



# Assessing the Drug Problem in Idaho by County:

A Survey of Criminal Justice Practitioners

A Descriptive Report

Produced by the Statistical Analysis Center  
Idaho State Police

# **Assessing the Drug Problem in Idaho by County**

A Survey of Criminal Justice Practitioners

A Descriptive Report

Idaho State Police  
Planning, Grants and Research  
Statistical Analysis Center  
Bryne Evaluation Unit  
PO Box 700  
Meridian, Idaho 83680- 0700  
(208) 884- 7040  
pgr@isp.state.id.us  
download at: [www.isp.state.id.us/pgr/Research/sac.html](http://www.isp.state.id.us/pgr/Research/sac.html)

Prepared by: Janeena Jamison Wing, Sr. Research Analyst in December 2003  
Editors: Salvador P. Vazquez, Director of the Idaho Statistical Analysis Center, and  
Misty Kifer, Sr. Research Analyst

This project was supported by Grant No. 02BYRN78 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance. The Bureau of Justice Assistance is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which includes the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Office for Victims of Crime. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the author and do not represent the official position or policies of the United States Department of Justice.

## Introduction

A survey was conducted in June 2003 by the Idaho State Police, Department of Planning, Grants, and Research aimed at understanding the best strategies to manage the drug problem in Idaho. Questions were posed with the intent of uncovering what prevention and treatment methods work best and will have the greatest impact fighting drugs in Idaho. The information was originally published in the report: Assessing the Drug Problem in Idaho: A Survey of Criminal Justice Practitioners. This is an analysis of the drug needs assessment by county.

**Table 1. Description of sample**

COUNTY	Population	Rate per 10000	Sample Size**	Response rate
Ada	300,904	1.06	32	50.8
Adams	3,476	2.88	1	33.3
Bannock	75,565	2.25	17	63.0
Bear Lake	6,411	3.12	2	40.0
Benewah	9,171	6.54	6	46.2
Bingham	41,735	3.11	13	56.5
Blaine	18,991	4.21	8	66.7
Boise	6,670	4.50	4	80.0
Bonner	36,835	1.63	6	46.2
Bonneville	82,522	1.94	16	84.2
Boundary	9,871	3.04	3	37.5
Butte	2,899	10.35	3	100.0
Camas	991	20.18	2	66.7
Canyon	131,441	0.61	8	32.0
Caribou	7,304	6.85	5	83.3
Cassia	21,416	1.87	4	44.4
Clark	1,022	0.00	0	0.0
Clearwater	8,930	5.60	5	71.4
Custer	4,342	9.21	4	66.7
Elmore	29,130	1.37	4	36.4
Franklin	11,329	0.88	1	14.3
Fremont	11,819	4.23	5	62.5
Gem	15,181	3.29	5	83.3
Gooding	14,155	2.83	4	44.4
Idaho	15,511	3.87	6	75.0
Jefferson	19,155	1.57	3	42.9
Jerome	18,342	2.18	4	66.7
Kootenai	108,685	1.47	16	61.5
Latah	34,935	2.00	7	63.6
Lemhi	7,806	3.84	3	42.9
Lewis	3,747	2.67	1	14.3
Lincoln	4,044	7.42	3	75.0
Madison	27,467	2.91	8	72.7
Minidoka	20,174	2.48	5	55.6
Nez Perce	37,410	4.54	17	73.9
Oneida	4,125	7.27	3	75.0
Owyhee	10,644	2.82	3	30.0
Payette	20,578	1.94	4	50.0
Power	7,538	7.96	6	100.0
Shoshone	13,771	2.90	4	40.0
Teton	5,999	6.67	4	80.0
Twin Falls	64,284	2.33	15	75.0
Valley	7,651	3.92	3	33.3
Washington	9,977	3.01	3	50.0
Total	1,293,953	2.13	276	56.3

\*The findings in this report include one extra response which was not included with the original report on assessing the drug problem in Idaho.

\*\* The Sample Size includes the number who responded, not the number of surveys sent out.

## Methodology

Five different types of questionnaires were drawn up with the occupation of the recipient in mind. Four hundred and ninety individuals; including judges, law enforcement, prosecutors, public defenders, and probation officers were sent surveys. Many of the questions asked to each group were the same to enable data comparisons. Two hundred and seventy-six surveys were returned, giving a response rate of 56.3%. Table 1 describes the sample by showing how many people from each county responded, the population of each county, the rate per 10,000 people the sample represents, and the response rate for each county. Table 2 gives a list of the occupation of the individuals given surveys, and the response rate for each type.

**Table 2. Occupation of survey respondents and response rate**

Occupation	Sample Size	Response Rate
Judicial	65	49.2
Law Enforcement	140	60.6
Prosecutor	34	64.2
Public Defender	18	42.9
Probation/Parole	19	59.4
Total	276	56.3

## Findings

The following report summarizes many of the survey results from the Assessing the Drug Problem in Idaho report by county. It must be kept in mind that this information is not representative of how people within each county feel. None of the information is statistically significant given the small sample size at the county level. It is merely the opinion of a few (if any) of the law enforcement, judges, probation officers, prosecutors or public defenders within each county, and must be used for descriptive purposes only.

## Impact of Crime on Society

Tables 3 and 4 are taken from a question regarding the impact of crime on society. Respondents were asked to rank whether they felt the following crimes were most to least serious on a scale of 1 - 5 in their jurisdiction. The following tables list the percent who ranked the crimes as serious to most serious by county.

**Table 3. Percent feeling the following crimes are serious to most serious in their area**

COUNTY	Population	Rate per 10000	Sample Size	Drinking and Driving	Drug Use	Drug Trafficking	Drug Production	Spouse Abuse	Child Abuse	Elder Abuse
Ada	300,904	1.06	32	96.9	96.9	90.6	87.5	93.8	96.9	43.8
Adams	3,476	2.88	1	100	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Bannock	75,565	2.25	17	94	94.1	94.1	94.1	82.4	70.6	35.3
Bear Lake	6,411	3.12	2	100	100.0	100.0	50.0	100.0	50.0	0.0
Benewah	9,171	6.54	6	100	100.0	66.7	66.7	83.3	66.7	66.7
Bingham	41,735	3.11	13	100	92.3	76.9	76.9	84.6	84.6	33.3
Blaine	18,991	4.21	8	75	100.0	87.5	50.0	75.0	50.0	12.5
Boise	6,670	4.50	4	100	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	66.7
Bonner	36,835	1.63	6	100	100.0	83.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	16.7
Bonneville	82,522	1.94	16	94	100.0	100.0	75.0	93.8	93.8	25.0
Boundary	9,871	3.04	3	100	100.0	100.0	66.7	100.0	66.7	0.0
Butte	2,899	10.35	3	100	66.7	66.7	66.7	66.7	0.0	0.0
Camas	991	20.18	2	100	100.0	100.0	50.0	100.0	100.0	50.0
Canyon	131,441	0.61	8	75	100.0	100.0	75.0	62.5	62.5	25.0
Caribou	7,304	6.85	5	100	100.0	80.0	40.0	40.0	60.0	20.0
Cassia	21,416	1.87	4	75	100.0	100.0	75.0	50.0	75.0	0.0
Clark	1,022	0.00	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Clearwater	8,930	5.60	5	100	100.0	80.0	100.0	60.0	40.0	0.0
Custer	4,342	9.21	4	100	100.0	50.0	50.0	100.0	50.0	25.0
Elmore	29,130	1.37	4	75	100.0	75.0	100.0	75.0	75.0	25.0
Franklin	11,329	0.88	1	100	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0
Fremont	11,819	4.23	5	100	100.0	100.0	60.0	80.0	80.0	20.0
Gem	15,181	3.29	5	100	100.0	80.0	40.0	80.0	80.0	20.0
Gooding	14,155	2.83	4	100	100.0	100.0	25.0	75.0	75.0	25.0
Idaho	15,511	3.87	6	100	100.0	83.3	50.0	66.7	83.3	20.0
Jefferson	19,155	1.57	3	100	100.0	66.7	66.7	33.3	33.3	33.3
Jerome	18,342	2.18	4	100	100.0	75.0	75.0	75.0	75.0	0.0
Kootenai	108,685	1.47	16	94	87.5	93.8	93.8	62.5	68.8	46.7
Latah	34,935	2.00	7	76	71.4	71.4	42.9	57.1	42.9	0.0
Lemhi	7,806	3.84	3	100	100.0	100.0	66.7	33.3	100.0	66.7
Lewis	3,747	2.67	1	0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lincoln	4,044	7.42	3	100	100.0	66.7	66.7	100.0	100.0	0.0
Madison	27,467	2.91	8	75	100.0	87.5	62.5	62.5	75.0	25.0
Minidoka	20,174	2.48	5	80	100.0	100.0	80.0	80.0	40.0	0.0
Nez Perce	37,410	4.54	17	94	88.2	82.3	82.4	76.5	88.2	17.6
Oneida	4,125	7.27	3	67	100.0	100.0	100.0	66.7	66.7	33.3
Owyhee	10,644	2.82	3	67	100.0	100.0	100.0	66.7	100.0	0.0
Payette	20,578	1.94	4	75	100.0	75.0	100.0	100.0	75.0	50.0
Power	7,538	7.96	6	80	100.0	100.0	66.7	83.3	83.3	16.7
Shoshone	13,771	2.90	4	25	100.0	75.0	75.0	25.0	50.0	25.0
Teton	5,999	6.67	4	50	100.0	75.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Twin Falls	64,284	2.33	15	76	93.3	86.7	66.7	60.0	60.0	13.3
Valley	7,651	3.92	3	100	100.0	100.0	66.7	66.7	66.7	100.0
Washington	9,977	3.01	3	100	100.0	66.7	66.7	66.7	33.3	0.0
Total	1,293,953	2.13	276	90	96.0	87.3	74.5	75.7	73.8	26.7

\*No response from this county

**Table 4. Percent feeling the following crimes are serious to most serious in their area**

COUNTY	Population	Rate per 10000	Sample Size	Elder Abuse	Burglary	Gangs	Crime in Schools	Vandalism	Dumping Waste and Trash	Poaching	Cyber Crime	Embezzlement
Ada	300,904	1.06	32	43.8	45.2	34.4	21.9	34.4	15.6	15.6	37.5	46.9
Adams	3,476	2.88	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Bannock	75,565	2.25	17	35.3	58.8	23.5	25.0	29.4	5.9	17.6	18.8	29.4
Bear Lake	6,411	3.12	2	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
Benewah	9,171	6.54	6	66.7	33.3	16.7	33.3	33.3	16.7	33.3	33.3	50.0
Bingham	41,735	3.11	13	33.3	38.5	38.5	15.4	46.2	7.7	7.7	15.4	7.7
Blaine	18,991	4.21	8	12.5	50.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0
Boise	6,670	4.50	4	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0
Bonner	36,835	1.63	6	16.7	50.0	0.0	16.7	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7
Bonneville	82,522	1.94	16	25.0	62.5	31.3	6.3	31.3	12.5	6.3	25.0	37.5
Boundary	9,871	3.04	3	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
Butte	2,899	10.35	3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
Camas	991	20.18	2	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	100.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
Canyon	131,441	0.61	8	25.0	62.5	75.0	25.0	37.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Caribou	7,304	6.85	5	20.0	80.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0
Cassia	21,416	1.87	4	0.0	50.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
Clark	1,022	0.00	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Clearwater	8,930	5.60	5	0.0	60.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
Custer	4,342	9.21	4	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	75.0	25.0	25.0
Elmore	29,130	1.37	4	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0
Franklin	11,329	0.88	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Fremont	11,819	4.23	5	20.0	50.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	20.0
Gem	15,181	3.29	5	20.0	80.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	0.0	40.0	20.0
Gooding	14,155	2.83	4	25.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0
Idaho	15,511	3.87	6	20.0	33.3	0.0	20.0	33.3	60.0	50.0	20.0	16.7
Jefferson	19,155	1.57	3	33.3	100.0	33.3	66.7	66.7	33.3	66.7	33.3	66.7
Jerome	18,342	2.18	4	0.0	75.0	75.0	50.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	50.0	25.0
Kootenai	108,685	1.47	16	46.7	68.8	6.3	12.5	12.5	6.3	6.3	0.0	6.3
Latah	34,935	2.00	7	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0	28.6	57.1
Lemhi	7,806	3.84	3	66.7	66.7	33.3	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3
Lewis	3,747	2.67	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lincoln	4,044	7.42	3	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Madison	27,467	2.91	8	25.0	75.0	25.0	37.5	50.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0
Minidoka	20,174	2.48	5	0.0	40.0	100.0	40.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0
Nez Perce	37,410	4.54	17	17.6	47.1	11.8	11.8	25.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	41.2
Oneida	4,125	7.27	3	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
Owyhee	10,644	2.82	3	0.0	100.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
Payette	20,578	1.94	4	50.0	75.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	50.0	50.0
Power	7,538	7.96	6	16.7	50.0	33.3	50.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Shoshone	13,771	2.90	4	25.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Teton	5,999	6.67	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
Twin Falls	64,284	2.33	15	13.3	60.0	53.3	33.3	26.7	6.7	13.3	26.7	26.7
Valley	7,651	3.92	3	100.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	100.0	66.7
Washington	9,977	3.01	3	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total	1,293,953	2.13	276	26.7	51.3	25.3	20.9	33.9	10.2	13.2	16.5	28.0

\*No response from this county

## Impact of Drugs on Society

Respondents were asked to determine how harmful the following drugs were in their jurisdiction on a scale of most to least harmful (1 - 5). Table 5 represents the percent ranking the drugs as “harmful” to “most harmful” by county.

