the reentry problem is simple: three decades of steadily increasing numbers of offenders sent to prison (and increasing prison capacity) has produced three decades of steadily increasing numbers of offenders returning to the community from prison. These numbers have dramatically outpaced the development of supervision and services for guiding the reentry of inmates. (There has been a movement to curtail parole in some jurisdictions in association with sentencing reforms driven by a deserts or punitively oriented philosophy.)

Compared to populations of inmates confined for minor offenses on a local level or sentenced to community-based supervision, the prison populations being released involve higher risk offenders who were convicted of more serious offenses. Recent concerns about a developing prisoner reentry problem implicitly reflect doubts that overcrowded correctional systems have not adequately prepared these individuals for their return to society. (Ironically, in many jurisdictions the strains placed on correctional resources have been exacerbated by justice policies sending record numbers of drug-involved offenders to prison.) If current rates of incarceration are maintained, large numbers of prisoners will return to localities poorly prepared

to rejoin the economic mainstream. They will have poor academic and vocational skills, will be qualified for mainly the lowest paying jobs, may have mental and physical health problems, and may have histories of substance abuse that have for the most part gone unaddressed in prison. Remarkably, many former prisoners will return to communities with little assistance for making the transition to law-abiding lives, and will have little or no supervision by overwhelmed parole or community corrections agencies.

The Nevada reentry court demonstration represents an attempt to address the intersection of at least three critical problem areas in American criminal justice: treatment of the large substance abusing population of offenders, correctional crowding, and the return of large numbers of prisoners to society after their terms of confinement. Primarily, however, the reentry court demonstration represents an extension of the drug court methodology to a new and even more challenging population of substance abusing offenders. Though deriving from the drug court methodology, the Nevada reentry court approach differs from other drug court and related court-based problem-solving approaches in significant ways.¹²

Defining and Reaching an Appropriate (and Useful) Target Population of State Inmates

Moving Sentenced Prisoners to the Community

One distinct way in which the Nevada reentry courts differ both from previous versions of drug courts and from other reentry drug courts is in the selection of the intended target population. Although many of the original drug courts were developed partly in response to local correctional overcrowding associated with drug-related criminal cases of the 1990s, the choice of reentry target population in Nevada was explicitly—though perhaps not solely—shaped in response to institutional crowding in the state (not local) prison system. The Nevada

¹² For a discussion of a typology classifying drug courts on the basis of key structural dimensions of the drug court model, see Goldkamp (2000) and Goldkamp et al., (2001a).

reentry drug court strategy sought to move non-violent drug-involved offenders out of confinement in the state correctional system and into the community under close supervision to receive treatment and related reentry services in advance of normal prison release dates. Part of the rationale supporting passage of the original Nevada legislation was savings that would be produced by reducing prison confinement costs. The savings generated per inmate (based on early release from prison) was estimated to exceed the per capita costs of treatment in the reentry drug courts. (In fact, the Nevada reentry courts were to be funded strictly out of savings from the Prisons budget, an arrangement that contributed to delay.)

In addition to therefore being distinct from jail-based drug courts,¹³ the Nevada reentry drug court initiatives stand out from other reentry courts nationally because they seek to enroll inmates already confined and serving state prison sentences. Courts in several states (e.g., Florida, Missouri, and Oklahoma) have adopted a sentence-based approach under which participation in reentry court was implemented as part of a split sentence. Under the sentence-based reentry court approach, offenders are sentenced, often through a split sentence, to serve a prison term to be followed by a term of probation or parole served in the community under the supervision of the reentry drug court. While the Nevada reentry approach strictly subtracts inmates who are already confined (and have been for a minimum of six months), the sentence-based model often adds confinement to the correctional population by sentencing persons to a period of confinement who might otherwise have been sentenced to probation before. A related difference is that the Nevada model, by design, offers a reduced period of confinement, subtracting as much as a year from the offender's expected parole date. Reduction of the length of confinement is not generally a feature of the split sentence approach and therefore does not serve as an incentive for participation in treatment.¹⁴

A Higher Risk Target Population

Beyond the type of individual targeted (prisoners serving sentences), the Nevada reentry court demonstration extended the drug court model to a higher-risk population than normally

¹³ Jail-based drug courts either hold drug court sessions in jail for detainees or persons serving local jail sentences or link drug court procedures closely to jail-based treatment services. (See Tauber & Huddleston, 1999).

¹⁴ The movement to devise "alternatives to incarceration" in the 1980s was characterized by a debate about whether sentencing approaches actually "avoided" confinement. Key in the debate was the notion that for population to be avoided, there must be certainty that the target population was in fact otherwise jail- or prison-bound. The most convincing argument that a target population was jail-bound was to plan an intervention that released inmates from jail. Other alternatives, it was argued, often ended up adding sanctions to persons who probably would not have been confined, thus failing to make an impact on levels of confinement in overcrowded systems. From this perspective, the Nevada reentry court demonstration was unmistakably aimed at a confinement population and, thus, had implications for population reduction.

dealt with in drug courts.¹⁵ (This is so despite the fact that few would characterize the drug offender population generally dealt with by drug courts as “low risk.”) State prison inmates generally have more extensive prior criminal histories and serious convictions than their “normal” drug court counterparts. They are unlikely to be first time offenders, which make up a noticeable portion of the clients of many drug courts. Moreover, they are likely to have more extensive histories of substance abuse and failure in previous treatment settings. Implicitly, the targeted prison inmates represent a population that could not be dealt with less restrictively in the community or through local jail terms, or they have records of performing poorly on probation or parole.

At the same time, the Nevada reentry court candidates, nevertheless, pose lower risks to public safety than most of their confined peers, who make up the remainder of the overall prison population. Moreover, requirements for stable housing and employment, intensive supervision, as well as the payment of fees, are intended to reduce participant risk through increased stability. As a result, it may be tempting to conclude that, because of the increased stability and monitoring, reentry participants are, in fact, *lower* risk than regular drug court participants (who may have fewer priors but no job or stable housing). However, based on our earlier work in Clark County, we clearly see that the reentry courts are tapping into a population with more extensive criminal histories than those seen by the regular drug court; and equally serious and longstanding substance abuse problems despite coming from a correctional setting. In fact, more than one-third of the reentry participants in Clark County are offenders who were terminated from the original drug court and were sent back to prison.

¹⁵ Because prior criminal history is strongly associated with the likelihood of reoffending, the risk attributes of the target population likely increased when, under its 2001 revision, the Nevada reentry drug court law extended eligibility to persons with up to four prior felony convictions.

Development of a New State-Local Screening Process

The Nevada reentry court approach faced questions about how such candidates would be identified and was forced to develop a screening process linking the local and state agencies participating, a process unlike that which had been put into place on the local level. The enabling legislation identified criteria that narrowed the pool of possible reentry court candidates in the prison population. The fact that, in addition to those criteria, the Director of the Department of Corrections is also required under the law to specify eligibility criteria from the outset was likely to increase the restrictiveness of the candidate identification and screening process. According to the legislative scheme, these criteria, which would also be approved by the local advisory committees, could be further tightened at the local court level, particularly when the judge's final discretion to accept candidates is taken into consideration. Thus, an important challenge for the reentry courts was to devise a screening process that coordinated input from the various agencies involved in candidate identification in a way that was both timely and productive in moving prisoners from confinement into the programs.

Special Adaptations of the Drug Court Model for Reentry Court Purposes

The reentry court target population does not represent the “normal” population of drug offenders enrolled by the drug courts in Reno and Las Vegas. As a result, the demonstration raises significant questions about how standard drug court methodology should be adapted to meet the needs and risks posed by this population. For example, the need for close and intensive supervision of released prisoners differed from what was deployed to monitor the “normal” drug court population. The prospect of joint supervision by Probation/Parole and the drug court poses challenges for coordination among new partners in ways not previously experienced. (In fact, some drug court participants had been supervised by Probation, but Probation supervision was not the norm.) Reporting requirements in court, in treatment, and elsewhere would need to be more intensive for the anticipated population, simply because the drug courts would take fewer chances and be even less tolerant of missed court dates and positive drug tests with the released prisoners than might be the case with its usual participants.

In addition, by the nature of the target population (persons serving sentences in prisons), the timing of intervention in the candidates’ drug problem would be different than in the regular drug court. An important theme in drug court treatment has been to emphasize “early intervention.” In the first drug courts, this meant trying to place participants in treatment as soon after arrest as possible. Intervention with sentenced prisoners who had been arrested, convicted, sentenced, and had served a minimum of six months in prison before they could be admitted to reentry drug court would be far from “early.” The frequency, intensity, and content of treatment services might also have to be adapted to the prisoner population. The status of the participant after successful completion certainly would be different if time still remained on the sentence to be served or if the participant was on parole. Appropriate housing and employment, and

important issues in regular drug court, are raised to a higher priority (prerequisites) under the enabling legislation. In short, adaptation, enhancement, or reorganization of the drug court approach was implicit in the agreement to move forward with demonstration of reentry drug courts in Nevada.

Responses to Participant Performance in Reentry Drug Court

In drug courts across the nation, a great deal of creative thinking has gone into the crafting of positive incentives and rewards for forward progress and appropriate sanctions for poor performance. Given the nature of the target population and the constraints faced by inmates still in the custody of the prison system while in the reentry program, another implication of the reentry court demonstration is that standard responses to participant performance (rewards and sanctions) will need to be adapted or rethought to have the intended effects. In the area of incentives, drug court participants can usually look forward to the possibility of dismissed charges, reduced charges, or non-incarcerative sentences upon successful completion of the treatment program, depending on their legal status at the time of entry. Although other positive motivations for completing the drug court program are cited—such as restored health, employment, preserving familial relationships, or maintaining child custody—these criminal case-related incentives are thought to provide the “carrot” that encourages candidates to work through the difficult treatment process in the regular Nevada drug courts. In fact, these assumptions are supported by findings from our focus groups with drug court participants in Las Vegas and other sites (Goldkamp et al., 2001a).

In short, a basic assumption of the original drug court model was that positive inducements are necessary to encourage participation and success in treatment. When this principle is applied to the reentry population, designers of reentry drug courts will need to ask

what sort of analogous incentives can be incorporated into the approach when it focuses on prison inmates. One might assume that early release from prison, reductions of prison terms,¹⁶ employment, and drug-free living offer powerful incentives that will encourage enrollment and successful participation in the reentry drug court treatment regimen for a minimum of one year.

If deterrence is to operate in the reentry population, then the reentry drug courts will also have to deploy population-appropriate sanctions to discourage poor performance. One of the major sanctions available to the Nevada reentry drug courts is the threat of immediate return to prison for any noncompliant behavior.¹⁷ Immediate return is possible because the participants remain in the custody of the prisons (i.e., according to the statute participation is “deemed a continuation of confinement” and not a release on parole). Thus, other than the drug court’s “show cause” hearing (to consider why the participant should not be terminated from the program), little due process is required to transfer participants back to the prison setting based on the judge’s decision. (Gagnon and Morrissey-type standards do not apply, as they would in revocation of probation and parole.) More challenging for the reentry court is the need for intermediate sanctions, that is, responses to poor performance that fall short of re-incarceration.

V. Reentry Drug Court Procedure in Clark and Washoe Counties

When the law establishing the reentry drug court demonstration was passed by the Nevada legislature and signed by the governor in May 1999, it was to take effect on July 1, 1999 and run through June, 2001.¹⁸ Once the law was enacted, the two sites began an accelerated planning process, with the aim of having the reentry drug courts in operation by October of the

¹⁶ See note 5, above.

¹⁷ The implications of zero tolerance policies in the two courts for program effectiveness are discussed below in section VIII.

¹⁸ 1999 NRS 209.4311-4311

same year. The pressure to move forward quickly was great, principally because the law approved funding for a period of two years and anticipated 25 participants per year in the Washoe County (Reno) reentry court and 50 per year in the Clark County reentry court (Las Vegas). A great deal had to be worked out to move from the approach authorized in the legislation to an operational program.

The Screening and Enrollment Process

The planning process had to develop procedures for identifying and enrolling eligible prisoners serving sentences in any one of nine state facilities, two restitution centers, or ten conservation (work) camps. The screening process to determine eligibility would require the prisons to devise new procedures to identify candidates in custody. (Existing classification procedures were not able, without modification, to screen the correctional population on all of the eligibility criteria listed by statute.) According to the original approach suggested by the statute, candidates identified by the prisons would then also have to be screened by Probation and Parole (at the central state offices in Carson City), as well as be reviewed by the local advisory committee consisting of representatives of a number of criminal justice and other agencies. In Clark County, in addition to the judge who chairs the local committee, representatives of the district attorney's office, defenders office, court administration, treatment provider (Choices Unlimited, Inc.), Probation and Parole, the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police, and (recently added) a warden of a state correctional facility about an hour away from Las Vegas sit on the local advisory committee. In Washoe County, the composition of the local advisory committee is similar, with the exception that state corrections is not represented and law enforcement is represented by the Washoe County Sheriff's Department.

