

Overview:

The Battering Intervention and Prevention Project—FY 2001

The Battering Intervention and Prevention Project was created by the 71st Legislature (Code of Criminal Procedure, Article 42.141) to work with family violence offenders to decrease violence in Texas homes. In 1989, during the first year of funding, 15 battering intervention and prevention programs (BIPPs) began operations with \$700,000 provided by the Legislature. The number of programs grew to 28 at the beginning of FY '00. But, overall funding was still at the relatively low level of \$1.9 million for the FY '00-'01 biennium while BIPP programs were dealing with twice as many batterers¹. This report examines trends and data from FY '01.

The interest in battering intervention services continues to grow at the local level. Technical assistance requests from criminal justice agencies and service providers statewide inquiring about the availability of BIPP services and how to initiate such services in their localities have increased for several years running. Recognizing this rising demand, the 76th Legislature approved an increase in funds providing for new BIPP programs in five new areas of the state (Kilgore, Lubbock, south Dallas County, Abilene, and Perryton).

Another way to understand the demand for BIPP programs is by examining some family violence statistics. When the totals are compared for the number of new participants in BIPPs with a DPS accounting of family violence incidents reported from all Texas law enforcement agencies in 2000 (most recent figures available) we see the scope of BIPP services available in Texas. There were 175,282 incidents reported to DPS while there were only 6,664 batterers entering BIPPs in FY '01. In other words, only 3.8% of family violence offenders represented by the DPS incident reports attended a qualified BIPP program². Thus, it can be seen that the amount of BIPP services provided in FY '01 was dramatically less than what is needed to accommodate the scope of the problem.

¹ For FY '91, 15 BIPPs had 3,273 participants while in FY '01 28 programs had 6,664 participants.

² This percentage is cited as an approximation of scale. The statistic assumes that the number of domestic violence incidents reported to DPS is equivalent to the number of batterers in Texas. This represents a conservative estimate for a number of reasons. There are undoubtedly many more domestic violence incidents than are reported to law enforcement agencies through these compiled incident reports. Family violence experts, including TDHS, speculate that due to low reporting there may be as many as 6-10 times more incidents than are reflected in these DPS numbers. It should be noted that the DPS statistic is for calendar year 2000 while the BIPP number is for FY '01; these two periods overlap for four months, but are not identical. This was the best comparison available.

BIPPs act to enhance victim safety by making and remaining in contact with the partner of the batterers in the program. In FY '01 the number of contacts made with victims exceeded the number of offenders enrolled in the programs. The BIPP Mission Statement explicitly calls for "promoting safety for victims"³.

BIPPs have proved themselves an efficient use of taxpayer money. Based on FY '00 data, BIPPs raise three dollars locally for every state dollar provided to fund their operations. In FY '01 Texas spent an average of \$137.36 for each participant receiving BIPP services. As a comparison, Criminal Justice Policy Council numbers indicate that it cost the state \$4,878 to keep an inmate in prison for four months in FY '01. Four months represents the approximate length of a BIPP program.⁴

Ultimately, BIPPs hold out the possibility that batterers can be resocialized away from violence and abuse⁵. However, they represent only one link in the chain of a community's response to the crime of domestic violence. BIPPs can only be effective as part of the entire community's response to the problem of violence against women. BIPPs in Texas increasingly occupy a position of importance in the effort to reduce and eliminate domestic violence.

I. BIPP Guidelines

Fiscal Year 2000 was the sixth year that programs operated under the BIPP Guidelines. These Guidelines are crucial to ensuring the effective delivery of services by the TDCJ-CJAD-funded BIPP programs.

These Guidelines were written in 1994 by a committee of representatives of battering intervention programs, criminal justice professionals, and battered women's advocates. After review and comment by programs throughout the state, the BIPP Guidelines went into effect September 1, 1995. These Guidelines served the state well for several years, and were re-evaluated in the late '90's. Revised BIPP Guidelines took effect on December 1, 1999.

The BIPP Guidelines are widely recognized as the measuring stick of quality when it comes to operating an intervention program for batterers. Ten states have sought Texas' Guidelines as a model for their own state efforts to enact standards⁶. Those working with

³ In full the Mission Statement of the BIPP Guidelines reads:

The mission of battering intervention and prevention programs in Texas is to eliminate male to female battering by providing services to batterers, promoting safety for victims, and bringing about social change necessary to end battering and all other forms of relationship abuse.

