



Analysis of Byrne/JAG Programs Administered by the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute: Multi-jurisdictional (Drug) Task Forces, 2006 and 2007

**Prepared for the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute
© 2007 Center for Urban Policy and the Environment (07-C47)
School of Public and Environment Affairs
Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis
334 North Senate Avenue, Suite 300
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-1708**



The Indiana Criminal Justice Institute Report Series, 2005-07

On January 26, 2006, the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI) contracted with the IUPUI Center for Urban Policy and the Environment (Center) to perform descriptive assessments and evaluations of 12 federal grant programs administered by ICJI. The ICJI asked the Center to examine subgrantee files maintained at the ICJI offices and assess the process of subgrantee grant applications and the extent to which performance of services proposed in the grant applications is consistent with subgrantee proposals. The primary sources of data for these assessments are in the subgrantee applications for funds and their fiscal and performance reports, all of which are maintained as internal administrative records by the ICJI. The major purpose of each assessment is to determine whether subgrantees are producing the services proposed in grant applications, as well as to compile any performance information contained within ICJI's internal subgrantee files.

The Center for Urban Policy and the Environment

The Center for Urban Policy and the Environment is devoted to supporting economic success for Indiana and a high quality of life for all Hoosiers. An applied research organization, the Center was created by the Indiana University School of Public and Environmental Affairs in 1992. The Center works in partnership with community leaders, business and civic organizations, nonprofits, and government. The Center's work is focused on urban and community development, health policy, and criminal justice research essential to developing strategies to strengthen Indiana's economy and quality of life.



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	4
JAG Program Description and ICJI Grant History	5
Indiana Task Force Production, 2006 ...	6
Byrne/JAG MJTF Case Studies: 12 Profiles	17
Case Study 1: Bi-State Drug Task Force	19
Case Study 2: DETECT Drug Task Force	22
Case Study 3: Hamilton/Boone County Drug Task Force	25
Case Study 4: Henry/Wayne County Area (HWCA) Drug Task Force ...	27
Case Study 5: Indiana Multi-Agency Group Enforcement (IMAGE) Drug Task Force	30
Case Study 6: Joint Effort Against Narcotics (JEAN) Drug Task Force	34
Case Study 7: Metropolitan (Metro) Drug Task Force	37
Case Study 8: Multi-Agency Narcotics (Southwest) Drug Task Force	40
Case Study 9: Muncie/Anderson- Delaware/Madison County (MADMC) Drug Task Force	43
Case Study 10: Tippecanoe/Clinton Drug Task Force	46
Case Study 11: Tri-County Drug Task Force	48
Case Study 12: United Drug Task Force	50
Summary of Key Recommendations ..	53
Appendix 1: Case Comparisons by Performance Metric	55
Appendix 2: MJTF Reported Collaboration with other Agencies	57

Authors

Thomas D. Stucky,
Assistant Professor,
School of Public and Environmental
Affairs, Indiana University–Purdue
University Indianapolis

William Newby,
Policy Analyst,
Center for Urban Policy and the
Environment, Indiana University–
Purdue University Indianapolis

Samuel Nunn,
Professor,
School of Public and Environmental
Affairs, Indiana University–Purdue
University Indianapolis





EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In federal fiscal year (FFY) 2005, the federal government combined the Byrne and Local Law Enforcement Block Grants (LLEBG) to create the Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) program.¹ Consistent with federal and state goals for JAG awards, Indiana grants a portion of JAG funds to multi-jurisdictional drug task forces (MJTF). The goal of these MJTFs is to “address drug control and/or violent crime problems [by] allowing law enforcement agencies in different jurisdictions to work together as a single enforcement entity with the ability to improve communication, share intelligence, and coordinate activities.”²

Since the inception of the JAG grant program in 2005, the state of Indiana has received a total of \$15.1 million in JAG awards, including \$6 million in FFY 2005, \$3.7 million in 2006, and \$5.4 million in 2007. Although MJTFs have been in operation since 1988, ICJI-funded MJTFs have declined in recent years from 35 in 2002–2004, to 25 in 2005, 19 in 2006, and 12 in 2007 (likely due to declining availability of federal funds). ICJI appears to be using awards in a timely manner, having expended \$8.8 million of the \$15.1 million (58 percent) awarded since 2005, including 99 percent of the 2005 award and 77 percent of the 2006 award.

Through examination of global statistics and case study analysis, this report examines ICJI grants to multi-jurisdictional drug task forces in the 2006 and 2007 grant periods. Information used in this report was collected through July 1, 2007, and therefore excludes any information submitted to ICJI subsequent to that date. Such information could alter the statistics discussed here. The statistics described below include 19 grants during the 2006 operating period (April 1, 2006,

to March 31, 2007) and 12 grants during the 2007 operating period (April 1, 2007, to December 31, 2007).³ During 2006, these 19 task forces received approximately \$2.2 million in grants and involved jurisdictions that collectively covered 51 Indiana counties, although this number declined to 31 counties in the 2007 period. ICJI grants to MJTFs varied substantially in size from \$24,000 to the R.U.F.F. Drug Task Force to \$393,725 to the Metro Drug Task Force.

ICJI-funded MJTFs are required to submit quarterly performance reports in which they report data on a variety of metrics including: agencies collaborated with, cases investigated, drugs seized, arrests and convictions obtained (by drug and non-drug cases, demographics, and offense type), investigations cleared through drug-related arrests, and a variety of gang-related metrics that focus primarily on the level of activity/involvement of gangs in task force jurisdictions. For the 2006 period, as of July 1, 2007, 86 percent (51 of 59) of quarterly reports were submitted by task forces.

Collectively, in the 2006 period, ICJI-funded MJTFs generated more than 4,000 new drug investigations, resulting in more than 3,000 arrests and 2,000 convictions, and nearly 1,100 kilograms of drugs seized and 20,000 dosage units of drugs seized.

Key observations from 12 case studies

The 12 case studies reviewed represent all ICJI-funded MJTFs in the 2007 operating period. All focus on arrests and convictions of drug offenders, but the types of drugs that are the major focus of enforcement vary across MJTFs. In

¹Bureau of Justice Assistance. *Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program, 2005*. Retrieved July 24, 2007, from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/pdf/jag05rpt.pdf>

²Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), Center for Program Evaluation. Retrieved August 7, 2007, from http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/evaluation/psi_mtf/forces1.htm

³One grant was awarded for the October 1, 2006 to September 30, 2007 period.



addition, MJTFs vary substantially in the number of arrests, charges, and convictions they produce, and this is only somewhat accounted for by variations in manpower. MJTFs also vary in the relative degree to which arrests and convictions were for possession/consumption activities versus manufacture/sales/distribution activities. There is also variation in the activities and the productivity of the ICJI-funded MJTFs profiled here.

The case studies provide considerable detail on the problems defined by these subgrantees, their goals and objectives, the program activities proposed to satisfy those objectives, and the fiscal performance of each as of July 1, 2007. One finding across all the programs was the variation in documentation provided by subgrantees. Some programs engaged in full and complete reporting with detailed documentation of the need for the program, and full reporting of their activities during the grant period. Other programs submitted much more general applications, apparently assuming that the need for which they wished to receive funding was self-evident or relying on past productivity of the MJTF as evidence of the local drug problem. Especially for training and program income reports, submission was less than universal or timely. One program—the Tippecanoe/Clinton County Drug Task Force—failed to submit any quarterly progress reports (as of July 1, 2007) to document what outcomes were produced with ICJI funds.

From a combination of the global analysis of the JAG MJTF grant program and the in-depth case studies, ten substantive recommendations were developed. They are summarized below:

1. ICJI should provide a mechanism for ensuring full compliance in submission of all required reports. Fiscal reporting was nearly complete, as was submission of quarterly performance reports. Improvements could be made in the completeness of training and program income reports, which provide a more complete picture of program activities.
2. Assessment plans for most subgrantees relied exclusively on documenting increases in productivity on performance reports or internal reports. Yet, there is no mechanism in the current reporting structure for documenting that any changes in productivity were achieved from previous years. Such information is central to many of the objectives described by subgrantees as indicators of success. ICJI should also provide a reporting mechanism for assessing whether subgrantees met other goals besides levels of seizures, arrests, and convictions. Currently, there is no mechanism for specifically documenting how any other goals were addressed.
3. Only one subgrantee mentioned demand reduction as a goal. Perhaps additional attention should be given to supporting demand reduction activities. Similarly, few MJTFs described support for alternatives to incarceration.
4. Most grant applications did not adequately address program sustainability, which is critical in an environment of declining ICJI funding.
5. Grant applicants should be encouraged to expand documentation



of need beyond simply including prior MJTF performance, as prior performance of the MJTF is not an independent measure of the scope of the local drug problem.

6. Revise the Performance Report so that (a) case and arrest/conviction metrics are collected for cohorts rather than on a rolling basis, (b) metrics are collected on the fruitfulness of various assistance to task forces (i.e., search warrants, confidential informants, citizen tips, police calls of suspected drug-related activity), (c) arrest/conviction demographic data and arrest/conviction offense type data are reported for the most serious offense, and (d) instructions are clear in terms of exactly what task forces are being asked to report.
7. The current quarterly report structure does not permit unique reporting of those arrested and convictions by demographics (age, race/ethnicity, and gender) across all types of drugs. Currently demographic reporting of arrestees can result in double counting across types of drugs. This permits demographic analysis within a particular drug type, but does not permit demographic analysis across all types of drugs. To clarify how many unique offenders are being processed, the quarterly performance report form should be modified to report the total numbers of arrests and convictions by age, race/ethnicity, and gender across all drug types at the beginning of the “Arrests and Convictions Demographics” section.
8. Problematic reporting is evident with several of the metrics. Examples include (a) reported case totals not matching the sum of case subsets, (b) reported arrests, charges, and conviction totals not matching the sum of drug and non-drug subsets for each category, and (c) the number of convicted persons for violent drug offenses only being greater than the number of criminal offenses individuals were convicted of—an impossibility. Clearer instructions would likely reduce inconsistencies in reporting.
9. It is not clear why gang-related metrics—particularly those that do not focus on drug activity—are included in the MJTF performance report. In the current reporting format, the reliability of MJTF-reported gang data is questionable because of a high likelihood of non-uniform interpretations of gang involvement across MJTFs. If ICJI believes that funded MJTFs should be asked to report this information, ICJI should consider revising the metrics to clearly define involvement level criteria.
10. The method used to calculate the value of street drugs appeared to be non-uniform across MJTFs. ICJI should consider clarifying the procedure for reporting the street value of drugs.



INTRODUCTION

Through examination of global statistics and through case study analysis, this report examines ICJI grants to multi-jurisdictional drug task forces (MJTF) in 2006 and 2007 grant periods. Limiting the grants analyzed here to those categories results in a population of 19 grants during the 2006 operating period (April 1, 2006, to March 31, 2007) and 12 grants during the 2007 operating period (April 1, 2007, to December 31, 2007). This MJTF examination is organized into three parts. The first section provides an overview of JAG grants, including the allocation of

federal JAG funds to Indiana, the rate at which ICJI spent these funds, and global statistics describing ICJI-funded MJTF task force production. The second section profiles twelve subgrantee programs funded during the 2006 and 2007 grant periods. These twelve programs comprise all grants made in the 2006 operating period for which a subsequent JAG grant was made for the 2007 operating period. The final section discusses key findings and recommendations for management of future JAG awards.



JAG PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND ICJI GRANT HISTORY

JAG Program

In federal fiscal year (FFY) 2005 (October 1, 2004, to September 30, 2005), as authorized by the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2005, Byrne and Local Law Enforcement Block Grants (LLEBG) were merged to create the Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) program.⁴ Once awarded to states and eligible local units of government, “JAG funds can be used for state and local initiatives, technical assistance, training, personnel, equipment, supplies, contractual support, and information systems for criminal justice for any one or more of the following purpose areas”:⁵

1. law enforcement,
2. prosecution and courts,
3. prevention and education,
4. corrections and community corrections,
5. drug treatment, and
6. planning, evaluation, and technology improvement.

Further, the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI) outlined six program areas in its 2006 JAG solicitation to be given priority in funding decisions.⁶ These included:

1. multijurisdictional drug and gang task forces;
2. aggressive prosecution of drug and violent criminal offenders;

3. alternatives to secure confinement for appropriate classes of offenders who will benefit from community-based alternatives to traditional punishment;
4. treatment programs for incarcerated offenders and drug interdiction efforts within prison and local jail/detention facilities as a component to re-entry;
5. improving data collection and research initiatives, including program evaluations, to enhance research-based decision making; and
6. improving criminal and juvenile justice information record systems and technology.

All of the grants documented here fall into JAG purpose area one and ICJI priority area one.

ICJI JAG Funding History

Since the inception of the JAG grant program in 2005, the state of Indiana has received a total of \$15.1 million in JAG awards (Table 1), including \$6 million in FFY 2005, \$3.7 million in 2006, and \$5.4 million in 2007 (averaging \$5 million per year). Consistent with grant guidelines, the state has four FFYs to expend each JAG award. Beginning with the 2005 award, the grant periods for the three JAG grants received are: October 1, 2004 – September 30, 2008; October 1, 2008 – September 30, 2012; October 1, 2012 – September 30, 2016.

⁴Bureau of Justice Assistance. *Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program, 2005*. Retrieved July 24, 2007, from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/pdf/jag05rpt.pdf>

⁵Bureau of Justice Assistance. *Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program, FY 2007 State Solicitation*. Retrieved July 24, 2007, from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/grant/06JAGStateSol.pdf>

⁶2007 JAG Grant Announcement. Retrieved July 24, 2007, from <http://www.in.gov/cji/drugfree/drugcrime/index.html>

⁷Amounts spent are not equal to award amounts because states may spend JAG grants over a number of years. And states typically spend earlier awards in full before expending more recent grants which is why no expenditures are reported for the 2007 award. Thus, the overall burn rate without considering the 2007 award is 90.8 percent.

Table 1: Federal JAG awards to ICJI and amounts spent⁷

Year (FFY)	Federal JAG Amount (\$)	JAG Amount Spent (\$)	Burn Rate (%)
2005	6,034,252	5,987,309	99.2%
2006	3,696,033	2,848,503	77.1%
2007	5,415,403		
TOTAL	15,145,688	8,835,812	58.0%



⁸Because all of the case studies examined here focus on drug offenses, multi-jurisdictional drug task force, multi-jurisdictional task force, MJTF, and task force are used interchangeably.

⁹Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), *Center for Program Evaluation*. Retrieved August 7, 2007, from http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/evaluation/psi_mtf/forces1.htm

¹⁰All of these task forces received grants for the April 1, 2007 to December 31, 2007 period, with the exception of one which received a grant for the October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007, period. Because performance reports for these task forces have not yet been submitted, this analysis will focus on the most recent completed operating year, 2006.

ICJI appears to be using awards in a timely manner, having expended \$8.8 million of the \$15.1 million (58 percent) awarded. The 2005 award has been almost completely expended (99 percent), while 77 percent of the 2006 award was expended in the first ICJI grant cycle. When considering only the 2005 and 2006 grants, ICJI has expended 90.8 percent of JAG awards.

