# 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,<br>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<br>FY11 Summary Report                   | 125 |
|          | Attachment C: Multi-Jurisdictional Cyber Crime Task Forces<br>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:<br>Pseudoephedrine / Ephedrine:                       | 13,195<br>50,957 | ,   | 1,670<br>4,744   |
|--|------------------|---|--|
| <u>Gallons of Drug Precursors Seized</u><br>Anhydrous Ammonia: | 3,928            | 293   | 298  |
| Sale/M   | 1                | <b>FY2010</b><br>Poss/Marijuana<br>Sale/Methamphetamine<br>Poss/Methamphetamine<br>Sale/Marijuana<br>Poss/Other | a Sale/Methamphetamine<br>Poss/Marijuana<br>Poss/Methamphetamine<br>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:                 | <ol> <li>Number of training sessions / seminars held.</li> <li>Number of persons attending training.</li> </ol>   |
| <b>Objective 2:</b> | Provide for additional trained, specialized investigators and prosecutors.  |
| PM:                 | <ul> <li>1 - An increase in the number of trained domestic/family violence investigators.</li> <li>2 - An increase in the number of prosecutors dedicated to domestic/family violence cases.</li> <li>3 - An increase in the number of specialized units dealing with domestic/family violence</li> </ul>   |
| Objective 3:        | Enhance the investigative abilities of domestic/family violence investigators.  |
| PM:                 | <ul> <li>1 – An increase in availability of evidence gathering equipment.</li> <li>2 – Increased availability of tools to assist in interviewing domestic/family violence victims</li> <li>3 – Availability of equipment for the presentation of evidence to prosecutors and courts.</li> </ul>   |
| Objective 4:        | Develop judicially accepted alternative domestic/family violence victim interview techniques.   |
| PM:                 | <ul> <li>1 - Victim's exposure to repeated questioning by different investigators is minimized.</li> <li>2 - Investigators from different jurisdictions coordinate efforts.</li> <li>3 - Stronger court cases are realized.</li> <li>4 -Number of offenders that completed domestic/family violence education and/or treatment programs.</li> </ul> |

**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.   |
|---|
| <ul> <li>1 – Number of training sessions/seminars held</li> <li>2 – Number of persons attending training.</li> </ul>  |
| Provide for additional trained, specialized investigators and prosecutors.  |
| <ul> <li>1 – An increase in the number of trained child abuse/neglect investigators.</li> <li>2 – An increase in the number of prosecutors dedicated to child abuse and neglect cases.</li> <li>3 – An increase in the number of specialized units dealing with child abuse and neglect.</li> </ul> |
| Enhance the investigative abilities of child abuse/neglect investigators.   |
| <ul> <li>1 – An increase in availability of evidence gathering equipment.</li> <li>2 – Increased availability of tools to assist in interviewing child victims</li> <li>3 – Availability of equipment for the presentation of evidence to prosecutors and courts.</li> </ul>                        |
|   |

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

#### 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<br>an automation plan.                                    |
|--------------|---|
|              | <ul><li>2 - Training plans and curriculums of developed training programs.</li><li>3 - Number of sites where training and assistance is provided.</li></ul> |
| 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:          | <ol> <li>Train Missouri law enforcement agencies with reporting requirements</li> <li>Conduct quality assurance reviews and audits</li> <li>Assist Missouri law enforcement agencies with reporting procedures</li> </ol> |
| Objective 2: | Support CHRS fingerprint and case disposition requirements  |
| PM:          | <ol> <li>Train Missouri law enforcement, prosecutor, and court agencies on correct record processing and<br/>procedures.</li> <li>Conduct seminars and attend conferences to support JAG</li> </ol>                       |

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!                                       |  |
| <ol> <li>Organization</li> <li>Investigations/Cases</li> <li>Arrest Breakdown</li> <li>Drug Purchases and Free Samples</li> <li>Informant Expenses</li> <li>Search Warrants</li> <li>Methamphetamine Drug Labs</li> </ol> | s integers and therefore require whole numbers (with the exception     | n of currency questions):  |
| The following sections of the report are formatted as dec<br>1) Free Sample Breakdown<br>2) Marijuana Eradicated<br>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<br>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<br>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  | <b>ys</b> \$0.00                        |                           |                            |                           |                              |                         |
| Number of reverse drug buys ma   | de                                      |                           |                            |                           |                              |                         |
| Dollar value of reverse drug bu  | <b>ys</b> \$0.00                        |                           |                            |                           |                              |                         |
| Number of free samples receiv  | ed                                      |                           |                            |                           |                              |                         |
| Dollar value (estimate) of dru   |   |                           |                            |                           |                              |                         |
| received from free samples, based<br>local street value at time receiv   |   |                           |                            |                           |                              |                         |
|  | <b>_</b>                                |                           |                            |                           |                              |                         |
| Drug Purchase and Free Sampl<br>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<br>Kilograms | ion results.<br>Pounds    | Ounces                     | Grams                     | Doses/Pills                  | Gallons                 |
|  |   |                           | Ounces                     |                           |                              |                         |
| Row  |   |                           | Ounces                     |                           |                              |                         |
| Row<br>Marijuana   |   |                           | Ounces                     |                           |                              |                         |
| Row<br>Marijuana<br>Cocaine  |   |                           | Ounces                     |                           |                              |                         |
| Row<br>Marijuana<br>Cocaine<br>Crack Cocaine   |   |                           | Ounces                     |                           |                              |                         |
| Row<br>Marijuana<br>Cocaine<br>Crack Cocaine<br>Methamphetamine  |   |                           | Ounces                     |                           |                              |                         |
| Row<br>Marijuana<br>Cocaine<br>Crack Cocaine<br>Methamphetamine<br>Heroin/Opiates  |   |                           | Ounces                     |                           |                              |                         |
| Row<br>Marijuana<br>Cocaine<br>Crack Cocaine<br>Methamphetamine<br>Heroin/Opiates<br>Hallucinogens - LSD   |   |                           | Ounces                     |                           |                              |                         |
| Row<br>Marijuana<br>Cocaine<br>Crack Cocaine<br>Methamphetamine<br>Heroin/Opiates<br>Hallucinogens - LSD<br>Hallucinogens - PCP  |   |                           | Ounces                     |                           |                              |                         |
| Row<br>Marijuana<br>Cocaine<br>Crack Cocaine<br>Methamphetamine<br>Heroin/Opiates<br>Hallucinogens - LSD<br>Hallucinogens - PCP<br>Ecstasy   |   |                           | Ounces                     |                           |                              |                         |
| Row<br>Marijuana<br>Cocaine<br>Crack Cocaine<br>Methamphetamine<br>Heroin/Opiates<br>Hallucinogens - LSD<br>Hallucinogens - PCP<br>Ecstasy<br>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<br>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 <del>2</del> 7 2                              |                              |        |   |      |        |
|   |   |                              |        |   |      |        |
| icate the types of  | f marijuana destroyed through erad                |                              | Oupcos |   | rame | Plante |
| icate the types of<br>Row   |   | cation operations.<br>Pounds | Ounces | G | rams | Plants |
| icate the types of<br>Row   | f marijuana destroyed through erad                |                              | Ounces | G | rams | Plants |
| licate the types of<br>Row<br>Id<br>Itivated  | f marijuana destroyed through erad                |                              | Ounces | G | rams | Plants |
| icate the types of<br>Row<br>d<br>tivated   | f marijuana destroyed through erad                |                              | Ounces | G | rams | Plants |
| icate the types of<br>Row<br>d<br>ttivated<br>semilla   | f marijuana destroyed through erad<br>Kilograms   |                              | Ounces | G | rams | Plants |
| icate the types of<br>Row<br>d<br>ttivated<br>semilla   | f marijuana destroyed through erad                |                              | Ounces | G | rams | Plants |
| icate the types of<br>Row<br>d<br>titvated<br>semilla<br>lethampheta  | f marijuana destroyed through erad<br>Kilograms   |                              | Ounces | G | rams | Plants |
| icate the types of<br>Row<br>d<br>titivated<br>semilla<br>lethamphetan<br>Number of me  | f marijuana destroyed through erad<br>Kilograms   | Pounds                       |        | G | rams | Plants |
| icate the types of<br>Row<br>Id<br>Itivated<br>Isemilla<br>Iethamphetan<br>Number of me   | f marijuana destroyed through erad<br>Kilograms   | Pounds                       |        | G | rams | Plants |
| icate the types of<br>Row<br>d<br>titivated<br>semilla<br>lethamphetan<br>Number of me  | f marijuana destroyed through erad<br>Kilograms   | Pounds                       |        |   | rams | Plants |
| icate the types of<br>Row<br>Id<br>Itivated<br>Isemilla<br>Iethamphetan<br>Number of me   | f marijuana destroyed through erad<br>Kilograms   | Pounds                       |        |   | rams | Plants |
| icate the types of<br>Row<br>d<br>titivated<br>semilla<br>lethamphetan<br>Number of me  | f marijuana destroyed through erad<br>Kilograms   | Pounds                       |        |   | rams | Plants |
| icate the types of<br>Row<br>Id<br>Itivated<br>Isemilla<br>Iethamphetan<br>Number of me   | f marijuana destroyed through erad<br>Kilograms   | Pounds                       |        |   | rams | Plants |
| licate the types of<br>Row<br>Id<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Iti | f marijuana destroyed through erad<br>Kilograms   | Pounds                       |        |   | rams | Plants |
| licate the types of<br>Row<br>Id<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Iti | f marijuana destroyed through erad<br>Kilograms   | Pounds                       |        |   | rams | Plants |
| dicate the types of<br>Row<br>ild<br>iltivated<br>hsemilla<br>Methamphetan<br>Number of me  | f marijuana destroyed through erad<br>Kilograms   | Pounds                       |        |   | rams | Plants |
| dicate the types of<br>Row<br>ild<br>iltivated<br>hsemilla<br>Methamphetan<br>Number of me  | f marijuana destroyed through erad<br>Kilograms   | Pounds                       |        |   | rams | Plants |
| Row<br>ild<br>ultivated<br>nsemilla<br>Methamphetan<br>Number of me   | f marijuana destroyed through erad<br>Kilograms   | Pounds                       |        |   | rams | Plants |
| dicate the types of<br>Row<br>ild<br>iltivated<br>hsemilla<br>Methamphetan<br>Number of me  | f marijuana destroyed through erad<br>Kilograms   | Pounds                       |        |   | rams | Plants |
| licate the types of<br>Row<br>Id<br>Itivated<br>Isemilla<br>Iethamphetan<br>Number of me<br>dicate the number   | f marijuana destroyed through erad<br>Kilograms   | Pounds                       |        |   | rams | Plants |
| ticate the types of<br>Row<br>Id<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Itivated<br>Iti | f marijuana destroyed through erad<br>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<br>larrative<br>Describe all work activities or areas of in<br>nclude any activities that will assist the I<br>formation or details) a lengthy intelliger<br>proe officers (e.g. SERT, polygraph, cri | Department of Public Safety<br>nce operation, which has not | to properly review and<br>yet resulted in arrests ( | evaluate the program. Fo<br>or significant drug/asset : | or example, it might be seizures. Describe all s    | appropriate to describe (wi<br>pecial training programs co | thout confidential<br>ompleted by task |
| larrative<br>Describe all work activities or areas of in<br>nclude any activities that will assist the I<br>nformation or details) a lengthy intelliger   | Department of Public Safety<br>nce operation, which has not | to properly review and<br>yet resulted in arrests ( | evaluate the program. Fo<br>or significant drug/asset   | or example, it might be<br>seizures. Describe all s | appropriate to describe (wi<br>pecial training programs co | thout confidential<br>ompleted by task |
| larrative<br>Describe all work activities or areas of in<br>nclude any activities that will assist the I<br>nformation or details) a lengthy intelliger   | Department of Public Safety<br>nce operation, which has not | to properly review and<br>yet resulted in arrests ( | evaluate the program. Fo<br>or significant drug/asset   | seizures. Describe all s                            | appropriate to describe (wi<br>pecial training programs co | thout confidential<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>certified to teach DARE  |
| Number of law enforcement teaching<br>one or more DARE classes,<br>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)<br>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<br>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)<br>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<br>problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations.<br>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<br>problems/issues or other individual concers. General get-acquainted conversations should not be counted as consultations.<br>Note that questions #G and #H refer to the total contract period and not just the reporting period.<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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.<br>Row                       | o operation production, by types of illicit drugs<br>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<br>reporting period where illicit drugs were<br>suspected, what was the average<br>processing time (in days)? |   |
|   |   |
| New Drugs   |   |
| Were any new illicit drugs identified in<br>the cases completed during the O Yes O No<br>reporting period?                                      |   |

