

146138 /
146683

STATE & LOCAL SPENDING

State and Local Spending on Drug Control Activities

Report from the National Survey
of State & Local Governments

146138 /
146683

Department of National Drug Control Policy
December 1993



State and Local Spending on Drug Control Activities

Report from the National Survey
of State & Local Governments

Office of National Drug Control Policy
October 1993

Foreword

The National Drug Control Strategy relies on the full participation of many partners to achieve the goal of reducing drug use and its consequences. Among the key participants are State and local governments. This arrangement is fundamental to our federal system of government: there is more than one level of authority with responsibility for making independent governmental and fiscal decisions. Some issues, like the drug issue, have an impact on all levels of government but in different ways, requiring that each government's programmatic response be fine tuned to match the particular circumstances facing it and to support the efforts of other levels of government.

Information about State and local government drug control spending has been scant. The National Drug Control Strategy describes Federal drug control efforts, both in terms of program and budget, in complete detail. Although the numerous drug control programs undertaken by State and local governments can be observed, an accounting of that effort has been unavailable until now.

This study was done to provide the accounting needed to assess government-wide drug control efforts. To this end and on our behalf, the U.S. Bureau of the Census surveyed State and local government units for their drug-related spending in Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991. Our purposes were twofold: to determine the extent of such spending and to view its functional allocation.

The survey found that State and local governments are more than

equal partners in the drug effort, spending \$15.9 billion on drug control activities in Fiscal Year 1991, or about one and one-half cents of every dollar they spent. By comparison, the Federal government spent \$11 billion in Fiscal Year 1991 (including an estimated \$3.2 billion in Federal drug grants, which is included in the State and local government totals). The bulk of this spending by State and local governments, 79 percent, was for criminal justice activities; education and rehabilitation comprised the remaining 21 percent of their drug control spending.

This Administration's drug control program will likely do much to change the nature of drug control spending in this country. The President's National Drug Control Strategy will focus activities to reduce the demand for drugs, particularly hard-core drug use and its consequences (crime, violence, health-related effects, and death). It will target special prevention efforts at youth (particularly those in the inner city) and expand treatment capacity specifically for those areas hardest hit by drug use. Further, in recognition of the critical roles and responsibilities of State and local governments in the overall drug effort, the Strategy will emphasize community empowerment approaches and will promote community-based efforts such as community policing to reclaim neighborhoods and streets, particularly in our inner cities. As a result of this change in focus, we expect that the distribution of spending on drug programs, which until now has favored supply reduction, will begin to shift more to the demand reduction activities.

Lee P. Brown
Director,
Office of National Drug Control Policy

State and Local Spending on Drug Control Activities

Purpose and scope of survey

This survey of State and local government spending on drug control activities was sponsored by the Office of National Drug Control Policy. Objectives were twofold: To develop a methodology for estimating State and local government spending on drug control and to tabulate estimates of such spending covering a two-year period. These estimates represent a first systematic effort to estimate the level and type of drug control spending by the State and local governments.

Data collection and tabulation were performed by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. The survey was conducted during 1992 and covers State and local government spending during Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (see Methodology section for definitions).

The survey covered all types of drug control activities, including those in the general areas of criminal justice (police, prosecution, and correction), education, and health/rehabilitation. Spending was tabulated separately for several functional categories. Readers should note the definitions following the tables.

The local government spending figures represent drug control spending by general purpose governments only (counties, municipalities, and townships). Two other types of local governments, special districts and independent school districts, were not included in the survey. This exclusion could affect the spending amounts presented.

For example, State and local education spending (generally for drug prevention) is underestimated to the extent that independent school districts were excluded from the sample design and subsequent tabulation. The same is true for the health and hospital spending, since special district governments include a large number of hospital districts. (The Methodology section describes this limitation in more detail.)

The survey findings are presented in a series of tables with accompanying text. Amounts presented are estimates for State and local governments only. Direct spending by the Federal Government is not included in the tables. However, at least some State and local government spending is supported by Federal grants-in-aid, and such amounts are included in the data given. Readers should note carefully the sections on methodology and definitions that follow the tables.

In the tables that follow, the District of Columbia is included in the national totals. It is not presented separately in the tables containing State area totals.

Summary of findings

State and local governments spent \$15.9 billion on drug control activities during Fiscal Year 1991, an increase of nearly 13 percent over the \$14.1 billion spent during Fiscal Year 1990. Spending by general purpose governments for drug control activities increased at a slightly faster pace than total State and local government spending, which grew 9 percent between 1990 and 1991.

Among other major findings of the survey were:

- Overall, about one and one-half cents of every dollar spent by State and local governments was spent for some aspect of drug control activity.

State and Local Spending on Drug Control Activities

Table 1. Direct government spending for drug control and other selected activities, by level of government, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991

Activity	1991			1990		
	State and Local	State	Local	State and Local	State	Local
State and local spending for selected functions (in millions of dollars)						
All activities	\$1,060,167	\$442,295	\$617,872	\$972,695	\$397,291	\$575,404
Education and libraries	314,108	80,750	233,358	292,250	75,758	216,492
Public welfare	126,965	100,114	26,850	107,287	83,336	23,951
Hospitals and health	81,110	38,504	42,606	74,635	35,543	39,092
Public safety	79,932	26,459	53,473	73,968	23,929	50,039
Housing and the environment	76,167	16,221	59,946	70,588	15,155	55,432
Transportation	75,409	40,341	35,068	70,628	37,782	32,846
Interest on debt	61,532	24,189	37,343	58,914	22,367	36,547
Government administration	48,461	18,942	29,519	44,836	17,707	27,129
State and local spending for drug control activities (in millions of dollars)						
Total drug control	\$15,907	\$7,451	\$8,455	\$14,075	\$6,248	\$7,827
Justice	12,619	5,501	7,118	11,525	4,739	6,786
Police protection	4,223	637	3,585	4,035	618	3,416
Judicial and legal services	1,449	469	980	1,346	438	908
Corrections	6,827	4,342	2,486	6,045	3,648	2,397
Other	120	53	68	100	34	66
Health and hospitals	2,784	1,611	1,173	2,184	1,250	933
Education	503	340	163	366	259	107
Drug control spending as a percent of spending on all activities						
Total drug control (in %)	1.5	1.7	1.4	1.4	1.6	1.4
Justice	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
Health and hospitals	.3	.4	.2	.2	.3	.2
Education	-	.1	-	-	.1	-

NOTE: For data on selected functions, "local" includes general purpose governments (counties, municipalities, and townships), independent school districts, and special districts. "Local" data for drug control include general purpose governments only. See Methodology section.

Source: Data for major selected functions are from the U.S. Census Bureau reports, *Government Finances*, for fiscal years cited. Fiscal Year 1991 data are preliminary.

- Represents zero or rounds to zero.

-
- State governments spent a slightly higher share on drug control than did local governments
 - The bulk of drug control spending was in the criminal justice system (\$12.6 billion, or 79 percent). Education and rehabilitation accounted for about 21 percent of drug control spending.
 - The largest share of drug control spending was for correctional services—\$6.8 billion in Fiscal Year 1991. This represented 43 percent of all drug control spending.
 - About 12 percent of all police spending was for some aspect of drug control activity (surveillance, arrest, detention, and other related activities).
 - An estimated 25 percent of all spending for corrections was drug-related.