⁴ The figure provided by the Criminal Justice Policy Council is a cost of \$40.65 per day. Multiplied by 120 days one arrives at the figure of \$4,878.

⁵ Recent data collected from the programs operating during FY '00 indicates that twice as many offenders who fail to complete their BIPP program are rearrested for a family violence offense as those men who complete the program (11.9% vs. 5.6%)

⁶ KY, IL, NV, NH, OK, NM, LA, VA, WV, OH.

batterers need to conduct their work in accordance with the BIPP Guidelines because these standards were developed with the safety and welfare of victims and children foremost in mind. In addition, the Guidelines point the way to the best practices in the field.

Because the Guidelines help create BIPPs that provide the greatest enhancements to victim safety and batterer resocialization we need to ensure that batterers have competent, Guidelines-compliant groups which they can attend. In FY'01 there were 27 BIPPs in the state⁷ that met the Guidelines. These 27 programs receive state funding and consequently are audited by TCFV to ensure their compliance with the Guidelines.

There are at least several dozen programs in Texas working with batterers that do not adhere to the BIPP Guidelines. This is a significant problem in terms of safety for victims and holding abusers accountable. TCFV has gathered a limited amount of information from and about these programs. These non-compliant programs are operating for a substantially shorter duration than those required by the BIPP Guidelines. The minimum requirement for BIPP programs calls for 18 weeks and 36 hours per participant while some of the other groups operate for 8 weeks or less. In one case a program which is utilized by some prosecutors and judges around the state takes place for eight hours on a Saturday.

In at least one instance a program mixes male and female participants in the same batterer's group. This is forbidden by the BIPP Guidelines on grounds that this arrangement can decrease the safety of battered women. Other programs base their curriculum on the tenets of anger management even though this treatment approach is rejected by the BIPP Guidelines as being out of step with the realities of family violence⁸.

These discrepancies and problems indicate that programs in Texas that work with batterers should be required to adhere to the BIPP Guidelines. Currently, only those programs receiving funds through TDCJ-CJAD are audited by TCFV. We owe it to family violence victims and their children, as well as the perpetrators themselves, to provide the best battering intervention programs we know how to create. The BIPP Guidelines are the blueprint for building those quality programs.

⁷ At the start of the biennium on 9-1-99 there were 28 BIPP programs receiving funds through TDCJ-CJAD. One of these, the BIPP based in Abilene, chose to decline their state funding after operating for only six months. Throughout this report 27 will be cited as the number of BIPPs funded for the FY '00-'01 biennium.

⁸ Anger is not the cause of a batterer's violence, but rather a symptom. Most batterers have adequate to good anger management skills as recognized by the fact that few of them beat up their friends or co-workers. In other words, a choice is made by a batterer as to where and when to use anger management skills.

II. Program Audits

The contract between TCFV and TDCJ-CJAD requires that each BIPP be audited at least once during the FY '00-'01 biennium. The TDCJ-CJAD funded BIPP programs were sorted into two categories at the beginning of the biennium. Those BIPPs that were well established and functioning smoothly would require only one site visit in the two-year period. Others would require an audit each year, based on audit history and other factors such as recent staff turnover and program requests. In addition, the five newly funded programs would be audited each fiscal year.

In FY'00, TCFV conducted 12 program audits during the year. All but one of those audits revealed a high degree of compliance with the BIPP Guidelines⁹. The start-up programs were found to be functioning well. In FY'01, TCFV conducted 14 program audits to round out the work of assessing all the BIPPs for the biennium. All programs were found to be in compliance.

Reports documenting Guidelines compliance are prepared for all program audits. Copies of each report are forwarded to the Coordinator of the BIPP program, the Chair of their Board of Directors, and TDCJ-CJAD.

III. Statistics

All local BIPPs are required to submit a monthly statistical accounting of their program activities to TCFV. The Monthly Activity Report (MAR) collects data in categories such as referrals, intakes, number of groups held, hours of services delivered, program completions and criminal justice trainings conducted.

Attachment One presents FY '01 data collected from these MARs. Noteworthy among these compiled statistics:

- The number of victim/partner contacts (7,335) made by the BIPPs exceeded the number of offenders (6,664) enrolled in the BIPPs. This is an indication of the seriousness and the efficacy with which the programs approach their mission of enhancing victim safety.
- The average completion rate for the 27 BIPPs was 59.39% which was up slightly from 59.15% in FY '00. This continues the pattern for completion rates which have hovered around 60% for several years.
- The 27 BIPPs conducted 225 trainings for criminal justice audiences in FY '01. This is up from 198 trainings presented in FY '00.

