
**A STATUS REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAMS
IN CITIES**

A 30-CITY SURVEY

MAY 31, 1989



THE UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	3
CITY PARTICIPATION IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN	4
THE GRANT-IN-AID SYSTEM -- RESPONSIVE TO CITY NEEDS?	5
STATE ADMINISTRATION OF THE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAMS	8
CITY INVOLVEMENT IN THE FY89 ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE BLOCK GRANTS	9
FEDERAL ANTI-DRUG ENFORCEMENT FUNDS RECEIVED BY THE SURVEY CITIES	11
CITIES RESPONDING TO THE SURVEY	12
SURVEY INSTRUMENT: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT GRANT PROGRAMS	13

143553

**U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice**

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

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by
U.S. Conference of Mayors

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).
Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

SUMMARY

The Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 marked the first time that the national government approached the problems of illegal drug trafficking and abuse in a comprehensive manner. Among its many provisions was the establishment of three new block grant programs for enforcement, education and treatment. These programs provided funds in block grants to the states, with the requirement that a large portion of the funds be passed through to local jurisdictions and agencies. A survey done by the Conference of Mayors in October 1987, exactly one year after the Act was signed into law, showed that only a small portion of the funds had been provided to local agencies. The purpose of this report is to update the 1987 survey by assessing the current status of implementation of the three block grant programs and the degree to which they are responsive to local needs.

Below are the findings for the 30 cities surveyed during May by the Conference.

CITY PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

- o Just under one in four of the survey cities have participated in the development of their state's plan for anti-drug education; 76 percent have never participated.
- o Just under one in five of the cities have participated in the development of their state's plan for treatment; 81 percent have never participated.
- o One-half of the cities have participated in the development of their state's plan for enforcement; half have never participated.

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

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

STATE ADMINISTRATION OF THE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAMS

- o Rating state administration of the anti-drug block grant programs:
 - * For education, one-half of the cities gave their states a poor rating and 29 percent gave a good rating.

- * For treatment, 68 percent of the cities gave their states a poor rating and 14 percent gave a good rating.
- * For enforcement, 46 percent of the cities gave a poor rating and 37 percent gave a good rating.

CITY INVOLVEMENT IN THE FY89 ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE BLOCK GRANTS

- o Forty-one percent of the survey cities have had an opportunity to review the state plan; the rest have not.
- o Thirty-six percent of the cities have had an opportunity to participate in the planning process; the rest have not.
- o Twenty-seven percent of the survey cities know how much funding they will receive under the plan; the rest do not.
- o Forty-one percent of the cities have a say in deciding how the funds which they receive will be spent; the rest do not.
- o Seventy-one percent of the cities say the funds are being spent for activities consistent with their city's drug enforcement priorities; the rest say they are not.

FEDERAL ANTI-DRUG ENFORCEMENT FUNDS RECEIVED BY THE CITIES

- o Twenty-three percent of the survey cities have yet to receive any funding for any year through the enforcement assistance block grant program.

INTRODUCTION

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

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

A survey done by the Conference of Mayors in October 1987, exactly one year after the Act was signed into law, showed that only a small portion of the funds actually had been provided to local programs in the survey cities in these areas and that the grant-in-aid system (state block grants) was not responsive to the needs of two-thirds of the cities surveyed.

The Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 amended the enforcement and treatment block grants. In the enforcement area, deadlines for the submission of the state plan, federal review of the plan and disbursement of the funds within the state were legislated. In the treatment and rehabilitation area, the separate substance abuse block grant was combined with the existing Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Block grant.

The purpose of this report is to assess the status of implementation of the three block grant programs. A questionnaire was sent to the Conference of Mayors' leadership on this issue: the members of the Executive Committee, Advisory Board and Task Force on Drug Control -- 46 mayors in all. Responses were received from 30 of them, 65 percent. The information which they provided is summarized on the following pages.

The reader should note that in no case do the percentages reported for a survey question include a city unable to respond to that question.

CITY PARTICIPATION IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

Less than one in four of the survey cities have participated in the development of their state's plan for anti-drug education; 76 percent of the cities have never participated. A Newton official served on the state planning board. Birmingham and Louisville participated through their school system. Citizens Against Substance Abuse in Cincinnati was able to give ideas. Washington, D.C., which performs the functions of both a state and a city for the block grant programs, was the only other city to have participated in the state planning process.