Drug control share of all government spending

Nationally, 1.5 percent of all State and local government spending was for drug control activities during Fiscal Year 1991. The estimated \$15.9 billion spent was distributed among three traditional services areas: criminal justice, health and hospitals, and education.

Table 2. Drug control expenditure, by activity and level of government, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991

[In millions of dollars except percents]									
Judicial and legal services									
Expenditure type by level of government	Total	Police protection	Courts only	Prosecution and legal services	Public defense	Corrections	Health and hospitals	Education	Other
1991									
All State and local	\$15,907	\$4,223	\$540	\$649	\$260	\$6,827	\$2,784	\$503	\$120
State	8,965	695	303	195	80	4,638	2,405	399	251
Direct	7,451	637	228	168	73	4,342	1,611	340	53
Intergovernmental	1,513	57	74	27	6	296	794	60	198
Local	8,567	3,586	313	483	187	2,500	1,268	163	68
Direct	8,455	3,585	311	482	187	2,486	1,173	163	68
Intergovernmental	112	1	1	1	-	14	94	-	-
1990									
All State and Local	\$14,075	\$4,035	\$496	\$594	\$256	\$6,045	\$2,184	\$366	\$100
State	7,476	677	284	191	74	3,899	1,878	303	170
Direct	6,248	618	209	159	70	3,648	1,250	259	34
Intergovernmental	1,228	58	75	32	4	251	628	44	136
Local	7,923	3,417	288	436	186	2,410	1,012	108	66
Direct	7,827	3,416	287	435	186	2,397	933	107	66
Intergovernmental	96	1	1	1	-	13	79	1	-
Percent change, 1990 to 1991									
All State and local	13.0%	4.7%	8.8%	9.3%	1.6%	12.9%	27.5%	37.6%	20.4%
State	19.9	2.7	6.4	2.0	7.0	19.0	28.1	31.8	47.6
Local	8.1	4.9	8.6	10.7	.5	3.7	25.2	51.5	2.9

NOTE: Intergovernmental expenditures consist of payments from one government to another. Such expenditures eventually show up as direct expenditures of the recipient government. Duplicative transactions between levels of government are excluded from the totals for all governments and for local governments.

- Represents zero or rounds to zero.

About 79 percent (see pgs. ii and 4) of drug control spending occurred in the criminal justice system area. This included police, judicial and legal services, and corrections. State and local government spending for operating correctional facilities was most affected by drug control costs. The \$6.8 billion devoted to drug control spending within the corrections function represented about one-fourth of all State and local government spending on corrections.

The share of government health and hospital services devoted to drug control costs was \$2.8 billion in 1991, a significant increase (27 percent) over the \$2.2 billion spent in 1990. Spending for drug control within the education function was relatively low in both years of the survey—\$503 million in 1991 and \$366 million in 1990.

Spending was classified by major activity and survey procedures did not permit a finer delineation. Thus, a drug treatment program operating within a prison was classified as a “corrections” activity. Similarly, an education/prevention program operated by a police department was classified as a “police protection” activity.

There was little change in the shares of spending for drug control between 1990 and 1991 at the national level. However, drug spending grew at a faster rate than total government spending (13 percent versus 9 percent).

Spending by level of government

The survey results showed that local government direct spending on drug control activities exceeded State direct spending (\$8.5 billion versus \$7.5 billion in 1991). However, State drug control activity was a slightly larger share of total State spending than it was for local governments.

Table 3. Distribution of drug control direct expenditure, by activity and level of government, Fiscal Year 1991

Level of government	<u>Judicial and legal services</u>								
	Total	Police protection	Courts only	Prosecution and legal services	Public defense	Corrections	Health and hospitals	Education	Other
Percent by level of government									
All State and local	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
State	46.8	15.1	42.3	25.8	28.2	63.6	57.9	67.5	43.8
Local	53.2	84.9	57.7	74.2	71.8	36.4	42.1	32.5	56.2
Percent by activity									
All State and local	100.0%	26.5%	3.4%	4.1%	1.6%	42.9%	17.5%	3.2%	.8%
State	100.0	8.6	3.1	2.3	1.0	58.3	21.6	4.6	.7
Local	100.0	42.4	3.7	5.7	2.2	29.4	13.9	1.9	.8

NOTE: Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

Table 4. Distribution of drug control direct expenditure, by activity and level of government, Fiscal Year 1990

Level of government	<u>Judicial and legal services</u>								
	Total	Police protection	Courts only	Prosecution and legal services	Public defense	Corrections	Health and hospitals	Education	Other
Percent by level of government									
All State and local	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
State	44.4	15.3	42.2	26.7	27.3	60.4	57.3	70.8	34.2
Local	55.6	84.7	57.8	73.3	72.7	39.6	42.7	29.2	65.8
Percent by activity									
All State and local	100.0%	28.7%	3.5%	4.2%	1.8%	42.9%	15.5%	2.6%	.7%
State	100.0	9.9	3.4	2.5	1.1	58.4	20.0	4.1	.5
Local	100.0	43.6	3.7	5.6	2.4	30.6	11.9	1.4	.8

NOTE: Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

State governments also had significant amounts of spending in the form of aid (intergovernmental spending) to local governments. These amounts (shown in Table 2 at \$1.5 billion and \$1.2 billion for 1991 and 1990) were not included in the State totals in Table 1. This avoided double counting at the national level, since the state aid supported subsequent local government spending on drug control activities. The following chart summarizes these data:

Government level	1991 spending (millions)
All State/local.....	\$15,907
State total	8,965
Direct	7,451
Intergovernmental.....	1,513
Local total.....	8,567
Direct	8,455
Intergovernmental	112

A rough estimate of government spending of its own funds can be obtained by netting State and Federal intergovernmental aid from the total spending amount. Doing so for 1991 results in local government spending of \$6.7 billion, compared with State government spending from its own funds of almost \$9 billion.

While the largest share of State government drug control spending was for corrections services, the largest local government share was for police services. This is consistent with State versus local level spending in total. The burden of corrections spending is greater for State governments and the local governments spend more for police protection.

Criminal justice system spending

The criminal justice system consists of multiple functional areas in which governments provide services. These are police, judicial (courts), prosecution and legal services, public defense, corrections, and other (miscellaneous). Criminal justice activities are affected more than most government functions by drug control efforts (compared for example with health, hospitals, and education). Since justice services are provided by general purpose governments only, the survey results permit a more detailed examination of the burden imposed on the government sector by this aspect of drug control costs. These are detailed in Tables 5 and 6.

