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Executive Summary

In 2002 and 2003, the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI) administered federally-funded grants to 35 multi-jurisdictional task forces (MJTF) that primarily provided drug enforcement services to surrounding county and local police and prosecution agencies. These 35 MJTFs worked with or provided coordinated drug enforcement services to perhaps 200 or so other agencies throughout the state. The most complete source of information describing the composition and productive activities of MJTFs is maintained by ICJI. Each task force has been required to submit regular financial and performance reports to ICJI staff, which have been maintained in hard-copy format within ICJI’s filing system archives. These performance reports are based on a questionnaire designed by ICJI staff. The large number of separate files (approximately 550 “packets” of information) posed a major challenge to any systematic description of the operations of Indiana MJTFs, much less any future possible analyses or evaluations. Beginning in fall 2004, the Indiana University Purdue University, Indianapolis Center for Urban Policy and the Environment (Center) converted these hard copy files into an electronic relational data base. Based on the data base that was developed, this report offers a descriptive analysis of the 35 MJTFs at work within the state during the calendar years 2002 and 2003.

This report essentially addresses three questions for the years 2002 and 2003. First, what was the general composition of Indiana MJTFs? Second, what were the estimated expenditures of the 35 task forces—that is, what did they cost and where did the funds originate? Third, what outputs and outcomes were “produced” by the MJTFs? In using the existing ICJI file archive of MJTF reports to answer these questions, it might be expected that the 35 MJTFs in Indiana would report considerable variation in expenditures, the composition of their expenditure stream, and the final outputs and outcomes produced by each task force. Significantly, this includes variation in the information each MJTF reports to ICJI for each year that grants are awarded. Some MJTFs have not submitted reports, and in many reports that are submitted, some information is not included. Nonetheless, some broad characterization of MJTFs and their productive activity in 2002 and 2003 was possible.

The MJTFs are composed primarily of law enforcement personnel, consisting of approximately 200 full-time sworn personnel, and a much smaller number of prosecutors and other civilian personnel. These MJTFs expended an estimated $8 million annually in 2002 and 2003. The source of approximately half of this amount comes from federal grant awards. The remainder comes from a combination of local funds, including proceeds from the sale of assets forfeited by drug offenders.

Given these investments in MJTFs, the task forces produced a variety of outputs and outcomes. Indiana MJTFs were involved in approximately 14,000 arrests during these two years, mostly for possession or distribution of illegal substances. The typical arrestee was an adult white male. The MJTFs initiated approximately 7,000 to 8,000 new cases in each of the two years. Combining 2002 and 2003, prosecution activity associated with MJTFs resulted in just under 4,200 convictions. From their arrest activities, Indiana MJTFs seized more than 130,000 “dosage units” of illegal drugs, as well as more than 11,000 kilograms of illegal substances. More than 1,200 methamphetamine labs were dismantled. For this two-year period, MJTFs seized assets valued at approximately $8.6 million. MJTFs netted a total of nearly $3.8 million in local income from those assets actually forfeited in 2002 and 2003.
Introduction

Multi-jurisdictional task forces (MJTF) have been funded by the U.S. National Institute of Justice Byrne grant programs since the late 1980s, primarily as components of drug enforcement policy. By 2003, the Byrne grant program was providing funds to approximately 35 MJTFs throughout the state of Indiana. The various MJTFs, along with the counties and cities of operation, are shown in Appendix 1. These MJTFs provide drug enforcement services to approximately 50 of 92 Indiana counties and approximately 47 other local jurisdictions, including information for at least nine metropolitan centers (Evansville, Fort Wayne, Gary, Indianapolis, Kokomo, Lafayette, Muncie, South Bend and Terre Haute). Although the Byrne grants dedicated to MJTFs have a fairly long history in Indiana, there have been few analyses of MJTF activities. Other than two short annual reports in 1989 and 1990, and a longer analysis of two MJTFs in 1991, there have been no systematic data analyses describing (nor evaluations of) Indiana MJTFs.¹

In response, the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI) expressed the need for a description of the activities of the various state MJTFs. One challenge to mounting this description was that all reports submitted to ICJI by each MJTF were in manual, hard-copy format, and had never been converted to a form (e.g., electronic data bases) that permitted efficient descriptions of MJTF activities followed by evaluation or analysis of MJTF performance. Therefore, the first step in any effort to evaluate the contributions of different MJTFs throughout the state was the creation of an aggregated data base to describe the activities of MJTFs. This data base would be comprised of regular quarterly and six month reports that have been submitted by MJTFs to ICJI. These report forms, in hard-copy format, have been provided to ICJI as a primary means of monitoring Byrne grant funds allocated to each task force. Guidance for reporting was provided by ICJI to MJTFs in the form of a detailed 12-page questionnaire.

ICJI needed these numerous hard-copy forms to be transformed into digital files to enable further future analysis. Working with ICJI staff, researchers from the Center for Urban Policy and the Environment (Center) of the School of Public and Environmental Affairs (SPEA) at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis designed an electronic data base which was then populated by performance and application data reported by Indiana MJTFs for the calendar years 2002 and 2003.

Reports submitted by MJTFs to ICJI are based on a questionnaire form designed by ICJI. A copy of that form is included in Appendix 2 of this report. The report requires detail on 29 separate information components, itemized across 12 pages. Based on the inventory of regular reports filed by MJTFs and maintained at ICJI, Center researchers assembled all MJTF applications, performance and fiscal reports submitted to ICJI for 2002 and 2003 that described task force personnel, participating agencies, case investigations and outcomes, drugs seized and purchased, drug labs dismantled, numbers of cases, type and value of assets seized or forfeited, arrests, charges filed, and convictions. There is some limited demographic information included in performance reports and funding applications for arrests, charges filed, and convictions. In addition, Center researchers performed a simple coding of the narrative MJTF

¹ See Center for Criminal Justice Research and Information, Multijurisdictional Drug Task Forces: An Enforcement Approach to Drugs in Indiana, Indiana Criminal Justice Institute, December 1989. Also see McGarrell, E.F. and K. Schlegel, An Evaluation of the South Central Indiana and Tri-County Narcotics Task Forces, Center for Criminal Justice Research and Information, Indiana Criminal Justice Institute, February 1991.
problem statements and task force goals included in the reports. The objective was to create an effective and relatively efficient data base capable of supporting some basic descriptions of MJTF organization and activity.

The primary sources of information were the Byrne grant applications, ICJI performance reports, and financial history reports filed by the Indiana MJTFs for 2002 and 2003. In total, this made up a sizeable number of hard-copy reports. By the time all information had been reviewed and coded—including MJTF grant applications, performance reports filed with ICJI, and all quarterly and final financial reports—approximately 550 separate document packages were examined. The Center coded the data from those reports into electronic files using the Microsoft Access 2003 relational data base program. Based on a series of meetings and discussions between ICJI staff and Center staff, the following tasks and data items comprised the bulk of work:

1. Assembled data submitted from MJTFs to ICJI for 2002 and 2003.
   1.1. All MJTF applications
   1.2. Periodic performance reports
   1.3. Financial reports

2. Based on a review of all data sources, designed an Access data base that would be populated by the MJTF data.

3. Reviewed the data base design and structure with ICJI staff, and made the appropriate modifications based on that review.

4. Coded the appropriate data, creating an inventory of task force descriptors, generally consisting of:
   4.1. Goals & objectives
   4.2. Personnel: how many, functions positions
   4.3. Participating agencies
   4.4. Case investigations and outcomes
   4.5. Drugs seized and purchased
   4.6. Drug labs dismantled
   4.7. Numbers of cases
   4.8. Type and value of assets seized and forfeited
   4.9. Arrests
   4.10. Charges filed
   4.11. Convictions
   4.12. Annual expenditures
   4.13. Project income (e.g., asset forfeiture sales), if included in financial reports

5. Assembled demographic information included in performance reports and funding applications.
   5.1. Arrests
   5.2. Charges filed
   5.3. Convictions

6. Analyzed all assembled information to build a basic description of MJTFs.

---

2 The problem statements and goal/objective listings submitted each year by the Indiana MJTFs are not included or discussed in this report.
Describing Indiana’s Multi-Jurisdictional Task Forces, 2002 & 2003

In reviewing Indiana’s 35 MJTFs, several limitations should be noted regarding the completeness and quality of the information contained in the MJTF performance reports. Other than some of the financial reports, all of the MJTF applications or performance reports for 2002 and 2003 were maintained as hard copies in the ICJI filing system. As will be shown, some files for MJTFs were incomplete or missing, although every effort was made to locate all available files. Even so, there were cases of missing data for some MJTFs. In addition to missing data, there were other issues that limited how the MJTF descriptive analysis should be interpreted. These are noted below.

