Police Executives Need to Show Leadership On Evidence Storage and Security Issues

BY BILL KILEY, PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR PROPERTY AND EVIDENCE, INC.

LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES THROUGHOUT OUR COUNTRY have, for some time, been forced to seek more and more storage space to accommodate the seemingly exponential increase in the amount of evidence that they must store.

At the same time, police departments continually are the subject of news stories when they cannot locate physical evidence that is needed for DNA examination; this has been particularly true in post-conviction cases undertaken by the Innocence Project and/or reviews by prosecutors’ offices. Unfortunately, we have seen too many newspaper headlines like "DA: Narcotics Missing from Evidence Room" and "Evidence, Funds Mistakenly Thrown Out in Police Evidence Room Cleanup" and "Impact of Tossed Evidence Widening."

As a result of scientific advances in DNA technology, many state legislatures have extended or eliminated statutes of limitation, because DNA can be extremely powerful evidence even in cold cases that are many years old. And some states have created statutes that now require that post-conviction evidence be held far beyond the legal appeal period, perhaps as long as the convicted person is incarcerated.

What are the implications of these statutory changes for police departments? Here’s the answer in a nutshell: Chiefs and sheriffs will be holding much more evidence for much longer periods of time. But how and where will they store this evidence?

In July, 2007 the Denver Post published a four-part Special Report on police property rooms throughout the United States. The series, along with a set of videos the Post produced as companion pieces to the articles, can be found at www.denverpost.com/evidence. I strongly recommend this series; in fact, I believe it may well be nominated for a Pulitzer Prize. These four articles address not only the sheer volume of evidence being stored, but also the issues pertaining to the conditions that must be maintained to preserve evidence, and the difficulties in ensuring accountability and the security of evidence storage.

To give you an idea, here are a few excerpts from the Post articles:

Authorities across the country have lost, mishandled or destroyed tens of thousands of DNA samples since genetic fingerprinting revolutionized crime solving 20 years ago....In a country whose prime-time TV lineup glorifies DNA forensics, many real-life evidence vaults are underfunded and mismanaged, struggling to keep up with technological advances and lagging behind most corner groceries in the way they track valuable crime-scene items. Facing real-world training and space challenges, even the best-intentioned clerks commonly toss DNA samples, especially from old cases, in what one expert calls the “sledge-o-matic approach to clearing out evidence rooms.”

What is needed, experts say, is a more informed and deliberate system for prioritizing and preserving evidence so that car bumpers from misdemeanors don’t crowd out relatively small and infinitely more valuable hairs, skin cells and other DNA specimens from the most violent felonies.... Two decades after genetic fingerprinting first was used in U.S. courtrooms, no national standards regulate the handling of DNA from the outset of major crime investigations in state cases.... “Nobody has stepped up to the plate and said, ‘This is the way it has to be,’” said Joe Latta, head of the International Association of Property and Evidence. “When I was at the FBI Academy 20 years ago, I looked in one of the best libraries in the world and there was nothing in there about evidence standards. Now, I look around today and there...
From Saturday Night Specials to AK-47s in 30 Years

THIS MONTH I WANT TO WRITE ABOUT OUR NATIONAL PROBLEM WITH THE INCREASED FIREPOWER OF THE WEAPONS USED BY CRIMINALS.

When I first joined the New York City Police Department in 1967 and was working the streets of the South Bronx, the weapons that we police officers faced were things that we called “Saturday Night Specials”—revolvers, often old and battered, sometimes held together with electrical tape—and “Zip guns”—improvised firearms, made from a piece of steel tubing, that could fire only a single shot and sometimes were so weak that they were destroyed the first time they were fired.

But in the 1970s and 1980s, criminals’ firepower began to increase, and we started to hear from police officers all across the country that they were being outgunned. In the early 80s one of my jobs was tracking the guns that the NYPD recovered on a yearly basis. At that time, maybe 10 percent of the guns we recovered were automatic weapons, as opposed to revolvers. But I remember that 1989 was the “crossover year”—for the first time in the department’s history, more than 50 percent of the guns we recovered were automatic weapons. And that was about the time we started to hear a nationwide call for increased firepower for police officers, in reaction to the increased firepower of the bad guys. And when Bill Bratton took over the New York Transit Police in 1990, he issued 9-millimeter Glocks to his officers.

