



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



Missouri State Highway Patrol
Statistical Analysis Center

MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE TREND ANALYSIS

STATE FISCAL YEARS 2011 - 2013

April 2015

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

STATEWIDE TREND ANALYSIS 3

 MDTF Administration and Employment 3

 MJDTF Drug Arrests 4

 MJDTF Drug Charges 4

 MJDTF Seizures 6

 MJDTF Methamphetamine Laboratory Destruction..... 9

 MJDTF Marijuana Eradication 9

 MJDTF Drug Buys and Purchases 10

MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE REGIONAL TRENDS 12

 Regional MJDTF Administration and Employment 13

 Regional MJDTF Sale and Manufacture Drug Charges..... 17


 Regional MJDTF Possession Charges 20

 25

 Regional MJDTF Seizures 26

 Regional Trends of Methamphetamine Laboratory Destruction 31

 Marijuana Eradication..... 32



..... 32

Regional MJDTF Drug Buys and Samples 32

APPENDIX: MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE DATA FISCAL YEARS 2011 - 2013 37

MJDTF Agencies and Law Enforcement Employment by Region and Fiscal Year 38

MJDTF Cases by Status and Arrestees by Region and Fiscal Year 39

MJDTF Charges Filed in Cases by Charge Type by Region and Fiscal Year 40

MJDTF Sale Charges by Drug Type by Region and Fiscal Year 41

MJDTF Possession Charges by Drug Type by Region and Fiscal Year 42

MJDTF Drug Buys, Informants, and Dollars Expended By Region and Fiscal Year 43

MJDTF Warrants and Consent Searches By Region and Fiscal Year 44

MJDTF Eradicated Marijuana and Destroyed Meth Labs by Region and Fiscal Year 45

MJDTF Ounces of Drugs Seized by Drug Type by Region and Fiscal Year 46

MJDTF Doses of Drugs Seized by Drug Type By Region and Fiscal Year 47

INTRODUCTION

Trends analyses of Missouri multi-jurisdictional drug task forces (MJDTFs) activities on statewide and regional basis are presented in this report. These analyses utilized data provided by twenty-seven (27) MJDTFs quarterly progress reports sent to the Missouri Department of Public Safety (DPS), Criminal Justice and Law Enforcement (CJ/LE) Unit during State Fiscal Years 2011, 2012, and 2013. Each quarter of a fiscal year, MJDTFs are required to submit progress reports describing the number of active agencies, full time officers, and part time officers; persons arrested and charges by category and drug type; ounces and value of drugs seized, destroyed, or eradicated; number and value of drug buys, reverse buys, and free samples; and number of informants and funds expended.

In FY11 through FY13, Missouri MJDTFs were funded by the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) and Recovery JAG grants administered by the Missouri DPS. These grants are funded by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), and Bureau of Justice (BJA). Under the 2010 - 2011 JAG and Recovery-JAG funding opportunities, the CJ/LE Unit awarded \$6,221,651.17 to twenty-seven (27) multi-jurisdictional drug task forces for July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2011. Under the 2011 - 2012 JAG and Recovery-JAG funding opportunities, the CJ/LE Program awarded \$6,834,034.77 to twenty-seven (27) multi-jurisdictional drug task forces for July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012. Under the 2012 - 2013 JAG and Recovery JAG funding opportunities, the CJ/LE Program awarded \$5,168,982.21 to twenty-seven (27) multi-jurisdictional drug task forces. The 2012 JAG project period was July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013 and the 2012 Recovery-JAG project period was July 1, 2012 to February 28, 2013.

Federal funding was awarded to the above-mentioned projects for multi-jurisdictional, multi-agency counter-drug enforcement efforts. During these fiscal years, 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 were forged in response to this threat to public safety, public health, and the sovereignty of our state's environment. The DPS CJ/LE has placed great emphasis on the establishment of a comprehensive Memorandum of Understanding/Agreement (MOU or MOA) between all partners of the multi-jurisdictional enforcement group so that a more extensive understanding of responsibilities and expectations exist. Trends in methamphetamine related activity are analyzed here to determine if local, state and federal collaborations and a continued aggressive response to these partnerships have affected a decrease. Because MJDTF partnerships target other illicit drugs in addition to methamphetamine, trends of activities associated with marijuana, cocaine, crack, heroin, LSD, PCP, ecstasy, drug paraphernalia, and other drugs are also analyzed to determine their affect.


STATEWIDE TREND ANALYSIS

A statewide trend analysis of the activities of 27 MJDTFs during State Fiscal Years 2011 through 2013 are presented in this section.


MJDTF Administration and Employment

The number of law enforcement agencies assigned to MJDTFs has continually decreased from FY11 to FY13. In FY11, 308 law enforcement agencies participated in MJDTFs while only 258 participated in FY13. This is a 16.2% decrease (Figure 1). Similarly, the number of assigned full time law enforcement officers decreased from 299 officers in FY11 to 272 officers in FY13. However, the number of full time officers assigned to MJDTFs in FY13 was an increase of 11.9% from the 243 assigned officers in FY12. The number of part time officers assigned to MJDTFs is small in comparison to full time officers. Additionally, the number of part time officers assigned to MJDTFs has not changed significantly during the past three fiscal years.

At any given time during a fiscal year, a MJDTF can work on new cases or cases carried over from a previous quarter. For the purpose of this report both are considered as active cases. Of this pool of active cases,



a proportion is disposed by offender arrests or turned over to another agency for action. Unfortunately, MJDTFs use different criteria to define a case and case disposal. Some MJDTFs define a case as a drug involved incident involving multiple persons while other MJDTFs define a case for each individual in an incident. For this reason, caution is warranted when interpreting analyses of active and disposed cases. Since FY11, the number of active cases handled by MJDTFs statewide has decreased. At the end of FY11, MJDTFs had an active case load of 21,446 while only 17,435 were active at the end of FY13 (Figure 2). This was an 18.7% decrease. Although the total case load decreased during this time, the number of disposed cases changed slightly. The number of disposed cases increased from 8,191 in FY11 to 8,756 in FY12. But the number of disposed cases decreased to 7,919 in FY13, or a 3.3% decrease from FY11.




MJDTF Drug Arrests

Figure 3 shows the number of persons arrested by Missouri MJDTFs for one or more drug charges in Fiscal Years 2011 through 2013. The greatest number of persons arrested occurred in FY12 when 7,792 persons were arrested for drug offenses. The number of persons arrested in FY12 increased 6.2% from FY11; but the number of persons arrested decreased 19.0% from FY12 to FY13.


MJDTF Drug Charges

In the arrests of 21,445 persons for one or more drug charges from FY11 to FY13, 25,502 charges were filed. Drug charges are grouped as either sale / manufacture or possession charges. As seen in Figure 4, a greater number of persons were arrested by MJDTFs for possession charges than for sale and manufacture charges. This is because more persons use drugs than produce and distribute drugs and because possession charges are more readily convicted. The number




of possession and sale and manufacture charges peaked in FY12 as compared to the other two fiscal years. Possession charges increased 11.4% from FY11 to FY12 and then decreased 10.3% in FY13. Sale and manufacture charges increased 11.5% from FY11 to FY12 and then decreased 18.3% in FY13.

The greatest number of sale and manufacture charges was for methamphetamine in all three fiscal years (Figure 5). This is a result of the state emphasis on Missouri drug task forces to reduce production and distribution of methamphetamine. The number of methamphetamine charges peaked in FY12 when they increased in number by 21.6% from FY11. In FY13 however, the number of charges decreased 14.4% from the previous fiscal year.




