

G1179.8  
St 29

Issued February 1989

# **GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE ON DRUG ABUSE**

**STATEWIDE STRATEGY  
FOR DRUG & VIOLENT  
CRIME CONTROL**



**Col. James B. Adams  
Chairman  
Arthur C. Eads  
Vice Chairman  
Jorge A. Solis  
Al Schorre  
Jerry P. Cunningham  
John M. Bott  
John A. Burns  
Bobby S. Weaver  
Christopher L. Milner**

**STATE OF TEXAS  
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR  
CRIMINAL JUSTICE DIVISION**

**GOVERNOR WILLIAM P. CLEMENTS, JR.**



0CLC 20613562

Government Publications  
Texas State Documents

NOV 22 1989 *pl*

Dallas Public Library





Governor's Task Force on Drug Abuse  
Drug Policy Subcommittee

# Statewide Strategy for Drug and Violent Crime Control

**February 1989**

*William P. Clements, Jr., Governor  
Rider Scott, Executive Director  
Criminal Justice Division*



PROCLAMATION  
BY THE  
Governor of the State of Texas

---

TO ALL TO WHOM THESE PRESENTS SHALL COME:

ESTABLISHING A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE  
GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE  
ON DRUG ABUSE

WHEREAS, Executive Order WPC-87-9, dated May 13, 1987, created the Governor's Task Force on Drug Abuse; and

WHEREAS, Congress passed and the President signed the Omnibus Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 (p.L. 99-570) which will provide Texas with over \$30 million to fight this menace in our state; and

WHEREAS, the intent of the federal legislation and the recommendation of the Justice Department is to coordinate the expenditure of these moneys and to enhance their effective use in combating substance abuse.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, William P. Clements, Jr., Governor of Texas, under authority vested in me do hereby create and establish the Drug Policy Subcommittee of the Governor's Drug Abuse Task Force.

The Subcommittee is charged with the responsibility of developing a statewide drug strategy with input from all parties interested in combating this problem. The Subcommittee will make recommendations for the expenditure of funds under the Act, and will report on the expenditure of funds by all agencies receiving federal drug abuse funds, and will perform other duties as requested by the Governor.

The members of the Subcommittee will be performing functions in aid of the State and will serve without compensation but may be reimbursed for their reasonable and necessary expenses.

All agencies of state and local governments are hereby directed to cooperate with and assist the Subcommittee in the performance of its duties.

The Executive Order shall be effective immediately and shall remain in full force and effect until modified, amended or rescinded by me.

Given under my hand this  
20th day of May, 1987.



*W. P. Clements, Jr.*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM P. CLEMENTS, JR.  
Governor

*Jack M. Rains*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jack M. Rains  
Secretary of State






February 14, 1989


The Honorable William P. Clements, Jr.  
Governor of the State of Texas  
State Capitol  
Austin, Texas


Dear Governor Clements:


In accordance with the directives of Executive Order WPC-87-9 establishing the Governor's Task Force on Drug Abuse, we, the members of the Drug Policy Subcommittee of the Task Force, having completed our assigned duties, herewith transmit the statewide drug strategy, including findings and recommendations.


Respectfully submitted,

  
Colonel James B. Adams, Chairman  
Former Director  
Texas Department of Public Safety


  
Arthur C. Eads, Vice Chairman  
District Attorney, Bell County


  
John A. Burns  
Assistant Regional Commissioner  
Southwest Region, U.S. Customs  
Service


  
Christopher Lee Milner  
Assistant U.S. District Attorney  
Chief, South Texas Division

  
John M. Bott  
Special Agent, Drug Enforcement  
Administration

  
Al Schorre  
District Attorney, Midland County

  
Jerry P. Cunningham  
Chairman, Texas Commission on  
Alcohol and Drug Abuse

  
Judge Jorge Solis  
350<sup>th</sup> Judicial District  
Taylor County

  
Bobby S. Weaver  
Sheriff, Gregg County



---

# Table of Contents

|  | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| Introduction to the Strategy .....   | 2           |
| <br><b>Overview of the State</b>   |             |
| I. Nature and Extent of the Problem .....                                    | 8           |
| II. Current Efforts .....  | 22          |
| III. Resource Needs .....  | 33          |
| IV. Areas of Greatest Need.....  | 38          |
| V. Impact of the Strategy on the Drug<br>and Violent Crime Problem.....      | 42          |
| <br><b>Development of the Strategy</b>                                       |             |
| VI. Strategy for Addressing the Problems.....                                | 48          |
| VII. User Accountability .....   | 50          |
| VIII. Coordination of Drug Control Efforts<br>Within the State of Texas..... | 53          |
| IX. Evaluation of the Strategy .....   | 57          |
| X. Data Requirements.....  | 57          |
| <br><b>Appendix</b>  |             |
| Matrix of Testimony Received at Public Hearings .....                        | 82          |

---

## Introduction to the Strategy

On November 18, 1988, President Reagan signed into law the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-690). The anti-drug bill is the most comprehensive assault on drugs in the nation's history. Congress' "get tough" attitude toward illegal narcotics is reflected in the bill.

The Drug Control and System Improvement Grant Program, Title VI, Subtitle C, of the Act, provides funds to assist states and local government in carrying out specific programs that offer a high probability of improving the functioning of the criminal justice system and enhancing drug control efforts at the state and local levels. It focuses principally on drug control, with emphasis on drug-related violent crimes.

The bill authorizes the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), U.S. Department of Justice, to make grants to states, to be used by states and units of local government, for the purpose of enforcing state and local laws that establish offenses similar to offenses in the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) and to improve the functioning of the criminal justice system, with emphasis on violent and serious offenders. Grants may provide personnel, equipment, training, technical assistance, and information systems for the more widespread apprehension, prosecution, adjudication, detention, and rehabilitation of persons who violate such laws. Also, the program authorizes grants to provide assistance to the victims of such crimes

(other than compensation).

Twenty-one specific programs authorized for funding by BJA are specified, ranging from multijurisdictional task force programs to projects designed to improve the operational effectiveness of the court process. States have the authority to identify the legislatively authorized programs that will receive priority funds. Each state is required by the Act to establish a drug and violent crime policy board. In Texas, the Governor's Task Force on Drug Abuse Drug Policy Subcommittee performs this function.

The Drug Policy Subcommittee was appointed by executive order of Governor William P. Clements, Jr., to serve as a forum for communication and a structure for coordination of drug law enforcement projects within the state. The subcommittee is charged with the responsibility of developing a statewide strategy for drug and violent crime control. Members are as follows:

## *Membership of the Drug Policy Subcommittee of the Governor's Task Force on Drug Abuse*

### **Colonel James P. Adams**

Colonel James P. Adams is the retired Director of the Texas Department of Public Safety, a position he held from January 1980 until May 1987. Colonel Adams began his distinguished career in public service as Assistant County Attorney of Limestone County, Texas, and was subsequently elected to the Texas House of Representatives. He resigned from that office in order to accept appointment as a Special Agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in July 1951, where he served over 27 years, attaining the position of Associate Director, the second highest ranking FBI official. In 1978 he was the recipient of the Attorney General's Award for Distinguished Service, and in 1979 he was awarded the National Intelligence Distinguished Service Medal by the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency on behalf of the National Foreign Intelligence Community. In 1979 he retired from the FBI and served as Executive Director of the Criminal Justice Division of the Office of the Governor, State of Texas, until his appointment by the Public Safety Commission to the director position of the Texas Department of Public Safety. His varied and extensive background in law enforcement and drug control, at both the federal and state level, provides the drug policy subcommittee with unmatched law enforcement expertise.

### **The Honorable Arthur C. (Cappy) Eads**

The Honorable Arthur C. (Cappy) Eads is presently the elected District Attorney for the 27th Judicial District, Bell County, Texas, a position he has held since 1976. He has enjoyed a very distinguished career as a prosecuting attorney, beginning as an investigator for the District Attorney's Office, 27th Judicial District of Texas, in 1968. His career also includes service as an Assistant District Attorney and County Attorney for the 27th Judicial District. Mr. Eads' professional affiliations include Chairman of the Board of the National District Attorneys Association, an organization in which he has been active for many years. He has also served as President of the Texas District and County Attorneys Association, and as a presidential appointee to the President's Child Safety Partnership. He has contributed his vast experience and expertise as a prosecuting attorney to the drug policy board and was instrumental in structuring drug prosecution recommendations in the 1987 Statewide Drug Strategy.

---

### **Jerry P. Cunningham**

Jerry P. Cunningham represents the area of drug treatment and rehabilitation in his service on the drug policy subcommittee. He is Chairman of the Board of the Texas Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse, the state agency responsible for drug treatment and rehabilitation in Texas. Mr. Cunningham was appointed as chairman of this governing board by Governor Clements in recognition of his service as Commissioner of the Texas Commission on Alcoholism from 1979 through 1985. He recently retired from his position as Director of Industry Affairs with Sedco Forex after more than 32 years of service.

### **The Honorable Jorge Solis**

The Honorable Jorge Solis is the newly elected District Judge for the 350th Judicial District, representing Taylor County. He began his career in criminal prosecution as an Assistant District Attorney for Taylor County in 1976 and was elected Criminal District Attorney of that county in 1983, a position he resigned in 1988 to seek election to the bench. Judge Solis is very active in local civic and human service organizations, including service on the advisory board of Abilene HRRS Drug Treatment and Rehabilitation Center.

### **The Honorable Al Schorre**

The Honorable Al Schorre is the District Attorney for the 142nd Judicial District, Midland County. He has served in this capacity since his election in 1985. His career as a prosecutor began in 1973 with service as First Assistant District Attorney for the 27th Judicial District of Texas and includes seven years of private practice with the law firm of Stubbsman, McRae, Sealy, Laughlin and Browder in Midland. In addition to lending his expertise as a prosecutor to the drug policy subcommittee, he brings the experience gained from his service as Director of the Council Against Substance Abuse.

### **Special Agent John M. Bott**

John M. Bott is presently Special Agent for the Drug Enforcement Administration, Houston Division, and serves as coordinator of one of the division's drug enforcement groups. Mr. Bott began his career in drug control in 1971 as a Special Agent for the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, U.S. Justice Department, in Chicago, Illinois. He served as a Special Agent for the Drug Enforcement Administration in

---

Chicago from 1973, when the newly formed agency was created, until 1985, when he was selected as coordinator of the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force for the Houston DEA Division. He is representative of federal drug law enforcement efforts in his service on the drug policy subcommittee and shares his firsthand knowledge and experience of metropolitan drug trafficking problems.

### **Assistant Commissioner John A. Burns**

John A. Burns currently holds the position of Assistant Regional Commissioner for Enforcement, U.S. Customs Service, Houston, Texas. Since his selection for this position in April 1986, he has been responsible for U.S. Customs law enforcement efforts in the Southwest Region, which includes Texas, Arizona, Oklahoma, and New Mexico. He began his career with the U.S. Customs Service in 1970 serving as a Special Agent in Chicago, Illinois. From 1979 through 1986, he served in San Diego, California, in various capacities, including Special Agent, Coordinator of the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force, and Assistant Special Agent in Charge. Additionally, Mr. Burns serves as Deputy Coordinator for Operation Alliance, the narcotics interdiction effort along the Southwest Border.

### **Sheriff Bobby S. Weaver**

Sheriff Bobby S. Weaver presently serves as Sheriff of Gregg County, Texas, a position he has held since his first election in 1980. He has an extensive career in law enforcement, beginning as a highway patrolman for the Texas Department of Public Safety and serving with the White Oak Police Department. His career is distinguished by his selection as Director of the Sheriffs' Association of Texas and President of the East Texas Peace Officers' Association. He is also a recipient of the Distinguished Service Award from the Reserve Officers' Association of America. The local law enforcement experience that he brings to the drug policy subcommittee is enhanced by his varied experience with local civic organizations.

---

The statewide strategy is designed to serve as a blueprint for the coordination of drug and violent crime control efforts, and the targeting of resources within the state. Since a thorough analysis of the nature and extent of the narcotics problem is essential in the development of a response that results in the greatest impact, the Drug Policy Subcommittee held statewide hearings to solicit testimony regarding narcotic trafficking and abuse. Public hearings were held January 4, 5, and 6, 1989, in Houston, Arlington, and El Paso, respectively.

---

*Drug abuse is an equal opportunity destroyer. Because of illegal narcotics, crimes are committed, lives are shattered, homes are invaded, and the safety of society is increasingly in jeopardy.*

---

Notification of the hearings was widely disseminated through publication in the Texas Register, statewide press releases, notices, and personal invitations to federal, state, and local law enforcement officials, governmental agency representatives, service providers, and the general public. Approximately 3,500 notices were mailed by the Criminal Justice Division to ensure full participation of public officials and private citizens in the development of Texas' statewide drug strategy. State and local notification included: district judges, county judges, district parole supervisors, adult probation supervisors, chief ju-

venile probation officers, chiefs of police, sheriffs, district attorneys, county attorneys, mayors, school superintendents, education service center directors, treatment providers, regional council of governments directors, and criminal justice agency representatives. Federal officials notified included U.S. Attorneys, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Drug Enforcement Administration, U.S. Customs, the Border Patrol, U.S. Marshals, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

In total, 31 witnesses testified to the severity of the drug problem in their regions, making recommendations to improve drug control in Texas. These recommendations are the basis for the programs given priority in the strategy.

In addition, the United States Attorneys in Texas met with Governor Clements and his staff on February 6, 1989, to brief the governor on the narcotics situation in their jurisdictions. The valuable input received in this meeting has been incorporated into the strategy.

The Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 provides \$6.7 million to Texas for fiscal year 1989. It will be used to continue the Texas Narcotics Control Program, a drug law enforcement program developed in 1987 that emphasizes the use of multi-jurisdictional task forces to enhance drug control.

Law enforcement professionals and state officials have praised the program's concept. George Luciano,



former Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance, while addressing a group of law enforcement officers gathered in Austin for the Texas Narcotics Control Program's first organizational conference, remarked, "I compliment Governor Clements and each of you for your participation in the development of a comprehensive approach to the drug problem."

Drug abuse is an equal opportunity destroyer. Because of illegal narcotics, crimes are committed, lives are shattered, homes are invaded, and the safety of society is increasingly in jeopardy. Drug dealers profit at the terrible expense of others, and they must be held accountable. In the words of Governor Clements, "We must shut down the drug business. We must reach out to Texas young people and educate them about the hazards of drug use. We must extend a hand of help and of concern to those individuals who turn to drugs. And, if we do this, we will reduce crime as well."

---



# Anti-drug program praised

Federal aid credited for drug seizures

# Bexar jail testing links drugs, crime

Drugs crowding prison doors, TDC study says

*Raid nets agents record cash haul*

# Speed epidemic takes hold

'Poor man's cocaine' popular in N. Texas

# Feds: Drug money soars in S. Texas

Police blame drugs for rise in crime

\$200 million in narcotics seized in Texas through federal program

# Customs finds 2,735-pound cocaine load

Drug abuse report offers grim details

Cocaine deaths up; amphetamines popular

# Cuban drug ring tied to 9 slayings

Law officers reaching for more firepower

Drug dealers have them outgunned, police say

# Slayings hit high as Dallas drug activity rises

# Counties unite to battle drugs

El Paso is headquarters for task force

Austin police confront rise in 'speed' labs

Border Patrol lauds drug dogs

Narcotics task force raids sweep up 20 suspects

## I. Nature and Extent of the Problem

Illegal drug trafficking is so pervasive in Texas that it is considered to be the most critical crime problem in our state. It has evolved into a crime that is sophisticated in method and quite complex in nature.

In Texas, we are concerned not only with narcotic demand and abuse, but also with responding to problems associated with the transshipment and domestic production of drugs. In the state as a whole, we are plagued by an alarmingly substantial amount of drug distribution by resident Texans and persons from other states and nations. Drugs are smuggled into Texas by land, air, and sea through organized, well-financed networks of career criminals. The Texas Department of Public Safety seized illegal drugs worth \$1.78 billion in 1988, up 2-1/2 times over the 1987 figure.

---

### **Factors in Texas' Drug Problem**

---

Principal factors contributing to Texas' narcotic and related crime problems are the geographical location and geographical composition of the state. These ingredients directly color the nature and extent of our illegal drug situation and compound the problem across the state.

Texas law enforcement officials police 262,017 square miles of land mass, an area large enough to fit 15 of the 50 states within its borders and still have 1,000 square miles left over. The boundary of Texas extends 3,816 miles, with Louisiana to the east,

Arkansas to the northeast, Oklahoma to the north, New Mexico to the west, and Mexico and the Gulf of Mexico to the south. The Rio Grande River forms the international boundary between Texas and Mexico and extends 1,248 miles along the Texas border. The tidewater coastline of the Gulf of Mexico extends 624 miles.

Not only is Texas geographically vast; the terrain of the state also differs dramatically from one region of the state to another. The state's surface ranges from coastal plains along the entire arc of the Gulf of Mexico, to grassy, rolling prairies covering thousands of square miles where ranches and the cattle industry thrive, to deep forests that blanket millions of East Texas acres. In the Central Texas Hill Country, steep limestone hills enfold secluded valleys. There are also mountainous and desert areas in the Trans-Pecos region.

The composition of each region contributes significantly to the type and quantities of drugs that are transshipped or produced in each particular area. Although the state as a whole experiences similar problems with narcotics, geographical factors do influence the situation in each particular region, resulting in varying problems throughout the state. The extensive sparsely populated regions of south and west Texas are ideally suited for the undetected smuggling of cocaine, marijuana, and heroin from Mexico via air or land.

Texas contains dense woodlands,

including 10.9 million acres of pine hardwood forests in East Texas known as the "Piney Woods." They extend over all or parts of 43 counties and include four national forests, covering 703,913 acres. These woodlands are conducive to the domestic production of marijuana, a problem that is significant in Texas. Illegal marijuana farming has exploded into a billion-dollar industry in Texas, surpassing the state's feed grains (\$1.1 billion) and cotton crops (\$950 million) in value, according to 1986 Texas Department of Agriculture figures. Texas marijuana production is large-scale, well-financed, and highly organized. National and international crime syndicates bankroll many of the largest growers.

Texas' woodlands, national forests, and commercial timberlands cleared by cutting operations are primary areas of marijuana cultivation because of favorable climatic conditions and the remoteness of the areas. Experts believe that the illegal crops are grown in virtually every region of the state. During the 1988 calendar year, 2.2 million marijuana plants were eradicated by local, state, and federal authorities. The total street value of the eradicated plants is estimated at \$1.2 billion by the Texas Department of Public Safety Narcotics Service.

A significant amount of marijuana is also cultivated for the drug trade by small-scale operators who may produce up to 100 pounds per year. It is

common for this type of marijuana producer to choose a spot that is owned or leased by lumber companies. The drugs can be grown and harvested without detection because of the sheer density of the forest and because lumber company officials cannot regularly inspect each timber plot.

---

*Illegal marijuana farming has exploded into a billion-dollar industry in Texas, surpassing the state's feed grains (\$1.1 billion) and cotton crops (\$950 million) in value, according to 1986 Texas Department of Agriculture figures.*

---

The vast rural areas of the state also provide the necessary seclusion for the clandestine manufacture of amphetamines and methamphetamines, known commonly as "speed." Speed laboratories have been found in homes, warehouses, motor homes, apartments, and hotels. Rural areas are preferred locations for speed labs, with most concentrated in Central, North, and East Texas. In secluded locations, the noxious odor produced during the manufacturing process attracts little attention, allowing undetected production. Trafficking in and abuse of this type of drug are a significant problem in our state, as evidenced by the number of laboratory seizures in the past year, a total of 142 by Texas Narcotics Control Program task forces alone. Texas has the dubious distinction of being the number two producer of this illegal substance, second in the nation only to California.

Texas is renowned for its vast state and interstate highway system, which allows ease of transportation for motorists and the commercial trucking industry. Unfortunately, this highway system also provides ready transportation routes for drugs going to our cities and into other states. In fact, Interstate Highway 10, which runs east-west through the state, is commonly called "the cocaine freeway" because of its direct route from Florida to Los Angeles and its use as a nationwide drug transshipment route. Law enforcement officials have focused on this avenue of trafficking, and many large seizures have resulted. During calendar year 1988, state troopers engaged in their routine traffic duties made over 836 arrests for felony drug violations.

---

*Interstate Highway 10, which runs east-west through the state, is commonly called "the cocaine freeway" because of its direct route from Florida to Los Angeles and its use as a nationwide drug transshipment route.*

---

Texas has a substantial marine smuggling threat because of the 624 miles of gulf coastline that can be used for drug drops or as staging areas. The Intracoastal Waterway has also been used as an avenue for transporting contraband to inland counties. The sizable commercial shrimping, fishing, and marine shipping business operating in the gulf adds to the potential for large-scale drug trafficking on our wa-

terways. One shrimp boat was found to conceal as much as 20,000 pounds of marijuana.

In addition to these factors, geographical location is the key factor to consider in an assessment of the Texas drug problem. Proximity to Mexico makes Texas very attractive to smugglers.

It is a significant factor in the nature and extent of the problem. The Texas-Mexico border has a long history of being an area frequented by smugglers, who bring contraband into Texas through any of the established international ports of entry or between established checkpoints. In recent years, it has been determined that one-third of all illicit drugs entering the United States is either produced by or transshipped through Mexico.

Mexico has been identified as a leading source country for heroin and marijuana entering the United States. An estimated 41% of the heroin that enters the United States is produced in Mexico, which accounts for a steady flow of Mexican brown and black tar heroin into Texas. Mexico is known as one of the world's leading producers of marijuana, exporting an estimated 4,000 tons to the United States in 1987. To underscore the amount of marijuana entering Texas, consider the 10,622 pounds (or over five tons) of marijuana confiscated in 96 separate seizures by the U.S. Border Patrol's El Paso sector during October 1988. Note that this seizure total for one month eclipses the sector's figure for all of

---

fiscal year 1986 — 6,594 pounds.

Although not a source country of cocaine, Mexico is a critical point of transshipment for the narcotic. The cocaine comes from the coca fields of Latin America, is processed in Colombia, and warehoused by Mexican smuggling families before it is transported north to U.S. markets. The smuggling operations are believed to be less risky to traffickers than shipping cocaine directly from South America to the United States. It is estimated that upwards of 30 metric tons of cocaine destined for the United States come through Mexico. Current Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) intelligence reports estimate that half the cocaine entering the United States may soon flow across the Mexican border into Texas for distribution.

