



CONTROLLING DRUG ABUSE IN AMERICA'S CITIES

**A 30-City Survey on the Implementation of
Anti-Drug Abuse Act Block Grant Programs
and on Local Drug Control Efforts**

September, 1990



126497

THE UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	5
THE DRUG CONTROL AND SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT GRANT PROGRAM -- AN ANALYSIS OF FY90 STATE SUBGRANT AWARD DATA	7
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAMS IN THE SURVEY CITIES	13
THE STATUS OF THE DRUG PROBLEM AND OF EFFORTS TO CONTROL IT IN THE SURVEY CITIES	21
CITIES RESPONDING TO THE SURVEY	33
SURVEY INSTRUMENT	35

126497

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this ~~copyrighted~~ material has been granted by

Public Domain

United States Conference of Mayors

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the ~~copyright~~ owner.

SUMMARY

The Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 marked the first time that the national government approached the problems of illegal drug trafficking and abuse in a comprehensive manner. Among its many provisions were several which established three new block grant programs for enforcement, education and treatment. These programs provided funds in block grants to the states, with the requirement that a large portion of the funds be passed through to local jurisdictions and agencies. Reports done by the Conference of Mayors have shown that only a small portion of the funds are reaching the nation's cities, and that these funds are not reaching the cities in either an efficient or an equitable manner.

The purposes of this report are 1) to examine the awards made by the states to state and local agencies during the first three-quarters of the current fiscal year under the Drug Control and System Improvement Grant Program, 2) to assess the status of implementation of the three block grant programs in 30 survey cities, with particular attention to the Drug Control and System Improvement Grant Program; and 3) to provide information on the extent of the drug problem in those cities, and on efforts to control it.

Following is a summary of the contents of this report:

THE DRUG CONTROL AND SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT GRANT PROGRAM — AN ANALYSIS OF FY90 STATE SUB-GRANT AWARD DATA

- o Of the \$386 million allocated to the 50 states and the District of Columbia through the formula grant program during the first three quarters of FY90:
 - * One-half (\$192 million) remains unawarded, or the grantee has not been named;
 - * Twenty-one percent (\$80 million) has been awarded to state agencies;
 - * Nine percent (\$34 million) has been awarded for multi-jurisdictional efforts;
 - * Eight percent (\$32 million) has been awarded to counties;
 - * Six percent (\$24 million) has been awarded to city governments;
 - * Five percent (\$19 million) has been retained by the states for administration;
 - * One percent (\$5 million) has been used to make confidential awards.
 - * In 20 states, no cities have received any funds.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAMS IN THE SURVEY CITIES

City Participation in the Development of the State Plans

- o Fifty-seven percent of the survey cities have participated in the development of their state's plans for anti-drug education; 43 percent of the cities have never participated.
- o One-half of the survey cities have participated in the development of their state's plans for treatment; the other half have not.
- o Seventy-nine percent of the cities have participated in the development of their state's plans for enforcement; 21 percent have not participated.

The Grant-in-Aid System — Responsive to City Needs?

- o Sixty-four percent of the survey cities do not believe that the grant-in-aid system (primarily state block grants) established through the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 is responsive to their needs; 36 percent believe it is.
- o Nearly three out of four of the cities responding to an open-ended question stated that direct federal funding of cities, or a sub-state funding entitlement for cities, would make the Anti-Drug Abuse Act programs more responsive to their needs.

State Administration of the Block Grant Programs

- o Rating state administration of the anti-drug block grant programs:
 - * For education, 38 percent of the responding cities gave their state a bad rating; 21 percent gave a good rating.
 - * For treatment, 59 percent of the cities gave their state a bad rating; 14 percent gave a good rating.
 - * For enforcement, 41 percent of the responding cities gave their state a bad rating; 37 percent gave a good rating.

City Involvement in the FY90 Enforcement Assistance Block Grant

- o Sixty-two percent of the survey cities have had an opportunity to review the state plan; 38 percent have not.
- o Sixty-six percent of the survey cities have had an opportunity to participate in the state planning process; 34 percent have not.
- o Fifty-seven percent of the cities know how much funding their city will receive under the plan; the rest do not.
- o Eighty-three percent of the responding cities have a say in deciding how the funds which come to their city will be spent; the rest do not.

- o Seventy-one percent of the responding cities feel that the funds are being spent for activities consistent with their city's drug enforcement priorities; 29 percent say they are not.

Federal Anti-Drug Enforcement Funds Received By the Survey Cities

- o Twenty-seven percent of the survey cities have yet to receive any funding for any year through the Drug Control and System Improvement Grant Program.

THE STATUS OF THE DRUG PROBLEM AND OF EFFORTS TO CONTROL IT IN THE SURVEY CITIES

Indicators of Illegal Drug Activity Over the Last Year

- o Casual drug use increased in 52 percent of the survey cities, decreased in 12 percent of the cities and remained the same in 36 percent of the cities.
- o Hard core drug use increased in 73 percent of the survey cities, decreased in four percent of the cities and remained the same in 23 percent of the cities.
- o Drug-related crimes increased in 82 percent of the cities, decreased in seven percent of the cities and remained the same in 11 percent of the cities.
- o The volume of drugs seized increased in 89 percent of the survey cities and decreased in 11 percent of the cities.

Local Media and the Drug Problem

- o Local media coverage of the drug problem increased in 64 percent of the survey cities, decreased in two cities and remained the same in 29 percent of the cities.
- o Local media coverage is having a positive effect in nine out of ten of the responding cities.
- o Officials in seven out of 10 of the survey cities report that the local media has played a role beyond coverage of the problem in their city's anti-drug efforts.

Are Cities Winning the War on Drugs?

- o Officials in 41 percent of the survey cities said that, taking all efforts into consideration, they are losing the war on drugs. Twenty-eight percent of the cities said they were winning the war on drugs. The remaining cities were unable to answer the question with a yes or a no.

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

The Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 marked the first time that the national government approached the problems of illegal drug trafficking and abuse in a comprehensive manner. It strengthened critical federal interdiction efforts, such as those of the Customs Service, the Coast Guard and the military, and it stiffened many federal criminal penalties for drug-related crimes. Of particular importance was the assistance to be provided to state and local governments for drug education, treatment and enforcement efforts.

When the 1986 Act was debated in Congress it was in the context of getting help to the cities, to the trenches in the war on drugs. What actually passed the Congress was a bill which provided funds primarily to the states, with the requirement that a good portion be passed through to local jurisdictions and agencies.

A survey done by the Conference of Mayors one year after the 1986 anti-drug law was enacted showed that only a small fraction of the funds intended to support local efforts had actually reached cities. Few cities had gotten commitments for funding, and fewer still had seen any funds. The money was bogged down in the bureaucracy of the federal and state governments.

During the second year of the program, the funds continued their slow movement. Mid-way through that fiscal year only 11 states had submitted plans to the Justice Department for the Drug Control and System Improvement Grant Program, the program which provides assistance to local enforcement efforts, and only five of those state plans had been approved.

As a result of changes in the federal law which put tight deadlines on the federal and state governments, state plans under the Drug Control and System Improvement Grant Program were submitted to the Justice Department much earlier in FY89, the third year of that program. Still, a survey done in the Spring of 1989 by the Conference of Mayors showed that two out of three of the survey cities believed that the system of state block grants established through the 1986 Act was not responsive to their needs. In response to an open-ended question, more than four out of five of the cities called for direct federal funding of cities, or for a sub-state funding entitlement for cities, to make the various programs more responsive to their needs. Half of the cities had never participated in the development of the state plan for enforcement, and 23 percent had yet to receive any funding for any year through the Drug Control and System Improvement Grant Program.