Table 5. Drug control justice direct expenditure as a percent of total justice system direct expenditure, Fiscal Year 1991

Justice activity	[In millions of dollars except percents]								
	State and local			State			Local		
	Total Justice	Drug Control Only* Amount	Percent	Total Justice	Drug Control Only* Amount	Percent	Total Justice	Drug Control Only* Amount	Percent
Total justice system	\$76,345	\$12,619	16.5%	\$31,302	\$5,501	17.6%	\$45,043	\$7,118	15.8%
Police protection	34,404	4,223	12.3	5,694	637	11.2	28,711	3,585	12.5
Judicial (courts only)	7,908	540	6.8	3,901	228	5.9	4,007	311	7.8
Prosecution and legal services	4,028	649	16.1	1,606	168	10.4	2,422	482	19.9
Public defense	1,429	260	18.2	623	73	11.7	806	187	23.2
Corrections	27,847	6,827	24.5	19,163	4,342	22.7	8,684	2,486	28.6
Other justice activities	730	120	16.5	315	53	16.7	414	68	16.3

*Excludes health, hospitals, and education drug control.

Table 6. Drug control justice direct expenditure as a percent of total justice system direct expenditure, Fiscal Year 1990

Justice activity	[In millions of dollars except percents]								
	State and local			State			Local		
	Total Justice	Drug Control Only* Amount	Percent	Total Justice	Drug Control Only* Amount	Percent	Total Justice	Drug Control Only* Amount	Percent
Total justice system	\$70,241	\$11,525	16.4%	\$28,492	\$4,739	16.6%	\$41,749	\$6,786	16.3%
Police protection	32,207	4,035	12.5	5,462	618	11.3	26,745	3,416	12.8
Judicial (courts only)	7,383	496	6.7	3,639	209	5.8	3,744	287	7.7
Prosecution and legal services	3,708	594	16.0	1,503	159	10.6	2,205	435	19.7
Public defense	1,310	256	19.5	579	70	12.1	730	186	25.5
Corrections	25,136	6,045	24.0	17,050	3,648	21.4	8,086	2,397	29.6
Other justice activities	497	100	20.1	259	34	13.2	238	66	27.6

*Excludes health, hospitals, and education drug control.

Measures of this burden varied by specific function within the justice system area. At the low end were civil and criminal courts, for which 6.8 percent of State and local government spending was directly attributable to drug control activity. Correctional costs were the other extreme. Nearly one-fourth of all State and local spending on corrections was attributable to drug control activities in general. Within the justice system as a whole, 16.5 percent of all spending was for drug control activities.

PERCENTAGE OF STATE AND LOCAL EXPENDITURE ATTRIBUTABLE TO DRUG CONTROL ACTIVITIES, FISCAL YEAR 1991

Police protection	12.3
Judicial/legal services:	
Courts only.....	6.8
Prosecution/Legal.....	16.1
Public defense.....	18.2
Corrections	24.5
Other justice expenditure.....	16.5

Variation was greater among the specific justice system categories than between years or between levels of government (State and local). In fact there was little change in the pattern of drug control expenditure between 1990 and 1991.

Spending by State areas

Governments in California, New York, and Florida spent the most on drug control during the survey period. These three states were the only ones in which government spending exceeded \$1 billion. In combination, they accounted for about 44 percent of all State and local government spending on drug control in each of the survey years.

Most states showed the same pattern of burden seen at the national level. That is, in most states correctional services accounted for the largest share of drug spending, followed by police protection. Other large shares included health and hospitals (combined) and prosecution/legal services.

State differences in drug control spending can be related to population size. In order to reduce the population size factor, the survey results are presented on a per capita basis in Table 12. When viewed on this

basis, governments in Alaska (at \$154) spend more than government in any other State. Among the States, the top five and bottom five areas for per capita drug activity spending were:

<u>State</u>	<u>Per capita spending</u>	<u>1991 rank</u>
Alaska	\$154.44	1
New York	149.00	2
Connecticut	130.45	3
California	102.30	4
Florida	85.04	5
Mississippi	21.99	46
West Virginia	20.87	47
North Dakota	19.64	48
Arkansas	19.36	49
South Dakota	13.73	50

Nationally, per capita State and local government spending for drug control activities was \$63.08 in 1991 and \$56.59 in 1990. Ten states exceeded the national figure in both 1991 and 1990.

The per capita and ranking measures did not change much between 1990 and 1991 for any of the states. We did not attempt in this survey to analyze the reasons for different absolute or per capita spending levels among the states. There are numerous factors involved, including size, geography, urban/rural economy, cost of living, and so on.

Again because of the nature of this survey, we can examine in more detail the relationship between State and local government drug control spending and total spending for criminal justice system functions. As mentioned, 16.5 percent of justice system spending at the national level was attributable to drug control activities. This percentage varied considerably by State. The numbers are shown in Table 9.

For governments in Connecticut, about 32 percent of the 1991 justice system expenditure was attributable to drug control activities. This was the highest percentage. Next was New York at 21.2 percent. The share was less than 10 percent in 13 states, with Maine (5.7 percent), South Dakota (6.3 percent) and Montana (6.7 percent) also showing low rates for Fiscal Year 1991.

Shares of direct spending by State

Drug control spending is still a relatively small share of total government expenditure. The 1.5 percent national share for 1991 was exceeded in eight states. Drug control spending was less than one percent of total State and local government spending in nearly one-half (23) of the states during Fiscal Year 1991. This statistic showed very little change from 1990 when eight states exceeded the national figure of 1.4 percent, while in 26 states such spending was less than one percent of total State and local government expenditure.

The survey data permit an examination of drug control spending as a share of selected functional spending in the states. These measures are shown in Tables 10 and 11.

Among the states, shares of police spending attributable to drug control varied from almost one-third in Alaska to less than 5 percent in Hawaii. For courts, most State shares during Fiscal Year 1991 were less than 10 percent. This apparently lower percentage was due in part to the fact that total spending on courts includes civil activity as well as criminal.

Table 7. State and local drug control expenditure, by activity and State, Fiscal Year 1991

[In millions of dollars]

