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SACPA Overview

Background

The Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act (SACPA), also known as Proposition 36, was passed by California voters November 7, 2000 and became effective July 1, 2001.

SACPA provides for probation with community drug treatment for persons convicted of non-violent drug offenses. Parolees who commit nonviolent drug offenses or violate drug-related conditions of parole are also eligible for SACPA treatment services in lieu of re-incarceration. Benefits include up to 12 months of treatment followed by aftercare. SACPA services are available for only two SACPA convictions. Drug treatment programs serving SACPA offenders must be State-licensed and/or certified. SACPA also established sanctions for offenders who do not sustain their participation in treatment or who violate certain conditions of probation or parole.

The Alameda County plan:

On June 1, 2001, Alameda County submitted its plan for the implementation of SACPA with Behavioral Health Care Services (BHCS) designated as the lead agency. Major responsibilities for the implementation were defined for the Superior Courts, Probation Department, District Attorney, Public Defender, Department of Corrections, Parole, and Alameda County’s Information Technology Department.

Among the key provisions of the Plan:

• Funding would ‘follow the Client’, regardless of the service or providing agency.

• Assessments would be accomplished using standardized assessment instruments.

• Monitoring of treatment through the transmission of progress and incident reports to probation and the courts would be computer assisted for most clients.

• Treatment, provided through a network of community based organizations (providers) includes methadone (opioid) detoxification and maintenance; residential, day treatment, outpatient, and early intervention programs, aftercare, and other (ancillary) services such as family counseling, vocational training, case management, and mental health services.

1 At the time, BHCS already had a network of substance-abuse service providers in place who could be used for SACPA referrals.
The SACPA Plan In Alameda County:

- The District Attorney determines initial eligibility.
- Upon conviction, if the defendant accepts SACPA, the Court sets participation in SACPA services as a condition of probation.
- The defendant/client is directed to BHCS for assessment and referral to a provider for identified services that may also include ancillary services such as vocational, mental health counseling, etc. ²
- The provider reports on the client’s treatment status to Probation/Courts prior to court hearings, or sooner if the treatment plan is not proving successful.
- Periodically, the Court holds hearings to review client/defendant treatment progress and provider recommended changes in that status, if any.
- Upon conclusion of treatment, the client is eligible for aftercare.
- Defendants successfully completing their treatment/aftercare program and fulfilling all other terms of probation, can petition the Court to expunge their record (dismiss the charges and clear their record of the conviction).
- Alameda county residents on parole or adjudicated in other counties may also be assessed and referred for Alameda County SACPA services through the BHCS Assessment Unit.

Behavioral Health Care (BHCS), as the designated ‘Lead Agency’, is responsible for program coordination across multiple county agencies to ensure effective and accountable services to the population. To deliver these services, BHCS uses a Provider Network consisting of 21 agencies with 30 facilities spread among Oakland, Alameda, Berkeley, San Leandro, Hayward, Fremont, Newark, and Pleasanton.

The District Attorney enforces the provisions of SACPA through filing criminal charges for crimes covered by SACPA, determining eligibility for SACPA services, and proving the commission of the crimes at either trial or probation revocation hearings.

The Public Defender represents the defendant, assisting defendants in making informed choices concerning accepting SACPA, serving their sentences, if any, or contesting the charges.

Probation ensures that program participants abide by Court ordered conditions of probation and facilitates the filing of all reports and petitions to the Courts. Deputy Probation Officers monitor program participant’s progress and provide intervention towards successful completion of the SACPA program.

² Referral has two meanings: referral from Courts or Parole to assessment and referral from assessment to a treatment provider. The meaning of the word is defined within the context of the data presented.
The Court component of the Alameda County SACPA system includes Alameda, Fremont, Hayward, Oakland, and Pleasanton. The Court sets SACPA participation as a condition of probation, provides ongoing judicial supervision of participants’ treatment plan, and holds progress hearings regarding participant recovery status.

Overview of this Report

This report presents data comparing the first, second, and third year of implementation in Alameda County. Described are the demographic characteristics and service needs of eligible defendants who received services, and the flow of clients through the SACPA system from eligibility to discharge. Also included is information on the service delivery system and oversight that has evolved to meet SACPA demands.

Data was obtained from:

- CORPUS (the criminal justice system that incorporates SACPA data from the web based Penal Code 1210 Tracking System),
- AccuData for demographic information based on ASI assessments³,
- Insyst (PSP), the BHCS service utilization database, and,
- BHCS’ financial system for expenditures.

Client counts are for unique clients i.e. when clients are referred to more than one provider to meet the client’s service needs, all referrals are counted but the client is counted only once. As a result, the number of referrals for services will be higher than the number of clients being served. This also applies to any client encounter that might occur more than once such as incident and progress reports, court hearings, etc.

Increased access to CORPUS records and better methods of matching records for defendants/clients from one data set to another has resulted in some significant changes in the conclusions reached in previous annual reports. To avoid the confusion that might occur from constant references to past reports illustrating each change, this annual report is designated as the baseline for future analysis.

Some variation still exists due to alternate codes and classifications that occur between separate systems and also due to data capture procedures and mechanisms not being fully operational during the early days of implementation, but these have been reduced to less than 5% of the population under study and therefore not considered significant to the overall analysis. We believe this report fairly reflects the overall implementation of the program through June 30, 2004.

If you have questions or need more information, please contact Flo Samuels, BHCS, (510) 777-2156.

