State of Missouri Department of Public Safety Office of the Director Criminal Justice/Law Enforcement Unit



Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) and Recovery-JAG Programs

FY11 State Annual Report

FOREWORD

On behalf of the State of Missouri and the Missouri Department of Public Safety, Office of the Director, it is my pleasure to present the FY11 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) and Recovery-JAG Program Annual Report. Since 1987, the Byrne/JAG Program has been an essential resource in our continuing effort to meet the public safety needs of our state criminal justice community. The Missouri Department of Public Safety remains committed to assisting criminal justice agencies in making Missouri a safer place. The JAG and Recovery-JAG Programs make it possible for Missouri to aggressively address the many public safety issues associated with illicit drugs and violent crime.

The FY11 JAG and Recovery-JAG Program Annual Report is a comprehensive evaluation of state- and local-level projects that have received financial assistance through the JAG and/or Recovery-JAG Program. During this reporting period of July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011, the Missouri Department of Public Safety - Criminal Justice/Law Enforcement Program provided grant awards to the following: 32 projects under the 2010 JAG Solicitation, 122 projects under the 2011 LLEBG Solicitation, 26 projects under the 2010 Recovery-JAG Solicitation, and 14 projects under the Recovery-MJCCG/JAG Solicitation.

Financial assistance was provided to projects supporting Law Enforcement, Prosecution and Court, Prevention and Education, and Planning, Evaluation, and Technology Improvement. By supporting the award of the JAG and Recovery-JAG Program money for projects within these purpose areas, we best serve the citizens of Missouri.

The Missouri Department of Public Safety remains committed to our vision, "By embracing the challenges of the future, the Department of Public Safety and the law enforcement community working together will provide the protection and service to create a quality of life in which all people feel safe and secure." The JAG and Recovery-JAG Programs help us realize this vision.

Jerry Lee, Director Missouri Department of Public Safety

Missouri Department of Public Safety

Criminal Justice/Law Enforcement Program

FY11 State Annual Report July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011

Forewo	rd	2
Acknow	ledgements	4
Executiv	ve Summary	5
Section	I - Introduction	
	Program Overview	6
	FY11 Summary	6
	FY11 Coordinating Program	9
	FY12 Summary	9
	II - FY11 Summary of Programs, Performance Measures, ion Methods and Evaluation Results	
	Purpose Area: Law Enforcement	12
	Purpose Area: Prosecution and Court	18
	Purpose Area: Prevention and Education	22
	Purpose Area: Planning, Evaluation, and Technology	24
Section	III - FY12 Evaluation and Activities	
	Law Enforcement Programs	28
	Prosecution and Court Programs	41
	Prevention and Education Programs	42
	Corrections and Community Corrections Program	45
	Drug Treatment Programs	46
	Planning, Evaluation, and Technology Improvement Programs	47
	Crime Victim and Witness Programs	49
	Crime Laboratory Projects	50
Section	IV - Supplemental Information and Documentation	
	Attachment A: Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Forces	
	FY11 Summary Report	54
	Attachment B: Crime Laboratories - MCLUP Projects FY11 Summary Report	125
	Attachment C: Multi-Jurisdictional Cyber Crime Task Forces FY11 Summary Report	135

Acknowledgements

Governor Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon

Director Jerry Lee Missouri Department of Public Safety, Office of the Director

Deputy Director Andrea Spillars Missouri Department of Public Safety, Office of the Director

Eric E. Shepherd, Program Manager Missouri Department of Public Safety, Office of the Director, Criminal Justice/Law Enforcement

> Criminal Justice/Law Enforcement Program Staff Ralph Lindsey, Program Specialist-DoD Heather Haslag, Program Specialist Sarah Verhoff, Program Representative Joan Dudenhoeffer, Part-Time Clerical Support Jason Miller, Part-Time Aid-DoD Lisa Geiser, Part-Time Aid-DoD

> > Ron Beck Chelse Dowell Statistical Analysis Center Missouri State Highway Patrol

The Missouri Department of Public Safety wishes to extend its appreciation to the Criminal Justice Agencies that provided the information included in this report.

Grant #2009-DJ-BX-0090 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, United States Department of Justice provided funding for this report.

> Researched and prepared by: The Criminal Justice/Law Enforcement Program staff and members of the Statistical Analysis Center - Missouri State Highway Patrol

> > Submitted to the Bureau of Justice Assistance November 2011

Executive Summary

In 1987, the Missouri Department of Public Safety initiated an administrative section within the Office of the Director, whose primary responsibility was to oversee and coordinate the dissemination of federal funding awards made to Missouri. This administrative section was implemented and titled as the Narcotics Assistance Control Program (NCAP) in response to the establishment of the federal Edward Byrne Memorial Formula Grant (Byrne) and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Grant (LLEBG) Programs authorized by Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, 42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq. Additionally, the furtherance of the overall mission of the Missouri Department of Public Safety, as defined in Chapter 650 of the Missouri Revised Statutes, became and continues to be the directive for the Criminal Justice/Law Enforcement Program. That mission is to provide a safe and secure environment for all individuals, through efficient and effective law enforcement.

Since the initial implementation, the NCAP has been renamed the Criminal Justice/Law Enforcement (CJ/LE) Program and the Byrne and LLEBG Programs have been consolidated into one program titled the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program.

Throughout the years, the Missouri Department of Public Safety (DPS), through the CJ/LE Program, has been involved in an on-going effort to identify the criminal justice needs of state and local units of government. As a result of this process, the CJ/LE Program has provided the financial and technical assistance required to initiate state and local level responses to crime and drug related issues. This response, which parallels the established objectives of the JAG Program as outlined by the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance, is the foundation for project initiatives within Missouri. It remains the priority of the CJ/LE Program to identify state and local initiatives which assist the state of Missouri in the enforcement of drug control or controlled substance laws, initiatives which emphasize the prevention and control of violent crime and serious offenders, and initiatives which improve the effectiveness of the state and local criminal justice system.

In compliance with section 522(a) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, the FY11 State Annual Report (SAR), will outline the impact of JAG and Recovery-JAG Program funding on the criminal justice system within the jurisdictions of state and local government. During the reporting period covered in this annual report, July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011, the Criminal Justice/Law Enforcement Program provided funding assistance in four (4) authorized purpose areas. The total monetary award for this reporting period was \$9,066,136.86 for which the CJ/LE Program was able to provide financial assistance to 194 state and local level projects.

For FY12, the level of JAG and Recovery-JAG funding awarded, as of the date of this report, by the CJ/LE Program is providing financial assistance in the amount of \$17,060,390.83 to 82 state and local level projects.

The DPS - CJ/LE Program continues to be an essential component of the statewide effort to address violent crime and drugs. Through the JAG and Recovery-JAG Programs, Missouri has the financial capability to maintain essential projects that provide needed services for the criminal justice community. In addition to the initiatives previously described, the CJ/LE Program places an equally high priority on the development and continuation of projects and partnerships that enhance a state or local unit of government's ability to implement aggressive responses to the public safety needs of their respective service areas. The CJ/LE Program strives to implement progressive demand reduction, community, multi-jurisdictional, judicial, correctional, analytical and informational-based response strategies to the public safety threats of crime and drugs.

I. INTRODUCTION

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Missouri Department of Public Safety, Office of the Director, Criminal Justice/Law Enforcement Program manages the distribution of federal funds provided to the State by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program. The unit responsible for the management of these funds is the Criminal Justice/Law Enforcement (CJ/LE) Program. Since 1987, the JAG Program (formerly known as the Edward Byrne Memorial Formula Grant and Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Programs) provided criminal justice agencies with financial resources to confront drugs and violence. The Missouri Department of Public Safety, Office of the Director is committed to assisting state and local efforts to make Missouri a safer place. Dealing with illicit drugs and violent crime head-on is critical to this effort and Federal grant monies make this possible.

The Missouri Department of Public Safety has undertaken a comprehensive approach to utilizing the JAG and Recovery-JAG dollars. Enforcement/interdiction, prevention/education, treatment, criminal litigation, improving criminal history records, and improving statewide illicit drug and violent crime data are the focus areas for the 2011/2012 funding year. By addressing these issues, we believe we can receive the most benefit for the citizens of Missouri.

Since the beginning of Byrne/JAG funding in 1987, the Missouri Department of Public Safety (DPS), CJ/LE Program, has developed a comprehensive strategic approach to the drug and violent crime problems facing Missouri. The current strategy has been designed as a strategic "road map" for the years of 2010 through 2011. The strategy developed by the DPS – CJ/LE Program, in conjunction with the Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) of the Missouri State Highway Patrol, will provide the State of Missouri with a directional foundation for the next century.

The State of Missouri has, and will continue to build on past years' successes by supporting effective projects, which are committed to the overall objective of a safer Missouri. DPS will continue to evaluate the effectiveness of each state and local project receiving federal money, to ensure that the goals and objectives of each project are addressing the needs of Missouri citizens.

FY11 SUMMARY

Implementation of the 2010/2011 funding year began with the review of JAG grant applications on March 24-25, 2010 by a review committee consisting of the DPS - CJ/LE Program staff and individuals from the criminal justice and private sector. Sixty-one (61) requests for funding were reviewed within the approved project categories as described below. The grant evaluation process was competitive in nature, and only those grant applications determined to coordinate with the goals and objectives of the statewide strategy were considered for funding. Thirty-two (32) grant awards were made to state and local recipients in the amount of \$5,812,481.42.

Thirty-three (33) requests for funding were received through the Recovery-JAG Program. Twenty-six (26) grant awards were made to local recipients in the amount of \$978,211.21.

In addition, the DPS – CJ/LE Program continued funding through a program titled the Multi-Jurisdictional Cyber Crime Grant (MJCCG) created as a result of the availability of Recovery-JAG funds. A total of 14 requests for funding were received and a review committee consisting of DPS – CJ/LE Program staff and individuals from the criminal justice and private sector met on June 22, 2010. Fourteen (14) grant awards were made to state and local recipients in the amount of 1,419,767.50.

Finally, 233 requests for funding were received through the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant (LLEBG) Program, which is money set aside from the less than \$10,000 portion of the JAG Program. A review committee consisting of DPS – CJ/LE Program staff and individuals from the criminal justice sector met on October 28-29, 2010 and awarded 122 projects for state and local recipients in the amount of \$855,676.43.

The FY11 program planning approach of the DPS – CJ/LE Program used statistical information obtained from various reporting entities throughout the State. This information not only aided in the identification of drug and crime related trends, but also assisted in the evaluation of projects supported by the DPS – CJ/LE Program. Quarterly reports required of Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Forces collected valuable information on their activities and workload as well as information on drug prevalence, enforcement, and distribution of drug industries in the state. Programs funded under other purpose areas provided

information in semi-annual and annual progress reports that described their activities and successes. Detailed reports of success are provided in Section III of this report.

Following is a brief summary on each category funded through the DPS - CJ/LE Program during the 2010/2011 funding cycle.

Law Enforcement Programs

Funding for Law Enforcement projects was the largest funding category for the DPS – CJ/LE Program during funding year 2010/2011.

Under the 2010 JAG funding opportunity, the CJ/LE Program awarded \$5,243,313.37 to 27 multi-jurisdictional drug task forces and \$248,382.46 to 1 multi-agency law enforcement group, for a total of \$5,491,695.83. Of the 114 counties in the state of Missouri, 99 counties were active participants/members of these multi-jurisdictional enforcement efforts.

Under the 2010 Recovery-JAG funding opportunity, the CJ/LE Program awarded \$978,211.51 to 26 of the 27 multijurisdictional drug task forces as a supplement to their JAG award. Of the 114 counties in the state of Missouri, 98 were active participants / members of these multi-jurisdictional enforcement efforts.

Federal funding was awarded for the above-mentioned projects as multi-jurisdictional, multi-agency counter-drug enforcement efforts. During 2010/2011, the illicit drug methamphetamine continued to be a priority for an aggressive law enforcement strategy, designed to slow or halt the spread of this drug. As the scope of the methamphetamine problem extends beyond the capabilities of a single entity, many partnerships have been forged in response to this threat to public safety, public health and the sovereignty of our State's environment. The DPS – CJ/LE Program has placed great emphasis on the establishment of a comprehensive Memorandum of Understanding/Agreement between all partners of the multi-jurisdictional enforcement group so that a more comprehensive understanding of responsibilities and expectations exist. Through local, state and federal collaborations and a continued aggressive response, we anticipate the rise in methamphetamine related activity to peak and eventually decline.

During the past three fiscal years, the following statistics were collected for the Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Forces funded by the DPS – CJ/LE Program in the State of Missouri. The following statistics are an example of the data collected through the Quarterly Progress Reports. More detailed information can be reviewed in Section III and IV of this report.

	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>
Arrested with one or more drug charges	6,009	5,556	7,141
Arrested with no drug charges	1,314	1,248	1,936
Total drug arrests	7,323	6,804	9,077
Search warrants served	1,088	1,208	1,134
Consent searches performed	3,718	3,776	2,903
Methamphetamine labs seized/destroyed:	1,206	1,449	1,593
New drug distribution organizations identified:	126	112	-
Number of gang drug trafficking or other gang			
organizations dismantled:	-	-	32
OUNCES OF DRUGS SEIZED	FY2009	FY 2010	<u>FY 2011</u>
Marijuana	157,861	177,414	232,006
Methamphetamine	2,816	1,895	2,089
Cocaine	5,610	3,235	4,318
Crack	297	192	121
Heroin	589	67	467
LSD	19	63	0.85
PCP	897	569	3
Ecstasy	566	3	7
Pseudoephedrine	592	519	1,955
Other Drugs	449	501	779
tal value of all drugs seized:	99,054,784	\$38,039,219	\$41,450,744

Doses of Drugs Seized

Ecstasy: Pseudoephedrine / Ephedrine:	13,195 50,957	,	1,670 4,744
<u>Gallons of Drug Precursors Seized</u> Anhydrous Ammonia:	3,928	293	298
Sale/M	1	FY2010 Poss/Marijuana Sale/Methamphetamine Poss/Methamphetamine Sale/Marijuana Poss/Other	a Sale/Methamphetamine Poss/Marijuana Poss/Methamphetamine Sale/Marijuana

Under the 2010 MJCCG funding opportunity, the CJ/LE Program awarded \$1,419,767.50 to 14 multi-jurisdictional cyber task forces. The MJCCG Program continues funding to a previously funded state program. In December 2006, the State of Missouri appropriated state monies for the purpose of establishing the Internet Cyber Crime Grant (ICCG) program, which allowed for the funding of salaries of detectives and forensic personnel and training for those individuals whom worked directly with internet crimes relating to child pornography, enticement, solicitation, and other sex-related offenses. State funding was re-appropriated in FY09 but was not re-appropriated for FY10 and FY11. Therefore, in FY11, the State of Missouri, Department of Public Safety, allocated monies from the Recovery-JAG Program in order to retain the previously funded positions and to continue the enforcement and public training provided by the cyber crime units within the state. Of the 114 counties in the state of Missouri, 89 counties were active participants/members of these multi-jurisdictional enforcement efforts during the 2010 funding opportunity.

Under the 2011 LLEBG funding opportunity, the CJ/LE Program awarded \$855,676.43 to 122 state and local law enforcement agencies. The LLEBG Program is a vital funding mechanism for law enforcement. Short-term contracts are awarded from the less than \$10,000 portion of the JAG Program for purchase of basic law enforcement and officer safety equipment that will enable Missouri law enforcement to meet their local needs. Such items include, but are not limited to light bars, sirens, mobile and portable radios, flashlights, handcuffs, protective clothing, ballistic vests, car cages, in-car cameras, locks, and trauma kits.

Prosecution and Court Programs

Under the 2010 JAG funding opportunity, the CJ/LE Program awarded two (2) projects for an award of \$72,995.47. These programs are designed to improve the criminal justice system's response to domestic and family violence, including spouse abuse and child abuse.

Prevention and Education Programs

Under the 2010 JAG funding opportunity, the CJ/LE Program awarded one (1) project for an award of \$177,060.61. This program is designed to provide the proper supplies and reference materials to law enforcement officers and emergency personnel to help safely respond to clandestine methamphetamine lab incidents and not harm the environment.

Corrections and Community Corrections Programs

No funding assistance was provided to this purpose area during the 2010/2011 funding cycle. Corrections Programs aim to supervise offenders and prepare them for return to their communities. Correctional agencies give inmates opportunities to develop life and work skills that will help their return be successful and are using treatment, work, education, and mental health programs to build these skills. Community-based-corrections are a criminal corrections option that provides an offender with sanctions, supervision, and treatment in a community setting instead of in prison.

Drug Treatment Programs

No funding assistance was provided to this purpose area during the 2010/2011 funding cycle. Drug-treatment-programs identify and meet the treatment needs of adult and juvenile drug dependent and alcohol-dependent offenders. Such programs can include behavioral therapy (such as counseling, cognitive therapy, or psychotherapy), medications, or a combination of both and are intended to provide intensive assistance to those individuals that are battling a substance abuse addiction.

Planning, Evaluation, and Technology Improvement Programs

Under the 2010 JAG funding opportunity, the CJ/LE Program awarded one (1) project for an award of \$70,729.51. This project enhances the State's ability to collect accurate criminal history record information, in a timely manner, and provide the appropriate storage mechanism within the Missouri Criminal Records Repository.

Crime Victim and Witness Programs

No funding assistance was provided to this purpose area during the 2010/2011 funding cycle. Crime victim and victimwitness-programs are designed to provide victims, witnesses to crimes, and jurors with services while involved in the criminal justice system. As a victim, such programs are geared to help deal with feelings of confusion, frustration, fear, and anger and explain your rights as a victim or witness. Other activities include advocacy for victims who encounter difficulty accessing services or who believe their statutory or constitutional rights have been denied and notification and assistance to victims whose offender has the potential for parole.

FY11 COORDINATING PROGRAM SUMMARY

Department of Defense (DOD) 1033 Excess Property Program

During July 1, 2010 and June 30, 2011, there continued to be an increase in the number of agencies that have registered to participate in the DOD 1033 Excess Property Program (Program). The Missouri Department of Public Safety (DPS) continues to see an increase in the number of agencies that are processing requests compared to FY10. With the ever-increasing budget restraints and manpower shortages, the number of agencies utilizing the electronic screening process over the internet-based website for the Defense Logistics Agency's (DLA) Disposition Services Agency (DSA) is increasing as well. The cost of shipping equipment directly to their agency is by far cheaper than the agency traveling to the Disposition Services Location (DSL) to pick the item(s) up. This in turn increases the total dollar amount of property the agencies are receiving each fiscal year.

As an approved Transitional Distribution Center (Center), DPS staff continued to screen and tag mostly IT equipment, such as desktop and laptop computers. Staff can bring these items back to the Center and refurbish them prior to issuing them out to the requesting local agencies. This IT equipment is assisting law enforcement agencies in capturing crime statistics data and managing records as well as inter-agency networking via the Internet.

Types of property these local agencies are tagging include, but are not limited to: watercraft, for the agencies located along one of the many rivers or lakes in the State of Missouri; generators, to assist during power losses due to storms; off-road 4x4 vehicles, to assist with drug eradication; and specialty gear that tactical teams are using for high risk entry, such as night vision goggles, spotting scopes, red dot rifle scopes, and load-bearing tactical vests. DPS staff has seen a significant increase in the number of agencies requesting weapons for high-risk search warrant entry and active shooter incident response along with an increase in requests for the off road HMMWV (Hummer) during FY11.

FY12 SUMMARY

Implementation of the 2010/2011 funding year began with the review of JAG grant applications on March 23-24, 2011 by a review committee consisting of the DPS - CJ/LE Program staff and individuals from the criminal justice and private sector. Sixty-one (61) requests for funding were reviewed within the approved project categories as described below. The grant evaluation process was competitive in nature, and only those grant applications determined to coordinate with the goals and objectives of the statewide strategy were considered for funding. Thirty-five (35) grant awards were made to state and local recipients in the amount of \$5,795,007.46.

Thirty (30) requests for funding were received through the Recovery-JAG Program and 30 grant awards were made to local recipients in the amount of \$1,304,359.35.

Three (3) requests for funding were received through the State Recovery-JAG Program. A review committee consisting of DPS – CJ/LE Program staff and individuals from the criminal justice sector met on June 27, 2011 and awarded 3 grants to state recipients in the amount of \$8,443,684.43.

In addition, the DPS – CJ/LE Program continued funding through a program titled the Multi-Jurisdictional Cyber Crime Grant (MJCCG) created as a result of the availability of Recovery-JAG funds. A total of 16 requests for funding were received and a review committee consisting of DPS – CJ/LE Program staff and individuals from the criminal justice and private sector met on June 7, 2011. Fourteen (14) grant awards were made to state and local recipients in the amount of \$1,516,702.05.

Finally, 183 requests for funding were received through the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant (LLEBG) Program, which is money set aside from the less than \$10,000 portion of the JAG Program. A review committee consisting of DPS – CJ/LE Program staff and individuals from the criminal justice sector met on October 20-21, 2011 and, as of the date of this report, tentatively awarded 105 projects for state and local recipients in the amount of \$746,333.77. These awards are awaiting approval by the Director, or his designee, and the necessary revisions by the sub-recipient, and are therefore subject to change.

Following is a brief summary on each category funded through the DPS – CJ/LE Program during the 2011/2012 funding cycle. Evaluation plans for these programs are provided in Section III of this report.

Law Enforcement Programs

Funding for Law Enforcement projects was once again the largest funding category for the DPS – CJ/LE Program during funding year 2011/2012.

Under the 2011 JAG funding opportunity, the CJ/LE Program awarded \$4,993,806.83 to twenty-seven (27) multi-jurisdictional drug task forces, \$18,750 to one (1) equipment project, and \$247,910.13 to one (1) multi-agency law enforcement group, for a total of \$5,438,152.64. Of the 114 counties in the state of Missouri, 99 counties were active participants/members of these multi-jurisdictional enforcement efforts.

Under the 2011 Recovery-JAG funding opportunity, the CJ/LE Program awarded \$1,315,709.87 to twenty-seven (27) multijurisdictional drug task forces as a supplement to their JAG award and \$24,525.92 to three (3) equipment projects, for a total of \$1,340,235.79.

Under the 2011 State Recovery-JAG funding opportunity, the CJ/LE Program awarded \$2,297,861.59 to one (1) equipment project and \$1,845,862.12 to one (1) law enforcement group, for a total of \$4,143,723.71.

Under the 2011 MJCCG funding opportunity, the CJ/LE Program awarded \$1,516,702.05 to 14 multi-jurisdictional cyber task forces. The MJCCG Program continues funding to a previously funded state program. In December 2006, the State of Missouri appropriated state monies for the purpose of establishing the Internet Cyber Crime Grant (ICCG) program, which allowed for the funding of salaries of detectives and forensic personnel and training for those individuals whom worked directly with internet crimes relating to child pornography, enticement, solicitation, and other sex-related offenses. State funding was re-appropriated in FY09 but was not re-appropriated for FY10, FY11, or FY12. Therefore, in FY12, the State of Missouri, Department of Public Safety, once again allocated monies from the Recovery-JAG Program in order to retain the previously funded positions and to continue the enforcement and public training provided by the cyber crime units within the state. Of the 114 counties in the state of Missouri, 102 counties were active participants/members of these multi-jurisdictional enforcement efforts during the 2011 funding opportunity.

Under the 2012 LLEBG funding opportunity, the CJ/LE Program has tentatively awarded \$746,333.77 to 105 state and local law enforcement agencies. The LLEBG Program is a vital funding mechanism for law enforcement. Short-term contracts are awarded from the less than \$10,000 portion of the JAG Program for purchase of basic law enforcement and officer safety equipment that will enable Missouri law enforcement to meet their local needs. Such items include, but are not limited to light bars, sirens, mobile and portable radios, flashlights, handcuffs, protective clothing, ballistic vests, car cages, in-car cameras, locks, and trauma kits.

Prosecution and Court Programs

Under the 2011 JAG funding opportunity, the CJ/LE Program awarded \$33,168.21. This approved purpose area will provide financial assistance to one (1) project to implement and enhance the response of criminal justice agencies to criminal activity. Training of law enforcement, prosecution, judicial, and medical staff may also be provided on proper handling/processing of

these cases as well as establishment of communication lines between involved criminal justice agencies leads to effective resolution of this problem.

Prevention and Education Programs

Under the 2011 JAG funding opportunity, the CJ/LE Program awarded \$205,705.16. This approved purpose area will provide financial assistance to two (2) projects. One of the projects will aim to provide safety and educational guidance within the school environment in the form of a DARE/SRO instructor. The other project will continue to provide the proper supplies and reference material to Missouri law enforcement, fire service and other emergency response officials to help them safely respond to methamphetamine laboratory incidents and perform their jobs with reduced risk of injury to themselves, the public, and the environment.

Corrections and Community Corrections Programs

No funding assistance provided to this approved purpose area during the 2011/2012 funding cycle.

Drug Treatment Programs

No funding assistance provided to this approved purpose area during the 2011/2012 funding cycle.

Panning, Evaluation, and Technology Improvement Programs

Under the 2011 JAG funding opportunity, the CJ/LE Program awarded \$91,650.10. This approved purpose area will provide financial assistance to two (2) projects. One project will fund the purchase of an automated evidence management system in an effort to streamline the collection of evidence, report writing, and access to data. The other project will continue to enhance the State's ability to collect accurate criminal history record information, in a timely manner. This goal remains a top priority for the State of Missouri and this approved purpose area provides the financial mechanism that enables the State to collect the required criminal records data from all criminal justice entities and provide the appropriate storage mechanism within the Missouri Criminal Records Repository. In addition, local criminal justice agencies are assisted with automated criminal justice reporting to the state central repository to ensure reports are timely, accurate and complete.

Under the 2011 State Recovery-JAG funding opportunity, the CJ/LE Program awarded \$4,299,960.72. This approved purpose area will provide financial assistance to one (1) project. This project will assist in improving institutional security by ensuring compliance with FCC narrowband regulations, eliminating dead spots within correctional facilities, and promoting radio interoperability with outside law enforcement agencies.

II. FY11 SUMMARY OF PROGRAMS, PERFORMANCE MEASURES, EVALUATION METHODS, AND EVALUATION RESULTS

State Fiscal	Awarded to	Expended by	Admin Expended
Year	Sub-Recipients	Sub-Recipients	by SAA
2010-2011	\$9,066,136.56	\$8,530,796.59	\$529,860.00

PURPOSE AREA: LAW ENFORCEMENT Number of Sub-grants: 190 Federal Funds Awarded: \$8,745,351.27 Federal Funds Expended: \$8,230,181.63

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Illicit drugs cause major problems for law enforcement agencies in the State of Missouri. The use, sale, distribution, and transportation of illegal narcotics must be addressed.