Less than one in five of the survey cities have participated in the development of their state's plan for treatment; 81 percent have never participated. Houston officials had "verbal interaction with staff of the Texas Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse." Louisville's involvement was through its membership on the board of directors of Seven Counties Services, Inc. and the Jefferson Alcohol and Drug Abuse Center. Philadelphia said it was able to comment on the state plan, "but with little or no influence." Other cities which participated were Washington, D.C. and Providence.

One-half of the survey cities have been involved in the development of their state's plan for enforcement; 54 percent have never been involved. Charlotte's Assistant Police Chief serves on the Governor's Crime Commission. The City of Phoenix is a member of the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission. Providence's police department was involved through the City-State Task Force on Drug Crimes. Through its Criminal Justice Coordinating Commission, the City of Philadelphia submitted a strategy for state and federal assistance in the first and third years of the program, but did not serve on any formal state planning body. Indianapolis police submitted a funding plan to the state criminal justice institute. Houston provided testimony at a public hearing, and written suggestions were submitted by the city government and its state representatives. New Orleans officials responded to a state questionnaire.

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

Officials in more than two out of three of the survey cities do not believe that the grant-in-aid system (primarily state block grants) established through the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 is responsive to their city's needs. Thirty-one percent of the survey cities believe the anti-drug grant-in-aid system is responsive to their needs.

Legislative Changes

More than four out of five of the cities responding to an open-ended question stated that direct federal funding of cities or a sub-state funding entitlement for cities would make the Anti-Drug Abuse Act programs more responsive to their needs. Among their comments:

Boston: "Provide a higher portion of funds directly to localities with the greatest need (based on crime statistics, for example)."

Colorado Springs: "Requirement for allocation to cities over 250,000 population based on proportion of their criminal justice expenditures."

Detroit: There should be "additional funding made available to local governments in the form of federal discretionary grants. In many instances a local government may have a worthwhile proposal that does not fit the parameters of the statewide priority areas." There should be "amendments that would send anti-drug abuse act resources directly to cities that have the problems in concentration."

Erie: "Legislation in the future should include direct funding to the municipalities. The present method is not working in this area. Although important for state programs, this funding is essential at the municipal level. Separate funding should be made available to each entity."

Houston: "Legislation should allow for direct funding to cities so that local needs and priorities are addressed."

Jamestown: "Monies should be made available to cities of all sizes directly from the U.S. government."

Kansas City: "Direct funding of cities."

Louisville: "Passage of 'entitlement provisions' which would allow large cities to apply directly to the federal government for funding under the Anti-Drug Abuse Act."

New Orleans: "There is a need for some direct entitlement programs in education, treatment and enforcement in order to speed up the process, minimize bureaucratic layers and to ensure that cities benefit from education and treatment funds for which we are currently out of the loop."

New York City: "Direct entitlement grants for major cities based on extent of drug problem and resources needed to address those problems."

Philadelphia: "1) Entitlement of a guaranteed percentage of the funds based upon percent of the drug crime problem and criminal justice expenditures. 2) Full funding of state and local law enforcement at the authorized level. 3) Need to get funds awarded within six months of the beginning of the federal fiscal year."

Phoenix: "Direct federal funding to local governments. Increase funding levels to support law enforcement efforts. Revise the funding formula based on the demonstrated needs of substance abuse in each state instead of total population of the states."

San Diego: "Drop the cash match requirement, and the funds should go directly to cities."

Trenton: "The Act should be amended to direct funding to the local jurisdictions without passing through the state government."

Five cities — Binghamton, Charleston, Detroit, Philadelphia, and Phoenix — specifically called for an increase in federal enforcement funds.

Administrative Changes

The city officials also described administrative changes which would make the anti-drug programs more responsive to their needs. Five each called for:

- o a requirement that the states include local governments in their planning and decision-making process;
- o better provision of information by the states about the availability of funding; and
- o reduced paperwork requirements by the states.

Among the cities' comments:

Birmingham: "Mandate inclusion of local agencies in state decisions."

Boston: "Improve mechanism for notifying localities of funding to be passed through the State. Enforce provisions of the law which direct states to distribute funds to areas of greatest need."

Charlotte: "Grant funding requires a tremendous amount of paperwork. This is not a major problem for larger cities that have the administrative staff to prepare grant applications and monitor the progress of the grant. It can, however, be a burden for smaller jurisdictions."