Not only would the prisoners have to have acceptable records and meet the criteria relevant to the prison system under the planned screening procedures, they would also have to meet all the other criteria listed above. The criteria that candidates would be required to demonstrate the availability of an acceptable (drug- and weapon-free) living situation in the community meant that the respective county branches of the Probation and Parole Division would be required to conduct investigations to determine whether the candidates would have acceptable living situations and employment prospects. The review of the local advisory committee would, presumably, carry the greatest weight in the selection process because candidates could not be accepted without the judge's final approval. In short, the reentry court demonstration was premised on an ability to carry out screening procedures that had not previously been in place, or at least, had not been coordinated in ways that would be required for an effective candidate identification and screening process.

Implicitly, the statute suggested an eligibility screening process that would operate similarly in each of the demonstration sites and that would merely distinguish candidates according to their geographic destinations (Clark or Washoe County). As the two site courts reached the implementation stage, the planned candidate eligibility screening and enrollment process involved the following steps:

1. ***Inmate application:*** Inmates voluntarily apply for the Prison Reentry Drug Court.
2. ***Corrections review of inmate application:*** The Classification Division of the Department of Corrections (formerly Prisons) reviews applications for eligibility taking into consideration statutory criteria as well as the prisoner's institutional record.

3. ***Approved application forwarded to local advisory board:*** If found eligible by Corrections, the classification staff assembles an application packet (including the most recent pre-sentence investigation report) and forwards it to the local reentry court advisory board.
4. ***Local advisory board makes provisional acceptance decision:*** The local advisory board meets to review the packet and decide whether to preliminarily accept the candidate.
5. ***Local board notifies Corrections of preliminary acceptance:*** If preliminary acceptance of the inmate's application is granted by the advisory board, the coordinator for the local advisory board notifies the Department of Corrections Classification staff.
6. ***Corrections notifies Probation and Parole:*** The Department of Corrections notifies the state Probation and Parole Release Coordinator and the relevant local Probation and Parole office (in Reno or Las Vegas).
7. ***Probation and Parole review:*** Probation and Parole conducts its own application evaluation, confirming that the statutory criteria are met and that the prisoner meets the Probation and Parole guidelines.
8. ***Local Probation and Parole investigation:*** Local Probation and Parole staff conduct an investigation of proposed housing and employment arrangements. In Clark County, the treatment provider assists as necessary.
9. ***Applicant interviewed by local advisory committee for final decision (Clark County only):*** If the applicant meets the Probation and Parole criteria, the local advisory committee is informed and, in most cases, an interview of the candidate is conducted,

after which the local committee makes a recommendation for acceptance to the judge for his final decision.

10. Order conveyed to Corrections for release of prisoner: Upon acceptance by the judge, the applicant completes paperwork for admission to reentry drug court and a judicial order for release to the program is faxed to the Department of Corrections.

11. Release date set by local advisory committee and Probation and Parole: The local advisory committee coordinator and local Probation and Parole office set a release date and first court appearance date for the inmate and notify Corrections.

12. Release of applicant to Probation and Parole to attend first treatment: The inmate is released from his or her correctional setting to the custody of the Probation and Parole staff, who transports the inmate from a correctional setting directly to the treatment provider (Choices, Inc.) for an initial intake (substance abuse evaluation) and then to the residence. (In Washoe County, the inmate is taken to transitional housing first to get situated, then directly to the treatment provider)

13. Participant attends first reentry court session: The inmate attends reentry drug court on the next court date and begins full participation in the program.¹⁹

Each of the reviews involved in the overall screening process can be time-consuming and involves different organizations, information systems, and sources. The three interrelated reviews also pose issues of coordination and communication among agencies without such procedures already routinely in place. A key assumption of the original screening and enrollment process was that inmates would voluntarily apply for the reentry drug court treatment program. This assumption was premised on another, that inmates in a prison system of 11

¹⁹ In Clark County, the preferred procedure is to begin the released inmate in treatment on Monday and to schedule the first court session for the next day. In Washoe County, the same sequence is followed (treatment is the first stop after release) but the court session may not be the next day and could be up to one week after release.

institutions and ten conservation camps spread across the large state would be aware of the option in the first place.

The Reentry Drug Court Regimen

A critical difference between the “normal” Washoe and Clark County drug courts and the reentry drug courts is simply that most standard drug court participants do not enter the treatment process from confinement. In fact, drug courts were designed partly as an alternative to incarceration, principally by avoiding or diverting participants from incarceration that would have otherwise occurred. Typically, if participants have been confined, it is likely that they were being held in the local jail in pretrial detention or awaiting sentencing. Few participants in each county enter the normal drug courts directly from the state prison system. The reentry court demonstration approach in Washoe and Clark Counties had to be designed not only to perform “normal” drug court treatment and supervision functions but also to facilitate the reentry into the community by state prisoners and to address the extra concerns related to stable housing, employment, and public safety. At its core the reentry regimen resembles the standard drug court approach (i.e., is built on the drug court “chasis”), but adds intensity and major enhancements to the overall experience designed to facilitate reentry or reintegration of the participant into the community and to eliminate any threat to public safety that might be posed.

The reentry process begins with the transfer by the Department of Corrections of the prisoner to the appropriate state facility closest to Las Vegas or Reno. Corrections then releases the inmate to a local Probation and Parole officer working with the reentry courts, who transports the released prisoner directly to the treatment provider (Choices, Inc.) for a first treatment appointment (intake). After a full briefing by Probation and Parole the prisoner is then transported to his or her approved residence and curfew rules are explained. In Las Vegas, the

offender spends the first night in the approved residence (with family, friends, sponsoring organization, and transitional housing) and then attends court for the first time the next day. In Washoe County, the Probation and Parole officer transports the released inmate to a specially designated structured-living residence (transitional housing similar to a halfway house) operated by a private provider, where the participant will reside for the first four months of the program. Then he or she is transported to the treatment provider (Choices, Inc.) for the first treatment appointment. The first court appearance may be within a day or two of arrival, but no longer than one week away. In both locations, the inmate turned participant begins treatment immediately and his or her new relationship with three agencies (treatment provider, court, and Probation and Parole) in the first few days after release.

Monitoring by Probation and Parole: In accepting higher-risk participants who have been serving sentences in confinement and releasing them to the community, the reentry drug court is very concerned with minimizing any chances that participants might reoffend and relies on close monitoring by Probation and Parole. Probation and Parole has responsibility for intensive supervision, which begins by placing the participant on a 24-hour curfew, which allows the offender to be only at approved locations during specified hours. (Such locations could include residence, court, treatment, work or vocational training and, on a selective basis, other approved appointments as may be needed.) In Washoe County, the transitional housing residence serves as the functional equivalent of curfew and restrictions of activities during the first four months.

In Clark County, a single Probation and Parole officer is assigned to closely monitor the released prisoners. The rather strict curfew is reduced as the participant moves successfully through phases of the program. In Clark County, the Probation and Parole officer makes a

minimum of one home visit per month, as well as any number of unannounced visits, which may include search of the premises if “deemed necessary.” In addition to meetings with participants in court, Probation and Parole staff will also contact the participant at work or drug treatment on an unannounced basis and may conduct surveillance of the participant or the residence on an unannounced basis. Probation and Parole also ensures that victim notification, if ordered, occurs and that the offenders are able to meet any financial obligations associated with the original sentence (restitution, supervision fees). Because the offender is still in the custody of state Corrections (under the supervision of Probation and Parole) while in the reentry court program, a noncompliant offender may be arrested and (on the order of the court) be returned to confinement without a hearing. Sending a noncompliant offender back to prison is treated by Corrections as a transfer from one correctional setting to another and is constrained, through agreement with participating courts, only by the need for a “show cause” hearing, at which the judge may agree to terminate the participant and concur with the recommitment.

Treatment: Treatment services for reentry court participants are provided by the same provider, Choices, Inc., in each location. The treatment regimen requires more intensive services and participation than standard felony drug court as well. (In fact, the released prisoners may include persons who formerly failed in the drug court and ended up in prison to serve probation back-time sentences as a result.) For a minimum of two weeks after release to the reentry program (Phase I), participants are required to attend the clinic on a daily basis. During this time they are drug tested at least three times per week, participate in acupuncture, and work on employment, housing, training, or other problems that may be involved in their reentry into community life. (The treatment provider helps with making and ensuring appropriate housing arrangements.) There is a major emphasis on employment (as directed by the law). Because,

unlike normal drug court participants, reentry participants presumably do not need detoxification in the first phase, they are required to begin work immediately—or at least to begin work on the process of getting work immediately, meeting with a vocational counselor each week to guide and monitor that process. In Las Vegas, the treatment provider has a minimum of one full-time staff member who is responsible for assisting in job searches and placement, and monitoring participants who are employed.

Individual counseling occurs on at least a weekly basis and counselors assigned to reentry participants maintain a considerably reduced caseload (ideally averaging around 25 participants to one counselor) compared to normal drug court treatment (in which counseling caseloads can be several times the reentry participant to counselor ratio). Group therapy sessions are conducted three times per week. Participants are under curfew restrictions as well. Once promoted to Phase II (which only occurs after six consecutive, clean drug tests), the participant continues three times weekly drug testing, participates in individual counseling sessions every other week, and attends two weekly 12-step meetings. The participant must have at least 20 treatment contacts per month in this phase, and he or she must meet with the employment counselor regularly if still unemployed. Finally, the participant must have 27 clean drug tests before advancing to Phase III. During Phase III, participants are drug tested twice weekly (approximately six to nine months into the program), and they must be employed. Random drug testing is employed in the last phase (IV) prior to graduation. The emphases in treatment shift from orientation and stabilization during the first phase to “criminal thinking and cognitive restructuring” in the second phase, wellness education in the third phase, and “process and strength enhancements” (preparing the participant for autonomous living in the community) during the final phase of reentry court involvement.

In Court: The requirement to attend court in both demonstration sites mirror those associated with participation in the existing felony drug court and is associated with the original drug court model.²⁰ Participants attend court on a weekly basis at first and, as they become more established in the program, attend on a bi-weekly basis or less frequently depending on the judge's view of the participant's progress. How the in court sessions are calendared differs in the two jurisdictions, based on different philosophies (and practicalities). In Clark County, the reentry drug court participants are treated in a separate calendar, and in fact are segregated from normal drug court participants in their treatment activities. The rationale for separation has to do with a belief that the reentry population has distinctly different experiences, problems, and responsibilities, as well as a feeling that they might not serve as a good influence on participants in the regular drug court. In contrast, reentry drug court participants in Washoe County are integrated into the overall drug court caseload (in part, because the number of participants is not sufficient to justify a separate calendar).

After the initial in-court appearance by the participant, court sessions usually involve status reviews during which the judge discusses the participant's progress and may offer encouragement, address problems that arise, impose sanctions for non-compliance with the program conditions, or, in the event of unsatisfactory performance, order the participant back to the prison system. As required under the law, participants are required to pay fees toward the costs of participation in the program. Most participants in the Clark County court began by paying \$10 per week, until the employment situation is stable. The participant is also responsible for a supervision fee and may have to pay restitution as well as part of the original sentence. In Washoe County, the candidate for reentry must pay the costs of the required four months of transitional (structured) housing and may not be released without \$250 as a first

²⁰ For an in-depth description of Clark County's felony drug court, see Goldkamp et al. (2001a).

payment (the cost thereafter is \$125 per week). In both reentry drug court sites, as in the standard drug court experience, the directive role of the judge and the courtroom framework are central to the overall treatment and reentry process.

Officials in both sites report that this early implementation stage was marked by three distinct phases. The first included the pre-implementation phase between the enactment of the legislation and operation of the reentry courts. The second phase involved an initial period during which a number of implementation obstacles had to be overcome and procedures refined. The third phase was characterized by marked changes and improvements, due chiefly to a new law and a new working relationship with the Nevada Department of Corrections.

VI. The Pre-implementation Period (Phase I)

The history of the reentry drug court demonstration in Nevada is still quite brief. The law authorizing the reentry drug court demonstration was signed by Nevada's governor in May 1999, with an effective date of July 1, 1999. That law authorized a two-year demonstration, with funding to support 50 participants in the Washoe County reentry court and 100 in the Clark County reentry court. According to the original legislation, the demonstration would expire as of June 30, 2001, presumably as other sources of funding were identified to sustain the programs if viable. The Clark County reentry drug court (originally named the Prison Early Release Court, but recently renamed Reentry Drug Court) accepted its first participants in December 2000, about 18 months after the legislation was enacted. The Washoe County court (the Prison Reentry Drug Court) accepted its first participants in April, 2001, about 22 months after the new law took effect. Thus, the Clark County Reentry Drug Court has been in operation a total of 16 months and the Washoe County Prison Reentry Drug Court has been operating about one year.

Nevada's two reentry courts share a similar basic philosophy and are promoted by the same law; however, the two drug courts are located in very different settings and different justice system cultures. Reno differs from Las Vegas in a number of obvious ways: the urban area and population is quite small in comparison with those of Las Vegas, and the criminal justice system is smaller and deals with less volume. (It also contributes proportionately less to the overall state prison population.) Site officials describe it as having more of a small town feel and as influenced by conservative political perspectives associated with its rural and sparsely populated surroundings.

