

ECTA

FINAL REPORT

EVALUATION

OF

WESTCHESTER COUNTY TREATMENT
ALTERNATIVES TO STREET CRIME

72373

FINAL REPORT

EVALUATION

OF

WESTCHESTER COUNTY TREATMENT

ALTERNATIVES TO STREET CRIME

PREFACE

The first Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC) program was established in 1972. At the present time there are more than forty TASC programs in operation. The proliferation of TASC has been accompanied by the growth of standard performance categories and a descriptive jargon. This preface is intended to provide the reader who is unfamiliar with TASC a capsule summary of the criteria and nomenclature that are found intermittently throughout this report.

TASC programs were designed to serve as a formal mechanism for linking the criminal justice and drug treatment systems. Whereas the courts have traditionally had their doubts about the efficacy of drug treatment and the integrity of treatment personnel, treatment programs have tended to view any criminal justice involvement in the treatment process as an insurmountable obstacle to client rehabilitation. By assuring treatment confidentiality while providing accountability to the courts, TASC sought to facilitate the diversion of drug-involved offenders from the courts and into treatment.

The TASC concept is built on the assumption that removing drug-involved offenders from the usual criminal justice channels and placing them in carefully monitored treatment programs benefits all parties concerned: the criminal justice system, by unclogging court calendars and enhancing traditional criminal justice monitoring and feedback mechanisms; drug treatment, by relieving treatment staff of the need to attend to a client's criminal justice problems rather than focusing solely on the treatment process; the client, by providing him with a valuable information resource, an "extra ear" in times of distress, and the motivation to cease substance abuse once and for all; and the public, by effecting substantial savings associated with reduced trial and incarceration costs, lowered crime and drug abuse, and increased productivity in terms of education and employment. To be maximally effective in all these areas, TASC must intersect with individuals having serious involvement in both illegal drug usage, and criminal activity. By eradicating the client's drug problem, it was felt that the drug abuse/crime/(re)arrest cycle could be effectively halted.

Serious criminal involvement is usually evidenced by arrests for felony offenses or, in more conservative communities, for lesser offenses that might result in incarceration.

A TASC client who is currently charged with, or has a prior record of, either burglary, robbery, or the sale of drugs is considered to be as serious an offender as TASC programs generally handle. Extensive criminal histories and one or more prior incarcerations are also indicative of serious criminal justice involvement. Serious drug involvement is evidenced primarily by the frequent use of unprescribed central nervous system (CNS) depressants. Heroin and other opiates are no longer as widely abused as they were only a few years ago. Instead, drugs like Talwin (a CNS depressant) and PCP are being abused with increasingly alarming frequency. For a TASC project to be considered effective, it must succeed in referring these "serious" persons to treatment programs.

In regard to drug involvement, it should be noted that, in the past several years, a few TASC programs have been able to admit clients whose primary drug of abuse is alcohol.

The standard TASC model is divided into three functional units -- screening and identification; diagnosis and evaluation; and tracking and monitoring -- and an administrative unit that coordinates project activities. Some programs also have a separate court liaison unit or individual, whereas

others include the court liaison within the screening unit. The case management approach, which combines two or more functions within a single unit is less frequently used by TASC agencies. Westchester TASC is unique in that it is a county-wide TASC program based on a decentralized case manager approach. Five court districts are each handled by a single case manager who performs screening and evaluation functions. One court district (Yonkers) is allotted more than one case manager, and two others (Peekskill and Northern Westchester) receive only part-time coverage. Jail screening is done by a single TASC worker on a part-time basis. Tracking is done primarily through periodic progress reports and other TASC/treatment contacts, and is coordinated by the central TASC office. Administratively, TASC programs are typically included as part of larger "umbrella" agencies. In the case of Westchester County TASC, this agency is the Department of Community Mental Health.

TASC client success has been defined in several ways. Some TASC programs define successful clients as those who have fully completed both criminal justice and treatment requirements. Most TASC agencies consider clients successful if treatment is proceeding well and criminal justice requirements are satisfied. So-called "neutral successes" are those clients whose justice system stipulation to TASC ends prior to any real treatment progress but without their participation in treatment having been unsuccessfully terminated up to that point.

When TASC clients violate the conditions of the TASC contract, they are often placed in an intermediary jeopardy status. Jeopardy most often occurs when clients are re-arrested, fail to appear in court, miss scheduled treatment sessions, or continue to abuse drugs (as indicated by a positive urinalysis which all TASC programs require on a regular basis for each TASC client). Being placed in jeopardy should indicate to the client that s/he is in danger of being terminated from TASC. Certain jeopardy categories may necessitate immediate termination (for example, a client may be incarcerated as a result of a rearrest). Often, TASC programs terminate clients after having conducted a set number of jeopardy sessions -- meetings to warn clients of their precarious status vis-a-vis TASC.

Whereas the original TASC model focused on pretrial diversion, especially for cases originally slated as felonies, the National Phase II TASC Evaluation stressed difficulties in this area. Many TASC programs have explored other referral pathways (for example, TASC as a sentence alternative) and, indeed, some programs have focused almost exclusively on one or more of these alternative pathways. Although Westchester County deals primarily with individuals prior to case disposition, they tend to acquire clients at or following disposition.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables.....	ii
---------------------	----

<u>CHAPTER</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
1	Executive Summary	1
2	Introduction	6
3	TASC Client Characteristics and Summary Flow	8
4	TASC Relationship With The Criminal Justice System	35
5	TASC Impact On The Criminal Justice System	42
6	TASC Relationship With Treatment Programs	71
7	TASC Impact On Treatment	76
8	Cost Analysis	87
9	TASC Information Management	96

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
3-1	TASC Acceptable Clients	16
3-2	TASC Terminations By Outcome	17
3-3	TASC Treatment Program Utilization	18
3-4	TASC Client Characteristics - Year One	20
3-5	Comparison of TASC Client Characteristics Between Jurisdictions	22
3-6	Client Characteristics By TASC Status Or Outcome For Clients Admitted To Treatment	25
3-7	TASC Terminations By Outcome By Type Of Treatment	29
3-8	TASC Client Characteristics By Type Of Treatment	30
3-9	Percentages Of Persons Screened And Deemed Unacceptable For TASC By Jurisdiction: February, 1980 - May, 1980	32
3-10	Characteristics Of Potential TASC Clients Found To Be Unacceptable In Yonkers Court	33
5-1	Six Month Sample - Yonkers City Court Caseload	57
	Dispositions of Arraignments For Drug Or Alcohol Abusing Population By Crime Category:	
5-2	Three Month Sample Prior To TASC	58
5-3	Three Month Sample After TASC	58
	Dispositions of Arraignments For Drug Or Alcohol Abusing Population Within Each Crime Category:	
5-4	Three Month Sample Prior To TASC	59
5-5	Three Month Sample After TASC	59

TABLEPAGEDispositions Of Arraignments For Drug Or Alcohol
Abusing Population By Current Treatment Status:

5-6	Three Month Sample Prior To TASC	60
5-7	Three Month Sample After TASC	60

Dispositions Of Arraignments For Drug Or Alcohol
Abusing Population By Treatment History:

5-8	Three Month Sample Prior To TASC	61
5-9	Three Month Sample After TASC	61

Crime Categories Of Drug And Alcohol Abusing
Population By Type Of Abuse:

5-10	Three Month Sample Prior To TASC	62
5-11	Three Month Sample After TASC	62

Dispositions Of Arraignments For Drug And Alcohol
Abusing Population By Type of Abuse:

5-12	Three Month Sample Prior To TASC	63
5-13	Three Month Sample After TASC	63

5-14	Yonkers City Court, Criminal Part III - Three Month Sample of Total Case Dispositions	64
------	--	----

5-15	Yonkers City Court, Criminal Part III: Three Month Sentencing Sample	65
------	---	----

5-16	Westchester County Department of Probation: Criminal Courts - Volumes Of Pre-Sentence Investigations	66
------	--	----

5-17	Yonkers City Court, Criminal Part III: Disposition And Sentencing of Drug Offenses - Three Month Sample	67
------	---	----

5-18	Westchester County Correctional Facilities: 1974-1978 Populations	68
------	--	----

5-19	County Jail Detention By Length Of Time Detained	69
------	--	----

TABLEPAGE

5-20	County Jail Detention Population By Length Of Time Detained For Specific Charges	70
7-1	Monthly Admissions And TASC Admissions To Alcohol Treatment Programs	81
7-2	Monthly Admissions And TASC Admissions To Methadone Maintenance Treatment Programs	82
7-3	Comparison Of Client Characteristics: TASC Client Admissions To Methadone Programs Vs. Three Month Sample Of Client Admissions	83
7-4	Monthly Admissions And TASC Admissions To Drug Free Outpatient Treatment Programs	84
7-5	Monthly Admissions And TASC Admissions To The Renaissance Project (Drug Free)	85
7-6	Comparison Of Client Characteristics: TASC Client Admissions To Drug Free Programs Vs. Three Month Sample Of Client Admissions	86
8-1	Average Client Service Hours Across Month Of TASC Participation By Type Of Activity	92
8-2	Treatment Attendance And Urinalysis Results Across Month Of TASC Participation	93
8-3	Comparison Of Westchester County TASC Average Client Service Hours With Those Of Other TASC Programs For A Client That Has Been In TASC For Six Months	94
8-4	Projected Annual Process Unit Costs For Westchester County TASC Compared With Seven "Newer" TASC Programs From The National TASC Evaluation	95

CHAPTER 1 - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study presents the findings of an external evaluation of the Westchester County Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC) Program. Westchester TASC is one of more than forty TASC programs throughout the country, all of which are designed to provide a formal mechanism for linking the criminal justice system with substance abuse treatment resources.

On the basis of their activities and analyses, the evaluators conclude the following:

- Unlike many of the urban TASC programs, Westchester TASC was faced with a decentralized criminal justice system, spread across a geographically large county. To adequately cover all the jurisdictions, TASC adopted a multi-site case management approach, rather than the more typical screening/diagnosis/tracking model for allocating client service functions. Tracking of all clients involved in treatment is centralized.
- Westchester TASC accepted nearly four hundred clients between August, 1979 and June, 1980. At least half of all clients admitted to treatment from each of TASC's geographic units were still active at the end of June, 1980. Successful terminations comprised 8.3 percent of all outcomes, with failures and neutral terminations making up 63.7 percent and 28.0 percent, respectively. At this early point in TASC operations, however, most clients have not yet had sufficient time in treatment to succeed. At the present time, therefore, outcome statistics are valuable only as indicators of why clients are being terminated, and not as a measure of ongoing client outcome rates. Within the next year, the number of successes should increase to, and remain at, a fairly steady level as many of TASC's early clients successfully complete a full year (or more) of TASC/treatment. The success/failure ratio will then have more validity.
- Westchester TASC is dealing with clients who are seriously involved both in substance abuse and in the criminal justice system. Over half of all TASC clients have had prior treatment for a substance abuse problem, and over sixty percent have at least one prior conviction. Certain client variables (age, race, sex, employment status, primary drug of abuse, and criminal history) tend to be more closely associated with specific types of TASC outcome, but these associations are neither atypical nor statistically significant. Similarly, those client variables (race, source of referral, charge, and type of substance abuse) associated with

the TASC acceptability decision are also fairly typical for TASC programs and are worth noting here primarily because differences in acceptability rates are not of significant proportions. The justice system agrees with the TASC screening decision in nine out of ten cases.

- Westchester TASC has been generally accepted as a valuable resource to the criminal justice system. Acceptance was facilitated by getting the District Attorney's office involved in the role of liaison at a very early stage. The support given to TASC by the prosecutors has been translated into increased willingness of defense attorneys to take a less acquittal-oriented approach to clients in genuine need of therapy. Probation officers at most sites are somewhat mistrustful of TASC, primarily because they may fear a loss of control over certain aspects of their workload. For example, most respondents were outspoken in their belief that, in cases of violation, the court should be notified by Probation rather than by TASC. The difficulties between TASC and Probation are best characterized not as a "turf battle," but rather as a case of inadequate communication. There is strong evidence to indicate that the formulation of specific guidelines to govern TASC/Probation interactions, as well as the continued sharing of resources through regular communication over time, will significantly improve the level of cooperation between TASC and Probation. Somewhat formal guidelines have been adopted by TASC and Pretrial Services to govern their interactions, and this relationship appears to be mutually satisfactory, as well as beneficial in terms of its impact on the criminal justice process.
- TASC's impact on the justice system has mainly been felt in providing legitimacy to conditional discharges. That is, rather than increasing the actual number of conditional discharges handed down by the courts, TASC has improved the quality of conditional discharges through its intensive monitoring. The end result is a disposition that can be used by the courts with increased confidence. However, TASC's impact has also been felt, to some extent, on both pretrial and other post-trial client populations. The potential for further TASC impact is substantial, due to the following factors:

- . A declining percentage of substance abusers in the Yonkers Court who are currently, or were previously, involved in treatment of some kind.
 - . More serious cases being handled at the local court level because of crowded county court dockets.
 - . An increase in sentences to local institutions.
 - . Infrequent use of probation dispositions because of the requirement for a pre-sentence investigation before assignment to probation.
 - . Fewer cases being disposed of at arraignment, and less frequent assignment of ROR.
 - . Overcrowding in the County Jail, as well as an increasing population in the County Penitentiary.
- Westchester TASC has developed successful relationships with treatment programs. TASC administrators and staff persons were described as accessible, flexible, and supportive. TASC has also impacted on treatment in the following ways:
- . Supplying programs with criminal justice referrals -- prior to TASC, obtaining these referrals was often impossible or extremely time-consuming.
 - . Effectively keeping clients in treatment through the TASC mandate.
 - . Improving the overall treatment process through additional diagnosis and monitoring.
- Through reference to officially reported data, the evaluators were able to make the following additional statements regarding TASC impact on treatment:
- . The volume of TASC referrals to all sorts of treatment programs is notable. Numerically, TASC has had a greater impact on alcohol programs than on drug programs, and a greater impact on drug-free programs than on methadone programs.
 - . TASC is referring many persons to drug programs who may not otherwise have entered treatment. This is particularly true with regard to methadone programs.

- It is estimated that a client who remains in TASC for four months will receive over eight hours of service from TASC, 44.3 percent of which will be in personal interactions and 55.7 percent of which will be in case management activities. A client who remains in TASC for eight months will receive nearly thirteen hours of service, 31.0 percent of which will be in personal interactions and 69.0 percent of which will be in case management activities.
- Client acquisition, evaluation, and monitoring expenses for the Yonkers unit are approximately \$27.67 per service hour. This figure is very close to the Medical Assistance reimbursed rate of \$25.00 per service hour for treatment services which is used in many states, and is quite reasonable for a first year TASC program functioning under the case management model. If service hours for clients that were not yet placed in treatment and for clients that failed before beginning treatment were also included, the expense per service hour would be even lower. Administrative costs of Westchester TASC are lower than those of most of the TASC projects included in national studies. Westchester TASC is approaching cost effectiveness, and will be able to continue handling a sufficient volume of clients to achieve a consistently acceptable level of costs per service hour.
- Westchester TASC's costs per client are very close to the median national costs per client. TASC's costs per successful client are slightly less than the median national costs in this category.
- TASC is viewed, by itself and by the justice system, as a legitimizing agent for conditional discharges rather than as a vehicle for the increased use of this disposition. Although TASC has not made the reduction of pretrial detention one of its priorities, it has effected some savings in this area through its impact on bail decisions. There are no figures available, though, to justify TASC through short-term cost benefits. If the penitentiary population continues to increase, however, TASC may effect a short-term cost benefit through its impact on the prison population.

- Westchester TASC has succeeded in overcoming not only the information management hurdles that confront many new TASC programs, but also the related information recording and transmittal problems that are often associated with decentralized programs. Client information forms have been developed with actual process in mind, and the current system satisfies both documentation and process requirements. Westchester TASC will itself be able to undertake, on an ongoing basis, the types of analysis used for this evaluation.

CHAPTER 2 - INTRODUCTION

The first Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC) Program was established in 1972. There are currently more than forty TASC programs in operation. TASC was designed to provide a formal mechanism to link the criminal justice system with the drug treatment system. Multiple audiences benefit when TASC can remove drug-involved offenders from the traditional criminal justice channels and place them in closely monitored treatment programs.

Specifically, TASC operations benefit:

- the criminal justice system, by reducing the backlog of court calendars and improving the usual criminal justice monitoring and feedback mechanisms;
- the treatment system, by allowing treatment staff to concentrate only on a client's treatment needs without having to worry about criminal justice difficulties also;
- the client, as an important source of information and support, and as the motivation to finally stop substance abuse; and
- the public, by effecting savings associated with lower trial and incarceration costs, reduced crime and substance abuse, and increased productivity in terms of education and employment.

In order to have substantive effect in each of these areas, TASC must intersect with persons who are seriously involved with both substance abuse and crime. By solving the client's substance abuse problem, the substance abuse/crime/(re)arrest cycle was expected to stop.

TASC programs have been permitted sufficient latitude to organize in the manner which is most beneficial to their environment. Unlike many of the urban TASC programs, Westchester County TASC was faced with a hugely decentralized criminal justice system, spread across a geographically large county. (Westchester County supports over forty courts.) To adequately cover all of the jurisdictions, TASC organized its operations in multi-sites. As a result of Westchester TASC's decentralization, they did not adhere to the standard TASC organizational model of functional units for: screening and identification; diagnosis and evaluation; tracking and monitoring; and administration. Instead, Westchester County TASC adopted the case management approach, which has proved to be very successful for them. Seven case managers each handle a different geographic area and one other case manager handles miscellaneous tasks, including jail screening. Tracking of all clients involved in treatment is centralized. One staff person is fully responsible for this.

In addition to its size, Westchester County has significant criminal justice and social service resources available for dealing with the problems of its urban centers. Within the numerous courts, there are a great number of criminal justice system actors - judges, prosecutors, etc. There are also a large number of treatment facilities. This new TASC program was presented with many inroads to make and confidences to gain while establishing itself. Because of this, TASC wisely staggered their start-up times over a six-month period in various jurisdictions. The first TASC office (Yonkers) began accepting clients in August, 1979, and the last TASC office (Peekskill) became operational in February, 1980.

Westchester County was concerned about alcohol-related crime, as well as drug-related crime, so the TASC program was established to handle both types of abusers. This is not uncommon for newer TASC programs. This suburban community was interested in effective intervention for both types of offenders.

Because the justice system in this county is so well staffed, court backlogs have not been a problem. With this in mind, TASC sought not to expedite court matters or increase diversions, but to improve upon court dispositions already being utilized. This was TASC's primary goal. Conditional discharges had frequently been assigned as case dispositions. However, conditions were never stipulated. A TASC stipulation¹ attached to a conditional discharge lent it legitimacy. To a lesser extent, TASC also adds more credibility to probation. TASC's structured monitoring system provides reliable information and saves time for over-burdened officers.

Secondary goals of Westchester County TASC included saving some pre-trial and post-trial incarceration time. However, these were not of major focus during the first year of operations. Westchester TASC did not expect to achieve short-term cost benefits. Emphasis was placed on long-term benefits.

The chapters that follow describe the clients with whom TASC has interacted, the TASC relationship with and impact upon the criminal justice and treatment communities, and the analysis of the costs involved with the operation of TASC.

¹The inclusion of TASC participation as part of a formal court disposition, with the implicit (or express) understanding that the court will impose alternative, presumably harsher, sanctions if TASC requirements are not satisfactorily fulfilled. The imposition of harsher sanctions is not necessarily implicit in, or an actual consequence of, the violation of probation or conditional discharge dispositions that do not include TASC requirements.

CHAPTER 3 - TASC CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS AND SUMMARY FLOW

Introduction

Westchester County TASC accepted nearly four hundred clients between August, 1979, and June, 1980. (Entire June census not included.) Because of this large volume and the decentralized nature of the courts in the County and the TASC program, the evaluators did not collect all data items on 100 percent of the clients. Only the first portion of this analysis discusses the information gathered on all TASC clients.

