HOW WILL THE LEGALIZATION OF METHAMPHETAMINE

IMPACT A MID SIZED LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY BY THE YEAR 2006?

A project presented to
California Commission on
Peace Officer Standards and Training

By

Captain Dennis McQueeny
Marin County Sheriff's Office

Command College Class XXXI

Sacramento, California
November 2001

31-0621

This Command College Project is a FUTURES study of a particular emerging issue in law enforcement. Its purpose is NOT to predict the future, but rather to project a number of possible scenarios for strategic planning considerations.

Defining the future differs from analyzing the past because the future has not yet happened. In this project, useful alternatives have been formulated systemically so that the planner can respond to a range of possible future environments.

Managing the future means influencing the future; creating it, constraining it, adapting to it. A futures study points the way.

The view and conclusions expressed in this Command College project are those of the author and are not necessarily those of the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST).

Copyright 2001
California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training

EPIGRAPH

The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing.

Edmund Burke

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
Chapter I	
ISSUE IDENTIFICATION	
Introduction	1
Statement of the Issue	10
Environmental Scan	11
Literature Review	13
Chapter II	
FUTURES STUDY	
Introduction	17
Nominal Group Technique	17
Trends	18
Events	23
Cross Impact Analysis	30
Alternative Scenarios	31
Optimistic Scenario	32
Pessimistic Scenario	33
Surprise Free Scenario	38
Chapter III	
STRATEGIC PLAN	
Introduction	42
Organizational Description	43
Situational Analysis	45
Strategy Development	50
Implementation Plan	53
Cost Analysis	54

Page

Chapter IV

TRANSITION MANAGEMENT

Introduction 56
Commitment Plan 56
Management Structure 60
Transition Techniques 62
Evaluation Activities 64

Chapter V

CONCLUSION

Project Summary 65
Recommendations 66
Implications for Leadership 66

THE APPENDICES

Appendix A
Nominal Group Technique Panel 68

Appendix B
List of Trends 69

Appendix C
List of Events 70

NOTES 71

BIBLIOGRAPHY 73

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Trend Summary	19
2	Event Summary	24
1	Cross Impact Analysis	30
2	Critical Mass Commitment	57
3	Responsibility Chart	63

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

With the support and encouragement of many people, I was able to complete the Command College. I am grateful that POST created the Command College and has sustained it throughout the years. Command College has been by far the most valuable and rewarding law enforcement educational experience I have ever had the honor or participating in.

I want to thank Sheriff Robert Doyle for allowing me the opportunity to attend the Command College. I also want to thank Sergeant Tim Lepinski for his leadership of the Marin County Major Crimes Task Force during my absences in San Marcos and when I was completing this and other required projects.

I am fortunate to have been a member of Class Thirty-One. This group of law enforcement professionals were a pleasure to be with, not only in the classroom, but after hours at dinners, baseball games, golfing and movies we enjoyed as a group. These men made the entire experience enjoyable and rewarding.

I want to especially thank my family. Vacations were shortened or cancelled and many important events were missed due to Command College commitments. My wife, Sheila, summed it up well in the early stages of the program, “ I hardly ever see you anymore. Even when you’re home, all you do is go upstairs and read.”

My children gained a valuable insight; education never ends.

CHAPTER ONE

ISSUE IDENTIFICATION

Introduction

In 1972, President Richard Nixon coined the phrase War on Drugs to give a sense of urgency and necessity to America's battle against illicit drug use, especially among this country's youth. Using this metaphoric comparison of America's drug problems to a war was a headline grabber then, and it has the same effect today. In this country's perspective, wars require a dedicated and relentless effort to win. Winning is everything, losing is not an option. This phrase served Nixon's political needs in 1972, but it has since spawned endless debate and controversy. Today, many in America feel that the war has gone on for too long without any tangible results. Support is growing for new strategies and the battle lines are changing.[1]

As the fall of Saigon signaled the failure of another war, Nixon's upcoming campaign needed an issue to ignite the electorate and force his opponents to take a side. America by the early 1970s had experienced Vietnam protests, urban riots, hippies, flower children, Charles Manson and rock star overdoses. It seemed that drug use was burgeoning and America's youth were increasingly at risk. A White House study predicted that heroin-addicted soldiers returning from Vietnam would bring with them crime and the attendant problems of chronic addiction. This problem never materialized but Nixon used the report to heighten interest and awareness of another potential contributor to the drug problem in America.[2]

Nixon furthered his highly publicized war on drugs with the formulation of ODALE, the Office of Drug Abuse Law Enforcement. This special unit of three hundred

federal drug agents answered directly to the White House, not to the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs (BNDD) or Customs, the federal agencies then fighting drugs. John Ingersoll, the director of BNDD at the time, was not even aware of the formulation of this unit. He first learned of ODALE when he saw President Nixon making the announcement on television. This unit's mission was street level drug enforcement, an activity, heretofore, never undertaken by federal law enforcement.

Nixon appointed former Customs Commissioner Myles Ambrose to head ODALE. Ambrose was a large man with a no-nonsense reputation in federal law enforcement. He was just the man Nixon needed to create some sensational drug busts that would capture media attention. Commissioner Ambrose used the inner city streets of American cities to create the telegenic drug war that Nixon wanted for his reelection campaign. Eighteen months later with Nixon in office, ODALE had served its purpose and was disbanded.[3]

In 1973, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) was formed. Congress mandated that DEA's primary mission would be the interdiction of illicit drugs on the highest level. It was placed in the Justice Department and given a higher stature than any previous federal drug enforcement agency. Drug agents from ODALE, BNDD and Customs were combined into this one agency. With elevated status, DEA's budget grew as agents were added and offices were opened around the country. Nixon made good on his campaign promise. He began training, arming and preparing his troops for the war on drugs. Nixon resigned in 1973 amid the Watergate scandal and Gerald Ford ascended to the presidency.

Ford's administration continued some of the treatment programs started by Nixon, but questions arose during this time about the real drug problem versus the perceived problem. President Ford considered the issue of studying the decriminalization of marijuana, something heretical to his former boss.

The war on drugs began to waiver without the strong advocacy of Richard Nixon. Eleven states either removed penalties for possession of marijuana or reduced the sanction to the level of a traffic ticket. In the 1976 presidential campaign, Jimmy Carter said incarcerating marijuana smokers was counterproductive.

Once elected, President Carter appointed Stanford-trained psychiatrist Peter Bourne as his drug policy advisor. Dr. Bourne was the first national drug advisor who really knew about drug addiction. He was one of the original founders of the Haight-Ashbury Free Clinic in San Francisco. Bourne finally convinced Carter that marijuana should be decriminalized and Carter addressed congress on this issue on August 2, 1977.[4] It appeared that the war on drugs was surrendering, until cocaine began to appear as a popular new drug in the mid 1970s. Poor judgement in prescribing a sedative for a staff member led to a scandal and loss of credibility for Bourne. Rumors began to spread that Bourne had attended a Washington, D.C. party where marijuana and cocaine had been used. Bourne resigned and Carter appeared vulnerable on drug issues. With the 1980 reelection campaign and Ronald Reagan looming ahead, the Carter administration restrained from further comments on the drug legalization issue.

Ronald Reagan saw an opportunity and he, like Nixon, deftly used drugs and crime issues against Carter in the 1980 campaign.[5] He quickly reversed the treatment and decriminalization movement of Ford and Carter and moved to return retribution and

revenge to government's role in drug enforcement. "We're taking down the surrender flag that has run over so many drug efforts. We're running up a battle flag."[6] The Omnibus Crime Act of 1984 gave the Reagan administration more and more weapons to deal with the incredible wealth and power that cocaine traffickers were amassing. Federal prosecutors were given new laws with stiffer penalties. Asset forfeiture laws were enacted to take away the drug dealers ill-gotten wealth. Drug profits or property used to facilitate drug-dealing efforts were subject to seizure without an underlying criminal conviction.

In 1985, crack cocaine hit the streets of America. This cheap, smokeable form of cocaine was now accessible to the poor. Inner city America exploded with gang wars, homicides and crack babies. The media wasted no time in exploiting the dramatic scenes of another drug-related murder, drug cops making dramatic sweeps or raids on fortified crack houses. Crack cocaine created a frighteningly real and vivid drug war, played out in the living rooms of America every night. More had to be done, and soon the drug war spread. America looked to stop cocaine at its source, in the coca plantations of Colombia and Peru.

George Bush, when Vice President, was assigned by President Reagan to head a multi-agency strike force in South Florida in the mid-1980s. Cocaine smuggling and distribution was out of control in South Florida. Bush's strategy worked; however, an unintended consequence led to the alliance of Colombian drug cartels with Mexican cartels and the shifting of smuggling to the Mexican border. A much larger problem emerged as Mexico's police, politicians and even the military fell prey to the corruptive influences of the Mexican cartels and the huge profits they were reaping.

George Bush won the presidency in 1988. He had been severely criticized in the campaign for his handling of the drug war for Reagan. The federal antidrug budget had been tripled during Reagan's years in office and there was virtually nothing to show for it. Bush vowed to fight on. Federal money and asset forfeiture dollars were flowing into the coffers of federal, state and local drug enforcement agencies. However, a series of scandals and revelations shed light on America's involvement in Central and South America.

The Iran-Contra guns-for-drugs scandal revealed in Senate hearings that the CIA was aware of the Contra's involvement in drug trafficking. National Security aide Ollie North brought this sordid affair directly into the White House. Panamanian dictator Manuel Noriega had been a CIA operative for many years and a photograph of Noriega and Bush together during this period added to Bush's growing credibility problems.

A CBS-*New York Times* poll taken just prior to the 1988 elections showed that half of the Americans polled saw drug trafficking as the number one international problem.[7] When George Bush assumed the presidency, he knew from his CIA and drug war background that an international effort requiring all of America's resources would be needed to fight the drug war and he knew that Americans supported it.

George Bush's one term in the White House marked a watershed period in America's drug war. The military's involvement in supporting drug interdiction activities in South America and along our Southern borders increased dramatically. The FBI and DEA joined with state and local law enforcement to provide manpower and financial assistance to local task forces and drug units. Asset forfeiture reached its zenith, with states passing laws mirroring federal asset seizure laws.

During George Bush's term, the combined local state and federal drug budgets were $120 billion, more than Americans spent on private health insurance.[8] In the early 1990s, press reports were common with anecdotal stories about police scandals produced by the drug war. Drug cops stealing drug money, drug cops raiding the wrong house, drug cops hurting or killing innocent people were common newspaper headlines. Real estate and personal property were being seized without due process or underlying criminal convictions. America began to speak up and politicians began to listen.

A child of the '60s, a saxophone player and an admitted marijuana smoker who did not inhale, William Jefferson Clinton entered the White House in 1992 and many opponents of the drug war saw an opportunity to turn things around. Clinton included more drug treatment in his massive health care reform proposal; however, Congress succeeded in thwarting Clinton's reform strategies on health care.

Clinton appointed Dr. Joycelyn Elders to be his Surgeon General. She had advocated for a change in national drug policy prior to appointment, so her stance on drugs was clear. However, once in office she responded to a question after a speech, "I do feel that we would markedly reduce our crime rate if drugs were legalized."[9] The White House quickly responded and noted that President Clinton was against the legalization of drugs. Dr. Elders' critics could not be silenced and she eventually resigned. Clinton's first drug budget was similar to Bush's, with a heavy emphasis on enforcement.

