

**Office of the Governor**  
**Criminal Justice Division**

**Annual Report**  
on the  
**Byrne**  
**Formula Grant Program**  
*June 1, 2002 – May 31, 2003*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	3
Introduction.....	5
Evaluation Plan and Activities.....	8
Summary of Programs, Performance Measures, Evaluation Methods .....	10
Counter-Terrorism Planning.....	12
Counter-Terrorism Training .....	15
Multi-Jurisdictional Narcotics Task Forces.....	17
Gang Prevention and Intervention .....	22
Criminal Justice Information Systems .....	24
Prosecution Programs.....	26
Drug Diversion Courts.....	28
Prevention and Treatment for Alcohol and Drug Abuse.....	30
Victim Services.....	32
Clandestine Laboratories.....	34
Texas Amber Alert Network.....	35

## Supplemental Information

### Attachments

- 1 Byrne Awards Active During the Reporting Period
- 2 Narcotic Service Task Force Report 6/1/ 2002 – 5/31/2003
- 3 Compliance and Review Checklist
- 4 Quality Assurance Monitoring Report

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The State of Texas has consistently used funds from the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Formula Grant Program to combat illegal drugs, violent crime and gang activities. A significant amount of illegal drugs from outside the United States flow through Texas to other states. The Texas-Mexico border runs 1,254 miles along the Rio Grande River from the Texas Gulf Coast to the Texas-New Mexico border. This large geographical area is sparsely populated which makes it difficult to maintain around-the-clock policing and presents opportunities for smugglers to run trafficking operations into and across the state. These activities lead to the distribution and sale of drugs and the residual violent crimes that follow illegal drug operations.

Texas law enforcement agencies and narcotics task forces work closely with the United States Border Patrol, United States Customs, Drug Enforcement Administration, Federal Bureau of Investigations, Adjutant General's Counter-drug Program and other federal partners to make a united attack on the flow of drugs into the state. The United States Coast Guard works with these same groups to target drug trafficking along the Texas Gulf Coast that covers 367 miles from the Texas-Mexico border to the Texas-Louisiana border. All agencies have now joined to add homeland security and protection of Texas ports and borders against terrorist activity to their missions. Many of these activities are supported with grants awarded under the Byrne Formula Grant Program.

The Governor's Criminal Justice Division (CJD) is the agency in Texas that administers the Byrne Formula Grant Program. During the Byrne reporting period (June 2002/ May 2003), CJD awarded 81 Byrne-funded grants to projects that supported the priorities identified in the *2002 Update to the Multi-Year Strategy for Drug and Violent Crime Control*. In addition to drug control, the priorities address counter-terrorism and drug demand reduction.

During this reporting period, eight new counter-terrorism projects totaling approximately \$2.2 million were awarded. Projects focused on enhancing the state's infrastructure for linking communication systems between key agencies and organizations, ensuring network security for these communications, and providing training for law enforcement agencies and other first responders.

Multi-jurisdictional narcotics task forces along the Gulf Coast and the Mexico border continued to participate in activities related to homeland security and the protection of Texas ports and borders. Eight task forces were granted supplemental awards totaling \$432,969 to provide for additional personnel, training and equipment dedicated to border security investigations.

CJD awarded 46 grants to Multi-Jurisdictional Narcotics Task Forces during the 2002-2003 grant year. These task forces cover 220 of the 254 counties in the state and serve as the primary narcotics law enforcement entity in most areas. Task forces seized over \$582 million in illegal drugs and over \$16 million in assets. This past year's grant period represents the first full grant year in which task forces reported statistics and activities through the Texas Department of Public Safety's (DPS) Narcotics Service Report (NSR) system. As DPS reporting procedures for drug seizures are different from previous measures used by the task forces, this year's cumulative statistics cannot be directly compared to statistics from previous years. The consistency and reliability of data gained through the statewide implementation of NSR will be of great benefit in measuring the effectiveness of task force projects.

DPS continued to provide operational oversight of the narcotic task forces and maintained primary responsibility for training task force officers. Task forces continued implementation of standardized policies and procedures that are integrated into the local, regional and statewide drug enforcement strategy.

In addition, Byrne grants were awarded to ten gang prevention and intervention projects, five substance abuse treatment projects, one court project, one criminal justice information system project, two prosecution projects, one clandestine lab project, one victim's project, and one child abduction project, along with two administrative grants.

All 81 projects were funded with awards from Byrne fund blocks 1998 through 2002. The total amount of funds awarded for all projects from all fund blocks was \$38,655,944.

CJD remained flexible during this grant period to accommodate current events and shifts in state priorities. CJD is committed to continue this practice and to assure that Byrne funds are used in the most effective and prudent manner possible.

## INTRODUCTION

The Governor's Office is the designated State Administrative Agency (SAA) for the federal Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Formula Grant Program for Texas. The Executive Director of the Governor's Criminal Justice Division (CJD) serves as the administrator of funds and provides direction to staff on funding projects that meet the state's priorities for the Byrne program.

In the last year CJD underwent a reorganization which streamlined its approach in the management of Byrne programs and subgrants. The Programs and Grant Administration Section currently is comprised of a director, assistant director, program administrators, and regional coordinators. Primary responsibility for program administration is with a Program Administrator. The Director maintains oversight for the program. All other staff, such as regional coordinators share a proportionate amount of responsibility in administering Byrne-funded subgrants. The Program Administrator is funded by the Byrne program.

For the 2002-2003 reporting period, three Texas National Guard personnel were assigned to the program by the Adjutant General's Counter-drug Program. Two guardsmen served as regional coordinators and one as a program coordinator. Three additional National Guard personnel are assigned to the Monitoring Section of CJD. They are responsible for monitoring Byrne-funded subgrants. Currently, one National Guard personnel is assigned to CJD to serve as a liaison between CJD and Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS) to further DPS's role in maintaining operational oversight of the multi-jurisdictional narcotics taskforces.

The Byrne allocation to Texas for the 2002 grant cycle (June 1, 2002 through May 31, 2003) was \$32,253,729. CJD used \$460,951 for administration and the remainder was used for improving the operations and effectiveness of the criminal justice system and to reduce crime, violence and drug abuse. This report reflects all active projects during the grant cycle, regardless of whether they were funded with Byrne 2002 or prior awards. A list of projects funded may be found under Attachment "1".

A total of 81 projects were awarded grants during the grant cycle with the majority of funds being awarded to 46 multi-jurisdictional narcotics task forces. Since the inception of the Byrne program in Texas, task forces have played a major role in reducing the supply and demand for drugs. In the Byrne 2002 grant cycle, task forces seized over \$582 million in illegal drugs and over \$16 million in assets. Attachment "2" contains data on task force activities.

Byrne grants also were awarded to eight counter-terrorism projects, ten gang prevention and intervention projects, five substance abuse treatment projects, one drug court project, one criminal justice information system project, two prosecution projects, one clandestine lab project, one victim's project, and one child abduction project.

Coordination of efforts and community planning were major factors in the success of these projects, especially the multi-jurisdictional narcotics task forces. It is essential that each project interact with key groups and individuals at the local, regional, state and federal level to assure adequate coordination and support to achieve stated goals. The sharing of information among task forces and law enforcement agencies at all levels is a critical component of reducing drug-related activities in the state. These daily communications promoted coordinated investigations, interdictions, and arrests.

In addition to their law enforcement activities, task forces actively participated in community awareness programs by making over 960 public presentations. To further promote community planning and coordination of activities, each of the task forces has an advisory committee that consists of

representatives from cities and counties included in their geographic coverage area. These committees were updated frequently on drug-related activities and were able to make recommendations for addressing issues in their target areas.

Byrne projects supported other priorities identified in the *2002 Update to the Multi-Year Strategy for Drug and Violent Crime Control*.

- Enhance counter-terrorism programs by providing planning, training, and resources.
- Coordinate efforts and leverage resources to disrupt the manufacturing, sale, distribution, and trafficking of illegal drugs.
- Reduce the demand for drugs in coordination with a network of prevention and treatment programs.

Supporting activities include:

**Enhance counter-terrorism programs by providing planning, training, and resources.**

CJD funded eight new counter-terrorism programs to support this goal. Projects focused on enhancing the state's infrastructure for linking communication systems between key agencies and organizations, ensuring network security for these communications, and providing training for law enforcement and other first responders.

The state's homeland security officials have identified communication networks as a critical infrastructure that will allow agencies to directly communicate with each other in case of a threat or catastrophic event. Increasing the interconnectivity of networks and the capacity for information sharing along with protecting networks from potential cyber-terrorists attacks have been priority projects over the past year. The Border Security Network Infrastructure Initiative by DPS has greatly increased the capacity for information sharing across the state's law enforcement community. To assist in network security efforts, the Network Security Enhancement Project was also started during this grant period. An estimated 25 state agency/university networks were examined to assess vulnerability and determine preparedness for cyber attacks.

Multi-jurisdictional narcotics task forces along the Gulf Coast and the Mexico border also continue to take on additional responsibilities related to homeland security and the protection of Texas ports and borders. Eight task forces were granted supplemental awards totaling \$432,969 to provide for additional personnel, training and equipment dedicated to border security investigations.

**Coordinate efforts and leverage resources to disrupt the manufacturing, sale, distribution, and trafficking of illegal drugs.**

Multi-jurisdictional narcotics task forces are the primary grantees that support this priority. Projects related to the courts, clandestine laboratories, criminal justice information systems, gangs, prosecutors and improvements to law enforcement also support the drug enforcement priority.

Task forces routinely work with state and federal agencies to conduct joint operations. During the grant period, 46 operations were conducted jointly with the Drug Enforcement Administration; 41 with the Federal Bureau of Investigation; 39 with the U.S. Attorney's

Office; 33 with U.S. Customs; 32 with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms; 31 with the U. S. Marshal; 25 with the Internal Revenue Service; 24 with the U. S. Postal Service; and 21 with the U. S. Immigration and Naturalization Service. An additional 95 operations were conducted with agencies such as the U. S. Department of Homeland Security, U. S. Treasury, U. S. Secret Service, U. S. Department of Justice and the U. S. Border Patrol.

Joint operations with state agencies included 47 with the Texas Department of Public Safety; 34 with the Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission; 30 with the Texas Department of Criminal Justice; 30 with the Texas National Guard; 29 with the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department; and 22 with the Texas Attorney General. An additional 44 operations were conducted with the Texas State Board of Pharmacy, Texas Youth Commission, Texas Lottery Commission, and the Adjutant General's Counter-drug Program.

Operational oversight of the narcotics task forces and training responsibilities for task force officers continues to be provided by DPS. CJD has renewed its Memorandum of Understanding with DPS to include increased command and control responsibilities for DPS. The past year's oversight has improved coordinated efforts and has helped to not only leverage resources but to address a unified statewide drug strategy.

**Reduce the demand for drugs in coordination with a network of prevention and treatment programs.**

Multi-jurisdictional task forces and gang projects participated in prevention activities. Due to the large amount of program income that some of the task forces had acquired through seizures, CJD redirected funds that would have been awarded to these task forces. Five grants totaling \$1,859,600 were awarded to local projects through regional council of governments to increase prevention and treatment activities in the coverage area served by task forces.