The second portion of this chapter deals with a partial sample of TASC clients and more specific client data. The partial sample is made up of clients that entered treatment in the following proportions: County Court clients - 100 percent; Yonkers Court clients - 100 percent; other court clients - 50 percent. All cases from County Court were included because of the larger impact that TASC can often make in the felony area. (If a felony charge is not resolved at the local court level, it is presented to the Grand Jury. If an indictment is subsequently issued, it is filed in County Court.) All Yonkers Court cases were included because this was the first TASC site and these data, therefore, cover a greater time period. The 50 percent samples were chosen randomly.

The third section in this chapter discusses persons found unacceptable for TASC. The evaluators present the percentage of screened out clients for each jurisdiction based on a 100 percent client sample of those screened between February, 1980, and May, 1980. The characteristics of those screened out, however, are only discussed in regard to Yonkers Court cases.

TASC Acceptable Clients - 100 Percent Sample

When analyzing a multi-site program, like the Westchester County TASC program, an obvious question arises. Are there major differences in the operations at the various sites that will alter outcome substantially? In Table 3-1, the evaluators first present the number of clients found acceptable to TASC from the various jurisdictions. More importantly, the second column in the chart indicates what percentage of these clients was actually admitted to treatment. The final column shows what portion of those admitted were still active in treatment as of June 30, 1980.

As would be expected, the number of clients accepted fluctuates greatly among the jurisdictions. This is easily attributable to the staggered start-up times of the units. The second column, however, does not show much variation. The lowest and highest percentages are based on the smallest number of cases and their respective positions are quite comprehensible. Only 40.0 percent of Miscellaneous cases were actually admitted to treatment. These are cases that are exceptional by definition¹ and most clients are

¹ Miscellaneous cases consisted of five clients who were acquired by TASC at other than the nine court locations routinely covered by TASC workers.

accepted while incarcerated. At the other end of the spectrum, 100.0 percent of County Court cases were admitted to treatment. The percentages for the eight misdemeanor courts are primarily clustered in the eighty to ninety percent range. White Plains Court has a slightly better percentage - 95.2, and Greenburgh/North Tarrytown's percentage is somewhat lower at 73.3. In all, the evaluators conclude from these figures that there are not large differences between the TASC units in their abilities to admit acceptable clients to treatment.

The third column of Table 3-1 shows a wider range of proportion of clients still active in treatment. However, on close examination, it is apparent that the courts with the highest percentages are those where the TASC units began operations most recently. The important information that can be gained from these percentages is that no individual TASC unit is having serious difficulty keeping clients active in treatment. At least half of all clients admitted to treatment from each unit were still active at the end of June, 1980.

For purposes of the outcome analyses used in this evaluation, the outcome categories developed by TASC were used. A "success" consisted of the successful completion of TASC/treatment requirements. The various outcomes comprising failures and neutral terminations are listed in Table 3-2.

Table 3-2 presents the outcomes for those clients that were no longer active as of June 30, 1980. This chart also includes clients that were accepted and never entered treatment. Successful terminations were 8.3 percent of the total, failures were 63.7 percent, and neutral terminations were 28.0 percent. More than one-third of the failures were due to a lack of treatment involvement - underlining the importance of the admitted to treatment figures in Table 3-1.

Although a success rate of 8.3 percent seems quite low, it is not at all low compared to the success rates of other young TASC programs. Most clients have not yet had sufficient time in treatment to succeed. Failures, on the other hand, generally occur shortly after acceptance. At this point in time, the statistics presented in Table 3-2 are only valuable as indications of why clients are being terminated, not as measures of TASC client outcomes. Within the next year, the number of successes should increase to, and remain at, a fairly steady level as many of TASC's early clients successfully complete a full year (or more) of TASC/treatment. The success/failure ratio will then have more validity.

The final chart that includes information about all TASC clients is Table 3-3 which displays TASC treatment program utilization. The chart lists TASC admissions to each agency and active clients as of June 30, 1980. This list of programs verifies the volume of treatment programs available to the Westchester County TASC program and

indicates how extensively they take advantage of the many treatment options. For virtually all of the agencies, the proportion of TASC admissions that they received was nearly equivalent to the proportion of active TASC clients in their program. The rate of attrition does not appear to be high for any of the programs.

TASC Clients Admitted To Treatment - Partial Sample

Table 3-4 presents the client characteristics for the partial sample of first year TASC clients. The figures show that a large majority of clients are males and more than half are white. Over sixty percent are thirty years old or younger and nearly that many are unemployed. Arraignment charges vary widely with larceny charges seen most frequently - 21.2 percent. More than a third of clients are charged with A-misdemeanors and one-quarter with violations. About thirty percent of arraignment charges are felonies.²

More than half of the clients are referred by judges and most frequently post-arraignment (49.1 percent). Defense attorneys are the second largest source of referrals. At sentencing is the second most likely time for referral, followed closely by pre-arraignment.

Alcohol is the primary drug of abuse for 58.5 percent of the clients. Opiates are the primary drug of 21.6 percent of clients, but 28.2 percent of clients use opiates. 47.1 percent of alcohol abusers only abuse alcohol. Only 7.9 percent of clients considered marijuana their primary drug. Close to sixty percent of clients had prior treatment of some kind and about the same percentage had criminal convictions.

From these client characteristics, the evaluators conclude that Westchester County TASC is dealing with serious clients. Clients are seriously involved in substance abuse - very few have a primary marijuana abuse problem and more than half have felt the need for treatment in the past. Clients are also seriously involved in the criminal justice system - over sixty percent have prior convictions, thirty percent are charged with felonies, and misdemeanor convictions in Westchester County Courts often result in sentences of incarceration.

Table 3-5 compares the client characteristics of those in the sample accepted from each of the eight city court units, from County Court and the miscellaneous group. There are some variations among the units male/female ratios, but women clients

² Under the New York State Penal Law, offenses are classified according to maximum sentences as follows:

A Felony - Life	E Felony - 4 Years
B Felony - 25 Years	A Misdemeanor - 1 Year
C Felony - 15 Years	B Misdemeanor - 90 Days
D Felony - 7 Years	Violation - 15 Days

never make up more than thirty percent of clients. Three of the units have a higher black than white client population, with blacks making up between 60.0 percent and 76.9 percent of clients. Clients are fairly evenly distributed among the various age groups, with the exception of the units with a very small number of clients in the sample. White Plains and County Court are the only units where a greater number of clients are employed rather than unemployed.

The point in the justice system when referrals to TASC are made reflects differences in case manager style. At least half of referrals were made post-arraignment in all courts except Mount Vernon, New Rochelle, and Peekskill. None of the five Peekskill cases were referred at this time and only fifteen percent of the New Rochelle cases. Five of the ten units received no cases in the sample pre-arraignment, while this was the most common time for a referral in Mount Vernon and New Rochelle.

Judges were the referral source for at least fifty percent of cases in seven of the ten units. County Court registered 40.0 percent of clients referred by judges, Peekskill had 25.0 percent of the small sample, and New Rochelle had only 21.1 percent of cases referred by judges.

Arraignment charges were widely spread in most courts. In all but the Northern Westchester unit, A-misdemeanors were the most common charges (in two units the lead was shared). Peekskill was the only court unit where no cases involved a felony charge. All cases in Northern Westchester were felonies. More than a third of Mount Vernon and Port Chester cases were felonies.

The drug abuse problems in Mount Vernon Court look very different from the other TASC units. At least half of the clients in the other nine units had primary alcohol problems. Only 21.4 percent of Mount Vernon clients abused alcohol primarily. With the exception of the minimal miscellaneous population, Mount Vernon clients had the highest percentage of opiate abusers and abusers of "other drugs." These findings can probably be explained, to a large extent, by the existence of a very active and very successful alcohol program already operating in Mount Vernon. Peekskill had no primary opiate users, six units had no primary marijuana abusers, and four units had no clients who primarily abused an "other" drug. Peekskill was also the only unit where no clients used any opiates. Northern Westchester was the only unit with no clients that only abused alcohol. The conspicuous absence of primary marijuana users reflects a stated administrative priority to have line staff devote substantial time to clients with more serious substance abuse problems.

A substantial portion of each unit's clients had prior treatment - at least half in eight of the units. With the exception of Peekskill, a notable percentage of clients in each unit had prior convictions. Mount Vernon and Northern Westchester were the only other units where fewer clients had previous convictions than those that did not.

The analysis of Table 3-5 emphasizes the complexities of a TASC program in a decentralized county and court system. Potential clients vary widely and court procedures vary considerably. Both crime and substance abuse patterns may also vary between sites. Westchester County TASC has been and must continue to be very flexible in this diversified environment.

Table 3-6 looks at the client characteristics of the partial sample by TASC status or outcome. Most of the figures in this chart are most meaningful when compared to the Year One Client Characteristics in Table 3-4. The outcome figures for the various jurisdictions cannot be considered valid for comparison at this point in time because of the variance in operations start-up times. As would be expected, the earlier units contain all of the successful outcomes.

Demographic comparisons show that males have succeeded slightly more and failed a little less than females have. Whites and Hispanics also succeeded more and failed less than black TASC clients have. Unemployed clients tend to be terminated (whether successfully, unsuccessfully, or neutrally) more quickly than are employed clients. Employed clients have a higher tendency to remain active. Older clients succeed more and remain active with more frequency than younger clients do - 72.8 percent of successes are older than twenty-five and this age group only represents 60.5 percent of all clients. Younger clients fail at a higher rate - 54.8 percent of failures are clients twenty-five or younger and this age group represents only 39.4 percent of the total population.

Clients charged with violations succeed more than they fail, but are under-represented in the active category. Felony clients fail slightly more than they succeed, but they are not disproportionately represented in either group. Misdemeanor clients have more of a likelihood of remaining active than felony clients do. TASC clients without prior convictions succeeded more and failed less than did those having prior convictions.

Clients with primary opiate abuse problems succeed less than those with all other types of abuse problems. Primary opiate users and marijuana abusers both fail more often than do alcoholics or other drug abusers. Clients who use opiates, whether or not as a primary drug, are not disproportionately represented among either successes or failures. Clients who only abuse alcohol succeed

more often and fail less than would be expected on the basis of the proportion of alcohol-abusing clients among the total client population. The strongest statement to be made about prior treatment is that those who had participated in treatment before were more likely to receive a neutral termination. Among treatment programs, the Alcoholism Clinic in Yonkers was the only program with more than one success. Renaissance at Ellenville was the only program with a high proportion of failures as opposed to the other outcomes and statuses. However, this is expected from a long-term therapeutic community program.

In all instances where outcome findings have been considered, it should be emphasized that the sample of successful cases available for this analysis was too small to permit any correlations approaching statistical significance to be derived.

To look at outcomes more compactly than by individual treatment programs, the evaluators grouped programs by type of treatment. Table 3-7 presents outcomes for methadone programs, drug free programs and alcohol programs. As would be expected in light of the relationships seen between client characteristics and outcome, clients in alcohol programs succeed most frequently, followed by those in drug free programs. Methadone programs did not record any successes. Failures, however, were less likely to occur in methadone programs than in either of the other types of agency. Neutral terminations were highly prevalent in methadone programs and infrequent in drug free programs. While attendance was the biggest cause of failure in drug free and alcohol programs, it caused no failures in methadone agencies. The opposite situation was true for urinalysis. Further explanations of these outcomes can be gained by looking at the client characteristics of TASC referrals to different treatment modalities.

Table 3-8 displays the TASC client characteristics by type of treatment. Methadone clients are both more frequently female and black - both types of population have low success/high failure rates. Alcohol clients are more male and include more Hispanics - both characteristics were more closely associated with success. Alcohol program participants and methadone program clients are much older than those in drug free programs and more often employed. Drug free clients have a high incidence of failure, as do younger clients. This is understandable in light of the fact that younger clients are more likely to be sent to drug-free programs.

Larceny is the most common arraignment charge for clients in both types of drug programs, but disorderly conduct is most frequent among alcohol clients. Alcohol clients have a much higher likelihood to have a violation charge than the other groups do. All types of programs, however, find their largest group of TASC clients are charged with misdemeanors. Alcohol

program clients are less often charged with felonies than drug program clients are. But they are slightly more likely to have prior convictions.

The referral sources and CJS client status at referral are unremarkable for this analysis. Drug usage is as would be expected within the various types of treatment. A great variance was found, though, among clients with prior treatment. Only 3.7 percent of clients referred to methadone programs had no prior treatment. Prior treatment was also associated with neutral terminations. Nearly half of the clients referred to the other types of treatment did not have a previous treatment experience. Alcohol clients received the most warning letters³ and methadone clients received the fewest.

This chart does serve to offer some explanations why alcohol program clients succeed more than methadone clients. It also gives some indications as to why drug free clients fail at a higher rate. However, as previously noted, all outcome discussions must not be accorded excessive weight at this point in time. The majority of clients have not yet had sufficient time to succeed.

Unacceptable TASC Clients

There are three primary concerns that a TASC program has about clients that are screened out or found unacceptable for TASC:

- Is screening done efficiently, or are multitudes of inappropriate persons screened by case managers?
- Are the results of screenings eliminating any particular groups of persons from TASC? Are any races or ages disproportionately weeded out?
- Who is finding clients unacceptable for TASC? Are CJS actors expressing a lack of confidence in TASC by rejecting potential TASC involvement for clients?

Table 3-9 explores all screening performed between February and May of 1980, for all of the units. This particular time period was chosen because all units were operational by February and all screening data were completely gathered through May. During these months, 340 persons were screened for TASC and 56.2 percent of these persons were deemed unacceptable. This figure represents an unusually efficient screening operation. It is especially outstanding for a TASC program with representatives in the courtrooms consistently. Mount Vernon and White Plains Courts had higher unacceptable percentages than the other units did, but comparing even these figures to other TASC programs, they are respectable.

³ A warning letter is mailed to a client to inform him that he is in non-compliance with one or more requirements of TASC participation, and that his case may be terminated from TASC and returned to the courts if compliance is not seasonably attained.

Characteristics of persons found unacceptable for TASC from Yonkers Court are considered in Table 3-10. To judge whether or not any group of persons was disproportionately screened out, the figures in Table 3-10 must be compared to the Yonkers acceptable clients reflected in Table 3-5. Two additional factors are also considered in Table 3-10, intake month and location. As far as intake month is concerned, May and June of 1980 saw a decrease in the percentage of clients found unacceptable (all figures for October were not recorded). Pre-screening techniques might be improving. Intake location unacceptables are representative of the percentage of screening done in the various locations. ⁴

Comparing Yonkers unacceptable cases with acceptable clients, some differences are seen. A somewhat higher percentage of black and Hispanic clients are screened out than white clients are, but it is not a large difference. Clients referred by defense attorneys, Pre-trial Services, or TASC case managers are screened out more often than those referred from other sources. Cases referred pre-arraignment are also screened out more frequently. Felony cases are slightly more likely to be found unacceptable than acceptable. A higher proportion of drug users are found unacceptable than alcohol abusers are. These differences are not atypical for TASC programs, and they are worth noting here primarily because they are not of significant proportions.

As far as preliminary eligibility is concerned, 80.4 percent of clients screened in Yonkers were considered eligible - again, evidence of a highly efficient screening system. Of these persons, nearly ninety percent of those screened out were found unacceptable by the TASC program. Only 11.3 percent of the cases screened out in Yonkers Court were found unacceptable by the justice system.

In sum, Westchester County TASC has no need for concern over its screening procedures. Screening is done in a time-efficient manner⁵ that has netted high client census. There are no populations that are being excluded substantially by screening procedure. Finally, the justice system agrees with the TASC screening disposition in nine out of ten cases.

⁴ Pre-screening consists of a cursory examination of certain threshold eligibility criteria to determine whether a full screening interview ought to be conducted.

⁵ See Chapter 8 in general, and Tables 8-1 and 8-3 in particular.

Table 3-1
TASC ACCEPTABLE CLIENTS
(100% Sample)

Admitted to Treatment AND Active in Treatment
June, 1980

<u>Court</u>	<u>No. Of Acceptable Clients</u>	<u>Percent Admitted To Treatment</u>	<u>Percent Still Active In Treatment (6/30/80)</u>
Yonkers	165	88.5	56.2
County Court	5	100.0	100.0
Port Chester	47	83.0	66.7
Mount Vernon	36	80.6	51.7
New Rochelle	49	81.6	72.5
White Plains	21	95.2	80.0
Greenburgh/ North Tarrytown	45	73.3	66.7
Northern Westchester	9	88.9	100.0
Peekskill	15	80.0	91.7
Miscellaneous	<u>5</u>	40.0	50.0
 TOTAL	 397	 84.1	 64.4

Table 3-2

TASC TERMINATIONS BY OUTCOME
100 PERCENT CLIENT SAMPLE*
(in percent)

Success:	8.3
Failure:	63.7
Attendance	35.8
Urinalysis	4.1
Sobriety or drug use	0.8
Re-arrest	4.9
Adherence to Treatment Program Rules	2.4
Treatment involvement	36.6
Other	15.4
Neutral:	28.0
Temporarily successful in treatment; but died	3.7
Incarcerated for a charge that occurred prior to TASC involvement	22.2
Incarcerated for current TASC charge	1.9
Convicted of new charge after TASC referral	35.2
Charges dropped before completion of treatment	14.8
Referred for non-drug treatment	3.7
Not in need of treatment	1.9
Hospitalized on a long-term basis	0.0
Other	16.7

* Includes clients that never entered treatment.

