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Report to the Eighty-ninth Arkansas General Assembly
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Dear Legislative Council:

In accordance with Act 742 of 2011, the Drug Court Division of the Administrative Office of the Courts has enclosed an electronic copy of the annual report of the Arkansas Drug Courts. A copy of the report is posted on the Judiciary website at: https://courts.arkansas.gov/drugcourt/index.cfm.

Thank you for your continued support of our state drug court programs.

Sincerely,

Kari E. Powers, State Drug Court Coordinator
Supreme Court of Arkansas

JIM HANNAH
CHIEF JUSTICE

625 MARSHALL STREET
LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS 72201

PHONE (501) 682-6873
FAX (501) 683-4006
EMAIL jim.hannah@arkansas.gov

September 5, 2012

Dear Member of the Arkansas General Assembly:

It is with great pride and pleasure that I forward to you the annual report of the Administrative Office of the Courts on Arkansas Drug Courts.

As chair of the State Drug Court Advisory Committee, I have watched the General Assembly’s support for drug courts increase. We, as the judiciary, are proud to be an important member of this partnership with you and the executive branch. We currently have 42 adult drug courts in the state, thirteen juvenile drug courts, and eight DWI courts.

Drug court programs can make a positive difference in communities. Drug courts divert offenders from the correctional institutions and provide an intensive substance abuse treatment and monitoring system that can result in the rehabilitation of the individual. The typical drug court graduate is a hard working, sober, responsible, taxpayer citizen that has been reunited with his or her family. Drug court judges frequently tell me how personally rewarding they find their work in the state drug court program despite the fact that these duties are in addition to their regular caseload.

Unfortunately, despite having the support of their communities, government agencies, and legislative representatives, Arkansas drug courts are facing a funding crisis. For the FY 2012, treatment funding has been reduced to one-third of what was provided during prior legislative sessions. Five-Hundred Thousand dollars was appropriated for drug court treatment funding, to be dispersed among 42 drug courts. A short-term residential stay for one client can cost $5,000. Many courts in the state receive only $8,000 for an entire year. It is apparent that the current funding cannot possibly sustain a successful drug court for a year.

I encourage you to try to attend a drug court graduation ceremony in your area. There you will witness the dramatic changes that the program can make in individual lives. We should all be proud that our state has one of the highest success rates in the country for program graduates—92.5%!

Thank you for your continued support of our state drug court programs.

Sincerely,

Jim Hannah
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I. Introduction

During the last legislative session, the 88th General Assembly approved Act 570 of 2011, a comprehensive corrections reform bill that contained provisions regarding drug courts, their program development, program criteria and measurements for success. Over the last year, Arkansas drug courts have been incorporating these new provisions while continuing to provide innovative and effective treatment to those suffering from addiction. Drug court programs also continue to provide services despite on-going struggles with adequate and stable treatment funding. While the majority of state officials voice support for the work of drug courts, the national economic downturn has seen drug court treatment funding has been cut to one-third the amount from the previous years.

Due to the decline in the national and state economic health, budget cuts reduced the treatment funding for drug court participants to $500,000.00 in 2011, compared to $1.5 million and $3 million in previous years. 2012 does not reflect an improvement in this figure, as treatment funding stands again at $500,000.00. This amount is disbursed among all 42 drug courts statewide. The legislature also declined to provide any funding for new drug court programs. They did approve five more locations for new drug court programs, but until revenue is established to fund these programs, they will remain on hold.

Although they do not receive any additional compensation for their leadership of the drug court program, circuit judges have generously volunteered to preside over the labor intensive drug courts that provide many addicts with their “first” chance to access substance abuse treatment and become responsible, taxpaying citizens. With a recidivism rate for graduates of only 7.5%, the drug court program has proven itself to be a wise investment on the part of the General Assembly.

The following report provides an overview of the current drug court program in Arkansas, as it has evolved from the single court in 1994 to the present, with a state advisory committee chaired by the Chief Justice of the Arkansas Supreme Court and an active state drug court professionals association. Section II provides some insight into future directions and needs for the drug court program to remain strong in the state. Section III provides updated information on the prevalence of substance abuse in Arkansas, current information on the correlation of substance abuse to crime and the impact such has on prisons, and the rationale for the creation of drug courts in our state. In addition, there is background information covering the national movement to support drug courts that began in 1989 in Dade County, Florida.
A copy of this report can be accessed and downloaded from the Drug Court page of the Arkansas Judiciary at: http://courts.arkansas.gov/drugcourt.
The information and data in this report was collected in July 2012. For further information, please contact the:

Administrative Office of the Courts
625 Marshall Street
Little Rock, AR 72201
501 682-9400

If the reader has any questions concerning the contents of this report or the drug court program in general, they can be addressed to the Drug Court Division of the Administrative Office of the Courts. The email for the state coordinator is: kari.powers@arkansas.gov.
II. History of Drug Courts

A. Overview of Drug Courts in the United States

First begun in Dade County, Florida in 1988, drug courts became a national trend during the late 1990s to address the overwhelming rise in illicit drug use and the resultant overcrowding in prison systems. Today, there are over 2100 problem solving courts in the U.S. in various stages of development. Over 1,040 of these are adult drug court programs. Recent years have seen an expansion of this model into the family courts and juvenile court settings as well as specialized dockets for veterans, homeless and persons convicted of DWIs.

A drug court program is typically defined as a “highly structured judicial intervention process for substance abuse treatment of eligible offenders which requires successful completion of the drug court program treatment in lieu of incarceration.” Although each court operates with some degree of flexibility, the purpose behind the creation of such courts is to reduce crime by changing the defendant’s substance abuse behavior. In exchange for full participation in the treatment program to graduation, charges are frequently dismissed or reduced, thus avoiding costly incarceration and additional societal costs, such as welfare payments for the defendant’s family and increased medical costs associated with substance abusers. In the meantime, while the offender processes through the drug court program, he/she remains employed in the community and often is required to perform community service work as a condition of his/her program participation.

A drug court team consists of the judge and court staff, the prosecuting attorney, the public defender or private counsel representing the defendant, treatment counselors, intake or assessment officers, and probation or parole personnel. Residential treatment programs are contracted for by the court with community providers. Out-patient treatment and group therapy are provided by the treatment counselors employed by the Department of Community Corrections. Most courts require attendance at support group programs, usually based on the 12 steps to recovery. Drug court treatment programs are rigorous in their requirements and frequently are presented in phases or stages, with advancement following completion of the earlier portion of the program. Treatment includes frequent mandatory drug testing and status hearings where the offender must reappear before the court. Prescribed sanctions and appropriate rewards are an important component to a successful drug court program. Much of the literature on drug courts indicates that the ultimate success or failure of a program often hinges on the close interpersonal interactions between the judge and the offender throughout the course of treatment. Those courts with lower success rates are ones that rotate a panel of judges through the drug court system in their jurisdiction.