Cincinnati: "It is hard for us to know how to apply for funds. All funds seem to stop in Columbus with state government."

Colorado Springs: "Requirement that the state involve cities over 250,000 population in developing and approving the state plan."

STATE ADMINISTRATION OF THE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAMS

The city officials were asked to rate their state's administration of the block grant programs for education, treatment and enforcement in terms of its responsiveness to addressing the illegal drug problems in their city. The rating was on a scale of one to five, with one being poor and five excellent. It should be noted again that the District of Columbia performs both city and state level functions in the administration of the block grant programs.

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

For treatment programs, 68 percent of the cities gave their states a poor rating of one or two. Fourteen percent of the cities rated their states' administration of the treatment block grant as good (a rating of four or five). Eighteen percent of the cities gave their states a rating of three for administration of the treatment block grant.

In the enforcement area, 46 percent of the cities gave their states a poor rating (of one or two) for block grant administration. Seventeen percent rated their states' administration of the enforcement block grant as a three. Thirty-seven percent of the cities gave their states a good rating (four or five) indicating their administration of the enforcement block grant was responsive to addressing the illegal drug problem in their city.

CITY INVOLVEMENT IN THE FY89 ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE BLOCK GRANTS

The survey cities were asked to describe their involvement in and knowledge and assessment of their state's FY89 plan for use of the law enforcement assistance block grant. Among the survey cities:

- o Forty-one percent have had an opportunity to review the state plan; 59 percent have not. Comments:
 - * Boston: The "city was able to review the state plan after it was submitted."
 - * New York City: "There was "insufficient opportunity to review plan prior to submission."
- o Thirty-six percent have had an opportunity to participate in the planning process; 64 percent have not. Comments:
 - * Boston: The "police commissioner was mailed a survey. However, a survey which gives equal weight to all cities, despite population, has little merit."
 - * Houston: "Participation was limited to testimony provided at one public hearing that was hastily called so that the state's plan could be submitted later in the month."
 - * New York City: It was "limited. (We) responded to a survey regarding the strategy."
- o Twenty-seven percent know how much funding their city will receive under the plan; the rest do not. Comments:
 - * Detroit officials explained that funding is based on competitive applications to the state.
 - * Houston: "Drug funds are distributed on a competitive basis; no allowances are made for targeting funds to the areas experiencing the greatest drug problems."
 - * Seattle: "We know how much money will come to the city because it doesn't get any."
- o Forty-one percent have a say in deciding how the funds which come to the city will be spent; the rest do not. Comments:
 - * Detroit: "We will have a say in the use of the funds if the city's application is accepted by the state."
 - * Boston: "To date Boston has not had a say in deciding how funds coming to Boston will be spent. However, staff of the Police Department and the Mayor's Office have been working to open lines of communication with the State to prevent a repeat of problems in the past."

- * Houston: "The state has established a priority for interjurisdictional task forces."
 - * New York City: The "City did not participate in State executive/legislative discussions concerning authorized programs. The City was given wide latitude in allocating federal funds to specific agencies."
 - * Philadelphia: "There is no provision for Philadelphia to make its own determination, only to advise the state. The state makes the final decision as to what the funding priorities are."
- o Seventy-one percent of the cities say the funds are being spent for activities consistent with their city's drug enforcement priorities; 32 percent say they are not. Comments:
- * Boston: "In the past, funds have not been earmarked for activities consistent with the city's drug enforcement priorities....However, efforts are underway to open the dialogue and work more closely with the State to better target federal dollars earmarked for Boston this year."
 - * Colorado Springs: From a May 4, 1989 letter from that city's Chief of Police to the State Division of Criminal Justice when the city's application for \$52,581 in funding for a DARE program was denied:
 "We selected DARE from the list of approved program areas cited in the RFP. The drug demand reduction objective of the DARE meets our local jurisdiction's needs, and reflects current national drug control strategies....We view the denial of our request for a proven demand reduction program as a penalty for already having enforcement programs in place."
 - * Houston: "To a large extent, yes. The City of Houston's law enforcement priorities include focusing on street and consumer-level dealers; drug buyers and consumers and mid-level and major traffickers. The state's plan appears consistent with these goals."
 - * Philadelphia: "What funds we do get are pretty much in line with our priorities."