| New Drugs   |   |
|---|---|
| If you marked Yes to the above question, list the<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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/<br>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<br>AGENCIES<br>IN TASK<br>FORCE | PART<br>TIME LE<br>OFFICERS | FULL<br>TIME LE<br>OFFICERS | TOTAL LE<br>OFFICERS |      | PART<br>TIME LE<br>OFFICERS | FULL<br>TIME LE<br>OFFICERS | TOTAL LE<br>OFFICERS |      | PART<br>TIME LE | FULL<br>TIME LE<br>OFFICERS | TOTAL LE<br>OFFICERS | TOTAL LE<br>AGENCIES<br>IN TASK<br>FORCE |
|  | FREQ                                     | FREQ                        | FREQ                        | FREQ                 | FREQ | FREQ                        | FREQ                        | FREQ                 | FREQ | FREQ            | FREQ                        | FREQ                 | FREQ                                     |
| DRUG TASK FORCE                                    |  |                             |                             |                      |      |                             |                             |                      |      |                 |                             |                      |  |
| N COUNTY MUNICPAL<br>ENF GRP-BRIDGETON             | 4  | 0                           | 4                           | 4                    | 4    | 0                           | 5                           | 5                    | 4    | 0               | 5                           | 5                    | 3  |
| BUCHANAN CO DRUG<br>STRIKE FORCE                   | 6  | 0                           | 12                          | 12                   | 6    | 0                           | 12                          | 12                   | 6    | 0               | 12                          | 12                   | 6  |
| LAKE AREA<br>NARCOTICS ENF GRP                     | 8  | 2                           | 7                           | 9                    | 9    | 0                           | 7                           | 7                    | 9    | 1               | 6                           | 7                    | 9  |
| COMBINED OZARKS<br>MULTIJUR ENF TEAM-<br>GREENE CO | 39                                       | 1                           | 15                          | 16                   | 39   | 1                           | 12                          | 13                   | 39   | 2               | 12                          | 14                   | 39                                       |
| JACKSON CO<br>MULTIJUR DRUG TASK<br>FORCE          | 14                                       | 0                           | 19                          | 19                   | 14   | 0                           | 18                          | 18                   | 14   | 0               | 16                          | 16                   | 14                                       |
| JASPER CO DRUG<br>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<br>TASK FORCE            | 3  | 1 | 4  | 5  | 3   |   | 1   | 4 (  | 5 3        |   | 1 4  | . 5  | i 3 |
| LAFAYETTE CO<br>NARCOTICS UNIT            | 7  | 0 | 4  | 4  | 7   |   | 0   | 4 4  | <b>i</b> 7 |   | 0 4  | 4    | 7   |
| MID-MO UNIFIED<br>STRIKE TEAM/NARC<br>GRP | 8  | 2 | 9  | 11 | 8   | 2 | 9   | 11   | 8          | 7 | 9    | 16   | 8   |
| MINERAL AREA DRUG<br>TASK FORCE           | 10 | 0 | 7  | 7  | 10  | 0 | 7   | 7    | 10         | 0 | 8    | 8    | 10  |
| SW MO DRUG TASK<br>Force                  | 14 | 0 | 5  | 5  | 14  | 0 | 5   | 5    | 14         | 0 | 5    | 5    | 14  |
| CLAY COUNTY DRUG<br>TASK FORCE            | 14 | 1 | 5  | 6  | 14  | 1 | 5   | 6    | 14         | 1 | 5    | 6    | 14  |
| NE MO NARCOTICS<br>TASK FORCE             | 8  | 0 | 6  | 6  | 8   | 0 | 6   | 6    | 8          | 0 | 6    | 6    | 8   |
| BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK<br>FORCE               | 5  | 0 | 7  | 7  | 5   | 0 | 7   | 7    | 5          | 0 | 7    | 7    | 5   |
| PLATTE CO MULTIJUR<br>ENF GRP             | 9  | 2 | 4  | 6  | 9   | 2 | 4   | 6    | 9          | 2 | 4    | 6    | 9   |
| SE MISSOURI DRUG<br>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<br>AGENCIES<br>IN TASK<br>FORCE |      | FULL<br>TIME LE<br>OFFICERS | TOTAL LE<br>OFFICERS |      | PART<br>TIME LE | FULL<br>TIME LE<br>OFFICERS | TOTAL LE<br>OFFICERS |      | PART<br>TIME LE<br>OFFICERS | FULL<br>TIME LE<br>OFFICERS | TOTAL LE<br>OFFICERS |      |
|  | FREQ                                     | FREQ | FREQ                        | FREQ                 | FREQ | FREQ            | FREQ                        | FREQ                 | FREQ | FREQ                        | FREQ                        | FREQ                 | FREQ |
| DRUG TASK FORCE                                  |  |      |                             |                      |      |                 |                             |                      |      |                             |                             |                      |      |
| ST CHARLES CO REG.<br>DRUG TASK FORCE            | 7  | 0    | 13                          | 13                   | 7    | 0               | 13                          | 13                   | 7    | 0                           | 13                          | 13                   | 7    |
| STL CO MULTIJUR<br>DRUG TASK FORCE               | 16                                       | 0    | 37                          | 37                   | 16   | 0               | 37                          | 37                   | 16   | 0                           | 39                          | 39                   | 7    |
| METRO MULTIJUR<br>Undrcvr drug prog.<br>Stl City | 2  | 0    | 24                          | 24                   | 2    | 0               | 25                          | 25                   | 2    | 0                           | 25                          | 25                   | 2    |
| N MO DRUG TASK<br>FORCE-ADAIR CO                 | 22                                       | 3    | 4                           | 7                    | 22   | 3               | 4                           | 7                    | 22   | 3                           | 4                           | 7                    | 22   |
| S CENTRAL DRUG<br>TASK FORCE-WEST<br>PLAINS CITY | 31                                       | 1    | 12                          | 13                   | 31   | 1               | 12                          | 13                   | 31   | 0                           | 11                          | 11                   | 31   |
| EAST CENTRAL DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                  | 10                                       | 0    | 6                           | 6                    | 10   | 0               | 6                           | 6                    | 10   | 0                           | 5                           | 5                    | 10   |
| MID-MO MULTIJUR<br>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<br>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<br>STRIKE FORCE                   | 0 | 12 | 12 |
| LAKE AREA<br>NARCOTICS ENF GRP                     | 1 | 6  | 7  |
| COMBINED OZARKS<br>MULTIJUR ENF TEAM-<br>GREENE CO | 2 | 12 | 14 |
| JACKSON CO<br>MULTIJUR DRUG TASK<br>FORCE          | 0 | 17 | 17 |
| JASPER CO DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                       | 0 | 5  | 5  |
|  |   |    |    |