---

³ ASI data includes city of residence, race, education, arrest and detention history, employment, substance use, treatment history, and ancillary vocational, educational, and counseling service needs.
**SACPA Population:**

Defendants eligible for SACPA services are defendants who were convicted of non-violent drug offenses and could use SACPA services if they so elected. They had the right to accept, decline, or decline by waiving their rights. At this point, to indicate the impact of SACPA defendants on the SACPA Court-Probation-Treatment system, the analysis focuses on unique individuals involved, regardless of the number of cases adjudicated. The exception is if a case is a second opportunity, under the law, for treatment services. In that event, they are counted as new to the SACPA system.

Based on this assumption, in FY 01-02, 2,329 dockets were designated in CORPUS as SACPA eligible (conviction) with the number decreasing to 1,850 in FY 02-03 and further decreasing to 1,601 by FY 03-04. Of those eligible in the first two fiscal years, 63% were felony convictions with the rate dropping to 59% in FY 03-04.

For those who accepted SACPA services, it was initially expected that approximately 2,500 eligible clients per year would accept. However, the number of accepts were 1,810 in FY 01-02 and then fell to 1,264 in FY 02-03, and 961 in FY 03-04. Felonies also dropped from 64% of total accepts in FY 01-02 to 58% in FY 03-04.

Of the 1,553 full assessments in FY 03-04, 55 (4%) were referred to another county of residence for treatment. Another 115 (7%) were identified as parolees. An additional 301 clients had accepted in prior fiscal years but, due to the passage of time, required a new assessment for treatment placement.

---

4 Due to data collection issues still being resolved, 13% of accepts are not so identified in the SACPA CORPUS system.

5 The number accepting is always lower than the number assessed because assessment figures include:
   - defendants new to the system (acceptees),
   - defendants entering the treatment system from other counties, i.e. they move to Alameda County,
   - parolees referred by a parole officer,
   - defendants from previous fiscal years who have changed their plea from decline or rights waived,
   - defendants in the system without official Court recordation of their acceptance, or
   - defendants who are now treatment clients but require reassessment due to changed circumstances or the previous assessment being over 90 days.

6 Parolees are defined as only those referred from a State of California parole officer. Parolees arrested and adjudicated in Alameda County are not included in this count.
**Referral Sources And Placements:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SACPA Convictions, Felony and Results</th>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Page 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SACPA Convictions, Felony and Results, FY 01-02/02-03</td>
<td>Appendix A, Table 1</td>
<td>Page 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACPA Accept, Assessed, Treated, and No-Show Rates</td>
<td>Table 2</td>
<td>Page 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACPA Accept, Assessed, Treated, and No-Show Rates, FY 01-02/02-03</td>
<td>Appendix A, Table 2</td>
<td>Page 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals to Treatment Summarized by Court</td>
<td>Table 3</td>
<td>Page 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals to Treatment Summarized by Service Level</td>
<td>Table 4</td>
<td>Page 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals Summarized by Court and Service Level</td>
<td>Appendix B, Table 1</td>
<td>Page 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals Summarized by Provider and Program</td>
<td>Appendix B, Table 2</td>
<td>Page 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CORPUS, including the SACPA Tracking System, is the primary source for data.

**Significant Findings for FY 03-04:**

- From FY 01-02 to FY 03-04, Oakland Court had a 32% decrease in its proportion of all dockets (44% to 30%) with a 33% decrease in defendants (48% to 32%). The ratio of felonies to total dockets for Oakland dropped slightly from 72% to 69%. In FY 03-04, Hayward’s share of dockets increased 43% in the three-year period (21% to 30%) although the proportion of felonies decreased slightly (40% to 37%). Over the three years, Fremont’s share of dockets held fairly steady (26% to 28%) while the proportion of felonies dropped from 19% to 12%.

- New convictions\(^7\) dropped from 2,378 in FY 01-02 to 1,628 in FY 03-04 (32%). In the same time period, felonies, as a proportion of convictions, decreased from 63% to 57%. Also in the same time period, Accepts decreased as a proportion of total convictions from 76% to 59%. In FY 03-04, 259 defendants had their convictions expunged (dismissal) and 456 were deemed unsuccessful or waived/declined. This brought the three-year total for dismissals to 391 and unsuccessful/waives to 1,006.

- The no-show rate, defined as attrition between acceptance and being assessed by the BHCS Assessment Unit within 30-days of conviction, increased from 25% (457 out of 1,810 defendants) in FY 01-02 to 38% (363 out of 961 defendants) in FY 03-04. From assessment to treatment, defined as receiving at least one treatment from a treatment provider, the no-show rate decreased from 18% (253 of 1,394 clients) to 15% (129 of 865 clients).

- Despite a 34% decrease in new client assessments from FY 01-02 to FY 03-04 (1,825 to 1,204), referrals from the BHCS Assessment Unit to treatment providers increased 10% (2,535 to 2,782).\(^8\) By the end of FY 01-02, 24% of assessments were

---

\(^7\) An analysis of clients served indicated SACPA CORPUS records do not fully reflect all Accepts and dispositions for SACPA cases. Therefore the aforementioned totals may be understated.

\(^8\) Client and referral numbers include parolees from other counties or Alameda County and clients from other counties who receive services in Alameda County.
reassessments or evaluations for re-referral of ongoing clients. This had increased to 41% by the end of FY 02-03 and 52% in FY 03-04.\footnote{Reassessments/evaluations included clients who entered the SACPA program in FY 01-02 or FY 02-03.}

- Although the Oakland Court’s share of client referrals (and clients) to treatment providers decreased during the three fiscal years (referrals from 62% to 52% and clients from 58% to 47%), the need for multiple referrals\footnote{As a result of the assessment, the client is referred to more than one provider due to the need for multiple services. For example, an outpatient client may also need methadone while attending outpatient services \textit{or may need detox before outpatient}.} for Oakland defendants (1.61 per client in FY 03-04) was the highest of all the courts.