Judicial and legal services

State	Total	Police protection	Courts only	Prosecution and legal services	Public defense	Corrections	Health and hospitals	Education	Other
Total	\$15,907	\$4,223	\$540	\$649	\$260	\$6,827	\$2,784	\$503	\$120
Alabama	121	45	4	8	1	38	11	9	6
Alaska	88	45	1	4	1	11	23	3	-
Arizona	200	49	14	15	8	91	17	2	5
Arkansas	46	15	1	2	-	17	1	7	3
California	3,108	876	107	229	83	1,486	223	84	19
Colorado	137	26	3	5	-	61	39	2	1
Connecticut	429	29	5	7	5	294	69	20	-
Delaware	53	17	3	5	1	19	7	2	-
Florida	1,129	331	41	23	15	496	196	24	3
Georgia	285	81	14	10	2	139	25	12	2
Hawaii	35	6	4	3	-	13	6	3	1
Idaho	28	8	1	1	-	10	6	2	-
Illinois	610	237	26	9	5	174	137	21	-
Indiana	138	38	3	5	1	52	27	10	3
Iowa	91	22	2	2	3	27	31	4	-
Kansas	107	32	1	1	1	49	14	3	5
Kentucky	89	23	1	1	3	35	21	5	-
Louisiana	150	34	8	7	-	61	28	8	3
Maine	27	9	1	2	-	3	11	2	-
Maryland	377	120	14	7	6	138	79	12	-
Massachusetts	384	52	12	4	7	181	119	8	3
Michigan	528	147	25	13	6	193	135	11	-
Minnesota	170	41	6	8	4	29	73	8	1
Mississippi	57	21	1	4	-	20	4	5	2
Missouri	154	34	7	5	1	35	34	15	24
Montana	21	6	1	-	-	6	5	2	-
Nebraska	38	14	2	-	-	13	6	2	-
Nevada	95	29	4	5	4	44	9	2	-
New Hampshire	26	6	2	2	1	9	5	2	-
New Jersey	582	175	16	45	4	264	61	14	2
New Mexico	68	10	1	4	-	31	19	3	-
New York	2,691	592	57	106	42	1,145	698	46	4
North Carolina	310	100	17	3	2	135	43	6	2
North Dakota	12	3	-	-	-	5	1	2	-
Ohio	435	118	20	16	8	175	56	37	6
Oklahoma	97	27	2	5	1	42	13	5	1
Oregon	112	36	2	4	5	39	19	4	2
Pennsylvania	462	115	30	17	5	167	106	21	1
Rhode Island	51	7	2	4	1	16	20	2	-
South Carolina	172	52	4	2	1	81	28	4	-
South Dakota	10	2	-	-	-	3	2	2	-
Tennessee	222	55	10	5	5	100	35	8	3
Texas	791	236	30	22	10	407	57	15	13
Utah	45	12	1	4	-	16	8	3	-
Vermont	19	5	1	1	-	2	8	2	-
Virginia	299	76	18	3	4	108	80	9	-
Washington	264	58	6	11	4	104	71	7	3
West Virginia	38	14	1	-	1	8	11	3	-
Wisconsin	187	44	3	9	2	68	45	17	1
Wyoming	16	5	2	-	-	3	4	1	-

NOTE: Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

- Represents zero or rounds to zero.

Table 8. State and local drug control expenditure, by activity and State, Fiscal Year 1990

[In millions of dollars]

Judicial and legal services

State	Total	Police protection	Courts only	Prosecution and legal services	Public defense	Corrections	Health and hospitals	Education	Other
Total	\$14,075	\$4,035	\$496	\$594	\$256	\$6,045	\$2,184	\$366	\$100
Alabama	99	39	3	7	-	29	13	4	3
Alaska	77	41	1	5	1	12	16	2	1
Arizona	177	44	13	13	5	86	12	1	3
Arkansas	38	13	1	2	-	13	-	6	2
California	2,865	801	96	205	88	1,402	182	71	19
Colorado	108	24	3	4	-	48	26	.1	1
Connecticut	347	25	4	7	4	229	60	18	-
Delaware	44	15	2	4	-	15	7	1	-
Florida	1,068	314	37	24	15	499	162	15	2
Georgia	250	79	14	9	2	120	20	7	-
Hawaii	31	6	4	2	-	12	4	3	-
Idaho	24	6	-	1	-	9	5	2	-
Illinois	543	243	25	7	4	130	119	16	-
Indiana	111	34	2	5	1	40	22	6	2
Iowa	73	18	2	1	2	22	25	2	-
Kansas	113	28	1	1	1	65	14	2	1
Kentucky	72	21	1	1	3	29	15	2	-
Louisiana	127	29	9	7	-	55	20	6	2
Maine	27	8	1	1	-	3	12	2	-
Maryland	336	114	12	7	6	127	62	9	-
Massachusetts	345	46	12	5	8	157	107	7	3
Michigan	446	142	19	11	6	175	81	13	-
Minnesota	155	37	6	7	4	24	72	4	1
Mississippi	34	19	1	2	-	5	4	2	1
Missouri	143	32	5	4	-	31	27	16	29
Montana	15	5	1	-	-	4	4	1	-
Nebraska	31	11	2	-	-	10	5	2	-
Nevada	85	28	3	4	3	39	7	1	-
New Hampshire	26	6	2	3	1	8	5	1	-
New Jersey	502	160	15	45	6	217	49	9	1
New Mexico	60	10	-	5	-	27	16	2	-
New York	2,464	694	58	104	46	1,021	500	38	3
North Carolina	231	88	15	3	2	92	24	5	2
North Dakota	11	3	-	-	-	6	1	1	-
Ohio	336	104	18	13	6	150	26	16	3
Oklahoma	83	24	2	4	1	36	12	5	-
Oregon	98	31	2	4	4	35	17	3	1
Pennsylvania	368	95	26	17	5	131	78	16	1
Rhode Island	47	6	3	4	1	14	17	1	4
South Carolina	148	48	4	1	1	67	24	2	-
South Dakota	9	2	-	-	-	3	2	1	1
Tennessee	187	49	10	6	4	81	30	5	3
Texas	675	211	29	19	8	340	49	11	7
Utah	41	12	2	3	-	15	7	2	-
Vermont	15	4	-	1	-	3	7	1	-
Virginia	264	69	17	3	4	98	67	6	-
Washington	217	51	7	10	4	76	63	4	4
West Virginia	31	13	-	-	-	5	10	1	-
Wisconsin	145	36	2	6	2	52	35	11	1
Wyoming	14	4	1	-	-	3	4	1	-

NOTE: Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.
 - Represents zero or rounds to zero.

Table 9. State and local drug control justice expenditure as a percent of total justice system expenditure, by State, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991

[In millions of dollars except percents]

State	Total Justice	1991		Total Justice	1990	
		Drug control only* Amount	Percent		Drug control only* Amount	Percent
Total	\$76,345	\$12,619	16.5%	\$70,241	\$11,525	16.4%
Alabama	728	101	13.9	668	81	12.2
Alaska	436	62	14.2	398	60	15.0
Arizona	1,377	181	13.1	1,279	164	12.8
Arkansas	309	38	12.4	273	31	11.5
California	14,391	2,801	19.5	13,032	2,611	20.0
Colorado	885	96	10.8	795	80	10.1
Connecticut	1,063	340	32.0	920	270	29.3
Delaware	260	44	17.0	241	36	15.0
Florida	4,686	909	19.4	4,321	891	20.6
Georgia	1,768	248	14.0	1,557	223	14.3
Hawaii	358	27	7.5	318	24	7.7
Idaho	216	20	9.2	193	17	8.7
Illinois	2,909	452	15.5	2,652	408	15.4
Indiana	958	100	10.5	841	83	9.9
Iowa	531	56	10.6	481	45	9.4
Kansas	621	90	14.4	594	97	16.3
Kentucky	648	63	9.8	588	55	9.4
Louisiana	927	114	12.2	852	102	11.9
Maine	245	14	5.7	227	13	5.8
Maryland	1,758	286	16.3	1,644	264	16.1
Massachusetts	1,981	257	13.0	1,832	232	12.6
Michigan	2,891	383	13.2	2,761	353	12.8
Minnesota	1,068	89	8.3	992	79	7.9
Mississippi	321	48	15.0	316	28	8.8
Missouri	992	105	10.6	955	100	10.5
Montana	209	14	6.7	128	10	7.8
Nebraska	265	29	10.9	243	24	9.8
Nevada	541	85	15.7	477	77	16.1
New Hampshire	236	19	8.2	235	19	8.3
New Jersey	2,874	506	17.6	2,705	444	16.4
New Mexico	424	46	10.9	386	42	10.9
New York	9,180	1,947	21.2	8,774	1,926	22.0
North Carolina	1,614	260	16.1	1,389	202	14.5
North Dakota	105	9	8.8	97	9	9.6
Ohio	2,485	341	13.7	2,199	294	13.4
Oklahoma	686	78	11.4	612	66	10.8
Oregon	861	89	10.4	762	78	10.3
Pennsylvania	2,557	335	13.1	2,307	274	11.9
Rhode Island	275	29	10.6	260	28	10.9
South Carolina	718	140	19.5	657	121	18.5
South Dakota	100	6	6.3	93	6	6.1
Tennessee	1,088	179	16.4	992	153	15.4
Texas	4,082	719	17.6	3,787	614	16.2
Utah	354	34	9.7	334	32	9.6
Vermont	124	9	7.2	116	7	6.3
Virginia	1,617	210	13.0	1,607	191	11.9
Washington	1,230	185	15.1	1,079	150	13.9
West Virginia	203	24	11.6	185	19	10.4
Wisconsin	1,363	126	9.3	1,211	100	8.2
Wyoming	119	10	8.6	119	9	7.5