First, the reports included in the ICJI files that were reviewed and converted into electronic files did not describe all two years of activities of all MJTFs in operation. For example, there were either one or both reports missing for 2002 and for 2003 for five task forces. Thus, the information contained in some of the tables are likely to be markedly different from what it would have been with the inclusion of this additional data.

Second, the MJTFs varied in terms of how complete the reports were that were included in the ICJI files. So, regarding the “completion rate” percentages found in each table, completeness was affirmed if task forces completed any part of a given section. For example, in the number of different agencies working with MJTFs table, task forces were given credit for completing the section even if they only listed local agencies and not other agencies as well. If task forces failed to complete any part of a section, an N/R (not reported) was entered in that table for the respective task force.

Third, some MJTFs submitted information in forms or ways that differed from what was requested in the ICJI report forms. For instance, information that was requested by the ICJI questionnaire was occasionally consolidated by grantees. That is, rather than providing individual figures for each type of question, one combined figure was sometimes provided. Consequently, when this happened, a degree of specificity was sometimes sacrificed.

Fourth, the frequent use of the “other” category in many questions ultimately meant that the recounting of many responses lost some detail. The “other” option was available to task forces on most questions and one that was frequently selected by task forces. Most “other” options included a line where task forces could specify what they meant by “other.” However, most task forces did not complete the “other” specification line.

Fifth, regarding statistics on methamphetamine labs, there is a potential for double reporting between the Indiana State Police (ISP) and the remaining 34 task forces. For example, the ISP reported dismantling 697 methamphetamine labs in 2002 while the remaining 34 task forces reported dismantling 460 combined. These statistics are not mutually exclusive—there is significant overlap between these figures as the ISP works with other task forces to dismantle methamphetamine labs.

Sixth, considering the substantial number of items reported within the ICJI report forms by the various MJTFs, conviction data were among the most poorly reported data in the performance reports. Some task forces stated that conviction data were maintained by the prosecutor’s office. In addition, convictions
often do not immediately follow arrests, which can result in reporting lags. Given these circumstances, comparisons between arrests and convictions are difficult and should be made with caution.

Finally, qualifiers for each individual table are also provided in the table notes, and vary from table to table depending on the information item being reported. The remainder of this descriptive report summarizes the findings drawn from the ICJI reports filed by MJTFs in Indiana.

**MJTFs at work in the state of Indiana, 2002-2003**

*Number of different agencies working with MJTFs (Table 1).* As befits their cross-jurisdictional character, MJTFs work with both local and other county, state, or federal agencies to perform their missions. Of the 35 task forces, 86 percent (30/35) reported the number of agencies on their task force for 2002 and 89 percent (31/35) reported this information for 2003. In addition to their local working relationships, MJTFs report working with up to a dozen other agencies during 2002 and 2003. On average, in both 2002 and 2003, MJTFs worked with about five other agencies.

*Number of personnel with full-time commitment (Table 2a).* Indiana MJTFs are dominated largely by law enforcement personnel, although some task forces have a limited number of prosecution or other personnel (e.g., administrative support staff). Of the 35 task forces, 86 percent (30/35) reported information on the number of personnel with full-time commitment for 2002 and 86 percent (30/35) reported this information for 2003. Eleven of the MJTFs reflect regular non-reporting habits regarding the full-time personnel commitment. Notably, three task forces reported having no full-time law enforcement personnel in 2002 and three task forces reported having no full-time law enforcement personnel in 2003. It is clear that the organizational structure of MJTFs varies across the state.

As illustrated in Table 2a, law enforcement personnel constitute the majority of task forces’ full-time personnel, followed by other personnel (legal, financial, administrative) and prosecution personnel. Furthermore, there appears to be little variation in the number of full-time law enforcement, prosecution, and other personnel from 2002 to 2003.

*Number of personnel with part-time commitment (Table 2b).* In addition to personnel with full-time commitment, task forces are asked to report the number of personnel with part-time commitment working with their task forces. While the completion rate does not change—as task forces received credit for completing the personnel section if they completed any part of the personnel section, full-time or part-time—the number of task forces who reported having part-time personnel differs. With this caveat in mind, of the 35 task forces, 34 percent (12/35) reported having part-time personnel in 2002 and 34 percent (12/35) reported having part-time personnel in 2003.

As illustrated in Table 2b, law enforcement personnel constitute the greatest number of task forces’ part-time personnel, followed by prosecution personnel, administrative personnel, financial personnel, and legal personnel. Furthermore, as with Table 2a, there appears to be little variation in the number of different types of part-time personnel from 2002 to 2003.
Table 1: Number of Different Agencies Working with MJTFs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Force Name</th>
<th>Local Agencies 2002</th>
<th>Local Agencies 2003</th>
<th>Other Agencies 2002</th>
<th>Other Agencies 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Police Department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Police Department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluffton Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connersville Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Prosecutor</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard County Prosecutor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State Police Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County Drug/Gang Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokomo Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosciusko County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaPorte County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County Justice Agency METRO Drug Task Force</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muncie Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski County Police Department</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Narcotics Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starke County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tippecanoe County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderburgh County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigo County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Carroll County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/R represents no information reported on agencies working with the task forces.

Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 86% (30/35) reported the number of agencies on their task force for 2002, and 89% (31/35) reported this information for 2003.

Local agencies was a yes/no response with 1 indicating having worked with local agencies and 0 indicating not having worked with local agencies.

The category ‘other agencies’ consists of non-local agencies that the task forces worked with during the reporting period. As such, these numbers reflect the number of different other agencies the task forces worked with rather than a yes/no response.
### Table 2a: Number of Personnel with Full-Time Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Force Name</th>
<th>Number of Law Enforcement Personnel</th>
<th>Number of Prosecution Personnel</th>
<th>Number of Other Personnel (legal, financial, administrative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Police Department</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Police Department</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluffton Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>2 N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connersville Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Prosecutor</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>6 N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard County Prosecutor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State Police Drug Task Force</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County Drug/Gang Task Force</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokomo Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosciusko County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaPorte County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County Justice Agency Metro Drug Task Force</td>
<td>14 N/R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muncie Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski County Police Department</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Narcotics Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starke County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tippecanoe County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderburgh County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigo County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Carroll County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/R represents non-completion of the entire personnel section for a given year.

Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 86% (30/35) reported information on the number of personnel with full-time commitment for 2002, and 86% (30/35) reported this information for 2003.
Table 2b: Number of Personnel with Part-Time Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluffton Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connersville Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard County Prosecutor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State Police Drug Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County Drug/Gang Task Force</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokomo Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosciusko County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaPorte County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County Justice Agency METRO Drug Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muncie Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski County Police Department</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Narcotics Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starke County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tippecanoe County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderburgh County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigo County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Carroll County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/R represents non-completion of the entire personnel section for a given year.
Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 86% (30/35) reported information on the number of personnel with full-time commitment for 2002, and 86% (30/35) reported this information for 2003.
MJTF cost during the 2002 and 2003 operating periods

Based on the financial reports submitted to ICJI from the various MJTFs, funds used for MJTF operations come from several sources. These include federal grant awards (i.e., Byrne funds), local (or in the case of the Indiana State Police, state) matches to these funds, proceeds from asset forfeitures (i.e., sale of assets seized), and other local income that might accrue to an MJTF. As shown in the following tables, the amounts of and relationships between these various sources vary considerably among the 35 MJTFs.

Funds allocated during 2002 and 2003 for MJTFs (Table 3). Based on the reports submitted by MJTFs to ICJI, the task forces spent approximately $6.4 million annually from all funding sources in 2002 and about the same amount again in 2003. Of the 35 task forces, 100 percent (35/35) reported funds allocated information for 2002 and 97 percent (34/35) reported this information for 2003. However, the following caveats should be taken into consideration when reviewing the financial information contained in the reports archived at ICJI. First, the “minimum total expenditures” consisted of federal grant awards, and state and local matches spent. These figures represented what should be considered the minimum that task forces spent during a reporting period. Second, total expenditure including project income consists of federal, state, and local matches spent, and project income expended. Because the financial reporting contents of the various MJTF reports were not always clear regarding sources and uses of funds, total expenditures may include some double counting as the project income expenditure could have been used as a local match. Furthermore, neither of these figures—minimum total expenditure and total expenditure including project income—includes forfeitures obtained within a project period, which could have been used as a funding source.

