

APPENDIX III

Form LEAA-OLEP-159
(edition 6-1-70)

	<p>LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION OFFICE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS</p>	<p>DISCRETIONARY GRANT PROGRESS REPORT</p>
<p>1. Grantee: Iowa State Planning Agency (Iowa Crime Commission)</p>	<p>4. Grant No. 5. Date of <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> April 1, 1973 71-DF-1071 Report: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> October 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Other</p>	
<p>2. Implementing Subgrantee: Linn County Crime Commission</p>	<p>6. Grant Amt. 7. Character <input type="checkbox"/> Interim \$70,338.00 of Report: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Final</p>	
<p>3. Title or Character of Project: Upgrade ^{by} Expand ^{by} Narcotics/ Dangerous Drugs Law Enforcement</p>	<p>8. Covering Period: 10/1/72 to 1/15/73</p>	

LINN
COUNTY (1A)

To: Cognizant Regional Office
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

State Planning Agency, State of Iowa

Submitted herewith is the grantee's progress report for the period shown above:

Project Director (signature)
George J. Matias, Chief of Police
Cedar Rapids, Iowa
(Typed Name and Title)

[Commence report below and add continuation pages as required.]

SEE ATTACHED 9-PAGE REPORT.

Instructions Appear on Reverse Side

DF 159

34326
READING ROOM

Introduction

The overall expenditure table has changed as follows:

As revised, March 20, 1973

Time expended	18 months or	100%
Time remaining		0%
Budget expended	Federal share Local share	Approximately 100%
Budget remaining		Approximately 0%

Since this is the final report of the LEAA discretionary grant #71-DF-1071, the time expenditure is 100%. The budget expenditure is approximately 100%. This report is to be comprehensive in nature with the statistics to show the up-to-date facts, activities, and evaluation of various equipment purchased with aid of the grant and of the effects of the project itself. Since inception of the project, the number of active investigations has multiplied greatly compared to any period prior to this grant. This is first to be attributed to the increased enforcement efforts and possibly heavier controlled substance traffic.

Cooperative Efforts: Police Agencies

The increased enforcement efforts noted are that different departments have gotten actively involved in the investigations. These departments include the communities adjacent to the City of Cedar Rapids: Linn County, Johnson County, Benton County, and

Iowa City, among others. It has been indicated that Iowa City has the notoriety of being the supposed drug capitol of the midwest.

Cooperative Efforts: Area Resources

The efforts of this department have included assistance from a number of area resources and agencies: the Regional Lab of the FBND in Chicago, the Iowa Bureau of Criminalistics Crime Lab in Des Moines, and a professor of pharmacognosy at the University of Iowa.

Activities and Accomplishments

As noted in the semi-annual report dated October 9, 1972, the conviction rate was reported as 37% in 1968 and in 1969 it increased to 51%. In 1970 it increased to 80.1% with 6% of the cases still pending and a 9.1% case dismissal, with 3% still active warrants. In 1971 our conviction rate currently stands at 65.3% guilty findings plus 13% pending and approximately 20% dismissal. It should be noted that in 1971 the majority of the cases were secured by virtue of search warrants, which gives the defendant a better chance to defend his case in court, as compared to the sales type case. In 1972 this department's cases currently consist of 46.9% guilty findings, 44.9% cases pending, and a 2.8% dismissal rate. Active warrants comprise 2.3% and .4% were not guilty by trial. The remaining very small percentage were returned with a "No Bill" by the grand jury. In the last fourteen months ending February 28, 1973, as compared to the

previous fourteen months ending December, 1971, the arrest rate has increased by 68.8% in controlled substance violations. Of the cases made in the last fourteen months, 49.2% of the cases were for sale of controlled substances, with 9% of the sale cases remaining as active warrants. As indicated in the guilty and pending percentages, with a 2.8% dismissal, this department expects to secure a 90% plus conviction rate during the time period under consideration. Through the involvement of other departments and additional members within our own unit, we have estimated increase of investigative hours and case preparation in the controlled substance traffic far exceeding 300%. This reflects the low dismissal rate of 2.8%. It has definitely been an aid in this type of investigation to have the availability of funds such as those obtained through this grant for agent purchases and informant fees. Several purchases have kept our units more aware of the substance(s) being distributed on the streets at any given time. It should again be noted that the use of undercover agents with the availability of purchase money began in December of 1971, with other portions of the grant beginning in July of 1972.