- Clients referred to Residential treatment providers increased from 8% to 13% over the three fiscal years. A similar increase was seen in clients utilizing Opioid Maintenance services (from 2% to 7% although this was a decrease from FY 02-03’s high of 11%). Outpatient remained as the highest treatment service used with 78% of the clients, a slight decrease from 81% in FY 01-02.
Table 1 SACPA Convictions, Felonies, and Results
July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Felony</th>
<th>All</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Defendants</td>
<td>% of Court</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Court</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of All Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 2</td>
<td>Defendants</td>
<td>Total 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept New</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline/Waive New</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Convictions</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>44%</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>5%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal, Completed Treat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful, Decline, Waive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Results</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>55%</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept New</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline/Waive New</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Convictions</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>10%</strong></td>
<td><strong>349</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>21%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal, Completed Treat</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful, Decline, Waive</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Results</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>13%</strong></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>20%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept New</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline/Waive New</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Convictions</strong></td>
<td><strong>188</strong></td>
<td><strong>60%</strong></td>
<td><strong>314</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>19%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal, Completed Treat</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful, Decline, Waive</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Results</strong></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
<td><strong>60%</strong></td>
<td><strong>211</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>30%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept New</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline/Waive New</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Convictions</strong></td>
<td><strong>634</strong></td>
<td><strong>84%</strong></td>
<td><strong>755</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>46%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal, Completed Treat</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful, Decline, Waive</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Results</strong></td>
<td><strong>264</strong></td>
<td><strong>83%</strong></td>
<td><strong>319</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>45%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept New</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline/Waive New</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Convictions</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>30%</strong></td>
<td><strong>135</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>8%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal, Completed Treat</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful, Decline, Waive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Results</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>26%</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept New</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline/Waive New</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Convictions</strong></td>
<td><strong>931</strong></td>
<td><strong>57%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,628</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal, Completed Treat</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful, Decline, Waive</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Results</strong></td>
<td><strong>423</strong></td>
<td><strong>59%</strong></td>
<td><strong>715</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes
1. Does not include: 1) multiple convictions for the same client, 2) defendants not identified in CORPUS as accepting SACPA services, 3) parolees/transfers in, 4) arrests for bench warrants.
2. Felony: Percent felony is of total defendants for that result.
   Total Defendants: Percent that result is of total defendants for that court.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court</th>
<th># of Felony Defendants</th>
<th># of Total Defendants</th>
<th>% Felony to Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Accept to Assessed</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assessed after transfers out</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Net Assessed Late (after 30 days)]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Net Assessed to Treated</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Accept to Assessed</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assessed after transfers out</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Net Assessed Late (after 30 days)]</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Net Assessed to Treated</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Accept to Assessed</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assessed after transfers out</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Net Assessed Late (after 30 days)]</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Net Assessed to Treated</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Accept to Assessed</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assessed after transfers out</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Net Assessed Late (after 30 days)]</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Net Assessed to Treated</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Accept to Assessed</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assessed after transfers out</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Net Assessed Late (after 30 days)]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Net Assessed to Treated</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Accept to Assessed</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assessed after transfers out</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>577</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Net Assessed Late (after 30 days)]</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>577</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Net Assessed to Treated</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Defendants</th>
<th>Parolees</th>
<th>Transfers In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessed</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Assessed to Treated</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes
1. Clients who accepted, were assessed, and received at least one service from July, 2001 to June, 2003. Does not include: 1) multiple convictions for the same client, 2) defendants with no acceptance in CORPUS, 3) parolees/transfers in, 4) clients who were treated but could not be matched to a PFN or parolee/transfer-in client number.
2. Assessed Late is included in Total Assessed for calculating No Show to Treatment percentages.
### Table 3 Referrals to Treatment Summarized by Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court</th>
<th>FY 03-04</th>
<th>FY 02-03</th>
<th>FY 01-02</th>
<th>FY 03-04</th>
<th>FY 02-03</th>
<th>FY 01-02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Clients</td>
<td>% of Clients</td>
<td>% of Clients</td>
<td>% of Clients</td>
<td># of Referrals</td>
<td>% of Referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>1445</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer In</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Unique Clients</strong></td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,782</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Unique Clients by Referral Source
2. Due to referrals to different programs for the same client and re-referrals to the same programs, total clients referred will be greater than total unique clients. As a result, the % of Clients total percent will not add to 100.