The largest MJTF expenditures occurred in perhaps predictable locales. Focusing on minimum total expenditures in 2003, for example, only four of the MJTFs—the Marion County METRO Drug Task Force, the Indiana State Police, the Lake County Police Department Drug Task Force, and the Floyd County Police Department Drug Task Force—accounted for 44 percent of minimum total expenditures. On average in 2003, an MJTF spent approximately $185,000 although the range of expenditures varied from $21,000 to more than $1 million.

Fund breakdown by source of funds 2002 and 2003 (Tables 4 and 5). Tables 4 and 5 provide additional information on the funding of MJTFs with a focus on various fund sources. As indicated in table 4, the primary sources of funding for MJTFs are federal awards and local matches. Only one task force, the Indiana State Police Drug Task Force (ISPDTF), reported receiving funding through a state match in 2002 and 2003. Total 2002 and 2003 federal funds for the 35 MJTFs amounted to just over $8.4 million, ranging between $23,000 and nearly $1.1 million. More than one-third of the cumulative federal awards for 2002 and 2003 went to the MJTFs for Lake County, the Indiana State Police, and Marion County. These three MJTFs, plus those in Floyd, Randolph, and Johnson counties, accounted for more than one-half of 2002 and 2003 federal funds spent by MJTFs. Regarding 2002 and 2003 local (or in one case, state) matches, the amounts contributed by MJTFs range between about $8,000 to more than $1 million, and these local contributions are anywhere from one-fifth to more than twice the federal amounts. There is clearly variation in the composition of MJTF funding streams.
Table 3: Funds Allocated During 2002 and 2003 for Individual Task Forces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Force Name</th>
<th>Minimum Total Expenditure</th>
<th>Total Expenditures Including Project Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$135,372</td>
<td>$136,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Police Department</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Police Department</td>
<td>$89,656</td>
<td>$102,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluffton Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$104,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$160,840</td>
<td>$160,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$26,232</td>
<td>$29,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connersville Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$58,056</td>
<td>$59,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$451,911</td>
<td>$451,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford County Prosecutor</td>
<td>$24,798</td>
<td>$21,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$211,908</td>
<td>$212,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$133,450</td>
<td>$133,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$226,146</td>
<td>$228,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard County Prosecutor</td>
<td>$183,860</td>
<td>$189,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State Police Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$691,269</td>
<td>$690,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County Drug/Gang Task Force</td>
<td>$229,705</td>
<td>$227,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokomo Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$216,217</td>
<td>$228,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosciusko County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$124,715</td>
<td>$124,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$553,106</td>
<td>$750,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaPorte County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$146,715</td>
<td>$146,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County Justice Agency METRO Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$905,666</td>
<td>$1,009,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$58,862</td>
<td>$55,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muncie Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$102,900</td>
<td>$102,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$21,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski County Police Department</td>
<td>$11,492</td>
<td>$19,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$238,448</td>
<td>$238,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Narcotics Task Force</td>
<td>$171,500</td>
<td>$168,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$182,415</td>
<td>$182,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starke County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$29,828</td>
<td>$30,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tippecanoe County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$76,576</td>
<td>$76,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderburgh County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$275,072</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigo County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$124,755</td>
<td>$123,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$149,025</td>
<td>$143,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$95,055</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Carrall County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$96,173</td>
<td>$96,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>$36,640</td>
<td>$36,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$6,394,363</td>
<td>$6,458,985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 100% (35/35) reported funds allocated information for 2002, and 97% (34/35) reported this information for 2003.

2 Minimum total expenditures consist of federal grants and state, and local matches spent.

3 Total expenditure including project income consists of federal, state, and local matches spent and project income expended. This may include some double counting as the project income expenditure could have been used as a local match.
## Table 4: Federal, Local, and Minimum Total Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen County Police Department</td>
<td>$83,044</td>
<td>$83,044</td>
<td>$52,328</td>
<td>$53,643</td>
<td>$135,372</td>
<td>$136,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Police Department</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Police Department</td>
<td>$42,967</td>
<td>$44,400</td>
<td>$46,689</td>
<td>$57,649</td>
<td>$99,656</td>
<td>$102,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluffton Police Department</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$29,794</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$104,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton County</td>
<td>$19,674</td>
<td>$21,700</td>
<td>$6,558</td>
<td>$7,305</td>
<td>$26,232</td>
<td>$29,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connersville Police Department</td>
<td>$44,998</td>
<td>$43,542</td>
<td>$14,994</td>
<td>$14,514</td>
<td>$59,992</td>
<td>$58,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Police Department</td>
<td>$302,911</td>
<td>$302,687</td>
<td>$149,000</td>
<td>$149,000</td>
<td>$451,911</td>
<td>$451,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Prosecutor</td>
<td>$16,098</td>
<td>$15,649</td>
<td>$8,700</td>
<td>$5,384</td>
<td>$24,792</td>
<td>$21,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County Police Department</td>
<td>$159,212</td>
<td>$159,315</td>
<td>$52,696</td>
<td>$53,117</td>
<td>$211,908</td>
<td>$212,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks County Prosecutor</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$33,450</td>
<td>$33,450</td>
<td>$133,450</td>
<td>$133,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry County Police Department</td>
<td>$75,040</td>
<td>$75,040</td>
<td>$151,106</td>
<td>$153,734</td>
<td>$226,146</td>
<td>$228,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard County Prosecutor</td>
<td>$89,115</td>
<td>$89,115</td>
<td>$94,745</td>
<td>$100,525</td>
<td>$183,860</td>
<td>$189,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State Police 1</td>
<td>$518,452</td>
<td>$517,830</td>
<td>$172,817</td>
<td>$172,610</td>
<td>$691,269</td>
<td>$690,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County Drug/Gang Task Force</td>
<td>$170,655</td>
<td>$168,132</td>
<td>$59,050</td>
<td>$59,050</td>
<td>$229,705</td>
<td>$227,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokomo Police Department</td>
<td>$73,252</td>
<td>$73,250</td>
<td>$142,965</td>
<td>$155,444</td>
<td>$216,217</td>
<td>$228,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosciusko County Police Department</td>
<td>$93,651</td>
<td>$93,704</td>
<td>$31,064</td>
<td>$31,237</td>
<td>$124,715</td>
<td>$124,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County Police Department</td>
<td>$519,810</td>
<td>$559,879</td>
<td>$33,296</td>
<td>$36,742</td>
<td>$553,106</td>
<td>$570,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaPorte County Prosecutor</td>
<td>$109,973</td>
<td>$109,914</td>
<td>$36,742</td>
<td>$36,742</td>
<td>$146,715</td>
<td>$146,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County Justice Agency METRO</td>
<td>$445,100</td>
<td>$445,100</td>
<td>$60,566</td>
<td>$56,601</td>
<td>$505,666</td>
<td>$1,009,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall County Prosecutor</td>
<td>$40,397</td>
<td>$41,259</td>
<td>$13,466</td>
<td>$13,753</td>
<td>$53,862</td>
<td>$55,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muncie Police Department</td>
<td>$77,175</td>
<td>$77,175</td>
<td>$25,725</td>
<td>$25,725</td>
<td>$102,900</td>
<td>$102,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru Police Department</td>
<td>$14,346</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$21,346</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski County Police Department</td>
<td>$8,620</td>
<td>$14,917</td>
<td>$2,873</td>
<td>$4,971</td>
<td>$11,492</td>
<td>$19,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph County Police Department</td>
<td>$178,871</td>
<td>$178,888</td>
<td>$59,577</td>
<td>$59,629</td>
<td>$238,448</td>
<td>$238,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Narcotics Task Force</td>
<td>$128,625</td>
<td>$126,411</td>
<td>$42,875</td>
<td>$42,137</td>
<td>$171,500</td>
<td>$168,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph County</td>
<td>$136,811</td>
<td>$136,811</td>
<td>$45,604</td>
<td>$45,604</td>
<td>$182,415</td>
<td>$182,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starke County Police Department</td>
<td>$14,637</td>
<td>$14,751</td>
<td>$15,191</td>
<td>$15,309</td>
<td>$29,828</td>
<td>$30,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tippecanoe County Prosecutor</td>
<td>$57,432</td>
<td>$57,432</td>
<td>$19,144</td>
<td>$19,144</td>
<td>$76,576</td>
<td>$76,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderburgh County</td>
<td>$206,304</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>$68,768</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>$275,072</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigo County</td>
<td>$93,566</td>
<td>$92,591</td>
<td>$31,189</td>
<td>$30,864</td>
<td>$124,755</td>
<td>$123,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren County</td>
<td>$110,345</td>
<td>$107,412</td>
<td>$38,680</td>
<td>$35,804</td>
<td>$149,255</td>
<td>$143,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne County</td>
<td>$71,291</td>
<td>$71,251</td>
<td>$23,764</td>
<td>$23,750</td>
<td>$95,055</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Carroll County</td>
<td>$71,173</td>
<td>$71,769</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$96,173</td>
<td>$96,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley County Prosecutor</td>
<td>$27,480</td>
<td>$27,480</td>
<td>$9,160</td>
<td>$9,160</td>
<td>$36,640</td>
<td>$36,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,288,388</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,121,606</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,108,257</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,335,097</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,396,454</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,456,703</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 For Indiana State Police, the "local match" is actually considered a "state match." It was the only state match reported by any of the MJTFs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Force Name</th>
<th>Forfeitures Obtained Within Project Period</th>
<th>Other Income Obtained Within Project Period</th>
<th>Project Income Expended Within Project Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen County Police Department</td>
<td>$30,122</td>
<td>$7,919</td>
<td>$48,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Police Department</td>
<td>$49,243</td>
<td>$6,096</td>
<td>$2,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Police Department</td>
<td>$44,710</td>
<td>$34,380</td>
<td>$45,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluffton Police Department</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Police Department</td>
<td>$4,865</td>
<td>$12,407</td>
<td>$59,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton County</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,874</td>
<td>$7,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connersville Police Department</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Police Department</td>
<td>$25,073</td>
<td>$55,613</td>
<td>$1,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Prosecutor</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County Police Department</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,662</td>
<td>$51,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks County Prosecutor</td>
<td>$263,060</td>
<td>$311,900</td>
<td>$4,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry County Police Department</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard County Prosecutor</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State Police</td>
<td>$9,099</td>
<td>$75,836</td>
<td>$2,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County Drug/Gang Task Force</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokomo Police Department</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosciusko County Police Department</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,745</td>
<td>$6,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County Police Department</td>
<td>$24,619</td>
<td>$30,731</td>
<td>$16,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaPorte County Prosecutor</td>
<td>$14,453</td>
<td>$13,573</td>
<td>$20,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County Justice Agency METRO</td>
<td>$111,366</td>
<td>$219,036</td>
<td>$15,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall County Prosecutor</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$74,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muncie Police Department</td>
<td>$93,495</td>
<td>$58,601</td>
<td>$67,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru Police Department</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski County Police Department</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph County Police Department</td>
<td>$10,619</td>
<td>$6,163</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Narcotics Task Force</td>
<td>$11,129</td>
<td>$9,428</td>
<td>$984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph County</td>
<td>$31,472</td>
<td>$48,109</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starke County Police Department</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tippecanoe County Prosecutor</td>
<td>$3,579</td>
<td>$17,823</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderburgh County</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigo County</td>
<td>$54,455</td>
<td>$30,936</td>
<td>$18,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren County</td>
<td>$79</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne County</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$46,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Carroll County</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White County</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$801,439</td>
<td>$954,832</td>
<td>$519,024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Eight task forces did not submit information on beginning and ending project balances, forfeitures and seizures obtained within project period, or income expended during project period.