Table 3-3

TASC TREATMENT PROGRAM UTILIZATION
(100% Sample)

Treatment Program	Admissions		6-30-80 Active Clients	
	(N=388)		(N=315)	
Albert Einstein, Bronx	1	(0.3)	0	(0.0)
Alcoholism Clinic, Yonkers	59	(15.2)	23	(10.7)
Beth Israel MMTP, Manhattan	3	(0.8)	2	(0.9)
Bronx Municipal Hospital, Bronx	4	(1.0)	3	(1.4)
Carver Center, Port Chester	2	(0.5)	1	(0.5)
Casa Serena, Mahopac	1	(0.3)	1	(0.5)
Common Sense, Mahopac	4	(1.0)	4	(1.9)
Comprehensive Alcoholism Program, Valhalla	39	(10.1)	26	(12.1)
Comprehensive Alcoholism Program, Ossining	12	(3.1)	10	(4.7)
Daytop, Mount Vernon	3	(0.8)	1	(0.5)
Daytop, Parksville	2	(0.5)	2	(0.9)
Daytop, Swan Lake	2	(0.5)	1	(0.5)
Glen Acres, Glenspey	5	(1.3)	2	(0.9)
Greenburgh Open Door, White Plains	3	(0.8)	1	(0.5)
Guidance Center of New Rochelle MMTP, New Rochelle	7	(1.8)	4	(1.9)
Inward House, Liberty	1	(0.3)	1	(0.5)
Larchmont, Mamaroneck NGC, Mamaroneck	1	(0.3)	1	(0.5)
Lincoln Hospital, Bronx	4	(1.0)	2	(0.9)
Misericordia MMTP, Bronx	2	(0.5)	0	(0.0)
Montrose VA Hospital	4	(1.0)	2	(0.9)
Mount Vernon Community Service Center	1	(0.3)	1	(0.5)
Mount Vernon MMTP	13	(3.4)	6	(2.8)
Mount Vernon Open Door	7	(1.8)	1	(0.5)
New York Hospital, White Plains	1	(0.3)	0	(0.0)
Outreach Center, New Rochelle	8	(2.1)	6	(2.8)
Psychiatric Services, White Plains	5	(1.3)	4	(1.9)
Reality House, Manhattan	3	(0.8)	1	(0.5)
Renaissance, Bedford	4	(1.0)	4	(1.9)
Renaissance, Ellenville	24	(6.2)	8	(3.7)
Renaissance, New Rochelle	11	(2.8)	7	(3.3)
Renaissance, Port Chester	7	(1.8)	4	(1.9)
Renaissance, Yonkers	31	(8.0)	17	(7.9)
Rockland Outpatient, Mt. Vernon	3	(0.8)	3	(1.4)
Rockland Outpatient, Yonkers	2	(0.5)	1	(0.5)
Rockland Rehab, Orangeburg	17	(4.4)	8	(3.7)
St. Christopher's Inn, Garrison	1	(0.3)	0	(0.0)
St. Joseph's MMTP, Yonkers	5	(1.3)	4	(1.9)
St. Vincent's Alcohol, Harrison	4	(1.0)	2	(0.9)
St. Vincent's Day Treatment, Harrison	1	(0.3)	1	(0.5)
St. Vincent's MMTP, Port Chester	3	(0.8)	2	(0.9)
St. Vincent's Outpatient, Harrison	2	(0.5)	2	(0.9)
Talbot House, Mahopac	1	(0.3)	0	(0.0)

Table 3-3

TASC TREATMENT PROGRAM UTILIZATION-continued
(100% Sample)

<u>Treatment Program</u>	<u>Admissions</u>		<u>6-30-80</u> <u>Active Clients</u>	
	<u>(N=388)</u>		<u>(N=215)</u>	
United Hospital Alcoholism Clinic, New Rochelle	34	(8.8)	22	(10.2)
United Hospital Mental Health Clinic, Port Chester	1	(0.3)	1	(0.5)
White Plains MMTP	1	(0.3)	0	(0.0)
White Plains Community Service Center	1	(0.3)	1	(0.5)
Yonkers General MMTP	3	(0.8)	2	(0.9)
Yonkers Community Service Center	5	(1.3)	3	(1.4)
Yonkers Youth Services Agency	11	(2.8)	5	(2.3)
Other	21	(5.4)	12	(5.6)

Table 3-4

TASC CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS - YEAR ONE
PARTIAL SAMPLE (N=261)
(In Percent)

<u>Sex</u>		<u>Age</u>	
Male	86.4	≤ 17	2.6
Female	13.6	18-21	19.3
		22-25	17.5
<u>Race</u>		26-30	24.1
White	55.6	31-40	22.4
Black	36.2	41+	14.0
Hispanic	8.2		
<u>Employment Status</u>			
Employed	40.4		
Unemployed	59.6		
<u>Arraignment Charge</u>			
Burglary (Criminal Trespass)		10.6	
Robbery		0.9	
Larceny-Receiving Stolen Property (RSP)		21.2	
Possession - Controlled Substance		11.5	
Sale/Delivery - Controlled Substance		1.3	
Possession - Marijuana		2.7	
Assault (Resisting Arrest)		7.1	
Disorderly Conduct		14.6	
Weapons		0.9	
Forgery		3.5	
Harassment		8.8	
Driving While Intoxicated - DWI		3.1	
Violation of Probation		0.4	
Other		13.3	
<u>Degree of Arraignment Charges</u>			
Violation		25.6	
V and T Misdemeanor *		1.8	
B Misdemeanor		4.4	
A Misdemeanor		37.9	
V and T Felony		0.4	
E Felony		7.5	
D Felony		16.7	
C Felony		3.5	
B Felony		0.0	
A Felony		0.9	
Misdemeanor (unknown degree)		0.4	
Felony (unknown degree)		0.9	
<u>Primary Drug</u>		<u>Opiate Use</u>	
Alcohol	58.5	Yes	28.2
Opiates	21.6	No	71.8
Marijuana	7.9		
Other	12.0		
		<u>Alcohol Use Only</u>	
		Yes	47.1
		No	52.9

*Vehicular and Traffic (V and T) Misdemeanor

Table 3-4

TASC CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS - YEAR ONE (continued)

Referral Source

Judge	52.7
Assistant District Attorney	7.1
Defense Attorney	17.6
Probation Officer	7.9
Treatment Program	1.7
Pre-trial Service	1.3
Self	0.4
Case Manager	8.8
Other	2.5

CJS Status At Referral

Pre-arraignment	17.1
Post-arraignment	49.1
Pre-sentence investigation	5.6
Sentencing	21.4
Other	6.8

Prior Treatment

Yes	59.6
No	40.4

Prior Convictions

Yes	60.3
No	39.7

Warning Letters

None	66.1
One	27.7
Two	6.2

Table 3-5

COMPARISON OF TASC CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS BETWEEN JURISDICTIONS
(partial sample)

	County Court (N=5)	Yonkers (N=165)	West Verona (N=14)	New Haven (N=20)	White Plains (N=10)	Port Chester (N=20)	Green- burgh/ Harr- isburg (N=16)	Peekskill (N=5)	Northern Westchester (N=4)	West- Haverstraw (N=2)
<u>SEX</u>										
Male	100.0	86.3	71.4	90.0	70.0	95.0	87.5	80.0	100.0	100.0
Female	0.0	13.7	28.6	10.0	30.0	5.0	12.5	20.0	0.0	0.0
<u>RACE</u>										
White	60.0	57.9	23.1	40.0	33.3	65.0	73.3	100.0	50.0	50.0
Black	40.0	31.4	76.9	60.0	66.7	25.0	13.3	0.0	50.0	50.0
Hispanic	0.0	10.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
<u>AGE</u>										
17	0.0	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
18-21	0.0	22.5	7.7	23.5	0.0	20.0	7.7	20.0	50.0	0.0
22-25	20.0	18.3	15.4	0.0	22.2	20.0	15.4	20.0	50.0	50.0
26-30	0.0	22.5	46.2	23.5	55.6	25.0	15.4	0.0	0.0	50.0
31-40	60.0	21.1	30.8	23.5	22.2	15.0	23.1	40.0	0.0	0.0
41+	20.0	12.0	0.0	29.4	0.0	20.0	38.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
<u>EMPLOYMENT STATUS</u>										
Employed	80.0	40.3	16.7	33.3	57.1	50.0	42.9	20.0	33.3	50.0
Unemployed	20.0	59.7	83.3	66.7	42.9	50.0	57.1	80.0	66.7	50.0
<u>CJS STATUS AT REFERRAL</u>										
Pre-arraignment	0.0	13.3	42.9	50.0	0.0	10.0	18.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Post-arraignment	50.0	54.5	35.7	15.0	71.4	50.0	56.3	0.0	50.0	50.0
Pre-sentence Investigation	0.0	6.3	7.1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	50.0
Sentencing	25.0	18.2	14.3	20.0	28.6	35.0	25.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Other	25.0	7.7	0.0	10.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
<u>REFERRAL SOURCE</u>										
Judge	40.0	56.6	50.0	21.1	50.0	75.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	100.0
Assistant District Attorney	0.0	6.9	14.3	15.8	10.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Defense Attorney	20.0	17.2	7.1	21.1	40.0	15.0	12.5	0.0	50.0	0.0
Probation Officer	20.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Treatment Program	0.0	1.4	0.0	10.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pre-trial Services	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Self	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Case Manager	0.0	6.9	7.1	26.3	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
Other	20.0	0.7	14.3	5.3	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 3-5

COMPARISON OF TASC CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS BETWEEN JURISDICTIONS-continued
(partial sample)

	County Court (N=5)	Yonkers (N=165)	Mount Vernon (N=14)	New Rochele (N=30)	White Plains (N=10)	Port Chester (N=20)	Green- burgh/ N. Tarry- town (N=16)	Peekskill (N=5)	Northern Westchester (N=4)	Miscellaneous (N=2)
<u>ARRAIGNMENT CHARGE</u>										
Burglary (Criminal Trespass)	0.0	10.3	7.1	5.6	0.0	10.0	18.8	20.0	50.0	0.0
Robbery	0.0	0.7	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Larceny (RSP)	25.0	16.2	14.3	27.8	62.5	30.0	31.3	20.0	0.0	100.0
Possession-Controlled Substance	0.0	7.4	50.0	11.1	25.0	15.0	6.3	0.0	25.0	0.0
Sale/Delivery- Controlled Substance	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Possession-Marijuana	0.0	1.5	21.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0
Assault (Resisting Arrest)	0.0	7.4	0.0	11.1	12.5	15.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Disorderly Conduct	0.0	19.9	0.0	16.7	0.0	5.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Weapons	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Forgery	0.0	3.7	7.1	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Harassment	0.0	11.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	10.0	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
DWI	50.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Violation of Probation	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	25.0	16.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0
<u>DEGREE OF ARRAIGNMENT CHARGE</u>										
Violation	0.0	31.9	21.4	22.2	0.0	15.8	18.8	20.0	0.0	0.0
V & T Misdemeanor	33.3	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
B Misdemeanor	0.0	5.1	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
A Misdemeanor	33.3	30.4	42.9	55.6	75.0	47.4	43.8	80.0	0.0	50.0
V & T Felony	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
E Felony	33.3	8.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	21.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
D Felony	0.0	18.1	14.3	16.7	12.5	15.8	6.3	0.0	75.0	0.0
C Felony	0.0	3.6	14.3	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
B Felony	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
A Felony	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0
Misdemeanor (Unknown degree)	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Felony (Unknown degree)	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0

Table 3-5
COMPARISON OF TASC CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS BETWEEN JURISDICTIONS-continued
(partial sample)

	(N=5)	(N=165)	(N=14)	(N=20)	(N=10)	(N=20)	(N=16)	(N=5)	(N=4)	(N=2)
<u>PRIMARY DRUG</u>										
Alcohol	80.0	58.2	21.4	55.0	50.0	65.0	81.3	80.0	66.7	50.0
Opiates	20.0	19.2	42.9	30.0	30.0	15.0	18.8	0.0	33.3	50.0
Marijuana	0.0	11.0	7.1	5.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	0.0	11.6	28.6	10.0	20.0	15.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
<u>OPIATE USE</u>										
Yes	20.0	25.7	50.0	36.8	50.0	21.1	18.8	0.0	66.7	50.0
No	80.0	74.3	50.0	63.2	50.0	78.9	81.3	100.0	33.3	50.0
<u>ALCOHOL USE ONLY</u>										
Yes	75.0	45.7	25.0	40.0	55.6	61.1	62.5	40.0	00.0	50.0
No	25.0	54.3	75.0	60.0	44.4	38.9	37.5	60.0	100.0	50.0
<u>PRIOR TREATMENT</u>										
Yes	80.0	55.5	57.1	65.0	100.0	70.0	40.0	80.0	33.3	100.0
No	20.0	44.5	42.9	35.0	0.0	30.0	60.0	20.0	66.7	0.0
<u>PRIOR CONVICTIONS</u>										
Yes	100.0	58.4	40.0	66.7	80.0	61.5	83.3	0.0	33.3	100.0
No	0.0	41.6	60.0	33.3	20.0	38.5	16.7	100.0	66.7	0.0

Table 3-6

CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS BY TASC STATUS
OR OUTCOME FOR CLIENTS ADMITTED TO TREATMENT
(in percent)
(partial sample)

	(N=147) <u>Active</u>	(N=11) <u>Success</u>	(N=65) <u>Failure</u>	(N=19) <u>Neutral</u>
<u>JURISDICTION</u>				
County Court	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Yonkers	55.8	63.6	67.7	68.4
Mount Vernon	3.4	9.1	10.8	5.3
New Rochelle	8.8	18.2	6.2	5.3
White Plains	5.4	0.0	3.1	0.0
Port Chester	9.5	9.1	6.2	5.3
Greenburgh/North Tarrytown	7.5	0.0	6.2	5.3
Peekskill	2.7	0.0	0.0	5.3
Northern Westchester	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Miscellaneous	0.7	0.0	0.0	5.3
<u>SEX</u>				
Male	86.4	90.9	84.6	89.5
Female	13.6	9.1	15.4	10.5
<u>RACE</u>				
White	59.7	63.6	49.2	42.1
Black	31.7	27.3	44.4	47.4
Hispanic	8.6	9.1	6.3	10.5
<u>EMPLOYMENT STATUS</u>				
Employed	50.8	27.3	27.4	17.6
Unemployed	49.2	72.7	72.6	82.4
<u>AGE</u>				
≥ 17	2.2	0.0	4.8	0.0
18-21	15.3	18.2	27.4	22.2
22-25	15.3	9.1	22.6	22.2
26-30	25.5	18.2	22.6	22.2
31-40	25.5	27.3	14.5	22.2
41+	16.1	27.3	8.1	11.1
<u>ARRAIGNMENT CHARGE</u>				
Burglary (Criminal Trespass)	8.3	9.1	14.1	15.8
Robbery	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.0
Larceny (RSP)	23.5	0.0	17.2	31.6
Possession-Controlled Substance	11.4	18.2	12.5	5.3
Sale/Delivery-Cont. Substance	1.5	0.0	0.0	5.3
Possession - Marijuana	1.5	0.0	6.3	0.0
Assault (Resisting Arrest)	9.1	0.0	4.7	5.3
Disorderly Conduct	11.4	27.3	18.8	15.8
Weapons	0.8	0.0	1.6	0.0
Forgery	3.8	9.1	1.6	5.3
Harassment	7.6	18.2	10.9	5.3
DWI	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Violation of Probation	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3
Other	15.9	18.2	9.4	5.3

Table 3-6

CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS BY TASC STATUS OR OUTCOME FOR CLIENTS
 ADMITTED TO TREATMENT - continued

	(N=147) <u>Active</u>	(N=11) <u>Success</u>	(N=65) <u>Failure</u>	(N=19) <u>Neutral</u>
<u>DEGREE OF ARRAIGNMENT CHARGE</u>				
Violation	19.5	45.5	35.4	22.2
V & T Misdemeanor	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
B Misdemeanor	6.0	0.0	0.0	11.1
A Misdemeanor	39.8	27.3	35.4	38.9
V & T Felony	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
E Felony	9.0	0.0	6.2	5.6
D Felony	15.8	27.3	15.4	22.2
C Felony	2.3	0.0	7.7	0.0
B Felony	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
A Felony	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Misdemeanor (unknown degree)	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Felony (unknown degree)	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
<u>PRIOR CONVICTIONS</u>				
No	38.5	60.0	34.0	50.0
Yes	61.5	40.0	66.0	50.0
<u>REFERRAL SOURCE</u>				
Judge	52.8	63.6	49.2	57.9
Assistant District Attorney	6.9	9.1	7.7	5.3
Defense Attorney	17.4	0.0	23.1	10.5
Probation Officer	9.0	9.1	6.2	5.3
Treatment Program	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pre-trial Services	1.4	0.0	1.5	0.0
Self	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Case Manager	7.6	18.2	7.7	15.8
Other	1.4	0.0	4.6	5.3
<u>CJS STATUS AT REFERRAL</u>				
Pre-arraignment	10.7	36.4	26.6	21.1
Post-arraignment	53.6	27.3	37.5	68.4
Pre-sentence investigation	6.4	0.0	6.3	0.0
Sentencing	21.4	36.4	23.4	5.3
Other	7.9	0.0	6.3	5.3
<u>PRIMARY DRUG</u>				
Alcohol	63.0	72.7	47.7	52.6
Opiates	19.2	0.0	29.2	26.3
Marijuana	4.8	9.1	15.4	5.3
Other	13.0	18.2	7.7	15.8
<u>OPIATE USE</u>				
Yes	25.4	18.2	35.6	31.6
No	74.6	81.8	64.4	68.4
<u>ALCOHOL USE ONLY</u>				
Yes	49.3	63.6	39.0	47.1
No	50.7	36.4	61.0	52.9

Table 3-6

CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS BY TASC STATUS OR OUTCOME FOR CLIENTS
 ADMITTED TO TREATMENT - continued

	(N=147) Active	(N=11) Success	(N=65) Failure	(N=19) Neutral
<u>PRIOR TREATMENT</u>				
Yes	60.7	54.5	52.3	78.9
No	39.3	45.5	47.7	21.1
<u>TREATMENT PROGRAM</u>				
Albert Einstein, Bronx	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0
Alcoholism Clinic, Yonkers	15.6	45.5	23.1	15.8
Beth Israel MMTP, Manhattan	1.4	0.0	1.5	0.0
Bronx Municipal Hospital, Bronx	2.0	0.0	1.5	0.0
Carver Center, Port Chester	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Casa Serena, Mahopac	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Common Sense, Mahopac	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Comprehensive Alcoholism Program, Valhalla	14.3	9.1	7.7	5.3
Comprehensive Alcoholism Program, Ossining	2.0	0.0	0.0	5.3
Daytop, Mount Vernon	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0
Daytop, Parksville	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Daytop, Swan Lake	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Glen Acres, Glenspey	0.7	0.0	1.5	5.3
Greenburgh Open Door, White Plains	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Guidance Center of New Rochelle MMTP, New Rochelle	1.4	0.0	0.0	5.3
Inward House, Liberty	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Larchmont, Mamaroneck NGC, Mamaroneck	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lincoln Hospital, Bronx	1.4	0.0	1.5	0.0
Misericordia MMTP, Bronx	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.5
Montrose VA Hospital	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mount Vernon Community Service Center	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mount Vernon MMTP	2.7	0.0	3.1	5.3
Mount Vernon Open Door	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.0
New York Hospital, White Plains	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outreach Center, New Rochelle	2.7	9.1	0.0	0.0
Psychiatric Services, White Plains	1.4	0.0	1.5	0.0
Reality House, Manhattan	0.7	0.0	1.5	5.3
Renaissance, Bedford	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Renaissance, Ellenville	2.0	0.0	16.9	0.0
Renaissance, New Rochelle	3.4	0.0	3.1	5.3
Renaissance, Port Chester	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Renaissance, Yonkers	9.5	0.0	12.3	10.5
Rockland Outpatient, Mt. Vernon	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rockland Outpatient, Yonkers	0.7	9.1	0.0	0.0
Rockland Rehab, Orangeburg	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 3-6

CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS BY TASC STATUS OR OUTCOME FOR CLIENTS
 ADMITTED TO TREATMENT - continued

	(N=147) <u>Active</u>	(N=11) <u>Success</u>	(N=65) <u>Failure</u>	(N=19) <u>Neutral</u>
TREATMENT PROGRAM-contd.				
St. Christopher's Inn, Garrison	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Joseph's MMTP, Yonkers	2.0	0.0	1.5	0.0
St. Vincent's Alcohol, Harrison	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Vincent's Day Treatment, Harrison	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Vincent's MMTP, Port Chester	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Vincent's Outpatient, Harrison	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Talbot House, Mahopac	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
United Hospital Alcoholism Clinic, New Rochelle	6.1	9.1	6.2	0.0
United Hospital Mental Health Clinic, Port Chester	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
White Plains MMTP	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3
White Plains Community Service Center	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Yonkers General MMTP	1.4	0.0	1.5	0.0
Yonkers Community Service Center	2.0	9.1	0.0	0.0
Yonkers Youth Services Agency	3.4	0.0	4.6	10.5
Other	3.4	0.0	4.6	5.3

Table 3-7

TASC TERMINATIONS BY OUTCOME BY TYPE OF TREATMENT
(Partial Sample - N=261)

	Methadone	Drug Free	Alcohol
SUCCESS:	0.0	8.5	18.9
FAILURE:	54.5	78.7	59.5
Attendance	0.0	40.5	54.6
Urinalysis	50.0	0.0	0.0
Sobriety or drug use	0.0	0.0	0.0
Re-arrest	0.0	2.7	4.5
Adherence to treatment program rules	16.7	5.4	0.0
Treatment involvement	33.3	29.7	40.9
Other	0.0	21.6	0.0
NEUTRAL:	45.5	12.8	21.6
Temporarily successful in treatment; but died	0.0	0.0	12.5
Incarcerated on a charge that occurred prior to TASC involvement	40.0	16.7	0.0
Incarcerated for current TASC charge	0.0	0.0	0.0
Convicted of new charge after TASC referral	20.0	16.7	12.5
Charges dropped before comple- tion of treatment	0.0	33.3	25.0
Referred for non-drug treatment	0.0	16.7	12.5
Not in need of treatment	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hospitalized on long-term basis	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	40.0	16.7	37.5

Table 3-8

TASC CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS BY TYPE OF TREATMENT

(Partial Sample - N=261)