Indiana Task Force Production, 2006

Beginning in 1988 with the passage of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act, Indiana and many other states began organizing and funding Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Forces (MJTFs) to facilitate cooperation among law

enforcement agencies.⁸ The goal of these MJTFs is to “address drug control and/or violent crime problems [by] allowing law enforcement agencies in different jurisdictions to work together as a single enforcement entity with the ability to improve communication, share intelligence, and coordinate activities.”⁹ ICJI-funded MJTFs have declined in recent years from 35 in 2002 – 2004, to 25 in 2005, and 19 in 2006 (Table 2) (likely due to declining availability of federal funds). Currently, there are 12 ICJI-funded MJTFs operating in Indiana.¹⁰ Information used in this report was collected through July 1, 2007. Any information submitted to ICJI by the MJTFs following this cutoff date is not included and could change some of the totals reported here.

Table 2: Counties covered by Task Force, 2002- 2007 and awards, 2006 and 2007

Task Force#	Task Force	2002–2003	2004	2005	2006	2006 Award(s) (\$)	2007	2007 Award(s) (\$)
5	Auburn Police Department/IMAGE Drug Task Force	DeKalb, LaGrange, Noble, Steuben	30,000	DeKalb, LaGrange, Noble, Steuben	12,947			
6	Bluffton Police Department DTF/DETECT DTF	Wells	Adams, Wells	Adams, Wells	Adams, Wells	30,700	Adams, Wells	12,947
7	Carmel PD Drug TF/ Hamilton-Boone County DTF	Boone, Hamilton	Boone, Hamilton	Boone, Hamilton	Boone, Hamilton	66,000	Boone, Hamilton	31,221
11	Grant County PD DTF/JEAN Team DTF	Grant, Marion	Grant	Grant, Wabash	Grant, Wabash	60,624	Grant, Wabash	38,842
12	Hendricks County Prosecutor DTF/United DTF	Hendricks, Putnam	Hendricks, Putnam	Hendricks, Putnam	Hendricks, Marion, Morgan, Owen, Putnam	50,000	Hendricks, Marion, Morgan, Owen, Putnam	25,894
20	Marion County Justice Agency METRO Drug Task Force	Hamilton, Marion	Hamilton, Hancock, Marion	Hamilton, Hancock, Marion	Hamilton, Hancock, Marion	393,725	Hamilton, Hancock, Marion	142,419
29	Vanderburgh County DTF/Multi-Agency Narcotics TF/ Southwest Indiana Multi-Agency DTF/Southwest Indiana DTF	Vanderburgh, Warrick	Vanderburgh	Vanderburg, Warrick	Vanderburg, Warrick	215,535	Vanderburg, Warrick	71,425

(continued on next page)



(continued from previous page)

Task Force#	Task Force	2002–2003	2004	2005	2006	2006 Award(s) (\$)	2007	2007 Award(s) (\$)
32	Warren County Drug Task Force/Bi-State Drug Task Force	Benton, Fountain, Vermilion, Warren,	Benton, Fountain, Jasper, Newton, Warren	Benton, Fountain, Jasper, Newton, Warren	Benton, Jasper, Newton, Warren	75,426	Benton, Jasper, Newton, Warren	25,894
25	Randolph County PD DTF/Tri-County Drug Task Force	Jay, Randolph, Indiana State Police	Blackford, Jay, Randolph	Blackford, Jay, Randolph	Blackford, Jay, Randolph	120,240	Blackford, Jay, Randolph	38,842
13	Henry County PD DTF/Henry-Wayne County DTF	Henry	Henry	Henry, Wayne	Henry, Wayne	78,486	Henry, Wayne	38,842
31	Wayne County Drug Task Force	Wayne	Wayne	Merged with TF 13				
22	Muncie PD Drug TF/ Muncie and Delaware County Drug TF/ Muncie-Anderson-Delaware-Madison County Drug TF	Delaware	Delaware	Delaware, Madison	Delaware, Madison	169,900	Delaware, Madison	30,536
4	Anderson Police Department/Madison County Drug Task Force	Madison	Madison	Merged with TF 22				
28	Tippecanoe County Prosecutor DTF/ Tippecanoe County DTF/Tippecanoe-Clinton DTF	Tippecanoe	Tippecanoe	Clinton, Tippecanoe	Clinton, Tippecanoe	69,500	Clinton, Tippecanoe	25,575
34	Clinton County Drug Task Force	Clinton	Clinton	Merged with TF 28				
2	South Central Narcotics Strike Force	Brown, Greene, Lawrence, Monroe, Sullivan	Brown, Greene, Lawrence, Monroe	Brown, Greene, Lawrence, Monroe	Brown, Greene, Lawrence, Monroe	111,882	NG	
37	Vermillion County DTF/Vigo and Vermillion Counties' DTF	See TF 32	Vermillion	Vermillion, Vigo	Vermillion, Vigo	156,166	NG	
30	Vigo County Drug Task Force	Vigo	Vigo	Merged with TF 37				
35	White Carroll County Drug Task Force/Cass, Carroll, White, and Pulaski County Multi-Jurisdictional DTF	Carroll, White	Carroll, White	Carroll, Cass, Pulaski, White	Carroll, Cass, Pulaski, White	175,499	NG	
36	Drug and Gang Initiative (Cass County)	NG	Cass	Merged with TF 35				
8	Connersville Police Department DTF/RUFF Drug TF	Decatur, Fayette, Rush, Shelby	Decatur, Fayette, Rush, Shelby	Fayette, Rush	Fayette, Rush, Shelby	24,000	NG	
16	Kokomo PD DTF/ Howard County DTF/ Howard-Miami County DTF	Howard	Howard - actual DTF	Howard, Miami	Howard, Miami	152,950	NG	
23	Peru PD DTF/Miami County DTF	Miami	Miami	Merged with TF 16				

(continued on next page)



(continued from previous page)

Task Force#	Task Force	2002–2003	2004	2005	2006	2006 Award(s) (\$)	2007	2007 Award(s) (\$)
9	Floyd County PD DTF/Southern Indiana DTF	Clark, Floyd, Harrison	Floyd, Harrison	Clark, Floyd, Harrison, Jackson, Scott	Floyd, Harrison	195,445	NG	
17	Kosciusko County Police Department Drug Task Force	Kosciusko	Kosciusko	Kosciusko, Whitley	Kosciusko, Whitley	48,474	NG	
33	Whitley County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	Whitley	Whitley	Merged with TF 17				
3	Allen County Police Department Drug Task Force	Allen, Huntington	Allen, Huntington, Wells	Allen, Huntington, Wells	NG		NG	
1	Indiana State Police Drug Task Force/Drug Enforcement Section (ISP)	Statewide	Indiana State Police	Statewide	NG		NG	
18	Lake County Police Department Drug Task Force	Lake	Lake	Lake	NG		NG	
19	LaPorte County Prosecutor DTF/ LaPorte Metro Operations Drug Unit/ Metro Operations Multi-Jurisdictional DTF	LaPorte	LaPorte	LaPorte	NG		NG	
26	St. Joseph County DTF/Metro Special Operations Section	St. Joseph	St. Joseph	St. Joseph	NG		NG	
21	Marshall County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	Fulton, Marshall, Pulaski	Marshall	Marshall	NG		NG	
24	Pulaski County Police Department	Part of Marshall Prosecutor Drug Task Force	Marshall, Pulaski	NG	NG		NG	
27	Starke County PD DTF/Starke County T.N.T.	Starke	Starke	NG	NG		NG	
14	Howard County Prosecutor/ Howard County DTF	Part of Kokomo Police Department Drug Task Force	Howard County Special Prosecutors for DTF	NG	NG		NG	
15	Johnson County Drug & Gang Task Force/ Regional Gang Interdiction Program	Johnson, Marion	NG	NG	Johnson, Marion Categorized as a Gang Task Force		NG	
10	Floyd County Prosecutor	Assigned to Southeast Indiana Drug Task Force out of the Floyd Police Department	NG	NG	NG		NG	

Note: NG = no grant for that period.



The following section focuses on the activities of 18 Indiana MJTFs (one MJTF failed to submit data and is therefore excluded from the tables below) funded by federal grants administered by ICJI during the 2006 period (April, 1, 2006, to March 31, 2007) (hereinafter referred to as 2006).¹¹ Together, these 19 task forces received approximately \$2.2 million in grants and involved jurisdictions that collectively covered 51 of Indiana’s 92 counties in the 2006 period, although this number declined to 31 counties in the 2007 period (see Table 2). ICJI-funded MJTFs are required to submit quarterly performance reports where they report data on a variety of metrics including: agencies collaborated with, cases investigated, drugs seized, arrests and convictions obtained (by drug and non-drug cases, demographics, and offense type), investigations cleared through drug-related arrests, and a variety of gang-related metrics that focus primarily on the level of activity/involvement of gangs in task force jurisdictions.¹² Taken together, these metrics represent various aspects of task force production which can be broken down into four broad categories: (a) agencies collaborated with and cases processed; (b) drugs seized and gross arrests, charges, convicted persons, and convictions; (c) arrests and convictions by offender demographics and offense type; and (d) investigations for non-drug offenses cleared through drug-related arrests. For the 2006 period, 86 percent (51 of 59) of quarterly reports were submitted by task forces though specific data may have not been reported in all reports (all tables show reporting rates).¹³

¹¹Seven task forces received two grants for the April 1, 2006 – March 31, 2007 period (one for each six months), six received grants for July 1, 2006 – March 31, 2007, five for April 1, 2006 – September 30, 2006, and one for July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007 for a total of 19 MJTFs. However, reports were unavailable for one task force so data are only presented for 18 MJTFs.

¹²For complete performance metrics reported by task forces see *Multijurisdictional Task Force Quarterly Performance Report*, at <http://www.in.gov/cji/drugfree/drugcrime/grantreport.html>.

¹³This report does not include any reports submitted after July 1, 2007. Beginning with the 2006 grant cycle, task forces started submitting quarterly performance reports rather than semi-annual reports, though three task forces submitted one semi-annual report. For the purposes of reporting rates, semi-annual reports were counted as two quarterly reports. Notably, the quarterly performance reports were modified to include gang-related metrics, estimated drug values of drugs seized, and minor revisions to some of the existing metrics.

Collaboration

Fundamental to MJTF operations, task forces work with a variety of law enforcement and other agencies in conducting investigations, executing law enforcement strategies, and prosecuting drug offenders. During the 2006 period, all ICJI-funded MJTFs reported collaborating with local and state agencies (see Table 3). However, the current reporting form does not allow MJTFs to report the specific local or state agencies with whom they collaborated. Such information is critical for determining the extent to which task forces are “multi-jurisdictional” and the quarterly performance report should be altered accordingly. ICJI-funded task forces also reported collaboration with several specific federal agencies such as the Drug Enforcement Agency, and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. Table 3 also shows, perhaps not surprisingly, that ICJI-funded MJTFs partnered with some federal agencies much more often than others.

Table 3: Percent of task forces reporting collaboration with various agencies

Agency	Count	Percent (%)
Local agencies	18	100.0
State agencies	18	100.0
DEA	14	77.8
ATF	12	66.7
US Attorney	11	61.1
US Postal Service	9	50.0
FBI	8	44.4
US Marshals Service	8	44.4
IRS	5	27.8
INS	4	22.2
US Customs	2	11.1
Coast Guard	1	5.6
FAA	1	5.6
Other	2	11.1

Notes:

1. Reporting rate was 83 percent (49 of 59 reports).
2. Task forces were credited with working with an agency if they reported working with the agency in any quarterly report.



Cases Processed

ICJI-funded task forces reported investigating a total of 8,137 cases in 2006. However, as Table 4 reveals, the MJTF-reported subcategories do not sum to the MJTF-reported totals. Comparing MJTF-reported *subtotals* with MJTF-reported *totals* for consistency showed that only 39 percent (7 of 18) of individual MJTF-reported subtotals equaled the MJTF-reported totals for cases. Similarly, only 22 percent (4 of 18) of MJTF-reported subtotals reported in Table 6 equaled the MJTF-reported totals for arrests/convictions. Thus, the reliability of case data reported by task forces is called into question by discrepancies between total cases and the subsets of cases that should equal the total. For example, the total number of cases (8,137) should equal the sum of new cases (4,701) and cases

carried over from the previous reporting period (4,137). However, this number (8,838) exceeds total cases reported by 700. Similarly, the sum of cases carried over into the next reporting period (4,127), closed cases (1,904), and cases filed for criminal charges (3,511) should equal total cases (8,137). However, this number (9,542) surpasses the total number of cases reported by 1,400 cases.

To establish as much consistency as possible, in the discussion of these metrics, we employ a “working total” which is generated by adding the MJTF reported subtotals for the metric in question. Using this working total (9,542), just over 43 percent of cases were carried over to the next reporting period, 37 percent were filed for criminal charges, and 20 percent were closed. However, the current reporting form

Table 4: Case investigations and outcomes, 2006

Case Types and Outcomes	Reported Total
Total number of cases	8,137
Cases carried over from previous period	4,137
New cases investigated	4,701
Closed cases	1,904
Cases filed for criminal charges	3,511
Cases carried over to next period	4,127
Illegal aliens identified	193
Search warrants executed	516
New confidential informants (CI)	464
Citizen tips (hotline activity)	8,189
Police calls of suspected drug-related activity	4,736
Cases resulting in drug seizures	4,251

Notes:

1. Reporting rate was 86 percent (51 of 59 reports).
2. Total number of cases should equal cases carried over from previous period + new cases investigated.
3. Cases carried over to next period should equal total number of cases - closed cases and cases filed for criminal charges.
4. Definitions:
 Cases: investigations involving one or more suspects for which a case number has been assigned.
 Closed cases: cases for which investigation was discontinued and no prosecution is anticipated.
 Cases filed for criminal charges: cases that have been referred for prosecution.



does not allow for a determination of what proportion of cases filed for criminal charges eventually result in convictions. A better understanding of this relation could be achieved if case outcomes were reported for cohorts of cases rather than on a rolling basis and if the numbers of individuals that comprise those cases were identified.

ICJI-funded MJTFs also report the number of search warrants executed, new confidential informants (CIs) developed, citizen tips (hotline activity) received, police calls of suspected drug-related activity, and cases investigated resulting in drug seizures. Comparing search warrants executed (516) to the number of cases investigated (9,542) indicates that search warrants are infrequently used by task forces with only approximately 5 percent of cases investigated utilizing search warrants. In 2006, task forces secured 464 new CIs, received 8,189 citizen tips, and had 4,736

police calls of suspected drug-related activity. However, the fruitfulness of this information in terms of the number of new cases generated, arrests made, or drugs seized, is indeterminate without additional information linking cases and arrests to their source.

Drugs Seized

As shown in Table 4, ICJI-funded task forces reported 4,251 cases resulting in drug seizures. Task forces report nine broad categories of drugs seized in seven different units of measurement (see Table 5).¹⁴ In 2006, task forces seized more than 1,000 kilograms, 20,000 dosage units, 700 plants, and nearly 500 other units of drugs.