Marijuana was the second most sale and manufacture charged drug in all three fiscal years. This probably reflects that marijuana is easily grown indoors and outdoors in Missouri and the prevalence of marijuana use is greater than other illicit drugs. This demand may be decreasing however, as suggested by the 29.1% decrease in sale and manufacture marijuana charges in arrests made by MJDTFs from FY12 to FY13.



Other significant sale and manufacture drug charges in MJDTF arrests were for heroin, crack cocaine, and cocaine. The number of sale and manufacture crack charges decreased from FY12 and FY13 while heroin and cocaine charges increased during this same time frame. Few arrests by MJDTFs were for sale and manufacture of ecstasy, LSD, or PCP.

MJDTF arrests for possession of marijuana were the most common possession charges in all three fiscal years (Figure 6). The number of marijuana possession charges peaked in FY12 when these increased by 15% from the previous fiscal year. Marijuana possession charges then decreased 27.4% in FY13. The large number of marijuana possession charges in arrests made by MJDTFs reflects the drug's large prevalence of use in Missouri.




Second to marijuana possession charges in MJDTF arrests were methamphetamine possession charges. Methamphetamine possession charges continuously increased from FY11 to FY13, unlike marijuana charges that showed a decrease between FY12 and FY13. Methamphetamine possession charges increased 12.1% from FY11 to FY12, and 1.1% from FY12 to FY13. MJDTF arrests for possession drug paraphernalia and other drugs also were common in all three analyzed fiscal years. Drug paraphernalia possession charges increased 44.7% from FY11 to FY12 and then decreased 13.9% in FY13. Charges for possession of other drugs increased 2.3% from FY11 to FY12 and decreased 20.1% in FY13.


To a lesser extent than drug paraphernalia and other drugs possession charges, MJDTF arrests for possession of heroin, pseudoephedrine, cocaine, and crack cocaine were also made in all three fiscal years. Charges for heroin and pseudoephedrine increased from FY12 to FY13 while possession charges for cocaine and crack cocaine decreased from FY12 to FY13. Only a few arrests were made by MJDTFs in FY11, FY12, and FY13 for possession of ecstasy, anhydrous ammonia, LSD, and PCP.

MJDTF Seizures


A total of 650,801 ounces of drugs were seized by MJDTFs in fiscal years 2011 through 2013 (Figure 7). The greatest proportion of drugs, or 37.7%, were seized in FY12, followed by drugs seized in FY11 (37.3%), and FY13 (25.0%). The decrease in amount of drugs seized in FY13 compared to FY12 possibly reflects the decrease in the number of agencies and officers assigned to MJDTF in that fiscal year.



The street value of seized drugs for the three analyzed fiscal years was estimated to be \$143,907,793. As seen in Figure 8, the greatest value of seized drugs was in FY12 (\$54,643,359), followed by FY13 (\$47,719,856), and FY11 (\$41,544,578). The street value of drugs seized in FY13 was proportionately larger than the proportion of amount of drugs seized in FY13. This possibly indicates the street value of drugs increased in that fiscal year due to decreased supplies. This disproportion may also reflect the types of drugs seized in each fiscal year.



During fiscal years 2011 through 2013, 577,262 ounces of marijuana were seized by MJDTFs. As seen in Figure 9, 234,225 ounces of marijuana was seized in FY11, or 40.6% of the total three year quantity. Another 190,602 ounces of marijuana were seized in FY12 which accounted for 33% of the total marijuana seizures. In FY13, 152,435 ounces of marijuana were seized which was the smallest annual quantity of marijuana seized by MJDTFs. Marijuana seizures in FY13 accounted for 26.4% of the total marijuana MJDTF seizures.



During FY11 through FY13, 42,663 ounces of methamphetamine were seized by MJDTFs. Figure 10 shows 37,295 ounces of methamphetamine was seized in FY12, or 87.4% of the total three year quantity. Another 3,266 ounces of methamphetamine was seized in FY13 which accounted for 7.7% of the total methamphetamine seizures. In FY11, 2,102 ounces of methamphetamine were seized which was the smallest annual quantity of methamphetamine seized by MJDTFs. Methamphetamine seizures in FY11 accounted for 4.9% of the total methamphetamine MJDTF seizures. Indicative of MJDTF focus on methamphetamine production in the state is the large quantities of seized methamphetamine in FY12.






Figure 11 displays ounces of other drugs seized by MJDTFs from FY11 through FY13. Notable seizures in cocaine, anhydrous ammonia, and other drugs occurred in all three fiscal years. Anhydrous ammonia is used in production of methamphetamine and large seizures in FY12 correlate with the large amounts of methamphetamine seized that fiscal year. The other drug category includes illicit use of prescription drugs such as pain relieving opiates, sedatives, and barbiturates. Seizures of these drugs increased significantly in FY12 and FY13.

A total of 10,444 ounces of cocaine were seized during these fiscal years, with the majority of cocaine being seized in FY 11 and FY12. The amount of cocaine seized in FY13 decreased 66.6% from the previous fiscal year. The amount of seized anhydrous ammonia and other drugs ounces was greatest in FY12. A total 5,648 ounces of anhydrous ammonia were seized in FY12, or 77.5% of total ounces seized in all fiscal years. This correlates with the largest seizures of methamphetamine in the same fiscal year. Seizures of ounces of other drugs, including illicit use of prescription opiates, sedatives, and barbiturates increased from 706

ounces in FY11 to 6,614 ounces in FY12, an increase of over 800%. Although seizures of other drug ounces decreased to 3,575 ounces in FY13, this was still a significant increase (406%) from the amount seized in FY11.



As shown in Figure 12, significant quantities of illicit drug doses were seized by MJDTFs during fiscal years 2011 through 2013. Although during the study period MJDTFs seized doses of several illicit drugs, by far the greatest seizures were of other drugs such as prescription opiates, sedatives, and barbiturates. During the three fiscal years analyzed, a total of 77,957 doses of other drugs were seized, indicating a significant problem with illicit use of prescription drugs. Using the conversion of one dose equaling 17 grams or 0.599 ounces, the seized doses of other drugs is equal to 46,696 ounces. Of the total doses of other drugs seized by MJDTFs, 16% was seized in FY11. However, seizures of doses of these drugs increased from 11,692




doses in FY11 to 33,541 doses in FY12, an increase of 187%. This large increase suggests the problem with illicit use of prescription drugs has occurred just recently. In FY13, 32,724 doses of other drugs were seized suggesting the problem of illicit use of prescription drugs remains at levels set in FY12.


Smaller quantities of heroin, ecstasy, pseudoephedrine LSD, PCP, and anhydrous ammonia doses were also seized by MJDTFs in FY11 through FY13. During the three fiscal years analyzed, 8,477 doses of heroin, 5,991 doses of ecstasy, and 14,195 doses of pseudoephedrine were seized by MJDTFs. Seizures of doses of all three of these drugs decreased from FY12 to FY13.

MJDTF Methamphetamine Laboratory Destruction

One indicator of the effect of MJDTFs on methamphetamine production in the state is the number of destroyed clandestine laboratories. In fiscal years 2011 through 2013, MJDTFs destroyed a total of 4,711



methamphetamine labs in Missouri (Figure 13). From FY11 through FY12, the number of destroyed methamphetamine labs increased by only 6.3%. This suggests the MJDTFs focus on this drug industry had the same priority during those fiscal years. However, the number of destroyed labs decreased 18.4% from FY12 to FY13 due to either a lower MJDTF focus on this industry or a decrease in the prevalence of use of the drug.