A significant amount of crime both in the State of Missouri, and nation as a whole can largely be attributed to drug violations. Drug violations can act as a springboard to other crimes such as homicides, robberies, assaults, larcenies, burglaries, vandalism, and violence in public housing, and help to create a fear of crime in neighborhoods.

Because of the sparse population in the rural areas of the State, drug traffickers for clandestine laboratories, where amphetamine/methamphetamine is manufactured, often use these areas. Many of the rural areas are protected by local law enforcement agencies that have limited resources and are unable to provide 24 hour staffing to protect its citizens, much less operate specialized drug units without financial assistance. The hazardous material generated by the manufacture of methamphetamine and left behind by clandestine laboratory operators compounds this problem.

In addition, use of the Internet has become widespread in the United States and is accepted by many juveniles as a way to communicate with their peers by posting personal websites or joining social networks. Unfortunately the anonymity of the Internet can lead to misuse by sex offenders and sexual predators and cyber bullies. In a Youth Internet Safety Survey conducted by the Crimes Against Children Research Center, **o**ne in five U.S. teenagers who regularly log on to the Internet say they have received an unwanted sexual solicitation such as sexual talk or release of personal sexual information, and 1 in 25 youth were solicited to make offline contact. Of those solicited for offline contact, four percent of youth in the CCRC survey were solicited to meet via telephone, mail, or in person. Of the surveyed children, 77% of the targets for online predators were age 14 or older and another 22% were aged 10 to 13.

Another common misuse of the Internet is consumer fraud or other white collar crimes. According to the Bureau of Justice Assistance, in 2009 the Internet Crime Complaint Center (IC3) received 336,655 complaint submissions. This is a (22.3%) increase when compared to 2008. These complaints represent a loss of \$264.6 million to Internet fraud, or median dollar loss of \$931.00 per complaint. The IC3 received 3,386 complaints from Missouri in 2007. Of the complaints originating from Missouri, 37.3% were for auction fraud and 22.6% were for non-delivery of merchandise or non-payment. Credit card, check, or confidence fraud accounted for 20.2% of IC3 complaints received from Missouri.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The overall drug and crime problem reveals an increasingly adverse effect upon our community and society in general. The Multi-Jurisdictional Task Force Program is a significant tool in combating the plague of drug and cyber crime activity that is present in our society. Agencies join together and combine resources in a team approach to provide enforcement in their target areas. As a result of the Multi-Jurisdictional Task Force programs, communications are improved between law enforcement agencies. These lines of communication are essential in sharing information and thereby coordinating a combined effort to

combat the drug and crime problem, as well as addressing the hazards associated with the residual effects of methamphetamine manufacturing.

Through in service training, cyber crime task force personnel will keep current on evolving trends in Internet solicitations and learn new techniques and best practices utilized in sting operations aimed at identifying and apprehending online sexual predators. Awareness of cyber crimes will be increased through computer crime prevention programs and presentations given to local businesses, schools, law enforcement agencies, as well as to the general public. The quality and quantity of collected evidence for prosecution of Internet sexual predators will be enhanced by increasing the number forensic laboratory and cell phone examinations conducted by cyber crime task forces.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, ACTIVITIES & PERFORMANCE MEASURES (PM)

Goal 1: To organize a Multi-Jurisdictional Task Force.

Objective 1: Agencies participating in a Multi-Jurisdictional Task Force Program funded under the JAG (or Recovery-JAG) Program must be involved early in planning for the implementation of this program. Program needs, as well as problems that may be encountered should be discussed.

PM: 1 - Cooperation of participating agencies is critical for an effective Multi-Jurisdictional Program. An agreement must be developed and signed by the department heads of the participating agencies pledging cooperative support.

Objective 2: Identify and arrest for successful prosecution individuals or groups involved in illicit drug trafficking.

- PM: 1 Gather intelligence / information
 - 2 Cultivate informants
 - 3 Identify previously unknown drug organizations and develop investigations on those groups
 - 4 Gather evidence for arrest and prosecution
 - 5 Seize illegal assets derived from drug related investigations

Objective 3: Develop a cost-effective system for the safe disposal of hazardous materials generated as by-products of clandestine drug laboratories.

PM: 1 - Develop a cross-discipline communication and cooperation model (task force, fire, EMS, environmental agencies, etc.)

2 - Train task force members in the proper collection and disposal methods associated with clandestine laboratories

Goal 2: Improve the response of Missouri law enforcement to Internet cyber crimes involving sexual solicitation of children.

- **Objective 1:** Develop comprehensive law enforcement service training programs to expand knowledge of Internet crimes and best practices and techniques to enforce cyber crime laws.
 - PM: 1 Representatives from cyber crime task forces will develop training plans and share techniques and practices with other task forces.
 - 2 Training plans and curriculums of developed training programs.
 - 3 Number of sites where training and assistance is provided.
- **Objective 2:** Provide training to law enforcement personnel in recognizing child victimizations of Internet crime and procedures for effective reporting and processing these crimes.
 - PM: 1 Attendance of law enforcement personnel at training.
- **Objective 3:** Increase and improve use of law enforcement tools for effectively respond to cyber crimes involving children and enhance prosecution of offenders of these crimes.
 - PM: 1 Number of forensic and cell phone examinations requested and conducted for child cyber crime cases.

2 - Number of warrants requested, authorized, served, arrests, and warrant seizures by law enforcement cyber crime task forces.

3 - Number of received tips and knock & talks resulting in cyber crime investigations.

Goal 3: Improve public awareness of Internet cyber crimes involving sexual solicitation of children.

- **Objective 1:** Develop comprehensive public awareness programs and presentations to expand knowledge of Internet crimes and best practices and techniques to enforce cyber crime laws.
 - PM: 1 Representatives from cyber crime task forces will develop awareness programs and presentations and share techniques and practices with other task forces.

2 - Provide comprehensive program plans and presentations to community businesses, schools, and other public audiences.

- 3 Number of sites where programs and presentations are provided.
- 4 Attendance to public awareness programs and presentations.

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES/COMPONENTS

All projects funded through this program must:

- Submit a copy of the Multi-Jurisdictional Task Force formal agreement
- Follow policies and guidelines for management of confidential expenditures (drug task forces)
- Report quarterly arrest, types and amounts of drugs purchased, and seizure statistics and anecdotal data by which to analyze the effectiveness of the task force (drug task forces)
- Report quarterly arrest, case activity, types and number of investigations, and training statistics and anecdotal data by which to analyze the effectiveness of the task force (cyber crime task forces)
- All projects funded from this program will receive at least one (1) monitoring contact
- Submit monthly reports of expenditures
- Submit quarterly progress reports

EVALUATION METHODS

Quarterly reports and the automated information system will be utilized for evaluation reporting.

EVALUATION RESULTS (ER)

The following is the list of Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Forces funded by the JAG and Recovery-JAG Program:

- Adair County North Missouri (NOMO) Drug Task Force
- Audrain County East Central Drug Task Force
- Barry County Southwest Missouri Drug Task Force
- Bates County Community Narcotics Enforcement Team (CNET)
- Bridgeton City North County MEG Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Force
- Buchanan County Drug Strike Force
- Camden County Lake Area Narcotics Enforcement Group (LANEG)
- Cole County Mid-Missouri Unified Strike Team And Narcotics Unit (MUSTANG)
- Excelsior Springs City Clay County Drug Task Force
- Farmington City Mineral Area Drug Task Force
- Franklin County Narcotics Enforcement Unit
- Greene County Combined Ozarks Multi-Jurisdictional Enforcement Team (COMET)
- Grundy County Northwest Missouri Interagency Team Response Operation (NITRO)
- Howell County South Central Drug Task Force
- Jackson County Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Force
- Jasper County Drug Task Force
- Jefferson County Municipal Enforcement Group
- Kansas City Multi-Jurisdictional Task Force
- Lafayette County Narcotics Unit Task Force

- Monroe City Northeast Missouri (NEMO) Narcotics Task Force
- Morgan County Mid-Missouri Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Force
- Pemiscot County Bootheel Drug Task Force
- Platte County Multi-Jurisdictional Enforcement Group
- Poplar Bluff City Southeast Missouri (SEMO) Drug Task Force
- St. Charles County Regional Drug Task Force
- St. Louis City Metro Multi-Jurisdictional Undercover Drug Program
- St. Louis County Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Force (only task force that did not receive Recovery-JAG funding)

A full statistical summary of Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Force accomplishments from FY11 is provided in Attachment A of this report. The following evaluation results are a summary of the data collected from the quarterly reports submitted by all the Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Forces. During this reporting period there were 27 Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Forces funded under this purpose area.

Organization of Multi-Jurisdiction Drug Task Forces

- 1. Organization and planning of each Multi-Jurisdictional Task Force is the responsibility of the primary governing body as outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
- 2. 293 law enforcement agencies were involved with Multi-jurisdictional Drug Task Forces
- 3. 252 full time and 11 part time law enforcement officers were involved with Multi-jurisdictional Drug Task Forces

Arrest and prosecution of individuals / groups in drug trafficking

- 1. Total arrests during fiscal year 2011 were 9,077 with a total of 7,141 charges
- 2. The five most frequent drug charges were: 1) sale methamphetamine; 2) possession marijuana; 3) possession methamphetamine; 4) sale marijuana; and 5) possession of paraphernalia
- 3. 2,950 arrest charges for possession of marijuana
- 4. 1,581 arrest charges for sale of methamphetamine
- 5. 4,258 arrest charges for possession of methamphetamine
- 6. 5,144 arrest charges were made for sale of marijuana
- 7. 6,415 arrest charges for possession of other
- 8. During the four quarters reported for fiscal year 2011, 1,134 search warrants were served and 1,059 search warrants resulted in arrests.
- 9. The 27 Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Forces of Missouri located and destroyed 1,593 methamphetamine clandestine laboratories.
- 10. The statewide street value of all drugs seized totaled \$41,450,744. This amount includes the seizures of 232,006.52 ounces of marijuana, 4,318.92 ounces of cocaine, 2,089.85 ounces of methamphetamine, 1,955.14 ounces of pseudoephedrine, 4,318.92 ounces of crack cocaine, 467.73 ounces of heroin, and 7.16 ounces of ecstasy.
- 11. Multi-jurisdictional Drug Task Forces seized a total of 4,744 doses of pseudoephedrine, 1,670 doses of ecstasy, and 298 gallons of anhydrous ammonia.
- 12. In addition to drug seizures, 2,170 firearms were seized.
- 13. Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Forces reported a total of \$127,510 of informant expenditures utilized for 682 active informants.
- 14. During this reporting period, a total of 9,059 new cases were filed, with 12,043 cases still active from the previous year. A total of 21,102 active court cases awaited trial in 2010 and 7,820 were disposed.
- 15. Total property forfeited under federal case by all Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Forces combined was valued at \$10,024,442.49. This property included weapons, currency, real estate, motor vehicles, and personal property and other assets. A total of \$402,088.31 in property was forfeited under state case to Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Forces.

The following is the list of Multi-Jurisdictional Cyber Crime Task Forces funded by the MJCCG Program:

- Boone County Mid-Missouri Internet Crimes Task Force
- Clayton City Regional Computer Crimes Education and Enforcement Group (RCCEEG)
- Dent County Computer Crime Education and Enforcement
- Independence City Against Internet Crime
- Joplin City Police Department Cyber Crimes Unit
- Kirksville City Internet Cyber Crime Task Force
- Missouri Department of Social Services STAT Operation Predator

- Platte County Western Missouri Cyber Crime Task Force
- Poplar Bluff City SEMO Cyber Crimes Task Force
- Springfield City Internet Cyber Crime Initiative
- St. Charles County Internet Crimes Against Children
- St. Louis County Special Investigations Unit
- State of Missouri Highway Patrol Computer Forensic Unit
- Taney County Tri-Lake Regional Internet Crimes Task Force

A full statistical summary of Multi-Jurisdictional Cyber Crime Task Force accomplishments from FY11 is provided in Attachment C of this report. The following evaluation results are a summary of the data collected from the quarterly reports submitted by all the Cyber Crime Task Forces. During this reporting period there were 14 Cyber Crime Task Forces funded under this purpose area.

Organization Cyber Crime Task Forces

- 1. 47 law enforcement agencies were involved with Cyber Crime Task Forces full time.
- 2. 37 law enforcement agencies were involved with Cyber Crime Task Forces part time.

Arrest and prosecution of individuals / groups in Cyber Crime

- 1. During this period there were 524 arrest offenses with 947 arrest made.
- 2. The five most frequent offenses were: 1) Possession of Child Porn, 2) Other, 3) Distribution/Receipt Child Porn, 4) Furnish child porn to minor, and 5) Child Solicitation.
- 3. There are 3,474 Carry in cases, 2,121 new cases, 5,595 active cases, 1,568 disposed cases, and 4,020 carry out cases.
- 4. There is a total 89 participating agencies at the end of FY11.
- 5. During the reporting period there were 2,873 warrants.
- 6. There were a total of 489computer crime prevention program & presentations attended in FY11.
- 7. A total of 47 in service training took place in FY11.
- 8. In the reporting period there were a total of 1,352 subpoenas.
- 9. In addition there were 2,686 cases that involved forensic lab and 1,037 cases that involved cell phone exams.

The following is the other multi-agency law enforcement project funded by the JAG Program:

Jackson County Drug Abatement Response Team (DART): This project continued support to the DART, a multijurisdictional initiative to identify and shut down drug houses and street level narcotics operations in thirteen municipal jurisdictions in Jackson County. The goal of this program was to eliminate illegal drug activity in the Jackson County community by coordinating and utilizing several sources. Through these efforts, the quality of life in the target area was restored and protected. Suspected drug activity could be anonymously reported to DART team members who then communicated the information to law enforcement for investigation. DART also coordinated street level investigations, buy / bust and reverse sting operations, property fire and housing code inspections of suspected drug houses, and notification of drug activity and its consequences to property owners. Property owner seminars, community presentations, and citizen training given on recognition of drug activities were provided by DART team members.

Report of Success: DART was instrumental in 47 criminal cases filed against individuals for possessing precursor chemicals, solvents, or solutions with intent to manufacture methamphetamine. DART closed down 76 methamphetamine labs. Owners were sent 311 notice letters that their property was being used for methamphetamine production and 28 evictions were completed. Another 43 evictions were pending. Following 129 fires and housing inspections made in the DART posted properties, 4 properties were vacated. In the DART area, 19 potential nuisance cases were filed. Over 635 residents had contact with the DART Coordinator, Methamphetamine Prosecutor, and Community Prosecutors. DART with other law enforcement agencies successfully served 201 search warrants and 319 arrests were made. In addition, law enforcement made 37 buy/busts that resulted in 68 arrests.

The DART team members recognized the importance of the service being provided to the community and how teamwork fostered their efforts to efficiently rid their neighborhoods of drug activity. When patrol officers shared information with the DART team, there was a broader view of the drug problems in the city. DART's database collected from police reports and their contacts is extremely helpful and attorneys used this database to assist in tracking witnesses and victims for various trials. Moreover, these data were used by community groups to show what houses were posted by DART and what impact DART has had in their community.

The DART Coordinator required several property owners to schedule a meeting with the DART Coordinator after their numerous weekly inspections. When the DART team arrived at a property for an inspection, the DART investigator and the DART coordinator were then prepared to discuss the issues with those present at the property at the time of the inspection. The DART Coordinator and Investigator attended numerous neighborhood social activities, meetings, and speaking engagements. This visibility to these neighborhoods where crime has been confirmed with drug activity was critical. The continued success of DART is greatly attributed to the wide range of resources that make up the DART team.

The continued success of DART is greatly attributed to community residents who are increasingly growing intolerant of drug activity in their neighborhood. Increased phone calls from community members regarding trespassing issues in posted DART properties are strong evidence of their growing intolerance to this illegal activity.

The following is a summary of equipment funded by the LLEBG Program:

Vehicles = 17 Light Bars/Lights = 173 Siren/Siren Boxes/Speakers = 33 Flashlights = 88 Ballistic Vests = 84 Protective Clothing (Gloves, Safety Vests, Jackets, Raincoats) = 118 In-Car Cameras = 60 Radios/Repeaters = 114 Cages/Partitions = 46 Trauma Kits = 42 Other (Handcuffs, Leg Irons, Surveillance Systems, Gun Racks, Gun Locks, etc) = 827

PURPOSE AREA: PROSECUTION AND COURT Number of Sub-grants: 2 Federal Funds Awarded: \$72,995.47 Federal Funds Expended: \$71,760.32

PROBLEM STATEMENT

The U.S. Department of Human Services reported 1,009,904 children were victimized in 2006. Of these victimized children, 66.3 percent experienced neglect (including medical neglect), 16.0 percent were physically abused, 8.8 percent were sexually abused, 6.6 percent were emotionally or psychologically maltreated, and 16.3 percent were victimized by another means or unknown. A recent survey conducted by the Crimes Against Children Research Center (CCRC) indicates a much greater proportion of children are physically assaulted. According to CCRC researchers just more than half of youth (53%) experienced a physical assault. The highest rate of physical assault victimization occurred during between ages six and 12. In addition, the CCRC survey indicated 8.2% of experienced sexual victimization, including sexual assault (3.2%) and attempted or completed rape (2.2%).

In 2008, 50,565 reports of child abuse or neglect were received by the Missouri Department of Social Services, Children's Division. Homicide was listed as the death certificate manner of death for 59 Missouri children in 2007 by Department of Social Services.

Citing *Crime in Missouri*, in 2010, a total of 41,507 domestic violence incidents were reported by Missouri law enforcement agencies. Of these incidents, the majority involved spouses (19.8%), persons not married but residing together (27.2%), or blood relatives (17.3%). In 2010, a total of 57 homicides were reported in Missouri that were related to domestic violence. Of these homicides, 59.6% involved a female family member including wives, mothers, daughters, ex-wives, common-law wives or girl friends. Another 33.4% involved husbands, boyfriends, and sons. Husband/wife relationships accounted for 19.3% of all 2010 domestic violence related homicides.

The consequences of domestic violence are far-reaching not only for families but for society as a whole. The U.S. Department of Justice has estimated that during their lifetime, one out of every six American women will experience violence by an intimate partner. Adults in abusive homes have a greater chance of developing alcohol, drugs, gambling, or relational problems. It has been suggested that children growing up in abusive households may develop problems with alcohol and drugs. These children also may become violators to their children when they become parents. The 2006 National Violence Against Women Survey found that more than 300,000 woman are estimated to be victims of sexual abuse every year in the United States.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Programs were sought that addressed the response of the Missouri criminal justice system to domestic / family violence in the State. These programs included law enforcement, intervention, and prosecution for domestic violence issues as they interfaced with the criminal justice system, regardless of where in or external to the system the program is based. Emphasis was placed on programs for victims of child sexual abuse and crimes against the elderly. Prosecution and court programs will be sought that demonstrate new and different approaches to the enforcement, prosecution, and adjudication of violent crime offenses. By encouraging applicants to develop new strategies and methodologies for dealing with violent crime, domestic violence and child abuse crime problems, it is hoped that gaps and/or redundancy in coverage areas will be minimized or eliminated and the effectiveness of available resources will be maximized. The program will also encourage applicants to develop a strategic view that encompasses more than one aspect of the war on violence and addresses elements such as supervision, employment, community service, mental and medical treatment, and restitution.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, ACTIVITIES & PERFORMANCE MEASURES (PM)

Goal 1: Improve effectiveness of criminal justice agencies response to violent crime through targeted enforcement, investigation, prevention, prosecution, and adjudication of specific criminal offenders.

Objective 1: Law enforcement agencies and prosecution offices collaboratively focus on high crime rate geographic areas.

PM: 1 - Identify high crime rate areas at local government level.
2 - Initiate, plan, and deploy criminal justice teams to enforce, prosecute, and share information regarding problem properties and offenders in identified high crime rate areas.
3 - Develop community involvement programs to inform and educate residents of high crime rate areas on crime prevention.
4 - Implement advocacy groups to encourage support for crime prevention, offender treatment, and witness programs.

Goal 2: Improving the criminal and juvenile justice system's response to domestic and family violence, including spouse abuse, child abuse, and abuse of the elderly

Objective 1:	Increase the awareness and skill levels of professionals involved in the identification, investigation, and prosecution of domestic/family violence
PM:	 Number of training sessions / seminars held. Number of persons attending training.
Objective 2:	Provide for additional trained, specialized investigators and prosecutors.
PM:	 1 - An increase in the number of trained domestic/family violence investigators. 2 - An increase in the number of prosecutors dedicated to domestic/family violence cases. 3 - An increase in the number of specialized units dealing with domestic/family violence
Objective 3:	Enhance the investigative abilities of domestic/family violence investigators.
PM:	 1 – An increase in availability of evidence gathering equipment. 2 – Increased availability of tools to assist in interviewing domestic/family violence victims 3 – Availability of equipment for the presentation of evidence to prosecutors and courts.
Objective 4:	Develop judicially accepted alternative domestic/family violence victim interview techniques.
PM:	 1 - Victim's exposure to repeated questioning by different investigators is minimized. 2 - Investigators from different jurisdictions coordinate efforts. 3 - Stronger court cases are realized. 4 -Number of offenders that completed domestic/family violence education and/or treatment programs.

Goal 3: To develop and implement programs that enhance the response to crimes involving child abuse and neglect, including child sexual abuse.

.

Increase the awareness and skill levels of professionals involved in the identification, investigation, and prosecution of child abuse and neglect cases.
 1 – Number of training sessions/seminars held 2 – Number of persons attending training.
Provide for additional trained, specialized investigators and prosecutors.
 1 – An increase in the number of trained child abuse/neglect investigators. 2 – An increase in the number of prosecutors dedicated to child abuse and neglect cases. 3 – An increase in the number of specialized units dealing with child abuse and neglect.
Enhance the investigative abilities of child abuse/neglect investigators.
 1 – An increase in availability of evidence gathering equipment. 2 – Increased availability of tools to assist in interviewing child victims 3 – Availability of equipment for the presentation of evidence to prosecutors and courts.

Objective 4: Develop judicially accepted alternative child victim interview techniques.

- PM: 1 Victim's exposure to repeated questioning by different investigators is minimized.
 - 2 Investigators from different jurisdictions coordinate efforts.
 - 3 Stronger court cases are realized.

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES/COMPONENTS

All projects funded through this program must:

- Maintain a time and activity sheet for personnel paid under the contract
- Submit monthly expenditure reports
- Submit quarterly progress reports
- Be required to submit evaluation data for measuring performance
- Submit a copy of the formal agreements for inter-disciplinary investigation teams.
- All projects funded from this program will receive at least one (1) monitoring contact

EVALUATION METHODS

Evaluations are based on quarterly reports submitted by grant recipients.

EVALUATION RESULTS (ER)

The following evaluation results were obtained from quarterly reports submitted by all programs funded under this program area:

St. Louis City Circuit Attorney's Office Domestic Violence Investigator: This project continued support of a misdemeanor domestic violence investigator to work with the St. Louis Attorney's Office domestic violence attorney. The goal of this project was to increase community safety and reduce domestic violence in the City of St. Louis. This goal was to be achieved by two objectives: 1) Focus on misdemeanor domestic violence incidents through cooperative efforts of the Misdemeanor Domestic Violence (DV) Investigator and the Circuit Attorney Office Violent Unit; and 2) Focus efforts on enhancing misdemeanor domestic violence collection, and trial preparation for prosecution.

Report of Success: The Misdemeanor Domestic Violence Investigator worked 200 cases and the Misdemeanor DV unit issued 100 new cases. The investigator acting as a liaison between the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department and the Circuit Attorney's Office interviewed police officers in preparation for trial on misdemeanor domestic violence cases. In addition, the investigator requested follow-up police, lab tests, investigations included photographs in 19 cases, crime scene reviews, witness interviews, medical releases were obtained, and additional evidence was collected.

Potential witnesses were located, served subpoenas, and interviewed for 200 pending misdemeanor domestic violence cases. The investigator served subpoenas for witnesses and victims in approximately four to five bench trials and ten to fifteen jury trials per week. The Misdemeanor DV Attorney currently has 118 cases pending trial dates. The Misdemeanor DV Investigator personally served subpoenas to 260 victims and interviewed 100 victims. An agreement is in place with the judges of the misdemeanor divisions that cases will be nolle prossed by the Circuit Attorney's Office rather than be dismissed. The Misdemeanor DV Attorney prepared 283 cases during the grant period. Trial preparation assistance was provided for 400 cases. Of the prepared cases: 143 pleas, 71 nolle process, 25 bench trials, 5 jury trial, and 13 dismissed for failure to prosecute.

Washington County Special Investigator of Crimes Against Children Program: This program continued support of a special investigator to collaborate with Washington County's Prosecuting Attorney's Office to investigate crimes involving children. The goals of the program were: 1) Improve the criminal justice system's response to serious child abuse cases through collaborative agency efforts; and 2) Specialize and improve investigations and increase prosecution rates of child abuse offenders. The objectives of the program were: 1) Investigate incidents of child sexual and felonious physical abuse and fatality cases; 2) Lead and coordinate a multidisciplinary team investigating child abuse cases; and 3) Improve life conditions of victims and non-offending parents by removing contacts with offenders.

Report of Success: The Special Investigator for Child Abuse/Neglect (SICAN) program began July 2003. This program has now successfully operated with measurable results for seventy-two months.

The following are totals from investigations of a collaborated effort between numerous regional law enforcement and children's agencies. Officers investigated 53 cases; 2 were reported as child abuse; 5 reported as child endangerment; 4 reported as child neglect; 0 reported as child molestation; 8 as statutory rape; 26 as statutory sodomy; 2 possession of child pornography; and 3 as sexual misconduct.

The Special Investigator attended training for Internet Crimes Against Children in San Jose, CA. The point of this training was to obtain as many resources for the department as possible to continue the work of protecting the child. Continued training in Dallas, TX for Crimes Against Children. While attending this training they received many different techniques to detect computer based crimes along with proper techniques for securing the evidence once found. Also attended training for SHIFT which is for personnel who maintain and view child pornography.

PURPOSE AREA: PREVENTION AND EDUCATION Number of Sub-grants: 1 Federal Funds Awarded: \$177,060.61 Federal Funds Expended: \$159,952.48

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Clandestine production of methamphetamine is very dangerous because of the volatile, hazardous and toxic chemicals and processes involved. It not only poses risks to those involved in this illegal drug industry but also to law enforcement, fire service, and other emergency response officials who discover, collect evidence, and dispose of clandestine laboratory sites. In addition, environment and public exposed to these are negatively affected. The instability of chemicals used in methamphetamine can cause fires and explosions during its production as well during cleanup of dumpsites. Outdoor clandestine laboratories are typically located in rivers, fields, and forests causing extensive damage to the environment. Because of methamphetamine production doesn't require elaborate equipment; indoor clandestine laboratories are commonly found in private residences, hotels/motels, garages, and abandoned buildings. This can expose family members as well as unassociated public to toxic chemicals.