Catch 22: Funding the Reentry Courts from Prison Savings

As difficult as the challenges of establishing new procedures and interagency working relationships would be, the principal initial obstacle contributing to delayed implementation in both sites was funding. The 1999 legislation provided funding for up to 150 participants in a two-year demonstration period.²¹ However, the law also stated that “funding for payments made by the department [of Prisons]...must be accrued from the savings incurred by the department as the result of assigning offenders to the custody of the division [of Probation and Parole]” for the purpose of the reentry court demonstration treatment programs, and, further, that the “savings must be documented, and the documentation must be reviewed and approved by the director (of Prisons).²² In short, according to the law the reentry court demonstrations would be funded from savings produced by moving prisoners from the prison setting to treatment in the community under the supervision of the reentry court.

²¹ The legislation provided that billing would be submitted from the site courts at the rate of \$1,500 for the first month and \$250 per month after the first month to the Department of Corrections (then Prisons). See Nevada Revised Statutes 1999, Section 209.4315.1.

²² 1999 Nevada Revised Statutes, Section 209.4315.4.

This arrangement placed the reentry court pilots in a “catch-22” situation. First, they needed funding to begin operation. Understandably, various staff and services would need to be arranged, put in place, and paid in order to accept even the first candidate from the prisons. (For example, the courts would have to contract with a treatment provider to provide services responsive to this particularly challenging population. These services would differ from those normally provided.) Yet, funding was not authorized until the courts could generate and document savings in prison costs. The problem faced by the courts was that it was logically impossible to produce the required savings, as the Alice-in-Wonderland reasoning under the law suggested, in advance of operating the reentry court program. To begin, the courts needed funding; funding would not be available until they produced savings.

Estimating Costs and Savings: Shifting Assumptions

A second, related problem was that the funding approach had direct implications for the then Department of Prisons budget. The money for the demonstration courts would come out of the Corrections budget as the savings were produced. This placed Corrections in the awkward position of having to worry about the impact of the new programs on its own budget. The “savings” generated would be deducted from the Prisons budget, and, from an institutional perspective, might not be viewed as a savings but a cost.

As the need to document savings sufficient to support the cost of the demonstration program became more real, the means for calculating costs and savings became important. For example, earlier during the legislative process, Prisons officials estimated that housing a prisoner cost about \$25,000 per year per capita. The comparable treatment costs (\$1,500 for the first month and \$250 for the next 11 months) were estimated at \$4,250 per year per participant.²³ With these figures, the treatment approach not only seemed cost effective—generating a net

²³ See 1999 Nevada Revised Statutes, Section 209.4315.1.

savings of about \$20,000 per inmate per year over confinement costs—but would provide Prisons with a strong motivation to place inmates in the reentry program. Multiplied by 75 inmates in year one of the program (a savings of $75 \times \$20,000$ or \$1,500,000) and 150 inmates in the second year (a savings of \$3,000,000), the program would produce a theoretical savings of \$4,500,000. The law also provided \$100 per offender per month as reimbursement to Probation and Parole for the extra supervision required under the reentry court demonstration, a cost passed on to the participants themselves.²⁴ This would bring the total billable annual costs per capita to \$5,450 and, when compared to the \$25,000 annual prison costs, would still produce a savings of roughly \$19,000 per inmate per year.

By the time the courts were looking for the funding to begin, the estimate of comparative costs and savings had been revised by the Department of Prisons. At the time the legislation was enacted, the Prisons changed its estimate of the annual cost of housing an inmate to approximately \$4,200 annually—about the same costs for reentry treatment (minus supervision), and then, subsequently, to only \$1,100 per year based only on food and clothing, a net loss (greater cost) for the Prisons of between \$3,000 to \$4,000 per inmate, when compared to estimated annual reentry treatment and supervision costs.

Calculation of confinement and treatment costs is clearly not an exact science. In fact, these costs are frequently debated in different contexts depending on the purposes (e.g., to support prison expansion or to fund alternatives to confinement) based on a variety of assumptions. For example, some estimates of prison costs include and others exclude capital costs. In this context, it appears, at least, that the plan to fund the reentry demonstrations in Washoe and Clark Counties from Department of Corrections budget savings placed the budget

²⁴ See 1999 Nevada Revised Statutes, Section 209.4315.2.

interests of the Prisons against the new program's need for adequate and stable funding. Given other pressing budget concerns, a great deal of pressure would have been placed on the Department of Prisons to employ an extremely conservative measure of "savings," finally, for only that amount would be at risk for paying treatment costs.

Competition with Existing Treatment Programs Not Paid from Corrections Budget

There was another potential conflict in institutional interests between the reentry demonstrations and the Prisons. Prior to the enactment of the enabling legislation, the prisons operated a drug treatment program intended to place inmates in residential treatment in the community. The previously existing approaches, referred to as "305's" and "317's" after the Senate Bills that proposed them, had also been designed to respond to the strains placed on the system by large numbers of substance abusing offenders being sentenced to prison terms in the state. The 305 option permitted persons serving prison sentences because of repetitive drunk driving convictions to be released to the community into a treatment program. The 317 option permitted release to the community of persons whose sentences were within two years of the expected parole date (much like the reentry drug court candidates) to be placed under house arrest. Although the 317 option could include substance abusing offenders, it provided no treatment services or requirements. The supervision of 317 releasees was carried out by Probation/Parole staff.

Two features of the existing treatment options raised problems for the new reentry demonstration approach. First, the population targeted by the new reentry initiative focused on part of the same population of inmates targeted by the previous, a ready existing 317 release option, which provided no treatment. Second, early release of inmates under the 317 house arrest supervision did not present costs to be paid from the Corrections budget. Thus, in a period

when budget resources were tightly guarded, Corrections would have an incentive to rely more on the existing program which released prisoners to house arrest and supervision (without substance abuse treatment) at no cost and to turn less to the demonstration reentry drug court programs that would be charged to the Prisons budget.

Department of Justice Funding and Matching Funds from the State

Because the Nevada legislature meets only every other year—and then is in session for 120 days—it was difficult for officials from the two sites to address the funding difficulties involved in the 1999 legislation. (After adjourning in the spring of 1999, the legislature would not reconvene until 2001.) The officials from the two demonstration sites adopted a two-pronged approach: they requested funding assistance from the Department of Justice and they sought to obtain matching funding from the state as required by the Justice Department grant. Efforts to obtain the grant (\$415,250) were successful, thanks to the Drug Court Program Office of the Office of Justice Programs. The matching funds (\$138,750) were approved by the Interim Finance Committee of the Nevada Senate in 2000 when the legislature was between sessions. Funding requirements were completed and funding became available to the sites in the fall of 2000. Thus, these efforts to secure funding were successful; however, only after some considerable delay to the overall implementation of the reentry drug courts.

VII. First Stages of Operation (Phase II): Finding the Target Population

Court Approaches

In the first months of operation—with Clark County accepting its first participant in December 2000 and Washoe County accepting its first participant in April 2001—efforts in both courts focused on putting in place the substance of the reentry drug court treatment programs and

establishing an efficient candidate enrollment process. Though similar in aims and based on a drug court model, the two site courts adopted different versions of the reentry court model. The philosophy of the Washoe County Prison Reentry Drug Court regarding the handling of the reentry caseload differs philosophically and practically from the perspective of its Clark County counterpart. The Washoe County court adopted the view that the reentry participants should be mixed into the overall drug court population, even though they may have different constraints placed on them (because of their correctional status). The Washoe County Prison Reentry Drug Court believes that, in this way, inmate participants can benefit from the overall dynamics of the drug court (while non-inmates would benefit from inmate participation as well), rather than having a separate, specialized, and segregated calendar. The mixed calendar or integrated caseload approach adopted by the Washoe County court may also have been dictated by practical constraints. The reentry caseload would probably be too small (at no more than 25 participants entering per year) to warrant a separate calendar. Thus, the court component for the reentry participants would closely resemble that normally experienced by regular drug court participants.

In contrast, Clark County court officials believed that reentry participants should be exposed to a specially adapted version of drug court, handled through a separate calendar and segregated treatment activities. They strongly believed that co-mingling of reentry inmates with regular drug court participants would be detrimental to both groups, that the two groups had different needs, problems, and legal requirements associated with their participation in the program. Thus, courtroom sessions as well as counseling and group sessions were designed exclusively for the reentry participant.

Supervision, Housing, and Employment

At a minimum, the reentry drug court demonstration incorporated the objective of intensive supervision of all of the participants' activities. As a result, the role of the Division of Probation and Parole was a significant part of the program's emphasis in both sites. Once candidates were reviewed by the central Division offices in Carson City, they were forwarded to the local Probation and Parole branches. At that time, local staff would investigate and approve proposed residences and employment situations (making certain that they comported with strict guidelines). Probation and Parole staff were also responsible for intensive supervision, although, theoretically, a special, reduced, and intensive caseload was to be supported through the resources that were authorized. In Clark County, however, the supervision of reentry candidates was to be carried out by one dedicated officer, with the reentry caseload added to a large existing caseload (of over 100 probationers/parolees). In Washoe County, a dedicated officer was not provided. Rather, three to four Probation officers would integrate supervision of reentry court participants into their overall supervision responsibilities.

Generally, the Probation and Parole staff treated the prisoners released to the reentry court as they treated other early release inmates (i.e., those released under the "317" house arrest program and those released to the "305" DUI release and treatment program). This included a zero tolerance orientation, which basically threatened to send participants back to prison as the result of a single act of noncompliance.

In Clark County, the probation officer provided very active, 24 hour monitoring and supervision of the participants assigned to him, making random home visits and requiring frequent contacts. In Washoe County, the Probation/Parole role was not as intensive, principally because, at least for the first four months, inmates were released to a transitional living residence

(similar to a halfway house) operated by a private provider. The structured living environment served as the functional equivalent of curfew monitoring, drug free living, etc., that in Clark County was provided by the Probation officer's supervision. Thus, the two courts differed also in their philosophies regarding the residences of inmates returning to the community to participate in the reentry program. In Clark County, the drug court philosophy favored allowing participants to live (under appropriate and carefully monitored circumstances) where they chose—as part of a program of taking responsibility for their lives. (The court would not approve certain locations that did not provide reasonable access through public transportation to the treatment center, their employment, and the courts.) The Washoe County perspective was based on a concern that released inmates should not be returned to the very neighborhoods where they first engaged in criminal offending and drugs. Rather, the Washoe approach sought to ease inmates back into the community under what is initially a very structured living situation. Then as the participants progressed through treatment and as employment became stable, they would move into more normal living situations and have a better chance of succeeding. The structured living, transitional housing strategy also addressed concerns about public safety; if the whereabouts and activities of the inmates were known at all times, there would be little risk to the community of new offending.

By statute, the reentry drug court demonstration emphasized employment. In the two sites, this emphasis either meant that participants were to find immediate employment or that, with the assistance of the treatment team and court, they would soon be employed. Choices, Inc. in Clark County employed two staff whose primary responsibilities were to seek out potential employers, prepare participants for employment, place them in jobs, and then monitor their experiences so that they would maintain their employment. All participants in both sites were

required to pay various fees and financial obligations, including restitution, treatment fees, supervision fees, and, in Washoe County, fees for transitional living residence. Clearly, stable employment was central to the “pay-as-you-go” philosophy of the drug courts in each location.

Establishing an Efficient Screening and Enrollment Process: Reaching the Target Population

When the proposal for legislation to fund the two Nevada reentry courts was in the drafting stages, the Nevada correctional population was reaching its highest levels and the pressures associated with overcrowding were being felt. The State prison population had grown from 665 inmates in 1969 to 9,227 in 1999, with the greatest increases contributed during the 1980s and 1990s. The rate of incarceration had more than doubled in Nevada from 230 sentenced inmates per 100,000 residents in 1980 to over 500 per 100,000 residents from 1996 on. The year preceding enactment of the reentry drug court demonstration, 1998, was the peak year in the last two decades with 542 sentenced inmates confined per 100,000 Nevada residents. In the year 2000, when Nevada’s rate of incarceration dropped slightly (to 518 per 100,000 residents), the state still had one of the ten highest incarceration rates in the nation.

In 1997, the last year for which data are published nationally, Nevada prisons released nearly 4,000 inmates, 1,843 conditionally (under supervision) and 1,939 unconditionally (Maguire & Pastore, 2000: Table 6.60). These figures were greatly influenced by drug arrests during that period. Drug arrests increased steadily to the late 1990s, while commitments to prison of persons convicted of drug offenses also were increasing. Although we were unable to obtain drug arrest data for the state overall and broken down by county, we were able to obtain arrest data from Clark County. Drug arrests in Clark County increased from under 5,000 in 1990-92 to over 7,000 in 1994 (20 percent increase). After 1994, drug arrests in Clark County fell back somewhat to 6,290 in 1995, 5,745 in 1996, and 5,827 in 1997—nearly returning to the

already historically high levels of the early 1990s. In short, at the time the legislation was enacted, there were good reasons to believe not only that the reentry demonstration courts would not have difficulty in finding a sufficient number of inmates to participate (the Reno and Las Vegas courts were funded for 25 and 50 inmates respectively for each of two years), but that such an approach would help reduce the population of the crowded prison system.