Another source of variation in MJTF funding sources is asset forfeiture proceeds (Table 5). Task forces reported the values of the assets forfeited during project periods. In terms of forfeiture totals for the two year period, three task forces reported total forfeiture values between $1,000 and $10,000, six between
$10,001 and $35,000, and eight between $35,001 and $100,000. In addition, three task forces—Hendricks County Prosecutor Drug Task Force, Marion County Justice Agency METRO Drug Task Force, Muncie Police Department Drug Task Force—reported total forfeiture values in excess of $100,000. More detail on asset seizures and the proceeds from asset forfeitures is provided in Tables 17 and 18.

Finally, in terms of project income expended within project period, four task forces reported expenditures during the two year period between $1,000 and $20,000, six between $20,001 and $50,000, four between $50,001 and $100,000, and eight between $100,001 and $200,000. In addition, four task forces—Hendricks County Prosecutor Drug Task Force, Lake County Police Department Drug Task Force, Marion County Justice Agency METRO Drug Task Force, and Muncie Police Department Drug Task Force—reported expenditures in excess of $200,000—with Marion County Justice Agency METRO Drug Task Force reporting the greatest expenditure total at $590,516.

**MJTF production during the 2002 and 2003 periods**

Based on the review of ICJI’s archive of MJTF performance reports, the production by individual task force operations can be characterized in several different ways. Individual offenders can be arrested. Cases against suspected offenders can be built and sent to prosecutors. From this, convictions can be obtained. In addition, illegal drugs can be seized. Drug laboratories or production facilities can be dismantled. Finally, assets held by offenders can be seized, and ultimately forfeited through sale or auction. The following tables characterize these various production measures for the 35 Indiana MJTFs during 2002 and 2003.

**Drugs of primary focus as identified by task forces (Table 6).** In addition to the quantitative information referenced above, task forces were also asked to report their drugs of primary focus in 2002 and 2003. These are described in Table 6.

**Arrests, convictions, and cases**

One function of MJTFs is to arrest drug offenders, build cases against them, and transfer the cases to state or federal prosecutors. It should be noted in the following tables that comparisons between arrests and convictions are difficult to make because double counting of arrests and convictions likely occurred as persons arrested and convicted for more than one type of drug or more than one type of offense were asked to be counted for each category for which they were arrested and convicted. In addition, arrests in one year are unlikely to correspond with convictions in that year (or even the next) because many arrests will not generate cases that come to trial in the same year. Of course, this also means that one year’s convictions are not necessarily related to that same year’s arrests.
Table 6: Drugs of Primary Focus as Identified by Task Forces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Force Name</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State Police</td>
<td>cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine</td>
<td>cocaine, heroin, MDMA, methamphetamine, powder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cocaine, oxycontin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Narcotics</td>
<td>crack cocaine, heroin, MDMA, methamphetamine, powder cocaine</td>
<td>crack cocaine, heroin, MDMA, methamphetamine, powder cocaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen County Police Department</td>
<td>cocaine, crack, marijuana</td>
<td>cocaine and marijuana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Police Department</td>
<td>crack cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine labs, opiate patches, prescription drugs</td>
<td>cocaine, crack cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine, narcotics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Police Department</td>
<td>cocaine, LSD, marijuana, methamphetamine</td>
<td>cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluffton Police Department</td>
<td>cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine, prescription drugs</td>
<td>cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine, prescr. pills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Police Department</td>
<td>MDMA, methamphetamine, powder cocaine</td>
<td>methamphetamine and powder cocaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connersville Police Department</td>
<td>crack cocaine, methamphetamine, oxycodone</td>
<td>crack cocaine, methamphetamine, oxycodone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Police Department</td>
<td>cocaine, methamphetamine, pharmaceuticals</td>
<td>cocaine, methamphetamine, pharmaceuticals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Prosecutor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County Police Department</td>
<td>cocaine, crack cocaine, powder cocaine, marijuana</td>
<td>cocaine, crack cocaine, powder cocaine, marijuana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks County Prosecutor</td>
<td>cocaine, crack cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine</td>
<td>cocaine, crack cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry County Police Department</td>
<td>prescription medication</td>
<td>prescription drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard County Prosecutor</td>
<td>cocaine</td>
<td>cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County Drug/Gang</td>
<td></td>
<td>cocaine, heroin, marijuana, methamphetamine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokomo Police Department</td>
<td>crack cocaine and methamphetamine</td>
<td>cocaine and meth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosciusko County Police Department</td>
<td>cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine</td>
<td>cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County Police Department</td>
<td>cocaine, crack cocaine, marijuana</td>
<td>cocaine, crack, marijuana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaPorte County Prosecutor</td>
<td>club drugs, cocaine, marijuana, Schedule II substances</td>
<td>cocaine, marijuana, Schedule II substances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County Justice Agency METRO</td>
<td>club drugs, cocaine, methamphetamine</td>
<td>club drugs, cocaine, methamphetamine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall County Prosecutor</td>
<td>cocaine, crystal methamphetamine, marijuana</td>
<td>cocaine, crystal methamphetamine, marijuana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muncie Police Department</td>
<td>cocaine, crack cocaine, marijuana, oxycodine</td>
<td>cocaine, crack cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru Police Department</td>
<td>methamphetamine</td>
<td>methamphetamine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski County Police Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph County Police Department</td>
<td>cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine, pills</td>
<td>cocaine, methamphetamine, pills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph County</td>
<td>cocaine, crack cocaine, marijuana</td>
<td>cocaine, crack cocaine, marijuana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starke County Police Department</td>
<td>marijuana, methamphetamine, oxycodone</td>
<td>marijuana, methamphetamine, prescription drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tippecanoe County Prosecutor</td>
<td>methamphetamine</td>
<td>methamphetamine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderburgh County</td>
<td>club drugs, cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine,</td>
<td>club drugs, cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigo County</td>
<td>cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine, prescription drugs</td>
<td>cocaine and methamphetamine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne County</td>
<td>cocaine, fraud, powder cocaine, scheduled drugs</td>
<td>cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine, prescription drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren County</td>
<td>cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine, prescription drugs</td>
<td>cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine, prescription drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley County Prosecutor</td>
<td>marijuana, MDMA, methamphetamine, pharmaceuticals</td>
<td>cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine, prescription pills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton County</td>
<td>marijuana and methamphetamine</td>
<td>cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Carroll County</td>
<td>cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine</td>
<td>cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine, prescription pills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
1) Of the 35 task forces, 83 percent (29/35) reported drugs of primary focus in 2002 and 91 percent (33/35) reported this information in 2003.
Total arrests and convictions by type of offense (Table 7). Reports filed with ICJI indicate that reporting MJTFs made nearly 14,000 arrests in 2002 and 2003. During this same two-year period, there were just under 4,200 convictions. However, these are likely undercounts due to incomplete reporting. Of the 35 task forces, 86 percent (30/35) reported arrests by offense type in 2002, and 91 percent (32/35) reported this information for 2003. In addition, 69 percent (24/35) reported convictions by offense type in 2002, and 74 percent (26/35) reported this information for 2003. Arrest and convictions were separated into six different offense types--Manufacturing/Cultivating, Importing/Transporting, Distributing/Selling, Buying, Possession/Using/Consuming, and Other. Of these offense types during the two year period, Possession/Using/Consuming accounted for the greatest number of arrests at 7,776, followed by Distributing/Selling (4,708), Manufacturing/Cultivating (741), Other (350), Buying (212), and Importing/Transporting (50). In terms of convictions, the ordering for the greatest frequency of offense types was the same as for arrests with Possession/Using/Consuming accounting for the greatest number of convictions at 2,236, followed by Distributing/Selling (1,482), Manufacturing/Cultivating (216), Other (154), Buying (64), and Importing/Transporting (35).