In 1992 something happened that really brought all this home to me. I was a deputy chief at the NYPD with citywide duty. A nurse coming home from work was caught in the crossfire between rival drug gangs in Harlem. Six hours later, the same gangs wound up in a shooting with police officers from the local precinct. There were eight guys on a grassy knoll between some high-rise buildings, and they dropped their guns and fled the scene. I was the responding duty chief, and I saw something that up to that point I had never seen in 25 years of policing. The eight guys dropped eight weapons, and they were all automatic weapons. And I thought, “Life has changed out here on the street for police officers.” About a year later, then-Police Commissioner Ray Kelly authorized the Glock for the NYPD.

At the same time, the arrival of assault weapons was getting a lot of attention, and there was a realization in Washington that something needed to be done. In 1994 President Clinton signed into law a ban on assault weapons, and it seemed to have a good effect.

Unfortunately, the law had a 10-year sunset provision, and in 2004 Congress failed to reauthorize it, so it expired. PERF is currently conducting a study of police departments regarding weapons used by criminals. What we are examining is how many assault weapons have been used in homicides over the last four years, and whether that number is increasing. If you look at Miami, for example, four years ago, of our shooting homicides, only 3 percent were committed with an assault weapon. The next year it was 9 percent. Two years ago, it was up to 18 percent, and last year it was about 21 percent. In South Florida, assault weapons have become the gun of choice for the drug gangs. We still tend to think of assault weapons as a “backup” weapon in really bad situations, but here it’s actually become the first weapon. There’s almost a casualness about it. A few months ago, one of my beat officers was summoned to a house in Coconut Grove. The mother said her son had beaten her up, the officer says, “Where is he?” The mother says he’s inside asleep, so the officer goes in to wake him up—and he’s in bed with his AK-47!

Many of you probably know that last week, a seven-year veteran of my department, Detective James Walker, was shot at multiple times and killed by someone with a Romanian AK-47. Detective Walker was the fifth police officer shot to death in South Florida in the last six months. The last two were killed with AK-47s. The assault weapon that was used to kill Detective Walker is a case in point. A year and a half ago, my deputy Frank Fernandez and I had a briefing at the ATF. They told us that since the ban on assault weapons lapsed in 2004, the South Florida gun market has been flooded with AK-47s imported from the old Soviet-bloc countries. The gun that killed Detective Walker was made in Romania, was brought in by a U.S. importer, and was purchased legally by a 19-year-old kid just north of Miami. The kid lent it to a friend, who lent it to another guy, who lent it to another guy, and then the AK-47 wound up in the hands of the suspect we’ve arrested for killing Detective Walker.

So the concerns that we’ve had ever since the assault weapons ban expired have come to fruition. The gun market in Miami is getting flooded with cheap AK-47s. These weapons now account for more than one-fifth of our gun homicides. And they’re being used to kill police officers.

Unfortunately, there is no spine in Congress right now during an election year to take on this issue of renewing the ban on assault weapons. In fact, I’ve noticed that there are some Presidential candidates who have now changed their positions and decided that gun control should be left to the individual states.

If the politicians are afraid to take on the NRA, maybe chiefs of police and others need to step up and put the pressure on, because in just 30 years, we’ve come from Saturday Night Specials held together with electrician’s tape to AK-47s and similar high-power weapons.

The question is: If we don’t do something now, what will it look like 10 years from now? Will “Rambo” become reality?
Congress Slashes Byrne Justice Assistance Grants

MULTIJURISDICTIONAL GANG AND DRUG TASK FORCES WILL face a significant cut in federal aid because of changes Congress has made in Justice Department appropriations for the 2008 fiscal year.

The Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Program (JAG) will receive $170 million for the year that began October 1, 2007, compared to $520 million the previous year, under the omnibus appropriations bill approved by Congress and signed by President Bush in December.

The JAG program funds a variety of criminal justice programs, including crime victim support initiatives, criminal justice information-sharing projects, community corrections, and offender reentry programs. But by far, the most common use of the money is multijurisdictional drug and gang task forces. At least 75 cents out of every JAG dollar goes directly to local police and sheriffs’ departments.