MJDTF Marijuana Eradication

Three types of marijuana are produced in Missouri: cultivated marijuana, sinsemilla plants, and wild marijuana plants (i.e., ditchweed). Together these plants account for large quantities of marijuana grown within the state. As seen in Figure 14, 32,417 marijuana plants were destroyed by MJDTFs from FY11 through FY13. Of this total, 45.3% was destroyed in FY11, 40.7% was destroyed in FY12, and 13.9% was

destroyed in FY13. This decreasing amount of destroyed marijuana plants may reflect a decrease in the priority set by MDTFs on eradicating marijuana cultivation.


From FY11 through FY13, 429,416 ounces of marijuana were eradicated by MJDTFs (Figure 15). Of this total, 75.3% was eradicated in FY12 and less than 1% was eradicated in FY13. The large quantity of eradicated marijuana ounces as compared to the number of destroyed plants in FY12 indicates MJDTFs destroyed greater amounts of harvested marijuana than crops in that fiscal year.




MJDTF Drug Buys and Purchases

In addition to drug seizures and eradication, illicit drugs are removed from circulation through planned drug buys, reverse buys, and from free samples. In fiscal years FY11 through FY13, MJDTF made 7,859 such buys with a total value of \$2,183,846 (Figure 16). This is equivalent to \$277.88 per drug buy and free sample.


Since FY11, the number of MJDTF drug buys, reverse buys, and free samples has steadily decreased. In FY12, MJDTFs recorded 2,677 transactions compared to 2,879 in FY11, a 7% decrease. In FY13, MJDTFs recorded 2,303 drug buys and free samples, which was a 14% decrease from the previous fiscal year. The largest value of drug buys and free samples was in FY12 when these transactions had a total value of \$1,012,299. This was nearly double the value of drug buys and free samples in FY11 (\$596,291) and in FY13 (\$575,256). The cost of drug buys and free samples per transaction in FY12 was equal to \$378.15. In comparison, the cost of drug buys and free samples per transaction was \$207.12 in FY11 and \$249.79 in FY13.



As seen in Figure 17, MJDTFs purchased or received as free samples doses three specific drugs: heroin, cocaine, and methamphetamine. During the three fiscal years studied, MJDTFs bought or received 945 ounces of cocaine, 594 ounces of methamphetamine, and 758 ounces of heroin. Of the total ounces of cocaine purchased or received as free samples, 619 ounces, or 65.5%, was in FY11. Conversely, of the total ounces of heroin purchased or received as free samples, 611 ounces, or 80.6%, was in FY13. This temporal change in purchases and free samples of cocaine to heroin possibly reflects the resurgence of heroin usage in recent years and a decline of cocaine use.



Other drugs including illicit use of prescription drugs continued to be a problem in all studied fiscal years. A total of 11,365 doses of other drugs including illicit prescription drugs were purchased or received as free samples by MJDTFs from FY11 to FY13. The amount of other drugs received from buys or free samples remained fairly constant, although there was a 22.1% decrease in purchases and free samples from FY11 to FY12. In FY13 the number of purchases and free samples returned to near FY11 levels.




MJDTF Informants

All MJDTFs used informants in drug investigations during the studied timeframe. From FY11 through FY13, MJDTFs utilized 1,962 informants at a cost of \$342,557 (Figure 18). A larger number of informants were used in FY11 compared to other fiscal years and the associated costs were highest in that year as well. The cost per informant was \$182.51 in FY11, \$152.01 in FY12, and \$188.12 in FY13.

MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE REGIONAL TRENDS


Regional trends of drug task force data were analyzed to determine whether illicit drug use varies across the state. For this analysis, MJDTFs were grouped into the eight regions shown in Figure 19 and MJDTF quarterly progress report data were then aggregated by these regions. Trend analyses were completed for Fiscal Years 2011, 2012 and 2013. The Appendix provides supporting data for all charts presented in this section.

Figure 19
Missouri MDTF by Region
Fiscal Years 2012 - 2013



Regional MJDTF Administration and Employment

In fiscal years 2011 and 2012 the greatest number of law enforcement agencies participated in the Southeast DTF (Figure 20). This is probably due to the large number of counties (26) grouped by this study to this task force. Because of a 25% decrease in the number of agencies in FY13, the number of participating agencies in the Southeast DTF was less than the number in the Southwest DTF. The number of agencies in other MJDTF also decreased in FY13 compared to FY12, including the Northeast DTF, West Central DTF, East Central DTF, and Southwest DTF. The West Central DTF had the largest decrease in participating agencies when it dropped 54 agencies in FY12 to 34 in FY13, a 37% decrease. Only the Central DTF had an increase in number of agencies in FY13.




From FY11 through FY13, 814 full time law enforcement officers participated in MJDTFs. Although a proportionately moderate number of agencies were in the East Central DTF during the study period, it had over double the number of assigned full time officers than other regional MJDTFs (Figure 21). Of the total full time law enforcement officers assigned to a DTF from FY11 through FY13, 44.6% were assigned to the East Central DTF. The number of assigned officers in East Central DTF was even greater than other DTF in FY13 due to a 35.2% increase of assigned officers in that fiscal year.


The number of assigned full time officers decreased or remained the same from FY11 to FY13 in all regional MDTF except for the East Central DTF. The greatest decrease was in the Northeast DTF where the number of assigned full time officers decreased from 53 in FY11 to ten in FY13, a 81.1% decrease.

Part time law enforcement officers were assigned to DTF in addition to full time officers. And as seen in Figure 22, three MJDTFs utilized significant numbers of part time law enforcement officers in their operations in all fiscal years. Twenty-two part time law enforcement officers were assigned to the Central DTF from FY11 through FY13, 19 were assigned to the West Central DTF, and 16 were assigned to the East


Central DTF. Two MJDTFs limited their utilization of part time law enforcement officers during the study period. Only one part time officer was assigned to the Northwest DTF from FY11 through FY13 and four were assigned to the Southeast DTF during this period.



Five part time law enforcement officers were assigned to the Southwest DTF in FY11 compared to two in FY12 and FY13. The Northeast DTF, West Central DTF, and East Central DTF assigned over twice the number of part time law enforcement officers in FY12 than in the previous fiscal year. In FY13, 11 part time law enforcement officers were assigned to the Central DTF as compared to five in FY12.




MJDTFs logged 56,253 active cases from FY11 through FY13 (Figure 23). Of this total, 23.1% were in the East Central DTF, 21.8% in the Southeast DTF, and 18% in the Northeast DTF. The Northwest DTF logged 2,746 active cases during the study period, which was the smallest number of active cases logged by a MJDTF.



Temporal trends vary in the number of active cases logged by regional DTF. The number of active cases logged by the Northwest DTF, Central DTF, East Central DTF, and Southwest DTF continually decreased from FY11 through FY13. Significant decreases in the number of active cases occurred from FY11 to FY12 in the Central DTF when active cases decreased 44.9%. Two regional DTF, West Central DTF and Southeast DTF, have experienced decreases in active cases from FY11 to FY12 followed by increases in FY13. The Southeast DTF experienced a 33.1% decrease in active cases from FY11 to FY12 but had a 4.5% increase the following fiscal year. Only the Northeast DTF had a steady increase in the number of active cases during the study period.


During the three studied fiscal years, MJDTFs disposed of 24,866 cases, or 44.2% of the total active cases logged by all MJDTFs (Figure 24). The East Central DTF disposed of 10,282 cases, or 41.3% of all disposed cases. Of the 12,969 active cases logged by the East Central DTF, 79.3% were disposed. The number of disposed cases was less in all other MJDTFs than the East Central DTF. However, three MJDTFs had a disposition proportions over 50%: the Northeast DTF disposed of 65.6% of their active cases; Southwest DTF disposed of 57.6%; and Central DTF disposed of 55.4%. The remaining MJDTFs disposed of less than half of their active cases: West Central disposed of 43.1% of their active cases; the Southeast DTF disposed of 25.2%; and the Northwest DTF disposed of 10.9%.