In1996, California passed into law Proposition 215, the medical marijuana or Compassionate Use Act. This followed the passage of a similar law in Arizona. The law reads in part:

> To ensure that seriously ill Californians have the right to obtain and use marijuana for medical purposes where that medical use is deemed appropriate and has been recommended by a physician who has determined that the person's health would benefit from the use of marijuana in the treatment of cancer, anorexia, AIDS, chronic pain, spasticity, glaucoma, arthritis, migraine, or any other illness for which marijuana provides relief.[10]

The confusion that this law created for California law enforcement and District Attorneys has yet to be settled. But the same wealthy philanthropists who provided millions of dollars for the successful passage of Proposition 215 also spent millions to fund the successful passage of Proposition 36 in November 2000.

Proposition 36 became law in July of 2001. This law provides probation and drug treatment programs in lieu of incarceration, for mere possession, use, transportation for personal use or being under the influence of controlled substances and similar parole violations, not including sale or manufacture.[11] The measure calls for the state to provide $120 million for drug treatment programs for California's fifty-eight counties. California passed Proposition 36 by a margin of 60.8 percent for and 39.2 percent against. In Marin, a mid-sized county, the measure passed by a margin of 71.6 percent for and 28.4 percent against. With the referendum process in California seeking changes in the way the war on drugs is waged, it will only be a matter of time before politicians author legislation seeking similar and possibly more sweeping changes.

But where will this trend toward treatment and decriminalization take us? Some noted libertarians, such as economist Milton Friedman, advocate that all drugs should be legalized. This, according to Friedman, will take the economic incentive

away from individuals and criminal groups who deal drugs.[12] Drug demand would decrease and associated criminal activity would be minimal and manageable.

What if current trends continue and all drugs are legalized? What will society be like? Will there be less drug-related crime as Friedman espouses, or more drug related crime, as former drug czars Barry McCaffery and William Bennett have said? How would law enforcement cope with a drug, such as methamphetamine, that is known to cause violence, paranoia, and psychotic behavior once it is legal to use and possess and presumably would become widely available if legalized?

This introduction has looked at a historical perspective of the War on Drugs in America beginning with the creation of the metaphor in 1972 by Richard Nixon. The war continued through the successive administrations of Presidents Ford, Reagan, George Herbert Walker Bush and Bill Clinton. Even recently elected President George W. Bush appears to be following in his father's footsteps of a hard-line approach to the war on drugs. The winds of change in this country's drug polices and strategies are starting to emerge. Many long-standing legalization/decriminalization organizations are aligning with local grass root efforts in California and throughout the country to bring these issues to the voters through the referendum process.

Contemporary Viewpoints

There are three distinct perspectives or viewpoints on the drug problem in America. They are the prohibitionist, public health and the liberal perspectives. Each of these perspectives can provide strong supporting evidence from history, medical research, laboratory research, the law, economics and philosophy to support their

viewpoint. How would the legalization of methamphetamine and its impact on violent crime be seen by these three points of view?

Those who see the drug problem as a crime and punishment problem, the "drug warrior perspective," argue that as the availability of drugs increases, more people abuse or become addicted to drugs and more crime follows. They point out that prohibition, which is frequently cited by drug legalization proponents as the cause for organized crime gaining a foothold in America, did produce some positive results. Cirrhosis of the liver, alcohol psychosis and alcohol related vehicle accidents were down during prohibition. Alcohol consumption did not reach pre-prohibition levels until 1971.[13]

The public health perspective sees marijuana as having medicinal qualities in the treatment of nausea and loss of appetite for serious life threatening illnesses. This group refutes that marijuana is a gateway drug to other more addictive and dangerous drugs. They also refute that once addicted, especially to heroin, the likelihood of successful treatment is negligible. They cite the case study of the heroin-addicted soldiers returning from Vietnam as proof that heroin addiction can be treated and stopped.

The third and final perspective is that of the libertarians. As mentioned previously, noted economist Milton Friedman sees drugs as an economic commodity. If there were no incentive to make money from its use, then drug crime would be significantly reduced. Another libertarian, a medical doctor, views our bodies as property; therefore, as a property right, the Constitution protects an individual's right to put anything into his or her body.[14]

The historical review and the contemporary perspectives presented in this introduction illustrate two salient points. First, a politician invented the war on drugs, the metaphoric phrase, for political purposes. Successive presidential administrations have continued to form their drug polices based on the political climate of the time. Second, highly regarded physicians, economists, lawyers, drug czars, research scientists and politicians view the drug problem with different viewpoints and different solutions.

Statement of the Issue

Pharmacologically, methamphetamine is a dangerous, sometimes lethal and unpredictable drug. It is a central nervous stimulant and it can be ingested by smoking, snorting, injecting or taken orally. The effects of the drug include temporary hyperactivity, euphoria, increased energy and tremors. Chronic use or overdosing can produce irritability, nervousness and paranoia. Chronic users suffer severe depression during withdrawal and psychosis similar to schizophrenia. Chronic abusers pick at unseen insects on their skin. They are self-absorbed and they suffer visual and auditory hallucinations. During these high-use binge cycles known as tweaking, the chronic user does not sleep nor eat for periods of up to fifteen days. It is during these tweaking episodes that chronic users have an intense craving for more methamphetamine, but no dosage at this point provides the sought after euphoric high. The tweaker at this point is very unpredictable and has a high potential for violence. The possibility of legalizing this drug is a critical concern for law enforcement.

For that reason, this study will focus on the question:

> How will the legalization of methamphetamine impact a mid sized law enforcement agency by the year 2006?

Environmental Scan

An environmental scan was conducted by reading books, government publications, newspapers and magazine articles. Also scanned were Internet sites for law enforcement, public health and drug abuse prevention organizations. The purpose of the scan was to identify current trends and events that would have significance or importance to the future of law enforcement. In addition to the environmental scan, Command College instruction and peer review aided in identifying and narrowing the scope of the issue.

Historical Review

As previously discussed, the war on drugs has been waged in this country for nearly thirty years. Six presidential administrations have fought the war and billions of dollars have been spent. Some would argue that nothing has been gained – that the war has been lost. Others would say that despite the time and the cost, the war must go on, forever if necessary.

Methamphetamine and Violence

Methamphetamine is produced in such large quantities in California that the state is considered a source country by DEA.[15] In addition to the psychotic effects of the drug, methamphetamine causes tooth decay, heart and kidney problems and destroys brain cells. It has also been attributed to unconscionable acts of violence throughout the state. The following newspaper articles illustrate several violence incidents attributable to the abuse of methamphetamine.

The McClatchy Company, publishers of the Sacramento, Modesto and Fresno Bee newspapers, published an eighteen page special edition on October 8, 2000, about the methamphetamine problem affecting California's Central Valley region. The front page led with the headline and title of the article, ”A Madness Called Meth.” The article contained fifteen chapters, each about a different aspect of the problem and the human suffering it causes. Chapter Eight was entitled “Suffer the Children.” Several stories described the most vulnerable of society, children; and how they have been victimized by neglect, toxic contamination and worst of all violent abuse and murder.

One such story, from Fresno, was that of four-year-old Dustin Haaland and his death in December of 1999 at the hands of his meth addicted father. Dustin’s father, Douglas Jr., was on parole for viciously picking up and slamming Dustin’s older brother, Dougie, to the ground. Haaland denied that he had a drug problem after being convicted of this abuse and reminded the court of his lack of a criminal record at sentencing. Two months after release from state prison, he was hooked on meth again. Douglas and his wife, Kathy Haaland, told relatives that Dustin had gone to visit relatives. After being missing for weeks, Dustin’s body was found in a shallow grave. Police in Fresno believed that Dustin was beaten for months and finally killed. Prior to Dustin’s murder, Douglas had been on a meth binge and had not slept in eight days. He ran out of the drug three days before his arrest and, “ … was very agitated and irritated.” Kathy had done nothing to stop the torture and death of her son and she helped her husband bury her son’s body. Douglas was sentenced to forty-four years in prison for Dustin’s death and Kathy received local jail time.[16]

In May of 1995, Shawn Nelson drove a stolen National Guard tank through the streets of San Diego crushing cars, motor homes and telephone poles. Neighbors described Nelson as acting erratically in the days leading up to the rampage. Nelson drove the tank onto a freeway barrier immobilizing the tank. Police were able to open the hatch and Nelson was ordered out. He refused and he continued to manipulate the tank, trying to dislodge it. The police shot and killed Nelson fearing he would not stop and he would eventually kill innocent citizens.[17] It was determined later that Nelson was a chronic user of methamphetamine who had been bingeing the days prior to breaking into a National Guard facility and stealing the tank. He had previously served in the Army and was familiar with the operation of this military equipment.

Literature Review

A literature review was conducted by reviewing books, periodicals and Internet resources. The purpose of this review was to gain historical perspectives of the larger issues – the war on drugs, its relationship to politics and the movement toward drug legalization. The review also produced physical and pharmacological information on methamphetamine, specifically, pointing out the medical problems produced by the drug as well as the potential for unpredictable and violent behavior.

Historical and current use patterns for methamphetamine were discovered to be much higher in the West and Northwest. However, Midwestern States, such as Nebraska and Iowa, are seizing an ever-increasing amount of clandestine labs showing that meth use is on the rise. The spread of meth to the Midwest is attributed to Mexican Nationals who have moved from California, or directly from Mexico, to the Midwest agriculture areas.[18]

The anecdotal link between violence and meth use is abundantly evident. Newspapers in California cities that have methamphetamine problems have produced literally hundreds of articles detailing the violent crimes perpetrated in their respective communities by meth abusers. For example, the Santa Rosa, California newspaper, The Press Democrat, published thirteen articles from October 1996 to December 2000 citing cases involving the increased use of methamphetamine in Sonoma, Lake and Mendocino Counties. In five of the articles, cases of homicide were reported. Two of the homicides involved local police shooting and killing two methamphetamine abusers. One incident involved police officers shooting a male subject after he had fired numerous rounds from several handguns in his mobile home park. This suspect was wearing a bulletproof vest.[19] The other officer-involved homicide occurred after a subject charged a police officer and was shot and killed.[20] This incident was also ruled justifiable homicide.

In March of 1996, two teenagers from a small Mendocino County community went to a river hangout with a twenty-eight year old man and his teenage nephew. The girls were given methamphetamine and then were sexually assaulted. Both girls fled into the nearby icy river. One girl survived, but sadly, one drowned. The teenage suspect was caught, tried and convicted but the twenty-eight year old uncle fled to Mexico and has yet to be captured.[21]

In another homicide, a convicted murderer on parole, Jerrold Johnson, beat a seventy-six year old woman to death. Johnson was described by acquaintances as, "… a methamphetamine user with extreme mood swings."[22]

In yet another senseless murder, a thirty-three year old man murdered a sixty-eight year old widow. The suspect had burglarized the older woman's mobile home twice, the second time awaking the victim. He bludgeoned the woman and then set the mobile home on fire. The suspect told a probation officer that he was consuming all the meth he could get his hands on. The presiding trial judge said:

> There is no easy answer to explain why Steinocher killed Hoey, but it is clear her life was taken for a few of her valuables which were sold for a very little to supply Steinocher's drug habit.[23]

An ex-felon sped from sheriff's deputies and crashed his car. His girlfriend was thrown from the vehicle and died. The suspect, Lance Lauman, ran from the vehicle, never stopping to aid or check the condition of his girlfriend. Lauman was caught and convicted of second-degree murder, possession, transportation and manufacturing of methamphetamine. Lauman admitted to a probation officer that he had used meth everyday for the past four years.[24]

Sonoma, Lake and Mendocino are considered rural counties. Sonoma, with a population of approximately 450 thousand residents, is a mid-sized county with a burgeoning methamphetamine problem that is spilling into adjacent Lake and Mendocino counties. Other areas and cities in California, such as Sacramento, the Central Valley Area, Los Angeles, San Diego and Riverside are also reporting numerous cases of methamphetamine related violent crime.

Numerous publications produced by the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP), the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), the California Department of Justice and the California Narcotics Officers

Association (CNOA) have all shown a link between violent crime and methamphetamine use.