	<u>Methadone</u> (11.2)	<u>Drug Free</u> (46.3)	<u>Alcohol</u> (42.6)
<u>SEX</u>			
Male	66.7	85.7	92.2
Female	33.3	14.3	7.8
<u>RACE</u>			
White	33.3	62.6	54.1
Black	63.0	32.7	32.7
Hispanic	3.7	4.7	13.3
<u>AGE</u>			
17	0.0	4.8	1.0
18-21	0.0	30.8	12.4
22-25	14.8	21.2	14.4
26-30	59.3	20.2	18.6
31-40	22.2	18.3	26.8
41+	3.7	4.8	26.8
<u>EMPLOYMENT STATUS</u>			
Employed	46.2	36.6	42.9
Unemployed	53.8	63.4	57.1
<u>ARRAIGNMENT CHARGE</u>			
Burglary (Criminal Trespass)	4.0	13.5	9.3
Robbery	0.0	1.9	0.0
Larceny (RSP)	44.0	27.9	8.2
Possession-Controlled Substance	24.0	16.3	3.1
Sale/Delivery-Cont. Substance	4.0	1.9	0.0
Possession-Marijuana	4.0	4.8	0.0
Assault (Resisting Arrest)	0.0	1.9	14.4
Disorderly Conduct	4.0	8.7	23.7
Weapons	0.0	1.0	1.0
Forgery	4.0	5.8	1.0
Harassment	4.0	5.8	13.4
DWI	4.0	1.0	5.2
Violation of Probation	0.0	1.0	0.0
Other	4.0	8.7	20.6
<u>DEGREE OF ARRAIGNMENT CHARGES</u>			
Violation	11.5	19.2	36.1
V & T Misdemeanor	0.0	1.0	3.1
B Misdemeanor	0.0	1.9	8.2
A Misdemeanor	53.8	39.4	32.0
V & T Felony	0.0	0.0	1.0
E Felony	19.2	9.6	2.1
D Felony	7.7	21.2	14.4
C Felony	0.0	5.8	2.1
B Felony	0.0	0.0	0.0
A Felony	3.8	1.0	0.0
Misdemeanor (unknown Degree)	0.0	0.0	1.0
Felony (unknown degree)	3.8	1.0	0.0

Table 3-8

TASC CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS BY TYPE OF TREATMENT-continued

	<u>Methadone</u> (11.2)	<u>Drug Free</u> (46.3)	<u>Alcohol</u> (42.6)
<u>PRIOR CONVICTIONS</u>			
Yes	58.8	58.6	62.9
No	41.2	41.4	37.1
<u>REFERRAL SOURCE</u>			
Judge	59.3	40.5	64.4
Assistant District Attorney	7.4	5.4	8.9
Defense Attorney	18.5	21.6	12.9
Probation Officer	0.0	11.7	5.9
Treatment Program	3.7	2.7	0.0
Pre-trial Services	0.0	2.7	0.0
Self	0.0	0.9	0.0
Case Manager	7.4	11.7	5.9
Other	3.7	2.7	2.0
<u>CJS STATUS AT REFERRAL</u>			
Pre-arraignment	11.5	15.6	20.2
Post-arraignment	53.8	47.7	49.5
Pre-sentence investigation	11.5	7.3	2.0
Sentencing	15.4	18.3	26.3
Other	7.7	11.0	2.0
<u>PRIMARY DRUG</u>			
Alcohol	11.1	33.3	98.1
Opiates	59.3	32.4	0.0
Marijuana	0.0	16.2	1.0
Other	29.6	18.0	1.0
<u>OPIATE USE</u>			
Yes	76.0	43.7	0.0
No	24.0	56.3	100.0
<u>ALCOHOL USE ONLY</u>			
Yes	9.5	0.0	100.0
No	90.5	100.0	0.0
<u>PRIOR TREATMENT</u>			
Yes	96.3	54.1	55.9
No	3.7	45.9	44.1
<u>WARNING LETTERS</u>			
None	77.8	67.9	61.2
One	14.8	28.6	30.1
Two	7.4	3.6	8.7

Table 3-9

PERCENTAGES OF PERSONS SCREENED AND
DEEMED UNACCEPTABLE FOR TASC BY JURISDICTION
FEBRUARY, 1980 - MAY, 1980
(100% Sample)

<u>Court</u>	<u>Number of Persons Screened</u>	<u>Percentage Unacceptable</u>
Yonkers	92	52.2
County Court	4	0.0
Port Chester	33	27.3
Mount Vernon	66	84.8
New Rochelle	37	48.6
White Plains	24	75.0
Greenburgh/ North Tarrytown	37	45.9
Northern Westchester	11	27.3
Peekskill	<u>36</u>	61.1
TOTAL	340	56.2

Table 3-10

**CHARACTERISTICS OF POTENTIAL TASC CLIENTS
FOUND TO BE UNACCEPTABLE IN YONKERS COURT (N=191)**

Intake Month		CJS Status at Referral	
10/79	2.1	Pre-arraignment	25.9
11/79	18.6	Post-arraignment	58.8
12/79	13.4	Pre-sentence investigation	3.5
1/80	11.3	Sentencing	5.9
2/80	10.3	Other	5.9
3/80	13.4		
4/80	17.5	Arraignment Charge	
5/80	8.2	Burglary (Criminal Trespass)	14.8
6/80	5.2	Robbery	2.5
		Larceny (RSP)	23.5
		Possession-Controlled Substance	6.2
		Sale/Delivery - Controlled Substance	1.2
		Possession - Marijuana	2.5
		Assault (Resisting Arrest)	8.6
		Disorderly Conduct	12.3
		Weapons	1.2
		Forgery	4.9
		Harassment	6.2
		DWI	1.2
		Violation of Probation	2.5
		Other	12.3
Sex			
Male	82.5		
Female	17.5		
Race			
White	47.2		
Black	36.0		
Hispanic	16.9		
Age			
17	4.8		
18-21	19.0		
22-25	19.0		
26-30	27.0		
31-40	22.2		
41+	7.9		
Employment Status		Degree of Arraignment Charge	
Employed	36.0	Violation	22.2
Unemployed	64.0	V and T Misdemeanor	0.0
		B Misdemeanor	4.9
		A Misdemeanor	34.6
		V and T Felony	0.0
		E Felony	12.3
		D Felony	19.8
		C Felony	2.5
		B Felony	0.0
		A Felony	0.0
		Misdemeanor (unknown degree)	2.5
		Felony (unknown degree)	1.2
Intake Location			
Local Lock-up	9.3		
County Jail	24.7		
TASC Office	14.4		
Telephone	1.0		
Court	41.2		
Other	9.3		
Referral Source		Primary Drug	
Judge	32.6	Alcohol	48.2
Asst. Dist. Attorney	5.3	Opiates	25.0
Defense Attorney	4.2	Marijuana	14.3
Probation Officer	10.5	Other	12.5
Treatment Program	0.0		
Pre-trial Services	11.6		
Self	0.0		
Case Manager	33.7		
Other	2.1		
		Alcohol Use Only	
		Yes	37.5
		No	62.5
		Opiate Use	
		Yes	33.3
		No	66.7

Table 3-10

CHARACTERISTICS OF POTENTIAL TASC CLIENTS FOUND TO BE UNACCEPTABLE
IN YONKERS COURT - continued

<u>Prior Treatment</u>		<u>Prior Convictions</u>	
Yes	44.0	Yes	66.7
No	56.0	No	33.3
<u>Preliminary Eligibility Determination</u>			
Ineligible/charge			0.0
Ineligible/mental condition			1.0
Ineligible/substance abuse			11.3
Ineligible/motivation			7.2
Ineligible/age			0.0
Eligible			80.4
<u>Screening Disposition</u>			
Not accepted per TASC evaluation			88.7
Acceptable to TASC, refused per:			
Court			10.3
District Attorney			1.0
Defense Attorney			0.0
Probation Officer			0.0
Other			0.0

CHAPTER 4 - TASC RELATIONSHIP WITH THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

New TASC programs are typically confronted with a series of readily identifiable problems concerning their working relationships with one or more categories of CJS actors. For example, in a particular jurisdiction there may be a District Attorney who feels that TASC's existence encourages otherwise jail-bound defendants to "invent" substance abuse problems; or a Public Defender who feels that TASC involvement would increase his client's chances of violating probation and who therefore vehemently objects to any attempt by TASC screeners to talk to any of his clients; or one or more judges who are philosophically opposed to the idea of treatment, in place of punishment, for a serious offender; or a Probation Department that feels threatened by TASC's involvement with its caseload. In most instances, there are no more than one or two categories of CJS actors presenting the major obstacles to TASC's acceptance, and the nature of these obstacles is usually quite specific.

Westchester County TASC faces a somewhat more complicated problem. Because it is a decentralized program -- one that covers multiple jurisdictions having a combined total of more than forty separate courts -- it must deal with a wide range of problems and relationships within the same category of CJS actors. From a policy standpoint, this situation raises some difficult questions. For example, how far can one go toward dealing with individual personalities (e.g., Probation Officer A wants a particular TASC monitoring report; Probation Officer B does not) before TASC's county-wide identity begins to take on a piecemeal quality? Or, how can administration accurately identify the causes of low client intake at a particular site (unaggressive staff? unwilling judges and/or prosecutors? low target population?), enabling it to make the appropriate changes in staffing, outreach or manpower allocation?

It is against this backdrop that the evaluators interviewed a total of 27 CJS representatives at seven sites in Westchester County. As anticipated, the assessments of TASC's performance were by no means uniform, even within particular categories of respondents. The findings for each group of respondents are summarized below:

Judges

Much of TASC's initial acceptance by the judiciary was attributed to the liaison role played by the District Attorney's Office. Including the Prosecutor in its original implementation design not only averted a series of potential obstacles to TASC acceptance from that quarter, but apparently also gave TASC immediate credibility

with the judiciary. Judges have very little case-specific information at arraignment, and therefore need to rely on the prosecutors' recommendations. Judges have been willing to go along with TASC recommendations primarily because the prosecutors seem to like the program.

Most respondents feel that TASC has had some impact on court dispositions, both pretrial and post-trial. It was suggested that TASC affords the judiciary greater flexibility, allowing judges to increase their use of conditional discharges because of confidence in TASC monitoring. One respondent pointed to TASC's value as an information resource at sentencing, and related how he was "talked into" releasing a jail-bound defendant to TASC by a TASC worker, who then personally escorted the defendant to a treatment program. According to another respondent, the percentage of defendants receiving alternative sentences (i.e., other than jail) because of TASC is very high in certain crime categories. When someone continues to be arrested for crimes arising out of drug or alcohol abuse, judges were formerly left with no option but jail following violations or probation. TASC is now seen as another option, although respondents differed as to the seriousness of a crime that would be suitable for TASC involvement. At the pretrial stage, TASC is viewed as an additional information resource, but most respondents did not feel that TASC has an impact on pretrial release beyond what Pretrial Services accomplishes,¹ except in borderline cases.

Several respondents felt that TASC has had an impact on court procedures. In general, judges feel that TASC enables them to get an early handle² on potential cases of treatment failure and/or rearrest and thereby prevent their occurrence. Some judges try to get these clients back in court to see what the trouble is, while others usually wait until sentencing to discuss TASC's treatment reports.

One respondent felt that TASC has had a decidedly positive impact on caseflow. Because defense counsel is no longer exclusively acquittal-oriented and the prosecution is no longer exclusively conviction-oriented, cases in this particular court are more likely to be resolved in one or two appearances, instead of being "kicked around" through four or five appearances.

¹ Including:

- a. interviewing of persons prior to arraignment
- b. recommendations regarding bond or release on recognizance (ROR)
- c. follow-up, to the point of trial, of all ROR persons

² Through TASC's submission of periodic monitoring summaries and special incident reports.

Most respondents are happy to have TASC workers in the courtroom. In addition to functioning as an information resource with regard to the substance abuse problems of defendants and the availability (and appropriateness) of various treatment modalities, TASC workers have been used as interpreters for Spanish-speaking defendants. TASC staff members are viewed as competent, hard-working, and cooperative, and judges appear to appreciate the availability of minority workers for dealing with minority defendants.

Negative feedback from judges tended to be of a more general nature, in most cases stemming from selective differences with the TASC concept (or treatment in general) than from any objection to the level or quality of TASC services as actually carried out. Several respondents felt that certain aspects of TASC services were duplicative of the services of other agencies (most notably Probation, Pretrial Services, and treatment programs). The only specific criticism leveled at TASC's service delivery concerned TASC's failure to deliver timely reports to several respondents. One respondent stated that he did not view this as a serious problem, while another respondent stated that he may not be receiving reports because of the periodic rotation of judges in his locale (he had no way of knowing whether the reports were actually being sent). Yet another judge found TASC reports to be duplicative of the reports he was already receiving from a particular treatment program. Clearly, increased central coordination is needed in designing report preparation and transmission policies that will satisfy multiple audiences.

Prosecutors

The resistance to TASC programs often found among prosecutors is conspicuously absent in Westchester County. As noted earlier, it was decided during the planning stages to include the District Attorney's Office, in the original grant itself, as TASC's liaison with the criminal justice system. By getting the prosecutors involved with TASC at an early stage and by keeping them informed of ongoing operations, TASC has succeeded in avoiding the aforementioned resistance and gaining a powerful supporter in the courts.

Respondents were unanimous in their assessment that TASC has had a significant impact at the sentencing stage. Because of TASC, people are either getting lighter sentences or, more commonly, avoiding jail time altogether. One respondent suggested that the major reduction in jail sentences has been in those cases that would have ordinarily received 30- or 45-day sentences. At the pretrial stage, TASC is seen as having a strong impact on "marginal" people -- defendants with relatively minor criminal justice involvement who nevertheless would have been less likely to

be released pretrial because of drug or alcohol involvement. With TASC monitoring them, prosecutors are more willing to let them be released and judges are more willing to go along with this.

It was suggested that TASC has had some impact on the prosecutor's functioning in the courtroom. Two respondents stated that TASC makes it easier for the D.A. to get the plea that he wants, resulting in fewer trials. One respondent has clients brought to him (via "priority warrants")³ when they are not doing well in treatment, and discusses the matter with them in open court.

For the most part, prosecutors are quite pleased with TASC's competency, credibility, and monitoring capability. TASC is viewed as a good resource on drug and alcohol programs, and serves an important educational function for the court. Most respondents are satisfied with the reports sent to them by TASC, but at one site there was an objection to the timing of reports (i.e., receiving a progress report without having received any prior notice of the defendant's being picked up by TASC). Several respondents felt very strongly that TASC should not exclude DWI cases. With regard to minor offenses, one respondent expressed a strong preference for putting someone charged with disorderly conduct into TASC (assuming other acceptability criteria are met), rather than waiting for the individual to become a felon.

Defense Attorneys

All respondents felt that TASC makes a difference at both the sentencing stage and the pretrial (bail decision) stage, with specific cases being cited to support their observations. TASC workers were characterized as cooperative and conscientious, with a good understanding of the criminal justice system. TASC's real strengths are seen as its continuing presence in the courtroom, and its credibility with judges and prosecutors.

The attorneys who were interviewed were having no problems with TASC in regard to possible interference in the attorney-client relationship (an issue often raised in other TASC jurisdictions). Respondents feel that TASC recommendations for treatment have been, by and large, appropriate and in the best interest of their clients.

Probation

TASC programs typically have a difficult time establishing a mutually satisfactory working relationship with Probation. Whereas TASC monitoring can mean a significant workload reduction for probation officers, TASC is likely to be seen initially as either a duplication of Probation services or, beyond that,

³ A warrant ordering the delivery of a person to the court (similar to a bench warrant), to be processed ahead of other (non-priority) warrants.

a material interference with Probation's operations and with its standing in the courts. Among respondents in Westchester County, the following objections to TASC were voiced:

- Many TASC cases seem more serious than typical Probation cases, adding to Probation's workload.
- Multiple supervision creates confusions and enables defendants to manipulate their supervisors.
- TASC may not have the requisite expertise for deciding in which cases treatment is really needed.
- TASC does not always inform Probation that it (TASC) is involved in a case -- this knowledge would be helpful in preparation of a PSI.⁴
- Probation has contacts with all local services and tracks independently of TASC -- why make treatment programs report to two CJS agencies?
- TASC is not accessible to Probation.
- TASC reports do not contain sufficient information to let Probation know how the client is really progressing in treatment.

The above comments were in direct contradiction to those offered at the Yonkers Probation Office, which has had a longer working relationship with TASC than has any other Westchester County Probation Office. In Yonkers, TASC is rapidly becoming viewed as a replacement for ODAS,⁵ with whom Probation had a formal arrangement. Initially, there was a general mistrust of TASC because the Probation/ODAS relationship had been so good, thereby making it difficult for TASC to really get started. It was feared that TASC would "take a piece of the action," but TASC has performed well and is considered a primary referral resource. The respondent suggested that it is considerably easier to deal with TASC than with twenty separate programs, but on a day-to-day basis there has been no change in caseload (e.g., people getting probation/TASC instead of jail) or in the amount of work done in each case. Although TASC has obviously been accepted by this Probation Office, it is still considered important that TASC notify Probation if someone is to be terminated, rather than go directly to the judge. The respondent stated that Probation fully intends to comply with TASC's wishes (that is, not try to conceal cases of non-compliance), but he feels that this is the one area where Probation's role could be threatened if formal procedures are not agreed to.

⁴ Presentence Investigation

⁵ Office of Drug Abuse Services, which handled drug abuse referrals from the CJS prior to TASC's inception.

It seemed apparent to the evaluators that the nature of TASC's relationship with Probation is mainly a function of time. As individual probation officers begin using TASC more frequently and become more familiar with TASC's services, they are likely to appreciate TASC's value as a service extender. It is probable that this process will be accelerated considerably if some protocol is agreed to that will clearly define respective areas of responsibility and provide some "protection" against potential encroachments while resources are mutually explored and utilized.

Pretrial Services

Pretrial arraignment is another stage at which TASC programs often find themselves cast in the role of "intruder" by pre-existing CJS agencies. Pretrial release programs may feel that TASC is riding in on Pretrial's coattails, with a view toward "taking over" in the pretrial area; or, that TASC is adding unnecessary conditions to ROR's; or, that TASC is adding to Pretrial's workload by requiring an additional step (i.e., notifying TASC of any substance abuse problems) in the review process.

The evaluators were surprised to find a remarkably high level of cooperation already existing between TASC and Pretrial Services at most sites. This relationship may be the result, in part, of fairly specific guidelines to govern TASC/Pretrial interactions. After PTS fieldworkers have conducted their interviews, they indicate to TASC which defendants would not be eligible for TASC. TASC is then free to discuss the possibility of TASC involvement with the others. At the pre-arraignment stage, PTS will not make a direct, in-court referral to TASC -- if the defendant qualifies for ROR without adding on TASC, then he should not be made to meet this added condition (there is no objection to voluntary referral to TASC by ROR clients). At the post-arraignment stage, however, PTS is willing to make formal and informal recommendations -- either the defendant has already been released, or TASC may help him get released. It is understood by all parties that PTS will not mention TASC or the possibility of TASC involvement when making its bail recommendation, nor will PTS even weigh this factor in deciding on the appropriate recommendation. When a TASC referral is to be considered, the State's Attorney is usually alerted and TASC is asked to approach the bench when the case is called. It should be noted, however, that each court appears to follow its own procedures for handling TASC referrals.

With regard to the impact that TASC is having at the arraignment stage, respondents made the following observations:

- . Although TASC involvement does not affect the PTS recommendation, a judge is more likely to release someone pretrial if he (the defendant) is going to be supervised by TASC
- . TASC is probably having an impact on the jail population, since so many of that population are drug and alcohol abusers
- . PTS's job has been made easier by TASC's keeping people in line with regard to court appearances
- . TASC has a positive impact on the overall processing of cases by providing a number of ancillary services to the court (e.g., serving as interpreter for Spanish-speaking defendants)

In sum, Westchester County TASC has been generally accepted as a valuable resource to the criminal justice system. Acceptance was facilitated by getting the District Attorney's Office involved in the role of liaison at a very early stage. The support given to TASC by the prosecutors has been translated into increased use of TASC by judges and the increased willingness of defense attorneys to take a less acquittal-oriented approach to clients in genuine need of therapy. Probation officers at most sites are somewhat mistrustful of TASC, primarily because they may fear a loss of control over certain aspects of their workload. For example, most respondents were outspoken in their belief that, in cases of violation, the court should be notified by Probation rather than by TASC. The difficulties between TASC and Probation are best characterized not as a "turf battle," but rather as a case of inadequate communication. There is strong evidence to indicate that the formulation of specific guidelines to govern TASC/Probation interactions, as well as the continued sharing of resources through regular communication over time, will significantly improve the level of cooperation between TASC and Probation. Somewhat formal guidelines have been adopted by TASC and Pre-trial Services to govern their interactions, and this relationship appears to be mutually satisfactory, as well as beneficial in terms of its impact on the criminal justice process.