Congressional leaders said they would have preferred to fund the JAG program and other federal grants for state and local police at higher levels, but were constrained by budget limitations. “Unfortunately, the subcommittee had to make some very difficult choices,” said Sen. Barbara Mikulski, chairwoman of the Senate Appropriations subcommittee with jurisdiction over Justice Department spending. “We’re spending billions on this war abroad, but pocket change on fighting crime next door,” said Sen. Joseph R. Biden, Jr. “We’ve known for a while that the federal-local partnership is critical to any long-term crime-fighting solution, and it’ll take more than a drop in the bucket to make that happen.”

The cut in JAG funding did not go unnoticed in Washington or across the country. In Washington, a number of policing and criminal justice groups denounced the cut. “Congress has just made the job of every police officer in this country more difficult,” said David Steingraber, president of the National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA), which tracks federal aid programs on behalf of state criminal justice officials. “A cut to the JAG program is a cut to local law enforcement and victims of crime everywhere.”

NCJA cited dozens of local newspaper and television news stories about the cut, with headlines like “Drug Forces Brace for Losses of Federal Funds” and “Feds Slash Funding Needed by Local Police.”

In some cases, drug task forces in Kentucky are trying to fund themselves by seizing drug traffickers’ assets, according to an article in the Lexington Herald-Leader, but asset forfeitures occur irregularly and do not provide a steady stream of income, and some police agencies receive very little asset forfeiture money, so some task forces will be forced to shut down because of the cut in federal aid.

In North Carolina, the Mount Airy News ran a December 24 story that began: “Like the Grinch who stole Christmas, Congress has taken away funding that local law enforcement officers rely on for equipment and overtime needs.”

In Maine, the Bangor Daily News said that “police across the state are reeling from a huge cut in federal funds used to pay for the Maine Drug Enforcement Agency (MDEA), a cut that some believe threatens the ability of law enforcement to wage any sort of significant war on drugs.” Maine Public Safety Commissioner Anne Jordan told the newspaper that the cut in federal aid will reduce MDEA’s budget by 75 percent. One local sheriff said, “I don’t know what Congress was thinking, how they could justify that type of a cut.”

In other sections of the Justice Department funding bill, Edward Byrne Discretionary Grants were cut from $192 million in 2007 to $187.5 million in 2008. And Weed and Seed appropriations dropped from $50 million to $32.1 million. Funding for the Regional Information Sharing System remained at level at $40 million.

COPS PROGRAMS GET AN INCREASE

Not all Justice Department programs were cut in the 2008 appropriations bill. Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) funding increased 8.4 percent, to $587 million. That includes $20 million for COPS “hiring initiatives,” which once were the backbone of the program, having provided funds for the hiring of 100,000 additional state and local police during the 1990s. The $20 million for 2008 is the first funding for the COPS hiring program since 2005.

The bill provides another $20 million for a “Violent Gang and Gun Crime Reduction Program,” consisting of grants to state and local law enforcement agencies to combat violent crime, “with special emphasis on areas plagued by violent gangs and drug-trafficking crime involving firearms.” This is somewhat similar to a proposal President Bush made last January when he sent his proposed 2008 budget to Congress, although the funding level is only 10 percent of the $200 million requested by the President. The President had wanted Congress to end all funding for JAG and to nearly eliminate COPS, leaving only $32 million to “keep the lights on” at the COPS Office and maintain management of existing grants, and to fund his violent crime initiative instead. But Congress left most of the current grant structure intact, albeit at much lower levels for JAG.

Other programs in the COPS Office for 2008 include $205 million for COPS Technology and Interoperability, compared to $240 million in 2007. This program awards grants to local law enforcement for police radios and other technology that improves their ability to share information with other law enforcement agencies. The COPS “Meth Hot Spots” program was cut from $64 million to $61.2 million, and funding for bullet-resistant vests was reduced from $30 million to $25.9 million.

COPS funding to reduce DNA testing backlogs was increased, from $109 million to $152 million.

HOMELAND SECURITY GRANTS GET OVERALL INCREASE

Department of Homeland Security grants affecting local police departments also received better treatment in the 2008 spending bill. The State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP) received $950 million for 2008, but under a new law approved last August, the so-called “9/11 Act,” 25 percent of SHSGP funding must go to a separate Homeland Security grant program, the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program (LETPP). Similarly, the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) received
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THE FIRST SESSION OF THE 110TH CONGRESS ADJOURNED on December 19, 2007. The House reconvenes on January 15, followed by the Senate on January 22. Below is a brief update of several legislative initiatives that were addressed during the past session.