**Table 5: Percent who feel the following drugs are harmful to most harmful in their area**

COUNTY	Population	Rate per 10000	Sample Size	Alcohol	Marijuana	Cocaine/ Crack	Meth	Heroin	"Club Drugs" such as ecstasy, Ketamine, LSD, etc.	Diverted Pharmaceuticals, such as hydrocodone and benzo diazepines
Ada	300,904	1.06	32	93.8	62.5	71.9	100.0	81.3	62.5	50.0
Adams	3,476	2.88	1	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Bannock	75,565	2.25	17	94.1	76.5	64.7	100.0	58.8	64.7	58.8
Bear Lake	6,411	3.12	2	50.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	50.0	50.0
Benewah	9,171	6.54	6	100.0	100.0	66.7	100.0	33.3	33.3	83.3
Bingham	41,735	3.11	13	100.0	76.9	69.2	100.0	53.8	38.5	53.8
Blaine	18,991	4.21	8	87.5	75.0	75.0	87.5	62.5	62.5	50.0
Boise	6,670	4.50	4	100.0	50.0	25.0	100.0	25.0	25.0	50.0
Bonner	36,835	1.63	6	100.0	83.3	50.0	100.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
Bonneville	82,522	1.94	16	93.8	93.8	81.3	100.0	62.5	75.0	68.8
Boundary	9,871	3.04	3	100.0	100.0	66.7	100.0	33.3	33.3	66.7
Butte	2,899	10.35	3	100.0	66.7	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Camas	991	20.18	2	100.0	100.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Canyon	131,441	0.61	8	87.5	100.0	75.0	100.0	50.0	25.0	0.0
Caribou	7,304	6.85	5	80.0	100.0	80.0	100.0	20.0	50.0	60.0
Cassia	21,416	1.87	4	100.0	50.0	25.0	100.0	0.0	25.0	75.0
Clark	1,022	0.00	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Clearwater	8,930	5.60	5	100.0	60.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	60.0
Custer	4,342	9.21	4	100.0	75.0	50.0	100.0	25.0	25.0	25.0
Elmore	29,130	1.37	4	100.0	50.0	50.0	100.0	50.0	25.0	25.0
Franklin	11,329	0.88	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Fremont	11,819	4.23	5	80.0	100.0	60.0	100.0	60.0	20.0	40.0
Gem	15,181	3.29	5	80.0	60.0	80.0	100.0	60.0	60.0	60.0
Gooding	14,155	2.83	4	100.0	75.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	25.0
Idaho	15,511	3.87	6	100.0	66.7	33.3	100.0	33.3	33.3	50.0
Jefferson	19,155	1.57	3	100.0	66.7	33.3	100.0	33.3	66.7	66.7
Jerome	18,342	2.18	4	100.0	50.0	75.0	75.0	75.0	75.0	50.0
Kootenai	108,685	1.47	16	93.8	75.0	62.5	100.0	31.3	50.0	43.8
Latah	34,935	2.00	7	85.7	57.1	28.6	85.7	0.0	28.6	57.1
Lemhi	7,806	3.84	3	100.0	100.0	33.3	100.0	0.0	0.0	66.7
Lewis	3,747	2.67	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lincoln	4,044	7.42	3	100.0	100.0	66.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Madison	27,467	2.91	8	87.5	87.5	25.0	100.0	25.0	50.0	75.0
Minidoka	20,174	2.48	5	80.0	80.0	40.0	100.0	40.0	20.0	80.0
Nez Perce	37,410	4.54	17	82.4	58.8	64.7	94.1	52.9	41.2	76.5
Oneida	4,125	7.27	3	100.0	100.0	66.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	66.7
Owyhee	10,644	2.82	3	100.0	66.7	100.0	100.0	66.7	0.0	0.0
Payette	20,578	1.94	4	100.0	50.0	75.0	100.0	25.0	25.0	25.0
Power	7,538	7.96	6	100.0	100.0	83.3	100.0	33.3	16.7	33.3
Shoshone	13,771	2.90	4	50.0	75.0	100.0	100.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
Teton	5,999	6.67	4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	25.0	50.0	50.0
Twin Falls	64,284	2.33	15	93.3	86.7	33.3	100.0	46.7	33.3	26.7
Valley	7,651	3.92	3	100.0	66.7	66.7	100.0	66.7	100.0	100.0
Washington	9,977	3.01	3	100.0	33.3	66.7	100.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
Total	1,293,953	2.13	276	92.4	75.7	60.5	97.1	45.3	42.9	50.4

\*No response from this county

## Resource Priority

Table 6 represents information taken from a question regarding how much time and money the survey sample estimated they spend dealing with problems associated with the drugs listed. Each drug was given a five point scale (from most time/money to least time/money) for the respondents to choose between.

**Table 6. Percent who feel they spend more to most of their time dealing with problems associated with the following drugs**

COUNTY	Alcohol		Marijuana		Cocaine		Meth		Heroin		Club Drugs		Diverted Pharmaceuticals	
	Sample Size	%	Sample Size	%	Sample Size	%	Sample Size	%	Sample Size	%	Sample Size	%	Sample Size	%
Ada	32	87.5	31	67.7	30	60.0	32	100.0	32	53.1	32	37.5	32	25.0
Adams	1	100.0	1	0.0	1	0.0	1	100.0	1	0.0	1	0.0	1	0.0
Bannock	17	76.5	17	58.8	17	35.3	17	88.2	17	11.8	17	17.6	17	23.5
Bear Lake	2	100.0	2	100.0	2	50.0	2	100.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	2	50.0
Benewah	6	100.0	6	83.3	6	66.7	6	100.0	6	16.7	6	16.7	6	33.3
Bingham	13	92.3	13	76.9	13	46.2	13	92.3	13	23.1	13	15.4	13	30.8
Blaine	8	87.5	8	50.0	8	50.0	8	87.5	8	50.0	8	12.5	8	25.0
Boise	4	100.0	4	25.0	4	25.0	4	100.0	4	25.0	4	25.0	4	25.0
Bonner	6	100.0	6	83.3	6	0.0	6	100.0	6	0.0	6	16.7	6	16.7
Bonneville	15	80.0	15	60.0	15	53.3	15	100.0	15	40.0	15	46.7	15	46.7
Boundary	3	100.0	3	100.0	3	33.3	3	66.7	3	0.0	3	33.3	3	33.3
Butte	3	100.0	3	100.0	3	33.3	3	33.3	3	0.0	3	0.0	3	0.0
Camas	2	50.0	2	100.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	2	0.0	2	50.0	2	0.0
Canyon	8	87.5	8	62.5	7	14.3	8	87.5	8	0.0	8	12.5	8	0.0
Caribou	5	100.0	5	100.0	5	40.0	5	80.0	4	0.0	5	20.0	5	60.0
Cassia	4	100.0	4	75.0	4	25.0	4	100.0	4	0.0	4	0.0	4	25.0
Clark	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*
Clearwater	5	100.0	5	80.0	5	0.0	5	100.0	5	0.0	5	0.0	5	0.0
Custer	3	100.0	3	66.7	3	66.7	3	100.0	3	33.3	3	33.3	3	33.3
Elmore	4	75.0	4	25.0	4	0.0	4	100.0	4	25.0	4	25.0	4	25.0
Franklin	1	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	1	0.0	1	0.0	1	0.0
Fremont	5	80.0	5	80.0	4	50.0	5	100.0	5	40.0	5	0.0	5	20.0
Gem	5	100.0	5	80.0	5	20.0	5	100.0	5	0.0	5	0.0	5	40.0
Gooding	4	100.0	4	25.0	4	0.0	4	100.0	4	0.0	4	0.0	4	25.0
Idaho	6	83.3	6	66.7	6	0.0	6	100.0	6	0.0	6	0.0	6	0.0
Jefferson	3	100.0	3	66.7	3	33.3	3	100.0	3	33.3	3	0.0	3	66.7
Jerome	4	100.0	4	50.0	4	50.0	4	75.0	4	50.0	4	25.0	4	0.0
Kootenai	16	93.8	16	75.0	16	18.8	16	93.8	15	6.7	16	12.5	16	6.3
Latah	7	85.7	7	57.1	7	14.3	7	57.1	7	0.0	7	14.3	7	14.3
Lemhi	3	66.7	3	100.0	2	0.0	3	100.0	3	0.0	3	0.0	3	33.3
Lewis	1	0.0	1	0.0	1	0.0	1	0.0	1	0.0	1	0.0	1	0.0
Lincoln	3	100.0	3	66.7	3	33.3	3	66.7	2	0.0	3	0.0	3	0.0
Madison	8	62.5	8	75.0	8	12.5	8	87.5	8	12.5	8	37.5	8	37.5
Minidoka	5	80.0	5	40.0	5	40.0	5	100.0	5	20.0	5	0.0	5	20.0
Nez Perce	17	88.2	17	64.7	17	47.1	17	88.2	17	29.4	17	11.8	17	41.2
Oneida	3	100.0	3	100.0	3	33.3	3	100.0	3	0.0	3	0.0	3	0.0
Owyhee	3	100.0	3	66.7	3	33.3	3	100.0	3	0.0	3	0.0	3	0.0
Payette	4	75.0	4	75.0	4	50.0	4	100.0	4	0.0	4	0.0	4	0.0
Power	6	100.0	6	100.0	6	33.3	6	100.0	6	0.0	6	0.0	6	16.7
Shoshone	4	50.0	4	25.0	4	0.0	4	100.0	4	0.0	4	0.0	4	25.0
Teton	4	100.0	4	100.0	4	75.0	4	75.0	4	25.0	4	0.0	4	25.0
Twin Falls	15	93.3	15	86.7	15	26.7	15	93.3	15	13.3	15	20.0	15	20.0
Valley	3	100.0	3	66.7	3	0.0	3	100.0	3	0.0	3	33.3	3	66.7
Washington	3	100.0	3	66.7	3	33.3	3	100.0	3	0.0	2	0.0	3	0.0
Total	276	88.3	273	69.2	269	34.9	274	91.6	271	19.6	273	17.6	274	23.7

\*No response from this county

**Table 7. Most common responses by county to the question: “What are the two or three most serious consequences of drug abuse in your community?”**

County	Sample Size	First	Second	Third
Ada	16	Increased crime rates	Neglected, abused children	Addiction leads to increasing recidivism
Adams	1	Lack of child care	Errant driving	
Bannock	8	Spouse and child abuse	Prison/incarceration	Threat to public safety
Bear Lake	2	Increased spouse abuse	Increased burglary	
Benewah	2	Violence	Property crimes	Unemployment/poverty
Bingham	5	Spouse and child abuse	Crime to supply drug habit	Death
Blaine	2	Unemployable, unproductive citizens	Family abuse and neglect	Theft and property crimes, violence
Boise	1	Domestic violence	child abuse/neglect	Vehicle accidents
Bonner	3	Destruction of family	Theft	Mental health issues
Bonneville	6	Property crime/secondary crimes	High cost of rehabilitation	Child abuse or neglect
Boundary	1	Spousal/child abuse		
Butte	2	Thefts to support drug habit	Violence	Accidents involving alcohol
Camas	1	Early age of meth use by teens leading to crime and pregnancy		
Canyon	3	Domestic violence	Theft to support usage	The loss of the person
Caribou	1	Destruction of family	Drug users are unproductive members of society	
Cassia	3	Thefts to support drug habit	Cost of treatment and incarceration to tax payers	Gangs
Clark	0			
Clearwater	3	Destruction of family	Family violence	Sex for drugs
Custer	1	Property damage	battery - simple and domestic	
Elmore	2	Child abuse and neglect	Crime to supply drug habit	Repeat offenders with escalating criminal behavior
Franklin	0			
Fremont	1	Accidents	Family violence	Thefts
Gem	2	Health of the individual	Effect of drug abuse on children	Crime
Gooding	1	Domestic violence	child abuse/neglect	Property crimes
Idaho	2	spousal and child abuse	DUI accidents	Marijuana use/sales by juveniles
Jefferson	1	Burglary	Spousal abuse - battery	
Jerome	1	Theft	Child abuse/neglect	Felony caseload which is becoming unmanageable
Kootenai	7	Increase in property crime	violence	Child abuse or neglect
Latah	4	Child abuse and neglect	Crimes against persons (battery, assault)	Theft
Lemhi	2	Broken homes	Unproductive citizens	Theft
Lewis	1	Leads to burglaries and thefts to support habit.		
Lincoln	0			
Madison	3	Child and spouse abuse	More crime (burglary/theft)	People getting hurt
Minidoka	1	property crimes	Crimes against other people	Addiction/ health issues
Nez Perce	5	Neglect of families due to use	Violence in the home and in the community	Driving injury (under influences)
Oneida	1	Theft	Child abuse/neglect	
Owyhee	1	Theft	Domestic abuse	Child abuse or neglect
Payette	1	Related crimes	Domestic violence	Theft
Power	1	Lost opportunity for education - "Got stoned and missed it.	Proliferation of dysfunctional group in society who won't work or participate in society.	
Shoshone	2	Family violence	Thefts	Neglect of families
Teton	2	Broken homes	Juvenile involvement	Child abuse or neglect
Twin Falls	7	Crime increases	Harm to others	Economic inability to keep a job.
Valley	1	Delivery use in school		
Washington	1	Spouse abuse	Burglary	Theft
Total	111	Increase in property and violent crime	Family violence - including child neglect and spousal abuse	The health and treatment costs to society



## Drug Trends

Respondents were asked if in the last five years they had noticed any changes in drug trends in regards to the user's drug of preference, the age of the average drug abuser, the sex of the average drug abuser, the public's opinion of drug abusers, the sentencing of drug offenders, the overall behavior of drug offenders, or a change in federally funded programs. Tables 8, 9, and 10 refer to this question.