Regional MJDTF Drug Arrests


In fiscal years 2011 through 2013, MJDTFs arrested 21,445 persons for one or more drug charges (Figure 25). The East Central DTF arrested 7,653 persons, or 35.7% of the total arrested. The Southwest DTF arrested 3,467 persons (16.7%) and the Southeast DTF arrested 3,659 persons (17.1%). The remaining four MJDTFs accounted for 6,666 persons arrested, or 31.2% of the total persons arrested.

The number of persons arrested for one or more drug charges increased from FY11 through FY12 in all but the Southwest DTF and Southeast DTF. However, the number of persons arrested decreased in all MJDTFs from FY12 through FY13. The largest decreases occurred in the two MJDTFs that showed decreases from



FY11 through FY12. The number of persons arrested for one or more charges decreased 42.7% in the Southwest DTF and 38.3% in the Southeast DTF.

Trends in charges are similar to those for persons arrested for one or more drug charges (Figure 26). From FY11 through FY13, 25,502 drug charges were filed in the arrests of 21,445 persons, at a rate of 1.2 charges per arrest. Of the total drug charges filed from FY11 through FY13, 38.6% were filed in arrests made in the East Central DTF. In this MJDTF, 9,848 drug charges were filed in the arrest of 7,653 persons, at a rate of 1.3 charges per arrest.



Except in the Southwest DTF and Southeast DTF, the number of drug charges filed in arrests increased from FY11 through FY12. The largest proportional increase in charges filed during this time occurred in the East Central DTF where the number of charges increased 16.6% from 3,014 in FY11 to 3,514 in FY12. All MJDTFs experienced a decrease in drug charges filed from FY12 through FY13. The largest decrease occurred in the Southwest DTF where the number of charges decreased 39% from 1,331 in FY12 to 812 in FY13.



Regional MJDTF Sale and Manufacture Drug Charges

Of all drug charges filed in arrests made by MJDTFs from FY11 through FY13, 40.1% were for sale or manufacture of illicit drugs (Figure 27). The East Central DTF filed 39.2% of the total sale and manufacture drug charges filed by all MJDTFs, the largest proportion of any region. The Northwest DTF filed 4.1% of all sale and manufacture charges filed by all regional MJDTFs.

Figures 28 through 34 display drug sale and manufacture charges filed in MJDTF arrests by drug type. Methamphetamine charges were the most common sale and manufacture charges filed. During the three fiscal years studied, MJDTFs filed 5,196 methamphetamine sale and manufacture charges in arrests of persons with one or more drug charges (Figure 28). Of the total methamphetamine sale and manufacture charges filed by MJDTFs, 33.2% were filed by East Central DTF. Another 20.6% of all methamphetamine


drug and sale charges were filed by Southeast DTF (19.1%) and 20.6% were filed by Southeast DTF. The least number of methamphetamine sale and manufacture charges (3.7%) were filed in arrests made by the Northeast DTF.

All but one MJDTF experienced an increase in the number of methamphetamine sale and manufacture charges from FY11 to FY12. Similar increases were experienced by the West Central DTF, Central DTF, and East Central DTF from FY 12 to FY13. Both Southwest DTF and Southeast DTF experienced significant decreases in the number methamphetamine sale and manufacture charges filed in their arrests. From FY12 to FY14, methamphetamine charges sale and manufacture decreased 42.5% in Southwest DTF and 42.4% in Southeast DTF.



During the three fiscal years studied, 2,609 marijuana sale and manufacture charges were filed in arrests made by MJDTFs (Figure 29). Of these, 48.2% were filed by East Central DTF. In addition, 16.5% were filed in Central DTF and 15.3% were filed in Southwest DTF.



Most MJDTFs experienced an increase in number of sale and manufacture marijuana charges filed in arrests from FY11 to FY12. Marijuana sale and manufacture charges increased 64.4% in Central DTF during this time frame while these charges increased 35.8% in Southwest DTF. From FY12 to FY13, five of seven MJDTFs experienced a decrease in the number of marijuana sale and manufacture charges filed in arrests. These charges decreased 59.1% in Southwest DTF arrests, 56.9% in Southeast DTF arrests, and 33.7% in East Central DTF arrests.



Cocaine sale and manufacture charges filed in arrests by MJDTFs have been sporadic since FY11 (Figure 30). A large increase in these charges was seen in the Southeast DTF from FY11 to FY12 but these charges then decreased to just one in FY13. From FY12 to FY13, a large increase in cocaine sale and manufacture charges occurred in the West Central DTF and East Central DTF. However, compared to the number of these charges in FY13 in East Central DTF were less than in FY11.



The number of crack cocaine charges filed in MJDTF arrests has significantly decreased in three MJDTFs since FY11 (Figure 31). These charges decreased 82.4% from 136 in FY11 to 24 in FY13 in the East Central DTF and 76.5% from 81 in FY11 to 19 charges in FY13 in the Southeast DTF. Small increases in crack cocaine charges filed in DTF arrests from FY11 to FY13 were seen in West Central DTF and Southwest DTF counties.

Heroin sale or manufacture charges were filed in arrests made by only certain MJDTFs from FY11 through FY13 (Figure 32). In East Central DTF, 432 heroin sale or manufacture charges were filed in arrests from FY11 through FY13. However, the trend in these arrests is constant over the three year study period. Although in smaller number of charges compared to those in the East Central DTF, possession charges filed in Central DTF and Southeast DTF arrests increased from FY11 through FY13.



Regional MJDTF Possession Charges

Possession charges filed in arrests made by four MJDTFs increased from FY11 through FY13 and decreased in three MJDTFs (Figure 33). The largest number of possession charges was filed in arrests made by the East





Central DTF and these charges increased 12.8% from 1,770 in FY11 to 1,996 in FY13. The greatest decrease in possession charges filed in drug task force arrests from FY11 through FY13 occurred in the Southwest DTF. These charges decreased 44.9% from 778 in FY11 to 429 in FY13.

The trends in drug types associated with possession charges filed in MJDTF arrests from FY11 through FY13 are shown in Figures 34 through 40. Marijuana possession charges decreased in arrests made by all MJDTFs except for two drug task forces. The greatest decrease in possession marijuana drug charges in MJDTF arrests occurred in the Southwest DTF where these charges decreased 49.4% from 245 in FY11 to 124 in FY13. Possession marijuana charges decreased by 4.7% in the West Central DTF arrests, 17.0% in the Central DTF arrests, 4.8% in the East Central DTF arrests, and 39.2% in the Southeast DTF arrests (Figure

34). Increases in possession marijuana arrests occurred in arrests by several MJDTFs from FY11 to FY12. The largest increase of possession marijuana charges occurred in the East Central DFT where possession marijuana charges increased 33.2%. However, the number of possession marijuana charges filed in East Central DTF arrests subsequently decreased 28.5% from FY12 through FY13.


Except in two regions of the state, increases of possession methamphetamine charges occurred in all MJDTF arrests from FY11 through FY13. The greatest proportional increase in possession methamphetamine charges occurred in Northeast DTF arrests where these charges increased 73.3% from 45 in FY11 to 78 in FY13 (Figure 35). The greatest increase in number of possession methamphetamine charges occurred in Central DTF arrests where 81 more possession methamphetamine charges were filed in



FY13 compared to FY11. Decreases in possession methamphetamine arrests occurred in arrests made by Southwest DTF and West Central DTF.