**BODY ARMOR**

On December 18, Sens. Patrick Leahy (VT), Hillary Clinton (NY), Barbara Mikulski (MD), Richard Shelby (AL) and Mary Landrieu (LA) introduced legislation that would provide for need-based waivers of the local matching-funds requirement for grants under the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program. Under the proposed changes, the director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance would be given discretion to waive or reduce the matching-funds requirements to state or local law enforcement agencies that demonstrate fiscal hardship. Congress recently provided $25.9 million for the program in its 2008 funding bill (see related story, page 3).

Senator Leahy said the impetus behind the bill was a tragic event in which a Tennessee correctional officer was shot outside the Kingston County Courthouse by the wife of an inmate he had been escorting. The officer was not wearing a protective vest despite a Tennessee Department of Corrections policy requiring that all individuals assigned to transportation duties be issued fitted vests, and despite the officer’s repeated requests for a vest. The officer was not issued a vest due to a lack of funding.

Leahy also stressed that waiving the matching-funds requirement would help police agencies in New Orleans “and other areas that experience disasters or any circumstances that create fiscal hardships.”

**COLLECTIVE BARGAINING**

The House passed its version of the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act of 2007 (HR 980) on July 17 by a vote of 314–97. This bill would provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by state or local governments.

Groups representing rank-and-file officers support this bill. The National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO) said that about 20 states do not fully protect the collective bargaining rights of public safety employees, and two states, Virginia and North Carolina, prohibit public safety employees from collectively bargaining.

But police management organizations oppose the legislation, saying it would federalize state and local governments’ labor-management relations.

On December 7, the Senate version of the legislation (S. 2123) was offered as an amendment to a farm bill, but was subsequently withdrawn when backers realized they could not surmount a filibuster threat by Sen. James DeMint (SC). But supporters of the legislation have the remainder of 2008 to win Senate passage and final approval of the measure, and NAPO said it is “optimistic” about its chances.

**COURT SECURITY**

On December 19 the House cleared legislation aimed at combating violence against judges, court personnel, and witnesses in legal proceedings. The Court Security Improvement Act of 2007 (H.R. 660/Public Law 110-177) would ban dangerous weapons from federal courthouses and boost criminal penalties for threatening or killing witnesses and informants. The measure also authorizes $20 million for grants to state and local governments to create and expand witness/victim protection programs, and $15 million to assist states in establishing and maintaining a threat assessment database. The House version of the bill included a provision that would have protected the personal information of public safety officers and their families. The Senate, however, did not agree to that provision. Instead, a compromise provision was agreed upon that protects all state or local law enforcement officers involved in federal criminal investigations. President Bush signed the measure into law on January 7, 2008.

**CRIME CONTROL**

Senator Joseph R. Biden, Jr. (DE) introduced his Omnibus Crime Control and Prevention Act of 2007 (S. 2237) on October 25. The bill would:

- Reauthorize and expand the Community Oriented Policing Services program.
- Authorize the hiring of an additional 1,000 FBI agents.
- Require background checks of gun purchasers at gun shows, and renew the ban on certain “assault weapons.”
- Establish a National Commission on Crime Intervention and Prevention Strategies.
- Reauthorize or establish new programs for the reduction of recidivism, for alternatives to incarceration for nonviolent mentally ill offenders, and for assisting the reentry of offenders into the community after release from incarceration.
- Establish the Homeland Security and Neighborhood Safety Trust Fund, which would provide $1.15 billion for COPS Office grants to state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies to hire officers, purchase technology, conduct training, and develop local counter-terrorism units; plus $900 million for the Justice Assistance Grant program.

The measure was referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee.
FIREARMS
In response to last year’s deadly shootings at Virginia Tech University, Congress approved legislation in December designed to improve the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS). Supported by both the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence and the National Rifle Association, the NCIS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (H.R. 2640, Public Law 110-180) strengthens gun buyer background checks by:

- Awarding grants to states to create electronic systems that provide accurate and up-to-date information under the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS).
- Authorizing new funding to help states enter felony convictions and mental disability and domestic violence records into the NICS database.
- Providing grant money to help states improve their capacity to perform NICS background checks.
- Requiring federal agencies to update, correct, modify, or remove obsolete records and notify the Attorney General of such action to keep the NICS up to date.
- Ensuring that all NICS information received from federal agencies is kept accurate and confidential.