In November 2002, the Anti-Crime Commission published its Report to the Governor that included recommendations about current programs, statutes, and regulations related to crime, sexual abuse, gang activity, and similar activities. Byrne funded projects supported some of the recommendations including:

- Increase emphasis on combating child pornography and related internet crimes.
- Reduce gang activity related to drug trafficking.
- Eliminate the profits of criminal enterprises.
- Continue activities to disrupt crime along the Texas-Mexico border.
- Increase interoperability and integration of information technology.
- Promote effective drug prevention and treatment programs.

## **EVALUATION PLAN AND ACTIVITIES**

The Governor's Criminal Justice Division (CJD) bases its funding decisions on the effectiveness of programs that are measured through an efficient and accurate progress reporting system. In the *2002 Update to the Multi-Year Strategy for Drug and Violent Crime Control*, CJD reported two major changes in the evaluation process for Byrne grants.

Operational oversight of the multi-jurisdictional narcotic task forces continues to be provided by the Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS). The increased command and control responsibilities by DPS includes a system for task forces to report case and statistical data. The past year's oversight has increased the coordination of efforts and leveraging of resources to reduce illegal drug activity in the state.

This past year's grant period represents the first full grant year in which multi-jurisdictional narcotics task forces reported statistics and activities through the DPS Narcotics Service Reporting System. DPS procedures for reporting drug seizure statistics are based on street values. Task forces had previously based values on whether the drugs were seized in wholesale or street value. This difference in the calculation of seizure values makes it difficult to compare this year's task force statistics with statistics from previous years. Statistics based on the new method of reporting can be found under Attachment 2.

### **Program Effectiveness**

The evaluation methodologies for CJD projects are qualitative as well as quantitative. The Public Policy Research Institute (PPRI) at Texas A&M University continues to collect and provide reports on data from the grantees. With the assistance of PPRI, the consistency and quality of information reported by grantees has improved over the past year. CJD and PPRI are currently working on standard performance measures that will accurately reflect the progress of each grantee's work. The information contained in reports from DPS and PPRI are reviewed and taken into consideration when grantees request continued or additional funding.

### **Quality Assurance**

The Grants Monitoring Section is a section within the Governor's Criminal Justice Division that evaluates the activities of recipients to ensure that grant awards are used for authorized purposes and eligible activities. The section provides on-site technical assistance as necessary. The Adjutant General's Counter-drug Program has assigned three National Guardsmen to the section that serve as compliance monitors for Byrne projects. Monitors are responsible for reviewing the technical and financial aspects of the grants including expenditure reports, cash match contributions, equipment inventory, confidential funds, and progress reports. During site visits, monitors meet with the project director, financial officer and authorized official for each grant. These meetings assist grantee staff in preparing, organizing and maintaining compliance information.

Draft monitoring reports are sent to grantees for review and action. Grantees respond to the report and supply their corrective action plans to any noted findings. Final reports are issued that include the grantees' responses. Monitors reviewed 23 Byrne task force projects totaling \$17,159,194 million during the 2002-2003 grant year.

The Grants Monitoring Section also participates in the annual grant training workshop held for grantees receiving Byrne funds. Monitors explain the review process during site visits, discuss compliance

requirements, and note recurring findings. A copy of the grantee checklist can be found under Attachment 3 and a summary of monitoring activity can be found under Attachment 4.

## SUMMARY OF PROGRAMS, PERFORMANCE MEASURES, EVALUATION METHODS AND RESULTS

As of October 2003, the State of Texas has received BJA approval for eighteen programs. Those programs are:

- Counter-Terrorism Planning
- Counter-Terrorism Training and Equipment
- Multi-jurisdictional Narcotics Task Forces
- Gang Prevention and Intervention
- Prosecution Programs
- Prevention and Treatment for Alcohol and Drug Abuse
- Criminal Justice Information Systems
- Texas Amber Alert Network
- Diversion Courts
- Clandestine Laboratories
- Victims Assistance
- Drug Courts
- Improving the Operational Effectiveness of Law Enforcement
- Forensic Laboratory Enhancements
- Program Evaluations
- Mentoring Children of Prisoners
- Victims of Domestic Violence

CJD funded 81 projects in eleven program areas during the Byrne 2002 grant year. The number of projects and dollars awarded to each program area is as follows:

<b>Program</b>	<b>Number of Projects</b>	<b>Amount Awarded</b>
Counter-Terrorism Planning	6	\$ 2,002,814
Counter-Terrorism Training and Equipment	2	622,000
Multi-jurisdictional Narcotics Task Forces	49	27,877,764
Gang Prevention and Intervention	10	2,653,071
Prosecution Programs	2	2,549,809
Prevention and Treatment for Alcohol and Drug Abuse	5	1,859,600
Criminal Justice Information Systems	1	250,000
Texas Amber Alert Network	1	200,000
Diversion Courts	1	132,599
Clandestine Laboratories	1	21,625
Victims Assistance	1	16,627
Administration	2	470,035
<b>Total</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>\$38,655,944</b>

Of the 81 projects funded during the Byrne 2002 grant year, 23 of those projects were funded from prior year awards. The following list reflects projects funded from each grant year:

DB 1998	3 projects	\$	248,236
DB 1999	5 projects		2,100,616
DB 2000	5 projects		2,299,681
DB 2001	10 projects		4,554,219
DB 2002	58 projects		29,453,192

Two of the 81 projects support administration charges for the reporting period which include:

DB 2002	Staffing/Overhead	\$	460,951
	Contracted Reporting		9,084

The following pages contain information on the program areas and the remaining 79 projects that received funding during the grant year, regardless of funding block.

**Program Title**      *Counter-Terrorism Planning*

**Description**

Support efforts that address and enhance the State's planning and preparedness for counter-terrorism including deep draft ports along the Texas coast.

**Byrne Purpose Area**    7 B

**Number of Projects**    6

Department of Public Safety, Border Security Network Infrastructure Initiative  
Department of Public Safety, Texas Network Security Enhancement  
Governor's Office, Criminal Justice Division, Mail Security Study  
Hays County, Mobile Incident Command  
Office of the Attorney General, Homeland Security  
Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission, Licensure Compliance  
and Identification of Potential Terrorist Connections

**Funds Awarded**        \$2,002,814  
(Note: \$432,969 of this total was awarded to eight multi-jurisdictional narcotics task forces to support homeland security activities.)

**Goal**    Assess, evaluate and prepare the State to respond to terrorist threats.

**Objectives**

- Develop state and regional plans for responding to terrorist threats.
- Evaluate the preparedness of law enforcement personnel, fire department personnel, emergency services personnel and other first responders.
- Develop intelligence and communications systems.

**Activities**

Development of state plans, appointment of task forces or advisory committees at the local, regional or statewide level, and implementation of counter-terrorism programs.

**Performance Measures and Evaluation Methods**

Measures might include development of a state plan, increased interagency communication and cooperation, completed assessments of various levels and types of preparedness, number of committees or task forces appointed, number of meetings held, number of recommendations, and number of plans implemented.

Grantees also develop specific, quantifiable and measurable objectives for their projects. The Criminal Justice Division reviews these measures as part of each project's program evaluation. In addition, CJD monitoring staff review a major portion of Byrne funded projects each year.

## Accomplishments and Evaluation Results

Six projects were funded with Criminal Justice Information Systems funds as part of the waiver from BJA to use these funds for homeland security projects. Projects focused on enhancing the state's infrastructure for linking communication systems between key agencies and organizations; ensuring network security for these communications; providing planning for law enforcement and other first responders; and protection of the state's Gulf Coast and Mexico border.

The Department of Public Safety, Border Security Network Infrastructure Initiative has increased the capacity for information sharing across the law enforcement community. Hardware and bandwidth upgrades along with implementation of encryption and system redundancy helped make this initiative a success. This dual access system provides an alternate data route for redundancy which is essential for disaster recovery. This project provided for increased capacity to a maximum of 148 Megabytes per second to the source services in Austin. Other enhancements included point-to-point encryption, improved database response and the expansion of internet services to 6.5 Megabytes.

The state's homeland security officials have identified networks as a critical infrastructure needing protection from both hackers and cyber-terrorists. To assist in these security efforts, the Network Security Enhancement Project was started during this grant period. The goal is to improve the state's network security by increasing the number of network assessments for state agencies and universities identifying vulnerabilities. An estimated 25 state agency/university networks were identified for assessment of vulnerability and to determine preparedness for cyber attacks. The outcome of this project's activities will be included in next year's Byrne report.

The Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission hired three additional investigators to review all questionable applications for licenses or permits to sell alcoholic beverages. Investigators carefully screened applications and conducted in-depth reviews to identify criminal and administrative law violations that could be tied to organized crime groups with a suspected connection to terrorist activity.

The Office of the Attorney General, Homeland Security Project, provided a homeland security advisor who is responsible for coordinating homeland security issues with all state, federal and local agencies. The advisor worked directly with the state's official charged with oversight of all homeland security activities. One of the major projects involved working with law enforcement agencies to develop an interoperable communications system that allows agencies to directly communicate with each other in case of a threat or catastrophic event. In addition, the advisor helped identify threats and develop response plans.

Multi-jurisdictional narcotics task forces along the Gulf Coast and the Mexico border continued to participate in activities related to homeland security and the protection of Texas ports and borders. Eight task forces were granted supplemental awards totaling \$432,969 to provide for additional personnel, training and equipment dedicated to border security investigations.

The Harris County Organized Crime and Narcotics Task Force opened nine counter-terrorism investigations in the first six months of its new initiative. Many task forces have been called upon to conduct security assessments of public schools, major power grids, water dams and other important facilities. The El Paso County Narcotics Task Force was able to hire, secure security clearances for, and train three new counter-terrorism analysts. These personnel are involved in all

Joint Terrorism Task Force Intelligence (JTTFI) meetings and share information and intelligence with federal and local agencies.

The Jefferson County Narcotics Task Force is located in Beaumont where the Port of Beaumont is home to Military Transport Commands. This task force performed over 30 missions, providing security and explosives detection for ships bound to the Middle East. The North Texas Regional Narcotics Task Force assisted the FBI and ATF in an investigation involving the manufacture and distribution of an explosive device, which resulted in three arrests on Federal charges.

**Program Title**      *Counter-Terrorism Training*

**Description**

Programs and activities that identify counter-terrorism training and equipment needs, develop curriculum, provide training and purchase equipment that helps prepare Texans and Texas emergency response personnel to deter or respond to terrorism.

**Byrne Purpose Area**    26

**Number of Projects**    2

DPS Counter-Terrorism Training Initiative  
Advanced Law Enforcement Rapid Response Training

**Funds Awarded**        \$622,000

**Goal**    Provide essential equipment and training to improve the knowledge and preparedness of persons and agencies involved in addressing terrorism.

**Objectives**

- Ensure that law enforcement, fire, emergency response, and other first responders are prepared to deter and respond to terrorism.
- Provide equipment that supports the ability of law enforcement and other emergency services personnel to respond to terrorism.

**Activities**

Projects may include training programs targeted at all or specific areas of counter-terrorism or securing equipment to assist law enforcement or emergency services personnel to respond to terrorism.

**Performance Measures and Evaluation Methods**

Performance measures include identification of training needs, development of a state plan to assure training of essential personnel, number of classes conducted, number of individuals trained, identification of equipment needs, purchase of equipment, installation of equipment if required and training on utilization of the equipment. The performance indicators will be considered as grantees develop specific, quantifiable and measurable objectives for their projects. The Criminal Justice Division will review these measures as part of each project's individual program evaluation. In addition, CJD monitoring staff review a major portion of Byrne funded projects each year.

