POLICE BODY WORN CAMERAS (BWCs)

Background, Issues and Funding Options

The Wichita Police Department (WPD) plans to outfit all patrol officers with a body worn camera (BWC) by December 31, 2015. The BWC can enhance transparency and accountability, both by police officers and citizens. In addition, BWCs can reduce use of force incidents, complaints of officer misconduct, and liability claims. BWC footage may also be a useful tool in collecting video evidence at crime scenes. However, the use of BWCs creates challenges. There are privacy issues for both officers and citizens. In addition, managing the video produced by BWCs can be a significant logistical and financial challenge.

This report reviews recent law enforcement trends regarding BWCs. Issues are examined, specifically from three cities that have piloted and evaluated BWC programs (Rialto, CA; Mesa, AZ; and Phoenix, AZ). Expected outcomes from a BWC strategy (as related to the City of Wichita) are discussed, as are the costs and potential financing options for BWC implementation by the WPD. Finally, the report concludes with potential implementation issues for the WPD, as well as funding recommendations for an expanded BWC program.

What is a BWC? - A police body worn camera (BWC) is a device that is worn on the body and records interactions between police and the public to increase officer and citizen accountability.[1] Multiple varieties of devices are available on the market, including those that are clipped on clothing, an ear piece, or glasses. Although significant, upfront costs tend to be a smaller barrier to establishing a BWC program. A much more significant financial consideration for any BWC program is the recurring costs to maintain and replace BWC equipment and (most significantly) the cost to store, access and manage the enormous amount of video that will be generated.

BWC Issues and Trends in Law Enforcement - Other law enforcement agencies already use BWC systems and have pilot programs to review their merits.[2,3] Since 2012, three cities (Rialto, CA; Mesa, AZ; and Phoenix, AZ) have piloted BWCs and have conducted studies on the effectiveness of the BWC strategy. In 2013, Federal Judge Shira Scheindlin recommended the use of BWCs in her ruling that declared New York's stop-and-frisk policy unconstitutional.[4] However, groups such as the American Civil Liberties Union have begun voicing privacy concerns related to BWCs.[5]

Other Cities with BWC Systems
Mesa, AZ
Phoenix, AZ
Rialto, CA
Albuquerque, NM
San Diego, CA
New York, NY
Washington, D.C.

More recently, two cities (San Diego, CA and Albuquerque, NM) began steps toward full implementation of BWCs. On June 10, 2014, the San Diego City Council approved a contract with TASER International, Inc., for the purchase of up to 1,000 BWCs, as well as related accessories and ongoing program support. The total cost of the multi-year contract was $3,937,247.[6,7]

Albuquerque, as part of a settlement agreement with the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), is now required to outfit all officers with a BWC. The settlement was approved by the Albuquerque City Council on November 6, 2014.[8] Previously, the Albuquerque Police Department had piloted BWCs.

BWC Issues and Studies - The number of empirical studies on the impact of BWCs is somewhat limited. A US Department of Justice (DOJ) report entitled "Police Officer Body Worn Cameras – Assessing the Evidence" identified three studies in the US as of September 2013. These include studies by Rialto, CA; Mesa, AZ; and Phoenix, AZ. The DOJ report identified "perceived benefits" and "perceived concerns." The perceived benefits include enhanced transparency, and improved behavior by both citizens and officers. Perceived concerns include privacy issues (for both officers and citizens), significant investments in policy development and training, and the substantial commitment of resources and logistics. The DOJ report did not offer empirical findings, but noted BWCs "hold great promise as a training tool," while stating that independent research on BWCs is "urgently needed." The report recommended that departments interested in BWC technology should "proceed cautiously."[9,10]

In 2013, the City of Rialto, CA conducted a randomized study that found BWCs reduced citizen complaints and use of force events by 59% and 87.5%, respectively.[11] This was one of the first empirical studies documenting the benefits of BWCs. However, the Rialto study is complicated by two factors. The Rialto Police Department is relatively small (111 officers) and the department had a significant number of pre-existing "issues," including a very high per capita number of officer misconduct complaints.[12]

The City of Mesa, AZ conducted a study of 50 BWCs from October 1, 2012 to September 30, 2013. Most of the study focused on the challenges and importance of properly cataloguing and storing videos for efficient retrieval. The study found a 40% decrease in complaints and a 75% decrease in use of force complaints, although the sample size was again very small.[13]