Drug courts operate in two ways, either allowing an eligible offender to enter treatment prior to being charged with the crime (pre-adjudication) or, after a plea to the court, as a condition of probation (post-adjudication). Not all offenders are eligible for
drug court participation. Typically, only those charged with non-violent crimes with a demonstrated chemical dependence on alcohol or an illicit drug can be considered by the program. Most courts exclude any defendants required to register as a sexual offender. Drug courts vary on whether offenders with prior criminal records can be considered for the program.

Since the rapid growth in drug courts of the late 1990s and early 2000s, the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) has supported the establishment of a National Drug Court Institute to provide support to drug courts in operation throughout the United States, as well as a professional organization known as the National Association of Drug Court Professionals (NADCP). These entities, along with a Drug Court Clearinghouse and Technical Assistance Project operated in the Justice Programs Office at American University, the NADCP and the Office of Justice Programs developed and published the ten key components that define drug courts. These ten basic elements provide the skeletal structure upon which most drug courts are formed. These components were incorporated into the Arkansas Drug Court Act of 2007, Act 1022, and have become requirements for drug courts operating in the state.

**KEY COMPONENTS OF DRUG COURTS**

1. Drug courts integrate alcohol and other drug treatment services with justice system case processing.

2. Using a non-adversarial approach, prosecution and defense counsel promote public safety protecting participants’ due process rights.

3. Eligible participants are identified early and promptly placed in the drug court program.

4. Drug courts provide access to a continuum of alcohol, drug, and other related treatment and rehabilitation services.

5. Abstinence is monitored by frequent alcohol and other drug testing.

6. A coordinated strategy governs drug court responses to participants’ compliance.

7. Ongoing judicial interaction with each drug court participant is essential.

8. Monitoring and evaluation measures the achievement of program goals and gauge effectiveness.

9. Continuing interdisciplinary education promotes effective drug court planning, implementation, and operations.

10. Forging partnerships among drug courts, public agencies, and community-based organizations generates local support and enhances drug court program effectiveness.
B. Development of Drug Courts in Arkansas

Arkansas' first drug court was established in 1994 in the Sixth Judicial District (Pulaski County) as a pre-adjudication program then known at S.T.E.P. (Supervised Treatment and Education Program). In operation as a pilot program until 1999, S.T.E.P. and the successor drug court program known as P.A.C. (Post-Adjudication Drug Court) were both supported from grants awarded by the Office of Justice Programs Drug Courts Program Office requiring the courts to follow a treatment modality. Recognizing the effectiveness of the program, when grant funding expired, the Department of Community Correction stepped in to provide support for drug courts.

In addition, since January 2012, Arkansas has thirteen juvenile drug courts that have become operational or continue in operation with funding to support an intake/probation officer. These courts are located in the juvenile division of circuit court and operated in Benton, Pulaski, Washington, Independence, Faulkner, St. Francis, Saline, Garland, Jefferson, Craighead, Hempstead, Pope, Drew and Ouachita Counties. Information concerning Arkansas adult drug courts and their locations is contained in Appendix B. Appendix C contains an Arkansas map displaying the 2012 Arkansas Juvenile Drug Court Program.

Arkansas drug court programs, now growing in their maturity, have become an integral part of the recovery community. Graduation programs are well attended by local officials, legislators, as well as family and friends of the participants. Drug courts routinely host community forums or cook-outs and participate in recovery month activities during the month of September each year. Court anniversaries are marked with celebrations that include drug court graduates, many coming back to share the story of their journey with current drug court participants. Local businesses and employers provide substantial support to Arkansas drug courts in the form of employment, contributions for incentives and monetary support for celebrations. To increase the awareness of the consequences of substance abuse, some drug courts hold hearings in local public schools.

Although Arkansas drug courts have proven themselves quite competitive in obtaining federal grant funding, the majority of the drug courts in Arkansas are dependent on state funds from the Department of Community Correction to operate. As new emphasis has been placed on drug courts by the federal government, many courts have succeeded in obtaining new federal funds for expansion of services in their courts. Some court programs are beginning to secure local community support through “Friends of the Drug Court” programs that solicit contributions and hold fund raisers to support the activities of the court. In 2011, these courts conducted over 82,000 drug tests on approximately 2000 participants. The number of participants has risen from 1426 in December 2006 to over 2100 in 2012. The capacity to grow further is limited by state law that restricts the number of participants per treatment counselor and number of participants per probation officer, necessary quality control measures to assure the adequate monitoring of participants in the program. The lack of additional funds to hire more personnel, as well as a lack of adequate funding to support additional treatment services to participants, also affects future growth of Arkansas drug courts.
On a state level, the courts operate under the guidance of a partnership between the Administrative Office of the Courts, the Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention in the Department of Health, and the Department of Community Corrections. In 2007, the legislature created the position of State Drug Court Coordinator in the Administrative Office of the Courts to develop a centralized management information system, to coordinate state training programs, to prepare reports and oversee evaluation activities. The court coordinator serves as the liaison with DHS and DCC at the state level. The coordinator assists drug courts with training, hosting an annual statewide conference to bring technical experts in drug court programs to the state. In 2008, the coordinator assisted drug courts in establishing the Arkansas Drug Court Professionals Association. The association co-hosts the annual conference and provides a leadership structure for the furtherance of professionalism in the drug court program. The drug court coordinator publishes a quarterly newsletter, *The Line*, posted on the AOC website that provides updates and information concerning drug courts’ activities throughout the state. The state drug court coordinator serves as the Arkansas representative to the national meeting of state drug court coordinators held each year and works with the National Association of Drug Court Professionals to secure support from the Arkansas Congressional delegation to the program in the Department of Justice. Currently, forty-six states, the District of Columbia and two territories have a designated state drug court coordinator, with the majority of these (88%) located in the state court administrator’s office.

C. Judges and Arkansas Drug Courts

Initially, drug courts were created and operated without specific statutory authority. When funds became available, either through a federal grant or from the Department of Community Correction, a drug court program could be initiated. In 1994, there was one drug court in the state. By 2012, there were 42 programs that had been established through the willingness of sitting circuit court judges to take on additional responsibilities in their circuit. In multi-judge judicial districts, judges who preside over the criminal docket frequently transfer appropriate drug related cases to the drug court within that district, thus creating additional cases above the caseload distribution.