## **Accomplishments and Evaluation Results**

The following two projects were funded with CJIS funds as part of the waiver from BJA to use these funds for homeland security projects.

The Department of Public Safety, Counter-Terrorism Training Initiative was developed to train law enforcement officers throughout the state and to assist them with the identification of potential terrorists, the process for gathering and disseminating intelligence, the recognition of forged and counterfeit documents and responding to terrorist attacks. During this grant cycle, training was provided to almost 2,000 state and local law enforcement officers at 12 different locations throughout the state.

The City of San Marcos, Advanced Law Enforcement Rapid Response Training's purpose is to provide high quality, dynamic first responder training classes utilizing "force-on-force" training techniques. This training targets officers across the state that are primarily responsible for responding to active shooters, homicidal/suicidal terrorists and other situations such as homicide-in-progress. TCLEOSE training credit is awarded to qualified attendees.

During the past grant cycle 864 officers were trained. Project staff delivered 36 Rapid Response, 16-hour classes, and three 8-hour classes in 18 different geographical areas. Average scores for the post-instructions critiques were 4.68 on a 5.0 scale, indicating the students' overwhelming positive learning experience.

**Program Title**      *Multi-Jurisdictional Narcotics Task Forces*

**Description**

This program is designed to provide a statewide network of multi-county, multi-jurisdictional task forces. These task forces coordinate federal, state and local law enforcement efforts to combat the proliferation of illegal drugs and violent crime in Texas communities.

**Byrne Purpose Area**    2

**Number of Projects**    46 narcotics task forces  
                                  1 Department of Public Safety, Operational Oversight  
                                  1 Department of Public Safety, Training  
                                  1 Money Laundering Task Force

**Funds Awarded**        \$27,877,764

**Goal**    Pool personnel, equipment, and resources to apprehend drug traffickers and fight the proliferation of drugs in Texas communities.

**Objectives**

- Interdict the flow of illegal drugs across Texas, the Texas-Mexico border and the Texas Gulf Coast.
- Reduce the manufacture, distribution, transportation and sale of illegal drugs within the state.
- Reduce violent crime, especially drug-related crime.

**Activities**

Depending on the geographical area of the state, task forces may be involved in highway or coastal interdictions; joint investigations with state and federal partners to pursue mid to high-level drug traffickers; investigations and arrest of individuals engaged in the use, manufacture, distribution and sale of illegal drugs; undercover operations; seizure and forfeiture of assets of individuals engaged in illegal drug activities; and community outreach.

Each task force has an advisory committee consisting of representatives from cities and counties within their geographical coverage area. These committees meet on a regular basis to monitor task force activities and to make recommendations on targeting the reduction of drugs and drug-related criminal activity.

**Performance Measures and Evaluation Methods**

Measures may include the value of drugs seized, quantity of drugs seized, number of arrests, number of convictions, number of clandestine laboratories closed, value of assets and property seized, number of community presentations, number of interdiction stops, and other pertinent data.

Task forces are required to submit monthly activity reports to DPS that contain data on the above referenced items and information on major seizures or operations that took place during the reporting period. Task forces also are required to report on their progress in meeting stated goals and objectives biannually to the Public Policy Research Institute (PPRI) at the Texas A&M University.

In addition to the required statistical reports, the monitoring staff have seven points of evaluation they review during field visits to the task forces. These points are:

- Has the grantee submitted complete and correct progress/activity reports by the specified deadline? Do reports accurately compare to seizure logs, expenditure reports and other information?
- Does the grantee have procedures in place to regularly evaluate the effectiveness of its project?
- Do the grantee's activities and services effectively address and achieve the project's stated purpose?
- Do annual reports include a comparison of actual accomplishments to the measurable objectives or outcomes established for the project?
- Do objectives include measurable outcome/outputs?
- When objectives are not being met as scheduled, are appropriate actions taken?
- Are the project's scope, objectives, methodology and geographic location consistent with the grantee's application?

### **Accomplishments and Evaluation Results**

The impact of the task forces has been dramatic. Since the inception of the program in 1987, task forces have collectively seized over \$7.3 billion in illegal drugs and \$314.3 million in assets. During the 2002-2003 grant year, task forces seized illegal drugs valued at \$582,352,583 and assets valued at \$16,691,550. Additional information can be found on the year-end statistical report under Attachment "2".

At the direction of the Governor, the delivery of narcotics services in the State of Texas continues to be overseen by DPS. DPS receives grant funds for operational oversight of the task forces, statewide training for narcotics officers, and disposal of hazardous chemicals found at clandestine laboratories. Including the two gang projects, there were 566 sworn officers and 157 support personnel assigned to the task forces. In accordance with CJD policies, drug tests were administered randomly to 398 individuals.

CJD and DPS are in the process of renewing their Memorandum of Understanding which will include the delineation of increased command and control responsibilities for DPS. The past year's oversight has shown much success in increasing the coordination of efforts and leveraging of resources to reduce illegal drug activity in the state.

Since the DPS also provides narcotic services through its own officers, the merger of these programs maximizes the utilization of resources, provides a statewide coordinated approach to stopping illegal drug activities in the state, and standardizes policies and procedures for operations and statistical reporting.

The DPS training program provides continuing education for the task forces as well as specialized training. During the past grant year, DPS provided training to a total of 2,391 officers. This included 31 different courses held in 14 locations across the state. Classes included basic narcotics investigation, surveillance techniques, interview and interrogation, clandestine lab certification and/or recertification, and other drug-related topics. DPS actively participates in drug demand reduction activities through community and school presentations. During the past year 462 individuals attended 10 presentations.

Task forces in rural counties continued to make significant progress in enforcement activities and increasing the level of community awareness. Many rural Texans believe that individuals who sell small quantities of drugs are major dealers. The vast expanse of rural area makes it a prime location for the manufacturing and distribution of narcotics at all levels. Rural task forces often are the primary, if not the only available narcotics enforcement authority. The impact of the combined efforts and pooling of resources continued to have a positive influence by reducing the attractiveness of illegal manufacturing and trafficking in rural areas.

Several task forces had full-time prosecutors assigned to them to work exclusively on drug-related cases generated by the task force. These prosecutors made a significant impact on the speed and accuracy with which cases were investigated and prepared for the judicial process. With the presence of a task force prosecutor, drug cases were no longer lost in the avalanche of other criminal prosecutions. An additional benefit of the prosecutors was the assistance and expertise they provided to officers in the preparation of sound cases for prosecution.

All 46 task forces have advisory boards that provided guidance to task forces in their respective jurisdictions. The 467 advisory board members included sheriffs, district and county attorneys, public officials, and police chiefs who were located in the geographical coverage area of the task force. These boards met 147 times throughout the grant period. In addition to their advisory activities, many of the board members shared information with local citizens groups and solicited community support through public awareness programs. The benefit of community involvement in the fight against illegal drugs has been proven and continued to be a priority of the task forces. In an effort to be accessible to the public, some of the task forces provided toll free numbers to reach them 24 hours a day.

Another major activity of the task forces was drug demand reduction through community presentations. These educational presentations not only offered an opportunity to provide information, but to enter into two-way dialogue with local citizens. This dialogue was critical to the successful operation of the task forces and at the same time built trust and enhanced communication among all parties. Task forces made 1,433 presentations covering 272 topics to 45,771 individuals. The combined number of hours officers spent in this activity totaled 1,698. Additionally, task force officers and commanders conducted 177 training sessions attended by 13,941 individuals for 45,775 contact hours. Combined, officers spent 2,474 hours in this activity.

The Attorney General's Money Laundering Task Force targets the profits that are realized by the sale of illegal drugs. Money laundering investigations generally impact the upper echelon leaders of the organization by reducing the ability to profit from domestic drug use and sales. During this reporting period, investigators were very successful in several joint state and federal endeavors. One case resulted in the dismantling of a sophisticated marijuana hydro-growing operation. Five subjects were arrested, and 1,500 plants were seized along with over \$700,000 in stolen property and assets. Another noteworthy coordinated effort resulted in the surveillance, stop and seizure of over \$2.4 million dollars in cash from an 18 wheeler which had been tracked through the

northern part of the United States as it came southbound into Texas headed for Mexico. The Money Laundering Task Force is notified by the multi-jurisdictional drug task forces as they uncover information that could lead to money laundering or organized crime.

Monitoring staff reviewed 23 task force grants during the 2002 grant cycle. These grants totaled \$17,159,194 with a disallowance of less than one-half of one percent. Attachment "4" provides a list of monitored grants and amounts disallowed.

Examples of task force activities and accomplishments include:

- The Dogwood Trails Narcotics Task Force located in East Texas was called upon and proved to be a great asset to federal, state and local authorities in responding to the Columbia Space Shuttle disaster.
- The Harris County Organized Crime and Narcotics Task Force continued its focus on mid and upper level dealers and organizations. Although the size of the task force was reduced by 18 officers, the remaining officers seized more than 2,527 pounds of marijuana, 187 growing plants, 86 pounds of powder cocaine, 1,993 grams of crack cocaine, 910 grams of black tar heroin, and 15,915 dosage units of ecstasy.
- The Alamo Area Narcotics Task Force exceeded its goal of seizing \$1.5 million in illegal drugs by seizing more than \$2.25 million. These seizures included 3,282 grams of powder cocaine, 234 grams of crack cocaine, 910 grams of black tar heroin, 3,079 grams of marijuana, and 908 grams of methamphetamine.
- The South Central Texas Narcotics Task Force reported a 95% conviction rate on cases prosecuted during the grant period.
- The Central Texas Narcotics Task Force exceeded its goal of 375 arrests by arresting 509 suspects that resulted in filing 427 felony cases and 230 misdemeanor cases. Seizures valued at more than \$1.2 million resulted from the arrests. The task force supported counter-terrorism activities at Fort Hood Army Base by using their bomb detection K-9 to provide sweeps of special events prior to the arrival of officials and dignitaries at the base.
- The Rural Area Narcotics Task Force used their undercover expertise to assist in dismantling an illegal gambling operation in the impact area.
- The Jefferson County Narcotics Task Force investigated and prosecuted two major trafficking organizations. Both cases received support from the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force (OCDETF). "Operation Starman" concluded with 12 indictments of a group trafficking cocaine from a business. "Operation Euphoria" is ongoing and has already resulted in the indictment of 16 individuals. The investigation marks the first time the project has been able to make a significant impact on organized crime in the project area's Vietnamese community.
- The rural STOP the Offender Program has one of the most successful interdiction programs in the state, and receives many requests to train other units. During the

past year, the STOP project seized \$1,494,803 in currency on interdiction cases alone.

- The Regional Controlled Substance Apprehension Program (RCSAP) is located in Paris. The task force's assistant commander and one of its investigators were recognized for their efforts in implementing and coordinating the project area's largest covert meth operation which resulted in 58 cases and 35 defendants.
- The Trans Pecos Drug Task Force is located in Pecos, Texas. During the past grant year it used its K-9 in 11 school presentations and in 130 searches.
- The Rio Concho Multi-Agency Drug Enforcement Task Force was instrumental in the successful conclusion of Operation Lucky Charm which yielded Federal indictments for 29 individuals for conspiracy related charges.
- The Tri-County Narcotics Task Force has a prosecutor on staff and the task force is better able to follow drug offenders from the investigative stage, arrest and eventual prosecution. This allows a unique insight into each offender, not only in the punishment phase but also the defendants' rehabilitation needs to lessen recidivism.
- The Tactical Narcotics Team had a 75% increase in Methamphetamine arrests. Investigations resulted in 98 cases and 64 arrests.
- The North Texas Regional Drug Enforcement Task Force reported that the majority of its offenders were directly involved in the introduction of methamphetamine labs into their community. Investigators assigned to the project have worked with the local farmers and ranchers advising them of the importance of properly storing chemicals that are in demand for the illegal manufacture of controlled substances.
- The Llano Estacado Drug Task Force participated with the National Guard in an anhydrous ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>) theft deterrent project. This NH<sub>3</sub> project was very successful and the number of anhydrous ammonia thefts and clandestine laboratories dropped significantly from the prior year.
- The Panhandle Regional Narcotics Task Force worked with the Drug Enforcement Agency, DPS, U.S. Immigration, and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms in a joint operation to execute 13 search warrants that resulted in the arrest of 26 suspects and the seizure of 42 pounds of methamphetamine and \$330,587 in cash.

