

# COUNTERDRUG TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT CENTER

## I. RESOURCE SUMMARY

(Budget Authority in Millions)

|   | <b>2004<br/>Final</b> | <b>2005<br/>Enacted</b> | <b>2006<br/>Request</b> |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Drug Resources by Function</b>       |                       |                         |                         |
| Research & Development                  | \$17.894              | \$17.856                | \$10.000                |
| State and Local Assistance              | 23.858                | 23.808                  | 20.000                  |
| <b>Total</b>                            | <b>\$41.752</b>       | <b>\$41.664</b>         | <b>\$30.000</b>         |
| <b>Drug Resources by Decision Unit</b>  |                       |                         |                         |
| Research                                | \$17.894              | \$17.856                | \$10.000                |
| Technology Transfer                     | 23.858                | 23.808                  | 20.000                  |
| <b>Total</b>                            | <b>\$41.752</b>       | <b>\$41.664</b>         | <b>\$30.000</b>         |
| <b>Drug Resources Personnel Summary</b> |                       |                         |                         |
| Total FTEs (direct only)                | 0                     | 0                       | 0                       |
| <b>Information</b>                      |                       |                         |                         |
| Total Agency Budget                     | \$41.8                | \$41.7                  | \$30.0                  |
| Drug Percentage                         | 100.0%                | 100.0%                  | 100.0%                  |

## II. PROGRAM SUMMARY

- The Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center (CTAC) was established within the ONDCP as the central counterdrug technology research and development (R&D) organization of the U.S. Government. Section 708 of the ONDCP Reauthorization Act of 1998 (P.L. 105-277) re-authorized CTAC.
- Since 1990, CTAC has been overseeing and coordinating a counterdrug R&D program that supports the goals of the *Strategy*. The CTAC R&D program provides support to law enforcement supply reduction by developing advancements in technology for improved capabilities, such as drug detection, communications, surveillance and methods to share drug crime investigative information. In addition, funding is available in the R&D program for demand reduction activities. Further, CTAC supports the Technology Transfer Program (TTP) to enhance the capabilities of state and local law enforcement agencies (LEAs) with developments stemming from the federal R&D programs.

- ONDCP has interagency agreements with the U.S. Army (Electronic Proving Ground), Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Agriculture (Agricultural Research Service), and other federal agencies and departments to perform contracting and technical oversight services associated with CTAC-sponsored R&D initiatives and TTP.
- The R&D program allocates funding to initiatives in two areas: 1) supply reduction/law enforcement applied technology development initiatives, and 2) demand reduction/drug abuse research and technology initiatives.
- Within the two areas of supply and demand reduction, the CTAC R&D budget apportions funds for an outreach effort that informs academic, private sector, and international government organizations on progress in counterdrug R&D. The outreach effort provides a forum to solicit innovative solutions to satisfy the Science and Technology needs. The R&D budget also apportions funds for technical support to develop and administer the R&D program.

### **III. BUDGET SUMMARY**

#### **2005 Program**

- CTAC is continuing the TTP in FY 2005 with \$23.8 million to deliver advanced drug crime-fighting technology, training and support to state and local law enforcement agencies across the country.
- FY 2005 plans include \$1.7 million for R&D programs that support supply reduction efforts.
- The FY 2005 R&D program includes plans to spend \$13.4 million for projects that support demand reduction activities. Demand reduction projects concentrate on equipping leading academic and addiction research institutions with advanced neuroimaging technology and medical instrumentation for drug abuse research.
- The FY 2005 R&D program includes \$2.8 million for contracting and technical oversight services.

#### **2006 Request**

- The FY 2006 request includes \$10.0 million for the counterdrug R&D program and \$20.0 million for the TTP. The proposed initiatives are presented in five categories:
  - federal law enforcement R&D;
  - supply reduction R&D;
  - substance abuse prevention and treatment research;
  - testbed evaluations, outreach activities, and contracting and technical support; and
  - technology transfer program.

## IV. PERFORMANCE

### Summary

- This section on CTAC’s program accomplishments is drawn from the ONDCP FY 2006 Budget Request and GPRA Performance Plan and FY 2004 Performance Report. Also included is material from the CTAC biannual reports submitted to the Appropriations Subcommittees on March 2004 and December 2004. The charts below include conclusions from the PART assessment conducted during the FY 2005 budget cycle: scores on program purpose, strategic planning, management, and results achieved are synthesized into an overall rating of the program’s effectiveness. The PART review was not updated during the FY 2006 budget cycle. The outcome-oriented measures and selected output measures presented indicate how program performance is being monitored.
- The OMB FY 2005 PART rating of “Results not Demonstrated” was based on a finding that both R&D and TTP programs utilized unsystematic prioritization processes, lacked baselines and performance targets, and had not conducted independent evaluations. Since then new measures have been developed for FY 2004 that include outcome-oriented measures that demonstrate the effectiveness of both the TTP and R&D programs.

