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Evidence collected at crime scenes can be immediately entered into the system, instantly establishing a secure chain of custody. This sets the stage for a successful investigation and prosecution.

Evidence admitted as a court exhibit will have a 100% reliable and secure chain of custody that will be inherent and maintained throughout the appellate process and beyond.
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Effectively and confidently manage not just incoming evidence, but evidence your agency will have for decades. Providing greater accountability and credibility for the community you serve.
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TAKE CONTROL OF YOUR EVIDENCE ROOM

DESIGNED BY COPS FOR COPS

PMI EVIDENCE TRACKER IS A POWERFUL EVIDENCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM: DESIGNED BY COPS FOR COPS, IT DRAMATICALLY REDUCES WORKLOAD BY PROVIDING AN AUTOMATED CONTROL SYSTEM USING BARCODES FOR MANAGING EVIDENCE AND PROPERTY.
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YOU'LL KNOW THE WHAT, WHERE, WHO, WHEN AND WHY FOR EACH PIECE OF EVIDENCE IN YOUR PROPERTY ROOM, FROM RECOVERY TO DISPOSAL. SAVE TIME WITH BATCH CHECK IN / CHECK OUT AND BARCODE SCANNING.

EASILY CUSTOMIZABLE
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OUR COP DESIGNED SYSTEM PROVIDES A SIMPLE SOLUTION TO A COMPLEX PROBLEM. WITH JUST ONE INPUT SCREEN AND UNLIMITED CUSTOM REPORTS, IT IS THE EASIEST TO USE, MOST ECONOMICAL AND THE FRIENDLIEST EVIDENCE SYSTEM ON THE MARKET TODAY.

BUDGET MINDED PRICING

System Includes: EVIDENCE & ASSET MODULES, BARCODE PRINTER, BARCODE SCANNER, LABELS, RIBBONS, A SITE LICENSE THAT YOU OWN PLUS A YEAR TECH SUPPORT AND FREE SHIPPING. Prices From $2,450 For Two User License And From $4,450 For Unlimited User License.

FOR A FREE DEMO CALL OR VISIT US AT WWW.PMIEVIDENCETRACKER.COM
TOLL FREE: (800) 325-7636 DIRECT: (904) 797-1050 FAX: (904) 797-6100
In Memoriam

ROBERT GILES
IAPE Past President & Charter Board Member

It is with great sadness that the IAPE Board of Directors advise our Members of the passing of our dear friend Bob Giles. Most of you know Bob as the Editor of our publication, the Evidence Log in which his “Giles Files” was always the source of useful information for all of us. Some of you remember Bob from being in the class with his close friend and fellow former member of the Burbank (CA) P.D. Joe Latta. The Giles and Latta families have been neighbors for almost fifty years. And a few of our members will remember Bob Giles from his conducting Property & Evidence classes in Paraguay, South America.

Bob was steadfast in his drive to professionalize those who are assigned to the crucial Evidence Storage function of law enforcement. He was the major contributor to the development of the IAPE Professional Standards and to keeping the standards abreast of technological advances. Bob always kept the Members of IAPE as his focus in all Board activities; he was always there for each of you. Recently diagnosed and undergoing treatment for a life-threatening condition, Bob was making progress when his sudden passing shocked all.

As a final tribute to our devoted Past President, we share the following Henry Van Dyke poem that carries in it our collective hopes.

Gone from My Sight

I am standing upon the seashore.
A ship at my side spreads her white sails to the morning breeze,
and starts for the blue ocean.
She is an object of beauty and strength,
and I stand and watch her until she hangs like a speck of white cloud
just where the sea and sky come down to mingle with each other.
The someone at my side says: “There! She’s gone!”
Gone where? Gone from my sight – that is all.
She is just as large in mast and hull and spar as she was when she left my side,
and just as able to bear her load of living freight
to the place of her destination.
Her diminished size is in me, and not in her.

And just at that moment
when someone at my side says: “There! She’s gone!”
there are other eyes that are watching for her coming;
and other voices ready to take up the glad shout:
“There she comes!”