*Excludes health, hospitals, and education drug control.

Table 10. State and local drug control justice expenditure as a percent of total justice expenditure, by function and State, Fiscal Year 1991

State	<u>Judicial and legal services</u>						
	Total Justice	Police protection	Courts only	Prosecution and legal services	Public defense	Corrections	Other Justice
Total	16.5%	12.3%	6.8%	16.1%	18.2%	24.5%	16.5%
Alabama	13.9	13.0	4.0	24.0	5.0	15.9	77.9
Alaska	14.2	32.4	2.6	3.4	20.0	8.5	66.7
Arizona	13.1	8.6	9.0	16.3	28.3	17.2	47.3
Arkansas	12.4	9.9	4.0	16.6	11.1	15.1	55.7
California	19.5	13.9	6.5	25.1	23.0	29.3	18.8
Colorado	10.8	6.6	2.6	10.9	2.5	19.7	4.7
Connecticut	32.0	7.0	4.0	18.3	36.4	64.1	.8
Delaware	17.0	16.0	6.1	50.5	16.2	20.2	-
Florida	19.4	15.1	9.5	9.4	14.8	30.1	4.0
Georgia	14.0	11.6	10.6	16.0	19.5	16.4	14.2
Hawaii	7.5	3.8	6.6	7.7	5.2	13.8	9.7
Idaho	9.2	7.1	2.3	7.8	7.6	14.5	100.0
Illinois	15.5	15.6	8.4	6.7	10.3	19.3	41.9
Indiana	10.5	7.8	3.8	12.9	11.4	14.5	23.2
Iowa	10.6	8.4	3.4	7.1	13.5	17.2	74.8
Kansas	14.4	11.5	1.0	6.0	14.3	19.4	95.6
Kentucky	9.8	9.3	1.3	1.7	33.0	14.1	5.0
Louisiana	12.2	7.2	9.4	15.7	30.8	19.4	51.7
Maine	5.7	7.4	2.0	14.0	2.0	3.7	100.0
Maryland	16.3	15.6	6.9	10.9	19.9	20.1	4.4
Massachusetts	13.0	6.6	5.6	5.7	12.6	25.4	1.7
Michigan	13.2	11.0	9.2	9.7	16.6	17.2	45.7
Minnesota	8.3	7.6	4.9	10.8	19.9	9.3	22.8
Mississippi	15.0	11.7	6.8	25.9	10.7	19.2	90.2
Missouri	10.6	6.2	6.2	11.0	4.0	14.0	98.5
Montana	6.7	5.2	4.1	3.6	2.6	11.9	3.5
Nebraska	10.9	9.1	5.7	2.4	6.5	18.6	-
Nevada	15.7	13.3	7.4	21.0	42.0	18.4	.9
New Hampshire	8.2	5.5	4.7	20.2	8.5	13.0	100.0
New Jersey	17.6	11.3	7.1	25.1	11.0	30.5	14.4
New Mexico	10.9	5.2	1.7	15.8	4.2	20.8	.5
New York	21.2	15.5	5.6	24.6	21.7	31.7	3.5
North Carolina	16.1	14.2	11.7	6.4	9.7	19.9	35.1
North Dakota	8.8	6.0	1.3	1.6	2.0	19.8	40.4
Ohio	13.7	10.7	6.9	12.0	21.9	18.9	59.1
Oklahoma	11.4	8.6	3.8	9.8	18.5	16.6	42.2
Oregon	10.4	10.4	2.9	6.5	14.3	12.2	47.0
Pennsylvania	13.1	9.5	9.9	16.2	18.0	18.7	9.1
Rhode Island	10.6	5.8	5.1	19.1	26.0	16.2	.5
South Carolina	19.5	16.9	10.0	16.3	30.4	23.0	2.1
South Dakota	6.3	5.8	2.3	3.9	8.8	7.5	94.0
Tennessee	16.4	12.8	11.0	12.1	27.0	20.2	100.0
Texas	17.6	12.5	9.4	9.0	21.9	27.0	20.4
Utah	9.7	7.5	3.1	16.7	11.8	13.7	24.0
Vermont	7.2	9.2	2.7	7.9	4.2	7.5	3.7
Virginia	13.0	10.1	11.0	8.9	16.8	17.2	1.4
Washington	15.1	10.5	5.0	12.2	12.0	23.7	88.4
West Virginia	11.6	14.4	1.5	1.4	5.8	16.1	-
Wisconsin	9.3	6.0	2.6	15.8	4.2	15.4	76.8
Wyoming	8.6	8.5	14.1	.6	8.5	8.6	27.6

NOTE: Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.
 - Represents zero or rounds to zero.

Table 11. State and local drug control justice expenditure as a percent of total justice expenditure, by function and State, Fiscal Year 1990