Increased Apprehension Capability

An example of the effectiveness of the unit in working with other law enforcement agencies is contained in a case initiated in Hiawatha, a suburb of Cedar Rapids. A token purchase was made by an agent from the State Narcotics Bureau

of the Iowa Department of Public Safety and another purchase was agreed on for the following day, with the purchase believed to have been arranged in another county. The officers felt there was an element of risk for the state agent involved; accordingly, monitors were placed on the agent and with the use of surveillance vehicles and other equipment, the suspect and agent were followed to another city approximately twenty-five miles away. At this time the agent accompanied the suspect to a private residence and made a purchase. On leaving the house, the defendant was arrested and a search warrant was obtained for the residence in Iowa City. A large amount of controlled substances and cash was received. Participating law enforcement agencies included the Linn County Sheriff's Department, Johnson County Sheriff's Department, Iowa City police, Iowa Department of Public Safety, and the Cedar Rapids Police Department. It is particularly significant to recognize that the equipment (surveillance, communications, monitoring, etc.) utilized during this investigation was purchased with funds made available through this grant. Since the department could not have afforded the necessary equipment, the incident being documented here presumably would never have occurred. Additionally, other departments have been able to employ this equipment in conducting similar investigations in their areas. Increased cooperation and coordination of the various agencies represents an important development in the expanded narcotics enforcement effort.

Trends in Usage

Current trends in narcotic usage are tentatively being identified with regard to traffic and violations in this area. Use of LSD type drugs appears to be declining, although a number of young people continue to prefer this drug. Increased involvement with marijuana, speed, cocaine, and heroin is indicated; the average heroin content being distributed in Cedar Rapids is approximately 7-9%, with a minimum low percentage of 4.3% and a high of approximately 14%. One individual for whom we obtained warrants with eight counts of controlled substance violations sold the undercover agent a product called gypsum (for heroin) in one of the sale cases. However, the department maintains the other purchases on this individual, and a guilty plea was offered with no appearance in the court of trial, to show the completed scope of investigations on each individual. More specifically with regard to the heroin traffic, it should definitely be noted that the department has learned, from investigations, of the existence of a more organized form of dealership. The cocaine being sold on the streets has currently had a high of 38% potency with the price being in the normal for this area. The LSD content is in the range of a high of 200mcg per unit to a low of 18 mcg per unit. Other substances not previously uncovered to any extent before inception of this grant include MDA, an oil hash or liquid hash with a current influx of micro-pane LSD. The white cross amphetamine is currently scarce on the street with the time released pellets or pharmaceutical amphetamines still being

noted and purchased for \$80 per ounce. The individuals involved in controlled substance abuse continue to represent a cross-section of the Cedar Rapids population: virtually every age, socio-economic and ethnic category is indicated in the arrest and adjudication data.

Narcotics Traffic: Impact on Other Areas

In the year 1972, compared to 1971, there was a decrease in house breakins and burglaries in the City of Cedar Rapids. This department recognizes that non-narcotic criminal activity is not an isolated phenomenon. Moreover, it is the feeling of the department that the increased narcotics enforcement effort is at least partially responsible for the decreased breakin and burglary data. Attached please find a copy of an article written by W. C. Skousen. It describes an experiment in Santa Barbara, California, commenting on crimes against property resulting from the activities of drug abusers and addicts. While it is difficult to positively attribute 35-40% of all crimes against property to drug addicts, we feel that the attributable factor is at least 35-40%. Perhaps it should be much higher. You are referred to the attached copy of the article, taken from Law and Order magazine.