CHAPTER 5 - TASC IMPACT ON THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

Introduction

The Westchester County criminal justice system is decentralized and consists of forty-four separate courts. In addition, the County has a number of criminal justice and social service resources of long standing. These factors can raise impact difficulties for a new alternative program like TASC. First of all, the County is fortunate to have separate jail facilities for pre-trial detainees and sentenced inmates. Although the pre-trial jail has had overcrowding problems, the facility for sentenced inmates has not. This being the case, judges feel free to incarcerate whenever this might be indicated. Secondly, the District Attorney's Offices are able to vigorously prosecute cases. Finally, the attitude of the community in Westchester County advocates strict penalties for crimes. Residents want to emphasize to offenders that Westchester County is not New York City and that consequences of crimes will be stiff. As a result of these factors, this TASC program finds an environment where incarceration is utilized often and alternatives have been neither necessary nor desirable for a volume of cases.

Despite these difficulties, TASC has done an admirable job in acquainting the many courts with its services. TASC's impact has mainly been felt in providing legitimacy to conditional discharges. That is, rather than increasing the actual number of conditional discharges handed down by the courts, TASC has improved the quality of conditional discharges through its intensive monitoring. The end result is a disposition that can be used by the courts with increased confidence. However, TASC impact has also been felt to some extent on both pre-trial and other post-trial client populations.

TASC expects to have a much greater ability to impact on the justice system during the next grant period. The evaluators concur with these expectations. The potential for impact is expected to expand greatly as the population in the correctional facility for sentenced men grows to capacity. (The other jail is already overcrowded.) Alternatives like TASC will be necessary for a much wider population than had previously been assigned alternatives. In future months, TASC may be utilized in many more ways.

This chapter discusses TASC's impact thus far and TASC's potential for impact in three categories: impact on pre-trial client populations; impact on case dispositions and sentencing; and impact on jail populations. Most of the findings were based on samples of cases from Yonkers Court. The primary findings were:

- Drug and alcohol abusers are present in Westchester County Courts. Examination of a Yonkers Court sample revealed that one in five persons arraigned had indications of abuse problems. Both drug and alcohol problems were evidenced - alcohol problems were slightly more common.

- Approximately forty percent of the abusers in the Yonkers sample had been involved or were currently involved in treatment of some kind. However, this percentage appears to be diminishing and treatment through TASC might soon be an entirely new experience for a larger number of clients.
- According to a pre-TASC sample,¹ the potential for TASC impact on pre-trial bail decisions was substantially greater for more serious offenders. But, more recently, the potential for TASC impact on less serious persons is increasing also. Fewer cases are being disposed of at arraignment and ROR is not assigned as frequently.
- TASC has greater potential for impact on drug abusing populations than it does on alcohol abusing persons. This is because drug abusers are generally charged with more serious offenses. Also, the potential is increasing as fewer drug abusers have been granted ROR in recent months.
- Numerous alcohol abusers, despite minor charges, are not assigned ROR. This is because many are transients and not reliable bail risks. For the same reason, they are not good TASC candidates. This reduces the potential for TASC impact on this population.
- More serious cases are now being handled at the local court level because of crowded county court dockets. This is resulting in a higher percentage of convictions in the city courts. These developments present greater potential for TASC impact on the lower court where TASC is already fully established.
- Sentencing patterns in Yonkers Court are changing. Sentences to local institutions are increasing and sentences of fines are decreasing.
- Probation was not seen to be a frequently used disposition in Yonkers. This is probably because of the Westchester County requirement for a pre-sentence investigation before assignment to probation.²
- Conditional discharges did not increase after TASC began operations. However, TASC did not intend for them to increase. TASC expected to legitimize conditional discharges.

¹ See page 46.

² See discussion on page 54.

- The pre-trial detention facility, the County Jail, has had overcrowding problems. The correctional facility for those sentenced -- the County Penitentiary -- has been housing some jail detention population overflow. For several reasons, the Penitentiary will soon be near capacity. The potential for TASC impact will increase greatly when this occurs. Judges and prosecutors will be forced to look for alternatives in lieu of sentences of incarceration.

A. TASC Impact On Pre-Trial Client Populations

Introduction

In order to measure impact in a proper perspective, it must be possible to compare the current extent of impact with the existent potential for impact in the environment. In this instance, the evaluators compare the Westchester County TASC program's impact on pre-trial clients with the potential for impact that exists within that population. If no pre-trial clients in Westchester County were drug or alcohol involved, TASC impact would be impossible. If, prior to TASC, substance abuse problems had been routinely handled during the pre-trial period, and this was followed by non-incarcerative case dispositions that included treatment monitoring, the potential impact of TASC would be severely limited. Other circumstances that would restrict the potential for TASC impact in a pre-trial setting would be if: most clients were charged with very minor charges; most clients were released on their own recognizance; or most clients convicted were probationed. TASC could then only deal with less serious offenders and would not be able to introduce any new cost-beneficial mechanisms for processing clients in a pre-trial status.

However, there are also factors that can create huge potentials for TASC program impact. In a city like Chicago, the TASC program finds a large number of substance abusers. There are two courtrooms that handle drug cases exclusively and each room processes an average of one hundred cases a day. Chicago TASC is also confronted with a population containing serious offenders that will face stiff penalties if convicted - impact possibilities are plentiful. TASC has an additional benefit in a city like Chicago where alternative programs are scarce. The TASC mechanism is virtually the only one available in the criminal justice system.

In order to determine TASC's potential for impact on pre-trial clients in Westchester County, the evaluators needed to discover who was entering the justice system and what was happening to them. Typical data problems were encountered. Aggregate data from the decentralized court system were not readily available. Fortunately, the evaluators were permitted access to the records of the Pre-Trial Services Institute of Westchester, Inc. (PTSI) PTSI conducts intensive pre-arraignment interviews with persons arrested for the purpose of presenting the court with appropriate recommendations of defendants for release on recognizance. PTSI then tracks clients recommended for and granted ROR through to final court disposition, providing clients with consistent court date reminders. PTSI records include multiple identifiers for clients involved in drug or alcohol abuse. Prior abuse problems are noted as well as present and suspected problems. Prior and current treatment histories are also available.

The evaluators examined all PTSI pre-arraignment interviews from the Yonkers Court for the three months prior to TASC's inception - May, June, and July of 1979 - and for three months after TASC - October and December of 1979 and February of 1980. The evaluators coded information on each individual case where PTSI had indicated a drug or alcohol identifier and all cases where the charge involved drugs. From this population the evaluators have drawn conclusions concerning the potential for TASC impact on Westchester County pre-trial clients.¹

Because all data had to be hand-coded by the evaluators and because Westchester Courts are decentralized, the evaluators selected one court to examine cases from for these determinations. Yonkers was chosen for several reasons. It is the largest and processes more serious cases. Also, Yonkers was the first courtroom that TASC began screening. It must be kept in mind, though, that this analysis is only based on one branch of the several courts where TASC is present.

Evidence of Drug and Alcohol Problems in Yonkers Court

Table 5-1 presents the cases that were arraigned in Yonkers City Court during the six sample months. This chart indicates what percentage of clients in the court caseload had indications of drug or alcohol problems. The evaluators included in this population: persons with admitted current abuse problems; persons with admitted prior addiction problems; persons whom PTSI interviewers perceived to have abuse problems (e.g., a person with obvious track marks on his arms); persons on methadone maintenance; and persons charged with drug offenses. Naturally, TASC could not impact on all of these persons. Some would probably be inappropriate for TASC. However, this is the pool of persons from which TASC clients might be drawn.

The three month sample of cases arraigned in Yonkers prior to the existence of the TASC program indicated that there were persons entering the court system with evidence of substance abuse problems. As Table 5-1 shows, 79 persons or nearly 20 percent of the court caseload had some indication of drug or alcohol problems. During the first sample month almost three-quarters of these persons evidenced an alcohol problem and only one-quarter a drug problem. The months of June and July showed a more even split between the types of abuse problems evidenced. This sample conclusively indicates that prior to TASC both drug and alcohol abusers were being processed by the Yonkers court.

The three month sample of cases after TASC began its activities confirmed that substance abusers were still present in the court system. The first two months show about the same proportion of abusers to non-abusers as in the previous sample. The third month shows a notable increase in the percentage - more than one-quarter

¹ Because of the way in which the samples were drawn, they are not strictly comparable and are only suggestive of TASC's potential for system impact.

of the total clients had indications of problems. The proportion of cases involving drug abuse as opposed to alcohol abuse fluctuated with the month, but the overall proportion was nearly even.

When the two three-month samples are combined, out of the 841 cases reviewed by the evaluators, 171, or one in five clients, had potential drug or alcohol problems. Alcohol problems appeared with slightly more frequency, 54.4 percent of the abusing population. Suspected drug abusers made up the remaining 45.6 percent.

Treatment History of Suspected Abusers

The percentage of the abusing population that was either currently involved in treatment at the time of arraignment, or had previously been involved, fluctuated considerably from month to month and between types of abuse problems. As Table 5-1 illustrates, a fairly large percentage of those with indications of drug problems during each of the first sample months (May and September, 1979) had a treatment history. During the same months, however, the percentage of alcohol abusers with a treatment history was the lowest of the three sample months. Coincidentally, during the second and third months of the first sample, the percentages of drug and alcohol involved clients that had treatment histories remained constant for the two month period - 41.7 percent of drug abusers and 64.3 percent of alcohol abusers. The overall percentages for the three month sample prior to TASC found that 39.4 percent of drug involved clients and 54.5 percent of alcohol involved clients were either currently or previously in treatment of some sort.

The first two months of the drug abusing sample after TASC did not deviate greatly from the previous sample - a minimally higher percentage of clients had been involved in treatment. The third month, however, showed a sharp decline in the proportion of drug abusers that had a treatment history. While the three month average showed 42.8 percent with a treatment history, only 16.7 percent of those in the third month had been involved in treatment.

The alcohol abusing population in the sample after TASC differed substantially from the pre-TASC population with regard to treatment history. While over one-half (54.5 percent) of the alcohol abusers in the first sample had a treatment history, only slightly more than one-quarter (27.0 percent) in the second sample did.

The six sample months' totals on Table 5-1 show that 41.0 percent of all drug involved persons arraigned already had been in treatment. The similar percentage for alcohol involved persons is nearly equivalent - 39.8 percent. These percentages indicate that a noteworthy proportion of the drug and alcohol abusers that are entering the Yonkers court system have already been involved with some type of treatment - approximately four out of ten persons.

Such percentages would seem to restrict TASC impact since treatment would not be a new experience for so many. However, when months are measured separately, there appears to be a trend towards fewer persons with a treatment history. The pattern is noticed throughout the after-TASC sample for alcohol abusers. It is only in the last sample month (February, 1980) that the percentage of drug abusers with a treatment history declines. However, the decline is marked. If the trends continue as they have been, there will be a substantial portion of the abusing population with no treatment history and the potential for TASC impact will be fairly large.²

Arraignment Dispositions of Suspected Abusers

The evaluators analyzed the arraignment dispositions of persons with indications of drug or alcohol problems in several ways. The first analysis studied the arraignment dispositions within various crime categories. Table 5-2 presents the raw number of dispositions received by the abusing population in the three month sample prior to TASC within each crime category. There were 79 cases in the total sample, but dispositions were unknown for two violations charges and one D-Felony. These three cases, therefore, were excluded. Table 5-3 presents the figures for the three month sample after TASC began operations in the same format as Table 5-2. There were 92 cases in the after TASC sample and dispositions were available for all cases. Arraignment dispositions are presented in these charts under four headings:

- ROR - Client was released on own recognizance.
- Bail - Client was assigned a cash bail amount, or secured bond, or was refused bail.
- Plea - Client pled guilty at arraignment and case was disposed.
- Dismissed/Transferred - Charges were dropped or case was transferred to another court.

Table 5-2 indicates that 21 of the 76 cases in the pre-TASC sample were terminated at the arraignment hearing. TASC involvement in this portion of the cases would be impossible. Another 30 cases received ROR at arraignment without any additional stipulations, barring any real potential for TASC impact in the pre-trial stages of these cases. Slightly less than a third of the drug or alcohol involved clients remain for TASC to impact on at a pre-trial level.

² Persons who have previously been in treatment are more likely to have more firmly entrenched notions regarding what they can or cannot accomplish in treatment than are persons who are entering treatment for the first time. The addition of TASC requirements may not, by itself, be sufficient to overcome any performance-related biases held by the former group.

Dispositions for the three month sample after TASC, however, are not distributed in the same way. As Table 5-3 shows, only 11 of the 92 cases are fully disposed of at arraignment. Even though a TASC stipulation aided 6 cases in receiving ROR, the total percentage of cases getting ROR was somewhat lower than in the previous sample. More than half of the cases in this sample fell into the bail category. TASC was a condition of bail in 4 of the cases. The remainder of the bail cases had potential for pretrial TASC impact.

Table 5-4 examines more concretely what the arraignment dispositions were within various crime categories for the three month sample prior to TASC. Violations were the most frequent type of charge among the substance abusing population and as this chart shows, one-half of these cases were disposed of at the arraignment. Also, more than one-third of violations received ROR. Bail cases for this largest population, therefore, are only 13.3 percent of all violations.

Sizeable numbers of drug and alcohol abusers fell into two other offense categories: A-Misdemeanors and D-Felonies. The A-Misdemeanor category did not allow for much potential for TASC impact in this sample. Only 17.7 percent of A-Misdemeanors were not disposed of or not released on their own recognizance in the pre-TASC sample. The more serious type offense, D-Felony, permitted more room for TASC impact. More than half (62.5 percent) of D Felonies were in the bail category. The other felony categories had similar distributions. On the basis of the pre-TASC sample, the evaluators conclude that for TASC to have pre-trial impact on the abusing population, they must involve themselves with the more serious offenders.

Again, the three month sample after TASC shows a shift. Table 5-5 shows two things quickly - a much higher percentage of persons are in the bail category (52.2 percent as opposed to 32.9 percent), and abusers are being charged with more serious offenses. In the post-TASC sample, the incidence of violations is almost 10 percent less than it was in the pre-TASC sample. This difference is seen in higher percentages for both misdemeanor and felony cases. But, even with the violation category, 32.1 percent of cases were in the bail group. A-Misdemeanor cases were as frequent as violations and 50.0 percent of these cases were in a bail type status allowing for potential for substantial TASC impact. E and D-Felonies had 70.0 and 64.3 percent of cases in the bail categories and more serious felonies had 100.0 percent of cases. (There is no direct evidence to indicate that TASC is wholly or partly responsible for the changes described above.)

Again, the potential for TASC impact is naturally greater for more serious offenders. However, the post-TASC sample indicates that TASC can have impact at the pre-trial level on less serious offenders as a notable proportion are assigned to the bail category. From this sample, TASC was a condition of ROR for four violations and two A-Misdemeanors. TASC was a condition of bail for two violations, an A-Misdemeanor and an E-Felony. One of the two B-Misdemeanor cases disposed of was by a plea and TASC was a condition of the sentence.

Arraignment Dispositions in Relation to Treatment History

Another factor that must be considered in addition to the bail determination is the treatment status and history of the persons. If a drug abuser is assigned a bail amount and is currently in a treatment program, the potential for TASC impact is reduced. Any treatment history also reduces impact somewhat. Table 5-6 shows what percentages of the abusing population in the pre-TASC sample were in treatment at the time of arrest. The chart is arranged by arraignment dispositions. The figures for cases in bail categories show that 20.0 percent of these persons were currently in treatment when arrested. This 20.0 percent reduces the TASC potential for impact on these cases. For this group of abusers, TASC could not be introducing treatment as a new mechanism.

Table 5-7 is a replica of Table 5-8, but it displays the figures for the three month sample after TASC. The percentage of bail cases that were currently in treatment when arraigned is larger for this sample - 25.0 percent. The potential for TASC impact is somewhat lower.

Table 5-8 and Table 5-9 present the same information as the two previous charts but this time clients with prior treatment and/or current treatment are compared with those having no treatment history at all. Table 5-8 shows that 60.0 percent of bail cases in the pre-TASC sample had no treatment history at all. This is the group of persons that TASC could have the greatest impact on. Table 5-9 presents the figures from the post-TASC sample and finds the impact potential even greater - 66.7 percent of bail cases had no treatment history.

Potential Impact on Drug Abusers vs. Alcohol Abusers

Table 5-10 illustrates what percentage of drug abusers and alcohol abusers from the pre-TASC sample were charged within certain crime categories. It is obvious from the chart that the drug abusers were involved in more serious offenses than the alcohol abusers were. More than half of the alcohol abusers were only arrested for violations. Many of these cases involved transients charged with disorderly conduct. The remainder of the alcohol abusers' cases were evenly divided between misdemeanor and felony charges. The distribution of cases of drug abusers looks very different from the alcohol configuration. Less than one-quarter of the drug abusers' cases are violations. The largest block of cases are felonies - 41.9 percent.

Table 5-11 presents the post-TASC sample in the same way. Again, more than half of the alcohol abusers are charged with violations. Felony cases were slightly more frequent than misdemeanors for alcohol abusers. Only a very small percentage of drug abusers in this sample were arrested for violations - 8.5 percent. Misdemeanors were a bit more prevalent than felonies among the drug

abusing population, 46.8 percent as opposed to 44.7 percent.

The data contained in Table 5-10 and Table 5-11 indicate that TASC has greater potential for impact on drug abusers than alcohol abusers because they are charged with more serious offenses. However, this information must be viewed in conjunction with arraignment dispositions to actually draw conclusions on the TASC potential for impact on pre-trial clients.

The chart presenting arraignment dispositions of drug abusers versus alcohol abusers for the three months after TASC (Table 5-13) looks quite different than the similar chart for the pre-TASC sample (Table 5-12). In the pre-TASC sample, 40 percent of the alcohol abusers had their cases disposed of at arraignment either through plea, dismissal, or transfer. A majority of these cases were violations. The post-TASC sample had a high percentage of violations among alcohol abusers also. However, in the post-TASC dispositions only 15.6 percent of alcohol abusers cases were disposed of at arraignment. As a result, the percentages of alcohol abusers receiving both ROR and bail are greater in the post-TASC sample than in the pre-TASC sample.

In the pre-TASC sample, a slightly higher number of alcohol abusers fell into the bail category (31.1 percent) rather than the ROR category (28.9 percent). The two groups are of identical size in the post-TASC sample (42.2 percent). Since many of the alcohol abusers were not charged with serious offenses, it might be expected that the bail category would be smaller than it is. However, a notable portion of the alcohol abusing population is made up of transients. Several of these persons were not considered good candidates for ROR by either PTSI interviewers or arraignment judges despite their minor charges. It is unlikely that very many of them would be good TASC candidates either. Although the percentage of cases in the bail category is not negligible, the potential impact of TASC on alcohol abusers in the bail category must be considered with this transience factor in mind.

Because the drug abusing population was involved in more serious crime, the percentage of drug abusers in the bail category would be expected to be high. However, in the sample before TASC more than half of the drug abusers were released on their own recognition. The percentage of drug abusers in the bail category (35.5 percent) was only a few points higher than the alcohol percentage (31.1) for this sample.

The three month sample after TASC differed greatly from the pre-TASC sample for drug abusers, just as it had for alcohol abusers. As Table 5-13 indicates, the percentage of drug abusers receiving ROR dropped from 54.8 percent to 29.8 percent. The volume of cases disposed of at arraignment remained virtually unchanged. The bail category, however, greatly increased from 35.5 percent to 61.7 percent of the drug abusing population.