The California Department of Justice published an article for law enforcement officers. Among other advice, it mentioned that the most dangerous state of meth abuse is the tweaker. A tweaker is described as someone who has not slept in 3-15 days and is irritable and paranoid. A tweaker often appears normal but he or she can be unpredictable and act out in a violent manner. The article admonishes police officers to call for backup when detaining a tweaker.[25]

Chapter one has introduced the issue statement and presented, through historical review, the war on drugs that this country has waged for thirty years. The pharmacological effects of methamphetamine have been described and an environmental review detailed several actual accounts of abuse, rampage and murder perpetrated by meth abusers. Trends and events signal changes in how this country is seeking change in dealing with drug abuse. California in particular, through the passage of Propositions 215 and 36, has sent a clear signal that other strategies must be tried. These trends and events portend a future where drugs may be legalized. The legalization of methamphetamine seems improbable, but it could happen. In Chapter Two, the legalization of methamphetamine and its impact on violent crime is studied. The future is looked at through forecasting techniques and hypothetical scenarios. Chapter One has laid a foundation for the future study to follow.

CHAPTER TWO

FUTURES STUDY

Introduction

Law enforcement in California has great concern for the future of drug enforcement, especially as it relates to a drug that produces violence, methamphetamine. Proposition 215, passed in 1996, has created confusion that has yet to be remedied. Proposition 36 passed in November 2000, with implementation in July 2001. It also has created an atmosphere of uncertainty.

These events and the general trend moving toward legalization of drugs necessitates futures oriented research. This research is not intended to predict the future but rather to forecast possible future trends and events and to prepare now so that choices can be made to influence future outcomes. For this project, the Nominal Group Technique, or NGT, was used as a tool to forecast the future of legalizing methamphetamine and how this would impact violent crime in California by 2006.

The Nominal Group Technique was used to forecast future trends and events and their probability of occurrence. A cross-impact analysis was used on these trends and events to forecast the impact future events would have on future trends.

Three alternative scenarios were created for possible futures. One scenario was selected to develop a strategic plan for the future selected.

Nominal Group Technique

The Nominal Group Technique (NGT) is a small group process in which a group of experts are brought together. The NGT eliminates social and psychological dynamics of group behavior, which tend to inhibit individual creativity and participation in

group sessions. Individuals can be more creative and everyone is given a structured opportunity to participate. This helps to overcome common problems often encountered in small group meetings organized for the purpose of generating ideas, planning programs and problem solving. Through rounds of discussion, ideas are generated, voted upon and prioritized. The panel assembled for this NGT is listed in Appendix A.

The panel members were provided with written instructions, newspaper articles and Internet sites for preparation and orientation on the issue. They were asked to identify trends and events on the study issue.

Trends

A trend is a series of events by which change is measured over time. The panel identified twenty-four applicable trends. A complete list of these trends can be found in Appendix B. Nine trends were selected for forecasting and an explanation follows for each of these nine selected trends.

In Table 1, the panel assigned a numerical rating for each trend, five years in the past, the present and five and ten years into the future. This represents the impact the stated trends are believed to have on the issue. The value in column two represents the level of the trend today. The panel also assigned a numerical rating between one and ten indicating their level of concern that the trend had on the issue.

Table 1

Trend Evaluation

Trends	-5 years	Today	+5 years	+10 years	Concern (1-10)
Trend 1	75	100	150	150	7
Trend 2	75	100	200	200	7
Trend 3	80	100	150	200	7
Trend 4	75	100	120	120	8
Trend 5	100	100	150	120	8
Trend 6	50	100	150	200	9
Trend 7	70	100	175	200	8
Trend 8	75	100	150	100	8
Trend 9	50	100	200	200	9

Analysis of Trends Selected By The Panel

Trend 1- Level of funding for law enforcement

Funding in the public sector is constantly under scrutiny and law enforcement must fight for its piece of the budget pie. Two current emergent issues in California include education and the power crisis. Drug enforcement efforts may be cut as funding is diverted for drug treatment as required by Proposition 36 and the emerging issues of education and electrical power. If drug enforcement efforts were cut and methamphetamine was legalized, the panel felt that law enforcement might be

overwhelmed and unable to cope with a surge in methamphetamine use and the violence that would follow.

If funding were cut for drug enforcement and methamphetamine was legalized, the panel felt that this trend would have an immediate impact on violent crime. The panel felt that initially the level of funding to combat methamphetamine violence would rise, but it would level out over time as other emergent issues gained political clout. The panel rated their level of concern for this trend at seven.

Trend 2- Proliferation of drug culture messages to America's youth

The media sends mixed messages about the acceptable use of legal drugs, especially to America's youth. Drug companies now aggressively advertise prescription drugs for a host of both physical and emotional ailments. The message is that there is a cure for whatever ails you. This may blur the lines between legal and illegal drugs in the minds of young people. Legalizing methamphetamine would further confuse young people on the acceptable use of drugs for therapeutic purposes. The panel viewed this trend as having an immediate and significant impact on the legalization of methamphetamine and how this would impact violent crime. They saw, in five years, a 100 percent increase in the proliferation of mixed messages about legal drugs, but not increasing from five to ten years into the future. The panel felt that America's youth would quickly become abusers of legalized methamphetamine and violence would follow. The panel's concern on this trend was seven.

Trend 3- Amount of environmental pollution from illicit methamphetamine labs.

Illicit methamphetamine labs produce a multitude of toxic products, which are dumped onto the ground, into waterways or simply abandoned. Legalization could foster more illicit labs, thus creating manmade toxic dumpsites in the middle of

residential areas. Several problems would be created, such as health problems, long term contamination and costly clean up. The panel indicated that this trend would have an immediate effect and it would be a growing trend ten years into the future. The panel reasoned that as the demand for methamphetamine increased, criminals would set up illicit labs to meet the demand. They rated their concern at seven.

Trend 4- Level of parental involvement

The panel recognized and studies support the mounting evidence that two parent homes with involved parents prevents a multitude of social problems as they relate to children. This is not to say single parents cannot effectively raise children but the key is involvement and the teaching of values. If methamphetamine were legalized, the panel felt that children lacking parental involvement would be susceptible to addiction, crime and violence. The panel saw only a small increase in the next five years on this issue. They felt that the “newness” of legalized meth would cause an upsurge in use, but the negative effects would quickly lead to a leveling off of abuse and attendant violence. The panel’s concern on this trend was placed at eight.

Trend 5- Level of priority on treatment

If treatment is given more funding and a higher priority, the underlying causes of drug addiction will be given less attention. Contributing factors to drug abuse/addiction such as psychological dysfunction, lack of affordable housing, unemployment and lack of medical insurance or poor medical care will continue to draw people into the cycle of methamphetamine abuse and addiction. If treatment is given a higher priority, which translates to more funding, the underlying causes of addiction will not be addressed; thus the cycle of addiction is never broken.

The panel saw this as a somewhat growing trend in five years as the effect of Proposition 36 is analyzed and studied. The panel felt that this trend would retreat in ten years after it is realized the underlying issues of addiction must be addressed as well as addiction itself. The panel rated their concern at eight.

Trend 6- Number of methamphetamine users

The panel felt that the legalization of methamphetamine would change the number of first time users of methamphetamine and this, in turn, would have a direct effect on violence. They saw an additional significant increase in methamphetamine users from five to ten years and their concern for this trend was nine.

Trend 7- Availability of methamphetamine could create greater demand

With legalization, economic market forces could produce greater demand for methamphetamine. This in turn would create more criminal enterprises to meet the demand and thus a return to gang wars over turf and customer bases. This was likened to the cocaine wars in the late 1980s early 1990s.

The panel saw an immediate and fairly significant impact of this trend on violence generated by the legalization of methamphetamine. They saw the impact doubling ten years into the future. The panel rated their concern on this trend at eight.

Trend 8- Public support of treatment programs

If treatment works, and addicts can be successfully treated, support will increase and drug enforcement will lose its standing in the war on drugs. There would be significant changes in drug related violence. The discussion on this trend saw two futures, drug problems as a whole would decrease and so would drug related violence but if treatment failed, violence would increase and law enforcement may not be

prepared. For the summary, the panel took the latter future, that treatment will fail. For that reason, they saw an immediate impact in the next five years, but they saw a leveling off and a return to today's impact in ten years.

Trend 9- Influence of the Internet on youth.

The popularity of drugs, legal or illegal, are quickly spread through the Internet, especially among the youth of this country. Trendy, "cool," things are put on the net and spread throughout the world. If meth were legalized, new users would be quick to spread the word on the initial positive experiences and results gained from using the drug. These results include increased energy and alertness, weight loss and the benefit of self-medication for hyperactivity disorders.

The panel felt the popularity and influence of the Internet has not peaked. Therefore, they felt that a larger audience would be reached in five years with an affirmation of methamphetamine from the youth subculture. This would lead to greater abuse of methamphetamine among America's youth. The panel saw this as having an immediate and highly significant impact on the legalization of methamphetamine and its impact on violent crime in the next five years, with no deviation in ten years. The panel rated their concern at nine for this trend.

Events

An event is a discrete, one-time occurrence. The panel identified twenty-five applicable events. A list of candidate events may be found in Appendix C. Nine events were selected for forecasting. The panel assigned values when the event would be likely to occur. Column Two of Table 2 represents the first year the event is likely to occur. The values in columns three and four represent the probability of the event

occurring within five to ten years. The values in column five represent the impact of the event on the issue and the group's opinion as to whether the impact will be positive or negative.

Table 2

Event Summary

Events	**Year > 0**	**+5 years**	**+10 years**	**Impact (-10 to +10**
Event 1	1	98	100	-5
Event 2	1	16	45	5
Event 3	1	75	90	10
Event 4	3	18	60	5
Event 5	3	43	68	-5
Event 6	4	55	78	2
Event 7	3	15	40	10
Event 8	1	60	78	-6
Event 9	5	25	60	-5

Selected Events and Analysis

Event 1- A Single traumatic criminal event where the suspect is under the influence of methamphetamine

The panel felt if a horrible singular event were to take place such as a mass murder, a school yard massacre, or the deliberate crash of a commercial airliner, and it was determined that the responsible person was under the influence of

methamphetamine, this would have a negative impact on the issue. They reasoned that an event like this would lead to legalized methamphetamine being returned to a controlled status once again. The panel felt that this would bring to light the true nature of this drug that it causes violence and it cannot be legalized because of the greater public safety issues.

The panel felt that there was a strong probability of this event occurring in the next five years and a 100 percent chance of it occurring in the next ten years, if methamphetamine were legalized.

Event 2- Medical applications discovered for methamphetamine

It is discovered that methamphetamine cures a disease or treats symptoms of some medical condition with positive results. The panel felt that if a medical discovery were made finding a legitimate use of methamphetamine, three negative things could occur. First, if methamphetamine were rescheduled for prescription purposes, there would be the chance of increased violence from chronic abusers. Second, diversion or theft could get the drug into the black market increasing supply and use. Third, illicit laboratories could increase to meet the demand from abusers who want more methamphetamine than their prescription calls for, or as a supply for the chronic abusers who were terminated from prescription access to methamphetamine because of their history of abuse. On the positive side, those who benefit from the medical use of methamphetamine and find relief from their particular problem would be satisfied and their lives better off. The panel did not feel confident that this event would occur within the next five years at all and only gave it a probability of 45 percent of occurrence in the next ten years. They rated this event's impact on the issue at positive five.

Event 3- Published report indicating the success of legalization

The panel felt that if a report were published showing strong evidence that drug legalization reduces crime and violence, drug legalization would sweep the country. The report would need strong empirical and direct supporting evidence. The direct evidence possibly coming from a respected foreign country that experimented with legalization. The panel felt that this event had a strong likelihood of happening within the next five years and an 80 percent chance of occurrence in the next ten years. The panel felt that this event would have a significant impact on the issue, thus rating it at positive ten.