**Table 8. Percent who have noticed a change in the last five years in regards to the following drug trends:**

COUNTY	User drug of preference		Age		Sex		Public's Opinion		Sentencing		Behavior of Drug Addicts		Federally funded Programs	
	Sample Size	%	Sample Size	%	Sample Size	%	Sample Size	%	Sample Size	%	Sample Size	%	Sample Size	%
Ada	31	54.8	31	35.5	31	38.7	31	35.5	31	48.4	31	41.9	30	46.7
Adams	1	100.0	1	0.0	1	100.0	1	0.0	1	0.0	1	100.0	1	0.0
Bannock	17	70.6	17	52.9	17	64.7	17	35.3	17	41.2	17	52.9	16	25.0
Bear Lake	2	100.0	2	100.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	2	0.0
Benewah	6	66.7	6	33.3	6	50.0	6	50.0	6	66.7	6	66.7	6	50.0
Bingham	13	53.8	13	46.2	12	8.3	13	30.8	13	46.2	13	46.2	13	38.5
Blaine	8	87.5	8	37.5	8	37.5	8	50.0	8	37.5	8	37.5	8	25.0
Boise	4	75.0	4	25.0	4	50.0	4	0.0	4	50.0	4	0.0	4	25.0
Bonner	6	83.3	6	50.0	6	16.7	6	33.3	6	83.3	6	100.0	6	50.0
Bonneville	15	60.0	15	53.3	15	40.0	15	40.0	14	50.0	15	53.3	14	35.7
Boundary	3	66.7	3	33.3	3	66.7	3	0.0	3	0.0	3	66.7	3	33.3
Butte	3	0.0	3	33.3	3	33.3	3	66.7	3	33.3	3	0.0	3	33.3
Camas	2	50.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	2	0.0
Canyon	8	62.5	7	28.6	7	14.3	7	28.6	7	42.9	7	57.1	7	42.9
Caribou	5	80.0	5	100.0	5	60.0	5	80.0	5	60.0	5	60.0	5	20.0
Cassia	4	100.0	4	50.0	4	50.0	4	25.0	4	25.0	4	100.0	4	75.0
Clark	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*
Clearwater	5	60.0	5	40.0	5	0.0	5	60.0	5	20.0	5	40.0	5	0.0
Custer	3	66.7	3	0.0	3	0.0	3	33.3	3	66.7	3	0.0	3	66.7
Elmore	4	100.0	4	50.0	4	0.0	4	25.0	4	75.0	4	50.0	4	25.0
Franklin	1	100.0	1	100.0	1	0.0	1	0.0	1	0.0	1	100.0	1	100.0
Fremont	5	40.0	5	0.0	5	40.0	5	0.0	5	80.0	5	20.0	5	60.0
Gem	5	40.0	5	20.0	5	40.0	5	40.0	5	40.0	5	20.0	5	60.0
Gooding	4	100.0	3	66.7	4	50.0	4	25.0	4	50.0	4	75.0	4	50.0
Idaho	5	40.0	5	20.0	5	0.0	5	60.0	5	0.0	5	20.0	5	20.0
Jefferson	3	66.7	3	33.3	3	33.3	3	0.0	3	0.0	3	66.7	3	33.3
Jerome	4	50.0	4	0.0	4	0.0	4	25.0	4	0.0	4	50.0	4	0.0
Kootenai	16	50.0	16	43.8	16	43.8	16	43.8	16	50.0	16	43.8	16	50.0
Latah	7	28.6	7	42.9	7	42.9	7	28.6	7	14.3	7	42.9	7	14.3
Lemhi	3	100.0	3	66.7	3	33.3	3	0.0	3	66.7	3	33.3	3	66.7
Lewis	1	0.0	1	100.0	1	0.0	1	100.0	1	0.0	1	0.0	1	0.0
Lincoln	3	66.7	3	33.3	3	66.7	3	33.3	3	66.7	3	33.3	3	33.3
Madison	8	100.0	7	57.1	7	71.4	7	42.9	7	71.4	7	42.9	7	71.4
Minidoka	5	60.0	5	60.0	5	20.0	5	0.0	5	60.0	5	60.0	5	60.0
Nez Perce	16	75.0	16	50.0	16	18.8	16	31.3	16	50.0	16	37.5	15	33.3
Oneida	3	100.0	3	33.3	3	33.3	3	33.3	3	100.0	3	100.0	3	0.0
Owyhee	3	33.3	3	33.3	3	0.0	3	33.3	3	33.3	3	33.3	3	0.0
Payette	4	75.0	4	25.0	4	0.0	4	0.0	4	50.0	4	75.0	3	33.3
Power	6	66.7	6	16.7	6	16.7	6	33.3	6	83.3	5	20.0	6	16.7
Shoshone	4	75.0	4	50.0	4	25.0	4	25.0	4	75.0	4	25.0	4	50.0
Teton	4	75.0	4	100.0	4	0.0	4	50.0	4	50.0	4	50.0	4	25.0
Twin Falls	15	73.3	15	73.3	15	53.3	15	20.0	15	53.3	15	46.7	14	35.7
Valley	3	1	3	100.0	3	0.0	3	33.3	3	33.3	3	66.7	3	0.0
Washington	3	0	3	33.3	3	0.0	3	0.0	3	33.3	3	0.0	3	33.3
Total	271	64.2	268	45.1	268	34.0	269	33.1	268	47.8	268	46.3	263	36.5

\*No response from this county

**Table 9. Percent who have noticed a change in the user's drug of preference in the last five years, and if so, from what previous drug of choice, to what new drug of choice**

COUNTY	Population	Rate per 10000	Sample Size	% "Yes"	From	To
Ada	300,904	1.06	31	54.8	Marijuana/cocaine	Meth
Adams	3,476	2.88	1	100.0	Cocaine	Meth
Bannock	75,565	2.25	17	70.6	Marijuana/cocaine	Meth
Bear Lake	6,411	3.12	2	100.0	Marijuana	Meth
Benewah	9,171	6.54	6	66.7	Marijuana/cocaine/alcohol	Meth
Bingham	41,735	3.11	13	53.8	Marijuana	Meth
Blaine	18,991	4.21	8	87.5	Cocaine/crack	Meth
Boise	6,670	4.50	4	75.0	Alcohol/cocaine	Meth
Bonner	36,835	1.63	6	83.3	Marijuana/cocaine	Meth
Bonneville	82,522	1.94	15	60.0	Cocaine/Marijuana	Meth
Boundary	9,871	3.04	3	66.7	Marijuana/Cocaine	Meth
Butte	2,899	10.35	3	0.0		
Camas	991	20.18	2	50.0	Marijuana	Meth
Canyon	131,441	0.61	8	62.5	Marijuana	Meth
Caribou	7,304	6.85	5	80.0	Marijuana/alcohol	Meth
Cassia	21,416	1.87	4	100.0	Marijuana/cocaine	Meth
Clark	1,022	0.00	0	*		
Clearwater	8,930	5.60	5	60.0	Marijuana	Meth
Custer	4,342	9.21	3	66.7	Cocaine	Meth
Elmore	29,130	1.37	4	100.0	Marijuana/cocaine	Meth
Franklin	11,329	0.88	1	100.0	Cocaine	Meth
Fremont	11,819	4.23	5	40.0	Alcohol	Meth
Gem	15,181	3.29	5	40.0	Heroin	Meth
Gooding	14,155	2.83	4	100.0	Cocaine/crack	Meth
Idaho	15,511	3.87	5	40.0	Cocaine/crack	Meth
Jefferson	19,155	1.57	3	66.7	Alcohol/marijuana	Meth
Jerome	18,342	2.18	4	50.0	cocaine/crack	Meth
Kootenai	108,685	1.47	16	50.0	Marijuana/cocaine	Meth
Latah	34,935	2.00	7	28.6	cocaine/crack	Meth
Lemhi	7,806	3.84	3	100.0	Marijuana/cocaine	Meth
Lewis	3,747	2.67	1	0.0		
Lincoln	4,044	7.42	3	66.7	Marijuana	Meth
Madison	27,467	2.91	8	100.0	Marijuana	Meth
Minidoka	20,174	2.48	5	60.0	Marijuana	Meth
Nez Perce	37,410	4.54	16	75.0	Cocaine/crack	Meth
Oneida	4,125	7.27	3	100.0	Cocaine/crack	Meth
Owyhee	10,644	2.82	3	33.3	Cocaine/crack	Meth
Payette	20,578	1.94	4	75.0	Marijuana/Cocaine	Meth
Power	7,538	7.96	6	66.7	Cocaine/crack	Meth
Shoshone	13,771	2.90	4	75.0	Marijuana	Meth
Teton	5,999	6.67	4	75.0	Marijuana	Meth
Twin Falls	64,284	2.33	15	73.3	Marijuana/Cocaine	Meth
Valley	7,651	3.92	3	1	Marijuana	Meth
Washington	9,977	3.01	3	0		
Total	1,293,953	2.09	271.0	166	268	34.0

\*No response from this county

**Table 10. Percent who in the last five years have noticed a change in the age of the average drug abuser, and from what previous age to what new age**

COUNTY	Population	Rate per 10000	Sample Size	% "yes"	From	To
Ada	300,904	1.06	31	35.5	Older: late teens	Younger: mid-teens
Adams	3,476	2.88	1	0.0		
Bannock	75,565	2.25	17	52.9	Older: late twenties	Younger: early twenties
Bear Lake	6,411	3.12	2	100.0	Older: early to mid twenties	Younger: teens
Benewah	9,171	6.54	6	33.3	Older: early twenties	
Bingham	41,735	3.11	13	46.2	Older: twenties	Younger: late teens
Blaine	18,991	4.21	8	37.5	Older: twenties	Younger: late teens
Boise	6,670	4.50	4	25.0	Younger	Older
Bonner	36,835	1.63	6	50.0	Older: twenties	Younger: late teens
Bonneville	82,522	1.94	15	53.3	Older: Mid-teens	Younger: elementary
Boundary	9,871	3.04	3	33.3	Older	Younger
Butte	2,899	10.35	3	33.3	Older:mid teens	Younger: early teens
Camas	991	20.18	2	50.0	Older: late teens	Younger: early teens
Canyon	131,441	0.61	7	28.6	Older: late teens	Younger: early teens
Caribou	7,304	6.85	5	100.0	Older/Younger	Older/Younger
Cassia	21,416	1.87	4	50.0	Older: early twenties	Younger: late teens
Clark	1,022	0.00	5	40.0		
Clearwater	8,930	5.60	3	0.0		
Custer	4,342	9.21	4	50.0		
Elmore	29,130	1.37	1	100.0	Older	Younger and "way older"
Franklin	11,329	0.88	5	0.0		
Fremont	11,819	4.23	5	20.0		
Gem	15,181	3.29	3	66.7	Older	Younger
Gooding	14,155	2.83	5	20.0	Older: mid thirties	Younger: mid- twenties
Idaho	15,511	3.87	3	33.3		
Jefferson	19,155	1.57	4	0.0		
Jerome	18,342	2.18	16	43.8		
Kootenai	108,685	1.47	7	42.9	Older: twenties	Younger:late teens
Latah	34,935	2.00	3	66.7	Older: twenties - thirties	Younger: late teens - early twenties
Lemhi	7,806	3.84	1	100.0	Older: adults	Younger: children
Lewis	3,747	2.67	3	33.3	Older: adults	Younger: children
Lincoln	4,044	7.42	7	57.1	Younger: early teens	Older: late twenties
Madison	27,467	2.91	5	60.0	Older:late teens	Younger: early teens
Minidoka	20,174	2.48	16	50.0	Older: late teens	Younger: early teens
Nez Perce	37,410	4.54	3	33.3	Older: mid teens	Younger: early teens
Oneida	4,125	7.27	3	33.3	Younger: teens	Older: thirty-five to fifty
Owyhee	10,644	2.82	4	25.0	Older: early twenties	Younger: early teens
Payette	20,578	1.94	6	16.7	Older:adults	Younger: teens
Power	7,538	7.96	4	50.0	Older:late teens	Younger: early teens
Shoshone	13,771	2.90	4	100.0	Younger/Older	Younger/Older
Teton	5,999	6.67	15	73.3	Older: twenties - thirties	Younger: mid- teens
Twin Falls	64,284	2.33	3	100.0	Older: late teens	Younger: early - mid teens
Valley	7,651	3.92	3	33.3	Older: twenties	Younger: teens
Washington	9,977	3.01	268	45.1	Older: late twenties	Younger: teens
Total	1,293,953	2.07	268	33.08	Older	Younger

\*No response from this county

### Change in Resources

Respondents were asked to note on a scale of 1 - 5 (A lot More to A lot Less) whether they had experienced a change in the amount of resources - money, experts, and drug treatment - they have available to help combat the drug problem. For each resource the upper two and lower two categories were combined creating three categories instead of five.