Generally, opiates/narcotics (including marijuana) comprise the largest category of seizures, accounting for 84 percent of kilogram seizures, 42 percent of dosage units, 86 percent of plants, and 33 percent of

Table 5: Drugs seized in Indiana by type and unit, 2006

Drug category	Kilograms	%	Dosage Units	%	Plants	%	Other	%
Opiates/Narcotics	908.41	83.6	8,605	41.7	632	85.9	161	32.5
Marijuana	895.91	82.4	10	0.0	454	61.7	0	0.0
Stimulants	92.11	8.5	799	3.9	0	0.0	3	0.6
Methamphetamines	92.08	8.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Cocaine	62.29	5.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Club drugs	19.14	1.8	2,835	13.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
Other	4.28	0.4	2,588	12.6	104	14.1	325	65.7
Hallucinogens	0.22	0.0	1,023	5.0	0	0.0	6	1.2
CNS depressants	0.21	0.0	4,765	23.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Inhalants	0.00	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	1,086.65	100.0	20,615	100.0	736	100.0	495	100.0

Notes:

1. Reporting rate was 86 percent (51 of 59 reports).
2. Task forces may also report drug seizures in ounces, pounds, and kilograms. Seizures reported in these units were converted to grams and added to the grams total; this included 6,125 ounces and 3,685 pounds (no seizures were reported in kilograms).
3. Total excludes subsets of marijuana and methamphetamines.

¹⁴Seizures reported in grams, ounces, and pounds were converted to kilograms.



“other” unit seizures. Marijuana accounted for 82 percent of all kilogram seizures and 62 percent of all plant seizures. Remaining kilogram seizures in descending order included stimulants (9 percent), cocaine (6 percent), and club/other drugs (combined 2 percent).

Focusing on dosage unit seizures, opiates/narcotics remained the largest category with 42 percent of seizures, followed by central nervous system depressants (23 percent), club drugs (14 percent), other (13 percent), hallucinogens (5 percent), and stimulants (4 percent). In terms of plant seizures, task forces seized 736 plants, 86 percent of which were opiates (with 62 percent coming from marijuana) and 14 percent “other” drugs. The majority of other unit seizures came from other drugs (66 percent). Some of the other units specified by task forces included *items, pills, pods, and mgs.* Notably, most seizures reported in other units were for paraphernalia (12 of 18).

Gross Arrests, Charges, Convicted Persons, and Convictions

ICJI-funded MJTFs are asked to report the number of individuals arrested and convicted by drug and non-drug offense types as well as the total charges and convictions. ICJI defines *arrests* as the number of individuals charged with criminal offenses, *charges* as the number of individual counts filed against persons, *persons convicted* as the number of persons found guilty of criminal offenses, and *convictions* as the number of criminal offenses for which individuals were convicted. Because cases may be adjudicated over several reporting periods, conviction data should not be compared to arrests reported in any given period.

In 2006, task forces reported arresting a total of 3,441 persons resulting in 4,062 charges and convicting 2,096 persons on 2,373 criminal offenses. However, Table 6

Table 6: Arrests, charges filed, and convictions by drug and non-drug offenses, 2006

	Arrested		Charges		Convicted Persons		Convictions	
	Violent	Non-Violent	Violent	Non-Violent	Violent	Non-Violent	Violent	Non-Violent
Drug offenses only	96	2,911	133	4,244	28	1,847	18	2,046
Non-drug offenses only	21	331	22	514	11	207	12	209
Drug and non-drug offenses	50	267	71	654	22	115	38	149
Working total (sum of above categories)	167	3,509	226	5,412	61	2,169	68	2,404
Reported total	160	3,281	186	3,876	61	2,035	64	2,309

Notes:

1. Reporting rate was 86 percent (51 of 59 reports).
2. Working total is the total used for analysis and was calculated by the analysts. Reported total is the total reported by task forces (rather than calculated) and should equal the sum of drug offenses only, non-drug offenses only, and drug and non-drug offenses.
3. Definitions:
 Arrested: The number of individuals charged with criminal offenses.
 Charges: The number of individual counts filed against one individual.
 Convicted Persons: The number of individuals found guilty of criminal offenses.
 Convictions: The number of criminal offenses for which individuals were convicted.



indicates discrepancies between the MJTF-reported totals and the MJTF-reported subsets which should equal the reported totals—most reported subset totals were greater than reported totals. For example, considering all arrests, MJTF-reported subsets of persons arrested sum to 3,676—exceeding the total reported by task forces by more than 200 arrests. Additionally, task forces reported a greater number of persons convicted for violent drug offenses (28) only than convictions for the same category (18)—a discrepancy that should not be possible.¹⁵ Such discrepancies point to the need for ICJI to reword the instructions so that it is clear what information is being requested and which values should sum to which totals.

As above, we generated a “working total” by summing the MJTF-reported sub-totals for further analysis of arrest and conviction data. Using the working totals, task forces reported arresting 3,676 persons resulting in 5,638 charges. ICJI-funded task forces reported convicting 2,230 persons on 2,472 offenses. ICJI-funded MJTF arrests equal approximately 15 percent of 24,698 reported in the UCR.¹⁶

As might be expected, the large majority of persons arrested (90 percent), charges filed (91 percent), persons convicted (90 percent), and convictions (91 percent) were for drug-related offenses. Moreover, the majority of these were for drug offenses only. In addition to being primarily drug-related offenders, task forces reported arresting and convicting offenders who were largely non-violent—96 percent of persons arrested and charges filed were for non-violent offenses, and 97 percent of persons convicted and convictions were for non-violent offenses.

While arrest and conviction data reported by task forces are useful for assessing their productivity, currently there is no way to determine what proportion of MJTF arrests result in convictions. As discussed above in the case section, this could be accomplished if arrest and conviction data were collected for cohorts of arrestees rather than on a rolling basis.

Arrests and Convictions by Offender Demographics and Offense Type

Demographic attributes of persons arrested and convicted by task forces are reported in Table 7. Task forces are asked to report “the number of individuals arrested [and convicted] during the current reporting period” by age, sex, race, and drug type. They are further instructed to count persons arrested/convicted for more than one type of drug offense in each drug category for which they were arrested/convicted. Thus, reported arrests and convictions by demographics are not likely to represent unique individuals arrested and convicted due to double counting across drug types. And, as with gross arrests, conviction data should not be compared to arrests because of the lag in case processing. ICJI-funded task forces reported 4,012 drug offense arrests and 1,977 drug offense convictions in 2006. The data indicate that drug offense arrests and convictions were primarily of whites, males, and persons 18 or older. Three-quarters of both drug offense arrests and convictions were males.¹⁸

Focusing on age, 98 percent of task force drug offense arrests and 99 percent of convictions were of persons 18 or older, while only 2 percent of arrests and 1 percent of convictions were 17 or younger.¹⁹

¹⁵The reporting form also has a row labeled “total number of individuals” which makes sense for only some of the columns and it is therefore unclear what this number represents. For example, it is not clear how “total number of individuals” should be interpreted under the columns entitled “No. Charges.” See Multijurisdictional Task Force Quarterly Performance report, section entitled “ARRESTS, CHARGES FILED, AND CONVICTIONS.”

¹⁶Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). *Crime in the United States, 2005*. Retrieved August 17, 2007, from http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/05cius/data/table_69.html

¹⁷When using a calculated gross conviction total (2,230), the number of convictions reported by demographics (1,977) is less than the gross total, indicating reporting inaccuracies.

¹⁸These proportions are slightly below national proportions reported in the 2005 UCR data for drug abuse violations which show males making up 80 percent of persons arrested for drug abuse violations and females 20 percent (FBI. *Crime in the United States, 2005* [Table 33]. Retrieved August 21, 2007, from http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/05cius/data/table_33.html).



Table 7: Arrests and convictions by demographics, 2006

Gender	Ethnicity	Arrested				Convicted			
		17 or Younger	18 or Older	Total	%	17 or Younger	18 or Older	Total	%
Male	Hispanics of any race	2	156	158	5	2	75	77	5
	African American, not Hispanic	14	845	859	28	9	467	476	32
	White, not Hispanic	51	1,961	2,012	66	5	928	933	62
	Other, not Hispanic		24	24	1		7	7	0
Subtotal		67	2,986	3,053	100	16	1,477	1,493	100
Female	Hispanics of any race		35	35	4		16	16	3
	African American, not Hispanic	1	175	176	18	1	100	101	21
	White, not Hispanic	9	729	738	77	4	363	367	76
	Other, not Hispanic		10	10	1				0
Subtotal		10	949	959	100	5	479	484	100
Grand Total		77	3,935	4,012	100	21	1,956	1,977	100

Notes:

1. Reporting rate was 86 percent (51 of 59 reports).
2. Task forces are asked to report each drug offense for which an individual is arrested and convicted. For this reason, the number of arrests and convictions reported may not equal the actual number of individuals arrested and convicted.
3. Convictions are not a subset of arrests; convictions can be from arrests made during prior reporting periods.

Finally, whites made up the majority of drug offense arrests and convictions, accounting for 69 percent and 66 percent, respectively, while African Americans were the second most frequently arrested (26 percent) and convicted (29 percent).²⁰ Hispanics of any race (5 percent arrested and convicted) and other/non-Hispanic (less than 1 percent for both arrests and convictions) comprised a small share of drug offense arrests and convictions. When considering all demographic factors

together, the following profiles emerge for drug offense arrests and convictions: White male adults rank first in both arrests (49 percent) and convictions (47 percent), followed by Black male adults (21 percent of arrests and 24 percent of convictions), White female adults (18 percent of arrests and convictions), and Black female adults (4 percent of arrests and 5 percent of convictions). All other demographic groups account for 7 percent of arrests and 6 percent of convictions.

¹⁹These proportions are above national proportions which showed 90 percent of persons arrested for drug abuse violations in 2005 being 18 or older and 10 percent 17 or younger (FBI. *Crime in the United States, 2005* (Table 32). Retrieved August 21, 2007, from http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/05cius/data/table_32.html)

²⁰Compared to national arrest data, proportions for Whites exceeded national levels (65 percent) while African American proportions were less than national levels (34 percent) (FBI. *Crime in the United States* (Table 43). Retrieved August 21, 2007, from http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/05cius/data/table_43.html).



Offense Types

In 2006, MJTFs reported 4,631 arrests and 2,427 convictions by offense type (see Table 8). Here again there are discrepancies in reported data when compared to data reported in Table 6. With the understanding that task forces could actually be reporting charge and conviction data—based on reporting instructions—offense arrests (4,631) are well below gross charges (calculated total of 5,638), while offense convictions (2,427) are only 45 fewer than gross convictions (calculated total of 2,472) reported, though still inconsistent with Table 6 data. The majority of arrests (58 percent) and convictions (67 percent) were for offenses on the demand side of the drug market. Possession/using/consuming accounted for 57 percent of offense type arrests and 67 percent of convictions. Buying, the second of the two demand type offenses, comprised only 1 percent of arrests and convictions.

Taken together, supply type offenses made up 37 percent of task force offense type arrests and 27 percent of convictions. Accounting for the largest supply offense type and the second largest overall offense type, distributing/selling represented 32 percent of all offense type arrests and 24 percent of convictions. Remaining supply offenses, manufacturing/cultivating and importing/transporting, made up 5 and 4 percent of offense type arrests and convictions, respectively. A final offense type category, other—which included some specified entries such as *script fraud*, *visiting/maintaining common nuisance*, and *precursors*—accounted for 5 percent of both offense type arrests and convictions.

Investigations for Non-Drug Offenses Cleared Through Drug-Related Arrests

Task forces often indirectly assist other law enforcement agencies in completing

Table 8: Arrests and convictions by offense type, 2006

Offense	Arrests	%	Convictions	%
Supply offenses	1,711	37	661	27
Manufacturing/cultivating	178	4	62	3
Importing/transporting, to or within the state	41	1	13	1
Distributing/selling	1,492	32	586	24
Demand offenses	2,678	58	1,633	67
Buying	38	1	17	1
Possession/using/consuming	2,640	57	1,616	67
Other (specify)	242	5	133	5
TOTAL	4,631	100	2,427	100

Notes:

1. Reporting rate of 85 percent (50 of 59 reports) for arrests and 54 percent (32/59 reports) for convictions.
2. Task forces are asked to report each drug offense and offense type for which an individual is arrested and convicted. For this reason, the number of arrests and convictions reported may not equal the actual number of individuals arrested and convicted.
3. Convictions are not a subset of arrests; convictions can be from arrests made during prior reporting periods.



investigations through the apprehension of individuals who are the subjects of ongoing criminal investigations. Table 9 shows the number of investigations MJTFs helped clear through drug-related arrests. Of the 945 investigations cleared, 46 percent were UCR Part I crimes (index crimes) indicating that drug offenders arrested by task forces can be connected with serious crimes, such as theft (24 percent), burglary (9 percent), and robbery (6 percent)—all putative drug habit-sustaining crimes. Interestingly, one task force (Henry/Wayne County) accounted for more than one-third (393 of 945) of all such clearances.

Gang-Related Metrics

Beginning with the 2006 JAG grant cycle, roughly one-third (5 of 17 pages) of the task force performance report focuses on gangs. This focus was likely precipitated by an emphasis on gang-related activities in the JAG performance measures outlined by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) (see Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Performance Measures, <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/grant/JAGPerfMeasures.pdf>). However, the inclusion of these metrics in the MJTF performance report and the metrics themselves raise various questions. To begin, it is unclear why gang-related metrics are included in the drug task force performance report given the distinction ICJI makes between gang and drug task forces (i.e., there is a separate performance report for gang task forces) and the fact that many of the gang metrics have nothing to do with drug activity—the primary focus of MJTFs. Clarification regarding a distinction between gang and drug task forces would be useful for understanding ICJI's approach to collecting gang-related metrics.

Table 9: Investigations cleared through drug-related arrests, 2006

Crime	Count	%
Theft	226	23.9
Burglary	89	9.4
Robbery	56	5.9
Carrying handgun without permit	55	5.8
Unlawful possession of firearm by serious felon	50	5.3
Forgery; counterfeiting	45	4.8
Battery	44	4.7
Fraud	43	4.6
Identity deception	39	4.1
Criminal mischief	37	3.9
Arson	29	3.1
Conversion	26	2.8
Criminal trespass	24	2.5
Deception	20	2.1
Domestic battery	19	2.0
Aggravated battery	18	1.9
Residential entry	17	1.8
Car jacking	15	1.6
Vicarious sexual gratification	14	1.5
Sexual battery	14	1.5
Criminal deviate conduct	13	1.4
Check deception	12	1.3
Murder	9	1.0
Auto theft	9	1.0
Criminal confinement	7	0.7
Child solicitation	4	0.4
Child molesting	3	0.3
Prohibited instruments of violence	3	0.3
Reckless homicide	2	0.2
Kidnapping	1	0.1
Rape	1	0.1
Sexual misconduct with a minor	1	0.1
Index Crimes	437	46.2
Other Crimes	508	53.8
TOTAL	945	100.0

Note:

1. Reporting rate of 66 percent (39 of 59 reports).



BYRNE/JAG MJTF CASE STUDIES: 12 PROFILES

Case studies were performed to answer questions about the performance of subgrantees and how individual MJTF grant recipients used ICJI funds. Twelve grants were selected for detailed review. The sampling frame included all 2006 operating period grants (April 1, 2006, to March 31, 2007) which used either 2003 or 2004 Byrne or 2005 JAG funds, where ICJI awarded a subsequent grant for the 2007 operating period (April 1, 2007, to December 31, 2007), which in most cases used 2006 JAG funds. All the case studies reflect ongoing funded projects for ICJI. The 12 case studies represent 61 percent of MJTF grant funds for 2006 and 100 percent of ICJI MJTF funds for 2007. One case study (Tippecanoe/Clinton County Drug Task Force) had provided no reporting data for 2006 as of July 1, 2007.