International airports in major Texas cities are doors through which much cocaine and heroin enters the state each year. The drugs are shipped in unaccompanied luggage, in passengers' carry-on bags, or hidden in passengers' clothing. Creative smugglers find innovative ways of hiding the drugs in their possessions. Also, despite the obvious risks involved, smugglers often carry the contraband internally to escape detection by law enforcement officers.

It may be difficult to comprehend how such a volume of drug smuggling can go undetected by law enforcement. However, consider that the 1,248-mile Texas-Mexico border is longer than the entire California coastline. The sheer

length of the border, coupled with the ingenuity of profit-driven drug runners, poses a formidable challenge to law enforcement. Cocaine, marijuana, and heroin are smuggled into this state from Mexico by pedestrians, vegetable trucks, jet planes, and every other conceivable conveyance. The El Paso Intelligence Center reports a dramatic increase in drugs smuggled across the border by land vehicles during 1988, a reversal from two years ago.

---

*The 1,248-mile Texas-Mexico border is longer than the entire California coastline. The sheer length of the border, coupled with the ingenuity of profit-driven drug runners, poses a formidable challenge to law enforcement.*

---

Some traffickers disguise the drugs as legal shipments and drive across the international bridges, gambling that customs agents will not detect their contraband, knowing that every vehicle cannot be checked because of the volume of traffic crossing the bridges daily. Other smugglers float their cargo across isolated stretches of the Rio Grande River or use four-wheel drive vehicles and motorcycles to cross.

Millions of dollars of drugs are regularly flown into Texas without a trace. The border lacks adequate radar coverage, and aircraft can enter this state in some areas at high altitudes without being detected. Also, it is possible for smuggling planes to easily head back into Mexico when

being pursued by law enforcement, thereby eluding capture.

As in all parts of the nation, licit drugs that are manufactured for medicinal purposes are a target for drug diversion by traffickers in Texas. The passage of triplicate-prescription legislation, which became effective in January 1982, has been instrumental in reducing Texas' drug-diversion problem. The triplicate-prescription system, operated by the Texas Department of Public Safety, provides an effective tracking system for certain controlled substances, from the prescription issued by the physician, through the dispensing of the drugs by the pharmacist, to the ultimate user. In 1988, the Triplicate Prescription Section processed 626,105 prescription receipts, which represent a 2.10% reduction in Schedule II prescriptions compared with those written for the previous year.

---

### **Drugs of Choice in Texas**

---

The drug and violent crime problems do vary somewhat across the state. However, the main drugs of choice during this reporting period are crack cocaine, cocaine powder, methamphetamine and amphetamines, marijuana, heroin, and a measurable amount of designer drugs. Hallucinogens, opiates, and depressants are also sold and consumed here. There is no region of the state that does not report a significant illegal drug problem or widespread availability of

all types of drugs.

Although the illegal drug problem continues to grow in scope and magnitude, we have clearly identified the nature and extent of the narcotics situation in Texas. Law enforcement officials are knowledgeable as to the types of drugs available on the street, as well as the source and method of distribution for the wide array of contraband marketed today, as illustrated by the following information on the drugs of choice in Texas.

#### **Crack Cocaine**

Reports from law enforcement officials throughout the state indicate that the most severe illicit drug trend in Texas is the alarmingly widespread sale and use of crack, a smokable form of cocaine powder that is produced through a simple chemical procedure using baking soda, heat, and water. It is readily available, relatively cheap, and highly addictive.

In the past two years, crack has rapidly become one of the most marketable drugs available. Crack is sold in capsule or "rock" form, with prices averaging \$20 per rock in Texas. A dealer can purchase an ounce of cocaine powder for around \$1,000, invest another dollar for baking soda, and reap a profit of \$7,000 through street sales.

Traditional drug enforcement strategies are less effective against crack because of the methods by which it is distributed. Sale of crack increasingly has become a mid-level operation organized by interstate gangs of ethnic



groups, particularly Jamaicans, Cubans, and Black Americans. Competition for lucrative crack markets tends to be intense, often resulting in violence. Crack is sold curbside or in "crack houses" that are set up solely for the purpose of distributing the illicit substance. Dealers use apartments and abandoned buildings that are typically heavily fortified to delay entry by police. It is difficult to make cases on crack houses for two reasons. The supply of crack on hand is always limited, with inventory being replenished as necessary, so that it can be quickly disposed of when police arrive. The use of rented or abandoned buildings prevents establishing an affirmative link between the suspect and the property if no drugs are present when a search warrant is executed.

Of great concern is the involvement of juveniles in abuse of and trafficking in crack. Because of its relatively low price — \$10-\$25 per rock throughout Texas — youths can easily purchase the drug. Dealers use teens extensively to help ply their trade either as couriers, curbside small-quantity dealers, or "good eyes" (responsible for watching for police).

### **Cocaine Powder**

Cocaine powder continues to rank as a drug of choice throughout Texas. The availability and purity of cocaine are on the increase, averaging \$100 per gram, \$800-1200 per ounce, or \$18,000 per kilogram throughout the state. Purity generally ranges from 63 to 92 percent. This trend indicates that a

high volume of the illicit drug is available.

Mexican national, Colombian, Cuban, and Jamaican organizations dominate the cocaine importation and distribution networks operating in Texas. Intelligence indicates that Colombians are increasingly aligning with Mexican drug-trafficking organizations. The seizure in October 1988 of five tons of cocaine found in a cave at Buena Ventura, Chihuahua, Mexico (100 miles south of El Paso), by the Mexican army is evidence of the escalating use of Mexico by Colombian cartels as a staging area. Narcotics agents report that the cocaine is flown into clandestine airfields in Mexico and then smuggled by land and air into the United States, a less risky operation than smuggling directly from South America.

While Colombians are still the major trafficking group for cocaine in Texas, intelligence reports disclose that Bolivians are now in direct competition with Colombian traffickers. Bolivians are offering to provide 96%-99% pure cocaine for \$2,000-2,500 per kilogram at the laboratory sites in Bolivia or for \$6,000 per kilogram delivered anywhere in Mexico with the client assuming the task of smuggling the purchase into the United States.

### **Methamphetamine and Amphetamine**

Methamphetamine and amphetamine, known as "speed," continue to be in direct competition with cocaine as the stimulant of choice in Texas,


mainly because the effects are similar but the cost is typically less. Average prices range from \$100-120 per gram, \$1,000 per ounce, and around \$12,000 per pound. Note that street prices for cocaine and speed are comparable at this time because of the huge supply in Texas.

Illegal manufacture of speed presents a major problem to Texas drug enforcement officers because great quantities of it are produced here, mainly in Central, North, and East Texas. A small laboratory can be set up for less than \$1,500, producing speed at a cost of 13 cents per gram. Laboratories have been found in homes, warehouses, motor homes, motels, and apartments. There has even been a report of lab operators setting up in an east Texas national forest by using a portable generator for a power supply.

There are tremendous profits to be gained from the manufacture and distribution of this drug, and more criminal offenders are becoming involved in the business. Intelligence indicates that speed cooks and dealers are becoming more organized, with reports that sophisticated high-output operations are being located in isolated outlying areas.

In addition to the profit motive involved in illegal drug production, the ease with which certain chemicals necessary in the manufacturing process are available contributes to the prevalence of laboratories in Texas. A new state law requiring certain reporting requirements for precursor chemicals has been in effect for over one year. Additional legislation is being considered by the Texas Legislature at this time, as discussed in the resource needs

### Seizures of Clandestine Drug Labs By DEA Field Division, Oct. 1, 1987 - June 30, 1988



*Texas is second only to California in seizures of drug labs*

section of this report.

Proper handling and disposal of the chemicals seized in clandestine laboratories is a serious issue, because of the potential health hazard to the officers and the prohibitive expense of chemical disposal.

Of equal concern to law enforcement officers is the amount of violence associated with the manufacture and distribution of speed. Cooks and dealers are typically speed addicts themselves, and the drug induces severe paranoia with long-term use. This results in their being heavily armed, notoriously violent, and unpredictable.

### **Marijuana**

The supply of marijuana is as plentiful as ever in Texas today. It is accessible in all regions of the state. Prices will vary greatly according to the locale in which marijuana is purchased and its source.

In the border cities from El Paso to McAllen, Mexican-grown marijuana can be bought for as little as \$40 per ounce or \$400-\$500 per pound. Farther into the state, the average street price will rise to \$100 per ounce and \$800-\$1,000 for a pound. In multi-pound quantities of 50-100 pounds, this illicit drug can be purchased for about \$550 per pound. This illustrates how prices for drugs rise when they are transported any appreciable distance.

The majority of the staggering quantity of marijuana available is grown in Mexico or Columbia. A small amount comes into the state from far eastern nations such as Thailand.

Mexican and Colombian marijuana is transported through Texas, with the state being used as a staging area to distribute the contraband to other parts of the country. Drug agents report that most of the marijuana seizures in excess of 500 pounds appear to be destined for areas outside of Texas.

Even without these sources for the drug, there would be no shortage of marijuana in our communities. Texas is a leading domestic producer of marijuana, as shown by the 2.2 million plants eradicated in Texas during 1988. Because of the success of the cooperative eradication program operated by federal, state, and local officers, marijuana growers have turned to smaller plots and indoor cultivation to elude detection. Large, well-financed greenhouse and underground marijuana farms have been discovered. Reports indicate that new techniques for the domestic production of marijuana have resulted in growth of a drug that is twice as potent as that grown in earlier years. The latest samples tested for THC content averaged 4.89% THC. Note that Mexican-grown marijuana has averaged about 2% THC and Colombian samples averaged about 4%.

### **Heroin**

Heroin is easily available in all areas of Texas, mainly because the state, particularly the El Paso-Juarez area, is a major shipping route for both Mexican brown and black tar varieties. Most of the trafficking is by Mexican nationals and Mexican-Americans;

however, Black Americans are also involved, obtaining the drug from Houston or border areas.

Officials are concerned about the high purity level of black tar heroin, which rivals Asian white heroin for purity. Seizures made on the border have a purity range of 38% to 70%. By the time it reaches the street, it ranges from 1% to 5% purity.

The average price for black tar heroin is \$300 per gram or \$4,000-\$6,000 per ounce, with prices lower in border areas. Mexican brown heroin is considerably cheaper, costing about \$150 per gram.

Asian heroin is also available, although it is less frequently encountered. Air passenger couriers or the international mail system are the means most often used for smuggling the drug into the United States. In December 1988, DEA agents seized more than six pounds of "China White" heroin, valued at \$5 million, and arrested three Hong Kong citizens. The drugs had arrived in Dallas from Burma or Thailand via Hong Kong and London, with New York as the ultimate destination. Authorities believe this seizure to be evidence of Dallas' surfacing as a key transfer point in the trafficking route from Asia to New York.

---

### **Drug Distribution Networks**

---

Texas is plagued by a multitude of organized networks involved in the manufacture and distribution of drugs, along with other associated crime. A

cross section:

#### **Border Drug Families**

Generations of close-knit families continue their organized smuggling tradition along the Texas-Mexico border. Interlocking groups of relatives on both sides of the river living close to the border easily convey drugs to the other side. Well versed in the difficult terrain, the smugglers dart in and out of the brush and between low bluffs to elude the Border Patrol. Marijuana is marketed in Texas by these organizations, which have controlled the drug's transportation for years. Because the traffickers are frequently related to each other, it is very difficult to penetrate the organizations.

#### **Traditional Organized Crime**

Houston and South Texas have significant problems with illegal weapons trafficking, an operation often associated with organized crime and drug-smuggling activities. The FBI reports that organized drug-dealing operations are becoming more powerful in Houston. In April of 1988, four men in Galveston were arrested for their role in major drug-smuggling operations between Sicily and the United States. The traffickers were involved in importing Asian heroin into the country and distributing it through pizzerias in four states.

#### **Latin American Organized Crime**

The U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration describes Colombian and Mexican drug supply rings as repre-

senting "organized crime at its best" in terms of money and ruthlessness. Estimates put drug revenues in Latin American countries such as Colombia and Bolivia at more than half of those countries' gross national profits. The "La Familia" network became particularly notorious in the United States after the abduction, torture, and murder of a special agent and his Mexican pilot in early 1985. Colombians appear to remain in the higher echelon of the major trafficking organizations, with social and possible business ties with other nationalities and ethnic groups including Cubans, Haitians, Dominicans, Peruvians, Belizians, Mexicans, and Black Americans.

### **Organized Gangs**

Outlaw motorcycle gangs in the state are heavily involved in the production and sale of drugs, particularly meth speed laboratories. The Scorpions, the Banshees, the Ghostriders, the Freewheelers, and the Conquistadors all have Texas outposts, but the Bandidos are the most prominent. Manufacturing, trafficking, and dealing in drugs are still the sources of income for most outlaw motorcycle gangs, though some sources of revenue include sales of stolen motorcycles and parts, supplying young girls as nude dancers or prostitutes, murder and arson for profit, robbery, burglary, and muscle for organized crime. A special 1985 analysis by the Corpus Christi Organized Crime Unit showed that over one-third of the Bandidos based in Texas are convicted felons, and

nearly 60% have felony arrest records.

An alarming trend has been reported from intelligence sources in the Dallas/Fort Worth area, disclosing that gangs of property crime offenders, after release from the Texas Department of Corrections, are becoming more involved in illegal drug laboratory operations, apparently because of the potential profit.

There are beginning to be reports of gang activity by the notorious California youth gangs, the "Bloods" and the "Crips." Texas Department of Public Safety officials believe that 20 to 30 members of the gangs are organizing low-profile drug operations in East Texas and Fort Worth.

### **Ethnic Drug Gangs**

Nontraditional ethnic organizations have become very active in drug trafficking, operating particularly in the Houston and Dallas areas. Organized groups of Cubans, Jamaicans, Colombians, Pakistanis, Nigerians, Puerto Ricans, Panamanians, and Haitians are formed specifically to traffic in drugs, dominating cocaine sales. The size and ruthlessness of the trafficking operations are shocking. In Dallas alone, a recent investigation into Jamaican drug organizations resulted in the identification of 500 individuals involved in cocaine trafficking. Ethnic gangs have quickly established reputations as the most violent and organized drug entrepreneurs in the business. Teenagers help staff the operations and are not spared from violence associated with the drug trade.

---

## **Drug Use Trends**

---

The Texas Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse (TCADA) is charged with the responsibility of drug treatment and rehabilitation. The Commission works with state and federal agency sources to track drug abuse patterns in various parts of the state. The most recently completed study, entitled "Substance Abuse: Changing Patterns in Texas, June 1988 Report," echoes drug trafficking trends reported by law enforcement agencies. Recent data show increasing problems with stimulant abuse. In northern areas, cocaine, amphetamines, and methamphetamines vie for status as the drug of choice; cocaine is preferred in other areas of the state. Opiate-related problems are declining somewhat in southern areas of the state, based on most indicators. Treatment data indicate that the use of needles is no longer decreasing, with an increasing number of needle users seeking treatment for amphetamine problems. Marijuana is no longer the most likely secondary drug problem of treatment clients, having been surpassed by alcohol.

---

## **Drugs and Crime**

---

It is of great concern that illegal drug trafficking not only violates controlled substance laws, but also involves an array of other criminal offenses: racketeering, conspiracy, bribery and corruption of public officials, property crime, auto theft, child abuse

and neglect, tax evasion, banking-law violations, illegal money transfers, crimes involving firearms, and an alarming amount of homicide and violent crime. The indisputable link between drugs and crime that law enforcement and criminal justice officials have theorized about for many years has now been validated by numerous statistical studies.

Recent studies in Texas supported by nationwide National Institute of Justice research indicate that drug use contributes significantly to the onset and continuance of all criminal behavior. Results from Drug Use Forecast (DUF) programs operating in Dallas, Houston, and San Antonio illustrate a very direct relationship between use of drugs, incidence of offenses, and types of crimes committed.

In Dallas participants, 89% of the males arrested for burglary tested positive for drug use. Larceny suspects tested 82% positive, as did 81% of those arrested for auto theft and stolen property. Of those arrested for robbery, 77% tested positive. Over all, seven of every ten arrested had used drugs up to two days before the arrest, with 53% using cocaine. For a complete discussion of DUF results for Texas, see the next section on current efforts.

The most alarming numbers released in Texas about drug-related crime are in regard to homicides in Dallas and Houston. Dallas set a record high for homicides in 1988, a total of 361 murders. Police attribute this

number to the growing drug trade and the accompanying violence. Drugs were identified as a factor in 36.3% of the city's violent deaths.

This trend is mirrored in Houston also, which reported a total of 465 homicides in 1988, compared with 338 the previous year. Houston Police Department evidence confirmed that there were 106 killings directly related to drugs. These murders occurred in white middle-class neighborhoods, not just in the disadvantaged areas of the city.

Crime analysts and police theorize that the rise in drug-related murders could be attributed to the popularity of crack and the influx of Jamaican, Colombian, and Cuban aliens, who are notorious for bloody turf battles in their transactions. The drug business has become so lucrative that dealers consider it worth killing for. Recently in San Antonio, authorities arrested 15 members of a Cuban drug ring on federal drug charges. The gang is tied to nine slayings, each bizarre and extremely violent in nature.

The proliferation of weapons that goes hand-in-hand with drug trafficking also escalates violent crime. Drug enforcement officers throughout the state report that almost 100% of the offenders are armed when search warrants are executed — they either have a weapon in hand or are reaching for one when police enter. A wide array of weapons is generally seized in connection with the majority of arrests.

The drug dealers favor more so-

phisticated weaponry, including automatics and anti-personnel devices. They carry the weapons to protect their substantial investment in contraband and also for show. Officers say criminals believe that the bigger gun they have, the bigger dope dealer they are.

---

*Crime analysts and police theorize that the rise in drug-related murders could be attributed to the popularity of crack and the influx of Jamaican, Colombian, and Cuban aliens, who are notorious for bloody turf battles in their transactions.*

---

Statistics show that armed encounters between suspects and law enforcement personnel are up. The Laredo Sector of the U.S. Border Patrol saw 45 armed encounters in 1988, compared with only 25 in 1987. In order to ensure greater protection for officers, law enforcement agencies are issuing more powerful weapons. DEA agents are being issued 9mm submachine guns and 9mm semiautomatic pistols, with distribution priority to areas of heavy drug activity. Several local agencies in Texas have followed this lead, issuing 9mm semiautomatic pistols. The Texas Department of Public Safety is considering this weaponry upgrade for its narcotics agents also.

Abuse of illegal drugs is also a factor in property crimes such as motor vehicle theft, burglary, theft, and robbery. Burglary of homes and businesses by drug addicts in search of

valuables to sell to support their habits is directly drug related. Reports from Houston reveal that the drug abusers are even taking aluminum siding off houses and tailgates off trucks and cutting up benches in the park to sell.

Texas is number two in the nation in motor vehicle theft, with a total of 123,378 reported thefts in 1987, amounting to a dollar loss to victims of \$725,812,519. Figures for January-June 1988 estimate statewide motor vehicle thefts at 61,301. Stolen autos and farm and construction equipment are traded for drugs in Mexico. Four-wheel-drive vehicles are particularly valuable in Mexico, as they are used by traffickers to carry contraband through remote areas. Some estimate that the drug network headed by Pablo Acosta (until his death in 1987) was directly or indirectly responsible for about 70% of all 4x4 and pickup thefts in the Texas Panhandle and West Texas, in addition to sizable shipments of heroin, cocaine, and marijuana.

Other drug-related crimes that are on the rise in Texas are money laundering and illegal financial transactions, which rise in correlation with smuggling activity. In addition, IRS investigators reported significant surplus currency in South Texas, considered to be a leading indicator of drug-trafficking activity. In the fiscal year ending June 1987, San Antonio Federal Reserve reported a cash surplus for local member banks of \$1.6 billion, a 60% rise from 1986. This is the largest increase among the nation's


five largest drug-trafficking areas — Miami, Los Angeles, San Antonio, El Paso, and Jacksonville. El Paso banks reported a cash surplus in 1987 of \$399 million, up 27% from 1986.

This surplus of cash — currency on pallets, not checks — is in clear contrast to the struggling financial industry in Texas. Although no figures are available that estimate what portion of the money represents drug revenue, IRS officials believe that perhaps as much as 50% of it represents narcodollars. More often than not, when investigators trace suspicious deposits they lead to illegal drug traffickers. Banks along the Texas-Mexico border have historically been used by drug lords in Mexico.



---

*Major Narcotic Importation Routes in Texas*



## II. Current Efforts

Within the past few years, there has been a heightened public awareness of drug trafficking and abuse. In Texas, as in many other states, the fight against drugs has acquired new political significance, improved laws and prosecutorial tools, and additional resources. Federal, state, and local governments, private and non-profit organizations, and individuals have all joined the effort to prevent, treat, and research drug abuse and to educate our citizens about the dangers of illegal drugs. Governor Bill Clements has made the continuing struggle against drugs and crime one of the top priorities of his administration and has a deep personal commitment to the cause.

---

### Special Anti-Drug Initiatives

---

The ultimate goal of both supply and demand reduction efforts is nothing less than the total elimination of drug abuse and trafficking. Law enforcement is directly responsible for the battle against the drug supply. Drug law enforcement forces attack the supply of drugs all along the distribution chain, from cultivation, processing, transmission, and distribution to the ultimate end user.

The Texas Narcotics Control Program (TNCP) created with the funds available from the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986, along with dedicated professionals from all across Texas, is answering the challenge. Texas law enforcement agencies have responded to

the latest trends in drug trafficking with the following new approaches and initiatives:

#### **Marijuana Crop Eradication**

The primary areas for the cultivation of marijuana in Texas are located within a 40-county area in the eastern part of the state. To combat the wholesale drug cultivators, a special task force, composed of federal DEA agents and state and local narcotics officers, was formed in 1985 for eradication purposes. Air surveillance is used to spot cultivation sites, which are then destroyed by land-based law enforcement units. Cooperative efforts of the local, state, and federal agencies resulted in the eradication of 2.2 million marijuana plants in calendar year 1988.

Eradication efforts have caused many growers to shift to smaller cultivated plots and to indoor and underground operations to avoid detection. The alertness of law enforcement teams has led to the discovery of many underground greenhouse operations.

#### **Drug Impact Courts and Specialized Prosecutors**

As in other states, Texas prosecutors and courts have been overburdened by the number of drug offense cases made by law enforcement agencies. Drug trials tend to get pushed back because the courts are overwhelmed, and violent crimes often are given priority.