Drug court dockets are a specialized docket. Because they require additional time both on and off the bench, they are very labor intensive endeavors for the judge. A successful drug court program must establish the criteria for participation in the court, determine the length and components of the treatment program learn about the evidence-based strategies for treatment and supervision of substance abusing/addicted individuals and determine appropriate sanctions or incentives for participants. All of these elements are integral components to program implementation. Each court must take into account factors specific to its area. Because the drug court program is a diversion of defendants from the regular criminal justice system, each judge must determine the level of community tolerance for the program. While some courts may choose to accept a certain case type, others have chosen to exclude that particular case type.
Once established, the more mature drug courts in Arkansas have seen that local support from the community can encourage the court to take on some of the more difficult defendants, providing these defendants with a second chance rather than seeing them processed through the prison system. The personal attention required of a drug court docket consumes an enormous amount of time from the judge who has regular exchanges with the drug court team members concerning "issues" with each drug court defendant. However, it is this personal attention and relationship that develops during the status hearings in court that has proven to make the drug court program such a success. Repeatedly, research in the field has indicated that the judge-participant relationship is the most important factor for a program that reduces recidivism and rehabilitates addicts in their community. On the following page is a list of the presiding judges and their locations:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult Drug Court Judges’ Names</th>
<th>Judicial District</th>
<th>Counties Served</th>
<th>Congressional District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bentley Story</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>St Francis</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Laser</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Craighead</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Philhours</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Thyer</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Crittenden</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Erwin</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Smith</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Randolph</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Smith</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Chadd Mason</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Sutterfield</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Pope</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon McCain</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Franklin, Johnson</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary McGowan</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Perry, Pulaski</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Williams</td>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Grant, Hot Spring</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan Culpepper</td>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; North</td>
<td>Hempstead, Nevada</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Griffin</td>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; South</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert McCallum</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; East</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Yeargan</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; West</td>
<td>Howard, Pike</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bynum Gibson</td>
<td>10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Ashley, Bradley, Desha, Drew, Chicot</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Pope</td>
<td>10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Ashley, Bradley, Desha, Drew, Chicot</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Henry</td>
<td>11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; East</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin Jones</td>
<td>11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; West</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Michael Fitzhugh</td>
<td>12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Sebastian</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Tabor</td>
<td>12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Sebastian</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Singleton</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin Keaton</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Ouachita</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Chandler</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Webb</td>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Baxter, Boone</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;/3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Don Ramey</td>
<td>15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Conway, Logan, Scott, Yell</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;/4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;/4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;/2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dan Kemp</td>
<td>16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Cleburne, Independence, Stone</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dan Kemp</td>
<td>16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Izard, Fulton</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Hannah</td>
<td>17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Homer Wright</td>
<td>18&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; East</td>
<td>Garland</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.W. Looney</td>
<td>18&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; West</td>
<td>Montgomery, Polk</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Crow</td>
<td>19&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; East</td>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Fryauf</td>
<td>19&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; West</td>
<td>Benton</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Clawson</td>
<td>20&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Faulkner</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Cottrell</td>
<td>21&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Herzfeld</td>
<td>22&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Saline</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Whiteaker</td>
<td>23&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Lonoke</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Drug Court Judges' Names</td>
<td>Judicial District</td>
<td>Counties Served</td>
<td>Congressional District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Hudson</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>St Francis</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Fergus</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Craighead</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey Zimmerman</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Coker</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Pope</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Wright</td>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Hempstead</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa French</td>
<td>10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnest Brown, Jr.</td>
<td>11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Chandler</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Harrod</td>
<td>16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki Cook</td>
<td>18&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Garland</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Fryauf</td>
<td>19&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Benton</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda Wood</td>
<td>20&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Faulkner</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobby McCallister</td>
<td>22&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Saline</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Drug Court Legislation

By 2007, with 37 operational drug courts in the state, the courts began to receive the attention of legislators and gather legislative support. During the 2007 legislative session, with the support of the Drug Court Judges Committee of the Arkansas Judicial Council, legislation was proposed to officially establish the procedure for creating these specialized dockets within the criminal justice system.

Act 1022 of 2007 provided that the administrative judge in each judicial district is empowered to specify the judge that will preside over the drug court docket. This information is part of the annual plan filed by administrative judges of the judicial circuits with the Arkansas Supreme Court. As a general rule, a drug court program serves the county in which it is established. Multi-county judicial circuits may have more than one drug court (one per county). In some cases, a different judge will preside over the drug court for that particular county. In other instances, the same judge will “ride circuit” and preside over all the drug courts within the judicial district. In a few cases, a single court location provides the program to more than one county.

Juvenile drug courts were also authorized in Act 1022 of 2007. By 2009, ten juvenile drug courts were established. In the 2011 legislative session, three more courts were authorized and funded bringing the total number to 13 juvenile drug courts, operational as of January 2012. Juvenile drug courts are becoming more common as the criminal justice community learns of the effectiveness of adult drug courts. The juvenile drug courts provide an additional tool for juvenile judges to more effectively address juveniles with substance abuse/addiction. Another important factor of juvenile drug courts is the inclusion of family services and family accountability.
During the 2009 legislative session, two pieces of legislation affecting drug courts programs were enacted. One clarified the collection and disbursement of drug court program fees for the courts. Prior to passage of Act 490 of 2009, the courts were authorized to collect up to $20 per month as a program user fee but the law provided no direction on where the money was to be remitted or disbursed. Act 490 eliminated the cap on the fee and created a special revenue fund in the county treasury for the drug court program for receipt of these fees. In turn, moneys collected by the court are to then be made available to support the drug court program in that county through the appropriation process of the county quorum court.

Act 1491 of 2009 clarified the authority of the drug court judge to expunge the charges of the drug court participant and provided the additional authority to restore the privilege of carrying a firearm to drug court participants who successfully complete the program. The act mandates the Court to notify the prosecutor of any expungement action, as well as notify the original trial judge.

During the 2011 session, an expansive corrections reform bill was passed. Act 570, The Public Safety Improvement Act, came into effect in July of 2011. Several sections of the act affect drug court programs. Definitions were given for evidence-based practices, validated risk-assessments, and violent felony offenses. Drug courts were charged with using validated risk-assessments to promote early identification of eligible target population. The drug court target population was identified as moderate to high risk participants. The act stated that drug court programs success will be determined by the rate of recidivism of all drug court participants, including participants who do not graduate.

Act 570 also addressed what treatment provisions a drug court must be able to provide to participants, mandating that programs develop clinical assessment capacity, including drug testing, identify participants with a substance addiction and develop a treatment protocol that improves the likelihood of participant success. Within the act, the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) was charged with developing criteria to determine future drug court locations. The AOC was also required to obtain data on the drug court programs within the state regarding the number of participants, applicants, successful applicants, successful participants, reasons for participant failure to complete the program, number of participants arrested for new criminal offenses, number of participants convicted of a new offense, number of participants who violated program conditions and the results of initial risk-needs assessments for participants.

Additional legislation was passed during the 2011 session authorizing district courts to preside over a drug court program under certain circumstances and increasing the court costs levied on misdemeanor possession of marijuana. The increased amount would go into a designated fund that can be used by both adult and juvenile drug courts to pay for treatment costs. Five additional drug courts were authorized as well within the Department of Community Correction budget; however, there is no funding available to establish the new courts.
E. AOC, DCC and OADAP Roles and Responsibilities

Act 1022 of 2007 also established the various roles and responsibilities of the three agencies involved with the Arkansas drug court program: the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC); the Department of Community Corrections (DCC); and the Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention (OADAP) in the Department of Human Services (DHS). Under the Act, the Division of Drug Courts is established within the AOC to provide state-level coordination and support to drug court judges and their programs. The position of state drug court coordinator, also created within the Act, serves as a liaison between drug court judges and the other two state-level agencies, DCC and OADAP. Training and education of drug court judges and other professionals are the responsibility of the division. In addition, the coordinator staffs the professional association and the state advisory committee, a 12 member committee comprised of representatives from the various agencies, and associations affiliated with drug courts. The Act provides for the oversight and disbursement of any funds appropriated to AOC for the maintenance or operation of local drug court programs and for the development of a funding formula by AOC and reviewed by the advisory committee to distribute such funds. The AOC is also charged with the responsibility of developing guidelines for the courts that will serve as a framework for effective local drug court programs and to provide a structure for conducting research and evaluation for drug court program accountability.