Evolving chemical processes to produce methamphetamine has possibly increased the hazards to all coming in contact with them. According to the National Drug and Intelligence Center (NDIC), five common production methods are used to make methamphetamine. Four of these involve chemical reduction ephedrine/pseudoephedrine but use different precursor chemicals. Common precursor chemicals include, but not limited to, hydriodic acid, red phosphorous, hypo-phosphorous acid, anhydrous ammonia, and mercuric acid. All of these are toxic and afford many health risks to those in contact.

In FY 2010, multi-jurisdictional drug task forces destroyed 1,449 clandestine methamphetamine laboratories. Almost one half of these (39.6%) were in the St. Louis, Troop C area. Although the number of seized clandestine laboratories suggests this illicit drug industry has decreased in recent years, it continues to be very problematic in Missouri.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Programs were sought that addressed the response of public safety and emergency service officials to clandestine methamphetamine laboratories. Applications were encouraged that addressed crime scene processing, site cleanup, and disposal of chemicals and equipment associated with these labs. Provision of supplies, training, and reference materials was available to Missouri law enforcement, fire service, and other emergency response officials to effectively equip them to safety process methamphetamine laboratories and construct collection stations for chemical disposal.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, ACTIVITIES, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES (PM)

Goal 1: Improve effectiveness of public safety and emergency service officials' response to processing of clandestine methamphetamine laboratories.

Law enforcement, fire service, state agencies collaboratively and appropriately respond to removal of methamphetamine laboratories.
 Develop communication plans and jurisdictional procedures to address methods for responding to service calls involving methamphetamine laboratories. Acquire proper supplies and equipment to effectively and safety clean methamphetamine laboratories. Establish and maintain hazardous material collection/control sites within a reasonable distance of
each task force's area of operations
Ensure first responders are adequately trained to initially process, collect criminal evidence, and quarantine discovered methamphetamine laboratories.
 Develop and provide training materials to law enforcement, fire service, and other emergency service personnel. Identify providers in service area

3 - Attendance of personnel in training

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES/COMPONENTS

All projects funded through this program must:

- Maintain a time and activity sheet for personnel paid under the contract
- Submit monthly expenditure reports
- Submit quarterly progress reports
- Be monitored at least one (1) time to ensure compliance with guidelines
- Be required to submit evaluation data for measuring performance

EVALUATION METHODS

Evaluation reports were based on quarterly reports submitted by the sub-recipient.

EVALUATION RESULTS (ER)

The following evaluation results were obtained from quarterly reports submitted by all program funded under this program area:

Missouri Department of Natural Resources Clandestine Drug Laboratory Collection Station: This continuing project supported the Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Emergency Response Section, Environmental Services Program to expand and enhance an existing project for responding to methamphetamine clandestine laboratory clean up requests. The goal of this project was to increase safety and reduce risk of injury to the staff, the public, and the environment exposed to clandestine laboratories. This goal was achieved by three objectives: 1) Provide proper supplies and reference material to Missouri law enforcement, fire service, and other emergency response officials; 2) Provide supplies for processing and disposal of clandestine drug lab materials to clandestine drug laboratory collection stations; and 3) Provide on-site responses to clandestine methamphetamine laboratory incidents, when requested by law enforcement, fire station, and other emergency officials.

Report of Success: The Missouri Department of Natural Resources' Environmental Emergency Response (EER) was afforded the purchases of proper supplies and reference materials to Missouri law enforcement, fire service and other emergency response officials to help them safely respond to clandestine methamphetamine lab incidents and perform their jobs with reduced risk of injury to themselves, the public, and the environment, supplies to process and dispose of clandestine drug lab materials from the clandestine drug laboratory collection stations (CDLCSs), and on-site response to clandestine methamphetamine lab incidents, if assistance was requested by law enforcement.

Part of the funding from this grant was used to purchase necessary personal protective equipment and supplies for safety, cleanup and air monitoring to help law enforcement and others respond safely and properly manage seized clandestine drug lab materials. The Department provided items such as sample bottles, vials, buckets with lids, air purifying respirator and cartridge, chemical protective coveralls, nitrile gloves, boot covers, trash bags, disposable pipettes, safety glasses, absorbent, duct tape, PH paper, Drager pumps and colorimetric tubes, and over-pack drums to law enforcement agencies. By providing these supplies, the Department helped ensure that these agencies could respond to clandestine methamphetamine lab incidents with reduced risk of injury to themselves, the public and the environment.

The Department established seventeen (17) CDLCSs throughout the State. These CDLCSs accepted drug lab material from various law enforcement and drug task force agencies. The Department provided supplies, operational oversight, and assistance to collection stations. The Department also provided assistance to the CDLCS personnel and helped with the processing of waste materials accepted at the collection stations, ensuring the completing of all required documentation. The Department used a tracking system to account for drug lab materials accepted at the collection stations. The following were processed: reused/recycled material (530 lbs), solid waste (8,422 lbs.), hazardous waste (2,206 lbs.), and hazardous substances (150 lbs.). The EER has staff available to respond on-site to clandestine drug labs and assist law enforcement, drug task forces, fire department, and other agencies within the State of Missouri with the proper management, cleanup and disposal of clandestine drug lab chemicals. From calendar year 2010, the Department estimates that there were 1,872 methamphetamine lab incidents.

PURPOSE AREA: PLANNING, EVALUATION, AND TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENT Number of Sub-grants: 1 Federal Funds Awarded: \$70,729.51 Federal Funds Expended: \$68,902.16

PROBLEM STATEMENT

In today's society, criminal history records are becoming increasingly relied upon by the criminal justice system to make charge, release, and sentencing decisions. Records are also used as a tool when making decisions regarding licensing and employment purposes, including foster care, schoolteachers and bus drivers, hospital, nursing home, and home health care employees, and in transactions relating to the purchase of firearms. Local criminal justice agencies are required to report criminal history to the Missouri State Highway Patrol's Central Criminal History Records System (CHRS) repository. The paper system of reporting is quickly becoming obsolete and does not allow timely, accurate, and complete criminal histories. Local criminal justice agencies are unable to report in an adequate manner when they have to stretch their budgets and personnel to the limits just to get their core duties accomplished. In order to achieve complete, accurate, and timely criminal history records, cooperative efforts of all the components of the criminal justice system must be implemented.

Illicit drugs impact on society is manifested in many ways. The criminal justice system is negatively impacted by the resources and efforts expended to control both illicit drug use and industries. These drugs also negatively affect the health of Missouri citizens, economic infrastructure, social fabric, and environment. No single data source or information system can directly measure illicit drugs adverse impact on these. The nature, extent, and temporal and geographic trends can only be accessed through analysis of many disparate data systems such as those of criminal laboratories, law enforcement, juvenile and adult courts, hospitals, treatment centers, and corrections.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Given that each component of the criminal justice system is responsible to a different authority (such as the circuit courts to the Office of State Courts Administrator, prosecutors and sheriffs to their constituencies and police to the mayor or city manager), no one agency can effectively support all elements of the criminal history system. This program is designed around a support structure to address each component. Through cooperative efforts, law enforcement, prosecutors, and courts will provide an integrated solution to improve the completeness, accuracy and timeliness of Missouri's criminal history records. The local criminal justice agencies will be provided with equipment, software and training for the automation and integration of systems for the improvement of the criminal history reporting capabilities. The implementation of law enforcement case management, prosecutor case management and courts case management systems will provide statewide access for users. Once local agencies are automated and linked to the state criminal record repository, the federal criminal files, state and federal wanted files and other databases become a substantial tool in fighting crime and protecting our citizens. A totally automated system is being developed where each agency with reporting responsibilities interacts directly with the criminal history system to provide the required information for the record event under their jurisdiction. The CHRS repository would then be responsible for coordinating this effort and controlling the quality and dissemination of the records. They would also be available to assist any element of the system that encounter problems and be responsible for training on an as needed basis.

The purpose of the Justice Assistance Grant Program is to assist states and units of local government in implementing specific programs that offer a high probability of enhancing and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the criminal justice system. Special emphasis is placed on controlling violent and drug-related crime and serious offenders, and fostering multi-jurisdictional and multi-state efforts to support national drug-control priorities. This is achieved through analysis of the illicit drug problem in Missouri and maintaining several criminal justice data systems.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, ACTIVITIES & PERFORMANCE MEASURES (PM)

Goal 1: Promote the timely collection of criminal history record information from all criminal justice agencies in Missouri and store these records at Missouri CHRS repository.

Objective 1: Develop a comprehensive information and training program to assist agencies in complying with mandatory criminal history records reporting requirements.

PM:	1 - Representatives from the courts, law enforcement and prosecution will meet monthly to develop an automation plan.
	2 - Training plans and curriculums of developed training programs.3 - Number of sites where training and assistance is provided.
Objective 2:	Provide equipment and software systems for automating criminal justice agencies.
PM:	1 - Counties throughout the state will be scheduled for implementation of systems.

- 2 Teams will install hardware and software and train criminal justice personnel based upon the implementation schedule.
 2 Number of counties entermeted
 - 3 Number of counties automated.

Goal 2: Establish a series of policies, procedures, systems, and reporting recommendations to enable the State of Missouri to effectively manage the JAG Program by analyzing drug and violent crime environment in the State; assessing effectiveness of existing programs; and offering data and interpretive analysis support for development of new programs.

Objective 1:	Ensure administration requirements of Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant are adequately met.
PM:	1 - Develop a drug and violent crime strategy as required under the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant.

- 2 Provide research services to Missouri DPS, criminal justice authorities, and other public officials.
- 3 Develop and publish evaluation criteria and information systems for funded programs
- 4 Provide statistical assistance in maintenance of UCR summary based information system

Goal 3: Provide training and support to criminal justice agencies with Missouri required crime reporting, including the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) System and Criminal History Records System (CHRS).

Objective 1:	Operate and maintain statewide UCR System
PM:	 Train Missouri law enforcement agencies with reporting requirements Conduct quality assurance reviews and audits Assist Missouri law enforcement agencies with reporting procedures
Objective 2:	Support CHRS fingerprint and case disposition requirements
PM:	 Train Missouri law enforcement, prosecutor, and court agencies on correct record processing and procedures. Conduct seminars and attend conferences to support JAG

3 -Employ CHRS quality control procedures and programs to monitor CHRS fingerprint and case disposition reporting compliance

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES/COMPONENTS

All projects funded through this program must:

- Identify the various criminal justice agencies providing input to the CHRS
- Provide a list of counties that are automated
- Provide a list of counties where training and assistance is provided
- Provide bid specifications on equipment
- Provide reports showing increase of criminal records being reported
- Submit monthly report of expenditures
- Conduct required crime and drug analyses and publish reports
- Submit quarterly progress reports
- Be monitored at least one (1) time during the contract period

EVALUATION METHODS

Evaluations are based on quarterly reports submitted by sub-recipients.

EVALUATION RESULTS (ER)

The following evaluation results were obtained from quarterly reports submitted by the program funded under this program area:

<u>Missouri State Highway Patrol - Administrative Data Analysis And Problem Identification</u>: This continuing project establishes a series of policies, procedures, systems, and reporting recommendations. The State of Missouri effectively managed the Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program by analyzing drug and violent crime environment in the State; assessing effectiveness of existing programs; and offering data and interpretive analysis support for development of new programs. The Missouri State Highway Patrol, coordinating their activities with Department of Public Safety's CJ/LE Program staff, completed the following project goals: 1) Provided base-line information to properly assess Missouri's illicit drug and violent crime problems; 2) Supported successful administration of Missouri's JAG Program by providing needed research, evaluation, and data processing services and 3) Develop and implement enhancements to UCR and MIBRS Internet-based data collection application to provide state and local criminal justice agencies with improved UCR and MIBRS operational administrative, and statistical/graphical reports.

Report of Success: <u>MSHP Statistical Analysis Center</u>. One SAC members attended the Bureau of Justice Statistics & Justice Research and Statistical Association 2010 national conference in Portland, Oregon.

Two reports, *Missouri Statewide Drug* and *Violent Crime Strategy* and *Nature and Extent of Illicit Drug Problems in Missouri* and *Analysis of Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Forces* were developed during this grant period. The publication *Missouri Statewide Drug and Violent Crime Strategy* was completed and provided to DPS CJ/LE staff in September, 2010. Analyses were completed from data gathered from Missouri state agencies such as Department of Health and Senior Services and Department of Mental Health. Data analyses included treatment and hospital admissions, juvenile referrals, prison incarcerations, criminal arrests, intravenous AIDS / HIV cases, multi-jurisdictional drug task force seizures, crime laboratory cases, and MJTF survey responses. Results of these analyses were published in the publication entitled *Nature and Extent of the Illicit Drug problem in Missouri, 2010.* An Internet based survey instrument was designed and implemented to capture drug task force officials' perceptions of the drug industry in Missouri. The survey was distributed to the points of contacts of twenty-seven multi-jurisdictional drug task forces. Analyses of survey responses were completed and results were incorporated into the 2010 edition of the publication entitled *Nature and Extent of Illicit Drug Problems in Missouri*.

The publication entitled *Justice Assistance Grant and Recovery Act - JAG Evaluation Plan 2010–2011* was published and provided to DPS CJ / LE in July 2010. In this publication, designs for programs funded in five purpose areas were constructed including prosecution / court programs (2 grants), prevention / education programs (1 grant), planning, evaluation and technology improvement programs (1 grant), law enforcement programs (28 grants), and crime laboratories (14 grants). Each program design included a set of criteria that DPS used to determine success of JAG funded programs.

The FY 2010 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program Annual Report was completed and provided to DPS CJ / LE staff in October 2010. Final reports of success were published in the Annual Report for FY10 funded multijurisdictional drug tasks forces and programs addressing law enforcement and drug task forces, prosecution and court, prevention and education, crime laboratories, internet cyber crime, and planning / evaluation / technology. In addition, summaries were published of quarterly reports submitted by multi-jurisdictional drug task forces and crime laboratories. A strategic plan for implementing FY11 JAG funded programs was included in the Annual Report with evaluation designs and performance measures.

Progress reports and quality control analysis were received and completed for FY10 fourth quarter and FY11 first through third quarter multi-jurisdictional drug task forces, FY11 first through fourth quarter Crime Laboratories and Internet Cyber Crime Grant (ICCG). Progress reports were processed and data entered to their respective databases, and results of these analyzes were provided to DPS CJ/LE program staff.

<u>MSHP Uniform Crime Reporting Unit</u>: Technical assistance was provided for UCR training and report requirements, quality assurance reviews/audits, and assistance to local agencies in reporting procedures included the following.

From July 1, 2010 to June 31, 2011, the UCR Unit provided the following training:

Training Provided	# Students
MIBRS Software Application Support	1
MIBRS Training (various training modules)	999
MIBRS RMS Software Demo & Install	1
MIBRS RMS Software Training	3
One-on-one UCR Training	75
Patrol Recruit Training	0
UCR Training (various training modules)	266
Total	1,345

From July 1, 2010 to June 31, 2011 the UCR Unit conducted the following reviews and audits:

Audit	# Conducted
UCR	161

From July 1, 2010 to June 31, 2011 the UCR Unit processed the following reports and provided feedback to supported agency personnel and to the Missouri Department of Public Safety on agency reporting status:

UCR Reports Pro	ocessed
Approved	9,221
Rejected	909
Total	10,130

Development of an Internet based MRMS was completed during this grant evaluation period. All data collection screens and database were developed in the Websphere environment. System and user testing was completed and the MRMS database was integrated to the MSHP MIBRS production database and file processing application. The MRMS was deployed over a secure SSL/VPN internet connection to a Missouri law enforcement agency.

III. FY12 EVALUATION & ACTIVITIES

EVALUATION DESIGN

The JAG program provides criminal justice authorities with substantial support in their endeavors to address Missouri's illicit drug and violent crime problems. Program evaluation is an essential CJ/LE Program responsibility required by its enabling legislation. To meet this responsibility, BJA has provided states with guidelines, technical training, and support for assessing these projects. In Missouri, the DPS has contracted with the Missouri State Highway Patrol (MSHP), Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) to administer the evaluation component of the JAG and Recovery-JAG Programs.

The following is a description of the 2011/2012 JAG program evaluation designs developed by SAC and approved by DPS. These evaluations are mostly administrative or process in nature.

Law Enforcement Programs

The following programs are funded from the JAG, Recovery-JAG, State Recovery-JAG, and/or MJCCG Program funding opportunities for the 2011/2012 fiscal year:

CARROLL COUNTY - REPLACEMENT OF POLICE MOBILE RADIOS: This project supports replacement of Carroll County Sheriff's Office's police mobile radios. The goal of this program is to help Carroll County communicate more effectively and to allow officers to better serve Carroll County citizens. This goal will be achieved by two objectives: 1) Improve the efficiency of the Carroll County 911 communication center by purchasing three new mobile radios; 2) Maintain reliable and effective communication between police officers and the 911 communication center.

EVALUATION DESIGN: The grantee will be evaluated on the following criteria:

- Overall project management and support services employed to implement the project
- Timely acquisition, installation, and implementation of new mobile radios
- Total number of calls for service dispatched by Carroll County 911 and number responded to by officers with new mobile radios
- Amount of time required to service new mobile radios compared to time required for older radios
- Other major work efforts and activities performed under auspices of project

The grantee is required to submit quarterly Narrative Status Reports on this project. Status reports should describe work completed and work in progress, as well as any impediments preventing the project from being successfully completed at the end of the contract period.

FUNDING: RECOVERY-JAG

DALLAS COUNTY - PATROL VEHICLES: This project supports Dallas County Sheriff's Office purchase of reliable used patrol to replace two older patrol vehicles currently in service. Maintenance cost for the replacement vehicles will be reduced compared to the older vehicles, reducing the Dallas County Sheriff's Office vehicle service budget. This goal will be achieved by completing the following objectives: 1) Improve the reliability of Dallas County Sheriff's Office patrol vehicles; and 2) Improve Dallas County Sheriff's Office visibility to citizens by increasing amount of time expended on patrol.

EVALUATION DESIGN: The grantee will be evaluated on the following criteria:

- Overall project management and support services employed to implement the project
- Timely acquisition, installation, and implementation of new patrol vehicles
- Monthly number of miles traveled and fuel consumed by replacement patrol vehicles
- Monthly number of hours utilized by new vehicles for county patrol
- Number of arrests, traffic citations and warnings issued by officers using replacement patrol vehicle

• Other major work efforts and activities performed under auspices of project

The grantee is required to submit quarterly Narrative Status Reports on this project. Status reports should describe work completed and work in progress, as well as any impediments preventing the project from being successfully completed at the end of the contract period.

FUNDING: JAG

JACKSON COUNTY - DRUG ABATEMENT RESPONSE TEAM (DART): This project continues support to DART, a multi-jurisdictional initiative to identify and shut down drug houses and street level narcotics operations in thirteen municipal jurisdictions in Jackson County. DART provides an interagency mechanism through which residents in Jackson County, Missouri, can report illegal narcotics activity within their respective communities. The goal of this program is to eliminate illegal drug activity in the Jackson County community by coordinating and utilizing several sources. Through these efforts, the quality of life in the target area is restored and protected. Suspected drug activity can be anonymously reported to DART members who then communicate the information to law enforcement for investigation. DART also coordinates street level investigations, buy / bust and reverse sting operations, property fire and housing code inspections of suspected drug houses, and notification of drug activity and its consequences to property owners. Property owner seminars, community presentations, and citizen training given on recognition of drug activities are provided by DART members.

EVALUATION DESIGN: The grantee will be evaluated on the following criteria:

- Overall project management and support services employed to implement the project
- Number of citizen reports of drug activity received by DART
- Number of drug houses and drug distribution operations closed
- Number of property owners trained on drug activity recognition
- Number of buy / bust / reverse sting operations coordinated with Patrol officers, community police, and prosecutors
- Number of property fire hazard and building code inspections completed, and number of notifications of drug activity made to property owners
- Number of community organizations given drug awareness presentations or training
- Other major work efforts and activities performed under auspices of this project

The grantee is required to submit quarterly Narrative Status Reports on this project. Status reports should describe work completed and work in progress, as well as any impediments preventing the project from being successfully completed at the end of the contract period.

FUNDING: JAG

IRON COUNTY - RECORDS MANAGEMENT: This project supports Iron County Sheriff's Office purchase of record management system (RMS) software. This software will provide a standardized system that allows officers to complete all required reports and will maintain required UCR and racial profiling information. The goal of this program is to have a RMS installed to assist Iron County Sheriff's Office with its reporting needs. This goal will be achieved by completing two objectives: 1) Identify and purchase an RMS and implement / integrate this system with existing agency functions; 2) Train all agency personnel on RMS software to enter and maintain reports.

EVALUATION DESIGN: The grantee will be evaluated on the following criteria:

- Overall project management and support services employed to implement the project
- Timely acquisition, installation, and implementation of new RMS
- Amount and type of equipment / technology installed along with training manuals provided
- Number of training hours provided to operators on operation of new RMS and number of agency personnel who received training
- Number of arrests, offenses, and traffic stops entered and maintained in new RMS
- Other major work efforts and activities performed under auspices of this project

The grantee is required to submit quarterly Narrative Status Reports on this project. Status reports should describe work completed and work in progress, as well as any impediments preventing the project from being successfully completed at the end of the contract period.

FUNDING: RECOVERY-JAG

MARIES COUNTY - K9 PATROL CRUISER: This project supports Maries County Sheriff's Office purchase of a reliable cruiser for its new K-9 program. Drug interdiction and officer safety in Maries County will greatly improve with the implementation of a K9 patrol. The goal of this program is provide the K-9 officer and dog with a reliable and adequately equipped vehicle to safely perform their duties. This goal will be achieved by one objective: 1) Purchase and equip a reliable patrol cruiser suitable for K-9 drug interdiction and other duties.

EVALUATION DESIGN: The grantee will be evaluated on the following criteria:

- Overall project management and support services employed to implement the project
- Timely acquisition, installation, and implementation of new K-9 patrol vehicle
- Monthly number of miles traveled and fuel consumed by K-9 patrol vehicle
- Number of drug interdictions, person searches, and other requests responded to by K-9 team
- Number of arrests, traffic citations and warnings issued by officers using K-9 patrol vehicle
- Other major work efforts and activities performed under auspices of project

The grantee is required to submit quarterly Narrative Status Reports on this project. Status reports should describe work completed and work in progress, as well as any impediments preventing the project from being successfully completed at the end of the contract period.

FUNDING: RECOVERY-JAG

MISSOURI STATE HIGHWAY PARTOL - RURAL CRIMES INVESTIGATIVE UNIT: This project supports Missouri State Highway Patrol with the employment of ten criminal investigators and two civilian criminal intelligence analysts. The goal of this program is to maximize statewide coverage by dispersing criminal investigators in six regional geographic areas and centrally locating unit's crime analysts in Jefferson City. This project is to investigate rural crime incidents and to provide assistance to other law enforcement agencies with their investigations of these crimes. This goal will be achieved by completing two objectives 1) Increase personnel assigned to the rural crimes investigation unit by five percent; and 2) Increase the number investigations in fiscal year 12 as compared to prior fiscal year.

EVALUATION DESIGN: The grantee will be evaluated on the following criteria:

- Overall project management and support services employed to implement the project
- Number of rural crime incidents handled by unit in fiscal years 11 and 12, and percent change in number of incidents between years
- Number of rural crime incidents worked in conjunction with other law enforcement agencies
- Number of arrests made as a result of rural crime investigations in fiscal years 11 and 12
- Type and value of property recovered as a result of convictions of offenders arrested from rural crime investigations
- Number of criminal investigators and criminal intelligence analysts assigned to rural crime unit before and after project
- Other major work efforts and activities performed under auspices of project

The grantee is required to submit quarterly Narrative Status Reports on this project. Status reports should describe work completed and work in progress, as well as any impediments preventing the project from being successfully completed at the end of the contract period.

FUNDING: STATE RECOVERY-JAG

MISSOURI STATE HIGHWAY PARTOL - STATE HELICOPTER PROJECT: This project supports Missouri State Highway Patrol's purchase of a new helicopter and helicopter flight simulator to train pilots for normal and emergency situations. This helicopter will be deployed to situations throughout the state and the flight simulator will provide training services to the MSHP and other law enforcement agencies. The goal of this program is to increase the Missouri State Highway Patrol's capability to provide dedicated airborne assets to public safety incidents that threaten life, welfare, and property in Missouri. This goal will be achieved by completing three objectives 1) Provide search and rescue missions upon request within three months of acquisition of helicopter; 2) Enhance citizens and officers safety by providing helicopter pilots' use of live video downlinks and moving maps; 3) Provide helicopter training to law enforcement agencies to ensure pilot safety.

EVALUATION DESIGN: The grantee will be evaluated on the following criteria:

- Overall project management and support services employed to implement the project
- Timely acquisition, installation, and implementation of new Patrol helicopter and helicopter flight simulator
- Number of trainees, agencies, and hours of training provided on helicopter flight simulator
- Number of helicopter flights and flight hours logged to search and rescue operations, criminal investigations, man hunts, and other public safety incidents
- Number of hours of maintenance provided for upkeep of helicopter
- Other major work efforts and activities performed under auspices of project

The grantee is required to submit quarterly Narrative Status Reports on this project. Status reports should describe work completed and work in progress, as well as any impediments preventing the project from being successfully completed at the end of the contract period.