### Research and Development Program

| Selected Measures of Performance  |    |  |               |
|---|----|--|---------------|
| <b>PART Review</b>  |    |  |               |
| Purpose   | 80 | FY 2005 Rating: <i>Results Not Demonstrated</i> . Baselines and targets are needed.              |               |
| Planning  | 30 | Program lacked prioritization of submitted proposals. Performance results should be made public. |               |
| Management  | 70 |  |               |
| Results   | 7  |  |               |
| <b>Outcome-Oriented Measures</b>  |    | <b>FY 2004</b>   |               |
|   |    | <b>Target</b>  | <b>Actual</b> |
| a.. Cumulative number of published articles in peer reviewed articles associated with drug abuse research using CTAC sponsored equipment. (Long term) |    | 10   | 16            |
| b. Complete the installation of neuroimaging systems at two research institutions each year. (Annual)   |    | 2  | 3             |
| c. The percentage of prototypes procure ured.   |    | 20%  | 25%           |
| d. The percentage of supply reduction R&D funding allocated to Interagency Working Group for Technology needs   |    | 75%  | 36%           |
| <b>Selected Output Measures</b>   |    |  |               |
| a. Conduct three regional workshops and one major regional symposium  |    | These measures were replaced for FY 2004 with the outcome-oriented measures above.               |               |
| b. Develop and field five technology prototypes to address counterdrug law enforcement and drug treatment requirements                                |    |  |               |
| c. Open a new brain imaging facility  |    |  |               |

### Discussion

- CTAC has taken steps to address each of the PART findings. Annual and long-term performance measures, baselines, targets and timeframes, have been developed. CTAC has

also committed to the prioritization of proposals received under its R&D program. Proposals will be evaluated by subject matter experts and peers for technical merit and relevance and undergo additional scrutiny based on cost feasibility and “best value” for the government.

- The R&D program either met or exceeded the majority of its FY 2004 targets. Progress was documented on the completion of three neuroimaging centers as well as research publications. The Interagency Working Group for Technology (IAWG-T) provided information on potential projects for supply reduction R&D. Thirty-six percent of the supply reduction R&D funding was utilized to fund the IAWG-T prioritized projects. The remaining funding was used to fund *Strategy* priorities for research and development.

### Technology Transfer Program

| Selected Measures of Performance  |    |   |              |
|---|----|---|--------------|
| <b>PART Review</b>  |    |   |              |
| Purpose   | 80 | FY 2005 Rating: <i>Results Not Demonstrated</i> . Baselines and targets are needed. Program lacked prioritization, operated on a "first-come, first-served" basis. Performance results should be made public. |              |
| Planning  | 38 |   |              |
| Management  | 60 |   |              |
| Results   | 11 |   |              |
| <b>Outcome-Oriented Measures</b>  |    | <b>FY 2004</b>  |              |
|   |    | <b>Target</b>   |              |
|   |    | <b>Actual</b>   |              |
| a. Percentage of recipient agencies that report improved efficiency relative to officer safety, investigative capability, and improved officer effectiveness. (Long term) |    | 75%   | Avail 3/2005 |
| b. Percentage of total costs dedicated to administrative costs.   |    | <10%  | 6%           |
| c. Percentage of TTP recipients that report that equipment has provided a technical solution to an investigative requirement.   |    | 95%   | Avail 3/2005 |
| d. Percentage of TTP recipients that report that TTP equipment training was adequate.   |    | 95%   | 95%          |
| <b>Selected Output Measures</b>   |    |   |              |
| a. Continue to develop and refine the nationwide deployment strategy for the Technology Transfer Program.   |    | This measure was replaced for FY 2004 with the outcome-oriented measures above.   |              |

### Discussion

- CTAC has taken steps to address each of the PART findings. Annual and long-term performance measures, baselines, targets and timeframes have been developed. CTAC is committed to improving the quality of its TTP data collection and to effectively use the data for better management of the program. TTP has taken steps to improve the application process, and has revised the recipient surveys to capture more meaningful performance-related data. Using new performance data, TTP managers will be able to manage the program better with a more equitable and efficient equipment distribution scheme.
- The FY 2004 administrative expenses for the TTP remained at the six percent level, exceeding the target of ten percent. Also on target is the goal of a 95 percent satisfaction level with the training for equipment that was provided. Interim data for the other outcome-oriented goals indicate they will be met or exceeded when final data is received.

# OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY: OPERATIONS

## I. RESOURCE SUMMARY

(Budget Authority in Millions)

|   | <b>2004<br/>Final</b> | <b>2005<br/>Enacted</b> | <b>2006<br/>Request</b> |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Drug Resources by Function</b>       |                       |                         |                         |
| Interdiction                            | \$3.708               | \$3.563                 | \$3.207                 |
| International                           | 3.708                 | 3.563                   | 3.207                   |
| Investigations                          | 2.119                 | 2.035                   | 1.833                   |
| Prevention                              | 6.093                 | 5.852                   | 5.269                   |
| Research & Development                  | 1.342                 | 1.339                   | 1.316                   |
| State and Local Assistance              | 5.563                 | 5.343                   | 4.810                   |
| Treatment                               | 5.298                 | 5.089                   | 4.582                   |
| <b>Total</b>                            | <b>\$27.831</b>       | <b>\$26.784</b>         | <b>\$24.224</b>         |
| <b>Drug Resources by Decision Unit</b>  |                       |                         |                         |
| Operations                              | \$24.998              | \$25.445                | \$22.908                |
| Research: Policy                        | 1.342                 | 1.339                   | 1.316                   |
| Model State Drug Laws                   | 1.491                 | 0.000                   | 0.000                   |
| <b>Total</b>                            | <b>\$27.831</b>       | <b>\$26.784</b>         | <b>\$24.224</b>         |
| <b>Drug Resources Personnel Summary</b> |                       |                         |                         |
| Total FTEs (direct only)                | 103                   | 123                     | 123                     |
| <b>Information</b>                      |                       |                         |                         |
| Total Agency Budget                     | \$27.8                | \$26.8                  | \$24.2                  |
| Drug Percentage                         | 100.0%                | 100.0%                  | 100.0%                  |

## II. PROGRAM SUMMARY

- The ONDCP provides the President's primary Executive Branch support for drug policy development and program oversight. ONDCP advises the President on national and international drug control policies and strategies and works to ensure the effective coordination of drug programs within the federal departments and agencies. ONDCP responsibilities include:

- Develop and publish the President's Strategy.
- Develop a consolidated National Drug Control Budget for presentation to the President and the Congress.
- Certify that the counterdrug budgets of National Drug Control Program Agencies are adequate to implement the *Strategy*.
- Coordinate and oversee federal counterdrug policies and programs.
- Encourage private-sector and state and local government drug prevention and control programs.
- Conduct policy analysis and research to determine the appropriateness of drug programs and policies in addressing the *Strategy's* priorities.
- Operate the Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center (CTAC) to serve as the central counterdrug research and development organization for the federal government.
- Develop and oversee a National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign—a multi-faceted communications campaign that harnesses the energies of parents, mass media, corporate America, and community anti-drug coalitions.
- Oversee the Drug-Free Communities Program, which serves as a catalyst for increased citizen participation to reduce substance abuse among our youth and provides community anti-drug coalitions with much needed funds to carry out their important missions.

### III. BUDGET SUMMARY

#### 2005 Program

- The total FY 2005 budget for ONDCP is \$26.8 million and 123 FTE.
- **Operations.** In FY 2005, ONDCP intends to spend almost \$25.5 million to pursue activities that allow the agency to support drug policy development and provide oversight on major programs such as the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign; the Drug-Free Communities Program; and the HIDTAs. Additionally, ONDCP provides coordination and policy oversight to a number of agencies and organizations involved in drug control.
- **Policy Research.** The budget includes over \$1.3 million for policy research to fund such projects as: regional and state patterns of drug use; the determination of availability of drugs for consumption; the price and purity of illicit drugs; determining the economic costs to society of drug abuse; and coordinating activities addressing the development of a market disruption model.

## **2006 Request**

- The total FY 2006 budget for ONDCP includes a request of \$24.2 million and 123 FTE. This request represents a decrease of \$2.56 million from the FY 2005 enacted level. This decrease is partially a result of the Office of Administration to fund ONDCP's costs of the health unit and space rental payments to the General Services Administration as part of the effort to centrally administer common enterprise service for the Executive Office of the President.

## **IV. PERFORMANCE**

- ONDCP has responsibility for operating four major programs: HIDTA, CTAC, the Drug-Free Communities program, and the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. Performance information for each program is provided in the respective sections of this document, except for HIDTA which is being proposed for transfer to the Department of Justice.

# HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS

## I. RESOURCE SUMMARY

(Budget Authority in Millions)

|   | <b>2004<br/>Final</b> | <b>2005<br/>Enacted</b> | <b>2006<br/>Request <sup>/1</sup></b> |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <b>Drug Resources by Function</b>       |                       |                         |                                       |
| Intelligence                            | \$49.647              | \$49.647                | \$0.000                               |
| Interdiction                            | 25.903                | 25.903                  | 0.000                                 |
| Investigations                          | 131.630               | 133.242                 | 0.000                                 |
| Prevention                              | 2.826                 | 2.826                   | 0.000                                 |
| Prosecution                             | 8.634                 | 8.634                   | 0.000                                 |
| Research & Development                  | 2.088                 | 1.984                   | 0.000                                 |
| Treatment                               | 4.287                 | 4.287                   | 0.000                                 |
| <b>Total</b>                            | <b>\$225.015</b>      | <b>\$226.523</b>        | <b>\$0.000</b>                        |
| <b>Drug Resources by Decision Unit</b>  |                       |                         |                                       |
| HIDTA                                   | \$225.015             | \$226.523               | \$0.000                               |
| <b>Total</b>                            | <b>\$225.015</b>      | <b>\$226.523</b>        | <b>\$0.000</b>                        |
| <b>Drug Resources Personnel Summary</b> |                       |                         |                                       |
| Total FTEs (direct only)                | 0                     | 0                       | 0                                     |
| <b>Information</b>                      |                       |                         |                                       |
| Total Agency Budget                     | \$225.0               | \$226.5                 | \$0.0                                 |
| Drug Percentage                         | 100.0%                | 100.0%                  | N/A                                   |

<sup>/1</sup> In FY 2006, the Administration proposes to transfer the HIDTA program to the Department of Justice. The program will be funded at \$100 million in FY 2006.

## II. PROGRAM SUMMARY

- The HIDTA program provides resources to local, state, and federal agencies within each of the 28 HIDTA's for implementing their regional joint strategy. The program empowers local, state, and federal officials to institutionalize their collaborative efforts and fosters innovation and systems solutions.



- A HIDTA usually consists of the following:
  - A 16-member executive committee, composed of local, state, and federal representatives, which manages the budget and daily activities of the HIDTA;
  - A task force(s) of co-located law enforcement representatives;
  - Co-located drug and money laundering task forces;
  - A regional joint intelligence center and information sharing network; and
  - Other supporting initiatives to sustain law enforcement activities.
- The HIDTA program has brought together representatives from law enforcement, criminal justice, and demand reduction disciplines to forge partnerships for developing effective multi-agency, multidisciplinary responses to regional drug problems.
- The following is a designation history of the current 28 areas designated as HDTAs: In 1990, ONDCP established the following five HDTAs: the Southwest Border, (California, Arizona, New Mexico, West Texas, and South Texas), Los Angeles, Houston, South Florida, and the New York/New Jersey HDTAs. In 1994, it designated Puerto Rico-U.S. Virgin Islands and Washington-Baltimore as HDTAs. In 1995, Atlanta, Chicago, Philadelphia-Camden were added as HDTAs. In 1996, ONDCP established HDTAs in the Northwest (Washington State), Lake County (Indiana), and the Midwest (including Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and South Dakota; focused on methamphetamine use, production and trafficking), Rocky Mountain (Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming), and the Gulf Coast (Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi). In 1997, the San Francisco Bay Area and Southeastern Michigan were designated as HDTAs. In FY 1998, Congress provided \$10 million for the creation of four new HDTAs in Appalachia (Kentucky, West Virginia, and Tennessee); Central Florida; North Texas and Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Congress also provided additional funding for methamphetamine reduction programs in HDTAs. In 1999, areas in Central Valley, California; Hawaii; New England (Connecticut, New Hampshire, Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Vermont); Ohio and Oregon were designated as HDTAs. Finally, in 2001, areas in North Florida and Nevada were designated as HDTAs.

### **III. BUDGET SUMMARY**

#### **2005 Program**

- The FY 2005 budget of \$226.5 million includes \$133.2 million for investigations, \$49.7 million for intelligence, \$8.6 million for prosecution, \$25.9 million for interdiction, \$2.8 million for prevention, \$4.3 million for treatment, and \$2.0 million for auditing services and research activities.
- All HDTAs have joint drug task forces that target drug trafficking organizations for dismantling and disruption, which increases the safety of America's citizens. HDTAs integrate federal, state, and local law enforcement and prosecution agencies to develop

sophisticated investigations of domestic and international drug trafficking organizations. HIDTA drug task forces conduct intensive surveillance of drug organizations; infiltrate street gangs; assist prosecutors in developing cases; and use specialized techniques to conduct sophisticated intelligence gathering, wire taps and investigations.