In January 1990 the Conference published an analysis of sub-state allocations and discretionary grants made through the Drug Control and System Improvement Grant Program during FY89. It showed that city governments received 15 percent (\$22.1 million) of the \$150 million in federal funds available for the program. The state formula grant program accounted for \$14.4 million of these funds; the remaining \$7.7 million were provided through the discretionary grants program.

PURPOSES

This report has several purposes. First, it examines the awards made by the states to state and local agencies during the first three quarters of the current fiscal year under the Drug Control and System Improvement Grant Program. Second, it assesses the status of implementation of the three block grant programs, with particular attention given to the Drug Control and System Improvement Grant Program. Finally, it provides information on the extent of drug problems in cities and efforts to control them.

A questionnaire was sent to the Conference of Mayors' leadership on this issue, members of the Executive Committee, Advisory Board and Task Force on Drug Control. Responses were received from 30 mayors of major cities across the nation. The information which they provided is summarized on the following pages. The reader should note that in no case do the percentages reported for a survey question include a city which did not respond to that question.

In addition, the Conference requested and received from the Bureau of Justice Assistance the data on substate awards that were the basis for the analysis of the FY90 subgrant awards.

THE DRUG CONTROL AND SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT GRANT PROGRAM —
AN ANALYSIS OF FY90 STATE SUBGRANT AWARD DATA

Analysis of state reports on the grants made to state and local agencies by state governments under the Drug Control and System Improvement Grant Program shows that more than three-fourths of the way through Fiscal Year 1990, city governments have been awarded six percent of the federal funds available to the states, and in 20 states, no cities have received any funds.

A total of \$386,247,000 was allocated to the 50 states and the District of Columbia through the formula grant program during FY90. Of these funds:

- o One-half (\$192,376,583) was either unawarded or the grantee has not been named;
- o Twenty-one percent (\$79,993,937) was awarded to state agencies;
- o Nine percent (\$34,193,430) was awarded for multi-jurisdictional efforts;
- o Eight percent (\$31,918,164) was awarded to counties;
- o Six percent (\$23,803,682) was awarded to city governments;
- o Five percent (\$18,550,312) was retained by the states for administration;
- o One percent (\$5,410,892) was used to make confidential awards.

The 20 states in which no funds have been awarded to cities are Colorado, Connecticut, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington and Wyoming.

It should be noted that approximately 15 percent of the multi-jurisdictional awards were made to city governments, but serve a broader area that extends beyond city limits. These awards, therefore, were included in the multi-jurisdictional category. Likewise, it should be recognized that cities are likely indirect beneficiaries of multi-jurisdictional awards made to other units of government. It is also likely that cities are recipients of some of the confidential awards.

The following table provides information on the sub-state awards for each state. This table is based on data supplied to the Conference of Mayors by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA). The states are required to file reports on their sub-state allocations within 30 days after they are made. The data, requested by the Conference on August 9, 1990 and received from BJA on August 17, 1990, should reflect all FY90 sub-state grants made during the first three-quarters of the current fiscal year, as well as those made at the start of the fourth quarter.

STATE FY 90 ALLOCATION/ % PASSED THROUGH TO LOCAL JURISDICTIONS		AWARDED TO STATE AGENCIES		RETAINED FOR STATE ADMINISTRATION		AWARDED TO CITIES		AWARDED TO COUNTIES		AWARDED FOR MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL EFFORTS		CONFIDENTIAL AWARDS		UNWARDED/ TO BE NAMED	
\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%
Alabama															
6,593,000	51.28%	1,118,256	17%	659,300	10%	381,457	6%	255,231	4%	4,057,912	62%	0		120,844	2%
Alaska															
1,704,000	24.63%	150,000	9%	85,200	5%	400,000	23%	0		1,068,800	63%	0		0	
Arizona															
5,755,000	61.23%	270,268	5%	172,650	3%	717,826	12%	1,256,936	22%	0		0		3,337,320	58%
Arkansas															
4,260,000	57.78%	541,983	13%	88,000	2%	256,349	6%	277,801	7%	0		0		3,095,867	73%
California															
39,676,000	64.37%	3,277,254	8%	1,983,800	5%	835,038	2%	4,818,272	12%	0		4,370,416	11%	24,391,220	61%
Colorado															
5,498,000	64.03%	0		274,900	5%	0		0		0		5,223,100	95%	0	
Connecticut															
5,405,000	44.76%	1,275,000	24%	230,000	4%	0		0		0		0		2,400,000	72%
Delaware															
1,890,000	28.47%	1,521,000	80%	90,000	5%	188,000	10%	91,000	5%	0		0		0	
District of Columbia															
1,831,000		0		92,000	5%	1,739,000	95%	0		0		0		0	
Florida															
17,842,000	65.13%	0		0	0%	27,119	0%	225,747	1%	96,557	1%	0		17,492,577	98%
Georgia															
9,653,000	58.16%	3,208,550	33%	965,300	10%	900,000	9%	0		4,546,550	47%	0		32,600	0%
Hawaii															
2,488,000	47.09%	895,275	36%	124,375	5%	0		1,468,350	59%	0		0		0	

STATE															
FY 90 ALLOCATION/ % PASSED THROUGH TO LOCAL JURISDICTIONS		AWARDED TO STATE AGENCIES		RETAINED FOR STATE ADMINISTRATION		AWARDED TO CITIES		AWARDED TO COUNTIES		AWARDED FOR MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL EFFORTS		CONFIDENTIAL AWARDS		UNWARDED/ TO BE NAMED	
\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%
Idaho															
2,358,000	62.82%	824,102	35%	141,480	6%	0		0		0		0		1,392,418	59%
Illinois															
16,857,000	66.51%	5,363,139	32%	842,850	5%	0		3,766,000	22%	3,807,139	23%	0		3,077,872	18%
Indiana															
8,580,000	58.91%	2,678,482	31%	429,000	5%	942,230	11%	1,699,782	20%	454,874	5%	0		2,375,632	28%
Iowa															
4,860,000	46.27%	2,250,000	46%	243,000	5%	25,000	1%	0		0		0		2,342,000	48%
Kansas															
4,397,000	54.58%	0		219,850	5%	0		0		0		0		4,177,150	95%
Kentucky															
6,080,000	30.33%	1,296,015	21%	304,000	5%	0		0		0		0		4,479,985	74%
Louisiana															
7,011,000	55.09%	915,000	13%	420,660	6%	1,246,141	18%	841,192	12%	2,039,946	29%	1,040,476	15%	507,585	7%
Maine															
2,634,000	45.98%	1,222,020	46%	98,000	4%	40,000	2%	94,000	4%	1,179,980	45%	0		0	
Maryland															
7,303,000	43.14%	3,745,393	51%	366,000	5%	402,750	6%	1,300,500	18%	0		0		1,488,357	20%
Massachusetts															
9,035,000	44.28%	4,235,000	47%	411,750	5%	1,038,250	11%	150,000	2%	0		0		3,200,000	35%
Michigan															
13,613,000	57.43%	0		450,000	3%	0		0		0		0		13,163,000	97%
Minnesota															
6,873,000	70.93%	3,464,962	50%	438,038	6%	0		15,000	0%	0		0		2,955,000	43%

