

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

Olympia, Washington

May 10, 2011

Request for Use of Asset Forfeiture Funds

**CITY MANAGER'S
RECOMMENDATION:**

Recommend to the full Council the expenditure of \$109,032 from the Asset Forfeiture Fund for one-time expense for law enforcement equipment.

STAFF CONTACT:

Ronnie Roberts, Chief of Police (753-8409)
rroberts@ci.olympia.wa.us
Dick Machlan, Police Administrative Services Manager (753-8006)
dmachlan@ci.olympia.wa.us

ORIGINATED BY:

Ronnie Roberts, Chief of Police

**PRESENTERS AND
OTHERS NOTIFIED:**

N/A

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 1: Cost detail on the proposed projects

BUDGET IMPACT/

\$109,032 from the Asset Forfeiture Fund. The current Fund balance available is \$180,016.

SOURCE OF FUNDS:

Asset Forfeiture Fund.

**PRIOR COUNCIL/
COMMITTEE REVIEW:**

Finance Committee (2002)

BACKGROUND:

The Olympia Police Department completed a large asset forfeiture process in late 2001, following criminal convictions in a homicide case. The net proceeds, \$369,247, were placed in the *Special Accounts Control Fund, Seizure and Forfeiture Account* ("Asset Forfeiture Fund"). By statute, money seized and/or forfeited as a result of criminal behavior must be used "exclusively for the expansion and improvement of law enforcement activities," and the funds may not be used to supplant pre-existing funding sources (RCW 10.105.010).

When the Asset Forfeiture Fund was established in 2002, Council determined that the primary purposes for its use were to invest in employees by providing them with special training and educational opportunities and to fund one-time expenditures for equipment.

Following the process established in 2002, the Finance (Budget) Committee does a paper review of requested uses of the fund and forwards the request on to the full Council with a recommendation.

ANALYSIS AND OPTIONS:

This year, the Department is seeking to utilize the Asset Fund to address some important equipment needs, as follows:

1. In-car video: In 2008, the Council committed to a long-term goal of equipping all of OPD's patrol vehicles with in-car video technology. The Department has already used \$42,477 in Justice Assistance Grant money to get started toward meeting that goal. Grant funds have paid for four mobile video units; the infrastructure needed to transmit data from patrol cars to the station; and the technology needed to store, review and prepare video evidence for court. The current infrastructure and in-station technology is designed to handle up to 10 mobile units, but it is expandable. The Department is asking to use money from the Asset Fund to add five additional mobile units - making it so the equipment would be available in a total of nine patrol vehicles.

Cost: \$30,403

2. Evidence room: The evidence room in the new City Hall is a well-designed, state-of-the-art location. However, equipment that helps to organize shelves and facilitate location of property was not included in the City Hall construction. Having bins designed to fit the shelving will help keep track of property in the Department's custody. Having the proper equipment for accessing high shelves will help avoid employee injury. The Department is asking to use money from the Asset Fund to purchase the equipment and supplies needed to make the Evidence function more productive.

Cost: \$8,650

3. SECTOR: OPD has started using the State's new electronic ticketing and accident reporting technology (SECTOR). The Department has provided all of the electronics necessary to use SECTOR using a grant from the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC). However, the WASPC grant will not pay for the equipment it takes to mount the electronics in our patrol cars, and it will not pay for mobile technology to purchase equipment for our traffic motorcycles. The Department is asking to use money from the Asset Fund to purchase the mounting equipment for our patrol cars and the computer hardware needed to equip our two traffic-enforcement motorcycles.

Cost: \$15,374

4. Crime scene investigation: OPD recently sent one of its detectives to a state-of-the-art crime scene investigation school. The training was provided at no cost to the City. Based on what was learned from the school, OPD is looking to equip its mobile crime scene investigation vehicle in a manner that supports contemporary investigative methods. The Department is asking to use money from the Asset Fund for that purpose.

Cost: \$28,225

5. Firearms: The Department's handguns must be replaced periodically in order to maintain certification from the manufacturer. Manufacturer certification is critical to both officer safety and to maintaining acceptable risk management standards. Handguns are on a regular replacement schedule that normally is funded through the General Fund. Because of the need for frugality in the tight economy, regular handgun replacement was not included in the Department's 2011 operating budget. The Department has an opportunity to take advantage of a special exchange program that will replace all of our duty weapons at no cost to us. The only expense we will incur is the cost of replacing holsters and accessories for the new handguns. The Department is asking to use the Asset Fund to make it possible to do the full handgun replacement this year to take advantage of the special pricing that is being made available.

Cost: \$10,701

6. RMS Server: In order to run the new police records management system (RMS) software on the City's computer network and maintain the security standards required by the FBI and the City, the City's IT Department needs to purchase a server that will allow isolation of the RMS network from the City's main network while making it so police employees can have access both networks on the same PCs.

Cost: \$15,679

This item is a written report only. No discussion is required unless there is a specific issue with the proposed use.

Option 1:

Recommend to the full Council the expenditure of \$109,032 from the Asset Forfeiture Fund for one-time expense for law enforcement equipment.

Implications

1. Addresses some critical equipment needs.
2. Takes advantage of favorable pricing on handgun replacement.

Option 2:

Elect not to recommend the expenditure of Asset Forfeiture Fund monies for this purpose.

Implications:

1. Preserves the money in the Asset Forfeiture Fund.
 2. Leaves some critical equipment needs unfilled.
 3. Misses an opportunity for savings on handgun replacement.
-