### Table 3 (contd.) Referrals to Treatment Summarized by Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court</th>
<th>FY 03-04</th>
<th>FY 02-03</th>
<th>FY 02-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referrals per Client</td>
<td>Referrals per Client</td>
<td>Referrals per Client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer In</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4 Referrals to Treatment Summarized by Service Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>FY 03-04</th>
<th>FY 02-03</th>
<th>FY 01-02</th>
<th>FY 03-04</th>
<th>FY 02-03</th>
<th>FY 01-02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Clients</td>
<td>% of Clients</td>
<td>% of Clients</td>
<td>% of Clients</td>
<td># of Referrals</td>
<td>% of Referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opioid Maintenance</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Intervention</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opioid Detox</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Unique Clients</strong></td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,542</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Unique Clients by Referral Type
2. Due to referrals to different programs for the same client and re-referrals to the same programs, total clients referred will be greater than total unique clients. As a result, the % of Clients total percent will not add to 100.
3. Not considered as treatment but still a Prop36 service.
4. Clients referred Out of County excluded from calculations due to undetermined service levels.
Referral Demographics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity of Clients Accepted, Assessed, and Treated</th>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th>Page 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Substance of Choice</td>
<td>Table 6</td>
<td>Page 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Patterns</td>
<td>Table 7</td>
<td>Page 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client’s City of Residence and City of Treatment</td>
<td>Table 8</td>
<td>Page 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definition of ‘referrals’: Referral can be from the Court to the BHCS Assessment Unit or from the Assessment Unit to a treatment provider. In this section, referral means from the Court to the Assessment Unit.

**Significant Findings for FY 03-04:**

- Males represented 73% of clients who accepted, were assessed, and treated.
- African Americans represented 44% of defendants who accepted SACPA services followed by Caucasians at 26% and Latinos at 12%. Unclassified was 12% with Asian and Native American the remaining 6%. These proportions were generally retained through assessment and treatment.
- Assessed clients with previous violations of parole or probation decreased from 61% to 57% while the average total violations per person increased from 3.4 to 4.2.
- Over the three years, cocaine as primary drug of choice dropped from 32% to 18%. The use of alcohol and drugs together increased from 9% to 26%.
- Assessed clients who had previously received drug treatment services increased from 33% to 36% and the time between last treatment and the current conviction increased from 5.2 to 5.8 years.
- During the three years, between 55% and 68% of assessed clients reported abstaining from drugs for at least a year.
- While the average years in school for assessed clients remained steady at 11, the average for new clients in treatment fell from 13.3 years in FY 01-02 to 11.9.
- During the three years, the average age of assessed clients was 39.
- The unemployed and under employed (part-time/intermittent) represented 70% of clients, a sharp increase from the 52% in FY 01-02. Those in a controlled environment (restricted in ability to leave) represented 3%, a significant drop from the 23% of FY 01-02. In FY 03-04, 36% considered treating their employment problem as extremely or considerably important, an increase over 24% in FY 01-02.
- At least 82% reported living in a domestic environment, i.e. not homeless or not restricted in ability to leave, a decrease from 86% in FY 01-02.
- While there was little noticeable shift in Defendant residence patterns, there was a significant shift in clients referred to treatment sites with Oakland increasing from 36% of the client base in FY 01-02 to 43% in FY 03-04. South county providers accounted for 41% of total treatment referrals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Accepted FY 03-04</th>
<th>FY 02-03</th>
<th>FY 01-02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Clients</td>
<td>% of Clients</td>
<td>% of Clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=1,230 n=1,843

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Assessed FY 03-04</th>
<th>FY 02-03</th>
<th>FY 01-02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Clients</td>
<td>% of Clients</td>
<td>% of Clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=1,179 n=1,652

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Treated FY 03-04</th>
<th>FY 02-03</th>
<th>FY 01-02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Clients</td>
<td>% of Clients</td>
<td>% of Clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=1,068 n=1,289

1. Based on new defendant acceptances in CORPUS, new defendant/client assessments in the AccuData system, and new client treatment recorded in Insyst. Does not include Parole or Transfer In.
Table 6 Major Substance of Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance</th>
<th>FY 03-04</th>
<th>FY 02-03</th>
<th>FY 01-02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td># of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>Clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphetamines</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one drug</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opioids (primarily Heroin)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol &amp; drug(s)</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannabis</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Based on completed assessments in the AccuData system where data was available for analysis.

Table 7 Employment Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>FY 03-04</th>
<th>FY 02-03</th>
<th>FY 01-02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td># of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>Clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time work</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time/Intermittent</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired/Disability/Student/Military</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled environment</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>1,067</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Based on completed assessments in the AccuData system where data was available for analysis.
2. Controlled environment is housing where the client cannot leave.

Table 8 Client’s City of Residence and City of Treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Residence FY 03-04</th>
<th>Residence FY 02-03</th>
<th>Residence FY 01-02</th>
<th>Treatment FY 03-04</th>
<th>Treatment FY 02-03</th>
<th>Treatment FY 01-02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Clients</td>
<td>% of Clients</td>
<td># of Clients</td>
<td>% of Clients</td>
<td># of Clients</td>
<td>% of Clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless/Unknown</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward (inc San Lorenzo)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark (inc Union City)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro (inc Castro Valley)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley (inc Albany)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton (inc Livermore/Dublin)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from BHCS Assessments and BHCS Utilization database
**Treatment:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance Abuse System of Services</th>
<th>Table 9</th>
<th>Page 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unique Clients Served by Year and Service Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACPA Clients Need for and Availability of Ancillary Services</td>
<td>Table 10</td>
<td>Page 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BHCS' utilization database (Insyst) is the primary source for data.

**Significant Findings for FY 03-04:**

- Since SACPA’s implementation in FY 01-02, the number of clients served by the BHCS system of providers has expanded 20%. By FY 03-04, the primary service demand was still outpatient (60% system-wide).

- Over the three fiscal years, a higher proportion of African Americans were admitted to the substance abuse treatment system through SACPA (46% to the non-SACPA 40%). However, the admission rate for Caucasians decreased at a greater rate for non-SACPA clients (34% to 30% non-SACPA against 31% to 29% for SACPA). Latino admissions increased faster in the SACPA population (11% to 15% for SACPA and 17% to 19% for non SACPA).