STATE		FY 90 ALLOCATION/ % PASSED THROUGH TO LOCAL JURISDICTIONS		AWARDED TO STATE AGENCIES		RETAINED FOR STATE ADMINISTRATION		AWARDED TO CITIES		AWARDED TO COUNTIES		AWARDED FOR MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL EFFORTS		CONFIDENTIAL AWARDS		UNWARDED/ TO BE NAMED	
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	
Mississippi	4,568,000	57.17%	675,000	15%	365,400	8%	0		0		0		0		3,527,600	77%	
Missouri	8,012,000	58.08%	0		320,480	4%	0		0		0		0		7,691,520	96%	
Montana	2,088,000	58.56%	557,693	27%	104,400	5%	291,119	14%	1,000,141	48%	0		0		134,646	6%	
Nebraska	3,177,000	60.13%	0		0		0		0		0		0		3,177,000	100%	
Nevada	2,428,000	61.93%	0		121,400	5%	308,213	13%	143,877	6%	378,410	16%	0		1,476,100	61%	
New Hampshire	2,470,000	54.88%	805,612	33%	123,500	5%	765,890	31%	67,475	3%	79,775	3%	0		627,748	25%	
New Jersey	11,538,000	58.55%	7,035,000	61%	621,750	5%	731,250	6%	187,500	2%	2,962,500	26%	0		0		
New Mexico	3,047,000	44.84%	915,933	30%	304,700	10%	581,924	19%	381,544	13%	862,899	28%	0		0		
New York	25,459,000	64.53%	8,062,450	31%	300,000	1%	3,890,836	15%	6,705,708	26%	0		0		6,500,006	26%	
North Carolina	9,854,000	39.31%	1,593,218	16%	985,400	10%	718,870	7%	375,837	4%	5,813,834	59%	0		366,841	4%	
North Dakota	1,899,000	60.24%	0		94,950	5%	0		0		0		0		1,804,050	95%	
Ohio	15,820,000	61.89%	0		790,000	5%	0		0		0		0		15,030,000	95%	

STATE FY 90 ALLOCATION/ % PASSED THROUGH TO LOCAL JURISDICTIONS		AWARDED TO STATE AGENCIES		RETAINED FOR STATE ADMINISTRATION		AWARDED TO CITIES		AWARDED TO COUNTIES		AWARDED FOR MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL EFFORTS		CONFIDENTIAL AWARDS		UNWARDED/ TO BE NAMED	
\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%
Oklahoma															
5,418,000	46.28%	2,445,154	45%	270,900	5%	697,240	13%	231,284	4%	1,086,979	20%	0		686,443	13%
Oregon															
4,769,000	49.38%	0		238,450	5%	0		0		0		0		4,530,550	95%
Pennsylvania															
17,386,000	67.76%	1,351,622	8%	869,800	5%	1,115,344	6%	802,895	5%	0		0		13,246,339	76%
Rhode Island															
2,345,000	44.75%	1,055,832	45%	117,250	5%	116,918	5%	0		1,055,000	45%	0		0	
South Carolina															
5,729,000	40.96%	1,578,428	28%	197,250	3%	1,780,857	31%	1,725,100	30%	428,180	7%	0		19,185	0%
South Dakota															
1,962,000	49.36%	665,349	34%	98,100	5%	311,000	16%	0		677,689	35%	0		209,862	11%
Tennessee															
7,676,000	52.21%	2,337,762	30%	383,800	5%	1,260,000	16%	0		72,105	1%	0		3,622,333	47%
Texas															
23,999,000	67.52%	1,690,000	7%	1,199,950	5%	0		0		0		0		21,109,050	88%
Utah															
3,297,000	50.90%	1,537,900	47%	164,800	5%	0		0		0		0		1,594,300	49%
Vermont															
1,749,000	28.20%	1,708,221	98%	40,779	2%	0		0		0		0		0	
Virginia															
9,207,000	31.59%	1,123,000	12%	920,700	10%	759,130	8%	150,559	2%	2,280,000	25%	0		3,973,611	43%
Washington															
7,339,000	62.91%	1,250,000	17%	366,950	5%	0		560,000	8%	0		0		5,162,050	70%

STATE															
FY 90 ALLOCATION/ % PASSED THROUGH TO LOCAL JURISDICTIONS		AWARDED TO STATE AGENCIES		RETAINED FOR STATE ADMINISTRATION		AWARDED TO CITIES		AWARDED TO COUNTIES		AWARDED FOR MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL EFFORTS		CONFIDENTIAL AWARDS		UNWARDED/ TO BE NAMED	
\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%
West Virginia															
3,551,000	49.86%	1,690,493	48%	177,550	5%	826,817	23%	279,357	8%	0		0		576,783	16%
Wisconsin															
7,622,000	67.39%	2,213,125	29%	241,900	3%	509,114	7%	4,291,376	56%	0		0		366,485	5%
Wyoming															
1,642,000	55.41%	1,450,446	88%	0		0		0		0		0		191,554	12%
Totals															
386,247,000		79,993,937	21%	18,550,312	5%	23,803,682	6%	31,918,164	8%	34,193,430	9%	5,410,892	1%	192,376,583	50%

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAMS IN THE SURVEY CITIES

CITY PARTICIPATION IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLANS

Fifty-seven percent of the survey cities have participated in the development of their state's plans for anti-drug education; 43 percent of the cities have never participated. Officials from Albuquerque, Atlanta, Knoxville and Newton have served on state planning boards or advisory committees. Boston officials met with the Governor's Alliance Against Drugs. The City of Houston initiated communication with the state and testified before a legislative task force. Indianapolis submitted its own plan to the state. Other cities which have participated are Birmingham, Dayton, Denver, Milwaukee, Philadelphia, Providence, San Francisco, Tampa and Washington, D.C. (which performs the functions of both a state and a city for the block grant programs).

One-half of the survey cities have participated in the development of their state's plans for treatment; the other half have not. Colorado Springs and Knoxville officials served on state planning boards or committees. Houston again initiated its own communications with the state and testified before a legislative task force. Indianapolis submitted its own plan to the state. Other cities which have participated are Atlanta, Boston, Dayton, Denver, Milwaukee, Philadelphia, San Francisco, Tampa and Washington, D.C.

Seventy-nine percent of the cities have participated in the development of their state's plans for enforcement; 21 percent have not participated. Albuquerque, Colorado Springs, Knoxville, Seattle and York officials all participated on state planning boards or committees. Alexandria officials participated in a state drug summit. Modesto officials participated in a state meeting at which they could comment on the plan. The process for participation for Louisville officials has been varied. In 1989 they presented testimony before the Governors' Commission for a Drug-Free Kentucky. Other cities which have participated in the state planning process for the enforcement block grant are Birmingham, Boston, Charlotte, Dayton, Denver, Houston, Indianapolis, Milwaukee, Philadelphia, Providence, San Francisco, Savannah, Tampa and Washington, D.C.

Some cities described efforts which related to the state planning process for all three of the block grants. The Mayor of Philadelphia and several citizens were interviewed by the Governor and the State Attorney General. As a result of those meetings the Governor designated "Pennfree Money" targeted for education and prevention funding, and additional money was provided for treatment and law enforcement. Milwaukee officials lobbied the state during its development of all three plans to see the recommendations of the Drug Free Milwaukee Task Force included in them.

THE GRANT-IN-AID SYSTEM — RESPONSIVE TO CITY NEEDS?

Officials in 64 percent of the survey cities do not believe that the grant-in-aid system (primarily state block grants) established through the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 is responsive to their cities needs. Officials in 10 cities believe the system is responsive to their needs.

LEGISLATIVE CHANGES

Nearly three out of four (73 percent) of the survey cities which responded to an open-ended question stated that direct federal funding of cities or a sub-state funding entitlement for cities would make the Anti-Drug Abuse Act programs more responsive to their needs. Among their comments on this and other needed changes:

Albuquerque: "More than one city agency should be allowed to receive funding."

Atlanta: "Grants should be made directly to some targeted cities rather than through the state."

Birmingham: There should be a "direct pass-through to cities, or a strict limitation on how long states can hold the money."

Boston: "Programs should be consolidated. Direct grants targeted through chief elected officials of cities would cut out state bureaucracy and allow the city to coordinate local strategies. Also, 'enforcement' money should be weighted on the basis of numbers of drug arrests."