NARC. ACTIVITIES

| REDCTN. COALTN<br>JEFFERSON CO            | 0 | 0  | 0  |
|---|---|----|----|
| KC MULTIJUR DRUG<br>TASK FORCE            | 1 | 4  | 5  |
| LAFAYETTE CO<br>NARCOTICS UNIT            | 0 | 4  | 4  |
| MID-MO UNIFIED<br>STRIKE TEAM/NARC<br>GRP | 5 | 6  | 11 |
| MINERAL AREA DRUG<br>TASK FORCE           | 0 | 8  | 8  |
| SW MO DRUG TASK<br>Force                  | 0 | 5  | 5  |
| CLAY COUNTY DRUG<br>TASK FORCE            | 1 | 5  | 6  |
| NE MO NARCOTICS<br>TASK FORCE             | 0 | 6  | 6  |
| BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK<br>FORCE               | 0 | 7  | 7  |
| PLATTE CO MULTIJUR<br>ENF GRP             | 2 | 4  | 6  |
| SE MISSOURI DRUG<br>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<br>TIME LE<br>OFFICERS |      |  |  |  |
|  | FREQ    | FREQ                        | FREQ |  |  |  |
| DRUG TASK FORCE                                  |         |                             |      |  |  |  |
| ST CHARLES CO REG.<br>DRUG TASK FORCE            | 0       | 12                          | 12   |  |  |  |
| STL CO MULTIJUR<br>DRUG TASK FORCE               | 0       | 10                          | 10   |  |  |  |
| METRO MULTIJUR<br>UNDRCVR DRUG PROG.<br>STL CITY | 0       | 25                          | 25   |  |  |  |
| N MO DRUG TASK<br>FORCE-ADAIR CO                 | 3       | 47                          | 50   |  |  |  |
| S CENTRAL DRUG<br>TASK FORCE-WEST<br>PLAINS CITY | 0       | 11                          | 11   |  |  |  |
| EAST CENTRAL DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                  | 0       | 4                           | 4    |  |  |  |
| MID-MO MULTIJUR<br>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<br>CARRY-IN<br>CASES | INITATED<br>NEW<br>CASES | ACTIVE | CASES D | ISPOSED | CASES<br>CARRIED<br>OUT |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------|---------|---------|-------------------------|
|  | FREQ                        | FREQ                     | FREQ   | FREQ    | %       | FREQ                    |
| DRUG TASK FORCE                                    |                             |                          |        |         |         |                         |
| N COUNTY MUNICPAL<br>ENF GRP-BRIDGETON             | 1                           | 366                      | 367    | 284     | 77.4    | 83                      |
| BUCHANAN CO DRUG<br>STRIKE FORCE                   | 323                         | 607                      | 930    | 596     | 64.1    | 334                     |
| LAKE AREA<br>NARCOTICS ENF GRP                     | 636                         | 329                      | 965    | 519     | 53.8    | 446                     |
| COMBINED OZARKS<br>MULTIJUR ENF TEAM-<br>GREENE CO | 494                         | 528                      | 1,022  | 419     | 41.0    | 603                     |
| JACKSON CO<br>MULTIJUR DRUG TASK<br>FORCE          | 456                         | 116                      | 572    | 88      | 15.4    | 484                     |
| JASPER CO DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                       | 70                          | 224                      | 294    | 261     | 88.8    | 33                      |
| NARC. ACTIVITIES<br>REDCTN. COALTN<br>JEFFERSON CO | 34                          | 390                      | 424    | 393     | 92.7    | 31                      |