- Age distribution for both groups was relatively similar, even after adjusting for non-SACPA clients under 18 (a population not served by SACPA). Close to one-third of clients are in the 36 to 45 age range. However, clients between 20 and 36 in both populations have increased: from 34% to 37% in FY 01-02 to 40% in FY 03-04.

- Substance of choice shows a significant difference between SACPA and Non-SACPA clients that has not changed since FY 02-03. Amphetamines and cocaine are preferred by SACPA clients at close to twice the rate as Non-SACPA clients with a corresponding reversal of preference for opioids (primarily heroin) and alcohol. However, since SACPA’s primary directive is substance-abuse other than alcohol, the heavier presence of alcohol problems in the non-SACPA population (22% to 7%) would tend to shift the proportionality relative to other substances.

- For those actually entering treatment, non-SACPA services had a higher proportion of females than SACPA (37% vs. 27%).

- About 90% of clients in either group spoke English, down from 93% in FY 01-02. Spanish language services accounted for 9%, up from 6% in FY 01-02.

- In FY 03-04, 920 clients requested ancillary services (vocational and family counseling, literacy training, and mental health services) and referrals or appointments were made for 507 to receive such services. The overall need increased by over 283% with the greatest increase in vocational counseling (492%) and family counseling (497%).
Table 9 Substance Abuse System of Services
Unique Clients Served By Year and Service Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Level</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>5,480</td>
<td>5,208</td>
<td>5,084</td>
<td>4,877</td>
<td>5,967</td>
<td>6,287</td>
<td>6,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opioid Detox/Maint</td>
<td>1,922</td>
<td>1,858</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>1,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>2,284</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>1,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Treatment</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Intervention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aftercare</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 8,712 9,764 9,188 8,560 9,912 10,658 10,231

Data from BHCS Utilization database

1. First full year of SACPA services.
2. Early Intervention is only available under SACPA.
3. Not considered as treatment but still a SACPA service. Not available to non-SACPA clients.

The majority of Aftercare clients enter Aftercare as a result of provider recommendations and transfers, not assessment referrals from the BHCS Assessment Unit.

Table 10 SACPA Clients Need for and Availability of Ancillary Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>FY 01-02</th>
<th>FY 02-03</th>
<th>FY 03-04</th>
<th>Change from FY 01-02 to FY 03-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needed</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>Needed</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Assistance</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Training</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Counseling</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Services</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unique Clients</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from Treatment Plans in the BHCS PC1210 databases.

1. Some clients received ancillary services even though they were not specifically called for in the Treatment Plan.
2. The total of # of Clients is greater than Total Unique Clients as some clients receive multiple ancillary services.
Retention:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SACPA Retention by Service Level</th>
<th>Table 11</th>
<th>Page 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SACPA Retention by Ethnicity</td>
<td>Table 12</td>
<td>Page 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The BHCS Utilization database and the CORPUS SACPA Tracking System are the primary sources for data.

- Retention is defined as the length of time the client actually received services.
- Early drop-out is defined as appearing for registration but not treatment.

Since SACPA clients have the sanction of incarceration if they do not appear for treatment, no conclusive comparisons can be made between the two populations concerning retention rates.

**Significant Findings for FY 03-04:**

- In FY 02-03, **1 to 3 times the number of SACPA clients stayed over 90 days in treatment compared to non-SACPA clients.** In FY 03-04 however, this difference narrowed significantly with non-SACPA clients being 20% more likely to stay over 90 days then SACPA clients. The early drop-out rates (no show after intake), also narrowed except for Outpatient where 24% of SACPA clients were early drop-outs compared to 16% of non-SACPA clients.

- By ethnicity, combined rates for early drop-out plus less-than-30-days of treatment ranged from 39% (African-Americans) to 29% (Latino). For non-SACPA clients, combined rates for early drop-out plus less-than-30-day ranged from 43% (Latino) to 39% (Caucasian).

- For SACPA clients, age showed no influence in retention/non-retention. However, for non-SACPA clients, the rates for 90 days or more were approximately 10% higher in the 31-35 and 46 to 50 year old categories.

- Substance type had no discernible influence on SACPA retention.

- The sex of the client played no major role in retention for either group.

11 Large empirical studies such as the Drug Abuse Reporting Program, the Treatment Outcome Prospective Study, and the Drug Abuse Treatment Outcome Study have shown that treatment outcomes are positively associated with the length of time an individual remains in treatment.

12 A disproportionate share of non-SACPA clients go through detox (60% compared to 10% of SACPA clients). Since opioid detox services, with few exceptions, are based on a 21-day program, this significantly skews the retention rates for this treatment type. Therefore, no comparisons were made.
### FY 03-04 Retention Tables

**Table 11** SACPA Retention by Service Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Level</th>
<th>Day Treatment</th>
<th>Early Intervention</th>
<th>Opioid Maint</th>
<th>Outpatient</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Aftercare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Clients</td>
<td>% of Clients</td>
<td># of Clients</td>
<td>% of Clients</td>
<td># of Clients</td>
<td>% of Clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early drop-out</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 Days</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-60 Days</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-90 Days</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-180 Days</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 181 Days</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Clients</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Early drop-out are clients who were registered by the provider but did not appear for treatment.