FUNDING: STATE RECOVERY-JAG

* MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCES

- Adair County North Missouri (NOMO) Drug Task Force
- Audrain County East Central Drug Task Force
- Barry County Southwest Missouri Drug Task Force
- Bridgeton City North County MEG Multi-Jurisdiction Drug Task Force
- Buchanan County Drug Strike Force
- Camden County Lake Area Narcotics Enforcement Group (LANEG)
- Clay County Clay County Drug Force
- Cole County Mid-Missouri Unified Strike Team and Narcotics Group (MUSTANG)
- Farmington City Mineral Area Drug Task Force
- Franklin County Narcotics Enforcement Unit
- Greene County Combined Ozarks Multi-Jurisdictional Enforcement Team (COMET)
- Grundy County NITRO Task Force
- Jackson County Multi-Jurisdictional Task Force
- Jasper County Drug Task Force
- Jefferson County Municipal Enforcement Group
- Kansas City Multi-Jurisdictional Task Force
- Lafayette County Narcotics Unit
- Monroe City Northeast Missouri (NEMO) Narcotics Task Force
- Morgan County Mid-Missouri Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Force
- Pemiscot County Bootheel Drug Task Force
- Platte County Multi-Jurisdictional Enforcement Group
- Poplar Bluff City Southeast Missouri (SEMO) Drug Task Force
- St. Charles County Regional Drug Task Force
- St. Louis City Metro Multi-Jurisdictional Undercover Drug Program

- St. Louis County Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Force
- Vernon County Community Narcotics Enforcement Team (CNET)
- West Plains City South Central Drug Task Force

The above grantees are required to submit quarterly Drug Task Force Status Reports on this project. The report format is as follows:

FUNDING: JAG and RECOVERY-JAG

Drug Task Force Status Report

Instructions		
Unless noted otherwise, all data supplied on this quarter	report should correspond to activities occurring within the reporting	g period.
Do not duplicate statistical data that has been reported b	by another participating agency!	
 Organization Investigations/Cases Arrest Breakdown Drug Purchases and Free Samples Informant Expenses Search Warrants Methamphetamine Drug Labs 	s integers and therefore require whole numbers (with the exception	n of currency questions):
The following sections of the report are formatted as dec 1) Free Sample Breakdown 2) Marijuana Eradicated 3) Drug Seizure Breakdown	imals to allow for fractions of a whole number.	
Enter data accordingly. If you receive an error in the for	matting of a decimal field, just insert a decimal behind the number.	For example, the value of 1 would be entered as 1.0.
Organization		
Organization		
Indicate the total number of law enforcement agencies of period.	comprising the multi-jurisdictional task force as well as any others	participating in task force work activities during the reporting
Number of agencies		
Indicate the total number of law enforcement officers (pa	art-time and full-time) comprising the multi-jurisdictional task force	during the reporting period.
Number of officers		
Part Time	e Full Time	
Investigations/Cases		
Number of active investigations/cases at beginning of the quarter		
Number of new investigations/cases	\neg	
intiated this quarter Number of cases disposed this quarter	\neg	
Number cases with evidence submitted	\neg	
to a State Crime Lab		
Arrests		
Total number of persons arrested for one or more drug offenses		
Arrest Breakdown		
	rovide the total number of charges associated with each arrest for	which the individual was picked up. Total charges must equal or
Row	Paraphernalia/Possession	Sales/Manufacture
Marijuana		
Cocaine		
Crack Cocaine		
Methamphetamine		
Heroin/Opiates		
Hallucinogens - LSD		
Hallucinogens - PCP		
Paraphernalia		
Ecstasy		
Psuedoephedrine/Ephedrine		
Anhydrous Ammonia		
Other illicit drugs		

Arrest Breakdown - Other Drugs	5					
If you identified an arrest for "other" illicit dr	ugs, please list the type o	of drug for which the arr	est was made. If reporting	g multiple "other" arrest	s, provide the arrest count	with each type of drug.
				~		
				*		
Drug Purchases and Free Samp	les					
Number of drug buys ma	de					
Dollar value of drug bu	ys \$0.00					
Number of reverse drug buys ma	de					
Dollar value of reverse drug bu	ys \$0.00					
Number of free samples receiv	ed					
Dollar value (estimate) of dru						
received from free samples, based local street value at time receiv						
	_					
Drug Purchase and Free Sampl Based on the numbers identified above, pro		man of drugs paguirad	brough drug huuro rouor	and the human and trace	complete reactived during th	a reporting pariod
based on the numbers identified above, pro	vide the quantities and ty	pes of utuys acquireu i	mough unug buys, revers	se uruq buys, anu nee i	samples received during li	ie reporting period.
Enter the suspected drug type; do not wait for				0,00		
Enter the suspected drug type; do not wait for Row	or scientific lab examinat Kilograms	ion results. Pounds	Ounces	Grams	Doses/Pills	Gallons
			Ounces			
Row			Ounces			
Row Marijuana			Ounces			
Row Marijuana Cocaine			Ounces			
Row Marijuana Cocaine Crack Cocaine			Ounces			
Row Marijuana Cocaine Crack Cocaine Methamphetamine			Ounces			
Row Marijuana Cocaine Crack Cocaine Methamphetamine Heroin/Opiates			Ounces			
Row Marijuana Cocaine Crack Cocaine Methamphetamine Heroin/Opiates Hallucinogens - LSD			Ounces			
Row Marijuana Cocaine Crack Cocaine Methamphetamine Heroin/Opiates Hallucinogens - LSD Hallucinogens - PCP			Ounces			
Row Marijuana Cocaine Crack Cocaine Methamphetamine Heroin/Opiates Hallucinogens - LSD Hallucinogens - PCP Ecstasy			Ounces			
Row Marijuana Cocaine Crack Cocaine Methamphetamine Heroin/Opiates Hallucinogens - LSD Hallucinogens - PCP Ecstasy Psuedoephedrine/Ephedrine			Ounces			
Row Marijuana Cocaine Crack Cocaine Methamphetamine Heroin/Opiates Hallucinogens - LSD Hallucinogens - PCP Ecstasy Psuedoephedrine/Ephedrine Anhydrous Ammonia Other Drugs	Kilograms		Ounces			
Row Marijuana Cocaine Crack Cocaine Methamphetamine Heroin/Opiates Hallucinogens - LSD Hallucinogens - PCP Ecstasy Psuedoephedrine/Ephedrine Anhydrous Ammonia Other Drugs	Kilograms	Pounds		Grams	Doses/Pills	
Row Marijuana Cocaine Crack Cocaine Methamphetamine Heroin/Opiates Hallucinogens - LSD Hallucinogens - PCP Ecstasy Psuedoephedrine/Ephedrine Anhydrous Ammonia Other Drugs	Kilograms	Pounds		Grams	Doses/Pills	
Row Marijuana Cocaine Crack Cocaine Methamphetamine Heroin/Opiates Hallucinogens - LSD Hallucinogens - PCP Ecstasy Psuedoephedrine/Ephedrine Anhydrous Ammonia Other Drugs	Kilograms	Pounds		Grams	Doses/Pills	
Row Marijuana Cocaine Crack Cocaine Methamphetamine Heroin/Opiates Hallucinogens - LSD Hallucinogens - PCP Ecstasy Psuedoephedrine/Ephedrine Anhydrous Ammonia Other Drugs	Kilograms	Pounds		Grams	Doses/Pills	
Row Marijuana Cocaine Crack Cocaine Methamphetamine Heroin/Opiates Hallucinogens - LSD Hallucinogens - PCP Ecstasy Psuedoephedrine/Ephedrine Anhydrous Ammonia Other Drugs	Kilograms	Pounds		Grams	Doses/Pills	
Row Marijuana Cocaine Crack Cocaine Methamphetamine Heroin/Opiates Hallucinogens - LSD Hallucinogens - PCP Ecstasy Psuedoephedrine/Ephedrine Anhydrous Ammonia Other Drugs	Kilograms	Pounds		Grams	Doses/Pills	
Row Marijuana Cocaine Crack Cocaine Methamphetamine Heroin/Opiates Hallucinogens - LSD Hallucinogens - PCP Ecstasy Psuedoephedrine/Ephedrine Anhydrous Ammonia Other Drugs	Kilograms	Pounds		Grams	Doses/Pills	
Row Marijuana Cocaine Crack Cocaine Methamphetamine Heroin/Opiates Hallucinogens - LSD Hallucinogens - PCP Ecstasy Psuedoephedrine/Ephedrine Anhydrous Ammonia Other Drugs	Kilograms	Pounds		Grams	Doses/Pills	
Row Marijuana Cocaine Crack Cocaine Methamphetamine Heroin/Opiates Hallucinogens - LSD Hallucinogens - PCP Ecstasy Psuedoephedrine/Ephedrine Anhydrous Ammonia Other Drugs	Kilograms	Pounds		Grams	Doses/Pills	
Row Marijuana Cocaine Crack Cocaine Methamphetamine Heroin/Opiates Hallucinogens - LSD Hallucinogens - PCP Ecstasy Psuedoephedrine/Ephedrine Anhydrous Ammonia Other Drugs	Kilograms	Pounds		Grams	Doses/Pills	

nformant Eve						
nformant Exp						
Number of	f active informants paid					
Dollar va	lue expended on active					
	informants $\phi 0.00$					
earch Warrar	nts					
Number of sea	rch warrants applied for					
Number of sea	rch warrants authorized					
Number of s	search warrants served					
	search warrants served Ig and/or paraphernalia					
	seizures					
lumber of conse	ent searches conducted					
licate the numbe	r of search warrants served in each	county of your jurisdiction:				
				~		
	177 2 7 2					
icate the types of	f marijuana destroyed through erad		Oupcos		rame	Plante
icate the types of Row		cation operations. Pounds	Ounces	G	rams	Plants
icate the types of Row	f marijuana destroyed through erad		Ounces	G	rams	Plants
licate the types of Row Id Itivated	f marijuana destroyed through erad		Ounces	G	rams	Plants
icate the types of Row d tivated	f marijuana destroyed through erad		Ounces	G	rams	Plants
icate the types of Row d ttivated semilla	f marijuana destroyed through erad Kilograms		Ounces	G	rams	Plants
icate the types of Row d ttivated semilla	f marijuana destroyed through erad		Ounces	G	rams	Plants
icate the types of Row d titvated semilla lethampheta	f marijuana destroyed through erad Kilograms		Ounces	G	rams	Plants
icate the types of Row d titivated semilla lethamphetan Number of me	f marijuana destroyed through erad Kilograms	Pounds		G	rams	Plants
icate the types of Row Id Itivated Isemilla Iethamphetan Number of me	f marijuana destroyed through erad Kilograms	Pounds		G	rams	Plants
icate the types of Row d titivated semilla lethamphetan Number of me	f marijuana destroyed through erad Kilograms	Pounds			rams	Plants
icate the types of Row Id Itivated Isemilla Iethamphetan Number of me	f marijuana destroyed through erad Kilograms	Pounds			rams	Plants
icate the types of Row d titivated semilla lethamphetan Number of me	f marijuana destroyed through erad Kilograms	Pounds			rams	Plants
icate the types of Row Id Itivated Isemilla Iethamphetan Number of me	f marijuana destroyed through erad Kilograms	Pounds			rams	Plants
licate the types of Row Id Itivated Iti	f marijuana destroyed through erad Kilograms	Pounds			rams	Plants
licate the types of Row Id Itivated Iti	f marijuana destroyed through erad Kilograms	Pounds			rams	Plants
dicate the types of Row ild iltivated hsemilla Methamphetan Number of me	f marijuana destroyed through erad Kilograms	Pounds			rams	Plants
dicate the types of Row ild iltivated hsemilla Methamphetan Number of me	f marijuana destroyed through erad Kilograms	Pounds			rams	Plants
Row ild ultivated nsemilla Methamphetan Number of me	f marijuana destroyed through erad Kilograms	Pounds			rams	Plants
dicate the types of Row ild iltivated hsemilla Methamphetan Number of me	f marijuana destroyed through erad Kilograms	Pounds			rams	Plants
licate the types of Row Id Itivated Isemilla Iethamphetan Number of me dicate the number	f marijuana destroyed through erad Kilograms	Pounds			rams	Plants
ticate the types of Row Id Itivated Iti	f marijuana destroyed through erad Kilograms	Pounds			rams	Plants

			reete: (De net melade an	ug buys and free samp	les.) Enter quantities at tim	le of seizure.
Row	Kilograms	Pounds	Ounces	Grams	Doses/Pills	Gallons
rijuana						
caine						
ack Cocaine						
thamphetamine						
roin/Opiates						
lucinogens - LSD						
llucinogens - PCP						
stasy						
uedoephedrine/Ephedrine						
nydrous Ammonia						
ner Drugs						
rug Seizure Breakdown - Oti	her Drugs					
you identified "other" drugs seized as a						
				V		
larrative				V		
				×		
arrative	nterest/concern not reported	in the prior sections.		Y		
Narrative larrative Describe all work activities or areas of in nclude any activities that will assist the I formation or details) a lengthy intelliger proe officers (e.g. SERT, polygraph, cri	Department of Public Safety nce operation, which has not	to properly review and yet resulted in arrests (evaluate the program. Fo or significant drug/asset :	or example, it might be seizures. Describe all s	appropriate to describe (wi pecial training programs co	thout confidential ompleted by task
larrative Describe all work activities or areas of in nclude any activities that will assist the I nformation or details) a lengthy intelliger	Department of Public Safety nce operation, which has not	to properly review and yet resulted in arrests (evaluate the program. Fo or significant drug/asset	or example, it might be seizures. Describe all s	appropriate to describe (wi pecial training programs co	thout confidential ompleted by task
larrative Describe all work activities or areas of in nclude any activities that will assist the I nformation or details) a lengthy intelliger	Department of Public Safety nce operation, which has not	to properly review and yet resulted in arrests (evaluate the program. Fo or significant drug/asset	seizures. Describe all s	appropriate to describe (wi pecial training programs co	thout confidential ompleted by task

* MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL CYBER CRIME TASK FORCES

- Boone County Boone County Sheriff's Department Cyber Crimes Task Force
- Clayton City Regional Computer Crime Education and Enforcement Group (RCCEEG)
- Dent County South Central Missouri Crime Task Force
- Independence City NE Jackson County Cyber Crimes Working Group Against Internet Crime
- Joplin City Southwestern Missouri Cyber Crime Task Force
- Kirksville City Regional Computer Crime Unit
- Missouri Department of Social Services/STAT Operation Cyber-Safe
- Missouri State Highway Patrol Computer Forensic Unit
- Platte County Western Missouri Cyber Crimes Task Force
- Poplar Bluff City Southeast Missouri (SEMO) Cyber Crimes Task Force
- Springfield City 2011 Internet Cyber Crime Initiative
- St. Charles County Internet Crimes Against Children
- St. Louis County St. Louis County Special Investigations Unit
- Stone County Tri-Lakes Regional Internet Crimes Task Force

The above grantees are required to submit quarterly Cyber Crime Task Force Status Reports on this project. The report format is as follows:

FUNDING: MJCCG

Cyber Crime Task Force Status Report

Instructions	
Unless noted otherwise, all data supplied on this quarter report should correspond to activities occurring within the reportin	ng period.
Do not duplicate statistical data that has been reported by another agency!	
Organization	
Indicate the total number of law enforcement agencies comprising the multi-jurisdictional task force as well as any others period.	participating in task force work activities during the reporting
Number of agencies	
Indicate the total number of law enforcement officers (part-time and full-time) comprising the multi-jurisdictional task force	e during the reporting period.
Number of officers	
Part-Time Full-Time	
Investigations/Cases	
Number of active investigations/cases at beginning of the quarter	
Number of new investigations/cases intiated this quarter	
Number of cases disposed this quarter	
Tips/Reports Received from Outside Persons	
Number of tips or reports received from outside persons during reporting period	
Investigations/Cases Referred	
Indicate the number of investigations/cases initiated but referred to other agencies during the quarter	
Row	Total
Other In-State Agencies	
Out-of-State Agencies	
Other Countries	
Federal Agencies	
Other	
Investigations/Cases Referred - Other	
If you identified an investigation/case was referred to an "other" agency, please list the type of agency. If you did not iden	lify an investigation/case being referred to an "other" agency, put
N/A.	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Forensic Examinations	
Forensic Examinations Each hard drive examined shall count as one exam. All other media regardless of size or type (per case) will count as or	e additional exam.
	e additional exam.

Forensic Examinations Breakdown	and the tested wave been of female in
Purpose of above mentioned forensic examinations conducted during reporting period. The total purposes of forensic examinations should equal or exc examinations performed. Click the "Help" icon at the top of the webpage for definitions of the following offenses.	eed the total number of forensic
Row	Total
Distribution/Receipt of Child Pornography	
Possession of Child Pornography	
Production of Child Pornography	
Child Solicitation/Enticement	
Sexual Exploitation of a Minor	
Child Trafficking	
Child Prostitution	
Furnishing Pornographic Materials to Minors	
Failure to Register as a Sex Offender	
Child Molestation	
Sexual Abuse of a Child	
Statutory Rape/Sodomy of a Child	
Other	
Forensic Examinations Breakdown - Other	
If you identified a forensic examination as an "other", please identify the purpose of the forensic examination. If you did not identify a forensic examination	ion as an "other", put N/A.
Cell Phone Analysis	
Number of cell phone analyses	
performed during the quarter	
Arrest Activity	
Number of persons arrested for one or	
more cyber crime offenses during the quarter	
Arrest Activity Breakdown	
Offenses for which the above mentioned persons were arrested during the quarter. The total type of arrests should equal or exceed the total number of a "Help" icon at the top of the webpage for definitions of the following offenses.	arrests indicated above. Click the
Row	Total
Distribution/Receipt of Child Pornography	
Possession of Child Pornography	
Production of Child Pornography	
Child Solicitation/Enticement	
Sexual Exploitation of a Minor	
Child Trafficking	
Child Prostitution	
Furnishing Pornographic Materials to a Minor	
Failure to Register as a Sex Offender	
Child Molestation	
Sexual Abuse of a Child	
Statutory Rape/Sodomy of a Child	
Other	

Arrest Activity Breakdown - Other
If you identified an arrest as "other", please identify the reason for the arrest. If you did not identify an arrest as "other", put N/A.
Child Victims Number of child victims identified during the quarter the quarter
Search Warrants/Visits
Number of search warrants applied for
during the quarter Number of search warrants authorized
during the quarter
Number of search warrants served during the quarter
Number of search warrants served resulting in cyber crime seizures
Number of "knock and talks" performed during the quarter
Court Activity Number of subpoenas served during the
quarter
Computer-Crime Prevention & Education Programs/Presentations Provide the total number provided and total number of attendees for each category listed below. Click the "Help" icon at the top of the webpage for examples of each category. Row Number Provided Number of Attendees Businesses
General Public
Law Enforcement Agencies
Schools
Training
To complete this section, you must first save the form. Then scroll down and click the Add button. List all trainings attended during the reporting period as a result of MJCCG grant funding. Do not mention trainings attended as a result of non-grant monies! Course/Training Name* # of Officers Attended Synopsis of Training
Narrative
Describe all other work activities or areas of interest/concern not reported in the sections above.
M No. Contraction of the second s

Prosecution and Court Programs

The following programs are funded from the JAG Program funding opportunity for the 2011/2012 fiscal year:

ST. LOUIS CITY - DOMESTIC AND SEXUAL ABUSE INVESTIGATION PROJECT: This project continues support of a domestic and sexual abuse investigator to work with the St. Louis Attorney's Office. The investigator will continue to work with two primary Domestic Violence Attorneys and Victim Advocate Caseworkers. This project focuses on 1) personal service of victims by the investigator who will assure the sharing of resource information and available support thus encouraging participation and subsequently reducing the number of cases dismissed for failure to prosecute, and 2) enhanced investigation, evidence, and trial preparation for prosecution.

EVALUATION DESIGN: The grantee will be evaluated on the following criteria:

- Overall project management, training, and services employed to support the project
- Number of domestic violence cases investigated by the St. Louis City Domestic and Sexual Abuse Investigator and prosecuted by the Circuit Attorney Office's Domestic Violence/Sex Crimes Unit
- Rate of change in domestic violence cases prosecuted compared to a like period prior to the grant project
- Number of non-domestic violence cases investigated and prosecuted by the domestic violence team
- Number of domestic violence victims provided information of support services
- Hours expended on domestic violence investigation, evidence collection, and trial preparation
- Other major work effort and activities performed under auspices of the project

The grantee is required to submit quarterly Narrative Status Reports on this project. Status reports should describe work completed and work in progress, as well as any impediments preventing the project from being successfully completed at the end of the contract period.

FUNDING: JAG

Prevention and Education Programs

The following programs are funded from the JAG Program funding opportunity for the 2011/2012 fiscal year:

MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES - CLANDESTINE DRUG LABORATORY COLLECTION STATION: This continuing project supports the Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Services Program in responding to methamphetamine clandestine laboratory clean-up requests. The goal of this project is to increase safety and reduce risk of injury to the staff, the public, and the environment exposed to clandestine laboratories. This goal will be achieved by completing three objectives: 1) Provide proper supplies and reference material to Missouri law enforcement, fire service, and other emergency response officials; 2) Provide supplies for processing and disposal of clandestine drug lab materials to clandestine drug laboratory collection stations; and 3) Provide on-site responses to clandestine methamphetamine laboratory incidents, when requested by law enforcement, fire station, and other emergency officials.

EVALUATION DESIGN: The grantee will be evaluated on the following criteria:

- Overall project management, training, and services employed to support the project
- Amount and type of supplies purchased specifically to reduce methamphetamine laboratory related injuries of emergency responders
- Number of injury and non-injury related laboratory incidents responded to
- Amount and type of supplies purchased specifically for processing and disposal of clandestine drug laboratory materials from clandestine drug laboratory collection stations
- Number of requests for on-site assistance to clandestine methamphetamine laboratory incidents by type of requestor (law enforcement, fire service, and other emergency response officials)
- Number of on-site responses to requests for assistance to clandestine methamphetamine laboratory incidents, by type of requestor (law enforcement, fire service, and other emergency response officials)
- Other major work effort and activities performed under auspices of the project

The grantee is required to submit quarterly Narrative Status Reports on this project. Status reports should describe work completed and work in progress, as well as any impediments preventing the project from being successfully completed at the end of the contract period.

FUNDING: JAG

GREENVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT - SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICER / DARE INSTRUCTOR: This project supports the Greenville Police Department's efforts to increase school safety and drug awareness. The goal of this project is to increase safety and inform school children of the dangers of drugs and alcohol. This goal will be achieved by completing three objectives: 1) Provide an on-site law enforcement officer to ensure a safe school environment for students, faculty, and community; 2) Increase response time for all instances of crime, disorder problems, gangs, and drug activities; and 3) Provide education and guidance in drug and alcohol prevention with DARE program.

FUNDING: JAG

The grantee is required to submit quarterly DARE Status Reports on this project. The report format is as follows:

DARE Status Report

Instructions
Unless noted otherwise, all data supplied on this quarter report should correspond to activities occuring within the reporting period.
Program Support Staff
Number of law enforcement officers certified to teach DARE
Number of law enforcement teaching one or more DARE classes, presentations, or orientations Part Time Full Time
Development/Enhancement
Total number of presentations/events other than those related to core, Junior High Training (JHT), Violence Education Gang Awareness (VEGA), or Senior High Training (SHT) curriculum, visitation instruction, or those mentioned above.
Row Total
Number of in-service orientation presentations to teachers
Number of parent education presentations
Number of community presentations
Number of other presentations/events (describe below)
Other Presentations/Events
Please describe these activities briefly, such as DARE clubs, summer programs, trips, etc.
v
DARE Visitation Work Activities (K to 4th) Question #F refers to the "total number of schools provided visitation for the total contract period". For example, during Quarter 1, you have 3 schools that receive visitation instruction. You would put 3 in #A and #F. During Quarter 2, one school that received visitation instruction in Quarter 1 receives another visitation and a new school receives visitation instruction. You would put 2 in #A but you would put 4 in #F because a total of four schools received visitation during the total contract period.
Question #F refers to the "total number of schools provided visitation for the total contract period". For example, during Quarter 1, you have 3 schools that receive visitation instruction. You would put 3 in #A and #F. During Quarter 2, one school that received visitation instruction in Quarter 1 receives another visitation and a new school receives visitation instruction. You would put 2 in #A but you would put 4 in #F because a total of four schools received visitation during the total contract period. Row Total
Question #F refers to the "total number of schools provided visitation for the total contract period". For example, during Quarter 1, you have 3 schools that receive visitation instruction. You would put 3 in #A and #F. During Quarter 2, one school that received visitation instruction in Quarter 1 receives another visitation and a new school receives visitation instruction. You would put 2 in #A but you would put 4 in #F because a total of four schools received visitation during the total contract period. Total Row Total A. Number of schools provided visitation instruction
Question #F refers to the "total number of schools provided visitation for the total contract period". For example, during Quarter 1, you have 3 schools that receive visitation instruction. You would put 3 in #A and #F. During Quarter 2, one school that received visitation instruction in Quarter 1 receives another visitation and a new school receives visitation instruction. You would put 2 in #A but you would put 4 in #F because a total of four schools received visitation during the total contract period. Row Total A. Number of schools provided visitation instruction
Question #F refers to the "total number of schools provided visitation for the total contract period". For example, during Quarter 1, you have 3 schools that receive visitation instruction. You would put 3 in #A and #F. During Quarter 2, one school that received visitation instruction in Quarter 1 receives another visitation and a new school receives visitation instruction. You would put 2 in #A but you would put 4 in #F because a total of four schools received visitation during the total contract period. Total Row Total A. Number of schools provided visitation instruction
Question #F refers to the "total number of schools provided visitation for the total contract period". For example, during Quarter 1, you have 3 schools that receive visitation instruction. You would put 3 in #A and #F. During Quarter 2, one school that received visitation instruction in Quarter 1 receives another visitation and a new school receives visitation instruction. You would put 2 in #A but you would put 4 in #F because a total of four schools received visitation during the total contract period. Total Row Total A. Number of schools provided visitation instruction
Question #F refers to the "total number of schools provided visitation for the total contract period". For example, during Quarter 1, you have 3 schools that receive visitation instruction. You would put 3 in #A and #F. During Quarter 2, one school that received visitation instruction in Quarter 1 receives another visitation and a new school receives visitation instruction. You would put 2 in #A but you would put 4 in #F because a total of four schools received visitation during the total contract period. Total Row Total A. Number of schools provided visitation instruction
Question #F refers to the "total number of schools provided visitation for the total contract period". For example, during Quarter 1, you have 3 schools that receive visitation instruction. You would put 3 in #A and #F. During Quarter 2, one school that received visitation instruction in Quarter 1 receives another visitation and a new school receives visitation instruction. You would put 2 in #A but you would put 4 in #F because a total of four schools received visitation during the total contract period. Total Row Total A. Number of schools provided visitation instruction
Question #F refers to the "total number of schools provided visitation for the total contract period". For example, during Quarter 1, you have 3 schools that receive visitation instruction. You would put 3 in #A and #F. During Quarter 2, one school that received visitation instruction in Quarter 1 receives another visitation and a new school receives visitation instruction. You would put 2 in #A but you would put 4 in #F because a total of four schools received visitation during the total contract period. Total Row Total A. Number of schools provided visitation instruction
Question #F refers to the "total number of schools provided visitation for the total contract period". For example, during Quarter 1, you have 3 schools that receive visitation instruction. You would put 3 in #A and #F. During Quarter 2, one school that received visitation instruction in Quarter 1 receives another visitation and a new school receives visitation instruction. You would put 2 in #A but you would put 4 in #F because a total of four schools received visitation during the total contract period. Total Row Total A. Number of schools provided visitation instruction
Question #F refers to the "total number of schools provided visitation for the total contract period". For example, during Quarter 1, you have 3 schools that receive visitation instruction. You would put 3 in #A and #F. During Quarter 2, one school that received visitation during the total contract period. Row Total A. Number of schools provided visitation instruction Row Contract period Image: Contract period B. Number of schools provided visitation instruction Image: Contract period C. Number of schools provided visitation instruction Image: Contract period D. Number of students who completed the course of visitation instruction Image: Contract period E. Number of students who completed the course of visitation instruction Image: Contract period D. Number of students who completed the course of visitation instruction Image: Contract period E. Number of students who completed the course of visitation instruction Image: Contract period D. Number of students who completed the course of visitation instruction Image: Contract period D. Number of schools provided visitation instruction Image: Contract period D. Number of schools provided visitation instruction Image: Contract period D. Number of students who completed the course of visitation instruction Image: Contract period Daret for bours of visitation instruction for tota
Question #F refers to the "total number of schools provided visitation for the total contract period". For example, during Quarter 1, you have 3 schools that receive visitation instruction. You would put 3 in #A and #F. During Quarter 2, one school that received visitation instruction in Quarter 1 receives another visitation and a new school receives visitation instruction. You would put 3 in #A and #F. During Quarter 2, one school that received visitation instruction in Quarter 1 receives another visitation and a new school receives visitation instruction. You would put 4 in #F because a total of four schools received visitation during the total contract period. Row Total A Number of schools provided visitation instruction
Question #F refers to the "total number of schools provided visitation for the total contract period". For example, during Quarter 1, you have 3 schools that receive visitation instruction. You would put 3 in #A and #F. During Quarter 2, one school that received visitation instruction in Quarter 1 receives another visitation and a new school receives visitation instruction. You would put 4 in #F because a total of four schools received visitation during the total contract period. Row Total A Number of schools provided visitation instruction
Question #F refers to the "total number of schools provided visitation for the total contract period". For example, during Quarter 1, you have 3 schools that receive visitation instruction. You would put 3 in #A and #F. During Quarter 2, one school that received visitation instruction in Quarter 1 receives another visitation and a new school receives visitation instruction. You would put 2 in #A but you would put 4 in #F because a total of four schools received visitation during the total contract period. Total A Number of schools provided visitation instruction
Question #F refers to the "total number of schools provided visitation for the total contract period". For example, during Quarter 1, you have 3 schools that receive visitation instruction. You would put 3 in #A and #F. During Quarter 2, one school that received visitation instruction in Quarter 1 receives another visitation and a new school receives visitation instruction. You would put 4 in #F because a total of four schools preceived visitation during the total contract period. Row Total A Number of schools provided visitation instruction
Question #F refers to the "total number of schools provided visitation for the total contract period". For example, during Quarter 1, you have 3 schools that receive visitation instruction. You would put 3 in #A and #F. During Quarter 2, one school that received visitation in Guarter 1 receives another visitation and a new school receives visitation instruction. You would put 4 in #F because a total of four schools previded visitation uning the total contract period. Row Total A Number of schools provided visitation instruction
Question #F refers to the *total number of schools provided visitation for the total contract period." For example, during Quarter 1, you have 3 schools that receive visitation instruction. You would put 3 in #A and #F. During Quarter 2, one school that received visitation during the total contract period. Number of schools provided visitation instruction Row Total A Number of schools provided visitation instruction Image: Contract period. Total A Number of schools provided visitation instruction Image: Contract period. Total A Number of schools provided visitation instruction Image: Contract period. Image: Contract period. C. Number of schools provided visitation instruction Image: Contract period. Image: Contract period. D. Number of schools provided visitation instruction Image: Contract period. Image: Contract period. D. Number of students who completed the course of visitation instruction Image: Contract period. Image: Contract period. D. Number of schools provided visitation instruction Image: Contract period. Image: Contract period. Image: Contract period. DARE Core Work Activities (Sth to Sth) Emplement of officer to student consultations." Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administrator concerning drug problem sites are or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations. Note that que