**Program Title**      *Gang Prevention and Intervention*

**Description**

This program supports law enforcement agencies and prosecutors in their efforts to target and track gangs and gang members that commit violent crimes and participate in the sale and trafficking of illegal drugs. Projects also may increase public awareness activities that discourage children from joining gangs, inform parents about warning signs of a child’s involvement in gang activities, and inform the general public about how they can help in the prevention and intervention of gang activities.

**Byrne Purpose Area**    24

**Number of Projects**    10

Killeen Anti-Gang Office  
San Antonio Gang Injunction Group  
Project Spotlight (8 projects)

**Funds Awarded**        \$2,653,071

**Goal**    Reduce the appeal of gang membership and to intervene in active gangs to disrupt criminal activities and the threat to the safety of innocent citizens and neighborhoods.

**Objectives**

- Reduce the number of gang-related violent crimes.
- Reduce gang involvement in the sale and trafficking of illegal drugs.
- Increase resources to investigate, track and prosecute gang members.
- Increase the public’s awareness of gang-related activity and how they can participate in prevention and intervention activities.
- Reduce the appeal of gang membership for youth of all ages, especially elementary school-age children.
- Develop and implement databases that track and monitor gang members and activities.
- Identify areas to target gang activities and develop action plans to address those areas.

**Activities**

Activities might include investigations of criminal activity including the sale and trafficking of illegal drugs, undercover operations, development of databases and identification of gang members for tracking, organization of committees to assist in targeting activities, community/school presentations, prosecutor/judicial support and participation, specialized training for law enforcement personnel and related activities.

**Performance Measures and Evaluation Methods**

Performance measures may include the number of prevention/educational presentations; number of attendees at presentations; number of gang members convicted of violent crimes; number of

gang members tracked and monitored through data systems; and the number of gang members enjoined from gang activities.

Specific quantifiable and measurable objectives are developed by each grantee. These measures are reviewed as part of the project's evaluation. In addition to performance measures, CJD staff may make random visits to grantees for an on-site review of activities and operations. Monitoring staff may perform desk reviews or make site visits to projects to determine compliance with programmatic and financial guidelines.

## **Accomplishments and Evaluation Results**

The November 2002 report from the Governor's Anti-Crime Commission included recommendations to continue support of projects targeted at reducing gang activity related to drug trafficking and monitoring gang members on probation.

Project Spotlight grants were awarded to eight major metropolitan areas of the state to target zip codes with a large population of at-risk juveniles and to provide direct services to juveniles that had been referred to probation departments. Activities included drug prevention counseling, mentoring and tutoring programs, graffiti removal programs, family counseling, and supervision/monitoring of juveniles referred to court for drug and gang-related activity.

The Killeen Anti-Gang Office (KAGO) was directly responsible for the investigation of 119 criminal gang cases. It was instrumental in the cold case investigation, apprehension and indictment of a gang murder suspect from New Year's 1998, an attempted capital murder of a school teacher by a 17 year old gang member, and a burglary ring made up of documented gang members. Nineteen burglary cases were cleared with the arrests of 6 suspects and 9 gang members were indicted for aggravated robberies that spanned four law enforcement jurisdictions.

During the past year, KAGO also conducted 57 community presentations with 4,717 people in attendance and distributed 4,947 handouts on gang prevention. The unit continued its CONSEQUENCES curriculum targeted at the sixth grade level. The curriculum enables detectives to work one-on-one with the schools to combat gang issues and provides officers with the opportunity to serve as mentors for the students.

The Bexar County Gang Injunction Group completed its third year of funding and was honored by being one of two projects asked to provide presentations at the BJA sponsored Project Development and Implementation Training held in Corpus Christi. Project staff continued their pursuit of securing injunctions against gang members. During the grant period, the project obtained 216 gang member and felony drug indictments, prosecuted 18 injunction violations, arrested 11 gang members through the use of undercover narcotic agents, and filed a public nuisance suit against a store that was a magnet for gang violence and narcotic activity. The project's specialized street crimes arrest team increased drug arrests by 72%, and had over 50% of enjoined gang members in custody at the end of the grant period.

The Wheatley Court Safety Zone created by the project indicated a 22.7% decrease in gang-related offenses and the East Terrace Safety Zone reported a 15.2% decrease. Of the neighborhood residents surveyed, 88% agreed the project had a positive impact and 100% felt that they could safely resume normal neighborhood activities.

**Program Title**      *Criminal Justice Information Systems*

**Description**

This program provides funds for projects to upgrade data systems to comply with federal and state mandates, including Chapter 60 of the *Texas Code of Criminal Procedures* as it relates to electronic disposition reporting. Projects receive a one-time grant to assist them in converting their electronic data systems, establishing the capability to transmit required data, reporting standardized data, and revising probation tracking systems.

**Byrne Purpose Area**    15-B

**Number of Projects**    1

Dallas County Adult CJIS

**Funds Awarded**        \$250,000

**Goal**    Bring criminal justice information reporting systems into compliance with state and federal laws, and to assure timely submission of data in a standardized format.

**Objectives**

- Timely transmission of data with an error rate of less than ten percent.
- Upgrade reporting procedures to “paperless” reporting.
- Upgrade the Automated Fingerprint Identification System.
- Expansion of the National Incident Based Reporting System.

**Activities**

Projects develop mechanisms for gathering information to be reported and for the electronic reporting of that data. They also review and assess local equipment capabilities and identify needed changes in system capacities. Once equipment needs are identified, projects submit requests to the Criminal Justice Division (CJD) for funds to purchase and install the equipment. Purchased equipment must meet technological requirements established by the state’s repository for law enforcement data (Texas Department of Public Safety- DPS). Staff are trained on use of the new equipment and convert electronic reporting to the new systems.

**Performance Measures and Evaluation Methods**

Grantees are measured on the timely installation of information systems, training of staff to use the systems and successful transmission of acceptable data. Projects are considered complete when equipment has been installed and is fully operational. Grantees are required to report data into the statewide system maintained and operated by the DPS.

## **Accomplishments and Evaluation Results**

In March 2002, CJD sought and received approval of a waiver from the Bureau of Justice Assistance to utilize unspent CJIS funds to support activities targeted at preparing for and preventing acts of terrorism. Projects eligible for funding with CJIS dollars were authorized under the following Byrne purpose areas:

- Developing and implementing anti-terrorism plans and training programs.
- Purchasing equipment for local law enforcement anti-terrorism projects.
- Improving community crime prevention and security.
- Creating multi-jurisdictional task forces in response to organized crime.
- Facilitating interagency and intelligence coordination.
- Integrating criminal justice information systems.
- Investigating and prosecuting money laundering and cyber crime.
- Improving DNA identification systems.

All eight grants outlined in Counter-Terrorism purpose area 7B and 26 were funded out of Byrne CJIS money authorized for terrorism projects.

Only one CJIS project was funded during this reporting period:

Dallas County, Adult CJIS Project – This project is completing its second year of a multi-phase project that will integrate the adult criminal justice information systems in Dallas County. The County has electronic arrest reporting and electronic disposition reporting systems in operation. These systems will be tied into the CJIS project and incorporate all of the Dallas County entities involved in the adult criminal justice system. This includes 26 municipalities, 82 district and county courts, Sheriff's Department, District Attorney's Office and the Probation Department. Collectively, these entities process approximately 120,000 adult cases each year. When completed, this project will serve as a model for the state and can be replicated in other areas. In addition, the system will support activities related to homeland security networks.

**Program Title**     *Prosecution Programs*

**Description**

Special programs that support investigative and prosecution activities targeted at drug cases, repeat offenders, gang violence and other illegal activities.

**Byrne Purpose Area**     8

**Number of Projects**     2

Career Criminal Apprehension Task Force  
Special Investigations and Prosecution Project

**Funds Awarded**                     \$2,549,809

**Goal**     Provide investigation and prosecution support to entities in the vigorous prosecution of drug cases, gang violence and other illegal activities.

**Objectives**

- Draft search and arrest warrants.
- Seize and forfeit the assets of those engaged in the manufacture, distribution and transportation of illegal drugs.
- Seek stiffer penalties for offenders.
- Prosecute middle and upper level drug traffickers.
- Prosecute violent gang offenders.
- Clear unsolved cases.

**Activities**

Projects may include assistance to local jurisdictions in the investigation and prosecution of money laundering offenses, asset forfeiture cases, and other civil and criminal activities that impact the profit-motivated component of organized crime. Projects may work in cooperation with federal partners such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Internal Revenue Service. Investigators and prosecutors may routinely review arrest records to identify individuals with prior felony convictions; review pawn shop records to identify felons pawning or selling firearms, seek enhanced penalties for repeat felons; re-interview witnesses and re-evaluate evidence in unsolved cases.

**Performance Measures and Evaluation Methods**

Grantees are required to submit progress reports that indicate the number and types of cases prosecuted, number of cases disposed, amount of asset forfeitures, number of cases solved, and other major activities. Additional measures are developed based on the individual project's focus. CJD monitoring staff also review projects for compliance with program and financial guidelines.

## **Accomplishments and Evaluation Results**

The Career Criminal project completed its fourth and final year of eligibility for Byrne funding. This project's main objective has been to remove recidivist criminals from the community. It has cultivated a partnership with all local law enforcement, and has been instrumental in assisting with and expediting cases for prosecution. The project continues to receive support from the entire community, including several positive newspaper articles about the project.

During the past year, investigators reviewed 1,097 new felony cases. The backgrounds of 92 individuals were investigated and 72 were confirmed to meet the program's criteria of having had at least two prior felony convictions. The task force accepted 35 of these and had them arraigned and indicted as career criminals. These 35 people received a combined 236.5 years in prison, which is 200.5 years over the minimum sentence, and approximately 5.7 years additional for each individual's sentence.

The project examined 2,240 pawn tickets where firearms were pawned or sold. Seven stolen firearms were recovered, and one new felon in possession of a firearm was identified. The project also assisted local law enforcement with compliance inspections on the sex offenders' database. The project performed 476 compliance inspections and developed cases on 14 individuals that were out of compliance.

The Special Investigation and Prosecution Project is a comprehensive project provided by the Office of the Attorney General. The project helps fill the need for resources at the state level that target internet and computer-related crime. Seven experienced investigators and four prosecutors aggressively enforced existing laws and achieved 139 indictments, 77 jury convictions, and 14 pleas.