Phoenix, Arizona piloted BWCs to enhance transparency with the community and determine the value of BWCs in clearing crimes, primarily domestic violence. The Phoenix pilot program is probably the best documented pilot in the US, although Phoenix's results are still not definitive. The Phoenix Police Department (PPD) partnered with Dr. Charles Katz, of Arizona State University, to study the impact of BWCs. The PPD spent one year developing a scope of services before completing an initial order of 56 cameras. Phoenix project managers recommended that an implementation be done "very deliberately," and the input from and impact on various stakeholders, including officers, the public, and other criminal justice agencies, be carefully considered. The BWCs in Phoenix were found to have a "civilizing" effect on citizens once they were aware they were being recorded. Citizen complaints decreased 44%.[14] However, the department also found data storage and retrieval requirements to be "manpower intensive." The

PPD is also studying the value of BWCs in enhancing domestic violence prosecution as a result of additional video evidence.[15]

Expected Outcomes and Performance Measures - There are numerous performance measures that should be directly impacted if a BWC system is procured and fully implemented. For example, data should point to a reduction in workers' compensation and public liability claims, use of force incidences, and citizen complaints. At the same time, BWCs could produce increased crime clearance rates. Three measures that are tracked as part of the City of Wichita's Performance Management System are reviewed below.

General Liability Claims per Capita: The Budget Office tracks the total number of claims per capita; there could be a sub-measure for Police Department claims per capita. For total claims, the lowest year in the dataset is 2012 (197 total claims), and the highest year is 2009 (398 claims).

Use of Force Incidents: This measure is tracked by the WPD, although it has not been included in the City's Performance Measure reports.

Number of External Citizen Complaints: In 2013, there were 102 external complaints. The lowest year in the dataset is 2006 (43 complaints) and the highest year was 2012 (123 complaints).

Citizen Survey - The National Citizen Survey, sponsored by the International City/County Management Association in cooperation with National Research Center, Inc., serves as an extension of Wichita's Performance Management System. Hundreds of local communities participate in the survey process, which provides feedback on perceptions about government rather than actual performance. The City of Wichita uses such feedback to enhance community engagement efforts and better educate the public. Optimally, perceptions will mirror actual performance trends through successful community engagement. An expanded BWC strategy could improve results in several measures including the ones below.

Police Services - Percent Rated "Excellent" or "Good": Officer interaction comprises part of the rating. Other factors also influence the rating. This question was asked in 2006 (66%), 2010 (74%), and 2012 (67%). In each year, the City of Wichita was similar to the benchmark.

Overall Impression of Most Recent Contact with WPD - Percent Rated "Excellent" or "Good": This is the Citizen Survey rating that would be most directly impacted by deployment of BWCs. This question has only been asked on one previous survey (in 2012) and the outcome was similar to the benchmark at 69%.

Implementation Issues - There are many specification issues to consider when purchasing a new BWC system, including: battery life; video quality; recording limits; night recording; camera focal width; audio recording; camera placement; and radio integration capability. In addition, many operational issues must

be resolved, most likely through the use of revised policies and procedures. Issues could include: when BWCs should be turned on; what operating policies and procedures will be needed; and what training (initial and recurring) should be provided.[16] There are legal issues to consider, including how long to retain videos, and when to release videos and under what circumstances. In addition, storage and retrieval of videos can be a laborious task. The estimated additional staffing (two positions) is based on a staff estimate and may need to be reviewed as a BWC program is fully implemented.

Considerations in BWC Procurement and Implementation
Initial Cost
Ongoing Operating Cost
Performance Outcomes
Policies and Procedures
Privacy Issues
Training Requirements

Presently, there are no uniform best practices that govern BWC usage. Privacy considerations, data retention and public disclosure policies, and social impacts and expectations should all be considered when implementing a BWC program. BWC usage in policing is a relatively recent phenomena, and a deliberate and methodical implementation is essential to the successful deployment of BWC equipment.

Costs and Options to Finance a BWC System for the WPD - The unit cost of a BWC can appear relatively small. However, total implementation costs can be significant. Even more challenging would be the ongoing costs, including operating costs for data storage and retrieval, as well as future planned replacement costs. Initial outlay for an additional 444 BWCs is estimated at $927,200. The operating and replacement costs over a ten-year life cycle are estimated at $6,440,585.