**Table 11. Percent saying they have “more, the same, or less” of the following resources for since five years ago.**

County	Money				Expert workers				Treatment			
	Sample Size	A lot more to more	The same	Less to A lot Less	Sample Size	A lot more to more	The same	Less to A lot Less	Sample Size	A lot more to more	The same	Less to A lot Less
Ada	30	30.0	30.0	40.0	30	46.7	23.3	30.0	31	51.6	19.4	29.0
Adams	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Bannock	16	50.0	31.3	18.8	17	64.7	23.5	11.8	17	29.4	47.1	23.5
Bear Lake	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Benewah	6	66.7	16.7	16.7	6	83.3	16.7	0.0	6	66.7	33.3	0.0
Bingham	13	30.8	46.2	23.1	13	38.5	46.2	15.4	13	23.1	46.2	30.8
Blaine	6	33.3	16.7	50.0	6	50.0	16.7	33.3	6	66.7	0.0	33.3
Boise	4	50.0	0.0	50.0	4	0.0	25.0	75.0	4	50.0	25.0	25.0
Bonner	5	40.0	40.0	20.0	5	100.0	0.0	0.0	5	80.0	20.0	0.0
Bonneville	15	46.7	40.0	13.3	15	73.3	20.0	6.7	15	60.0	33.3	6.7
Boundary	3	66.7	0.0	33.3	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	3	0.0	100.0	0.0
Butte	3	33.3	66.7	0.0	3	66.7	33.3	0.0	3	0.0	100.0	0.0
Camas	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0
Canyon	7	0.0	57.1	42.9	7	42.9	42.9	14.3	7	14.3	57.1	28.6
Caribou	5	20.0	40.0	40.0	5	60.0	40.0	0.0	5	20.0	80.0	0.0
Cassia	4	25.0	0.0	75.0	4	25.0	50.0	25.0	4	50.0	25.0	25.0
Clark	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*
Clearwater	5	0.0	20.0	80.0	5	20.0	20.0	60.0	5	20.0	0.0	80.0
Custer	3	0.0	33.3	66.7	3	0.0	100.0	0.0	3	33.3	66.7	0.0
Elmore	4	50.0	0.0	50.0	4	0.0	100.0	0.0	4	0.0	50.0	50.0
Franklin	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Fremont	5	20.0	40.0	40.0	5	40.0	60.0	0.0	5	0.0	80.0	20.0
Gem	5	0.0	80.0	20.0	5	80.0	20.0	0.0	5	60.0	0.0	40.0
Gooding	4	25.0	25.0	50.0	3	66.7	0.0	33.3	3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Idaho	5	40.0	20.0	40.0	5	20.0	80.0	0.0	5	0.0	80.0	20.0
Jefferson	3	0.0	33.3	66.7	3	66.7	0.0	33.3	3	33.3	66.7	0.0
Jerome	4	25.0	25.0	50.0	4	25.0	25.0	50.0	4	50.0	25.0	25.0
Kootenai	16	6.3	56.3	37.5	16	18.8	56.3	25.0	16	25.0	62.5	12.5
Latah	7	28.6	42.9	28.6	7	57.1	28.6	14.3	7	42.9	0.0	57.1
Lemhi	3	0.0	33.3	66.7	3	66.7	33.3	0.0	3	0.0	66.7	33.3
Lewis	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lincoln	3	66.7	33.3	0.0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Madison	7	42.9	28.6	28.6	8	75.0	12.5	12.5	8	37.5	37.5	25.0
Minidoka	5	60.0	20.0	20.0	5	100.0	0.0	0.0	5	40.0	60.0	0.0
Nez Perce	16	31.3	31.3	37.5	16	43.8	37.5	18.8	16	6.3	43.8	50.0
Oneida	3	0.0	66.7	33.3	3	33.3	33.3	33.3	3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Owyhee	3	0.0	66.7	33.3	3	0.0	66.7	33.3	3	0.0	33.3	66.7
Payette	4	25.0	50.0	25.0	4	50.0	50.0	0.0	4	25.0	75.0	0.0
Power	6	33.3	0.0	66.7	6	83.3	16.7	0.0	6	50.0	50.0	0.0
Shoshone	4	0.0	25.0	75.0	4	0.0	50.0	50.0	4	0.0	50.0	50.0
Teton	4	25.0	50.0	25.0	4	50.0	25.0	25.0	4	50.0	50.0	0.0
Twin Falls	15	40.0	26.7	33.3	15	53.3	33.3	13.3	15	26.7	40.0	33.3
Valley	3	33.3	66.7	0.0	3	66.7	0.0	33.3	3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Washington	3	0.0	66.7	33.3	3	33.3	33.3	33.3	3	0.0	66.7	33.3
Total	264	29.2	35.2	35.6	265	49.8	32.5	17.7	265	33.2	40.0	26.8

\*No response from this county

### Availability and Quality of Current Prevention Measures

Respondents were asked to indicate if a list of drug prevention measures were available in their jurisdiction. If so, they were asked how effective they felt the measures were at preventing drug abuse in their jurisdiction. The measures included: drug prevention programs in schools, alcohol prevention programs in schools, other drug/alcohol prevention programs, drug/alcohol treatment for offenders, social services for delinquent juveniles who have drug or alcohol problems, community or citizen groups formed to prevent or combat drug/alcohol problems, and “data you use for assessing drug problems” Tables 12 - 18 list the responses by county.

**Table 12. The availability and quality of drug prevention programs in schools.**

Drug Prevention Programs in Schools						
	"Yes" they're available		Quality			
	Sample Size	%	Sample Size	Highly to More effective	Effective	Somewhat to Not Effective
Ada	28	100.0	29	13.8	31.0	55.2
Adams	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bannock	15	100.0	16	25.0	31.3	43.8
Bear Lake	1	100.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0
Benewah	6	66.7	4	0.0	50.0	50.0
Bingham	11	100.0	13	38.5	30.8	30.8
Blaine	6	100.0	6	16.7	33.3	50.0
Boise	3	100.0	3	0.0	33.3	66.7
Bonner	6	66.7	4	0.0	50.0	50.0
Bonneville	13	100.0	14	21.4	35.7	42.9
Boundary	3	100.0	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Butte	3	66.7	2	0.0	100.0	0.0
Camas	2	100.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0
Canyon	6	83.3	7	14.3	42.9	42.9
Caribou	3	66.7	3	33.3	0.0	66.7
Cassia	3	100.0	4	0.0	25.0	75.0
Clark	0	*	0	*	*	*
Clearwater	5	100.0	5	0.0	60.0	40.0
Custer	3	100.0	3	0.0	66.7	33.3
Elmore	4	100.0	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
Franklin	1	100.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Fremont	5	100.0	5	60.0	0.0	40.0
Gem	5	80.0	4	0.0	50.0	50.0
Gooding	3	33.3	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Idaho	4	100.0	4	50.0	0.0	50.0
Jefferson	3	100.0	3	33.3	66.7	0.0
Jerome	3	100.0	4	0.0	75.0	25.0
Kootenai	16	93.8	15	26.7	46.7	26.7
Latah	7	100.0	7	0.0	28.6	71.4
Lemhi	2	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Lewis	1	100.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Lincoln	2	50.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Madison	6	100.0	8	37.5	62.5	0.0
Minidoka	5	80.0	4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Nez Perce	16	93.8	15	20.0	33.3	46.7
Oneida	3	100.0	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Owyhee	3	100.0	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
Payette	3	100.0	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
Power	6	100.0	6	16.7	50.0	33.3
Shoshone	3	66.7	2	0.0	50.0	50.0
Teton	4	100.0	4	0.0	75.0	25.0
Twin Falls	14	71.4	11	0.0	36.4	63.6
Valley	3	66.7	2	50.0	0.0	50.0
Washington	3	100.0	3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Total	242	90.9	234	20.1	37.2	42.7

\*No response from this county

**Table 13. Availability and quality of alcohol prevention programs in schools**

<b>Alcohol Prevention Programs in Schools</b>						
	<b>"Yes" they're available</b>		<b>Quality</b>			
	Sample Size	%	Sample Size	Highly to More effective	Effective	Somewhat to Not effective
Ada	27	96.3	26	7.7	30.8	61.5
Adams	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bannock	15	93.3	15	26.7	33.3	40.0
Bear Lake	1	100.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0
Benewah	6	66.7	4	0.0	75.0	25.0
Bingham	11	90.9	12	33.3	33.3	33.3
Blaine	5	100.0	5	0.0	60.0	40.0
Boise	3	100.0	3	0.0	33.3	66.7
Bonner	6	66.7	4	0.0	50.0	50.0
Bonneville	12	91.7	12	16.7	25.0	58.3
Boundary	3	100.0	3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Butte	3	66.7	2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Camas	2	100.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0
Canyon	6	66.7	6	16.7	50.0	33.3
Caribou	3	66.7	3	33.3	0.0	66.7
Cassia	4	75.0	3	33.3	0.0	66.7
Clark	0	*	0	*	*	*
Clearwater	5	100.0	5	0.0	20.0	80.0
Custer	3	66.7	2	0.0	50.0	50.0
Elmore	4	100.0	3	33.3	0.0	66.7
Franklin	1	100.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Fremont	5	60.0	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
Gem	5	80.0	4	0.0	50.0	50.0
Gooding	3	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Idaho	4	100.0	4	50.0	0.0	50.0
Jefferson	3	100.0	3	33.3	66.7	0.0
Jerome	3	100.0	4	0.0	75.0	25.0
Kootenai	15	100.0	16	18.8	31.3	50.0
Latah	7	100.0	7	0.0	14.3	85.7
Lemhi	2	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Lewis	1	100.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Lincoln	1	100.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Madison	6	100.0	8	25.0	75.0	0.0
Minidoka	5	80.0	4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Nez Perce	15	80.0	13	15.4	15.4	69.2
Oneida	3	100.0	3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Owyhee	3	33.3	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Payette	2	100.0	3	33.3	0.0	66.7
Power	6	100.0	6	16.7	50.0	33.3
Shoshone	3	66.7	2	0.0	100.0	0.0
Teton	3	100.0	3	0.0	100.0	0.0
Twin Falls	13	76.9	11	9.1	27.3	63.6
Valley	3	66.7	2	50.0	0.0	50.0
Washington	3	100.0	3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Total	234	85.9	216	17.6	33.3	49.1