Grant Assistance

It is definitely noted that during this grant period, which involved the employment of undercover agents, the city

was unable to disburse the funds used in this type of investigation since there is a problem of accessibility of funds. Expenditures have to be noted and explained each and every month. Had this been a grant restriction, the department would have been unable to utilize undercover agents on the street for a total period of 13 months, as indicated. One particular agent, who worked 13 months in undercover activity, was directly responsible for approximately sixty warrants which included just under two hundred counts of controlled substance violations. Another agent, working alone for a period of six months, was able to secure several warrants. The activities of these agents constituted a significant asset to this agency. Although it is difficult to measure the effect of this activity of non-narcotic violations, this department feels that a substantial impact has been made. During the last fourteen months of the operation, five agents of this organization have continued to function in an undercover capacity. Their efforts have been primarily independent in nature, with two agents assuming a life style frequently observed on the street. The effect of this tactic has been to increase the capacity to infiltrate the controlled substance violator situation. Information obtained by these undercover agents, together with information from informants, was channeled directly to the central group of the Cedar Rapids Metro Narcotics Unit; moreover, numerous arrests can be directly attributed to this type of work to effect the

arrest of dealers in controlled substances. Increases in arrest data during this fourteen-month period reflect favorably on the total narcotics enforcement and control effort. This department recognizes the very substantial impact and contribution of the grant on this effort. It should be emphasized at this time that the monitoring devices were employed in a number of cases. Agents were able to obtain very successful results, including convictions by jury in the court of trial. The use of undercover agents notwithstanding, it is admittedly difficult to penetrate the system of dealer traffic in heroin and cocaine. Departmental success in infiltration efforts is attributed to funding provided by this grant. The expenditures for buys and informant fees during this period of time amounted to the thousands of dollars and had a definite and direct impact on the freedom of movement of dealers in this area. Warrants were obtained for people from Illinois and Nebraska in addition to Iowa. This will hopefully provide a geographical reference framework which can be employed in an evaluation of the enforcement effort undertaken by this department.

(NOTE) See attached samples of defendant arrest data including types of drugs and expenditures as an example of the effort required to bring about the arrest of many defendants.

Conclusion

The members of the Metro Narcotics Squad are convinced that their efforts have made a substantial impact on the drug traffic situation in this area. In order to continue apprehension and detection of dealers, intensive, coordinated enforcement efforts are indicated. Some information regarding the nature and extent of illicit drug usage has been offered in this report. The necessity of an ongoing and comprehensive narcotics control unit is clearly pointed out throughout the discussion. If the drug control force is reduced or eliminated, increased usage of various narcotics will undoubtedly occur; therefore, it is imperative that the officers be allowed to maintain their status as special Metro Squad personnel.

This is not intended to suggest that a continued enforcement program will result in a community free of drug abuse. Rather, the community will be assured of at least a substantial reduction and control of this most serious law enforcement problem. Needless to say, the most important component of the project is funding, which subsidizes equipment purchases, salary, maintenance, undercover buys, and so forth.

Hopefully, the report speaks for itself. Few would deny the seriousness of the project under consideration here. Finally, it should be reiterated that the primary factor to be dealt with both now and in the future is the ever present, illegal, and alarming incidence of dangerous drug and narcotics violations.

HOW MUCH CRIME IS DRUG-RELATED



W. C. SKOUSEN

BASED ON the boasts of arrested drug addicts, it has been estimated that 35 to 40% of all crimes against property is the result of drug addicts trying to get "fix" money, particularly where heroin is involved.

A recent experiment in Santa Barbara, California, would suggest that this estimate is too low.

Police Chief A. W. Trembly said he wondered, "just what would happen if all the addicts not on a controlled rehabilitation program were abruptly removed from the streets." For a period of time a campaign was undertaken to arrest all the known heroin addicts and hold them on various bona fide charges to see what it would do to the crime rate. The results were rather phenomenal. Crimes against property temporarily decreased 55%!

Obviously, as long as the permissive climate for drug addicts continues to prevail, the crime rate against property will continue to run high.

Many experts are suggesting that judicial action against convicted heroin addicts should rapidly move in the direction Japan has pioneered. That nation has virtually wiped out heroin addiction as a way of life by requiring all convicted addicts to go through the trauma of withdrawal without supplementary drugs to cushion the pain. Within a very short time, heroin addiction had been reduced to an unprecedented level, the lowest of any major country in the world.