Table 10 compares the average across the case study MJTFs who submitted requisite reports (one task force discussed below failed to submit quarterly performance reports) included in the analysis for selected metrics with the overall average of MJTFs funded by ICJI in the 2006 operating period. Table 10

shows that the MJTFs selected for inclusion in the case studies described below are relatively representative of the MJTFs funded by ICJI across a variety of measures.

For each case study described below, we reviewed the identification of problems to be addressed, documentation of program activities, and evidence of program effectiveness in addressing the identified problem. Following this review, cases were assigned a simple qualitative rating of below average, average, or above average. An average program was considered to be one that completed the grant application correctly, attempted to establish that a problem existed in the problem statement, offered a detailed program description, identified a reasonable program goal, objectives, and activities, submitted timely and accurate financial and progress reports, provided discussions of program activities in the progress reports, and appeared to have a somewhat positive impact on the problem the program attempted to address. Cases that did not meet this standard were called below average; those that exceeded

Table 10: Comparison of case studies with all task forces on selected metrics, 2006

Metrics	Average (case study task forces)	Number reporting	Average (all task forces)	Number reporting
Total cases	414	11	479	17
Search warrants	32	11	31	17
New confidential informants	27	11	27	17
Cases resulting in drug seizures	326	10	274	16
Drugs seized				
Kilograms	63.5	11	60.4	18
Dosage units	1,581	11	1,288	16
Plants	87	3	123	6
Other	26	7	55	9
Persons arrested	198	11	204	18
Charges filed	304	11	313	18
Persons convicted	174	8	159	14
Conviction counts	205	8	177	14
Investigations cleared through drug-related arrests	69	10	59	16



it were considered above average. Using these standards for the 12 case studies as explained below, 3 were classified as above average, 3 as average, and 6 as below average.

In some cases ICJI made more than one grant to an individual MJTF to cover the 12-month period from April 1, 2006, to March 31, 2007. If so, the performance metrics discussed below include figures from both grants in the tables. In some cases, ICJI made grants for periods other than the standard 12-month period. Notation of this is made in the case description where it occurred. Because the 2007 operating period was just beginning at the time of this review, case descriptions focus on the 2006 operating period (usually April 1, 2006, to March 31, 2007). Financial figures include the combination of ICJI funds and the local match. Keep in mind that information

submitted to ICJI prior to July 1, 2007, was used to describe and assess MJTFs in the case studies. Additional information submitted by subgrantees subsequent to this date could change reported totals.

Subgrantee reporting was not uniform, so program assessment was limited by unavailability of key reports for some subgrantees. In general, subgrantees were required to submit quarterly fiscal, program income, training, and performance reports. Fiscal and performance reporting for the 2006 operating period appears to be nearly universal, although one subgrantee provided no performance information to describe what was accomplished with the ICJI funds they expended. Program income and training reporting is less universal. Two-thirds of program income quarterly reports and 42 percent of quarterly training reports were submitted.



CASE STUDY 1: BI-STATE DRUG TASK FORCE

*05-DJ-022 \$75,426 JAG award, \$116,040
total program (7/1/06–3/31/07)*

*06-DJ-027 \$25,894 JAG award, \$51,788 total
program (4/1/07–12/31/07)*

Program Description

The Bi-State Drug Task Force operates in Warren, Benton, Newton, and Jasper counties, cooperating with two Eastern Illinois DTFs (which is apparently the source of Bi-State in the name). The Bi-State MJTF directly employs two full-time investigators and has been in existence for 16 years. The application specifically discusses methamphetamine and marijuana as major drug problems in the area. ICJI made a nine-month grant in the 2006 funding cycle, due to a low evaluation score of the grant application. The subgrantee was given a three-month extension in which to re-file the application. The initial grant period was from July 1, 2006, to March 31, 2007, and the second grant covered April 1, 2007, to December 31, 2007.

Problem Statement

The 05-DJ-022 grant application simply states that there is a drug problem in the jurisdictions covered, but provides no statistical evidence to support this assertion. Even previous law enforcement activities are lacking. The application does include some newspaper clippings documenting drug activity and arrests in the area.

Goals, Objectives, and Program Activities

The 05-DJ-022 grant application states that the goal of the Bi-State MJTF is to create a centralized intelligence gathering and drug enforcement agency to engage in drug

activity detection and prosecution. The grant application lists three objectives:

1. to develop a centralized shared database of drug intelligence information,
2. to conduct surveillance of local drug traffickers, and
3. to conduct interdiction campaigns on local major traffic routes.

The application describes a four-part implementation plan but this plan is vague and does not specifically address the first objective. The success of the program in meeting its goals and objectives is to be documented to the MJTF's Board of Directors, but is not specifically described. The application notes that the Bi-State MJTF would be unlikely to continue in the absence of federal funding.

Measurements and Performance Metrics

The Bi-State MJTF submitted two of three required quarterly performance, fiscal, and program income reports for the nine-month 05-DJ-022 grant period, but failed to submit any training reports. Even keeping the six-month reporting period in mind, the Bi-State MJTF reported a small number of total cases, arrests, charges, and other investigations cleared, which may be because only two full-time investigators were assigned to the unit. The few arrests and convictions reported also focused approximately equally on production/distribution activities and possession/consumption activities. Search warrants and new informants were well below average, and the amount of drugs seized is small relative to the average. The program reported only \$1,446 in asset forfeitures.



Table 11: Bi-State Drug Task Force (July 1, 2006 to March 31, 2007)

Metrics	Bi-State MJTF	Average (all task forces)
Total cases	54	488
Search warrants	4	31
New confidential informants	12	27
Cases resulting in drug seizures	32	274
Drugs seized		
Kilograms	10.8	60.4
Dosage units	31	1,288
Plants	0	123
Other	0	55
Persons arrested	8	204
Charges filed	13	313
Persons convicted	8	159
Conviction counts	0	177
Investigations cleared through drug-related arrests	1	59

Note:

1. Drugs seized are reported in grams, ounces, and pounds. Seizures reported in these units were converted to kilograms.
2. Performance reports submitted cover six months.

Fiscal Performance

According to the 05-DJ-022 grant application, the previous level of ICJI funding was \$109,340. ICJI granted \$75,426 with a total project amount of \$116,040. The bulk of funds were budgeted for salary (\$77,000) for the two full-time investigators employed by the Bi-State MJTF. The grant also devoted \$11,364 to the purchase of a vehicle, \$19,125 for operating expenses, and \$7,500 for confidential informants. This grant was one of the few MJTFs included in the case studies that did not expend all of its funds, expending only 81.6 percent of ICJI funds.

Assessment of April 1, 2007, to December 31, 2007 Grant

The grant application for 06-DJ-027 received \$25,894 in ICJI funds with an identical local match for a total of \$51,788. ICJI-funded expenditures included: \$14,183 on salary and fringe, \$8,587 on operating expenses, and \$2,725 on confidential informant funds.

The application generally echoes the previous application in terms of the scope of the problem and once again fails to use any statistical evidence to support statements that drugs are a local problem. The goals and objectives are much more clearly laid out and continue to focus on investigations and arrests as well as developing a centralized repository for drug intelligence. Unfortunately, there are no numerical benchmarks that could be used to evaluate the success of the program in meeting its objectives. The implementation plan is vague, failing to document how the proposed database will be created or by whom. No quarterly reports from the current grant period were available at the time of this report to document program activities or expenditures.

Overall Program Assessment

The 05-DJ-22 grant application is weak, providing no statistical evidence to support assertions that drugs are a local problem.



The only evidence provided comes in the form of newspaper clippings. The application lists its primary goal as the creation of a centralized database for gathering drug intelligence information but does not ask for program funds to further this goal. Little information is given that could be used to evaluate whether the goal of intelligence gathering was met.

Submission of required documentation was not complete for the first grant period. The Bi-State MJTF appears to have generated few cases and arrests, and did not appear to seize a large amount of drugs or engage in many asset forfeiture actions, especially given the amount of ICJI funds invested. Our overall assessment is below average.



CASE STUDY 2: DETECT DRUG TASK FORCE

03-DB-064 \$18,500 Byrne award, \$28,462
total program (4/1/06–9/30/06)
05-DJ-069 \$12,200 JAG award, \$18,770
total program (10/1/06–3/31/07)
06-DJ-029 \$12,947 JAG award, \$25,894
total program (4/1/07–12/31/07)

Program Description

The program includes the Adams County Sheriff’s department, and the Bluffton and Decatur police departments serving Adams and Wells counties and was established in 1990. The DETECT MJTF consisted of two officers at 90 percent of their time and one officer at 50 percent time. The application does not single out a specific drug priority. ICJI made two six-month grants (03-DB-064, 05-DJ-069) due to funding issues that will be treated as one grant for the purposes of this review. The two grant applications were identical with respect to everything but the budget.

Problem Statement

The grant application was vague in documenting the problem to be

addressed. Claims as to the seriousness of the local problems of cocaine, methamphetamines, and prescription drugs were not supported by any statistics, local or otherwise.

Goals, Objectives, and Program Activities

According to the grant application, “the overriding and ever-present goal of the DETECT Drug Task Force is the continued, focused effort to effectively and efficiently enforce drug laws.” The DETECT MJTF hopes to increase arrests for drug crimes through purchasing superior equipment and enhancing training to substantially increase drug prosecutions.

The application lists five objectives:

1. to cultivate information to assist in drug investigations,
2. to conduct drug searches in schools with canines,
3. to update surveillance equipment,

Table 12: DETECT Drug Task Force (April 1, 2006, to March 31, 2007)

Metrics	DETECT MJTF	Average (all task forces)
Total cases	155	488
Search warrants	5	31
New confidential informants	9	27
Cases resulting in drug seizures	19	274
Drugs seized		
Kilograms	0.9	60.4
Dosage units	78	1,288
Plants	0	123
Other	8	55
Persons arrested	54	204
Charges filed	120	313
Persons convicted	24	159
Conviction counts	31	177
Investigations cleared through drug-related arrests	31	59

Note:

1. Drugs seized are reported in grams, ounces, and pounds. Seizures reported in these units were converted to kilograms.
2. Performance reports submitted cover 12 months.



4. to attend pertinent training courses,
5. to achieve more and higher-quality drug arrests.

Measurements and Performance Metrics

Total cases, search warrants, new CIs, drugs seized, cases resulting in seizures, arrests, charges, persons convicted, and convictions were all well below the case study averages, especially given that the DETECT MJTF reported approximately five full-time investigators for the grant. Arrests and convictions, though few, did focus on drug production/distribution activities rather than possession or consumption.

Fiscal Performance

The DETECT MJTF has been in operation since 1990. In the immediately previous grant cycle, the DETECT MJTF received \$40,000 of ICJI funding. For the April 1 to September 30, 2006, period the ICJI grant amount was \$18,500, with an overall approved project budget of \$71,000, including \$52,500 in local funds. The bulk of these funds were designated for paying personnel expenses (\$46,500), operating expenses (\$7,800), and equipment (\$15,700), with \$1,000 in confidential informant funds. The majority of grant funds were expended during the grant period, with the exception of \$4,446. The DETECT MJTF documented purchasing a digital audio repeater, leasing two surveillance vehicles, and paying for training of officers. For the second operating period (October 1, 2006, to March 31, 2007), ICJI provided \$12,200 in funding, which was completely expended, but existing information does not make it clear how the funds were spent, as the

financial reporting form does not specify the source of dollars spent.

Assessment of April 1, 2007 to December 31, 2007 Grant

The grant application for 06-DJ-029 continues to vaguely discuss the drug problem to be addressed, supported only by statements noting that drugs are a local problem, with no statistical evidence documenting the problem (local or otherwise). The application lists one goal of identifying, investigating, and arresting drug dealers and abusers. The application lists three objectives:

1. to maintain the current number of drug arrests,
2. to increase the number of informants developed,
3. to maintain the level of K-9 searches in schools and businesses.

Each of these objectives can be assessed but requires comparisons to prior year data that are not feasible to report on the current forms required by ICJI. The application requests \$12,947 from ICJI, which was granted. Most of this money is used to fund operating expenses such as cell phone service, copy costs, office supplies, and vehicle fuel and maintenance. The remaining amount is used to fund training.

Overall Program Assessment

The 2006 grant period application is vague on goals and assessment. The only assessment mechanism discussed is a plan to compare current activities with prior activities, which is not reported anywhere, perhaps because there is no mechanism for such reporting in required documents. Submission of required documentation



was complete, although required documentation did not assist in determining whether goals and objectives were met because of the nature of the required documentation. Additional documentation would be necessary to evaluate whether the DETECT MJTF met the stated goals and objectives. The DETECT MJTF appears to be a viable MJTF from a fiscal standpoint because ICJI only provided a relatively small percentage of its overall operating expenses. During the second six-month period of the grant, the DETECT MJTF documented training received for task

force members, consistent with their stated goal. The DETECT MJTF documented only \$600 in asset forfeitures, which would seem to be a critical deficiency in maintaining long-term stability. The DETECT MJTF appears to be a functioning MJTF but the return on the investment appears to be less than optimal, which may be due to the small size of the jurisdictions where the DETECT MJTF is operating. The number of cases, arrests, and convictions appears to be below average, as does the amount of drugs seized. Our overall assessment is below average.



CASE STUDY 3: HAMILTON/ BOONE COUNTY DRUG TASK FORCE

03-DB-061 \$66,000 Byrne award, \$101,539
total program (4/1/06–9/30/06)

05-DJ-066 \$31,221 JAG award, \$48,033
total program (10/1/06–9/30/07)

Program Description

The Hamilton/Boone County (HBC) Drug Task Force consists of investigators from Carmel (five), Fishers (three), Noblesville (two), and Zionsville (one) police departments and was established in 1990. The application does not single out a specific drug priority. The initial grant period 03-DB-061 was for 6 months and the second grant was for a 12-month period. This should be borne in mind because statistics and budgets describe a 6-month period rather than the 12-month period covered in most other case studies.

Problem Statement

The grant application describes prior MJTF activity in a detailed annual report from 2005 and uses this information persuasively to document that drugs are a local problem, especially given the proximity of the two counties to Marion County.

Goals, Objectives, and Program Activities

The grant application lists four goals:

1. to reduce illegal drugs and weapons available for purchase,
2. to arrest and successfully prosecute those engaging in drug activity,
3. to focus on mid- to large-scale dealers and repeat offenders,
4. to increase uniformed interdiction on major highways in the counties.

The application lists four objectives:

1. to increase search warrants 10 percent;

2. to increase arrests 10 percent,
3. to increase repeat offender arrest rate by 50 percent,
4. to increase interdiction patrols by 10 percent.

The application lists several specific activities that appear to support these goals and objectives.

Measurements and Performance Metrics

The HBC MJTF submitted both quarterly performance reports for the six-month 03-DB-061 grant period. Keeping the six-month reporting period in mind, the HBC MJTF reported an average number of total cases, a well above average number of search warrants and confidential informants, but a below average number of cases resulting in drug seizures. The HBC MJTF reported having approximately 13 full-time investigators. The amount of drugs seized is somewhat above the case study average, but arrests and convictions are below average, though more arrests and convictions were for production/distribution activities than possession/consumption activities. The HBC MJTF reported no trainings being conducted and reported no seizures or forfeitures.