This crowding in the prosecution and adjudication system gives accused drug dealers time to make necessary

preparations to leave the country despite large bonds that have been deposited. In the larger cities in the state it may take several years for defendants to go to trial. In the meantime, they continue to deal drugs on Texas streets. In an 18-month period ending in October 1987, 20 drug defendants scheduled to be tried in Dallas County disappeared.

Through the TNCP, drug impact courts and specialized prosecutors that handle only drug trials have alleviated this situation somewhat. With fiscal year 1987 funds, three projects were initiated that only prosecute drug offenders. In Harris County, the vertical prosecution method has been used successfully to move cases through the courts. One prosecutor handles each case from filing through disposition. This concept has resulted in expedited prosecutions, including cases being indicted within 48 hours, increased confidence in the court system from law enforcement officers, appropriate bonds being set that ensure that the defendant will appear for trial, and higher rates of convictions. In the first year of operation, 345 cases have been filed, of which 103 have been disposed of (note that the project operates with only two full-time prosecutors). Of these total dispositions, the average prison sentence imposed was 25 years. Only three acquittals have resulted. A total of \$5.7 million in fines was assessed, an average of \$66,000 per case.

Fifteen other TNCP projects in-

clude prosecution components that aid in the filing and disposition of cases and asset-forfeiture proceedings.

#### **Seizure of Drug-Related Assets**

Current state laws allow for seizures of assets such as drugs, cash, vehicles, and weapons that the offender may have in his possession at the time of arrest. Texas law also provides for the seizure of non-drug assets that can be proven to have been purchased from proceeds of illegal activity. In calendar year 1988, Department of Public Safety narcotics officers seized 354 vehicles, 58 weapons, and \$6.7 million in currency.

After forfeiture proceedings in state court, proceeds from assets seized from narcotics traffickers are shared among participating law enforcement agencies. The percentage each agency receives is typically relative to its contribution to the investigation that resulted in the seizure.

Often seized assets are adjudicated in federal court in lieu of state proceedings. Through the Drug Enforcement Administration's asset-removal team, many local agencies that participated in joint investigations have benefited by receiving substantial proceeds. In fiscal year 1988, the Houston Division of DEA turned over approximately \$2 million to local and state agencies for their role in a total of 78 investigations.

Recognizing that asset forfeiture is an effective tool that can seriously hamper the operation of a drug dealer, the Governor's Office created a special

condition for projects funded by the TNCP. Cooperative agreements with district attorneys in each task force's jurisdiction are negotiated that provide for all proceeds from seized assets to be returned to the seizing agency (task force) to be used to further the goals and objectives of the project. Thus, the seizures and forfeitures are used to offset the continuing cost of operations.

During the 71st Legislative Session, which convened January 1989, asset-forfeiture statutes will be examined in an effort to improve current laws. Chapter III of this report on resource needs details recommended legislative changes.

#### **Governor's Task Force on Drug Abuse**

Another initiative in the war on drugs is the Governor's Task Force on Drug Abuse. In June of 1987, Governor Clements appointed a group of Texans headed by Dallas attorney Paul Eggers to examine the illegal drug situation and current antidrug resources. The focus includes educational programs for the public; anti-drug legislation; law enforcement; educational programs for judges, district and county attorneys, and law enforcement officers; and drug use in the workplace. A full report of the task force's activities and recommendations was issued in October 1988.

#### **Drug Use Forecasting**

The nationwide Drug Use Forecasting (DUF) program funded by the National Institute of Justice has

yielded firm evidence of the connection between drugs and crime. Data from voluntary diagnostic urine tests at the time of arrest provide information about the prevalence of drug abuse among suspected criminals and what types of drugs are used. Analysis of ten drugs and multiple drug use is conducted.

In Texas, Houston, Dallas, and San Antonio have been selected to participate in the federally funded program. The Houston Police Department has been included in the DUF study since 1987, and the Dallas Sheriff's Department began testing in the summer of 1988. The San Antonio Police Department, in cooperation with Bexar County, started the program in September of 1988 and has recently completed first phase results.

The DUF study showed that 62% of male arrestees in Houston tested positive for at least one type of drug. Of those charged with burglary offenses in the Houston sample, over 67% tested positive for drugs, equaling the percentage for drug offense arrestees. Additionally, it was found that 44% of the Houston arrestees tested positive for cocaine.

The first results from the Dallas project were released in October of 1988. Of the sample tested, 73% of all arrested for a serious offense tested positive for illegal drug use. The Dallas results also showed a 53% rate of cocaine use. Drug use was consistently high across all arrest categories, ranging from 54% for assault to 94% for

drug offenses.

Results released in late January 1989 for the San Antonio project indicate that more than 63% of males and 51% of the 341 prisoners participating in the study tested positive for drug use. Marijuana use accounted for 62% and cocaine for 53% of the drug positive findings. The findings show that marijuana and cocaine were clearly the drugs of choice. The percentage of those testing positive for amphetamines was surprisingly low — only 9% — which led officials to speculate that the speed that is produced in the area is distributed elsewhere.


**State Crime Labs**

A large percentage of the substance analysis required for prosecution of drug cases is provided by 12 crime laboratories operated through-

out the state by the Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS). These laboratories receive and analyze narcotics seized by DPS and the majority of local law enforcement agencies. The number of samples submitted to the labs for analysis increased 79% from 1980 to 1986.

As recognized during development of the 1987 statewide drug strategy, the existing level of staffing, equipment, and operating funds was insufficient to meet the existing workload and certainly would not allow for the increase expected to be generated by the Texas Narcotics Control Program task forces. Beginning in fiscal year 1987, DPS received TNCP funds to upgrade equipment and increase personnel in order to allow examination of 25% more drug samples, reduce processing time,

**Percentage of Male Arrestees in Houston Who Tested Positive for Drugs by Top Arrest Charge**



*Results from the DUF program have proven the connection between drug use and crime.*

and provide chemists as expert witnesses in drug trials. State crime labs provide valuable services in 12 major cities across the state.

---

## **Law Enforcement Resources**

---

Texas has approximately 41,000 commissioned peace officers employed in municipal, county, and state law enforcement agencies. On the local level, drug law enforcement is the responsibility of police departments, which have jurisdiction within city limits, and sheriff departments, which have jurisdiction countywide. There are 868 chiefs of police in Texas and 254 sheriffs, or one sheriff per county.

### **Texas Narcotics Control Program Task Forces**

No other Texas law-enforcement program has had more far-reaching effects than the Texas Narcotics Control Program (TNCP). A complete discussion of the program and its impact

---

*Not only have task forces proven to be the most efficient use of the limited resources — they also have effected the type of interagency cooperation and intelligence sharing that is crucial for effective drug control.*

---

on the drug problem is the subject of Chapter V of this report.

The concept behind the program is a simple yet effective one. Resources of equipment, personnel, and evidence-purchasing ability are combined to provide a united front in the drug war.

Thirty-one multi-agency, multi-jurisdictional task forces were established in December 1987, adding 190 narcotics agents to the state drug effort. Their contribution to the anti-drug offensive is vital.

Use of the broad-based task force approach is particularly successful in Texas because of the complexity of Texas drug trafficking and the size and population distribution of the state. Seventy-four percent of the counties in which illegal drug laboratories have been seized since 1981 have a population of less than 100,000, and nearly half have a population of less than 30,000. Unfortunately, a great number of Texas counties are protected solely by local law enforcement agencies with severely limited personnel and equipment. Many rural areas within the state are unable to provide 24-hour protection, much less special drug control units. TNCP regional initiatives have created specialized narcotics law enforcement efforts where none would otherwise exist.


The TNCP task force concept has received strong support from state, local, and federal officials. Not only have task forces proven to be the most efficient use of the limited resources — they also have effected the type of interagency cooperation and intelligence sharing that is crucial for effective drug control.

### **Organized Crime Control Units**

In addition to the TNCP, another type of multi-agency effort is under way in Texas. At the present time,

## *Headquarters Locations for Multi-Agency Task Forces*

*(Includes Texas Narcotics Control Program Task Forces, Organized Crime Control Units, and DEA/State and Local Task Forces)*



*NOTE: Many metropolitan areas are served by more than one multi-agency task force, and the impact areas for many task forces extend past the county of location for the task force headquarters. See detail maps on pages 31 and 44.*

---

there are eight Organized Crime Control Units (OCCU) operating throughout Texas, funded by state and local money. Established to reduce the incidence of organized crime offenses in their particular jurisdictions, these units focus on burglary and theft, narcotics trafficking, gambling, and auto theft.

The units rely on a multi-agency regional approach to develop strategic and tactical intelligence pertaining to organized criminal activity. Crime networks that are too small in scope to merit the attention of federal agents are investigated by the OCCUs.

Cooperation with local, state, and federal agencies is a key component of each OCCU's organization, allowing the units to participate in investigations that are self-initiated and those spearheaded by other agencies. The regional approach allows each unit to focus on crime problems that are particular to its locale.

### ***Texas Organized Crime Control Units***

| <i>Location</i> | <i>Area</i> | <i>Employees</i> |
|-----------------|-------------|------------------|
| Austin          | 12 counties | 29               |
| Corpus Christi  | 1 county    | 10               |
| Amarillo        | 5 counties  | 14               |
| Fort Worth      | 1 county    | 23               |
| Dallas          | 1 county    | 10               |
| Houston         | 1 county    | 21               |
| Galveston       | 1 county    | 20               |
| Brownsville     | 1 city      | 7                |

### **State Narcotics Enforcement**

The Texas Department of Public Safety Narcotics Service is charged with statewide enforcement of controlled-substance laws. The Narcotics Service employs 196 commissioned narcotics officers, 16 criminal law enforcement troopers, eight narcotics analysts, and 77 support personnel.

During 1988, the DPS Narcotics Service reported that 1,419 investigations were opened in the state, which resulted in 1,492 felony drug arrests. Drugs with an estimated street value of \$1.7 billion were seized. These statistics include investigations conducted by the local and federal agencies with DPS assistance.

Because of the everchanging tactics used to enforce the drug laws, the Narcotics Service is unique in that it has its own training section. The Training Section is responsible for the training of narcotics personnel and, when requested, other Criminal Law Enforcement Services of the Department of Public Safety, as well as other state and local agencies. In 1988, the Training Section instructed over 600 officers and over 900 civilians.

The Technical Unit is also unique to the Narcotics Service. Members of the Technical Unit are recognized as experts in the use of electronic surveillance techniques. In 1988, the Technical Unit conducted six court-authorized wire intercepts, which resulted in 25 arrests and the seizure of controlled substances with a value of over \$1 million.



The Triplicate Prescription Section of the Narcotics Service provides an effective means of tracking prescriptions for Schedule II Controlled Substances from the physician, through the pharmacists, to the ultimate user. In 1988, the Triplicate Prescription Section processed 626,105 prescription receipts.

The Controlled Substances Registration Section is responsible for the registration of every person who lawfully manufactures, distributes, analyzes, or dispenses controlled substances in Texas. During 1988, this section processed 2,795 new applications and 42,863 renewal applications. During fiscal year 1988, the section collected \$221,781 in registration fees. Note that the operating and salary budget of the Section was only \$190,000.

The Narcotics Service Analyst Section provides professional assistance to all services of the Department of Public Safety, as well as to local and federal agencies. Members of the Analyst Section not only identify suspects and analyze information, but are also responsible for several programs within the Narcotics Service.

The newest program assigned to the Analyst Section is the Precursor Chemical Program. Since September of 1987, the Narcotics Service has been legislatively required to maintain reports of all individuals who sell, transfer, or otherwise furnish any of the designated precursor chemicals that are used to illegally manufacture con-

trolled substances. During 1988, the Precursor Chemical Program received 2,580 receipts, which developed into 367 investigative leads. In 1988, the Narcotics Service seized 64 clandestine laboratories, which represented a decline from the 1987 all-time high of 86. A major factor in the reduction of laboratory seizures in 1988 was the recent precursor chemical legislation.

---

### Federal Initiatives in Texas

---

In recognition of the extent of drug trafficking in Texas, the federal government has made a significant commitment of personnel and resources to Texas. Federal agents work cooperatively with local and state officers in joint investigations and provide resources and expertise that may be lacking. Texas has benefited greatly from the level of federal/state/local cooperation that occurs on a daily basis.

All federal agencies that are charged with drug enforcement responsibility are active in Texas, including:

- Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA)
- U.S. Customs Service
- U.S. Coast Guard
- Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS)
- U.S. Border Patrol
- Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)
- Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (ATF)
- U.S. Marshals Service

In addition to the ongoing activi-

ties of these federal agencies, the following federal initiatives operate in Texas:

#### **DEA/State and Local Task Forces**

Through formal agreements with DEA and participating state and local agencies, narcotics task forces operate in Lubbock, Tyler, Corpus Christi, San Antonio, and McAllen and at the Dallas/Fort Worth Airport.

#### **El Paso Intelligence Center**

This federal air and marine interdiction and tactical intelligence effort, located in El Paso, provides for the sharing of intelligence among agencies in Texas. EPIC responds to requests from field units on specific conveyances and persons suspected of transporting drugs. It provides analyses of smuggling methods, routes, and sources.

#### **Operation Alliance**

This new federal initiative, announced in August 1986, is a bold approach to fight smuggling in high-risk areas. Federal, state, and local agencies have formed an alliance to share information and tactics in order to effectively curtail the passage of contraband across the U.S.-Mexico border. It is a multi-agency coordinated effort to control the flow of drugs, weapons, and aliens across the U.S.-Mexico border.

#### **Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force Program**

This network of regional task forces is designed to coordinate federal law enforcement efforts with state and local efforts to combat the national and

international organizations that cultivate, process, and distribute illicit drugs. Administered out of the U.S. Attorney's Office, the program uses a consensus approach to investigation and prosecution that pools the strengths of participating agencies.

#### **United States Attorneys**

The United States Attorneys and their assistants conduct prosecutions in federal court of drug trafficking and connected illegal activities, and coordinate major drug investigations to prepare cases for prosecution. The United States Attorneys have established Law Enforcement Coordinating Committees (LECCs) in all federal judicial districts. Through the LECCs, officials of federal, state, and local law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies collectively assess the crime problems in each district and determine how best to use available resources to address those problems. Cross-designation of state and local prosecutors as federal prosecutors (Assistant United States Attorneys), and of federal prosecutors as state and local prosecutors, is now a frequent occurrence in cooperative investigations and prosecutions.

#### **National Narcotics Border Interdiction System**

This management system is designed to coordinate the multi-agency efforts of drug law enforcement agencies, and to call on those federal, state, and local resources that will improve the effectiveness and efficiency of drug interdiction efforts. Its primary objectives include coordinating joint efforts


## Multi-Agency Task Forces in Texas

○ Criminal Justice Division Funded Organized Crime Control Units (OCCU)

1. Panhandle Regional OCCU, Amarillo
2. Fort Worth Multi-Agency Property Crime & Enforcement Unit
3. Greater Dallas Organized Crime Task Force
4. Greater Austin Area OCCU, Austin
5. Narcotics and Dangerous Drug Control Unit, Brownsville
6. Nueces County OCCU, Corpus Christi
7. Harris County OCCU, Baytown
8. Galveston County OCCU, Galveston

□ DEA/State and Local Task Forces

1. Lubbock
2. DFW Airport
3. Tyler
4. San Antonio
5. Corpus Christi
6. McAllen



of law enforcement agencies, providing Department of Defense assets for drug interdiction, and developing tactical information and intelligence to support interdiction efforts. Created with the goal of providing behind-the-scenes support, the National Narcotics Border Interdiction System has no field operatives and generates no seizures or cases. The Southwest Region Center began operating in Houston in February 1987 and is one of seven regional divisions in the United States. The Center is responsible for coordinating drug-interdiction operations along the border from Brownsville, Texas, to Yuma, Arizona. It focuses on border smuggling and relies on personnel contributed by federal drug enforcement agencies, DPS, U.S. Marshals Service, and each branch of the military.

In addition to these enhanced federal efforts in Texas, several local law enforcement agencies received federal funding under the Bureau of Justice Assistance Narcotics Control Discretionary Grant Program, as follows:

**Dallas County  
Organized Crime Narcotics  
Trafficking Program**

This funding helps develop and implement a regional enforcement project designed to remove specifically targeted major organized crime narcotics-trafficking conspiracies. One of 21 projects of this type conducted throughout the nation, the Dallas County project is a joint operation of local, state, and federal law enforce-

ment personnel, featuring close coordination and sharing of intelligence.

**Bexar County  
Street Sales**

**Enforcement Program**

Funding is being used by the San Antonio Police Department to target street-level narcotic dealers and buyers through planning, investigation, and prosecution.

**City of Houston  
Crack/Focused Substance  
Enforcement Program**

With this funding, the Houston Police Department has improved its ability to investigate and immobilize crack cocaine trafficking organizations.

The consensus of law enforcement officials throughout the state is that the existing structure for drug control is well organized and effective, particularly with the additional resources of the Texas Narcotics Control Program, which have closed many gaps.

All agree, however, that these resources are insufficient to handle the current volume and must be increased in order for law enforcement to respond to the growing rate of crime. Still needed are more trained personnel, confidential funds, equipment upgrades, overtime pay, and operating funds. Drug traffickers have virtually unlimited resources available and have graduated to more sophisticated operations. Law enforcement must respond in kind, with innovative approaches such as coordinated multi-agency, multi-jurisdictional task forces.

### III. Resource Needs


The Texas criminal justice system is organized to effectively carry out crime-related duties and responsibilities from criminal investigation through parole. By design, it is structured to prevent gaps in services, but as crime rates and Texas' population have increased, criminal justice system resource commitment has not advanced at a commensurate rate. Crime in Texas has increased significantly in the past decade. Total index crime increased by 49.1% between 1980 and 1987. This has caused overburdening of the system and dramatically increased workloads for all.

Testimony received in the public hearings held by the Governor's Task Force on Drug Abuse Drug Policy Subcommittee reflected support for the criminal justice mechanisms in

place, but noted that all components are seriously hampered in terms of efficiency because of sheer volume. Law enforcement officials testified about the ever-increasing amount of drugs transported through the state, the prevalence of weapons involved in drug trafficking, and the lack of sufficient funding to enhance personnel, equipment, and operating expense to the level required. All who testified expressed complete support for the multi-agency, multi-jurisdictional task force concept, stating that it is the most cost-effective approach. Task forces provide services to jurisdictions that do not have resources to combat narcotics, thereby giving them further opportunity to enforce drug laws.

An area of particular concern to participants in the public hearings is

**Total Index Crime Reported in Texas, 1980-1987**



the issue of the proper handling and disposal of hazardous chemicals seized from illegal drug laboratories. Texas has a serious problem with speed laboratories, as noted in the previous chapter. Law enforcement agencies are gravely concerned over potential health hazards to agents who are involved in handling chemicals used in the production of illicit substances.

---

*Law enforcement agencies are gravely concerned over potential health hazards to agents who are involved in handling chemicals used in the production of illicit substances.*

---

Also, the sizable expense involved in the proper disposal of the chemicals is an onerous burden to law enforcement agency budgets. At this time, agencies contract with private enterprise for the removal and destruction of each laboratory seized. The average cost per lab for this service is \$3,500. In the case of the Tarrant County Narcotics Intelligence and Coordination Unit (TNCP), 30 clandestine laboratories were seized during the first ten months of operation. Disposal of the chemicals seized cost the task force \$105,000 for that period.

Obviously, small law enforcement agencies with tight operating budgets cannot expend such amounts, especially if the expense is unanticipated. There have been reports of instances in which agencies have seized laboratories, and, because of lack of knowledge or available funds to properly dispose of the chemicals, the substances were

handled and stored improperly. Public health and the environment must not be exposed to such risk because of lack of funds.

To address this problem, the Governor's Office allows this expense as a line item in project budgets. The state is also monitoring development of the Joint Federal Task Force on Illegal Drug Laboratories to be formed by the Drug Enforcement Administration and Environmental Protection Agency. This was established by Title II of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 in order to address the escalating problem of clean-up and disposal of hazardous waste produced by illegal drug laboratories. Provisions of the Act allow for grants to, and contracts with, state and local governments for this purpose.

Also of great concern to the participants in the public hearings are the current Texas statutes for asset seizure and forfeiture. As discussed in the following chapter of this report regarding recommendations to the Legislature, the Texas asset-forfeiture law needs to be modified. It must be kept in mind that the illegal drug trade is a big business, as illustrated by a 1988 issue of *Fortune* magazine that estimates that the global drug trade generates \$500 billion annually, more than twice the value of all U.S. currency in circulation. Seizing the cash, cars, weapons, and other assets that have been used in the commission of drug-law offenses or that are derived from the profits of the drug business through

strong asset-forfeiture laws can help remove the financial incentive from drug trafficking. Forfeited funds can also be used by law enforcement and prosecution agencies to enhance the apprehension and prosecution of drug dealers.

Policy makers are faced with the relentless increase in crime in the state and the resulting impact on the criminal justice system. Currently, the 71st Session of the Texas Legislature is convening and criminal justice matters are a priority. In preparation, the Texas Criminal Justice Task Force, which was created by Governor Bill Clements, has worked diligently over the past two years to address numerous criminal justice issues. In January 1989, the task force provided Governor Clements with legislative recommendations developed from input received from statewide public hearings and the Texas Criminal Justice Summit.

Recommendations regarding drug and violent crime control are summarized as follows:

- Make drug education mandatory for public school students by incorporating it into the essential elements; train teachers to recognize substance abuse, making this training a prerequisite of teacher certification.

- Expand the felony offenses covered by determinate sentencing in order to give judges more flexibility to enhance the state's ability to prosecute the hardened, violent juvenile offender.

- Broaden rehabilitation efforts

for juvenile offenders by allowing the sentencing juvenile court the discretion to submit a rehabilitation plan for the offender prior to transfer to the Texas Youth Commission.

- Increase the penalty for committing the offense of aggravated assault on, or threatening of, a peace officer to a first degree felony.

- Enhance the state provision for asset forfeiture to allow for seizure of all property defined as "contraband," which includes any real, personal, tangible, or intangible property that is used in the commission of a felony or is the proceeds of the commission of a felony or is acquired with proceeds from the commission of a felony. Current state law does not provide for the seizure of real property such as farms, office buildings, condominiums, and exclusive homes when the purchases are not directly traceable to drug profits, even though the property was used in drug operations. Even real estate purchased with falsified documents cannot be seized under Texas law.