\*No response from this county

**Table 14. Availability and quality of other drug/alcohol programs**

<b>Other Drug/Alcohol Prevention Programs</b>						
	<b>"Yes" they're available</b>		<b>Effectiveness</b>			
<b>County</b>	<b>Sample Size</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Sample Size</b>	<b>Highly to More Effective</b>	<b>Effective</b>	<b>Somewhat to Not effective</b>
Ada	25	88.0	22	18.2	31.8	50.0
Adams	1	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bannock	11	81.8	11	9.1	36.4	54.5
Bear Lake	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Benewah	6	66.7	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
Bingham	10	60.0	9	22.2	55.6	22.2
Blaine	7	57.1	4	25.0	50.0	25.0
Boise	3	100.0	3	0.0	66.7	33.3
Bonner	5	40.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Bonneville	11	90.9	11	27.3	18.2	54.5
Boundary	2	100.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Butte	3	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Camas	2	100.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0
Canyon	6	50.0	5	20.0	40.0	40.0
Caribou	3	100.0	4	25.0	0.0	75.0
Cassia	2	100.0	3	33.3	0.0	66.7
Clark	0	*	0	*	*	*
Clearwater	5	40.0	2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Custer	2	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Elmore	3	33.3	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Franklin	1	100.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Fremont	4	50.0	2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gem	5	60.0	3	0.0	33.3	66.7
Gooding	3	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Idaho	4	50.0	2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Jefferson	2	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Jerome	3	100.0	4	25.0	50.0	25.0
Kootenai	13	53.8	7	42.9	14.3	42.9
Latah	7	57.1	3	0.0	33.3	66.7
Lemhi	2	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Lewis	1	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lincoln	1	100.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Madison	5	80.0	6	16.7	50.0	33.3
Minidoka	5	80.0	4	25.0	0.0	75.0
Nez Perce	15	73.3	11	18.2	45.5	36.4
Oneida	3	33.3	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Owyhee	3	66.7	2	0.0	50.0	50.0
Payette	2	50.0	2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Power	5	40.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Shoshone	3	33.3	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Teton	4	50.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0
Twin Falls	12	58.3	8	12.5	0.0	87.5
Valley	3	33.3	2	50.0	0.0	50.0
Washington	2	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total	216	62.0	151	19.9	31.1	49.0

\*No response from this county

**Table 15. Availability and quality of drug/alcohol treatment for offenders**

Drug/alcohol Treatment for Offenders						
County	"Yes" they're available		Quality			
	Sample Size	%	Sample Size	Highly to More effective	Effective	Somewhat to Not effective
Ada	28	100.0	29	20.7	27.6	51.7
Adams	1	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Bannock	16	75.0	13	30.8	30.8	38.5
Bear Lake	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Benewah	5	100.0	6	50.0	16.7	33.3
Bingham	11	90.9	12	33.3	41.7	25.0
Blaine	8	75.0	6	33.3	0.0	66.7
Boise	3	66.7	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
Bonner	6	100.0	6	50.0	33.3	16.7
Bonneville	13	92.3	13	38.5	46.2	15.4
Boundary	2	50.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Butte	3	100.0	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
Camas	2	50.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Canyon	5	60.0	6	0.0	33.3	66.7
Caribou	4	50.0	3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cassia	3	66.7	3	33.3	0.0	66.7
Clark	0	0.0	0	*	*	*
Clearwater	5	60.0	3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Custer	3	66.7	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Elmore	4	100.0	4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Franklin	0	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Fremont	5	80.0	4	0.0	25.0	75.0
Gem	5	80.0	4	0.0	25.0	75.0
Gooding	3	100.0	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
Idaho	3	100.0	6	16.7	33.3	50.0
Jefferson	2	50.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Jerome	3	66.7	3	33.3	0.0	66.7
Kootenai	16	87.5	14	42.9	14.3	42.9
Latah	7	85.7	6	33.3	16.7	50.0
Lemhi	2	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Lewis	1	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Lincoln	1	100.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Madison	6	83.3	7	28.6	28.6	42.9
Minidoka	5	80.0	4	25.0	50.0	25.0
Nez Perce	15	93.3	16	12.5	37.5	43.8
Oneida	3	100.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Owyhee	3	33.3	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Payette	2	100.0	3	33.3	0.0	66.7
Power	6	83.3	5	40.0	20.0	40.0
Shoshone	3	100.0	3	33.3	0.0	66.7
Teton	4	50.0	2	50.0	0.0	50.0
Twin Falls	13	76.9	11	27.3	18.2	54.5
Valley	3	100.0	2	50.0	0.0	50.0
Washington	3	66.7	2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Total	237	82.7	219	26.5	25.1	47.9

\*No response from this county



**Table 16. Availability and quality of social services for delinquent juveniles who have drug or alcohol problems**

Social Services for Delinquent Juveniles who have Drug or Alcohol Problems						
County	"Yes" they're available		Quality			
	Sample Size	%	Sample Size	Highly to More effective	Effective	Somewhat to Not effective
Ada	27	96.3	26	19.2	23.1	57.7
Adams	1	100.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bannock	14	71.4	12	33.3	33.3	33.3
Bear Lake	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Benewah	5	100.0	6	33.3	33.3	33.3
Bingham	11	100.0	13	15.4	53.8	30.8
Blaine	7	100.0	6	33.3	16.7	50.0
Boise	3	66.7	3	33.3	0.0	66.7
Bonner	6	83.3	5	40.0	20.0	40.0
Bonneville	13	84.6	12	25.0	25.0	50.0
Boundary	3	66.7	2	0.0	50.0	50.0
Butte	3	33.3	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Camas	2	50.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Canyon	5	60.0	6	0.0	33.3	66.7
Caribou	4	25.0	2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cassia	3	66.7	3	33.3	0.0	66.7
Clark	0	*	0	*	*	*
Clearwater	5	40.0	2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Custer	3	66.7	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Elmore	3	66.7	2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Franklin	1	100.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Fremont	5	40.0	2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gem	5	60.0	3	0.0	33.3	66.7
Gooding	3	66.7	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Idaho	4	50.0	3	0.0	33.3	66.7
Jefferson	3	66.7	2	0.0	100.0	0.0
Jerome	3	66.7	3	33.3	0.0	66.7
Kootenai	15	86.7	13	38.5	23.1	38.5
Latah	7	85.7	6	33.3	16.7	50.0
Lemhi	2	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Lewis	1	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lincoln	1	100.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Madison	6	83.3	7	28.6	42.9	28.6
Minidoka	5	80.0	4	50.0	25.0	25.0
Nez Perce	14	92.9	13	15.4	23.1	61.5
Oneida	3	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Owyhee	3	66.7	2	50.0	0.0	50.0
Payette	3	66.7	6	33.3	33.3	33.3
Power	6	100.0	3	0.0	66.7	33.3
Shoshone	3	66.7	2	0.0	100.0	0.0
Teton	4	50.0	11	18.2	18.2	63.6
Twin Falls	13	76.9	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
Valley	3	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Washington	3	33.3	196	24.0	27.6	48.5
Total	235	75.7		24.0	27.6	48.5

\*No response from this county

**Table 17. Availability and quality of community groups formed to combat drug/alcohol problems**

<b>Community or Citizen Groups Formed to Prevent or Combat Drug/Alcohol Problems</b>						
	<b>"Yes" they're available</b>		<b>Quality</b>			
<b>County</b>	<b>Sample Size</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Sample Size</b>	<b>More Effective</b>	<b>Effective</b>	<b>Less Effective</b>
Ada	25	92.0	25	8.0	16.0	76.0
Adams	1	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bannock	14	64.3	10	20.0	10.0	70.0
Bear Lake	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Benewah	5	80.0	5	20.0	40.0	40.0
Bingham	11	54.5	7	14.3	42.9	42.9
Blaine	6	66.7	4	25.0	25.0	50.0
Boise	3	66.7	3	33.3	0.0	66.7
Bonner	5	60.0	3	0.0	33.3	66.7
Bonneville	13	53.8	8	37.5	37.5	25.0
Boundary	3	33.3	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Butte	2	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Camas	2	100.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0
Canyon	6	33.3	4	0.0	25.0	75.0
Caribou	4	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cassia	4	25.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Clark	0	*	*	*	*	*
Clearwater	5	60.0	3	33.3	66.7	0.0
Custer	3	33.3	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Elmore	4	25.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Franklin	0	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Fremont	5	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gem	5	40.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0
Gooding	3	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Idaho	4	100.0	5	20.0	20.0	60.0
Jefferson	3	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Jerome	3	33.3	2	0.0	50.0	50.0
Kootenai	16	75.0	12	25.0	25.0	50.0
Latah	7	14.3	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Lemhi	2	100.0	3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Lewis	1	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lincoln	1	100.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Madison	5	40.0	4	0.0	25.0	75.0
Minidoka	4	25.0	2	50.0	0.0	50.0
Nez Perce	14	35.7	7	14.3	0.0	85.7
Oneida	3	33.3	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Owyhee	3	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Payette	3	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Power	4	25.0	2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Shoshone	3	33.3	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Teton	4	25.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Twin Falls	13	53.8	8	0.0	37.5	62.5
Valley	3	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Washington	3	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>48.5</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>15.4</b>	<b>22.8</b>	<b>61.8</b>

\*No response from this county

**Table 18. Availability and quality of “the data you use for assessing drug problems”**

<b>Data Used For Assessing Drug Problems</b>						
	<b>"Yes" it's available</b>		<b>Quality</b>			
<b>County</b>	<b>Sample Size</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Sample Size</b>	<b>Highly to More effective</b>	<b>Effective</b>	<b>Somewhat to Not effective</b>
Ada	23	78.3	20	35.0	30.0	35.0
Adams	1	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bannock	14	57.1	9	22.2	22.2	55.6
Bear Lake	1	100.0	2	50.0	0.0	50.0
Benewah	6	100.0	6	33.3	33.3	33.3
Bingham	11	45.5	7	28.6	42.9	28.6
Blaine	5	40.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Boise	3	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0
Bonner	6	66.7	4	25.0	0.0	75.0
Bonneville	12	58.3	8	37.5	62.5	0.0
Boundary	3	100.0	3	0.0	66.7	33.3
Butte	2	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Camas	2	50.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Canyon	6	50.0	5	20.0	20.0	60.0
Caribou	5	20.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cassia	4	25.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Clark	*	*	*	*	*	*
Clearwater	4	25.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Custer	3	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Elmore	4	75.0	3	0.0	33.3	66.7
Franklin	0	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Fremont	5	20.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Gem	5	60.0	3	0.0	100.0	0.0
Gooding	3	66.7	2	50.0	0.0	50.0
Idaho	4	100.0	5	20.0	60.0	20.0
Jefferson	2	100.0	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Jerome	3	33.3	2	50.0	0.0	50.0
Kootenai	16	75.0	12	33.3	33.3	33.3
Latah	7	28.6	2	0.0	50.0	50.0
Lemhi	2	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Lewis	1	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lincoln	1	100.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Madison	5	40.0	4	0.0	75.0	25.0
Minidoka	5	100.0	5	40.0	20.0	40.0
Nez Perce	15	33.3	7	71.4	14.3	14.3
Oneida	3	33.3	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Owyhee	3	33.3	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Payette	3	33.3	2	50.0	0.0	50.0
Power	6	66.7	4	50.0	50.0	0.0
Shoshone	3	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Teton	4	25.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Twin Falls	13	61.5	9	33.3	11.1	55.6
Valley	3	33.3	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Washington	2	50.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>53.3</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>32.0</b>	<b>32.7</b>	<b>35.4</b>

\*No response from this county

### Ways of Reducing the Problem

Respondents were asked on a scale of 1 - 5 (“Extremely likely” to “will not help”) how likely a list of elements would be at reducing the drug problem in their jurisdiction. The list included: (1) programs in schools to prevent student’s drug and alcohol use, such as DARE, or a School Resource Officer, (2) increased emphasis on apprehending/prosecuting drug dealers, (3) increased emphasis on apprehending/prosecuting drug distributors, (4) expanded capacity to incarcerate drug offenders, (5) regional drug task forces operated jointly by local agencies, (6) outpatient drug treatment programs, (6) inpatient treatment, (7) drug courts, (8) community residential drug treatment programs for offenders, (9) rehabilitation programs that teach drug abusers life/job/cognitive skills, and (10) social services for juveniles who have drug problems but aren’t in the correctional system. Tables 19 - 29 list the responses to this question by county.