| KC MULTIJUR DRUG<br>TASK FORCE            | 26    | 251 | 277   | 246 | 88.8 | 31    |
|---|-------|-----|-------|-----|------|-------|
| LAFAYETTE CO<br>NARCOTICS UNIT            | 2     | 160 | 162   | 160 | 98.8 | 2     |
| MID-MO UNIFIED<br>STRIKE TEAM/NARC<br>GRP | 1,462 | 607 | 2,069 | 550 | 26.6 | 1,519 |
| MINERAL AREA DRUG<br>TASK FORCE           | 11    | 329 | 340   | 329 | 96.8 | 11    |
| SW MO DRUG TASK<br>FORCE                  | 151   | 322 | 473   | 418 | 88.4 | 55    |
| CLAY COUNTY DRUG<br>TASK FORCE            | 156   | 149 | 305   | 171 | 56.1 | 134   |
| NE MO NARCOTICS<br>TASK FORCE             | 142   | 218 | 360   | 276 | 76.7 | 84    |
| BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK<br>Force               | 2     | 171 | 173   | 168 | 97.1 | 5     |
| PLATTE CO MULTIJUR<br>ENF GRP             | 158   | 122 | 280   | 56  | 20.0 | 224   |
| SE MISSOURI DRUG<br>TASK FORCE            | 2,169 | 429 | 2,598 | 182 | 7.0  | 2,416 |
| ST CHARLES CO REG.<br>DRUG TASK FORCE     | 521   | 582 | 1,103 | 399 | 36.2 | 704   |
| STL CO MULTIJUR<br>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<br>CARRY-IN<br>CASES |       | TOTAL<br>ACTIVE<br>CASES | CASES I | DISPOSED | CASES<br>CARRIED<br>OUT |
|--|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|---------|----------|-------------------------|
|  | FREQ                        | FREQ  | FREQ                     | FREQ    | 8        | FREQ                    |
| DRUG TASK FORCE                                  |                             |       |                          |         |          |                         |
| METRO MULTIJUR<br>UNDRCVR DRUG PROG.<br>STL CITY | 8                           | 332   | 340                      | 338     | 99.4     | 3                       |
| N MO DRUG TASK<br>FORCE-ADAIR CO                 | 2,300                       | 519   | 2,819                    | 163     | 5.8      | 2,656                   |
| S CENTRAL DRUG<br>TASK FORCE-WEST<br>PLAINS CITY | 1,576                       | 503   | 2,079                    | 303     | 14.6     | 1,776                   |
| EAST CENTRAL DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                  | 457                         | 194   | 651                      | 80      | 12.3     | 571                     |
| MID-MO MULTIJUR<br>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<br>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<br>STRIKE TEAM/NARC<br>GRP | 210 | 100.0 |
|---|-----|-------|
| MINERAL AREA DRUG<br>TASK FORCE           | 588 | 100.0 |
| SW MO DRUG TASK<br>Force                  | 135 | 100.0 |
| CLAY COUNTY DRUG<br>TASK FORCE            | 56  | 100.0 |
| NE MO NARCOTICS<br>TASK FORCE             | 73  | 100.0 |
| BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK<br>FORCE               | 235 | 100.0 |
| PLATTE CO MULTIJUR<br>ENF GRP             | 104 | 100.0 |
| SE MISSOURI DRUG<br>TASK FORCE            | 453 | 100.0 |
| ST CHARLES CO REG.<br>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<br>CHAR |       | SALE/MANUFCT<br>DRUG CHARGES |       |      |       | TOTAL CHARGES |       |
|--|------------------|-------|------------------------------|-------|------|-------|---------------|-------|
|  | FREQ             | ROW % | FREQ                         | ROW % | FREQ | ROW % | FREQ          | ROW % |
| DRUG TASK FORCE                                    |                  |       |                              |       |      |       |               |       |
| N COUNTY MUNICPAL<br>ENF GRP-BRIDGETON             | 308              | 98.4  | 5                            | 1.6   | 0    | 0.0   | 313           | 100.0 |
| BUCHANAN CO DRUG<br>STRIKE FORCE                   | 212              | 84.8  | 38                           | 15.2  | 0    | 0.0   | 250           | 100.0 |
| LAKE AREA<br>NARCOTICS ENF GRP                     | 253              | 65.7  | 132                          | 34.3  | 0    | 0.0   | 385           | 100.0 |
| COMBINED OZARKS<br>MULTIJUR ENF TEAM-<br>GREENE CO | 523              | 57.7  | 383                          | 42.3  | 0    | 0.0   | 906           | 100.0 |
| JACKSON CO<br>MULTIJUR DRUG TASK<br>FORCE          | 77               | 77.0  | 23                           | 23.0  | 0    | 0.0   | 100           | 100.0 |
| JASPER CO DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                       | 88               | 47.8  | 96                           | 52.2  | 0    | 0.0   | 184           | 100.0 |
| NARC. ACTIVITIES<br>REDCTN. COALTN<br>JEFFERSON CO | 165              | 42.1  | 227                          | 57.9  | 0    | 0.0   | 392           | 100.0 |
| KC MULTIJUR DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                     | 183              | 100.0 | 0                            | 0.0   | 0    | 0.0   | 183           | 100.0 |
| LAFAYETTE CO<br>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<br>TASK FORCE       | 380 | 65.0 | 205 | 35.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 585 | 100.0 |
| SW MO DRUG TASK<br>FORCE              | 47  | 34.8 | 88  | 65.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 135 | 100.0 |
| CLAY COUNTY DRUG<br>TASK FORCE        | 13  | 13.4 | 84  | 86.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 97  | 100.0 |
| NE MO NARCOTICS<br>TASK FORCE         | 92  | 70.8 | 38  | 29.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 130 | 100.0 |
| BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK<br>FORCE           | 99  | 42.1 | 136 | 57.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 235 | 100.0 |
| PLATTE CO MULTIJUR<br>ENF GRP         | 152 | 84.4 | 28  | 15.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 180 | 100.0 |
| SE MISSOURI DRUG<br>TASK FORCE        | 247 | 54.3 | 208 | 45.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 455 | 100.0 |
| ST CHARLES CO REG.<br>DRUG TASK FORCE | 238 | 50.7 | 231 | 49.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 469 | 100.0 |
| STL CO MULTIJUR<br>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<br>CHARGES DRUG CHARGES CHARGES TOT/ |      | •     |      | -     |      | TOTAL C | TAL CHARGES |  |
|--|------|---|------|-------|------|-------|------|---------|-------------|--|
|  | FREQ | ROW %   | FREQ | ROW % | FREQ | ROW % | FREQ | ROW %   |             |  |
| DRUG TASK FORCE                                  |      |   |      |       |      |       |      |         |             |  |
| METRO MULTIJUR<br>Undrcvr drug prog.<br>STL CITY | 330  | 62.3  | 200  | 37.7  | 0    | 0.0   | 530  | 100.0   |             |  |
| N MO DRUG TASK<br>FORCE-ADAIR CO                 | 85   | 52.1  | 78   | 47.9  | 0    | 0.0   | 163  | 100.0   |             |  |
| S CENTRAL DRUG<br>TASK FORCE-WEST<br>PLAINS CITY | 68   | 42.0  | 94   | 58.0  | 0    | 0.0   | 162  | 100.0   |             |  |
| EAST CENTRAL DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                  | 103  | 57.2  | 77   | 42.8  | 0    | 0.0   | 180  | 100.0   |             |  |
| MID-MO MULTIJUR<br>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<br>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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>Frequency   | Cumulative<br>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<br>-PSUEDOEPHEDRINE<br>-MARIJUANA<br>-MARIJUANA<br>-CRACK<br>-OTHER | -METH 59<br>-METH 48<br>-PSUEDOEPHEDRINE 29<br>-MARIJUANA 17<br>-MARIJUANA 17<br>-CRACK 7<br>-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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>t Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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<br>Frequency | Cumulative<br>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.<br>DRUG<br>BUYS | NO.<br>REVERSE<br>DRUG<br>BUYS | NO.<br>FREE<br>SAMPLES | VALUE OF<br>DRUGS BOUGHT | VALUE OF<br>REVERSE<br>DRUGS BOUGHT | TOTAL VALUE<br>OF BUYS | VALUE OF<br>FREE SAMPLES |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
|  | Sum                 | Sum                            | Sum                    | Sum                      | Sum                                 | Sum                    | Sum                      |
| DRUG TASK FORCE                                    |                     |                                |                        |                          |                                     |                        |                          |
| N COUNTY MUNICPAL<br>ENF GRP-BRIDGETON             | 34                  | 3                              | 0                      | \$3,960                  | 0                                   | \$3,960                | 0                        |
| BUCHANAN CO DRUG<br>STRIKE FORCE                   | 243                 | 0                              | 0                      | \$18,265                 | 0                                   | \$18,265               | 0                        |
| LAKE AREA<br>NARCOTICS ENF GRP                     | 172                 | 0                              | 0                      | \$14,015                 | 0                                   | \$14,015               | 0                        |
| COMBINED OZARKS<br>MULTIJUR ENF TEAM-<br>GREENE CO | 136                 | 0                              | 0                      | \$18,166                 | 0                                   | \$18,166               | 0                        |
| JACKSON CO<br>MULTIJUR DRUG TASK<br>FORCE          | 163                 | 0                              | 0                      | \$310,877                | 0                                   | \$310,877              | 0                        |
| JASPER CO DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                       | 44                  | 0                              | 0                      | \$16,200                 | 0                                   | \$16,200               | 0                        |
| NARC. ACTIVITIES<br>REDCTN. COALTN<br>JEFFERSON CO | 51                  | 1                              | 0                      | \$6,180                  | \$77,000                            | \$83,180               | 0                        |
| KC MULTIJUR DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                     | 0                   | 0                              | 0                      | 0                        | 0                                   | 0                      | 0                        |
| LAFAYETTE CO<br>NARCOTICS UNIT                     | 7                   | 0                              | 0                      | \$410                    | 0                                   | \$410                  | 0                        |