After Sen. Tom Coburn (OK) expressed concern that the legislation would inappropriately take away the gun rights of veterans who might be tagged unfairly as having mental problems, Senator Leahy and Sen. Chuck Schumer (NY) introduced a substitute amendment mandating the notification of veterans who are affected by the requirements and requiring the federal government to pay the court costs of those who successfully challenge their inclusion in NICS. President Bush signed the bill into law on January 8, 2008.

GANGS
On September 21 the Senate passed the Gang Abatement and Prevention Act of 2007 (S. 456). This bill would increase law enforcement resources committed to the investigation and prosecution of violent gangs and expand gang prevention programs. The bill would: (1) create “High Intensity Gang Activity Areas” (HIGAA); authorizing more than $400 million over five years for gang prevention and intervention efforts, a new program for gang protection block grants, and mentoring and after-school programs; (2) establish a national research, evaluation, and policy institute to collect, analyze, and teach best practices for fighting gang violence; and (3) create a National Commission on Crime Prevention to examine prevention and intervention strategies, identify programs for replication, and provide funding. Los Angeles Police Chief William J. Bratton has testified in favor of the legislation.

The measure has remained in the House Education and Labor Subcommittee on Healthy Families and Communities, the House Judiciary Committee, and the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health since October. Backers hope to win House approval and final passage of the bill in 2008.

HATE CRIMES
The House of Representatives passed the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 2007 (H.R. 1592) on May 3 by a 237–180 margin.

This measure would expand existing hate crime laws to include offenses motivated by sexual orientation or gender identity, and would provide federal assistance to state and local governments to establish programs designed to combat hate crimes, including programs to train local law enforcement officers in identifying, investigating, prosecuting, and preventing such crimes. The measure authorizes a total of $10 million for fiscal years 2008 and 2009.

The Senate version (S. 1105) was attached as an amendment to the Fiscal Year 2008 National Defense Authorization Act (H.R. 1585) in September, but House and Senate negotiators subsequently dropped it from the defense bill on December 6.

The White House has called the legislation “unnecessary and Constitutionally questionable,” and said that if the measure were presented to President Bush, “his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.” Supporters of the legislation had hoped that by attaching it to a high-priority defense bill, they could make it more veto-proof. That provoked outrage from opponents of the measure, who said the defense bill was being “hijacked.”

Sen. Edward Kennedy (MA), the sponsor S. 1105, said he was disappointed by the failure to keep the hate crimes measure on the defense bill, because “we’ve lost the best opportunity to enact hate crimes legislation in this Congress.” But he added, “We’re committed to getting it enacted. It’s long past time for this measure to become law.” Both the House and Senate would need to approve an identical version of the bill by the close of the 2008 Congressional session in order to send it to the White House.

IMMIGRATION
Rep. Heath Shuler (NC), along with more than 80 cosponsors, introduced the Secure America through Verification and Enforcement (SAVE) Act of 2007 (H.R. 4088) on November 6. Congressman Shuler said his goal is “to drastically reduce illegal immigration.” Noting that Congress failed to achieve passage of an immigration bill last year, he added that “Americans are very upset at their government for not taking action, and they have a right to be.”

In addition to beefing up border security and creating an employee verification plan to prevent the hiring of illegal immigrants, the bill would improve the use of satellite and other technologies to ensure clear and secure two-way communications between the Department of Homeland Security and state and local law enforcement agencies; require the Secretary of Homeland Security to work in consultation with state and local officials in developing a national strategy for border security; expand federal training programs for state and local law enforcement officers; and authorize a border relief grant program to assist state and local law enforcement agencies operating within 25 miles of the United States’ southern border.

The bill was referred to multiple committees where it has remained since being introduced. The Senate companion bills are S. 2236 and S. 2368, both of which were introduced on November 15.