Possession cocaine charges have decreased in arrests made by all MJDTFs except one from FY11 through FY13 (Figure 36). The greatest proportional decrease in these charges occurred in arrests made by Central DTF. These charges decreased from 26 in FY11 to 2 in FY13, a 1200% decrease. The largest number of possession cocaine charges were filed in East Central DTF arrests. However, these charges decreased 24.1% from 58 in FY11 to 44 in FY13.

Nearly all possession crack charges were filed in arrests made by East Central DTF (Figure 37). These charges decreased 6.3% from 112 in FY11 to 105 in FY13. Although the number of possession crack charges filed in other DTF arrests are significantly less than the number filed in East Central DTF, nearly all decreased from FY11 to FY13.



Like crack possession charges, most heroin possession charges were filed in arrests made by East Central DTF (Figure 38). Heroin possession charges, however, in East Central DTF arrests have increased from FY11 through FY13. Heroin possession charges filed in East Central DTF arrests decreased 15.4% from 285 in FY11 to 241 in FY12. These charges then increased by 21.2% to 292 charges filed in FY13.

Paraphernalia possession charges filed in arrests increased in most MJDTF regions from FY11 to FY12 but these decreased in FY13 (Figure 39). Only in the Northeast DTF and the East Central DTF did filed paraphernalia possession charges increase from FY12 to FY13. The greatest number of paraphernalia possession charges was filed in the East Central DTF.



Compared to possession charges of other illicit drugs, the number of ecstasy possession charges was very small in all years studied (Figure 40). Only in arrests made by East Central DTF was the number of ecstasy possession charges significant.

Charges for possession of non-prescribed psychotherapeutic drugs were filed in arrests made by all MJDTFs (Figure 41). But since FY11, filings of these charges decreased in all MJDTF arrests except in arrests made by Central DTF and East Central DTF. In these two MJDTFs, the number of possession of other drug charges increased from FY11 to FY12. These charges continued to increase in the East Central DTF in FY13 but decreased in the Central DTF in that year.

Figure 39
 MJDTF Paraphernalia Possession Charges
 by Region and Fiscal Year






Figure 40
 MJDTF Ecstasy Possession Charges
 by Region and Fiscal Year







Regional MJDTF Seizures

Two regional MJDTF were responsible for 80.7% of all ounces of drugs seized in fiscal years 2011 through 2013. As seen in Figure 42, the West Central DTF seized 243,259 ounces of drugs during the study period and the East Central DTF seized 281,696 ounces of drugs. The amount of drug ounces seized by the West Central DTF increased 39.5% from 52,538 ounces in FY11 to 73,288 ounces in FY13. Comparatively, the amount of drugs seized by the East Central DTF decreased 71.8% from 158,024 in FY11 to 41,604 in FY13.


The value of drugs seized by MJDTF in fiscal years 2011 through 2013 is shown in Figure 43. All seven MJDTF seized drugs that had some value during this time frame. However, the West Central DTF seized the greatest value of drugs, accounting for \$95,593,986.






The trend of marijuana ounces seized by MJDTF is similar to the trend for all drugs. The greatest amount of marijuana was seized in the East Central DTF where 265,805 ounces of marijuana were seized (Figure 44). Additionally, 195,720 ounces of marijuana were seized in the West Central DTF, 43,881 ounces were seized in the Southwest DTF, and 50,152 ounces were seized in the Southeast DTF.

Except for very large amounts of methamphetamine seized by the West Central DTF in FY12 and FY13, the amount of methamphetamine seized was nearly constant across regions and fiscal years (Figure 45). Only small amounts of methamphetamine were seized by the Northwest DTF and Northeast DTF while moderate amounts were seized by the Central DTF, East Central DTF, and Southwest DTF, and Southeast DTF.





Cocaine was seized primarily by three MJDTF in fiscal years 2011 through 2013; West Central DTF, East Central DTF, and Southeast DTF (Figure 46). A total of 5,669 ounces of cocaine were seized by the East Central DTF, 3,648 ounces were seized by the West Central DTF, and 1,037 ounces were seized by the Southeast DTF. In all of these MJDTF, the amount of seized cocaine decreased from FY11 to FY13.

Crack cocaine was seized by MJDTF in all regions of the state but the largest seizures of this drug occurred in the East Central DTF where 140 ounces of crack cocaine were seized (Figure 47). Crack cocaine seizures increased in four MJDTF and decreased in three MJDTF.

Significant seizures of heroin occurred in only two MJDTF in fiscal years 2011 through 2013. As seen in Figure 48, 446 ounces of heroin were seized by the East Central DTF during this time frame and 469 ounces were seized by the West Central DTF. A total of 13 ounces of heroin were seized by all other MJDTF combined. The greatest amount of heroin seizures occurred in FY11 by the East Central DTF when 342 ounces were seized.

Although pseudoephedrine is a precursor of methamphetamine, locations of seizures of this drug do not mimic those of methamphetamine. Large amounts of methamphetamine were seized by the West Central DTF in fiscal years 2011 through 2013 but no pseudoephedrine was seized by this DTF (Figure 49) during the same time frame. Of all MJDTF, the Central DTF and East Central DTF seized the greatest amount of pseudoephedrine from FY11 through FY13. However, these two DTF seized only moderate amounts of methamphetamine in the same period.

All MJDTF seized other drugs such as barbiturates, sedatives, and analgesics used illicitly (Figure 50). The largest seizures of these drugs were made by West Central DTF (5,431 ounces) in fiscal years 2012 and 2013 and the by the Southeast DTF (2,094 ounces) in FY12.

Figure 46
Ounces of Cocaine Seized by MJDTF
by Region and Fiscal Year




Figure 47
Ounces of Crack Cocaine Seized by MJDTF
by Region and Fiscal Year




Figure 48
Ounces of Heroin Seized by MJDTF
by Region and Fiscal Year






Figure 49
Ounces of Pseudoephedrine Seized by MJDTF
by Region and Fiscal Year






Regional Trends of Methamphetamine Laboratory Destruction


Although methamphetamine laboratories were destroyed by MJDTF throughout the state during fiscal years 2011 through 2013, the majority were destroyed in the East Central DTF, Southwest DTF, and Southeast DTF (Figure 48). Of 4,711 methamphetamine labs destroyed during the study time frame, 3,814, or 81%, were destroyed by these three drug task forces.

The number of methamphetamine laboratories destroyed by drug task forces has decreased during the study period in all task forces regions except in the East Central DTF region. The number of methamphetamine labs destroyed by the East Central DTF increased 23.3% from 544 destroyed labs in FY11 to 671 destroyed labs in FY13.



Marijuana Eradication



As seen in Figure 49, marijuana plants were destroyed by MJDTF in all regions of the state. However, trends of marijuana plant eradication were erratic; large plant eradications in a fiscal year were followed by small numbers of plants eradicated in the next fiscal year. This may reflect the large number of plants grown in single sites and the discovery / destruction of those large grow sites in a fiscal year. The West Central DTF destroyed 8,794 marijuana plants during fiscal years 2011 through 2013, the largest number destroyed by MJDTF. Large numbers of marijuana plants were also eradicated in the Northwest DTF, Central DTF, East Central DTF, and Southwest DTF.



Regional MJDTF Drug Buys and Samples

All MJDTFs utilize drug buys, reverse drug buys, and free samples to enforce drug laws. However, the use of these has decreased in several MJDTFs since FY11 (Figure 50). The greatest decrease occurred in the East Central DTF where drug buys, reverse buys, and free samples dropped 47.6% from 944 in FY11 to 495 in FY13. Drug buys, reverse buys, and free samples have increased since FY11 in the West Central DTF and Southeast DTF. These increased 48.7% in the West Central DTF from 263 in FY11 to 391 in FY13.