Fiscal Performance

The HBC MJTF has been in operation since 1990. For the April 1 to September 30, 2006, period, the ICJI grant amount was \$66,000, with an overall approved project budget of \$101,539. The bulk of these funds were designated for paying personnel expenses (\$92,308) with the remaining \$9,231 designated for confidential informants. Personnel



Table 13: Hamilton/Boone County Drug Task Force, April 1, 2006 to September 30, 2006

Metrics	HBC MJTF	Average (all task forces)
Total cases	189	488
Search warrants	40	31
New confidential informants	21	27
Cases resulting in drug seizures	51	274
Drugs seized		
Kilograms	43.4	60.4
Dosage units	822	1,288
Plants	83	123
Other	5	55
Persons arrested	128	204
Charges filed	128	313
Persons convicted	0	159
Conviction counts	0	177
Investigations cleared through drug-related arrests	18	59

Note:

1. Drugs seized are reported in grams, ounces, and pounds. Seizures reported in these units were converted to kilograms.
2. Performance reports submitted cover six months.

supported included three full-time officers, one 25 percent time officer, and a small amount of administrative support. All grant funds were expended during the grant period.

Assessment of October 1, 2006 to September 30, 2007 Grant

The grant application for 05-DJ-066 was not available for review at the time of the report. The grant amount from ICJI declined substantially to \$31,221 for the 12-month period from October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007, compared to \$66,000 in ICJI funds for the previous six-month period. Initial documentation provided in submitted quarterly reports is insufficient to determine the activities of the HBC MJTF for the second grant period. Two quarterly performance reports indicate enforcement activities consistent with prior activity but financial information was lacking.

Overall Program Assessment

Our overall assessment is above average. The 2006 grant period application is

exceptionally clear on goal and objectives and supports the need for the HBC MJTF using local statistics of prior activities. Presumably this is intended to indicate the level of the drug problem in the jurisdictions being served, but this is an assumption. No independent drug use or sales information is provided. Submission of required documentation was complete for the first grant period, although required documentation did not assist in determining whether goals and objectives were met because of the nature of the required documentation. Additional documentation would be necessary to evaluate whether the HBC MJTF met the stated goals and objectives. The HBC MJTF appears to be a relatively strong MJTF, especially in terms of the search warrants and new confidential informants developed. The number of cases, arrests, and convictions appears to be below average, as does the amount of drugs seized, especially given the relatively large number of full-time investigators.



CASE STUDY 4: HENRY/WAYNE COUNTY AREA (HWCA) DRUG TASK FORCE

04-DB-050 \$78,486 Byrne award, \$120,748
total program (4/1/06–9/30/06)

06-DJ-031 \$38,842 JAG award, \$191,469
total program (4/1/07–12/31/07)

Program Description

The HWCA Drug Task Force operates in Henry and Wayne counties, with investigators from both sheriff's departments, the Indiana State Police, and the New Castle and Richmond police departments. The application specifically discusses prescription drug abuse and marijuana as major drug problems in the area. The initial grant period ran from April 1, 2006, to September 30, 2006, and the second grant covered April 1, 2007, to December 31, 2007. Thus, statistics and budgets describe a six-month period.

Problem Statement

The 04-DB-050 grant application describes the drug problem through statements regarding the activities of the HWCA MJTF in 2005, noting 420 investigations in 2005. The application also notes that I-70 runs through both counties, which facilitates the transportation of drugs. The application focuses specifically on the issues of marijuana and illegal prescription drug use, which together account for 60 percent of the HWCA case investigations. No outside evidence of the local drug problem is offered, aside from MJTF activity.

Goals, Objectives, and Program Activities

The 04-DB-050 grant application states that the main goal of the HWCA MJTF is to reduce availability of illegal drugs in the jurisdictions served, reducing other crime and leading to safer communities. The grant application lists five objectives:

1. to assign officers to a pharmaceutical drug unit,
2. to educate community groups and the public on illegal drugs,
3. to build a strong relationship with smaller police departments in the counties,
4. to update training of MJTF investigators,
5. to establish a comprehensive database system to cross-reference investigation information.

The application lists activities that appear to be somewhat related to the objectives but is vague as to how they would be implemented, especially on objectives 3 and 5. The success of the program in meeting its goals and objectives is to be documented in the quarterly performance reports but the assessment plan is only weakly related to the objectives and program activities. The application addresses future funding in only a limited way.

Measurements and Performance Metrics

The HWCA MJTF submitted both quarterly performance reports for the six-month 04-DB-050 grant period but failed to submit any training or program income reports. Keeping the six-month reporting period in mind, the HWCA MJTF reported a large number of total cases, arrests, charges, and other investigations cleared. The arrests and convictions also focused mainly on production/distribution activities rather than possession/consumption activities. The HWCA MJTF also cleared a substantial number of non-drug cases through arrests. Search warrants and new informants were



Table 14: Henry/Wayne County Drug Task Force (April 1, 2006 to September 30, 2006)

Metrics	HWCA MJTF	Average (all task forces)
Total cases	588	488
Search warrants	11	31
New confidential informants	15	27
Cases resulting in drug seizures	0	274
Drugs seized		
Kilograms	0.3	60.4
Dosage units	643	1,288
Plants	0	123
Other	0	55
Persons arrested	207	204
Charges filed	219	313
Persons convicted	67	159
Conviction counts	67	177
Investigations cleared through drug-related arrests	393	59

Note:

1. Drugs seized are reported in grams, ounces, and pounds. Seizures reported in these units were converted to kilograms.
2. Performance reports submitted cover six months.

slightly below average, and the amount of drugs seized is small relative to the average. No asset forfeiture information is provided. There were approximately eight full-time investigators attached to the HWCA MJTF.

Fiscal Performance

According to the 04-DB-050 grant application, the previous level of ICJI funding was \$150,000 and the requested amount in the current cycle was \$157,000. ICJI granted \$78,486, with a total project amount of \$191,469. All federal funds were expended in the grant period but existing financial information does not specify on what because an amended budget in line with the amount of the actual grant was not available for review. The available information also does not make clear what monies were spent on education, training, or new computing capability.

Assessment of April 1, 2007 to December 31, 2007 Grant

The grant application for 06-DJ-031 requested \$38,842 in ICJI funds, all of which was granted. ICJI-funded expenditures were to include: \$19,421 on salary, \$2,428 on travel and per diem, \$2,428 on a digital repeater, \$9,711 on operating expenses/office supplies, and \$4,855 on confidential informants. The application generally echoes the previous application in terms of the scope of the problem and uses only MJTF activity in the previous periods as an indicator of the problem in the area. The goals and objectives are somewhat vague but continue to focus on investigations, educating the public and training, and again do not provide numerical benchmarks that could be used to evaluate the success of the program in meeting its objectives. The implementation plan is vague and only



related to the drug investigations portion of the objectives. No quarterly reports from the current grant period were available at the time of this report to document program activities or expenditures.

Overall Program Assessment

The 2006 grant period application provides specific information on the prior activities of the HWCA MJTF regarding prescription drug use and marijuana in the two counties served. The application lists specific goals for training officers,

educating the public, and enhancing computer capabilities. No information was available to assess whether any of these goals were met. Submission of required documentation was not complete for the first grant period. Additional documentation would be necessary to evaluate whether the HWCA MJTF met the stated goals and objectives. The HWCA MJTF appears to have generated a fair number of cases and arrests, but did not appear to seize a large amount of drugs or engage in any asset forfeiture actions. Our overall assessment is below average.



CASE STUDY 5: INDIANA MULTI- AGENCY GROUP ENFORCEMENT (IMAGE) DRUG TASK FORCE

*05-DJ-023, \$30,000 JAG award, \$46,154
total program (7/1/2006–3/31/2007)*
*06-DJ-030, \$12,947 JAG award, \$25,894
total program (4/1/2007–12/31/2007)*

Program Description

The program covers DeKalb, LaGrange Noble, and Steuben counties in northeast Indiana and was established in 1993 “in an attempt to combat the manufacture, sale, and distribution of illicit controlled substances.” The goal of the IMAGE MJTF is to “combine the resources of the mostly rural jurisdictions that it serves in [an] effort to maximize the limited resources available” because the investigations undertaken can be lengthy and complex. The cities of Auburn and Kendallville, and the counties of Steuben and Noble each supply one full-time officer to the IMAGE MJTF. The application states that other agencies contribute officers as they are able on a part-time basis. The application states that the main focus is on methamphetamines but that the IMAGE MJTF investigates other drugs as well.

Program Description and Problem Statement

The initial grant application for the April 1, 2006, to March 31, 2007, operating period was vague in documenting the problem to be addressed. No statistics were offered to document the scope of the local drug problem. As a result of this vagueness, ICJI allowed the IMAGE MJTF an opportunity to re-submit their application with three months of continuation funding so the grant period for 05-DJ-023 was July 1, 2006, to March 31, 2007. The revised grant application was a substantial improvement over the initial application.

The revised application notes that the area served contains popular tourist attractions, as well as major interstate traffic routes, which bring drug activity to the area. However, the application offers limited local statistics to document the problem of drugs specifically. It does contain one table identifying the number of drug and alcohol offenders placed on probation within DeKalb County as increasing from 279 in 2002 to 370 in 2004. There is also a statement from Congressman Mark Souder that is referenced in the application which contains facts that appear to represent Indiana as a whole rather than the area served by the IMAGE MJTF. There are several assertions that drugs (specifically, methamphetamines) are a problem statewide and locally, but few specific statements provide local documentation of the problem. According to the application, the number of new drug cases dropped from 171 in 2004 to 70 in 2005.

Goals, Objectives, and Program Activities

The revised application lists four goals:

1. to reduce the use, manufacture, and distribution of drugs through proactive investigation,
2. to increase quality of life for citizens by reducing the availability of drugs and reducing crimes associated with drug use,
3. to produce high quality investigations resulting in maximum penalties for offenders,
4. to educate and interact with federal, state, and local law enforcement to better share information to reduce illegal drug trade and crime.



The application lists five objectives:

1. to obtain updated computers, cameras, and surveillance equipment,
2. to increase the number of investigations, arrests, and drug seizures by 10 percent over 2005 levels,
3. to reduce expenses by eliminating non-critical services and equipment,
4. to increase training and interaction with area law enforcement agencies,
5. to attend training and education on conducting drug investigations.

Measurements and Performance Metrics

The IMAGE MJTF developed 85 cases which is somewhat below average, and only four search warrants. This is also a low number given that on average four investigators were engaged in full-time

task force activities. In terms of drug seizures, arrests, charges, persons convicted, and counts of convictions, the IMAGE MJTF reported below average numbers compared to the other MJTFs in the case studies. Of the arrests reported, a large percentage was for production/distribution activities and only a small percentage of the arrests was for possession/consumption activities.

Fiscal Performance

The IMAGE MJTF has been in operation since 1993. In the immediate previous grant cycle, the IMAGE MJTF received \$40,000 of ICJI funding. For the July 31, 2006, to March 31, 2007, period, the ICJI grant amount was \$30,000 with a local match of \$16,154. The bulk of these funds were designated for paying personnel expenses (\$16,154), operating expenses (\$19,535), and confidential expenditures (\$9,460). The budget was amended to transfer \$8,000 from the operating

Table 15: Indiana Multi-Agency Group Enforcement Drug Task Force (IMAGE) (July 1, 2006 to March 31, 2007)

Metrics	IMAGE MJTF	Average (all task forces)
Total cases	85	488
Search warrants	4	31
New confidential informants	30	27
Cases resulting in drug seizures	16	274
Drugs seized		
Kilograms	1.2	60.4
Dosage units	700	1,288
Plants	0	123
Other	30	55
Persons arrested	115	204
Charges filed	164	313
Persons convicted	94	159
Conviction counts	3	177
Investigations cleared through drug-related arrests	3	59

Note:

1. Drugs seized are reported in grams, ounces, and pounds. Seizures reported in these units were converted to kilograms.
2. Performance reports submitted cover nine months.



expenditures to confidential funds. All grant funds were expended during the grant period. For the second operating period (April 1, 2007, to December 31, 2007), the total award decreased to \$25,894 (\$12,947 from ICJI plus a local match of \$12,947). In the second grant period, all ICJI federal funds were to be used for confidential informants.

Assessment of April 1, 2007 to December 31, 2007 Grant

The application for the second operating period represents a substantial improvement over the previous grant application, as reflected in the 76/100 rating by the ICJI grant reviewer at the time of submission. The documentation of the local nature of the problem is improved, at least in part due to improvements in the ICJI application forms. The new application specifies goals, objectives, and related performance indicators. This application lists two goals: investigation of drugs, and identifying and safeguarding children who are victims of drug crimes. The objectives and performance indicators for the two goals are clear and connected to the goals. The weakest area of the new application (noted by the ICJI reviewer) is the evaluation of the program. The mechanism for evaluation is not clearly explained. This continues to be a weakness from the previous grant application. Sustainability is weakly addressed in both applications, as noted by the reviewer.

Overall Program Assessment

Documentation of the local nature of the drug problem in the grant application is a weakness in both grant periods examined. In addition, evaluation and sustainability

could be more effectively addressed. The application makes a general statement about assessment of the program being conducted by the Board of Directors, but is vague on exactly what will be assessed or how. The goals listed in the grant application are broad, general, and difficult to measure. Further, since no mechanism is suggested for assessment, it is difficult to imagine how one could evaluate whether the goals are being met. For example, the stated goal is to reduce the availability of drugs and decrease the manufacture, distribution, and use of drugs. However, to assess this goal, one must know how much of each kind of drug activity occurs before and after the grant period.

The objectives are clearer and more amenable to evaluation, although it is not clear specifically how the objectives support the goals. The documentation in the submitted forms provides minimal evidence that the IMAGE MJTF purchased equipment, cut costs, increased communication, or conducted training. Only one report documents any training and this report fails to discuss the number of officers trained. In addition, there is no evidence that any of the computer or other equipment was purchased. Some of this lack is no doubt due to the constrained nature of the quarterly reporting forms, which do not easily permit discussion of these activities. Submission of documentation was in compliance with requirements, but lacked detail in some areas.

The IMAGE MJTF appears to be a functioning MJTF. The number of cases, arrests, and convictions appears to be somewhat below average, as does the amount of drugs seized. On the positive side, most arrests were for



production/distribution activities rather than simple possession or consumption of drugs. Presumably this will have a greater impact on the availability of drugs than if most arrests were for possession of drugs

alone. There is not much evidence that the IMAGE MJTF can be self-sustaining as it reported no income from seizures or forfeitures. Our overall assessment of the IMAGE MJTF is average.