Colorado Springs: The Act should be "revised to allow for direct funding to larger cities by the federal government. The current state block grant program is just not meeting our needs on a timely basis."

Dayton: "The money for treatment should be increased, especially for indigent persons, with funding directly to cities."

Denver: "There needs to be some system implemented that would enable automatic refunding for successful grant programs."

Houston: "Legislative amendments that provide for the distribution of funds based on a population-need sensitive formula would result in the more equitable distribution of funds and efficient collection of data. It would reduce unnecessary competition and eliminate needless bureaucracy. Such legislation would enhance long range planning for issues that require complex, dynamic approaches."

Indianapolis: "A direct pass-through to cities would allow the cities to track drug funding. Although constituents believe that the mayor has control over drug funding, he does not. Law enforcement grants are given instead to the Metro Drug Task Force, which is a coalition of local police departments and narcotics detectives."

Kansas City (MO): "Funding should be increased."

Knoxville: There should be a "100 percent pass-through."

Louisville: There should be "1) a direct pass-through to local jurisdictions, 2) a broadened match provision to include in-kind contributions, and 3) maintenance of the 75:25 match provision." (Current law would change the matching ratio to 50:50 in FY91; legislation is pending in Congress to maintain the current 75:25 match.)

Milwaukee: There should be "1) direct funding to cities, especially with law enforcement funding, 2) funds for the rehabilitation and/or demolition of properties seized during drug investigations and by court actions, and 3) the community policing approach should be encouraged."

Modesto: "The Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 addressed the correct law enforcement problems, but funds allocated were not sufficient to address the problems with a significant impact."

Oxnard: There should be a "direct pass-through of federal funds to cities."

Philadelphia: There should be a "direct grant to Philadelphia without restrictive language governing how the funding may be utilized."

Providence: "Legislation that would establish a direct pass-through of anti-drug enforcement grant funds through the states to local governments would make the Act more responsive because it would insure a more prompt receipt of much-needed funds to the cities, which are on the front lines of the war on drugs."

Savannah: "Federal aid should be granted directly to cities on an entitlement basis."

Seattle: "The Mazzoli amendment should become law." (The Mazzoli amendment would establish a formula-based direct pass-through to local governments in the Drug Control and System Improvement Grant Program.)

Tampa: "Direct allocations to cities would ensure city needs are met. However, as long as there is a cooperative and coordinated effort between the city and the county, the current allocation system is meeting local needs."

York: "Property and monies seized as a result of local initiatives should be forfeited to that municipality for its continuing enforcement efforts."

ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES

In response to an open-ended question, the city officials also described administrative changes which would make the anti-drug programs more responsive to their needs. Six cities called for simplified and/or clarified application, fund disbursement and reporting requirements. Three cities called for the more equitable and timely distribution of funds to cities. Two called for requirements relating to the involvement of city governments in the state planning process. Among the cities' comments:

Albuquerque: "Tighter control over the states should be maintained to insure that a more equitable distribution of funds occurs."

Birmingham: There should be "greater review of the state administration of funds, specifically as to the state government timetable for distribution and percentages of funds (which go) to urban as opposed to rural areas."

Charlotte: "Reporting requirements should be made known at the beginning of the grant period to insure that appropriate data are kept."

Colorado Springs: "The Bureau of Justice Assistance should be more flexible in the application of funding requirements."

Dayton: "The timing sequence for application submission and reviews locally needs improvement."

Denver: There should be "more involvement of the recipient agencies in the planning process before the agency funding period ends. Surveys should be sent out prior to completion of the project's funding. This should be done at the state level, which could add to the success of other programs being implemented."

Houston: "Administrative changes that would ensure equitable and efficient collection of statistical data are urgently needed. The present system has resulted in statistics that unevenly portray the extent of our state's drug problem. An inaccurate statistical picture inherently supports an inaccurate comprehensive solution."

Louisville: They should "1) mandate that cities be participants in the development of the state plan and allow local jurisdictions to review the state plan before it is submitted to the federal government, and 2) outline specific procedures for the disbursement of funds to ensure consistency and uniformity."

Milwaukee: There should be a "return to the pre-1988 drug law rules on federal adoptive forfeitures."

Modesto: "Administratively, California, through the Office of Criminal Justice Planning, did a good job with the funds this year. They were allocated non-competitively, through a formula which incorporated both population and crime rate. They were, however, allocated to California counties, not cities."

Philadelphia: "Philadelphia and other cities would like to see requirements which would lead to fewer categorical initiatives imposed by the states. We would also like to see a larger percentage of the dollars allocated at the beginning of our fiscal year, rather than at various points throughout the year."

Providence: "Administrative changes are necessary that would result in a less lengthy and complicated procedure for applying for funds."

Santa Barbara: "We are not notified when grant monies are available."

Savannah: "State agencies should not receive a large portion of 'local' anti-drug abuse act funds."

Seattle: There should be a "requirement that local law enforcement funds be distributed to some extent (based) on the magnitude of the drug problem, not just on a geographic basis."

Tampa: "Programmatic and project-generated income reporting requirements should be revised."

York: "Funding for local municipalities should be more readily available. For instance, if the local municipality has a cogent plan, such as an educational program (SPECDA or DARE) or an enforcement plan, monies should be available to help fund the program."

STATE ADMINISTRATION OF THE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAMS

The city officials were asked to rate their state's administration of the block grant programs for education, treatment and enforcement in terms of its responsiveness to addressing the illegal drug problems in their city. The rating was on a scale of one to five, with one being poor and five being excellent.

For the education block grant, 38 percent of the responding cities gave their state a bad rating (a rating of one or two on the scale). Forty-two percent gave their state a three. Twenty-one percent of the cities rated their state's administration of the education block grant program as good (four or five on the scale).

For the treatment program, 59 percent of the cities gave their states a bad rating (of one or two on the scale). Twenty-seven percent of the cities gave their state a rating of three. Fourteen percent of the cities gave their state a good rating of four. No cities gave their state a five in this category.

In the enforcement area, 41 percent of the cities gave their state a bad rating (of one or two) for block grant administration. Twenty-two percent of the cities rated their state's administration of the enforcement block grant as a three. Thirty-seven percent of the cities gave their states a good rating (of four or five), indicating that their administration of the enforcement block grant was responsive to the illegal drug problem in their city.

CITY INVOLVEMENT IN THE FY90 ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE BLOCK GRANT

The survey cities were asked to describe their involvement in and knowledge and assessment of their state's FY90 plan for funds under the Drug Control and System Improvement Block Grant Program. Among the survey cities:

- o Sixty-two percent have had an opportunity to review the state plan; 38 percent have not. Comments:

Houston: "Our state's anti-drug plan does not provide for the most effective approach to our city's specific problems."

Louisville: "The plan was reviewed after it had been submitted to the federal government."

Tampa: "The plan was reviewed by the Governor's Anti-Drug Abuse Task Force, which is chaired by the City of Tampa's Public Safety Director."

York: "It seems as though these plans are a well-guarded secret."

- o Sixty-six percent have had an opportunity to participate in the state planning process; 34 percent have not. Comments:

Boston: "Once the plan was submitted meetings were held, but discussions were in the context of the plan already submitted."

Colorado Springs: "We were given the opportunity to provide input to the state's goals and objectives, as well as to identify particular community needs."

Houston: "Testimony at Task Force hearings is the extent of our city's invited involvement."

Louisville: "The Crime Commission provided written testimony to the Governor's Commission for a Drug-free Kentucky (the Mayor of Louisville was a member), but the plan was written solely by the state."

Providence: "Police Department officials were consulted during the planning process."

Savannah: We had an "opportunity to attend a hearing, but it appears that the priorities were set prior to that input."

- o Fifty-seven percent know how much funding their city will receive under the plan; the rest do not. Comments:

Albuquerque: "There doesn't seem to be parity in this state in terms of per capita disbursement of funds. Smaller towns get more funding."