Although the East Central DTF had the greatest number of drug buys, reverse buys, and free samples from FY11 to FY13, the greatest value of these was in the West Central DTF (Figure 51). In this MJDTF, drug buys, reverse buys, and free samples were valued at \$874,793 for all three years studied. However, the value of drug buys, reverse buys, and free samples decreased from \$464,015 in FY11 to \$215,255 in FY13.



Regional MDTF Informants

All MJDTFs obtain information on drug use and manufacture from informants. The Central DTF, East Central DTF, and Southeast DTF use informants to a greater extent than all other MJDTFs (Figure 52). The use of informants in the East Central DTF has decreased significantly from FY11 to FY13 while the use of these has increased in the Central DTF and Southeast DTF.

From FY11 to FY13 the value of funds expended on informants increased in most MJDTFs (Figure 53). However, in two of the MDTF that used informants more than other MDTF (Central DTF and East Central DTF), the value of funds expended on informants decreased. This decrease was very large in the East Central DTF where funds expended on informants decreased from \$52,640 in FY11 to \$24,352 in FY13.





Regional MJDTF Warrants and Consent Searches

All MJDTFs utilized warrants and consent searches to enforce illicit drug laws in their regions. As seen in Figure 54, the largest number of warrant applications in fiscal years 2011 through 2013 were made in the East Central DTF (963), followed by the Central DTF (605) and Southwest DTF (583). The number of warrant

applications increased from FY11 to FY13 in all MJDTF except in the Southwest DTF and Southeast DTF where the number of warrant applications decreased.

Consent searches were not as widely used as search warrants by MJDTF during fiscal years 2011 to 2013. During these fiscal years, the majority of consent searches were made in the West Central DTF where 4,592 consent searches were made (Figure 55). The number of consent searches made by the West Central DTF continually increased from 1,054 in FY11 to 1,502 in FY12, and to 2,036 in FY13. The East Central DTF followed and made 2,282 consent searches during the same time frame, but unlike the West Central DTF, the number of consent searches made remained fairly constant from FY11 to FY13.



APPENDIX: MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCE DATA FISCAL YEARS 2011 - 2013

MJDTF Agencies and Law Enforcement Employment by Region and Fiscal Year

FY11

		PTE Officers	FTE Officers	LE Agencies
Northwest	NW	1	18	13
Northeast	NE	3	53	30
West Central	WC	4	34	47
Central	C	6	18	24
East Central	EC	6	109	52
Southwest	SW	5	25	64
Southeast	SE	0	42	78
Statewide Total		25	299	308

FY12

		PTE Officers	FTE Officers	LE Agencies
Northwest	NW	0	17	13
Northeast	NE	9	4	31
West Central	WC	11	31	54
Central	C	5	16	21
East Central	EC	10	108	45
Southwest	SW	2	26	62
Southeast	SE	1	41	76
Statewide Total		38	243	302

FY13

		PTE Officers	FTE Officers	LE Agencies
Northwest	NW	0	18	13
Northeast	NE	0	10	28
West Central	WC	4	33	34
Central	C	11	15	29
East Central	EC	0	146	39
Southwest	SW	2	14	58
Southeast	SE	3	36	57
Statewide Total		20	272	258

MJDTF Cases by Status and Arrestees by Region and Fiscal Year

FY11

	Active Carry In Cases	Initiated New Cases	Total Active Cases	Cases Disposed	Cases Carried Out	Total Arrestees One or More Drug Charges
Northwest	355	643	998	631	367	290
Northeast	2,442	737	3,179	439	2,740	222
West Central	798	798	1,596	721	875	539
Central	2,425	1,326	3,751	1,469	2,282	982
East Central	1,505	3,248	4,753	2,721	2,033	2,484
Southwest	760	1,219	1,979	1,228	751	1,410
Southeast	3,758	1,432	5,190	982	4,208	1,411
	12,043	9,403	21,446	8,191	13,256	7,338

FY12

	Active Carry In Cases	Initiated New Cases	Total Active Cases	Cases Disposed	Cases Carried Out	Total Arrestees One or More Drug Charges
Northwest	374	565	939	664	275	339
Northeast	2,602	720	3,322	374	2,948	331
West Central	620	803	1,423	530	893	618
Central	718	1,347	2,065	1,507	558	1,113
East Central	585	3,645	4,230	3,647	576	2,693
Southwest	787	1,136	1,923	944	979	1,308
Southeast	1,968	1,502	3,470	1,090	2,380	1,390
	7,654	9,718	17,372	8,756	8,609	7,792

FY13

	Active Carry In Cases	Initiated New Cases	Total Active Cases	Cases Disposed	Cases Carried Out	Total Arrestees One or More Drug Charges
Northwest	275	534	809	504	305	326
Northeast	2,948	650	3,598	285	3,313	259
West Central	906	890	1,796	822	974	575
Central	558	1,335	1,893	1,296	597	1,072
East Central	583	3,403	3,986	2,914	1,051	2,476
Southwest	787	940	1,727	1,078	649	749
Southeast	2,380	1,246	3,626	1,020	2,606	858
	8,437	8,998	17,435	7,919	9,495	6,315

MJDTF Charges Filed in Cases by Charge Type by Region and Fiscal Year

FY11

	Possession Charges	Sale/Manufacture Charges	Total Charges
Northwest	221	107	328
Northeast	177	116	293
West Central	479	185	664
Central	688	453	1,141
East Central	1,770	1,244	3,014
Southwest	778	631	1,409
Southeast	794	643	1,437
	4,907	3,379	8,286

FY12

	Possession Charges	Sale/Manufacture Charges	Total Charges
Northwest	271	105	376
Northeast	242	188	430
West Central	632	122	754
Central	886	518	1,404
East Central	2,068	1,446	3,514
Southwest	589	742	1,331
Southeast	777	648	1,425
	5,465	3,769	9,234

FY13

	Possession Charges	Sale/Manufacture Charges	Total Charges
Northwest	255	85	340
Northeast	244	93	337
West Central	464	254	718
Central	758	591	1,349
East Central	1,996	1,324	3,320
Southwest	429	383	812
Southeast	756	350	1,106
	4,902	3,080	7,982

MJDTF Sale Charges by Drug Type by Region and Fiscal Year

FY11

Sale Charges

	Meth	Marijuana	Cocaine	Crack	Heroin	Ecstasy	LSD	PCP
Northwest	74	14	1	8	3	0	0	0
Northeast	52	32	4	3	2	0	0	0
West Central	78	80	9	1	1	0	0	0
Central	231	104	36	25	7	0	0	0
East Central	378	463	52	136	149	12	11	5
Southwest	375	137	6	7	1	8	1	3
Southeast	408	102	7	81	16	0	0	0
	1,596	932	115	261	179	20	12	8

FY12

Sale Charges

	Meth	Marijuana	Cocaine	Crack	Heroin	Ecstasy	LSD	PCP
Northwest	92	2	0	2	4	0	0	0
Northeast	70	29	5	73	2	0	0	0
West Central	59	43	4	0	7	0	0	0
Central	250	171	4	29	21	1	1	2
East Central	659	478	14	102	133	6	9	4
Southwest	390	186	9	22	28	5	3	0
Southeast	420	72	50	48	4	8	0	0
	1,940	981	86	276	199	20	13	6

FY13

Sale Charges

	Meth	Marijuana	Cocaine	Crack	Heroin	Ecstasy	LSD	PCP
Northwest	27	29	10	10	5	0	0	0
Northeast	68	20	0	1	0	0	2	0
West Central	118	66	44	4	0	0	0	0
Central	293	157	7	25	50	5	0	0
East Central	686	317	44	24	150	29	9	1
Southwest	226	76	8	24	0	5	0	0
Southeast	242	31	1	19	42	1	0	0
	1,660	696	114	107	247	40	11	1