**Table 19. How likely respondents felt programs in schools to prevent students’ drug or alcohol use would be at reducing the drug problem in the respondent’s jurisdiction**

<b>Programs in schools to prevent students' drug and alcohol use, such as DARE or a school resource officer</b>				
		Extremely Likely to	Neutral	Not Likely to Will Not Help
	Sample Size	Likely		
Ada	33	36.4	36.4	27.3
Adams	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bannock	16	62.5	18.8	18.8
Bear Lake	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Benewah	5	80.0	0.0	20.0
Bingham	13	76.9	7.7	15.4
Blaine	8	37.5	12.5	50.0
Boise	4	50.0	25.0	25.0
Bonner	6	83.3	16.7	0.0
Bonneville	15	40.0	26.7	33.3
Boundary	3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Butte	3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Camas	2	0.0	50.0	50.0
Canyon	8	50.0	37.5	12.5
Caribou	4	50.0	50.0	0.0
Cassia	4	25.0	25.0	50.0
Clark	0	*	*	*
Clearwater	5	80.0	20.0	0.0
Custer	4	75.0	0.0	25.0
Elmore	4	50.0	25.0	25.0
Franklin	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Fremont	5	60.0	20.0	20.0
Gem	4	75.0	0.0	25.0
Gooding	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Idaho	6	50.0	50.0	0.0
Jefferson	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Jerome	4	50.0	50.0	0.0
Kootenai	16	75.0	6.3	18.8
Latah	7	28.6	42.9	28.6
Lemhi	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Lewis	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Lincoln	3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Madison	8	87.5	12.5	0.0
Minidoka	5	40.0	20.0	40.0
Nez Perce	17	58.8	17.6	23.5
Oneida	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Owyhee	3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Payette	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Power	6	66.7	0.0	33.3
Shoshone	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Teton	4	75.0	0.0	25.0
Twin Falls	14	57.1	28.6	14.3
Valley	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Washington	3	0.0	100.0	0.0
Total	271	58.3	22.1	19.6

\*No response from this county

**Table 20. How likely respondents felt increased emphasis on apprehending/prosecuting drug dealers would be at reducing the drug problem in their area.**

<b>Increased emphasis on apprehending/prosecuting drug dealers</b>					
<b>County</b>	<b>Sample Size</b>	<b>Extremely</b>	<b>Likely to</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Not Likely to</b>
		<b>Likely</b>	<b>Likely</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Will Not Help</b>
Ada	33	63.6	24.2	12.1	
Adams	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	
Bannock	17	82.4	5.9	11.8	
Bear Lake	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	
Benewah	5	100.0	0.0	0.0	
Bingham	13	61.5	23.1	15.4	
Blaine	8	62.5	37.5	0.0	
Boise	4	50.0	50.0	0.0	
Bonner	6	66.7	33.3	0.0	
Bonneville	16	93.8	6.3	0.0	
Boundary	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	
Butte	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	
Camas	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	
Canyon	8	100.0	0.0	0.0	
Caribou	5	100.0	0.0	0.0	
Cassia	4	75.0	25.0	0.0	
Clark	0	*	*	*	
Clearwater	5	80.0	0.0	20.0	
Custer	4	100.0	0.0	0.0	
Elmore	4	75.0	25.0	0.0	
Franklin	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	
Fremont	5	80.0	0.0	20.0	
Gem	5	80.0	20.0	0.0	
Gooding	4	100.0	0.0	0.0	
Idaho	6	66.7	33.3	0.0	
Jefferson	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	
Jerome	4	100.0	0.0	0.0	
Kootenai	16	75.0	6.3	18.8	
Latah	7	71.4	14.3	14.3	
Lemhi	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	
Lewis	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	
Lincoln	3	66.7	33.3	0.0	
Madison	8	100.0	0.0	0.0	
Minidoka	5	100.0	0.0	0.0	
Nez Perce	17	76.5	11.8	11.8	
Oneida	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	
Owyhee	3	66.7	0.0	33.3	
Payette	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	
Power	6	33.3	33.3	33.3	
Shoshone	4	100.0	0.0	0.0	
Teton	4	75.0	25.0	0.0	
Twin Falls	15	66.7	13.3	20.0	
Valley	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	
Washington	3	66.7	0.0	33.3	
<b>Total</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>78.5</b>	<b>13.1</b>	<b>8.4</b>	

\*No response from this county

**Table 21. How likely respondents felt apprehending/prosecuting drug distributors would be at reducing the drug problem in their jurisdiction**

<b>Increased emphasis on apprehending/prosecuting drug distributors</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Sample Size</b>	<b>Extremely</b>		
		<b>Likely to Likely</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Not Likely to Will Not Help</b>
Ada	33	75.8	9.1	15.2
Adams	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bannock	17	76.5	11.8	11.8
Bear Lake	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Benewah	5	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bingham	13	69.2	15.4	15.4
Blaine	8	75.0	12.5	12.5
Boise	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Bonner	6	83.3	16.7	0.0
Bonneville	15	100.0	0.0	0.0
Boundary	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Butte	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Camas	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Canyon	8	100.0	0.0	0.0
Caribou	5	100.0	0.0	0.0
Cassia	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Clark	0	*	*	*
Clearwater	5	80.0	0.0	20.0
Custer	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Elmore	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Franklin	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Fremont	5	100.0	0.0	0.0
Gem	5	80.0	0.0	20.0
Gooding	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Idaho	6	66.7	33.3	0.0
Jefferson	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Jerome	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Kootenai	16	81.3	6.3	12.5
Latah	7	71.4	14.3	14.3
Lemhi	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Lewis	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Lincoln	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Madison	8	100.0	0.0	0.0
Minidoka	5	100.0	0.0	0.0
Nez Perce	17	82.4	11.8	5.9
Oneida	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Owyhee	3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Payette	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Power	6	50.0	16.7	33.3
Shoshone	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Teton	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Twin Falls	15	66.7	13.3	20.0
Valley	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Washington	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>83.9</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>8.1</b>

\*No response from this county

**Table 22. How likely expanded capacity to incarcerate drug offenders would be at reducing the drug problem in the respondent's jurisdiction**

<b>Expanded capacity to incarcerate drug offenders</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Sample Size</b>	<b>Extremely</b>		
		<b>Likely to Likely</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Not Likely to Will Not Help</b>
Ada	33	36.4	24.2	39.4
Adams	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Bannock	17	41.2	29.4	29.4
Bear Lake	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Benewah	5	80.0	20.0	0.0
Bingham	13	53.8	30.8	15.4
Blaine	7	71.4	14.3	14.3
Boise	4	50.0	25.0	25.0
Bonner	6	33.3	66.7	0.0
Bonneville	16	62.5	18.8	18.8
Boundary	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Butte	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Camas	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Canyon	8	62.5	37.5	0.0
Caribou	5	80.0	20.0	0.0
Cassia	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Clark	0	*	*	*
Clearwater	5	80.0	20.0	0.0
Custer	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Elmore	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Franklin	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Fremont	5	40.0	20.0	40.0
Gem	5	60.0	0.0	40.0
Gooding	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Idaho	6	33.3	66.7	0.0
Jefferson	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Jerome	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Kootenai	16	43.8	25.0	31.3
Latah	7	28.6	28.6	42.9
Lemhi	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Lewis	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Lincoln	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
Madison	8	62.5	37.5	0.0
Minidoka	5	60.0	20.0	20.0
Nez Perce	17	47.1	29.4	23.5
Oneida	3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Owyhee	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
Payette	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Power	6	33.3	0.0	66.7
Shoshone	4	50.0	50.0	0.0
Teton	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Twin Falls	15	40.0	33.3	26.7
Valley	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Washington	3	0.0	66.7	33.3
Total	273	54.6	25.6	19.8

\*No response from this county

**Table 23. How likely the respondents felt that regional drug task forces operated jointly by local agencies would be at reducing the drug problem in their jurisdiction**

<b>Regional drug task forces operated jointly by local agencies</b>				
County	Sample Size	Extremely Likely to Likely	Neutral	Not Likely to Will Not Help
Ada	33	57.6	33.3	9.1
Adams	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Bannock	17	64.7	23.5	11.8
Bear Lake	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Benewah	5	80.0	0.0	20.0
Bingham	13	61.5	30.8	7.7
Blaine	8	62.5	25.0	12.5
Boise	3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Bonner	6	83.3	16.7	0.0
Bonneville	16	87.5	12.5	0.0
Boundary	3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Butte	3	33.3	66.7	0.0
Camas	2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Canyon	7	85.7	14.3	0.0
Caribou	5	60.0	40.0	0.0
Cassia	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Clark	0	*	*	*
Clearwater	5	80.0	20.0	0.0
Custer	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Elmore	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Franklin	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Fremont	5	40.0	40.0	20.0
Gem	5	80.0	0.0	20.0
Gooding	4	50.0	50.0	0.0
Idaho	6	50.0	50.0	0.0
Jefferson	3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Jerome	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Kootenai	16	43.8	50.0	6.3
Latah	7	71.4	0.0	28.6
Lemhi	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Lewis	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Lincoln	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Madison	8	75.0	25.0	0.0
Minidoka	5	80.0	20.0	0.0
Nez Perce	17	64.7	23.5	11.8
Oneida	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Owyhee	3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Payette	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Power	6	33.3	16.7	50.0
Shoshone	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Teton	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Twin Falls	15	46.7	40.0	13.3
Valley	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Washington	3	33.3	66.7	0.0
Total	274	65.7	24.5	9.9

\*No response from this county



**Table 24. How likely outpatient drug treatment programs would be at reducing the drug problem in the respondent's jurisdiction**

<b>Outpatient drug treatment programs</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Sample Size</b>	<b>Extremely Likely to Likely</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Not Likely to Will Not Help</b>
Ada	33	81.8	9.1	9.1
Adams	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Bannock	16	68.8	25.0	6.3
Bear Lake	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Benewah	5	40.0	60.0	0.0
Bingham	13	53.8	30.8	15.4
Blaine	8	75.0	0.0	25.0
Boise	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Bonner	6	83.3	16.7	0.0
Bonneville	15	66.7	20.0	13.3
Boundary	3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Butte	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Camas	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Canyon	8	75.0	25.0	0.0
Caribou	5	80.0	0.0	20.0
Cassia	3	33.3	66.7	0.0
Clark	0	*	*	*
Clearwater	5	20.0	80.0	0.0
Custer	4	50.0	50.0	0.0
Elmore	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Franklin	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Fremont	5	20.0	80.0	0.0
Gem	5	60.0	40.0	0.0
Gooding	4	50.0	50.0	0.0
Idaho	6	83.3	16.7	0.0
Jefferson	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Jerome	4	25.0	75.0	0.0
Kootenai	16	68.8	25.0	6.3
Latah	7	85.7	14.3	0.0
Lemhi	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
Lewis	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Lincoln	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Madison	8	62.5	25.0	12.5
Minidoka	5	80.0	20.0	0.0
Nez Perce	17	64.7	29.4	5.9
Oneida	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Owyhee	3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Payette	3	33.3	66.7	0.0
Power	6	50.0	50.0	0.0
Shoshone	4	25.0	50.0	25.0
Teton	4	50.0	25.0	25.0
Twin Falls	15	73.3	20.0	6.7
Valley	3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Washington	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Total	272	66.2	25.7	8.1

\*No response from this county

**Table 25. How likely inpatient treatment would be at reducing the drug problem in the respondent's jurisdiction**

<b>Inpatient treatment</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Sample Size</b>	<b>Extremely Likely to Likely</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Not Likely to Will Not Help</b>
Ada	32	84.4	12.5	3.1
Adams	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Bannock	17	76.5	23.5	0.0
Bear Lake	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Benewah	5	80.0	20.0	0.0
Bingham	13	53.8	30.8	15.4
Blaine	8	62.5	12.5	25.0
Boise	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bonner	6	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bonneville	15	73.3	20.0	6.7
Boundary	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Butte	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Camas	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Canyon	8	75.0	25.0	0.0
Caribou	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Cassia	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Clark	0	*	*	*
Clearwater	5	60.0	40.0	0.0
Custer	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Elmore	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Franklin	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Fremont	5	40.0	60.0	0.0
Gem	5	60.0	40.0	0.0
Gooding	4	50.0	50.0	0.0
Idaho	6	66.7	33.3	0.0
Jefferson	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Jerome	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Kootenai	16	81.3	12.5	6.3
Latah	7	85.7	14.3	0.0
Lemhi	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Lewis	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Lincoln	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Madison	8	87.5	12.5	0.0
Minidoka	5	100.0	0.0	0.0
Nez Perce	17	82.4	11.8	5.9
Oneida	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Owyhee	3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Payette	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Power	6	83.3	16.7	0.0
Shoshone	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Teton	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Twin Falls	15	86.7	13.3	0.0
Valley	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Washington	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Total	272	78.7	18.0	3.3

\*No response from this county

**Table 26. How likely drug courts would be at reducing the drug problem in the respondent's jurisdiction**

<b>Drug courts</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Sample Size</b>	<b>Extremely Likely to Likely</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Not Likely to Will Not Help</b>
Ada	33	72.7	18.2	9.1
Adams	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bannock	17	70.6	11.8	17.6
Bear Lake	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Benewah	5	80.0	0.0	20.0
Bingham	13	69.2	15.4	15.4
Blaine	8	75.0	0.0	25.0
Boise	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bonner	6	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bonneville	16	75.0	12.5	12.5
Boundary	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
Butte	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Camas	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Canyon	8	50.0	50.0	0.0
Caribou	5	40.0	40.0	20.0
Cassia	4	50.0	0.0	50.0
Clark	0	*	*	*
Clearwater	4	0.0	50.0	50.0
Custer	4	50.0	50.0	0.0
Elmore	4	50.0	25.0	25.0
Franklin	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Fremont	5	20.0	80.0	0.0
Gem	5	60.0	40.0	0.0
Gooding	4	50.0	0.0	50.0
Idaho	6	50.0	33.3	16.7
Jefferson	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Jerome	4	50.0	25.0	25.0
Kootenai	16	68.8	18.8	12.5
Latah	7	85.7	0.0	14.3
Lemhi	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Lewis	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Lincoln	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Madison	8	62.5	25.0	12.5
Minidoka	5	100.0	0.0	0.0
Nez Perce	17	58.8	29.4	11.8
Oneida	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Owyhee	3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Payette	4	50.0	50.0	0.0
Power	6	83.3	0.0	16.7
Shoshone	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Teton	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Twin Falls	14	71.4	21.4	7.1
Valley	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Washington	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
Total	274	67.2	20.1	12.8