State	<u>Judicial and legal services</u>						
	Total Justice	Police protection	Courts only	Prosecution and legal services	Public defense	Corrections	Other Justice
Total	16.4%	12.5%	6.7%	16.0%	19.5%	24.0%	20.1%
Alabama	12.2	12.0	3.2	24.3	5.4	13.3	55.2
Alaska	15.0	32.8	2.8	4.4	16.8	9.9	66.7
Arizona	12.8	8.3	9.2	16.4	21.2	17.5	22.3
Arkansas	11.5	9.6	3.5	14.5	11.2	14.4	43.2
California	20.0	14.3	6.5	25.6	27.3	29.4	28.0
Colorado	10.1	6.8	2.8	9.0	2.7	17.5	13.4
Connecticut	29.3	6.0	3.6	18.8	35.4	67.2	.3
Delaware	15.0	14.0	6.0	44.1	12.9	18.6	.1
Florida	20.6	15.6	9.7	10.8	16.7	32.2	3.5
Georgia	14.3	12.3	11.0	16.2	21.6	16.6	4.5
Hawaii	7.7	4.1	7.0	5.9	5.9	15.1	-
Idaho	8.7	6.1	2.1	5.6	7.4	16.7	100.0
Illinois	15.4	17.1	8.0	5.1	9.7	17.1	92.3
Indiana	9.9	7.6	3.4	13.2	12.9	13.7	26.8
Iowa	9.4	7.5	3.8	4.8	13.5	14.4	43.7
Kansas	16.3	10.4	1.0	5.1	11.9	26.8	95.4
Kentucky	9.4	9.3	1.6	1.9	32.9	13.1	4.0
Louisiana	11.9	6.5	10.1	16.9	28.6	19.7	52.5
Maine	5.8	6.9	2.3	12.2	2.3	4.5	100.0
Maryland	16.1	15.4	6.2	10.4	19.9	20.3	5.6
Massachusetts	12.6	6.0	6.0	6.4	14.7	22.7	10.5
Michigan	12.8	10.9	8.0	9.0	18.1	16.4	42.2
Minnesota	7.9	7.3	5.5	9.4	20.1	8.5	24.2
Mississippi	8.8	11.0	5.7	9.3	9.8	4.9	74.2
Missouri	10.5	6.2	4.2	9.0	3.9	12.3	98.7
Montana	7.8	7.0	6.1	3.9	2.7	11.7	3.1
Nebraska	9.8	8.2	6.2	2.0	6.1	16.7	-
Nevada	16.1	15.0	7.7	17.0	41.1	17.7	1.1
New Hampshire	8.3	5.1	5.5	30.5	10.4	11.5	100.0
New Jersey	16.4	10.7	7.1	28.9	12.1	27.4	31.2
New Mexico	10.9	5.9	1.3	17.5	3.4	18.6	.2
New York	22.0	18.7	5.5	24.5	23.7	31.0	3.4
North Carolina	14.5	12.9	11.4	6.1	9.3	18.3	36.7
North Dakota	9.6	6.2	1.3	1.5	2.1	23.9	9.8
Ohio	13.4	10.3	7.4	11.3	20.1	18.8	62.1
Oklahoma	10.8	8.2	4.5	7.9	15.3	16.4	16.0
Oregon	10.3	9.6	2.7	6.5	14.4	13.6	27.8
Pennsylvania	11.9	8.5	8.9	16.3	18.8	17.3	8.9
Rhode Island	10.9	5.3	7.2	21.8	30.7	16.2	.4
South Carolina	18.5	16.8	10.1	10.6	25.6	21.6	.9
South Dakota	6.1	5.1	2.1	3.6	2.6	7.9	96.0
Tennessee	15.4	11.9	11.0	13.4	19.7	19.1	99.8
Texas	16.2	11.9	9.4	8.4	20.7	24.7	11.9
Utah	9.6	7.6	3.1	16.2	11.8	14.3	21.8
Vermont	6.3	7.1	1.8	6.2	4.9	8.3	-
Virginia	11.9	8.8	10.9	7.9	17.4	16.6	1.2
Washington	13.9	10.4	6.5	12.9	15.0	19.6	98.0
West Virginia	10.4	14.0	1.5	1.2	4.6	12.5	-
Wisconsin	8.2	5.3	2.6	11.7	4.2	14.8	79.4
Wyoming	7.5	7.9	6.9	.6	8.6	8.9	27.6

NOTE: Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.
 - Represents zero or rounds to zero.

Table 12. State and local drug control per capita expenditure, by State, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991

Rank			Drug control expenditure per capita	
1991	1990		1991	1990
1	1	Alaska	\$154.44	\$140.61
2	2	New York	149.00	136.98
3	3	Connecticut	130.45	105.65
4	4	California	102.30	96.27
5	5	Florida	85.04	82.56
6	8	Delaware	78.22	65.77
7	7	Maryland	77.63	70.26
8	9	New Jersey	75.02	65.00
9	6	Nevada	74.31	70.42
10	10	Massachusetts	64.06	57.41
		All State and local	63.08	56.59
11	12	Michigan	56.40	48.02
12	11	Arizona	53.24	48.26
13	13	Illinois	52.84	47.53
14	16	Washington	52.53	44.66
15	14	Rhode Island	50.88	46.79
16	18	South Carolina	48.32	42.39
17	17	Virginia	47.50	42.68
18	24	North Carolina	45.94	34.92
19	19	Texas	45.60	39.71
20	22	Tennessee	44.77	38.36
21	20	New Mexico	44.02	39.59
22	21	Georgia	43.04	38.65
23	15	Kansas	42.72	45.56
24	26	Colorado	40.52	32.66
25	27	Ohio	39.75	30.96
26	28	Pennsylvania	38.64	30.95
27	25	Oregon	38.48	34.54
28	23	Minnesota	38.37	35.43
29	31	Wisconsin	37.81	29.74
30	30	Louisiana	35.18	30.13
31	29	Wyoming	34.36	30.68
32	36	Vermont	32.88	26.34
33	35	Iowa	32.74	26.34
34	32	Hawaii	31.20	28.20
35	34	Oklahoma	30.51	26.41
36	33	Missouri	29.89	27.87
37	37	Alabama	29.49	24.39
38	39	Idaho	26.83	23.63
39	45	Montana	25.56	18.92
40	38	Utah	25.34	23.77
41	42	Indiana	24.55	19.96
42	43	Kentucky	23.92	19.50
43	44	Nebraska	23.84	19.42
44	40	New Hampshire	23.64	23.57
45	41	Maine	22.02	21.62
46	49	Mississippi	21.99	13.28
47	47	West Virginia	20.87	17.05
48	46	North Dakota	19.64	17.94
49	48	Arkansas	19.36	16.10
50	50	South Dakota	13.73	12.47

State and Local Spending on Drug Control Activities

Table 13. State and local drug control expenditure as a percent of direct expenditure on all activities, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991

[In millions of dollars except percents]