## **2006 Request**

- The President's FY 2006 Budget proposes to transfer this program to the Department of Justice.
- The HIDTA program started in 1990 with the designation of the five most problematic drug trafficking areas in the country (New York City, Miami, Los Angeles, Houston, and the Southwest Border). For four years those were the only HIDTAs. Since 1994, however, 23 additional HIDTAs have been designated, an average of almost three a year. HIDTAs are now located in 43 of the 50 states.
- More than one-third of the 23 HIDTAs designated since 1994 were explicitly mentioned in annual appropriations acts, and many of the others were designated as HIDTAs after the accompanying Appropriations Committee reports directed ONDCP to consider their designation. Annual funding for the program has grown from \$82 million in 1991, the first year the five HIDTAs were fully operational, to \$226.5 million in fiscal year 2005.
- While the HIDTA program has been effective in encouraging cooperation among federal, state, and local agencies, and fostering the development of deconfliction and intelligence infrastructures, the expansion of the program has taken place despite the absence of robust program performance measures. Efforts by ONDCP to focus the HIDTAs on the President's *Strategy* priority of targeting high-level organizations such as the Consolidated Priority Organization Targeting List have not been successful, and have in fact been hindered by the practice of funding individual HIDTAs at the same level from year to year.
- Starting in FY 2006, the Department of Justice will reformulate the operations of the HIDTA program to operate within FY 2006 funding levels and to target the drug trade in a manner that is strategic and complementary of the OCDETF program. At the same time, the department will preserve the HIDTA program's most worthy and effective elements, such as intelligence sharing and fostering multi-agency and multi-jurisdictional law enforcement coordination.

## OTHER FEDERAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAMS

### I. RESOURCE SUMMARY

(Budget Authority in Millions)

|  | <b>2004</b>      | <b>2005</b>      | <b>2006</b>      |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|  | <b>Final</b>     | <b>Enacted</b>   | <b>Request</b>   |
| <b>Drug Resources by Function</b>              |                  |                  |                  |
| Intelligence                                   | \$2.982          | \$1.984          | \$0.000          |
| Prevention                                     | 213.732          | 198.400          | 200.000          |
| Research & Development                         | 9.941            | 10.862           | 12.300           |
| Treatment                                      | 0.994            | 0.744            | 1.000            |
| <b>Total</b>                                   | <b>\$227.649</b> | <b>\$211.990</b> | <b>\$213.300</b> |
| <b>Drug Resources by Decision Unit</b>         |                  |                  |                  |
| National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign        | \$144.145        | \$119.040        | \$120.000        |
| Drug-Free Communities                          | 69.587           | 79.360           | 80.000           |
| United States Anti-Doping Agency               | 7.158            | 7.440            | 7.400            |
| Counterdrug Intelligence Executive Secretariat | 2.982            | 1.984            | 0.000            |
| National Drug Court Institute                  | 0.994            | 0.744            | 1.000            |
| Performance Measures Development               | 1.988            | 0.992            | 2.000            |
| World Anti-Doping Agency Dues                  | 0.795            | 1.438            | 2.900            |
| National Alliance of Model State Drug Laws     | 0.000            | 0.992            | 0.000            |
| <b>Total</b>                                   | <b>\$227.649</b> | <b>\$211.990</b> | <b>\$213.300</b> |
| <b>Drug Resources Personnel Summary</b>        |                  |                  |                  |
| Total FTEs (direct only)                       | 1                | 1                | 1                |
| <b>Information</b>                             |                  |                  |                  |
| Total Agency Budget                            | \$227.6          | \$212.0          | \$213.3          |
| Drug Percentage                                | 100.0%           | 100.0%           | 100.0%           |

### II. PROGRAM SUMMARY

- Activities supported by Other Federal Drug Control Programs include the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign (Media Campaign); the Drug-Free Communities Program (DFCSP); the United States Anti-Doping Agency (USADA); the Counterdrug Intelligence Executive (CDX) Secretariat; Performance Measures Development (PMD); the

National Drug Court Institute, World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) dues and the National Alliance of Model State Drug Laws.