Since TASC began operations, the potential for pre-trial impact on drug abusers seems to have increased substantially. While the arraignment dispositions of alcohol abusers have altered considerably (the sharp decline in cases disposed of at arraignment), the potential for TASC impact is uncertain. The alcohol abusing bail population has increased, but the nature of the population itself might prevent possible TASC impact.

B. TASC Impact On Dispositions And Sentencing

Once again, in order to measure TASC impact, the potential for impact in the environment must be known. In this instance, the evaluators studied three months of dispositional and sentencing patterns from Yonkers City Court, Criminal Part III. The months chosen were March, 1979; September, 1979; and March, 1980. This selection then included time before TASC, time when TASC was just beginning, and time after TASC was fully functioning. The actual data were accessed through the Division of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) in Albany. The DCJS Statistical Control Unit is conducting research into the outcome of procedures in local criminal courts and provided the evaluators with Yonkers data.

Crowded Westchester County Court dockets have created a movement of some criminal cases to the lower court. This recent trend towards handling more serious cases at the city court level is apparent in the three months dispositions examined. Table 5-14 shows that in March, 1980, the percentage of cases held for the grand jury dropped to 5.8 percent of the city court cases disposed of in that month. The two earlier sample months had 9.0 and 11.3 percent of cases held for the grand jury. This trend has also had an impact on the percentage of cases gaining convictions. With the addition of more serious cases, the percent of persons convicted and sentenced rose to 56.7 percent in March, 1980. The other sample months recorded conviction rates of 49.0 and 43.6 percent.

The disposal of more serious cases in city court is advantageous to the potential for TASC impact. Since TASC staff members are routinely present in city courts, a TASC type disposition is more likely to occur there. Also, judges in the lower court have had experience with TASC and would probably be apt to utilize the alternative to TASC in these more serious cases.

For the three month sentencing sample, the evaluators considered the four basic sentences of city court: incarceration at local institutions, probation, conditional discharge, and fine. Table 5-15 presents the proportion of cases receiving each sentence for each of the sample months. Sentences for all offenses are recorded as well as sentences for four specific charges: assault, petit larceny, criminal trespass, and disorderly conduct.

Over the course of the sample, two notable changes occurred. First, sentences to local institutions increased considerably. During the first two sample months, slightly more than one-quarter of convictions resulted in sentences of incarceration. However, during March, 1980, 41.9 percent of all sentences were to local institutions.

The pattern for sentences of fines progressed in the opposite direction. With each sample month, the percent of cases sentenced with a fine decreased from 21.4 percent to 17.6 percent to 7.4 percent. A substantial factor in the decrease between the second and third sample months was the reduction in the volume of fine sentences for charges of disorderly conduct. During the second sample month - September, 1979 - 21.2 percent of persons convicted of disorderly conduct were sentenced with a fine. But during the third sample month - March, 1980 - none of the persons convicted of disorderly conduct were sentenced with a fine. As a result, utilization of each of the other sentence types increased for disorderly conduct during this time frame.

The proportion of convicted clients probationed did not change greatly during the course of the sample, nor did the proportion of conditional discharges. Probations were always a fairly small percentage of total sentences and these percentages were even somewhat smaller in the months after TASC began. Conditional discharges remained stable for the three months - always between forty and fifty percent of the total sentences. The overall utilization of conditional discharges did not increase after TASC, but TASC did not intend for it to increase. TASC's involvement with conditional discharges was and is directed at legitimizing an otherwise nebulous sentence.

It seems unusual for probation to be utilized so infrequently by a lower court. However, in Westchester County there is a reason for this. Probation is not assigned as a sentence unless there is a pre-sentence investigation completed. Table 5-16 presents the comparison in the volume of pre-sentence reports between the superior and local courts. Obviously, the local court probation officers are already overburdened with these investigations. Any attempt to increase the use of probation would overwhelm them with investigation requests. Because of this, conditional discharge is a popular sentence. If a person is not likely to be incarcerated as a result of conviction, conditional discharge saves the time and expense of the investigation that would have to precede a sentence of probation. The frequent use of conditional discharge as opposed to probation provides TASC with a number of convicted persons who were previously unsupervised. The potential for TASC impact, qualitatively, is substantial because of this void.

The alternative to TASC as a tool for case disposition or sentence is never as apparent as it is for charges involving drugs. Table 5-17 presents the number of cases disposed of and sentenced during the sample months for drug offenses. The numbers are not large but they are greater for the final sample month. This follows with the finding from the previous section in this chapter - there are more drug abusers entering the system than there previously had been. Since the volume of drug offenses disposed of is increasing, the potential for TASC impact will also be growing.

C. TASC Impact On Jail Populations

Westchester County maintains three correctional facilities: the County Jail for pre-trial detention for men; the County Penitentiary for sentenced men; and the County Correctional Unit for Women with sections for both sentenced women and those in pre-trial detention. Recently, all attentions have been focused on the County Jail because of overcrowded conditions. The Jail has not been able to handle the volume of men that are being held in pre-trial detention. The Jail has had to rely on the Penitentiary to house the overflow. Thus far, the Penitentiary has been able to meet the demand.

None of the jail facilities in Westchester County maintains readily accessible data. The only solid jail population information that the evaluators could gather was from the Office of Criminal Justice Planning. Table 5-18 presents the three facilities' figures for 1974 through 1978. As early as 1978, the average daily County Jail population was at capacity and growing. During four of the five years on the chart, the Jail was over capacity at some point. The Penitentiary population appears more stable on this chart than the Jail population does. Capacity was never reached in the Penitentiary. It was never reached at the Women's Unit during the five years, either. However, the number of women incarcerated was obviously increasing rapidly according to these data.

There are several factors involved in the Jail overcrowding. Many persons in Westchester County are detained initially and then released at bond hearings when rap sheets are available. Presently, it can take several days to receive a rap sheet. Table 5-19 indicates that 50.4 percent of a sample* of the detention population are released within ten days of their detention. The percentage from Yonkers Court is even higher - 57.0 percent. A substantial portion of these persons are detained awaiting rap sheets. Another factor involved in large numbers of persons detained relates back to the requirement for pre-sentence investigations. Anyone who pleads guilty and does not receive a conditional discharge or a fine for a sentence, must wait in pre-trial detention (the Jail) until the investigation is completed. The Jail overcrowding problems, therefore, also tip the balance away from probation sentences and towards conditional discharges.

*The Westchester County Office of Criminal Justice Planning is in the process of conducting a study on the Jail population. A partial sample is being drawn by tracking all persons who are in incarceration on Saturday nights. The study was begun on January 1, 1979, and the evaluators have assessed the results of the first six months for discussion in this report.

Solutions to the Jail problem are being sought constantly. Some new cells are being built and new mechanisms are being developed to receive rap sheets more quickly. The Pre-trial Services Institute has been considered quite helpful. TASC has also been given some credit for having a small role in reducing the population. TASC, however, has never considered this a primary objective and the agency is not viewed as a solution to this problem. Table 5-20 shows, however, that a notable portion of those detained are charged with offenses often related to drug or alcohol abuse. The addition of TASC to either ROR or a bail amount might expedite releases for some of these persons, if TASC chose to concentrate further in this area.

While all attentions have been directed towards the problems of the Jail, the Penitentiary has gone unnoticed. As Table 5-18 shows, the Penitentiary was not near capacity in 1978. However, these statistics are two years old and no longer representative of the real situation. In the shadow of the Jail overcrowding problems, the Penitentiary population has been growing steadily. Several factors have contributed to this. Of course, housing the Jail overflow has increased the population. As was seen earlier in this chapter, more persons are being sentenced to incarceration at local institutions in recent months. Also, the disposal of more serious cases at the lower court level will result in more jail sentences assigned.

If the Penitentiary is not crowded, there is no pressure on Westchester County judges to seek alternatives to incarceration. This has been the situation. The justice system has not had to use TASC. TASC has been viewed primarily as a qualitative improvement to conditional discharges. While the justice system actors welcome TASC, they have not been utilizing it to its fullest capacity.

With the Penitentiary population consistently rising, soon the justice system will not have an easy option for incarceration. When the Penitentiary fills to near capacity, judges and prosecutors will be forced to look for alternatives. TASC has been steadily gaining credibility in the justice system and will be available to impact on the Penitentiary population when the time comes. Conditional discharges with the legitimacy of TASC will probably increase. Also, judges might utilize TASC with probation rather than incarcerate some persons. At the current rate of increase in the Penitentiary population, it is likely that TASC alternative dispositions will be increasingly sought during the second grant period of Westchester County TASC.

Table 5-1

SIX MONTH SAMPLE - YONKERS CITY COURT CASELOAD

Three Months Prior To TASC:

Month/ Year	Total No. of Cases	No. of Drug/ Alcohol Involved Clients	% of Cases With Drug/ Alcohol Involved Clients	% of Drug/ Alcohol Involved Clients Abusing Drugs	% of Drug Abusers With Treatment History	% of Drug/ Alcohol Involved Clients Abusing Alcohol	% With Treatment History
5/79	141	27	19.1	25.9	57.1	74.1	35.0
6/79	121	26	21.5	46.2	41.7	53.8	64.3
7/79	150	26	17.3	46.2	41.7	53.8	64.3

Three Months After TASC:

9/79	168	33	19.6	48.5	68.8	51.5	23.5
12/79	113	20	17.7	35.0	42.9	65.0	30.8
2/80	148	39	26.4	61.5	16.7	38.5	26.7

Six Month Totals:

841	171	20.3	45.6	41.0	54.4	39.8
-----	-----	------	------	------	------	------

DISPOSITIONS OF ARRAIGNMENTS FOR DRUG OR
ALCOHOL ABUSING POPULATION BY CRIME CATEGORY
(in raw figures)

Table 5-2 Three Month Sample Prior to TASC:

	ROR (N = 30)	Bail (N = 25)	Plea (N = 12)	Dismissed/ Transferred (N = 9)	Total (N = 76)
Violation	11	4	12	3	30
B - Misdemeanor	2	2	0	1	5
A - Misdemeanor	10	3	0	4	17
E - Felony	1	4	0	0	5
D - Felony	5	10	0	1	16
C - Felony	1	2	0	0	3

Table 5-3 Three Month Sample After TASC:

	ROR (N = 33)	Bail (N = 48)	Plea (N = 5)	Dismissed/ Transferred (N = 6)	Total (N = 92)
Violation	14	9	4	1	28
B - Misdemeanor	1	1	1	1	4
A - Misdemeanor	11	14	0	3	28
E - Felony	2	7	0	1	10
D - Felony	5	9	0	0	14
C - Felony	0	4	0	0	4
B - Felony	0	4	0	0	4

DISPOSITIONS OF ARRAIGNMENTS FOR DRUG OR
ALCOHOL ABUSING POPULATION WITHIN EACH CRIME CATEGORY
(in percent)

Table 5-4 Three Month Sample Prior To TASC

	Violation (N = 30)	B-Misdemeanor (N = 5)	A-Misdemeanor (N = 17)	E-Felony (N = 5)	D-Felony (N = 16)	C-Felony (N = 3)	
ROR (39.5)	36.7	40.0	58.8	20.0	31.3	33.3	
Bail (32.9)	13.3	40.0	17.7	80.0	62.5	66.7	
Disposed Cases (27.6)	50.0	20.0	23.5	0.0	6.3	0.0	

Table 5-5 Three Month Sample After TASC

	Violation (N = 28)	B-Misdemeanor (N = 4)	A-Misdemeanor (N = 28)	E-Felony (N = 10)	D-Felony (N = 14)	C-Felony (N = 4)	B-Felony (N = 4)
ROR (35.9)	50.0	25.0	39.3	20.0	35.7	0.0	0.0
Bail (52.2)	32.1	25.0	50.0	70.0	64.3	100.0	100.0
Disposed Cases (12.0)	17.9	50.0	10.7	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

DISPOSITIONS OF ARRAIGNMENTS FOR DRUG OR
ALCOHOL ABUSING POPULATION BY CURRENT TREATMENT STATUS
(in percent)

Table 5-6 Three Month Sample Prior to TASC				
	ROR (N = 30)	Bail (N = 25)	Plea (N = 12)	Dismissed/ Transferred (N = 9)
Currently in treatment (N = 20) 26.3	33.3	20.0	25.0	22.2
Not in treatment (N = 56) 73.7	66.7	80.0	75.0	77.8

Table 5-7 Three Month Sample After TASC				
	ROR (N = 33)	Bail (N = 48)	Plea (N = 5)	Dismissed/ Transferred (N = 6)
Currently in treatment (N = 21) 22.8	27.3	25.0	0.0	0.0
Not in treatment (N = 71) 77.2	72.7	75.0	100.0	100.0

DISPOSITIONS OF ARRAIGNMENTS FOR DRUG OR
ALCOHOL ABUSING POPULATION BY TREATMENT HISTORY
(in percent)

Table 5-8 Three Month Sample Prior to TASC

	ROR (N = 30)	Bail (N = 25)	Plea (N = 12)	Dismissed/ Transferred (N = 9)
Current or prior treatment history (N = 38) 50.0	60.0	40.0	50.0	44.4
No treatment history (N = 38) 50.0	40.0	60.0	50.0	56.6

Table 5-9 Three Month Sample After TASC

	ROR (N = 33)	Bail (N = 48)	Plea (N = 5)	Dismissed/ Transferred (N = 6)
Current or prior treatment history (N = 30) 32.6	36.4	33.3	20.0	16.7
No treatment history (N = 62) 67.4	63.6	66.7	80.0	83.3

CRIME CATEGORIES OF DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSING
POPULATION BY TYPE OF ABUSE

(in percent)

Table 5-10

Three Months Prior To TASC:

	Drug (N = 31)	Alcohol (N = 45)
Violation (N = 30)	22.6	51.1
B - Misdemeanor (N = 5)	9.7	4.4
A - Misdemeanor (N = 17)	25.8	20.0
E - Felony (N = 5)	16.1	0.0
D - Felony (N = 16)	22.6	20.0
C - Felony (N = 3)	3.2	4.4

Table 5-11

Three Months After TASC:

	Drug (N = 47)	Alcohol (N = 45)
Violation (N = 28)	8.5	53.3
B - Misdemeanor (N = 4)	2.1	6.7
A - Misdemeanor (N = 28)	44.7	15.6
E - Felony (N = 10)	14.9	6.7
D - Felony (N = 14)	19.1	11.1
C - Felony (N = 4)	6.4	2.2
B - Felony (N = 4)	4.3	4.4

DISPOSITIONS OF ARRAIGNMENTS FOR DRUG
AND ALCOHOL ABUSING POPULATION BY TYPE OF ABUSE
(in percent)

Table 5-12 Three Months Prior to TASC		
	Drug (N = 31) 40.8	Alcohol (N = 45) 59.2
ROR	54.8	28.9
Bail	35.5	31.1
Plea	6.5	22.2
Dismissed/ Transferred	3.2	17.8

Table 5-13 Three Months After TASC		
	Drug (N = 47) 51.1	Alcohol (N = 45) 48.9
ROR	29.8	42.2
Bail	61.7	42.2
Plea	4.3	6.7
Dismissed/ Transferred	4.3	8.9

Table 5-14

YONKERS CITY COURT, CRIMINAL PART III

THREE MONTH SAMPLE OF TOTAL CASE DISPOSITIONS

<u>Month/ Year</u>	<u>Total No. of Cases Disposed</u>	<u>No. Held for Grand Jury</u>	<u>No. Convicted & Sentenced</u>		<u>No. Adjudi- cated Youthful Offender</u>	<u>Number Acquitted</u>	<u>Number Accusatory Instrument Dismissed</u>	<u>Other**</u>
3/79	200	18 (9.0)	1 (0.5)	97 (48.5)	6 (3.0)	2 (1.0)	32 (16.0)	44 (22.0)
9/79	273	31 (11.3)	2 (0.73)	117 (42.9)	10 (3.7)	0 (0.0)	74 (27.1)	39 (14.3)
3/80	240	14 (5.8)	4 (1.7)	132 (55.0)	13 (5.4)	3 (1.3)	37 (15.4)	37 (15.4)

**Other includes several types of unspecified dispositions. However, the majority of the category seems to be made up by ACD cases. Two offenses made up a substantial portion of these cases:

<u>Month/Year Year</u>	<u>Total No. of Other Case Dispositions</u>	<u>No. of Other Case Dispositions for Petit Larceny</u>	<u>No. of Other Case Dispositions for Disorderly Conduct</u>
3/79	44	20	10
9/79	39	22	5
3/80	37	14	9

Table 5-15

YONKERS CITY COURT, CRIMINAL PART III - THREE MONTH SENTENCING SAMPLE

	Local Institutions			Probation			Conditional Discharge			Fine		
	3/79	9/79	3/80	3/79	9/79	3/80	3/79	9/79	3/80	3/79	9/79	3/80
MISDEMEANORS:												
Assault	1 (25.0)	2 (40.0)	3 (42.9)	2 (50.0)	2 (40.0)	1 (14.2)	1 (25.0)	1 (20.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (42.9)
Petit Larceny	11 (68.8)	8 (47.1)	12 (75.0)	4 (25.0)	1 (5.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (6.3)	7 (38.9)	4 (25.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (5.6)	0 (0.0)
Criminal Trespass	2 (100.0)	2 (100.0)	13 (76.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (11.8)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (11.8)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
VIOLATION:												
Disorderly Conduct	7 (14.6)	6 (11.5)	7 (16.7)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (2.4)	31 (64.6)	35 (67.3)	34 (81.0)	10 (20.8)	11 (21.2)	0 (0.0)
ALL OFFENSES:	27 (27.5)	33 (27.7)	57 (41.9)	9 (9.1)	6 (5.0)	9 (6.6)	47 (48.0)	59 (49.6)	60 (44.1)	21 (21.4)	21 (17.6)	10 (7.4)

Table 5-16

WESTCHESTER COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PROBATION

CRIMINAL COURTS - VOLUMES OF PRE-SENTENCE INVESTIGATIONS

	Superior Court	Local Court	Total
1974	926 (38%)	1,510 (62%)	2,436
1975	1,066 (37%)	1,814 (63%)	2,880
1976	1,102 (36%)	1,959 (64%)	3,061
1977	1,024 (31%)	2,279 (69%)	3,303

Table 5-17

YONKERS CITY COURT, CRIMINAL PART III
DISPOSITION AND SENTENCING OF DRUG OFFENSES -
THREE MONTH SAMPLE

<u>Offense Category - Original Charge</u>	<u>No. of Cases Disposed</u>		
	<u>3/79</u>	<u>9/79</u>	<u>3/80</u>
Controlled Substance (felony)	2	0	1
Controlled Substance (misdemeanor)	3	5	4
Marijuana (felony)	0	0	1
Marijuana (misdemeanor)	1	3	4
Marijuana (violation)	3	3	3

<u>Offense Category - At Sentencing</u>	<u>No. of Cases Sentenced</u>		
	<u>3/79</u>	<u>9/79</u>	<u>3/80</u>
Controlled Substance (misdemeanor)	1	0	5
Marijuana (misdemeanor)	1	2	0
Marijuana (violation)	4	5	3

Table 5-18
WESTCHESTER COUNTY CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES
1974 - 1978 POPULATIONS

JAIL (250 Capacity)

	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Highest Number of Inmates at Any Time During Year	268	262	234	265	294
Lowest Number of Inmates at Any Time During Year	164	178	180	192	201
Daily Average Number of Inmates During Year	208	222	206	228	248

PENITENTIARY (377 Capacity)

	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Highest Number of Inmates at Any Time During Year	197	210	203	225	203
Lowest Number of Inmates at Any Time During Year	148	134	119	158	119
Daily Average Number of Inmates During Year	170	162	157	191	157

WOMEN'S UNIT (62 Capacity)

	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Highest Number of Inmates at Any Time During Year	31	28	37	45	52
Lowest Number of Inmates at Any Time During Year	14	14	17	19	28
Daily Average Number of Inmates During Year	20	20	14	31	39

Table 5-19

COUNTY JAIL DETENTION POPULATION
BY
LENGTH OF TIME DETAINED*
(in percent)

<u>Number of</u> <u>Days Detained</u>	<u>From Yonkers</u> <u>Court</u> (N = 235)	<u>From All</u> <u>Courts</u> (N = 1242)
1 - 2	26.8	22.1
3 - 5	18.3	15.5
6 - 10	11.9	12.8
11 - 15	6.8	6.7
16 - 20	6.4	6.5
21 - 30	8.5	7.7
31 - 40	3.0	6.3
41 - 90	10.6	11.1
91 -150	3.4	4.8
151 -250	3.0	3.9
252 -365	1.3	2.5

*Based on partial sample drawn by Office of Criminal
Justice Planning - January 1, 1979 through
June 30, 1979.