⁹ That program was given an action plan and a time frame to come into compliance with the Guidelines. They did so.

Some categories showed relatively minor fluctuations:

- Batterers entering BIPPs decreased from 6,862 to 6,664 (a 2.9% decrease), thereby decreasing the category of Participant Services which declined from 207,317 hours to 200,926 hours (a 3.2% decrease)

Several statistical categories for FY '01 show a more significant decline in numbers as compared to FY '00;

- Total BIPP referrals from all sources decreased from 12,462 to 10,806 (a 13.2% decrease)
- Referrals to BIPPs from CSCDs decreased from 6,260 to 5,414 (a 13.5% decrease)

These significant declines deserve closer scrutiny. In the FY '00 – '01 biennium five new BIPPs received funding and thus their statistics are added to the annual totals. So, the numbers for those BIPPs in the FY '00 – '01 biennium must be subtracted from the totals in order to make an accurate comparison to FY '98 and '99 numbers. When adjusted numbers are used the previous four fiscal years reveal a steady decline in the utilization of the BIPP programs.

For instance, the category of New Participants tells us how many people are entering BIPP programs. Attachment One indicates that for FY '01 there were 6,664 in that category while last year's statistics tell us that there were 6,862 New Participants in FY '00. Attachment Two and Table A below show New Participant numbers for the previous four years (FY '98 – '01) when an adjustment is made to account for the additional five BIPPs during the second biennium. The trend indicates a steady decline over the four year period.

Table A

New Participants (Adjusted)

	FY '98	FY '99	FY '00	FY '01
ADJUSTED TOTALS	6,316	6,113	5,869	5,761

Table B shows similarly adjusted numbers for the category of Potential Participants (Referrals). This captures the numbers of referrals from all sources that a BIPP received from their community. The adjusted totals demonstrate that there were fewer referrals to BIPPs in FY '01 than there were in FY '98

Table B

Potential Participants (Adjusted)

	FY '98	FY '99	FY '00	FY '01
ADJUSTED TOTALS	10,938	9,883	11,046	9,662

Table C documents the largest sub-group of referrals received by BIPPs—referrals from Community Supervision and Corrections Departments (CSCDs). In FY'01 the total number of referrals to BIPPs from CSCDs decreased by 499 (9.8%) from the numbers reported for FY'00. This decline in CSCD referrals is over four times greater than the decline in numbers of participants entering BIPPs over the same time period¹⁰, suggesting that overall participant numbers would have increased had the number of referrals from CSCDs remained steady.

The decline in CSCD referrals is not a random nor a minor fluctuation, but is part of a four year trend. In fact, fewer probationers were referred to BIPPs in FY '01 than were referred in FY'98. Refer to Attachment Three to see a complete statistical comparison for all the BIPPs. The fall off from 5,146 CSCD referrals in FY '98 to 4,567 in FY '01 represents an 11.3% decline.

Table C

Referrals from CSCDs (Adjusted)

	FY '98	FY '99	FY '00	FY '01
ADJUSTED TOTALS	5,146	4,648	5,066	4,567

Breaking down these CSCD referral numbers sheds some light. In comparing FY '00 and FY '01 if we combine the totals from eight BIPPs in the largest urban areas¹¹, we discover that they *accounted for more than the entire state's decline in CSCD referrals*. Specifically, the eight urban BIPPs experienced a decline in referrals totaling 609 less than the previous year (see Attachment Four). The 19 other BIPPs totaled an increase of 237 referrals over the same time period. So, the question becomes not why did CSCD referrals decline last year, but why did CSCD referrals decline for those BIPPs located in the state's largest urban areas while they increased in the rest of the state?

Informal inquiry indicates that there has been no decrease in the numbers of probated batterers in those urban counties. Instead there are clear indications that CSCDs in those urban areas are referring offenders to programs that do not comply with the BIPP Guidelines, that is, programs that do not adhere to the practices accepted in Texas as

¹⁰ Refer to Table A numbers for FY '00 and '01 which yields a decline of 108 participants.

¹¹ These BIPPs are located in Bexar, Travis, Harris, Tarrant, El Paso, and Dallas Counties. All these counties have one CJAD-funded and Guidelines-compliant program except for Dallas County which has three.

providing the maximum safety for victims and the best prospects for offender rehabilitation¹². Section VI-B makes suggestions for remedying this situation.