The diversity of the panel was evident during discussion of this event. Those in the criminal justice system said any evidence would not change their opinion, while other members felt that a valid, respected report might sway their opinion of drug legalization.

Event 4- Law passed assessing taxation for the legal sales of methamphetamine as a revenue source

If methamphetamine were legalized, the assumption is that the government will tax the sale of it. The legal use of methamphetamine would provide a revenue source that could be used for treatment of chronic abusers, thereby reducing violence. Educational programs to prevent young people from ever trying methamphetamine could lead to reduced demand. The eventual outcome would be less violence from the use of methamphetamine since there would be fewer people using the drug.

The panel gave low probability (18 percent) in the next five years of this event occurring. They did see an increased probability (60 percent) of this event occurring in ten years. The panel gave the impact of this event on the issue a positive five.

Event 5- A school based incident where a large number of children overdose on methamphetamine

The panel considered the anecdotal stories that occur almost every school year where there is a drug overdose incident on a school campus. If methamphetamine were legalized and there was an incident where a number of children overdosed and there were acts of violence as a result of the overdose, then this would have a negative impact on the legalization of methamphetamine. Like event number one, an incident of this nature would probably lead to the repeal of legalization and it would forever link methamphetamine with violent producing tendencies. The panel saw a 48 percent probability of this event occurring in the next three to five years and a 68 percent chance of it occurring in the next ten years.

Event 6- Passage of legislation providing long mandatory prison sentences for manufacturing, or distributing illicit methamphetamine

The panel felt that legalization of methamphetamine would require even stronger sentencing for those who would still manufacture or distribute illicit methamphetamine. With legalization, would come strict government control, and taxation (event 5). In order to maintain quality control and eliminate illicit labs, there must be severe punishment for those who seek economic gain from the criminal side of methamphetamine. The panel saw this event as having a 55 percent chance of occurring in five years and 78 percent chance in ten years. They saw the impact of this event on the issue as only a positive two.

Event 7- Technology alternative to drug use such as virtual reality that provides the same pleasure and euphoria as methamphetamine

People of all races, ethnicity and cultures have, throughout history, sought ways to gain personal pleasure. Drugs have been one of the methods to gain this pleasure. The panel thought that if technology could produce, through simulation, the same pleasure, stimulation and euphoria that drugs provide, it could eliminate the demand for methamphetamine. If demand for methamphetamine was reduced or eliminated, there would not be any violence attributed to methamphetamine use, there would not be any illicit labs and criminal enterprises that manufacture and distribute meth would not exist. Surprisingly, the panel rated this event as having the greatest impact on the issue, a positive ten and the highest of all ten events selected by the panel. They saw this event as having a 15 percent chance of occurring in five years and 40 percent in ten years.

Event 8- Contamination of a major water source by an illicit methamphetamine lab

The panel saw the very real possibility of this occurring after viewing videotape depicting several documented cases of local contamination incidents. The panel felt that if a large clandestine meth lab, known as a super lab, were to operate in a remote area undetected for a long period of time dumping toxic waste into a river or stream, then a major ecological disaster could occur. In lieu of California's delicate water supply system, this could easily spell disaster for a major metropolitan area that relies on a single source of water.

The panel saw a strong probability of this occurring in the next five years, increasing to a 78 percent chance of occurrence in ten years. The panel saw this event producing an impact of minus six. They viewed their negative rating on the issue in terms of reversing legalization. The public outcry would silence the legalization argument of drugs, at least for methamphetamine. Like events one and six, this event

would shock the conscience of America, proving that this drug cannot be legalized because of its violence and also its ecologically damaging qualities.

Event 9- Medical discovery that blocks methamphetamine addiction or genetic engineering that prevents addiction

With all the reports of the immense medical possibilities from the mapping of the human genome, the panel felt that these discoveries could be used to cure or suppress addiction. If addiction can essentially be stopped before it even begins, then chronic use of methamphetamine and the violence associated with it would be eliminated.

The panel saw a 25 percent chance of this occurring in five years and a 60 percent chance in ten years. The panel gave this a negative five impact. The panel believed that this would call into question the need for legalizing methamphetamine, since chronic use could be controlled and violence would no longer be an issue.

Cross Impact Analysis

Cross impact analysis is a method used in futures forecasting to determine the impact selected events, if they occur, will have on selected trends. By graphing the analysis, a clear understanding is demonstrated showing the impact events have on trends. By understanding these relationships, the future can be influenced by encouraging or discouraging event occurrence. Each impact is rated on a scale range of negative five to positive five.

A panel of three mid-level police managers with twenty-five years' experience in their managerial ranks was assembled to conduct the analysis. The three panel members had also participated in the NGT. The panel reached a consenus to determine each impact. Table 3 shows the results of the analysis.

Table 3

Cross Impact Analysis

	TRENDS								
EVENTS	Trend 1	Trend 2	Trend 3	Trend 4	Trend 5	Trend 6	Trend 7	Trend 8	Trend 9
Event 1	3	1	0	2	1	2	0	-3	0
Event 2	-4	-3	-3	2	-2	-3	-5	-1	-2
Event 3	3	0	-4	0	2	1	1	2	0
Event 4	1	-4	-4	-1	-2	1	1	2	0
Event 5	3	2	0	1	-2	1	0	3	0
Event 6	1	2	2	0	1	1	4	1	0
Event 7	-3	2	4	0	0	2	0	-1	2
Event 8	4	3	4	0	1	0	0	-3	2
Event 9	-1	4	4	0	4	3	4	3	2

Event number nine, a medical discovery that blocks methamphetamine addiction or a genetic solution to addiction, seemed to be the most important event. The panel felt that a discovery of this nature would have a panacea effect on all the trends. A discovery of this magnitude would essentially create the possibility of eliminating methamphetamine addiction and the violence that is attributed to it. Discussion arose about the need for legalization of methamphetamine if an event such as this occurred.

Event number eight, contamination of a major water source by an illicit methamphetamine lab, was the second most important event recognized by the panel. It was felt that an event of this nature, especially in light of California's delicate water

supply system and environmental concerns, would have an immediate and far reaching response on the part of many segments of the population. An unlikely coalition of law enforcement, environmentalists, water conservationists, and politicians would seize an event like this and change would immediately take place. With catastrophic events, "knee-jerk" draconian reaction is common. The panel saw a strong possibility that law enforcement would take a dominant role in future prevention of this type of event. Greater efforts would be applied to control the chemicals and equipment that are used in the illicit process to make methamphetamine. An event of this nature would cause California to review legalization of methamphetamine and consider its far-reaching implications.

Event number six, long mandatory sentences for large illicit manufacturers or distributors of methamphetamine, was recognized as the third most important event. With the legalization of methamphetamine and a caveat of tough sentencing for those involved in sales and manufacturing, the panel felt that this event would tend to mitigate the increase of methamphetamine related violent crime. With government control and taxation (event number five), those who desire methamphetamine could obtain the drug through legal sources. Those who choose to make and sell methamphetamine on the black market would suffer severe criminal penalties. By reducing the criminal manufacturing and sales of methamphetamine, some violence would be reduced. This would have no impact on violence associated with the individual chronic or binge user.

Alternative Scenarios

Scenarios are created in futures study to provide a picture of what the future may be like. The Nominal Group Technique, environmental and literature scanning and

personal knowledge provided the background for three future scenarios. One of the three scenarios was selected so a strategic plan could be developed to influence or encourage the selected future to happen. Then, a plan is presented that describes how the strategy can be implemented that ensures the desired future is attained.

The three scenarios present an optimistic, pessimistic and surprise free future. All three scenarios take place five years into the future coinciding with the issue statement that asks, how will the legalization of methamphetamine impact a mid-sized law enforcement agency by 2006? All of the scenarios describe future events that were forecasted by the NGT panel.

Optimistic Scenario

An article from the JAMA - The Journal of American Medical Association December 6, 2006

"Methamphetamine Gene Discovered In Addiction Study"

Dr. Benjamin Schultz, of the Harvard School of Medicine, found in a double blind study that a gene within the human genome was characteristically stimulated when exposed to methamphetamine. By isolating this gene, Dr. Shultz was able to treat the specific gene with a protease inhibitor that blocked the methamphetamine from producing the euphoric as well as stimulating effect of the drug. Chronically addicted patients used in the study reported that use of methamphetamine after treatment with the inhibitor produced none of the sought after effects they craved from using the drug. Methamphetamine users ceased using the drug since it did not produce the desired effects. Seventy-eight percent of the patients in the study also reported severe side effects when methamphetamine and the inhibitor were taken at the same time. Dr.

Shultz reported in the study that this provided an additional negative stimulus to break addictive behavior.

Dr. Shultz indicated that this breakthrough would, in a short time, provide the background for development of a genetic therapy where the entire population could be inoculated at a young age against all addictive behaviors. Because of the far-reaching implications of drug addiction and the current problems facing California after it legalized methamphetamine, current research will only focus on methamphetamine addiction.

Dr. Shultz's two-year clinical study was funded by the National Institute of Health. Coincidentally to this study, Dr. Shultz made some promising discoveries that methamphetamine in early stages of diagnosis actually reversed the effects of Alzheimer's patients. The National Institute of Health is funding an additional grant to Dr. Shultz's research team to move forward with this promising discovery.

Pessimistic Scenario

Fred and Ethel Baxter lived in a small neighborhood of Columbia County, California, known as Heavenswood. Their home backed up to a neighborhood elementary school. Fred and Betty were both graduates of U.C. Berkeley. Fred was a chemical engineer at a nearby Chevron Oil refinery; Betty taught biology at a local high school. Their children were married and they had two grandchildren.

Fred and Betty were the quintessential "opposites attract" couple. Fred was from a conservative ranching family in the Central Valley of California and Betty came from a wealthy family with strong ties to liberal politics in San Francisco. They had been

actively involved with their children when they were young and they still remained active in local politics and civic affairs.

Betty, ever the liberal, had advocated treatment and even legalization of drugs. She had participated in the Proposition 215, the medical marijuana initiative, petition drive in 1996 and did the same for Proposition 36, a drug treatment initiative in 2000. Fred, too, had become disillusioned with the war on drugs. He felt that something new and different needed to be tried. Fred and Betty both had voted for SB 11350, the bill legalizing methamphetamine. The proponents of the bill convinced them that legalization would reduce drug-related violence and provide more funding for education and treatment. Drug reform advocates touted the bill as a continuation of drug treatment started by Proposition 36. Law enforcement had campaigned vigorously against this bill as yet another veiled attempt to dupe the public into passing laws that legalized drugs under the guise of treatment. The bill became law by a fairly comfortable margin in California. Columbia County, known for its liberal politics, passed the bill by an even greater margin.

The good life changed abruptly in the summer of 2006. The Baxters neighbors of 25 years retired and moved to Arizona. The home sold quickly and for a handsome price. The new neighbors, Bill and Ginger Grimsley, seemed pleasant but Fred immediately felt something odd about their two teenage boys, ages seventeen and nineteen. Marco, the nineteen year-old, seemed especially hard and menacing. Rumors soon spread that Marco was recently paroled from prison and was a gang member in Contra Costa County, where they had previously lived. Fred was concerned but did not pry and he hoped that whatever Marco's problems were, they were now

behind him. The other son, Dave, looked and acted much like his older brother, but was quieter and kept to himself.

Once, Fred confronted Marco about his loud music and dangerous driving habits. Marco cursed Fred and told him to mind his own business. Fred informed Bill Grimsly about this encounter with Marco. Bill said he'd speak to Marco, but he told Fred that Marco was unreasonable and did not listen to him. Bill mentioned that Marco was now off parole and his behavior was becoming more erratic.