The Board of Directors, on behalf of all of our members around the world, express our sincere condolences to the Giles family.

Rest in Peace, Bob.

We appreciate IAPE board member emeritus William Kiley for preparing this eulogy for our membership.
REMEMBERING BOB GILES AS EVIDENCE LOG EDITOR AND FRIEND

The following was written by IAPE Executive director, Joe Latta.

The Giles Files has been a regular feature of the Evidence Log since Volume 2001, Issue #4 – almost 18 years ago – begun by Editor Bob Giles who has been with the IAPE Board from its inception. Unfortunately, the name of this column may have to change, as Bob unexpectedly passed away in mid-June. This was a devastating blow to both myself and our Board of Directors. Bob and I worked together at the Burbank, California Police Department for 30-plus years and he lived just six doors away from me. We were long-time work colleagues, as well as neighbors and best friends.

Bob always worked tirelessly to gather and author stories of interest to our members for publication in the Evidence Log. Additionally, he was one of the authors of the IAPE Professional Standards, from when they were rolled out in 2002, and continuing through the most recent Version 3.0, as he was responsible for the annual updates and modifications.

For every issue of the magazine, Bob and I would make final edits, and almost religiously, we would have animated discussions about words that he chose to use in the articles. Bob had an outstanding vocabulary and always wanted to test me as well as our members. Frequently, I would read an article and ask the question, “Bob, what does this word mean? Most readers may not know the meaning.” He would always respond, “That’s why we have dictionaries – they can look it up!”

If you ever read through any of the old Evidence Logs, or our IAPE Professional Standards, and see a word that you don’t know the meaning of (and neither did I) – just look it up and remember that was a “Bob Word!”

We are sad to say goodbye to Bob and his words.

We will all miss him as a great Friend, Cop, and Board Member.

Beginning with the last issue, we have once again started a review of our Professional Standards, as we do every four years. In the current issue we provide a plethora (Bob Word) of information about the importance of developing overall policies for all department personnel in the handling of evidence, as well as a Property Procedures Manual for Property Room personnel as that was gleaned from Section 2 – Policies/Procedures – Standard 2.1 Policies/Procedures – Written Directives.

Additionally, in this issue you will find numerous other articles relating to a variety of topics that should be considered when developing policies. We hope we do Bob’s professionalism justice as we present this issue without the invaluable input he provided as editor for so many years.

Joe Latta
The ELASTEC Municipal Waste Incinerator and Drug Terminator destroys evidence & take-back drugs on-site with a clean, environmentally friendly burn.
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More than 1,000 guns were found in a home in the upscale Los Angeles neighborhood of Holmby Hills, but authorities said there was no indication they were used in crimes.

“At this time, there is no indication they were, but that could change as the investigation continues,” Ginger Colbrun, spokeswoman for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, said Thursday. Authorities will trace all the weapons, she said.

ATF agents and Los Angeles police officers on Wednesday executed a search warrant in an investigation of someone suspected of manufacturing and selling illegal firearms, Los Angeles police Officer Jeff Lee said.

The property resembled “a hoarder’s house” and it took 30 law enforcement officers more than 15 hours to clear the house and remove all the weapons, a law enforcement official familiar with the investigation told CNN.

Police also searched a home about 15 miles away, near Chinatown, the source said.

Police arrested Girard Saenz, 57, at the first house over allegations of violating California’s law regarding assault weapons and .50 Browning Machine Gun rifles, Los Angeles police Lt. Chris Ramirez said. The law prohibits the manufacture, distribution, transportation, importation and sale of any assault rifle or .50 BMG rifles, except in specific circumstances, according to the California Legislature.

Saenz posted $50,000 bail and was released Thursday morning. Details on the conditions of his release were not immediately available, Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department Deputy Marvin Crowder said.

No formal charges have been filed.

The complaint that led to the arrest involved the sale of firearms, but the investigation remains ongoing, Ramirez said, and more charges, including federal counts, are possible.
2nd Edition
Up-Dated & Expanded Version

The most comprehensive book ever written about managing the Property and Evidence function has been completely rewritten in this latest edition. Contains everything you expect from IAPE re: definitions, concepts, forms, case studies, policy elements, and more...