IV. Training and Technical Assistance

TCFV provided practitioners statewide with technical assistance by phone, fax, in person, and by mail during the year, responding to 569 requests for information or assistance. This number of technical assistance requests represents an increase (14.7%) from FY '00. Quarterly accountings of these technical assistance activities were reported to TDCJ-CJAD throughout FY '01.

The TCFV staff, funded by the TDCJ-CJAD grant, provided 12 training presentations (totaling 26.5 hours) to 378 people during FY'01. Nearly all of the participants were criminal justice professionals, battered women's advocates, or battering intervention staff. The venues for these training presentations ranged from TCFV-sponsored events to the Friendship of Women in Brownsville to the Nevada Coalition Against Domestic Violence to the CJAD Skills Conference.

BIPP staff helped prepare and present TCFV's Second Annual Forum on Men's Work to End Violence Against Women. This event drew 38 participants from across the state to explore men's roles in the effort to end battering and abuse. A third Forum is planned for FY'02.

V. Community Education Campaign

The FY '01 Community Education Campaign project had four components. They were:

- 1) inclusion of a BIPP article in the TCFV newsletter, *The River*
- 2) reproduction of existing community education materials and their continued distribution
- 3) production and distribution of a new educational video, and
- 4) production and distribution of the Men Make Choices Community Awareness and Action Kit.

In FY '01, two issues of *The River* included columns written by TCFV staff (see Attachment Five). Both were written by Carole Geiger, Communications Specialist, with input from TCFV BIPP staff. The Spring of 2001 issue dealt with working with Spanish speaking batterers while the other in the Summer 2001 reported on TCFV's newly produced video Circle of Accountability (see below).

¹² For instance, Bexar County Court at Law #7 which deals with virtually all Class A and B misdemeanor family violence charges referred only 393 out of 1,130 batterers to the Guidelines-compliant BIPP in San Antonio during the calendar year of 2001 (source: Dr. Larry Etter, Family Violence Prevention Services, Inc., San Antonio, personal conversation on April 29, 2002).

"Is He Really Going to Change This Time?", a brochure for the female partners of men in BIPP groups, was reprinted (see Attachment Six). In the five years since it was written by TCFV staff over 100,000 copies of this brochure in English and Spanish have been distributed. In FY '01, TCFV reprinted 7,000 copies in English and 4,000 in Spanish. This brochure has become one of TCFV's most requested educational pieces, with a distribution far beyond BIPP programs and the partners of men in BIPP groups. Permission to excerpt or reproduce it for local use has been granted to domestic violence groups in several states (Connecticut, Oregon, Iowa), several cities (Brooklyn, New Orleans, Charlotte) and other organizations.

TCFV continued to distribute the brochure entitled "BIPP Programs are Viable Alternatives for Family Violence Offenders". The purpose of this piece is to educate and inform Community Supervision Officers, prosecutors, and judges about what BIPPs are and how they can aid the criminal justice community (see Attachment Seven). Reports from the field have been enthusiastic about the usefulness of this brochure.

Using funding obtained through the Office of the Governor TCFV produced a 17 minute video called Circle of Accountability. The video features several men who had attended Texas BIPP programs and significantly changed their behavior and attitudes about their use of violence. Also various criminal justice personnel were interviewed along with a BIPP program Coordinator. Copies of the video were distributed free of charge to all BIPPs and domestic violence shelters in Texas as well as TDCJ-CJAD.

In FY'01, TCFV and our contractor, Orchard Communications, Inc., finalized materials for the Men Make Choices campaign. After conducting focus groups in previous years to ascertain key messages which would reach men and doing several field tests to refine the materials we pilot tested the campaign in three Texas communities. The pilot phase in San Antonio, Tyler, and El Paso revealed that the materials in both English and Spanish (posters, brochures, radio PSAs) were well received and, more importantly, drew a response from men in those locales.

Thus, we went forward with production of kits containing samples of all the materials plus a copy of "Circle of Accountability". These kits were distributed to all domestic violence shelters and BIPPs in the state along with order forms for programs to bulk order the materials¹³. In addition, kits were also sent to each of the state domestic violence coalitions plus several dozen selected state and regional organizations such as Men Stopping Violence in Atlanta, EMERGE in Boston, the White Ribbon Campaign in Toronto, and Family Violence Prevention Fund in San Francisco.

¹³ Any Texas nonprofit program was sent requested quantities of print materials free of charge while out of state programs and for-profit organizations were charged replacement costs.