MJDTF Possession Charges by Drug Type by Region and Fiscal Year

FY11

Possession Charges

	Meth	Marijuana	Cocaine	Crack	Heroin	Ecstasy	LSD	PCP	Other	Pseudo Ephedrine	Anhydrous	Paraphernalia
Northwest	73	32	13	25	23	0	1	0	47	2	0	12
Northeast	45	46	8	12	0	0	0	0	27	14	1	47
West Central	111	234	24	6	7	3	0	1	57	1	0	51
Central	294	176	26	19	15	1	2	0	53	54	4	94
East Central	275	521	58	112	285	24	7	3	130	71	4	318
Southwest	272	245	4	4	0	8	0	1	176	37	2	122
Southeast	264	166	17	25	24	2	0	0	109	117	29	70
	1,334	1,420	150	203	354	38	10	5	599	296	40	714

FY12

Possession Charges

	Meth	Marijuana	Cocaine	Crack	Heroin	Ecstasy	LSD	PCP	Other	Pseudo Ephedrine	Anhydrous	Paraphernalia
Northwest	118	56	11	9	20	4	0	0	26	0	0	32
Northeast	63	67	3	7	7	0	0	0	19	1	0	84
West Central	135	294	19	13	4	1	1	23	54	0	2	95
Central	321	197	0	6	19	0	1	0	147	20	0	214
East Central	359	694	49	123	241	22	4	0	157	89	30	341
Southwest	199	168	2	4	12	7	9	0	128	45	0	114
Southeast	301	157	21	12	14	2	1	0	82	58	21	153
	1,496	1,633	105	174	317	36	16	23	613	213	53	1,033

FY13

Possession Charges

	Meth	Marijuana	Cocaine	Crack	Heroin	Ecstasy	LSD	PCP	Other	Pseudo Eph	Anhydrous	Paraphernalia
Northwest	113	45	10	14	26	2	3	1	21	1	0	23
Northeast	78	50	7	1	9	0	0	0	6	0	1	94
West Central	101	223	17	8	6	1	0	19	58	0	0	53
Central	375	146	2	0	17	0	0	0	113	2	0	157
East Central	342	496	44	105	292	24	2	1	186	59	4	486
Southwest	191	124	8	3	2	2	2	0	70	22	0	49
Southeast	313	101	8	6	15	0	0	0	36	259	5	27
	1,513	1,185	96	137	367	29	7	21	490	343	10	889

MJDTF Drug Buys, Informants, and Dollars Expended By Region and Fiscal Year

FY11

	No. Drug Buys, Reverse Buys, Free Samples	Value Drug Buys, Reverse Buys, Free Samples	No. Informants	Dollars Expended
Northwest	283	\$117,980	77	\$7,402
Northeast	141	\$24,207	19	\$5,817
West Central	263	\$464,015	38	\$7,077
Central	536	\$53,645	112	\$23,854
East Central	944	\$242,136	264	\$52,640
Southwest	241	\$39,724	82	\$23,100
Southeast	471	\$70,592	122	\$10,420
	2,879	\$1,012,299	714	\$130,310

FY12

	No. Drug Buys, Reverse Buys, Free Samples	Value Drug Buys, Reverse Buys, Free Samples	No. Informants	Dollars Expended
Northwest	255	\$74,407	46	\$12,088
Northeast	87	\$6,697	9	\$765
West Central	249	\$194,523	34	\$7,528
Central	380	\$75,669	81	\$18,638
East Central	768	\$115,303	238	\$25,964
Southwest	241	\$40,924	55	\$13,960
Southeast	697	\$88,768	162	\$16,107
	2,677	\$596,291	625	\$95,050

FY13

	No. Drug Buys, Reverse Buys, Free Samples	Value Drug Buys, Reverse Buys, Free Samples	No. Informants	Dollars Expended
Northwest	194	\$43,198	40	\$15,902
Northeast	96	\$10,031	14	\$236
West Central	391	\$216,255	49	\$12,844
Central	399	\$74,980	119	\$20,480
East Central	495	\$92,279	194	\$24,352
Southwest	180	\$44,378	45	\$15,686
Southeast	548	\$94,135	162	\$27,697
	2,303	\$575,256	623	\$117,197

MJDTF Warrants and Consent Searches By Region and Fiscal Year

FY11		Warrants			
	Applied For	Authorized	Served	Served/Arrest	Consent Searches
Northwest	70	70	70	60	88
Northeast	41	41	40	32	85
West Central	142	142	142	132	1,054
Central	172	172	165	165	291
East Central	311	310	305	276	726
Southwest	239	239	230	223	364
Southeast	193	193	193	180	368
	1,168	1,167	1,145	1,068	2,976

FY12		Warrants			
	Applied For	Authorized	Served	Served/Arrest	Consent Searches
Northwest	59	58	58	45	98
Northeast	82	82	81	70	97
West Central	156	155	154	145	1,502
Central	188	188	188	188	242
East Central	298	297	288	254	785
Southwest	225	225	217	216	305
Southeast	202	203	202	180	451
	1,210	1,208	1,188	1,098	3,480

FY13		Warrants			
	Applied For	Authorized	Served	Served/Arrest	Consent Searches
Northwest	84	81	81	78	86
Northeast	92	92	90	70	80
West Central	193	189	188	177	2,036
Central	245	245	240	238	259
East Central	354	354	354	309	771
Southwest	119	119	107	116	181
Southeast	160	160	160	149	287
	1,247	1,240	1,220	1,137	3,700

MJDTF Eradicated Marijuana and Destroyed Meth Labs by Region and Fiscal Year

FY11	Eradicated Marijuana		Meth Labs Destroyed
	Ounces	Plants	
Northwest	0	4,500	4
Northeast	2	374	120
West Central	100,007	2,308	12
Central	0	99	173
East Central	2,582	4,013	544
Southwest	661	2,582	291
Southeast	429	823	463
	103,681	14,699	1,607

FY12	Eradicated Marijuana		Meth Labs Destroyed
	Ounces	Plants	
Northwest	320,000	0	7
Northeast	0	647	138
West Central	0	5,109	7
Central	0	3,596	169
East Central	3,157	432	741
Southwest	100	2,501	275
Southeast	0	938	372
	323,257	13,223	1,709

FY13	Eradicated Marijuana		Meth Labs Destroyed
	Ounces	Plants	
Northwest	0	0	1
Northeast	1,504	373	109
West Central	960	1,377	5
Central	0	279	152
East Central	11	1,651	671
Southwest	2	418	171
Southeast	0	397	286
	2,478	4,495	1,395

MJDTF Ounces of Drugs Seized by Drug Type by Region and Fiscal Year

FY11

Ounces of Drugs Seized

	Value	Marijuana	Cocaine	Crack	Meth	Heroin	LSD	PCP	Ecstasy	Pseud oEph	Anhyd rous	Other
Northwest	\$1,244,825	2,257	4	12	32	1	0	0	0	0	0	18
Northeast	\$79,449	122	1	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
West Central	\$25,791,940	50,238	983	4	636	122	0	0	0	0	0	554
Central	\$2,532,500	6,182	45	2	668	1	0	0	4	101	0	23
East Central	\$9,150,128	154,177	3,004	61	266	342	1	1	1	66	0	106
Southwest	\$1,513,045	7,768	9	4	192	0	0	2	2	6	0	2
Southeast	\$1,232,691	13,480	310	37	297	2	0	0	0	32	0	1
	\$41,544,578	234,225	4,355	123	2,102	468	1	3	7	205	0	706