**Program Title**     *Drug Diversion Courts*

**Description**

Drug diversion courts respond to the broad array of problems caused by drug abuse and drug-related crime. These courts offer a system of options for release and treatment of adults arrested for felony possession of small amounts of controlled substances. Courts provide an integrated program of justice, treatment, and support services designed to reduce addiction and promote drug-free living in the community. The prospect of having the drug possession charge dismissed if the program is successfully completed provides a strong incentive for the first-time offender to stay in the program and make behavioral changes that could potentially prevent the individual from becoming a recidivist.

**Byrne Purpose Area**    20

**Number of Projects**    1

DIVERT Court Program

**Funds Awarded**        \$132,599

**Goal**    Decrease the backlog of cases in the court system by diverting offenders from incarceration and providing a broad array of alternative programs designed to reduce recidivism.

**Objectives**

- Reduce the number of drug offenders entering the court system while providing a program that ensures appropriate treatment and sanctions.
- Reduce the cost of processing drug offenders in the criminal justice system.
- Create additional space in prisons for more serious and dangerous offenders by redirecting less serious and dangerous offenders through alternative projects.

**Activities**

Activities may include treatment programs for eligible recipients; ongoing monitoring of participants through counseling and urinalysis; and training in life-skills and behavioral modification.

**Performance Measures and Evaluation Methods**

Measures may include the number of persons served by the project, number of persons completing the project, number of persons re-arrested, number of positive urinalysis tests, number of sanctions for non-compliance with program requirements, and number of persons attending educational programs.

## **Accomplishments and Evaluation Results**

This project completed its fourth and final year of Byrne funding. DIVERT is a three-phase, highly structured treatment program lasting from one year to 18 months, depending upon individual progress. Each phase consists of specified treatment objectives, therapeutic and rehabilitative activities, and requirement for graduation into the next phase. Phase II consists of at least 140 hours of outpatient counseling and/or 30 to 45 days of inpatient residential treatment. The level of treatment is determined by Licensed Chemical Dependency Counselors in the evaluation phase of the program. Phase III includes 15 weeks of substance abuse education.

During this reporting period, DIVERT graduated 75 participants from the program. Of significance was the fact that two drug-free babies were born to graduates during the reporting period. These drug-free births saved taxpayers medical and social service costs, estimated to be approximately \$250,000 per baby.

Two DIVERT alumni members recently participated in the National Drug Court Conference as guests of the National Drug Court Institute. The alumni meet two times a month and provide mentorship to new participants. The alumni also selected an advisory board that meets quarterly. All these functions are supported by the court and provide a valuable link to the recovering community.

DIVERT staff conducted 3,685 tests for drug use on an average of 269 participants. Eleven percent or 392 tested positive for illegal substances leaving 89% of the participants with a reduction in the frequency of substance abuse. Of this year's 75 graduates, 66 have achieved full time employment and only 8 graduates have been rearrested.

**Program Title**            *Prevention and Treatment for Alcohol and Drug Abuse*

**Description**

This program targets prevention and treatment of drug and alcohol abuse. Services are provided through a variety of programs and may be administered by cities or counties or contracted from licensed treatment facilities or groups targeting prevention. Services may be provided to the individual or may target the family unit as an integral part of the treatment program. Programs may be school or community based and may involve the support of local law enforcement agencies.

**Byrne Purpose Area**    13

**Number of Projects**    5

Juvenile Drug Intervention Services  
Project Action  
Prevention and Treatment of Juvenile Substance Abuse  
Substance Abuse Services Division  
Prevention and Treatment

**Funds Awarded**        \$1,859,600

**Goal**    To promote the prevention of drug and alcohol abuse and to provide treatment for alcohol and drug dependency.

**Objectives**

- Provide educational programs targeted at prevention of alcohol and drug abuse.
- Provide crisis intervention programs.
- Provide alternative activities to youth.
- Provide in-patient and out-patient treatment programs.

**Activities**

Activities may include licensed residential treatment programs for adults or youth, Family Counseling, Drug Abuse Resistance Education, Intervention and Drug Education, Project Outreach, Juvenile Probation Centers, Juvenile Drug Courts, Adult Probation Centers. Sub-contracted project activities may be sponsored by organizations such as YMCA, Girls or Boys Clubs, and Neighborhood Community Centers.

**Performance Measures and Evaluation Methods**

Measures may include the number of persons served by the project, number of persons completing the project, number of persons re-arrested, number of positive urinalysis tests, or number of persons attending educational programs. Performance indicators will be considered as grantees develop specific, quantifiable and measurable objectives for their projects.

## **Accomplishments and Evaluation Results**

Last year, CJD sought and received approval from BJA for a new prevention and treatment program. Five two-year grants, that were awarded to local projects through regional council of governments are still active and will end during the next Byrne reporting period.

The purpose of the Travis County Substance Abuse Services project is to procure appropriate gender-specific substance abuse services, independent case management services and a continuum of assessments for juveniles with substance abuse needs. A drug court team consisting of a judge, public defender, prosecutor, treatment provider, drug court coordinator and the assigned probation officer convene weekly to make determination of advancements through levels of supervision. For the typical girl in the juvenile justice system, the root causes for the substance abuse, type of treatment and support services provided differ significantly from that of the male counterpart. During its first year, 30 youth participated in the drug court, 8 received gender specific female services, and 12 youth and their families were linked to in home case management services.

The Panhandle Prevention and Treatment of Juvenile Substance Abuse Project uses a two-pronged approach to address juvenile substance abuse. One element of the program provides treatment services to juveniles with known substance abuse problems. The objective is to help those individuals learn how to abstain from using illegal substances. The second element involves prevention education. The objective is to equip juveniles with the knowledge and skills needed to abstain from substance use as a matter of personal choice before they become deeply involved.

This project provided prevention education skills training to 206 parents and 727 youth. Alternative activities were participated in by 29 parents and 70 youth. Prevention crisis intervention services were received by 2 parents and 93 youth, and intervention counseling was received by 239 parents and 529 youth.

McAllen's Project Action serves three counties along the Texas-Mexico border. Project staff took a threefold approach to juvenile drug use and prevention in the three county area. First, a mechanism was established to collect, assemble and analyze data needed to determine the types of drugs on school campuses, usage trends and available resources. Second, it provided an anonymous and neutral setting where youth drug abuse may be reported or referred for treatment assistance. Third, the project established a regional database to formulate policies and govern a plan of action to address the identified drug problems.

**Program Title**            *Victim Assistance*

**Description**

Services to crime victims and their families may include individual or group counseling; on-site crisis counseling; crisis intervention; case management; emergency health care; temporary emergency food, shelter and transportation; legal advocacy; law enforcement liaison; participation in investigations and interviews; community presentations targeted an increasing public awareness; and referrals to other resources.

**Byrne Purpose Area**    14

**Number of Projects**    1

North Central Texas Council of Governments, Some Things Last a Lifetime

**Funds Awarded**        \$16,627

**Goal**    To reduce the trauma suffered by victims of violent crime.

**Objectives**

- To provide immediate on-site assistance to victims
- To provide professional counseling services.
- To provide emergency food, shelter and transportation if needed.
- To provide legal advocacy and assist victims with the judicial process.
- To assist law enforcement agencies with interviewing and supporting victims.
- To assist victims in applying for crime victim’s compensation funds.
- To increase community awareness of victim services and the trauma suffered by victims.
- To assist families of victims with support services.

**Activities**

Activities may include Victim Services, Victim Assistance, Children’s Advocacy Centers, Legal Aid, Crisis Counseling Centers, Shelters for Battered Women, Children’s Emergency Services, Law Enforcement Victims Program, Community Outreach, etc.

**Performance Measures and Evaluation Methods**

Measures may include the number of victims served by the project, number of on-site crisis assistance services, number of follow-up counseling sessions, number of families served, number of victims applying for crime compensation, number of presentations or training sessions, number of nights of lodging or emergency services provided or number of court appearances. Performance indicators will be considered as grantees develop specific, quantifiable and measurable objectives for their projects.

## **Accomplishments and Evaluation Results**

This project provides the opportunity for victims of crime to speak on Victim Impact Panels (VIP), thereby potentially easing their burden through the healing process and indirectly impacting offender's recidivism rates by training personnel who work with victims and offenders. The project also provides a 40 hour victimization training program that includes seven accompanying videos, handouts, and an opportunity to hear victims share their stories.

**Program Title**      *Clandestine Laboratories*

**Description**

Projects seek to locate and close illegal clandestine drug laboratories and to dispose of hazardous chemicals used to manufacture methamphetamines in these laboratories. Participate in community initiatives to inform the public about the hazards of the laboratories and how to identify laboratories operating in their neighborhoods.

**Byrne Purpose Area**    3

**Number of Projects**    1

Dallas Clandestine Lab Initiative

**Funds Awarded**        \$21,625

**Goal**    Reduce the number of clandestine laboratories, hazardous waste by-products, and the production of street drugs.

**Objectives**

- Increase the public’s awareness about methamphetamines, designer drugs and clandestine laboratories.
- Increase the availability of training for law enforcement agents in the recognition, seizure and handling of hazardous chemicals.
- Increase the capability of law enforcement to detect and disassemble laboratories, and to arrest and prosecute offenders.

**Performance Measures and Evaluation Methods**

Measures may include the number of seizures, number of arrests, number of cases submitted for prosecution, amount of intelligence gathered to identify and target areas for increased surveillance and enforcement activities; number of interviews with distributors/dealers of precursor chemicals; development of databases to track distributors that sell precursor chemicals to suspects; number of community presentations, number of people attending presentation, number of citizens reporting suspected laboratories, and informational materials developed, printed and distributed. Projects also will be monitored by CJD staff to determine compliance with program and financial guidelines.

**Accomplishments and Evaluation Results**

During this grant cycle, officers made 92 arrests and closed 16 illegal labs. Officers spent most of their time investigating methamphetamine and ecstasy cases. Federal conspiracy cases on two groups were developed, which considerably reduced the number of labs in Dallas.

Interdiction efforts are made to determine and track the origin of chemicals found at labs. Investigators interview all suspects at the scene where lot numbers are recorded and sent for a match with wholesalers.

**Program Title**            *Texas Amber Alert Network*

**Description**

Governor Rick Perry issued Executive Order RP 16 on August 12, 2002, establishing the Texas Amber Alert Network. The Network provides the framework for any child abduction in the State of Texas to receive the immediate attention of the general public and law enforcement officials. Local law enforcement agencies have the option of initiating the Texas Network for abductions that meet the following five criteria set forth by the Governor:

- The abducted child is 17 years of age or younger.
- The local law enforcement agency believes that the child has been abducted, that is, unwillingly taken from their environment without permission from the child’s parent or legal guardian.
- The local law enforcement agency believes that the missing child is in immediate danger of serious bodily harm or death.
- Sufficient information is available to disseminate to the public that could assist in locating the child, the suspect, or the vehicle used in the abduction.
- The local law enforcement agency confirms that an investigation has taken place that verified the abduction and has eliminated alternative explanations for the missing child.

To initiate the Texas Network, the law enforcement agency must first contact the Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS). The DPS (1) requests the Texas Highway Department to activate electronic highway signs in the search zone informing motorists of the abduction; (2) requests the National Weather Service to activate its warning system in the search area; (3) notifies other law enforcement agencies via teletype; and (4) notifies the Texas Missing Persons Clearinghouse of the abduction.

Secondly, the law enforcement agency goes on-line to a contracted web site (BeyondMissing.com) and completes information on the child and suspect if known. This action generates a flyer that is then automatically e-mailed and faxed to media outlets, businesses and citizens within a 200 mile radius of the abduction.