Table 7: Total Arrests and Convictions by Type of Offense 1, 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Offense</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>Total Arrests</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>Total Convictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possession/Using/Consuming</td>
<td>3,566</td>
<td>4,210</td>
<td>7,776</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>2,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributing/Selling</td>
<td>2,379</td>
<td>2,329</td>
<td>4,708</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>1,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing/Cultivating</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importing/Transporting</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,499</td>
<td>7,338</td>
<td>13,837</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>2,279</td>
<td>4,187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Double counting of arrests and convictions likely occurred because persons arrested and convicted for more than one type of drug or more than one type of offense were asked to be counted for each category for which they were arrested and convicted.

1 Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 86% (30/35) reported arrests by offense type in 2002, and 91% (32/35) reported this information for 2003.
2 Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 69% (24/35) reported convictions by offense type in 2002, and 74% (26/35) reported this information for 2003.

Total number of persons arrested by demographic characteristics (Table 8 and Table 9). Demographic information on arrests was available for gender, race, and age of arrestees, although again there is not complete reporting. Of the 35 task forces, 83 percent (29/35) reported arrest information by demographics for 2002 and 89 percent (31/35) reported this information for 2003. In terms of gender, males accounted for 77 percent of total arrestees and females accounted for 19 percent. The comparatively large “unclassified” designation followed from one task force’s bracketing of responses and represented 5 percent of arrestees. In terms of race, whites accounted for the greatest number of arrests with 61 percent, followed by blacks (26 percent), Hispanics (5 percent), and other (2 percent). Similar to gender, “unclassified” accounted for 6 percent of arrestees. In terms of age, 92 percent of arrestees were 18 years or older.
Table 8 offers different detail on the demographic characteristics of arrestees, by excluding the “unclassified” arrestees. The typical arrestee was a white, adult male. Fewer than 4.0 percent of arrestees were juvenile.

Table 8: Total Number of Persons Arrested by Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total Arrests</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>2,192</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,303</td>
<td>4,708</td>
<td>9,011</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,349</td>
<td>6,387</td>
<td>11,736</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Total Arrests</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black American</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>1,799</td>
<td>3,014</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td>236</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,554</td>
<td>3,646</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td></td>
<td>173</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,349</td>
<td>6,387</td>
<td>11,736</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total Arrests</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 or younger</td>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 or older</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,166</td>
<td>5,617</td>
<td>10,783</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,349</td>
<td>6,387</td>
<td>11,736</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 83% (29/35) reported arrest information by demographics for 2002, and 89% (31/35) reported this information for 2003.

2 One task force submitted bracketed totals for some information. This information represents the unclassified values.
Table 9: Total Number of Persons Arrested in 2002 and 2003, by Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
<td>18 years or older</td>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black American</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2,394</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>5,399</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, classified</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>8,512</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As percent of persons arrested

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
<td>18 years or older</td>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black American</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, classified</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The majority of the Unclassified arrests were defined as such because they were not entered according to race, sex, or age of the arrestee. Rather, these entries represented the reporting method of one of the task forces and their use of bracketed responses. The remaining Unclassified arrests were the result of the absence/failure to report on one of the three demographic characteristics of arrestees.

Number of arrests by offense type by MJTF by year (Table 10). The number of arrests by offense type was dominated by possession and distribution. Of the 35 task forces, 86 percent (30/35) reported arrests by offense type in 2002 and 91 percent (32/35) reported this information for 2003. Of the five offense types, Possessing/Using/Consuming accounted for the greatest number of arrests over the two year period with 7,776. This was followed by Distributing/Selling (4,708), Manufacturing/Cultivating (741), Other (350), Buying (212), and Importing/Transporting (50). The number of arrests in Table 9 exceeds the number of persons arrested because persons arrested for more than one type of drug or more than one type of offense were required by the ICJI questionnaire to be counted for each category for which they were arrested.

Number of convictions by offense type by MJTF by year (Table 11). The patterns of convictions generally followed that of arrests during 2002 and 2003. Of the 35 task forces, 69 percent (24/35) reported convictions by offense type in 2002, and 74 percent (26/35) reported this information for 2003. As with arrests by offense type, convictions were separated into five offense types. Of these offense types, Possessing/Using/Consuming accounted for the greatest number of convictions over the two year period with 2,236 followed by Distributing/Selling (1,482), Manufacturing/Cultivating (216), Other (154), Buying (64), and Importing/Transporting (33). Again, double counting of convictions likely occurred here because persons convicted for more than one type of drug or more than one type of offense were required to be counted for each category for which they were convicted.
# Table 10: Number of Arrests by Offense Type by MJTF by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Force Name</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Cultivating</th>
<th>Importing, Transporting</th>
<th>Distributing, Selling</th>
<th>Buying</th>
<th>Possession, Using, Consuming</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Annual subtotals</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen County Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Police Department</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Police Department</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluffton Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Police Department</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connersville Police Department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Police Department</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Prosecutor</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks County Prosecutor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry County Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard County Prosecutor</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State Police</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokomo Police Department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosciusko County Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaPorte County Prosecutor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County Justice Agency METRO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall County Prosecutor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muncie Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski County Police Department</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph County Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Narcotics Task Force</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starke County Police Department</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tippecanoe County Prosecutor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderburgh County</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigo County</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren County</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne County</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Carroll County</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley County Prosecutor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total                                      | 310           | 431          | 27                      | 23                    | 2,379  | 2,329                        | 153   | 59              | 3,566      |

1 Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 86% (30/35) reported arrests by offense type in 2002, and 91% (32/35) reported this information for 2003.

N/R represents task forces not reporting information for arrests by offense type.

Double counting of arrests likely occurred as persons arrested for more than one type of drug or more than one type of offense were asked to be counted for each category for which they were arrested.
Table 11: Number of Convictions by Offense Type by MJTF by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Force Name</th>
<th>Manufacturing, Cultivating</th>
<th>Importing, Transporting</th>
<th>Distributing, Selling</th>
<th>Buying</th>
<th>Possession, Using, Consuming</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Annual Subtotals</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen County Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Police Department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Police Department</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluffton Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Police Department</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connersville Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Prosecutor</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks County Prosecutor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry County Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard County Prosecutor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State Police</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County Drug/Gang</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokomo Police Department</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosciusko County Police Dept.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County Police Department</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaPorte County Prosecutor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Co. Justice Agency METRO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall County Prosecutor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muncie Police Department</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru Police Department</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski County Police Department</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph County Police Dept.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Narcotics Task Force</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph County</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starke County Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tippecanoe County Prosecutor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderburgh County</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigo County</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren County</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne County</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Carroll County</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley County Prosecutor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 69% (24/35) reported convictions by offense type in 2002, and 74% (26/35) reported this information for 2003.