- Amend precursor chemical laws for controlled substances and their analogues to require that manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers of precursors of controlled substances and their analogues be required to register with the state and submit to the state a report of each transaction at least 21 days before delivery of the substance. In addition, amend current law to allow the Director of the Texas Department of Public Safety to add precursors for controlled substance

analogues as well as for controlled substances to the list of chemicals to be monitored.

Legislation passed by the 70th Legislature requires that manufacturing wholesalers and retailers of precursor chemicals (chemicals used to manufacture a controlled substance) report their precursor sales to the state. However, manufacturers and distributors of controlled substances have persisted in using fake identification, aliases, false addresses, and surrogates in the purchase of these chemicals. Adequate time to investigate the legitimacy of the transaction is not currently available under Texas law. Another problem is that the ingredients or precursor chemicals used to create controlled substance analogues (designer drugs) differ from those used to create the controlled substance; therefore, the precursors for analogues are not covered by current laws although the drugs themselves are illegal.

- Clarify the good-faith exception to the exclusionary rule so that evidence deemed acceptable under federal law will also be acceptable under state law.

- Expand recent legislation that provides for the placement of a defendant's fingerprints on the actual judgment itself for convictions for driving while intoxicated, involuntary manslaughter, and all misdemeanors punishable by confinement in jail to include provision for placement of a defendant's fingerprints on the judgment for convictions for any felony offenses

or misdemeanor cases punishable by confinement in jail. This would facilitate the discovery and proof of an offender's prior criminal record and make for better recordkeeping efficiency.

- Restore the requirement of one-third of the sentence or 20 years of calendar time for violent offenders.

- Add murder to the list of violent offenses that require minimum calendar time.

- Increase the minimum calendar time required for repeat offenders, in recognition that the recidivist accounts for the greatest percentage of crime committed in Texas.

- Add aggravated offenses under the Controlled Substance Act (delivery, possession with intent to deliver, or manufacture of significant quantities of drugs) to the list of offenses that require minimum calendar time.

- Include drug testing and rehabilitation as a condition of probation whenever appropriate and at all stages of the criminal justice process where release from confinement or reduction in the level of sanction restriction is considered.

- Make continuing education a condition of probation and parole in recognition of the part that lack of education plays in the crime equation. A profile of inmates in the Texas Department of Corrections showed that 91% had not completed high school, and the average grade level of achievement was slightly more than sixth



grade. It is recommended that a strong education program of remedial or continuing education be included in a well-rounded program of prevention and rehabilitation in the period of probation and parole.

- Increase funding for probation and parole alternatives to incarceration through enhanced supervision models such as intensive supervision probation and electronic monitoring.

- Include drug testing and rehabilitation as a condition of parole in order to reinforce measures started while the offender is in the Texas Department of Corrections. Studies that indicate that two-thirds of parolees tested by the Board of Pardons and Paroles tested positive for drugs demonstrate a disturbing pattern of non-compliance with the terms and conditions of parole. In order to make meaningful progress toward reducing recidivism, the drug-abuse treatment programs initiated in prison must be continued during the parole period, when there is great temptation to fall back into old habits even among the parolees who are most motivated to stay off drugs.

As noted previously, the Texas Legislature is in session at the time this report is being prepared. The recommendations contained herein will be made during this session but may not become law. It is believed that these recommendations are necessary in order to fine-tune the current criminal justice structure to make

it a fair and equitable system capable of effectively dealing with drug and violent offenses.

At this time, cooperative inter-agency efforts by education and prevention, treatment and rehabilitation, and law enforcement agencies are well coordinated. As outlined in the chapter concerning coordination of drug control efforts within the state, each discipline is providing effective drug control services.

Federal, state, and local law enforcement officers work together in Texas to a degree beyond expectation, furthering the drug control efforts of each agency. Sharing of intelligence, personnel, financial resources, and training is at a commendable level.

---

## IV. Areas of Greatest Need

Drug trafficking continues to be a catalyst for crime in Texas. Drugs are smuggled into Texas by land, air, and sea through organized, well-financed networks of career criminals. Although record-breaking seizures continue to occur, some officers estimate that they catch only 10% of the illegal drugs being smuggled into Texas.

Texas shares a 1,248-mile border with Mexico, a country that has been identified as the leading single country source of heroin and marijuana entering the United States and a leading point of transfer for cocaine. Cocaine traffickers from South America have

---

*The movement of drug traffickers from the Florida coast to the Rio Grande Valley has made this area of Texas the hottest smuggling spot — land or sea — in the nation.*

---

been using Mexico increasingly as an alternative to Caribbean routes through Florida. Once in Mexico, smugglers use private and commercial vehicles to smuggle the drugs into Texas. The movement of drug traffickers from the Florida coast to the Rio Grande Valley has made this area of Texas the hottest smuggling spot — land or sea — in the nation.

Texas' extensive, sparsely populated regions are well suited for undetected drug-trafficking operations. Texas' national forests and commercial timberlands cleared by cutting operations are ideal for growing marijuana. Throughout the state marijuana grow-


ers are using sophisticated cultivation techniques such as a \$300,000 greenhouse found underneath a barn in Nacogdoches, Texas. The vast rural areas of Texas also provide the seclusion necessary for clandestine laboratories to manufacture dangerous drugs. Texas leads all southwestern states in drug seizures; it ranks second in the nation in clandestine laboratories, and seventh in domestic cultivation of marijuana. Prior to the development of the Texas Narcotics Control Program, the 1,248 miles of international border with Mexico had fewer than 50 state or local law enforcement officers assigned to drug-interdiction efforts.

It is commonplace for Texas Department of Public Safety highway patrol officers to interdict large shipments of marijuana and cocaine on Texas highways leading from the border region, destined for locations as far away as Chicago, New York, and California. Texas has an interstate highway system that goes from the border region and coastal waterways to virtually every location in the United States.

The Texas border regions and vast rural areas have a very low per-capita income, and therefore a low tax base. Law enforcement personnel are few in number, and the necessary financing for equipment, buy money, and supplies to fight drugs is virtually nonexistent. There is a vital need for federal and state assistance in these areas if the war on drug transshipment and production is going to have an impact.

---

# Scope of Drug Trafficking in the U.S. — Cocaine



Source: FBI National Drug Strategy

With the inception of the Texas Statewide Drug Strategy and the funding provided by the 1986 Omnibus Drug Act, multi-agency, multi-jurisdictional task forces were created along the entire border and throughout the rural areas of Texas. Currently, there are eight border drug enforcement task forces in operation, covering the entire 1,248 miles of international border with Mexico, all major cities, and rural communities in this region. Federal, state, county, and local law enforcement agencies have committed personnel, finances, and equipment to these projects.

The same type of effort has taken place in the central rural areas of Texas. Under the Statewide Drug Strategy, 11 multi-agency, multi-jurisdictional task forces have been created in rural areas to bring federal, state, county, and local law enforcement agencies into a cooperative effort of sharing manpower, resources, and equipment in this fight on illegal drugs.

To significantly affect the smuggling and manufacturing of illegal drugs in these two priority areas of Texas, allocation of federal resources for the Texas Narcotics Control Program would have to be greatly enhanced. Additionally, other established federal initiatives in these areas, particularly in the border region, would have to be more extensive and financially enhanced.

The demographics and geography of Texas are extremely varied from re-

gion to region and with this variation go individual drug problems. The Texas border regions and the Central Texas vast rural areas are the priorities in the area of resource needs. With the continued implementation of the Texas Statewide Drug Strategy, an effort to provide these needs is being made.

## *Update: Drug Trafficking and Abuse in Texas 1989*

- Recent Drug Enforcement Administration marijuana seizure statistics indicate an increase in efforts to bring larger quantities of the contraband across the Mexico border into Texas. Law enforcement officials state that most of the marijuana seizures in excess of 500 pounds appear to have been destined for areas outside the state of Texas, a clear indicator of the use of the Texas/Mexico border as a smuggling route.

- Armed encounters by the Border Patrol show an alarming increase. According to statistics provided by the Laredo Sector, agents experienced 18 armed encounters in the first quarter of fiscal year 1989, compared with a total of 45 for fiscal year 1988 and 25 for fiscal year 1987.

- A major prison drug trafficking ring in the Texas Department of Corrections that was financed by a California man, sanctioned by prison gangs and run by convicts and prison guards was discovered in October 1988. Officials arrested one prison employee, confiscated nearly \$32,000, and isolated two convicts.

- DEA reports a tremendous increase in the incidents of violence directly attributable to drug-related activity. During the reporting period for October, November, and December of 1988, over 400 incidents of drug-related violence have occurred, with 24 drug-related homicides occurring in the Houston metropolitan area alone.

- The Laredo Sector of the U.S. Border Patrol reports a significant increase in illicit drug traffic in South Texas in the last three months of 1988, particularly in the amount of marijuana and cocaine seized by agents in their geographical jurisdiction. For instance, 24,522 pounds of marijuana were seized in fiscal year 1988, while 16,549 pounds of the drug were seized in the first quarter of 1989.

- The Dallas Police Department reported a 12 percent increase in murder for 1988 and attributed the rise in violent deaths to drug activity. An analysis shows that drugs were a factor in at least 36.3% of the city's slayings.

- An increasing trend of methamphetamine lab operators' using rented motel rooms to operate on a smaller and more mobile scale has been noted. Prices for clandestinely manufactured methamphetamine range from \$1,100 to \$1,200 per ounce.

- The Houston metropolitan area continues to be a highly favored entry point for drug-smuggling operations based in South America. Because of Houston's location near the Gulf of Mexico and the Mexican border, smugglers have a choice of methods for transporting large shipments of cocaine directly from South America or from staging areas in Central America and Mexico via air, vessel, or land routes.

## V. Impact of the Strategy on the Drug and Violent Crime Problem

The Texas Statewide Drug Strategy has formed a new line in the war on drugs. In this chapter you will see the cumulative total of the production statistics from just one short year's operation of the projects created under this strategy. To best exemplify the impact of this strategy on the state of Texas, one merely has to consider all the seized illegal drugs, weapons, drug-related assets, and drug offenders that would still be in Texas communities without this program.

---

*First-year returns from the Texas Narcotics Control Program demonstrate what a coordinated and cooperative effort by law enforcement agencies can achieve... An initial investment of \$10 million in federal funds has, in just 12 months, paid dividends by a multiplier of 30.*

---

A significant new law enforcement initiative to counteract the drug threat has been launched. Texas, under the direction and urging of Governor Bill Clements, created the Texas Narcotics Control Program in December of 1987. The governor awarded 41 grants, which cover 175 Texas counties and serve 14 million of the state's citizens.

First-year returns from the Texas Narcotics Control Program demonstrate what a coordinated and cooperative effort by law enforcement agencies can achieve. The 99th Congress authorized this far-reaching program with the Omnibus Anti-Drug Abuse

Act, and the 100th Congress saw fit to reauthorize this valuable program.

The statewide drug control strategy that is the basis for the program stressed coverage of the border areas in recognition of the amount of drugs flowing into our state from Mexico. Eight task forces were funded to secure the border from El Paso to Brownsville.

A key element of the program is the use of cooperative agreements between the task forces and district attorneys that use asset-forfeiture awards to assist in offsetting operating costs of the task forces so that they can continue the fight against drugs where the need is great, but the population is sparse.

The impact has been immediate. In the first 12 months of the Texas Narcotics Control Program, which has received national attention, drugs worth over \$290 million have been taken off the streets. An initial investment of \$10 million in federal funds has, in just 12 months, paid dividends by a multiplier of 30.

Coordinated task force busts in 1988 have led to the arrest of 6,111 individuals. Cash, cars, guns, and other property valued at \$7.5 million have been confiscated. These statistics are not just numbers on a page. They represent the 32,443 pounds of marijuana, 306.9 pounds of cocaine, and 476 state-of-the-art weapons that would still be on Texas streets if this program did not exist.


The Department of Public Safety employs 196 narcotics control officers. Their contribution to the anti-drug offensive is vital. The Texas Narcotics Control Program added 190 officers to the state's anti-drug effort, in effect doubling our statewide drug work force.

The sharing of intelligence and resources is crucial to our continued success in the war on drugs. It is

imperative that law enforcement agencies have the ability to respond to the sophisticated operation of drug traffickers.

### ***Texas Narcotics Control Program Statistics*** ***Calendar Year 1988***

|   |                            |         |       |
|---|----------------------------|---------|-------|
| <b>Total Drug Seizures</b>              | <i>Marijuana</i>           | 781,743 | lbs.  |
| \$290,136,146                           | <i>Cocaine Powder</i>      | 4,958   | lbs.  |
| <b>Arrests</b>                          | <i>Heroin</i>              | 14      | lbs.  |
| 6,111                                   | <i>Crack Cocaine</i>       | 5       | lbs.  |
| <b>Value of Non-Drug Asset Seizures</b> | <i>LSD</i>                 | 2,097   | doses |
| (Vehicles, Weapons,<br>Currency, etc.)  | <i>Synthetic narcotics</i> | 29      | lbs.  |
| \$7,545,634                             | <i>Hallucinogens</i>       | 4       | lbs.  |
| <b>Weapons Seized</b>                   | <i>Amphetamines</i>        | 949     | lbs.  |
| 476                                     | <i>Methamphetamines</i>    | 724,926 | doses |
| <b>Clandestine Labs Seized</b>          | <i>Barbiturates</i>        | 304     | lbs.  |
| 142                                     | <i>Precursor chemicals</i> | 71,596  | doses |
|   | <i>Tranquilizers</i>       | 1,745   | doses |
|   |                            | 6,196   | lbs.  |
|   |                            | 1,603   | doses |



**1988 Texas Narcotics Control Projects**  
Area of Impact



## *1988 Texas Narcotics Control Program Projects*

1. City of Amarillo "Panhandle Regional Narcotics Trafficking Task Force"
2. City of Austin "Regional Anti-Drug Abuse Task Force"
3. Bell County "Central Texas Narcotics Control Task Force"
4. Bexar County "Adjudication of Drug Offenders"
5. Brazos County "Narcotics Trafficking Task Force"
6. Cameron County "Drug Enforcement Task Force"
7. Cass County "Regional Intrastate Narcotics Task Force"
8. Chambers County "Narcotics Trafficking Task Force"
- 9.\*\* Criminal Justice Policy Council "Drug Abuse Data Collection and Analysis"
10. City of Dallas "Love Field Drug Task Force and Targeted Traffickers"
11. Dallas County "Adjudication of Drug Offenders and Asset Forfeitures"
12. City of Del Rio "Narcotics Trafficking Task Force"
- 13.\* City of Eagle Pass "Organized Narcotics Task Force"
14. El Paso County "West Texas Multi-County Task Force"
15. Erath County "Cross Timbers Narcotics Task Force"
16. Grayson County "Pretrial Drug Detection Program"
17. Gregg County "Narcotics Trafficking Task Force"
18. Harris County "Prosecution of Drug Offenders"
19. Hill County "Agriplex Roadrunners"
- 20.\* City of Houston "Hobby Airport Task Force"
21. City of Kerrville "216th Judicial District Narcotics Task Force"
22. City of Laredo "Narcotics Trafficking Task Force Program"
23. City of Lubbock "South Plains Regional Narcotics Task Force"
24. City of McAllen "Narcotics Trafficking Task Force"
25. Midland County "Permian Basin Narcotics Control Program"
26. Nacogdoches County "Deep East Texas Narcotics Trafficking Task Force"
27. City of Orange "Special Drug Enforcement Unit"
28. City of Paris "Regional Controlled Substance Apprehension Program"
29. City of San Angelo "Rio Concho Multi-Agency Drug Enforcement Task Force"
30. City of San Antonio "Multi-Agency Narcotics Trafficking Task Force"
31. San Patricio County "Tri-County Narcotics Task Force"
32. Starr County "Tri-County Drug Abuse Task Force"
33. Tarrant County "Narcotics and Intelligence Coordination Unit"
34. Taylor County "West Central Texas Interlocal Crime Task Force"
- 35.\*\* Texas Department of Public Safety "Expanded Crime Laboratory Services"
36. Matagorda County "Two County Narcotics Trafficking Task Force"
37. Brazoria County "Special Investigative Unit"

\* Continued with 1987 funds \*\* Statewide projects

## *Texas Narcotics Control Program Select Seizure Report*

- West Texas Multi-County Task Force in El Paso arrested a Hudspeth County employee and seized 1,200 pounds of marijuana having an estimated street value of \$1,080,000.

- Midland County's Permian Basin Drug Task Force, working on information provided by U.S. Customs, seized 1,600 pounds of marijuana and a twin-engine Cessna airplane. U.S. Customs tracked the plane coming across the border and notified task force officials as it appeared to land in Midland County. Task force officers responded and effected the seizure and the arrest of three males. The Cessna was ultimately awarded to the task force to be used for operations.

- Tarrant County Narcotics Intelligence and Coordination Unit conducted a raid on an operational crack house. Working on information that a shipment had just arrived, agents arrested two male suspects in the house, then set up a reversal operation in the house that netted 32 arrests in a matter of three hours.

- Tarrant County Narcotics Intelligence and Coordination Unit raided two clandestine methamphetamine labs operated by the same group of suspects. Five arrests were effected, and \$1.2 million of methamphetamine oil was seized.

- McAllen Narcotics Trafficking Task Force, working on intelligence information, stopped a semitractor trailer loaded with onions. Found under the onions was over 2,000 pounds of cocaine valued at \$325 million. One arrest was effected at this time, and the semitractor-trailer was seized.

- West Texas Multi-County Task Force in El Paso executed a search warrant on an El Paso residence. Seized in the search were 14 AK47 semiautomatic rifles, 14 bayonets, 3,000 rounds of ammunition, and \$14,000 cash. These weapons were to be traded for narcotics in Mexico. Three adults were arrested.

- West Texas Multi-County Task Force in El Paso, working on intelligence information, set up a surveillance operation in Brewster County and observed a convoy of several vehicles coming from a remote border crossing. A stop was made, 500 pounds of marijuana was seized, and six arrests were effected.

- Austin Regional Anti-Drug Abuse Task Force raided an operational clandestine methamphetamine lab located in a residence in Austin. Seized in the raid was \$900,000 in methamphetamine oil and precursor chemicals. Arrested were six adults.

- Eagle Pass Organized Narcotics Task Force seized two operational clandestine methamphetamine labs in Dimmit County. \$500,000 worth of methamphetamine was seized, and two arrests were effected.

- Austin Regional Anti-Drug Abuse Task Force seized two working clandestine labs. Discovered in the raid were operational surveillance cameras with listening devices that were set up around the clandestine location. Six arrests were effected, and precursor chemicals capable of making approximately \$1.8 million worth of methamphetamine were seized.

- Eagle Pass Organized Narcotics Task Force, working an undercover buy bust, arrested three adults and seized 1/2 pound of cocaine valued at \$84,000.

- Hill County Agri-plex Roadrunners Narcotics Task Force, in the first months of its operation, reported seizure of nine working clandestine labs, arrest of 9 suspects, recovery of 70 guns, and seizure of 17 vehicles.

- San Antonio's Multi-Agency Narcotics Trafficking Task Force raided a working illegal methamphetamine lab that netted \$300,000 worth of amine oil, \$4 million worth of methamphetamine, \$1,900 in cocaine, and \$2,000 cash. Also seized were four commercial plant growers that had psilocybe mushrooms growing in them. Four arrests were effected. The unique facet of this incident is that it was the first encounter by task force personnel of a clandestine lab utilizing red phosphorus in its operation.

- San Angelo Rio-Concho Multi-Agency Narcotics Task Force seized a working underground clandestine lab in Coke County. They report that the lab was very sophisticated in structure. Two pounds of methamphetamine valued at \$600,000 was seized. Additionally, \$3 million in production value of phenocidic acid was confiscated. One arrest was effected.

- McAllen Narcotics Trafficking Task Force seized 2,406 pounds of cocaine located in a temporary storage unit in McAllen. The value of the cocaine was estimated at \$350 million.

- East Texas Narcotics Trafficking Task Force, operating out of Tyler, seized a working clandestine lab and confiscated approximately \$5 million worth of methamphetamine. The lab had high-tech surveillance equipment located around the perimeter, with a live cougar utilized for security of the inner perimeter. Three arrests were effected.

- Cass County Ark-La-Tex Narcotics Enforcement Task Force seized a working methamphetamine clandestine lab. Recovered in the raid were 40 pounds of Mexican marijuana, \$200,000 worth of methamphetamine, and several vehicles. Four suspects were arrested.

- McAllen Narcotics Trafficking Task Force conducted a search at a residence and seized 700 pounds of marijuana. Additionally, \$18,600 cash was confiscated. Two adults were arrested.

## VI. Strategy for Addressing the Problem

Development of an effective statewide strategy is vital to the ultimate goal of reducing the supply of and demand for drugs and the incidence of drug-related crime. A clear statement of various goals and objectives established to implement the strategy is necessary.

A concise overview of the state has been prepared, from information obtained in public hearings, written testimony, the research of drug and crime studies, the collection and analysis of certain data, and information received from law enforcement, criminal justice, treatment, and education officials. This information has been incorporated into a comprehensive strategy for the coordination of drug and violent crime control efforts, and the careful targeting of federal, state, and local resources.

---

### Goals for the Statewide Strategy

---

Texas' 1989 Statewide Strategy for Drug and Violent Crime Control prescribes the following goals, objectives, and plans for implementation:

**Goal:** To sharply reduce the supply of illegal drugs trafficked through our state.

- Enhance the apprehension of drug traffickers through use of multi-jurisdictional narcotic task forces located throughout our state.
- Increase the number of multi-jurisdictional task forces

operating throughout the state by establishing task force projects where none exist; the goal is to prevent gaps in services.

- Increase the number of trained narcotics officers assigned to existing task forces.
- Upgrade the equipment necessary for effective apprehension efforts.
- Continue the level of cooperation existing between federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies.

**Goal:** Immobilize illegal drug networks by targeting specific drug organizations for identification and investigation, under the following categories:

- Colombian/South American groups involved in marijuana and cocaine trafficking.
- Mexican national groups involved in the production and distribution of marijuana and heroin and the transshipment of cocaine.
- Traditional organized crime groups involved in drug trafficking and drug-related organized crime.
- Major regional drug groups involved in the production and distribution of illegal drugs, through multi-agency investigations.
- Outlaw motorcycle gangs involved in the production and

distribution of methamphetamine and amphetamine and the commission of property and violent crimes.