Marco moved into a shed that was in the backyard of the Grimsley property. He fixed it up, ran power into it and it appeared that he was living there. Fred nonchalantly asked Bill Grimsley about the shed and Bill said it was a compromise arrangement. They wanted Marco out of the house, but with neither job nor money, Marco could not afford to move out. The shed was temporary, contingent on Marco getting a job.

Fred saw Marco infrequently, but he heard him talking on the phone or with friends inside the shed. Marco's friends were coming by often, day and night, and staying for short duration. Music, noise, fighting and cars speeding in the street made life in Heavenswood miserable for the Baxters.

Then it stopped. Fred did not see or hear Marco for six months. He finally asked Bill. Bill told him Marco was doing time in the county jail for driving under the influence of drugs. Bill said that Marco was a "crankster" and it was good he was in jail, maybe he would get some treatment. Fred did not want to appear naive so he did not ask Bill what a "crankster" was. He finally asked his son one day. Now schooled in drug slang for a chronic methamphetamine abuser, Fred did some research on the Internet. Bill

became frightened. He now knew that Marco was a dangerous and unpredictable neighbor.

Fred spoke to Betty about Marco and his drug problem. They began to question the wisdom of their support of meth legalization. They had heard through the local sheriff the evils of meth and the violence attributed to abusers. They felt, at the time, that this was a typical law enforcement reaction so they discounted it and voted for SB 11350. Bill now feared for the safety of Betty, himself and his neighbors. He hoped Marco would not come back home after his jail stint but he did.

Marco did his jail time and he looked better when he got out. Soon, though, the same crowd was back and hanging out in the shed. One warm summer night, Fred was awakened to a chemical odor coming from Marco's shed. It smelled like the labs he did research in at Berkeley. He knew it was the result of a chemical process, not one singular product. The lights were on and he could hear voices inside. He did not know what to think, but he did not want a confrontation with Marco. He hated to admit it but he was scared of him.

Fred had left work early one Friday so he could pack for a Lake Tahoe trip. He was crossing the Columbia Bridge when he heard a special report on the radio. An armed man had entered Roosevelt Elementary School, the school behind his house, and had fired an automatic weapon indiscriminately into a crowd of children and teachers in the schoolyard. A police helicopter over the scene reported numerous casualties in the schoolyard. Sheriff's deputies on scene were reporting gunshots inside the school and the suspect was holding hostages in the cafeteria.

Fred reached Betty by cell phone and she was still at work. His relief was tempered by the horrible vision of children and teachers dead and wounded right behind his house. Marco Grimsley's name came to mind. He thought it could not be him but it was.

Marco finally responded to the calls of the hostage negotiator by sticking his head out of a window in the cafeteria. A stream of obscenities was the final words that Marco uttered. A police sniper's rifle round found its mark between Marco's eyes, ending the nightmare. Fifteen children died, seven were seriously wounded and three were slightly wounded. The school principal and three teachers also died as a result of gunshot wounds.

Subsequent follow-up by the Columbia County Sheriff's Office and the Coroner revealed that Marco had an illicit meth lab in the shed. Friends and acquaintances said that Marco had been on a meth "run" for at least eight days. He had not slept or eaten during this period. He was unable to get enough methamphetamine through the new dispensing procedures that were implemented after SB 11350 was passed. He resorted to making meth in a makeshift lab in the shed. He was also "ripping off" his drug friends by threatening or robbing them at gunpoint. Investigators discovered that Marco was injecting meth every two to three hours. Friends said that Marco had become more and more paranoid and he had even shot the family dog two nights before the massacre. The autopsy revealed a nearly lethal dose of methamphetamine in Marco's body. Bill Grimsley blamed it on the methamphetamine.

Methamphetamine was a drug that the Baxters knew nothing about until Marco Grimsley entered their lives. They saw with their own eyes how this drug had

perpetrated an unimaginable tragedy that they would never forget. They shared in the grief of the families of the children and teachers who were killed that day. They saw the Grimsley family harassed and literally run out of town. No one grieved for them. Fred and Betty aged twenty years in six months. According to their son, their health deteriorated and they were never the same. They felt responsible. They had both voted for a law that was terribly flawed. Fred also felt like a coward for not confronting Marco and Bill Grimsley before things got out of hand. He thought he could have prevented the tragedy. He was wrong but he could not be convinced otherwise.

Surprise Free Scenario

An article from the Columbia Daily News, April 23, 2007

"California's Failed Attempt at Methamphetamine Legalization To Face Emergency Legislation"

With the Roosevelt Elementary School serving as a backdrop, Sheriff Everett Baeman of Columbia County led a pro SB 182 rally, a bill that would repeal California's meth legalization law, last night in Heavenswood. Sheriff Baeman vowed after the school massacre perpetrated by meth addict Marco Grimsley, that law enforcement must take a leadership role in the repeal of SB 11350, the meth legalization law passed in November of 2006. Sheriff Baeman and other high-ranking law enforcement officials from throughout the state, as well as state and local politicians, spoke at the rally. Mary Landers, the assistant principal of Roosevelt Elementary, gave a stirring account of the tragedy that methamphetamine and Marco Grimsley brought to this quiet neighborhood school.

Fred and Betty Baxter, neighbors of the school and Marco Grimsley, also spoke of the tragedy and the trauma the incident brought to their lives. They also spoke of their naive support of SB 11350 and how they were now involved with the Columbia County committee to repeal the meth legalization law.

State Senator Barbara Flaxon, the author of SB 11350, took to the podium to a chorus of jeers. She surprised everyone when she spoke of the biggest personal and political mistake of her life – this law and how it has affected her. Senator Flaxon indicated that she has thrown her support to Senator Robert Hamilton of Orange County, the author of SB 182.

Edward Ferndale of the Sierra Club also promised his organization's support of the repeal legislation. Several publicized reports of toxic contamination of sensitive wildlife and fishery habitats from clandestine meth labs had brought this unlikely ally into the anti-meth legalization camp.

Dr. Robert Dunn, Columbia County's director of Health and Human Services, offered evidence of how funding and support for drug treatment had waned since the passage of SB 11350. Dr. Dunn felt the public saw meth legalization as the cure for drug abuse and addiction and that funding for treatment programs should not come from tax dollars.

Much of the success of getting SB 182 through the California legislature and on the ballot lies squarely in the hands of Sheriff Baeman. Columbia County is not the heavyweight county like Los Angeles and Orange counties in the south or Santa Clara and Alameda in North. But Baeman saw how his mid-sized county was affected by meth before SB 11350 and how it got worse after it was passed. Property crime shot

up, especially near meth clubs that sprang up to dispense the now legal drug. Illicit labs had moved from rural property along the coast to an almost complete infiltration of every neighborhood in the county. Legal disbursement did not seem to meet the demands of addicts and ever-present criminal opportunists took advantage. Gang wars flourished as rivals sought to take and keep territory.

Sheriff Baeman had spoken out early and often on the evils of legalizing meth. Ironically, Columbia County, one of the most liberal in the state, would be the location where fifteen students and three teachers would have to die to prove a point. Thus the impetus for reversing a law that many thought would end the war on drugs was resurrected on a battlefield, a playground, in Sheriff Baeman's county. He fought hard, he fought fair and he won. Leadership sometimes emerges from the least likely people and Sheriff Baeman was now viewed as an innovator in galvanizing law enforcement, citizens and diverse political interests. Both parties are courting Baeman for greater political office.

In this chapter, a futures study was presented that analyzed the issue statement. A Nominal Group Technique (NGT) panel was assembled to forecast the legalization of methamphetamine and how this would impact violent crime. The NGT process identified trends and events and their probability of occurrence. Then, a select group of law enforcement professionals used a cross impact analysis on the trends and events to forecast the impact future events would have on future trends.

The trends and events identified by the NGT panel provided background for three alternative scenarios. One of the scenarios was selected to develop a strategic plan. In

Chapter three, the strategic plan is developed. Three alternative plans are presented and one is selected as the preferred plan.

CHAPTER THREE

STRATEGIC PLAN

Introduction

A strategic plan was developed to influence the selected future scenario, which was the surprise free or normative scenario. The plan was designed to encourage the attainment of the forecasted scenario in five years for sheriff's office of Columbia County, California. Columbia County is a mid-size county, with an approximate population of 250,000. The Sheriff's Office has two hundred sworn members and one hundred civilian employees. The methamphetamine problem in Columbia County was growing before the passage of SB 11350 in November of 2006. The new law did not reduce associated crime, especially violent crime as proponents said it would, instead it increased it dramatically. The Columbia County Sheriff's Office and SB 11350 are fictional, but the attainment of the future scenario could be real.

Columbia County Sheriff Everett Baeman, referred to by the deputies as E-Bay, was raised in Columbia County, the son of a dairy rancher. He was fifty-eight years old, looked ten years younger and was a local through and through. He had a BS in animal science from U.C Davis, but he fell in love with police work and has never looked back.

Sheriff Baemann had his share of varied experiences with the Sheriff's Department but he always said his best memories came from the days he worked narcotics. After the passage of Proposition 36 in 2000, the sheriff preached to his command staff about the future of drug enforcement in California. He began forecasting then that the legalization of drugs was not far off, if no one did anything to counter the lies and deception of the legalization movement. The sheriff constantly worried about

the future. You had to in ranching or you would starve. The sheriff had learned a valuable lesson when he sat idly by as Propositions 215 and 36 were passed. When SB 11350 started to appear on the radar screen, he told his staff to prepare for change, which he defined as doing something better you already knew how to do. The old narc felt that enforcement would have to share with the treatment and education community, who were now partners in the war on drugs. But the sheriff knew that the legalization movement was empowered by their previous successes and they would not stop in their quest to end the drug war—thorough legalization. With the tragedy of Roosevelt Elementary providing the inspiration, Sheriff Baeman set out to change his organization and Columbia County to provide a model for all California counties that the drug war can be won without legalization.

Organizational Description

Columbia County's rural charm had changed over the years. The Bay Area's sprawl had forced many workers to commute further and further for affordable housing and less crime. Many came to Columbia and developers were quick to meet the high demand for housing. Freeways and roads were expanded, strip malls went in and the quality of life began to take a turn. Drugs, crime and violence surged in the late 1980s. Baeman was elected Sheriff in 1988 at the age of forty. He ran unopposed through four successive campaigns. He was fervently loyal to his department and its employees. He was respected and admired both within and outside law enforcement throughout the state. He was a visionary when it came to forecasting new trends and his innovative responses were legendary.

Sheriff Baeman constantly bullied and pushed his staff to be ahead of the curve. He preached that change would come from within and would not be precipitated by forces outside his organization. He required that success not be measured from the traditional statistical driven methods of the past, but on customer satisfaction, problems solved, innovation and an efficiency that others marveled at.

The sheriff fought hard to prevent the passage of SB11350. He suffered no illusions this time and he took an active role in Columbia and throughout the State getting the truth out on this dangerous legislation. He grieved when it passed. He predicted an event like the Marco Grimsley incident at Roosevelt Elementary but he never thought it would happen in Columbia. Sheriff Baeman wasted no time after the massacre. He ignited his staff to begin the process of developing internal as well as external strategies to confront SB 11350 and overturn this legislation. The Columbia County Sheriff's Office had always been at the forefront in preparing for the future. It took only a simple directive by the sheriff to get the machinery moving. The community was ready after Marco Grimsley's unconscionable act. All that was needed was leadership and direction and the Columbia County Sheriff's Office was going to deliver these ingredients.

The sheriff was, however, not without his detractors. Columbia County's liberals had always thought Baeman had grown too powerful and his conservative ways were a constant irritation. With drugs, the sheriff's enemies thought they might have found his Achilles' heel. A drug warrior whose old and tired methods would not work and they would do everything to undermine the Sheriff's efforts.