N/R represents task forces not reporting information for convictions by offense type.

Double counting of convictions likely occurred as persons convicted for more than one type of drug or more than one type of offense were asked to be counted for each category for which they were convicted.
**Total drug arrests by type of drug by year (Table 12).** Regardless of the type of offense involved (e.g., possession, distribution, etc.), different drugs can be involved. ICJI reporting requirements call for information regarding the types of drugs generating arrest activity. In this regard, marijuana forms the bulk of drug arrests, although there are significant quantities of other drugs driving arrests as well. Of the 35 task forces, 83 percent (29/35) reported drug arrests by type of drug for 2002 and 89 percent (31/35) reported this information for 2003. To streamline reporting, drug arrests were combined by Center researchers into three categories: marijuana, cocaine, and other. Other drug arrests consist of club drugs, depressants, inhalants, hallucinogens, hashish, opiates/narcotics, stimulants (which includes methamphetamines), and other drugs. In terms of the distribution of drug arrests by category, 39 percent were for marijuana, 26 percent were for cocaine, and 35 percent were for other in 2002. In 2003, marijuana accounted for 37 percent of drug arrests, cocaine 27 percent, and other 36 percent.

**Total case investigations and outcomes (Table 13).** Another measure included in MJTF reports to ICJI is the number of case investigations produced by task force operations. This measure is broken down further into new cases and (old) cases carried over to the new reporting year. Case status is additionally classified in terms of the number referred for prosecution and the number of cases that are simply discontinued. Of the 35 task forces, 86 percent (30/35) reported investigations initiated and completed information for 2002 and 94 percent (33/35) reported this information for 2003. Cases were assigned to three different categories—new cases, cases carried over (from previous reporting period or previous year), and case outcomes (referred for prosecution and discontinued cases). In excess of 7,000 new cases were initiated annually in both 2002 and 2003. Moreover, a substantial number were referred for prosecution. However, any comparisons based on these “total case investigations” data should be conducted with caution.

### Table 12: Total Drug Arrests by Type of Drug by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Drug</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td>2,069</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>2,367</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>1,722</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,874</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2,298</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5,349</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6,387</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 83% (29/35) reported drug arrests by type of drug for 2002, and 89% (31/35) reported this information for 2003.

When entering arrest data, it was noted that the conviction data was incomplete because task forces claimed that conviction data was maintained by the prosecutor’s office. Similarly, three of the task forces (Floyd County Prosecutor, Howard County Prosecutor, Marshall Pulaski County Police Department) claim to be part of other task forces which suggests that there may be some overlap in the information they provided.

3 One limitation of the information contained in this table relates to cases carried over. Of the 35 task forces, only 14 accurately carried over cases from the previous reporting period (within the same year) in 2002 and 11 in 2003. In addition, only 9 task forces accurately carried over cases from the previous year in 2002 and 0 in 2003. Accuracy was obtained if, after reviewing the reports, the “number of cases carried over from the previous reporting period” matched the “number of cases carried over into next reporting period” from the previous report.
Table 13: Total Case Investigations and Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Status</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of New Cases</td>
<td>7,149</td>
<td>8,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases Carried Over</td>
<td>6,515</td>
<td>8,583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Status</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Referred for Prosecution</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>5,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Discontinued</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>1,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,146</td>
<td>7,487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 86% (30/35) reported investigations initiated and completed information for 2002, and 94% (33/35) reported this information for 2003.

2 Cases Carried Over—Of the 35 Task Forces, 14 accurately carried over cases from the previous reporting period (within the same year) in 2002 and 11 in 2003. In addition, 9 task forces accurately carried over cases from the previous year in 2002 and 0 in 2003. Accuracy was obtained if, after reviewing the reports, the “number of cases carried over from the previous reporting period” matched the “number of cases carried over into next reporting period” from the previous report.

3 “Number of referred” cases are those that have been referred for prosecution. “Number of discontinued” cases are cases for which investigation was discontinued and no prosecution is anticipated. The combination of these case outcomes (referred and discontinued) comprises the total number of case outcomes.

Number of cases carried over, new cases, and cases completed by MJTF by year (Table 14). There is considerable variation in the number of cases initiated and carried over during 2002 and 2003 when the focus shifts to individual MJTF operations. Of the 35 task forces, 89 percent (31/35) reported the number of cases carried over in 2002 and 94 percent (33/35) reported this information for 2003. In addition, of the 35 task forces, 86 percent (30/35) reported the number of new cases in 2002, and 94 percent (33/35) reported this information in 2003. The category, “Case outcomes,” is a count of the number of cases referred for prosecution and the number of cases dismissed for a reporting period. As mentioned above in Table 12, a limitation of the information contained in this table relates to cases carried over (see footnote 3). New cases in 2002 or 2003 range from a low of 10 to a high of 1,753. Meanwhile, there is a regular and substantial backlog of cases carried over from the previous period.

Drugs seized and methamphetamine labs dismantled

The MJTFs seize drugs when offenders are arrested (or even if they are not arrested) for drug violations. In addition, drug manufacturing or processing facilities are typically dismantled or otherwise destroyed when they are uncovered. Both of these activities are reported by MJTFs as part of the ICJI reporting questionnaire.
Table 14: Number of Cases Carried Over, New Cases, and Cases Completed by MJTF by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Force Name</th>
<th>Cases Carried Over From Previous Period</th>
<th>New Cases</th>
<th>Case Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen County Police Department</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Police Department</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Police Department</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluffton Police Department</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Police Department</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton County</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connersville Police Department</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Police Department</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Prosecutor</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County Police Department</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks County Prosecutor</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry County Police Department</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard County Prosecutor</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State Police</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>3,660</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County Drug/Gang Task Force</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokomo Police Department</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosciusko County Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County Police Department</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaPorte County Prosecutor</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County Justice Agency METRO</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall County Prosecutor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muncie Police Department</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru Police Department</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski County Police Department</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph County Police Department</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Narcotics Task Force</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph County</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starke County Police Department</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tippecanoe County Prosecutor</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderburgh County</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigo County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren County</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne County</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Carroll County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley County Prosecutor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,515</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,583</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,149</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 89% (31/35) reported the number of cases carried over in 2002, and 94% (33/35) reported this information in 2003. In addition, of the 35 task forces, 86% (31/35) reported the number of new cases in 2002, and 94% (33/35) reported this information in 2003.

2 Cases Carried Over–Of the 35 task forces, 14 accurately carried over cases from the previous reporting period (within the same year) in 2002 and 11 in 2003. In addition, 9 task forces accurately carried over cases from the previous year in 2002 and 0 in 2003. Accuracy was obtained if, after reviewing the reports, the “number of cases carried over from the previous reporting period” matched the “number of cases carried over into next reporting period” from the previous report.

3 Case Outcomes include the number of cases referred for prosecution and the number of cases dismissed for a reporting period.
Total quantities of drug seizures by type of drug by year (Table 15). A prime activity of all MJTFs is the seizure of illegal drugs. Of the 35 task forces, 86 percent (30/35) reported drug seizure information for 2002 and 94 percent reported this information for 2003. The measurement of drug seizures is not straightforward. One consideration is the type of drugs seized, which can of course vary, and another is what unit of measurement to use to quantify the volume of the seizure. To that end, drug seizures were assigned to one of ten different drug types—club drugs, depressants, cocaine, hallucinogens, hashish, marijuana, opiates/narcotics, other, paraphernalia, and stimulants—and were quantified according to four different units of measurement—dosage units, kilograms, plants, and other.4

Because of differences in the units of measurement, comparisons of drug seizure quantities are difficult. For example, considering the “dosage units” measure, the greatest amount of seizures during the 2002-2003 period was the “other” category,” which accounted for 41 percent of total dosage units seized followed by depressants (17 percent), opiates/narcotics (15 percent), club drugs (11 percent), and stimulants (11 percent).5 Within stimulants, methamphetamines comprised 96 percent of the dosage units seized. In terms of kilograms of drugs seized (and plants), marijuana represented the greatest seizure amount. Cocaine and stimulants each represented 3 percent of the kilograms seized with methamphetamine comprising 30 percent of the total stimulants. Marijuana accounted for 99 percent of the plant seizures while hallucinogens and other represented the remaining 1 percent. In terms of seizures listed by other unit of measurement, other represented 51 percent of the total seizures followed by depressants (23 percent), opiates/narcotics (18 percent), and paraphernalia (7 percent). Hallucinogens, marijuana, and stimulants comprised the remaining 1 percent.