The DCC provides personnel for all drug courts. The probation officer and administrative assistant are employed by DCC. In the majority of drug courts, the treatment counselor is also an employee of DCC. DCC provides for the random drug testing performed by drug court personnel. During 2011-82,201 samples were tested from over 2100 participants in the drug court program. 93% of these samples tested negative for presence of illicit substances. This number compares much more favorably against the 63% of negative tests from regular probation and parole samples.

Treatment counselors in the program provide outpatient treatment services, conducting both individual counseling sessions and group therapy sessions for participants. The Act specifies that the ratio for participants to treatment counselor is to be 30 to 1 and for participants to probation officers, 40 to 1, thus assuring intensive monitoring of the program participants. The quality of outpatient treatment services is required to meet the high standards of evidence based practices. The use of evidence based practices within treatment services is also mandated in Act 570.

In addition, DCC serves as the fiscal agent for the drug court treatment fund that pays for intensive short- or long- term residential treatment of drug court participants as ordered by the court. Money is allocated each year in July for courts to access for treatment services using a formula based on a set base amount per court plus a per-case average amount above that base. DCC’s administrative assistants provide drug court judges with monthly updates to assist in monitoring the amount of treatment dollars being expended by the court. In January 2012, the DCC establish two short-term residential treatment facilities for drug court participants. The two facilities are located within the Texarkana community correction center (males) and the Pine Bluff correction center (females). Fifty beds in each facility house drug court participants in need of residential substance abuse treatment for periods ranging from 30 to 90 days.
The OADAP serves as the fiscal agent for funding treatment provided to juveniles in the juvenile drug court programs. In the adult program, OADAP certifies and licenses treatment providers and facilities to be considered for the provision of treatment services in the adult drug court program. OADAP supplies DCC with an ongoing list of licensed providers to assure eligibility for contracting with DCC and providing treatment to the courts. One of the requirements for eligible providers is to be able to provide an open bed for the participant within twenty-four hours of the request. The OADAP also serves as a liaison between the licensed providers and the drug court programs.

F. State Drug Court Advisory Committee

Act 1022 of 2007 created the State Drug Court Advisory Committee to provide state stakeholder organizations an opportunity for input into the development of adult drug courts in the state. Comprised of various directors of state agencies and association, or their designees, the committee meets quarterly to oversee and discuss issues that arise and affect the efficiency and effectiveness of the state adult drug court program. The committee also reviews the drug court treatment funding allocation formula each year and forwards any changes in the rationale behind the formula to the Legislative Council for approval. Each member of the committee serves as the official liaison between the drug court programs and their particular association or agency. Both the House of Representatives and the Senate have members who serve on the committee. Chief Justice Jim Hannah currently serves as the chair of the committee. Current members and their representative organization are found in Appendix D.

G. Arkansas Drug Court Professionals Association (ADCPA)

Act 1022 of 2007 outlined the creation of a professional association to serve the professionals participating throughout the state in drug court programs. Created as a non-profit state association, the ADCPA elected its first slate of officers to serve two-year terms during the 2nd Annual Statewide Drug Court Training Conference held in 2008. Five board members were selected to serve from each of the four congressional districts. From those elected to the board, four officers were elected to the positions of President, Vice-President, Treasurer and Secretary. Membership in the association costs $50.00 annually and is open to anyone who has a regular working relationship with a drug court program in the state. The association holds its annually membership and business meeting during the statewide training conference each spring. The officers of the association serve as an important link for the state with the National Association of Drug Court Professionals (NADCP). The association president, former president and secretary represented the state organization during the NADCP meeting held in Nashville, T.N. in June of 2012. Attendance at these annual national meetings helps to ensure that Arkansas drug court programs remain knowledgeable of the most current research and programmatic developments relating to drug courts.
III. Why Drug Courts?

A. Impact of Substance Abuse on Federal, State and Local Budgets

In a comprehensive 2005 study conducted by the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University, for the first time, the total amount spent by federal, state, and local governments on substance abuse was calculated.

In Arkansas, according to the study, spending on substance abuse ($888 million) is third, behind elementary and secondary education ($2.3 million) and higher education ($2.1 million). Ninety-five cents of every dollar is spent on the burden substance abuse creates on public programs while two cents goes to prevention, roughly three cents to treatment and less than a penny to regulation and compliance. The following table from the report shows the break-down by category of burden spending in the state:

Arkansas
Summary of State Spending on Substance Abuse and Addiction (2005)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burden Spending</th>
<th>State Spending by Category ($000)</th>
<th>Amount Related to Substance Abuse</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>As Percent of State Budget</th>
<th>Per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>417,941.6</td>
<td>417,941.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>127.97</td>
<td>$300.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Corrections</td>
<td>266,924</td>
<td>266,924</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>$194.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Justice</td>
<td>45,747.8</td>
<td>45,747.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>$19.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judiciary</td>
<td>102,869.7</td>
<td>102,869.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>$78.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (Elementary/Secondary)</td>
<td>1,831,969.2</td>
<td>1,831,969.2</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>$211.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>231,357.8</td>
<td>133,199.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>$45.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child/Family Assistance</td>
<td>71,971.0</td>
<td>48,891.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>$37.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Welfare</td>
<td>48,931.8</td>
<td>33,628.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>$33.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Assistance</td>
<td>12,769.1</td>
<td>5,180.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>$19.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health/Developmental Disabilities</td>
<td>113,856.6</td>
<td>40,213.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>$45.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>67,391.2</td>
<td>36,669.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>$43.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Disabilities</td>
<td>46,465.4</td>
<td>3,544.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>33,606.0</td>
<td>6,972.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Workforce</td>
<td>597,299.1</td>
<td>1,761.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>$0.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Regulation/Compliance                                 | 3,626.4                           | 3,626.4                           | 0.1     | 0.11                      | $0.70      |
| Licensing and Control                                 | 3,126.4                           | 3,126.4                           | 0.1     | 0.13                      | $0.70      |
| Collection of Taxes                                   | 500.0                             | 500.0                             | 0.0     | 0.01                      | $0.70      |

| Prevention, Treatment and Research                    | 38,242.8                          | 38,242.8                          | 100.0   | 47.61                      | $315.75    |
| Prevention                                            | 9,774.3                           | 9,774.3                           | 100.0   | 12.9                      | $143.75    |
| Treatment                                             | 17,072.7                          | 17,072.7                          | 100.0   | 20.4                      | $253.75    |
| Research                                              | NA                                | NA                                | 0.0     | 0.0                       | $0.00      |
| Unspecified                                           | 11,395.7                          | 11,395.7                          | 100.0   | 14.5                      | $181.00    |

| Total                                                 | 588,724.8                         | 588,724.8                         | 100.0   | 79.4                      | $315.75    |