\*No response from this county

**Table 27. How likely community residential drug treatment programs for offenders would be at reducing the drug problem in the respondent's jurisdiction**

<b>Communitiy residential drug treatment programs for offenders</b>				
<b>Co unty</b>	<b>Sample Size</b>	<b>Extremely Likely to Likely</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Not Likely to Will Not Help</b>
Ada	33	84.8	12.1	3.0
Adams	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Bannock	17	76.5	17.6	5.9
Bear Lake	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Benewah	5	60.0	40.0	0.0
Bingham	13	46.2	38.5	15.4
Blaine	8	62.5	12.5	25.0
Boise	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bonner	6	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bonneville	15	86.7	0.0	13.3
Boundary	3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Butte	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Camas	2	50.0	0.0	50.0
Canyon	8	50.0	37.5	12.5
Caribou	5	60.0	20.0	20.0
Cassia	4	50.0	25.0	25.0
Clark	0	*	*	*
Clearwater	5	20.0	40.0	40.0
Custer	4	50.0	50.0	0.0
Elmore	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Franklin	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Fremont	5	20.0	40.0	40.0
Gem	5	80.0	20.0	0.0
Gooding	4	50.0	50.0	0.0
Idaho	5	40.0	60.0	0.0
Jefferson	3	0.0	33.3	66.7
Jerome	4	50.0	50.0	0.0
Kootenai	16	75.0	12.5	12.5
Lata h	7	71.4	14.3	14.3
Lemhi	3	0.0	66.7	33.3
Lewis	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Lincoln	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Madison	8	50.0	25.0	25.0
Minidoka	5	60.0	40.0	0.0
Nez Perce	17	70.6	23.5	5.9
Oneida	3	33.3	66.7	0.0
Owyhee	3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Payette	4	50.0	25.0	25.0
Power	6	66.7	16.7	16.7
Shoshone	4	50.0	50.0	0.0
Teton	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Twin Falls	15	73.3	26.7	0.0
Valley	3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Washington	3	33.3	66.7	0.0
Total	274	65.3	23.7	10.9

\*No response from this county

**Table 28. How likely rehabilitation programs that teach drug abusers life/job/cognitive skills would be at reducing the drug problem in the respondent's jurisdiction**

<b>Rehabilitation programs that teach drug abusers life/job/cognitive skills</b>				
County	Sample Size	Extremely		
		Likely to Likely	Neutral	Not Likely to Will Not Help
Ada	33	78.8	15.2	6.1
Adams	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Bannock	17	88.2	5.9	5.9
Bear Lake	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Benewah	5	60.0	40.0	0.0
Bingham	13	61.5	15.4	23.1
Blaine	8	50.0	25.0	25.0
Boise	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bonner	6	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bonneville	16	87.5	6.3	6.3
Boundary	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Butte	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Camas	2	50.0	0.0	50.0
Canyon	8	62.5	25.0	12.5
Caribou	5	80.0	20.0	0.0
Cassia	4	75.0	0.0	25.0
Clark	0	*	*	*
Clearwater	5	40.0	40.0	20.0
Custer	4	50.0	25.0	25.0
Elmore	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Franklin	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Fremont	5	40.0	20.0	40.0
Gem	5	80.0	20.0	0.0
Gooding	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Idaho	6	83.3	16.7	0.0
Jefferson	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Jerome	4	50.0	50.0	0.0
Kootenai	16	68.8	18.8	12.5
Latah	7	85.7	14.3	0.0
Lemhi	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Lewis	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Lincoln	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Madison	8	87.5	12.5	0.0
Minidoka	5	80.0	20.0	0.0
Nez Perce	17	58.8	35.3	5.9
Oneida	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Owyhee	3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Payette	4	75.0	0.0	25.0
Power	6	66.7	33.3	0.0
Shoshone	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Teton	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Twin Falls	15	86.7	6.7	6.7
Valley	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Washington	3	33.3	66.7	0.0
Total	276	73.9	17.8	8.3

\*No response from this county

**Table 29. How likely social services for juveniles who have drug problems but are not in the correctional system would be at reducing the drug problem in the respondent's jurisdiction**

<b>Social Services for juveniles who have drug problems but are not in the correctional system</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Sample Size</b>	<b>Extremely Likely to Likely</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Not Likely to Will Not Help</b>
Ada	33	63.6	24.2	12.1
Adams	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bannock	16	87.5	12.5	0.0
Bear Lake	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Benewah	5	60.0	40.0	0.0
Bingham	13	61.5	23.1	15.4
Blaine	8	62.5	12.5	25.0
Boise	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bonner	6	83.3	16.7	0.0
Bonneville	14	64.3	21.4	14.3
Boundary	3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Butte	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Camas	2	50.0	0.0	50.0
Canyon	8	62.5	37.5	0.0
Caribou	5	80.0	0.0	20.0
Cassia	4	25.0	50.0	25.0
Clark	0	*	*	*
Clearwater	5	60.0	20.0	20.0
Custer	4	50.0	50.0	0.0
Elmore	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Franklin	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Fremont	5	40.0	40.0	20.0
Gem	5	60.0	40.0	0.0
Gooding	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Idaho	6	66.7	16.7	16.7
Jefferson	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Jerome	4	50.0	50.0	0.0
Kootenai	16	81.3	12.5	6.3
Latah	7	57.1	28.6	14.3
Lemhi	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Lewis	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Lincoln	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Madison	8	100.0	0.0	0.0
Minidoka	5	100.0	0.0	0.0
Nez Perce	17	70.6	23.5	5.9
Oneida	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Owyhee	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Payette	4	75.0	0.0	25.0
Power	6	83.3	16.7	0.0
Shoshone	4	50.0	25.0	25.0
Teton	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Twin Falls	15	66.7	26.7	6.7
Valley	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Washington	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
Total	273	70.3	20.5	9.2

\*No response from this county

### Drug Programs (Law Enforcement Group ONLY)

The law enforcement group was asked to decide on a scale of 1 - 5 (“Needed most” to “Not needed”) how much a list of programs were needed in their area to help fight drugs. The programs included: (1) school resource officer (2) multi-jurisdictional task force (3) gang enforcement (4) K-9 handlers (5) acquisition and development of secure communications (6) crime analysis (7) development of information systems to share data within organization and with surrounding organizations (8) community awareness - classes/presentations to community groups (9) community policing and (10) DUI enforcement. Tables 30 - 33 list the responses by county.

**Table 30. How needed are the following drug programs in your area.**

County	School Resource Officer				Multi-jurisdictional task forces				Gang Enforcement			
	Sample Size	Needed Most to Needed	Neutral	Needed Less to Not Needed	Sample Size	Needed Most to Needed	Neutral	Needed Less to Not Needed	Sample Size	Needed Most to Needed	Neutral	Needed Less to Not Needed
Ada	18	50.0	27.8	22.2	18	55.6	27.8	16.7	18	50.0	22.2	27.8
Adams	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*
Bannock	10	80.0	10.0	10.0	10	70.0	30.0	0.0	10	20.0	50.0	30.0
Bear Lake	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Benewah	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Bingham	5	100.0	0.0	0.0	5	60.0	20.0	20.0	5	0.0	20.0	80.0
Blaine	3	33.3	0.0	66.7	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	3	33.3	0.0	66.7
Boise	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0
Bonner	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0
Bonneville	6	66.7	16.7	16.7	6	100.0	0.0	0.0	6	50.0	33.3	16.7
Boundary	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Butte	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Camas	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*
Canyon	5	60.0	40.0	0.0	5	80.0	0.0	20.0	5	80.0	20.0	0.0
Caribou	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0
Cassia	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	50.0	0.0	50.0
Clark	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*
Clearwater	4	25.0	50.0	25.0	4	50.0	25.0	25.0	4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Custer	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Elmore	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Franklin	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*
Fremont	4	75.0	0.0	25.0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	4	0.0	25.0	75.0
Gem	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Gooding	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Idaho	3	66.7	0.0	33.3	3	66.7	33.3	0.0	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Jefferson	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	3	33.3	33.3	33.3	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Jerome	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Kootenai	8	87.5	0.0	12.5	8	62.5	37.5	0.0	8	25.0	50.0	25.0
Latah	5	20.0	40.0	40.0	5	20.0	20.0	60.0	5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Lemhi	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Lewis	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Lincoln	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Madison	5	80.0	20.0	0.0	5	100.0	0.0	0.0	5	40.0	0.0	60.0
Minidoka	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Nez Perce	8	50.0	37.5	12.5	8	75.0	12.5	12.5	8	0.0	50.0	50.0
Oneida	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Owyhee	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	50.0	0.0	50.0
Payette	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	50.0	0.0	50.0
Power	4	75.0	25.0	0.0	4	75.0	0.0	25.0	4	0.0	75.0	25.0
Shoshone	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Teton	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Twin Falls	7	85.7	14.3	0.0	7	71.4	28.6	0.0	7	85.7	0.0	14.3
Valley	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0
Washington	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Total	141	70.9	17.7	11.3	140	73.6	17.1	9.3	141	32.6	30.5	36.9

\*No response from this county

**Table 31. How needed law enforcement respondents felt the following programs were needed in their area to fight drugs**

County	K-9 handlers				Acquisition and development of secure communications				Crime analysis			
	Sample Size	Needed Most to Needed	Neutral	Needed Less to Not Needed	Sample Size	Needed Most to Needed	Neutral	Needed Less to Not Needed	Sample Size	Needed Most to Needed	Neutral	Needed Less to Not Needed
Ada	18	61.1	38.9	0.0	18	55.6	33.3	11.1	18	55.6	33.3	11.1
Adams	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*
Bannock	10	60.0	40.0	0.0	10	70.0	30.0	0.0	10	50.0	40.0	10.0
Bear Lake	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Benewah	3	66.7	33.3	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bingham	5	20.0	60.0	20.0	5	80.0	0.0	20.0	5	20.0	60.0	20.0
Blaine	3	33.3	33.3	33.3	3	33.3	33.3	33.3	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
Boise	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0
Bonner	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Bonneville	6	100.0	0.0	0.0	6	83.3	16.7	0.0	6	50.0	33.3	16.7
Boundary	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0
Butte	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Camas	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*
Canyon	5	60.0	40.0	0.0	5	60.0	40.0	0.0	5	40.0	60.0	0.0
Caribou	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0
Cassia	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0
Clark	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*
Clearwater	4	100.0	0.0	0.0	4	75.0	25.0	0.0	4	50.0	50.0	0.0
Custer	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Elmore	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Franklin	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*
Fremont	4	25.0	50.0	25.0	4	50.0	25.0	25.0	4	50.0	25.0	25.0
Gem	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Gooding	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Idaho	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Jefferson	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	3	33.3	66.7	0.0	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Jerome	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Kootenai	8	75.0	25.0	0.0	8	62.5	25.0	12.5	8	50.0	37.5	12.5
Latah	5	60.0	0.0	40.0	5	20.0	40.0	40.0	5	40.0	0.0	60.0
Lemhi	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Lewis	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Lincoln	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Madison	5	40.0	60.0	0.0	4	100.0	0.0	0.0	5	80.0	20.0	0.0
Minidoka	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	3	66.7	33.3	0.0	3	33.3	66.7	0.0
Nez Perce	8	75.0	12.5	12.5	8	50.0	50.0	0.0	8	25.0	50.0	25.0
Oneida	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Owyhee	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	50.0	0.0	50.0
Payette	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Power	4	50.0	0.0	50.0	4	75.0	0.0	25.0	4	25.0	50.0	25.0
Shoshone	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Teton	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Twin Falls	7	57.1	42.9	0.0	7	42.9	57.1	0.0	7	28.6	71.4	0.0
Valley	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	50.0	0.0	50.0
Washington	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Total	141	65.2	27.0	7.8	139	68.3	24.5	7.2	140	45.714	41.42857	12.857