Table 5-20

COUNTY JAIL DETENTION POPULATION BY
LENGTH OF TIME DETAINED FOR SPECIFIC CHARGES*

	<u>From Yonkers Court</u>		<u>From All Courts</u>	
	<u>Detained 10 Days or Less</u>	<u>Detained More Than 10 Days</u>	<u>Detained 10 Days or Less</u>	<u>Detained More Than 10 Days</u>
Felonies:				
Criminal Trespass	0	2	6	9
Burglary	19	20	87	120
Criminal Mischief	1	2	7	6
Drug Offenses	4	3	32	32
Misdemeanors:				
Assault	1	1	13	17
Criminal Trespass	5	2	21	16
Criminal Mischief	2	1	10	6
Petit Larceny	28	7	54	37
Drug Offenses	1	1	11	5
Violation:				
Disorderly Conduct/Harassment	11	8	60	21
TOTAL OFFENSES	134	101	627	615

*Based on partial sample drawn January 1, 1979 through June 30, 1979 by Office of Criminal Justice Planning.

CHAPTER 6 - TASC RELATIONSHIP WITH TREATMENT PROGRAMS

Introduction

Westchester County TASC does not have a bias towards any particular type of treatment or treatment modality. Referrals are made based on the results of individual client screenings. Consequently, TASC has relationships with: a residential drug program, drug-free outpatient programs, methadone maintenance programs, youth-oriented drug programs, and various types of alcohol treatment programs. The evaluators interviewed representatives from several of these agencies in an effort to determine the quality of these relationships and any impact that the existence of TASC has had on them.

As a result of these interviews, the evaluators concluded that Westchester County TASC has been successful in establishing very good working relationships with the majority of programs that they utilize. TASC administrators and staff persons were described as accessible, flexible, and supportive. Several TASC workers are considered very knowledgeable and experienced in the treatment and criminal justice fields. Less experienced staff have been viewed as eager learners.

The following sections discuss the impact that TASC is having on treatment programs in Westchester County. The comment and conclusions are based on the interviews conducted with treatment staff.

A. Impact On Treatment Referrals

According to respondents, TASC clients make up anywhere from five percent to thirty-five percent of the caseload of the treatment programs visited. Several programs cited TASC as a valuable source of referrals from the criminal justice system. The agency that TASC utilizes most frequently for drug treatment referrals was involved in the court system prior to the existence of TASC in Westchester County. When TASC became established in the courts, this agency withdrew. The court activity of the TASC staff has supplied the agency with as many clients as they were receiving previously through their own outreach efforts. Most of the counselors interviewed from this agency feel that court referrals have increased because the TASC workers are in court on a daily basis while the counselors from the program were only in court two or three days a week. The fact that TASC is strongly supported by the Assistant District Attorneys was also noted as a reason that TASC can get more justice system referrals.

A representative from the program for youthful drug offenders stated that prior to TASC he consistently tried to elicit referral from the justice system, but he was unsuccessful in acquiring them. Referrals from TASC were the first court clients that he received. Methodone programs also expressed hope that their evolving relationship with TASC will lead to many more court referrals. They have traditionally felt that the justice system did not favor or understand the type of treatment that they offered.

TASC referrals were characterized as appropriate in the majority of cases. Several programs stated that, more importantly, TASC never "dumps" clients on programs. If there are problems with a client referred, the TASC workers handle them. If a new referral is needed, TASC arranges for one. Cooperation from other referral sources is not as consistent.

B. Differences Between TASC and Non-TASC Clients

TASC clients do not look very different physically from other clients in treatment programs in Westchester County. In the alcohol programs, TASC clients are somewhat younger than others. One alcohol program also noted a much higher concentration of males among TASC referrals, in comparison to clients from other referral sources. In the youthful drug programs, TASC clients are generally the oldest clients in treatment. Other types of drug programs considered TASC referrals very typical clients in the programs.

Most of the agencies where TASC clients were younger than others found TASC clients to be somewhat more difficult to work with in treatment. The clients tend to need more support and lack sufficient motivation. On the other hand, when TASC clients were the older segment of the treatment population, counselors felt that TASC clients were easier to treat than others because of their maturity.

The majority of the respondents thought that the leverage of the criminal justice mandate was a helpful tool in keeping clients involved in the treatment process. In addition to TASC clients, most programs receive probation clients mandated to treatment. Although treatment and probation seem to share an unusually good relationship in Westchester County, several counselors expressed the feeling that the TASC mandate had more strength than others because of TASC's strict monitoring system.

C. Impact on the Treatment Process

Several TASC programs have encountered difficulties with treatment programs over interference with clients. TASC projects have frequently been accused of overstepping their boundaries and becoming too involved in the treatment process. This has not been a problem for Westchester County TASC. In fact, the majority of programs encourage TASC to participate in the treatment process to some extent.

Some TASC workers personally escort clients to treatment for intake. This procedure is greatly preferred by treatment staff. The counselors feel that the more personal contact that TASC has with treatment and the client, the more impact they will have on the process. Some programs reported that they have had a lot of personal contacts with TASC. Others reported that they have had numerous interactions with some workers, but would like more contacts with other staff members. Telephone contact was universally considered high.

Only one treatment agency expressed real dissatisfaction with the level of contacts with TASC. This program feels that TASC should get much more involved with the clients. They think that the referrals need to be followed-up with support from TASC workers. This program would rather see staff working directly with clients than being in court all day. A portion of this agency's complaint, however, actually addressed the TASC concept more than the Westchester County project.

Another area of potential conflict between TASC projects and treatment agencies is client termination. TASC requirements are different and often stricter than treatment's and this can cause a problem. Westchester County TASC has not experienced much difficulty in this area. One agency stated that TASC terminated clients faster than they did and another said that TASC was slower to terminate than they were. No agency felt that this was a problem.

One treatment program feels strongly that urine monitoring interferes with the treatment process. However, they realize that TASC must continue to do this.

One other incidence of negative impact on the treatment process was mentioned during the interviews. In one program, a youth was both a TASC client and a probationer. The probation officer allegedly did not want TASC to be involved with the client. After inter-agency fighting over the

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

client, the probation officer withdrew the client from treatment. The treatment program was quite upset. They felt that the client was greatly in need of counseling and that he was progressing. This was an isolated incident. However, the program hopes that relations between probation and TASC do not again interfere with a client's treatment.

D. Impact on Treatment Program Operations

The largest operational impact that TASC has had has been on the treatment agency that had sent representatives to court. Prior to TASC, the supervisor from each of the five program sites spent two or three days a week in court. The court schedule was difficult to integrate with counseling schedules. Evening counseling sessions clashed with daytime work hours in court. At times the supervisors even had to attend evening court. The net result was that supervisors had very little time to devote to actual treatment.

Since TASC has been in existence, this agency has stopped sending representatives to court regularly. They are very satisfied with TASC's screening abilities and credibility in the courts. They feel that they are receiving as many referrals as they would have if they were still in court. TASC has saved them a considerable amount of manpower and money by taking over this responsibility. Treatment personnel are now available to provide treatment since they have been relieved of their court duties.

The evaluators cited two other obvious indications that TASC has had an impact on treatment operations. The first was in the office of a supervisor at a drug program. On his wall, the supervisor had three large clipboards hanging. The purpose of these boards is to record process data from daily treatment activities. Two of the three clipboards recorded TASC information only. One was for TASC urinalysis and the other was for TASC client attendance. It was apparent that TASC is having an impact on this agency.

The other indication was found at a program for youthful drug offenders. The supervisor of the agency visited has assigned a particular counselor to handle all TASC clients. This agency considers their relationship with TASC an important one. The counselor was assigned to ensure that the relationship continues to be a mutually satisfactory one.

E. Paperwork

Only one of the treatment programs visited considered TASC reporting burdensome. Some others lightly complained about the time involved in completing report forms. However, one of these counselors was quick to add that he finds the reports to be a helpful client review for himself. Most agency representatives found TASC requirements acceptable and this type of paperwork just a fact of life. One counselor compared the TASC report form to reports that have to be done for probation. TASC reports were considered much quicker to do than the narrative style of report that probation requires.

The diagnostic information that TASC forwards to agencies on referrals is satisfactory to all programs. All of the treatment programs prefer to do their own client assessment, though. TASC information, therefore, is a helpful introduction, but any additional diagnostic work by TASC would only be duplicated by the programs.

One area of paperwork that disturbed several respondents was the TASC client contract. Treatment programs felt that the wording of the contract invited clients to abuse drugs or alcohol at least once after the contract was signed.¹ However, TASC has been working with treatment to develop a more appropriate client contract.

In sum, the evaluators concluded that Westchester County TASC has developed successful relationships with treatment programs. Also, TASC has had a positive impact on treatment in several regards. The major areas of impact are:

- TASC has supplied programs with criminal justice system referrals. Prior to TASC, some of these referrals were impossible or time-consuming to get.
- The TASC mandate is considered an effective mechanism to keep clients in treatment.
- Treatment programs feel that TASC participation in the treatment process is likely to have a positive impact on treatment.

The evaluators recommend that TASC:

- Maintain personal contact with treatment staff and, when at all possible, escort clients to initial intake interviews.
- Clarify lines of responsibility to clients with the treatment agency that was dissatisfied with the level of contacts.
- Ensure that any difficulties with other agencies do not interfere with a client's treatment.
- Review the revised client contract with treatment programs.

¹ The exact wording is:
For drug clients: "...and no more than one urine tested positive in any 30-day period after the first month..."
For alcohol clients: "...and no more than one occurrence of intoxication per month may occur subsequently..."

CHAPTER 7 - TASC IMPACT ON TREATMENT

TASC programs can have both positive and negative impact on treatment programs that they utilize. The following possibilities exist:

- TASC can become a significant source of clients - in the extreme, the near sole source of referrals.
- TASC can become a significant source of clients who have not been previously involved in treatment. The TASC alternative is responsible for the decision to enter treatment now.
- TASC can become a significant source of clients who succeed in treatment. If TASC clients succeed with a greater frequency than non-TASC clients, it can be argued that the extra leverage of compliance with criminal justice stipulations under TASC supervision results in greater success.
- TASC can become a significant source of criminal justice contacts. Even if TASC does not provide a treatment program with a large volume of referrals, TASC can still impact substantially if the agency uses TASC as a clearinghouse for criminal justice information for both TASC and non-TASC clients. Indications of this impact would be reduced court-related work, reduced escort services, and increased use of TASC as a source of information and referrals.
- TASC can have a negative impact through burdensome paperwork requirements or interference in the treatment process. The amount of paperwork that an agency will complete, and the level of interactions with TASC that an agency will encourage, will reflect that agency's perception of TASC's positive impact and the extent of its usefulness in the treatment process.
- TASC can become a source of inappropriate, difficult, or troublesome clients. If TASC clients fail in treatment more readily than others, or disrupt treatment for other clients, the conclusion might be that this is attributable to the lack of motivation or manipulative nature of TASC clients.

Several of the above impact issues have already been addressed in the preceding chapter on TASC's relationship with treatment programs. Comments of treatment staff interviewed definitely discounted the possibility that this TASC program is having a negative impact on its treatment programs. TASC paperwork is not welcomed by most of the agencies, but it is not resented either. Interactions between treatment staff and TASC staff are greatly

encouraged by treatment. Obviously, TASC is viewed as an asset to the treatment process. TASC clients have been described both as easier to deal with and somewhat more difficult to deal with than others, but their presence has never been depicted as a negative influence on treatment.

The previous chapter also discusses the perceptions of treatment personnel as to how much of a positive impact TASC has had on their program. In this section, the evaluators present actual data to illustrate what that impact has been. Through the Westchester County Department of Mental Health, the evaluators were permitted access to monthly census reports submitted by all drug and alcohol treatment programs in the County. In addition to the census figures for the drug programs, the evaluators were also given access to client characteristics of the monthly admissions. The evaluators selected three months of program admissions prior to the existence of TASC for a baseline comparison. Data from the three months - January, March, and June of 1979, - were hand-coded by the evaluators for seven methadone maintenance programs, eight drug-free programs, and seven alcohol programs.

Alcohol Programs

Table 7-1 presents the number of admissions that alcohol programs had during the three sample months. It also shows the number of TASC admissions to each of the programs. (All references to TASC admissions in this chapter include all clients admitted to treatment through May, 1980, plus some of June's admissions.) For two of the programs, there were no TASC admissions. However, the evaluators were informed by Westchester County Medical Center staff that admissions to their detoxification unit (one of the programs where TASC had no admissions) must be processed through the psychiatric unit, which would present difficulties for TASC. According to TASC administration, however, this situation has not existed for the last six months, it being further claimed that at least four persons have been admitted to Detox via TASC during this time. The other alcohol program to which TASC did not admit clients, Halfway Houses of Westchester, Inc., is very small. During the three sample months, this program never had a client census of over nine persons. Therefore, each of these programs would be problematic for TASC to impact upon.

For four out of five of the other alcohol programs, the volume of TASC admissions is greater than the volume of monthly admissions for any of the sample months. If TASC admissions represented a full year of referrals that were admitted to treatment, TASC admissions would represent 13.0 percent of admissions to the five agencies. Since these figures do not nearly reflect a full year for TASC (for the last TASC site, they only represent a maximum of four months' referrals), TASC impact on these alcohol programs probably exceeds 13.0 percent by quite a bit. This data confirms that TASC is having a positive impact on alcohol treatment programs as a supplier of admissions.

Methadone Maintenance Programs

Table 7-2 presents similar information, but this chart is devoted to methadone maintenance programs. There is only one methadone program to which TASC has not had a client admitted. This program, however, is located in the area where TASC was established most recently. For the other six agencies, TASC admissions ranged from one to thirteen, and averaged a little more than five per program. TASC has not yet had the numerical impact on methadone programs that it has had on alcohol programs. If these admissions represented a full year of TASC, TASC clients would be 4.3 percent of methadone program admissions at these agencies. After a full year with all units operating, the percentage will obviously be greater.

The evaluators also compared client characteristics for TASC admissions to methadone maintenance programs to those of the admissions during the three sample months. This comparison was done to see if the TASC clients looked the same as the other methadone clients, or if TASC was involving different sorts of persons in this type of treatment. Table 7-3 presents the findings.

Some notable distinctions between the two groups were found. TASC clients were older than others - 14.8 percent of TASC client admissions were 25 years old or younger, 34.9 percent of sample admissions were in this younger age group. TASC clients were somewhat more female - 33.3 percent as opposed to 25.8 percent. The racial balance of admissions was reversed for the two groups. Over sixty percent of TASC admissions were black, while over sixty percent of the sample admissions were white. Based on the results of this comparison, the evaluators conclude that TASC is having an impact on methadone programs by involving persons in this type of treatment who would not otherwise have entered it.

Drug Free Programs

Table 7-4 presents data on seven outpatient drug free treatment programs and compares this to TASC admissions to the programs. TASC has never had clients admitted to two of the programs. One of the two, Cage, is actually a teen center more than a treatment program and many TASC clients would be too old for this agency. The other program, Pelham Guidance Council, did not have any admissions for two of the three sample months either. In addition, the Pelham program focuses on prevention and early intervention and may not be appropriate for many TASC clients. A third program merged with another since TASC's inception, thereby blunting any possible TASC impact on total admissions.

The number of TASC referrals to the remaining four programs ranged from one client - to another program with a main thrust towards prevention, to eighteen clients - to a multi-site counseling program. Referrals averaged nine per agency. If TASC admissions represented a full operational year, they would be 8.1 percent of admissions to these programs. TASC's impact, therefore, is certainly at least 10 percent of these agencies.

The largest Westchester County drug free program, the Renaissance Project, was considered separately in Table 7-5. This was considered individually for two reasons: because TASC utilizes it more frequently than any other program, and because the introduction of TASC had a different type of impact on this program. Renaissance was the only program, prior to TASC, that was heavily involved in the courts. When TASC began operations, Renaissance withdrew almost entirely from the courts in anticipation of receiving the same type of court referrals that they had been attracting through TASC. The data in Table 7-5 test for this impact.

In three sample months of 1979, the Renaissance residential facility at Ellenville received nine admissions. In less than one year, TASC referred and admitted twenty-four clients to the program. Certainly not all of the 1979 Ellenville residents were court referred. It seems apparent, therefore, that TASC is admitting even more court clients to the Renaissance residence than had been previously placed through their own outreach efforts. (TASC has not been in operation long enough to have any admissions to the other residential Renaissance facility - Re-entry.)

There are four primary Renaissance sites for outpatient drug free treatment - New Rochelle, Port Chester, and Yonkers have been constant. Prior to TASC, there was a facility in Mount Kisco. This has relocated in Bedford Hills. TASC has accounted for fifty-three referrals to the four sites in less than one year. Even if the TASC figure represented one fully operational year, TASC would be supplying Renaissance outpatient programs with nearly thirty percent of their clients. TASC is obviously identifying, referring, and admitting the court clients that the Renaissance workers would have if they had remained in court.

Table 7-6 examines the client characteristics of the admissions to the drug free programs (Renaissance and the seven others) from the three sample months. The characteristics are compared to those of all TASC clients admitted to drug free programs. Again, this type of chart is utilized to see if TASC is involving different sorts of clients in treatment. Some differences did emerge.

TASC clients in drug free programs are older than the general population from this 1979 sample - 43.3 percent of TASC clients were older than twenty-five years old, and only 22.3 percent of others were in this age bracket. Drug free TASC clients had a slightly higher frequency to be male and white than sample clients did. The largest distinction between the groups was seen in primary drug of abuse. One-third of the TASC clients abused alcohol primarily,¹ as opposed to less than three percent of the general drug free treatment population. The incidence of primary opiate abuse was nearly even for the two groups. Almost thirty percent of the 1979 sample considered marijuana their primary drug. Only 16.2 percent of TASC clients were primary marijuana abusers. On the basis of this chart, one can conclude that TASC is admitting more persons who are older, with a higher incidence of alcohol problems, to drug free treatment programs than had previously been admitted.

Impact Statements

As a result of the analyses in this chapter, the following statements can be made about the impact of TASC on treatment programs in Westchester County:

- The volume of TASC referrals to all sorts of treatment programs is notable. TASC is obviously a recognizable source of clients. Numerically, TASC has had a greater impact on alcohol programs than drug programs. Also, impact has been greater on drug free programs as opposed to methadone programs.
- TASC is referring different sorts of persons to drug programs than they traditionally receive. This is particularly true with regard to methadone programs. Without TASC, many of these persons may not have entered treatment. (Data were not available on persons in alcohol treatment.)
- TASC is definitely a significant source of criminal justice contacts for the Renaissance Project. Renaissance virtually stopped previous court activity to rely upon TASC referrals. The volume of admissions from TASC referrals is very high. The impact of TASC has been very positive.

¹ Drug free outpatient programs are more likely to admit persons having mixed addictions (i.e., drug and alcohol) than are alcohol treatment programs.

Table 7-1

MONTHLY ADMISSIONS AND TASC ADMISSIONS
TO ALCOHOL TREATMENT PROGRAMS

<u>Alcohol Program</u>	<u>Monthly Admissions</u>			<u>TASC Admissions</u>
	<u>January 1979</u>	<u>March 1979</u>	<u>June 1979</u>	
Rockland Psychiatric Center Programs	1	6	6	22
Westchester County Medical Center (OP)*	41	36	49	51
Westchester County Medical Center (Detox)	36	67	65	0
United Hospital Alcoholic Clinic	24	20	14	34
Halfway Houses of Westchester, Inc.	3	2	3	0
St. Vincent's Clinic	10	10	13	7
Alcoholism Clinic	35	35	33	59
 TOTALS	 150	 176	 183	 173

*Includes outpatient facilities at Valhalla and Ossining.