### III. BUDGET SUMMARY

#### 2005 Program

- The FY 2005 total program of \$212 million includes \$198.4 million for prevention, \$0.7 million for treatment, \$10.9 million for research & development, and \$2.0 million for intelligence activities. This funding supports the following programs:
  - **Media Campaign (\$119 million).** The Media Campaign is an integrated effort that combines TV, radio, print, and interactive media with public communications outreach to youth and parents. Anti-drug messages conveyed in national advertising are supported by web sites, media events, outreach to the entertainment industry, and the formation of strategic partnerships with public health organizations, NGOs, and other government and private sector entities that enable the anti-drug messages to be amplified in ways that personally resonate with audiences. In particular, the Media Campaign focuses the majority of its efforts on educating 14-16 year olds and their parents on the negative consequences of using marijuana. Advertising depicting the consequences of marijuana use will be supported by local roundtables that bring together community leaders, media, experts, teens, and their parents to raise awareness. Materials and resources will continue to be developed in order to fulfill public requests for information received by national clearinghouses and through the Media Campaign's web sites.
  - **DFCSP (\$79.4 million).** This program supports the development and expansion of community anti-drug coalitions throughout the United States. Initially created as a five-year program (FY 1998 through FY 2002) authorized by the Drug-Free Communities Act of 1997, the program was re-authorized by Congress for an additional five-year period that will extend the program through FY 2007. The program provides up to \$100,000 per year in grant funding to local community, anti-drug coalitions, which must be matched by local communities. These grants are awarded through peer-reviewed annual competitions. Community coalitions typically strive to increase community involvement and effectiveness in carrying out a wide array of drug prevention strategies, initiatives, and activities. Additionally, some funds will be used for a grant to continue support to a private sector National Community Coalition Institute.
  - **USADA (\$7.4 million).** Funding will continue USADA's effort to educate athletes on the dangers of drug use and eliminate its use in Olympic sports. These funds will be used to assist the USADA in administering a transparent and effective anti-doping program in preparation for the upcoming winter Olympic Games in Torino, Italy. Specifically, these funds will support athlete drug testing programs, research initiatives, educational programs, and efforts to inform athletes of the newly adopted rules governing the use of prohibited substances outlined in the World Anti-Doping Code, the ethics related to doping, and the harmful health consequences of drug use.

- **CDX (\$2 million).** The FY 1998 Treasury and Government Appropriations Act required ONDCP to improve counterdrug intelligence coordination, production and sharing, and eliminate unnecessary duplication. FY 2005 funding will support the CDX's continuing work toward completing the most important remaining action items contained in the General Counterdrug Intelligence Plan.
- **PMD (\$0.7 million).** These resources will continue to assist in research and evaluation efforts to develop means for continually assessing the effectiveness of drug market disruption programs. These projects include measurement of changes in drug availability patterns, improving data collection and analyses techniques, and integrating multiple data sets into a coherent picture of the drug market. Additionally, the requested funds will be used to conduct evaluations of programs to determine why they are not achieving their objectives. These evaluations will be performance-focused and will assist in improving future budget decisions.
- **NDCI (\$1.0 million).** The NDCI supports the expansion and improvement of drug courts through its research, training, and technical assistance programs. NDCI has researched and reported on successful methods of financing and sustaining drug courts and will provide technical assistance to court systems wishing to adopt these methods. NDCI has developed and fosters standard drug court data collection practices, which allow for comparisons across drug court systems. Over the medium-term, NDCI plans to develop and maintain a bank of standardized data from all drug courts in the country. NDCI has formulated training materials to help courts increase their participant retention and completion rates, with an 87 percent completion rate as the target for success. As a next step, NDCI will provide court-specific technical assistance to those courts working to improve their retention and completion rates.
- **WADA (\$1.4 million).** WADA's mission is to combat performance enhancing and illicit drug use in Olympic sports. The organization is jointly funded by national governments and the international sporting movement. FY 2005 funding will cover the full participant membership by the U.S. government for CY 2004. The United States continues to play a leadership role in WADA's development by serving on WADA's governing Foundation Board and chairing the influential Ethics and Education Committee. Funds will be applied to drug testing, athlete drug education and prevention efforts, and research.
- **National Alliance of Model State Drug Laws (MSDL) (\$1 million).** The National Alliance of Model State Drug Laws: 1) will prepare for and conduct state model law summits, 2) assist state officials in the promotion and adoption of summit-based laws, 3) draft and distribute updated model laws, and 4) produce and distribute analyses of state laws and bills involving drug issues.

## 2006 Request

- A total of \$213.3 million is requested in FY 2006, a net increase of \$1.3 million from the FY 2005 enacted level. This net increase includes the following adjustments: elimination of the Counterdrug Intelligence Executive Secretariat and the National Alliance of Model State

Drug Laws. Also included in this net increase are program increases of \$3.7 million identified below:

- **DFCSP (+\$0.6 million).** These additional resources will bring total funding for the DFCSP to \$80 million in FY 2006. This program provides matching grant monies to local community anti-drug coalitions that are working to prevent substance abuse among young people in their communities.
- **NDCI (+\$0.3 million).** These additional funds will support expansion and improvement of drug courts through its research, training, and technical assistance programs.
- **Media Campaign (+\$1 million).** These additional resources will help purchase additional media time and space.
- **WADA (+\$1.5 million).** These additional resources will cover full participant membership for both CY 2005 and 2006. This one-time budget increase from the FY 2005 level is to ensure dues are paid at the beginning, instead of at the end, of the calendar year. This one-time increase will ensure that the U.S. is not in arrears on assessed dues.
- **PMD (+\$0.3 million).** These additional resources will increase assistance in the research and evaluation efforts to develop improved means for assessing the effectiveness of drug market disruption programs.