Situational Analysis

The Columbia County Sheriff's Office had to formulate a strategic plan. The plan had to do two things: convince local constituents to repeal SB 11350 and provide a model for local activism that other counties throughout California could use for the same purposes. Sheriff Baeman chose the "WOTS-UP" model to assess the readiness of the department to respond to the issue. WOTS-UP is an acronym that stands for Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats, and Strengths – Underlying Planning. Opportunities and threats are identified and viewed as external to the organization. They include identified trends and events. Strengths and weaknesses are also identified and they are viewed as internal to the organization's objectives.

Sheriff Baeman ran his monthly staff meetings like a focus group, forcing individuals to express diverse opinions and views through brainstorming and nominal group techniques. Convening a group to apply the WOTS-UP process to the repeal of SB 11350 was normal and customary with his style. The sheriff wanted the group to focus on local strategy that would unify stakeholders on the issue and deliver a message to the voting public. He also wanted to develop and implement a model that law enforcement agencies throughout California could use in their communities to repeal SB 11350 and prevent any future drug legalization initiatives from getting on the ballot.

The group identified the following internal weaknesses:

- The department lacked a drug enforcement strategy.
- The county drug task force and its various oversight bodies provided a cookie cutter drug enforcement strategy that did not work for all agencies.

- Community policing provided a wide variety of drug enforcement programs, which were not consistently applied to all patrol areas.
- Patrol deputies lacked training and education in drug enforcement and contemporary political issues.
- The public information officer was reactive rather than proactive in delivering the department's message on SB 11350 and drug legalization in general.
- The sheriff needed to utilize the "bully pulpit" of his position more to get the message out on the issue.
- The Deputy Sheriff's Association (DSA) had endorsed local politicians who were in favor of drug legalization.
- Political alliances on the issue were tenuous and ill defined.

The group identified the following external opportunities:

- Public opinion had shifted dramatically after the Marco Grimsley shooting.
- The public was turning to law enforcement for leadership on the issue.
- Politicians were seeking alliances and leadership as well.
- Sheriff Baeman had already garnered local and state attention on the issue.
- Pro-legalization groups had yet to articulate a rebuttal to the Marco Grimsley tragedy and the possibility of future similar events.
- A local grass roots group was forming around repeal legislation and they were getting attention in the county.
- The incumbent governor was being challenged from within his own party because of his pro-legalization stance.

- Federal legislation was proposed after the Grimsley case that would deny California federal funding if SB 11350 was not repealed.
- MADD-Mother's Against Drunk Driving, was forming an off shoot group called Mother's Against Drug Legalization.
- The teacher's union was demanding school security to prevent any future Marco Grimsley type incidents.
- The media was supporting the repeal of SB 11350 and the defeat of any future attempts at drug legalization.

The group identified the following external threats:

- The drug legalization movement was well funded and focused on its agenda.
- Many local and state politicians were elected on a pro SB 11350 and drug legalization platform.
- Public interest in the drug war was waning as treatment and education had shown success.
- Several district attorneys and sheriffs had to fend off recall movements because of their stand on anti-drug legalization.
- Vigilantism against drug users, dealers, and especially illicit methamphetamine lab cooks was increasing.
- Police professional organizations and lobbying groups lacked a comprehensive anti-drug legalization strategy.

The group identified the following internal strengths:

- The organization has experience in dealing with futures issues with innovative responses.

- The chief executive has already been recognized for his leadership on the issue.
- The organization is respected in the community.
- The culture of the organization is experienced and trained in transition and change.
- The organization has a healthy quid pro quo relationship with local and state politicians.
- The DSA has been politically active and also has developed healthy quid pro quo relationships with local politicians.
- Sheriff's Deputies are better-equipped and trained than local police officers and have greater respect in the community.
- The Sheriff's Department is on the verge of gaining two contract cities in Columbia County.
- Sheriff Baeman's political star is rising and both political parties are courting his favor.

Stakeholder Analysis

The identification of stakeholders and an analysis of their concerns and issues are important and critical to the strategic planning process. Stakeholders are defined as individuals or groups who are impacted by what law enforcement does or does not do and conversely they impact what law enforcement can and cannot do.

The following is a list of stakeholders that Sheriff Baeman's focus group identified. Assumptions that reflect each stakeholder's concern are identified.

1. The citizens of Columbia County
   - desire a peaceful crime free community
   - seek change in drug enforcement strategy
   - are outraged by the Marco Grimsley incident and are seeking leadership on the issue of repealing SB 11350

2. The Sheriff of Columbia County, Everett Baeman
   - is informed on the issue
   - is passionate on the repeal of SB 11350 and other drug legalization legislation
   - is a recognized law enforcement leader throughout the state
   - has political alliances on the issue
   - is also outraged by the Marco Grimsley incident

3. Local politicians
   - are firmly behind the sheriff on his plan for repeal of SB 11350
   - pressure is mounting for legislative response to the Marco Grimsley incident
   - need to appear strong on anti-drug measures, but open to innovative ideas

4. The media
   - now support anti-legalization and repeal efforts
   - continue to advocate for innovative ideas to deal with drugs, but do not want return to “drug war” approach
   - has given extensive coverage to the Marco Grimsley incident
   - far left media is against repeal of SB 11350 and still advocates legalization

5. County government
   - total support for the sheriff
   - has concern for the fiscal impact if new drug enforcement, education and treatment laws are passed
   - prior to the Grimsley incident, enjoyed revenue generated from legalized meth

6. The business community
   - feel legalization has increased crime and negatively affected business
   - supports sheriff and local drug enforcement efforts
   - legalization has decreased employee work productivity
   - medical insurance costs for drug treatment are increasing
   - several instances of workplace violence

7. The medical community
   - never advocated meth legalization
   - increase in addiction and abuse problems
   - costs escalating to treat addicted patients who have little or no medical insurance
   - support Sheriff’s inclusiveness on drug repeal issue
   - support treatment for drug abuse and research into genetic breakthrough

8. Education
   - school safety a major concern
   - legalization has sent the wrong message to children, the opposite of current curriculum
   - concern that funding may be diverted from education to deal with increase in crime from meth legalization

9. Criminal justice components: probation, parole, district attorney
   - resource concerns to deal with crime increase
   - political concerns for elected officials
   - concern that public may see criminal justice as ineffective in dealing with methamphetamine crime and attendant problems

10. Highway safety advocates
   - the CHP is concerned about an increase in motor vehicle accidents caused by driving under the influence of methamphetamine
   - MADD has same concerns
   - National Transportation Safety Board is threatening legal action and the withholding of federal gas tax funds if meth law is not repealed in California

11. Domestic violence advocacy groups
   - meth related spousal abuse rising
   - increase in child abuse and neglect due to meth addicted parents
   - lack of sympathy for addicts who are abused by others

Potential snaildarters were also identified by the panel. These are people or groups who may seem insignificant to the issue, but who can dramatically alter outcomes or policy development. Although the panel felt that pro-legalization proponents were dealt a severe blow by the Grimsley incident and the toxic contamination reports, they felt that they could not be ignored due to their well-financed and organized efforts. A second snaildarter was the local and state politicians who had been elected on a pro-legalization platform. This group was given the snaildarter label since it was uncertain if they would continue to support SB 11350 and thwart the repeal legislation.

Strategy Development

As part of the strategic plan, alternative strategies are developed to influence the desired future. Consideration was given to the organizational description, situational awareness and stakeholder analysis. The chosen strategy was selected to influence the occurrence of the selected forecast scenario.

Strategy #1

This strategy would be the same failed strategy that law enforcement implemented to block the passage of Propositions 215 and 36 and SB 11350. It amounts to essentially doing nothing, believing that these initiatives did not have enough public support. When polls predicted that these initiatives were gaining ground for approval, last ditch efforts were ineffective in swaying public opinion. The process of identifying strengths and weakness did not occur and stakeholders were not identified, or identified too late.

This non-strategy requires little or no effort on the part of law enforcement executives. The burden falls on higher-ranking state or national figures or professional organizations such as the California Narcotics Officer's Association (CNOA). Without support of and alliances with local stakeholders, pro-legalization groups can use ambiguous or deceptively worded propositions to confuse voters at the local level, without any presentation of opposing views. The alarming result of this strategy was clearly evident with the passage of Propositions 215 in 1996, 36 in 2000 and SB 11350 in 2006. A better strategy exists and follows as Strategy #3.

Strategy #2

This strategy is rooted in the drug warrior mentality. This strategy believes that the public will not support legislation or propositions legalizing drugs and that the war on drugs must essentially be continued, with drug treatment now getting some recognition. This strategy continued even after Propositions 215, 36 and SB 11350 were passed. In

this strategy, no plan is developed through the identification of strengths and weaknesses and only treatment stakeholders are identified and included. Other stakeholders are not identified and therefore not included. The obvious weakness to this strategy is that the opposition is well organized on the local level and can operate with impunity in delivering their slanted message. Again, law enforcement at the local level must take a leadership role. Many law enforcement executives' careers span all or part of the thirty-year existence of the drug war. Their mind-set has been formed by this strategy and they are reluctant to be innovative in new approaches to the war on drugs, even though they have been witnesses to the ever-increasing success of the drug legalization movement.

Strategy #3

This preferred strategy is rooted in the surprise free scenario. The horrors of methamphetamine abuse and addiction have been presented in this study, both in fact and fiction. Law enforcement executives should influence their organizations to be nimble and adaptive to change and able to quickly mobilize a local effort to counter and repeal legislation such as SB 11350. Through the situational analysis process and the identification of stakeholders, efforts to prevent initiatives of this nature or repeal laws that legalize drugs can be implemented. Columbia County had a unifying event, the tragic event at Roosevelt Elementary, which ignited a local grass roots movement to repeal methamphetamine legalization. Law enforcement must not assume that drug legalization will not happen. The best strategy to prevent the legalization of methamphetamine would have been to stop it before it happened. In the case of this study, methamphetamine was legalized. Therefore, Columbia County S.O. had to

develop new strategies, identify stakeholders, promote alliances and be prepared to influence the future.

Implementation Plan

An implementation plan was devised for the preferred strategy (number 3). The plan would be implemented following the steps below:

1. The law enforcement organization identifies potential stakeholders through an internal focus group
2. A stakeholder committee is formed and lead by a law enforcement representative
3. The committee formulates strategy that will impact the issue – the repeal of SB 11350 and the prevention of future pro-legalization measures
4. Timetables, objectives and goals are set for stakeholders
5. Stakeholders deliver the strategy to their respective constituencies
6. Periodic stakeholder meetings are held to report on efforts and to discuss new strategies
7. New stakeholders are identified and apprised of strategy
8. Polls, surveys and other feedback methods are monitored to gage public opinion and the results of efforts

Stakeholder Committee

The stakeholder committee would consist of the sheriff or police chief in an ex-officio, but active role, local politicians, the media, the medical community, business groups or individuals, education, criminal justice components and other interested and represented groups.

A ranking member of the law enforcement organization would chair the committee with additional representation from other local law enforcement agencies. Law enforcement would select the committee members.

The committee would develop and fine tune the strategy needed to impact the issue of repealing SB 11350 and prevention of future drug legalization initiatives or legislation. This can be done using focus group techniques. Goals, objectives and timetables would be set. Communication and reporting methods would be established to ensure that all efforts remain on point. New strategies would be discussed and implemented.

Committee members would be encouraged to develop sub-committees within their stakeholder areas to ensure that the entire community is presented with facts and rebuttal evidence on methamphetamine. The politics of the issue would be closely monitored and poll results would be used as a tool in the process.

Implementation and follow through of this plan would have a significant and highly probable chance of successfully defeating any referendum or legislation promoting the legalization of methamphetamine.