### Table 12** SACPA Retention by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Level</th>
<th>African-American</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific</th>
<th>Native American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Clients</td>
<td>% of Clients</td>
<td># of Clients</td>
<td>% of Clients</td>
<td># of Clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early drop-out</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 Days</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-60 Days</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-90 Days</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-180 Days</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 181 Days</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Clients</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Early drop-out are clients who were registered by the provider but did not appear for treatment.
Budget and Expenditures:

SACPA funding is a five-year annual allocation (July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2006), including start-up funds (January 1, 2001 to June 30, 2001), based on a state formula that takes into account population (50%), treatment caseload (25%), and adult felony and misdemeanor arrest data (25%). Unspent amounts can be rolled over for use in subsequent fiscal years.

FY 03-04 expenditures of $8.1 million were funded by the annual allocation of $5.4 million with the remaining $2.7 million coming from roll-over funds. Treatment, including assessments, accounted for $5.8 million, 72% of total expenditures. Probation and the Courts accounted for another $1.26 and $700,000 was spent for support services provided by BHCS that includes BHCS Administration and discretionary expenditures (Information Technology).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures by Category, FY 03-04</th>
<th>Table and Chart 13</th>
<th>Page 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures by Service Level, FY 03-04</td>
<td>Table 14</td>
<td>Page 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BHCS Finance is the primary source for data.

**Significant Findings for FY 02-03:**

- Of total treatment dollars, residential treatment for FY 03-04 increased from 31% in FY 02-03 to 35% in FY 03-04 ($1.6 million to $2.0 million).\(^{13}\) Residential clients represented 13% of total clients treated, up from 11% the previous year.

- Outpatient expenditures represented 35% of total treatment dollars down from 39% in FY 02-03. The percentage of clients served also declined but at a slightly slower rate (66% to 64%).

- While a SACPA service, Aftercare is not considered as treatment. Even so, it represented approximately 6% of expenditures when included in treatment costs (up from 2% in FY 02-03) and 14% of total unique clients (up from 7% in FY 02-03).\(^{14}\)

---

\(^{13}\) In an attempt to slow residential expenditures, new protocols were implemented to better define referrals and transfers to residential treatment facilities.

\(^{14}\) Because Aftercare follows from successful completion of treatment, in most cases clients in Aftercare will have been double-counted in some other treatment service.
Table 13 Expenditures by Category, FY 03-04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY 02-03</th>
<th>FY 03-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ Amount</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>$5,815,506</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>957,925</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHCS Administration</td>
<td>549,235</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary (ITD)</td>
<td>132,997</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>300,501</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aftercare Services/Mental Health</td>
<td>338,667</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>3,356</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$8,098,187</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SATTA (Drug Testing) $252,347
SATTA funding is separate from SACPA funding.

Table 14 Expenditures by Service Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Level</th>
<th>FY 01-02</th>
<th>FY 02-03</th>
<th>FY 03-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ Amount</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>$ Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>$ 795,028</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>$2,051,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>515,700</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1,632,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>509,242</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>726,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Treatment</td>
<td>130,800</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>453,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opioid Maintenance</td>
<td>82,300</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>412,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opioid Detox</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>3,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Intervention</td>
<td>4,772</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>27,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 2,044,042</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$5,306,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aftercare</td>
<td>$112,295</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$338,667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Not considered as treatment but still a SACPA service.
Treatment Reporting and Supervision:

Providers are required to provide progress reports on the client’s progress in treatment. Incident reports relating to negative events during treatment include both the Progress Report client base and defendants who never entered treatment (failed to appear).

Reports are reviewed by Probation and forwarded to the courts as part of the SACPA review hearings. The client/defendant’s SACPA status is determined in these hearings where the client is ordered to continue treatment, removed from treatment and remanded to custody or other action taken, or the case dismissed for successful completion of the program.

Due to changes in reporting format (from manual to electronic) in FY 02-03 that required time to ensure all providers were defining incident types the same, then further changes in report formats in FY 03-04, no reasonable comparison can be made between the fiscal years on volume or client count. Therefore, treatment reporting will only address FY 03-04 progress reports. Supervision will address court and probation activities only relative to clients in treatment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress Reports</th>
<th>Table 15</th>
<th>Page 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court Activity for Clients in Treatment</td>
<td>Table 16</td>
<td>Page 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CORPUS, including the SACPA Tracking System, is the primary source for data.

**Significant Findings for FY 03-04:**

- In FY 03-04, 17% of clients received a recommendation for transfer to less intensive levels of treatment, an increase from 11% in FY 02-03. Another 7% received a recommendation for transfer to more intensive levels of treatment, down from 17% the previous year.

- In FY 03-04, all categories of SACPA-related hearings increased due to the increase in clients in the system. While the number of hearings increased, the number per client remained constant except for SACPA non36PR hearings, which decreased by 17% (from 2.8 per client to 2.3). Bench warrants for failure to appear, probation violations, revocations, reinstatements, and incarceration all decreased from FY 02-03, reflecting the decrease (ranging from 11% to 23%) in the number of clients convicted of these charges. The number of findings per client remained stable over the two years.