Having overcome funding problems and developed the programmatic substance of the reentry drug court process, the primary obstacle to effective start-up of the two courts was the inability of the planned screening process to identify and enroll eligible inmates. Assumptions about the suitability of procedures that would be employed to identify candidates through the Prisons management information system and the Division of Probation and Parole turned out to have been overly optimistic. Both reentry drug court sites discovered that the planned, multi-agency, multi-level candidate identification process did not work as hoped—and/or that the presumed target population did not exist in the numbers estimated. The screening process simply failed to produce sufficient numbers of acceptable candidates and, when candidates were identified, the process took too long to move them from the prisons to the reentry programs, ranging sometimes from three to six months.

The impact of this problem was potentially serious. First, from a practical perspective, the programs could not begin without participants. To provide the special and more intensive services planned, a minimum critical mass of participants would be required. Secondly, lengthy delays meant that inmates, who initially had at least one year before their expected parole dates, might have only a few months left to serve in prison before their likely release through normal channels. The implication of this was that the reentry courts would lose authority over participants once their initial terms were completed; there was no special understanding with the

Nevada Parole Commissioners that would require participation in reentry court as a condition of parole.²⁵ At the same time, a major incentive for inmates for participation would be removed: early release. If inmates were going to gain release in any event in a very short period, participation in the reentry drug courts would not represent “early” release. Even if inmates agreed to participate during parole, the reentry court had not been designed as a parole drug court; it could not demonstrate savings in prison costs if inmates were not removed from confinement before they would have been without the reentry court option.

Other Factors Affecting Enrollment of Candidates from the Prisons

Several factors combined to undermine some of the assumptions made about the availability and accessibility of an appropriate reentry drug court population. These included a) a change in drug laws reducing the likelihood that drug offenders would serve prison sentences (at least in the numbers seen previously); b) increased capacity in the state correctional system; c) the competition for the same target population provided by the existing “317” house arrest option for eligible state inmates; d) restrictive statutory eligibility criteria; e) the state and county residency requirement; and f) the state of management information in the participating justice agencies.

Recent Change in Drug Laws

In 1995, several years prior to enactment of the law authorizing Nevada’s reentry drug court demonstration in 1999, the Nevada legislature passed a law that reduced the penalties associated with certain categories of drug offenses.²⁶ In particular, the legislation prohibited jail

²⁵ A different dilemma was also conceivable: A prisoner who had more than two years left on his or her sentence at the time of admission into the reentry court program could finish the treatment process successfully in one year. In what status should the offender be during that last year? Having graduated from treatment court, should the offender be returned to prison to serve out the remainder of the term? Again, the probable solution was seen by site officials to relate to parole policy.

²⁶ 2001 Nevada Revised Statutes 453.336 and 193.130.

time for felony (E) possession of a controlled substance (for first and second offenses). In our previous study of the Clark County drug court (Goldkamp et al., 2001a), we found that this law caused a shift in prosecutorial policy regarding drug court participation. Because the law shifted punishment of these felony possession offenses away from incarceration and to probation, the prosecutor had a newfound incentive for supporting the drug court option because, at least, it offered more intensive supervision and treatment than regular probation.

After several years—and by the time the reentry drug court demonstration law was enacted—the impact of the law may have been to divert a large number of drug offenders from the state prison system who, prior to that law, would have been prison bound. It would have taken awhile for this effect to manifest itself as persons already serving prison terms would complete those terms but then not be replaced by similar inmates. One could argue, then, that just as this law had an important impact on the Clark County drug court in a number of critical areas, it may have contributed to a reduction in the state prison population as the already sentenced cohort of drug offenders moved out of the prison system and more recently convicted drug offenders were handled through non-prison options.

One could also project that the impact of this law change on the prison population in Nevada would be temporary, as the large numbers of felony drug offenders placed on probation would produce large numbers of probation violators and revocations, sending offenders to the prison system after all to serve the “owed” sentences. To the extent that these revocations were the result of new arrests, ironically, the drug offenders who were subsequently incarcerated would not, under the reentry demonstration law, be eligible for reentry court. In short, the 1995 drug law shifting penalties to probation for relevant categories of drug offenders would have a) reduced the numbers of targeted inmates serving sentences in the Nevada prisons at the time of

the 1999 reentry legislation, and b) increased the numbers of those who were confined as a result of probation revocation for new arrests, a category excluded from eligibility for the reentry courts under the 1999 law.

Increased Capacity in the State Prison System

Prior to 1998, the rated capacity of the Nevada correctional institutions was 5,839 inmates, with an additional capacity for 1,784 inmates in the state's ten conservation camps and two restitution centers. In 1998, the prison system added a 291 person women's facility in southern Nevada and a 3,000 person men's prison northwest of Las Vegas in 2000. The addition of these two institutions amounted to an increase of 56 percent to institutional capacity or about 43 percent to overall capacity. Although the development of the reentry drug court demonstration was only partly aimed at alleviating population strains in the state correctional system (it was prompted also by the governor's concern over the high rate of return to prison by releasees), it appears that the introduction of the program coincided with a notable expansion in the population capacity of the Nevada correctional system. Pressures to move large numbers of drug offenders from institutions were reduced with the addition of capacity.

Overlap with the 305 and 317 Early Prison Release Options

At the time Nevada Senate Bill 184 was passed into law, two other early release options were already available to specified categories of inmates. Basically, the 305 option permitted repeat DUI (drunk driving) offenders to be released to residential treatment programs in the community. The 317 option permitted the early release of offenders within two years of their expected parole dates under house arrest and supervision by the Division of Probation and Parole. The previous Director of the Department of Prisons as well as some Probation and Parole officials argued that, while the eligibility criteria for early release under the 305 and 317

options do not focus specifically on substance abusing offenders or provide drug treatment, many of the inmates eligible for reentry drug court release would also qualify for the other early release options. In other words, the reentry court target population was a subpopulation of the 305- and 317-eligible populations.

According to the Probation and Parole Division, not only do the target populations of the pre-existing 305 and 317 options overlap with the population targeted under Senate Bill 184, their recent numbers have been dropping and have not involved a large number of inmates in the first place. In 1999, for example, the year the reentry demonstration law was enacted, on average, 82 offenders were on active release under the 305 treatment option; in 2000, the average number of participants was 64 offenders. On average, 94 offenders were on active release under the 317 house arrest option in 1999; in 2000 that average number had dropped to 72 participants. Thus, the total population of state inmates eligible for early release options dropped about 23 percent (from 176 to 136) in the first year the reentry drug court demonstration law was in effect.²⁷

The implications of these numbers for enrollment of the potential reentry drug court target population depend on the assumptions one makes. If one assumes that the reentry target population overlaps to a great extent with the target populations hitherto enrolling in the 305 or 317 early release options, then the hoped for enrollment of 75 offenders per year into the two reentry courts would require the capturing of 43 to 55 percent of the population eligible for early release, depending on the year. If the reentry demonstration were successful in reaching those totals, it would represent a considerable reduction in the use of the 305 and 317 options for early inmate release. If one assumes instead that the reentry target population is not a subpopulation

²⁷ As the total number of offenders released to these options dropped, the ratio of offenders returned on violations to average participating increased from .25 to .50. Source: Amy Baker, Division of Probation and Parole.

of the 305/317 eligible inmate population, these numbers are of no help in estimating the potential pool of eligible prison inmates.

Statistics provided to the Clark County Drug Court by the National Institute of Corrections relating to the Nevada prison population suggested that the state's population of female inmates might produce a large number of reentry drug court candidates. The NIC data showed 865 female inmates in the state system in early 2001 and about 80 percent were due to be released within three years; about 394 were serving sentences for non-violent offenses; 294 were residents of southern Nevada and would be eligible under the expanded criteria provided in the 2001 law (see below). These NIC statistics suggest that the demonstration drug courts could theoretically reach capacity by focusing solely on female inmates. (In fact, these data helped encourage Clark County's efforts to develop a particular relationship with the state facility for women located in North Las Vegas.)

Candidates in the Conservation Camps versus Prison Setting

The eligibility requirements described in the law establishing the reentry demonstration that inmates were within two years of probable release date—and the reentry court policy that they had served at least six months—meant that many candidates would be found in the state's system of conservation (work) camps established in mostly rural locations across Nevada from 1980 through 1991. Transfer to a conservation camp setting is viewed as attractive to prisoners because a) they can accelerate credits earned against the sentences compared to being in a prison setting, b) they can earn money at a higher rate than in prison, and c) the routine of work and the living accommodations are more agreeable to many inmates. In essence, against this dynamic of the Nevada corrections system, the demonstration reentry courts would ask inmates to voluntarily: a) relinquish these benefits to participate in a difficult program with strict

supervision; b) be subjected to the threat of return to prison custody for noncompliance; c) accept a lower rate of credit against final release date; and d) agree to involvement in a treatment program that may extend past the probable parole date and itself might become a condition of parole when it might have been so otherwise.

In addition to the dynamics of the incentives associated with the conservation camp system for candidate inmates, the reentry court demonstration faced another possible source of resistance linked to the camps. Some officials have suggested that full implementation of the reentry system could have a major effect on the conservation camps, which have capacities ranging from about 150 to 240 inmates. Most of the camps are located in fairly remote areas of rural Nevada and represent a source of employment to local residents. To the extent that the reentry program reduced the number of inmates of certain camps below their minimum acceptable population level—without providing for replacement from the population of the prisons—the reentry courts could be perceived as a threat to the economic viability of the camps and surrounding areas.

Restrictive Statutory Criteria

The drug court judges (Lehman and Breen) serving as the leaders of the demonstration reentry courts as well as some members of their local advisory boards have suggested that the reentry courts should not be limited only to offenders serving prison terms for drug offenses, but should also be permitted to accept prisoners whose convictions involved other non-violent, drug-related offenses, such as fraud, burglary, and gaming offenses. This perspective argues that the statutory criteria limiting admission to drug convictions artificially narrows the potential scope of the reentry effort, making large numbers of appropriate offenders with drug problems ineligible.

Two other statutory eligibility criteria were influential in narrowing the potential scope of the reentry court demonstration. The first excluded persons who had been convicted of more than one prior (non-violent) felony. The second excluded persons who were serving sentences “as a result of having had his probation or parole revoked on or after July 1, 1998, for committing a crime while on parole or probation.” By definition, most of the offenders in the state prison population have had numerous other encounters with the justice system. Few prison inmates, not to mention confined drug offenders, are first-time offenders with no other felony convictions. Moreover, by the same logic, most drug-involved offenders (at least those whose involvement in crime is closely linked with their substance abuse) have been on probation and have failed on probation, probably because of new drug or drug-related arrests (hence their current prison confinement). Undoubtedly, the potential pool of drug-involved offenders who could benefit from the reentry court treatment approach could have been significantly expanded if the Washoe and Clark County demonstrations had been given the discretion under the 1999 law to consider persons with more than one prior felony conviction and whose probation or parole revocation had involved arrest for new (non-violent or drug crimes).

Non-Residency of Eligible Inmates

The reentry court law requires not only that inmates wishing to participate are Nevada residents, but also suggests that they would be residents of the two reentry court counties when released. It was estimated by Corrections officials that roughly one-third of prisoners are not Nevada residents. Thus, the pool of possible candidates of drug offenders would be considerably narrowed by the state residency requirement. The additional requirement that offenders would be returning to Washoe or Clark Counties further trims the candidate pool.²⁸ Considerably more

²⁸ The Washoe County Prison Reentry Drug Court accepts inmates who are residents of other northern counties on a selective basis, as long as they will be living in the Reno area during the treatment program.

Nevada inmates originate from the south of the state, in theory making the pool of potential candidates greater for the Clark County Reentry Drug Court.

Management Information Difficulties

In crafting the law, there was an assumption that the Department of Corrections would have the capacity through its classification information system to readily identify appropriate candidates in its population. This assumption was simply not borne out. In fact, candidates were identified only with difficulty and, then, apparently, not with great accuracy. (The Prisons computer system had not been designed to sort through the inmate population based on all the criteria specified in the statute.) Clark County, for example, at first received persons who were convicted of manufacturing, clearly not the substance-abusing felony drug offenders anticipated under the law. When candidates were identified, as a result, it involved manual processes, which were cumbersome and inefficient. Moreover, there were information inconsistencies between the prison system data and the database used by the Division of Probation and Parole. Essentially, different agencies had data strengths in areas directly relevant to their own institutional purposes. Data inadequacies were evident when reviews of candidates were conducted across agencies for purposes other than those for which the data systems had been designed. In short, in the initial stages, candidates were identified with great difficulty.

Collectively, these factors made it difficult for both demonstration sites to review and enroll the number of target population candidates they had anticipated. Considerable effort, therefore, during the initial stages of the operation of the reentry courts in both sites was devoted to improving the process for identifying candidates in the state prison population. Not only was it difficult to identify candidates using the prison's information system, but potentially eligible

inmates were not made aware of the existence of the program. It followed that if inmates were not aware of the option, they would not voluntarily seek to enroll in it.