The combined efforts of the local law enforcement agency, Department of Public Safety, Texas Highway Department, National Weather Service, media outlets and local citizens greatly increase the possibility of the child being rescued and returned to their home setting.

**Byrne Purpose Area**    28

**Number of Projects**    1

Beyond Missing

**Funds Awarded**        \$200,000

**Goal** Provide law enforcement agencies with a coordinated network of services to aid them in the prompt dissemination of vital information about child abductions.

### **Objectives**

- Make services available for any child abduction in the State.
- Provide services to all law enforcement agencies, regardless of size or location.
- Enlist the support of the media and general public in a traditional law enforcement activity.

### **Activities**

The Texas Amber Alert Network is the primary project. Supporting projects might relate to web services, media services, public awareness, training, staffing, etc.

### **Performance Measures and Evaluation Methods**

Measures may include the number of abductions, number of tips resulting from activation of the network, number of children recovered that can be attributed to information disseminated through the network, number of media outlets participating in the network, number of private citizens and businesses participating in the network, length of time taken for dissemination of information, number of training sessions conducted, number of brochures distributed, number of passwords and user IDs distributed to agencies, number of highway signs activated. Performance indicators will be considered as grantees develop specific, quantifiable and measurable objectives for their projects.

### **Accomplishments and Evaluation Results**

Local and out-of-state agencies have contacted DPS over 60 times to discuss potential Amber Alerts. In most of the cases, an alert was not issued because the child returned home, had runaway or was with relatives. The network was activated seven times during the grant period and all children were successfully recovered.

Beyond Missing is the state's contractor that provides a database consisting of several thousand Texas businesses and individuals that have requested notification in the event of an Amber Alert in their geographical area. The system has worked very well and the contractor has added a Spanish language translation component to assist distributing the abduction message to the large Hispanic population in the state.

# **Attachment 1**



## Byrne Formula Grant Program 2002-2003

### AWARDS

Grantee	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Dallas County - Drug Intervention Court	\$132,599				
Governor's Office – CJD - Mail Security Study	\$50,000				
Sam Houston State University - Project Spotlight Conferences	\$65,637				
Bexar County - Project Spotlight		\$321,923			
Henderson, City of - Northeast Texas Narcotics Task Force		\$341,271			
San Marcos, City of - Advanced Law Enforcement Response Training		\$500,000			
Texas Department of Public Safety - Border Security Network Infrastructure Initiative		\$815,422			
Texas Department of Public Safety - Counter-Terrorism Training Initiative		\$122,000			
Dallas County - Adult CJIS Systems			\$250,000		
Dallas County - Project Spotlight Projects			\$321,923		
Johnson County - S.T.O.P. the Offenders Program (Task Force)			\$787,484		
Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission -Alcoholic Beverage Investigators to Ensure Law Compliance			\$269,998		
West Central Texas Council of Governments - Byrne Fund Grant Program(Prevention & Treatment)			\$670,276		
Beyond Missing, Inc. - Texas Amber Alert Network				\$200,000	
El Paso County - Project Spotlight				\$321,923	
Harris County - Project Spotlight				\$321,923	
North Central Texas Council of Governments - Some Things Impact a Lifetime				\$16,627	
Office of the Attorney General - Special Investigations and Prosecution Project				\$2,371,360	
Panhandle Regional Commission - Prevention/Treatment of Planning Juvenile Substance Abuse				\$226,249	
Tarrant County - Project Spotlight				\$321,923	
Texas Department of Public Safety -Operational Oversight of Drug Task Forces				\$254,429	
Texas Department of Public Safety - Statewide Training for Program for Drug Task Forces				\$194,785	
Texas Department of Public Safety - Texas Network Security Enhancement				\$325,000	
Amarillo, City of - Panhandle Regional Narcotics Trafficking Task Force					\$488,759
Anderson County - Dogwood Trails Narcotic Task Force					\$416,484
Ark-Tex Council of Governments - Juvenile Drug Intervention Services					\$116,100
Baytown, City of - Harris County Organized Crime & Narcotics Task Force					\$3,198,661
Bell County - Central Texas Narcotics task Force					\$361,962
Bexar County - Gang Injunction Group (GIG)					\$200,790
Brazos County - Brazos Valley Narcotics Task Force					\$649,991
Brenham, City of - Independence Narcotics Task Force					\$246,712
Caldwell County - Chisholm Trail Narcotics Task Force					\$305,913

<b>Grantee</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>
Cameron County - Drug Enforcement Task Force					\$584,985
Cass County - Ark-La-Tex Narcotics Task Force					\$490,649
Chambers County - Narcotics Task Force					\$479,961
Converse, City of - Alamo Area Narcotics					\$656,900
Dallas, City of - Clandestine Lab Initiative					\$21,625
Denton County - North Central Narcotics Task force					\$701,344
Duval County - Central South Texas Narcotics Task Force					\$479,632
Ector County - West Texas Narcotics Enforcement Task Force					\$786,169
El Paso County - Metro Narcotics Task Force					\$1,163,235
Galveston County - Galveston County Narcotics Task Force					\$673,201
Governor's Office – CJD – Internal Administration					\$460,951
Hays County - Mobile Incident Command Vehicles					\$48,150
Jefferson County - Narcotics Task Force					\$1,057,000
Kerrville, City of - 216th Judicial District Narcotics Task Force					\$442,824
Killeen, City of - Killeen Anti-Gang Office (KAGO)					\$133,311
Kimble County - Southwest Texas Narcotics Task Force					\$206,701
Kingsville, City of - South Texas Specialized Crimes & Narcotics Task Force					\$505,271
Lampasas County - Rural Area Narcotics Task Force					\$435,727
Laredo, City of - Laredo Multi-Agency Narcotics Task Force					\$1,075,415
Lubbock, City of - South Plains Regional Narcotics Task Force					\$365,986
Marble Falls, City of - 33rd Judicial District Narcotics Enforcement Team (Task Force)					\$576,079
McAllen, City of - Combined Governmental Drug Enforcement & Special Crimes Task Force					\$856,409
McAllen, City of - Project Action Substance Abuse Treatment					\$548,000
McLennan County - Agriplex Roadrunners Drug Task Force					\$339,841
Nacogdoches County - Deep East Texas Regional Narcotics Task Force					\$629,960
Nueces County - Project Spotlight					\$321,923
Odessa, City of - Career Criminal Apprehension					\$178,449
Office of the Attorney General - Money Laundering & White Collar Crime Task Force					\$291,529
Office of the Attorney General - Homeland Security					\$61,275
Paris, City of - Regional Controlled Substance Apprehension Program (Task Force)					\$382,925
Reeves County - Trans Pecos Drug Task Force					\$503,106
Robertson County - South Central Texas Narcotics Task Force					\$377,188
Rockwall, City of - Northeast Area Drug Interdiction Task Force					\$698,737
San Angelo, City of - Rio Concho Multi-Agency Drug Enforcement Task Force					\$384,330
San Patricio County - Tri-County Narcotics Task Force					\$396,265
Seguin, City of - 25th Judicial District Narcotics Task Force					\$334,954
Sulphur Springs, City of - Tactical Narcotic Team Task Force					\$351,252

<b>Grantee</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>
Tarrant County -Metro Narcotics Intelligence & Coordination Unit (Task Force)					\$2,294,103
Taylor County - West Central Texas Interlocal Crime Task Force					\$0
Texas A&M University - Project Reporting					\$9,084
Travis County - Substance Abuse Services Division					\$298,975
Travis County - Project Spotlight					\$321,795
Val Verde County - 63rd Judicial District Task Force					\$257,949
Walker County - Central East Texas Narcotics Task Force					\$393,713
Waller County - Westside Narcotics Task Force					\$456,973
Wichita Falls, City of - North Texas Regional Narcotics Task Force					\$345,340
Wilson County - 81st Judicial District Narcotics Task Force					\$383,163
Yoakum County - Llano Estacado Task Force					\$218,533
Young County - Cross Timbers Narcotics Task Force					\$486,933

Totals

<b>\$248,236</b>	<b>\$2,100,616</b>	<b>\$2,299,681</b>	<b>\$4,554,219</b>	<b>\$29,453,192</b>
------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	---------------------



## **Attachment 2**

## Byrne Formula Grant Program

### Task Force Statistics

#### Drug Seizures

2002-2003

Drug Seizures – Based on Street Value

Drug	Kilograms	Dollar Value
Amphetamine	44.0239	\$ 2,493,953.94
Black Tar Heroin	537.5546	83,406,971.74
Cannabis	56,043.8136	112,087,627.20
Cocaine	1,495.569	82,585,320.18
Crack Cocaine	15.1756	1,009,632.67
Designer Drugs	4.2014	336,112.00
Heroin	17.8721	2,027,411.02
Methamphetamine	361.4608	25,031,160.40
Solid Precursors	36.8879	737,758.00
Drug	Liters	Value
GHB	6.0833	\$ 121,666.00
Liquid Precursors	1,877.3347	46,933,367.50
Meth Oil	240.3698	2694,545.46
P2P	74.24	313,292.00
Steroids – Liquid	1.0093	15,139.50
Drug	Dosage Units	Value
Depressants	13,385,402.4	\$ 200,781,036.00
LSD	3,181.0	31,810.00
MDMA	40,786.6	815,732.00
Other Hallucinogens	348,843.4	3488,434.00
Other Narcotics	276,016.8	11,040,672.00
Rohypnol	180.6	3,612.00
Steroids – Solid	11,789.0	235,780.00
Stimulants	91,109.7	1,822,194.00
Drug	Quantity	Value
Marijuana Plants – Cultivated	2,777.1	\$ 4,304,505.00
Marijuana Plants – Wild	85.0	34,850.00
<b>TOTAL VALUE OF ALL DRUGS</b>		<b>\$ 582,352,583.40</b>

*Note: The method for converting the value of seizures was changed to street value during the grant period. Also, all seizures may not be included due to conversion to a new electronic reporting system.*



## Byrne Formula Grant Program

*Task Force Statistics  
Asset Seizures and Forfeiture Awards  
2002-2003*

Seizures			Forfeitures		
Description	Number	Value	Description	Number	Value
Aircraft	0	0	Aircraft	1	\$ 35,000.00
Currency	744	\$ 10,164,395.11	Currency	488	3,380,638.61
Other	677	620,710.00	Other	136	163,146.14
Real Estate	6	1,964,000.00	Real Estate	4	99,859.27
Vehicles	552	3,839,241.00	Vehicles	274	1,052,129.56
Weapons	377	103,204.00	Weapons	109	23,885.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,356</b>	<b>\$ 16,691,550.11</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,012</b>	<b>\$ 4,754,658.58</b>

*Task Force Statistics  
Total Arrests  
2002-2003*

Felony Arrests	8,440
Felony Charges Filed	5,261
Indictments Returned	1,732
Indictments Served	769
Misdemeanor Arrests	3,566
Misdemeanor Charges	1,995

***Task Force Statistics  
Interdiction Activities  
2002-2003***

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Number</b>
Currency/Drug Seizures	466
DWI/DUID Arrests	21
Felony Arrests	171
Misdemeanor Arrests	220
Searches Verbal	4,129
Searches Written	238
Stolen Vehicles Recovered	13
Traffic Violations	4,200
Traffic Warnings	13,871

***Task Force Statistics  
Miscellaneous Activities  
2002-2003***

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Number</b>
Confidential Informants Established	1,096
Controlled Deliveries	506
Court Appearances	2,052
Investigative Reports Written	13,696
Clandestine Laboratories Seized	569
Searches by Consent	4,120
Search Warrants	1,338
Search Warrant Assists	1,563

## **Attachment 3**





---

**RICK PERRY, GOVERNOR**

**Ken C. Nicolas, Executive Director  
Criminal Justice Division**

**Rebecca L. Martinez  
Director  
Grants Monitoring  
April 29, 2003**

## FOREWORD

The Criminal Justice Division of the Office of the Governor (CJD) is required to monitor and evaluate the activities of subrecipients to ensure that federal and state awards are used for authorized purposes in compliance with laws, regulations and the provisions of contracts or grant agreements, that performance goals are achieved, and that technical and program assistance is provided as necessary.