- In FY 03-04, 259 defendants had their records expunged and 456 were dismissed from the SACPA system as unsuccessful, waive or declines, compared to FY 02-03 when 129 had their records expunged and 481 were unsuccessful, waived or declined.
### Table 15 Progress Reports ¹ FY 03-04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Discharge</th>
<th># of Reports</th>
<th>% of Reports</th>
<th># of Clients</th>
<th>% of Clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discharge to lower level of service</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge to higher level of service</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge, Aftercare complete</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge, transfer to Aftercare</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge, service complete, no Aftercare</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge, service not complete</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge, Court order</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Unique Clients** 1,902

**Total Reports for Clients Treated** 6,362

1. Selected reporting out of 6,362 progress reports submitted to Probation and the Courts.

### Table 16 Court Activity for Clients in Treatment ¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Hearing/Result Type</th>
<th>FY 03-04 # of Hearings/ Results</th>
<th>FY 02-03 # of Hearings/ Results</th>
<th>Change from 02-03</th>
<th>Clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Clients Treated</strong>²</td>
<td>2,268</td>
<td>2,268</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proceedings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing (SACPA)</td>
<td>2,123</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Report (SACPA)</td>
<td>6,114</td>
<td>4,724</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACPA Violation</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petition to Revoke Probation (DA)</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petition to Revoke Probation (Prob)</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Unique In-County Clients</strong></td>
<td>1,755</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bench Warrant</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>2,184</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Violation of Probation</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Revoked</td>
<td>2,178</td>
<td>1,394</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Reinstated</td>
<td>1,883</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarceration</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Unique Clients</strong></td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td>1,813</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Clients who were received at least one service from a service provider other than a report (Progress or Incident) or urinalysis.
2. Total Clients Treated includes transfers from other counties and clients recommended by their parole officer. These clients are not tracked in the CORPUS system.
### Appendix A, FY 01-02 and FY 02-3 Tables

#### Table 1 SACPA Convictions, Felonies, and Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court</th>
<th># of Defendants</th>
<th>% of Court Total</th>
<th>Total Defendants</th>
<th>% of Court Total</th>
<th>% of All Court's</th>
<th>% of All Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Felony</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept New</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline/Waive New</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Convictions</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>35%</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal, Completed Treat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful, Decline, Waive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Results</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept New</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline/Waive New</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Convictions</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>22%</strong></td>
<td><strong>463</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>19%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal, Completed Treat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful, Decline, Waive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Results</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>44%</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>13%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept New</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline/Waive New</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Convictions</strong></td>
<td><strong>247</strong></td>
<td><strong>60%</strong></td>
<td><strong>410</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>17%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal, Completed Treat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful, Decline, Waive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Results</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>59%</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>24%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept New</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline/Waive New</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Convictions</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,072</strong></td>
<td><strong>81%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,325</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>56%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal, Completed Treat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful, Decline, Waive</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Results</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>72%</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>60%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept New</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline/Waive New</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Convictions</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>41%</strong></td>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal, Completed Treat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful, Decline, Waive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Results</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>50%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept New</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline/Waive New</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Convictions</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,490</strong></td>
<td><strong>63%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,378</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal, Completed Treat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful, Decline, Waive</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Results</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>64%</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Footnotes**

1. Does not include: 1) multiple convictions for the same client, 2) defendants not identified in CORPUS as accepting SACPA services, 3) parolees/transfers in, 4) arrests for bench warrants.

2. Felony: Percent felony is of total defendants for that result.

3. Re-arrests where the conviction is designated as SACPA (Accept, Decline, Waive). Does not include re-arrests where there is no conviction or the conviction is not designated as SACPA.
## Table 1 SACPA Convictions, Felonies, and Results
### July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Felony</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Felony</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Felony</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Felony</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Felony</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of</td>
<td>% of Court</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Court</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of All Court's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defendants</td>
<td>Total 2</td>
<td>Defendants</td>
<td>Total 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>Accept New</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decline/Waive New</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total New Convictions</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dismissal, Completed Treat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsuccessful, Decline, Waive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Results</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>Accept New</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decline/Waive New</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total New Convictions</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dismissal, Completed Treat</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsuccessful, Decline, Waive</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Results</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>Accept New</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decline/Waive New</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total New Convictions</strong></td>
<td>252</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dismissal, Completed Treat</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsuccessful, Decline, Waive</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Results</strong></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Accept New</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decline/Waive New</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total New Convictions</strong></td>
<td>800</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dismissal, Completed Treat</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsuccessful, Decline, Waive</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Results</strong></td>
<td>253</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>Accept New</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decline/Waive New</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total New Convictions</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dismissal, Completed Treat</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsuccessful, Decline, Waive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Results</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Courts</td>
<td>Accept New</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decline/Waive New</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total New Convictions</strong></td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dismissal, Completed Treat</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsuccessful, Decline, Waive</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Results</strong></td>
<td>408</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Footnotes
1. Does not include: 1) multiple convictions for the same client, 2) defendants not identified in CORPUS as accepting SACPA services, 3) parolees/transfers in, 4) arrests for bench warrants.
2. Felony: Percent felony is of total defendants for that result.
3. Total Defendants: Percent that result is of total defendants for that court.
4. Re-arrests where the conviction is designated as SACPA (Accept, Decline, Waive). Does not include re-arrests where there is no conviction or the conviction is not designated as SACPA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court</th>
<th># of Felony Defendants</th>
<th># of Total Defendants</th>
<th>% Felony to Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Accept to Assessed</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assessed after transfers out</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Net Assessed to Treated</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Accept to Assessed</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assessed after transfers out</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Net Assessed to Treated</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Accept to Assessed</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assessed after transfers out</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Net Assessed to Treated</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Accept to Assessed</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assessed after transfers out</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Net Assessed to Treated</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Accept to Assessed</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assessed after transfers out</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Net Assessed to Treated</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Accept to Assessed</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assessed after transfers out</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Net Assessed to Treated</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Defendants</th>
<th>Parolees</th>
<th>Transfers In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessed</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Assessed to Treated</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes
1. Clients who accepted, were assessed, and received at least one service from July, 2001 to June, 2002. Does not include: 1) multiple convictions for the same client, 2) defendants with no acceptance in CORPUS, 3) parolees/transfers in, 4) clients who were treated but could not be matched to a PFN or parolee/transfer-in client number.
2. Assessed Late is included in Total Assessed for calculating No Show to Treatment percentages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court</th>
<th># of Felony Defendants</th>
<th># of Total Defendants</th>
<th>% Felony to Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Accept to Assessed</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assessed after transfers out</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Treated</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Accept to Assessed</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assessed after transfers out</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Treated</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Accept to Assessed</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assessed after transfers out</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Treated</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Accept to Assessed</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assessed after transfers out</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>492</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Treated</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Accept to Assessed</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assessed after transfers out</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Treated</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Accept to Assessed</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assessed after transfers out</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Treated</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Defendants</th>
<th>Parolees</th>
<th>Transfers In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessed</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Show Rate Assessed to Treated</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes
1. Clients who accepted, were assessed, and received at least one service from July, 2001 to June, 2003. Does not include: 1) multiple convictions for the same client, 2) defendants with no acceptance in CORPUS, 3) parolees/transfers in, 4) clients who were treated but could not be matched to a PFN or parolee/transfer-in client number.
2. Assessed Late is included in Total Assessed for calculating No Show to Treatment percentages.
### Appendix B, Referrals by Court and Provider Tables