Total number of methamphetamine (meth) labs dismantled (Tables 16, 16a, and 16b). The MJTFs reported the number of meth labs that were dismantled each year. However, less than three-quarters of the MJTFs reported lab information. Of the 35 task forces, 71 percent (25/35) reported methamphetamine labs dismantled information for 2002, and 71 percent (25/35) reported this information for 2003. For Table 16, drug labs dismantled are divided into two categories—labs dismantled by the ISP and drug labs dismantled excluding the ISP. This was done because the ISP assists many of the task forces in dismantling labs. Approximately 1,910 meth labs were dismantled in the two years surveyed here. In total, this is likely to be an undercount of total meth labs dismantled because of the substantial underreporting of this question by the MJTFs. Furthermore, there is substantial variation in the number and types of meth labs dismantled among reporting MJTFs (see Table 16a and 16b). Three MJTFs account for the lion’s share of lab activity during the 2002 and 2003 operating periods. These are Vanderburgh County Drug Task Force (221), Vigo County Drug Task Force (249), and South Central Narcotics Strike Force (211).

Most meth labs dismantled were classified as “Nazi-Type” as shown in Table 16b. The individual MJTFs reported that of the 1,213 labs dismantled, ISP assistance was used 742 times.

4 In addition, several MJTF performance reports documented seizures of various drugs in pounds or ounces. These were all converted to kilograms to maintain a consistent reporting standard.

5 The other category includes the following: Anabolic-Androgenic Steroids, Antidepressants, Paraphernalia, and Other drug (specify)
Table 15: Total Quantities of Drug Seizures by Type of Drug by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Club Drugs</td>
<td>7,138</td>
<td>8,057</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depressants</td>
<td>13,425</td>
<td>9,271</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallucinogens</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>4,885</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hashish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7,405</td>
<td>3,514</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>2,574</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opiates/Narcotics</td>
<td>7,194</td>
<td>13,176</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>46,921</td>
<td>9,512</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,997</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphernalia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulants</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methamphetamine</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>14,756</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75,238</td>
<td>60,306</td>
<td>7,673</td>
<td>4,223</td>
<td>1,304</td>
<td>2,611</td>
<td>2,823</td>
<td>1,380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 86% (30/35) reported drug seizure information for 2002, and 94% (33/35) reported this information for 2003.

Table 16: Total Number of Meth Labs Dismantled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drug Labs Dismantled (excluding ISP)</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>1,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP Labs Dismantled</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>1,910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 71% (25/35) reported meth labs dismantled information for 2002, and 71% (25/35) reported this information for 2003.

2. ISP is included separately because they assist other task forces in dismantling meth labs which results in overlapping of information.

3. The ISP included attachments to their performance reports outlining their activities related to the dismantling of meth labs. The attachment for the first six month report was undated while the second six month report specified the time period when the labs were dismantled. Notably, there is some overlap between the reports for the month of September. In addition, March is omitted from the specified dates for 2002.
Table 16a: Number of Meth Labs Dismantled by MJTF by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Force Name</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Police Department</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Police Department</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluffton Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connersville Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Prosecutor</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard County Prosecutor</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State Police Drug Task Force</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County Drug/Gang Task Force</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokomo Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosciusko County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaPorte County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County Justice Agency METRO Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muncie Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski County Police Department</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Narcotics Task Force</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starke County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tippecanoe County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderburgh County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigo County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Carroll County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>1,910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Completion rate: of the 35 Task Forces, 71% (25/35) reported labs dismantled information for 2002, and 71% (25/35) reported this information for 2003.
2. The Indiana State Police assists nearly all counties in the dismantling of meth labs. As such, there is significant overlap between the ISP figures and other task forces.
3. N/R represents no information reported on task forces dismantled.
4. This figure does not include labs dismantled by ISP in 2003 (ISP dismantled labs statistics not reported by ISP in 2003).
Table 16b: Number of Meth labs Dismantled by MJTF, by Year, and with Indiana State Police Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Force Name</th>
<th>Red Phosphorous</th>
<th>Nazi-Type</th>
<th>Methamphetamine</th>
<th>Methcathanon</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen County Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Police Department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluffton Police Department</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connersville Police Department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Police Department</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Prosecutor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks County Prosecutor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks County Prosecutor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard County Prosecutor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State Police</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County Drug/Gang</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokomo Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosciusko County Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaPorte County Prosecutor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Co. Justice Agency METRO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall County Prosecutor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe County Police Department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski County Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph County Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Narcotics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starke County Police Dept.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tippecanoe County Prosecutor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderburgh County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigo County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16b: Number of Meth Labs Dismantled by MJTF, by Year, and with Indiana State Police Assistance (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Force Name</th>
<th>Red Phosphorous</th>
<th>Nazi-Type</th>
<th>Methamphetamine</th>
<th>Methcathanon</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warren County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Carroll County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley County Prosecutor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ISP reported an additional 15 labs which they classified as other. These labs are not represented in the table.
Assets seized and forfeited

As noted in an earlier section, drug arrests often result in the seizure of assets held by offenders, followed by the forfeiture via sale or auction of some or all of the assets previously seized. The Indiana MJTFs are required to report on the numbers of different types of assets seized, an estimate of their individual values, and the amount of funds obtained from the forfeiture of the assets. In comparing assets and forfeitures, at least two factors should be considered. First, comparisons between the number of seizures and the estimated value of seizures should be made with caution as there is not always a number of seizures to correspond with a value. Second, comparisons between seizures and forfeitures should be made with caution as the information on forfeitures could be carried over from previous reporting periods as a result of the time it takes to process seizures and convert them into forfeitures.

Assets seized and forfeited and values by asset category by year (Table 17). As with other report questions, there is incomplete reporting of this item. Of the 35 task forces, 74 percent (26/35) reported assets seized information for 2002 and 83 percent (29/35) reported this information for 2003. Assets seized and forfeited were combined into five main types—financial, other, property, transport, and weapons. In terms of the number of seizures for the two years, weapons seizures were the greatest with 66 percent of the total, followed by other (20 percent), transport (10 percent), and property and financial (4 percent). In terms of the number of forfeitures, “other” forfeitures were the greatest with 58 percent of the total, followed by transport (16 percent), weapons (13 percent), and financial and property (13 percent).

---

6 When the police arrest someone for an offense for which asset seizure is possible and assets are in fact seized, the police agency can then file a lawsuit in civil court to be given permission for asset forfeiture. Forfeitures can occur at variable periods after the assets have been seized. Certain assets might be held for months or years, possibly because criminal and civil proceedings are delayed. In any given year, there is no certainty at all that forfeitures will equal asset seizures—there might in fact be very little correlation between assets seized in a given year and assets forfeited that same year.

7 Based on the ICJI questionnaire, it is unclear whether “number of seizures” refers to the number of seizure events (e.g., in 1148 seizures in 2002, weapons were seized 700 times) or the number of items seized (e.g., 700 weapons were seized in 2002).
Table 17: Total Number of Assets Seized and Forfeited and Values by Asset Category by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Type</th>
<th>Number of Seizures</th>
<th>Estimated Value of Seizures</th>
<th>Number of Forfeitures</th>
<th>Actual Value of Forfeitures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$2,147,862</td>
<td>$3,368,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>$106,470</td>
<td>$109,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$54,270</td>
<td>$321,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>$644,365</td>
<td>$1,414,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1673</td>
<td>$57,135</td>
<td>$343,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>2446</td>
<td>$3,031,102</td>
<td>$5,558,416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 74% (26/35) reported assets seized information for 2002, and 83% (29/35) reported this information for 2003. Of the 35 task forces, 66% (23/35) reported estimated value of assets information for 2002, and 77% (27/35) reported this information for 2003.

2 Comparisons between the number of seizures and the estimated value of seizures should be made with caution as there is not always a number of seizures to correspond with a value.

3 Comparisons between seizures and forfeitures should be made with caution as the information on forfeitures could be carried over from previous reporting periods as a result of the time it takes to process seizures.

4 Vanderburgh County Drug Task Force submitted bracketed totals for some information. This information represents the unclassified values.

This translates into dollar terms in two ways—as an early estimate of the value of assets seized, and as the money actually obtained through the forfeiture process. For purposes of financing future MJTF operations, it is the volume of forfeitures that are perhaps most important, because these funds can be captured by the individual MJTF and used as a source of program income. In this context, the reporting MJTFs acquired approximately $3.8 million during 2002 and 2003 from asset forfeitures. Again, this is a likely undercount of total funds from asset forfeitures, largely due to reporting shortfalls.