Colorado Springs: "The state changed the allocation formula for FY90 by diverting \$2 million to the five largest cities. This was done in response to large cities' lobbying for more proportionate money."

Houston: "The funding is restricted, and is not being used as efficiently as possible."

Modesto: "No money will come to the City of Modesto. It will go the Stanislaus County Drug Enforcement Agency, of which the City is a member."

Oxnard: "Funds will be distributed to the counties. Ventura County will receive \$191,321. No funds are scheduled for distribution to the City of Oxnard."

- o Eighty-three percent have a say in deciding how the funds which come to their city will be spent; the rest do not. Comments:

Boston: We have "input, but the state sets priorities."

Colorado Springs: "We identify our funding needs in the grant application. The state, however, decides which applications to approve."

Houston: "Allocation of funds within the city is limited to the restrictions as outlined in the grant applications."

Tampa: "The City of Tampa, through representation on the Hillsborough County Anti-Drug Abuse Advisory Council, participates in the planning and approval process for all projects to receive ADA funds. Any funds awarded to the City through this joint planning process are for specific projects proposed by the City which conform with federal/state eligibility guidelines."

- o Seventy-one percent feel that the funds are being spent for activities consistent with their city's drug enforcement priorities; 29 percent say they are not. Comments:

Birmingham: "Who knows? They don't come to the Mayor's Office to find out what we think."

Boston: "We would clearly have different priorities."

Houston: "The multi-jurisdictional requirements of the state plan conflict with the best use of funds by our police department."

Louisville: "The state determines the priorities. As noted earlier, we have had limited input to development of the state plan."

Providence: "Expenditures would be even more consistent if funds went directly to the city."

Savannah: "The funded Housing Authority project is under-funded and, while it addresses a need, there are other needs that were not eligible for funding (e.g. mini-stations, crime prevention, neighborhood programs, etc.)."

Seattle: "We get some funds, but it does not reflect our priorities; it reflects state priorities."

FEDERAL ANTI-DRUG ENFORCEMENT FUNDS RECEIVED BY THE SURVEY CITIES

The cities were asked to indicate the amount of anti-drug enforcement funding the city government received in 1987, 1988 and 1989 and expects to receive in 1990. Twenty-seven percent of the cities report that they have received no funding thus far through this program. These eight cities are Birmingham, Evanston, Modesto, Newton, Oxnard, San Juan, Santa Barbara and York. Dayton, Savannah and Seattle expect their first grants under the program this year.

The table on the next page shows the amount of funds the survey cities received in 1987, 1988 and 1989 and expect to receive this year through the Drug Control and System Improvement Grant Program.

FUNDING IN DOLLARS

CITY	1987	1988	1989	1990
Albuquerque	50,000	75,000	0	50,000
Birmingham	0	0	0	0
Boston	106,187	156,600	155,160	1,700,000/a
Charlotte	78,000	78,000	--	296,000
Colorado Springs	65,000	0	0	463,286
Dayton	0	0	0	689,131
Denver	0	300,000	236,000	430,000
Evanston	0	0	0	0
Houston	200,000	0	660,690	1,164,097
Indianapolis	0	441,861	255,586	3,014
Kansas City (MO)	0	273,856	54,000	216,187
Knoxville	125,000	125,000	200,000	396,000
Louisville	0	258,403	170,889	816,980/b
Modesto	0	0	0	0
Newton	0	0	0	0
Oxnard	0	0	0	0
Philadelphia	2,250,000	2,153,000	665,000	2,000,000
Providence	89,000	46,620	60,000	150,000
San Francisco	--	1,150,000	1,300,000	360,000
San Juan	0	0	0	0
Santa Barbara	0	0	0	0
Savannah	0	0	0	135,000
Seattle	0	0	0	140,000
Tampa	0	230,003	151,159	0
Washington, D.C.	889,000	571,000	731,000	1,831,000
York	0	0	0	0

a -- Amount of application pending with the state

b -- \$322,252 of this is amount of application pending with the state.

**THE STATUS OF THE DRUG PROBLEM AND OF
EFFORTS TO CONTROL IT IN THE SURVEY CITIES**

INDICATORS OF ILLEGAL DRUG ACTIVITY OVER THE LAST YEAR

The city officials were asked to provide information that would identify trends in the local drug problem. They reported that over the past year:

- o Casual drug use increased in 52 percent of the survey cities. It decreased in Boston, Philadelphia and Washington, D.C., and remained the same in 36 percent of the cities: Alexandria, Charlotte, Colorado Springs, Evanston, Kansas City (MO), Knoxville, Louisville, San Francisco and Seattle.
- o Hard core drug use increased in 73 percent of the cities. It decreased in Washington, D.C., and remained the same in 23 percent of the cities: Alexandria, Colorado Springs, Dayton, Evanston, Philadelphia and Seattle.
- o Drug-related crimes increased in 82 percent of the cities. They decreased in Tampa and Washington, D.C., and remained the same in 11 percent of the cities: Colorado Springs, Evanston and Seattle.
- o The volume of drugs seized increased in 89 percent of the survey cities. It decreased in San Francisco, Tampa and Washington, D.C.

LOCAL MEDIA AND THE DRUG PROBLEM

The city officials were asked several questions regarding the relationship of media coverage and the drug problem in their city. They reported that local media coverage of the drug problem increased in 64 percent of the cities. It decreased in San Francisco and Washington, D.C. It remained the same in 29 percent of the cities: Alexandria, Boston, Denver, Madison, Providence, Santa Barbara, Seattle and York.

They were also asked whether local media coverage is having a positive or negative effect on the drug problem in their city. Of those able to answer yes or no, nine out of 10 of the cities report that local media coverage is having a positive effect on the local drug problem. Among the cities' comments:

Alexandria: "With few exceptions, the media has had a positive effect on the City's enforcement efforts. They have helped in demonstrating the seriousness and depth of the drug problem."

Birmingham: "Media coverage has increased awareness, but the effect on the problem has to be considered negligible."

Boston: "Media coverage has remained constant, as has the magnitude of the problem. We draw no correlation between coverage and the drug problem. However, the media coverage of drug-related violence has, on occasion, unfairly stereotyped neighborhoods. More national efforts are also needed to curb the level of violence."

Charlotte: "Awareness has increased, although there are still segments of the population who believe drugs have no direct effect on them."

Colorado Springs: "Increased awareness has led to a far greater number of people and funding options being applied to the solutions to our City's drug problem."

Dayton: "There is increased community awareness of the problem."

Denver: "In some respects it has been positive in pointing out the problem. To those prone to criminal behavior the increased coverage has glamorized the drug dealer as an entrepreneur of some repute."

Evanston: "It has brought more public awareness to the drug situation, thereby affording the police department more resources to deal with it."

Houston: "In keeping with one of the goals of Houston Crackdown, the media has heightened the sensitivity of all citizens to become involved in the war on drugs."

Madison: "Present media coverage has had minimal impact on the drug problem."

Milwaukee: "The media often portrays the drug problem as an inner city, minority problem, rather than a problem we all must deal with. Too many editorials are against drug wars and not enough on fighting poverty."

Modesto: "There is more information available to the general public about how widespread the drug problem is. I do not believe, however, that media coverage affects drug usage."

Oxnard: There has been "no significant effect, either positive or negative."

San Francisco: "At times the effect was negative, as it glamorized the drug scene. Lately it has been more positive, as it has highlighted communities that have 'taken back their neighborhoods' from dealers."

Washington, D.C. "Despite an often negative portrayal of the problem as exclusively an African-American one, coverage seemed to get a message across about the harmful effects of drug use. The media has been instrumental in stigmatizing drug use."