\*No response from this county



**Table 32. How needed the following drug programs are according to law enforcement respondents**

Development of information systems to share data within organization and with surrounding organizations					Community awareness - classes/presentations to community groups				Community policing			
County	Sample Size	Needed Most to Needed	Neutral	Needed Less to Not Needed	Sample Size	Needed Most to Needed	Neutral	Needed Less to Not Needed	Sample Size	Needed Most to Needed	Neutral	Needed Less to Not Needed
Ada	19	84.2	15.8	0.0	18	50.0	44.4	5.6	18	66.7	22.2	11.1
Adams	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*
Bannock	10	60.0	40.0	0.0	10	90.0	10.0	0.0	10	70.0	20.0	10.0
Bear Lake	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Benewah	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bingham	5	60.0	20.0	20.0	5	40.0	60.0	0.0	5	60.0	40.0	0.0
Blaine	3	66.7	33.3	0.0	3	0.0	100.0	0.0	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
Boise	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Bonner	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0
Bonneville	6	83.3	16.7	0.0	6	66.7	33.3	0.0	6	66.7	0.0	33.3
Boundary	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Butte	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Camas	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*
Canyon	5	100.0	0.0	0.0	5	80.0	20.0	0.0	5	80.0	20.0	0.0
Caribou	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0
Cassia	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0
Clark	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*
Clearwater	4	50.0	50.0	0.0	4	50.0	50.0	0.0	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Custer	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Elmore	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Franklin	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*
Fremont	4	100.0	0.0	0.0	4	50.0	50.0	0.0	4	50.0	50.0	0.0
Gem	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Gooding	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Idaho	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Jefferson	3	66.7	33.3	0.0	3	33.3	66.7	0.0	3	33.3	66.7	0.0
Jerome	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Kootenai	8	50.0	37.5	12.5	8	87.5	0.0	12.5	8	75.0	12.5	12.5
Latah	5	40.0	20.0	40.0	5	80.0	0.0	20.0	5	40.0	20.0	40.0
Lemhi	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Lewis	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Lincoln	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Madison	5	100.0	0.0	0.0	5	80.0	20.0	0.0	5	80.0	20.0	0.0
Minidoka	3	66.7	33.3	0.0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Nez Perce	8	75.0	25.0	0.0	8	75.0	25.0	0.0	8	62.5	37.5	0.0
Oneida	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Owyhee	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Payette	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	50.0	0.0	50.0
Power	4	50.0	50.0	0.0	4	75.0	0.0	25.0	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Shoshone	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Teton	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Twin Falls	7	85.7	14.3	0.0	7	85.7	14.3	0.0	7	71.4	28.6	0.0
Valley	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Washington	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Total	141	75.2	22.0	2.8	140	70.0	25.7	4.3	141	65.2	25.5	9.2

\*No response from this county

**Table 33. How needed DUI enforcement is needed according to law enforcement respondents**

<b>DUI Enforcement</b>				
<b>County</b>	<b>Sample Size</b>	<b>Needed Most to Needed</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Needed Less to Not Needed</b>
Ada	18	61.1	27.8	11.1
Adams	0	*	*	*
Bannock	10	70.0	30.0	0.0
Bear	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Benewa	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bingham	5	80.0	20.0	0.0
Blaine	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
Boise	2	0.0	100.0	0.0
Bonner	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Bonnevil	6	50.0	50.0	0.0
Boundar	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Butte	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Camas	0	*	*	*
Canyon	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Caribou	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Cassia	2	0.0	50.0	50.0
Clark	0	*	*	*
Clearwa	4	50.0	50.0	0.0
Custer	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Elmore	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Franklin	0	*	*	*
Fremont	4	75.0	25.0	0.0
Gem	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Gooding	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Idaho	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Jefferso	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Jerome	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Kootenai	8	87.5	12.5	0.0
Latah	5	60.0	20.0	20.0
Lemhi	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Lewis	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Lincoln	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Madison	5	60.0	20.0	20.0
Minidoka	3	66.7	33.3	0.0
Nez	8	87.5	0.0	12.5
Oneida	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Owyhee	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Payette	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Power	4	50.0	25.0	25.0
Shoshon	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Teton	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Twin	7	100.0	0.0	0.0
Valley	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Washing	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>68.8</b>	<b>24.6</b>	<b>6.5</b>

\*No response from this county

### Availability and Quality of Sentencing Information (Judges, Prosecutors, and Probation/Parole Officers ONLY)

Judges, prosecutors and probation/parole officers were asked to rate the availability and quality of the following list: (1) sufficient information to identify offenders' alcohol or drug problems (2) sentencing options to meet substance abuse treatment needs of adult offenders (3) sentencing options to meet substance abuse treatment needs of juvenile offenders (4) cooperation from public agencies in providing drug-related treatment for persons sentenced and (5) a workload level that permits timely adjudication of cases involving illicit transfer of drugs. The availability was on a four point scale (in most cases to rarely), and the quality was in comparison with three years ago on a three point scale (better now to worse now). Tables 34 - 36 refer to this question.

**Table 34. Extent sufficient information to identify offenders' alcohol or drug problems is available, and the quality of this information**

Sufficient information to identify offender's alcohol or drug problems							
County	Currently Available			Quality Compared with 2000			
	Sample Size	In most cases	Rarely	Sample Size	Better Now	Same Now	Worse Now
Ada	13	84.6	15.4	12	58.3	41.7	0.0
Adams	0	*	*	0	*	*	*
Bannock	6	100.0	0.0	6	50.0	50.0	0.0
Bear Lake	0	*	*	0	*	*	*
Benewah	1	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bingham	6	83.3	16.7	5	80.0	20.0	0.0
Blaine	4	100.0	0.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0
Boise	1	100.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bonner	2	100.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bonneville	9	100.0	0.0	7	42.9	57.1	0.0
Boundary	0	*	*	0	*	*	*
Butte	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Camas	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Canyon	3	66.7	33.3	2	0.0	50.0	50.0
Caribou	2	0.0	100.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0
Cassia	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Clark	0	*	*	0	*	*	*
Clearwater	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Custer	1	100.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Elmore	2	50.0	50.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0
Franklin	1	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Fremont	0	*	*	0	*	*	*
Gem	2	100.0	0.0	2	50.0	0.0	50.0
Gooding	3	100.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Idaho	1	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Jefferson	0	*	*	0	*	*	*
Jerome	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Kootenai	7	100.0	0.0	6	50.0	50.0	0.0
Latah	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Lemhi	1	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Lewis	0	*	*	0	*	*	*
Lincoln	1	0.0	100.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Madison	1	0.0	100.0	2	50.0	0.0	50.0
Minidoka	1	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Nez Perce	7	71.4	28.6	6	0.0	83.3	16.7
Oneida	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Owyhee	0	*	*	0	*	*	*
Payette	1	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Power	1	100.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Shoshone	2	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Teton	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Twin Falls	7	85.7	14.3	5	20.0	60.0	20.0
Valley	0	*	*	0	*	*	*
Washington	2	100.0	0.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0
Total	96	86.5	13.5	80	38.8	52.5	8.8

\*No response from this county

**Table 35. Extent that sentencing options to meet the needs of adult and juvenile offenders are available when wanted by the courts, prosecutors and public defenders in the respondent's district**

County	Sentencing options to meet substance abuse treatment needs of adult offenders							Sentencing options to meet substance abuse treatment needs of juvenile offenders						
	Currently Available			Quality Compared with				Currently Available			Quality Compared with 2000			
	Sample Size	In most cases	Only Rarely	Sample Size	Better Now	Same Now	Worse Now	Sample Size	In most cases	Only rarely	Sample Size	Better Now	Same Now	Worse Now
Ada	13	84.6	15.4	12	25.0	66.7	8.3	11	81.8	18.2	10	30.0	50.0	20.0
Adams	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	0	*	*	*
Bannock	6	66.7	33.3	6	50.0	33.3	16.7	5	80.0	20.0	5	40.0	20.0	40.0
Bear Lake	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	0	*	*	*
Benewah	1	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bingham	6	83.3	16.7	5	40.0	40.0	20.0	6	83.3	16.7	5	60.0	20.0	20.0
Blaine	4	75.0	25.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	4	75.0	25.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0
Boise	1	100.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bonner	2	100.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bonneville	9	77.8	22.2	7	42.9	57.1	0.0	7	42.9	57.1	5	20.0	80.0	0.0
Boundary	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	0	*	*	*
Butte	1	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Camas	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Canyon	3	100.0	0.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0
Caribou	2	0.0	100.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	2	0.0	100.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0
Cassia	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Clark	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Clearwater	1	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Custer	1	100.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Elmore	2	0.0	100.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	2	0.0	100.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0
Franklin	1	100.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Fremont	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gem	2	100.0	0.0	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	2	100.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Gooding	3	66.7	33.3	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Idaho	1	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Jefferson	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Jerome	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Kootenai	7	71.4	28.6	6	66.7	33.3	0.0	6	50.0	50.0	5	80.0	20.0	0.0
Latah	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Lemhi	1	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Lewis	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lincoln	1	0.0	100.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Madison	1	0.0	100.0	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	1	0.0	100.0	2	50.0	0.0	50.0
Minidoka	1	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Nez Perce	7	57.1	42.9	6	50.0	33.3	16.7	7	42.9	57.1	6	0.0	50.0	50.0
Oneida	1	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Owyhee	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Payette	1	0.0	100.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Power	1	100.0	0.0	0	*	*	*	1	100.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Shoshone	2	50.0	50.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Teton	1	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Twin Falls	7	42.9	57.1	5	20.0	40.0	40.0	7	85.7	14.3	5	20.0	40.0	40.0
Valley	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Washington	2	50.0	50.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0
Total	96	68.8	31.3	79	38.0	50.6	11.4	87	63.2	36.8	72	29.2	51.4	19.4

\*No response from this county

**Table 36. Quality and availability of cooperation from public agencies in providing drug-related treatment for persons sentenced, and a caseload level that permits timely adjudication of cases (or sufficient contact with clients) involving illicit transfer of drugs**

Cooperation from public agencies in providing drug - related treatment for persons sentenced								A caseload/workload level that permits sufficient contact with clients (or adjudication of cases) involving illicit transfer of drugs							
County	Currently Available			Quality Compared with				Currently Available			Quality Compared with				
	Sample Size	In most cases	Only Rarely	Sample Size	Better Now	Same Now	Worse Now	Sample Size	In most cases	Only rarely	Sample Size	Better Now	Same Now	Worse Now	
Ada	13	30.8	69.2	11	18.2	54.5	27.3	13	53.8	46.2	11	0.0	72.7	27.3	
Adams	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	
Bannock	5	80.0	20.0	5	40.0	60.0	0.0	5	20.0	0.0	5	0.0	40.0	60.0	
Bear Lake	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	
Benewah	1	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	
Bingham	6	50.0	50.0	5	20.0	60.0	20.0	3	33.3	33.3	5	40.0	60.0	0.0	
Blaine	4	50.0	50.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	4	75.0	25.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	
Boise	1	0.0	100.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	
Bonner	2	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	
Bonneville	9	88.9	11.1	7	57.1	42.9	0.0	8	75.0	25.0	7	0.0	85.7	14.3	
Boundary	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	
Butte	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	
Camas	1	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Canyon	3	100.0	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	3	33.3	66.7	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	
Caribou	2	0.0	100.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	2	100.0	0.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	
Cassia	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Clark	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	
Clearwater	1	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	
Custer	1	100.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0	*	*	*	
Elmore	2	0.0	100.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Franklin	1	100.0	0.0	0	*	*	*	1	100.0	0.0	0	*	*	*	
Fremont	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	
Gem	2	50.0	50.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	
Gooding	3	33.3	66.7	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	
Idaho	1	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	
Jefferson	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	
Jerome	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	
Kootenai	7	42.9	57.1	6	33.3	66.7	0.0	7	71.4	28.6	6	0.0	100.0	0.0	
Latah	1	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	
Lemhi	1	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	
Lewis	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	
Lincoln	1	0.0	100.0	0	*	*	*	1	100.0	0.0	0	*	*	*	
Madison	1	0.0	100.0	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	1	0.0	100.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	
Minidoka	1	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0	*	*	*	
Nez Perce	7	28.6	71.4	6	16.7	66.7	16.7	7	71.4	28.6	6	16.7	66.7	16.7	
Oneida	1	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	1	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	
Owyhee	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	
Payette	1	0.0	100.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0	*	*	*	
Power	1	100.0	0.0	0	*	*	*	1	100.0	0.0	0	*	*	*	
Shoshone	2	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	
Teton	0	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	0	*	*	*	
Twin Falls	7	28.6	71.4	4	0.0	75.0	25.0	7	57.1	42.9	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	
Valley	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	0	*	*	*	
Washington	2	50.0	50.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	2	0.0	100.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	
Total	94	48.9	51.1	75	25.3	54.7	20.0	21	38.1	61.9	70	8.6	65.7	25.7	

\*No response from this county