Cost Analysis

The monetary cost of implementation of this strategic plan should be minimal or non-existent. Law enforcement contribution would be in addition to normal duties and would fit with current community policing formats. Command staffs of law enforcement agencies are generally salaried and therefore exempt from overtime. Non-staff level employees who contribute as a committee member or participant in strategy

implementation might incur overtime costs, but this could be overcome with flexible or alternative scheduling.

The legalization of methamphetamine already has increased costs for law enforcement. Property and violent crime is up and the public is demanding more service and special enforcement efforts, necessitating overtime. Calls for service are also up for domestic disturbances and neighborhood disputes. Meth is a contributing cause in these cases. Environmental costs are increasing from clandestine lab investigations and the illegal dumping of illicit lab chemicals in creeks, streams and rural property. The courts, jails and probation have incurred significant cost increases, all attributed to the legalization of meth. Social service agencies are incurring increased costs as a direct result of the increased use of meth since legalization.

The Columbia County Sheriff's Office formulated a strategic plan. The plan had two goals: convince Columbia County constituents that SB 11350 must be repealed and second, to provide a model for all California counties to obtain the same results. Sheriff Baeman chose the WOTS-UP model to assess his organization, to identify stakeholders and to also identify snaildarters. Three alternative strategies were developed and one was chosen to influence the selected scenario. An eight-step process described the implementation plan. Chapter three will describe the transition of the plan from the present to the desired future state.

CHAPTER FOUR

TRANSITION MANAGEMENT

Introduction

A transition management plan is critical and therefore one was developed to implement the strategic plan designed for the fictional Columbia County Sheriff's Office. The plan's purpose is to move the organization from the present state to the desired future state. Columbia County S.O. needs to move and lead the county through a political process repealing SB 11350, the meth legalization legislation. The department also needs to reinforce the public's knowledge of the Marco Grimsley incident into a long lasting negative opinion of drug legalization.

Three methods were used in the transition management plan.

1. A commitment plan to identify critical mass stakeholders
2. A management structure to manage the transition
3. Transition techniques to support the plan

Commitment Plan

Critical mass assessment identifies those key individuals who, without their support, meaningful change is difficult, if not impossible to accomplish. These individuals provide the talent, respect, energy, charisma and inertia that provide the building blocks for change. The critical mass individuals were selected from the stakeholders identified in the strategic plan. The critical mass individuals were:

1. Columbia County Sheriff Everett Baeman
2. The Chairperson of the County Board of Supervisors

3. The Chairman of the Columbia County Council of Mayors and City Councilmen
4. The County Superintendent of Schools
5. The County Health Director
6. The State Senator for Columbia County
7. A local community activist against the legalization of methamphetamine

It is important to identify the current level of commitment of critical mass stakeholders. This was determined and charted on a critical mass assessment table. Table 4 reflects this assessment and indicates the commitment to change and the shifts in commitment necessary to achieve the strategic plan.

Table 4
Critical Mass Commitment

Critical Members Mass	Block the Change	Let Change Happen	Help Change Happen	Make Change Happen
Sheriff			**X->**	**O**
Chairman BOS		**X->**		**O**
Chairman CCCMC		**X->**		**O**
Super. Of Schools		**X->**		**O**
Health Director	**X->**		**O**	
State Senator			**X->**	**O**
Community Activist			**X->**	**O**

In Table 4, **X** equals the current position and **O** equals the desired position.

The Sheriff

The sheriff would deliver the support of his organization, as well as the power and prestige of his office. He would also have influence over police chiefs and criminal justice agencies within Columbia County. He would also bring support from the California State Sheriffs' Association and other law enforcement professional organizations. Sheriff Baeman has been at the forefront of this issue and has garnered local and statewide attention. The sheriff must provide internal and external leadership, direction and logistical support. He must move from helping the change to happen to making it happen.

Chairman of the Board of Supervisors

The chairman would influence the rest of the board and deliver their unified support for the plan. With the county being an extension of state government, the chairman would influence state agencies and politicians as well. He would seek to influence local politicians and administrators and various constituencies who have a regular and quid pro quo relationship with county government. The chairman would also influence the board to provide fiscal support in the county's effort to educate the electorate on the issue of legalization of methamphetamine, countering proponents with debates advertising and campaign literature. This critical mass member would need to move from the let change happen area to making change happen.

Chairman of the Columbia County Council of Mayors and City Councilmen

This chairman, like the chairman of the Board of Supervisors, would seek unity among his peers on the issue and the plan. He would seek to influence all voters in the county vicariously through the smallest political sub-divisions of the county. He would

ensure that the strategy of information dissemination was consistent and comprehensive. He/she would also seek fiscal support through the cities for funding to support campaign advertising and the like. This member would also need to move from let change happen to making it happen.

Superintendent of Public Schools

The superintendent would use her office to educate the parents and students of the county on the repeal and future anti-legalization message. The various parent groups and affiliations could be tapped for fund raising, campaigning and political advertising. The superintendent's influence would be substantial in light of the Marco Grimsley incident occurring on district school grounds. The superintendent must shift from letting this change happen to making the change happen.

The County Health Director

The director favored Proposition 215, the use of medicinal marijuana. He had in the past resisted alliances with law enforcement but he now saw a need for an alliance to repeal SB 11350 and to counter any future drug legalization efforts. As a physician, he could not see any tangible evidence that methamphetamine had any medicinal value. His position, like many in the treatment community, was addiction can be treated and should not be abandoned by legalizing drugs. The health director would need to move from blocking change to helping change happen for the plan to succeed.

State Senator

The State Senator representing Columbia County would be an essential player on the critical mass team. She would most likely have long standing personal, business and political ties to the county. The senator would represent the county in Sacramento

and would seek alliances with other state senators and assemblymen on the issue and implementation of the plan. The senator would be a source of state fiscal support and would also have access to business and special interests that could provide additional fiscal resources. The senator would need to move from helping the change to happen to making it happen.

Community Activist

Community activists bring a passion and zeal that many others cannot or will not bring to an issue. They are generally unguarded and, therefore, uninterested in whether they offend people, especially those opposing their views. For these reasons, an activist is an essential component of the critical mass team. She will raise interest in the issue and will be a galvanizing force in obtaining alliances from diverse groups. The community activist must make this change happen, moving from helping change happen.

Management Structure

In the strategic plan, eight steps were outlined for the implementation of the plan. They were:

1. The law enforcement organization identifies potential stakeholders through an internal focus group
2. A stakeholder committee is formed and led by a law enforcement representative
3. The committee formulates strategy that will impact the issue – the repeal of SB 11350, the law legalizing methamphetamine
4. Timetables, objectives and goals are set for stakeholders
5. Stakeholders deliver the strategy to their respective constituencies

6. Periodic stakeholder meetings are held to report on efforts and to discuss new strategies

7. New stakeholders are identified and apprised of strategy

8. Polls, surveys and other feedback methods are monitored to gauge public opinion and results of efforts

The initial step would require the selection of a project manager and two additional members of the sheriff's command staff. The project manager should be a recognized leader in the department and he or she should have superior communication and problem-solving skills. Through brainstorming, the project manager and two other members should produce a candidate list of stakeholders. This ad hoc group would remain as the management structure for transition management.

The list would be presented to the sheriff and pared down to between ten and fifteen members. The stakeholder candidates would be invited to a meeting and presented with the issue and the sheriff's plan. The candidates would be polled on their acceptance and commitment to implementing the plan. Those who could not commit would be eliminated from the committee.

The committee would formulate overall strategies on how best to implement the plan within Columbia County. Stakeholders would be encouraged to modify the strategy to fit their constituency base, as long as confusion did not result. Benchmarks would be set and periodic meetings would be held for accountability and verification of efforts. Flexibility would be built into the plan to allow for strategy changes or alterations if needed. This process might identify new stakeholders that may have to be added to the committee.

Polls and surveys would be commissioned to monitor public opinion. Feedback would validate, or not, if the message is getting to the public and is being understood and having the desired effect – swaying opinion.

The transition management structure would report regularly to the sheriff. The management structure would utilize the sheriff appropriately, along with other high profile stakeholders, for presentations to groups and media events that would garner print or television coverage.

The importance of maintaining the management structure during implementation of the plan is vitally important. This will ensure that stakeholders are held accountable and that the committee is supported with leadership and direction.

If SB 11350 is repealed, this same stakeholder group could provide the transition management team with direction in formulating new strategies and a plan to deal with post repeal community input on enforcement efforts and other public safety issues relative to the re-criminalization of methamphetamine.

Transition Techniques

An important step in transition management is identifying and clarifying roles, setting and achieving goals, establishing accountability and completing tasks. Responsibility charting is a method that depicts tasks and activities related to the strategic policy. These actors or participants are compared against the tasks to be performed. A rating of responsibility, approval, support and informing or consulting is applied to each actor illustrating their responsibility for that task.

Table 5

Responsibility Chart

Actors								
Sheriff	A	R	A	A	R	R	R	S
Chair of BOS	S	S	A	A	R	S	R	S
Chair CCCMC	S	S	A	A	R	S	R	S
Super. Schools	S	S	A	A	R	S	R	S
Health Director	S	S	A	A	R	S	R	S
State Senator	S	S	A	A	R	S	R	S
Comm. activist	S	S	A	A	R	S	R	S
Tasks	Identification of stakeholders	Formulation of stakeholder committee	Committee formulates strategy	Goals and objectives set	Stakeholders disseminate strategy	Committee mtgs. for reports	New stakeholders identified	Polls and survey

Key

R = Responsibility
A = Approval
S = Support (put resources toward)
I = Inform (to be consulted)

A transition management plan has been presented that implements the Columbia County Sheriff's Office's strategic plan for overturning SB 11350, the law that legalized methamphetamine. Critical mass stakeholders were identified. The level of commitment for these stakeholders was charted to illustrate the movement the critical mass stakeholders would have to make to make the transition occur. Finally, a responsibility chart showed what each stakeholder must do to contribute to a successful transition.

Evaluation Activities

A simple evaluation of the issue would be the successful repeal of SB 11350 and the consistent disapproval by voters of any future drug propositions or legislation. Sheriff Baeman and the Columbia County Sheriff's Office provided a model for a partnership between law enforcement and local stakeholders to work together to repeal a law. Use of this model in other counties would validate the process.

Additional measures would consist of environmental scanning for future trends and events that might be a predictor of efforts to place drug legalization initiatives on the ballot. Implementation of strategies and rekindling of the stakeholder group could be done in anticipation of these events thwarting petition drives and preventing a drug legalization proposition from even qualifying for the ballot.

.

Chapter Five

CONCLUSION

Project Summary

When the title of this study was given to friends, peers and especially NGT panelists, the response was a moment of silence, a furrowed brow and a response indicating it would never happen, not with meth. A question was posed to these naysayers. Did you ever think that marijuana would be legalized for medicinal purposes or that possession of hard drugs would send the defendant to treatment rather than jail? The unanimous response was, no, they thought it would never go that far. Further discussion of these and other trends caused the naysayers to reconsider their initial response that meth would never be legalized. They saw the possibility and it frightened them.

In the introduction, some of the more significant trends and events were presented from environmental and literature scanning. This provided a historical perspective for a foundation of how the study question could even be raised. Through the futures study, the Nominal Group Technique provided future trends and events to consider, and the impact of these trends and events on the issue was analyzed and charted. The NGT and cross impact analysis became the ingredients for three scenarios, all of which looked at the impact the legalization of methamphetamine would have in the future.

Two of the future scenarios provided a backdrop of events surrounding the fictional Columbia County Sheriff's Office and its sheriff. The preferred scenario selected for strategic planning and implementation featured Sheriff Baeman, a

respected and innovative leader, and how he took it upon himself to get bad law repealed.