Purchase printed book and receive Forms By The Book on CD as a bonus,

OR

select digital version with downloadable book on an SD Card, also with forms included!

For either option, go to: http://home.iape.org/books.html for on-line ordering.
The latest version of the popular “Property and Evidence By The Book” - the most comprehensive book ever written about the management of the Property and Evidence function - is now available. Co-authored by Joseph Latta, Executive Director of the IAPE and Gordon Bowers, IAPE Board Member, the revised volume contains over 350 pages of definitions, explanations, concepts, case studies, elements and more! A “must read” for managers, supervisors and all property room personnel.

Our companion publication, Forms By The Book, was formerly offered for purchase as a separate item, but is now being included with every order of Property and Evidence By The Book (in both print and electronic formats), as a package deal.

ORDER FORM

We accept Checks, Credit Cards & Money Orders

Fill out this form & Fax or Mail to address below:
Name: ____________________________________________
Title: _____________________________________________
Agency: __________________________________________
Mailing Address: __________________________________
City: _____________________________________________
State: ____________________________________________
Zip: _____________________________________________
Phone: ( ) ___________________________ FAX: ( ) ___________________________
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Fax completed form with payment to: 818.846.4543

PLEASE SELECT ONE

Credit Card Type: □ VISA □ MasterCard □ American Express
Number: ___________________________ Exp. Date: _____________
Cardholder’s Signature: ________________________________

OR

Mail completed form with payment to:
Int’l. Association for Property & Evidence, Inc. 
Attn: Training Division
7474 Figueroa Street, Suite 125
Los Angeles, California 90041

PRICING

Both versions (printed book & SD card) now come with a copy of Forms By The Book!

Printed Book . . . . $ 45.95 x ( ) $ ________
(plus forms on CD)

Digital Book . . . . $ 29.95 x ( ) $ ________
(book & forms on SD card)

IAPE Membership $ 50, annually $ ________
(includes the Evidence Log Magazine)

Sub-total $ ________

Postage (US / Canada) $ 6.95 x ( ) $ ________

TOTAL $ ________

Order On-Line: http://home.iape.org/features/iape-books-cd-s.html
Keeping your crime scene secure throughout the chain of custody

Spacesaver’s evidence lockers are specifically designed to provide an extremely secure chain of custody during the critical short-term evidence storage period, which is the period of time when evidence leaves the hands of the person who collected, until it’s properly logged and stored in the evidence and property room.

Preferred by law enforcement agencies throughout North America, Spacesaver evidence lockers serve as a secure, unattended evidence drop-off system. Officers can securely deposit evidence day or night without having to deal with keys or combinations, or rely on an evidence technician.

For the latest videos, case studies and brochures on evidence storage visit www.storeyourevidence.com

Scan the QR code for quick access to the video.
Free Mobile App http://gettag.mobi
Standard 2.1: Policies and Procedures – Written Directives

Standard: The submission, handling, storage, and disposition of property and evidence needs to be documented in written directives.

Definition: Written directives are policies and procedures, placed in written guidelines to provide direction and understanding of responsibilities, duties and tasks.

Reasoning: In order to clarify and standardize the procedures for the submission, documentation, packaging, storage, movement, security, purging, and disposition of property/evidence, it is imperative that directives be used to guide the operation of an agency's property and evidence handling. These directives should clearly define the duties and responsibilities of any agency employee who takes part in the seizing, handling, storage, or disposition of property/evidence, and these directives should be reviewed yearly and regularly updated, as necessary to reflect legal and policy changes. It is also important that such orders and directives be disseminated in a systematic manner to those persons who will be held accountable by these policies and/or procedures.

General Orders/SOPs: It is critical that a law enforcement agency's property and evidence General Orders (GOs) and Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) contain policy statements for the submission, receipt, handling, transfer, and disposition of all property and evidence.