Most DARE programs focus on 5th and 6th grades, but if your program has adopted a VEGA curriculum, please indicate that activity in this section.		
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administra problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations.	tor concerning d	lrug
Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period. Row	Tot	al
A. Number of schools provided Violence Education Gang Awareness (VEGA) curriculum		
B. Number of classes provided VEGA curriculum		
C. Number of students completing VEGA course of education		
D. Number of students de-selected from the VEGA course of education		
E. Number of hours of VEGA curriculum instruction		
F. Number of officer/student consultations		
G. Number of schools provided VEGA curriculum for total contract period		
H. Number of classes provided VEGA curriculum for total contract period		
Junior High DARE Work Activities (7th to 9th) Most DARE programs focus on 5th and 6th grades, but if your program has adopted a JHT curriculum for junior high schools, please indicate that activity in this se	ection.	
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administra problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations.	tor concerning di	lrug
Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period.		
Row	Total	
A. Number of schools provided Junior High Training (JHT) curriculum		
B. Number of classes provided JHT curriculum		
C. Number of students who completed the JHT course of education		
D. Number of students de-selected from the JHT course of education		
E. Number of hours of JHT curriculum instruction		
F. Number of officer/student consultations		
G. Number of schools provided JHT curriculum for total contract period		
H. Number of classes provided JHT curriculum for total contract period		
High School DARE Work Activities (9th to 12th) Most DARE programs focus on 5th and 6th grades, but if your program has adopted a SHT curriculum for high schools, please indicate that activity in this section.		
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administra problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations.	tor concerning d	lrug
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administra problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations. Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period.		
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administra problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations. Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period. Row	tor concerning di	
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administration problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations. Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period. Row A. Number of schools provided Senior High Training (SHT) curriculum		
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administration problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations. Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period. Row A. Number of schools provided Senior High Training (SHT) curriculum B. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum		
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administration problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations. Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period. Row A. Number of schools provided Senior High Training (SHT) curriculum B. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum C. Number of students who completed the SHT course of education		
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administrate problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations. Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period. Row A. Number of schools provided Senior High Training (SHT) curriculum B. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum C. Number of students who completed the SHT course of education D. Number of students de-selected from the SHT course of education		
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administration problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations. Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period. Row A. Number of schools provided Senior High Training (SHT) curriculum B. Number of students who completed the SHT course of education D. Number of students de-selected from the SHT course of education E. Number of hours of SHT curriculum instruction		
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administration problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations. Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period. Row A. Number of schools provided Senior High Training (SHT) curriculum B. Number of students who completed the SHT course of education D. Number of students de-selected from the SHT course of education E. Number of hours of SHT curriculum instruction F. Number of officer/student consultations		
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administration problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations. Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period. Row A. Number of schools provided Senior High Training (SHT) curriculum B. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum C. Number of students who completed the SHT course of education D. Number of students de-selected from the SHT course of education E. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of schools provided SHT curriculum instruction F. Number of schools provided SHT curriculum for total contract period		
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administration problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations. Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period. Row A. Number of schools provided Senior High Training (SHT) curriculum B. Number of students who completed the SHT course of education D. Number of students de-selected from the SHT course of education E. Number of hours of SHT curriculum instruction F. Number of officer/student consultations		
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administration problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations. Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period. Row A. Number of schools provided Senior High Training (SHT) curriculum B. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum C. Number of students who completed the SHT course of education D. Number of students de-selected from the SHT course of education E. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of schools provided SHT curriculum instruction F. Number of schools provided SHT curriculum for total contract period		
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administration problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations. Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period. Row A. Number of schools provided Senior High Training (SHT) curriculum B. Number of students who completed the SHT course of education D. Number of students de-selected from the SHT course of education E. Number of students de-selected from the SHT course of education F. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of schools provided SHT curriculum instruction F. Number of schools provided SHT curriculum for total contract period H. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum for total contract period H. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum for total contract period		
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administration problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations. Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period. Row A. Number of schools provided Senior High Training (SHT) curriculum B. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum C. Number of students who completed the SHT course of education D. Number of students de-selected from the SHT course of education E. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of students de-selected from the SHT course of education F. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of students de-selected from the SHT course of education F. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of schools provided SHT curriculum for total contract period H. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum for total contract period H. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum for total contract period		
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administration problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations. Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period. Row A Number of schools provided Senior High Training (SHT) curriculum B. Number of classes provided Senior High Training (SHT) curriculum C. Number of students who completed the SHT course of education D. Number of students de-selected from the SHT course of education E. Number of flicer/student consultations G. Number of schools provided SHT curriculum instruction F. Number of schools provided SHT curriculum for total contract period H. Number of schools provided SHT curriculum for total contract period M. Number of schools provided SHT curriculum for total contract period M. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum for total contract period M. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum for total contract period M. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum for total contract period Marrative	Viithout confider	1 ntial
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administration problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations. Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period. Row A. Number of schools provided Senior High Training (SHT) curriculum B. Number of students who completed the SHT course of education D. Number of students who completed the SHT course of education D. Number of students de-selected from the SHT course of education E. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum instruction F. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum for total contract period H. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum for total contract period H. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum for total contract period H. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum for total contract period H. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum for total contract period H. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum for total contract period H. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum for total contract period H. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum for total contract period H. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum for total contract period Include any activities or areas of interest/concern not reported in the prior sections. Include any activities that will assist the Department of Public Safety to properly review and evaluate the program. For example, it might be appropriate to describe information or details) a lengthy intelligence operation, which has not yet resulted in arrests or significant drug/asset seizures. Describe all special training program	Viithout confider	1 ntial
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administration problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations. Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period. Row A Number of schools provided Senior High Training (SHT) curriculum B. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum C. Number of students who completed the SHT course of education D. Number of students de-selected from the SHT course of education E. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of schools provided SHT curriculum for total contract period H. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum for total contract period Narrative Narrative Describe all work activities or areas of interest/concern not reported in the prior sections. Include any activities that will assist the Department of Public Safety to properly review and evaluate the program. For example, it might be appropriate to describe information or details) a lengthy intelligence operation, which has not yet resulted in arrests or significant drug/asset seizures. Describe all special training program force officers (e.g. SERT, polygraph, criminal prosecution classes, etc).	Viithout confider	1 ntial
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administration problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations. Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period. Row A Number of schools provided Senior High Training (SHT) curriculum B. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum C. Number of students who completed the SHT course of education D. Number of students de-selected from the SHT course of education E. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of schools provided SHT curriculum for total contract period H. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum for total contract period Narrative Narrative Describe all work activities or areas of interest/concern not reported in the prior sections. Include any activities that will assist the Department of Public Safety to properly review and evaluate the program. For example, it might be appropriate to describe information or details) a lengthy intelligence operation, which has not yet resulted in arrests or significant drug/asset seizures. Describe all special training program force officers (e.g. SERT, polygraph, criminal prosecution classes, etc).	Viithout confider	1 ntial
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administration problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations. Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period. Row A Number of schools provided Senior High Training (SHT) curriculum B. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum C. Number of students who completed the SHT course of education D. Number of students de-selected from the SHT course of education E. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of schools provided SHT curriculum for total contract period H. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum for total contract period Narrative Narrative Describe all work activities or areas of interest/concern not reported in the prior sections. Include any activities that will assist the Department of Public Safety to properly review and evaluate the program. For example, it might be appropriate to describe information or details) a lengthy intelligence operation, which has not yet resulted in arrests or significant drug/asset seizures. Describe all special training program force officers (e.g. SERT, polygraph, criminal prosecution classes, etc).	Viithout confider	1 ntial
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administration problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations. Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period. Row A Number of schools provided Senior High Training (SHT) curriculum B. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum C. Number of students who completed the SHT course of education D. Number of students de-selected from the SHT course of education E. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of schools provided SHT curriculum for total contract period H. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum for total contract period Narrative Narrative Describe all work activities or areas of interest/concern not reported in the prior sections. Include any activities that will assist the Department of Public Safety to properly review and evaluate the program. For example, it might be appropriate to describe information or details) a lengthy intelligence operation, which has not yet resulted in arrests or significant drug/asset seizures. Describe all special training program force officers (e.g. SERT, polygraph, criminal prosecution classes, etc).	Viithout confider	1 ntial
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administration problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations. Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period. Row A Number of schools provided Senior High Training (SHT) curriculum B. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum C. Number of students who completed the SHT course of education D. Number of students de-selected from the SHT course of education E. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of schools provided SHT curriculum for total contract period H. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum for total contract period Narrative Narrative Describe all work activities or areas of interest/concern not reported in the prior sections. Include any activities that will assist the Department of Public Safety to properly review and evaluate the program. For example, it might be appropriate to describe information or details) a lengthy intelligence operation, which has not yet resulted in arrests or significant drug/asset seizures. Describe all special training program force officers (e.g. SERT, polygraph, criminal prosecution classes, etc).	Viithout confider	1 ntial
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administration problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations. Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period. Row A Number of schools provided Senior High Training (SHT) curriculum B. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum C. Number of students who completed the SHT course of education D. Number of students de-selected from the SHT course of education E. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of schools provided SHT curriculum for total contract period H. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum for total contract period Narrative Narrative Describe all work activities or areas of interest/concern not reported in the prior sections. Include any activities that will assist the Department of Public Safety to properly review and evaluate the program. For example, it might be appropriate to describe information or details) a lengthy intelligence operation, which has not yet resulted in arrests or significant drug/asset seizures. Describe all special training program force officers (e.g. SERT, polygraph, criminal prosecution classes, etc).	Viithout confider	1 ntial
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administration problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations. Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period. Row A Number of schools provided Senior High Training (SHT) curriculum B. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum C. Number of students who completed the SHT course of education D. Number of students de-selected from the SHT course of education E. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of schools provided SHT curriculum for total contract period H. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum for total contract period Narrative Narrative Describe all work activities or areas of interest/concern not reported in the prior sections. Include any activities that will assist the Department of Public Safety to properly review and evaluate the program. For example, it might be appropriate to describe information or details) a lengthy intelligence operation, which has not yet resulted in arrests or significant drug/asset seizures. Describe all special training program force officers (e.g. SERT, polygraph, criminal prosecution classes, etc).	Viithout confider	1 ntial
#F refers to "total number of officer to student consultations". Consultations would be one-on-one discussions with students at their request or though an administration problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations. Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period. Row A Number of schools provided Senior High Training (SHT) curriculum B. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum C. Number of students who completed the SHT course of education D. Number of students de-selected from the SHT course of education E. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of officer/student consultations G. Number of schools provided SHT curriculum for total contract period H. Number of classes provided SHT curriculum for total contract period Narrative Narrative Describe all work activities or areas of interest/concern not reported in the prior sections. Include any activities that will assist the Department of Public Safety to properly review and evaluate the program. For example, it might be appropriate to describe information or details) a lengthy intelligence operation, which has not yet resulted in arrests or significant drug/asset seizures. Describe all special training program force officers (e.g. SERT, polygraph, criminal prosecution classes, etc).	Viithout confider	1 ntial

Corrections and Community Corrections Programs

No projects are being funding under this purpose area during the 2011/2012 funding period.

Drug Treatment Programs

The following program is funded from the JAG Program funding opportunity for the 2011/2012 fiscal year:

STONE COUNTY PROSECUTING ATTORNEY - DRUG / ALCOHOL OFFENDER PROGRAM: This new project supports the Stone County Prosecuting Attorney's office response to offenders and multiple offenders of drug or alcohol related charges. The goal of this project is to address the gap in the current prosecution/treatment model for alcohol/drug offenders. This goal will be achieved by completing three objectives: 1) Provide a drug court to process serious drug offenders; 2) Enhance disposed drug offenders' probation through a combination of probation and parole; and 3) Provide monitoring and supervision through the prosecutor's office.

EVALUATION DESIGN: The grantee will be evaluated on the following criteria:

- Overall project management, training, and services employed to support the project
- Timely implementation of Stone County drug court
- Number of drug / alcohol offenders participating in drug court
- Number of offenders successfully completing drug court
- Number of drug test given and percent of positive test results
- Number of cases monitored by prosecutor's office as part of this program
- Other major work efforts and activities performed under auspices of project

The grantee is required to submit quarterly Narrative Status Reports on this project. Status reports should describe work completed and work in progress, as well as any impediments preventing the project from being successfully completed at the end of the contract period.

FUNDING: JAG

Planning, Evaluation, And Technology Improvement Programs

The following programs are funded from the JAG Program funding opportunity for the 2011/2012 fiscal year:

CREVE COEUR POLICE DEPARTMENT - AUTOMATING EVIDENCE MANAGMENT: This new project supports the Creve Coeur Police Department's purchase of a new automated evidence management system. The goal of this project is to increase efficiency and reduce time spent on evidence maintenance. This goal will be achieved by completing three objectives: 1) Provide an efficient evidence processing system that saves case prosecution time and money; 2) Maintain a thorough and accountable evidence chain of custody; and 3) Improve the city's prosecution of criminal cases.

EVALUATION DESIGN: The grantee will be evaluated on the following criteria:

- Overall project management, training, and services employed to support the project
- Timely acquisition, installation, and implementation of new automated evidence management system
- Number of evidence items logged into and purged from evidence management system
- Number of man hours expended on maintenance of evidence management system
- Amount and type of equipment / technology installed and training manuals provided
- Number of training hours provided to operators of the evidence management system
- Other major work efforts and activities performed under auspices of project

The grantee is required to submit quarterly Narrative Status Reports on this project. Status reports should describe work completed and work in progress, as well as any impediments preventing the project from being successfully completed at the end of the contract period.

FUNDING: JAG

MO STATE HIGHWAY PATROL (MSHP) - ADMINISTRATIVE DATA ANALYSIS & PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM: This continuing project involves establishing a series of policies, procedures, systems, and reporting recommendations. The State of Missouri will effectively manage the JAG and Recovery-JAG Programs by analyzing drug and violent crime environments in the State; assessing effectiveness of existing programs; and offering data and interpretive analysis support for development of new programs. The MSHP, coordinating their activities with DPS's CJ/LE Program staff, will complete the following project goals: 1) Provide base-line information to properly assess Missouri's illicit drug and violent crime problems; 2) Support successful administration of Missouri's JAG and Recovery-JAG Programs by providing needed research, evaluation, and data processing services; 3) Develop and implement Missouri's UCR data collection application and output report application; and 4) Enhance capabilities of Missouri's criminal justice information systems in supporting statewide illicit drug and violent crime problems and grant administration.

EVALUATION DESIGN: The grantee will be evaluated on the following criteria:

- Overall project management, training, and support services employed to implement the project.
- Assistance provided in successful development and/or modification of Missouri's drug and violent crime strategy required under the JAG and Recovery-JAG Program including, but not limited to, conducting a statewide illicit drug and violent crime problem analysis and developing an annual grant report
- Number of research services provided to DPS, Missouri criminal justice authorities, and other public officials
- Assistance provided in development and implementation of evaluation criteria and information systems for programs supported under the JAG and Recovery-JAG Programs. Publication of a report describing all approved evaluation designs
- Technical assistance provided in maintenance of UCR summary-based information system input, file maintenance, and output software
- Technical assistance provided for UCR training and report requirements, quality assurance

reviews/audits, and assistance to local agencies in reporting procedures

- Number of seminars and conferences attended in support of the JAG and Recovery-JAG Programs
- Other major work effort and activities performed under auspices of this project

The grantee is required to submit quarterly Narrative Status Reports on this project. Status reports should describe work completed and work in progress, as well as any impediments preventing the project from being successfully completed at the end of the contract period.

FUNDING: JAG

MO DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS - ENHANCING SAFETY IN DAI: This new project is intended for the acquisition of UHF and VHF base stations, hand-held radios, and desktop consoles for 14 institutions to replace and improve outdated radio systems. The goals of this project include: 1) to improve institutional security, 2) ensure compliance with FCC narrowband regulations, and 3) improve public safety by allowing radio interoperability with outside law enforcement agencies. These goals will be achieved by the following objectives: 1) ensuring the department institutions have radio systems compliant with FCC mandates, 2) decreasing incidents of equipment failure, 3) decreasing dead spots in identified institutions, and 4) ensuring staff have the ability to communicate with other institutions and other law enforcement agencies.

EVALUATION DESIGN: The grantee will be evaluated on the following criteria:

- Overall project management, training, and services employed to support the project
- Timely acquisition, installation, and implementation of new radio systems
- Number of incidents of equipment failure
- Number of dead spots in department institutions
- Amount and type of equipment / technology installed and training manuals provided
- Number of training hours provided to operators of the radio systems
 - Other major work efforts and activities performed under auspices of project

The grantee is required to submit quarterly Narrative Status Reports on this project. Status reports should describe work completed and work in progress, as well as any impediments preventing the project from being successfully completed at the end of the contract period.

FUNDING: STATE RECOVERY-JAG

Crime Victim and Witness Programs

No projects are being funding under this purpose area during the 2011 / 2012 funding period.

Crime Laboratory Projects

Although not funded from the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) program, Missouri crime laboratories are included in this report because analysis of evidence is a key to the successful prosecution of drug offenders. In addition, data collected from crime laboratories can be an invaluable resource for analyzing Missouri's illicit drug problem. Several crime laboratories receive funding from the state-funded Missouri Crime Lab Upgrade Program (MCLUP) grant administered by the DPS - CJ/LE Program. These grants provide state-of-the-art equipment, supplies, and manpower to regional crime laboratories and their funding source follows. The anticipated achievements of crime laboratories receiving MCLUP grant funding are then described in detail.

The following crime laboratories are required to submit quarterly Crime Lab Status Reports:

INDEPENDENCE POLICE DEPARTMENT: This project supports the purchase of equipment that will be used daily in the Independence Crime Laboratory for drug and other analyses. Purchased equipment includes a Nicolet iS10 FT-IR spectrometer. Supply items include one capillary column.

The Nicolet iS10 FT-IR spectrometer is a vital instrument that is used for identification and verification of a variety of narcotics substances with minimal investment in time for preparation and analysis run time. The equipment is necessary as it will provide identification and verification of narcotic substances for surrounding counties.

The items mentioned above will improve the Independence Missouri Crime Laboratory's ability to provide quality services to the citizens of the community and will be used for many years.

KANSAS CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT: This project will support supplies and contractual services funding lost to severe budget shortfalls of the Kansas City Crime Laboratory.

The crime laboratory has identified several areas in personnel and supplies without a funding source that will be removed from the upcoming budget. If these areas are not funded, the productivity, efficiency and the effectiveness of the entire crime laboratory would be affected in a negative manner. For this reason, the Kansas City Crime Laboratory is seeking funding sources to supplement this deficit to maintain the current level of quality service that is provided.

Other items include memberships in professional societies that promote an exchange of information.

- MISSOURI STATE HIGHWAY PATROL (MSHP): This project supports the purchase of new equipment, maintenance and/or consumables utilized during the analysis of evidence. The Missouri State Highway Patrol provides analysis of evidence submitted by law enforcement agencies from all areas of the state. This evidence may be examined at any one of the eight (8) laboratories operated by the Patrol. The MCLUP funds are used to purchase new equipment, maintenance and/or consumables utilized during the analysis of evidence. Missouri State Highway Patrol Crime Laboratory Division provides analysis of evidence submitted by law enforcement agencies from all areas of evidence.
- ST. CHARLES COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE: This project is a crime laboratory upgrade program for the employment of an additional forensic scientist for the overall existing level of forensic services provided by the St. Charles County Sheriff's Department Criminalistics Laboratory.
- ST. LOUIS METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT: This project supports the employment of personnel for the Latent Print Unit and purchase and upgrade of laboratory equipment that will increase the analytical capacity of the St. Louis Metropolitan Crime Laboratory. The St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department moved to a new facility in 2005 and many computers were purchased at that time. These computers should be replaced as they have now become out dated and no longer have optimal efficiency. Due to this newer technology, compatible laser printers, barcode scanners and printers and flat bed scanner will be purchased as well.

The St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department also will purchase computers to replace its old computers. The crime laboratory will purchase new Kardex filing units and will upgrade video surveillance cameras both inside and on the exterior of the laboratory.

✤ <u>ST. LOUIS COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT</u>: This project supports the St. Louis County Crime Laboratory that provides forensic services to the over one million citizens of St. Louis County. The laboratory provides support and forensic services to the unincorporated areas of St. Louis County and to the 91 municipalities and 60 law enforcement agencies within St. Louis County. Additionally, the laboratory provides forensic services to any federal law enforcement agency conducting criminal investigations within the Eastern District of Missouri.

The MCLUP Grant funding continues to afford the St. Louis County Police Department the opportunity to enhance personnel at our Police Crime Laboratory by providing funding for one Forensic Scientist position.

Funding from this grant will also assist with the purchase of a hydrogen generator, two digital ovens, a microbalance and printer, a large bench top balance and printer, and four stereoscopes, each with a carmera. The additional instrumentation will provide analysis capabilities currently unavailable to the Police Crime Laboratory and will greatly increase the efficiency at which drug cases are analyzed.

Overall, the funding form the MCLUP Grant will be used to reduce the Drug and Fire Debris case backlog and proved services currently unavailable to the Police Crime Laboratory.

Crime Lab Status Report

Instructions	
Unless noted otherwise, all data supplied on this quarter report should correspond to activities occuring within the	he reporting period.
Do not duplicate statistical data that has been reported by another agency!	
Cases/Examinations	
Row	Number of Cases
Number of cases in which all requested examinations were completed (sum of A, B, & C)	
A. Number of cases where no tests for illicit drugs were requested	
B. Number of cases where illicit drug exams were requested/tested and none were identified	
C. Number of cases where illicit drug exams were requested/tested and one or more drugs were identified	
Number of active cases pending at the end of the reporting period	
Cases - Clandestine Laboratory operation related	
Identify the number of cases completed during the reporting period in which the following illicit drugs and/or prec operation.	ursors were detected while being produced in a Clandestine Laboratory
Row	Number of Cases
Methamphetamine Final Product only	
Methamphetamine Precursors only	
Methamphetamine Precursors and Final product	
LSD	
PCP	
Other Illicit Drugs	
Cases - Not Clandestine Laboratory operation related	
Identify the number of cases completed during reporting period, that were not directly related to Clandestine Lab. Row	o operation production, by types of illicit drugs Number of Cases
Marijuana	Number of Odses
Cocaine Powder	
Crack	
Methamphetamine	
Heroin/Opiates	
LSD	
PCP	
Other Illicit Drugs	
Average Processing Time	
NOTE: Processing time is from the date case was received to date it was considered completed	
Of all cases completed during the reporting period where illicit drugs were suspected, what was the average processing time (in days)?	
New Drugs	
Were any new illicit drugs identified in the cases completed during the O Yes O No reporting period?	