Reproduction of the print materials was done in the following amounts (see Attachment Eight for brochures and 8 ½" X 11" reductions of the posters):

Men Make Choices brochures in English	41,000
Men Make Choices brochures in Spanish (<i>Hombres de Verdad Escogen</i>)	12,000
Domestic Violence is a Crime poster in English	3,000
Domestic Violence is a Crime poster in Spanish (<i>La Violencia Doméstica es un Crimen</i>)	750

The FY '02 Community Education budget allots significant funds for further reproduction of these print materials as needed.

VI. Recommendations

A. Expansion of Services

Because family violence continues at high rates of incidence in Texas the need to intervene with batterers to decrease the violence in Texas homes is great. In FY '01, TDCJ-CJAD funding allowed for only 27 BIPP programs serving 24 counties. The BIPPs in these 24 counties had satellite BIPP groups in an additional 14 counties. Thus, only 38 of 254 Texas counties had access to qualified BIPP programs that meet the Guidelines enacted by TDCJ-CJAD. As stated in the Overview Section, less than 4% of family violence offenders entered qualified BIPP programs in FY '00.

"The Texas Domestic Violence Databook"¹⁴ surveyed domestic violence service providers around the state and found that respondents ranked "adequate funding for batterer programs" as the ninth most critical unmet need in their county out of a possible

¹⁴ Texas Domestic Violence Databook, May 1998, The Center for Social Work Research at the University of Texas at Austin and the Texas Council on Family Violence.

29 choices. Significantly, this unmet need was ranked above the need for shelter services for victims.

In addition, the report "Access to Safety, Justice, and Opportunity: A Blueprint for Domestic Violence Interventions in Texas" released in 2002 concludes its section on Batterer Accountability with a recommendation that:

Funding for additional Battering Intervention and Prevention Programs should be allocated to ensure the availability of services throughout the state

The need is clearly great for additional BIPPs that meet the state Guidelines. Therefore, TCFV recommends that funding through TDCJ-CJAD be increased by a third over the previous biennium¹⁵ to fund four new programs in unserved and underserved areas of the state and to bolster the capacity of existing programs.

B. Program Referrals

TDCJ-CJAD enacted the BIPP Guidelines as a set of parameters for operating batterers programs that would enhance safety of victims and present information most likely to lead offenders toward a nonviolent lifestyle. Those Guidelines need to be supported to the maximum extent possible.

Currently, judges are encouraged by HB 2187 (passed in the last Legislature) to send convicted batterers to BIPP programs that meet the state Guidelines or a counselor, or a social worker. Judicial discretion is appropriate in many cases to adapt the needs of justice to local circumstances. However, this law as currently written can lead to the incorrect assumption that a counselor or social worker with uncertain training is equivalent to a qualified BIPP program which meets the Guidelines. This is clearly not the case and to act as though these programs are equivalent not only does a disservice to all concerned—victims of family violence and their children, the community, and, the offender—it also undermines the efforts of TDCJ-CJAD in enacting the Guidelines to assure quality programs.

In addition, a recent court ruling held that when a judge refers offenders to only one provider when there are alternatives, they open themselves to a possible conflict of interest charge. In terms of intervention with batterers, the same logic applies—that a counselor or social worker is not equivalent to a qualified BIPP program which meets the Guidelines. Therefore, if a BIPP program that meets the Guidelines exists in a certain jurisdiction, it should be the referral of choice. That program is the only option within

¹⁵ This increase of one third over the previous biennium is similar to the increase the legislature has provided in each of the last three biennia.

the category because social workers, counselors, and programs that don't meet the Guidelines are not equivalent services¹⁶.

In fact, as documented in Section III the four year decline of CSCD referrals to BIPPs is directly attributable to the largest urban areas where batterers are referred to programs of uncertain qualifications rather than to TCFV audited programs.

We recommend that TCFV and TDCJ-CJAD jointly advocate for changes that will bring about referrals to qualified, Guidelines-compliant BIPPs rather than other individuals and programs who are unaccountable to the BIPP Guidelines. This will lead to more offenders being directed into programs specifically structured to bring about a cessation in violence and teach the rudiments of a nonviolent lifestyle.

Together these two recommendations can lead to greater safety for victims of family violence and their children. They will help decrease chances of future family violence incidents and lead to greater accountability for offenders. Those are, after all, the major reasons that the state of Texas chooses to fund BIPP programs.

¹⁶ In fact, TCFV does not refer to programs which do not meet the Guidelines as "BIPPs" since they often do not resemble Battering Intervention and Prevention Programs as described in the Code of Criminal Procedures, Article 42.141 and the BIPP Guidelines.