- Border drug families controlling transportation of drugs across the Texas-Mexico border and distribution throughout Texas.
- Ethnic drug gangs involved in large-scale, well-organized trafficking in cocaine, heroin and marijuana, and sales of crack on city streets.

**Goal:** Combat street sales of crack.

- Enhance street sales interdiction programs.
- Develop nontraditional enforcement strategies to effectively deal with crack houses.

**Goal:** Break the link between drugs and crime.

- Identify drug users in need of rehabilitation at the time of detention.
- Support drug-abuse treatment services in community-based programs.
- Support drug-abuse treatment programs for incarcerated offenders.

**Goal:** Remove the financial incentive for drug trafficking through the use of asset seizure and forfeiture.

- Support modification of Texas statutes.
- Continue working with the

DEA asset-removal team.

- Establish a state asset-removal team that can aid local agencies in filing for asset seizure and forfeiture.

**Goal:** Enhance investigations of drug trafficking organizations by developing intelligence sources.

- Increase the amount and occurrence of intelligence sharing on regional and statewide basis.

**Goal:** Conduct further evaluation of established drug control efforts.

- Continue the data collection project initiated to study TNCP arrests and case dispositions.

**Goal:** Fight violent crime through strengthened legislative provisions.

- Increase the calendar time that drug and violent offenders must serve before becoming eligible for parole.
- Enhance the penalty for drug-related murders.
- Take steps to curb the proliferation of automatic weapons and assault rifles.

**Goal:** Reduce the amount of methamphetamine and amphetamine available on the streets.

- Target suspected lab sites.
- Target groups involved in illegal drug production and distribution.

- Curtail the availability of precursor chemicals through statutory revisions.

**Goal:** Expedite the prosecution and adjudication of drug offenders.

- Enhance existing projects for this purpose in areas where such assistance could be utilized.
- Use the vertical prosecution method.
- Shorten time between indictment and disposition.
- Develop drug impact courts designed specifically to adjudicate drug offenses.

These goals can be accomplished through the existing criminal justice system but will require additional funds and personnel. In some instances, legislative changes are required.

---

### **Program Areas Authorized for 1989**

---

Many of the goals were addressed during the first year of operation of the Texas Narcotics Control Program. The purpose of the Drug Control and System Improvement Grant Program, as established by the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, is to assist states and local governments in carrying out specific programs that offer a high probability of improving the functioning of the criminal justice system, with emphasis on violent crime and serious offenders.

Grants may provide personnel,

equipment, training, technical assistance, and information systems for the more widespread apprehension, prosecution, adjudication, and detention and rehabilitation of persons who violate controlled substance laws, and to assist the victims of crime (other than compensation) through 21 specific programs specified in the Act.

As identified by the Governor's Task Force on Drug Abuse Drug Policy Subcommittee, the following legislatively authorized program areas are priorities for fiscal year 1989:

**1. Multi-jurisdictional task force programs** that integrate federal, state, and local drug enforcement agencies and prosecutors for the purpose of enhancing interagency coordination and intelligence and facilitating multijurisdictional investigations.

**2. Developing programs to improve drug control technology**, such as pre-trial drug testing programs, programs that provide for the identification, assessment, referral to treatment, case management, and monitoring of drug dependent offenders, and the enhancement of state and local forensic laboratories.

**3. Innovative programs that demonstrate new and different approaches** to the enforcement, prosecution, and adjudication of drug offenses and other serious crimes.

**4. Drug control evaluation programs** that the state and local units of government may utilize to evaluate programs and projects directed at state drug control activities.

## VII. User Accountability

With the passage of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, the innovative concept of user accountability, a major component of the legislation, has been heralded as a unique sanction that has the potential to reduce both drug demand and supply. In recent years, not enough focus has been placed on the casual user of illegal drugs, because of the ever-increasing attention that drug trafficking has demanded.

The 71st Legislature, now in session, is exploring the appropriate initiatives that could be enacted to hold drug users accountable. Such mechanisms will force drug users to recognize their role in drug trafficking. By creating the demand, the drug users are necessitating the supply and are indirectly responsible for problems such as the crime and violence that accompany the drug trade.

Texas already has in place strict penalties for those who use or distribute illegal drugs. During the 1981 session of the Legislature, the aggravated drug offense category was created to provide lengthy sentences and increased fines for the second conviction for possession, possession with intent to deliver, and manufacturing of controlled substances.

In addition, Texas enacted legislation in 1981 permitting wiretapping in certain circumstances to enhance law enforcement's ability to detect and infiltrate drug organizations. Wiretap evidence has been used to convict numerous criminals engaged in the organized distribution of drugs. Last

year 33 defendants in just one case in Gregg County were indicted and many received substantial sentences based on evidence obtained through an intercept on an apartment in Longview.

As previously discussed, Texas also has a triplicate-prescription requirement that has cracked down on criminal networks that divert prescription drugs for illegal use. Other effective tools that Texas has provided to law enforcement agencies include a strong asset-forfeiture law to help remove the profit motive from drug trafficking and a precursor chemical registration law to help track "speed cooks" and other manufacturers of dangerous controlled substances.

However, efforts are under way to make our tough laws even stronger and further increase law enforcement agencies' ability to hold offenders accountable for unlawfully possessing or using controlled substances. The chapter on resource needs detailed the recommendations of the Governor's Texas Criminal Justice Task Force to be acted on by the 71st Legislature. The recommendations include requiring aggravated drug offenders to serve flat time of one-fourth of the sentence or 15 years before becoming eligible for parole, increasing the ability to prosecute organized crime through an enhanced asset-forfeiture provision that permits the seizure of real property derived from drug proceeds, and making drug testing a condition of probation and parole.

These and other proposals such as a state death penalty for major drug

traffickers have already garnered significant support in the Legislature. They have been endorsed by House Speaker Gib Lewis and have received support from prosecutors, police chiefs, and mayors from across the state in testimony before the House Criminal Jurisprudence Committee.

The 71st Legislature is also reviewing innovative penalties and drug-demand reduction programs to hold drug users accountable for their actions. A number of these proposals were part of the recommendations of the Governor's Task Force on Drug Abuse. While studies indicate that drug-demand reduction efforts such as Texans' War on Drugs have been successful, it is also apparent that additional steps must be taken to significantly reduce drug use and its attendant activities. The Governor's Task Force on Drug Abuse submitted a comprehensive master plan to the 71st Legislature to accomplish this goal. The task force recommendations include:

- Establish a drug and alcohol abuse policy for all state employees, including programs of screening, testing, and assistance.
- Encourage the adoption of state employee anti-drug policy by all municipalities, school districts, and other governmental jurisdictions for their employees.
- Require private companies contracting or under consideration for contracting with the state to adopt the state drug and alcohol abuse policy for

their employees.

- Establish a comprehensive drug and alcohol abuse education plan, with standardized materials and teacher training, for all school districts in the state.
- Establish drug and alcohol education criteria for school textbooks that include strong provisions against any type of drug use.
- Provide legal immunity for teachers and administrators who intervene in the drug and alcohol problems of individual students, and a procedure whereby any necessary legal costs must be borne by the school district.
- Mandate the automatic suspension of drivers' licenses, and mandatory license deferrals, for those under the age of 21 convicted of drug- and alcohol-related offenses.
- Require mandatory substance abuse tests for school bus drivers.
- Establish drug screening for all defendants entering the criminal justice system, and educational programs within the system for those indicating drug use.

There is no question that the lenient attitude of society toward so-called "recreational" drug use has fostered the growth of a drug-abuse epidemic of overwhelming proportions. It is hoped that the increased law enforcement efforts under way and the innovative user accountability penalties being researched in Texas will turn back the tide of illegal drug use that is engulfing this nation.



## VIII. Coordination of Drug Control Efforts Within the State of Texas

Nothing less than our organized total commitment is required to combat drugs. A detailed statewide drug strategy and interagency cooperation as mandated by the Anti-Drug Abuse Acts of 1986 and 1988 are absolutely necessary if the battle being waged against narcotics is to be effective. The war on drugs can be won only by cooperative effort.

Developing a statewide strategy has been particularly important in a state as large and diverse as Texas. We must address the crucial needs to educate our young people about the dangers of drug abuse, provide adequate facilities to treat drug abusers, increase public awareness of the threat posed by drugs, and curtail drug dealing in our major cities. In addition, Texas is a major transshipment route for drugs destined for other parts of the country, and funds must be allocated to provide needed resources to help cut off the supply pipeline through Texas to other states.

The strategy that is the cornerstone of the significant new law enforcement initiative created with the State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1986 was developed after analysis of over 900 pages of testimony from law enforcement officials, corrections professionals, drug treatment experts, educators, parents, and concerned citizens. More than 260 specific proposals to fight drugs were reviewed. The priorities developed by

the committee for drug control efforts emphasize the importance of working together across agency and jurisdictional lines to present a unified front against drugs. Drug treatment and education professionals made valuable contributions to the development of the statewide law enforcement drug strategy.

The Texas Narcotics Control Program demonstrates what a coordinated and cooperative effort by federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies can achieve in efforts to control the amount of drugs available on the streets.

---

*A detailed statewide drug strategy and interagency cooperation as mandated by the Anti-Drug Abuse Acts of 1986 and 1988 are absolutely necessary if we are to make our battle against narcotics effective. The war on drugs can be won only by cooperative effort.*

---

However, there would be no supply of drugs if we could eradicate the demand for substances like marijuana, heroin, speed, and crack. Drug demand reduction through education is a particular priority of Governor Clements, and he received the "Governor's Award" last fall from the National Federation of Parents for his drug abuse prevention initiatives such as the nonprofit statewide organization Texans' War on Drugs. The opportunities provided by the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 created an impetus for the

state to take a comprehensive, coordinated approach to the problem of illicit drugs.

A mechanism has been implemented in Texas to ensure coordination among all the state agencies involved in anti-drug abuse efforts. In 1987, the Texas Legislature created the Alcohol and Substance Abuse Oversight Committee after the completion of a special study by the Legislative Budget Board of the ten state agencies that provide or contract for chemical-dependency services. The examination of the substance-abuse delivery system

---

*As a result of the Alcohol and Substance Abuse Oversight Committee's efforts to provide an overarching structure to the entire continuum of drug abuse education and treatment services, unparalleled cooperation has been developed by the participating agencies.*

---

in Texas stressed the need for interagency coordination and planning to identify the best uses for the new federal funding and the state funds available. To further the goal of close coordination between the drug law enforcement, drug prevention and education, and drug treatment and rehabilitation efforts in the state, the Executive Director of the Texas Narcotics Control Program serves as chair of the Alcohol and Substance Abuse Oversight Committee.

The agencies involved in this effort are the Texas Education Agency, the Texas Commission on Alcohol and

Drug Abuse, and the Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation, which received funding from the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986, plus the Texas Rehabilitation Commission, the Texas Department of Health, and all of the state corrections agencies, such as the Texas Youth Commission, the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission, the Texas Adult Probation Commission, the Texas Department of Corrections, and the Texas Board of Pardons and Paroles. Never before had there been an attempt to coordinate the efforts against substance abuse of both health and human services agencies and the criminal justice agencies.

The Alcohol and Substance Abuse Oversight Committee has been charged with the authority to review, evaluate, and approve plans for the federal drug demand reduction funds, as well as to foster coordination and cooperation to maximize the use of state funds. The committee is currently refining 32 specific recommendations for legislative action on how to make more efficient and effective use of demand reduction resources in Texas.

As a result of the committee's efforts to provide an overarching structure to the entire continuum of drug abuse education and treatment services, unparalleled cooperation has been developed by the participating agencies, as illustrated by the following examples:

- Responsibilities under the Drug-Free Schools and Communities

Act of 1986 are shared by the Texas Education Agency and the Texas Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse.

- The Texas Education Agency is working closely with Texans' War on Drugs to develop a comprehensive pre-kindergarten to grade 12 curriculum for use in all 1,071 school districts and to provide in-depth teacher education on how to recognize and intervene in cases of substance abuse.

- The Texas Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse convened a special justice advisory committee to determine the best uses for funds available for drug treatment initiatives with criminal justice agencies.

- The Texas Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse has agreed to target individuals from criminal justice and mental health populations for treatment because of the social and cost-effective benefits of such treatment.

- Additionally, the Texas Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse and the Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation developed a joint plan for coordinating and establishing a system of community-based services.

The Texas Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse provides services directly and on a contract-for-services basis to public and private nonprofit agencies. The Commission's prevention efforts include programs for high-risk youth, student assistance programs, and special help for children of substance abusers.

The Commission deserves special recognition for undertaking major studies on the prevalence of drug abuse among secondary school students, prison admissions, juvenile offenders, and female inmates, as well as in the general population. The agency's continuing efforts are providing crucial data on the nature and extent of drug abuse in the state.

## *Coordination Under the Anti-Drug Act of 1988*

For more information about the specific agency initiatives to coordinate programs under the Anti-Drug Abuse Acts of 1986 and 1988, please contact the following agencies:

### State & Local Law Enforcement Act

Rider Scott, Executive Director  
The Texas Narcotics Control Program  
Criminal Justice Division  
Office of the Governor  
P.O. Box 12428  
Austin, Texas 78711

*Staff contact:* John Coffel or  
Georgia Whitehead  
(512) 463-1919

### ADMHA Existing Block Grants

Dennis Jones, Commissioner  
Texas Department of Mental  
Health and Mental Retardation  
909 West 45th Street  
Austin, Texas 78752

*Staff contact:* Buddy Matthijetz  
(512) 465-4582

### Alcohol and Substance Abuse Oversight Committee\*

Rider Scott, Chair

*Staff contact:* Duke Millard  
(512) 463-1788

### Drug-Free Schools & Communities Assistance Act (Education Funds)

Dr. William Kirby, Executive Director  
Drug Abuse Prevention Program  
Texas Education Agency  
1701 North Congress Avenue  
Austin, Texas 78701

*Staff contact:* Nell Hoffman  
(512) 463-9501

### Drug-Free Schools & Communities Act (Community Prevention and High Risk Youth Funds)

-and-

### Emergency Substance Abuse Treatment and Rehabilitation Act

Bob Dickson, Executive Director  
Texas Commission on Alcohol and  
Drug Abuse  
1705 Guadalupe  
Austin, Texas 78701

*Staff contact:* Jane Maxwell  
(512) 463-5510

\* The Oversight Committee has organized the testimony on anti-drug efforts and initiatives from all ten participating agencies into six spiral-bound notebooks that can be made available to interested parties upon request.

## IX. Evaluation of the Strategy

Prior to the development of the 1989 Strategy, an in-depth assessment was made of the impact of the programs created under the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986. The critical elements of each operation, including data on production and performance indicators, were closely evaluated.

The data needed for evaluation are provided by quarterly reports required of each subgrantee. These reports include arrests, drug seizures, non-drug seizures, and other information. These quarterly reports have proven to be a very valuable tool, and the same reporting requirements will be imposed on projects receiving funding under the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988. Attached is a sample report.

In addition to the quarterly reporting requirements, the Criminal Justice Policy Council is conducting a data-collection project that follows cases initiated by the Texas Narcotics Control Program through arrest and disposition. This project goes beyond the Uniform Crime Reporting Collection.

At the end of this project period, the Criminal Justice Division will assess the accomplishments and production data from each project.

## X. Data Requirements

The data in the charts that follow are reported based on the format by which it is collected in Texas. An effort has been made to report in the recommended format if possible, in some cases using the data forms provided by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA).

As is reflected in the data tables, not all requested data are collected or reported in the state, most notably drug-specific and offense-specific information. Where requested data are not available for the state as a whole, we have provided data reported by Texas Narcotics Control Program projects (collected by the Criminal Justice Division of the Governor's Office and the Criminal Justice Policy Council).

---

---

## *List of Attachments*

|   | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| Sample Texas Narcotics Control Program Subgrantee<br>Quarterly Report .....                                       | 59          |
| Estimate of Availability of Drugs in the State .....  | 63          |
| Patterns of Drug Trafficking and Drug Use in the State.....   | 64          |
| Drug-Related Incidents .....  | 65          |
| State and Local Drug Arrests .....  | 67          |
| Texas Narcotics Control Program Production Statistics .....   | 69          |
| State and Local Dispositions for Drug Offenses and<br>Violent Crimes .....  | 70          |
| State and Local Drug Sentences.....   | 72          |
| State and Local Treatment Resources .....   | 73          |
| State and Local Drug Removals .....   | 74          |
| Non-Drug Asset Seizures and Forfeitures .....   | 76          |
| State and Local Arrests for Violent Crimes .....  | 78          |
| State Strategy .....  | 79          |
| Recommendations for the State and Local Drug Enforcement<br>Component of the National Drug Control Strategy ..... | 80          |
| Training and Technical Assistance Priorities.....   | 81          |
| Research Priorities .....   | 81          |

---

**TEXAS NARCOTICS CONTROL PROGRAM  
NARCOTIC SEIZURE REPORT**

DATE OF REPORT: \_\_\_\_\_

GRANT NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

GRANTEE NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

QUARTER 1 2 3 4

PROJECT TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_

BEGINNING MONTH: \_\_\_\_\_

PREPARED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

ENDING MONTH: \_\_\_\_\_

REVIEWED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

PROJECT DIRECTOR'S SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_

(16 oz = 1 lb)      (28 grms = 1 oz)      (Dose Unit = 1 Pill, Tablet or Capsule)

| SOLID POUNDS | SOLID OUNCES | SOLID GRAMS | LIQUID OUNCES | DOSE UNITS | ITEMS | STREET VALUE |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|------------|-------|--------------|
|--------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|------------|-------|--------------|

(Please do not write in shaded areas.)

**A. Marijuana**

- 1. Packaged
- 2. Plants

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**B. Marijuana Fields & Gardens**

- 1. Gardens
- 2. Wild Fields
- 3. Cultivated Fields
- 4. Greenhouses

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**C. Hashish**

- 1. Liquid, Oil
- 2. Solid

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**D. Opiates**

- 1. Morphine
- 2. Heroin
- 3. Codeine
- 4. Gum Opium

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**E. Cocaine**

- 1. Solid
- 2. Liquid
- 3. Crack

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**F. Hallucinogens**

- 1. LSD
- 2. PCP
- 3. Mushrooms
- 4. Peyote
- 5. Designer Drugs

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**G. Clandestine Labs**

Type of Drug  
Manufactured  
By Each Lab

LAB 1 \_\_\_\_\_ LAB 4 \_\_\_\_\_  
LAB 2 \_\_\_\_\_ LAB 5 \_\_\_\_\_  
LAB 3 \_\_\_\_\_ LAB 6 \_\_\_\_\_

**H. Precursor  
Chemicals Seized**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

**I. Other Drugs**

- 1. Barbiturates
- 2. Amphetamines
- 3. Methamphetamines
- 4. Tranquilizers
- 5. Synthetic Narcotics

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**TEXAS NARCOTICS CONTROL PROGRAM**

REPORT PERIOD \_\_\_\_\_

**NON-DRUG SEIZURES AND FORFEITURES**

GRANT NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_

| STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES    | ASSET SEIZURES     |               | ASSET FORFEITURES     |               |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------|
|                             | number of seizures | dollar amount | number of forfeitures | dollar amount |
| Vehicles                    | _____              | _____         | _____                 | _____         |
| Vessels                     | _____              | _____         | _____                 | _____         |
| Aircraft                    | _____              | _____         | _____                 | _____         |
| Currency                    | _____              | _____         | _____                 | _____         |
| Other Financial Instruments | _____              | _____         | _____                 | _____         |
| Real Property               | _____              | _____         | _____                 | _____         |
| Weapons                     | _____              | _____         | _____                 | _____         |
| TOTALS                      | _____              | _____         | _____                 | _____         |

**WITH FEDERAL ASSISTANCE**

|                             |       |       |       |       |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Vehicles                    | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Vessels                     | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Aircraft                    | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Currency                    | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Other Financial Instruments | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Real Property               | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Weapons                     | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| TOTALS                      | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

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



ARREST REPORT

|                     | POSSESSION |    |    | MANUFACTURE |    |    | SALE |    |    | TOTAL |
|---------------------|------------|----|----|-------------|----|----|------|----|----|-------|
|                     | M          | F  | J  | M           | F  | J  | M    | F  | J  |       |
|                     | AG         | AG | AG | AG          | AG | AG | AG   | AG | AG |       |
| MARIJUANA           |            |    |    |             |    |    |      |    |    |       |
| HASHISH             |            |    |    |             |    |    |      |    |    |       |
| MORPHINE            |            |    |    |             |    |    |      |    |    |       |
| HEROIN              |            |    |    |             |    |    |      |    |    |       |
| CODEINE             |            |    |    |             |    |    |      |    |    |       |
| GUM OPIUM           |            |    |    |             |    |    |      |    |    |       |
| COCAINE             |            |    |    |             |    |    |      |    |    |       |
| CRACK               |            |    |    |             |    |    |      |    |    |       |
| LSD                 |            |    |    |             |    |    |      |    |    |       |
| PCP                 |            |    |    |             |    |    |      |    |    |       |
| MUSHROOMS           |            |    |    |             |    |    |      |    |    |       |
| PEYOTE              |            |    |    |             |    |    |      |    |    |       |
| DESIGNER DRUGS      |            |    |    |             |    |    |      |    |    |       |
| BARBITURATES        |            |    |    |             |    |    |      |    |    |       |
| AMPHETAMINES        |            |    |    |             |    |    |      |    |    |       |
| METHAMPHETAMINES    |            |    |    |             |    |    |      |    |    |       |
| TRANQUILIZERS       |            |    |    |             |    |    |      |    |    |       |
| SYNTHETIC NARCOTICS |            |    |    |             |    |    |      |    |    |       |
| CLANDESTINE LABS    |            |    |    |             |    |    |      |    |    |       |
| PRECURSOR CHEMICALS |            |    |    |             |    |    |      |    |    |       |
| INHALANTS           |            |    |    |             |    |    |      |    |    |       |
| OTHER               |            |    |    |             |    |    |      |    |    |       |
| TOTALS:             |            |    |    |             |    |    |      |    |    |       |

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

DATA ELEMENTS FOR ANTI-DRUG ABUSE PROGRAM

(Preprinted Sequence #)

ARREST DATA

No 00016083

Suspect's Last Name: \_\_\_\_\_ First Name: \_\_\_\_\_ M.I. \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Arrest (MM/DD/YY): \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_ Arresting Agency: \_\_\_\_\_

Sex (Circle One): 1.Male 2.Female Date of Birth (MM/DD/YY): \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Highest Offense Charged (NCIC Code): \_\_\_\_\_ Total Offenses Charged: \_\_\_\_\_

Highest Drug Offense (if different from above - NCIC Code): \_\_\_\_\_

Drug Involved?: \_\_\_\_\_ Amount Seized: \_\_\_\_\_ Units(gr.,lb.): \_\_\_\_\_

Suspect's DPS number: \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Prior: Arrests: \_\_\_\_ Convictions: \_\_\_\_ Probations: \_\_\_\_ Prison Sentences: \_\_\_\_

COURT DATA

County of Jurisdiction: \_\_\_\_\_ Total Number of Charges Filed: \_\_\_\_\_

Highest Charge Filed by Prosecutor (NCIC Code): \_\_\_\_\_ Level: 1. Felony 2. Misd

Highest Drug Charge Filed (if different from above - NCIC Code): \_\_\_\_\_ Level: 1.Felony 2.Misd

What Drug is Involved?: \_\_\_\_\_

Date Case Filed (MM/DD/YY): \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_ Court Cause Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Court Disposition Date (MM/DD/YY): \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Court Disposition (Circle One): 1. Acquitted 2. Dismissed 3. Convicted 4. No Bill

Type of Trial (Circle One): 1. Trial By Judge 2. Trial By Jury

Plea at Trial (Circle One): 1. Guilty 2. Not Guilty 3. Nolo Contendere

Highest Offense of Conviction (NCIC Code): \_\_\_\_\_ Level: 1. Felony 2. Misd

Highest Drug Conviction(if different from above - NCIC Code): \_\_\_\_\_ Level: 1. Felony 2. Misd

What Drug is Involved?: \_\_\_\_\_

Sentence: 1. Fine: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Probated Fine (Circle One): Yes No 3. County Jail: \_\_\_\_\_ Months  
4. TDC: \_\_\_\_\_ Years 5. Probated Jail/TDC(Circle one): Yes No  
6. Deferred Adjudication(Circle one): Yes No

Sentenced by (Circle one): 1. Judge 2. Jury

When Arrested, Was The Offender Already on (Circle all that apply): 1. Probation 2. Parole  
3. Mandatory Supervision

If Offender Was Already on Probation, Parole, or Mandatory Supervision, is That Release Status Being Revoked: 1.Yes 2.No

a. Instead of seeking a new conviction for this arrest? 1. Yes 2. No  
b. In addition to seeking a new conviction for this arrest? 1. Yes 2. No

## ESTIMATE OF AVAILABILITY OF DRUGS IN THE STATE

*Please estimate the amount of controlled substances which are produced in the state and/or transported into the state. Indicate the type of drugs, source of the drugs and any observed changes in availability. Estimates may be derived from a variety of sources, such as a survey of law enforcement, DEA estimates, household surveys, etc. Please indicate the sources of the information and the methods used to make the estimates.*

Main drugs of choice during this reporting period are crack cocaine, cocaine powder, methamphetamine and amphetamines, marijuana, heroin, and a measurable amount of controlled substance analogues. Also, hallucinogens, opiates, and depressants are marketed and abused.