State	1991			1990		
	All activities	Drug control	Percent	All activities	Drug control	Percent
Total	\$1,060,167	\$15,907	1.5%	\$972,695	\$14,075	1.4%
Alabama	14,159	121	.9	12,830	99	.8
Alaska	6,284	88	1.4	5,968	77	1.3
Arizona	15,697	200	1.3	15,487	177	1.1
Arkansas	6,439	46	.7	5,943	38	.6
California	146,233	3,108	2.1	133,690	2,865	2.1
Colorado	13,669	137	1.0	12,772	108	.8
Connecticut	16,414	429	2.6	14,872	347	2.3
Delaware	3,056	53	1.7	2,815	44	1.6
Florida	51,721	1,129	2.2	46,571	1,068	2.3
Georgia	24,768	285	1.2	22,772	250	1.1
Hawaii	5,772	35	.6	4,902	31	.6
Idaho	3,296	28	.8	2,945	24	.8
Illinois	43,734	610	1.4	39,271	543	1.4
Indiana	18,562	138	.7	16,774	111	.7
Iowa	10,516	91	.9	9,700	73	.8
Kansas	9,003	107	1.2	8,413	113	1.3
Kentucky	12,395	89	.7	10,909	72	.7
Louisiana	15,904	150	.9	14,529	127	.9
Maine	4,986	27	.5	4,389	27	.6
Maryland	20,470	377	1.8	18,667	336	1.8
Massachusetts	29,985	384	1.3	27,536	345	1.3
Michigan	39,181	528	1.3	36,643	446	1.2
Minnesota	21,179	170	.8	19,279	155	.8
Mississippi	7,872	57	.7	7,418	34	.5
Missouri	15,627	154	1.0	14,264	143	1.0
Montana	3,196	21	.6	2,920	15	.5
Nebraska	6,963	38	.5	6,572	31	.5
Nevada	5,839	95	1.6	4,824	85	1.8
New Hampshire	3,821	26	.7	3,646	26	.7
New Jersey	36,162	582	1.6	33,816	502	1.5
New Mexico	5,746	68	1.2	5,486	60	1.1
New York	117,400	2,691	2.3	106,875	2,464	2.3
North Carolina	24,211	310	1.3	22,226	231	1.0
North Dakota	2,442	12	.5	2,383	11	.5
Ohio	42,095	435	1.0	38,495	336	.9
Oklahoma	10,635	97	.9	9,746	83	.9
Oregon	12,312	112	.9	11,146	98	.9
Pennsylvania	44,729	462	1.0	41,516	368	.9
Rhode Island	4,518	51	1.1	4,123	47	1.1
South Carolina	13,279	172	1.3	11,915	148	1.2
South Dakota	2,288	10	.4	2,157	9	.4
Tennessee	18,177	222	1.2	17,026	187	1.1
Texas	58,087	791	1.4	55,080	675	1.2
Utah	6,867	45	.7	6,461	41	.6
Vermont	2,435	19	.8	2,234	15	.7
Virginia	22,875	299	1.3	21,239	264	1.2
Washington	24,830	264	1.1	22,051	217	1.0
West Virginia	6,061	38	.6	5,437	31	.6
Wisconsin	20,010	187	.9	18,210	145	.8
Wyoming	2,574	16	.6	2,376	14	.6

NOTE: Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

Methodology

Coverage

The data in this report were collected by the U.S. Bureau of the Census for the Office of National Drug Control Policy using a special sample survey of State and local governments. The sample panel included all 50 State governments and all 3,042 county governments. It also included all municipalities that had a 1986 population of 10,000 or more, with municipalities of under that population cutoff selected using a scientifically designed sample procedure. The sample panel included all townships of 10,000 population or more within the six New England states, the three Middle Atlantic states, Michigan, and Wisconsin. Additional township governments were selected using the sample procedure. In total, the sample panel consisted of 8,867 local governments (3,042 counties, 4,693 municipalities, and 1,132 townships).

Data collection

The survey was accomplished using three methods of data collection: field compilation, specialized office compilation with supplemental agency contacts, and mail canvass. Trained field representatives compiled expenditure data from the governments' own records for the 50 states, the 25 counties, and the 25 municipalities having the largest total expenditure for the police, judicial, and corrections functions in 1990. Specialized office compilation procedures were used to collect data for 680 units, which consisted of counties with a population greater than 100,000 and municipalities and urban townships with a population greater than 75,000 that were not included as field compilation units. The field and specialized office compilations were completed between April and November 1992. All other units in the sample were canvassed for expenditure data by mail beginning in June 1992. Respondent governments accounted for 87 percent of the estimated total justice expenditure data. The overall response rate for the mail canvass was 54 percent. Response for field compilation units was 100 percent. Response for specialized office compilation units was 90 percent.

The survey efforts were supplemented by reference to a variety of published government documents such as budgets, financial statements, audit reports, and drug strategies.

In some cases, such sources were the basis for breaking down totals into more detailed expenditure figures. In addition, agency records of arrests, investigations, court filings and dispositions, inmate counts, etc., were used in some cases to estimate the proportion of agency resources that were drug related.

Survey period

The State expenditure data presented in this report cover the fiscal years ending June 30, 1990 and 1991, for all States except four whose fiscal years ended as follows: New York, March 31; Texas, August 31; and Alabama and Michigan, September 30. Some State agencies operate on a different fiscal year basis than the State government. In such instances, the data are for the agency's fiscal year that ended within the State's regular fiscal year.

For local governments, the 1990 expenditure data are for the governments' fiscal year that ended between July 1, 1989, and June 30, 1990. The 1991 expenditure data are for the governments' fiscal year that ended between July 1, 1990, and June 30 1991. Most municipalities and counties ended their fiscal year on December 31 or June 30. By using the July 1 to June 30 reference period, some governments' data are for a fiscal year that the local government may refer to as the prior fiscal year. For example, those that ended December 31, 1989, may be referred to as Fiscal Year 1989. The fiscal years reported for Washington, D.C., ended September 30.

Limitations of the survey data

Readers should compare states with caution. Differences in functional responsibilities from State-to-State may affect the comparability of the data. Some State governments directly administer activities that local governments administer in other states. For example, the State governments of Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Rhode Island, and Vermont operate local jails as well as State prisons.

The data reported for local governments came from a sample and therefore, are an estimate that might vary from the results of a complete enumeration. This variation, together with variations that would occur from all possible samples of the same size and procedure, is known as sampling error.

Sampling error can be estimated. The local government sample for this survey was designed to estimate the portion of total justice expenditure made by local governments in each State with a relative sampling error of less than one half of one percent at the two-thirds confidence level.

Data for local governments and the total for State and local governments rely on samples. State government figures are not subject to sampling errors because all State governments were included in the survey.

All data are subject to possible inaccuracies in classification, response, and processing. Every effort was made to keep such errors to a minimum through examining, editing, and tabulating the data submitted by government officials and through extensive follow-up procedures to clarify inadequate or inconsistent survey returns.

Definitions of terms

The following is a glossary of terms and concepts used in this report and comments regarding their limitations.

The definitions are those applied in the field compilation of data for the 50 states, 25 counties and 25 municipalities having the largest total expenditure for the police, judicial, and corrections functions in 1990; and for the 680 specialized office compilation units. These definitions were summarized for inclusion in the survey questionnaires sent to governments in the mail portion of the survey.

These terms are grouped into three categories:

- Governmental units and types of governments
- Governmental expenditures
- Governmental functions

Government units and types of government

A **government** is an organized entity whose governmental character is evidenced by the popular election of officials or their appointment by public officials, a high degree of public accountability, and the power to raise revenue to provide authorized services. In addition, a governmental unit must have sufficient discretion in the management of its

own affairs to distinguish it from the administrative structure of any other governmental unit.

State governments. This category refers to the governments of the 50 states that constitute the United States.

Local governments. The U.S. Bureau of the Census classifies local governments by five major types: county, municipal, township, independent school district, and special district.

Counties. Organized county governments are found throughout the Nation except in Connecticut, Rhode Island and limited portions of a few other states. These governments are legally designated as boroughs in Alaska and parishes in Louisiana. Excluded from county government statistics and included with municipalities or townships are certain local governments that combine area and governmental characteristics of both counties and municipalities or townships.