| MID-MO UNIFIED<br>STRIKE TEAM/NARC<br>GRP | 362 | 0 | 0 | \$39,530  | 0     | \$39,530  | 0 |
|---|-----|---|---|-----------|-------|-----------|---|
| MINERAL AREA DRUG<br>TASK FORCE           | 33  | 0 | 0 | \$4,178   | 0     | \$4,178   | 0 |
| SW MO DRUG TASK<br>FORCE                  | 16  | 0 | 0 | \$2,585   | 0     | \$2,585   | 0 |
| CLAY COUNTY DRUG<br>TASK FORCE            | 85  | 0 | 0 | \$147,317 | 0     | \$147,317 | 0 |
| NE MO NARCOTICS<br>TASK FORCE             | 38  | 0 | 0 | \$2,439   | 0     | \$2,439   | 0 |
| BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK<br>FORCE               | 76  | 0 | 0 | \$19,430  | 0     | \$19,430  | 0 |
| PLATTE CO MULTIJUR<br>ENF GRP             | 8   | 0 | 0 | \$5,411   | 0     | \$5,411   | 0 |
| SE MISSOURI DRUG<br>TASK FORCE            | 231 | 0 | 0 | \$33,366  | 0     | \$33,366  | 0 |
| ST CHARLES CO REG.<br>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.<br>DRUG<br>BUYS | NO.<br>REVERSE<br>DRUG<br>BUYS | NO.<br>FREE<br>SAMPLES | VALUE OF<br>DRUGS BOUGHT | VALUE OF<br>REVERSE<br>DRUGS BOUGHT | TOTAL VALUE<br>OF BUYS | VALUE OF<br>FREE SAMPLES |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
|  | Sum                 | Sum                            | Sum                    | Sum                      | Sum                                 | Sum                    | Sum                      |
| DRUG TASK FORCE                                  |                     |                                |                        |                          |                                     |                        |                          |
| STL CO MULTIJUR<br>DRUG TASK FORCE               | 232                 | 1                              | 0                      | \$33,430                 | \$100                               | \$33,530               | 0                        |
| METRO MULTIJUR<br>UNDRCVR DRUG PROG.<br>STL CITY | 202                 | 0                              | 0                      | \$38,070                 | 0                                   | \$38,070               | 0                        |
| N MO DRUG TASK<br>FORCE-ADAIR CO                 | 100                 | 1                              | 2                      | \$21,300                 | \$400                               | \$21,700               | \$68                     |
| S CENTRAL DRUG<br>TASK FORCE-WEST<br>PLAINS CITY | 125                 | 0                              | 6                      | \$13,508                 | 0                                   | \$13,508               | \$110                    |
| EAST CENTRAL DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                  | 62                  | 0                              | 0                      | \$3,820                  | 0                                   | \$3,820                | 0                        |
| MID-MO MULTIJUR<br>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<br>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<br>ENF GRP-BRIDGETON             | 0   | \$0      |
| BUCHANAN CO DRUG<br>STRIKE FORCE                   | 77  | \$7,402  |
| LAKE AREA<br>NARCOTICS ENF GRP                     | 72  | \$13,129 |
| COMBINED OZARKS<br>MULTIJUR ENF TEAM-<br>GREENE CO | 36  | \$1,915  |
| JACKSON CO<br>MULTIJUR DRUG TASK<br>FORCE          | 24  | \$3,908  |
| JASPER CO DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                       | 20  | \$18,050 |
| NARC. ACTIVITIES<br>REDCTN. COALTN<br>JEFFERSON CO | 0   | \$0      |
| KC MULTIJUR DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                     | 1   | \$20     |
| LAFAYETTE CO<br>NARCOTICS UNIT                     | 3   | \$44     |
| MID-MO UNIFIED                                     |     |          |

STRIKE TEAM/NARC

| GRP                                   | 40 | \$10,725 |
|---------------------------------------|----|----------|
| MINERAL AREA DRUG<br>TASK FORCE       | 0  | \$0      |
| SW MO DRUG TASK<br>Force              | 16 | \$1,810  |
| CLAY COUNTY DRUG<br>TASK FORCE        | 8  | \$2,905  |
| NE MO NARCOTICS<br>TASK FORCE         | 4  | \$127    |
| BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK<br>FORCE           | 27 | \$2,500  |
| PLATTE CO MULTIJUR<br>ENF GRP         | 2  | \$200    |
| SE MISSOURI DRUG<br>TASK FORCE        | 70 | \$4,502  |
| ST CHARLES CO REG.<br>DRUG TASK FORCE | 13 | \$1,060  |
| STL CO MULTIJUR<br>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<br>UNDRCVR DRUG PROG.<br>STL CITY | 82  | \$27,010  |
|--|-----|-----------|
| N MO DRUG TASK<br>FORCE-ADAIR CO                 | 15  | \$5,690   |
| S CENTRAL DRUG<br>TASK FORCE-WEST<br>PLAINS CITY | 25  | \$3,418   |
| EAST CENTRAL DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                  | 30  | \$3,735   |
| MID-MO MULTIJUR<br>DRUG TASK FORCE               | 0   | \$0       |
| NITRO-GRUNDY TF                                  | 0   | \$0       |
| FRANKLIN UNION TF                                | 5   | \$120     |
| CNET - BATES CO<br>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-<br>OUS<br>AMMONIA | OTHER<br>DRUGS |
|--|-----------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------------------------|----------------|
|  | OUNCES    | OUNCES  | OUNCES | OUNCES | OUNCES | OUNCES | OUNCES | OUNCES  | OUNCES  | OUNCES                    | OUNCES         |
| DRUG TASK FORCE                                    |           |         |        |        |        |        |        |         |         |                           |                |
| N COUNTY MUNICPAL<br>ENF GRP-BRIDGETON             | 10.54     | 0.25    | 0.39   | 0.14   | 0.09   | 0      | 0      | 0       | 0       | 0                         | 0              |
| BUCHANAN CO DRUG<br>STRIKE FORCE                   | 75.01     | 13.17   | 10.12  | 4.42   | 1.17   | 0      | 0      | 0       | 0       | 0                         | 0              |
| LAKE AREA<br>NARCOTICS ENF GRP                     | 97.27     | 0.04    | 0.06   | 1.50   | 0.11   | 0      | 0      | 0       | 0       | 0                         | 0              |
| COMBINED OZARKS<br>MULTIJUR ENF TEAM-<br>GREENE CO | 685.45    | 0.56    | 0.14   | 5.13   | 0.01   | 0      | 0      | 0       | 0       | 0                         | 0              |
| JACKSON CO<br>Multijur drug task<br>Force          | 82.52     | 66.53   | 8.68   | 38.75  | 0.29   | 0      | 0.17   | 0       | 0       | 0                         | 13.34          |
| JASPER CO DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                       | 12.50     | 0.07    | 0.58   | 0.57   | 0.16   | 0      | 0      | 0       | 0       | 0                         | 0              |
| NARC. ACTIVITIES<br>REDCTN. COALTN<br>JEFFERSON CO | 25.54     | 0.11    | 0.07   | 0.27   | 0.56   | 0      | 0      | 0       | 0       | 0                         | 0              |
| KC MULTIJUR DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                     | 0         | 0       | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0       | 0       | 0                         | 0              |
| LAFAYETTE CO<br>NARCOTICS UNIT                     | 1.80      | 0       | 0      | 0.08   | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0       | 0       | 0                         | 0              |