There is no region of the state that does not report a significant illegal drug problem or widespread availability of all types of drugs. This information is discussed in further detail in Section I, Nature and Extent.

Estimates of availability of drugs were derived from the following sources:

- Texas Department of Public Safety, Narcotics Service
- Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA)
- Texas Narcotics Control Program task force commanders
- Narcotics officers in metropolitan jurisdictions with population in excess of 250,000
- Organized Crime Control Units
- Immigration & Naturalization Service (INS)
- Texas Commission on Alcohol & Drug Abuse
- Oral and written testimony received at public hearings held by the Governor's Task Force on Drug Abuse Drug Policy Subcommittee in development of the strategy
- U.S. Customs Service
- Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, & Firearms (ATF)
- U.S. Border Patrol
- United States Attorneys

## PATTERNS OF DRUG TRAFFICKING AND DRUG USE IN THE STATE

*Please describe the role of organized crime, motorcycle gangs or other groups in the drug problem in the state. Please distinguish between traditional organized crime (Mafia, La Cosa Nostra, Mob) and non-traditional organized crime (racial or ethnic organized groups).*

Organized drug distribution networks operating in Texas include:

- (1) Mexican nationals and Mexican-Americans organized as "border drug families"
- (2) Traditional organized crime groups
- (3) Latin American organized crime groups
- (4) Outlaw motorcycle gangs
- (5) Ethnic drug gangs - Cubans, Jamaicans, Colombians, Pakistanis, Nigerians, Puerto Ricans, Panamanians, Haitians

Section I, Nature and Extent, contains a full description of the illegal drug distribution activity of these groups.

*Please describe any changes in drug use over the past several years, including changes in the drug of preference, such as crack or designer drugs, or changes in age groups using specific drugs.*

Cocaine indicators (deaths, emergency room episodes, treatment admissions) have risen sharply over the last five years. Most of these increases have been due to use of crack cocaine. The use of methamphetamine and amphetamine, and hallucinogens (such as LSD and Ecstasy) has also increased in several areas of the state. Heroin indicators have leveled off or declined somewhat over the last year. Marijuana use indicators have generally declined for several years.

Crack cocaine as the drug of preference has escalated in the past two years. Age groups of persons using specific drugs has not changed significantly.

Source: Texas Commission on Alcohol & Drug Abuse

*Please describe patterns for drug use across the state (e.g., does the type and level of drug use vary in different parts of the state).*

According to a recent survey, the areas with the highest rates of drug abuse (adjusting for population size) are the Houston area, the Dallas/Fort Worth area, the Central Texas area (including Austin, Waco, College Station) and the San Antonio area. Reports from community sources indicate that use of various substances are particularly prevalent in selected areas, such as stimulants in the Dallas area and crack in the Houston area.

Source: Texas Commission on Alcohol & Drug Abuse

## DRUG-RELATED INCIDENTS

Please indicate the number of drug-related deaths, accidents and emergency room incidents. For emergency room incidents, please show the number of drug mentions within the chart and indicate the total number of episodes (drug-related visits to an emergency room) in the space provided below the chart. The drug mentions may exceed the number of episodes, as more than one drug may be mentioned.

| INCIDENT                                   | MAJOR DRUG INVOLVED |         |          |   |            |                  |                   |       |
|--|---------------------|---------|----------|---|------------|------------------|-------------------|-------|
|  | OPIATES             | COCAINE | CANNABIS | DANGEROUS DRUGS   |            |                  | UNKNOWN/<br>OTHER | TOTAL |
|  |                     |         |          | HALLU-<br>CINOGENS  | STIMULANTS | DEPRES-<br>SANTS |                   |       |
| Death                                      |                     |         |          |   |            |                  |                   | 348   |
| Emergency Rm. Incident                     | 372                 | 1058    | 572      | 130   | 141        | 93               | 6821              |       |
| Fatal Traffic Accident                     |                     |         |          |   |            |                  |                   | 49    |
| Non-Fatal Traffic Accident                 |                     |         |          |   |            |                  |                   | 737   |
| Total                                      |                     |         |          |   |            |                  |                   |       |
| Total Emergency Room Episodes <u>5,204</u> |                     |         |          |   |            |                  |                   |       |
| Number of Agencies Reporting <u>26</u>     |                     |         |          | Percent of Population Served by Reporting Agencies <u>See Below</u> |            |                  |                   |       |

### Percent of Population Served by Reporting Agencies:

Death & Traffic Accidents = 100%

Emergency Room Incidents = 5.58%

SOURCE: Texas Commission on Alcohol & Drug Abuse;  
Drug Abuse Warning Network (DAWN)

## DRUG-RELATED SCHOOL INCIDENTS

*Please indicate the number of drug-related disciplinary actions reported by the schools.*

| ACTION FOR<br>DRUG USE             | TYPE OF DRUG |         |          |  |            |                  |                   | TOTAL |
|------------------------------------|--------------|---------|----------|--|------------|------------------|-------------------|-------|
|                                    | OPIATES      | COCAINE | CANNABIS | DANGEROUS DRUGS  |            |                  | UNKNOWN/<br>OTHER |       |
|                                    |              |         |          | HALLU-<br>CINOGENS                                       | STIMULANTS | DEPRES-<br>SANTS |                   |       |
| Disciplinary                       |              |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| Suspension                         |              |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| Expulsion                          |              |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| ACTION FOR<br>SELLING<br>DRUGS     |              |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| Disciplinary                       |              |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| Suspension                         |              |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| Expulsion                          |              |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| Total                              |              |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| Number of Agencies Reporting _____ |              |         |          | Percent of Population Served by Reporting Agencies _____ |            |                  |                   |       |

THIS INFORMATION IS NOT COLLECTED IN TEXAS AT THIS TIME

## STATE AND LOCAL DRUG ARRESTS

Report Period \_\_\_\_\_

*Please indicate the total number of drug-related arrests made by state and local law enforcement agencies in the state during the report period.*

| OFFENSE                               | MAJOR DRUG INVOLVED  |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
|---------------------------------------|--|---------|----------|--|------------|------------------|-------------------|-------|
|                                       | OPIATES  | COCAINE | CANNABIS | DANGEROUS DRUGS  |            |                  | UNKNOWN/<br>OTHER | TOTAL |
|                                       |  |         |          | HALLU-<br>CINOGENS                                       | STIMULANTS | DEPRES-<br>SANTS |                   |       |
| Buying/Receiving                      |  |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| Cultivation/<br>Manufacture           |  |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| Distribution/Sale                     |  |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| Operating/<br>Promoting/<br>Assisting | SEE "STATE AND LOCAL DRUG ARRESTS"<br>Texas Department of Public Safety<br>Uniform Crime Reporting |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| Possession/<br>Concealing             |  |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| Transportation/<br>Importation        |  |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| Using/Consuming                       |  |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| Other                                 |  |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| Total                                 |  |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| Number of Agencies Reporting _____    |  |         |          | Percent of Population Served by Reporting Agencies _____ |            |                  |                   |       |

Report Period \_\_\_\_\_

## STATE AND LOCAL DRUG ARRESTS MADE WITH FEDERAL COOPERATION

*Please indicate the number of arrests (also included above) which were made in cooperation with Federal agencies.*

| OFFENSE                               | MAJOR DRUG INVOLVED  |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
|---------------------------------------|--|---------|----------|--|------------|------------------|-------------------|-------|
|                                       | OPIATES  | COCAINE | CANNABIS | DANGEROUS DRUGS  |            |                  | UNKNOWN/<br>OTHER | TOTAL |
|                                       |  |         |          | HALLU-<br>CINOGENS                                       | STIMULANTS | DEPRES-<br>SANTS |                   |       |
| Buying/Receiving                      |  |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| Cultivation/<br>Manufacture           | THIS INFORMATION IS NOT READILY AVAILABLE;<br><br>FEDERAL AGENCIES COOPERATE WITH STATE AND<br>LOCAL DRUG ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES THROUGHOUT<br>THE STATE ON A REGULAR, ONGOING BASIS |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| Distribution/Sale                     |  |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| Operating/<br>Promoting/<br>Assisting |  |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| Possession/<br>Concealing             |  |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| Transportation/<br>Importation        |  |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| Using/Consuming                       |  |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| Other                                 |  |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| Total                                 |  |         |          |  |            |                  |                   |       |
| Number of Agencies Reporting _____    |  |         |          | Percent of Population Served by Reporting Agencies _____ |            |                  |                   |       |

**STATE AND LOCAL DRUG ARRESTS  
DRUG ABUSE VIOLATIONS  
January thru June, 1988**

|  |             | JUVENILES<br>(16 and<br>Under) | ADULTS<br>(17 and<br>Older) |
|--|-------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>SALE/MANUFACTURING</b>  | M . . . . . | 71                             | 3,386                       |
| Subtotal   | F . . . . . | 16                             | 698                         |
| Opium/Cocaine/Derivatives<br>(Morphine, Heroin)                  | M . . . . . | 11                             | 1,584                       |
|  | F . . . . . | 3                              | 328                         |
| Marijuana  | M . . . . . | 47                             | 1,056                       |
|  | F . . . . . | 10                             | 164                         |
| Synthetic Narcotics  | M . . . . . | 9                              | 541                         |
|  | F . . . . . | 1                              | 157                         |
| Other Dangerous Non-Narcotic<br>Drugs (Barbiturates, Benzedrine) | M . . . . . | 4                              | 205                         |
|  | F . . . . . | 2                              | 49                          |
| <b>POSSESSION</b>  | M . . . . . | 1,411                          | 22,190                      |
| Subtotal   | F . . . . . | 259                            | 4,202                       |
| Opium/Cocaine/Derivatives<br>(Morphine, Heroin)                  | M . . . . . | 115                            | 6,561                       |
|  | F . . . . . | 24                             | 1,530                       |
| Marijuana  | M . . . . . | 1,134                          | 12,411                      |
|  | F . . . . . | 191                            | 1,619                       |
| Synthetic Narcotics  | M . . . . . | 54                             | 2,083                       |
|  | F . . . . . | 21                             | 671                         |
| Other Dangerous Non-Narcotic<br>Drug (Barbiturates, Benzedrine)  | M . . . . . | 108                            | 1,135                       |
|  | F . . . . . | 23                             | 382                         |
| <b>GRAND TOTAL</b>   | M . . . . . | 1,482                          | 25,576                      |
|  | F . . . . . | 275                            | 4,900                       |
|  |             | <u>1,757</u>                   | <u>30,476</u>               |

Source: Texas Department of Public Safety  
Uniform Crime Reporting, Crime Records Division  
Number of Agencies Reporting: 815  
Percent of Populations Served by Reporting Agencies: 99.9%  
(M=Male/F=Female)



TEXAS NARCOTICS CONTROL PROGRAM

PRODUCTION STATISTICS  
Calendar Year 1988

|  |                            |
|--|----------------------------|
| DRUG SEIZURES  | \$290,136,146              |
| ARRESTS  | 6,111                      |
| NON-DRUG ASSET SEIZURES<br>(Vehicles, Weapons, Currency, etc.) | \$ 7,545,634               |
| WEAPONS SEIZED   | 476                        |
| CLANDESTINE LABS   | 142                        |
| <hr/>  |                            |
| Marijuana  | 81,743 pounds              |
| Cocaine  | 4,958 pounds               |
| Heroin   | 14 pounds                  |
| Crack  | 5 pounds                   |
| LSD  | 2,097 doses                |
| Synthetic Narcotics  | 29 pounds<br>3,386 doses   |
| Hallucinogens  | 4 pounds                   |
| Amphetamines   | 949 pounds<br>24,926 doses |
| Methamphetamines   | 304 pounds<br>1,596 doses  |
| Barbiturates   | 1,745 doses                |
| Precursor Chemicals  | 6,196 pounds               |
| Tranquilizers  | 1,603 doses                |

STATE AND LOCAL DISPOSITIONS FOR DRUG OFFENSES  
AND VIOLENT CRIMES

DISTRICT COURT ACTIVITY

Statewide Summary of Reported Activity for Year Ending August 31, 1988

(Criminal)

| CRIMINAL DOCKET                         |                    |                                       |                       |                       |                        |                       |                  |              |              |               |              |                    |                        | TOTAL            |                 |                          |        |
|---|--------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|--------|
|   | Cap-<br>ital       | Murder<br>Or Vol<br>Mansl-<br>aughttr | Asslt<br>Or<br>Murder | Sex<br>Asslt<br>Adult | Sex<br>Asslt<br>Child  | Sex<br>Asslt<br>Child | Robbery          | Burg         | Theft        | Auto<br>Theft | Arson        | Drug<br>Sale<br>Dr | Drug<br>Posse-<br>sion | Felony<br>D.W.I. | Other<br>Felony | All<br>Misde-<br>meanors | TOTAL  |
| <b>CAUSES ON DOCKET:</b>                |                    |                                       |                       |                       |                        |                       |                  |              |              |               |              |                    |                        |                  |                 |                          |        |
| Causes Pending 9-1-87                   | 391                | 2091                                  | 5922                  | 1315                  | 3478                   | 4205                  | 15590            | 19730        | 4562         | 560           | 6924         | 12849              | 3638                   | 17997            | 6887            | 106139                   |        |
| Docket Adjustments                      | -7                 | -5                                    | -23                   | -3                    | -23                    | 15                    | 70               | -260         | 276          | 6             | 24           | -19                | -22                    | -33              | -1014           | -1018                    |        |
| Causes Filed By Indictment              | 279                | 1391                                  | 6441                  | 1219                  | 4056                   | 6134                  | 21967            | 14469        | 5731         | 543           | 9188         | 18399              | 4641                   | 18997            | 800             | 114255                   |        |
| Causes Filed By Information             | 6                  | 51                                    | 461                   | 42                    | 224                    | 499                   | 3892             | 1832         | 1081         | 61            | 594          | 2001               | 415                    | 2080             | 3168            | 16407                    |        |
| <b>OTHERS REACHING DOCKET:</b>          |                    |                                       |                       |                       |                        |                       |                  |              |              |               |              |                    |                        |                  |                 |                          |        |
| Motions To Revoke Filed                 | 4                  | 119                                   | 1436                  | 223                   | 557                    | 1279                  | 9318             | 4491         | 1970         | 175           | 2060         | 5216               | 1242                   | 5532             | 453             | 34075                    |        |
| Shock Probation From TDC                |                    | 23                                    | 85                    | 30                    | 75                     | 92                    | 311              | 114          | 56           | 9             | 209          | 166                | 26                     | 152              | 10              | 1358                     |        |
| Transfer From Other Counties            | 17                 | 5                                     | 17                    | 1                     | 8                      | 3                     | 6                |              | 2            | 1             | 2            | 5                  | 1                      | 19               | 8               | 95                       |        |
| Other Causes Added                      | 15                 | 44                                    | 121                   | 31                    | 46                     | 86                    | 207              | 144          | 50           | 10            | 106          | 152                | 29                     | 253              | 569             | 1863                     |        |
| <b>TOTAL CAUSES ON DOCKET</b>           | <b>705</b>         | <b>3719</b>                           | <b>14460</b>          | <b>2058</b>           | <b>8421</b>            | <b>12313</b>          | <b>51361</b>     | <b>40520</b> | <b>13728</b> | <b>1365</b>   | <b>19107</b> | <b>38769</b>       | <b>9970</b>            | <b>44997</b>     | <b>10881</b>    | <b>273174</b>            |        |
| <b>DISPOSITIONS:</b>                    |                    |                                       |                       |                       |                        |                       |                  |              |              |               |              |                    |                        |                  |                 |                          |        |
| <b>Convictions:</b>                     |                    |                                       |                       |                       |                        |                       |                  |              |              |               |              |                    |                        |                  |                 |                          |        |
| Guilty Plea - No Jury                   | 64                 | 552                                   | 2937                  | 573                   | 1663                   | 4285                  | 16125            | 7788         | 4212         | 288           | 5372         | 10622              | 4048                   | 10400            | 1502            | 70431                    |        |
| Not Guilty Plea - No Jury               |                    | 33                                    | 100                   | 10                    | 46                     | 71                    | 204              | 74           | 45           | 9             | 85           | 140                | 22                     | 123              | 12              | 974                      |        |
| Guilty Plea - Jury Verdict              | 15                 | 29                                    | 44                    | 17                    | 37                     | 66                    | 97               | 34           | 16           | 1             | 63           | 65                 | 8                      | 66               | 1               | 559                      |        |
| Not Guilty Plea - Jury Ver              | 55                 | 295                                   | 227                   | 93                    | 201                    | 316                   | 409              | 120          | 62           | 11            | 252          | 251                | 32                     | 276              | 18              | 2618                     |        |
| <b>Total Convictions</b>                | <b>134</b>         | <b>909</b>                            | <b>3308</b>           | <b>693</b>            | <b>1947</b>            | <b>4738</b>           | <b>16835</b>     | <b>8016</b>  | <b>4335</b>  | <b>309</b>    | <b>5772</b>  | <b>11078</b>       | <b>4110</b>            | <b>10865</b>     | <b>1533</b>     | <b>74582</b>             |        |
| Placed On Deferred Adjudication         |                    | 67                                    | 872                   | 109                   | 551                    | 535                   | 3748             | 3029         | 926          | 85            | 1030         | 3736               | 20                     | 3453             | 200             | 18361                    |        |
| <b>Acquittals:</b>                      |                    |                                       |                       |                       |                        |                       |                  |              |              |               |              |                    |                        |                  |                 |                          |        |
| Non-Jury Trials                         |                    | 11                                    | 38                    | 8                     | 28                     | 36                    | 87               | 65           | 40           | 4             | 42           | 93                 | 8                      | 74               | 1               | 535                      |        |
| Jury Verdicts                           | 5                  | 38                                    | 67                    | 24                    | 81                     | 38                    | 59               | 33           | 20           | 3             | 27           | 37                 | 6                      | 72               | 7               | 517                      |        |
| Directed Verdicts                       | 1                  | 2                                     | 5                     | 1                     | 8                      | 4                     | 13               | 8            | 5            | 3             | 5            | 8                  |                        | 15               |                 | 78                       |        |
| <b>Total Acquittals</b>                 | <b>6</b>           | <b>51</b>                             | <b>110</b>            | <b>33</b>             | <b>117</b>             | <b>78</b>             | <b>159</b>       | <b>106</b>   | <b>65</b>    | <b>10</b>     | <b>74</b>    | <b>138</b>         | <b>14</b>              | <b>161</b>       | <b>8</b>        | <b>1130</b>              |        |
| <b>Dismissals:</b>                      |                    |                                       |                       |                       |                        |                       |                  |              |              |               |              |                    |                        |                  |                 |                          |        |
| Insufficient Evidence                   | 8                  | 52                                    | 233                   | 65                    | 154                    | 166                   | 563              | 568          | 181          | 31            | 195          | 778                | 54                     | 608              | 164             | 3820                     |        |
| Def Convict Other Cause                 | 28                 | 63                                    | 566                   | 113                   | 359                    | 380                   | 1615             | 839          | 385          | 38            | 498          | 824                | 173                    | 1565             | 162             | 7608                     |        |
| Speedy Trial Act Limits                 |                    | 7                                     | 7                     | 6                     | 10                     | 7                     | 25               | 24           | 10           | 1             | 12           | 7                  | 6                      | 40               | 5               | 167                      |        |
| Cause Refiled                           | 34                 | 150                                   | 297                   | 103                   | 190                    | 303                   | 606              | 447          | 170          | 33            | 332          | 406                | 99                     | 675              | 14              | 3859                     |        |
| Defendant Unapprehended                 |                    | 2                                     | 45                    | 3                     | 14                     | 18                    | 59               | 327          | 36           | 7             | 35           | 49                 | 9                      | 180              |                 | 784                      |        |
| Def Granted Immunity                    |                    |                                       | 1                     | 1                     | 1                      | 1                     | 6                | 5            | 2            | 2             |              | 8                  |                        | 15               |                 | 42                       |        |
| Other Dismissals                        | 24                 | 95                                    | 1050                  | 218                   | 553                    | 482                   | 1614             | 1893         | 489          | 67            | 594          | 1448               | 226                    | 2199             | 652             | 11604                    |        |
| <b>Total Dismissals</b>                 | <b>94</b>          | <b>369</b>                            | <b>2199</b>           | <b>509</b>            | <b>1281</b>            | <b>1357</b>           | <b>4488</b>      | <b>4103</b>  | <b>1273</b>  | <b>179</b>    | <b>1666</b>  | <b>3520</b>        | <b>567</b>             | <b>5282</b>      | <b>997</b>      | <b>27884</b>             |        |
| Change Of Venue Transfers               | 12                 | 7                                     | 10                    | 1                     | 8                      | 4                     | 8                | 8            | 2            |               | 5            | 5                  | 1                      | 28               | 8               | 107                      |        |
| Transfers To County Court               |                    | 1                                     | 33                    |                       | 4                      |                       | 37               | 82           | 6            |               | 11           | 21                 | 22                     | 211              | 896             | 1324                     |        |
| Placed On Shock Probation               | 1                  | 23                                    | 77                    | 24                    | 75                     | 88                    | 337              | 113          | 53           | 8             | 199          | 167                | 28                     | 148              | 8               | 1349                     |        |
| Motion To Revoke Granted                | 2                  | 65                                    | 709                   | 116                   | 278                    | 782                   | 5259             | 2152         | 1254         | 99            | 1004         | 2613               | 672                    | 2667             | 172             | 17844                    |        |
| Motion To Revoke Denied                 |                    | 57                                    | 531                   | 60                    | 190                    | 326                   | 2671             | 1521         | 554          | 60            | 638          | 1424               | 383                    | 1829             | 121             | 10355                    |        |
| All Other Dispositions                  | 6                  | 26                                    | 187                   | 24                    | 49                     | 69                    | 506              | 235          | 84           | 21            | 144          | 250                | 87                     | 417              | 333             | 2438                     |        |
| <b>TOTAL DISPOSITIONS</b>               | <b>255</b>         | <b>1575</b>                           | <b>8036</b>           | <b>1569</b>           | <b>4490</b>            | <b>7977</b>           | <b>34048</b>     | <b>19365</b> | <b>8552</b>  | <b>771</b>    | <b>10543</b> | <b>22952</b>       | <b>5904</b>            | <b>25061</b>     | <b>4276</b>     | <b>155374</b>            |        |
| <b>CAUSES PENDING 8-31-88</b>           | <b>450</b>         | <b>2144</b>                           | <b>6424</b>           | <b>1289</b>           | <b>3931</b>            | <b>4336</b>           | <b>17313</b>     | <b>21155</b> | <b>5176</b>  | <b>594</b>    | <b>8564</b>  | <b>15817</b>       | <b>4066</b>            | <b>19936</b>     | <b>6605</b>     | <b>117800</b>            |        |
| <b>CAUSES - UNAPPREHENDED DEFENDANT</b> |                    |                                       |                       |                       |                        |                       |                  |              |              |               |              |                    |                        |                  |                 |                          |        |
| <b>SENTENCING INFORMATION:</b>          |                    |                                       |                       |                       |                        |                       |                  |              |              |               |              |                    |                        |                  |                 |                          |        |
| Death Sentences - Causes                | 37                 |                                       |                       |                       |                        |                       |                  |              |              |               |              |                    |                        |                  |                 |                          | 37     |
| Life Sentences - Causes                 | 31                 | 84                                    | 22                    | 25                    | 16                     | 66                    | 40               | 5            | 3            | 1             | 18           | 10                 | 2                      | 28               | 1               | 352                      |        |
| Lesser Offense Convictions              | 20                 | 131                                   | 708                   | 88                    | 183                    | 779                   | 1535             | 1119         | 445          | 49            | 526          | 603                | 189                    | 1310             | 39              | 7724                     |        |
| <b>ADDITIONAL COURT ACTIVITY:</b>       |                    |                                       |                       |                       |                        |                       |                  |              |              |               |              |                    |                        |                  |                 |                          |        |
| Jury Panels Examined                    |                    |                                       |                       |                       |                        |                       |                  |              |              |               |              |                    |                        |                  |                 |                          | 4306   |
| Jury Sworn & Evd Presented              |                    |                                       |                       |                       |                        |                       |                  |              |              |               |              |                    |                        |                  |                 |                          | 4025   |
| Attorneys Appointed                     |                    |                                       |                       |                       |                        |                       |                  |              |              |               |              |                    |                        |                  |                 |                          | 85329  |
| <b>AGE OF CAUSES DISPOSED</b>           |                    |                                       |                       |                       |                        |                       |                  |              |              |               |              |                    |                        |                  |                 |                          |        |
|   | 60 Days<br>Or Less |                                       | 60 Days<br>To 90 Days |                       | 91 Days<br>To 120 Days |                       | Over 120<br>Days |              |              |               |              |                    |                        |                  |                 |                          | TOTAL  |
|   | 60518              |                                       | 19960                 |                       | 14954                  |                       | 59942            |              |              |               |              |                    |                        |                  |                 |                          | 155374 |