POLICE RESPONSE TO PERSONS WITH MENTAL ILLNESS
The House Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security approved legislation on November 1 that would provide grants to improve the mental health treatment provided to prison inmates. The Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Reauthorization and Improvement
still are almost no standards whatsoever. “In many evidence rooms, car parts, bikes, lawn mowers, computers, backpacks, six-packs, suitcases and even tree limbs from nonviolent cases sit mixed in with deliberate biological samples from the most heinous rapes and murders. Piles accumulate in cramped and aging rooms often not built to store evidence.

The Post articles noted that more than 70 percent of police departments surveyed by researchers at Washington State University in 2005 reported facing “highly critical” storage problems. In addition to the overcrowding of storage facilities, departments have lost evidence due to floods, leaky roofs, and failures of freezers that stored biological evidence.

But the Post reporters did find some bright spots, particularly in Dallas and Charlotte-Mecklenburg, N.C., where police have gotten better organized at preserving evidence that can help convict violent criminals and uncover wrongful convictions. The Post reporters also tell many stories of persons who most probably committed crimes but have not been prosecuted due to missing evidence, along with stories of convicted persons whose appeals have been thwarted by the loss of evidence that might have exonerated them. Crime victims also tell their stories in the articles.

The Post articles included comments from Colorado legislators as well as Congressional representatives, who have called for committee hearings into the storage of evidence by law enforcement. Colorado Gov. Bill Ritter appointed a commission to investigate this issue and the feasibility of creating evidence standards for law enforcement in his state. In December 2007 that commission made its recommendations to the Governor; included is the recommendation that evidence used to convict an individual should be stored as long as the person is incarcerated.

The State of North Carolina also has taken a lead on this issue, creating an “Actual Innocence Commission,” chaired by the Chief Justice of the State, whose members are the leading stakeholders of the state’s criminal justice system. In April 2006 I.A.P.E. executive director Joseph T. Latta and I were invited to meet with the commission to discuss issues related to evidence storage. Clearly, the members of this body realize the implications of evidence storage on local police and sheriffs’ departments. North Carolina is considering, among other options, the feasibility of regional climate-controlled evidence storage facilities run by the state. The issues being examined in North Carolina are the same issues facing states, counties, and cities across the United States.

Based upon the existing trends of increasing quantities of evidence, the changes in state statutes related to the duration of evidence storage, and the publication of news media coverage such as the above noted Denver Post series, I and my colleagues in I.A.P.E. are concerned that there may well be a tsunami-like wave of evidence that is about to hit our state and local law enforcement agencies.

I.A.P.E. will encourage discussion among the members of PERF and other policing organizations that have an interest and professional investment in the area of evidence intake, storage and disposition. We submit that there is a need for our profession to begin to examine the issues related to the packaging, storage criteria, accountability, space requirements, security and disposition of evidence. Collectively we need to address the current and future requirements that impact upon law enforcement CEOs’ budgets, facilities and staffing.

After 30 years in the police profession and having held a wide variety of assignments, I am aware that police property rooms are usually not a budget priority. However, police executives may not be aware of the clear evidence storage trends from California to New York—trends that will place more unfunded mandates upon our police. The time for collaboration and for proactive leadership on these issues is upon us.

A great deal of additional information is available on our website, www.iape.org.

Bill Kiley is a retired Deputy Chief with the Suffolk County, New York Police Department, who currently serves as President of the Board of Directors of the International Association for Property and Evidence, Inc. I.A.P.E. is a nonprofit association whose mission is the training and education of law enforcement personnel who are responsible for the warehousing, accountability, security, and disposition of evidence in police agencies. Mr. Kiley, who holds graduate degrees in both Criminal Justice and Educational Technology, is a 1989 graduate of PERF’s Senior Management Institute for Police, as well as the 146th Session of the FBI National Academy. A graduate of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Bill Kiley retired as a Colonel after a 28-year career in the U.S. Army Reserve.
$820 million for 2008, but 25 percent must go to LETPP.

The bottom line is that SHSGP received $712.5 million, a 40-percent increase; UASI received $615 million, an 18-percent decrease; and LETPP received $442 million, a 21-percent increase.

A new program created by the 9/11 Act, the Interoperable Emergency Communications Grant Program, received $50 million for 2008. The funds are to be used to improve the ability of police and other first responder agencies to communicate more easily when responding to natural disasters or acts of terrorism. And $15 million was provided for state and local Emergency Operations Centers.
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