Officials in seven out of 10 of the survey cities report that the local media has played an active role beyond coverage of the problem in their city's anti-drug efforts. Comments on this issue include:

Boston: "To some extent. Local media and press sponsor youth events acknowledging noteworthy accomplishments. Most events, however, are not geared to anti-drug efforts alone. Organizations work hard, but still too often sensationalize the drug problem."

Colorado Springs: "Radio stations have aired PSAs. The newspaper published a methadone story which attracted heroin users to the local methadone treatment program."

Dayton: "A special broadcast was coordinated with all local public and private TV stations participating."

Denver: "The media has sponsored some anti-drug abuse programs and has broadcast group meetings on drug problems, but more needs to be done showing the involvement of the youth who are saying 'no' to drugs."

Houston: "Our media outlets have participated in special events, broadcasts, sponsorships, etc. They have indeed taken the lead in many efforts."

Knoxville: "The Knoxville News-Sentinel Company, Metropolitan Drug Commission and the City of Knoxville have sponsored a 10-week comprehensive alcohol and other drug training program. In January of 1991, the combined media group will launch a one-year campaign of community education and information. The media have sponsored television specials, call-in panels and print media stories on specific issues of chemical health."

Modesto: "Post Newsweek Cable has donated air-time for programs dealing with drugs, drug-related crimes, and drug suppression programs."

Newton: "Newton's local newspapers have done an excellent job in reporting and communicating about school and citywide prevention programs, as well as discussing editorially the drug problem and the city's efforts in combatting abuse. Our local cable television company has also provided excellent coverage of the city's anti-drug abuse programs and events."

Philadelphia: "During the past year in this market, most of the local TV stations have run prime time anti-substance abuse programs. Several of the television and radio stations are running public service spots to include the excellent messages from Partnership for a Drug Free America."

Providence: "There has been some media coverage of prevention and enforcement efforts, but there always is room for more. Some media entities (e.g. TV stations) have actively served as sponsors of major anti-drug events. For example, WJAR-TV has co-sponsored the March Against Drugs, which has involved thousands of students in downtown Providence for the past three years."

Tampa: We have had "public service announcements and joint sponsorship of events to educate and inform the public."

Washington, D.C.: "Some local stations have become involved in addressing the problem through PSA's and special community outreach projects."

ARE CITIES WINNING THE WAR ON DRUGS?

The city officials were asked whether their city was winning the war on drugs, taking all efforts into consideration. Twenty-eight percent of the survey cities said yes, forty-one percent said no. The remaining cities were unable to provide a yes or no answer, although most provided a comment.

Those cities which say they are winning the war on drugs are Dayton, Indianapolis, Knoxville, Philadelphia, Providence, San Francisco, Tampa and Washington, D.C. Among their comments:

Dayton: "Progress is slow. To be successful in our war on drugs we must control the demand for and the supply of drugs. Law enforcement alone cannot alleviate the drug problem. Therefore, a multi-pronged approach must be utilized. These include community awareness education and prevention, the criminal justice system, drug treatment and rehabilitation and appropriate legislation with funding to cities."

Indianapolis: "Awareness has increased, as have the many, myriad efforts to inform and teach kids to 'just say no.' Although interdiction efforts are bringing in more drugs off the streets, community attitudes seem to be improving on our efforts to fight drugs."

Knoxville: "The yes is qualified. The community is just beginning to be unified and looking at all areas of need. To have an unqualified 'win' we must have broad-based programs addressing interdiction, prevention and especially treatment. This takes coordination and money to develop what is needed."

Providence: "We are doing the best we can to send the message that the City of Providence will not tolerate drug and alcohol use and abuse. As the capital city of Rhode Island, we continue to face the major problem that we must fight not only drug dealing and abuse by the citizens of Providence, but also users and dealers who come into our city from surrounding cities and towns. We do feel our drug prevention curriculum in our schools and our community-based prevention efforts through the Providence Substance Abuse Prevention Council are having a positive impact."

San Francisco: "Community strategies have been identified to address the problem more effectively. School education and general awareness campaigns regarding drugs have been instituted and will hopefully bring about a reduction in demand. Law enforcement and prosecution coordination efforts have been significantly enhanced."

Washington, D.C.: "Most indicators show a decline in the use of drugs in the District. Community involvement has intensified, and public opinion has turned heavily against drug use."

Forty-one percent of the cities said they were not winning the war. Among their comments:

Birmingham: "Until more funding is earmarked for the war on drugs all cities in this country will continue to lose."

Colorado Springs: "As publicity about drug problems has increased, casual/experimental use has decreased. We are losing a greater number of youth and adults, however, to addictive drug use, so the tide has not turned. We need additional resources on all fronts."

Denver: "There is no major metropolitan city that is 'winning' the war on drugs, including Denver. More drugs are coming into our country than at any time. The Denver Police Department feels very proud of the fact that in such areas as crack and public housing great strides have been made to reduce the problem of trafficking -- but 'winning,' not yet."

Louisville: "While we believe we have initiated numerous successful anti-drug programs, we have only won a few battles and are far from winning the war. The war must be fought on many fronts, including enforcement, treatment, and prevention/education, and resources at the local level remain severely limited."

Oxnard: "Statistics for all narcotics-related offenses continue to increase."

Santa Barbara: "Drugs continue to be a major contributing factor in many crime/social problems. A large percentage of law enforcement funds are spent on narcotics or narcotics-related crimes."

Savannah: "A way must be found to successfully reduce the demand for drugs at the same time the effort is made to cut off the supply. The solution will involve addressing not only the criminal justice aspects of the problem, but also the economic and social impoverishment that give rise to the problem. The criminal justice aspect is being addressed. However, the task of addressing the economic and social impoverishment issues is more difficult and costly."

Seattle: "The volume of available cocaine has decreased. The kilo price in '89 was \$17,000-22,000; currently it is \$25,000-32,000. Disruption in Columbia is most probably responsible for this. Overall, illegal drug use seems to be staying about the same or decreasing. The abatement program has moved much of the trafficking from rock houses to the street."

Nine cities did not answer the question directly, but provided comments:

Alexandria: "We are winning battles and sense that we are beginning to turn the tide. I believe it is still too premature to make an assessment concerning whether or not we are winning the war."

Atlanta: "That's hard to say, but we are not losing!"

Birmingham: "I'm not sure that the war on drugs is an accurate description of this nation's response. We seem to have no goals, or even a clear delineation of the good guys or bad guys involved. If this is a war, it is clearly modeled on the Vietnam model, rather than World War II. This description applies to America, Birmingham and everywhere else."

Boston: "While anti-drug efforts are making inroads, no city can "win the war on drugs" alone. There are insufficient federal resources available to cities to support fully the magnitude of efforts needed, particularly in providing economic opportunities to counter drugs and despair. That is an unmet federal responsibility. We have made great progress in enforcement, arrests are up and more drug dealers have been taken off the streets, but unfortunately somebody is ready to take their place. We need a comprehensive plan, including education, treatment, rehabilitation, enforcement and interdiction, as well as economic opportunity."

Evanston: "Our police department's major drug initiative over the past two years has been successful. To say we are winning or losing a war depends on one's perspective. We are optimistic that we are effective and doing good in the community."

"Drugs, particularly cocaine, are a major community issue in the minority community. That community does not feel significant progress has been made in stemming the tide. An initial project of the Mayor's Task Force is an assessment of our current situation."

Houston: "Our city is beginning to win the hearts and minds of the citizens in eliminating denial and encouraging them to seek ways to fight the war on drugs at home, in neighborhoods, at work, in our city, state and nation."

Madison: "I believe we're holding our own and making some progress. Police Department efforts in education will continue to influence our community's youth and promote demand reduction and abuse prevention. Our neighborhood drug enforcement program should also have a significant impact on our enforcement efforts in the coming year."