FY12

Ounces of Drugs Seized

	Value	Marijuana	Cocaine	Crack	Meth	Heroin	LSD	PCP	Ecstasy	Pseud oEph	Anhyd rous	Other
Northwest	\$811,840	2,546	1	2	19	1	0	0	1	2	0	28
Northeast	\$184,490	2,572	1	0	8	0	4	0	0	0	0	30
West Central	\$36,740,213	75,655	1,742	8	36,159	206	0	195	0	0	0	3,468
Central	\$5,412,780	3,871	1	3	429	2	0	0	0	7	1,280	37
East Central	\$5,681,623	73,959	2,092	31	260	47	23	300	17	24	4,368	947
Southwest	\$2,835,830	30,524	1	4	113	0	0	0	1	0	0	290
Southeast	\$2,976,583	1,475	726	5	308	1	0	0	0	17	0	1,814
	\$54,643,359	190,602	4,566	55	37,295	255	27	495	18	49	5,648	6,614

FY13

Ounces of Drugs Seized

	Value	Marijuana	Cocaine	Crack	Meth	Heroin	LSD	PCP	Ecstasy	Pseud oEph	Anhyd rous	Other
Northwest	\$827,057	1,845	12	11	41	4	0	0	0	0	0	87
Northeast	\$364,820	2,312	6	13	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
West Central	\$33,061,833	68,827	923	28	1,930	141	1	29	0	0	0	1,409
Central	\$2,091,905	997	2	1	143	1	0	0	0	0	0	935
East Central	\$8,653,054	37,669	573	48	696	57	7	97	9	79	1,637	730
Southwest	\$954,625	5,589	6	12	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	15
Southeast	\$1,766,562	35,197	2	2	387	0	0	0	0	2	0	279
	\$47,719,856	152,435	1,523	116	3,266	204	9	126	10	81	1,637	3,575

MJDTF Doses of Drugs Seized by Drug Type By Region and Fiscal Year

FY11

Doses of Drugs Seized

	Marijuana	Cocaine	Crack	Meth	Heroin	LSD	PCP	Ecstasy	Pseudo Ephedrine	Anhydrous Ammonia	Other
Northwest	0	0	0	0	458	0	0	141	0	0	1,407
Northeast	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
West Central	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	919	0	0	1,206
Central	0	0	0	0	512	0	0	0	1,079	5	99
East Central	0	0	0	0	1,690	329	10	192	4,696	111	3,117
Southwest	0	0	4	0	0	2	12	100	268	0	3,127
Southeast	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	317	452	181	2,607
	0	0	4	0	2,660	335	22	1,669	6,495	297	11,692

FY12

Doses of Drugs Seized

	Marijuana	Cocaine	Crack	Meth	Heroin	LSD	PCP	Ecstasy	Pseudo Ephedrine	Anhydrous Ammonia	Other
Northwest	0	2	0	0	103	0	0	11	0	0	695
Northeast	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	530
West Central	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1,293	20	0	2,046
Central	0	0	0	0	216	0	0	10	561	0	817
East Central	0	0	0	0	1,894	14	0	1,090	1,908	1	5,758
Southwest	0	1	0	0	1,281	439	3	56	911	0	7,146
Southeast	0	0	0	0	14	6	0	1	1,074	15	16,549
	0	3	0	0	3,508	461	3	2,461	4,474	16	33,541

FY13

Doses of Drugs Seized

	Marijuana	Cocaine	Crack	Meth	Heroin	LSD	PCP	Ecstasy	Pseudo Ephedrine	Anhydrous Ammonia	Other
Northwest	0	0	0	0	269	6	0	89	0	0	3,259
Northeast	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	40
West Central	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	204	0	0	16,055
Central	0	0	0	36	28	4	0	7	68	0	980
East Central	8	0	0	1	1,996	65	1	1,511	1,939	150	2,777
Southwest	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	50	796	0	8,359
Southeast	0	0	0	0	13	5	0	0	423	4	1,254
	8	0	0	37	2,309	82	1	1,861	3,226	154	32,724

Ounces of Drugs Obtained by Purchases and Free Samples

FY11

	Marijuana	Cocaine	Crack	Meth	Heroin	LSD	PCP	Ecstasy	Pseudo Ephedrine	Anhydrous Ammonia	Other
Northwest	147	13	13	67	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Northeast	133	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
West Central	946	70	9	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Central	324	3	10	4	62	0	0	1	0	0	10
East Central	36,954	530	20	23	57	0	0	0	1	0	20
Southwest	701	1	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southeast	99	1	23	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
	39,304	619	78	156	121	0	0	1	1	0	50

Ounces of Drugs Obtained by Purchases and Free Samples

FY12

	Marijuana	Cocaine	Crack	Meth	Heroin	LSD	PCP	Ecstasy	Pseudo Ephedrine	Anhydrous Ammonia	Other
Northwest	40	11	9	36	0	0	2	3	0	0	5
Northeast	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
West Central	53	18	13	110	5	0	4	0	0	0	37
Central	129	1	9	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
East Central	120	6	8	1	17	0	0	0	212	0	0
Southwest	71	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Southeast	74	57	16	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
	524	93	56	168	26	0	6	3	212	0	49

Ounces of Drugs Obtained by Purchases and Free Samples

FY13

	Marijuana	Cocaine	Crack	Meth	Heroin	LSD	PCP	Ecstasy	Pseudo Ephedrine	Anhydrous Ammonia	Other
Northwest	9	3	5	22	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Northeast	8	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
West Central	189	27	9	201	0	0	2	1	0	0	35
Central	79	1	4	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
East Central	1,627	197	5	3	607	9	0	1	0	0	2
Southwest	61	1	5	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Southeast	170	2	2	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
	2,143	233	34	270	611	9	2	2	0	0	50

Doses of Drugs Obtained by Purchases and Free Samples

FY11

	Marijuana	Cocaine	Crack	Meth	Heroin	LSD	PCP	Ecstasy	Pseudo Ephedrine	Anhydrous Ammonia	Other
Northwest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	247
Northeast	0	0	0	5	117	0	0	0	0	0	355
West											
Central	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	406
Central	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	605
East Central	0	0	0	0	571	27	0	69	668	0	795
Southwest	0	0	0	0	5	0	12	42	0	0	1,114
Southeast	0	0	0	0	0	31	0	100	0	0	581
	0	0	0	5	693	58	12	211	668	0	4,103

Doses of Drugs Obtained by Purchases and Free Samples

FY12

	Marijuana	Cocaine	Crack	Meth	Heroin	LSD	PCP	Ecstasy	Pseudo Ephedrine	Anhydrous Ammonia	Other
Northwest	0	0	0	0	30	0	0	33	0	0	152
Northeast	0	0	0	0	36	0	0	0	0	0	111
West Central	0	0	0	0	93	0	3	0	0	0	430
Central	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	472
East Central	1	0	0	0	760	38	0	8	0	5	900
Southwest	0	0	0	0	69	10	136	0	0	0	216
Southeast	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145	0	914
	1	0	0	0	988	48	139	41	145	5	3,195

Doses of Drugs Obtained by Purchases and Free Samples

FY13

	Marijuana	Cocaine	Crack	Meth	Heroin	LSD	PCP	Ecstasy	Pseudo Ephedrine	Anhydrous Ammonia	Other
Northwest	0	0	0	200	0	8	0	0	0	0	304
Northeast	0	0	0	0	59	4	0	0	0	0	114
West Central	7	8	1	104	0	2	3	52	0	0	934
Central	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	0	0	338
East Central	0	0	0	0	241	5	0	1,028	0	0	273
Southwest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	241
Southeast	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	0	0	1,863
	7	8	1	304	300	19	13	1,206	0	0	4,067