New Drugs	
If you marked Yes to the above question, list the classification the drug falls into, such as hallucin	e name of the new drug, the number of cases where it was detected, and a description of the new drug. The description should include the ogen, inhalant, etc.
Name*	
No. of cases*	
Description*	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Old Drugs	
If yes, please list below	
Did you notice any resurgence of older	
drugs in the cases completed during the reporting period?	○ Yes ○ No
Old Drugs	
If you marked Yes to the above question, list the	name of the older drug, the number of cases where it was detected, and a description of the new drug. The description should include the
classification the drug falls into, such as hallucin	ogen, inhalant, etc.
Name*	
No. of cases*	
Description*	
	<u> </u>
Equipment	
List the types of laboratory equipment acquired	<u>vith grant funds</u> during the reporting period.
Provide as much information as is available duri Operational. Continue to include the item in your	ing the reporting period. If an item has been ordered but not yet received and/or installed, indicate TBA under Date Received or Date quarterly reporting until it is fully operational.
Item*	
Quantitut	
Quantity*	
Date Ordered	
Date Received	
Date Operational	
Newstern	
Narrative	
Describe all work activities or areas of interest/ and evaluate your program.	concern not reported in the sections above. Provide any information that can be used by the Department of Public Safety to properly review
	Y .

Attachment A

Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Forces FY11 Summary Report

TABLE 1 INVOLVEMENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS/AGENCIES BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

QUARTER

		QT	R 1		QTR2					QTR3			
	TOTAL LE AGENCIES IN TASK FORCE	PART TIME LE OFFICERS	FULL TIME LE OFFICERS	TOTAL LE OFFICERS		PART TIME LE OFFICERS	FULL TIME LE OFFICERS	TOTAL LE OFFICERS		PART TIME LE	FULL TIME LE OFFICERS	TOTAL LE OFFICERS	TOTAL LE AGENCIES IN TASK FORCE
	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ
DRUG TASK FORCE													
N COUNTY MUNICPAL ENF GRP-BRIDGETON	4	0	4	4	4	0	5	5	4	0	5	5	3
BUCHANAN CO DRUG STRIKE FORCE	6	0	12	12	6	0	12	12	6	0	12	12	6
LAKE AREA NARCOTICS ENF GRP	8	2	7	9	9	0	7	7	9	1	6	7	9
COMBINED OZARKS MULTIJUR ENF TEAM- GREENE CO	39	1	15	16	39	1	12	13	39	2	12	14	39
JACKSON CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	14	0	19	19	14	0	18	18	14	0	16	16	14
JASPER CO DRUG TASK FORCE	4	0	5	5	4	0	5	5	5	0	5	5	5
NARC. ACTIVITIES													

REDCTN. COALTN.-

JEFFERSON CO	7	0	10	10) 7		0 1	0 10) 7		0 10) 10	0
KC MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	3	1	4	5	3		1	4 (5 3		1 4	. 5	i 3
LAFAYETTE CO NARCOTICS UNIT	7	0	4	4	7		0	4 4	i 7		0 4	4	7
MID-MO UNIFIED STRIKE TEAM/NARC GRP	8	2	9	11	8	2	9	11	8	7	9	16	8
MINERAL AREA DRUG TASK FORCE	10	0	7	7	10	0	7	7	10	0	8	8	10
SW MO DRUG TASK Force	14	0	5	5	14	0	5	5	14	0	5	5	14
CLAY COUNTY DRUG TASK FORCE	14	1	5	6	14	1	5	6	14	1	5	6	14
NE MO NARCOTICS TASK FORCE	8	0	6	6	8	0	6	6	8	0	6	6	8
BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK FORCE	5	0	7	7	5	0	7	7	5	0	7	7	5
PLATTE CO MULTIJUR ENF GRP	9	2	4	6	9	2	4	6	9	2	4	6	9
SE MISSOURI DRUG TASK FORCE	24	0	16	16	24	0	16	16	24	0	16	16	32

(Continued)

TABLE 1 INVOLVEMENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS/AGENCIES BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

QUARTER

		QT	R 1		QTR2					QTR3			
	TOTAL LE AGENCIES IN TASK FORCE		FULL TIME LE OFFICERS	TOTAL LE OFFICERS		PART TIME LE	FULL TIME LE OFFICERS	TOTAL LE OFFICERS		PART TIME LE OFFICERS	FULL TIME LE OFFICERS	TOTAL LE OFFICERS	
	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ
DRUG TASK FORCE													
ST CHARLES CO REG. DRUG TASK FORCE	7	0	13	13	7	0	13	13	7	0	13	13	7
STL CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	16	0	37	37	16	0	37	37	16	0	39	39	7
METRO MULTIJUR Undrcvr drug prog. Stl City	2	0	24	24	2	0	25	25	2	0	25	25	2
N MO DRUG TASK FORCE-ADAIR CO	22	3	4	7	22	3	4	7	22	3	4	7	22
S CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE-WEST PLAINS CITY	31	1	12	13	31	1	12	13	31	0	11	11	31
EAST CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE	10	0	6	6	10	0	6	6	10	0	5	5	10
MID-MO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	7	0	6	6	7	0	6	6	7	0	6	6	7
NITRO-GRUNDY TF	7	1	5	6	7	1	5	6	7	1	5	6	7
FRANKLIN UNION TF	7	5	7	12	7	6	7	13	0	0	0	0	7

CNET - BATES CO SHERIFF	5	2	4	6	5	2	4	6	7	6	7	13	6
STATEWIDE TOTAL	298	21	257	278	299	20	255	275	295	24	249	273	292

TABLE 1 INVOLVEMENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS/AGENCIES BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS	1	-	4,	2011	QUARTER
------	---	---	----	------	---------

QTR4

PART FULL TIME LE TIME LE TOTAL LE OFFICERS OFFICERS OFFICERS

FREQ FREQ FREQ

DRUG TASK FORCE

N COUNTY MUNICPAL			
ENF GRP-BRIDGETON	0	4	4
BUCHANAN CO DRUG STRIKE FORCE	0	12	12
LAKE AREA NARCOTICS ENF GRP	1	6	7
COMBINED OZARKS MULTIJUR ENF TEAM- GREENE CO	2	12	14
JACKSON CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	0	17	17
JASPER CO DRUG TASK FORCE	0	5	5

NARC. ACTIVITIES

REDCTN. COALTN JEFFERSON CO	0	0	0
KC MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	1	4	5
LAFAYETTE CO NARCOTICS UNIT	0	4	4
MID-MO UNIFIED STRIKE TEAM/NARC GRP	5	6	11
MINERAL AREA DRUG TASK FORCE	0	8	8
SW MO DRUG TASK Force	0	5	5
CLAY COUNTY DRUG TASK FORCE	1	5	6
NE MO NARCOTICS TASK FORCE	0	6	6
BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK FORCE	0	7	7
PLATTE CO MULTIJUR ENF GRP	2	4	6
SE MISSOURI DRUG TASK FORCE	0	16	16

(Continued)

TABLE 1 INVOLVEMENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS/AGENCIES BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS 1 - 4, 2011	QUARTER					
	TIME LE	FULL TIME LE OFFICERS				
	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ			
DRUG TASK FORCE						
ST CHARLES CO REG. DRUG TASK FORCE	0	12	12			
STL CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	0	10	10			
METRO MULTIJUR UNDRCVR DRUG PROG. STL CITY	0	25	25			
N MO DRUG TASK FORCE-ADAIR CO	3	47	50			
S CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE-WEST PLAINS CITY	0	11	11			
EAST CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE	0	4	4			
MID-MO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	0	6	6			
NITRO-GRUNDY TF	1	6	7			
FRANKLIN UNION TF	6	7	13			
CNET - BATES CO						

SHERIFF	3	3	6
STATEWIDE TOTAL	25	252	277

TABLE 2 PROCESSING STATUS OF DRUG CASES/INVESTIGATIONS BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS 1 - 4, 2011	ACTIVE CARRY-IN CASES	INITATED NEW CASES	ACTIVE	CASES D	ISPOSED	CASES CARRIED OUT
	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	%	FREQ
DRUG TASK FORCE						
N COUNTY MUNICPAL ENF GRP-BRIDGETON	1	366	367	284	77.4	83
BUCHANAN CO DRUG STRIKE FORCE	323	607	930	596	64.1	334
LAKE AREA NARCOTICS ENF GRP	636	329	965	519	53.8	446
COMBINED OZARKS MULTIJUR ENF TEAM- GREENE CO	494	528	1,022	419	41.0	603
JACKSON CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	456	116	572	88	15.4	484
JASPER CO DRUG TASK FORCE	70	224	294	261	88.8	33
NARC. ACTIVITIES REDCTN. COALTN JEFFERSON CO	34	390	424	393	92.7	31

KC MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	26	251	277	246	88.8	31
LAFAYETTE CO NARCOTICS UNIT	2	160	162	160	98.8	2
MID-MO UNIFIED STRIKE TEAM/NARC GRP	1,462	607	2,069	550	26.6	1,519
MINERAL AREA DRUG TASK FORCE	11	329	340	329	96.8	11
SW MO DRUG TASK FORCE	151	322	473	418	88.4	55
CLAY COUNTY DRUG TASK FORCE	156	149	305	171	56.1	134
NE MO NARCOTICS TASK FORCE	142	218	360	276	76.7	84
BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK Force	2	171	173	168	97.1	5
PLATTE CO MULTIJUR ENF GRP	158	122	280	56	20.0	224
SE MISSOURI DRUG TASK FORCE	2,169	429	2,598	182	7.0	2,416
ST CHARLES CO REG. DRUG TASK FORCE	521	582	1,103	399	36.2	704
STL CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	343	898	1,241	644	51.9	597

(Continued)

TABLE 2 PROCESSING STATUS OF DRUG CASES/INVESTIGATIONS BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS 1 - 4, 2011	ACTIVE CARRY-IN CASES		TOTAL ACTIVE CASES	CASES I	DISPOSED	CASES CARRIED OUT
	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	8	FREQ
DRUG TASK FORCE						
METRO MULTIJUR UNDRCVR DRUG PROG. STL CITY	8	332	340	338	99.4	3
N MO DRUG TASK FORCE-ADAIR CO	2,300	519	2,819	163	5.8	2,656
S CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE-WEST PLAINS CITY	1,576	503	2,079	303	14.6	1,776
EAST CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE	457	194	651	80	12.3	571
MID-MO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	327	390	717	400	55.8	317
NITRO-GRUNDY TF	32	36	68	35	51.5	33
FRANKLIN UNION TF	141	130	271	162	59.8	109
CNET - BATES CO SHERIFF	45	157	202	180	89.1	22
STATEWIDE TOTAL	12,043	9,059	21,102	7,820	37.1	13,283

TABLE 3 OFFENSE STATUS OF PERSONS ARRESTED BY DRUG TASK FORCES BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS 1 - 4, 2011 TOTAL ARRESTEES WITH ONE OR MORE DRUG CHARGES

FREQ ROW %

100.0

100.0

DRUG TASK FORCE

- N COUNTY MUNICPAL ENF GRP-BRIDGETON 225 100.0
- BUCHANAN CO DRUG STRIKE FORCE 236 100.0
- LAKE AREA NARCOTICS ENF GRP 226 100.0
- COMBINED OZARKS MULTIJUR ENF TEAM-GREENE CO 904 100.0
- JACKSON CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE 95
- JASPER CO DRUG TASK FORCE 184 100.0
- NARC. ACTIVITIES REDCTN. COALTN.-JEFFERSON CO 360
- KC MULTIJUR DRUGTASK FORCE180100.0
- LAFAYETTE CO NARCOTICS UNIT 104 100.0

MID-MO UNIFIED STRIKE TEAM/NARC GRP	210	100.0
MINERAL AREA DRUG TASK FORCE	588	100.0
SW MO DRUG TASK Force	135	100.0
CLAY COUNTY DRUG TASK FORCE	56	100.0
NE MO NARCOTICS TASK FORCE	73	100.0
BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK FORCE	235	100.0
PLATTE CO MULTIJUR ENF GRP	104	100.0
SE MISSOURI DRUG TASK FORCE	453	100.0
ST CHARLES CO REG. DRUG TASK FORCE	404	100.0

(Continued)

TABLE 3

OFFENSE STATUS OF PERSONS ARRESTED BY DRUG TASK FORCES BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

> QTRS 1 - 4, 2011 TOTAL ARRESTEES WITH ONE OR MORE DRUG CHARGES

FREQ ROW % DRUG TASK FORCE STL CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE 520 100.0 METRO MULTIJUR UNDRCVR DRUG PROG. STL CITY 300 100.0 N MO DRUG TASK FORCE-ADAIR CO 100.0 149 S CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE-WEST PLAINS CITY 135 100.0 EAST CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE 100.0 180 MID-MO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE 546 100.0 NITRO-GRUNDY TF 54 100.0 FRANKLIN UNION TF 260 100.0 **CNET - BATES CO** SHERIFF 225 100.0 STATEWIDE TOTAL 100.0 7141

TABLE 4 DRUG OFFENSE STATUS OF CHARGES IN TASK FORCE ARRESTS BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS 1 - 4, 2011	POSSESSI CHAR		SALE/MANUFCT DRUG CHARGES				TOTAL CHARGES	
	FREQ	ROW %	FREQ	ROW %	FREQ	ROW %	FREQ	ROW %
DRUG TASK FORCE								
N COUNTY MUNICPAL ENF GRP-BRIDGETON	308	98.4	5	1.6	0	0.0	313	100.0
BUCHANAN CO DRUG STRIKE FORCE	212	84.8	38	15.2	0	0.0	250	100.0
LAKE AREA NARCOTICS ENF GRP	253	65.7	132	34.3	0	0.0	385	100.0
COMBINED OZARKS MULTIJUR ENF TEAM- GREENE CO	523	57.7	383	42.3	0	0.0	906	100.0
JACKSON CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	77	77.0	23	23.0	0	0.0	100	100.0
JASPER CO DRUG TASK FORCE	88	47.8	96	52.2	0	0.0	184	100.0
NARC. ACTIVITIES REDCTN. COALTN JEFFERSON CO	165	42.1	227	57.9	0	0.0	392	100.0
KC MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	183	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	183	100.0
LAFAYETTE CO NARCOTICS UNIT	54	51.9	50	48.1	0	0.0	104	100.0
MID-MO UNIFIED								

STRIKE TEAM/NARC

GRP	85	40.5	125	59.5	0	0.0	210	100.0
MINERAL AREA DRUG TASK FORCE	380	65.0	205	35.0	0	0.0	585	100.0
SW MO DRUG TASK FORCE	47	34.8	88	65.2	0	0.0	135	100.0
CLAY COUNTY DRUG TASK FORCE	13	13.4	84	86.6	0	0.0	97	100.0
NE MO NARCOTICS TASK FORCE	92	70.8	38	29.2	0	0.0	130	100.0
BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK FORCE	99	42.1	136	57.9	0	0.0	235	100.0
PLATTE CO MULTIJUR ENF GRP	152	84.4	28	15.6	0	0.0	180	100.0
SE MISSOURI DRUG TASK FORCE	247	54.3	208	45.7	0	0.0	455	100.0
ST CHARLES CO REG. DRUG TASK FORCE	238	50.7	231	49.3	0	0.0	469	100.0
STL CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	308	53.6	267	46.4	0	0.0	575	100.0

(Continued)

TABLE 4 DRUG OFFENSE STATUS OF CHARGES IN TASK FORCE ARRESTS BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS 1 - 4, 2011		SESSION DRUG SALE/MANUFCT NON DRUG CHARGES DRUG CHARGES CHARGES TOT/		•		-		TOTAL C	TAL CHARGES	
	FREQ	ROW %	FREQ	ROW %	FREQ	ROW %	FREQ	ROW %		
DRUG TASK FORCE										
METRO MULTIJUR Undrcvr drug prog. STL CITY	330	62.3	200	37.7	0	0.0	530	100.0		
N MO DRUG TASK FORCE-ADAIR CO	85	52.1	78	47.9	0	0.0	163	100.0		
S CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE-WEST PLAINS CITY	68	42.0	94	58.0	0	0.0	162	100.0		
EAST CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE	103	57.2	77	42.8	0	0.0	180	100.0		
MID-MO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	350	64.1	196	35.9	0	0.0	546	100.0		
NITRO-GRUNDY TF	9	11.5	69	88.5	0	0.0	78	100.0		
FRANKLIN UNION TF	141	54.2	119	45.8	0	0.0	260	100.0		
CNET - BATES CO SHERIFF	130	57.8	95	42.2	0	0.0	225	100.0		
STATEWIDE TOTAL	4740	59.0	3292	41.0	0	0.0	8032	100.0		

TABLE 5 STATEWIDE DRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGES TOTAL ARRESTS = 7141 QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

CHARGE TYPE

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
SALE	-METH	1581	19.68	1581	19.68
POSS	-MARIJUANA	1369	17.04	2950	36.73
POSS	-METH	1308	16.28	4258	53.01
SALE	-MARIJUANA	886	11.03	5144	64.04
POSS	-PARAPHERNALIA	681	8.48	5825	72.52
POSS	-OTHER	590	7.35	6415	79.87
POSS	-HEROIN	331	4.12	6746	83.99
POSS	-PSUEDOEPHEDRINE	296	3.69	7042	87.67
SALE	- CRACK	243	3.03	7285	90.70
POSS	-CRACK	192	2.39	7477	93.09
SALE	-HEROIN	171	2.13	7648	95.22
POSS	-COCAINE	140	1.74	7788	96.96
SALE	-COCAINE	115	1.43	7903	98.39
POSS	-ANHYDROUS AMMONIA	40	0.50	7943	98.89
POSS	-ECSTASY	35	0.44	7978	99.33
SALE	-ECSTASY	20	0.25	7998	99.58
SALE	-LSD	12	0.15	8010	99.73
POSS	-LSD	9	0.11	8019	99.84
SALE	-PCP	8	0.10	8027	99.94
POSS	-PCP	5	0.06	8032	100.00

TABLE 6 N COUNTY MUNICPAL ENF GRP-BRIDGETON DRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGES TOTAL ARRESTS = 225 QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

CHARGE TYPE

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
POSS	-MARIJUANA	95	30.35	95	30.35
POSS	-HEROIN	65	20.77	160	51.12
POSS	-PARAPHERNALIA	65	20.77	225	71.88
POSS	-CRACK	39	12.46	264	84.35
POSS	-METH	15	4.79	279	89.14
POSS	-OTHER	10	3.19	289	92.33
POSS	-COCAINE	8	2.56	297	94.89
POSS	- ECSTASY	5	1.60	302	96.49
POSS	-LSD	3	0.96	305	97.44
SALE	-MARIJUANA	3	0.96	308	98.40
POSS	-PCP	2	0.64	310	99.04
SALE	-METH	2	0.64	312	99.68
POSS	- PSUEDOEPHEDRINE	1	0.32	313	100.00

TABLE 7 BUCHANAN CO DRUG STRIKE FORCE DRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGES TOTAL ARRESTS = 236 QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

CHARGE TYPE

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
POSS	-METH	65	26.00	65	26.00
POSS	-OTHER	47	18.80	112	44.80
POSS	-MARIJUANA	32	12.80	144	57.60
POSS	-CRACK	24	9.60	168	67.20
POSS	-HEROIN	23	9.20	191	76.40
SALE	-MARIJUANA	14	5.60	205	82.00
POSS	-COCAINE	13	5.20	218	87.20
POSS	-PARAPHERNALIA	12	4.80	230	92.00
SALE	-CRACK	8	3.20	238	95.20
SALE	-METH	5	2.00	243	97.20
SALE	-HEROIN	3	1.20	246	98.40
POSS	-PSUEDOEPHEDRINE	2	0.80	248	99.20
POSS	-LSD	1	0.40	249	99.60
SALE	-COCAINE	1	0.40	250	100.00

TABLE 8LAKE AREA NARCOTICS ENF GRPDRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGESTOTAL ARRESTS = 226QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
SALE	-METH	109	28.31	109	28.31
POSS	-METH	96	24.94	205	53.25
POSS	-PARAPHERNALIA	65	16.88	270	70.13
POSS	-MARIJUANA	55	14.29	325	84.42
POSS	-OTHER	25	6.49	350	90.91
SALE	-MARIJUANA	12	3.12	362	94.03
POSS	-PSUEDOEPHEDRINE	11	2.86	373	96.88
SALE	-CRACK	4	1.04	377	97.92
POSS	-COCAINE	3	0.78	380	98.70
POSS	-HEROIN	2	0.52	382	99.22
SALE	-HEROIN	2	0.52	384	99.74
POSS	- ECSTASY	1	0.26	385	100.00

TABLE 9 COMBINED OZARKS MULTIJUR ENF TEAM-GREENE CO DRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGES TOTAL ARRESTS = 904 QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
SALE	-METH	209	23.07	209	23.07
POSS	-MARIJUANA	169	18.65	378	41.72
POSS	-METH	151	16.67	529	58.39
POSS	-OTHER	139	15.34	668	73.73
POSS	-PARAPHERNALIA	111	12.25	779	85.98
SALE	-MARIJUANA	91	10.04	870	96.03
POSS	-ECSTASY	8	0.88	878	96.91
SALE	-ECSTASY	8	0.88	886	97.79
SALE	-COCAINE	6	0.66	892	98.45
POSS	-PSUEDOEPHEDRINE	5	0.55	897	99.01
POSS	-COCAINE	3	0.33	900	99.34
POSS	- CRACK	2	0.22	902	99.56
SALE	-PCP	2	0.22	904	99.78
SALE	-HEROIN	1	0.11	905	99.89
SALE	-LSD	1	0.11	906	100.00

TABLE 10JACKSON CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCEDRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGESTOTAL ARRESTS = 95QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
POSS	-METH	38	38.00	38	38.00
POSS	-MARIJUANA	16	16.00	54	54.00
POSS	-OTHER	11	11.00	65	65.00
SALE	-METH	11	11.00	76	76.00
POSS	-PARAPHERNALIA	9	9.00	85	85.00
SALE	-MARIJUANA	8	8.00	93	93.00
POSS	-COCAINE	2	2.00	95	95.00
POSS	-HEROIN	2	2.00	97	97.00
POSS	-PCP	1	1.00	98	98.00
SALE	-COCAINE	1	1.00	99	99.00
SALE	- CRACK	1	1.00	100	100.00

TABLE 11 JASPER CO DRUG TASK FORCE DRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGES TOTAL ARRESTS = 184 QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
-METH	59	32.07	59	32.07
-METH	48	26.09	107	58.15
-PSUEDOEPHEDRINE	29	15.76	136	73.91
-MARIJUANA	17	9.24	153	83.15
-MARIJUANA	17	9.24	170	92.39
- CRACK	7	3.80	177	96.20
-OTHER	5	2.72	182	98.91
- CRACK	2	1.09	184	100.00
	-METH -PSUEDOEPHEDRINE -MARIJUANA -MARIJUANA -CRACK -OTHER	-METH 59 -METH 48 -PSUEDOEPHEDRINE 29 -MARIJUANA 17 -MARIJUANA 17 -CRACK 7 -OTHER 5	-METH 59 32.07 -METH 48 26.09 -PSUEDOEPHEDRINE 29 15.76 -MARIJUANA 17 9.24 -MARIJUANA 17 9.24 -CRACK 7 3.80 -OTHER 5 2.72	Frequency Percent Frequency -METH 59 32.07 59 -METH 48 26.09 107 -PSUEDOEPHEDRINE 29 15.76 136 -MARIJUANA 17 9.24 153 -MARIJUANA 17 9.24 170 -CRACK 7 3.80 177 -OTHER 5 2.72 182

TABLE 12 NARC. ACTIVITIES REDCTN. COALTN.-JEFFERSON CO DRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGES TOTAL ARRESTS = 360 QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
SALE	-METH	145	36.99	145	36.99
POSS	-METH	47	11.99	192	48.98
POSS	-MARIJUANA	46	11.73	238	60.71
SALE	-MARIJUANA	44	11.22	282	71.94
POSS	-HEROIN	29	7.40	311	79.34
POSS	-OTHER	27	6.89	338	86.22
SALE	-HEROIN	22	5.61	360	91.84
POSS	-PSUEDOEPHEDRINE	20	5.10	380	96.94
SALE	-CRACK	4	1.02	384	97.96
POSS	-ANHYDROUS AMMONIA	3	0.77	387	98.72
POSS	-COCAINE	3	0.77	390	99.49
POSS	-LSD	2	0.51	392	100.00

TABLE 13 KC MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE DRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGES TOTAL ARRESTS = 180 QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative t Frequency	Cumulative Percent
				rrequency	
POSS	-MARIJUANA	139	75.96	139	75.96
POSS	-COCAINE	14	7.65	153	83.61
POSS	-OTHER	11	6.01	164	89.62
POSS	-METH	7	3.83	171	93.44
POSS	- CRACK	6	3.28	177	96.72
POSS	-HEROIN	3	1.64	180	98.36
POSS	-ECSTASY	2	1.09	182	99.45
POSS	-PARAPHERNALIA	1	0.55	183	100.00

TABLE 14 LAFAYETTE CO NARC UNIT DRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGES TOTAL ARRESTS = 104 QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
SALE	-MARIJUANA	27	25.96	27	25.96
POSS	-METH	25	24.04	52	50.00
POSS	-MARIJUANA	19	18.27	71	68.27
SALE	-METH	18	17.31	89	85.58
POSS	-OTHER	8	7.69	97	93.27
SALE	-COCAINE	4	3.85	101	97.12
POSS	-COCAINE	2	1.92	103	99.04
POSS	-PSUEDOEPHEDRINE	1	0.96	104	100.00

TABLE 15MID-MO UNIFIED STRIKE TEAM/NARC GRPDRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGESTOTAL ARRESTS = 210QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
SALE	-MARIJUANA	40	19.05	40	19.05
SALE	-COCAINE	35	16.67	75	35.71
POSS	-MARIJUANA	27	12.86	102	48.57
SALE	- CRACK	20	9.52	122	58.10
POSS	-OTHER	19	9.05	141	67.14
POSS	- CRACK	18	8.57	159	75.71
POSS	-METH	14	6.67	173	82.38
SALE	-METH	14	6.67	187	89.05
POSS	-COCAINE	10	4.76	197	93.81
POSS	-PARAPHERNALIA	5	2.38	202	96.19
POSS	-ANHYDROUS AMMONIA	4	1.90	206	98.10
POSS	-PSUEDOEPHEDRINE	2	0.95	208	99.05
SALE	-HEROIN	2	0.95	210	100.00

TABLE 16 MINERAL AREA DRUG TASK FORCE DRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGES TOTAL ARRESTS = 588 QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
SALE	-METH	162	27.69	162	27.69
POSS	-METH	121	20.68	283	48.38
POSS	-OTHER	65	11.11	348	59.49
POSS	-PSUEDOEPHEDRINE	64	10.94	412	70.43
POSS	-PARAPHERNALIA	52	8.89	464	79.32
POSS	-MARIJUANA	40	6.84	504	86.15
SALE	-MARIJUANA	35	5.98	539	92.14
POSS	-ANHYDROUS AMMONIA	29	4.96	568	97.09
POSS	-HEROIN	9	1.54	577	98.63
SALE	-HEROIN	5	0.85	582	99.49
POSS	-COCAINE	2	0.34	584	99.83
SALE	-COCAINE	1	0.17	585	100.00