The Substance Abuse Dollar

The breakdown of the substance abuse dollar shows:

- Prevention: 8.9%
- Treatment: 36.6%
- Regulation/Compliance: 3.8%
- Public Safety: 6.3%
- Education: 3.3%
- Health: 1.2%
- Medicaid: 1.2%
- Substance Abuse and Addiction: 28.9%
- Higher Education: 1.8%
- Transportation: 0.8%
- Economic Costs: 1.8%
- Total: 100%

*Numbers may not add due to rounding.
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B. Prevalence of Illicit Drug Use and Alcohol Abuse

Although federal, state, and local funding for treatment programs has risen gradually in the past few years, these increases are falling short of the level of need. In Arkansas, there has been no increase in funding for the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention program in the past 13 years. The Arkansas Legislature did pass a tobacco tax increase that will provide substance abuse coverage through the state Medicaid program for pregnant women and adolescents. Nationally, only 1% of individuals in need of substance abuse treatment receive it. Each year, hundreds of thousands of Arkansans in need of substance abuse treatment lack access to it.

A comprehensive picture of substance abuse in Arkansas youth can be found in the Arkansas Prevention Needs Assessment (APNA) conducted through the public schools each November. Since 2002, there has been an overall decrease in student using of alcohol, cigarettes, smokeless tobacco and marijuana. However, the 2011 APNA still indicated heavy use by the youth of Arkansas of these substances. Binge drinking appears to be the most serious problem among Arkansas’ youth. Over 13% of youth reported binge drinking in the past two weeks prior to the survey. Perhaps most alarming is the reported average age of initiation to alcohol use in Arkansas. The average first regular use of alcohol (more than a sip) has remained steady over the past six years for the state at age 14.1. In response to a question concerning source, across all grades, the most prominent response was “I got it from someone over 21.” Twenty-seven percent of high school seniors that reported drinking reported the source as someone over 21. However, over four percent of the students reported their source as “getting it from the home with parent’s permission.” Retail sales of alcohol to minors does not appear to be a major issue in Arkansas with the total reporting purchases with or without a fake I.D. being below 1 percent.

In Arkansas, marijuana continues to be the illicit drug most used by those over 18 years of age. According to the APNA, 1 in 4 adults between the ages of 18 to 25 report smoking marijuana at least once during the past year.

The charts listed below illustrate the drug use trends in the U.S. and Arkansas as of June 2012.

**National Illicit Drug Use Trends 2012**

- **Illicit Drugs**: 22.6
- **Marijuana**: 17.4
- **Psychotherapeutics**: 7.0
- **Cocaine**: 4.6
- **Hallucinogens**: 1.2
- **Inhalants**: 0.7
- **Heroin**: 0.2

[Graph showing drug use trends]
Drug use trends in Arkansas among youth

| TABLE 10: ARKANSAS PREVENTION NEEDS ASSESSMENT (APNA) SURVEY |
| 2008 % OF RESPONDENTS WHO USED ATOD* DURING THE PAST 30 DAYS BY GENDER, GRADE, RACE, & ETHNICITY |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Alcohol</th>
<th>Cigarettes</th>
<th>Smokeless Tobacco</th>
<th>Marijuana</th>
<th>Inhalants</th>
<th>Stimulants</th>
<th>Sedatives</th>
<th>Ecstasy</th>
<th>Prescription Drugs</th>
<th>Over-the-Counter</th>
<th>Any Drug</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHNICITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT HISPANIC</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Data on cocaine, methamphetamine, hallucinogens, and heroin use are not reported here to conserve space. (0.4% of students reported past 30 day use of cocaine, 0.4% use of methamphetamine, 0.5% use of hallucinogens, and 0.3% use of heroin). The Any Drug category contains the percent of students reporting use of marijuana, hallucinogens, cocaine, ecstasy, inhalants, sedatives, methamphetamines, stimulants, heroin, prescription drugs, and over-the-counter drugs.

* Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs

C. Drugs/Alcohol and Crime

The correlation between substance abuse and criminal activity continues to be demonstrated daily in the Arkansas criminal justice system as more and more repeat offenders are recycled through the judicial system and on to the correction community for incarceration. The fact that the top offense for both admission and serving time in Arkansas Department of Correction in fiscal year 2011 is controlled substance is a testament to this reality. More persons were sent to the Arkansas penitentiary for controlled substance charges in FY 2011 (2,107) than those sent for burglary, and assault and battery combined (1070 and 445 respectively). The average sentence for those serving time for controlled substances is fourteen years nine months. Offenders suffering from substance addiction are not having their addiction issues addressed with a prison sentence alone, upon release, addiction and addictive behaviors resurface and the cycle back to prison begins again. Drug courts are one method of alternative sentencing that has been proven to effectively address high risk/high need individuals who are addicted to drugs and/or alcohol. The recidivism rates for this group are the lowest of any other group that participates in drug court. The cost benefit for this group is also the highest when comparing drug court costs to prison incarceration costs.
According to the report on Drug Use and Dependence, State and Federal Prisoners, 2009 (the most recent report available from the Bureau of Justice Statistics), the percent of state prisoners under the influence of drugs at the time of commission of their offense was 33%. Those that indicated drug use in the month prior to their offense was 57%. In 2004, only about a third of the prisoners who met the criteria for drug dependency or abuse the month before their offense participated in drug abuse programs in state prison. The effect noted above of recycling prisoners through the criminal justice system is indicated by the fact that prisoners with drug dependency or abuse had extensive criminal records. Among state prisoners who were dependent on or abusing drugs, 53% had at least three prior sentences to probation or incarceration, compared to 32% of other inmates. Substance dependent or abusing inmates were also more likely to have been on probation or parole supervision (48%) than other inmates (37%). In the future, as effects from reforms provided within Act 570 become available concerning criminal activity and substance abuse in the state, more in-depth comparisons and correlations can be analyzed that factor in drug courts and other alternative sentencing programs.

D. Impact on Corrections

A large portion of the state general revenue budget goes to support the operations of corrections in Arkansas (8% in fiscal year 2011 according to the National Association of State Budget Officers, State Expenditure Reports). In a study conducted in 2008 by the PEW Center on the States, Arkansas ranked 10th in the nation in percentage of total general fund expenditure for corrections. The report, entitled *One in 100: Behind Bars in America 2008* provides interesting detail and state-by-state analysis of growth in prison populations across the country. For example, one out of every 102 adults in Arkansas is incarcerated; one out of every 29 adults is under correctional control, i.e. incarcerated, on probation or parole. In 1982, only one in 134 adults was incarcerated, on probation or parole. In 1983, the cost per offender, per day, for incarceration in prison was $19.09. In 2011, that costs was reported as $59.70.