These written directives should establish rules that apply to all employees of the agency as they pertain to property and evidence and include such areas as:

1. requiring all property/evidence to be logged into agency records as soon as practical
2. requiring all property/evidence to be placed under the control of the property room before the officer ends his or her tour of duty
3. requiring a numbered report detailing the circumstances by which the property and evidence comes into the agency's possession and describing each item of property/evidence submitted
4. requiring that a written receipt be issued to finders/owners of property that is taken into custody with information on how to retrieve the items retained, when applicable; i.e., found property and safekeeping
5. assigning the responsibility to identify and notify the owner or designee regarding the disposition of property/evidence in the agency's custody
6. establishing procedures for the temporary release of property/evidence items from the control of the property unit; i.e. court, prosecutor, crime lab, and other agencies
7. requiring employees who submit evidence to comply with established packaging directives
8. requiring employees to comply with purging and review notices that have been disseminated from the property officer

Packaging Manual: Law enforcement agencies should develop specific guidelines for the packaging and labeling of property/evidence that meets the needs of their agency and the crime lab servicing the agency. These guidelines should be disseminated in a manner that all persons who book property/evidence have access to the guidelines and are held accountable to follow them. One recognized method would be to develop a guide that provides both written instructions as well as photographs that illustrate the required packaging protocol. This manual should be available in printed form in the packaging station and in digital form for personnel to access online. This manual should be reviewed yearly and updated, as necessary.

GOs and SOPs should be reviewed yearly and updated, as necessary.

Property Unit Procedures Manual: A law enforcement agency should develop or compile and publish a detailed Property Unit Procedures Manual on the receipt, handling, storage, and disposition of property/evidence for property unit personnel. Additionally, the Property Unit Procedures Manual should provide both supervisors and managers with detailed descriptions of subordinate responsibilities.

Continued on Next Page
The elements contained in a Property Room Procedural Manual should include, but are not limited to:

1. receipt of evidence
2. documentation
3. assignment of storage locations
4. temporary releases/movement
5. tickler files
6. purge-review protocols
7. disposition of evidence
8. destruction of evidence
9. auction
10. diversion
11. release
12. housekeeping
13. audits
14. inventories

All directives and manuals should be reviewed and updated yearly by the supervisor or manager to ensure that policies and procedures are up to date, necessary, and feasible.
History/Commentary

During the past 25 years this author has conducted over 650 property and evidence training classes from coast to coast and throughout Canada, with over 15,000 property room professionals attending. During every class informal surveys have been conducted. One of the questions is to ascertain how many departments have appropriate property and evidence policies and procedures that provide direction to employees on how to complete the many critical tasks that occur within the property and evidence management function. The results are often frightening, as it is consistently found that 50–75% of the law enforcement agencies across the country don’t have any type of formal guidelines regarding how to operate and manage the property functions of submission, storage, or disposition of evidence in an efficient and legally defensible manner. (Latta /IAPE Training Seminars).

Frequently a sergeant, lieutenant, or captain who is newly assigned to property room responsibilities is given direction from the chief or sheriff to develop or update the property room policies. A logical question would be how the sworn supervisor or manager with perhaps 15 or more years of police experience, but usually no property room experience whatsoever, obtains the knowledge necessary to develop adequate policies. Tragically, the answer is often that the policy never gets properly developed, and policy development for the property room is passed on to the next rotating supervisor or manager who will be equally unequipped for the task.

Additionally, it is not unusual for a new property officer being assigned as the department’s “evidence custodian” to be a new employee, or an existing employee who is being transferred to the property room with no experience or training. The situation is greatly exacerbated when that new property officer is being supervised by a new supervisor who shares the lack of property room expertise.

Unfortunately, a significant scandal or other major problem involving property room operations frequently results in there being a new property officer and a new supervisor/manager at the same time. When the situation also includes the lack of adequate policy and procedures to guide the new employees, the result is a “worst case” scenario. When a critical issue arises in this void of both policy/procedures and property room experience, it is generally handled by the “best guess” method, or by attempting to locate someone within the organization who may have worked in property years and years ago! This isn’t the way to operate a property room, and these poor management practices often result in the property unit continuing to flounder year after year.