TABLE 17 SW MO DRUG TASK FORCE DRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGES TOTAL ARRESTS = 135 QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
SALE	-METH	73	54.07	73	54.07
POSS	-METH	29	21.48	102	75.56
SALE	-MARIJUANA	13	9.63	115	85.19
POSS	-MARIJUANA	9	6.67	124	91.85
POSS	-OTHER	6	4.44	130	96.30
POSS	-PSUEDOEPHEDRINE	3	2.22	133	98.52
POSS	-COCAINE	1	0.74	134	99.26
POSS	-PARAPHERNALIA	1	0.74	135	100.00

TABLE 18 N METRO DRUG & GANG TASK FORCE-N KC DRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGES TOTAL ARRESTS = 56 QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
SALE	-METH	41	42.27	41	42.27
SALE	-MARIJUANA	28	28.87	69	71.13
POSS	-OTHER	13	13.40	82	84.54
POSS	-METH	6	6.19	88	90.72
POSS	-MARIJUANA	5	5.15	93	95.88
SALE	-COCAINE	4	4.12	97	100.00

TABLE 19 NE MO NARCOTICS TASK FORCE DRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGES TOTAL ARRESTS = 73 QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
POSS	-PARAPHERNALIA	27	20.77	27	20.77
POSS	-MARIJUANA	22	16.92	49	37.69
SALE	-METH	22	16.92	71	54.62
POSS	-METH	21	16.15	92	70.77
POSS	-OTHER	11	8.46	103	79.23
POSS	- CRACK	9	6.92	112	86.15
POSS	-PSUEDOEPHEDRINE	7	5.38	119	91.54
SALE	-MARIJUANA	6	4.62	125	96.15
POSS	-COCAINE	4	3.08	129	99.23
POSS	-ANHYDROUS AMMONIA	1	0.77	130	100.00

TABLE 20 BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK FORCE DRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGES TOTAL ARRESTS = 235 QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
SALE	-METH	60	25.53	60	25.53
SALE	- CRACK	53	22.55	113	48.09
POSS	-MARIJUANA	40	17.02	153	65.11
POSS	-METH	29	12.34	182	77.45
POSS	-OTHER	16	6.81	198	84.26
SALE	-MARIJUANA	13	5.53	211	89.79
POSS	- CRACK	12	5.11	223	94.89
POSS	-COCAINE	10	4.26	233	99.15
POSS	-PARAPHERNALIA	2	0.85	235	100.00

TABLE 21 PLATTE CO MULTIJUR ENF GRP DRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGES TOTAL ARRESTS = 104 QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
POSS	-MARIJUANA	55	30.56	55	30.56
POSS	-PARAPHERNALIA	41	22.78	96	53.33
POSS	-METH	35	19.44	131	72.78
SALE	-MARIJUANA	17	9.44	148	82.22
POSS	-OTHER	14	7.78	162	90.00
SALE	-METH	8	4.44	170	94.44
POSS	-COCAINE	6	3.33	176	97.78
POSS	-HEROIN	2	1.11	178	98.89
POSS	-ECSTASY	1	0.56	179	99.44
SALE	-HEROIN	1	0.56	180	100.00

TABLE 22 SE MISSOURI DRUG TASK FORCE DRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGES TOTAL ARRESTS = 453 QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
SALE	-METH	118	25.93	118	25.93
POSS	-METH	77	16.92	195	42.86
POSS	-MARIJUANA	66	14.51	261	57.36
POSS	-PSUEDOEPHEDRINE	53	11.65	314	69.01
SALE	-MARIJUANA	38	8.35	352	77.36
SALE	-CRACK	28	6.15	380	83.52
POSS	-OTHER	25	5.49	405	89.01
POSS	-PARAPHERNALIA	16	3.52	421	92.53
POSS	-CRACK	13	2.86	434	95.38
POSS	-HEROIN	8	1.76	442	97.14
SALE	-COCAINE	5	1.10	447	98.24
POSS	-COCAINE	3	0.66	450	98.90
SALE	-HEROIN	3	0.66	453	99.56
POSS	- ECSTASY	2	0.44	455	100.00

TABLE 23 ST CHARLES CO REG. DRUG TASK FORCE DRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGES TOTAL ARRESTS = 404 QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
SALE	-MARIJUANA	103	21.96	103	21.96
POSS	-MARIJUANA	68	14.50	171	36.46
POSS	-PARAPHERNALIA	61	13.01	232	49.47
SALE	-HEROIN	54	11.51	286	60.98
POSS	-METH	48	10.23	334	71.22
SALE	-COCAINE	27	5.76	361	76.97
POSS	-HEROIN	19	4.05	380	81.02
POSS	-OTHER	18	3.84	398	84.86
POSS	- PSUEDOEPHEDRINE	16	3.41	414	88.27
SALE	-ECSTASY	12	2.56	426	90.83
SALE	-METH	11	2.35	437	93.18
SALE	-CRACK	9	1.92	446	95.10
POSS	-ECSTASY	8	1.71	454	96.80
POSS	-COCAINE	5	1.07	459	97.87
POSS	- CRACK	4	0.85	463	98.72
SALE	-LSD	4	0.85	467	99.57
POSS	-ANHYDROUS AMMONIA	1	0.21	468	99.79
POSS	-LSD	1	0.21	469	100.00

TABLE 24 STL CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE DRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGES TOTAL ARRESTS = 520 QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
SALE	-MARIJUANA	142	24.70	142	24.70
POSS	-MARIJUANA	85	14.78	227	39.48
POSS	-PARAPHERNALIA	57	9.91	284	49.39
POSS	-HEROIN	53	9.22	337	58.61
SALE	- CRACK	42	7.30	379	65.91
SALE	-METH	40	6.96	419	72.87
POSS	-METH	27	4.70	446	77.57
POSS	- CRACK	26	4.52	472	82.09
POSS	-PSUEDOEPHEDRINE	22	3.83	494	85.91
POSS	-OTHER	20	3.48	514	89.39
SALE	-HEROIN	20	3.48	534	92.87
POSS	-COCAINE	16	2.78	550	95.65
SALE	-COCAINE	11	1.91	561	97.57
SALE	-LSD	7	1.22	568	98.78
SALE	-PCP	5	0.87	573	99.65
POSS	-ECSTASY	2	0.35	575	100.00

TABLE 25 METRO MULTIJUR UNDRCVR DRUG PROG.-STL CITY DRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGES TOTAL ARRESTS = 300 QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
POSS	-MARIJUANA	105	19.81	105	19.81
SALE	-MARIJUANA	94	17.74	199	37.55
POSS	-PARAPHERNALIA	81	15.28	280	52.83
POSS	-HEROIN	72	13.58	352	66.42
SALE	-CRACK	55	10.38	407	76.79
SALE	-HEROIN	36	6.79	443	83.58
POSS	-OTHER	33	6.23	476	89.81
POSS	- CRACK	28	5.28	504	95.09
SALE	-COCAINE	10	1.89	514	96.98
POSS	-COCAINE	7	1.32	521	98.30
POSS	- ECSTASY	5	0.94	526	99.25
POSS	-METH	1	0.19	527	99.43
POSS	-PCP	1	0.19	528	99.62
POSS	- PSUEDOEPHEDRINE	1	0.19	529	99.81
SALE	-METH	1	0.19	530	100.00

TABLE 26 N MO DRUG TASK FORCE-ADAIR CO DRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGES TOTAL ARRESTS = 149 QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
SALE	-METH	30	18.40	30	18.40
SALE	-MARIJUANA	26	15.95	56	34.36
POSS	-MARIJUANA	24	14.72	80	49.08
POSS	-METH	24	14.72	104	63.80
POSS	-PARAPHERNALIA	20	12.27	124	76.07
POSS	-OTHER	16	9.82	140	85.89
POSS	-PSUEDOEPHEDRINE	7	4.29	147	90.18
POSS	-COCAINE	4	2.45	151	92.64
SALE	-COCAINE	4	2.45	155	95.09
POSS	-CRACK	3	1.84	158	96.93
SALE	-CRACK	3	1.84	161	98.77
SALE	-HEROIN	2	1.23	163	100.00

TABLE 27 S CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE-WEST PLAINS CITY DRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGES TOTAL ARRESTS = 135 QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
SALE	-METH	68	41.98	68	41.98
POSS	-METH	37	22.84	105	64.81
POSS	-MARIJUANA	20	12.35	125	77.16
SALE	-MARIJUANA	16	9.88	141	87.04
SALE	-HEROIN	8	4.94	149	91.98
POSS	-HEROIN	7	4.32	156	96.30
POSS	-OTHER	3	1.85	159	98.15
POSS	-COCAINE	2	1.23	161	99.38
SALE	-COCAINE	1	0.62	162	100.00

TABLE 28 E CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE DRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGES TOTAL ARRESTS = 180 QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
SALE	-METH	46	25.56	46	25.56
POSS	-MARIJUANA	35	19.44	81	45.00
POSS	-METH	25	13.89	106	58.89
POSS	-PARAPHERNALIA	21	11.67	127	70.56
SALE	-MARIJUANA	16	8.89	143	79.44
POSS	-OTHER	9	5.00	152	84.44
SALE	-CRACK	8	4.44	160	88.89
POSS	-COCAINE	6	3.33	166	92.22
POSS	-HEROIN	4	2.22	170	94.44
POSS	-PSUEDOEPHEDRINE	3	1.67	173	96.11
SALE	-COCAINE	3	1.67	176	97.78
POSS	-CRACK	2	1.11	178	98.89
POSS	- ECSTASY	1	0.56	179	99.44
SALE	-HEROIN	1	0.56	180	100.00

TABLE 29 MID-MO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE DRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGES TOTAL ARRESTS = 546 QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
POSS	-METH	184	33.70	184	33.70
SALE	-METH	108	19.78	292	53.48
POSS	-MARIJUANA	94	17.22	386	70.70
SALE	-MARIJUANA	52	9.52	438	80.22
POSS	-PSUEDOEPHEDRINE	41	7.51	479	87.73
POSS	-PARAPHERNALIA	24	4.40	503	92.12
POSS	-COCAINE	13	2.38	516	94.51
POSS	-HEROIN	13	2.38	529	96.89
POSS	-OTHER	9	1.65	538	98.53
SALE	-HEROIN	3	0.55	541	99.08
POSS	-LSD	2	0.37	543	99.45
POSS	-CRACK	1	0.18	544	99.63
SALE	-COCAINE	1	0.18	545	99.82
SALE	-CRACK	1	0.18	546	100.00

TABLE 30 NITRO-GRUNDY TASK FORCE DRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGES TOTAL ARRESTS = 54 QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
SALE	-METH	69	88.46	69	88.46
POSS	-METH	8	10.26	77	98.72
POSS	-CRACK	1	1.28	78	100.00

TABLE 31 FRANKLIN UNION DRUG TASK FORCE DRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGES TOTAL ARRESTS = 260 QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
SALE	-METH	90	34.62	90	34.62
POSS	-METH	77	29.62	167	64.23
POSS	-MARIJUANA	36	13.85	203	78.08
POSS	-HEROIN	19	7.31	222	85.38
SALE	-MARIJUANA	15	5.77	237	91.15
POSS	-PSUEDOEPHEDRINE	8	3.08	245	94.23
SALE	-HEROIN	5	1.92	250	96.15
POSS	-OTHER	4	1.54	254	97.69
POSS	-COCAINE	3	1.15	257	98.85
POSS	- CRACK	2	0.77	259	99.62
SALE	-COCAINE	1	0.38	260	100.00

TABLE 32 CNET - BATES CO SHERIFF DRUG AND NON DRUG ARREST CHARGES TOTAL ARRESTS = 225 QTRS 1 - 4, 2011

The FREQ Procedure

DRUG		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
SALE	-METH	90	34.62	90	34.62
POSS	-METH	77	29.62	167	64.23
POSS	-MARIJUANA	36	13.85	203	78.08
POSS	-HEROIN	19	7.31	222	85.38
SALE	-MARIJUANA	15	5.77	237	91.15
POSS	- PSUEDOEPHEDRINE	8	3.08	245	94.23
SALE	-HEROIN	5	1.92	250	96.15
POSS	-OTHER	4	1.54	254	97.69
POSS	-COCAINE	3	1.15	257	98.85
POSS	- CRACK	2	0.77	259	99.62
SALE	-COCAINE	1	0.38	260	100.00

TABLE 33 DRUGS OBTAINED BY PURCHASES AND FREE SAMPLES BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS 1 - 4, 2011	NO. DRUG BUYS	NO. REVERSE DRUG BUYS	NO. FREE SAMPLES	VALUE OF DRUGS BOUGHT	VALUE OF REVERSE DRUGS BOUGHT	TOTAL VALUE OF BUYS	VALUE OF FREE SAMPLES
	Sum	Sum	Sum	Sum	Sum	Sum	Sum
DRUG TASK FORCE							
N COUNTY MUNICPAL ENF GRP-BRIDGETON	34	3	0	\$3,960	0	\$3,960	0
BUCHANAN CO DRUG STRIKE FORCE	243	0	0	\$18,265	0	\$18,265	0
LAKE AREA NARCOTICS ENF GRP	172	0	0	\$14,015	0	\$14,015	0
COMBINED OZARKS MULTIJUR ENF TEAM- GREENE CO	136	0	0	\$18,166	0	\$18,166	0
JACKSON CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	163	0	0	\$310,877	0	\$310,877	0
JASPER CO DRUG TASK FORCE	44	0	0	\$16,200	0	\$16,200	0
NARC. ACTIVITIES REDCTN. COALTN JEFFERSON CO	51	1	0	\$6,180	\$77,000	\$83,180	0
KC MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAFAYETTE CO NARCOTICS UNIT	7	0	0	\$410	0	\$410	0

MID-MO UNIFIED STRIKE TEAM/NARC GRP	362	0	0	\$39,530	0	\$39,530	0
MINERAL AREA DRUG TASK FORCE	33	0	0	\$4,178	0	\$4,178	0
SW MO DRUG TASK FORCE	16	0	0	\$2,585	0	\$2,585	0
CLAY COUNTY DRUG TASK FORCE	85	0	0	\$147,317	0	\$147,317	0
NE MO NARCOTICS TASK FORCE	38	0	0	\$2,439	0	\$2,439	0
BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK FORCE	76	0	0	\$19,430	0	\$19,430	0
PLATTE CO MULTIJUR ENF GRP	8	0	0	\$5,411	0	\$5,411	0
SE MISSOURI DRUG TASK FORCE	231	0	0	\$33,366	0	\$33,366	0
ST CHARLES CO REG. DRUG TASK FORCE	263	1	0	\$55,603	\$150	\$55,753	0

(Continued)

TABLE 33 DRUGS OBTAINED BY PURCHASES AND FREE SAMPLES BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS 1 - 4, 2011	NO. DRUG BUYS	NO. REVERSE DRUG BUYS	NO. FREE SAMPLES	VALUE OF DRUGS BOUGHT	VALUE OF REVERSE DRUGS BOUGHT	TOTAL VALUE OF BUYS	VALUE OF FREE SAMPLES
	Sum	Sum	Sum	Sum	Sum	Sum	Sum
DRUG TASK FORCE							
STL CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	232	1	0	\$33,430	\$100	\$33,530	0
METRO MULTIJUR UNDRCVR DRUG PROG. STL CITY	202	0	0	\$38,070	0	\$38,070	0
N MO DRUG TASK FORCE-ADAIR CO	100	1	2	\$21,300	\$400	\$21,700	\$68
S CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE-WEST PLAINS CITY	125	0	6	\$13,508	0	\$13,508	\$110
EAST CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE	62	0	0	\$3,820	0	\$3,820	0
MID-MO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	2	0	0	\$100	0	\$100	0
NITRO-GRUNDY TF	39	0	1	\$99,315	0	\$99,315	\$400
FRANKLIN UNION TF	2	0	0	\$1,200	0	\$1,200	0
CNET - BATES CO SHERIFF	34	6	1	\$1,973	\$200	\$2,173	\$150
STATEWIDE TOTAL	2760	13	10	\$910,648	\$77,850	\$988,498	\$728

TABLE 34

NUMBER OF ACTIVE INFORMANTS AND DOLLARS EXPENDED BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS 1 - 4, 2011	DOLLARS
	NO. ACTIVE EXPENDED ON
	INFORMANTS INFORMANTS

	Sum	Sum
DRUG TASK FORCE		
N COUNTY MUNICPAL ENF GRP-BRIDGETON	0	\$0
BUCHANAN CO DRUG STRIKE FORCE	77	\$7,402
LAKE AREA NARCOTICS ENF GRP	72	\$13,129
COMBINED OZARKS MULTIJUR ENF TEAM- GREENE CO	36	\$1,915
JACKSON CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	24	\$3,908
JASPER CO DRUG TASK FORCE	20	\$18,050
NARC. ACTIVITIES REDCTN. COALTN JEFFERSON CO	0	\$0
KC MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	1	\$20
LAFAYETTE CO NARCOTICS UNIT	3	\$44
MID-MO UNIFIED		

STRIKE TEAM/NARC

GRP	40	\$10,725
MINERAL AREA DRUG TASK FORCE	0	\$0
SW MO DRUG TASK Force	16	\$1,810
CLAY COUNTY DRUG TASK FORCE	8	\$2,905
NE MO NARCOTICS TASK FORCE	4	\$127
BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK FORCE	27	\$2,500
PLATTE CO MULTIJUR ENF GRP	2	\$200
SE MISSOURI DRUG TASK FORCE	70	\$4,502
ST CHARLES CO REG. DRUG TASK FORCE	13	\$1,060
STL CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	99	\$17,845

(Continued)

TABLE 34 NUMBER OF ACTIVE INFORMANTS AND DOLLARS EXPENDED BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS	1	-	4,	2011			DOLLAR	3
					NO.	ACTIVE	EXPENDED	ON
					INF	ORMANTS	INFORMA	NTS

Sum	Sum
-----	-----

METRO MULTIJUR UNDRCVR DRUG PROG. STL CITY	82	\$27,010
N MO DRUG TASK FORCE-ADAIR CO	15	\$5,690
S CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE-WEST PLAINS CITY	25	\$3,418
EAST CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE	30	\$3,735
MID-MO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	0	\$0
NITRO-GRUNDY TF	0	\$0
FRANKLIN UNION TF	5	\$120
CNET - BATES CO SHERIFF	13	\$1,395
STATEWIDE TOTAL	682	\$127,510

TABLE 35 OUNCES OF DRUGS OBTAINED BY PURCHASES AND FREE SAMPLES BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS 1 - 4, 2011	MARIJUANA	COCAINE	CRACK	METH	HEROIN	LSD	PCP	ECSTASY	/EPHED-	ANHYDR- OUS AMMONIA	OTHER DRUGS
	OUNCES	OUNCES	OUNCES	OUNCES	OUNCES	OUNCES	OUNCES	OUNCES	OUNCES	OUNCES	OUNCES
DRUG TASK FORCE											
N COUNTY MUNICPAL ENF GRP-BRIDGETON	10.54	0.25	0.39	0.14	0.09	0	0	0	0	0	0
BUCHANAN CO DRUG STRIKE FORCE	75.01	13.17	10.12	4.42	1.17	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAKE AREA NARCOTICS ENF GRP	97.27	0.04	0.06	1.50	0.11	0	0	0	0	0	0
COMBINED OZARKS MULTIJUR ENF TEAM- GREENE CO	685.45	0.56	0.14	5.13	0.01	0	0	0	0	0	0
JACKSON CO Multijur drug task Force	82.52	66.53	8.68	38.75	0.29	0	0.17	0	0	0	13.34
JASPER CO DRUG TASK FORCE	12.50	0.07	0.58	0.57	0.16	0	0	0	0	0	0
NARC. ACTIVITIES REDCTN. COALTN JEFFERSON CO	25.54	0.11	0.07	0.27	0.56	0	0	0	0	0	0
KC MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAFAYETTE CO NARCOTICS UNIT	1.80	0	0	0.08	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

MID-MO UNIFIED STRIKE TEAM/NARC GRP	226.88	2.88	9.45	2.92	61.60	0	0.11	0.99	0	0	9.74	
MINERAL AREA DRUG TASK FORCE	6.07	0.02	0	0.33	0.07	0	0	0	0	0	0	
SW MO DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	1.38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CLAY COUNTY DRUG TASK FORCE	861.48	0	0	9.87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NE MO NARCOTICS TASK FORCE	11.73	0.07	0	0.11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.69	
BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK FORCE	5.01	0.04	8.14	1.63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
PLATTE CO MULTIJUR ENF GRP	0.65	3.02	0	0.36	0.05	0	0	0	0	0	0.14	
SE MISSOURI DRUG TASK FORCE	66.82	0.46	14.67	0.98	0.15	0	0	0	0.27	0	2.47	
ST CHARLES CO REG. DRUG TASK FORCE	291.81	286.91	1.48	4.48	21.02	0	0	0.23	1.10	0	0.01	
STL CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	36561.58	204.70	8.07	17.42	14.94	0	0	0	0	0	20.04	

(Continued)

TABLE 35 OUNCES OF DRUGS OBTAINED BY PURCHASES AND FREE SAMPLES BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS 1 - 4, 2011	MARIJUANA	COCAINE	CRACK	МЕТН	HEROIN	LSD	PCP	ECSTASY	PSUEDO- /EPHED- RINE	ANHYDR- OUS AMMONIA	OTHER DRUGS
	OUNCES	OUNCES	OUNCES	OUNCES	OUNCES	OUNCES	OUNCES	OUNCES	OUNCES	OUNCES	OUNCES
DRUG TASK FORCE											
METRO MULTIJUR Undrcvr drug prog. STL CITY	33.81	35.38	8.98	0	15.45	0	0	0	0	0	0.14
N MO DRUG TASK FORCE-ADAIR CO	121.37	1.40	3.74	0.83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
S CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE-WEST PLAINS CITY	20.89	0	0	1.17	0.08	0	0	0	0	0	2.68
EAST CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE	6.81	0.15	0.23	0.20	0.04	0	0	0	0	0	0
MID-MO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.18
NITRO-GRUNDY TF	72.01	0	3.00	63.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.25
FRANKLIN UNION TF	0	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CNET - BATES CO SHERIFF	2.51	0	0	0.22	0.04	0	0	0	0	0	0
STATEWIDE TOTAL	39280.06	617.76	77.80	155.81	115.83	0	0.28	1.22	1.37	0	49.68

TABLE 36 DOSES OF DRUGS OBTAINED BY PURCHASES AND FREE SAMPLES BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS 1 - 4, 2011	MARIJUANA	COCAINE	CRACK	METH	HEROIN	LSD	PCP	ECSTASY	PSUEDO- /EPHED- RINE	ANHYDR- OUS AMMONI- A*	OTHER DRUGS
	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES
DRUG TASK FORCE											
N COUNTY MUNICPAL ENF GRP-BRIDGETON	C	0	0	0	51	0	0	0	0	0	0
BUCHANAN CO DRUG STRIKE FORCE	o	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	247
LAKE AREA NARCOTICS ENF GRP	o	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	605
COMBINED OZARKS MULTIJUR ENF TEAM- GREENE CO	C	0 0	0	0	5	0	12	42	0	0	730
JACKSON CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	C	0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
JASPER CO DRUG TASK FORCE	o	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
NARC. ACTIVITIES REDCTN. COALTN JEFFERSON CO	O	0	0	0	44	0	0	0	0	0	10
KC MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAFAYETTE CO NARCOTICS UNIT	C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

MID-MO UNIFIED STRIKE TEAM/NARC GRP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MINERAL AREA DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
SW MO DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175
CLAY COUNTY DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	348
NE MO NARCOTICS TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156
BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
PLATTE CO MULTIJUR ENF GRP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SE MISSOURI DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	82
ST CHARLES CO REG. DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	350	24	0	68	48	0	553

(Continued)

*Anhydrous ammonia is measured in gallons.

DOSES OF DRUGS OBTAINED BY PURCHASES AND FREE SAMPLES BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS 1 - 4, 2011	MARIJUANA	COCAINE	CRACK	METH	HEROIN	LSD	РСР	ECSTASY		ANHYDR- OUS AMMONI- A*	OTHER DRUGS
	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES
DRUG TASK FORCE											
STL CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	620	0	41
METRO MULTIJUR UNDRCVR DRUG PROG. STL CITY	0	0	0	0	126	0	0	0	0	0	9
N MO DRUG TASK FORCE-ADAIR CO	0	0	0	5	117	0	0	0	0	0	199
S CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE-WEST PLAINS CITY	0	0	0	0	0	31	0	98	0	0	459
EAST CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	182
MID-MO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NITRO-GRUNDY TF	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FRANKLIN UNION TF	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CNET - BATES CO SHERIFF	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176
STATEWIDE TOTAL	0	0	0	5	693	58	12	211	668	0	407

*Anhydrous ammonia is measured in gallons.