#### Referrals Summarized by Court and Service Level

**FY 03-04, July 1 to June 30**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Service Level</th>
<th># of Clients</th>
<th>% of Clients</th>
<th># of Referrals</th>
<th>% of Referrals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>After Care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>Day Treatment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>Early Intervention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>Opioid Detox</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>Opioid Maintenance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Unique Clients</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>Aftercare</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>Day Treatment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>Early Intervention</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>Opioid Detox</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>Opioid Maintenance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>Transfer-Out</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Unique Clients</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>After Care</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>Day Treatment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>Early Intervention</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>Opioid Detox</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>Opioid Maintenance</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>Transfer-Out</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Unique Clients</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>After Care</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Day Treatment</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Early Intervention</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Opioid Detox</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Opioid Maintenance</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Transfer-Out</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Unique Clients</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>Aftercare</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>Day Treatment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>Early Intervention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>Opioid Detox</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>Opioid Maintenance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>Transfer-Out</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Unique Clients</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole</td>
<td>Day Treatment</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole</td>
<td>Opioid Detox</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole</td>
<td>Opioid Maintenance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole</td>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Unique Clients</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer In</td>
<td>Day Treatment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer In</td>
<td>Early Intervention</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer In</td>
<td>Opioid Detox</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer In</td>
<td>Opioid Maintenance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer In</td>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer In</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Unique Clients</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,782</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Includes clients new to the treatment system and re-referred clients.
2. Due to referrals to different programs for the same client, total clients referred will be greater than total unique clients.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Program and Service Level</th>
<th>% of Clients</th>
<th>% of Clients</th>
<th># of Referrals</th>
<th>% of Referrals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Med Center</td>
<td>Aaftercare</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Med Center</td>
<td>Day Treatment</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Med Center</td>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Comm Mental Health</td>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-Bell</td>
<td>EORC/Outpatient</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURA</td>
<td>Fremont/Residential</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURA</td>
<td>Oakland/Residential</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB-CRP</td>
<td>Hayward/Aftercare</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB-CRP</td>
<td>Hayward/Day Treatment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB-CRP</td>
<td>Hayward/Outpatient</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB-CRP</td>
<td>Oakland/Aftercare</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB-CRP</td>
<td>Oakland/Day - Dual Diagnosis</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Inc.</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAART</td>
<td>Hayward / Opiod Maint</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAART</td>
<td>Oakland / Opiod Detox</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAART</td>
<td>Oakland / Opiod Maint</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home of Comfort</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon</td>
<td>Chrysalis/Residential</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon</td>
<td>Cronin / Residential</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino Commission</td>
<td>El Chante/Residential</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino Commission</td>
<td>Mujeres/Aftercare</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino Commission</td>
<td>Mujeres/Outpatient</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino Commission</td>
<td>Si Se Puedo/Aftercare</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino Commission</td>
<td>Si Se Puedo/Outpatient</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionaries</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bridge Foundation</td>
<td>Day Treatment</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bridge Foundation</td>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bridge Foundation</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Leaf</td>
<td>Aaftercare</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Leaf</td>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Aaftercare</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Day Treatment</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAACS</td>
<td>Opioid Maint</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Chance</td>
<td>Ashland/Aftercare</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Chance</td>
<td>Ashland/Early Intervention</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Chance</td>
<td>Ashland/Outpatient</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Chance</td>
<td>Hayward/Aftercare</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Chance</td>
<td>Hayward/Outpatient</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Chance</td>
<td>Phoenix/Outpatient</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Chance</td>
<td>Tri Cities/Aftercare</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Chance</td>
<td>Tri Cities/Early Intervention</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Chance</td>
<td>Tri Cities/Outpatient</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Foundation</td>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Foundation</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Systems</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>Aaftercare</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>Early Intervention</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xanthos</td>
<td>Aaftercare</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xanthos</td>
<td>Early Intervention</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xanthos</td>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZDK</td>
<td>Opioid Detox</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZDK</td>
<td>Opioid Maint</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-County Programs</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,908</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,799</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Includes clients new to the treatment system and re-referred clients.
2. Due to referrals to different programs for the same client, total clients referred will be greater than total unique clients.