As a result of these initial difficulties in identifying candidates for the reentry drug courts, the Clark County advisory committee developed a proactive approach. The drug court manager and Judge Lehman's assistant manually reviewed lists of prison inmates, made contacts with the relevant correctional institutions, personally visited prisons and camps to make the various institutions and work sites aware of the reentry option, and distributed a brochure describing the reentry drug court option. These activities convinced the local advisory committee that most candidates would be in the conservation camps and that the new women's facility, located not far from Las Vegas, would be an important source of reentry court candidates. The reentry court team was impressed after a visit to the women's facility with the array of programs it operated, including substance abuse treatment, and was convinced that they could serve as helpful preparation for women who might choose to enter the reentry court.

VIII. Finding the Rhythm (Phase III): A New Law and Change in Corrections Leadership

The Nevada reentry drug court demonstration can be viewed as the extension of an essentially local court-based innovation²⁹ to a state-wide level of operation. Features that distinguished the reentry drug court model from its normal, locally based justice functions included: a) the fact that the demonstration courts were established through legislation; b) that their funding was tied to the state Department of Corrections budget; and c) that the two localities had to develop cooperative arrangements with (at least) two state agencies (the

²⁹ The fact that the two courts, the Second and Eighth Judicial Districts in Reno and Las Vegas, are part of the state judicial system should not be overlooked. However, these two felony courts—like many other drug courts nationally—were serving a largely local justice function.

Department of Corrections and the Division of Probation of Parole of the Department of Motor Vehicles and Public Safety). It is perhaps predictable, then, that some of the most difficult challenges faced by the two reentry courts during the implementation involved the development of new state-local interactions. The relatively slow pace of implementation in the two sites was dramatically improved by the fall of 2001 as a result of two major changes: a) new legislation; and b) a change in the leadership and philosophy of the Nevada Department of Corrections.

Revision of the Nevada Law Establishing the Demonstration Reentry Drug Courts (2001)

Just a few months prior to adjournment in the spring of 2001, the Nevada legislature amended the 1999 law to address some of the issues faced by the demonstration reentry courts in the first stages of development. First, the revision³⁰ extended the demonstration period through June 2003 (from June 2002) and appeared to delete the provision in the earlier law requiring that the reentry courts be funded through the Corrections budget from savings generated from reduced confinement costs. The very specific provisions for payment of costs associated with the reentry courts were, at least implicitly, superseded by the Department of Justice grant and the state's matching funds contribution. Although this did not change the mandate that the reentry courts would need to demonstrate their effectiveness, it did mean that the funding would be handled in a more accessible and practical manner.

A second important revision replaced the one felony limitation on candidates' prior criminal records by excluding offenders who had "previously been four times convicted" of felonies (in Nevada or their equivalents in other states). This modification in the statutory eligibility criteria—permitting four prior felony convictions in addition to the current case—had the practical effect of greatly expanding the pool of inmates potentially eligible for the reentry

³⁰ 2001 NRS 209.4314.

court treatment program. By definition, most drug-involved offenders in prison would have more than one felony conviction (inclusive of their current offense).

The 2001 amendment allowed persons serving consecutive sentences to be considered as well as those serving concurrent sentences and provided a means for determining eligibility when consecutive sentences were involved. Only inmates with concurrent sentences had been considered eligible under the previous version of the law. This modification too widened the pool of prisoners who could now be considered for the reentry court program.

In another critical revision, the new reentry court legislation dropped the exclusion from eligibility of inmates who were serving sentences after probation revocation from new charges. In the earlier law, inmates in prison for probation or parole revocation due to new offenses could not be considered for the reentry drug courts in Clark and Washoe Counties. This change would prove to be potentially very significant to the candidate identification process. Many drug-involved offenders in prison would have failed on probation as a prelude to their incarceration. Probation failure is common among substance abusing offenders who do not receive effective treatment.

Changes in Corrections

As the discussions above suggest, the role of the Nevada Department of Corrections in identifying and processing inmate candidates was essential to the efficient operation of the reentry drug courts. Stated another way, the procedures, information system, budgetary interests and reluctant cooperation of the Prisons contributed significantly to the difficulties experienced by the reentry drug courts in their early months of operation. It appeared that, in operation, the reentry court demonstration, which was designed to reduce prison population, save confinement

costs and reduce the rate of reoffending among released inmates, was not fully embraced by the Department of Prisons administration.

Between the spring and fall of 2001 two important developments began to change this state of affairs. First, the legislature renamed (and reorganized) the Department of Prisons, which became the Nevada Department of Corrections. This change in name symbolized a larger philosophical shift in the goals of the state correctional system, away from a punishment-oriented philosophy to a more rehabilitative, "correctional" approach. Second, the Governor replaced his former Director of Prisons Robert Bayer with a new Director of Corrections, Jackie Crawford. The former Director's reluctance to embrace the reentry demonstration certainly played a role in the Governor's decision to make a change in leadership. In fact, the new Director's "correctional" philosophy and willingness to support the reentry demonstration signaled to all parties the level of support from the Governor's Office for the new program.

In a short period, a great deal in the relationship between the Department of Corrections and the two reentry courts began to change. From about October 2001 on, the reentry courts noticed a very positive attitude on the part of the Corrections Department regarding use of the reentry courts for the treatment of released inmates. It appeared that the demonstration was now being viewed as a helpful resource in moving offenders from the prison setting back to the community. As a sign of the improved relationship, for example, Judge Lehman appointed a warden of a Corrections facility to the Clark County local advisory committee to incorporate the perspective of the state Department of Corrections into the local review process and to help educate the committee on Corrections issues.

Classification staff of the Department of Corrections greatly improved their ability to identify candidates throughout the state correctional system and provided files of candidates in a

much more timely fashion. Moreover, once candidates were approved by the local advisory committees, they were released to the program much more promptly. By the spring of 2002, it was no longer necessary for reentry court staff themselves to try to contact prisons and camps to make staff and inmates aware of the program. The Clark County reentry drug court advisory committee was interviewing four to five candidates per week (after having reviewed considerably more applications); the Washoe County reentry drug court was reviewing from eight to ten applicants per month. Both courts anticipated reaching the target numbers of participants (100 for Clark County, 50 for Washoe County) by year's end with little difficulty.

IX. The First Participants: Processing and Progress in Clark and Washoe Counties

Early Stages of Operation: Clark County

Processing and Progress of First Candidates

Based upon a review of treatment and court files, we obtained information on the first 38 offenders to enter the Clark County Reentry Drug Court program. Findings are summarized in Table 1 on page 63-64.

Demographics: Sixty-six percent of the initial Clark County participants were white, 23 percent were African-American, and 11 percent were Hispanic. Unlike the participants in the regular adult drug court, the majority (63 percent) of the initial reentry drug court participants were female. Participants ranged in age from 21 to 52 years old, though two-thirds were over the age of 30, and 20 percent were over 40.

Housing, Skills Development Status, and Employment: At the time Clark County Reentry Drug Court participants entered the program after release from prison, 61 percent indicated that they were living with family, 15 percent with friends, and 21 percent in half-way

or transitional housing. Educational information was missing for about one-third of the initial group, but for those with information, nearly two-thirds were high school graduates, and 12 percent had at least some college. One-quarter had not graduated high school at the time they entered the program. Logically, all prisoners were unemployed at the time they entered the program. However, as of the latest court status reviews described in files, 73 percent of participants were employed full-time, with an additional three percent part-time (one-quarter were still unemployed as of their most recent appearance before the judge). These were the most recent enrollees with the shortest period in the community.

Substance Abuse and Prior Treatment History: Fifty percent of the Clark County Reentry Drug Court participants have had no prior experience in substance abuse treatment. About one-third had been participants in the regular drug court program and had been terminated and sent to prison. Eighteen percent had previously experienced some other type of substance abuse treatment.

In the intake assessment interviews, two-thirds of reentry participants indicated that their primary drug of choice was methamphetamines. Cocaine/crack (14 percent), marijuana (14 percent) and heroin (6 percent) were also cited as primary drugs of choice. When asked about their drug histories, nearly all participants (91 percent) indicated polydrug use at some point in their lives. Clark County Reentry Drug Court participants reported their age of first drug use, on average, to be about 16 years old. Calculating from that median age of first drug use to the average age at admission (35), it appears that Clark County reentry participants had been abusing drugs for an average of 19 years.³¹ At assessment, the Choices, Inc. treatment staff diagnosed nearly half (45 percent) of the entering participants with methamphetamine dependence, 41

³¹ Years of active drug use was calculated by subtracting the age of first use from the participant's age. This figure includes their recent time in state prison, presumably when they were still addicted to but not currently using drugs.

percent with polydrug dependence, and 10 percent with cocaine/crack dependence. In short, the Clark County Reentry Drug Court appeared to enroll participants who were long-time and seriously addicted individuals.

Family/Ties: Fifty-nine percent of the first Clark County Reentry Drug Court participants were single, and 23 percent were divorced or separated, with only 18 percent married. Nearly three-quarters of reentry participants (71 percent) had children. (Recall that two-thirds were female.)

Prison Status at Time of Enrollment: When entering the Clark County Prison Early Release Court program, 10 percent of the prisoners had been in prison six months or less, 55 percent had served at least one year in prison, and approximately one-quarter had served more than one year in prison. The median time in prison prior to release is 462 days, or about one year and three months.

Conviction Offenses: The Clark County reentry enrollees had been serving sentences for a variety of offenses. More than half (53 percent) of reentry participants were in prison serving convictions for drug trafficking/manufacturing/distribution before being released to the program. The Clark County local advisory committee distinguished between substance abusers who were arrested for selling or having an amount in excess of what was assumed to be for personal use as well as offenders who were primarily drug traffickers. (This last category was not welcomed.) Twelve percent were serving time for possession and six percent for being under the influence of a controlled substance. Just over one-quarter (29 percent) were serving time for non-drug offenses, including burglary (12 percent), forgery (12 percent), and theft/larceny (six percent).

Prior Criminal History: Review of criminal histories indicates that there were no first-time offenders among the reentry participants, judging from arrest histories at least. They

averaged (a median of) six prior arrests. One-third of the enrollees had ten or more prior arrests. One-fourth had one prior felony conviction and 16 percent had two or three prior felony convictions. Misdemeanor convictions were more common: 71 percent had at least one and 35 percent had two or more.

Time in the Program: As of our review of program data in March 2002, the average time spent by participants in the Clark County Reentry Court was 155 days; 11 percent had been in the program for less than one month, more than half had been in the program for less than six months, and 11 percent had been participating for a year or more.

Current Status in the Program: As of March 2002, 77 percent of the Clark County reentry participants were still active and in good standing. Nine percent, or three participants, had successfully concluded the program. Two participants were terminated because of continued drug use (dirty UAs), and one was terminated for a new offense (shoplifting). One rearrest of 35 participants amounts to a 3 percent rearrest rate so far.

Use of Sanctions: According to program files, 66 percent of the Clark County reentry participants have been in full compliance with program requirements. Approximately one-third of reentry participants have been sanctioned for some sort of noncompliance with the program. Although jail has been employed as a sanction for a few individuals, the most commonly used sanction is repetitive writing. If a participant commits a minor violation, such as being late to treatment, missing an appointment with the employment counselor, or having a cell phone ring during group, he or she may be required to write a phrase, such as "I will not be late to treatment," 500 or 1,000 times. Several participants' treatment files are an inch thick with dozens of pages saying "my cell phone will not go off in group, my cell phone will not go off in group, my cell phone will not go off in group..."

Illustrative Case Histories

Participant 1: Participant 1, a 33 year old African-American male, began the reentry program on January 8, 2002. He is not married and has two children, both of whom live with their grandmother in Mississippi—far from Nevada. Participant 1 moved back to live with his mother while participating in the Clark County Reentry Drug Court program. Records show that he completed the 11th grade. During his assessment, Participant 1 reported that he had been on medication for high blood pressure and that he had been diagnosed with manic depression. He had been enrolled in the Clark County Drug Court in 1998, but was terminated for having three bench warrants. His drug of choice was methamphetamine which, he reported at intake prior to his incarceration, he smoke by the quarter ounce. He remembers beginning his history of substance abuse at the age of 15 with alcohol. He also used LSD and marijuana frequently over the intervening years.

Participant 1 was sentenced to state prison for 19-48 months on January 30, 2001 on a forgery conviction. He had been in prison for about one year (343 days) at the time of his release to the reentry program. Participant 1 had a total of 11 prior arrests, including four felony and 11 misdemeanor charges (all non-violent). He had one prior felony conviction and two misdemeanor convictions.

As of March 2002, Participant 1 has been active in the Clark County Reentry Drug Court program for just over two months. He is currently in Phase II, attending three weekly groups and submitting three weekly UAs. He remains negative for drugs, but he has not been complying completely with program rules. Recently, he forgot to bring his group book to treatment and was required to write 1,000 times, "I will not forget my group book." He also has been driving without a license, and has missed a scheduled appointment with the employment counselor. At

the status review on March 19, 2002, the treatment representative asked the court to address the participant's "unacceptable behavior, and requested a one week review" schedule (meaning he would be ordered to attend drug court weekly).