A January 2011 PEW Working Group Report, *Consensus Report of the Arkansas Working Group on Sentencing and Corrections*, stated that “Arkansas’s prison population has doubled during the past 20 years, driving corrections costs up 450 percent. At the same time, recidivism and crime rates have remained stubbornly high. If left unchecked, the population will grow by as much as 43 percent in the next decade and cost Arkansas taxpayers an additional $1.1 billion.” The report concluded that.” An extensive review of data revealed that the state is underutilizing probation, imposing longer prison sentences for non-violent offenses, and delaying transfer to parole.”

On any given day, approximately 1800 prisoners remain behind bars although they have been approved for release. At a cost of $59.70 compared to $1.37 per day on probation, $14.99 per day for drug court probation, the potential costs do mount up. The Arkansas drug court program continues to be an important and proven strategy in reducing costs of prison growth in the state. Although only providing a diversion program
for approximately 2100 participants during FY 2011, when multiplied by the costs per day ($59.70) and days per year, the program saved approximately $35 million dollars for the state in corrections costs. (This includes the deduction of approximately $14.99 per day for a drug court participant as reported by the Division of Legislative Audit.) In a recent report, DCC reported that the recidivism rate for drug court graduates (those who successfully complete the drug court program requirements) is 7.5 percent, nearly one-fourth the rate for persons in the regular probation/parole program (20.8% probation and 25.2% parole) and a stark contrast to the overall recidivism rate for the Department of Correction (41.4%). Drug court programs seem to be very successful in breaking the churning cycle that otherwise sends offenders repeatedly through the criminal justice system.

E. The Future of Drug Courts in Arkansas

Drug court programs are perhaps the most cost effective strategy for addressing the growing numbers of persons suffering from addiction to alcohol or other drugs in our state. They relieve the crowding situation in the Arkansas prison system and the county jail back-ups, while providing a highly restrictive, structured and monitored program in the community setting that can successfully rehabilitate persons addicted to alcohol or drugs. Many noted professionals in the field have stated that we cannot build our way out of the current substance abuse crisis by merely housing more offenders in the prison system where the likelihood of their return to prison is so great.

Without additional funding to provide an increase in the personnel to the existing drug court programs, the current caseload, hovering at approximately 2100+ participants, will become stagnant. The intensity of the supervision and the amount of labor involved in a successful program require that ratios of counselor and probation officer to number of participants remain at the levels currently articulated in law. Thus, caseloads per court will likely remain at the current levels without additional resources. Any increase in the caseload of the drug court program, must include an increase for treatment funds provided by the courts to maintain the success of the program. A program without access to sufficient treatment funding for participants will ultimately perform under par compared to a program with sufficient funding.

More funding is also required to establish new drug courts in counties where none exist. Currently, eighteen Arkansas counties lack a drug court program. Although court judges and staff, prosecutors and public defenders are willing to put in the unpaid extra hours to establish drug court programs in many of these areas, until positions in DCC can be funded for probation officers, administrative assistants, and treatment counselors for these courts they will not become a reality.

There is increased emphasis on development of additional specialized dockets from the federal level and state level as evidenced by the establishment of SWIFT Courts, HOPE Courts, and the increased number of DWI and Mental Health courts. Federal agencies view the adult drug court model as a highly successful strategy for crime
reductions. More of these “problem solving courts” are being sought and funded through grants from federal agencies that are turning more and more to treatment as a way to reduce demand for illegal drugs and criminal justice costs. Court ordered treatment is an integral part of any drug court program. Without such, the rate of rehabilitated addicts will most likely be very low. The opportunities for drug court program growth are limited without a combined effort of both methodological support for drug courts and fiscal support of drug court programs treatment needs. Without the adequate access and ability to provide a continuum of treatment services to drug courts that include outpatient specialty treatment services, long term residential, and mental health treatment to drug courts these programs will not reach their success potential. Since the money that drug courts save the state in incarceration costs continues to expand in the millions, it only makes sense to put more state revenue into a program that costs less than other strategies and has such a rewarding outcome for the citizens of the state--- an intact family with a rehabilitated, tax-paying breadwinner who is supporting his or her family and participating in improving his or her community.
Notes
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1st JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Counties Served: St. Francis (Forrest City)

Type: Adult/ Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Bentley Story

Court Address: P.O. Box 249
Forrest City, AR 72336

Contact: Glynda Wilson- Assistant Area Manager
Phone: 870-261-7545
E-mail: Glynda.Wilson@arkansas.gov

2nd JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Counties Served: Craighead (Jonesboro)

Type: Adult/ Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. David Laser

Court Address: P.O. Box 420
Jonesboro, AR

Contact: Tammy Darnell- Administrative Assistant
Phone: 870-972-6206
E-mail: tammy.darnell@arkansas.gov
2nd JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Counties Served: Greene (Paragould)

Type: Adult/ Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Randy Philhours

Court Address: 320 West Court Street, Box 121
Paragould, AR 72450

Contact: Scott Rogers- Administrative Assistant
Phone: 870-236-7500
E-mail: scott.rogers@arkansas.gov

2ND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Counties Served: Crittenden (West Memphis)

Type: Adult/ Pre and Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Cindy Thyer

Court Address: 320 West Court Street, Room 212
Paragould, AR

Contact: Brian Holt- Drug Court Coordinator
Phone: 870-735-4486
E-mail: brian.holt@arkansas.gov
3rd Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Jackson (Newport, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Harold Erwin

Court Address: 208 Main Street
Newport, AR 72112

Contact: Cathy Jeffery-Administrative Specialist III
Phone: (870) 523-4191
E-mail: cathy.jeffery@arkansas.gov

3rd Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Randolph (Pocahontas, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Philip Smith

Court Address: 1112 Pace Road
Pocahontas, AR 72455

Contact: Tara Sharp – Probation/Parole Officer
Phone: (870) 248-3330
E-mail: tara.sharp@arkansas.gov
3rd Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Lawrence (Walnut Ridge, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Philip Smith

Court Address: 1000 W. Main Street
Walnut Ridge, AR 72476

Contact: April Faughn – Probation/Parole Officer
Phone: (870) 886-3553
E-mail: april.faughn@arkansas.gov

4th Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Washington (Fayetteville, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. G. Chadd Mason

Court Address: 123 N. College
P.O. Box 4703
Fayetteville, AR 72702

Contact: Cindy Dickey
Phone: 479-973-8432
E-mail: cdickey@co.washington.ar.us
5th Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Johnson, Franklin (Clarksville, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Hybrid

Judge: Hon. Gordon McCain

Court Address: 215 West Main Street
                Clarksville, AR 72830

Contact: Nancy Patton
Phone: 479-754-0351
E-mail: Nancy.Knowles@arkansas.gov

---

5th Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Pope (Russellville, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Hybrid

Judge: Hon. Dennis Sutterfield

Court Address: 100 W. Main Street
                Russellville, AR 72802

Contact: William Titsworth-Coordinator
Phone: (479) 968-5154
E-mail: william.titsworth@arkansas.gov

28
6th Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Perry, Pulaski (Little Rock, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Mary S. McGowan