| MID-MO UNIFIED<br>STRIKE TEAM/NARC<br>GRP | 226.88   | 2.88   | 9.45  | 2.92  | 61.60 | 0 | 0.11 | 0.99 | 0    | 0 | 9.74  |  |
|---|----------|--------|-------|-------|-------|---|------|------|------|---|-------|--|
| MINERAL AREA DRUG<br>TASK FORCE           | 6.07     | 0.02   | 0     | 0.33  | 0.07  | 0 | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0 | 0     |  |
| SW MO DRUG TASK<br>FORCE                  | 0        | 0      | 0     | 1.38  | 0     | 0 | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0 | 0     |  |
| CLAY COUNTY DRUG<br>TASK FORCE            | 861.48   | 0      | 0     | 9.87  | 0     | 0 | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0 | 0     |  |
| NE MO NARCOTICS<br>TASK FORCE             | 11.73    | 0.07   | 0     | 0.11  | 0     | 0 | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0 | 0.69  |  |
| BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK<br>FORCE               | 5.01     | 0.04   | 8.14  | 1.63  | 0     | 0 | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0 | 0     |  |
| PLATTE CO MULTIJUR<br>ENF GRP             | 0.65     | 3.02   | 0     | 0.36  | 0.05  | 0 | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0 | 0.14  |  |
| SE MISSOURI DRUG<br>TASK FORCE            | 66.82    | 0.46   | 14.67 | 0.98  | 0.15  | 0 | 0    | 0    | 0.27 | 0 | 2.47  |  |
| ST CHARLES CO REG.<br>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<br>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-<br>/EPHED-<br>RINE | ANHYDR-<br>OUS<br>AMMONIA | OTHER<br>DRUGS |
|--|-----------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
|  | OUNCES    | OUNCES  | OUNCES | OUNCES | OUNCES | OUNCES | OUNCES | OUNCES  | OUNCES                     | OUNCES                    | OUNCES         |
| DRUG TASK FORCE                                  |           |         |        |        |        |        |        |         |                            |                           |                |
| METRO MULTIJUR<br>Undrcvr drug prog.<br>STL CITY | 33.81     | 35.38   | 8.98   | 0      | 15.45  | 0      | 0      | 0       | 0                          | 0                         | 0.14           |
| N MO DRUG TASK<br>FORCE-ADAIR CO                 | 121.37    | 1.40    | 3.74   | 0.83   | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0       | 0                          | 0                         | 0              |
| S CENTRAL DRUG<br>TASK FORCE-WEST<br>PLAINS CITY | 20.89     | 0       | 0      | 1.17   | 0.08   | 0      | 0      | 0       | 0                          | 0                         | 2.68           |
| EAST CENTRAL DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                  | 6.81      | 0.15    | 0.23   | 0.20   | 0.04   | 0      | 0      | 0       | 0                          | 0                         | 0              |
| MID-MO MULTIJUR<br>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<br>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-<br>/EPHED-<br>RINE | ANHYDR-<br>OUS<br>AMMONI-<br>A* | OTHER<br>DRUGS |
|--|-----------|---------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|---------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|
|  | DOSES     | DOSES   | DOSES | DOSES | DOSES  | DOSES | DOSES | DOSES   | DOSES                      | DOSES                           | DOSES          |
| DRUG TASK FORCE                                    |           |         |       |       |        |       |       |         |                            |                                 |                |
| N COUNTY MUNICPAL<br>ENF GRP-BRIDGETON             | C         | 0       | 0     | 0     | 51     | 0     | 0     | 0       | 0                          | 0                               | 0              |
| BUCHANAN CO DRUG<br>STRIKE FORCE                   | o         | 0       | 0     | 0     | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0       | 0                          | 0                               | 247            |
| LAKE AREA<br>NARCOTICS ENF GRP                     | o         | 0       | 0     | 0     | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0       | 0                          | 0                               | 605            |
| COMBINED OZARKS<br>MULTIJUR ENF TEAM-<br>GREENE CO | C         | 0 0     | 0     | 0     | 5      | 0     | 12    | 42      | 0                          | 0                               | 730            |
| JACKSON CO<br>MULTIJUR DRUG TASK<br>FORCE          | C         | 0 0     | 0     | 0     | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0       | 0                          | 0                               | 58             |
| JASPER CO DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                       | o         | 0       | 0     | 0     | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0       | 0                          | 0                               | 8              |
| NARC. ACTIVITIES<br>REDCTN. COALTN<br>JEFFERSON CO | O         | 0       | 0     | 0     | 44     | 0     | 0     | 0       | 0                          | 0                               | 10             |
| KC MULTIJUR DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                     | C         | 0       | 0     | 0     | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0       | 0                          | 0                               | 0              |
| LAFAYETTE CO<br>NARCOTICS UNIT                     | C         | 0       | 0     | 0     | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0       | 0                          | 0                               | 0              |

| MID-MO UNIFIED<br>STRIKE TEAM/NARC<br>GRP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0   |
|---|---|---|---|---|-----|----|---|----|----|---|-----|
| MINERAL AREA DRUG<br>TASK FORCE           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 3   |
| SW MO DRUG TASK<br>FORCE                  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 175 |
| CLAY COUNTY DRUG<br>TASK FORCE            | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 348 |
| NE MO NARCOTICS<br>TASK FORCE             | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 156 |
| BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK<br>FORCE               | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 37  |
| PLATTE CO MULTIJUR<br>ENF GRP             | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0   |
| SE MISSOURI DRUG<br>TASK FORCE            | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0  | 0 | 2  | 0  | 0 | 82  |
| ST CHARLES CO REG.<br>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-<br>OUS<br>AMMONI-<br>A* | OTHER<br>DRUGS |
|--|-----------|---------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|---------|-------|---------------------------------|----------------|
|  | DOSES     | DOSES   | DOSES | DOSES | DOSES  | DOSES | DOSES | DOSES   | DOSES | DOSES                           | DOSES          |
| DRUG TASK FORCE                                  |           |         |       |       |        |       |       |         |       |                                 |                |
| STL CO MULTIJUR<br>DRUG TASK FORCE               | 0         | 0       | 0     | 0     | 0      | 3     | 0     | 1       | 620   | 0                               | 41             |
| METRO MULTIJUR<br>UNDRCVR DRUG PROG.<br>STL CITY | 0         | 0       | 0     | 0     | 126    | 0     | 0     | 0       | 0     | 0                               | 9              |
| N MO DRUG TASK<br>FORCE-ADAIR CO                 | 0         | 0       | 0     | 5     | 117    | 0     | 0     | 0       | 0     | 0                               | 199            |
| S CENTRAL DRUG<br>TASK FORCE-WEST<br>PLAINS CITY | 0         | 0       | 0     | 0     | 0      | 31    | 0     | 98      | 0     | 0                               | 459            |
| EAST CENTRAL DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                  | 0         | 0       | 0     | 0     | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0       | 0     | 0                               | 182            |
| MID-MO MULTIJUR<br>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<br>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<br>APPLIED<br>FOR | WARRANTS<br>AUTHORIZED | WARRANTS<br>WARRANTS SERVED/ARREST<br>SERVED MADE |      |       | CONSENT<br>SEARCHES |
|--|----------------------------|------------------------|---|------|-------|---------------------|
|  | FREQ                       | FREQ                   | FREQ  | FREQ | 8     | FREQ                |
| DRUG TASK FORCE                                    |                            |                        |   |      |       |                     |
| N COUNTY MUNICPAL<br>ENF GRP-BRIDGETON             | 20                         | 20                     | 20  | 20   | 100.0 | 20                  |
| BUCHANAN CO DRUG<br>STRIKE FORCE                   | 50                         | 50                     | 50  | 50   | 100.0 | 76                  |
| LAKE AREA<br>NARCOTICS ENF GRP                     | 64                         | 64                     | 57  | 57   | 100.0 | 45                  |
| COMBINED OZARKS<br>MULTIJUR ENF TEAM-<br>GREENE CO | 124                        | 124                    | 124   | 124  | 100.0 | 139                 |
| JACKSON CO<br>MULTIJUR DRUG TASK<br>FORCE          | 43                         | 43                     | 43  | 42   | 97.7  | 43                  |
| JASPER CO DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                       | 62                         | 62                     | 54  | 54   | 100.0 | 12                  |
| NARC. ACTIVITIES<br>REDCTN. COALTN<br>JEFFERSON CO | 33                         | 33                     | 33  | 33   | 100.0 | 164                 |
| KC MULTIJUR DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                     | 49                         | 49                     | 49  | 46   | 93.9  | 941                 |
| LAFAYETTE CO<br>NARCOTICS UNIT                     | 30                         | 30                     | 29  | 23   | 79.3  | 25                  |
|  |                            |                        |   |      |       |                     |