Participant 2: Participant 2 is a 29 year old Hispanic male who entered the Clark County Reentry Drug Court program on December 15, 2000, making him one of the first prisoners to enroll and be accepted. He is also unmarried and has no children. He lives with his mother, brother, and nephew in the Las Vegas area. Participant 2 has been a Clark County resident for 29 years. He did not graduate from high school, but he did obtain his high school equivalency degree (GED) in 1985.

Participant 2 reported that his drug of choice was marijuana, which he used daily. The assessment file notes that he often supplemented marijuana use with alcohol. He has attended Alcoholics Anonymous classes in the past. His drug history began at the age of 13 with cocaine and prescription drugs (valium). He began drinking alcohol at age 14, and admits past use of LSD, mushrooms, and ecstasy. At his assessment, he was diagnosed by Choices staff as having polydrug dependence. Participant 2 had been serving time in state prison on a trafficking controlled substance charge before being released to the program.

Participant 2 attended the program for one year and graduated on December 17, 2001. During his participation in the program, he remained drug-free and in compliance with all program rules. On his Final Discharge Form, Participant 2 noted that each of the following issues had been resolved completely: accountability, responsibility, anger, response/reaction, grief, nutrition, life management, and criminal thinking. When asked what had been the most important issue he learned in treatment, participant 2 wrote, "life management...I can go out in the world and be productive without drugs and life management taught me how to live like a

person who can manage the everyday stress life brings.” Participant 2 cited the structure of the program as its main strength, including the curfews in the beginning, urinalysis, AA/NA meetings, probation officer visits, and group and vocational counseling. When asked about the main weakness of the program, he pointed to the need for an additional counselor. When, in his exit interview, he was asked his final thoughts on what he would like to give back to society, Participant 2 said “just to be as productive as I can and help those who are in need, and strive to be the best at what I do no matter what it is.”

Participant 3: Participant 3, a 35 year old white male, began the reentry program on February 9, 2001. He too was not married, but reported having two children, ages three and 11. Both children were residing with their maternal grandmother. Participant 3 graduated from high school in 1983.

Participant 3’s drug of choice is methamphetamine; his secondary drug of choice is marijuana. He reports using methamphetamine daily (one gram) prior to his incarceration. He has not received any prior drug treatment. Participant 3 was convicted of trafficking a controlled substance and sentenced to prison on April 24, 2000. He had been in prison for just over nine months before being released to the reentry program. Participant 3 has a total of eight prior arrests, resulting in three misdemeanor convictions (false identification to a peace officer, trespassing, and the use/sell/delivering of drug paraphernalia).

Participant 3 was active in the program for about 13 months and was set to graduate on February 12, 2002. However, he did not respond to a random observed drug test call on February 11. On February 12, the day before he was scheduled to graduate, he was ordered by the judge to submit to a drug test, which turned out to be positive for methamphetamine. Instead of being terminated and returned to prison (with loss of good time), Participant 3 was ordered by

the judge to participate in the program for an additional six months and was informed that another positive drug test would result in termination from the program. He is currently attending treatment daily, submitting three weekly observed drug tests, attending one weekly group counseling session, has a curfew from 9 am to 5 pm, and must attend 90 12-step meetings in 90 days. He was also required to reimburse Choices \$100 for the confirming urinalysis he requested when he tested positively. This participant's failures close to graduation posed a test of the assumed zero tolerance policy of the Reentry Drug Court. Given the substantial progress the individual had made until then, Judge Lehman opted to give him another try and to keep him out of prison.

Participant 4: Participant 4, a 36 year old Hispanic female, began the reentry program on December 16, 2000. She is not married and has two children, a 16 year old son and a seven year old daughter. Both children live in California with relatives. Participant 4 did not graduate from high school, but she did obtain her high school equivalency in October 2000 while incarcerated, just prior to her release to the reentry program.

Participant 4 reported her drug of choice to be methamphetamines, which she started abusing at the age of 20, when she was also very involved with cocaine. Her substance abuse history began at 16 with marijuana and then alcohol. Participant 4 had been enrolled in the Clark County Drug Court in April 1999 and reached Phase II before being terminated from the program in January 2000 for testing positively and being noncompliant.

After about one year's participation in the Clark County Reentry Drug Court, Participant 4 graduated on December 17, 2001, making her one of the first graduates. In her exit interview she cited "lifestyle changes, anger management, and the con game thinking errors" as the most helpful topics addressed in the program. According to Participant 4, the main strengths of the

program included “the books, having someone to talk to and share your feelings with, all the support.” When asked for final thoughts on what she would like to give back to society, she said “I would like to say some of us always wanted to change, just never knew how. It’s nice to have received a second chance.”

Early Stages of Operation: Washoe County

At the time of our review of the program in spring 2002, the Washoe County Early Release Court had its 16 active participants. Findings are summarized on pages 63-64.

Processing and Progress of First Candidates

Demographics: Seventy-seven percent of the initial participants were white, and 23 percent African-American. Like the Clark County participants, the reentry court participants in Washoe County were mostly (63 percent) female, again offering a strong contrast to the make-up of the regular drug court. Participants ranged in age from 21 to 44 years old, with a median of 33 years old. Seventy-five percent of participants were the age of 30; nearly one-fifth were over 40 years old.

Housing and Employment: At the time participants entered the program after release from prison, all Washoe County participants were required to reside in transitional housing for a period of at least four months. Participants’ files indicate that most moved out of the structured housing when eligible to do so. Logically, all participants were unemployed at the time they were released from prison to enter the program. As of their latest court status review, all participants were employed at the time of our review.

Substance Abuse and Prior Treatment History: This information was not available from program files at the time of the review.

Family/Ties: This information was not available from program files at the time of review.

Prison Status at Time of Enrollment: When entering the Washoe County Prison Reentry Drug Court program, 12 percent of the enrollees had been in prison six months or less, 56 percent had served at least one year in prison, and 44 percent had served more than one year in prison. The median time in prison prior to release is 309 days, or about 10 months.

Conviction Offenses: Fifty percent of reentry participants were in prison serving convictions for drug trafficking/manufacturing/distribution before being released to the program. Nineteen percent were serving time for being under the influence of a controlled substance, and six percent for possession. One-quarter were serving time for non-drug offenses, including burglary (12 percent) and theft/larceny (12 percent).

Prior Criminal History: Review of criminal histories indicates that all Washoe County reentry participants had been arrested previous to the offense sending them to prison. Reentry participants averaged six prior arrests. Fifty-six percent of participants had no prior felony convictions; one-third had just one prior felony conviction. Thirteen percent of reentry participants had two or three prior felony convictions. Misdemeanor convictions were more common; only six percent had none. Thirty-eight percent of participants had one prior misdemeanor conviction, 50 percent had two or more, and 25 percent had five or more (ranging up to nine).

Time in the Program: As of our review in March 2002, the average time in the Washoe County Prison Early Release Program was 150 days. No one had been in the program for less than one month or for more than one year. Approximately 38 percent had been in the program for less than 6 months.

Current Status in the Program: As of March 2002, 88 percent of the reentry participants were still active and in good standing (14 of 16). Twelve percent, or two participants, have been terminated from the program. Both participants were terminated because of continued drug use (positive drug tests). So far, no participant had been arrested for a new crime while on release in the program

Illustrative Case Histories

Participant 1: Participant 1, a 27 year old white female, began participation in the Washoe County Prison Early Release program on April 4, 2001. She had three prior arrests, resulting in one conviction for petty theft (misdemeanor). On March 8, 2000, Participant 1 entered the Nevada State Prison system to serve 26 months to 10 years for trafficking of a controlled substance.

Participant 1 served a little more than one year (392 days) in prison before being released to the Washoe County reentry program. She lived in transitional housing for the required four months before moving to a private residence. Participant 1 has been working for the same employer since shortly after her release from prison and has been in the program for 352 days. She was to be Washoe County's first reentry graduate later in April 2002.

Participant 2: Participant 2, a 34 year old white male, began the reentry program on October 2, 2001. He had three prior arrests resulting in two misdemeanor convictions (driving while under the influence and possession of drug paraphernalia). On June 30, 2000, Participant 2 began serving a two to five year prison term for trafficking of a controlled substance.

Participant 2 served 459 days in prison before being released to the Washoe County reentry program. He lived in transitional housing for the required four months and he continues to live there. Participant 2 has been working for the same employer since shortly after his release from

prison and has been active in good standing in the program for 171 days as of the end of March 2002. **Comparing the Early Experiences in Clark and Washoe Counties**

In earlier sections of this report we have described the distinctive experiences of each reentry site, as the respective reentry teams were faced with and overcame both common and site-specific obstacles. Despite arising from the same legislation, drawing from the same state prison population, and using the same basic treatment modality, the reentry programs in Clark and Washoe Counties are different in a number of important ways. The history and process that is documented in this report, and the diversity that emerged in the programs as they developed, highlight the need for flexibility and adaptability among program leadership during these early stages. As it spread across the nation and abroad, the original Miami drug court model was not applied with a “cookie-cutter” approach, and it is reasonable to assume that jurisdictions choosing to develop reentry drug courts will need to employ that same basic creativity to meet their local needs.

That being said, examination of the early experiences among the Clark and Washoe County reentry drug courts, in terms of participant backgrounds and performance, shows quite similar results. Participants in both programs are primarily white and female, with extensive prior criminal histories. About half of participants in both programs had been serving time for convictions involving drug trafficking/manufacturing/distribution, and about 25-30 percent had been in prison for a non-drug conviction. Participants in Clark County had long-term substance abuse problems, typically involving polydrug use and methamphetamine addiction. Although substance abuse history data were not immediately available in Washoe County, discussions with program staff indicate that participants in Reno suffered from similarly serious drug problems.

Table 1 Summary Characteristics of Clark and Washoe County Reentry Drug Court Participants

Demographics	Clark County % (n=38)	Washoe County % (n=16)
Race		
White	66%	77%
African American	23%	23%
Hispanic	11%	0%
Gender		
Male	37%	37%
Female	63%	63%
Living arrangements upon release		
Living with family	61%	0%
Living with friends	15%	0%
Living in transitional housing	21%	100%
Missing	3%	0%
Education		
Did not graduate high school	25%	-
High school graduate	63%	-
Some college	12%	-
Marital status		
Single	59%	-
Married	18%	-
Divorced/Separated	23%	-
Does participant have children?		
No	29%	-
Yes	71%	-
Employment status at latest review		
Not employed	24%	0%
Employed full-time	73%	100%
Employed part-time	3%	0%
Substance Abuse/Prior Treatment		
Any prior substance abuse treatment?		
No	50%	-
Yes	50%	-

History of polydrug use indicated		
No	9%	-
Yes	91%	-
Primary drug of choice		
Methamphetamine	66%	-
Cocaine/Crack	14%	-
Marijuana	14%	-
Heroin	6%	-
Criminal History		
Prison status at time of enrollment		
In prison six months or less	10%	12%
In prison at least one year	55%	56%
In prison more than one year	25%	44%
Conviction offense		
Drug trafficking/manufacturing/distribution	53%	50%
Drug possession	12%	6%
Under influence controlled substance	6%	19%
Burglary	12%	12%
Forgery	12%	0%
Theft/larceny	6%	12%
Any prior arrests?		
No	0%	0%
Yes	100%	100%
Median number of prior arrests		
	6	6
Behavior While in the Program		
Any rearrests?		
No	97%	100%
Yes	3%	0%
Median days in treatment		
	155	150
Any sanctions?		
No	66%	-
Yes	34%	-
Current status in program		
Terminated	14%	12%
Active, in good standing	77%	88%
Graduated	9%	0%

There were some minor differences between participants as well. The reentry program in Washoe County had not enrolled a Hispanic participant during this early implementation phase, while just over 10 percent of Clark County participants were Hispanic. The Washoe County participants were more likely to have served longer sentences prior to release, with nearly one-half spending more than a year in prison (compared to 25 percent in Clark County). Washoe County participants were also three times as likely to be serving time for an under the influence conviction.

Importantly, both programs witnessed similar, positive outcomes among the first wave of participants. To date, participants in both programs averaged 150 days in treatment, and the vast majority remain active and in good standing (77 percent in Clark County, 88 percent in Washoe County). Despite intensive supervision and less tolerance than the traditional drug court approach, very few participants in either program have been terminated and sent back to prison (14 percent in Clark County and 12 percent in Washoe County). Because the Clark County program began accepting inmates before its sister program in Reno, the Clark County program has graduated its first participants. Finally, no one in the Washoe County program and only one person in the Clark County program have been arrested on new charges. To sum up, despite the different developmental experiences in the two demonstration sites, the respective reentry programs have enrolled similar participants and witnessed similarly positive early outcomes.

X. Implementation of Nevada's Reentry Drug Courts: Issues and Implications

In this implementation-focused descriptive report, we have argued that the Nevada reentry drug courts in Clark County (Las Vegas) and Washoe County (Reno) represent a significant development in court innovation and prisoner reentry for several reasons.