Initial Capital Outlay - There are three basic costs to implement a BWC program: the camera and equipment; the docking stations; and the IT costs, including hardware and infrastructure to communicate with each Patrol substation. The latest cost estimate for each camera is $1,300.[17] Outfitting all patrol officers would require 444 cameras at an estimated cost of $577,200. In addition, 74 docking stations would be needed, at a total estimated cost of $148,000. An estimated $25,000 in IT equipment and $177,000 for connectivity infrastructure would also be required. This would fund fiber-optic connections between Police substations and City Hall.

BWC Estimated Implementation Costs	
Camera	$600
Mounting Kit and Accessories	200
Extended Warranty	300
In-Car Video Viewers	200
Total Camera Unit Cost	$1,300
Total Costs for 444 Cameras	$577,200
Docking Stations	$1,500
Extended Warranty	500
Total Docking Station Unit Cost	$2,000
Total Costs for 74 Docks	$148,000
IT Equip & Connectivity Costs	$202,000
Total Initial Capital Outlay	**$927,200**

Operating Costs - Multiple ongoing operating costs would also be required to utilize BWCs. Annual data storage and software licensing costs would be incurred. These annual costs are estimated at $150 and $300 per BWC, respectively. With 504 cameras (60 currently operated and an additional 444), the annual cost would be $226,800. In addition, managing the high volume of stored video evidence would require increased and dedicated staffing. Presently, two Clerk II positions are projected to be required, but staffing demands may

vary either upward or downward depending on actual experience. The estimated cost of these two positions in year one is $108,312, with annual increases in subsequent years based on wage and benefit cost changes. Finally, an annual allowance of $15,000 is estimated for replacement parts and batteries. Ongoing annual operating costs are estimated at $350,112 in year 1. Costs would be expected to rise in future years as wage and licensing fees increase.

BWC Estimated Annual Operating Costs	
Data Storage Cost	$150
Software Licensing Cost	300
	$450
Data and License Costs 504 BWC	$226,800
Additional Police Dept Staffing (2 positions)	$108,312
Misc repairs, replacement, etc.	$15,000
Total Annual Operating Costs	$350,112

Replacement Costs - BWCs are typically covered by an initial three-year warranty, which limits replacement costs in early years. However, after the warranty period expires, system replacement costs must be programmed to replace damaged, destroyed, lost, or obsolete BWC devices. Assuming unit costs of $1,300 per camera, a total of $655,200 would be required, based on 504 cameras.

Based on initial assumptions and assuming moderate inflation rates, the cost of a ten-year BWC system is estimated at $6,440,585. This includes $2,548,723 in capital outlay and $3,891,862 in operating costs.[18]

Selected Options to Fund a New BWC System - There are a variety of opportunities to finance both the capital and ongoing operating costs of a new BWC system. Options include various grant opportunities, narcotics seizure funds, capital improvement program (CIP) resources, and reallocation within the WPD budget or broader General Fund budget. All options will require a prioritization process, and there are no simple financing solutions. Funding the initial cost could include some form of grant funding, narcotics seizure funding, CIP resources, or a reallocation within the General Fund. Operating cost options would be more challenging, and would require either additional General Fund resources or a reallocation of current expenditures within the General Fund.

Potential BWC Financing Alternatives
Grant Opportunities
Narcotics Seizure Funds
CIP Resources
Reallocation of WPD Budget
Reallocation of GF Budget

Initial Outlay Options

Grants: The Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program and Community Oriented Policing Services Making Officer Redeployment Effective (COPS MORE) are examples of grants that may allow for allocation of monies to obtain BWCs and related equipment. The Wichita City Council approved $177,076 in JAG assistance for general police equipment (including funding for Tasers, BWCs, and other equipment purchases and repairs) on June 3, 2014.[19] JAG resources typically provide around $180,000 annually, and the WPD expects to receive annual JAG awards in the future.

Narcotics Seizure Funds: The WPD has a sizable balance in the Narcotics Seizure Fund. However, the use of these funds is restricted.[20] The City is not allowed to use anticipated future forfeiture revenues when

developing the budget. Any budgeted spending must be financed by cash currently on hand. Annually, approximately $360,000 is typically used for eligible investigations operating expenditures. The current balance of the Narcotics Seizure fund is $1.5 million.

CIP Resources: CIP resources could be used to finance a BWC system purchase. For example, $4 million was included in the 2011-2020 Adopted CIP to finance mobile radio purchases.[21] It is important to note that BWCs would most likely be purchased using Debt Service Fund cash rather than issuing bonds.