CASE STUDY 6: JOINT EFFORT AGAINST NARCOTICS (JEAN) DRUG TASK FORCE

*03-DB-067 \$60,624 Byrne award, \$93,268
total program (4/1/06-9/30/06)*

*06-DJ-028 \$38,842 JAG award, \$77,684
total program (4/1/07-12/31/07)*

Program Description

The JEAN Drug Task Force, established in 1988, operates in Grant and Wabash counties, with contributing investigators from Grant and Wabash county sheriff's departments and the Marion and Wabash police departments. The application describes cocaine/crack and marijuana as the major drug problems in the area, as well as a growing problem with methamphetamine manufacture. The initial grant period 03-DB-061 ran from April 1, 2006, to September 30, 2006, and the second grant covered April 1, 2007, to December 31, 2007. This should be borne in mind because the statistics and budgets discussed below describe a six-month period rather than the 12-month period covered in most other case studies. The JEAN MJTF applied for additional funds to cover the period from October 1, 2006, to March 31, 2007, but this request was not granted.

Problem Statement

The 03-DB-067 application describes the nature of the local drug problem through anecdotal evidence of children possessing marijuana, a discussion of recent increases in case activity in the immediate prior year by the JEAN MJTF, and a discussion of local unemployment problems that contribute to drug and alcohol additions. The application also notes that Grant County contains I-69, which is stated to be a major route for drugs from Detroit to Fort Wayne and Indianapolis.

Goals, Objectives, and Program Activities

The 03-DB-067 grant application states that the main goal of the JEAN MJTF is to make a safe environment for the communities they serve by preventing, investigating, arresting, and prosecuting drug distributors and manufacturers. The grant application lists four objectives:

1. to identify and increase local patrols in areas of suspected drug activity,
2. to increase contacts, investigations, and arrests in targeted areas,
3. to use confidential informants to direct MJTF investigators to suppliers, and
4. to train MJTF personnel on surveillance, undercover investigations techniques, and awareness of methamphetamine laboratories.

The application lists numerous specific activities that appear to support these objectives. The application states that the JEAN MJTF will evaluate its progress in an ongoing fashion through daily, weekly, monthly, and quarterly meetings of relevant parties to share information and report on the status of various investigations. Ultimately the success of the JEAN MJTF is to be measured by the amount of drugs confiscated, and arrests and convictions generated.

Measurements and Performance Metrics

The JEAN MJTF submitted both quarterly performance reports for the six-month 03-DB-067 grant period. Keeping the six-month reporting period in mind, the



JEAN MJTF reported an above average number of total cases (which may be the result of having approximately 11 full-time investigators), search warrants, confidential informants, and approximately an average number of cases resulting in drug seizures. Arrests and convictions are below average, but the amount of drugs seized is substantially below the case study average, and arrests and convictions focus mainly on possession/consumption rather than production/distribution activities. The training reports showed MJTF members receiving undercover narcotics, methamphetamine, and homicide investigations training but does not identify how many received training. The program income report showed \$24,755 in asset forfeitures and \$606 in restitution.

Fiscal Performance

According to the 03-DB-067 grant application, the previous level of ICJI funding was \$185,000 and the requested

amount in the current cycle was \$121,248. ICJI granted \$60,624 with a total grant amount of \$93,268, all of which was expended in the six-month period of the grant. Approximately \$41,000 of these funds paid salary and fringe benefits for an intelligence analyst/administrator, secretary, and evidence technician. Approximately \$14,000 were spent on leasing seven vehicles and a copy machine; \$5,250 on confidential informants; and \$32,224 on operating expenses including communications, supplies, vehicle maintenance, and building utilities/insurance. All grant funds were expended during the grant period.

Assessment of April 1, 2007 to December 31, 2007 Grant

The grant application for 06-DJ-028 requested \$38,842 in ICJI funds, all of which was granted. Approximately \$28,000 is to be spent on salary and fringe benefits, nearly \$7,000 is earmarked for

Table 16: Joint Effort Against Narcotics (JEAN) Drug Task Force (April 1, 2006, to September 30, 2006)

Metrics	JEAN MJTF	Average (all task forces)
Total cases	330	488
Search warrants	24	31
New confidential informants	28	27
Cases resulting in drug seizures	133	274
Drugs seized		
Kilograms	1.9	60.4
Dosage units	885	1,288
Plants	175	123
Other	0	55
Persons arrested	127	204
Charges filed	181	313
Persons convicted	37	159
Conviction counts	28	177
Investigations cleared through drug-related arrests	19	59

Note:

1. Drugs seized are reported in grams, ounces, and pounds. Seizures reported in these units were converted to kilograms.
2. Performance reports submitted cover six months.



operating expenses, and \$1,600 is to be spent on confidential informants. The application is very similar in format to the prior grant applications, providing evidence of the local drug problem primarily in terms of prior JEAN MJTF activity increases. The objectives and activities are very similar to the previous grant, but there is an additional focus on training and education of private businesses, community leaders, and schools on how to identify suspicious activities that might be drug activity. The implementation plan appears to be supportive of these goals and objectives. No quarterly reports from the current grant period were available at the time of this report to document program activities or expenditures.

Overall Program Assessment

The 2006 grant period application is relatively clear on goals and objectives and supports the need for the JEAN MJTF

using local statistics documenting prior activities. These statistics are intended to indicate the level of the drug problem in the jurisdictions being served, but this is an assumption. No independent drug use or sales information in the jurisdiction is discussed in the application. Submission of required documentation was complete for the first grant period, although required documentation did not assist in determining whether goals and objectives were met because of the nature of the required documentation. As with other MJTFs, additional documentation would be necessary to evaluate whether the JEAN MJTF met the stated goals and objectives. The JEAN MJTF appears to have a strong focus on search warrants and new confidential informants developed, especially in asset-seizures. The number of cases, arrests, and convictions appears to be below average, as does the amount of drugs seized. Our overall assessment is average.



CASE STUDY 7: METROPOLITAN (METRO) DRUG TASK FORCE

03-DB-063 \$244,500 Byrne award,
\$376,231 total program (4/1/06-9/30/06)
05-DJ-068 \$149,225 JAG award, \$229,500
total program (10/1/06-3/31/07)
06-DJ-023 \$142,419 JAG award, \$284,838
total program (4/1/07-12/31/07)

Program Description

The Metropolitan (Metro) Drug Task Force includes the Indianapolis Police Department and the Hamilton and Hancock county sheriff's departments. The application lists cocaine, marijuana, and methamphetamine as specific priorities for investigation. ICJI made two six-month grants (03-DB-063, 05-DJ-068) due to funding issues that will be treated as one grant for the purposes of this review. The application also notes that there is a Marion County prosecutor devoted strictly to prosecuting cases generated by the Metro MJTF in the jurisdiction.

Problem Statement

The 03-DB-063 grant application lists a variety of local statistics to document increases in activity regarding the three targeted drugs, including prior MJTF activities, Marion County court cases involving drugs, and the percent of Marion County jail inmates testing positive for drugs. The application also notes that the jurisdictions served are a major transportation hub with several interstate highways that facilitate the transportation of illegal drugs to the area.

Goals, Objectives, and Program Activities

The grant application describes the overall goal of the Metro MJTF as the joining together of several law enforcement agencies to create a unified, focused

approach to investigate, arrest, and prosecute dealers of methamphetamines, cocaine, and marijuana. The application also notes the goal of depriving these dealers of their assets and becoming self-sustaining within three years. The application lists four objectives:

1. to initiate a cooperative multi-jurisdictional approach to drug investigations,
2. to initiate more money-laundering and RICO investigations related to drugs,
3. to increase arrest and prosecution of street and mid-level dealers of methamphetamines, and
4. to provide training in financial investigations, Spanish, and methamphetamine laboratories.

The program activities appear to be related to the objectives identified, although the measurement tools suggested are somewhat vague. The application notes that assessment of the program objectives will mainly be tracked through the ICJI quarterly reports but also refers to a 2006 *Police Quarterly* article, suggesting that drug enforcement activity in one section of Indianapolis reduced overall calls for service and showed the value of drug interdiction activities. The assessment appears to be suited to tracking the objectives.

Measurements and Performance Metrics

With respect to the number of cases generated, search warrants, and new confidential informants, the Metro MJTF is average or slightly above average. With respect to arrests, charges, and convictions, the Metro MJTF is below average, especially given the size of the



grant and the approximately 11 full-time investigators employed. The Metro MJTF seized a substantial amount of drugs, however, and arrests/convictions focused on production/distribution activities rather than possession/consumption. The Metro MJTF documented \$219,000 in assets seized or forfeited across the two grant periods. No training reports were available to document that any training occurred in either grant period.

Fiscal Performance

In the immediate previous grant cycle, the Metro MJTF received \$489,100 of ICJI funding. For the April 1 to September 30, 2006, period the ICJI grant amount was \$244,500, with an overall approved budget of \$376,231. All federal funds were related to salary for personnel and the entire balance was expended for the first operating period. The Metro MJTF received \$149,225 in ICJI funds with a program total of \$229,500 for the 05-DJ-068 grant. At the time of this report only

one financial report was available so it is unclear what proportion of ICJI funds were expended in the second grant period.

Assessment of April 1, 2007 to December 31, 2007 Grant

The 06-DJ-023 application requested \$142,419 in ICJI funds for salary and fringe benefits, all of which was granted. The needs statement, goals, and objectives are nearly identical to the prior cycle's grant application but, as before, are well laid out. It remains to be seen as to whether the documentation to assess whether any of these objectives (especially in terms of training) will be more complete for the current grant period than the prior grant period.

Overall Program Assessment

The Metro MJTF appears to have been successful with respect to some of its program goals, especially asset seizure/forfeitures. It is unclear if any

Table 17: Metro Drug Task Force (April 1, 2006 to March 31, 2007)

Metrics	Metro MJTF	Average (all task forces)
Total cases	484	488
Search warrants	42	31
New confidential informants	47	27
Cases resulting in drug seizures	67	274
Drugs seized		
Kilograms	210.3	60.4
Dosage units	1,525	1,288
Plants	0	123
Other	1	55
Persons arrested	92	204
Charges filed	155	313
Persons convicted	81	159
Conviction counts	41	177
Investigations cleared through drug-related arrests	20	59

Note:

1. Drugs seized are reported in grams, ounces, and pounds. Seizures reported in these units were converted to kilograms.
2. Performance reports submitted cover 12 months.



training occurred because no training reports were submitted, and available information does not allow a determination as to whether RICO/money laundering investigations were undertaken or successful. With respect to the number of cases generated, search warrants, and new confidential

informants, the Metro MJTF is average or slightly above average. With respect to arrests, charges, and convictions, the Metro MJTF is below average, especially given the size of the grant. The Metro MJTF seized a substantial amount of drugs, however. Our overall assessment is average.



CASE STUDY 8: MULTI-AGENCY NARCOTICS (SOUTHWEST) DRUG TASK FORCE

*03-DB-062 \$130,135 Byrne award,
\$200,208 total program (4/1/06-9/30/06)*
*05-DJ-067 \$85,400 JAG award, \$131,385
total program (10/1/06-3/31/07)*
*06-DJ-033 \$71,425 JAG award, \$142,850
total program (4/1/07-12/31/07)*

Program Description

The Southwest Indiana (Southwest) Drug Task Force covers Vanderburgh and Warrick counties, including officers from the Vanderburgh and Warrick county sheriff's departments, the Evansville Police Department, and deputy prosecutors from the Vanderburgh County Prosecutor's Office. The program appears to involve a substantial number of investigators but only one is funded through the grant. The funds of the grant appear mainly to support the deputy prosecutor's salary. The application focuses on marijuana, cocaine, and methamphetamine. ICJI made two six-month grants (03-DB-062, 05-DJ-067) that will be treated as one grant for the purposes of this review.

Problem Statement

The 03-DB-062 grant application establishes the level of drug activity mainly through documentation of previous law enforcement activities, although these statistics suggest that drug production is a problem in the jurisdictions discussed. The application does suggest that methamphetamine labs are a problem, but shows a declining trend in this activity from 2002 through 2005. The application also notes that the jurisdictions served are a major transportation hub facilitating the transportation of illegal drugs to the area.

Goals, Objectives, and Program Activities

The grant application describes the goal of the Southwest MJTF as reducing the

availability of illegal drugs, especially methamphetamine, and to prevent passage of these drugs through the counties to other Indiana counties. The application lists four objectives:

1. to investigate arrest and prosecute individuals for producing and distributing drugs, especially methamphetamine,
2. to identify and dismantle methamphetamine labs,
3. to enforce new laws regulating purchase of pseudoephedrine and use information to investigate methamphetamine producers, and
4. to work with retail businesses and the public to help identify methamphetamine activity.

The program activities appear to be related to the objectives identified. The assessment plan appears to be limited to the submission of the ICJI quarterly performance reports, which are not well suited to documenting whether several of the objectives are met in the way described in the application. Additional information would be necessary to determine if the program goals were met. The application addresses future funding but does not lay out a clear plan to become self-sustaining.

Measurements and Performance Metrics

With respect to the number of cases generated, search warrants, and new confidential informants the Southwest MJTF is the highest producing MJTF of those included in the case studies. Some of this may be the result of having a substantial number of officers (although not ICJI-funded) involved in



investigations. The Southwest MJTF generated a substantial amount of arrest/prosecution activity, although a majority of the arrests and convictions were for possession/consumption rather than production/distribution activities. The Southwest MJTF documented \$81,500 in assets seized or forfeited across the two grant periods.

Fiscal Performance

In the immediate previous grant cycle, the Southwest MJTF received \$280,000 of ICJI funding. For the April 1 to September 30, 2006, period, the ICJI grant amount was \$130,135, with an overall approved budget of \$200,208. The bulk of funding was for salary and fringe benefits for a director, two deputy prosecutors, two secretaries, and an investigator. ICJI funds also were used to purchase respirator packs (\$3,420), support operating expenses such as leasing vehicles (\$5,772), and the purchase of evidence (\$5,000). The Southwest MJTF received \$85,400 in ICJI funds with a program total of \$131,385 for the 05-DJ-

067 grant. All ICJI funds were expended for both grant periods.

Assessment of April 1, 2007 to December 31, 2007 Grant

The 06-DJ-033 grant included \$71,425 in ICJI funds with an identical local match for a total project amount of \$142,850. Grant funds continued to be used for a similar mix of predominantly salary and fringe benefits for prosecutorial staff, operating expenses, and confidential funds. The needs statement, goals, and objectives are clearly laid out, although documentation of the local drug problem continues to rely on internally generated statistics. The current grant application does not mention training or education as a goal, unlike the previous grant application. At the time of this report, no performance or fiscal information was available to assess actual program activities.

Overall Program Assessment

The Southwest MJTF appears to be one of the highest performing MJTFs in the state,

Table 18: Multi-Agency Narcotics (Southwest) Drug Task Force (April 1, 2006, to March 31, 2007)

Metrics	Southwest MJTF	Average (all task forces)
Total cases	1,276	488
Search warrants	86	31
New confidential informants	40	27
Cases resulting in drug seizures	1,674	274
Drugs seized		
Kilograms	348.3	60.4
Dosage units	6,559	1,288
Plants	0	123
Other	0	55
Persons arrested	786	204
Charges filed	1,435	313
Persons convicted	811	159
Conviction counts	987	177
Investigations cleared through drug-related arrests	69	59

Note:

1. Drugs seized are reported in grams, ounces, and pounds. Seizures reported in these units were converted to kilograms.
2. Performance reports submitted cover 12 months.



documenting substantial numbers of arrests and convictions. No training reports were available to document that any training occurred in either grant period, which is disappointing given education of the public was a stated goal of the program. Further information to

specifically evaluate the program goals beyond arrests and convictions would be beneficial. This is especially true for this MJTF because funds directly supported prosecutorial activities, unlike most others in the case studies. Our overall assessment is above average.