#### IV. PERFORMANCE

##### Summary

- This section on the performance of the major programs—DFCP and the Media Campaign—is drawn from ONDCP’s FY 2006 Budget Request and Performance Plan, the FY 2004 Performance Report, and the FY 2005 PART review. The charts include observations from the PART assessment: scores on program purpose, strategic planning, management, and results achieved are synthesized into an overall rating of the program’s effectiveness. Also included is a comparison of FY 2004 targets and achievements from the GPRA documents listed above, for the latest year for which data are available. The outcome-oriented measures and selected output measures presented indicate how program performance is being monitored.
- The FY 2005 PART rating of “Adequate” for DFCP reflected strong program management and planning. Although outcome measures have been identified, baselines and targets are needed. The review recommended public reporting of performance and an evaluation of program performance. In response, the program has made several changes in how data is collected from coalitions and how that data should be interpreted. Further, the coalitions themselves are being evaluated under a new performance management system to ensure continued progress in their objectives. Meanwhile there is anecdotal evidence of coalition effectiveness.

- The FY 2005 PART review found that the Media Campaign program had made improvements in planning and management, including the establishment of reasonable and measurable performance goals. However, the results of the independent evaluation (managed by NIDA) detected no connection between the program advertisements and youth attitudes and behavior toward drug use. Other evidence, such as the findings from MTF, NSDUH, and PATS, suggest there maybe a positive effect on youth attitudes and behavior.

### Drug-Free Communities Program

| Selected Measures of Performance   |     |   |
|--|-----|---|
| <b>PART Review</b>   |     |   |
| Purpose  | 100 | FY 2005 Rating: <i>Adequate</i> . Program management is strong. |
| Planning   | 50  | Baselines and targets are needed. Performance information       |
| Management   | 80  | should be made public.  |
| Results  | 42  |   |
| <b>Outcome-Oriented Measures</b>   |     | <b>FY 2004</b>  |
|  |     | <b>Target      Actual</b>                                       |
| a. Decrease risk factors in the community  |     | 35%      *  |
| b. Increase protective factors   |     | 35%      *  |
| c. Decrease substance abuse indicators   |     | 35%      *  |
| d. Increase the number of coalitions that have developed external funding streams  |     | TBD      *  |
| e. Increase the number of coalitions implementing evidence-based prevention strategies   |     | 50%      *  |
| <b>Selected Output Measures</b>  |     | <b>FY 2004</b>  |
|  |     | <b>Target      Actual</b>                                       |
| a. Percent coalitions that reported increased citizen participation  |     | TBD      *  |
| b. Percent coalitions reporting they have provided training on various coalition capabilities                                  |     | TBD      *  |
| c. Percent coalitions using data on long-term outcomes   |     | 80%      *  |
| d. Increase the number of coalitions trained and assisted by the Coalition Institute in economically disadvantaged communities |     | 10%      *  |

\* Not Available

### Discussion

- The program has taken the necessary steps to address each of the PART findings. DFCP is currently designing a monitoring system to track individual grantee performance in order to aid the development of appropriate baselines, realistic future goals according to coalition typology, and the reporting of performance data. This change is expected to yield more useful real-time data as a management tool. Meanwhile, output measures have been augmented with more appropriate outcome-oriented measures, e.g., the percent of coalitions that change risk/protective factors, and the percent of coalitions that change key indicators such as drug use. These are now required to be reported from all grant applicants.
- The shift to a new federal partner (SAMHSA) for administering the program plus the establishment of a new performance management system have resulted in a break in the data collected from the coalitions. While data are not currently available for the performance targets, there is still some evidence of success. For example, the Tri-County Northland

Coalition in Kansas City, MO saw reductions in marijuana use (22 percent decline) and tobacco use (38 percent decline) for 8<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> graders in the county's two largest school districts. Coalitions across the nation are working with local businesses to reduce liquor and tobacco sales to minors, and are also working throughout each community to educate parents and young people of the dangers of substance abuse.

- The DFCP grant application has been revised to require grantees to report the best available data to their community on a regular basis. In September of FY 2004, the national competition for grants resulted in 153 first-year grants being awarded; DFCP currently funds a total of 714 grantees, which includes first-year through seventh-year grantees.