	Dates	Amount	Substance	DUPLICATE counts	DCS counts	CIDACS counts	TOT counts	BOND
71-L-1	12-24-71	\$ 5.00	marihuana	1	1		2	<u>250</u>
72-L-2	1-6-72	\$30.00	marihuana	1	1			
	1-13-72	\$14.00	speed	1	1			
	1-25-72	\$20.00	marihuana	1	1		6	<u>250</u>
72-L-3	1-27-72	\$45.00	marihuana	1	1		2	<u>250</u>
72-L-4	1-19-72	\$20.00	speed	1	1			
	1-19-72	\$20.00	hashish	1	1			
	1-3-72	\$10.00	secobarbital	1	1		6	<u>250</u>
72-L-5	1-3-72	\$60.00	marihuana	1	1		2	<u>250</u>
72-L-6	1-17-72	\$40.00	marihuana	1	1		2	<u>250</u>
72-L-7	1-23-72	\$ 9.00	LSD	1	1	1	3	<u>250</u>
	1-23-72		LSD	1	1	1	3	<u>250</u>
72-L-11	1-24-72	\$21.00	marihuana	1	1			
	1-3-72	\$ 7.00	Hashish	1	1		4	<u>250</u>
72-L-13	1-3-72	\$50.00	Hashish	1	1	1	3	<u>250</u>
	1-8-72		Hashish	1	1	1	3	<u>250</u>
72-L-14	1-8-72	\$60.00	marihuana	1	1		2	<u>250</u>
72-L-15	1-9-72	\$30.00	marihuana	1	1	1	3	<u>250</u>
	1-9-72		marihuana	1	1	1	3	<u>250</u>
72-L-17	1-17-72	\$170.00	marihuana	1	1		2	<u>250</u>
72-L-18	4-5-72	\$20.00	LSD		1		1	<u>1000</u>
72-L-19	4-5-72	\$ 4.00	LSD	1	1			
	4-3-72	\$ 5.25	speed	1	1			
	4-6-72	\$ 4.00	speed	1	1		6	<u>500</u>
72-L-20	4-7-72	\$30.00	speed		1			
	4-8-72	\$60.00	speed		1		2	<u>250</u>
72-L-21	4-20-72	\$12.00	speed & barb	1	1		2	<u>250</u>
72-L-22	4-16-72	\$20.00	hashish	1	1			
	4-15-72	\$15.00	marihuana	1	1		4	<u>250</u>
72-L-23	4-20-72	\$15.00	marihuana	1	1			
	4-25-72	\$30.00	marihuana	1	1			
	4-72	\$60.00	marihuana	1				