Municipalities and townships. As used in this report, "municipalities" includes both municipalities and townships. A municipality is a political subdivision within which a municipal corporation has been established to provide general local government services for a specific population concentration in a defined area. A municipality may be legally termed a city, village, borough (except in Alaska), or town (except in the New England States, Minnesota, New York, and Wisconsin). Included in this category are certain cities that are completely or substantially consolidated with their county governments, operate outside the geographic limits of any county, or for other reasons have no organized county government operations within their boundaries. "Townships," as distinguished from municipalities, are created to serve inhabitants of areas defined without regard to population concentration. This classification is applied to local governments in 20 States, including government units officially designated as "towns" in the six New England states, New York, and Wisconsin; some "plantations" in Maine; and some "locations" in New Hampshire. In Minnesota, the terms "town" and "township" are used interchangeably.

Independent school districts. These governments are organized local entities providing public elementary, secondary, and/or higher education, which, under State law, have sufficient administrative and fiscal

autonomy to qualify as separate governments. Data for these governments were not included in the scope of this survey. However, data for these governments are included in the denominator when drug control expenditures are presented as a percentage of all government expenditure to allow comparisons across states and governments that make varying use of these districts.

Special districts. These are organized local entities (other than counties, municipalities, townships, and school districts) authorized by State law to provide a limited number of designated functions and with sufficient autonomy to qualify as separate governments. They are known by a variety of names, including districts, authorities, boards, and commissions. Data for these governments were not included in the scope of this survey. However, data for these governments are included in the denominator when drug control expenditures are presented as a percentage of all government expenditure to allow comparisons across states and governments that make varying use of these districts.

Governmental expenditures

Total expenditure is direct and intergovernmental expenditure of a government. In the expenditure tables, certain totals have been adjusted to exclude duplicative intergovernmental expenditure amounts. For example, money paid by a State government to a county government within that State is reported by the State government as an intergovernmental expenditure and by the county as a direct expenditure when the money is spent. Therefore, to arrive at a combined State-local government total that does not duplicate these transactions, intergovernmental expenditure amounts are deducted from the State-local total because those amounts also are reflected in the direct expenditure of the recipient government. The same treatment is used for intergovernmental payments between counties and municipalities within the same State when computing local totals.

Direct expenditure is all expenditure except that classed as intergovernmental and is further divided into two categories:

direct current, which includes salaries, wages, fees, commissions, and the purchase of supplies, materials, and contractual services; and

capital outlay, which includes expenditure for the three object categories of construction, equipment (with an expected life of 5 or more years), and purchase of land and existing structures.

Expenditure for interest on general debt and assistance and subsidies is not applied to specific functions.

Intergovernmental expenditure comprises payments from one government to another, including grants-in-aid, shared revenues, fiscal assistance, and amounts for services performed by one government for another on a reimbursable or cost-sharing basis (e.g., payments by one government to another for boarding prisoners). It excludes amounts paid to other governments for purchase of commodities, property, or utility services and any tax imposed and paid as such.

Drug related expenditure includes payments for identifiable drug-related activities and a percentage of administrative/support personnel and overhead costs and other estimated costs that are associated with drug control activity.

Governmental functions

Police protection is the function of enforcing the law, preserving order, and apprehending those who violate the law, whether these activities are performed by a police department, a sheriff's department, or a special police force maintained by an agency whose prime responsibility is outside the justice system but that has police power to perform these activities in its specialized area (geographic or functional). This function includes regular police services; police patrols and communications; crime prevention activities; temporary lockups and "holding tanks"; buildings used exclusively for police purposes; medical examiners and coroners; law enforcement activities of sheriffs' offices; specialized police forces (including public and private contract forces) such as airport police, free and toll highway police, free and toll bridge and tunnel police, housing police, maritime police, park police, transit and other utility system police, college and university campus police, alcoholic beverage control agents with arrest powers, alcoholic beverage licensing and enforcement agents (to cover sale and distribution of alcoholic beverages to minors) regardless of arrest powers.

The special police forces included in the data are only those that are part of a general purpose government. Security forces, building guards, school crossing guards, and parking law enforcement staff without general arrest powers were excluded. Those special police forces that are part of independent school districts or special districts are not included in the data because they are not general purpose governments.

Judicial services (courts only) includes all civil and criminal activities associated with courts. This function includes civil and criminal functions of courts at all levels of legal jurisdiction, appellate, general jurisdiction, and limited jurisdiction; activities associated with courts, such as law libraries, grand juries, and petit juries; court reporters, judicial councils, bailiffs, and registers of wills and similar probate functions.

The court-related activities of sheriffs' offices are included here. Excluded are monetary judgements and claims or other payments of a government as a defendant in judicial or administrative proceedings. Probation where separately identifiable is not included (it is classified under the corrections function).

Prosecution and legal services includes the criminal justice activities of the attorneys general, district attorneys, States' attorneys (and their variously named equivalents); corporation counsels, solicitors, and legal departments with various names, including those providing legal advice to the chief executives and subordinate departmental officers, representation of the government in lawsuits, and the prosecution of accused violators of criminal law; various investigative agencies having full arrest powers and attached to offices of attorneys general, district attorneys, or their variously named equivalents.

Public defense includes legal counsel and representation in either criminal or civil proceedings. This function includes court-paid fees to individually retained counsel, fees paid by the court to court appointed counsel, government contributions to private legal-aid societies and bar association-sponsored programs, and the activities of an established public defender office or program.

Corrections is the function of government that involves the confinement and rehabilitation of adults and juveniles convicted of offenses against the law and suspected of a crime awaiting trial or adjudica-

tion. (Data for lockups or "tanks" holding prisoners less than 48 hours are included in the police protection function.) This function includes jails; prisons and penitentiaries; reformatories; houses of correction; and other variously named correctional institutions, such as correctional farms, workhouses, industrial schools, and training schools; institutions and facilities exclusively for the confinement of the criminally insane; institutions and facilities for the examination, evaluation, classification, and assignment of inmates; and facilities for the confinement, treatment, and rehabilitation of drug addicts and alcoholics, if the institution is administered by a correctional agency; the cost of maintaining prisoners in institutions of other governments; the supervision of prison industries and agricultural programs; and probation agencies, boards of parole, boards of pardon, and their variously named equivalents.

Health/hospitals (treatment) includes expenditures for hospital facilities directly operated by State and local governments and payments to private medical facilities. This function includes payments to clinics, treatment centers, counseling services, community service boards, and research into effective treatment for drug abusers.

Education (prevention) includes expenditures by State and local general purpose governments for elementary and secondary school systems that are administratively dependent on State or local governments. This function includes payments by State and local governments to private institutions and/or to independent school district governments and payments for drug abuse education and prevention programs. Excluded are expenditures by independent schooldistrict governments.

"Other" and "combined" includes criminal justice or drug control expenditures that are not classified elsewhere, that cut across more than one category, or that are not allocable to separate categories. Examples include alcohol and drug abuse councils, crime commissions, and State criminal justice coordinating councils.

For the purpose of this survey, treatment and prevention activities were classified under the primary function where they occurred (e.g., corrections, law enforcement) unless there was a major program that could be classified under the appropriate health or education function.

Office of National Drug Control Policy
Executive Office of the President
Washington, D.C. 20500