Number of Agencies Reporting: All

Percent of Population Served by Reporting Agencies: 99.9%

Report Period CY 1988**STATE AND LOCAL DRUG DISPOSITIONS**

Please indicate the results, by defendant, of cases reaching disposition during the report period. Because of the time lag between arrest and disposition, the arrests reported in the previous chart and the dispositions reported in this chart may refer to different cases.

| DISPOSITION                             | MAJOR DRUG INVOLVED |         |          |   |            |                  |                   |       |
|---|---------------------|---------|----------|---|------------|------------------|-------------------|-------|
|   | OPIATES             | COCAINE | CANNABIS | DANGEROUS DRUGS   |            |                  | UNKNOWN/<br>OTHER | TOTAL |
|   |                     |         |          | HALLU-<br>CINOGENS  | STIMULANTS | DEPRES-<br>SANTS |                   |       |
| Convicted                               | 4                   | 355     | 243      | 11  | 183        | 5                | 94                | 895   |
| Acquitted                               | 0                   | 3       | 2        | 0   | 1          | 1                | 0                 | 6     |
| Dismissed                               | 0                   | 45      | 30       | 0   | 33         | 0                | 18                | 126   |
| Declined                                | 1                   | 22      | 20       | 0   | 26         | 0                | 6                 | 75    |
| Unknown                                 | 0                   | 0       | 0        | 0   | 0          | 0                | 0                 | 0     |
| Total                                   | 5                   | 425     | 295      | 11  | 242        | 6                | 118               | 1102  |
| Number of Agencies Reporting <u>25*</u> |                     |         |          | Percent of Population Served by Reporting Agencies <u>82%</u> |            |                  |                   |       |

\*Texas Narcotics Control Program task forces

Report Period CY 1988**STATE AND LOCAL DRUG CONVICTIONS**

Please indicate the total number of drug-related convictions within the state during the report period.

| OFFENSE                                 | MAJOR DRUG INVOLVED |         |          |   |            |                  |                   |       |
|---|---------------------|---------|----------|---|------------|------------------|-------------------|-------|
|   | OPIATES             | COCAINE | CANNABIS | DANGEROUS DRUGS   |            |                  | UNKNOWN/<br>OTHER | TOTAL |
|   |                     |         |          | HALLU-<br>CINOGENS  | STIMULANTS | DEPRES-<br>SANTS |                   |       |
| Buying/Receiving                        |                     |         |          |   |            |                  |                   |       |
| Cultivation/<br>Manufacture             |                     |         | 1        |   | 29         |                  |                   |       |
| Distribution/Sale                       | 1                   | 219     | 74       | 6   | 66         | 2                | 33                | 401   |
| Operating/<br>Promoting/<br>Assisting   |                     |         |          |   |            |                  |                   |       |
| Possession/<br>Concealing               | 3                   | 124     | 163      | 5   | 81         | 3                | 21                | 400   |
| Transportation/<br>Importation          |                     | 4       | 2        |   |            |                  |                   | 6     |
| Using/Consuming                         |                     |         |          |   |            |                  |                   |       |
| Other                                   |                     | 8       | 3        |   | 7          |                  | 40                | 58    |
| Total                                   | 4                   | 355     | 243      | 11  | 183        | 5                | 94                | 895   |
| Number of Agencies Reporting <u>25*</u> |                     |         |          | Percent of Population Served by Reporting Agencies <u>82%</u> |            |                  |                   |       |

\*Texas Narcotics Control Program task forces

### STATE AND LOCAL DRUG SENTENCES

Please indicate the type of sentence for those convicted of drug-related offenses during the report period. If the sentence includes a combination of sentencing alternatives, show the conviction as receiving the most serious sentence. Alternatives are listed in order of seriousness, with prison being the most serious.

| ALTERNATIVE                             | MAJOR DRUG INVOLVED |         |          |   |            |                  |                   |       |
|---|---------------------|---------|----------|---|------------|------------------|-------------------|-------|
|   | OPIATES             | COCAINE | CANNABIS | DANGEROUS DRUGS   |            |                  | UNKNOWN/<br>OTHER | TOTAL |
|   |                     |         |          | HALLU-<br>CINOGENS  | STIMULANTS | DEPRES-<br>SANTS |                   |       |
| Prison                                  | 2                   | 239     | 75       | 6   | 96         | 2                | 44                | 464   |
| Local Jail                              |                     | 2       | 13       |   | 2          | 3                | 6                 | 26    |
| Jail and Probation                      |                     |         |          |   |            |                  |                   | 0     |
| Community Corrections                   |                     |         |          |   |            |                  |                   |       |
| Probation                               | 2                   |         | 92       | 5   | 83         |                  | 32                | 325   |
| Fine                                    |                     | 3       | 59       |   | 2          |                  | 12                | 76    |
| Suspended Sentence                      |                     |         |          |   |            |                  |                   |       |
| Deferred Judgement                      |                     |         |          |   |            |                  |                   |       |
| Other                                   |                     |         | 4        |   |            |                  |                   | 4     |
| Total                                   | 4                   | 355     | 243      | 11  | 183        | 5                | 94                | 895   |
| Number of Agencies Reporting <u>25*</u> |                     |         |          | Percent of Population Served by Reporting Agencies <u>82%</u> |            |                  |                   |       |

\*Texas Narcotics Control Program task forces

### SENTENCE LENGTH FOR DRUG-RELATED OFFENSES

Please indicate the average sentence length for offenders convicted of drug-related offenses who were sentenced to prison during the report period. Please show the average sentence length in months.

| OFFENSE                                | MAJOR DRUG INVOLVED |         |          |   |            |                  |                   |       |
|--|---------------------|---------|----------|---|------------|------------------|-------------------|-------|
|  | OPIATES             | COCAINE | CANNABIS | DANGEROUS DRUGS   |            |                  | UNKNOWN/<br>OTHER | TOTAL |
|  |                     |         |          | HALLU-<br>CINOGENS  | STIMULANTS | DEPRES-<br>SANTS |                   |       |
| Buying/Receiving                       |                     |         |          |   | 273.0      |                  |                   |       |
| Cultivation/<br>Manufacture            |                     |         |          |   | 273.0      |                  |                   | 273.0 |
| Distribution/Sale                      | 240.0               | 198.3   | 107.1    | 129.0   | 119.7      | 144.0            | 110.4             | 168.4 |
| Operating/<br>Promoting/<br>Assisting  |                     |         |          |   |            |                  |                   |       |
| Possession/<br>Concealing              | 24.0                | 149.7   | 120.3    | 90.0  | 131.6      |                  | 214.9             | 140.4 |
| Transportation/<br>Importation         |                     | 96.0    |          |   |            |                  |                   | 96.0  |
| Using/Consuming                        |                     |         |          |   |            |                  |                   |       |
| Other                                  |                     | 454.5   | 20.0     |   | 195.0      |                  | 403.0             | 344.9 |
| Total                                  | 132.0               | 193.7   | 111.7    | 116.0   | 158.5      | 144.0            | 216.3             | 173.8 |
| Number of Agencies Reporting <u>25</u> |                     |         |          | Percent of Population Served by Reporting Agencies <u>82%</u> |            |                  |                   |       |

\*Texas Narcotics Control Program task forces

## STATE AND LOCAL TREATMENT RESOURCES

Please indicate the total drug treatment resources available within the state and resources available to drug offenders during the report period. Also indicate the number of clients served and the average waiting period for admission.

| TOTAL DRUG TREATMENT PROGRAMS | BED SPACE/SLOTS AVAILABLE | CLIENTS SERVED | AVERAGE WAIT FOR ADMISSION    |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|
| Self-help                     |                           |                | Monthly                       |
| Inpatient/Hospital-based      | 1,639                     |                | collection of waiting list    |
| Therapeutic Community         |                           |                | data at end of:               |
| Residential                   | 1,271                     | 7,206          | Sept '88=1110<br>Oct '88=1089 |
| Day Care                      |                           |                | Nov '88=1060<br>Dec '88= 962  |
| Methadone                     | 1,250                     | 650            |                               |
| Outpatient Drug-free          | 4,608                     | 11,778         |                               |
| Other                         |                           | 2,804          |                               |

| DRUG TREATMENT RESOURCES DEDICATED TO CRIMINAL JUSTICE CLIENTS | BED SPACE/SLOTS AVAILABLE  | CLIENTS SERVED  | AVERAGE WAIT FOR ADMISSION |
|--|--|---|----------------------------|
| Self-help  |  |   |                            |
| Inpatient/Hospital-based                                       | ALL PROGRAMS MUST GIVE PRIORITY TO CLIENTS IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM; 34.2% OF ALL CLIENTS ARE REFERRED FROM THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM. |   |                            |
| Therapeutic Community  |  |   |                            |
| Residential  |  |   |                            |
| Day Care   |  |   |                            |
| Methadone  |  |   |                            |
| Outpatient Drug-free   |  |   |                            |
| Other  |  |   |                            |
| Number of Agencies Reporting <u>103</u>                        |  | Percent of Population Served by Reporting Agencies <u>34.2%</u> |                            |

| DRUG TREATMENT PROGRAMS WITHIN CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES  | CLIENTS SERVED IN ADULT FACILITIES  | CLIENTS SERVED IN JUVENILE FACILITIES                         |
|---|---|---|
| Self-help   | 12,874  | Estimate @96-100 juveniles per year                           |
| Education   | 4,589   |   |
| Special Programming (e.g., therapeutic communities, ethnic programs)<br>Please describe the types of programs on a separate page. | Therapeutic = 1,301<br>1988 Backlog to enter Phase I, II, III = 1,998<br>Pending to enter Phase I = 1,069 |   |
| Number of Agencies Reporting <u>2</u>   |   | Percent of Population Served by Reporting Agencies <u>All</u> |

Report Period \_\_\_\_\_

### STATE AND LOCAL DRUG REMOVALS

Please indicate the total amount of drugs removed from the market by state and local agencies during the report period. Report opiates and cocaine in kilograms, cannabis in pounds and other drugs in dosages.

| TYPE OF DRUG                       | METHOD OF REMOVAL  |  |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
|                                    | SEIZURE  | PURCHASE   |
| OPIATES                            |  |  |
| Heroin                             |  |  |
| Opium                              |  |  |
| Morphine                           | SEE "DRUG SEIZURES AND STATISTICS"<br>Texas Department of Public Safety<br>Narcotics Service |  |
| COCAINE                            |  |  |
| Crack                              |  |  |
| CANNABIS                           |  |  |
| Marijuana                          |  |  |
| Hashish                            |  |  |
| Hash Oil                           |  |  |
| DANGEROUS DRUGS                    |  |  |
| Methamphetamines/Amphetamines      |  |  |
| Other Stimulants                   |  |  |
| Barbiturates                       |  |  |
| Other Depressants                  |  |  |
| PCP                                |  |  |
| LSD                                |  |  |
| Other Hallucinogens                |  |  |
| UNKNOWN/OTHER                      |  |  |
| Number of Agencies Reporting _____ |  | Percent of Population Served by Reporting Agencies _____ |

### STATE AND LOCAL DRUG ERADICATION

Please indicate the amount of marijuana eradicated within the state through state and local efforts. The size of the plot and the means of destruction determine the common method of reporting the amount of drugs eradicated. Please report the number of plants destroyed or the number of acres of marijuana destroyed. Both methods may be used for different plots.

| TYPE OF MARIJUANA DESTROYED         | AMOUNT OF MARIJUANA DESTROYED                              |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Cultivated    All types             | 2,241,484  |
| Wild (Ditchweed)                    |  |
| Number of Agencies Reporting    All | Percent of Population Served by Reporting Agencies    100% |

**NARCOTICS SERVICE DRUG SEIZURE STATISTICS**

**January through December 1988**

| <u>Drug Seized</u>           | <u>Quantity Seized</u> | <u>Estimated Value</u> |
|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Cannabis Plants Eradicated   | 2,241,484 plants       | \$1,202,950,393        |
| Cannabis                     | 37,176.51 kg.          | 53,536,761             |
| Cocaine                      | 100,339.40 ozs.        | 505,288,925            |
| Heroin                       | 2,965 gms.             | 390,641                |
| LSD                          | 59,217 d.u.            | 295,935                |
| Methamphetamine              | 587.89 ozs.            | 1,526,776              |
| Methamphetamine Oil          | 13,171.12 ozs.         | 3,371,792              |
| Amphetamine                  | 247.16 ozs.            | 407,838                |
| Amphetamine Oil              | 8,149.69 ozs.          | 2,598,183              |
| Depressants                  | 34,786.25 d.u.         | 578,595                |
| THC/Hash                     | 30,400 d.u.            | 54,400                 |
| Other                        | 14,199.40 d.u.         | 14,199                 |
| Stimulants                   | 34,115 d.u.            | 830,423                |
| Other Narcotics              | 352,591 d.u.           | 16,210,570             |
| Other Hallucinogens          | 31,030.15 d.u.         | 108,161                |
| P2P                          | 11,189.33 ozs.         | <u>1,130,325</u>       |
| <b>TOTAL ESTIMATED VALUE</b> |                        | <b>\$1,789,491,192</b> |

Source: Texas Department of Public Safety, Narcotics Service

## NON-DRUG ASSET SEIZURES AND FORFEITURES

Please indicate the number of non-drug assets seized or forfeited involving state and local agencies during the report period and the estimated dollar amount of the assets. Please provide the same information for seizures and forfeitures (also included in state and local figures) in which there was Federal assistance.

| STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES           | ASSET SEIZURES                          |  | ASSET FORFEITURES     |               |
|------------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------|---------------|
|                                    | NUMBER OF SEIZURES                      | DOLLAR AMOUNT  | NUMBER OF FORFEITURES | DOLLAR AMOUNT |
| Vehicles                           |   |  |                       |               |
| Vessels                            |   |  |                       |               |
| Aircraft                           |   |  |                       |               |
| Currency                           | SEE "NON-DRUG SEIZURES AND FORFEITURES" |  |                       |               |
| Other Financial Instruments        | Texas Department of Public Safety       |  |                       |               |
| Real Property                      |   |  |                       |               |
| Weapons                            |   |  |                       |               |
| Other                              |   |  |                       |               |
| <b>WITH FEDERAL ASSISTANCE</b>     |   |  |                       |               |
| Vehicles                           |   |  |                       |               |
| Vessels                            |   |  |                       |               |
| Aircraft                           |   |  |                       |               |
| Currency                           |   |  |                       |               |
| Other Financial Instruments        |   |  |                       |               |
| Real Property                      |   |  |                       |               |
| Weapons                            |   |  |                       |               |
| Other                              |   |  |                       |               |
| Number of Agencies Reporting _____ |   | Percent of Population Served by Reporting Agencies _____ |                       |               |

## STATE AND LOCAL DRUG CONTROL UNITS

Please indicate the number of agencies in the state which have drug control units and the number of full-time equivalent employees (FTE) assigned to the unit.

| TYPE OF AGENCY  | NUMBER OF AGENCIES WITH DRUG UNITS | FTE ASSIGNED   |
|---|------------------------------------|--|
| State Law Enforcement Agency (DPS)                    | 1                                  | 196  |
| Statewide Drug Enforcement Task Force (TNCP)          | 33                                 | 190  |
| Local Law Enforcement Agencies 250,000+ Jurisdictions | 11                                 | 395  |
| Local Drug Enforcement Task Force (OCCU)              | 8                                  | 23   |
| DEA/State & Local Task Forces                         | 6                                  | 80   |
| Local Prosecutors                                     | 6                                  | 10   |
| Number of Agencies Reporting <u>All</u>               |                                    | Percent of Population Served by Reporting Agencies <u>100%</u> |



NON-DRUG SEIZURES AND FORFEITURES

January through December 1988

| <u>ITEM</u>   | <u>SEIZURES</u> | <u>FORFEITURES</u> |
|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Vehicles      | 354             | 47                 |
| Aircraft      | 5               | 1                  |
| Weapons       | 58              | 3                  |
| Real Property | \$2,135,210     | 0                  |
| Jewelry       | \$67,934        | 0                  |
| Currency      | \$6,709,389     | \$744,329          |

Source: Texas Department of Public Safety, Narcotics Service

Department of Public Safety seizure figures may include cases worked with local and federal agencies.