### National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign

| Selected Measures of Performance   |     |  |               |
|--|-----|--|---------------|
| <b>PART Review</b>   |     |  |               |
| Purpose  | 100 | FY 2005 Rating: <i>Results Not Demonstrated</i> . Improvements in planning and management have occurred, however there is little evidence of direct favorable campaign effects on youth; there is evidence of some favorable effects on parents. |               |
| Planning   | 67  |  |               |
| Management   | 70  |  |               |
| Results  | 6   |  |               |
| <b>Outcome-Oriented Measures</b>   |     | <b>FY 2004</b>   |               |
|  |     | <b>Target</b>  |               |
|  |     | <b>Actual</b>  |               |
| a. Percent of 10th graders who report use of marijuana within the past 30 days                               |     | 18.9%  | 15.9%         |
| b. Percent youth ages 12-18 who believe there is great risk/harm in occasional marijuana use                 |     | 44.5%  | *             |
| <b>Selected Output Measures</b>  |     | <b>FY 2004</b>   |               |
|  |     | <b>Target</b>  | <b>Actual</b> |
| a. Percent matching pro bono private sector contributions obtained   |     | 100%   | 101%          |
| b. Percent increase in user sessions to the Campaign's flagship Web sites: theAntiDrug.com and Freevibe.com. |     | 10%  | 61%           |

\* To be reported March 2005

### Discussion

- The Media Campaign has taken several steps to address the PART findings. The program has used data from the semi-annual reports from the independent evaluation to initiate significant changes in the program's operation. The creative development process has been modified to increase ONDCP involvement in the entire process, streamline the approval process, decrease the lag time between ad planning and production, and allow for more rapid responses to changing societal norms that may necessitate changes in ad messages. The program has also strengthened its ad testing standards by narrowing the number of message platforms used and focusing on the effectiveness of each advertisement. All Campaign TV ads now undergo three levels of testing: formative creative evaluation panels consisting of focus groups of youth and parents providing initial feedback; quantitative copy testing with youth and parents providing feedback to ensure that the program's ads communicate the intended messages and do not generate any unintended negative consequences; and advanced tracking allowing ONDCP to monitor and modify in real time the performance of aired advertisements. This new, more intensive level of testing has enabled the Media Campaign



to more effectively evaluate ads prior to airing them, allowing more specific refinements as indicated by the copy testing.

- In FY 2003 ONDCP shifted the focus of the program to concentrate on marijuana, which is the most common illicit drug used by youth and offers the best opportunity for meaningful reductions in overall drug use. The program's youth target audience has shifted upward from ages 11-13 to ages 14-16, targeting those at greatest risk for initiating drug use. Appropriate goals and corresponding measures were introduced in the FY 2004 Performance Plan. In 2005, ONDCP is exploring the possibility of either expanding the current youth brand name or introducing a new one. Additionally, the Campaign is looking at innovative, aggressive ways of reaching the youth target in non-traditional ways, as their consumption of traditional media continues to decline.
- Concerns have been raised by ONDCP regarding the sensitivity of the evaluation to detect a level of change in drug use commensurate with the policy goal. The University of Michigan's Monitoring the Future (MTF) study and the National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH) are both reliable data sources for information on drug use trends. These surveys assist ONDCP in judging the program's efforts. MTF data from 2004 indicate use of any illicit drug in the past 30 days (current use) among students declined 17 percent, from 19.4 percent in FY 2001 to 16.1 percent in FY 2004. MTF also found that use of marijuana, the most commonly used illicit drug among youth and the drug of primary interest to the Media Campaign, also declined significantly by 18 percent (from 16.6 percent to 13.6 percent in the same time period). In terms of exposure, the MTF suggest that over the course of the Media Campaign there has been an increase in the percentage of youth who believe that anti-drug ads have made them to a great or very great extent feel less favorable toward drugs, and in the percentage of youth who think anti-drug ads have made them less likely to use drugs. Additionally, in the calendar year 2003 NSDUH, a majority (83.6 percent) of youth aged 12 to 17 reported having seen or heard alcohol or drug prevention messages outside of school in the past year. Youths who had seen or heard these messages indicated a lower past month use of an illicit drug (10.8 percent) than youths who had not seen or heard these types of messages (13.7 percent). Specific exposure questions were added to the Partnership Attitude Tracking Study (PATS) in 2003, and special tabulation undertaken of data from the 2004 PATS study for youth and adults. These have assisted ONDCP in assessing the impact of the Marijuana Campaign. Findings from analyses of the PATS data suggest that youth with high exposure to the Media Campaign are more likely to have better anti-drug attitudes, beliefs and intentions than those with low exposure.
- Last year the nation exceeded the President's two-year goal for youth drug use reduction and ONDCP believes there is evidence that the Media Campaign made a substantial contribution to the declines. ONDCP is well on its way to meeting the President's goal of decreasing drug use by 25 percent in 5 years, with the 3-year decline of 17 percent (MTF 2004). This year, we are ahead of the projected 5-year goal.