This document is prepared to assist CJD monitors and COG criminal justice planners in evaluation and grantees in preparation and performance of on-site program compliance and quality assurance monitoring and technical assistance visits.

CJD on-site evaluation procedures are substantially less in scope than an audit and are not to be construed as such. Because situations and conditions can vary between program areas and grantees, this monitoring checklist addresses only the most material features pertaining to all grants to direct the monitor's attention to those focal points. This document is a working tool and individual judgment should be exercised to determine the extent of compliance test procedures required in each area.

CJD will issue a draft report on all monitoring visits. The grantee shall respond to the draft report and the deficiencies, if any, and submit a plan of corrective action, if necessary, to CJD within a time frame specified by CJD. Management decisions are considered final and will be issued within six months of the grantee response.

References are supplied for each evaluation measure. Grantees must comply with all applicable state and federal statutes, rules and regulations and guidelines. In instances where both federal and state requirements apply to a grantee, the more restrictive requirement applies. CJD adopts by reference the rules listed below.

### GOVERNING DIRECTIVES

#### Federal

OMB Circular A-133 (revised 1997) - Audits of States, Local Governments and Non-Profit Organizations

OMB Circular A-102 (amended 1997) - Grants Management Common Rule

OMB Circular A-110 - Uniform Administrative Requirements (amended 1997)

OMB Circulars A-21, A-87 & A-122 - Cost Principles

*OMB COMMON RULE (For Uniform Administrative Requirements)*

Office of Justice Programs (OJP) Financial Guide (2002)

#### State

Texas Administrative Code (TAC) Criminal Justice Division – as adopted September 30, 2002.

Uniform Grant Management Standards (UGMS) - January 2001, as adopted November 2000.

Texas Code of Criminal Procedure

CJD Application for Grant Funding

**PRE-REVIEW CHECKLIST**

**Grantee and Project Title** \_\_\_\_\_

**Designated Officials**  
**Names ,Numbers, Addresses**

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Grant Number[s] and Award Amount** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date(s) of Visit** \_\_\_\_\_

- \_\_\_ **Make hotel, car, airline reservations**
- \_\_\_ **Send e-mail, FAX or make telephone call to grantee and COG planner confirming visit**
- \_\_\_ **Review current and previous year grant files**
- \_\_\_ **Verify required grant file attachments are complete and special conditions have been met. (GTS/Grant file)**
- \_\_\_ **Make a copy of program narrative summary and budget schedules A & D**
- \_\_\_ **Obtain copies of progress reports (Texas A&M biannual report-Judy Switzer)**
- \_\_\_ **Print financial expenditure reports (GTS)**
- \_\_\_ **Obtain printout of CJD disbursement record (FIS/Accounting) (USE VOUCHER #S TO CHECK EQUIPMENT INVOICES)**
- \_\_\_ **Obtain copies of "Request for Funds" and equipment invoices. (Sheila Lummis)**
- \_\_\_ **Obtain printout of current budget digest, including adjustments (GTS/Grant file)**
- \_\_\_ **Review previous grantee monitoring reports**
- \_\_\_ **Check current status of single audit report (Single Audit Coordinator-Liza L.)**
- \_\_\_ **Review monitoring checklist and complete questions that may be completed prior to visit**
- \_\_\_ **Instruct organization to prepare copies of the following:**

- Each participating organization's pay scale and travel policy**
- List of all personnel assigned to the grant, to what position each person is assigned,**
- and what percentage of their time is assigned to the grant**
- Detail ledger, balance sheet and summary of accounts**
- Equipment inventory report**

**Comments:** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

LEP Performance Indicator 1—Program Outcomes and Outputs

Yes	No	Review Activities	Level	Reference
		<p><b>1.A. Grantee must monitor activities to assure that performance goals are being achieved. (TAC; UGMS pg. 90)</b></p> <p><u>1.A.1.</u> Has the grantee submitted complete and correct progress reports by the specified deadline? (TAC 3.2527 (b) pg.41)</p> <p><u>1.A.2.</u> Does grantee have procedures in place to regularly evaluate the effectiveness of the project in achieving its stated purpose? (TAC 3.2525 pg.41)</p> <p><u>1.A.3.</u> Does the grantee’s activities and services address and achieve the project’s stated purpose? (TAC 3.2525 pg.41)</p> <p><u>1.A.4.</u> Do progress reports include a comparison of actual accomplishments to the measurable objectives or outcomes established for the period?(TAC 3.19 (b) (1) pg.8; UGMS pg. 90)</p> <p><u>1.A.5.</u> Do objectives include measurable outcome/outputs?(TAC 3.19 (b) (1) pg.8; UGMS pg. 90)</p> <p><u>1.A.6.</u> When objectives are not being met as scheduled, are appropriate actions taken? (TAC 3.19 (b) (1) pg.8; UGMS pg. 90)</p> <p><u>1.A.7.</u> Is the project’s scope, objectives, methodology and geographic location consistent with the grantee’s application?(TAC 3.2513 (d)(1) pg.40)</p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <p><b>1.B. Significant developments, delays, or adverse conditions which will materially impair the grantee’s ability to meet the objectives of the award must be reported to the state regulatory body as soon as the grantee becomes aware of such condition. (TAC; UGMS pg. 90-91)</b></p> <p><u>1.B.1.</u> The disclosure must include a statement of the action taken, or planned to be taken, and any assistance needed to resolve the situation.( TAC 3.19 (b) (1) pg.8; UGMS pg. 90-91)</p> <p><u>1.B.2.</u> Such significant delays may result in sanctions, including the imposition of special conditions under __.12 Special conditions for high-risk grantees.( TAC 3.19 (b) (1) pg.8; UGMS pg. 90-91)</p>	<p>I, II, III</p>	

LEP Performance Indicator 2—Financial and Management Accountability

Yes	No	Review Activities	Level	Reference
		<p><b>2.A. General Budget and Grant Administration (TAC ; OJP Financial Guide)</b></p> <p><u>2.A.1.</u> Have all special conditions been met?(TAC 3.2001 pg.36)</p> <p><u>2.A.2.</u> Are all required cooperative working agreements accomplished? (TAC 3.2009 pg.37)</p> <p><u>2.A.3.</u> Are all District Attorney contracts accomplished? (TAC 3.719 pg.25)</p>	<p>I, II, III</p> <p>I, II, III</p> <p>I, II, III</p>	

	<p><u>2.A.4.</u> Are all Inter-Agency Agreements accomplished? (TAC 3.2019 pg.37 )</p> <p><u>2.A.5.</u> Are timely, complete and accurate expenditure reports submitted each calendar quarter? Reconcile reports to detail and GPI ledgers. (TAC 3.2507 pg.39; OJP pg. 19; TAC 3.19 (b) (11)).</p> <p><u>2.A.6.</u> Does grantee maintain all financial records, supporting documents, statistical records and all other records pertinent to the award for at least three years? (TAC 3.2505 pg.38)</p> <p><u>2.A.7.</u> Grant Adjustments: Have grant adjustments requests been signed by one of the three designated grant officials? (TAC 3.2513 (a) pg.39)</p> <p>Have grant adjustments been approved as required, and submitted prior to the last 30 days of the grant period? (TAC 3.2513 (b) (5) pg.40)</p> <p>Does the grantee have accurate records that show all budget adjustments, to include those made within the 10% rule? (TAC 3.2513 (b) (3) pg.39)</p> <p>Have any changes of designated grant officials been properly reported and approved, as applicable? (TAC 3.2501) (d) pg.38)</p> <p>Are requests for extension submitted in writing and approved by the CJD executive director? (TAC 3.2513 (d)(2) pg.40)</p> <p><u>2.A.8.</u> Verify that no conflict of interest exist, ie. auctions and contract services. (TAC 3.19 (b) (1,2) pg.8 ;OJP pg. 5; UGMS pg. 80-81)</p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <p><b>2.B. Financial Management Systems (TAC; OJP Financial Guide; UGMS)</b></p> <p><u>2.B.1.</u> Are grantee requests for funds in compliance with cash management/minimum cash on hand procedures? (TAC 3.19 (b) (1,2) pg.8; UGMS pg. 68-69; OJP pg. 25-26)</p> <p><u>2.B.2.</u> Does grantee comply with fund-specific cash match requirements (TAC 3.73 pg.11; OJP pg. 32-34)</p> <p><u>2.B.3.</u> Were expenditures obligated before the end of the grant year? (TAC 3.2503 pg.38)</p> <p><u>2.B.4.</u> Is the use of CJD funding limited to costs that are reasonable, allocable, necessary to the project? (TAC 3.19 (b) 1-2 pg.8; UGMS pg. 12-13; OJP Chapter 7)</p> <p><u>2.B.5.</u> Are procurement procedures, including sole-source justification over \$100,000, followed for equipment and contract services, including proper documentation and CJD approval as necessary? (TAC 3.2013 (a-b) pg.37; UGMS pg. 80-89)</p> <p><u>2.B.6.</u> Are internal controls and management controls adequate, i.e., segregation of duties, accountability of petty cash, financial controls, accurate accounting of expenditures within budget categories, etc. (TAC 3.19 (b) (1) pg.8; UGMS pg. 67; A-123 p. 4, 5)</p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>	<p>I, II, III I, II, III, C I, II, III, C I, II, III, C I, II, III I, II, III I, II I, II I, II, C I, II, C I, II I, II, C</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p><b>C. Program Income (TAC, Code of Criminal Procedure, Art. 59.03, .06, .08; OJP Financial Guide, Chapter 4)</b></p> <p><u>2.C.1.</u> Program Income:  Is program income used for approved, eligible purposes?(TAC 3.87 (a)(b) pg.14, OJP pg. 36)  Are written requests to carry forward program income accurate and approved? (TAC 3.87 (d) pg.14)  Does all property and funds seized by the project revert to the task force as program income in accordance with DA contract? (TAC 3.719 (a) (2-4) pg.25)</p> <p>Is the use of program income, to pay overtime, approved by CJD in advance?(TAC 3.75 (e) pg.12)  Does the grantee's GPI include forfeitures, cash contributions, donations, restitution, interest income, fees and royalties as required? (TAC 3.719 pg.25; OJP pg. 36-37)</p> <p><u>2.C.2.</u> Is all program income accounted for and accurately reported on narcotics activity reports and quarterly expenditure reports? Review monthly reports and corresponding case logs, GPI accounts and seizure logs. (TAC 3.2507 pg.39 ; OJP pg. 19)</p> <p><u>2.C.3.</u> Are accurate records of seized contraband maintained at the task force location?(CCP-Code of Criminal Procedure Art. 59.03)</p> <p><u>2.C.4.</u> Test case files to verify that seized contraband , including cash, is stored in a proper location within 72 hours after the seizure?(CCP-Code of Criminal Procedure Art. 59.03, .06, .08)</p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <p><b>D. Personnel and Professional Contract Services (TAC; UGMS; OJP)</b></p> <p>Do personnel records contain evidence of:</p> <p><u>2.D.1.</u> Job descriptions and salaries that are commensurate with the rank and authority of the assigning agency? (TAC 3.75 (a)(1-3) pg.12 ; UGMS pg. 19-20)</p> <p><u>2.D.2.</u> Do time and attendance records include actual times and hours worked, indicator of grant assignment and signatures of employee and supervisor?(TAC 3.75 (b) pg.12; UGMS pg. 23)</p> <p><u>2.D.3.</u> Verify that grantee is not using grant positions to supplant existing positions. (TAC 3.19 (b) (2) pg.8; OJP pg. 22, 34)</p> <p><u>2.D.4.</u> Contract/consulting agreements are in writing and comply with fund specific requirements(TAC 3.77(a)(b) pg.12; OJP pg. 94)</p> <p><u>2.D.5.</u> Verify that grantee is drug testing 25% of all grant-<b>assigned</b> personnel at least quarterly.(TAC 3.721 pg.26)</p> <p><u>2.D.6.</u> Is the use of grant funding for accrued compensatory time, for personnel leaving employment, in accordance with regulation? (TAC 3.75 (d) pg.12)</p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <p><b>E. Travel and Training (TAC, OJP, UGMS)</b></p>	<p>I, C</p> <p>I, C</p> <p>I, C</p> <p>I</p> <p>I, II</p> <p>I, II</p> <p>I, II</p> <p>I, II</p> <p>I, II</p> <p>I, II, C</p> <p>I</p>	
--	---	--	--