Court Address: 401 West Markham, Suite 320
Little Rock, AR 72201

Contact: Jackie Austin-Case Coordinator
Phone: (501) 340-5602
E-mail: jaustin@pulaskimail.net

7th Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Grant, Hot Spring (Malvern, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Chris Williams

Court Address: 210 Locust Street
Malvern, AR 72104

Contact: Linda White – Intake
Phone: 501-467-3633
E-mail: linda.d.white@arkansas.gov
8th N. Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Hempstead, Nevada (Hope, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Pre-Adjudication
Judge: Hon. Duncan Culpepper

Court Address: 2806 N. Hazel Street
               Hope AR, 71801

Contact: Sandra Hundley – Administrative Specialist II
Phone: (870) 777-2445
E-mail: sandra.hundley@arkansas.gov

8th S. Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Miller (Texarkana, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication
Judge: Hon. Joe Griffin

Court Address: 410 Laurel, Suite 207
               Texarkana, AR 71854

Contact: Jodi Burke – Coordinator
Phone: 870-774-2421
E-mail: jodiburke@cableone.net
9th E. Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Clark (Arkadelphia, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Robert McCallum

Court Address: 419 Clay Street, 2nd Floor of Court Complex Bldg.
Arkadelphia, AR 71923

Contact: Mike Wolfe – Intake
Phone: 870-403-0383
E-mail: mike.wolfe@arkansas.gov

9th W. Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Howard, Pike (Nashville, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Charles Yeargan

Court Address: 420 N. Main, Suite 3
Nashville, AR 71852

Contact: Tomekia Williamson – Probation Officer
Phone: (870) 845-3793
E-mail: Tomekia.Williamson@arkansas.gov
10th Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Ashley, Bradley, Drew, Desha & Chicot (Monticello East, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Bynum Gibson

Court Address: Drew County Courthouse
210 South Main
Monticello, AR 71655

Judge: Hon. Sam Pope

Court Address: 205 E. Jefferson, # 12
Hamburg, AR 71646

Contact: Trinita Newton – Probation Officer
Phone: 870-367-3201
E-mail: trinita.newton@arkansas.gov

11th E. Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Arkansas (Stuttgart, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. David Henry

Court Address: 302 College Street
Stuttgart, AR 72160

Contact: Thelma Robinson – Intake
Phone: 870-673-8410
E-mail: thelma.robinson@arkansas.gov
11th W. Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Jefferson (Pine Bluff, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Berlin C. Jones

Court Address: 101 West Barraque
               Pine Bluff, AR 71601

Contact: Latonya Taggart – Counselor Officer
Phone: (870) 850-8986
E-mail: lotonya.taggart@arkansas.gov

12th Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Sebastian (Fort Smith, Arkansas)

Type: Adult Pre-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. J. Michael Fitzhugh &
       Hon. Stephen Tabor

Court Address: 901 S. B Street
               Fort Smith, AR 72901

Contact: Shirl Page – Coordinator
Phone: (479) 784-1507
E-mail: spage@co.sebastian.ar.us
13th Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Ouachita (Camden, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post–Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Edwin Keaton

Court Address: 145 Jefferson Street
               Camden, AR 71701

Contact: Lynette Langley-Drug Court Administrator
Phone: 870-837-1140
E-mail: lynette.langley@arkansas.gov

13th Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Union (El Dorado, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post–Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Hamilton Singleton

Court Address: Union County Courthouse
               101 N. Washington
               El Dorado, AR 71730

Contact: Paul Meason –Coordinator
Phone: 870-881-9301
E-mail: paulmeason@sasaelda.org
13th Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Columbia (Magnolia, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Larry Chandler

Court Address: 222 S. Pine
Magnolia, AR 71753

Contact: Jennifer White-Intake
Phone: 870-234-2720
E-mail: jenniferw@arkansas.gov

14th Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Boone (Harrison, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Gordon Webb

Court Address: Boone County Courthouse
100 N. Main
Harrison, AR 72601

Contact: Rachel Pippin – Probation Officer
Phone: 870-741-3228
E-mail: rachel.pippin@arkanss.gov

35
14th Judicial Circuit

Counties Served:  Baxter (Mountain Home, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Gordon Webb

Court Address: Department of Community Corrections
               613 South Street
               Mountain Home, AR 72653

Contact: Eva Frame – Drug Court Probation/Parole Officer
Phone: 870-425-9139
E-mail: evaf@arkansas.gov

15th Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Logan, Scott (Booneville, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Jerry Don Ramey

Court Address: Logan County Courthouse
               366 N. Broadway
               Booneville, AR 72927

Contact: Dee Stokes-Intake
Phone: 479-675-3170
E-mail: dee.stokes@arkansas.gov
15th Judicial Circuit

County Served: Yell (Danville & Dardanelle, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Pre - Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Jerry Don Ramey

Court Address: 110 W. 6th
Danville, AR 72833

Contact: Lisa Wells
Phone: 479-495-5731
E-mail: lisa.wells@arkansas.gov

15th Judicial Circuit

County Served: Conway (Morrilton, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Hybrid

Judge: Hon. Jerry Don Ramey

Court Address: 117 S. Moose
Morrilton, AR 72110

Contact: Tiffany Landon - Intake
Phone: (501) 354-2164
E-mail: tiffany.landon@arkansas.gov

37
16th Judicial Circuit

County Served: Independence (Batesville, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. John Dan Kemp

Court Address: 107 West Main Street, Suite G
Mountain View, AR 72560

Contact: Debi Spinks-Intake
Phone: 870-793-7965
E-mail: debi.spinks@arkansas.gov

16th Judicial Circuit

County Served: Cleburne (Heber Springs, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. John Dan Kemp

Court Address: 110 D. Tulaka Blvd.
Heber Springs, AR 72543

Contact: Louis Short
Phone: (501) 362-3229
E-mail: Louis.Short@arkansas.gov
16th Judicial Circuit

County Served: Fulton, Izard (Melbourne, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. John Dan Kemp

Court Address: 110 D. Tulaka Blvd.
                Heber Springs, AR 72543

Contact: Louis Short
Phone: (501) 362-3229
E-mail: Louis.Short@arkansas.gov

16th Judicial Circuit

County Served: Stone (Mountain View, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. John Dan Kemp

Court Address: 107 W. Main Street, Suite G
                Mountain View, AR 72560

Contact: Dan Trammell-Intake
Phone: 870-269-5225
E-mail: danny.trammell@arkansas.gov
17th Judicial Circuit

County Served: White (Searcy, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Craig Hannah

Court Address: White County Courthouse
               Court Square
               Searcy, AR 72143

Contact: Rebecca Bohannon-Intake
Phone: 501-279-7990
E-mail: becky.bohannon@arkansas.gov

18th E. Judicial Circuit

County Served: Garland (Hot Springs, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. John Homer Wright

Court Address: 501 Ouachita Ave., Suite 300
               Hot Springs, AR 71901

Contact: Michael Hall-Probation Officer
Phone: (501) 624-3347
E-mail: michael.j.hall.dcc@arkansas.gov
18th W. Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Polk, Montgomery (Mena, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. J. W. Looney