72-L-2	5-30-72	\$ 5.00	prescription	1	1		1	
72-L-3	6-12-72	\$30.00	heroin	1	1		2	<u>5000⁰⁰</u>
72-L-4	7-1-72	\$ 1.50	speed	1	1			
	11-15-72	\$30.00	marihuana	1	1		4	<u>2500⁰⁰</u>
72-L-5	7-6-72	\$10.00	speed	1	1		2	<u>2500⁰⁰</u>
72-L-6	7-23-72	\$ 5.00	speed	1	1		2	<u>2500⁰⁰</u>
72-L-7	7-23-72	\$ 7.00	presc.		1		1	2500⁰⁰
72-L-8	7-29-72	\$30.00	cocaine	1	1			
	7-3-72	\$45.00	oil hashish	1	1			
	8-12-72	\$20.00	HDA	1	1		6	<u>10000⁰⁰</u>
72-L-9	7-2-72	\$30.00	speed	1	1		2	<u>2500⁰⁰</u>
72-L-10	8-18-72	\$30.00	speed		1		1	<u>4000⁰⁰</u>
72-L-11	8-21-72	\$150.00	speed	1	1			
	8-26-72	\$150.00	speed	1	1			
	8-22-72	\$30.00	speed	1	1		6	<u>5000⁰⁰</u>
72-L-12	8-28-72	\$100.00	hashish	1	1			
	8-17-72	\$60.00	hashish	1	1		4	<u>2500⁰⁰</u>
72-L-13	9-5-72	\$ 5.00	marihuana	1	1			
	9-6-72	\$80.00	marihuana	1	1		4	<u>2500⁰⁰</u>
72-L-14	9-13-72	\$95.00	hashish	1	1	1	3	<u>2500⁰⁰</u>
72-L-15	9-21-72	\$75.00	marihuana	1	1		2	<u>2500⁰⁰</u>
72-L-16	9-27-72	\$15.00	marihuana	1	1	1	2	<u>2500⁰⁰</u>
72-L-17	10-1-72	\$24.00	heroin	1	1	1	3	<u>5000⁰⁰</u>
72-L-18	10-1-72	\$24.00	heroin	1	1	1		
72-L-19	10-10-72	\$29.50	heroin	1	1	1		
72-L-20	10-30-72	\$29.00	heroin	1	1		8	<u>10000⁰⁰</u>
72-L-21	10-10-72	\$29.50	heroin		1	1		
72-L-22	12-12-72	\$24.00	heroin	1	1		4	<u>5000⁰⁰</u>
72-L-23	10-17-72	\$175.00	marihuana	1	1		2	<u>2500⁰⁰</u>
72-L-24	10-25-72	\$175.00	marihuana	1	1	1	3	<u>2500⁰⁰</u>
	10-25-72		marihuana	1	1	1	3	
72-L-25	10-16-72	\$ 3.00	LSD	1	1		2	<u>2500⁰⁰</u>

Continued

72-L-53	10-27-72	\$38.00 Hashish	1	1		2	<u>2500.00</u>
72-L-58	11-22-72	\$15.00 presc		1		2	<u>2500.00</u>
	12-18-72	\$15.00 presc		1			
72-L-59	12-1-72	\$24.00 heroin	1	1	1	3	<u>2500.00</u>
72-L-62	12-20-72	\$30.00 marihuana	1	1			<u>2500.00</u>
	12-23-72	\$60.00 marihuana	1	1		4	<u>2500.00</u>
72-L-64	12-27-72	\$10.00 speed	1	1		2	<u>2500.00</u>
72-L-65	12-28-72	\$24.00 heroin	1	1		2	<u>2500.00</u>
72-L-66	12-31-72	\$10.00 speed	1	1		2	<u>2500.00</u>
72-L-67	1-2-73	\$20.00 speed	1	1		2	<u>2500.00</u>

other cases made which were initiated by narcotic cases;

10-29-72 \$10.00 bottlegging

11-2-72 \$30.00 Rec Stolen property

6-5-72 larceny

e #	defendant	purchase date	cost	substance	counts	counts	counts	total amount
-M-1		1-23-72	\$100.00	speed	1	1		\$2500.00
		1-31-72	\$100.00	speed	1	1		
-M-2		2-4-72	\$ 5.00	hashish		1	1	\$2500.00
-M-3		2-23-72	\$15.00	marihuana	1	1	2	\$2500.00
-M-4		3-1-72	\$40.00	speed	1	1	2	\$2500.00
-M-5		3-4-72	\$95.00	hashishs	1	1	1	\$2500.00
		3-4-72	\$95.00	hashish	1	1	1	\$2500.00
-M-6		3-17-72	\$ 5.00	prescription	1	1	2	\$500.00
-M-7		3-4-72	\$60.00	lidocaine	1	1	2	\$2500.00
-M-8		5-8-72	\$60.00	heroin	1	1	2	\$2500.00
-M-9		5-8-72	\$40.00	heroin	1	1	1	\$2500.00

Cases made by use of other agents;

72-N-1	3-21-72	\$110.00	Hashish	1	1		2	<u>\$2500.00</u>
72-N-2	8-19-72	\$100.00	heroin	1	1	1	3	<u>\$2500.00</u>
	8-19-72	\$100.00	herion	1	1	1	3	<u>\$2500.00</u>
72-H-3	8-22-72	\$20.00	phencyclidine	1	1		2	<u>\$2500.00</u>

END

7. 11/23/1961