Table 7-2

MONTHLY ADMISSIONS AND TASC ADMISSIONS
TO METHADONE MAINTENANCE TREATMENT PROGRAMS

<u>Methadone Program</u>	<u>Monthly Admissions</u>			<u>TASC Admissions</u>
	<u>January 1979</u>	<u>March 1979</u>	<u>June 1979</u>	
Guidance Center of New Rochelle MMTP	14	5	19	7
Mount Vernon MMTP	8	5	18	13
Peekskill MMTP	6	3	5	0
St. Joseph's MMTP	10	9	28	5
St. Vincent's MMTP	5	10	5	3
White Plains Hospital MMTP	15	10	15	1
Yonkers General Hospital MMTP	4	3	3	3
TOTALS	62	45	93	32

Table 7-3

COMPARISON OF CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS
TASC CLIENT ADMISSIONS TO METHADONE PROGRAMS
VS.
THREE MONTH SAMPLE* OF CLIENT ADMISSIONS
(in percent)

	AGE					
	≥17	18-21	22-25	26-30	31-40	41+
TASC	0.0	0.0	14.8	59.3	22.2	3.7
Sample	0.0	6.1	26.8	43.4	21.2	2.5

	SEX			RACE		
	Male	Female		White	Black	Hispanic
TASC	66.7	33.3	TASC	33.3	63.0	3.7
Sample	74.2	25.8	Sample	60.1	35.4	4.5

	PRIMARY DRUG OF ABUSE			
	Alcohol	Opiates	Marijuana	Other
TASC	11.1	59.3 **	0.0	29.6
Sample	0.0	97.5	0.0	2.5

*Sample consists of admissions configured in Table 7-2.

**Because of TASC's method of rank-ordering drugs used by seriousness and by frequency, opiates did not appear as the primary drug in some of these cases. However, every case did involve opiate use.

Table 7-4

MONTHLY ADMISSIONS AND TASC ADMISSIONS
TO DRUG FREE OUTPATIENT TREATMENT PROGRAMS

<u>Outpatient Program</u>	<u>Monthly Admissions</u>			<u>TASC Admissions</u>
	<u>January 1979</u>	<u>March 1979</u>	<u>June 1979</u>	
Daytop	25	25	22	7
Cage	5	4	5	0
Larchmont/ Mamaroneck NGC	11	4	4	1
New Rochelle CAA*	2	2	6	-
Pelham NGC	7	0	0	0
Westchester Community Opportunity Program	4	4	3	18
Yonkers YSA	7	0	5	11
TOTALS	61	39	45	37

*Agency is now part of the Westchester Community Opportunity Program.

Table 7-5

MONTHLY ADMISSIONS AND TASC ADMISSIONS
TO THE RENAISSANCE PROJECT (Drug Free)

<u>Renaissance Program</u>	<u>Monthly Admissions</u>			<u>TASC Admissions</u>
	<u>January 1979</u>	<u>March 1979</u>	<u>June 1979</u>	
New Rochelle	3	1	2	11
Port Chester	4	9	1	7
Yorktown Heights	6	4	4	N/A
Yonkers	4	7	5	31
Ellenville*	3	2	4	24
Re-entry*	0	0	0	N/A
Jail	0	0	0	N/A
Mount Kisco	4	2	4	0
Bedford Hills	N/A	N/A	N/A	4
TOTALS	24	25	20	77

*Residential Facilities

Table 7-6

COMPARISON OF CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS
TASC CLIENT ADMISSIONS TO DRUG FREE PROGRAMS
VS.
THREE MONTH SAMPLE* OF CLIENT ADMISSIONS
(in percent)

	AGE					
	≥17	18-21	22-25	26-30	31-40	41+
TASC	4.8	30.8	21.2	20.2	18.3	4.8
Sample	29.8	28.4	19.4	16.6	5.7	0.0

SEX			RACE		
	Male	Female		White	Black Hispanic
TASC	85.7	14.3	TASC	62.6	32.7 4.7
Sample	78.5	21.5	Sample	59.3	36.5 4.2

PRIMARY DRUG OF ABUSE				
	Alcohol	Opiates	Marijuana	Other
TASC	33.3	32.4	16.2	18.0
Sample	2.8	33.2	29.4	34.6

*Sample consists of admissions configured
in Table 7-4 and Table 7-5.

CHAPTER 8 - COST ANALYSIS

The costs of Westchester County TASC are analyzed from three different perspectives:

- Cost Effectiveness
What are the actual expenditures by function in relation to the services delivered to each client? How reasonable are these expenditures?
- Cost Comparison
Are the costs associated with the operations of the Westchester County TASC project comparable to the costs of other TASC programs?
- Cost Benefit
To what extent are Westchester County TASC's operational expenses offset by savings resulting from TASC activities?

Cost Effectiveness

Based on operating costs incurred by Westchester County TASC during the first eight months of client service delivery (August, 1979 through March, 1980), the evaluators project that TASC's total expenditures for its first twelve months of service delivery will be approximately \$244,965.05. This amount includes a \$23,000.00 yearly salary for an assistant district attorney to aid with TASC's entrance into the criminal justice system. Deducting this start-up cost, the actual TASC program operations expenditures amount to \$221,965.05 for the first year. Using personnel costs as a base, approximate functional costs per month were determined to be as follows:

Administration.....	\$ 3,871.48
Case Management.....	14,625.61

In order to assess the reasonableness of these expenditures, the evaluators conducted a process transaction analysis. A thirty case sample was selected from Yonkers Court. Fifteen active clients and fifteen terminated clients were randomly chosen. ECTA staff members extracted all personal interaction and case management activities from the selected files. Personal interactions were defined as direct communication between a TASC worker and a client (person-to-person or telephone) and physical meetings by a TASC worker with collateral persons (judge, treatment counselor, etc.) on a particular client's behalf. Case management activities were defined as all other case-related actions - telephone calls to collateral persons, reports, letters, and case reviews. While extracting these activities

from the files, the evaluators also collected data concerning client attendance at treatment and results of urinalysis, also for use in this analysis.

The data collected from the thirty files were analyzed to assess the level and nature of TASC service activities and the costs associated with these activities. Table 8-1 presents the evaluators' findings with respect to the number of service hours that will have been expended by the case managers on a TASC client after particular periods of TASC involvement. Service hours for each month are subdivided into personal interaction and case management hours. Cumulative figures for total service hours by month are also noted. Table 8-2 presents client treatment attendance and urinalysis results in the same format - by month of TASC participation.

On the basis of these findings, the evaluators are able to make several statements about the expected level of client services over various lengths of time in TASC. If a client remains in TASC for four months, it is estimated that he will receive 8.19 hours of service from TASC, of which 44.3 percent will be in personal interactions, and 55.7 percent will be case management activities. After eight months in TASC, it is estimated that a client will receive nearly thirteen hours of service, of which 69.0 percent will be case management activities as opposed to 31.0 percent in personal interactions. In an average month, it is estimated that a client will attend ten treatment sessions. Treatment attendance does not vary much across month of participation. Urinalysis results, on the other hand, do change with time. Of the client cases selected for the transaction analysis, none had any positive urines after the third month of TASC participation. Urines were taken with slightly less frequency after five months of participation.

Table 8-3 places the Westchester County TASC program's average client service hours in a comparative context. This chart compares the average service hours that a TASC client has received after six months of involvement in the Westchester program with the similar figures for seven other TASC projects. Figures are displayed for both personal interactions and case management activities, as well as total service hours. Of the eight projects, Westchester TASC ranks sixth in total service hours provided, seventh in personal interactions and fourth in case management hours.

The next step in this analysis was to select a month that represented "mature" TASC operations and determine the number of clients in their first, second, third, etc., month of participation in TASC. These figures were then multiplied by the average

service hours for each sub-group presented in Table 8-1. The number of hours case managers expended each month in client services can then be computed. The month selected was June, 1980, and cases from Yonkers Court provided the sample.

The final step in the analysis entailed dividing the monthly costs of Yonkers' case management by the total number of service hours delivered by the Yonkers' case managers during June, 1980. The figure that results represents the cost per service hour of the TASC Yonkers case managers.

On the basis of this analysis, the evaluators were able to make the following statements about Westchester County TASC's cost effectiveness:

- Client acquisition, evaluation, and monitoring cost approximately \$14,625.61 per month. One-quarter of operational personnel are assigned to Yonkers Court. The Yonkers unit monthly cost for these functions, therefore, is \$3,656.40. Case managers from Yonkers provided 132.14 client service hours in June, 1980, for an average expense of \$27.67 per service hour. This figure is very close to the Medical Assistance reimbursed rate of \$25.00 per service hour for treatment services which is used in many states. This is a very reasonable figure for a first year TASC program functioning in the case management mold. Several multi-unit TASC projects have per unit costs that are equal or greater to this figure. In addition, this project has the added expense of being so decentralized. It also must be noted that the evaluators were only accounting for service hours provided to TASC clients that were actually admitted to a treatment program. If service hours for clients that were not yet placed in treatment and for clients that failed before beginning treatment were also included, the expense per service hour would be even lower. The evaluators considered the activities accomplished during these service hours to be very purposeful.
- Administrative costs of Westchester County TASC are approximately \$3,871.48 per month. These costs are lower than those of most of the TASC projects included in national studies. The proportion of total expenditures spent for administration by Westchester County TASC is less than the median administrative expenditure found in the National TASC Evaluation (20.9 percent vs. 26.9 percent). There are two major reasons for this:
 - . The assistant director functions as a line supervisor rather than as administrative personnel.
 - . The salary of the assistant district attorney (\$23,000 per year) that is paid for by TASC is not included in administrative costs. However, this contact has provided TASC with many linkages in the CJS that often absorb great amounts of administrative time for a young TASC program to develop.

In sum, the evaluators conclude that Westchester County TASC is approaching cost effectiveness. The purposeful activities of the case managers have and will continue to allow them to handle a sufficient volume of clients to achieve a consistently acceptable level of costs per service hour. The administrative costs of the program are already low and the overhead of the prosecutor's salary will end with the grant.

Cost Comparison

For purposes of cost comparison, the evaluators again defined "TASC clients" as acceptable TASC clients that actually entered treatment. Based on figures at the end of eleven months of service delivery, the evaluators projected that at the end of the first Westchester County TASC year there will be: 235 active clients; 130 total discharges; 18 successful completions. Table 8-4 details Westchester County TASC's projected costs for two cost classifications, using the seven "newer" TASC programs from the National Evaluation for the purposes of this analysis. Since operational costs are found to decrease substantially over time, considering only these newer programs provides a more accurate picture of Westchester County TASC's relative costs.

The following observations can be made from Table 8-4:

- Westchester County TASC's costs are very close to the median national costs per TASC client.
- Westchester County TASC's cost per successful client is slightly less than the median national cost.

The total first year projected expenditures (including the assistant district attorney salary) were used for these calculations and still the Westchester program showed comparably acceptable costs. These costs are particularly remarkable when the expense of the decentralized operation is considered. Also, the cost per TASC client would be somewhat lower yet if the figures included clients who never entered treatment after being accepted into TASC.

This analysis further confirms the evaluators' conclusion that the TASC staff engages only in activities and services that have definite purpose. This allows them sufficient time to handle enough clients to be cost efficient.

Cost Benefit

The costs associated with the operation of a program like TASC must be measured against the benefits to society. In the case of this TASC program, is it beneficial to Westchester County to have a TASC program to intersect with drug and alcohol involved offenders?

The National TASC Evaluation identified two types of cost savings that were likely to result from the addition of TASC in the criminal justice and treatment processes:

Short term -

- . Reduced pre-trial costs because of a smaller pre-trial detention population.
- . Reduction in court costs either because of deferred prosecution or faster resolution of cases.
- . Lower incarceration costs because of increased use of probation with a TASC condition.
- . Reduction in societal monetary losses from drug-related crime.
- . Less money spent on illicit drugs as more drug abusers enter closely monitored treatment.

Long term -

- . Positive contributions of TASC graduates to society resulting from gainful employment, continued education, etc.
- . Lower crime-related costs to society.
- . Lower drug-related costs to society.

At this point in time, Westchester County TASC has directed its energies towards long-term goals. TASC has been viewed by the justice system as it perceives itself. This is as a legitimizing agent for conditional discharges, rather than a vehicle for increased use. Although TASC has not set a priority on reducing pre-trial detention, it has allowed some savings in this area through TASC's impact on bail decisions. There are no figures, though, to justify TASC through short-term cost benefits. The majority of current clients would not have faced incarceration possibilities.

There is a possibility for short-term TASC cost benefit in the future. If the penitentiary population continues to build as is expected, TASC should be able to have substantial impact on it. However, in the meantime, TASC's cost benefit must wait for the availability of long-term treatment outcome and follow-up data and client recidivism rates.

Table 8-1

AVERAGE CLIENT SERVICE HOURS
ACROSS MONTH OF TASC PARTICIPATION
BY TYPE OF ACTIVITY

<u>ACTIVITY</u>	<u>MONTH OF PARTICIPATION</u>									
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>
Personal Interaction	2.14	0.61	0.45	0.43	0.11	0.15	0.03	0.07	0.13	0.00
Case Management	1.41	1.08	1.03	1.04	0.95	0.96	1.20	1.20	1.08	1.13
Total Service Hours	3.55	1.69	1.48	1.47	1.06	1.11	1.23	1.27	1.21	1.13
Cumulative Service Hours	3.55	5.24	6.72	8.19	9.25	10.36	11.59	12.86	14.07	15.20

Table 8-2

TREATMENT ATTENDANCE AND URINALYSIS RESULTS
ACROSS MONTH OF TASC PARTICIPATION

	<u>MONTH OF PARTICIPATION</u>								
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
Treatment Sessions Attended	8.42	10.42	10.64	11.69	11.00	11.09	11.67	7.40	10.67
Treatment Sessions Missed	0.42	0.33	0.86	0.50	1.08	0.64	1.00	0.40	1.33
Cumulative Attended	8.42	18.84	29.48	41.17	52.17	63.26	74.93	82.33	93.00
Cumulative Missed	0.42	0.75	1.61	2.11	3.19	3.83	4.83	5.23	6.56
Cumulative Scheduled	8.84	19.59	31.09	43.28	55.36	67.09	79.76	87.56	99.56
Urines - Negative	3.00	3.86	3.29	3.75	3.25	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50
Urines - Positive	1.00	1.43	0.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cumulative Negative	3.00	6.86	10.15	13.90	17.15	19.65	22.15	24.65	27.15
Cumulative Positive	1.00	2.43	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Cumulative Urines	4.00	9.29	13.15	16.90	20.15	22.65	25.15	27.65	30.15

130

Table 8-3

COMPARISON OF WESTCHESTER COUNTY TASC
AVERAGE CLIENT SERVICE HOURS
WITH THOSE OF OTHER TASC PROGRAMS
FOR A CLIENT THAT HAS BEEN IN TASC FOR SIX MONTHS

	<u>Westchester County TASC</u>	<u>Program A</u>	<u>Program B</u>	<u>Program C¹</u>	<u>Program D</u>	<u>Program E</u>	<u>Program F</u>	<u>Program G</u>
Personal Interaction	3.89	7.76	6.66	4.00	8.00	2.53	4.35	8.70
Case Management	6.47	5.27	6.89	11.00	5.06	4.23	4.89	13.38
	10.36	13.03	13.55	15.00	13.06	6.76	9.24	22.08

¹ Figures are estimates

Table 8-4

PROJECTED ANNUAL PROCESS UNIT COSTS
FOR WESTCHESTER COUNTY TASC
COMPARED WITH
SEVEN "NEWER" TASC PROGRAMS
FROM THE NATIONAL TASC EVALUATION

<u>Process Indicator</u>	<u>Westchester TASC Costs</u>	<u>Median National Costs</u>	<u>National Range</u>
Total Cost Per TASC			
Client ¹	\$671	\$ 638	\$455-1,159
Total Cost Per Successful			
TASC Client ²	\$968	\$1,128	\$715-1,863

¹ Cost/Active Clients At Year End
Plus Year's Discharges

² Cost/Active Clients At Year End
Plus Year's Successes

CHAPTER 9 - TASC INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

The Phase II National TASC Evaluation concluded that "poor file management and inadequate information management are widespread among....TASC projects...." The logistical problems that confront all new TASC programs are likely to be compounded when dealing with a decentralized model like Westchester TASC. Not only must client data be recorded accurately and in a uniform manner at several sites, but the question of how to ensure accurate and timely transmittal of these data to a centralized monitor for report purposes must also be addressed. Accordingly, the evaluators made information management their first priority during the first year evaluation period.

In reviewing TASC information management, the evaluators attempted to answer four questions:

- Are client files sufficiently well-organized to meet all case management and report needs?
- Can TASC management easily access valid reports concerning aggregate client flow?
- Does TASC routinely collect and aggregate the entire range of client variables needed for the analyses to be performed for this evaluation?
- Does TASC have the capability to access and aggregate information that will permit self-evaluation on a continuing basis?

In their "Suggested Information Management Protocol for Westchester TASC," the evaluators presented several minimum procedure requirements for configuring a workable centralized information system. The optimal client file system suggested by the evaluators consisted of the following components:

- Client log books for each TASC district, to be maintained at the central office.
- Looseleaf books for recording client attendance and urine results reported by treatment programs on a regular basis. A separate looseleaf book organized according to treatment programs would enable the TASC monitor to collect information on all clients in a single contact with each program.
- Looseleaf books for storing discharge reports and weekly court activity reports received from each district.
- A cardbox for filing limited demographic information on all screened individuals, to be used for purposes of identification in case of ambiguity.

The evaluators also suggested that TASC formulate demographic and dispositional codes for recording client data, and that specific file maintenance procedures be adhered to in order to ensure consistency in the use of data codes and accountability for the storing and reporting of client information.

At the present time, it is apparent that Westchester TASC has indeed developed a workable information management system to meet both its own needs, and those of the evaluators. Most of the evaluators' suggestions have been implemented with modifications made where appropriate. The information system is truly centralized, with case managers being required to call the central office for a TASC client number each time a screening is completed. Log sheets are regularly transmitted to the central office, and the coded formats used for recording client data are perfectly suited to statistical analysis, both for the purposes of this evaluation and for TASC's ongoing self-evaluation. Responsibility for central maintenance of log sheets has been vested in a single individual.

The evaluators were most impressed by TASC's efforts at standardizing its file maintenance and information management procedures. A ten-page manual describing the purpose of each form contained in client files and the procedures to be followed in the completion of all forms was prepared by TASC administration and distributed among staff. The files themselves are organized according to a fixed document sequence and contain the following forms:

- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| . Screening Report | . Referral for Treatment |
| . Consents | . Treatment Program Response Report |
| . Participation Agreement | . Attendance Report |
| . Needs Assessment | . Urine Report |
| . Status Report | . Warning Notice |
| . Delayed Disposition Report | . Monthly Treatment Progress Report |
| . Court Activity Report | . Monthly Progress Report to the Court |
| . Arrest Report | . Termination Notice |
| . Case Manager's Notes | . Change of Treatment Modality Report |

A short while after operations began, TASC administration became aware of a need to streamline the screening and diagnostic processes. Forms have undergone revision, with the screening form reduced from three pages to two pages, and the needs assessment form reduced from five pages to three pages. The current file configuration represents a workable balance between the often conflicting needs for complete documentation and uninterrupted client process.

In sum, Westchester TASC has succeeded in overcoming not only the information management hurdles that confront many new TASC programs, but also the related information recordation and transmittal problems that are often associated with decentralized programs. Client information forms have been developed with actual process in mind, and the current system satisfies both documentation and process requirements. Westchester TASC will, itself, be able to undertake, on an ongoing basis, the types of analysis used for this evaluation.

END