Court Address: 507 Church Street
Mena, AR 71953

Contact: Steve Free – Counselor
Phone: 479-394-4107
E-mail: Steven.Free@arkansas.gov

19th E. Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Carroll (Berryville, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Kent Crow

Court Address: 44 S. Main
Eureka Springs, AR 72616

Contact: Danyaile Willing – Probation Officer
Phone: 870-423-5695
E-mail: danyaile.willing@arkansas.gov
19th Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Benton (Bentonville, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Mark Fryauf

Court Address: Benton County Circuit Court Div. 3
102 North East "A" Street, Box 2
Bentonville, AR 72712

Contact: Brenda Marshall – Intake
Phone: 479-696-9967
E-mail: brenda.marshall@arkansas.gov

20th Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Faulkner (Conway, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Charles Clawson

Court Address: 801 Locust Street
Conway, AR 72034

Contact: Kim Gary – Coordinator
Phone: 501-450-4970
E-mail: kgary@faulknercc.org
21st Judicial Circuit

Counties Served: Crawford (Van Buren, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Gary Cottrell – Circuit Judge

Court Address: Crawford County Court
300 Main Street, Room 25
Van Buren, AR 72956

Contact: Ranelle Brock-Officer
Phone: 479-424-3560
E-mail: ranelle.brock@arkansas.gov

22nd Judicial Circuit

County Served: Saline (Benton, Arkansas)

Type: Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Robert Herzfeld

Court Address: 321 N. Main
Benton, AR 72015

Contact: Andy Gill – Prosecutor
Phone: (501) 315-7767
E-mail: acgill07@gmail.com
23rd Judicial Circuit

County Served: Lonoke (Lonoke, Arkansas)

Type: Adult - Post-Adjudication

Judge: Hon. Phillip Whiteaker

Court Address: 301 N. Center Street
Lonoke, AR 72086

Contact: Mary "Liz" Hayes – Intake
Phone: (501) 676-3378
E-mail: mary.hayes@arkansas.gov
1st JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Counties Served:  St. Francis (Forrest City, Arkansas)

Type:  Juvenile Drug Court

Judge:  Hon. Ann Hudson

Court Mailing Address:  P.O. Box 995
Forrest City, AR 72336-0995

Contact:  Wonda Smith – Drug Court Coordinator
Phone: 870-317-9046

2nd JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Counties Served:  Craighead (Jonesboro, Arkansas)

Type:  Juvenile Drug Court

Judge:  Hon. Lee Fergus

Court Mailing Address:  P.O. Box 1472
Jonesboro, AR 72403

Contact:  John Krumholz – Drug Court Coordinator
Phone: 870-897-8142
4th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Counties Served: Washington (Fayetteville, Arkansas)

Type: Juvenile Drug Court

Judge: Hon. Stacey Zimmerman

Court Mailing Address: 885 Clydesdale Drive
                    Fayetteville, AR 72701

Contact: Bryan Hubbell – Drug Court Coordinator
Phone: 479-973-8443

5th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Counties Served: Pope (Russellville, Arkansas)

Type: Juvenile Drug Court

Judge: Hon. Ken Coker

Court Mailing Address: P.O. Box 297
                    Russellville, AR 72811-0297

Contact: John Riley – Drug Court Coordinator
Phone: 479-967-1520
8th N. JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Counties Served: Hempstead (Hope, Arkansas)

Type: Juvenile Drug Court

Judge: Hon. Randy Wright

Court Mailing Address: P.O. Box 621
                    Hope, AR 71801

Contact: Tracie Robinson – Drug Court Coordinator
Phone: 870-703-0462

10th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Counties Served: Ashley (McGehee, Arkansas)

Type: Juvenile Drug Court

Judge: Hon. Teresa French

Court Mailing Address: P.O. Box 50
                   McGehee, AR 71654

Contact: Kenneth Ellis – Drug Court Coordinator
Phone: 870-723-8891
11th W. JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Counties Served: Jefferson (Pine Bluff, Arkansas)

Type: Juvenile Drug Court

Judge: Hon. Earnest Brown, Jr.

Court Mailing Address: P.O. Box 6116
Pine Bluff, AR 71611

Contact: Dennis Johnson – Drug Court Coordinator
Phone: 870-541-5455

13th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Counties Served: Columbia (Magnolia, Arkansas)

Type: Juvenile Drug Court

Judge: Hon. Larry Chandler

Court Mailing Address: P.O. Box 785
Magnolia, AR 71753

Contact: Oree (O.J.) Johnson – Drug Court Coordinator
Phone: 870-904-2168
16th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Counties Served: Independence (Heber Springs, Arkansas)

Type: Juvenile Drug Court

Judge: Hon. Lee Harrod

Court Mailing Address: P.O. Box 1421
Heber Springs, AR 72543

Contact: Shari Stubbs – Drug Court Coordinator
Phone: 501-362-7466

18th E. JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Counties Served: Garland (Hot Springs, Arkansas)

Type: Juvenile Drug Court

Judge: Hon. Vicki Cook

Court Mailing Address: 607 Ouachita Avenue, Room 203
Hot Springs, AR 71901

Contact: Chris Burrow – Drug Court Coordinator
Phone: 501-622-3772
19th W. JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Counties Served: Benton (Bentonville, Arkansas)

Type: Juvenile Drug Court
Judge: Hon. Mark Fryauf
Court Mailing Address: 1301 Melissa Drive
Bentonville, AR 72712
Contact: Donna Rohrer – Drug Court Coordinator
Phone: 479-271-1047

20th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Counties Served: Faulkner (Conway, Arkansas)

Type: Juvenile Drug Court
Judge: Hon. Rhonda Wood
Court Mailing Address: 1423 Caldwell
Conway, AR 72034
Contact: Ashley Shows – Drug Court Coordinator
Phone: 501-328-5967
22nd JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Counties Served: Saline (Benton, Arkansas)

Type: Juvenile Drug Court

Judge: Hon. Bobby McCallister

Court Mailing Address: 200 N. Main
                        Benton, AR 72015

Contact: Jack Campbell – Drug Court Coordinator
Phone: 501-303-5730

For more information on the Juvenile Drug Court Program you can send an e-mail to List Serve: jvdc@lists.state.ar.us
Appendix C

ARKANSAS DRUG COURT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Chief Justice Jim Hannah  Arkansas Supreme Court
Mr. Alonza Jiles  State Board of Correction
Mr. David Eberhard  Director, Dept. of Community Correction
Mr. Ron Angel  Director, Division of Youth Services
Mr. John Felts  Commissioner Parole Board
Hon. Robin Carroll  Circuit Court Judge
Hon. Kent Krause  Deputy Public Defender
Mr. J.D. Gingerich  Director, Administrative Office of the Courts
Senator Bill Pritchard  Senate Member
Representative John W. Walker  House Member
Ms. Fran Flener  Arkansas Drug Director
Judge Joe Griffin  Circuit Court Judge
Representative Kathy Webb  House Member