MID-MO UNIFIED

| STRIKE TEAM/NARC<br>GRP               | 36  | 36  | 36  | 36  | 100.0 | 13  |
|---------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|
| MINERAL AREA DRUG<br>TASK FORCE       | 17  | 17  | 17  | 17  | 100.0 | 117 |
| SW MO DRUG TASK<br>Force              | 28  | 28  | 28  | 27  | 96.4  | 118 |
| CLAY COUNTY DRUG<br>TASK FORCE        | 12  | 12  | 12  | 12  | 100.0 | 8   |
| NE MO NARCOTICS<br>TASK FORCE         | 12  | 12  | 11  | 10  | 90.9  | 36  |
| BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK<br>FORCE           | 21  | 21  | 21  | 21  | 100.0 | 125 |
| PLATTE CO MULTIJUR<br>ENF GRP         | 8   | 8   | 9   | 9   | 100.0 | 37  |
| SE MISSOURI DRUG<br>TASK FORCE        | 118 | 118 | 118 | 105 | 89.0  | 105 |
| ST CHARLES CO REG.<br>DRUG TASK FORCE | 63  | 63  | 58  | 58  | 100.0 | 107 |
| STL CO MULTIJUR<br>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<br>APPLIED<br>FOR |      | WARRANTS<br>WARRANTS SERVED/ARREST<br>SERVED MADE |      |       | CONSENT<br>SEARCHES |  |
|--|----------------------------|------|---|------|-------|---------------------|--|
|  | FREQ                       | FREQ | FREQ  | FREQ | %     | FREQ                |  |
| DRUG TASK FORCE                                  |                            |      |   |      |       |                     |  |
| METRO MULTIJUR<br>UNDRCVR DRUG PROG.<br>STL CITY | 75                         | 75   | 75  | 60   | 80.0  | 13                  |  |
| N MO DRUG TASK<br>FORCE-ADAIR CO                 | 29                         | 29   | 29  | 22   | 75.9  | 49                  |  |
| S CENTRAL DRUG<br>TASK FORCE-WEST<br>PLAINS CITY | 37                         | 37   | 37  | 37   | 100.0 | 21                  |  |
| EAST CENTRAL DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                  | 37                         | 36   | 36  | 25   | 69.4  | 46                  |  |
| MID-MO MULTIJUR<br>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<br>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<br>WILD<br>MARIJUANA | OUNCES<br>CULT<br>MARIJU-<br>ANA | OUNCES<br>SINS<br>MARIJU-<br>ANA | PLANTS<br>PLANTS WILD CULT<br>MARIJUANA MARIJUANA |       | PLANTS<br>SINS<br>MARIJUANA |
|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|-------|-----------------------------|
|  | TOTAL                       | TOTAL                            | TOTAL                            | TOTAL   | TOTAL | TOTAL                       |
| DRUG TASK FORCE                                    |                             |                                  |                                  |   |       |                             |
| N COUNTY MUNICPAL<br>ENF GRP-BRIDGETON             | 0                           | 0                                | 0                                | 0   | 9     | 0                           |
| BUCHANAN CO DRUG<br>STRIKE FORCE                   | 0                           | 0                                | 0                                | 4,500   | 0     | 0                           |
| LAKE AREA<br>NARCOTICS ENF GRP                     | 0                           | 0                                | 0                                | 0   | 15    | 0                           |
| COMBINED OZARKS<br>MULTIJUR ENF TEAM-<br>GREENE CO | 0                           | 552.00                           | 109.00                           | 0   | 300   | 0                           |
| JACKSON CO<br>MULTIJUR DRUG TASK<br>FORCE          | 0                           | 0                                | 0                                | 0   | 8     | 0                           |
| JASPER CO DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                       | 0                           | 0                                | 0                                | 0   | 0     | 0                           |
| NARC. ACTIVITIES<br>REDCTN. COALTN<br>JEFFERSON CO | 0                           | 0                                | 0                                | 0   | 294   | 0                           |
| KC MULTIJUR DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                     | 0                           | 0                                | 0                                | 0   | 475   | 0                           |
| LAFAYETTE CO<br>NARCOTICS UNIT                     | 0                           | 7.20                             | 0                                | 0   | 56    | 0                           |

| MID-MO UNIFIED<br>STRIKE TEAM/NARC<br>GRP | 0         | 0 | 0      | 0     | 14    | 0 |
|---|-----------|---|--------|-------|-------|---|
| MINERAL AREA DRUG<br>TASK FORCE           | 0         | 0 | 0      | 0     | 495   | 0 |
| SW MO DRUG TASK<br>FORCE                  | 0         | 0 | 0      | 0     | 2,244 | 0 |
| CLAY COUNTY DRUG<br>TASK FORCE            | 100000.00 | 0 | 0      | 737   | 0     | 4 |
| NE MO NARCOTICS<br>TASK FORCE             | 0         | 0 | 0      | 327   | 47    | 0 |
| BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK<br>Force               | 0         | 0 | 0      | 0     | 5     | 0 |
| PLATTE CO MULTIJUR<br>ENF GRP             | 0         | 0 | 0      | 1,000 | 28    | 0 |
| SE MISSOURI DRUG<br>TASK FORCE            | 0         | 0 | 428.82 | 75    | 28    | 0 |
| ST CHARLES CO REG.<br>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<br>ENF GRP-BRIDGETON             | 6   |
| BUCHANAN CO DRUG<br>STRIKE FORCE                   | 4   |
| LAKE AREA<br>NARCOTICS ENF GRP                     | 91  |
| COMBINED OZARKS<br>MULTIJUR ENF TEAM-<br>GREENE CO | 104 |
| JACKSON CO<br>MULTIJUR DRUG TASK<br>FORCE          | 6   |
| JASPER CO DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                       | 72  |
| NARC. ACTIVITIES<br>REDCTN. COALTN<br>JEFFERSON CO | 169 |
| KC MULTIJUR DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                     | 0   |
| LAFAYETTE CO<br>NARCOTICS UNIT                     | 5   |
| MID-MO UNIFIED<br>STRIKE TEAM/NARC<br>GRP          | 12  |
| Gru  | 16  |