FEDERAL ANTI-DRUG ENFORCEMENT FUNDS RECEIVED BY THE SURVEY CITIES

The cities were asked to indicate the amount of anti-drug enforcement funding the city government had received in 1987 and 1988 and expects to receive in 1989. Seven of the cities — Binghamton, Erie, Jamestown, Newton, Santa Barbara, Seattle and York — report that they have received no funding thus far through the anti-drug enforcement grant program. The table below shows the amount of funds the survey cities received in 1987 and 1988 and expect to receive in 1989.

FUNDING IN DOLLARS

CITY	1987	1988	1989
Binghamton	0	0	0
Boston	131,187	181,600	
Charleston	0	35,148	21,000
Charlotte		(156,000 for three years)	
Colorado Springs	86,000	11,250	0
DeKalb	0	0	7,000
Detroit	0	303,446	
Erie	0	0	0
Houston	200,000	0	(1,200,000)
Indianapolis	536,251	279,156	
Jamestown	0	0	0
Kansas City	465,000	64,000	
Louisville	254,403	172,673	
Miami	0	350,000	0
New Orleans	544,724	168,176	328,556
Newton	0	0	
New York City	4,006,946	957,280	2,583,644
Philadelphia	2,250,000	1,800,000	
Phoenix		327,100	219,878
Saint Paul	125,394	37,618	
San Diego	753,515	355,415	513,875
Santa Barbara	0	0	(20,296)
Seattle	0	0	0
Trenton	32,000	0	0
Washington, D.C.	1,505,889	2,198,000	2,153,863
York	0	0	0

() = amount applied for

CITIES RESPONDING TO THE SURVEY

CITY	POPULATION
Binghamton, NY	52,910
Birmingham, AL	227,510
Boston, MA	573,600
Charleston, SC	68,900
Charlotte, NC	352,070
Cincinnati, OH	369,750
Colorado Springs, CO	272,660
DeKalb, IL	31,570
Detroit, MI	1,086,220
Elkhart, IN	44,180
Erie, PA	115,270
Houston, TX	1,728,910
Indianapolis, IN	719,820
Jamestown, NY	34,710
Kansas City, MO	441,170
Louisville, KY	286,470
Miami, FL	373,940
New Orleans, LA	554,500
New York City, NY	7,262,700
Newton, MA	82,140
Philadelphia, PA	1,642,900
Phoenix, AZ	894,070
Providence, RI	157,200
Saint Paul, MN	263,680
San Diego, CA	1,015,190
Santa Barbara, CA	79,290
Seattle, WA	486,200
Trenton, NJ	91,160
Washington, D.C.	626,000
York, PA	44,430

City _____

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT GRANT PROGRAMS

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

	Yes	No	Type of Involvement	Agency Involved
Education				
Treatment				
Enforcement				

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

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

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

3. Using the chart below, please rate your state's administration of the block grant programs for education, treatment and enforcement in terms of its responsiveness to addressing the illegal drug problem in your city.

Education Programs	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
	Poor				Excellent
Treatment Programs	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
	Poor				Excellent
Enforcement Programs	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
	Poor				Excellent

4. Your state has submitted its plan for use of the funds available in FY89 under the anti-drug law enforcement assistance block grant to the Bureau of Justice Assistance.

- a. Have you had an opportunity to review the plan?
Yes _____ No _____ Comments.
- b. Did your city have an opportunity to participate in the planning process?
Yes _____ No _____ Comments.
- c. Do you know how much funding will come to your city under the plan?
Yes _____ No _____ Comments.
- d. Did your city have a say in deciding how those funds which come to your city will be spent?
Yes _____ No _____ Comments.
- e. Are the funds being spent for activities consistent with your city's drug enforcement priorities?
Yes _____ No _____ Comments.

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

1987 \$ _____
1988 \$ _____
1989 \$ _____

NAME AND TELEPHONE NUMBER OF PERSON COMPLETING FORM

THE UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

**ARTHUR J. HOLLAND, MAYOR OF TRENTON
PRESIDENT**

**KATHRYN J. WHITMIRE, MAYOR OF HOUSTON
VICE PRESIDENT**

* * *

**EDWARD I. KOCH, MAYOR OF NEW YORK CITY
MAUREEN O'CONNOR, MAYOR OF SAN DIEGO
CO-CHAIRS, TASK FORCE ON DRUG CONTROL**

* * *

J. THOMAS COCHRAN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

**1620 Eye Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 293-7330**