TABLE 37 PROCESS STATUS OF SEARCH WARRANTS AND CONSENT SEARCHES BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS 1 - 4, 2011	WARRANTS APPLIED FOR	WARRANTS AUTHORIZED	WARRANTS WARRANTS SERVED/ARREST SERVED MADE			CONSENT SEARCHES
	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	8	FREQ
DRUG TASK FORCE						
N COUNTY MUNICPAL ENF GRP-BRIDGETON	20	20	20	20	100.0	20
BUCHANAN CO DRUG STRIKE FORCE	50	50	50	50	100.0	76
LAKE AREA NARCOTICS ENF GRP	64	64	57	57	100.0	45
COMBINED OZARKS MULTIJUR ENF TEAM- GREENE CO	124	124	124	124	100.0	139
JACKSON CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	43	43	43	42	97.7	43
JASPER CO DRUG TASK FORCE	62	62	54	54	100.0	12
NARC. ACTIVITIES REDCTN. COALTN JEFFERSON CO	33	33	33	33	100.0	164
KC MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	49	49	49	46	93.9	941
LAFAYETTE CO NARCOTICS UNIT	30	30	29	23	79.3	25

MID-MO UNIFIED

STRIKE TEAM/NARC GRP	36	36	36	36	100.0	13
MINERAL AREA DRUG TASK FORCE	17	17	17	17	100.0	117
SW MO DRUG TASK Force	28	28	28	27	96.4	118
CLAY COUNTY DRUG TASK FORCE	12	12	12	12	100.0	8
NE MO NARCOTICS TASK FORCE	12	12	11	10	90.9	36
BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK FORCE	21	21	21	21	100.0	125
PLATTE CO MULTIJUR ENF GRP	8	8	9	9	100.0	37
SE MISSOURI DRUG TASK FORCE	118	118	118	105	89.0	105
ST CHARLES CO REG. DRUG TASK FORCE	63	63	58	58	100.0	107
STL CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	51	51	51	50	98.0	209

(Continued)

TABLE 37 PROCESS STATUS OF SEARCH WARRANTS AND CONSENT SEARCHES BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS 1 - 4, 2011	WARRANTS APPLIED FOR		WARRANTS WARRANTS SERVED/ARREST SERVED MADE			CONSENT SEARCHES	
	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	FREQ	%	FREQ	
DRUG TASK FORCE							
METRO MULTIJUR UNDRCVR DRUG PROG. STL CITY	75	75	75	60	80.0	13	
N MO DRUG TASK FORCE-ADAIR CO	29	29	29	22	75.9	49	
S CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE-WEST PLAINS CITY	37	37	37	37	100.0	21	
EAST CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE	37	36	36	25	69.4	46	
MID-MO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	72	72	72	72	100.0	233	
NITRO-GRUNDY TF	20	20	20	10	50.0	12	
FRANKLIN UNION TF	17	17	17	17	100.0	92	
CNET - BATES CO SHERIFF	28	28	28	22	78.6	97	
STATEWIDE TOTAL	1156	1155	1134	1059	93.4	2903	

TABLE 38 ERADICATED MARIJUANA OUNCES BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS 1 - 4, 2011	OUNCES WILD MARIJUANA	OUNCES CULT MARIJU- ANA	OUNCES SINS MARIJU- ANA	PLANTS PLANTS WILD CULT MARIJUANA MARIJUANA		PLANTS SINS MARIJUANA
	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL
DRUG TASK FORCE						
N COUNTY MUNICPAL ENF GRP-BRIDGETON	0	0	0	0	9	0
BUCHANAN CO DRUG STRIKE FORCE	0	0	0	4,500	0	0
LAKE AREA NARCOTICS ENF GRP	0	0	0	0	15	0
COMBINED OZARKS MULTIJUR ENF TEAM- GREENE CO	0	552.00	109.00	0	300	0
JACKSON CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	8	0
JASPER CO DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	0	0
NARC. ACTIVITIES REDCTN. COALTN JEFFERSON CO	0	0	0	0	294	0
KC MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	475	0
LAFAYETTE CO NARCOTICS UNIT	0	7.20	0	0	56	0

MID-MO UNIFIED STRIKE TEAM/NARC GRP	0	0	0	0	14	0
MINERAL AREA DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	495	0
SW MO DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	2,244	0
CLAY COUNTY DRUG TASK FORCE	100000.00	0	0	737	0	4
NE MO NARCOTICS TASK FORCE	0	0	0	327	47	0
BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK Force	0	0	0	0	5	0
PLATTE CO MULTIJUR ENF GRP	0	0	0	1,000	28	0
SE MISSOURI DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	428.82	75	28	0
ST CHARLES CO REG. DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	102	210	0

(Continued)

TABLE 38 ERADICATED MARIJUANA OUNCES BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS 1 - 4, 2011 OUNCES OUNCES OUNCES CULT SINS PLANTS PLANTS WILD MARIJU- MARIJU- PLANTS WILD CULT SINS MARIJUANA ANA ANA MARIJUANA MARIJUANA MARIJUANA TOTAL TOTAL TOTAL TOTAL TOTAL TOTAL DRUG TASK FORCE STL CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE 0 0 0 2582.43 0 194 METRO MULTIJUR UNDRCVR DRUG PROG. STL CITY 0 79 0 0 0 0 N MO DRUG TASK FORCE-ADAIR CO 1.55 0 0 0 0 0 S CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE-WEST PLAINS CITY 0 0 220 0 0 0 EAST CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE 0 0 0 2,500 226 56 MID-MO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE 0 0 0 0 70 0 NITRO-GRUNDY TF 0 0 0 0 0 0 FRANKLIN UNION TF 0 0 0 0 343 0 **CNET - BATES CO** SHERIFF 0 0 0 0 0 38 STATEWIDE TOTAL 100000.00 3143.18 537.82 60 9,241 5,398

DESTROYED METHAMPHETAMINE LABS BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS 1 - 4, 2011 METH LABS

TOTAL

DRUG TASK FORCE	
N COUNTY MUNICPAL ENF GRP-BRIDGETON	6
BUCHANAN CO DRUG STRIKE FORCE	4
LAKE AREA NARCOTICS ENF GRP	91
COMBINED OZARKS MULTIJUR ENF TEAM- GREENE CO	104
JACKSON CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	6
JASPER CO DRUG TASK FORCE	72
NARC. ACTIVITIES REDCTN. COALTN JEFFERSON CO	169
KC MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	0
LAFAYETTE CO NARCOTICS UNIT	5
MID-MO UNIFIED STRIKE TEAM/NARC GRP	12
Gru	16

MINERAL AREA DRUG TASK FORCE	219
SW MO DRUG TASK Force	103
CLAY COUNTY DRUG TASK FORCE	1
NE MO NARCOTICS TASK FORCE	64
BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK Force	36
PLATTE CO MULTIJUR ENF GRP	0
SE MISSOURI DRUG TASK FORCE	92
ST CHARLES CO REG. DRUG TASK FORCE	85
STL CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	105

(Continued)

TABLE 39 DESTROYED METHAMPHETAMINE LABS BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS 1 - 4, 2011 METH LABS

TOTAL

DRUG TASK FORCE

METRO MULTIJUR UNDRCVR DRUG PROG. STL CITY	8
N MO DRUG TASK FORCE-ADAIR CO	56
S CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE-WEST PLAINS CITY	116
EAST CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE	79
MID-MO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	70
NITRO-GRUNDY TF	0
FRANKLIN UNION TF	81
CNET - BATES CO SHERIFF	9
STATEWIDE TOTAL	1593

OUNCES OF DRUGS SEIZED

		DRUGS SEIZ		
BY	MULTI-JURISDICT	IONAL DRUG	TASK FO	RCE

QTRS 1 - 4, 2011	VALUE OF DRUGS SEIZED	MARIJUANA OUNCES	COCAINE OUNCES	CRACK OUNCES	METH OUNCES	HEROIN OUNCES	LSD OUNCES	PCP OUNCES	ECSTASY OUNCES	/EPHED-	ANHYDR- OUS AMM. OUNCES	OTHER DRUGS OUNCES
	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL
DRUG TASK FORCE												
N COUNTY MUNICPAL ENF GRP-BRIDGETON	\$183,227	556.07	196.30	13.64	1.55	6.22	0.54	1.18	0	0	0	0
BUCHANAN CO DRUG STRIKE FORCE	\$1,134,625	974.58	2.59	4.72	15.90	1.31	0.08	0	0	0.27	0	0
LAKE AREA NARCOTICS ENF GRP	\$34,985	95.44	0.01	0.28	4.19	0.17	0	0	0.01	3.01	0	0.02
COMBINED OZARKS MULTIJUR ENF TEAM- GREENE CO	\$998,116	6,846.75	2.25	0.30	107.81	0.01	0	0	0.67	0	0	0.46
JACKSON CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	\$617,647	516.22	85.36	1.06	63.79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
JASPER CO DRUG TASK FORCE	\$237,750	500.29	6.16	3.50	39.61	0	0	0	1.80	5.96	0	0
NARC. ACTIVITIES REDCTN. COALTN JEFFERSON CO	\$156,012	1,875.80	0.01	0.18	4.29	2.72	0.02	0	0	10.90	0	0.49
KC MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	\$24,125,178	47,513.70	718.94	3.00	565.51	121.26	0	0	0	0	0	468.21
LAFAYETTE CO NARCOTICS UNIT	\$653,273	835.54	177.76	0	1.14	0	0	0	0	0.33	0	0.04

MID-MO UNIFIED

STRIKE TEAM/NARC GRP	\$1,362,515	5,522.23	37.58	1.53	12.28	0.49	0	0.04	4.23	11.11	0	6.84
MINERAL AREA DRUG TASK FORCE	\$398,350	62.33	0.02	0.02	247.84	0.61	0	0	0	28.09	0	0
SW MO DRUG TASK FORCE	\$139,969	345.56	0.10	0	19.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CLAY COUNTY DRUG TASK FORCE	\$164,000	595.99	0.04	0	2.00	0.07	0	0	0	0	0	80.88
NE MO NARCOTICS TASK FORCE	\$48,400	86.03	0.09	3.56	1.06	0	0	0	0	0.08	0	0.87
BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK Force	\$433,700	104.25	282.20	7.66	3.72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PLATTE CO MULTIJUR ENF GRP	\$231,842	776.90	0.70	0	3.99	0.23	0	0	0.09	0	0	4.79
SE MISSOURI DRUG TASK FORCE	\$325,883	653.19	28.15	29.05	31.06	0.84	0	0	0	3.34	0	0
ST CHARLES CO REG. DRUG TASK FORCE	\$1,126,776	4,714.25	47.21	0.87	161.38	5.88	0	0	0.18	0	0	7.19

(Continued)

OUNCES OF DRUGS SEIZED

BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS 1 - 4, 2011	VALUE OF DRUGS SEIZED	MARIJUANA OUNCES	COCAINE OUNCES	CRACK OUNCES	METH OUNCES	HEROIN OUNCES	LSD OUNCES	PCP OUNCES	ECSTASY OUNCES	/EPHED-	ANHYDR- OUS AMM. OUNCES	OTHER DRUGS OUNCES
	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL
DRUG TASK FORCE												
STL CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	\$1,619,820	104,278.37	205.61	11.14	20.93	22.68	0	0	0	751.00	0	1.24
METRO MULTIJUR UNDRCVR DRUG PROG. STL CITY	\$3,272,647	10,335.45	2492.43	31.60	0.02	302.20	0	0	0.11	0	0	0.14
N MO DRUG TASK FORCE-ADAIR CO	\$31,049	36.35	0.44	0.09	9.51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
S CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE-WEST PLAINS CITY	\$74,758	12,659.75	0.08	0	14.11	0.95	0	0	0	0.30	0	1.27
EAST CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE	\$884,246	243.65	0.96	0.92	37.43	0.57	0	0	0.07	8.15	0	63.20
MID-MO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	\$1,135,000	564.73	7.87	0.21	651.35	0.04	0.21	0	0	86.54	0	16.53
NITRO-GRUNDY TF	\$110,200	1,282.82	1.00	6.88	16.55	0	0	0	0	0	0	17.89
FRANKLIN UNION TF	\$1,430,000	28,836.51	25.06	0.96	26.72	1.13	0	0	0	46.06	0	32.82
CNET - BATES CO SHERIFF	\$520,776	1,193.77	0	0	26.41	0.35	0	1.94	0	1000.00	0	76.75
STATEWIDE TOTAL	\$41,450,744	232,006.52	4318.92	121.17	2089.85	467.73	0.85	3.16	7.16	1955.14	0	779.63

DOSES OF DRUGS SEIZED

BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS 1 - 4, 2011	MARIJUANA	COCAINE	CRACK	METH	HEROIN	LSD	PCP	ECSTASY	PSUEDO- /EPHED- RINE	ANHYDR- OUS AMMONI- A*	OTHER DRUG
	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES
DRUG TASK FORCE											
N COUNTY MUNICPAL ENF GRP-BRIDGETON	o	0	0	O	428	2	O	86	0	0	237
BUCHANAN CO DRUG STRIKE FORCE	٥	0	0	O	458	0	0	141	0	0	1179
LAKE AREA NARCOTICS ENF GRP	0	0	0	O	0	0	0	0	918	0	99
COMBINED OZARKS MULTIJUR ENF TEAM- GREENE CO	0	0	4	O	0	2	12	44	6	0	1657
JACKSON CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
JASPER CO DRUG TASK FORCE	O	0	0	O	0	0	0	56	122	0	107
NARC. ACTIVITIES REDCTN. COALTN JEFFERSON CO	0	0	0	O	115	0	0	0	770	0	290
KC MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	o	0	0	O	0	0	0	919	0	0	547
LAFAYETTE CO NARCOTICS UNIT	O	0	0	O	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

MID-MO UNIFIED

STRIKE TEAM/NARC GRP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	
MINERAL AREA DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	181	1110	
SW MO DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140	0	791	
CLAY COUNTY DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	
NE MO NARCOTICS TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	
BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	
PLATTE CO MULTIJUR ENF GRP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	427	
SE MISSOURI DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	317	0	0	1333	
ST CHARLES CO REG. DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	496	324	0	46	11	0	1478	

(Continued)

*Anhydrous ammonia is measured in gallons.

DOSES OF DRUGS SEIZED

BY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE

QTRS 1 - 4, 2011	MARIJUANA	COCAINE	CRACK	METH	HEROIN	LSD	PCP	ECSTASY		ANHYDR- OUS AMMONI- A*	OTHER DRUG
	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES	DOSES
DRUG TASK FORCE											
STL CO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	O	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	664	6	40
METRO MULTIJUR Undrcvr drug prog. Stl city	0	0	0	0	650	0	0	59	0	0	65
N MO DRUG TASK FORCE-ADAIR CO	o	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
S CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE-WEST PLAINS CITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	452	0	126
EAST CENTRAL DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	469
MID-MO MULTIJUR DRUG TASK FORCE	0	0	0	0	512	0	0	0	161	0	0
NITRO-GRUNDY TF	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	228
FRANKLIN UNION TF	٥	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1500	50	463
CNET - BATES CO SHERIFF	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	558
STATEWIDE TOTAL	0	0	4	0	2659	335	12	1670	4744	298	1160

*Anhydrous ammonia is measured in gallons.

Attachment B

Criminal Laboratories State-Funded MCLUP Projects FY11 Summary Report

TABLE 1 COMPLETION STATUS OF CASES DURING REPORTING PERIOD BY CRIME LABORATORY

QTRS 1 - 4, FY 2011	CASES CO	MPLETED	CASES P (4th Qu		TOTAL ACTIVE CASES (4th Quarter)		
	CASES	ROW %	CASES	ROW %	CASES	ROW %	
CRIME LABORATORY							
KCPD LAB RESPONSE	9869	71.1	4004	28.9	13873	100.0	
ST. LOUIS CO CRIME LAB	6083	69.0	2733	31.0	8816	100.0	
ST. LOUIS METRO POLICE LAB	10121	72.5	3830	27.5	13951	100.0	
TRUMAN STATE UNIVERSITY	93	96.9	3	3.1	96	100.0	
MSHP TECHNICAL LAB	8269	68.0	3900	32.0	12169	100.0	
MSHP TROOP B SATELLITE LAB	1285	71.0	524	29.0	1809	100.0	
MSHP TROOP C SATELLITE LAB	1880	65.3	1001	34.7	2881	100.0	
MSHP TROOP D SATELLITE LAB	7191	72.3	2758	27.7	9949	100.0	
MSHP TROOP D CARTHAGE LAB	1609	74.9	538	25.1	2147	100.0	
MSHP TROOP E SATELLITE LAB	3620	65.5	1907	34.5	5527	100.0	
MSHP TROOP G SATELLITE LAB	744	62.2	452	37.8	1196	100.0	
MSHP TROOP H SATELLITE LAB	1599	70.5	670	29.5	2269	100.0	
ST. CHARLES COUNTY CRIME LAB	1743	76.2	543	23.8	2286	100.0	
INDEPENDENCE REG. CRIME LAB	1216	66.7	607	33.3	1823	100.0	
STATEWIDE TOTAL	55322	70.2	23470	29.8	78792	100.0	

TABLE 2 DRUG TEST STATUS OF CASE EXAMINATIONS BY CRIME LABORATORY

QTRS 1 - 4, FY 2011	COMPLETE	D EXAMS	DRUG TES REQUE		DRUGS NOT IDENTIFIED CASES DOW &		DRUGS IDENTIFIED	
CRIME LABORATORY	CASES	ROW %	CASES	ROW %	CASES	ROW %	CASES	ROW %
KCPD LAB RESPONSE	9869	100.0	7920	80.3	60	0.6	1889	19.1
ST. LOUIS CO CRIME LAB	6083	100.0	2166	35.6	228	3.7	3689	60.6
ST. LOUIS METRO POLICE LAB	10121	100.0	6908	68.3	250	2.5	2963	29.3
TRUMAN STATE UNIVERSITY	93	100.0	7	7.5	12	12.9	74	79.6
MSHP TECHNICAL LAB	8269	100.0	5535	66.9	154	1.9	2580	31.2
MSHP TROOP B SATELLITE LAB	1285	100.0	33	2.6	88	6.8	1164	90.6
MSHP TROOP C SATELLITE LAB	1880	100.0	13	0.7	340	18.1	1527	81.2
MSHP TROOP D SATELLITE LAB	7191	100.0	3795	52.8	244	3.4	3152	43.8
MSHP TROOP D Carthage Lab	1609	100.0	469	29.1	65	4.0	1075	66.8
MSHP TROOP E SATELLITE LAB	3620	100.0	1828	50.5	91	2.5	1701	47.0
MSHP TROOP G SATELLITE LAB	744	100.0	0	0.0	40	5.4	704	94.6
MSHP TROOP H SATELLITE LAB	1599	100.0	295	18.4	82	5.1	1222	76.4

ST. CHARLES COUNTY

CRIME LAB	1743	100.0	644	36.9	80	4.6	1019	58.5
INDEPENDENCE REG. CRIME LAB	1216	100.0	359	29.5	282	23.2	666	54.8
STATEWIDE TOTAL	55322	100.0	29972	54.2	2016	3.6	23425	42.3

TABLE 3DRUGS AND PRECURSORS DETECTED INCASES INVOLVING CLANDESTINE LABSBY CRIME LABORATORY

QTRS 1 - 4, FY	METH F	INAL			METH PRODUCT &								
2011	PROD	UCT	METH PRE	CURSORS	PRECUP	SORS	LS	SD	PC	P	OTHER CL	.AN LAB	
	CASES	COL %	CASES	COL %	CASES	COL %	CASES	COL %	CASES	COL %	CASES	COL %	
CRIME LABORATORY													
KCPD LAB RESPONSE	2	0.6	3	2.2	9	3.0	0	*	0	0.0	0	0.0	
ST. LOUIS CO CRIME	40		40				•	*		400.0			
LAB	13	3.6	13	9.6	1	0.3	0	•	2	100.0	0	0.0	
ST. LOUIS METRO													
POLICE LAB	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	*	0	0.0	0	0.0	
	U	0.0	Ŭ	010	Ū	0.0	Ŭ		J	0.0	Ŭ	0.0	
TRUMAN STATE													
UNIVERSITY	1	0.3	1	0.7	1	0.3	0	*	0	0.0	0	0.0	
MSHP TECHNICAL LAB	46	12.8	12	8.9	61	20.0	0	*	0	0.0	1	6.3	
MSHP TROOP B													
SATELLITE LAB	6	1.7	3	2.2	13	4.3	0	*	0	0.0	0	0.0	
MSHP TROOP C		40.0				40.0	•						
SATELLITE LAB	69	19.2	36	26.7	59	19.3	0	*	0	0.0	9	56.3	
MSHP TROOP D													
SATELLITE LAB	43	12.0	18	13.3	52	17.0	0	*	0	0.0	1	6.3	
		12.0	10	10.0	52	17.0	U		Ŭ	0.0	•	0.0	
MSHP TROOP D													
CARTHAGE LAB	48	13.4	24	17.8	67	22.0	0	*	0	0.0	0	0.0	
					5.		•		-		-		

MSHP TROOP E													
SATELLITE LAB	22	6.1	9	6.7	10	3.3	0	*	0	0.0	3	18.8	
MSHP TROOP G SATELLITE LAB	96	26.7	5	3.7	17	5.6	0	*	0	0.0	2	12.5	
MSHP TROOP H													
SATELLITE LAB	0	0.0	3	2.2	0	0.0	0	*	0	0.0	0	0.0	
ST. CHARLES COUNTY CRIME LAB	10	2.8	5	3.7	12	3.9	0	*	0	0.0	0	0.0	
INDEPENDENCE REG. CRIME LAB	3	0.8	3	2.2	3	1.0	0	*	0	0.0	0	0.0	
STATEWIDE TOTAL	359	100.0	135	100.0	305	100.0	0	*	2	100.0	16	100.0	

TABLE 4 DRUGS IDENTIFIED IN CASES NOT INVOLVING CLAN LABS BY CRIME LABORATORY

QTRS 1 - 4, FY 2011	MARI	(JUANA	COC	AINE	CF	RACK	ME	TH	HEROIN	N/OPIATE	L	.SD	F	PCP	OTHER	DRUGS
	CASES	COL %	CASES	COL %	CASES	COL %	CASES	COL %	CASES	COL %	CASES	COL %	CASES	COL %	CASES	COL %
CRIME LABORATORY KCPD LAB RESPONSE	654	6.7	195	19.9	518	21.5	475	10.6	82	1.8	7	7.6	172	70.5	331	5.0
ST. LOUIS CO CRIME LAB	1175	12.0	115	11.7	237	9.8	95	2.1	587	12.8	1	1.1	7	2.9	649	9.9
ST. LOUIS METRO POLICE LAB	1322	13.5	78	7.9	757	31.4	32	0.7	1140	24.9	0	0.0	22	9.0	2420	36.9
TRUMAN STATE UNIVERSITY	59	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.1	3	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	13	0.2
MSHP TECHNICAL LAB	1077	11.0	148	15.1	229	9.5	661	14.8	457	10.0	16	17.4	10	4.1	572	8.7
MSHP TROOP B SATELLITE LAB	549	5.6	86	8.8	201	8.3	231	5.2	174	3.8	3	3.3	8	3.3	175	2.7

MSHP TROOP C SATELLITE LAB	763	7.8	50	5.1	30	1.2	251	5.6	521	11.4	6	6.5	0	0.0	397	6.1	
MSHP TROOP D SATELLITE LAB	1109	11.3	71	7.2	134	5.6	1274	28.5	634	13.8	22	23.9	3	1.2	651	9.9	
MSHP TROOP D CARTHAGE LAB	408	4.2	16	1.6	19	0.8	436	9.8	149	3.3	2	2.2	1	0.4	190	2.9	
MSHP TROOP E SATELLITE LAB	1133	11.6	55	5.6	131	5.4	233	5.2	182	4.0	10	10.9	0	0.0	183	2.8	
MSHP TROOP G SATELLITE LAB	380	3.9	5	0.5	3	0.1	129	2.9	166	3.6	15	16.3	0	0.0	208	3.2	
MSHP TROOP H SATELLITE LAB	547	5.6	55	5.6	75	3.1	334	7.5	154	3.4	2	2.2	6	2.5	187	2.9	
ST. CHARLES COUNTY CRIME LAB	434	4.4	55	5.6	45	1.9	66	1.5	288	6.3	8	8.7	1	0.4	396		
INDEPENDENCE REG. CRIME LAB	168	1.7	53	5.4	29	1.2	245	5.5	45	1.0	0	0.0	14	5.7	185	2.8	
STATEWIDE TOTAL	9778	100.0	982	100.0	2408	100.0	4468	100.0	4582	100.0	92	100.0	244	100.0	6557	100.0	

TABLE 5AVERAGE DRUG CASE PROCESSING TIME BY CRIME LABORATORY
QTRS 1 - 4, FY 2011STATEWIDE AVERAGE IS WEIGHTED BY
THE NUMBER OF CASES OF EACH LABORATORY

LABID	AVERAGE PROCESSING TIME - DAYS
KCPD LAB RESPONSE	66.6
ST. LOUIS CO CRIME LAB	183.1
ST. LOUIS METRO POLICE LAB	26.2
TRUMAN STATE UNIVERSITY	25.9
MSHP TECHNICAL LAB	225.3
MSHP TROOP B SATELLITE LAB	93.4
MSHP TROOP C SATELLITE LAB	238.8
MSHP TROOP D SATELLITE LAB	125.6
MSHP TROOP D CARTHAGE LAB	65.6
MSHP TROOP E SATELLITE LAB	130.9
MSHP TROOP E SATELLITE LAB	134.6
MSHP TROOP G SATELLITE LAB	208.2
MSHP TROOP H SATELLITE LAB	95.1
ST. CHARLES COUNTY CRIME LAB	40.5
INDEPENDENCE REG. CRIME LAB	265.9

FOURTH QUARTER FY11 - (MARCH 1, 2011 - MAY 31, 2011)

TABLE 6 IDENTIFICATION OF NEW ILLICIT DRUGS BY CRIME LABORATORY				
QTRS 1 - 4, FY 2011	TOTAL NEW ILLICIT DRUG CASES			
LABID	TOTAL	COL %		
KCPD LAB RESPONSE	2	3.5		
ST. LOUIS CO CRIME LAB	13	22.8		
ST. LOUIS METRO POLICE LAB	1	1.8		
TRUMAN STATE UNIVERSITY	0	0.0		
MSHP TECHNICAL LAB	6	10.5		
MSHP TROOP B SATELLITE LAB	0	0.0		
MSHP TROOP C SATELLITE LAB	0	0.0		
MSHP TROOP D SATELLITE LAB	0	0.0		
MSHP TROOP D CARTHAGE LAB	12	21.1		
MSHP TROOP E SATELLITE LAB	0	0.0		
MSHP TROOP G SATELLITE LAB	0	0.0		
MSHP TROOP H SATELLITE LAB	7	12.3		
ST. CHARLES COUNTY CRIME LAB	16	28.1		

INDEPENDENCE REG. CRIME LAB	0	0.0	
STATEWIDE TOTAL	57	100.0	

TABLE 7 IDENTIFICATION OF RESURGENT ILLICIT DRUGS BY CRIME LABORATORY

QTRS 1 - 4, FY 2011	TOTAL RESURGENT ILLICIT DRUG CASES		
	TOTAL CO	L%	
LABID KCPD LAB RESPONSE	0	0.0	
ST. LOUIS CO CRIME LAB	0	0.0	
ST. LOUIS METRO POLICE LAB	0	0.0	
TRUMAN STATE UNIVERSITY	0	0.0	
MSHP TECHNICAL LAB	0	0.0	
MSHP TROOP B SATELLITE LAB	0	0.0	
MSHP TROOP C SATELLITE LAB	0	0.0	
MSHP TROOP D SATELLITE LAB	0	0.0	
MSHP TROOP D CARTHAGE LAB	0	0.0	

MSHP TROOP E

SATELLITE LAB	0	0.0
MSHP TROOP G SATELLITE LAB	0	0.0
MSHP TROOP H	-	
SATELLITE LAB	0	0.0
ST. CHARLES COUNTY CRIME LAB	35	100.0
INDEPENDENCE REG. CRIME LAB	0	0.0
STATEWIDE TOTAL	35	100.0

Attachment C

Multi-Jurisdictional Cyber Crime Task Forces FY11 Summary Report

