Milwaukee: "The war on drugs is not just a fight against illegal drug activity. We see increases and decreases in arrest activity. The real fight is against poverty and, in that regard, we have a long way to go. We are working at it all the time. It's not about winning and losing. This is not a game or activity that can be measured in wins and losses. If we arrest hundreds of people involved in illegal drug activities, is that really considered a win? The cost to prosecute and jail, is that a loss?"

Newton: "While we are pleased with our progress in recent years in addressing the problem of substance abuse, it is too early to tell whether our efforts are truly preventive, or effective in reversing trends. There is a continued need for federal and state support in this area since local communities are unable to find the resources to launch an effective attack on the problem without this assistance."

York: "We're holding our own. Given financial assistance we could be winning. Without it, we'll continue to merely shovel sand against the tide with our pitchforks."

SUCCESSFUL CITY ANTI-DRUG PROGRAMS

The cities were asked to provide a description of their most successful anti-drug program or effort. In response, many cities cautioned that singling out one program was quite difficult. Following are brief descriptions of programs identified by the survey cities:

Albuquerque: "We have implemented a **street level narcotics enforcement program** which is designed to attack mid-level and small narcotics distributors. This program has received meager funding from the state through the Drug Control and System Improvement Block Grant. Considering the amount of funding, the program has been relatively successful."

Alexandria: "I believe that our most effective effort is our **eviction program**, which was initiated subsequent to the drug-related homicide of Corporal Charles Hill in public housing on March 22, 1989. The police department is primarily responsible for administration of the program, with very strong support and cooperation from the Alexandria Housing Authority and the Commonwealth Attorney's Office. The eviction program was primarily initiated by the Mayor, with strong

support from high officials at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. No funding is actually required for this program."

Atlanta: "**Atlanta Religious Mobilization Against Crime (ARMAC)**, called together by Mayor Maynard Jackson, has generated a lot of interest. Christian, Jewish and Islamic religious leaders are working through their congregations and communities focussing on education, prevention, mobilization and treatment. The clergy work with state and local officials to address the issues of drugs. ARMAC has an executive committee which administers its funds."

Birmingham: "**The Drug Abuse Information Center** is funded through Community Development Block Grant and city funds. Services are provided by Aletheia House, a local treatment/prevention program, and supervised by the Mayor's office. The program provides community-based counseling, a drug abuse hotline, short-term treatment, and a speaker's bureau. The hotline was so successful that the state has assumed this function."

Boston: "**Boston Against Drugs** and the **Boston Safe Neighborhoods Plan** are two programs working hand in hand to expand alternatives to drugs and despair. Through Boston Against Drugs, corporations are taking the lead in individual neighborhoods to sponsor drug education programs. The Boston Safe Neighborhoods Plan is a plan assembled by neighborhood leaders throughout the city to prevent violence, reach out to young people, and promote an agenda of hope and opportunity."

Charlotte: "No one program can be termed the most successful. We have been extremely pleased with the response to our participation in the **DARE** program. We have staged a series of **drug marches**, organized by the Mayor's office, to increase awareness and to mobilize community support for a drug-free city. We have also appointed the **Charlotte-Mecklenburg Drug and Alcohol Commission**, which is a cross section of community leaders charged with developing a comprehensive strategy to address the drug problem in Charlotte."

Colorado Springs: "Collaborative efforts between prevention, treatment and law enforcement sectors of the community result in a coordinated drug war which utilizes a multi-strategy approach to the problems, limits duplication of services, and assures efficient use of resources. The **El Paso County Health Department Outpatient Alcohol and Drug Treatment Program** offers treatment for persons unable to pay and who have no insurance. The program is one of long-term treatment and has a good success rate. Elements of treatment include: methadone maintenance, anti-abuse, families, adolescents and adults. The program has existed for 20 years, serves over 1,000 persons per year, is funded 50:50 with state and county funds, and is administered by the El Paso County Health Department."

Dayton: "Our most successful effort is the **Drug Canine Unit**. This unit, consisting of two dogs and two handlers, assists in the detection of illegal narcotic substances in major transportation and commerce facilities and locating illegal substances during various drug investigations. The program was initiated with the purchase of our first trained drug dog in 1988. The program is administered by the Dayton Police Department and funded within their existing budget."

Denver: "Three programs come to mind. The **Interdiction Program at Stapleton International Airport** has been a great success. It is a seven-man unit consisting of DPD and DEA officers. Financing comes from DEA and the City of Denver. Denver Police oversee the operation. The second program is the **Crack Task Force**. This is funded by a federal grant which is administered by the Denver Police. It involves Denver and Aurora police, and has been extremely successful. The third program is a federal/state grant which funded the **Narcotics Enforcement in Public Housing Unit**. This six-man unit has been quite successful in reducing the availability of drugs in public housing and educating the tenants who live there about the hazards surrounding the use and abuse of drugs."

Houston: "**Houston Crackdown** is our city's collaborative effort between the public and private sectors to develop solutions to all problems associated with unlawful drug use. It was initiated as a result of the report issued by the Mayor's Task Force on Substance Abuse commissioned in March, 1987. Administered through the Mayor's office, the staff is composed of a director and an assistant director who are members of the Mayor's executive staff. Assistant directors are on loan to the project from the Houston Police Department, City Department of Health and Human Services and the Houston Independent School District. Its programs target education/prevention, treatment/intervention and law enforcement. The project is guided by a 40-member steering committee chaired by the Mayor. The programs are implemented by volunteers who work through eight standing committees: business, community awareness and prevention, education, judicial, law enforcement, legislative, media, and treatment and research."

Indianapolis: "Initiated by the Lilly Endowment, **Project I-STAR (Indiana Students Taught Awareness and Resistance)** developed a credible curriculum and survey process that targets middle school children. Teachers are given specific lesson plans and materials, and even the parents are involved with homework completion."

Knoxville: "**The Metropolitan Drug Commission** was established in June 1986 by a group of community leaders concerned about issues of chemical abuse in Knoxville/Knox County. The membership of the Commission is comprised of officials and community leaders from government, law enforcement, treatment, social services, education, business and the religious community. The MDC operates as the umbrella organization regarding issues and programs related to alcohol and other drugs. The Commission is funded by state, city and county funds and private contributions, and is administered by the Commission's executive board.

"In addition, Knoxville has a progressive **police department** which has sought federal and state support for prevention and intervention programs and has worked in concert with existing programs to develop these services. The Neighborhoods in Action parenting program has been established. The Metro Narcotics Unit and Knoxville's Community Development Corporation have worked cooperatively to develop education, prevention and enforcement activities within the public housing development.

"The City also has appointed a **Community Coordinator of Alcohol and Drug Programs**, an advocate within the governmental structure who is developing linkages with local, state and federal resources and organizations to develop

appropriate planning and implementation of a continuum of alcohol and other drug services for the community.

"The **Knox County School System** has two full-time drug abuse prevention specialists working with grades K-6. This funding is from the Drug Free Schools Act."

Louisville: "The most successful anti-drug program has been the **Street Sales Enforcement Project**. This project involved a multi-jurisdictional enforcement task force which was funded through formula block grant monies and targeted street corner operations. The grant was coordinated and fiscally managed through the Louisville-Jefferson County Crime Commission and represents a joint city-county grant application."

Madison: "During the last years the Madison Police Department **CrimeStopper** program has played a significant role in solving drug-related crimes. The program was initiated in 1982 and is administered by a police officer who works in contact with a board of directors. The Board is comprised of interested citizens and business leaders in the community. The program is funded through tax deductible contributions."