- They anticipate the current call for strategies to address problems associated with prisoner reentry in the United States, as the cohorts of offenders sentenced to prison during the 1990s are now returning to society in large numbers.
- They represent a major extension and test of the court-based treatment strategy pioneered in drug courts to a state prisoner population.
- In adapting many of the tenets of drug courts to this challenging population, they differ importantly from other emerging court-based reentry models in the United States. One of their acknowledged purposes is to serve as a prison population reduction strategy (alternative to confinement). Thus, they differ from other reentry court approaches in Oklahoma, California, Florida, Missouri, and New York because they expressly seek to move eligible drug-involved inmates currently serving terms of confinement into the community rather than placing additional offenders in confinement and then moving them to reentry courts as part of a split sentencing option.
- Viewed within the narrower context of the drug court movement, the Nevada reentry court demonstration is significant because of its challenging target population (state prisoners serving sentences for drug-related offenses), the interagency and inter-jurisdictional nature of collaboration (between the three branches of government) on

which it is premised, and the manner by which it was established (legislation approached by Nevada's Assembly and Senate, and signed by the Governor).

As an inmate-focused strategy, the reentry court demonstration is particularly timely as national attention is now turning to the consequences of the incarceration policies of the 1990s and the limits of resources available for prison construction. The Nevada reentry court initiative represents one constructive tool for addressing issues of prisoner reentry and confinement capacity with its balanced emphases on community safety, intensive supervision and treatment, and reintegration into society. The Clark and Washoe County reentry drug court pilots are also significant because, implicitly, they recognize the importance of judicial policies and practices in producing the inmate population—and, therefore, in devising acceptable alternatives or complements to prison time as a response to drug-related crime. For this alone, Judge Lehman of Clark County's Eighth Judicial District and Judge Breen of Washoe County's Second Judicial District—and their full drug court teams and local advisory committees consisting of law enforcement, prosecution, defense counsel, treatment, and corrections—should be recognized for their contribution.

The process of implementation, this report suggests, has not been easy. A number of difficult issues are raised by the Nevada reentry drug court model both in itself and in operation. Several of these are highlighted briefly.

Identifying and Enrolling Candidates

After winning acceptance of the notion that "local" courts could play a central, hands-on role in facilitating the treatment of substance-abusing offenders, the next most difficult challenge was to institute the inter-agency and inter-jurisdictional process of identifying inmate-candidates, reviewing the candidates for eligibility, and enrolling them in the respective drug court

programs. It is safe to say the procedures as originally set out worked very poorly from the beginning. The identification of candidates depended on the former Prisons administrative staff, whose information system, geographic diffusion, budgetary, and institutional interests served as initial obstacles. Initially, too few candidates were made aware of the program and those who applied might not have been notified of their acceptance in less than four or five months. The lengthy screening process for identifying eligible inmates meant that, by the time they were identified, they might have less than 12 months left to serve on their sentences before their expected parole release dates. This circumstance raised possible problems for the courts: judicial authority would expire once participants were paroled because the participants would be in the custody of Corrections while in reentry court. This development raised issues about parole and established the need for a relationship between the reentry drug court programs and the paroling authority, the Nevada Board of Parole Commissioners. More worrisome, however, was the fact that the long candidate identification process meant that the demonstration courts would have a difficult time saving incarceration costs. They were not designed as parole drug courts. Nor could they save confinement days if participants had only a short time left to expected parole release. The longer the time required for enrollment and release to the reentry programs, the less incentive inmates would have to gain "early" release.

Fortunately, in the second year after the original legislation, the role and philosophy of the new Nevada Department of Corrections changed. At the same time, the new law expanded the eligibility for participation by allowing up to four previous non-violent felony convictions (as opposed to the original one), and permitting consideration of prisoners serving both consecutive and concurrent sentences, as well as sentences resulting from revocation of probation caused by new offenses (as long as they too were non-violent). With these critical changes, the reentry

drug courts have been able to greatly streamline the candidate identification and review process, eliminating unnecessarily overlapping and sequential reviews, and greatly increasing the timeliness of reviews as well as the numbers found eligible for treatment.

Layered Discretion and Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction, authority, and layered discretion formed important aspects of the challenges associated with establishing the Nevada reentry drug courts. On the local level, the operation of drug courts is made possible only through carefully negotiated agreements among the courts, prosecution, and defense counsel. Without the concerns of defense counsel or prosecutors being met, drug courts could not function. Often, drug courts can only function within the context of state laws or based on the prosecutor's discretion in charging, diversion, and plea policies. Certainly, drug courts could not operate without judicial interest, leadership, discretion, and, ultimately, authority. In fact, often it has been judicial power and authority—or at least the perception of authority—that has provided the clout to establish and operate drug courts within otherwise reluctant justice systems. The fruits of these local negotiations, relationships, and local politics are represented in the Nevada demonstration in the local advisory committees that guide the functioning of the reentry courts in Clark and Washoe Counties.

Historically, the local politics or diplomatic struggles of drug courts in establishing themselves have been extremely challenging. When state-level agencies are added to this picture, questions of jurisdiction, authority, and judicial discretion become even more challenging. Not only have the Nevada reentry drug courts had to pioneer in the development of working relationships and procedures between essentially local functions and authority³² and state-level government agencies (the Department of Corrections, the Department of Motor

³² We again point out the technical exception that the courts are not local. They are part of the statewide court system operating in localities. Politically, and in the context of drug courts, they are important local justice system actors, with state-level authority.

Vehicles and Public Safety, the Division of Probation and Parole, the Nevada Board of Parole Commissioners), but their authorization required support from the two other branches of government (the Governor and both houses of the Nevada legislature). Thus, in a novel twist, the reentry drug courts are supervising inmates still in the custody of the state Department of Corrections who may also fall under the jurisdiction of the paroling authority, the Board of Parole Commissioners, partway through the reentry court treatment process. The possibilities of conflicting authority, discretion, and jurisdiction under the Nevada reentry court model are seemingly endless. The authority of the Department of Corrections to assign or transfer inmates to custody levels, the parole commissioners' authority to grant, deny, or revoke parole, Probation and Parole's authority to detain offenders pending revocation proceedings, police authority to arrest released inmates who have outstanding warrants or holds, and the judge's role in terminating participation in the reentry program without needing to follow the due process requirements governing probation or parole revocation are all relevant to the successful operation of the reentry drug courts.

The easy way to navigate these jurisdictional issues for a local court would be to establish a version of reentry court through its sentencing powers. In fact, in several states, reentry courts have been crafted by imposing sentences that require confinement to be followed by release to a reentry court for treatment. The reentry court procedures and arrangements are, in effect, demanded by the sentencing approach. The path followed by officials in creating the Nevada reentry drug court model, however, is far more difficult, though potentially more productive. Under the Nevada approach, and building on the existing local understandings governing the original drug courts, questions of authority and jurisdiction have been carefully negotiated and worked through between branches and levels of government. In fact, addressing these issues and

crafting appropriate procedures and understandings formed the principal substance of the early stages of implementation of the reentry drug courts. Thus, whether intentionally or not, the establishment of these new working relationships between state and local partners in the process has been an important part of the Nevada reentry drug court demonstration. In addressing these difficult challenges, the Nevada officials raise a model for consideration in other states dealing with similar issues of crime, prison capacity, substance abuse, and prisoner reentry.

Participant Behavior: Incentives and Sanctions in the Reentry Drug Court Process

As the use of reentry drug courts expands across the United States, how these jurisdictional and institutional questions are worked out will have an important bearing on the shape of this innovation. As the drug court model is adapted to address these expanded challenges, the ultimate role of reentry drug courts will also be closely tied to another critical drug court ingredient—the manipulation of incentives and sanctions in response to participant performance. In this studied response to participant performance through rewards and sanctions, drug courts have adopted basic deterrence theory as a core operating theme. Not only the designers of drug courts, but participants themselves,³³ believe that participants' progress in treatment will be shaped by the threat of punishment (in various sanctions that include scolding, sitting in the jury box and watching court, demotion to earlier phases of treatment, increased drug testing, and jailing) and the rewards provided by positive incentives (progress from one phase to the next, recognition in court by peers and the court, graduation, employment, etc.). Although this notion has been adopted in different forms across the hundreds of drug courts, its emphasis is ubiquitous.

The use of incentives and sanctions in the drug court methodology raises some interesting questions when it is applied to the Nevada reentry court demonstration. Court officials describe

³³ See Goldkamp et al., (2001b).

a range of incentives for participation in the reentry court. The most important include the prospects of early release from confinement, assistance with housing and employment, proximity of family and friends, and a treatment program that will help them adjust to life in the community without falling back into drug use and facing the chances of re-incarceration. Perhaps the major issue posed for use of sanctions by participation in reentry court is the policy of zero tolerance. As drug courts have evolved, they have in most cases framed their responses to participant noncompliance with program conditions within an understanding of addict behavior. That is, it is unlikely to expect perfect behavior in the first stages of participation among individuals who have spent their lives so far acting irresponsibly, failing at school, at employment, in relationships, etc. Drug courts teach a respect for consequences of behavior through progressive applications of sanctions—in a very public setting. However, most courts have avoided the one-strike-and-you're-out approach to poor performance. In fact, even when participants have finally worked their ways up to jail as a sanction, it usually is still a sanction from which they can recover and return to the program (if they wish).

In managing offenders on probation and parole or, more relevantly, inmates granted early release, the Division of Probation and Parole has taken a zero tolerance view of participant behavior, intending to violate or to send back to prison those who make a single misstep. (This has been more of an issue in Clark County than in Washoe County). The zero tolerance orientation stems in part from the agency philosophy, which is very law enforcement oriented. Although a zero tolerance policy is important to communicate to possible applicants the seriousness of the reentry drug court experience, rigid adherence to such a policy would contrast with the philosophy of most drug courts in the United States as evidenced over their 13 year history. These courts have generally sought to combine a very firm, rule oriented philosophy

toward participation with some flexibility as difficult problems are being addressed over time. Thus, for example, use of sanctions, including jailing, is not uncommon in most drug courts. Program termination for one noncompliant act, however, is almost unheard of.

As the agencies involved in the Nevada reentry drug court demonstration continue to work through issues related to their new programs, the question of zero tolerance will increasingly come into play. Both courts recognize the need to convince prospective participants of the severity of noncompliant behavior (given their continuing status as inmates of the Corrections Department). At the same time, the courts want to reserve discretion for the judge to decide when to show some flexibility or when to make some allowances in the service of longer-term treatment goals. Indeed, arriving at an understanding in this area involves negotiation of clear understandings, otherwise Probation and Parole officers would be within their rights to detain and Corrections within its authority to remove or transfer participants without regard to the wishes of the reentry court judge or treatment team. In addition, to the extent that participants are on parole during the later stages of participation in the reentry court, the parole board would also be acting within its mandate to terminate parole based on different understandings of noncompliance among reentry court participants.

Assessing Impact: The Longer-Term Contribution of the Nevada Reentry Drug Courts

The purposes of this report in examining the Nevada reentry drug court demonstration at its earliest stages of implementation and operation are descriptive and analytic. We have sought to document the early stages of development and implementation of a unique reentry drug court initiative with implications for prisoner reentry issues in jurisdictions around the nation. In addition, we have identified some of the problems encountered during the challenging implementation efforts in both sites and discussed their implications for application of such a

reentry court model in other locations. The need for evaluation, implicit in the legislative enactment of a “demonstration,” is not lost on the officials in Las Vegas and Reno who were responsible for establishing these programs. The original legislation, in fact, had conditioned funding of treatment based on a documented showing of cost savings, one measure of impact. For continued funding and support, it is understood in Nevada, the courts will have to demonstrate both the feasibility and the impact of the reentry strategy.

Our descriptive examination of the reentry court initiatives in Clark and Washoe Counties finds strong support for the feasibility of the approach in Nevada. Both courts in their different settings have grappled with difficult implementation challenges during the early start-up phases and, as of the date of this report, have shown demonstrable progress (against tough odds) in moving from theory to practice, from legislation to operation. They have established the new inter-agency and inter-jurisdictional working relationships on which the success of the reentry drug court strategy will ultimately rest. The “proof” of the feasibility of this strategy is found not only in the establishment of the new procedures, where none had previously existed, and the multi-agency cooperation on both local and state levels, but also in the growing numbers of candidates forwarded from the Department of Corrections for consideration by the local advisory committees and, not incidentally, in the fact that the Nevada reentry drug court demonstration has produced its first successful inmate graduates. The question of longer term impact will await more formal, in-depth evaluation.