CASE STUDY 9: MUNCIE/ ANDERSON- DELAWARE/ MADISON COUNTY (MADMC) DRUG TASK FORCE

04-DB-052 \$115,000 Byrne award,
\$176,924 total program (4/1/06-9/30/06)
05-DJ-076 \$54,900 JAG award, \$84,462
total program (10/1/06-3/31/07)
06-DJ-026 \$30,536 JAG award, \$284,838
total program (4/1/07-12/31/07)

Program Description

The MADMC Drug Task Force includes the Anderson, Muncie, Elwood, and Ball State police departments (collaborating with several other smaller departments in Delaware County), the Delaware and Madison county sheriff's departments, and the Indiana State Police. The application specifically discusses cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine, hallucinogens, and illegal prescription drug use. ICJI made two six-month grants (04-DB-052, 05-DJ-076) due to funding issues that will be treated as one grant for the purposes of this review. The application notes that both counties have assigned deputy prosecutors to handle cases generated by the MADMC MJTF.

Problem Statement

The 04-DB-052 grant application uses a substantial number of local statistics to document increases in drug activity across the several drugs discussed. This evidence makes a pretty convincing case that illegal drug activity is high and increasing in the jurisdictions discussed. It should be noted, however, that all statistics are related to MADMC task force activities. No non-police-based information on drug use in the area is discussed.

Goals, Objectives, and Program Activities

The grant application lists two goals for the MADMC MJTF—investigating and prosecuting high-level drug dealers in

the jurisdictions served and educating law enforcement officers and private citizens to increase awareness of illegal drugs. The application lists four objectives:

1. to contact each law enforcement agency in both counties to assist in locating sources of illegal drugs,
2. to educate the community on abuse of prescription drugs, methamphetamine manufacture, and other illegal drug trafficking activities,
3. to increase the number of investigated cases by 25 percent, and
4. to consult with the Madison County prosecutor to divert offenders to the Madison County Drug Court.

The program activities appear to be moderately related to the objectives identified, although the measurement tools suggested are somewhat vague. An assessment plan is discussed but is vague on what data will be tracked, by whom, and how this relates to program goals. The application addresses future funding/sustainability primarily through aggressive asset forfeiture/seizure policies.

Measurements and Performance Metrics

The MADMC MJTF documented 118,761 in assets seized or forfeited across the two grant periods (04-DB-052, 05-DJ-076). The MADMC MJTF also documented conducting several trainings for law enforcement on illegal drug recognition for police officers, civic organizations, doctors/nurses, and students. The MADMC MJTF reported a substantial number of arrests and convictions but the majority were for possession/consumption.



Table 19: Muncie/Anderson-Delaware/Madison County (MADMC) Drug Task Force (April 1, 2006, to March 31, 2007)

Metrics	MADMC MJTF	Average (all task forces)
Total cases	974	488
Search warrants	113	31
New confidential informants	47	27
Cases resulting in drug seizures	1,054	274
Drugs seized		
Kilograms	59.7	60.4
Dosage units	4,982	1,288
Plants	3	123
Other	122	55
Persons arrested	429	204
Charges filed	670	313
Persons convicted	267	159
Conviction counts	454	177
Investigations cleared through drug-related arrests	127	59

Note:

1. Drugs seized are reported in grams, ounces, and pounds. Seizures reported in these units were converted to kilograms.
2. Performance reports submitted cover 12 months.

Fiscal Performance

In the immediate previous grant cycle, the MADMC MJTF received \$180,000 of ICJI funding. For the April 1 to September 30, 2006, period the ICJI grant amount was \$115,000, with an overall approved project budget of \$176,924. Federal funds supported salary and fringe benefits (\$71,887), equipment (\$56,211), operating expenses (\$25,803), and confidential funds (\$22,700). All federal funds were expended in the first operating period of 2006 (04-DB-052). For the second operating period funded by 05-DJ-076, the MADMC MJTF received \$54,900 in ICJI funds with a program total of \$84,462 This funding was spread across salary, equipment, operating expenses, and confidential funds in a similar fashion to the 04-DB-052 grant. All funds were expended in the second operating period as well.

Assessment of April 1, 2007 to December 31, 2007 Grant

The 06-DJ-023 application requested \$64,736 in ICJI funds. Existing documentation does not clarify how this money was to be expended. The needs statement, goals, and objectives are all clearly laid out and similar to the prior grant application. No quarterly performance, fiscal, or training reports were available at the time of this report to document actual activities.

Overall Program Assessment

This MJTF is a model of inter-agency cooperation that appears to have generated substantial results. The MADMC MJTF generated a large number of cases, search warrants, and arrests and convictions. It also conducted training of law enforcement officers and the public, in accordance with its stated goals. The



MADMC MJTF also engaged in a substantial amount of asset forfeiture activities that should assist in sustainability of this MJTF. The MADMC MJTF is one of the few programs studied to include a narrative addendum to the

quarterly performance reports required by ICJI documenting specific program activities. Such narratives are especially helpful in getting a better understanding of actual program activities during the grant period and should be encouraged if



CASE STUDY 10: TIPPECANOE/ CLINTON DRUG TASK FORCE

*05-DJ-061 \$69,500 JAG award, \$106,924
total program (7/1/06-6/30/07)*

*06-DJ-034 \$25,575 JAG award, \$51,150
total program (7/1/07-12/31/07)*

Program Description

The Tippecanoe/Clinton (TC) Drug Task Force includes investigators from Tippecanoe and Clinton county sheriff's departments, and the Lafayette and Frankfort police departments. This MJTF has been in existence since 1989. The application primarily focuses on the problems of cocaine, methamphetamine, and ecstasy within the jurisdictions served. The application notes that the location of the jurisdictions served between Indianapolis and Chicago on I-65 creates drug and gang problems. The application also notes that the main focus is on production/distribution activities rather than possession/consumption activities.

Problem Statement

The 05-DJ-061 grant application discusses the local drug problem convincingly, although the only statistical evidence used to support the existence of the problem is internal to the system in terms of an increase in arrests and court cases from 2004 to 2005. Many unsupported statements are made, however, with respect to assessing the scope of the drug problem, especially with respect to gang activity.

Goals, Objectives, and Program Activities

The grant application describes the goal as making the community safer by reducing drug availability through enforcement, as well as reducing demand for drugs. The application discusses several objectives including increasing manpower, as well as

creating a drug court and developing other diversion programs.

The implementation plan discusses mainly prosecution and diversion activities, focusing little attention on the activities of police investigators. An assessment plan is discussed in terms of increasing arrests, convictions, forfeitures, and increasing use of diversion, but is vague on how the requisite data will be collected and by whom. The application discusses future funding but doesn't establish a strong basis for the existence of the TC MJTF independent of ICJI funding.

Measurements and Performance Metrics

At the time of this report, the TC MJTF had not submitted any quarterly performance, training, or program income reports. Therefore, it is impossible to assess the productivity of the TC MJTF or whether the activities during the grant period were related to the goals and objectives in the grant application.

Fiscal Performance

In the immediate previous grant cycle, the TC MJTF received \$90,000 in ICJI funds. For the July 1, 2006, to June 30, 2007, period the ICJI grant amount was \$69,500 with an overall approved project budget of \$106,924. Grant funds (federal and local match) were used to fund salary (\$74,473), equipment (\$14,796), operating expenses (\$12,655), and confidential funds (\$10,000). All federal funds were expended.

Assessment of July 1, 2007, to December 31, 2007 Grant

The 06-DJ-034 application represents a substantial improvement over the



previous application. The goals, objectives, and activities are clearly laid out and describe specific and potentially attainable goals that can be assessed. The application also describes an external assessment plan to be completed by a Purdue University professor, but does not explain how this will be funded. The 06-DJ-021 grant is for \$25,575 in ICJI funds with an identical local match for a grant total of \$51,150. The grant funds are to be used for equipment (\$7,000), operating expenses (\$3,575), and confidential funds (\$15,000). No quarterly performance, fiscal, or training reports were available at the time of this report to document actual activities.

Overall Program Assessment

The TC MJTF warrants a below average rating for the 05-DJ-061 grant period. The sub-grantee failed to submit any of the required performance, training or program income reports, leaving no information available to explain what the TC MJTF did with the money it expended or what outcomes were produced. Given the failure of compliance with basic reporting requirements, future funding should be withheld from this subgrantee. The application for the 06-DJ-034 grant was substantially improved but at the time of this report it was too soon to tell whether submission of required reports had improved.



CASE STUDY 11: TRI-COUNTY DRUG TASK FORCE

05-DJ-020 \$120,240 JAG award, \$189,315
total program (7/1/06-3/31/07)

06-DJ-021 \$38,842 JAG award, \$77,684
total program (4/1/07-12/31/07)

Program Description

The Tri-County Drug Task Force includes six investigators (presumably sheriff's deputies although this is not spelled out) from Randolph, Jay, and Blackford counties. This MJTF has been in existence since 1989. The application primarily focuses on the problems of marijuana and methamphetamine within the jurisdictions served. ICJI made a nine-month grant in the 2006 funding cycle, due to a poor evaluation of the grant application. The subgrantee was given a three-month extension in which to re-file the application.

Problem Statement

The 05-DJ-020 grant application is vague and uses almost no statistical evidence to support claims of drug problems in the area. The application simply makes the assertion that the drugs discussed, particularly methamphetamines and marijuana, are a problem in the jurisdictions served, especially given the rural nature of the areas. The problem statement is short and vague.

Goals, Objectives, and Program Activities

The grant application describes the goal as making the community safer by reducing methamphetamine manufacture and sale. The application lists three objectives:

1. to increase arrests and convictions of methamphetamine manufacture, sale, and use by 10 percent,
2. to set up public educational booths from May through October 2006, and

3. to enhance communication between all law enforcement agencies in the jurisdictions served.

The program activities appear to be somewhat related to the objectives identified, but the implementation plan is vague as to specific details of implementation. An assessment plan is discussed but is not clear on how the data mentioned will be collected, by whom, and how this relates to showing whether program goals were achieved. The application notes that the Tri-County MJTF operates solely on ICJI grant funds and would not be able to exist without such funding because of the small budgets of the three counties, noting that asset forfeiture is not a significant source of revenue for the Tri-County MJTF.

Measurements and Performance Metrics

Even taking the nine-month grant period into account, the Tri-County MJTF generated a below average number of total cases, search warrants, cases resulting in drug seizures, and drugs seized. Persons arrested and charges filed are also below average (especially given the approximately seven full-time investigators working on the project), and no convictions are reported, although the reason for this is unclear. The Tri-County MJTF submitted all required performance and fiscal reports, but no training reports. The lack of training reports is problematic given the stated objective of informing the public. The Tri-County MJTF reported \$1,823 in restitution, but no asset forfeiture or seizure activities.

Fiscal Performance

In the immediately previous grant cycle, the Tri-County MJTF received \$156,000 in



Table 20: Tri-County Drug Task Force (July 1, 2006 to March 31, 2007)

Metrics	Tri-County MJTF	Average (all task forces)
Total cases	144	488
Search warrants	10	31
New confidential informants	16	27
Cases resulting in drug seizures	34	274
Drugs seized		
Kilograms	0.4	60.4
Dosage units	241	1,288
Plants	0	123
Other	4	55
Persons arrested	126	204
Charges filed	152	313
Persons convicted	0	159
Conviction counts	0	177
Investigations cleared through drug-related arrests	9	59

Note:

1. Drugs seized are reported in grams, ounces, and pounds. Seizures reported in these units were converted to kilograms.
2. Performance reports submitted cover nine months.

ICJI funds. For the July 1, 2006, to March 31, 2007, period the ICJI grant amount was \$120,240 with an overall approved budget of \$189,315. Grant funds (federal and local match) were used to fund salary and fringe benefits (\$111,765), travel (\$3,800), equipment (\$3,000), operating expenses (\$48,750), and confidential funds (\$22,000). Virtually all federal funds were expended.

Assessment of April 1, 2007, to December 31, 2007 Grant

The 06-DJ-021 application represents a substantial improvement over the previous application. There is much more detail to support the case that drugs are a local problem in the jurisdictions served. The application notes arrest trends in the three counties (though again using task force specific numbers), as well as noting the higher unemployment problem in Randolph County relative to the state of Indiana. The increased quality of the application is evident given the near doubling of the internal rating score from the previous grant cycle. The goals,

objectives, and activities are clearly laid out but not well related to each other. The 06-DJ-021 grant is for \$38,842 in ICJI funds, with an identical local match for a grant total of \$77,684. The grant funds were to be used primarily for salary and fringe (\$18,000) and confidential funds (\$20,000). No quarterly performance, fiscal, or training reports were available at the time of this report to document actual activities.

Overall Program Assessment

The Tri-County MJTF warrants a below average rating for the 05-DJ-020 grant period. The application is short and vague, failing to document the nature of the local drug problem. The output of the program is also small in terms of drug arrests, seizures, and charges, especially given the substantial amount of ICJI grant money devoted to this program. The application for the 06-DJ-021 grant was substantially improved although the goals and objectives could still be more closely tied to specific program activities.



CASE STUDY 12: UNITED DRUG TASK FORCE

04-DB-051 \$50,000 Byrne award, \$76,924
total program (4/1/06-9/30/06)

06-DJ-024 \$25,894 JAG award, \$51,788
total program (4/1/07-12/31/07)

Program Description

The United Drug Task Force operates in Hendricks, Putnam, Marion, Morgan, and Owen counties, with six investigators from sheriff's departments, the Indiana State Police, and the Brownsburg and Plainfield police departments, and was established in 1991. The application describes cocaine/crack, prescription drug abuse, and marijuana as the major drug problems in the area, as well as a growing problem with methamphetamine manufacturing, especially in the rural areas of the counties served. The initial grant period ran from April 1, 2006, to September 30, 2006, and the second grant covered April 1, 2007, to December 31, 2007. Thus, statistics and budgets describe a six-month period. The United MJTF applied for additional funds to cover the period from October 1, 2006, to March 31, 2007, but this request was not granted.

Problem Statement

The 04-DB-051 grant application describes the drug problem through statements regarding increasing drug use as Hendricks County's population expands and due to its proximity to Marion County. The application also notes that I-70 and I-74 run through Putnam County immediately to the west of Hendricks County, which facilitates the transportation of drugs. The application makes general reference to the problem of drug use increasing and the only statistical evidence offered to support this claim is a note in the executive summary that 253 new cases were opened in 2005, with 68 arrests.

Goals, Objectives, and Program Activities

The 04-DB-051 grant application states that the main goal of the United MJTF is to make a safe environment for the communities they serve by stopping drug dealers in the area. The grant application lists five objectives:

1. to identify and arrest drug dealers,
2. to identify outside sources of drugs and pass information to the appropriate authorities for follow-up investigation,
3. to identify and seize assets involved in illegal drug sales,
4. to cooperate with local prosecution teams to bring cases to trial in a timely fashion, and
5. to carry out investigation carefully and with respect for the rights of suspects.

The application lists several specific activities that appear to support these objectives. The application states that the United MJTF will evaluate its progress in an ongoing fashion through regular information sharing among relevant parties. The success of the program in meeting its goals and objectives is to be documented in the quarterly performance reports. The application fails to address future funding, however.