Milwaukee: "We have recently undertaken two community-based efforts. The first is a drug house abatement team. The team is made up of personnel from the vice squad, building inspection department, city attorney's office and three community groups. The program was recommended by the Drug Free Milwaukee Task Force and funded by the state. The team is working in a target area. The goal is to rid neighborhoods of drug houses. In six weeks, over 100 properties have been referred for investigation.

"The second program is the Wisconsin Against Drug Environments (WADE). This, too, resulted from the Mayor's Task Force. The state agreed to use federal drug money to fund an effort to house drug education and prevention programs in community-based organizations. Milwaukee received \$700,000 for year one. The program will be administered by our anti-poverty agency, with funds going directly to approximately 22 community-based organizations."

Modesto: "Initiated in the fall of 1987 through a State Office of Criminal Justice Planning Crime Resistance Program grant, **DARE, Drug Abuse Resistance Education**, is now funded by donations from private individuals and businesses, and by the local school districts and the City of Modesto. It is administered by the City of Modesto through the police department. Modesto police officers teach the DARE curriculum in local schools to grades one, three, five and seven."

Newton: "The most important aspect of our approach to substance abuse is the **coordination of efforts in education, treatment and enforcement**. These coordinated efforts are made possible through a **city-wide task force** with wide representation of city agencies. Two examples of these coordinated efforts are the **DARE** Program, an educational program in the public schools utilizing specially trained police officers, and **recovery groups** in the schools for recovering substance abusers, with consultation from the community mental health clinics."

Oxnard: "The most successful anti-drug effort is the **undercover work** of the police department's Narcotics Unit. The police department has also taken an

aggressive approach to training patrol officers to recognize drug abuse symptoms. Consequently, the department's patrol officers achieve a substantial number of drug-related arrests. These efforts are funded by the City's general fund and by asset forfeiture funds."

Philadelphia: "A group of people from all walks of life, called the **Philadelphia Resistance Congress**, created a plan known as **PEARL**, an acronym for Prevention, Education, Action, Rehabilitation and Law Enforcement. This plan, which attacks the drug cancer on all fronts, was placed into effect April 9, 1990 in a small section of Philadelphia. This model utilizes existing city funds and is attempting to acquire additional monies from state and federal agencies, which are currently cooperating."

Providence: "**The Mayor's A Team** is designed to prevent drug abuse and promote self-esteem and success in middle schoolers living in public housing. The A Team involves 23 Brown University Students and 23 middle schoolers in a one-on-one relationship maintained through weekly letters and bi-weekly visits."

Santa Barbara: "Our most successful program is the **DARE Program (Drug Abuse Resistance Education)**. The program was initiated by the police department, which is also responsible for its administration."

Savannah: "**The Neighborhood Services Program** is a partnership between the city and two showcase neighborhoods to organize two at-risk neighborhoods. City resources are concentrated to work with associations and block organizations to identify physical and social problems in areas and work together to improve them. The program is funded by the city and administered by the Neighborhood Services Department. It is utilized by the police, sanitation, fire, engineering, facilities maintenance and leisure services bureaus."

Tampa: "**The Q.U.A.D. (Quick Uniformed Attack on Drugs) Program** utilizes 41 locally-funded police officers whose sole purpose is the suppression of street drug sales. They work closely with individual residents and neighborhoods and receive strong support from all city departments and the media. This program has operated for 18 months and seems to have become a national model. Street narcotics sales have declined to the pre-crack-level, crime has declined steadily for one and one-half years, and there is widespread support of the program throughout the community. Tied in the Q.U.A.D. Program is a program that regularly identifies and demolishes crack houses deemed unfit for human habitation."

Washington, D.C.: "**The 32-Bed Pilot Treatment Program** in the Department of Corrections is an intensive drug treatment program for inmates at Lorton. An extensive impact evaluation is being undertaken, and the results to date are impressive. The program accepts prisoners close to release who admit to a serious drug abuse problem and show some willingness to change. The program has been featured in several media profiles. It is funded in part by the law enforcement block grant."

York: "Our **SPECDA (School Program to Educate and Control Drug Abuse)** has completed its third full year. We have reached over 3,000 students in the fifth and sixth grades. The curriculum is comparable to the DARE program, and we believe it will have a very positive influence on the youngsters as they grow through adolescence into adulthood."

"We're also very proud of our year-old **Community-oriented Policing Program**, which was implemented in July of 1989 in our worst drug-infested neighborhood. Drug arrests and seizures in this neighborhood rose drastically, while overall crime dropped slightly. Officers have seized \$50,000 in drugs and cash while arresting 82 persons on felonies and serving a total of 549 warrants.

"Both programs are totally funded with local dollars. If more money were available we could make an even greater impact on drug abuse in our community."

CITIES RESPONDING TO THE SURVEY

CITY	POPULATION
Albuquerque, NM	378,480
Alexandria, VA	107,800
Atlanta, GA	421,910
Birmingham, AL	277,510
Boston, MA	573,600
Charlotte, NC	352,070
Colorado Springs, CO	272,660
Dayton, OH	178,920
Denver, CO	508,150
Evanston, IL	71,570
Houston, TX	1,729,720
Indianapolis, IN	719,820
Kansas City, MO	441,170
Knoxville, TN	173,210
Louisville, KY	286,470
Madison, WI	175,830
Milwaukee, WI	605,090
Modesto, CA	132,940
Newton, MA	82,140
Oxnard, CA	126,980
Philadelphia, PA	1,647,565
Providence, RI	157,200
San Francisco, CA	749,000
San Juan, PR	433,849
Santa Barbara, CA	79,290
Savannah, GA	146,800
Seattle, WA	501,800
Tampa, FL	277,580
Washington, D.C.	626,000
York, PA	44,430

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

City _____

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT GRANT PROGRAMS

1. Please indicate on the chart below if your city government has been involved in the development of your state's anti-drug abuse plans for education, treatment or enforcement. If yes, please describe the type of involvement (i.e. served on planning board, submitted suggestions for state plan, etc.), and the specific local agency that was involved.

Yes	No	Type of Involvement	Agency Involved
<hr/>			
Education			
<hr/>			
Treatment			
<hr/>			
Enforcement			
<hr/>			

2. Do you believe that the grant-in-aid system (primarily state block grants) established through the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 is responsive to your city's needs? Yes _____ No _____

A. Please describe any legislative amendments that would make the Act more responsive to your needs.

B. Please describe any administrative changes that would make the Act more responsive to your needs.

5. Federal funds have been available for anti-drug enforcement programs during fiscal years 1987, 1988, 1989, and 1990. Please indicate the amount of funding your city government received in 1987, 1988 and 1989 and how much it has received or expects to receive during 1990.

1987 \$ _____

1988 \$ _____

1989 \$ _____

1990 \$ _____

6. Over the past year in your city:

a. Has casual drug use _____ increased, _____ decreased or _____ stayed the same?

b. Has hard core drug use _____ increased, _____ decreased or _____ stayed the same?

c. Has the number of drug-related crimes _____ increased, _____ decreased or _____ stayed the same?

d. Has the volume of drugs seized _____ increased, _____ decreased or _____ stayed the same?

e. Has local media coverage of the drug problem _____ increased, _____ decreased or _____ stayed the same?

f. Has local media coverage had a _____ positive or _____ negative effect on the drug problem in your city? Please explain.

g. Has the local media played an active role, beyond coverage of the problem, in your city's anti-drug efforts (e.g., special events, broadcasts, etc.)
_____ Yes _____ No. Comments:

7. Please describe in one paragraph what you view as your city's most successful anti-drug program or effort. Include the program's name, how it was initiated, how it is funded, and what agency is responsible for administering it.

8. Taking all efforts into consideration, is your city winning the war on drugs? Yes____ No____ Comments:

PERSON COMPLETING FORM

NAME

TITLE

AGENCY

ADDRESS

CITY/STATE/ZIPCODE

TELEPHONE NUMBER()