REFERENCES

- Beck, A. (2000). *Prisoners in 1999* (Bulletin NCJ 183476). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Beck, A. & Mumola, C. (1999). *Prisoners in 1998* (NCJ 175687). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Goldkamp, J. S. (2000). The Drug Court Response: Issues and Implications for Justice Change. *Albany Law Review*, 3(63).
- Goldkamp, J. S., White, M. D., & Robinson, J. B. (2001a). *From Whether to How Drug Courts Work: Retrospective Evaluation of Drug Courts in Clark County (Las Vegas) and Multnomah County (Portland)*. Philadelphia: Crime and Justice Research Institute.
- Goldkamp, J. S., White, M. D., & Robinson, J. B. (2001b). *"An Honest Chance": Perspectives of Drug Court Participants: Findings from Focus Groups in Brooklyn, Miami, Seattle, Las Vegas, and San Bernardino*. Philadelphia: Crime and Justice Research Institute.
- Lynch, J.P & Sabol, W.J. (2000a). Prison Use and Social Control. In J. Horney (Ed.), *Policies, Processes, and Decisions of the Criminal Justice System* (pp. 7-44). Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.
- Lynch, J.P & Sabol, W.J. (2000b). *Prisoner Reentry and the Consequences of Sentencing Reform*. [Online]. Available: www.urban.org/news/tuesdays/12-00/lynch.html.
- Lynch, J.P & Sabol, W.J. (2001). *Prisoner Reentry in Perspective* (Monograph). Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Maguire, K., & Pastore, A. L. (Eds.). (2000). *Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics* (28 ed.).
- MacKenzie, D.L. (2001). Corrections and Sentencing in the 21st Century: Evidence-Based Corrections and Sentencing. *The Prison Journal*, 81 (3), 299-312.
- McCaffrey, B. (1998). *Drug Treatment in the Criminal Justice System*. Washington, DC: Office of the National Drug Control Policy.
- Petersilia, J. (2000, November). When Prisoners Return to the Community: Political, Economic, and Social Consequences. *Issues for the 21st Century: Papers from the Executive Sessions on Sentencing and Corrections*.
- Petersilia, J. (2001). Prisoner Reentry: Public Safety and Reintegration Challenges. *The Prison Journal*, 81 (3), 360-375.
- Rottman, D.B., Flango, C.R., Cantrell, M.T., Hansen, R., & LaFountain, N. (2000). *State Court Organization 1998* (Bureau of Justice Statistics Publication No. NCJ 178932). Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.

- Tauber, J., & Huddleston, C. W. (1999). *Reentry Drug Courts*. Alexandria, VA: National Drug Court Institute.
- Tonry, M. (1996). *Sentencing Matters*. New York: Oxford University Press,
- Tonry, M. (1999). The Fragmentation of sentencing and corrections in America. In *Sentencing and Corrections: Issues for the 21st Century* (Bureau of Justice Statistics Publication No. NCJ 181413). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Travis, J., Solomon, A. L., & Waul, M. (2001). *From Prison to Home: The Dimensions and Consequences of Prisoner Reentry* (Monograph). Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Travis, J. & Petersilia, J. (2001). Reentry Reconsidered: A New Look at an Old Question. *Crime and Delinquency*, 47 (3), 291-313.

APPENDIX
Senate Bill No. 184—Committee on Finance
Assembly Bill No. 574—Committee on Judiciary

ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 574—COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

MARCH 26, 2001

Referred to Committee on Judiciary

SUMMARY—Makes changes to provisions concerning programs of treatment for abuse of alcohol or drugs for certain offenders and clarifies that eligibility for parole from consecutive sentences is based upon longest sentence. (BDR 16-1327)

FISCAL NOTE: Effect on Local Government: No. Effect on the State: No.

EXPLANATION – Matter in *bolded italics* is new; matter between brackets ~~omitted material~~ is material to be omitted. Green numbers along left margin indicate location on the printed bill (e.g., 5-15 indicates page 5, line 15).

AN ACT relating to offenders; providing for the continuation of certain programs of treatment for the abuse of alcohol or drugs for certain offenders; revising certain provisions concerning such programs of treatment; clarifying that eligibility for parole from consecutive sentences is based upon the sentence with the longest period before the prisoner is eligible for parole; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, REPRESENTED IN SENATE AND ASSEMBLY, DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

1-1 Section 1. NRS 209.4314 is hereby amended to read as follows:
1-2 209.4314 1. Except as otherwise provided in this section, if an
1-3 advisory board has been created pursuant to NRS 209.4316 in the judicial
1-4 district in which an offender was sentenced to imprisonment, the director
1-5 shall, after consulting with the division, refer the offender to the advisory
1-6 board if the director believes that the offender would participate
1-7 successfully in and benefit from a program of treatment and:
1-8 (a) The offender has:
1-9 (1) Established a position of employment in the community, or a
1-10 judge in the judicial district to which the offender would be assigned
1-11 pursuant to NRS 213.500 will assist the offender to establish a position of
1-12 employment in the community; and
1-13 (2) Demonstrated an ability to pay for all or part of the costs of his
1-14 participation in a program of treatment, including, without limitation, costs
1-15 for room and board, and to meet any existing obligation for restitution to
1-16 any victim of his crime, or a judge in the judicial district to which the
1-17 offender would be assigned will assist the offender to ensure that the
1-18 offender has the ability to pay for such costs and to meet such obligations;
1-19 and

2-1 (b) The offender:

2-2 (1) Is within 2 years of his probable release from prison as
2-3 determined by the director; or

2-4 (2) Is imprisoned as a result of having had his parole ~~for probation~~
2-5 revoked on or after July 1, 1998, for a reason other than for committing a
2-6 crime while on parole. ~~for probation.~~

2-7 2. Except as otherwise provided in this section, if the director is
2-8 notified by an advisory board pursuant to NRS 209.4316 that an offender
2-9 should be assigned to the custody of the division to be assigned to
2-10 participate in a program of treatment, the director shall assign the offender
2-11 to the custody of the division to be assigned to participate in a program of
2-12 treatment for a minimum of 1 year, but not longer than the remainder of his
2-13 sentence.

2-14 3. The director shall adopt, by regulation, standards providing which
2-15 offenders are eligible to be assigned to the custody of the division pursuant
2-16 to this section. The standards must be approved by the board and reviewed
2-17 by the interim finance committee. The standards adopted by the director
2-18 must provide that an offender who:

2-19 (a) Has recently committed a serious infraction of the rules of an
2-20 institution or facility of the department;

2-21 (b) Has not performed the duties assigned to him in a faithful and
2-22 orderly manner;

2-23 (c) Has ever been convicted of:

2-24 (1) Any crime involving the use or threatened use of force or violence
2-25 against the victim that is punishable as a gross misdemeanor or felony; or

2-26 (2) A sexual offense;

2-27 (d) Has *previously* been *four times* convicted *in this state or elsewhere,*
2-28 ~~of [more than one felony in this state or] any offense [in another state that~~
2-29 ~~would be a felony if committed in this state, unless each felony or] that~~
2-30 *under the laws of the situs of the offense or of this state would amount to*
2-31 *a felony, unless an* offense which the offender has been convicted of arose
2-32 out of the same act, transaction or occurrence~~;~~ *as another offense, in*
2-33 *which case the convictions for those offenses shall be deemed to*
2-34 *constitute a single conviction for the purposes of this paragraph;*

2-35 (e) Has escaped or attempted to escape from any jail or correctional
2-36 institution for adults; or

2-37 (f) Has not made an effort in good faith to participate in or to complete
2-38 any educational or vocational program or any program of treatment, as
2-39 ordered by the director,
2-40 is not eligible for assignment to the custody of the division pursuant to this
2-41 section to be assigned to participate in a program of treatment.

2-42 4. The director shall adopt regulations requiring offenders who are
2-43 assigned to the custody of the division pursuant to this section to reimburse
2-44 a court, the division and the department for any costs incurred pursuant to
2-45 NRS 209.4311 to 209.4317, inclusive, and 213,500. The regulations must
2-46 be approved by the board and reviewed by the interim finance committee.

2-47 5. A court to which an offender has been assigned pursuant to NRS
2-48 213.500 may return the offender to the custody of the department at any
2-49 time.

3-1 6. If an offender assigned to the custody of the division pursuant to this
 3-2 section violates any of the terms or conditions imposed by a court to which
 3-3 the offender has been assigned pursuant to NRS 213.500 and is returned to
 3-4 the custody of the department, the offender forfeits all or part of the credits
 3-5 for good behavior earned by him before he was returned to the custody of
 3-6 the department, as determined by the director. The director may provide for
 3-7 a forfeiture of credits pursuant to this subsection only after proof of the
 3-8 violation and notice to the offender, and may restore credits forfeited for
 3-9 such reasons as he considers proper. The decision of the director regarding
 3-10 such a forfeiture is final.

3-11 7. The assignment of an offender to the custody of the division
 3-12 pursuant to this section shall be deemed:

3-13 (a) A continuation of his imprisonment and not a release on parole; and

3-14 (b) For the purposes of NRS 209.341, an assignment to a facility of the
 3-15 department,

3-16 except that the offender is not entitled to obtain any benefits or to
 3-17 participate in any programs provided to offenders in the custody of the
 3-18 department.

3-19 8. An offender does not have a right to be assigned to the custody of
 3-20 the division pursuant to this section, or to remain in that custody after such
 3-21 an assignment, and it is not intended that the provisions of NRS 209.4311
 3-22 to 209.4317, inclusive, or 213.500 create any right or interest in liberty or
 3-23 property or establish a basis for any cause of action against the State of
 3-24 Nevada, its political subdivisions, agencies, boards, commissions,
 3-25 departments, officers or employees.

3-26 9. The director shall not assign more than 150 offenders to the custody
 3-27 of the division pursuant to this section to be assigned to participate in a
 3-28 program of treatment during each biennium.

3-29 **Sec. 2.** NRS 213.1213 is hereby amended to read as follows:

3-30 213.1213 If a prisoner is sentenced pursuant to NRS 176.035 to serve
 3-31 two or more concurrent *or consecutive* sentences, whether or not the
 3-32 sentences are identical in length or other characteristics, eligibility for
 3-33 parole from any of the concurrent *or consecutive* sentences must be based
 3-34 on the sentence which requires the longest period before the prisoner is
 3-35 eligible for parole.

3-36 **Sec. 3.** Section 14 of chapter 552, Statutes of Nevada 1999, at page
 3-37 2883, is hereby amended to read as follows:

3-38 **Sec. 14. 1.** This act becomes effective on July 1, 1999.

3-39 **2.** Sections 1 to 10, inclusive, of this act expire by limitation on
 3-40 ~~June 30, 2001.~~ **June 30, 2003.**

10. Grey area problems and questions

Q. Can the inmates regain custody of their children?

A. Your state's family court will have the final decision. Nevada's family court seems to feel the inmates need time to settle into the program and to get a job and a stable residence before they grant custody. The inmate may get visitation rights while waiting though.

Q. Can the inmate leave the state for vacation or family visits?

A. Absolutely NOT! There is no out of state privileges allowed.

Q. What if the inmate has warrants from another state?

A. The inmate is still considered a ward of your state's prison system and extradition may only occur once the inmate is finished with the program and placed on parole.

If you have any other questions feel free to call.

Officer Brian D. Zana (702)486-3627

Nevada Division of Parole and Probation

215 E. Bonanza Rd. Las Vegas, NV 89101

**Nevada Division
Of
Parole And Probation
SB 184
Program**



GRANT NUMBER 2000-DC-VX-0031

GRANTEE'S INFORMATION

Name :Crime and Justice Research Institute

Number :232-51-0540

Address :520 North Columbus Road, Philadelphia PA 19123

GRANT INFORMATION

Title :Nevada Re-Entry Drug Court Demonstration in Las Vegas & Reno

Proj Begin	Proj End	Bud Beg Date	Bud End Date	Award Date
11/01/2000	07/31/2002	11/01/2000	07/31/2002	09/30/2000

Monitor :Munsterman

Organization Code :NIRE

Award Amount :\$74,963

Other Amount :\$ 0

Type of Asst :04

St Appl ID No: SAI NOT AVAILABLE

called 12/10/03 not a good number

Application No :200070054PAIJ Rec Center Accession No : - -

Contact Person :John S. Goldkamp

Phone :(215)627-3766

Subj Code	POMS Code	Act Code	Targ Pop	Juv/Adult Cd	CFDA No
340	DA	F2	G	P	16.585

Status Date :07/31/2002 Status :90

Press any key *215-204-7918 main office*
1671 Goldkamp

Grant Section

Press <Esc> key to exit, <Enter> key to Display, <F2>Project Summary, <F3>Funding History, <F4>Subgrants, <F5>Sort, <F7>Drawdowns

	AWARD	AWARD	AWARD	
GRANT NUMBER	DATE	BEGINS	ENDS	AMOUNT

2000-DC-VX-0031	09/30/2000	11/01/2000	07/31/2002	74,963
2000-DC-VX-0050	09/30/2000	09/01/2000	08/31/2003	500,000
2000-DC-VX-0051	09/30/2000	09/01/2000	08/31/2003	77,140
2000-DC-VX-0052	09/30/2000	09/01/2000	08/31/2003	299,934
2000-DC-VX-0053	09/27/2000	09/01/2000	08/31/2003	166,700

Title :Nevada Re-Entry Drug Court Demonstration in Las Vegas & Reno

Grantee :Crime and Justice Research Institute

Federal ID. Number :232-51-0540

Monitor :Munsterman

City :Philadelphia

County :Philadelphia

State :PA

Grant Type :DISCRETIONARY

Organization :NIRE

H1-DT. Final H1

Progress Report Date

Final Report

06/05/2002 NO

05/07/2002

NO

Sorted by Grant Number: To search type Grant Number

Searching for : 2000DCVX0031