General Fund: The General Fund could be used to finance the initial capital outlay. This would either require a reallocation of currently budgeted items, or the use of General Fund reserves. As a one-time cost, the use of reserves would be structurally acceptable. However, maintaining and enhancing the General Fund reserve level has also been an important policy issue in recent years.

Stabilization Reserve Fund: The City maintains a Stabilization Reserve account within the General Fund. There is currently a cash balance of slightly more than $1 million. This one-time source of funding could be used to fund the initial outlay costs.

Operating Cost Options

The City of Wichita operating budget allocates resources to produce meaningful outcomes in four strategic priority areas: ensure physical safety; protect property; protect public infrastructure assets; and create a growing community. For the WPD, ensuring physical safety and protecting property are probably the most important strategic priority areas. To the extent an expanded BWC program supports these strategic priority areas better than alternative services and programs, existing General Fund resources might be reprioritized to fund the increased operating costs.

Estimated Ten-Year Air Section Costs	
Helicopter Repl.	$2,000,000
Operating Costs	3,789,339
	$5,789,339

Air Section: The WPD's Air Patrol Section is supported through the City of Wichita's General Fund budget. The Air Section is very useful in providing backup to ground officers and in conducting searches and surveillance. A total of 200 flight hours annually are budgeted. This Section includes a Police Officer and a Helicopter Mechanic. A third position (Police Lieutenant) supports the Air Section periodically (as a pilot) but is attached to the Special Investigations Bureau, and is not included in the Air Section operating costs in this report. The 2015 budget for this Section is $345,891. The current helicopter will need to be replaced within the next ten years at an estimated cost of $2 million. The ten-year cost of the Air Section, including capital costs, is estimated at $5,789,339.

If an expanded BWC program supports the strategic priorities of ensuring physical safety and protecting property to a greater extent than the Air Section, then resources might be repurposed from the Air Section to support the BWC program. This would provide $3.8 million over the next ten years to fund operating costs, and eliminate the need to identify $2 million for a future helicopter replacement. In addition, approximately $250,000 from contingency reserves and $800,000 in estimated proceeds from a sale of the helicopter could be applied to cover any initial and future capital outlay costs for BWCs.

Other Police Strategies: At least two other Police strategies have been reviewed in recent years. The 2015 Adopted Budget includes $425,251 in the General Fund to finance eight School Resource Officers. These officers are funded equally by the City and USD 259. The officers provide outcomes of mentoring youth, serving as a positive role model for adolescents, and investigating and preventing crime in USD 259 locations (primarily high schools). This program was restructured in 2011 and has been reviewed several times. It is highly leveraged (the City only funds 50% of the costs) and it provides outcomes in sync with protecting property and life in Wichita. However, the outcomes are less empirical and more anecdotal. The Police Mounted Unit has also been discussed in the past. It is an effective strategy for crowd control and crime prevention, but it is a tactic used infrequently. The total cost of the Mounted Unit on an annual basis is around $53,000.

Other General Fund Services or Additional General Fund Resources: A new BWC program could be funded with a mill levy increase of approximately 0.20 mills, or with the reallocation of approximately $640,000 annually from other current General Fund services.

Fee to Offset Video Retrieval Costs: A fee may be warranted to partially offset the costs associated with reproduction of BWC videos. Fees are presently charged for background checks and access to accident reports and other police reports. These fees partially offset the cost of providing these services. Currently, a fee of $25 is charged for the production of police videos and total revenues are minimal. However, with an expanded BWC program, fee revenue could provide a small amount to fractionally offset operating costs. Revenue is difficult to estimate; however, assuming an increased demand for videos based on the enormous amount of videos that would be created, a fee could generate an estimated $57,152 annually.

Recommendations for Funding an Expanded BWC Program - Funding an expanded BWC program presents two separate issues: financing the initial implementation and life cycle replacement costs (estimated at $2,548,723 over the next ten years); and funding the projected annual operating costs (estimated at $3,891,862 over the next ten years). Matching one-time funding sources for the periodic capital outlay is less difficult than identifying recurring resources to fund operating costs. Finally, future costs (continued replacement costs as well as staffing costs once full implementation is achieved) are speculative, and funding recommendations should be considered conceptual. A combination of grant and seizure funds are recommended for initial implementation, with other balances and video fees reserved for future replacements. For operating costs, the Air Section budget is recommended to be reallocated to fund BWC operating costs.