| MINERAL AREA DRUG<br>TASK FORCE       | 219 |
|---------------------------------------|-----|
| SW MO DRUG TASK<br>Force              | 103 |
| CLAY COUNTY DRUG<br>TASK FORCE        | 1   |
| NE MO NARCOTICS<br>TASK FORCE         | 64  |
| BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK<br>Force           | 36  |
| PLATTE CO MULTIJUR<br>ENF GRP         | 0   |
| SE MISSOURI DRUG<br>TASK FORCE        | 92  |
| ST CHARLES CO REG.<br>DRUG TASK FORCE | 85  |
| STL CO MULTIJUR<br>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<br>UNDRCVR DRUG PROG.<br>STL CITY | 8    |
|--|------|
| N MO DRUG TASK<br>FORCE-ADAIR CO                 | 56   |
| S CENTRAL DRUG<br>TASK FORCE-WEST<br>PLAINS CITY | 116  |
| EAST CENTRAL DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                  | 79   |
| MID-MO MULTIJUR<br>DRUG TASK FORCE               | 70   |
| NITRO-GRUNDY TF                                  | 0    |
| FRANKLIN UNION TF                                | 81   |
| CNET - BATES CO<br>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<br>SEIZED | MARIJUANA<br>OUNCES | COCAINE<br>OUNCES | CRACK<br>OUNCES | METH<br>OUNCES | HEROIN<br>OUNCES | LSD<br>OUNCES | PCP<br>OUNCES | ECSTASY<br>OUNCES | /EPHED- | ANHYDR-<br>OUS<br>AMM.<br>OUNCES | OTHER<br>DRUGS<br>OUNCES |
|--|--------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|---------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
|  | TOTAL                    | TOTAL               | TOTAL             | TOTAL           | TOTAL          | TOTAL            | TOTAL         | TOTAL         | TOTAL             | TOTAL   | TOTAL                            | TOTAL                    |
| DRUG TASK FORCE                                    |                          |                     |                   |                 |                |                  |               |               |                   |         |                                  |                          |
| N COUNTY MUNICPAL<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>MULTIJUR ENF TEAM-<br>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<br>MULTIJUR DRUG TASK<br>FORCE          | \$617,647                | 516.22              | 85.36             | 1.06            | 63.79          | 0                | 0             | 0             | 0                 | 0       | 0                                | 0                        |
| JASPER CO DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                       | \$237,750                | 500.29              | 6.16              | 3.50            | 39.61          | 0                | 0             | 0             | 1.80              | 5.96    | 0                                | 0                        |
| NARC. ACTIVITIES<br>REDCTN. COALTN<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>FORCE              | \$139,969   | 345.56   | 0.10   | 0     | 19.70  | 0    | 0 | 0    | 0    | 0     | 0 | 0     |
| CLAY COUNTY DRUG<br>TASK FORCE        | \$164,000   | 595.99   | 0.04   | 0     | 2.00   | 0.07 | 0 | 0    | 0    | 0     | 0 | 80.88 |
| NE MO NARCOTICS<br>TASK FORCE         | \$48,400    | 86.03    | 0.09   | 3.56  | 1.06   | 0    | 0 | 0    | 0    | 0.08  | 0 | 0.87  |
| BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK<br>Force           | \$433,700   | 104.25   | 282.20 | 7.66  | 3.72   | 0    | 0 | 0    | 0    | 0     | 0 | 0     |
| PLATTE CO MULTIJUR<br>ENF GRP         | \$231,842   | 776.90   | 0.70   | 0     | 3.99   | 0.23 | 0 | 0    | 0.09 | 0     | 0 | 4.79  |
| SE MISSOURI DRUG<br>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.<br>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<br>SEIZED | MARIJUANA<br>OUNCES | COCAINE<br>OUNCES | CRACK<br>OUNCES | METH<br>OUNCES | HEROIN<br>OUNCES | LSD<br>OUNCES | PCP<br>OUNCES | ECSTASY<br>OUNCES | /EPHED- | ANHYDR-<br>OUS<br>AMM.<br>OUNCES | OTHER<br>DRUGS<br>OUNCES |
|--|--------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|---------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
|  | TOTAL                    | TOTAL               | TOTAL             | TOTAL           | TOTAL          | TOTAL            | TOTAL         | TOTAL         | TOTAL             | TOTAL   | TOTAL                            | TOTAL                    |
| DRUG TASK FORCE                                  |                          |                     |                   |                 |                |                  |               |               |                   |         |                                  |                          |
| STL CO MULTIJUR<br>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<br>UNDRCVR DRUG PROG.<br>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<br>FORCE-ADAIR CO                 | \$31,049                 | 36.35               | 0.44              | 0.09            | 9.51           | 0                | 0             | 0             | 0                 | 0       | 0                                | 0                        |
| S CENTRAL DRUG<br>TASK FORCE-WEST<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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-<br>/EPHED-<br>RINE | ANHYDR-<br>OUS<br>AMMONI-<br>A* | OTHER<br>DRUG |
|--|-----------|---------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|---------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|
|  | DOSES     | DOSES   | DOSES | DOSES | DOSES  | DOSES | DOSES | DOSES   | DOSES                      | DOSES                           | DOSES         |
| DRUG TASK FORCE                                    |           |         |       |       |        |       |       |         |                            |                                 |               |
| N COUNTY MUNICPAL<br>ENF GRP-BRIDGETON             | o         | 0       | 0     | O     | 428    | 2     | O     | 86      | 0                          | 0                               | 237           |
| BUCHANAN CO DRUG<br>STRIKE FORCE                   | ٥         | 0       | 0     | O     | 458    | 0     | 0     | 141     | 0                          | 0                               | 1179          |
| LAKE AREA<br>NARCOTICS ENF GRP                     | 0         | 0       | 0     | O     | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0       | 918                        | 0                               | 99            |
| COMBINED OZARKS<br>MULTIJUR ENF TEAM-<br>GREENE CO | 0         | 0       | 4     | O     | 0      | 2     | 12    | 44      | 6                          | 0                               | 1657          |
| JACKSON CO<br>MULTIJUR DRUG TASK<br>FORCE          | 0         | 0       | 0     | 0     | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0       | 0                          | 0                               | 73            |
| JASPER CO DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                       | O         | 0       | 0     | O     | 0      | 0     | 0     | 56      | 122                        | 0                               | 107           |
| NARC. ACTIVITIES<br>REDCTN. COALTN<br>JEFFERSON CO | 0         | 0       | 0     | O     | 115    | 0     | 0     | 0       | 770                        | 0                               | 290           |
| KC MULTIJUR DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                     | o         | 0       | 0     | O     | 0      | 0     | 0     | 919     | 0                          | 0                               | 547           |
| LAFAYETTE CO<br>NARCOTICS UNIT                     | O         | 0       | 0     | O     | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0       | 0                          | 0                               | 37            |
|  |           |         |       |       |        |       |       |         |                            |                                 |               |

MID-MO UNIFIED

| STRIKE TEAM/NARC<br>GRP               | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0   | 0   | 5   | 0    |  |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|---|-----|-----|-----|------|--|
| MINERAL AREA DRUG<br>TASK FORCE       | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0   | 0   | 181 | 1110 |  |
| SW MO DRUG TASK<br>FORCE              | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0   | 140 | 0   | 791  |  |
| CLAY COUNTY DRUG<br>TASK FORCE        | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 122  |  |
| NE MO NARCOTICS<br>TASK FORCE         | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 60   |  |
| BOOTHEEL DRUG TASK<br>FORCE           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 38   |  |
| PLATTE CO MULTIJUR<br>ENF GRP         | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 427  |  |
| SE MISSOURI DRUG<br>TASK FORCE        | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 4   | 0 | 317 | 0   | 0   | 1333 |  |
| ST CHARLES CO REG.<br>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-<br>OUS<br>AMMONI-<br>A* | OTHER<br>DRUG |
|--|-----------|---------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|---------|-------|---------------------------------|---------------|
|  | DOSES     | DOSES   | DOSES | DOSES | DOSES  | DOSES | DOSES | DOSES   | DOSES | DOSES                           | DOSES         |
| DRUG TASK FORCE                                  |           |         |       |       |        |       |       |         |       |                                 |               |
| STL CO MULTIJUR<br>DRUG TASK FORCE               | O         | 0       | 0     | 0     | 0      | 3     | 0     | 2       | 664   | 6                               | 40            |
| METRO MULTIJUR<br>Undrcvr drug prog.<br>Stl city | 0         | 0       | 0     | 0     | 650    | 0     | 0     | 59      | 0     | 0                               | 65            |
| N MO DRUG TASK<br>FORCE-ADAIR CO                 | o         | 0       | 0     | 0     | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0       | 0     | 0                               | 69            |
| S CENTRAL DRUG<br>TASK FORCE-WEST<br>PLAINS CITY | 0         | 0       | 0     | 0     | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0       | 452   | 0                               | 126           |
| EAST CENTRAL DRUG<br>TASK FORCE                  | 0         | 0       | 0     | 0     | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0       | 0     | 55                              | 469           |
| MID-MO MULTIJUR<br>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<br>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<br>(4th Qu |       | TOTAL ACTIVE<br>CASES<br>(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<br>2011        | COMPLETE | D EXAMS | DRUG TES<br>REQUE |       | DRUGS NOT<br>IDENTIFIED<br>CASES DOW & |       | DRUGS<br>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<br>LAB     | 6083     | 100.0   | 2166              | 35.6  | 228                                    | 3.7   | 3689                | 60.6  |
| ST. LOUIS METRO<br>POLICE LAB | 10121    | 100.0   | 6908              | 68.3  | 250                                    | 2.5   | 2963                | 29.3  |
| TRUMAN STATE<br>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<br>SATELLITE LAB | 1285     | 100.0   | 33                | 2.6   | 88                                     | 6.8   | 1164                | 90.6  |
| MSHP TROOP C<br>SATELLITE LAB | 1880     | 100.0   | 13                | 0.7   | 340                                    | 18.1  | 1527                | 81.2  |
| MSHP TROOP D<br>SATELLITE LAB | 7191     | 100.0   | 3795              | 52.8  | 244                                    | 3.4   | 3152                | 43.8  |
| MSHP TROOP D<br>Carthage Lab  | 1609     | 100.0   | 469               | 29.1  | 65                                     | 4.0   | 1075                | 66.8  |
| MSHP TROOP E<br>SATELLITE LAB | 3620     | 100.0   | 1828              | 50.5  | 91                                     | 2.5   | 1701                | 47.0  |
| MSHP TROOP G<br>SATELLITE LAB | 744      | 100.0   | 0                 | 0.0   | 40                                     | 5.4   | 704                 | 94.6  |
| MSHP TROOP H<br>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.<br>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<br>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<br>CRIME LAB | 10  | 2.8   | 5   | 3.7   | 12  | 3.9   | 0 | * | 0 | 0.0   | 0  | 0.0   |  |
| INDEPENDENCE REG.<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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.<br>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<br/>QTRS 1 - 4, FY 2011STATEWIDE AVERAGE IS WEIGHTED BY<br/>THE NUMBER OF CASES OF EACH LABORATORY

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

| INDEPENDENCE REG.<br>CRIME LAB | 0  | 0.0   |  |
|--------------------------------|----|-------|--|
| STATEWIDE TOTAL                | 57 | 100.0 |  |

#### TABLE 7 IDENTIFICATION OF RESURGENT ILLICIT DRUGS BY CRIME LABORATORY

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

MSHP TROOP E

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

# Attachment C

Multi-Jurisdictional Cyber Crime Task Forces FY11 Summary Report

