May 24, 2002

Jennifer King
TDCJ-CJAD
P.O. Box 12427
Austin, TX 78711

Dear Ms. King,

Enclosed please find TCFV's annual report on the Battering Intervention and Prevention Project for FY 2001. We feel proud of the collaborative work of TDCJ-CJAD and TCFV in working with programs for batterers. We are pleased to work with a state agency that joins us in our concern for the safety of domestic violence victims and the task of holding batterers accountable.

I hope that at our next scheduled meeting we can discuss the recommendations that we make in this document.

Please let us know if there are any questions or clarifications in regard to this report.

Sincerely,

Tony Switzer
Men's Nonviolence Project Coordinator

New Participants (Adjusted)

BIPP	FY '98	FY '99	FY '00	FY '01
Abilene	-	-	-	-
Amarillo	105	122	109	76
Austin	734	715	792	759
Bastrop	133	112	113	111
Beaumont	345	322	284	275
Brownsville	93	149	163	284
Corpus Christi	96	83	111	77
Dallas/C.O.T.	-	-	-	-
Dallas/F.P.	659	609	435	480
Denton	251	295	308	211
El Paso	577	420	375	444
Fort Worth	360	547	321	292
Garland	226	256	237	234
Houston	644	610	664	661
Kerrville	89	119	88	89
Kilgore	-	-	-	-
Lubbock	-	-	-	-
Marble Falls	64	55	93	74
McAllen	139	146	279	283
Midland	133	180	189	170
Paris	60	53	43	44
Perryton	-	-	-	-
Plano	74	129	152	148
Port Arthur	79	78	55	54
San Antonio	1,028	690	614	605
Sherman	254	234	170	109
Texarkana	74	56	109	114
Tyler	99	133	165	167
TOTALS	6,316	6,113	5,869	5,761

Those five programs in **Bold** are the new BIPPs added in FY' 00 - '01. Their numbers are not included so as to provide an accurate comparison.

Referrals by CSCDs (Adjusted)

BIPP	FY '98	FY '99	FY '00	FY '01
Abilene	44	0	-	-
Amarillo	85	95	198	107
Austin	346	347	280	186
Bastrop	143	155	162	211
Beaumont	206	185	143	190
Brownsville	154	216	277	312
Corpus Christi	50	41	54	42
Dallas/C.O.T.	-	-	865	630
Dallas/F.P.	523	478	431	446
Denton	204	119	331	170
El Paso	248	44	146	105
Fort Worth	97	235	94	102
Garland	473	337	308	271
Houston	538	581	794	684
Kerrville	42	51	114	104
Kilgore	-	-	58	39
Lubbock	-	-	264	157
Marble Falls	32	14	27	17
McAllen	145	141	226	393
Midland	48	63	114	88
Paris	51	52	41	19
Perryton	-	-	7	21
Plano	33	58	35	40
Port Arthur	15	39	15	50
San Antonio	1,258	976	745	630
Sherman	210	213	156	68
Texarkana	85	55	49	93
Tyler	116	153	298	239
TOTALS	5,146	4,648	5,066	4,567

Referrals by CSCDs (Adjusted)

Highlighting the BIPPs in Urban Areas

BIPP	FY '98	FY '99	FY '00	FY '01
Abilene	44	0	-	-
Amarillo	85	95	198	107
Austin	346	347	280	186
Bastrop	143	155	162	211
Beaumont	206	185	143	190
Brownsville	154	216	277	312
Corpus Christi	50	41	54	42
Dallas/C.O.T.	-	-	865	630
Dallas/F.P.	523	478	431	446
Denton	204	119	331	170
El Paso	248	44	146	105
Fort Worth	97	235	94	102
Garland	473	337	308	271
Houston	538	581	794	684
Kerrville	42	51	114	104
Kilgore	-	-	58	39
Lubbock	-	-	264	157
Marble Falls	32	14	27	17
McAllen	145	141	226	393
Midland	48	63	114	88
Paris	51	52	41	19
Perryton	-	-	7	21
Plano	33	58	35	40
Port Arthur	15	39	15	50
San Antonio	1,258	976	745	630
Sherman	210	213	156	68
Texarkana	85	55	49	93
Tyler	116	153	298	239
TOTALS	5,146	4,648	5,066	4,567

Those programs in **Bold** are the eight BIPPs in the largest urban areas. They received 609 less referrals from CSCDs in FY '01 than they did in FY '00 (a 16.6% decrease).