**Number and value of assets seized and forfeited by MJTF by year (Table 18).** There is substantial variation in seizure and forfeiture activity among the MJTFs. Of the 35 task forces, 66 percent (23/35) reported estimated value of assets information for 2002, and 77 percent (27/35) reported this information for 2003. In terms of the combined seizure values for both years, five task forces reported estimated seizure values between $1000 and $10,000, seven between $10,001 and $50,000, five between $50,001 and $150,000, seven between $150,001 and $300,000, and three between $300,001 and $1 million. In addition, three task forces—Indiana State Police Drug Task Force, Lake County Police Department Drug Task Force and Marion County Justice Agency METRO Drug Task Force—reported estimated seizure values in excess of $1 million—with Marion County Justice Agency METRO Drug Task Force reporting the greatest estimated value at $1,533,550.

However, total seizure values do not necessarily translate into forfeiture values. In terms of the combined forfeiture values for both years, four task forces reported total forfeiture values between $1,000 and $10,000, nine between $10,001 and $50,000, three between $50,001 and $150,000, and three between $150,001 and $300,000. In addition, five task forces—Hendricks County Prosecutor Drug Task Force, Marion County Justice Agency METRO Drug Task Force, Lake County Police Department Drug Task Force, Allen County Police Department Drug Task Force, Johnson County Drug/Gang Task Force—reported total forfeiture values in excess of $300,001—with Johnson County Drug/Gang Task Force reporting the greatest estimated value at $765,500.
Table 18: Number and Value of Assets Seized and Forfeited by MJTF by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Force Name</th>
<th>2002 Assets Seized</th>
<th>2003 Assets Seized</th>
<th>Total Assets Seized</th>
<th>2002 Forfeitures</th>
<th>2003 Forfeitures</th>
<th>Total Forfeitures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen County Police Department</td>
<td>$109,239</td>
<td>$352,096</td>
<td>$461,335</td>
<td>$566,932</td>
<td>$99,031</td>
<td>$665,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Police Department</td>
<td>$92,000</td>
<td>$138,160</td>
<td>$230,160</td>
<td>$30,942</td>
<td>$19,098</td>
<td>$50,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Police Department</td>
<td>$14,800</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$15,300</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluffton Police Department</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Police Department</td>
<td>$90,717</td>
<td>$58,463</td>
<td>$149,180</td>
<td>$52,044</td>
<td>$81,950</td>
<td>$133,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton County</td>
<td>$4,950</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$17,950</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connersville Police Department</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Police Department</td>
<td>$16,813</td>
<td>$73,764</td>
<td>$90,577</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$27,205</td>
<td>$27,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Prosecutor</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>$32,704</td>
<td>$32,704</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County Police Department</td>
<td>$17,045</td>
<td>$18,590</td>
<td>$35,635</td>
<td>$6,651</td>
<td>$13,861</td>
<td>$20,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks County Prosecutor</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$202,200</td>
<td>$216,200</td>
<td>$116,790</td>
<td>$257,615</td>
<td>$374,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry County Police Department</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard County Prosecutor</td>
<td>$20,453</td>
<td>$22,840</td>
<td>$43,293</td>
<td>$3,960</td>
<td>$17,702</td>
<td>$21,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State Police</td>
<td>$293,461</td>
<td>$897,148</td>
<td>$1,190,609</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County Drug/Gang Task Force</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>$886,531</td>
<td>$886,531</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>$765,500</td>
<td>$765,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokomo Police Department</td>
<td>$68,398</td>
<td>$66,251</td>
<td>$134,649</td>
<td>$22,493</td>
<td>$8,414</td>
<td>$25,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosciusko County Police Department</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>$157,300</td>
<td>$166,297</td>
<td>$4,952</td>
<td>$28,852</td>
<td>$33,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County Police Department</td>
<td>$650,035</td>
<td>$580,727</td>
<td>$1,238,762</td>
<td>$8,602</td>
<td>$433,764</td>
<td>$442,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaFollette County Prosecutor</td>
<td>$57,148</td>
<td>$2,007</td>
<td>$59,155</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County Justice Agency METRO</td>
<td>$593,270</td>
<td>$940,280</td>
<td>$1,533,550</td>
<td>$273,036</td>
<td>$124,825</td>
<td>$397,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall County Prosecutor</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muncie Police Department</td>
<td>$94,853</td>
<td>$26,101</td>
<td>$120,954</td>
<td>$117,445</td>
<td>$67,480</td>
<td>$184,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru Police Department</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski County Police Department</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph County Police Department</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$3,350</td>
<td>$1,350</td>
<td>$6,295</td>
<td>$6,122</td>
<td>$12,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Narcotics Task Force</td>
<td>$184,952</td>
<td>$109,600</td>
<td>$294,552</td>
<td>$38,668</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$75,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph County</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$262,000</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starke County Police Department</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$14,389</td>
<td>$14,489</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$14,389</td>
<td>$14,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tippecanoe County Prosecutor</td>
<td>$9,362</td>
<td>$153,624</td>
<td>$162,986</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,415</td>
<td>$8,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderburgh County</td>
<td>$481,493</td>
<td>$490,640</td>
<td>$972,133</td>
<td>$110,870</td>
<td>$136,519</td>
<td>$247,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigo County</td>
<td>$80,396</td>
<td>$145,454</td>
<td>$225,850</td>
<td>$62,740</td>
<td>$163,311</td>
<td>$226,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren County</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>$1,425</td>
<td>$1,425</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>$1,425</td>
<td>$1,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne County</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>$23,143</td>
<td>$23,143</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Carroll County</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley County Prosecutor</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,030,102</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,533,848</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,563,950</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,423,569</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,358,452</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,782,021</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1) Comparisons between seizures and forfeitures should be made with caution as the information on forfeitures could be carried over from previous reporting periods as a result of the time it takes to process seizures. In addition, many task forces did not report a corresponding forfeiture value, or, conversely, a corresponding seizure value.
2) Of the 35 task forces, eight did not include a corresponding forfeiture value in 2002 and six did not include this figure in 2003.
Appendix 1
Multi-jurisdictional
Task Forces in Indiana, 2002-2003
## Indiana Drug Task Force Supported by Byrne Formula Grant Funds in FY 2002-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Force</th>
<th>Jurisdictions Covered by Task Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Allen, Huntington Counties; Cities of Fort Wayne and Huntington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Police Department</td>
<td>Madison County; City of Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Police Department</td>
<td>Noble, LaGrange, DeKalb, Steuben Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluffton Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Wells County; City of Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Hamilton, Boone Counties; Cities of Carmel, Zionsville and Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Clinton County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connersville Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Fayette, Shelby, Rush, Decatur Counties; Cities of Connersville and Shelbyville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Floyd, Harrison, Clark Counties; Towns of New Albany, Clarksville and Scottsburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County Prosecutor</td>
<td>Assigned to Southeast Indiana Drug Task Force out of the Floyd County Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Grant, Marion Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Hendricks, Putnam Counties; Towns of Brownsburg and Plainfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Henry County; Towns of New Castle, Middletown, Sulphur Springs, Spiceland and Knightstown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard County Prosecutor</td>
<td>Part of Kokomo Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State Police Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County Drug/Gang Task Force</td>
<td>Marion, Johnson Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokomo Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Howard County; City of Kokomo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosciusko County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Kosciusko County; City of Warsaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Lake County; Cities of Cedar Lake, Crown Point, Dyer, East Chicago, Lowell, Merrillville, Munster, New Chicago, Schererville and St. John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaPorte County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>LaPorte County; Cities of LaPorte and Michigan City, Towns of Long Beach, Trail Creek and Kingsford Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County Justice Agency METRO Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Marion, Hamilton Counties; City of Indianapolis and Marion County Police Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Marshall, Fulton, Pulaski Counties; City of Plymouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muncie Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Delaware County; City of Muncie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Miami County; City of Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski County Police Department</td>
<td>Part of Marshall County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Randolph, Jay Counties; Indiana State Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Narcotics Strike Force</td>
<td>Monroe, Brown, Sullivan, Lawrence, Greene Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>St. Joseph County; Cities of South Bend and Aishawakana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starke County Police Department Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Starke County; Town of Knox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tippecanoe County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Tippecanoe County; City of Lafayette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderburgh County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Vanderburgh, Warrick Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigo County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Vigo County; City of Terre Haute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Warren, Benton, Fountain, Vermillion Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Wayne County; City of Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Carroll County Drug Task Force</td>
<td>White and Carroll Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley County Prosecutor Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Whitley County; Town of Columbia City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2
Multi-jurisdictional
Drug Task Force Performance Report Form