Measurements and Performance Metrics

The United MJTF submitted both quarterly performance reports for the six-month 04-DB-051 grant period. Keeping the six-month reporting period in mind, the United MJTF reported an above average number of total cases and



Table 21: United Drug Task Force (April 1, 2006, to September 30, 2006)

Metrics	United MJTF	Average (all task forces)
Total cases	276	488
Search warrants	12	31
New confidential informants	30	27
Cases resulting in drug seizures	175	274
Drugs seized		
Kilograms	21.5	60.4
Dosage units	926	1,288
Plants	0	123
Other	15	55
Persons arrested	102	204
Charges filed	102	313
Persons convicted	0	159
Conviction counts	29	177
Investigations cleared through drug-related arrests	0	59

Note:

1. Drugs seized are reported in grams, ounces, and pounds. Seizures reported in these units were converted to kilograms.
2. Performance reports submitted cover six months.

confidential informants, and a somewhat below average number of cases resulting in drug seizures. Charges and convictions were below average, even accounting for the six-month period of the grant. The United MJTF documented \$12,036 in forfeitures on one program income report, but the other report was not submitted, nor were either of the two required training reports submitted. The United MJTF employed approximately six full-time investigators and reported arrests focused roughly equally on production/distribution and possession/consumption activities.

Fiscal Performance

According to the 04-DB-051 grant application, the previous level of ICJI funding was \$95,000 and the requested amount in the current cycle was \$100,000. ICJI granted \$50,000 with a total program amount of \$76,924, all of which was expended in the six-month period of the grant. Of these funds, \$66,924 paid salary

and fringe benefits for investigators, with the remaining \$10,000 spent on confidential informants. All grant funds were expended during the grant period.

Assessment of April 1, 2007, to December 31, 2007 Grant

The grant application for 06-DJ-024 requested \$82,000 in ICJI funds of which \$25,894 was granted. Existing information does not make clear how these funds are to be expended, but it would appear that the bulk of the funds would go to salary as in the previous grant cycle. The application is a substantial improvement over the previous application because it uses many local statistics on the United MJTF’s recent activities relating to drug arrests. Particularly impressive is the statement that, “the United Drug Task Force filed 72 percent of all A and B felony arrests in Hendricks County, and 40 percent of all arrests total in 2006.” The objectives and activities are very similar to the previous grant but, as noted by the



ICJI application reviewer, do not provide numerical benchmarks that could be used to evaluate the success of the program in meeting its objectives. The implementation plan also appears to be targeted to the objectives listed. No quarterly reports from the current grant period were available at the time of this report to document program activities or expenditures.

Overall Program Assessment

The 2006 grant period application is vague on goals and objectives and supports the need for the United MJTF using only the number of cases and arrests from the previous year along with unsupported statements that drug use is a local

problem. No independent drug use or sales information is provided. Submission of required documentation was incomplete for the first grant period; missing were two training reports and one of two program income reports. As with other MJTFs, additional documentation would be necessary to evaluate whether the United MJTF met the stated goals and objectives. The United MJTF appears to have generated a high number of new cases and new confidential informants, and engaged in some asset forfeiture actions. The number of charges and convictions appear to be below average, especially given the number of investigators engaged in MJTF activities. Our overall assessment is below average.



SUMMARY OF KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

From the global analysis of ICJI metrics and the 12 in-depth case studies, the following recommendations have been developed. These recommendations center on both the performance of subgrantees and ways to improve the ICJI grant process, particularly with respect to reporting of key metrics.

General Issues

1. ICJI should provide a mechanism for ensuring full compliance in submission of all required reports. Fiscal reporting was nearly complete, as was submission of quarterly performance reports. Improvements could be made in the completeness of training and program income reports, which provide a more complete picture of program activities.
2. Assessment plans for most subgrantees relied exclusively on documenting increases in productivity on performance reports or internal reports. Some better mechanism for assessment of programs should be included, especially for objectives beyond arrests and convictions.
3. Only one subgrantee mentioned demand reduction as a goal. Perhaps additional attention should be given to supporting demand reduction activities.
4. Similarly, few MJTFs described support for alternatives to incarceration.
5. Most grant applications did not adequately address program sustainability, which is critical in an environment of declining ICJI funding.
6. Grant applicants should be encouraged to expand documentation

of need beyond simply including prior MJTF performance, as prior performance of the MJTF is not an independent measure of the scope of the local drug problem.

Suggested Changes in ICJI Reporting Procedures

1. Revise Performance Report so that (a) case and arrest/conviction metrics are collected for cohorts rather than on a rolling basis, (b) metrics are collected on the fruitfulness of various assistance to task forces (e.g., search warrants, confidential informants, citizen tips, police calls of suspected drug-related activity), (c) arrest/conviction demographic data and arrest/conviction offense type data are reported for the most serious offense, and (d) instructions are clear in terms of what exactly task forces are being asked to report.
2. The current quarterly report structure does not permit unique reporting of individuals arrested and convictions by demographics (age, race/ethnicity, and gender) across all types of drugs. Currently, demographic reporting of arrestees can result in double counting across types of drugs. This permits demographic analysis within a particular drug type, but does not permit demographic analysis across all types of drugs. To clarify how many unique offenders are being processed, the quarterly performance report form should be modified to report the total numbers of arrests and convictions by age, race/ethnicity, and gender across all drug types at the beginning of the "Arrests and Convictions Demographics" section.



3. Problematic reporting is evident with several of the metrics. Examples include (a) reported case totals not matching the sum of case subsets, (b) reported arrests, charges, and conviction totals not matching the sum of drug and non-drug subsets for each category, and (c) the number of convicted persons for violent drug offenses only being greater than the number of criminal offenses for which individuals were convicted—an impossibility. The source of these reporting discrepancies should be investigated and corrected. Perhaps clearer instructions are necessary.
4. ICJI should provide a reporting mechanism for addressing other goals besides levels of seizures, arrests, and convictions. Currently, there is no mechanism for specifically documenting how any other goals were addressed.
5. There is also no mechanism for documenting that any changes in productivity were achieved from previous years. Such information is central to many of the objectives described by subgrantees as indicators of success.
6. ICJI should also change the reporting form so that task forces can document with which local and state agencies they cooperated. Such information is crucial for determining the degree to which MJTFs are “multi-jurisdictional.”
7. The submission of amended budgets would be helpful in determining how subgrantees spent the funds that ICJI actually granted. Current documentation only included category breakdowns for the funds for which the MJTF applied. If the subgrantee was awarded a smaller amount than they requested, there was no simple way to determine what funds were supposed to be spent on, only how much was actually spent in a given category.
8. Given that some grants funded prosecutors, reporting requirements should be tailored specifically to documenting the goals, objectives, and activities for prosecution, which is not well-captured on current performance reports.
9. It is not entirely clear why gang-related metrics—and particularly those that do not focus on drug activity—are included in the MJTF performance report. Aside from presupposing that task forces have unique knowledge about the activities of gangs, nearly all data are collected using Likert scales where the degree of gang involvement is rated from low to high with an option to indicate no involvement or an unknown level of involvement. However, no criteria are established for what exactly constitutes the various degrees of involvement, leaving those reporting to make such a judgment. The reliability of gang data reported by task forces is questionable then because of a high likelihood of non-uniform interpretations by task forces of involvement levels. Assuming MJTFs are appropriate for collecting gang-related metrics, ICJI should rework some of the metrics taking the above issues into consideration while also focusing on which information will be the most useful.
10. ICJI should consider clarifying the method by which street value of drugs is to be calculated if it is to be reported. Current information submitted by ICJI-funded MJTFs suggests tremendous variation in the methods by which street value of drugs are estimated, casting doubts about the reliability of such metrics.

APPENDIX 1: CASE COMPARISONS BY PERFORMANCE METRIC

Table A1 shows a side-by-side comparison of case study task forces and the metrics reported earlier in the individual case tables. The time period for which task forces reported these metrics and the number of full-time officers devoted to MJTF activities should be considered when making comparisons between task forces on individual metrics and/or overall production. For additional information on individual task forces, see the case studies discussed in the body of the report.

Table A1: Case Comparisons by Performance Metric, 2006

Task Force	ICI Grant Amounts*	Total Program	Months Covered by Performance Reports	Average FTE Officers	Agencies Worked With	Case Investigations and Outcomes				Drugs Seized				Arrests, Charges Filed, and Convictions			Investigations Cleared Through Drug arrests	
						Total Cases	Search Warrants	New Informants	Resulting in Drug Seizures	Grams	Dosage Units	Plants	Other	Persons Arrested	Charges filed	Persons Convicted		Conviction Counts
Bi-State Drug Task Force (7/1/2006 - 3/31/2007)	\$75,426	\$116,040	6	2	4	54	4	12	32	10,805	31	0	0	8	13	8	0	1
DETECT Drug Task Force (4/1/2006 - 3/31/2007)*	\$30,700	\$47,232	12	5	7	155	5	9	19	859	78	0	8	54	120	24	31	31
Hamilton/Boone County Drug Task Force (4/1/2006 - 9/30/2006)	\$66,000	\$101,539	6	13	2	189	40	21	51	43,377	822	83	5	128	128	0	0	18
Henry/Wayne County Area Drug Task Force (4/1/2006 - 9/30/2006)	\$70,486	\$120,748	6	8	6	588	11	15	0	300	643	0	0	207	219	67	67	393
Indiana Multi-Agency Group Enforcement Drug Task Force (IMAGE) Drug Task Force (7/1/2006 - 3/31/2007)	\$30,000	\$46,154	9	4	7	85	4	30	16	1,240	700	0	30	115	164	94	3	3
Joint Effort Against Narcotics (JEAN) Drug Task Force (4/1/2006 - 9/30/2006)	\$60,624	\$93,268	6	11	8	330	24	28	133	1,911	885	175	0	127	181	37	28	19

(continued on next page)

APPENDIX 1: CASE COMPARISONS BY PERFORMANCE METRIC

(continued from previous page)

Task Force	ICJI Grant Amounts*	Total Program	Months Covered by Performance Reports	Average FTE Officers	Agencies Worked With	Case Investigations and Outcomes				Drugs Seized				Arrests, Charges Filed, and Convictions				Investigations Cleared Through Drug arrests
						Total Cases	Search Warrants	New informants	Resulting in Drug Seizures	Grams	Dosage Units	Plants	Other	Persons Arrested	Charges filed	Persons Convicted	Conviction Counts	
Metro Drug Task Force (4/1/2006 - 3/31/2007)*	\$393,725	\$605,731	12	11	9	484	42	47	67	210,296	1,525	0	1	92	155	81	41	20
Multi-Agency Narcotics (Southwest) Drug Task Force (4/1/2006 - 3/31/2007)*	\$215,535	\$331,593	12	25	10	1,276	86	40	1,674	348,255	6,559	0	0	786	1,435	811	987	69
Muncie/Anderson-Delaware/Madison County Drug Task Force (4/1/2006 - 3/31/2007)*	\$169,900	\$261,386	12	0	10	974	113	47	1,054	59,729	4,982	3	122	429	670	267	454	127
Tri-County Drug Task Force (7/1/2006 - 3/31/2007)	\$120,240	\$189,315	9	7	4	144	10	16	34	363	241	0	4	126	152	0	0	9
United Drug Task Force (4/1/2006 - 9/30/2006)	\$50,000	\$76,924	6	6	4	276	12	30	175	21,451	926	0	15	102	102	0	29	0
TOTAL	\$1,282,636	\$1,989,930		91	N/A	4,555	351	295	3,255	698,586	17,392	261	185	2,174	3,339	1,389	1,640	690
Task force mean	\$116,603	\$180,903		8.4		414	32	27	296	63,508	1,581	24	17	198	304	126	149	63
Standard deviation	\$108,752	\$166,846		6.8		393	37	14	548	112,771	2,144	56	36	223	411	240	307	116

*For MJTFs marked, two grant amounts are combined to cover the reporting period.

Notes:

Data as of July 1, 2007. Performance metrics for the entire operating period might not have been entered as of July 1, 2007. No reports available on July 1, 2007, for Tippecanoe/Clinton Drug Task Force.

APPENDIX 2: MJTF REPORTED COLLABORATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES

The table below shows the collaboration of ICJI-funded task forces in the 2006 operating period. All task forces reported collaboration with local and state agencies (although the current report does not permit determination of which ones). There was variation in the degree to which task forces collaborated with other federal agencies, from 0 to 8. Some federal agencies such as DEA and ATF, not surprisingly, were much more likely to be reported as partner with task forces than others.

Table A2: Reported Agency Collaboration by Task Force, 2006

Task Force	Local Agencies	State Agencies	DEA	ATF	US			US				Grand Total	
					Attorney	Postal Service	FBI	Marshall's Service	IRS	INS	US Customs		Coast Guard
Bi-State Drug Task Force	x	x		x	x								4
DETECT Drug Task Force	x	x	x	x	x		x						7
Hamilton/Boone County Drug Task Force	x	x											2
Henry County Police Department Drug Task Force	x	x	x	x	x		x						6
Howard County Drug Task Force (Kokomo)	x	x	x	x	x					x			6
Image Drug Task Force/ Auburn Police Dept.	x	x		x	x						x	x	7
J.E.A.N. Team Drug Task Force	x	x	x	x	x					x			8
Kosciusko Special Operations	x	x	x	x	x				x				7
Metro Drug Task Force	x	x	x	x	x					x	x		9
Multi-Agency Narcotics Task Force (Southwest)	x	x	x	x	x				x	x			10
Muncie/Delaware County Drug Task Force	x	x	x	x	x				x		x		10
R.U.F.F. Drug Task Force	x	x											2

(continued on next page)

APPENDIX 2: MJTF REPORTED COLLABORATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES

(continued from previous page)

Task Force	Local Agencies		State Agencies		US ATF		US Attorney		US Postal Service		US Marshal's Service		US IRS		US INS		US Customs		Coast Guard		FAA		Other		Grand Total	
South Central Narcotics Strike Force	x		x		x		x		x								x							x	8	
Southern Indiana Drug Task Force	x		x		x		x																		7	
Tri-County Drug Task Force	x		x																						4	
United Drug Task Force	x		x		x																				4	
Vermillion County Drug Task Force	x		x																						8	
White/Carroll County Drug Task Force	x		x																						4	
Grand Total	18		18		14		12		11		9		8		8		5		4		2		1		1	2
Percent of task forces that worked with agency	100.0		100.0		77.8		66.7		61.1		50.0		44.4		44.4		27.8		22.2		11.1		5.6		5.6	11.1

Notes:

1. Because the total time commitment likely includes the same officers across reporting periods, an average full-time equivalent was calculated to provide an indication of the unique number of officers that work for/with the task force during a given grant period (rather than report period). Muncie/Delaware County DTF did not report time commitment percentages for officers.
2. Task forces may also report drug seizures in ounces, pounds, and kilograms. Seizures reported in these units were converted to grams and added to the grams total reported.
3. Persons arrested, charges filed, persons convicted, and conviction counts are the sum of drug, non-drug, and drug and non-drug offenses reported by task forces.
4. See individual case tables in report for additional notes for specific task forces.
5. N/A = not applicable