**STATE AND LOCAL ARRESTS FOR VIOLENT CRIMES**

January thru June 1988

|                          |   | JUVENILES<br>(16 and under) | ADULTS<br>(17 and over) |
|--------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Murder and Non-negligent | M | 50                          | 683                     |
| Manslaughter             | F | 2                           | 88                      |
| Manslaughter by          | M | 7                           | 140                     |
| Negligence               | F | 0                           | 13                      |
| Forcible Rape            | M | 94                          | 1,004                   |
|                          | F | 4                           | 15                      |
| Robbery                  | M | 374                         | 2,925                   |
|                          | F | 24                          | 312                     |
| Aggravated Assault       | M | 711                         | 6,489                   |
|                          | F | 146                         | 971                     |
| Burglary-Breaking and    | M | 4,415                       | 11,267                  |
| Entering                 | F | 250                         | 727                     |
| GRAND TOTALS.....        |   | <u>6,077</u>                | <u>24,634</u>           |

Source: Texas Department of Public Safety  
Uniform Crime Reporting  
Crime Records Division

Number of Agencies Reporting: 815  
Percent of Population Served by Reporting Agencies: 99.9%

(M = Male/F = Female)

## STATE STRATEGY

*Please state clearly the strategy which will be implemented to address the drug problem and violent crime in the state. The strategy should include broad statements, which provide direction and guidance to state and local agencies, on how the state will address the drug and violent crime problems. The statements should be followed by specific goals and objectives to be accomplished through the strategy implementation.*

- (1) To reduce the supply of illegal drugs trafficked through our state.
- (2) Immobilize illegal drug networks by targeting specific drug organizations for identification and investigation.
- (3) Combat street sales of crack.
- (4) Break the link between drugs and crime.
- (5) Remove financial incentive for drug trafficking through use of asset seizure and forfeiture.
- (6) Enhance investigations of drug trafficking organizations by developing intelligence sources.
- (7) Further evaluation of established drug control efforts.
- (8) Fight violent crime through strengthened legislative provisions.
- (9) Reduce the amount of methamphetamine and amphetamine available on the streets.
- (10) Expedite prosecution and adjudication of drug offenders.

Please refer to Section VI for implementation plans and discussion of the state strategy in full detail.

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE STATE AND LOCAL DRUG ENFORCEMENT COMPONENT OF THE NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY

*Please outline recommendations on Federal level or multi-level (Federal, state and local) cooperative activities which should be implemented, enhanced or changed to assist the drug control efforts in your state. These recommendations will be provided to the Office of National Drug Control Policy for consideration in the development of the National Drug Control Strategy.*

- (1) Multi-agency initiatives should be enhanced, particularly along the Texas:Mexico border.
- (2) Assignment of one or more special agents from federal drug law enforcement agencies to established multi-agency task forces should be encouraged.
- (3) Federal assistance to state and local agencies in the removal and destruction of hazardous chemicals seized from clandestine laboratories.
- (4) Enhance intelligence sharing through regularly scheduled regional conferences and provisions for local, established task forces to access information maintained by El Paso Intelligence Center.
- (5) Cross-designation of law enforcement officers and prosecutors.

## TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PRIORITIES

*Please identify specific training and technical assistance to improve the functioning of the criminal justice system or to enhance the state's drug control efforts, which are not available within the state. Identify the type of training or technical assistance requested, the agency or agencies which would receive the assistance and problem to be addressed.*

- (1) Sophisticated money laundering schemes, i.e., investigation procedures and established sufficient proof
- (2) Scientific improvements used in the illegal drug manufacturing process, such as use of red phosphorous
- (3) Proper handling and disposal of chemicals used in illegal drug manufacturing
- (4) Financial investigation associated with asset forfeiture efforts

Recommended training and technical assistance as outlined above would benefit all drug enforcement personnel, including state, local, and multi-jurisdictional task forces.

## RESEARCH PRIORITIES

*Please identify issues or areas of dilemma impeding the state's drug control efforts or the functioning of the criminal justice system which require research, development of models or other guidance. Please describe each issue and the type of response which would be of assistance to the state.*

- (1) Drug/Crime Link
- (2) Tangible Cost to Society of Drug Trafficking, Drug Abuse, and Drug-Related Crime
- (3) Use of Drug Testing as a Deterrent to Drug Abuse
- (4) Drug Abuse as an Indicee of Juvenile Criminal and Sociopathic Tendencies

---

**SYNOPSIS OF PUBLIC INPUT FOR THE  
STATEWIDE STRATEGY FOR DRUG AND VIOLENT CRIME  
PUBLIC HEARINGS 1989**

---

On January 4th, 5th, and 6th, 1989, public hearings were conducted in Houston, Arlington, and El Paso, respectively. The hearings were conducted by the Drug Policy Subcommittee of the Governor's Task Force on Drug Abuse, with assistance by the Criminal Justice Division of the Governor's Office.

Notice of the hearings appeared in the December 27, 1988 issue of the Texas Register, per attached.

The purpose of the hearings was to receive both oral and written testimony to be used in the development and implementation of a statewide strategy. In total, 31 witnesses testified about the nature and extent of the drug problem in their region. This resulted in over 250 pages of transcribed testimony. Twenty-two written reports were received and reviewed.

From the witnesses and reports, various proposals and endorsements were presented. Attached, please find matrix of these proposals.

# Open Meetings

Agencies with statewide jurisdiction must give at least seven days notice before an impending meeting. Institutions of higher education or political subdivisions covering all or part of four or more counties (regional agencies) must post notice at least 72 hours prior to a scheduled meeting time. Some notices may be received too late to be published before the meeting is held, but all notices are published in the *Texas Register*.

**Emergency meetings and agendas.** Any of the governmental entities named above must have notice of an emergency meeting, an emergency revision to an agenda, and the reason for such emergency posted for at least two hours before the meeting is convened. Emergency meeting notices filed by all governmental agencies will be published.

**Posting of open meeting notices.** All notices are posted on the bulletin board outside the Office of the Secretary of State on the first floor of the East Wing in the State Capitol, Austin. These notices may contain more detailed agenda than what is published in the *Texas Register*.

## Texas Department of Agriculture

Wednesday, January 4, 1989, 10 a.m. The Texas Department of Agriculture will meet in the Cottle County Courthouse, 811 Ninth Street, Paducah. According to the agenda, the department will conduct a public hearing to receive comment concerning proposed amendments to special exemptions for Cottle County under the Texas Herbicide Regulations regarding the application of hormone-type herbicides.

Contact: Dolores Alvarado Hibbs, P.O. Box 12847, Austin, Texas 78711, (512) 463-7583.

Filed: December 20, 1988, 2:21 p.m.

TRD-8812864

## State Aircraft Pooling Board

Wednesday, January 11, 1989, 2 p.m. The State Aircraft Pooling Board will meet at 4900 Old Manor Road, Austin. According to the agenda, the board will approve minutes of the previous meeting; hear report of facility expansion; approve fiscal year 1990 and 1991 "request for legislative appropriations"; and discuss any other aircraft pooling board operational matters.

Contact: Sherry Johnson, (512) 477-8900.

Filed: December 20, 1988, 10:32 a.m.

TRD-8812855

## Texas Education Agency

Tuesday, January 3, 1989, 8 a.m. The Standard Setting Panel and the Content Validation Panel for the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP) of the Texas Education will meet at various locations around the state to consider registration, introduction to the Texas Academic Skills Program, individually review test items, and consider orientation to test item review task (this portion closed pursuant to Texas Attorney General Opinions H-484 (1974) and H-780 (1976)). Locations follow.

Lubbock Inn, 3901 19th Street, Lubbock.

Dallas Marriott Market Center, 2101 Stemmons Freeway, Dallas.

Houston Marriott Greenspoint, 255 North Belt, Houston.

Thursday, January 5, 1989, 8 a.m. The Standard Setting Panel and the Content Validation Panel for the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP) of the Texas Education will meet at various locations around the state to consider registration, introduction to the Texas Academic Skills Program, individually review test items, and consider orientation to test item review task (this portion closed pursuant to Texas Attorney General Opinions H-484 (1974) and H-780 (1976)). Locations follow.

Sheraton Fairway Resort Inn, South 10th Street at Wichita Avenue, McAllen.

Wyndham Southpark, 4140 Governor's Row, Austin.

El Paso Marriott, 1600 Airway Boulevard, El Paso.

Contact: Pam Tacket, 1701 North Congress Avenue, Austin, Texas 78701, (512) 463-9525.

Filed: December 20, 4:47 p.m.

TRD-8812938-8812948

Tuesday, January 10, 1989, 10:30 a.m. The Teachers' Professional Practices Commission of Texas (TPPC) for the Texas Education Agency will meet in Room 1-110, William B. Travis Building, 1701 North Congress Avenue, Austin. According to the agenda, the commission will adopt minutes of the September 30, 1988, meeting; introduce new member, Mr. Robert W. Caster; update on travel information; hear report on Sunset Commission recommendations concerning TPPC, and report on distribution of revised Code of Ethics; consider appeal of jurisdiction, Pike v. Glass, by commission en banc; discuss hearing panels for Collins v. Luce and Nelson v. Armstrong; hear director's report; and discuss next meeting date.

Contact: Edward Vodicka, 1701 North Congress Avenue, Austin, Texas 78701, (512) 463-9337.

Filed: December 20, 1989, 4:50 p.m.

TRD-8812933

## Office of the Governor, Criminal Justice Division

Wednesday, January 4, 1989, 8:30 a.m. The Governor's Task Force on Drug Abuse, Drug Policy Subcommittee will meet in the Guest Quarters Hotel, 5353 Westheimer, Houston. According to the agenda, the subcommittee will solicit testimony from interested persons regarding the illegal drug and violent crime problem in Texas for development of the statewide drug strategy.

Contact: Georgia Whitehead, 201 East 14th Street, Austin, Texas 78701, (512) 463-1919.

Filed: December 22, 1988, 9:51 a.m.

TRD-883009

Thursday, January 5, 1989, 8:30 a.m. The Governor's Task Force on Drug Abuse, Drug Policy Subcommittee will meet in the Arlington Convention Center, 1200 Stadium Drive, East, Arlington. According to the agenda summary, the subcommittee will solicit testimony from interested persons regarding the illegal drug and violent crime problem in Texas for development of the statewide drug strategy.

Contact: Georgia Whitehead, 201 East 14th Street, Austin, Texas 78701, (512) 463-1919.

Filed: December 22, 1988, 9:51 a.m.

TRD-883008

Friday, January 6, 1989, 8:30 a.m. The Governor's Task Force on Drug Abuse, Drug Policy Subcommittee will meet in the Westin Paso Del Norte Hotel, 101 South El Paso Street, El Paso. According to the agenda summary, the subcommittee will solicit testimony from interested persons regarding the illegal drug and violent crime problem in Texas for development of the statewide drug strategy.

Contact: Georgia Whitehead, 201 East 14th Street, Austin, Texas 78701, (512) 463-

SUMMARY OF ORAL TESTIMONY  
PRESENTED TO GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE ON DRUG ABUSE  
JANUARY 1989

| SPEAKER  | RECOMMENDATION   |
|--|--|
| <u>Houston Hearing 01/04/89</u>  |  |
| 1. Mike Scott-----<br>Commander<br>DPS Narcotics   | 1. Interdiction<br>2. Apprehension<br>3. Focus on gang members<br>4. Mutli-agency cooperation  |
| 2. Antonio R. Gonzales, Jr.-----<br>U.S. Border Patrol<br>Houston, Texas                           | 1. Public education<br>2. Continued multi-agency<br>cooperation<br>3. Apprehension<br>4. Interdiction  |
| 3. Ronald G. Parra-----<br>District Director<br>INS<br>Houston, Texas                              | 1. Public education<br>2. Increased personnel<br>3. Focus on gang members<br>4. Multi-agency cooperation<br>5. Interdiction<br>6. Lengthened detention   |
| 4. Lt. Harry Stiles-----<br>Brazoria County Special<br>Investigative Unit<br>Angleton, Texas       | 1. Funding<br>2. Multi-agency cooperation<br>3. Interdiction<br>4. Equipment<br>5. Peace officer training<br>6. Increased personnel  |
| 5. Capt. Dennis Schumann-----<br>Narcotics Division<br>Houston Police Department<br>Houston, Texas | 1. Interdiction<br>2. Funding<br>3. Increased personnel<br>4. Multi-agency cooperation<br>5. Focus on consumer level and<br>street dealers<br>6. Computers for information<br>analysis<br>7. Increased prosecution<br>8. Exemption from multi-agency<br>mandate for Houston Police<br>Department |



## SPEAKER

## RECOMMENDATION

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 6. Bill Taylor-----<br>Special Crimes Bureau<br>Harris County D.A.'s Office<br>Houston, Texas | 1. Increased personnel<br>2. Funding<br>3. Prosecutor specialization<br>4. Vertical Prosecution<br>5. Early bond assessment which<br>is commensurable with street<br>value of narcotics being<br>dealt by individual<br>6. Reduce time period until<br>indictment<br>7. Better communication with<br>filing police agency |
| 7. Chief J. C. Elliot-----<br>El Campo Police Department<br>El Campo, Texas                   | 1. Funding<br>2. Increased personnel<br>3. Zero tolerance   |
| 8. Chief Lee P. Brown-----<br>Houston Police Department<br>Houston, Texas                     | 1. Enforcement at all levels:<br>- wholesaler<br>- dealer<br>- street seller<br>- consumer<br>2. Funding<br>3. Exemption from multi-agency<br>mandate for HPD<br>4. Multi-agency cooperation  |

Arlington Hearing 01/05/89

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Charles Hogue-----<br>Tarrant County Narcotics<br>Intelligence Coordination Unit<br>Tarrant County D.A.'s Office | 1. Aggressive enforcement<br>2. Multi-agency cooperation<br>3. Public education<br>4. Effective rehabilitation<br>efforts          |
| 2. Brent Carr-----<br>Assistant District Attorney<br>Tarrant County   | 5. Better communication with<br>filing agency<br>6. Legislation<br>7. Vertical prosecution<br>8. Funding<br>9. Longer prison terms |
| 3. Lt. Joey Ziemann-----<br>Eules Police Department<br>Eules, Texas   | 1. Peace officer training<br>2. Equipment<br>3. Chemical disposal<br>4. Multi-agency cooperation                                   |

| SPEAKER  | RECOMMENDATION  |
|--|---|
| 4. Cecil Emerson-----<br>Chief, Organized Crime Unit<br>Dallas County D.A.'s Office                        | 1. Funding<br>2. Accelerated prosecution<br>3. More holding facilities<br>4. Increased personnel<br>5. Multi-agency cooperation<br>6. Form new "Drug Abuse Law<br>Enforcement Agency"                                   |
| 5. Jim F. Wells-----<br>Dallas County Adult Probation  | 1. Increase treatment efforts<br>to keep probationers out of<br>prison  |
| 6. Chief Tom Vannoy-----<br>Temple Police Department<br>Temple, Texas                                      | 1. Multi-agency support<br>2. More prisons<br>3. Prison treatment and<br>rehabilitation programs<br>4. Education<br>5. Legislation<br>6. Equipment<br>7. Peace officer training<br>8. Increased personnel<br>9. Funding |
| 7. Sheriff Dan Smith-----<br>Bell County<br>Central Texas Narcotics<br>Control Task Force                  | 1. Multi-agency concept<br>2. Funding<br>3. Chemical disposal<br>4. Focus on gangs<br>5. Peace officer training<br>6. Deterrent factors<br>7. Public awareness<br>8. Description of weapons on<br>statistical report    |
| 8. Billy Conway-----<br>Central Texas Narcotics<br>Control Task Force                                      | 1. Increased personnel<br>2. Funding  |
| 9. Ann Rice-----<br>Executive Director of<br>Fort Worth Challenge<br>Fort Worth, Texas                     | 1. Education and treatment<br>2. Funding<br>3. Legislation  |
| 10. Chief J. L. McGlasson-----<br>North Richland Hills Police<br>Department<br>North Richland Hills, Texas | 1. Multi-agency concept<br>2. Interdiction<br>3. Legislation<br>4. Deterrent factors  |
| 11. Doug Davis-----<br>Director of Public Safety<br>Pantego, Texas   | 1. Chemical disposal<br>2. Funding<br>3. Deterrent factors<br>4. Multi-agency cooperation   |

| SPEAKER   | RECOMMENDATION   |
|---|--|
| 12. Chief Michael Courville-----<br>Duncanville Police Department<br>Duncanville, Texas             | 1. Media communication<br>2. Legislation<br>3. Enhanced sentencing<br>4. Drug testing and treatment<br>5. Public education<br>6. Early intervention  |
| 13. Ms. Annette Burtis-----<br>Executive Director<br>Texoma Council on Alcoholism<br>and Drug Abuse | 1. Intervention<br>2. Education  |
| <u>El Paso Hearing 01/06/89</u>   |  |
| 1. Mr. Steve Simmons-----<br>District Attorney<br>El Paso County                                    | 1. Interdiction<br>2. Funding<br>3. Multi-faceted approach by<br>law enforcement agencies<br>4. Legislation  |
| 2. Guadalupe Dominguez-----<br>Chief Deputy<br>El Paso Sheriff's Office                             | 1. Funding<br>2. Multi-agency cooperation  |
| 3. Mr. Hank Webb-----<br>Assistant Director<br>West Texas Multi-County Task<br>Force                | 1. Police training<br>2. Equipment<br>3. Increased personnel<br>4. Funding<br>5. Multi-agency cooperation<br>6. Intelligence bulletin<br>7. Weapon description on<br>statistical report<br>8. Public education |
| 4. Jimmy Apadoca-----<br>Project Director<br>West Texas Mualti-County Task<br>Force                 | 1. Public awareness<br>2. Seized firearm statistics  |
| 5. Sheriff Richard E. Upchurch--<br>Culberson County  | 1. Multi-agency cooperation<br>2. Equipment  |
| 6. Bobby Garcia-----<br>Victory Outreach<br>El Paso, Texas  | 1. Rehabilitation  |

| SPEAKER   | RECOMMENDATION   |
|---|--|
| 7. Mr. Chilo Madrid-----<br>Executive Director<br>Aliviane, Inc.<br>El Paso, Texas        | 1. Legislation<br>2. Treatment and rehabilitation<br>3. Education and prevention<br>4. Funding<br>5. Networking law enforcement,<br>treatment, and education |
| 8. Sheriff Jack L. McDaniel-----<br>Brewster County                                       | 1. Funding<br>2. Multi-agency cooperation<br>3. Equipment<br>4. Increased personnel  |
| 9. Sheriff Richard Love-----<br>Hudspeth County   | 1. Funding<br>2. Increased personnel<br>3. Interdiction<br>4. Equipment  |
| 10. Sgt. Jeff Mitchell-----<br>Department of Public Safety<br>Narcotics<br>El Paso, Texas | 1. Multi-agency cooperation  |

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN TESTIMONY  
PRESENTED TO GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE ON DRUG ABUSE  
JANUARY 1989**

| AUTHOR   | RECOMMENDATION  |
|--|---|
| 1. John Vance-----<br>Criminal District Attorney<br>Dallas County  | 1. Stringent sentencing and<br>incarceration<br>2. Additional courts<br>3. Asset forfeiture legislation<br>4. Funding   |
| 2. Dennis R. Jones-----<br>Texas M.H.M.R.<br>Austin, Texas   | 1. Treatment services and centers<br>2. Increased personnel<br>3. Legislation   |
| 3. Sheriff Vastine Koopman-----<br>La Grange County  | 1. Multi-agency cooperation   |
| 4. Chief W. D. "Bill" Smith-----<br>Columbus Police Department<br>Columbus, Texas                        | 1. Multi-agency cooperation   |
| 5. Kathy A. Eckerman-----<br>Administrative Assistant<br>Hempstead Police Department<br>Hempstead, Texas | 1. Funding  |
| 6. Sheriff Doyne Bailey-----<br>Travis County  | 1. Multi-agency cooperation<br>2. Larger jurisdictional limits  |
| 7. Sheriff Joe Corley-----<br>Montgomery County  | 1. Funding<br>2. Equipment<br>3. Multi-agency cooperation<br>4. Larger prison capacity<br>5. Increased personnel  |
| 8. John D. Squier-----<br>Project Director<br>Agriplex Roadrunners<br>Hill County                        | 1. Interdiction<br>2. Funding<br>3. Increased personnel<br>4. Increase prosecution<br>5. Multi-agency cooperation<br>6. Legislation<br>7. Prosecution training<br>8. Interstate intelligence<br>network<br>9. Chemical disposal |

| AUTHOR   | RECOMMENDATION  |
|--|---|
| 9. Roy E. Vaughn-----<br>Ellis County Anti-Drug Law<br>Enforcement Association<br>Midlothian, Texas                        | 1. Increased personnel<br>2. Funding  |
| 10. Chief W. M. "Mike" Lane-----<br>Bellville Police Department<br>Bellville, Texas  | 1. Increased personnel<br>2. Funding<br>3. Focus on street level  |
| 11. Chief Sherman Collins-----<br>Lufkin Police Department<br>Lufkin, Texas  | 1. Increased personnel<br>2. Task force concept<br>3. Focus on street level   |
| 12. Thomas J. Callahan-----<br>Sheriff Wichita County  | 1. Multi-agency cooperation<br>2. New and additional prisons<br>3. Increased personnel<br>4. Equipment<br>5. Funding<br>6. Legislation  |
| 13. Frances A. Cox-----<br>Planning and Program<br>Development Coordinator<br>Texas Adult Probation Comm.<br>Austin, Texas | 1. Intervention<br>2. Treatment centers<br>3. Specialized training for<br>probation officers<br>4. Funding  |
| 14. Chief Alan Sheffield-----<br>Iowa Park Police Department<br>Iowa Park, Texas   | 1. Funding<br>2. Police officer training<br>3. Increased personnel  |
| 15. Phillip E. Jordan-----<br>Special Agent-in-Charge<br>Dallas Division<br>Drug Enforcement Agency                        | 1. Multi-agency cooperation<br>2. Asset seizures<br>3. Immobilize highest echelon<br>of drug traffickers<br>4. Intensive interdiction<br>5. Public awareness and<br>education |
| 16. U.S. Border Patrol-----<br>El Paso Sector  | 1. Prevention<br>2. Apprehension<br>3. Interdiction<br>4. Multi-agency cooperation  |

## *ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS*

Prepared under the direction of:  
Rider Scott, Executive Director  
Criminal Justice Division  
and  
John Coffel, Program Director,  
Texas Narcotics Control Program

Research, writing, and editing by:  
Georgia Whitehead, Assistant Program Director

Page layout and design by:  
Joni Sager, Communications Coordinator

Typing and additional assistance provided by:  
Betty Stamm and Carol Funderburgh, Support Services