<p><u>2.E.1.</u> Are travel expenses only for positions assigned to the grant? (TAC 3.19 (b)(2) pg.8; OJP pg. 60)</p> <p><u>2.E.2.</u> Are travel expenditures verifiable and do they conform to local, or state, mileage, per diem, and lodging rates? (TAC 3.79(a) pg.13; UGMS p. 34-35)</p> <p><u>2.E.3.</u> Is reimbursement allowed only for travel points at least 50 miles from the grantee agency's headquarters/agent's assigned location? (TAC 3.79(a) pg.13)</p> <p><u>2.E.4.</u> Is training being accomplished in accordance with the grantees approved training budget? Does grantee maintain records that properly document the completion of grant funded training? (TAC 3.79 (c) pg.13)</p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>	<p>I</p> <p>I</p> <p>I</p>	
<p><b>F. Equipment (TAC; UGMS; OJP )</b></p> <p><u>2.F.1.</u> Is equipment capitalized in accordance with guidelines? (TAC 3.3 (14) pg.6)</p> <p><u>2.F.2.</u> Does the actual inventory agree with the inventory report and the final expenditure report? (TAC 3.2509 (a) pg.39)</p> <p><u>2.F.3.</u> Are property management standards adhered to regarding the disposition of equipment? (TAC 3.19 (b) (1) pg.8; UGMS pg. 78-79; TAC 3.2509 (a)(b) pg.39)</p> <p><u>2.F.4.</u> Is there evidence that the items purchased are being used as proposed and to the extent indicated in the grant application? (TAC 3.19 (b)(2) pg.8; OJP pg. 45)</p> <p><u>2.F.5.</u> Is equipment purchased IAW the grant application or approved grant adjustment (TAC 3.81 pg.13)</p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>	<p>I</p> <p>I, C</p> <p>I, C</p> <p>I</p> <p>I, C</p>	
<p><b>Supplies and Direct Operating Expenses (TAC 3.717; OJP Chp 8)</b></p> <p><u>2.G.1.</u> Is the grantee using CLERIS?(TAC 3.703 (1) pg.23 )</p> <p><u>2.G.2.</u> Do only cashiers who are bonded make disbursements? (TAC 3.19 (b) (2) pg.8; OJP pg. 66)</p> <p><u>2.G.3.</u> Do informant cash receipts include all required information?( TAC 3.717 pg.25; OJP pg. 66-67)</p> <p><u>2.G.4.</u> Are cash expenditure reports available for all transactions from cashier to officer/agent and from officer/agent to PE/PI/PS?( TAC 3.717 pg.25; OJP pg. 72)</p> <p><u>2.G.5.</u> Are reconciliation reports prepared on imprest funds quarterly? Reconcile ledger with amounts expended according to case receipts. Report should include the assumed name of the informant payee, and to what extent the information contributed to the investigation. (TAC 3.19 (b) (2) pg.8; OJP pg. 68)</p> <p><u>2.G.6.</u> Are procedures for handling outstanding confidential funds in accordance with CJD requirements? (TAC 3.717 (c) 1-4 pg.25)</p> <p><u>2.G.7.</u> Are informant payments made only to those who are not law enforcement officers or public officials?( TAC 3.717 (f) pg.25)</p> <p><u>2.G.8.</u> Are informant files kept in a separate, secure area with sign-out logs used to indicate the date, informant number, time in and out, and the signature of the person reviewing the file?( TAC 3.19 (b) (2) pg.8; OJP pg. 68)</p>	<p>I, II</p> <p>I, II</p> <p>I, II</p> <p>I, II, C</p> <p>I, II, C</p> <p>I, II, C</p> <p>I, II, C</p> <p>I, II</p> <p>I, II</p>	

	<p><u>2.G.9.</u> Do informant files contain all the required information?( TAC 3.19 (b)(2) pg.8; OJP pg. 68-69)</p> <p><u>2.G.10.</u> Are informant payments commensurate with the value of the information provided?( TAC 3.19 (b)(2) pg.8; OJP pg. 71)</p> <p><u>2.G.11.</u> Is prior approval obtained for payments to CI's in excess of \$2,500? (TAC 3.717 (5) pg.25)</p> <p><u>2.G.12.</u> Are expenditures made on only documented investigations and charged to the appropriate account (PE/PI/PS)?( TAC 3.19 (b) (2) pg.8; 3.717(a)(b)(c) pg.25; OJP pg. 72)</p> <p><u>2.G.13.</u> Is supporting documentation available for P/S expenditures when not endangering the safety of the officer? If not available, has supervisor certified that the expenditures were necessary and justified why supporting documents were not obtained. (TAC 3.19 (b)(2) pg.8 ; OJP pg. 73)</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>I, II</p> <p>I, II</p> <p>I, II, C</p> <p>I, II</p> <p>I, II</p>	

**Post Review Activities**

DATE

- \_\_\_\_\_ Complete travel voucher (within 5 business days)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Enter monitoring visit report data into Grants Monitoring tracking database (1<sup>st</sup> business day after visit)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Complete draft monitoring report and file for peer review (within 8 business days)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Revise draft report as necessary and turn into Grants Monitoring Director (within 10 business days)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Save approved report in appropriate electronic monitors' file
- \_\_\_\_\_ Mail approved draft report to project director, financial officer and task force commander (should be within 10 business days after visit)
- \_\_\_\_\_ File copies of report in grant file and in monitoring report file
- \_\_\_\_\_ Track return of grantee's response to findings and review upon receipt (30 days after date of report)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Complete final report acknowledging receipt and adequacy of grantee's response
- \_\_\_\_\_ Mail letter to authorized official, COG planner, project director, financial officer and task force commander
- \_\_\_\_\_ File copy of final report and grantee's response in monitoring



## **Attachment 4**



## Monitoring Review Report 6/1/02 - 5/31/03

Grantee	Project	Grant Number	Funding Source Yr	Date Reviewed	Amount Reviewed	Disallowed Costs
Wilson County	81st Judicial District Narcotics Task Force	DB-01-A10-13914-03	6/1/01-5/31/02	6/5/2002	\$383,163	\$0
City of Seguin	25th Judicial District Narcotics Task Force	DB-00-A10-13913-03	6/1/01-5/31/02	6/27/2002	\$404,701	\$0
City of San Angelo	Rio Concho Multi-Agency Drug Enforcement TF	DB-00-A10-12003-03	6/1/01-5/31/02	7/11/2002	\$384,372	\$0
Galveston County	Galveston County Narcotics Task Force	DB-99-A10-13876-03	6/1/01-5/31/02	7/11/2002	\$673,201	<b>\$10,746.56</b>
City of Laredo	Laredo Multi-Agency Narcotics Task Force	DB-01-A10-12039-03	6/1/01-5/31/02	7/26/2002	\$998,115	\$0
El Paso County	El Paso County Metro Narcotics Task Force	DB-01-A10-13859-03	6/1/01-5/31/02	8/2/2002	\$989,879	\$0
City of Amarillo	Panhandle Regional Narcotics Trafficking Task Force	DB-01-A10-13840-03	6/1/01-5/31/02	8/30/2002	\$719,937	\$0
Denton County	North Central Texas Narcotics Task Force	DB-01-A10-11990-03	6/1/01-5/31/02	8/30/2002	\$701,344	\$0
City of Marble Falls	33rd Judicial District Narcotics Enforcement Team	DB-01-A10-13864-03	6/1/01-5/31/02	6/21/2002	\$588,178	\$0
Anderson County	Dogwood Trails Narcotics Task Force	DB-99-A10-13857-03	6/1/01-5/31/02	8/13/2002	\$416,484	\$0
Ellis County	Southeast Metroplex Narcotics Task Force	DB-01-A10-13848-03	6/1/01-5/31/02	6/12/2002	\$340,065	\$0
Chambers County	Narcotics Trafficking Task Force	DB-02-A10-13877-03	6/1/01-5/31/02	10/17/2002	\$448,329	\$0
Brazos County	Brazos Valley Narcotics Trafficking TF	DB-00-A10-13867-03	6/1/01-5/31/02	10/31/2002	\$529,167	\$0
Tarrant County	Metro Narcotics Intelligence & Coordination Unit	DB-02-A10-11988-04	6/1/02-5/31/03	11/22/2002	\$2,294,103	\$0
City of Baytown	Harris County Organized Crime Narcotics TF	DB-01-A10-12019-04	6/1/02-5/31/03	12/13/2002	\$3,198,661	\$0
City of McAllen	Combined Governmental Drug Enforcement T.F.	DB-02-A10-13888-04	6/1/02-5/31/03	1/9/2003	\$797,320	\$0
City of McAllen	Project ACTION	DB-02-A10-16416-01	6/1/02-5/31/03	1/9/2003	\$578,000	\$0
Caldwell County	Chisholm Trails Narcotics Task Force	DB-02-A10-16315-01	6/1/02-5/31/03	1/30/2003	\$305,913	\$0
Walker County	Central East Texas Narcotics Task Force	DB-02-A10-13881-04	6/1/02-5/31/03	2/21/2003	\$427,197	\$0
City of Converse	Alamo Area Narcotics Task Force	DB-02-A10-13882-05	6/1/02-5/31/03	4/17/2003	\$798,337	\$0
City of San Marcos	Advanced Law Enforcement Rapid Response Training	DB-02-A10-16386-01	5/1/02-8/31/03	5/21/2003	\$500,000	\$0
City of Brenham	Independence Narcotics Task Force	DB-02-A10-13869-04	6/1/02-5/31/03	6/19/2003	\$247,001	\$0
Lampasas County	Rural Area Narcotics Task Force	DB-02-A10-13892-04	6/1/02-5/31/03	6/27/2003	\$435,727	\$0
<u>23 Byrne Projects</u>					<b>\$17,159,194</b>	<b>\$10,747</b>

B