As mentioned above, to fund the initial implementation costs estimated at $927,203, a combination of grant and Narcotics Seizure Fund resources could be used. The 2015 JAG grant could provide $100,000 and $827,203 could be utilized from existing Narcotics Seizure Fund cash. Assuming the Air Section is disbanded, the current balance in the Helicopter Maintenance Account (estimated at $250,000) and any residual value from the sale of the current MD 500E helicopter (estimated at $800,000) could be reserved for future replacement costs. Finally, any video fees (estimated at $57,152 annually) could be reserved to fund future replacement costs.

Recommendation for Funding Ongoing Operating Costs - There are two primary options to finance the ongoing costs of a new BWC program: 1) reprioritize spending within the WPD budget; or 2) reprioritize spending within the General Fund. Given past policy direction, increasing the mill levy to fund a BWC program is not recommended. If disbanded, the Air Section could provide $3.8 million over ten years to pay for operating expenditures. On an annual basis, the projected Air Section operating costs match very closely with projected BWC operating costs. Over the 10-year life cycle, Air Section costs would be approximately $102,523 less than required. However, phasing the initial implementation of the additional 444 cameras in 2015 (which is recommended operationally) would reduce the 10-year operating costs to within the amount available from disbanding the Air Section.

Recommended Ten Year Financing Plan

BWC Program Cost	Cost Amount	Source of Financing	Financing Amount	Financing Surplus/(Deficit)
Capital Outlay	**$2,548,723**	**Capital Financing**	**$2,548,723**	**$0**
- Initial Implementation	$927,200	Grants/ Narc. Seizure	$927,203	0
		- JAG Resources	$100,000	
		- Narcotics Seizure	$827,203	
- Continual Replacement	$1,621,523	Helicopter sale, Fees	$1,621,520	0
		- Maintenance Fund	$250,000	
		- Sale of Helicopter	$800,000	
		- Video Fee	$571,520	
Operating Costs	**$3,891,862**	**Operations Financing**	**$3,891,862**	**$0**
		- Air Section Operations	$3,789,339	
		- Savings from Phased Implementation	$102,523	
Total	**$6,440,585**		**$6,440,585**	

Footnotes

1. On November 1, 2011, the Wichita City Council authorized the purchase of 20 BWCs through the combination of an American Reinvestment and Recovery Act Justice Assistance Grant and the WPD's General Fund budget. The total estimated cost for the 20 BWCs, associated accessories, one year of video storage and retrieval support, and a three-year warranty was $125,000. Today, the City of Wichita operates and maintains 60 cameras as part of an ongoing pilot project. The existing cameras would not preclude a switch to a new BWC system if all patrol officers are to be outfitted with BWCs, assuming a new system would better meet the needs of the WPD.

2. Pearce, Matt, LA Times Reporter. 2014. Growing use of Police Body Cameras Raises Privacy Concerns. Page 1.

3. For more regarding Washington, D.C. and police BWCs, see: Washington, D.C. Police Complaint Board. 2014. Enhancing Police Accountability Through an Effective On-Body Camera Program for MPD Officers. http://policecomplaints.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/office%20of%20police%20complaints/publication/attachments/Final%20policy%20rec%20body%20camera.pdf. Page 1-12.

4. David Floyd, Lalit Clarkson, et al. v. The City of New York. Case 1:08-cv-010134. United States District Court Southern District of New York. http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2013/08/12/nyregion/stop-and-frisk-decision.html.

5. Ramirez, Eugene P. of Manning & Kass, Ellrod, Ramirez, Trester LLP. A Report on Body Worn Cameras. http://www.parsac.org/parsac-www/pdf/Bulletins/14-005_Report_BODY_WORN_CAMERAS.pdf. Page 1-23.

6. City of San Diego, CA. 2014. Resolution R-2014-712. http://www.sandiego.gov/city-clerk/pdf/officialdocs/legisdocs/140610tuesdaydock.pdf. Page 21-22.

7. City of San Diego, CA. 2014. Item-101, June 10, 2014 Council Docket. http://dockets.sandiego.gov/sirepub/cache/2/plz3vobt2zoq05tpuv2mbdue/678206111020140808353361.PDF. Page 1-5.

8. City of Albuquerque, NM. 2014. EC-14-194. https://cabq.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=1989477&GUID=5E86A4AD-BD0C-46DB-9FB9-7E04DB573EF0. Page 1.