Recommendations for the Future

Law enforcement's role in drug enforcement is changing. It must now share the stage with treatment and education. In California, we have seen the legalization advocates use medical and treatment arguments as a subterfuge to effectively gain a foothold on the quest to legalize all drugs. We must acknowledge and realize that since we are sharing the stage, that funding for enforcement could be cut. But rather than resist, we should seek partnerships that are real and effective. We must not continue to hold onto the values that we, the drug warriors, are the only effective weapons against the war on drugs. Our duty is to resist legalization as did Sheriff Baeman.

Implications for leadership

With the passage of Proposition 215 in 1996 and Proposition 36 in 2000, the need for strong effective leadership for drug enforcement in California has never been greater. The legalization camp is empowered by its success and millions of dollars are available for future attempts to chip away at legalization. California's bellwether position on this issue makes this state a fertile ground for many battles. Law enforcement leaders cannot sit back and believe that poorly crafted propositions, that presumably no one would vote for, are good cause to do little or nothing to fight back against drug legalization. Hopefully, a valuable lesson has been learned from the passage of Propositions 215 and 36.

Conclusion

It is easy to say today that methamphetamine will not be legalized in five years. It is a drug with a dangerous pharmacology. It is known to provoke violence in abusers and addicts and the human suffering it causes is well documented. So how could it be legalized? Five years ago, in1996, did we think that Proposition 215 had a chance of approval? The voters approved this proposition and it laid the groundwork for Proposition 36. Has Proposition 36 laid the foundation for SB 11350?

If methamphetamine is legalized or any other dangerous drug, law enforcement must be prepared to confront these potential future issues with foresight and planning. "How will the legalization of methamphetamine impact a mid-sized law enforcement agency by the year 2006?" Through the perspectives of the Baxters, Marco Grimsley and Sheriff Baeman, Columbia County, California was confronted with an act of violence beyond comprehension. Columbia County, like the rest of California, had supported the legalization of methamphetamine to reduce abuse and related crime. Instead, the legalization of methamphetamine was a colossal mistake.

Methamphetamine should never be legalized. Law enforcement should be aware, though, that in the future an initiative could be brought before the voters of California seeking legalization. With Propositions 215 and 36 signaling a trend that the legalization of hard drugs is the goal or many people in this state, we in law enforcement must be prepared to prevent legalization and to fight back as Sheriff Baeman did.

As Edmund Burke said over two hundred years ago, "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing."[26]

Appendix A

Nominal Group Technique Panel

Ms. Carole Alkabes	A recovering methamphetamine addict
Mr. Dale Attarian	Police Lieutenant City of San Leandro Command College Classmate
Mr. Tom Boyd	Police Captain, City of San Rafael Command College Graduate and Mentor
Ms. Judith Brown	Deputy District Attorney, Marin County District Attorney's Office
Mr. Robert Elsberg	Senior Special Agent-in-Charge, California Department of Justice, Bureau of Narcotic Enforcement
Mr. Ron Frazier	Lieutenant, City of Walnut Creek Command College Classmate
Dr. Ralph Lamson, PhD.	Director of Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Kaiser Hospital, San Rafael
Ms. Sherry Mackey	Citizen of Marin County and Parent of Methamphetamine abuser
Mr. Joe Mazza	Director, Marin County Alcohol and Drug Programs
Ms. Theresa Torrence-Tillman	Deputy Probation Officer, Marin County Probation Department
Mr. David Vogelstein	Criminal Defense Attorney, Marin County

Appendix B

List of Trends

1. Meth contributes to road rage
2. **Level of funding for law enforcement**
3. Immigration and migration to and from the U.S. and spreading throughout the country
4. Change in rate of meth treatment / hospitalization
5. Change in public education approach
6. Law enforcement focus on specific drug issues
7. General population using meth for without loss / stimulation
8. War on drugs is failing
9. **Proliferation of drug culture messages to America's youth**
10. Attitudes towards individual responsibility and accountability
11. Promotion of harm reduction strategies, needle exchanges, etc.
12. **Amount of environmental pollution from illicit methamphetamine labs**
13. **Level of parental involvement**
14. **Level of priority on treatment**
15. **Number of methamphetamine users**
16. Violent crime trends still seen with legalization because of the desire for a adrenaline rush
17. **Availability of methamphetamine could create greater demand**
18. Genetic engineering to minimize dependent personality
19. Changes in diagnosing capabilities, early intervention, legitimate medical applications
20. **Public support of treatment programs**
21. Simplify attributions about addictions, no "silver bullets"
22. **Influence of the Internet on youth**
23. Bias affects our budgets
24. Impact of politics on the issue

Note: Phrases in bold indicate the events that the panel felt would have the most impact in the issue.

Appendix C

List of Events

1. **Single traumatic criminal event, suspect under the influence**
2. Passing of Proposition 36
3. Current power crisis
4. Explosion of clandestine laboratory
5. Election of Vincente Fox in Mexico
6. Failure of Proposition 36 implementation
7. **Medical applications discovered for meth**
8. Passage of Proposition 215
9. **Published report indicating success of legalization**
10. Disease specifically attributed to meth
11. Development of new and similar analog drugs like ecstasy
12. Election of George W. Bush
13. President of U.S. advocates decriminalization
14. Movies like “traffic”
15. **Law passed assessing taxation for the legal sales of methamphetamine as a revenue source**
16. **A school based incident where a large number of children overdose on methamphetamine**
17. **Passage of legislation providing long mandatory prison sentences for large illicit manufactures or distributors of methamphetamine**
18. Major natural disaster taking resources away from law enforcement
19. Mandatory psychological testing for conviction of meth user
20. Demand reduction caused by price increase
21. **Technology alternative to drug use such as virtual reality that provides the same pleasure and euphoria as methamphetamine**
22. Legalization by referendum
23. Health care plans that cover the cost of prescribed meth
24. **Contamination of water source by an illicit methamphetamine laboratory**
25. **Medical discovery that blocks methamphetamine addiction or genetic engineering that prevents addiction**

Note: Phrases in bold indicate the trends that the panel felt would have the most impact in the issue.

Endnotes

[1] Dan Baum, Smoke and Mirrors: The War on Drugs and the Politics of Failure, (New York: Little, Brown and Company, 1996, Back Bay Books, 1997) Introduction

[2] Ibid., 62

[3] Ibid., 68

[4] Mike Gray, Drug Crazy: How We Got Into This Mess and How Can We Get Out, (New York: Random House Inc., 1998, Routledge, 2000) 98

[5] Ibid., 100

[7] Ibid., 112

[8] Dan Baum, Smoke and Mirrors: The War on Drugs and the Politics of Failure, (New York: Little, Brown and Company, 1996, Back Bay Books, 1997) viii

[9] Ibid., 334

[10] " Medical Use of Marijuana. Initiative Statute" University of California Hastings College of the Law. 1996. Internet. http://holmes.uchastings.edu/cgi-bin/starfinder/28662/calprop.txt. Accessed March 28, 2001

[11] California Voters Guide, (Sacramento 2000)22

[12] Jeffery A. Schaler, Drugs: Should We Legalize or Deregulate? ed. Milton Freidman, *There's No Justice In The War On Drugs* (New York: Prometheus Books, 1998) 209

[13] Jeffery A. Schaler, Drugs: Should We Legalize or Deregulate? ed. (New York: Prometheus Books, 1998) 12

[14] Ibid., *Drugs as Property: The Right We Rejected,* Thomas S. Szasz, 182

[15] "Methamphetamine", United States Department of Justice, Drug Enforcement Administration, Internet. <http://www.DEA.gov> Accessed April 4, 2001

[16] "A Madness Called Meth", The Modesto Bee (October 8, 2000)

[17] "CRUSH HOUR", The San Diego Union-Tribune (May 18, 1995)

[18] "Methamphetamine." United States Department of Justice, Federal Advisory Committee, Interagency Task Force Final Report", January 2000. Internet. <http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/180155.pdf>.

[19] Carter, Lori. "RP Police Justified in Shooting D.A. Clears Officers In Death of Man Who Shot At Them Near Mobile Home Park", The Press Democrat. December 16, 2000. Internet. <http://www.pressdemocrat.com> Accessed March 26, 2001

[20] "Meth Off the Street",. March 16, 1998. Internet. <http://www.pressdemocrat.com> Accessed March 26, 2001

[21] Geniella, Mike. "Meth Becoming Bane of N. Coast Popular Drug Linked to Violent Crime", March 16, 1998.The Press Democrat. Internet. <http://www.pressdemocrat.com> Accessed March 26, 2001

[22] Wang, Ucilla. "Jury Says Elderly Woman's Killer Deserves to Die", October 27, 2000. The Press Democrat. Internet. <http://www.pressdemocrat.com> Accessed March 26, 2001

[23] Mason, Clark. "Elderly Widow's Killer Get Life Term". October 21, 1998. The Press Democrat. Internet. <http://www.pressdemocrat.com> Accessed March 26, 2001

[24] Mason, Clark. "30-year to Life Sentence For Chase Death". May 18,2000. The Press Democrat. Internet. <http://www.pressdemocrat.com> Accessed March 26, 2001

[25] "Tweaking and Safety." California Department of Justice. Internet. <www.stopdrugs.org> Accessed April 3, 2001

[26] Famous Quotations eQuotes Service. <http://www.famous-quotations.com> Accessed April 1, 2001

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A Madness Called Meth." The Modesto Bee. October 8, 2000. Special section.

Baum, Don. Smoke and Mirrors: The War on Drugs and the Politics of Failure. New York: Little Brown and Company, 1996, Back Bay Books, 1997.

Carter, Lori. "RP Police Justified in Shooting D.A. Clears Officers In Death of Man Who Shot At Them Near Mobile Home Park", The Press Democrat. December 16, 2000. Internet. <http://www.pressdemocrat.com> Accessed March 26, 2001

California Voters Guide (Sacramento 2000) 22

"CRUSH HOUR", The San Diego Union-Tribune (May 18, 1995)

Famous Quotations eQuotes Service. <http://www.famous-quotations.com> Accessed April 1, 2001

Geniella, Mike. "Meth Becoming Bane of N. Coast Popular Drug Linked to Violent Crime", March 16, 1998.The Press Democrat. Internet. <http://www.pressdemocrat.com> Accessed March 26, 2001

Gray Mike. Drug Crazy: How We Got Into This Mess and How Can We Get Out. New York: Random House Inc., 1998, Routledge, 2000

Mason, Clark. "Elderly Widow's Killer Get Life Term". October 21, 1998. The Press Democrat. Internet. <http://www.pressdemocrat.com> Accessed March 26, 2001

Mason, Clark. "30-year to Life Sentence For Chase Death". May 18,2000. The Press Democrat. Internet. <http://www.pressdemocrat.com> Accessed March 26, 2001

" Medical Use of Marijuana. Initiative Statute" University of California Hastings College of the Law. 1996. Internet. <http://holmes.uchastings.edu/cgi-bin/starfinder/28662/calprop.txt> Accessed March 28, 2001

"Meth Off the Street",. March 16, 1998. Internet. <http://www.pressdemocrat.com> Accessed March 26, 2001

"Methamphetamine", United States Department of Justice, Drug Enforcement Administration. Internet. <http://www.DEA.gov> Accessed April 4, 2001

"Methamphetamine." United States Department of Justice, Federal Advisory Committee, Interagency Task Force Final Report", January 2000. Internet. <http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/180155.pdf>.

Schaler, Jeffery A. Drugs: Should We Legalize or Deregulate? ed. New York: Prometheus Books, 1998 12.

"Tweaking and Safety." California Department of Justice. Internet, <http://www.stopdrugs.org/methcrisis.html>. Accessed April 10, 2001.

Wang, Ucilla. "Jury Says Elderly Woman's Killer Deserves to Die", October 27, 2000. The Press Democrat. Internet. <http://www.pressdemocrat.com> Accessed March 26, 2001