9. White, Michael D., Ph.D., Consultant for U.S. DOJ Office of Justice Programs. 2014. Police Officer Body-Worn Cameras: Assessing the Evidence. https://ojpdiagnosticcenter.org/sites/default/files/spotlight/download/Police%20Officer%20Body-Worn%20Cameras.pdf. Page 6-9.

10. Michael D. White, Ph.D. shares findings in common with numerous other research reports on the matter of police BWCs. In particular, the U.S. DOJ has sponsored numerous research reports on the matter. For another report on BWCs, see also: U.S. DOJ Community Oriented Policing Services. 2012.

Implementing a Body-Worn Camera Program: Recommendations and Lessons Learned. http://www.justice.gov/iso/opa/resources/472014912134715246869.pdf. Page 1-77.

11. "Self-awareness to Being Watched and Socially-Desirable Behavior: A Field Experiment on the Effect of Body-Worn Cameras on Police Use-of-Force" is a 14 page study summarizing the effect of body cameras. The study was conducted by the Rialto, CA Police Department in 2012 and 2013.

12. Cato Institute: National Police Misconduct Reporting Project 2010. http:\www.policemisconduct.net\statistics\2010-annual-report\.

13. Mesa, AZ Police Department. 2013. End of Program Evaluation/Recommendations On-Officer Body Camera System. http://issuu.com/leerankin6/docs/final_axon_flex_evaluation_12-3-13-. Page 1-16.

14. Interview with Dr. Charles Katz on 20 August 2014. http://www.msnbc.com/the-last-word-with-lawrence-odonnell/watch/-video-changes-everything--320356931874.

15. The Arizona State University School of Criminology and Criminal Justice maintains a webpage for the PPD BWC Projects at the following address: http://ccj.asu.edu/news-events/news/spi-phoenix-police-department-body-worn-camera-project. The site includes interviews with Commander Michael Kurtenback, PPD, and Dr. Charles Katz, Arizona State University.

16. US DOJ Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice. 2012. A Primer on Body-Worn Cameras for Law Enforcement. https://www.justnet.org/pdf/00-Body-Worn-Cameras-508.pdf. Page 5-10.

17. Cost estimates in this report are based on informal inquires and experience gained through the BWC pilot project. The estimates are not meant to infer precision, but rather potential magnitudes.

18. Below is a more detailed ten-year cost estimate for a new BWC system as developed by City staff.

Ten-Year Estimated Cost of a BWC System						
Year	**Cameras**	Licensing	Staffing	Misc	**Subtotal: Operating Costs**	**Total Costs**
Year 1	**$927,200**	$226,800	$108,312	$15,000	**$350,112**	**$1,277,312**
Year 2		$226,800	$111,561	$15,375	**$353,736**	**$353,736**
Year 3		$226,800	$113,795	$15,759	**$356,354**	**$356,354**
Year 4	**$780,745**	$250,345	$116,640	$16,153	**$383,138**	**$1,163,883**
Year 5		$250,345	$119,556	$16,557	**$386,458**	**$386,458**
Year 6		$250,345	$122,545	$16,971	**$389,861**	**$389,861**
Year 7	**$840,778**	$269,594	$125,609	$17,395	**$412,598**	**$1,253,376**
Year 8		$269,594	$128,749	$17,830	**$416,173**	**$416,173**
Year 9		$269,594	$131,968	$18,276	**$419,838**	**$419,838**
Year 10		$269,594	$135,267	$18,733	**$423,594**	**$423,594**
Total	**$2,548,723**	$2,509,811	$1,214,002	$168,049	**$3,891,862**	**$6,440,585**

19. See Agenda Item No. II-14 from the June 3, 2014 Wichita City Council Meeting at http://wichitaks.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=2&clip_id=2640&meta_id=136248.

20. Generally, Seizure Funds must be used in accordance with the U.S. DOJ's "Guide to Equitable Sharing for State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies," which can be found at http://www.justice.gov/usao/ri/projects/esguidelines.pdf. Pages 16-19 outline permissible uses as well as non-permissible uses. Generally, seizure funds cannot supplant current local resources, cannot fund ongoing staff, and should be used only on law enforcement related costs, including equipment, facilities, training, and grant matches. Anticipated seizure revenues also cannot be utilized.

21. For more on the mobile radio project, see http://wichitaks.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=2&clip_id=1549&meta_id=95755.