Management’s policies and procedures need to utilize several different methodologies in effectively disseminating information to the employees of the department. Although it is extremely easy to identify a need for new policies and/or procedures, it is important first to understand the similarities of, and differences between, policies and procedures, and also to look at their various format options.

Policy

A policy is a general statement of management philosophy concerning an objective, principle, or value which guides performance levels and department activities as established by the department head (sheriff or chief of police).

Continued on Page 15
LOCK IT UP!

With Woven Wire Partition from WireCrafters

Build any size evidence storage enclosure quickly & economically
- Ten standard widths, 1’-10’ in 1’ increments
- Two standard heights, 8’ & 10’
- Easy install
- Re-configure cage as needs change
- Clear-span ceilings available
- Hardware only accessible from inside cage
- Stock orders ship in 48 hours

Also Available:
- Extra-heavy gauge woven wire mesh
- Solid 16 GA sheet metal panels

Build any size evidence storage enclosure quickly & economically

Contact Us Today for a Quick Quote!
WireCrafters.com 800-808-1860

Evidence Control Systems, Inc. has been providing property and evidence management consulting services since 1984 in both the United States and Canada. The staff members of ECS have over 120 years of law enforcement experience combined.

You can depend on our staff for expert services in the following areas:

PROPERTY ROOM AUDITS or ASSESSMENTS
- Policy Analyses
- Design Services
- Inventory Analyses
- Staffing
- Space Evaluation
- Workload Issues

www.evidencecontrolsystems.com 818.731.8181

JOSEPH T. LATTA, CPES
President and Owner
Evidence Control Systems, Inc. • Burbank, California • 818.731.8181
Policy

The distinguishing features of policy are:

- Policy is goal-directed, i.e. formulated by analyzing objectives and identifying those principles that will best guide the department in achieving its objectives.
- Policy is based upon ethics, experience, the desires of the community, and/or the mandates of the law.
- Policy is objective, rather than situation, oriented.
- Policy is stated in general terms in order to encompass all situations.
- Policy is objective, rather than situation, oriented.
- Policy is stated in general terms in order to encompass all situations.
- Policy in many states is classified “Public Information” so it must be phrased with public opinion in mind.
- Policy is a method for identifying and specifying attitudes about the manner in which a job and related task activities will be accomplished.
- Policy is intended to include the way one thinks about the job.
- Policy for Property Room management directs department employees in the principles that shall be adhered to in all areas of the property management function. (Doran, 1997; pp 61)

Procedures

The characteristics of procedures are:

- A method of performing an operation, or a manner of proceeding on a course of action.
- A series of steps to follow, usually in a specific order.
- A checklist of things that must be accomplished in order to complete a task.
- A particular way of accomplishing a task. (Doran, 1997; pp 62)

Law enforcement frequently provides officers with General Orders, often called the Department Manual, Rules and Regulations (R&Rs), or Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), for tasks they routinely perform, such as pursuit driving, use of force, and other critical and highly visible functions. Such guidance for property and evidence operations are often lacking in law enforcement agencies. Generally speaking, most law enforcement supervisors and managers assigned to manage or supervise a particular unit may have previously worked the assignment they will be supervising. The exact opposite is true in the property function: very few supervisors or managers assigned there have ever had the opportunity of actually working the assignment. Especially with such a dearth of policy guidance, it becomes almost impossible for supervisory or management level personnel to effectively oversee and evaluate this critically important function of the department.

In order to have effective policies and procedures in place, the various property and evidence management tasks and concerns needing standardization must first be identified. There are certain tasks and duties that generally apply to the employee submitting property or evidence, who in varying agencies may be an officer, deputy, or other crime scene personnel. Tasks include packaging, documenting, submission, and retrieval for such purposes as court or further investigation. The submitting employee has no interest in, or need to know, about such things as storage options, property room security, audits and inventories, diversion, or auctions.

Conversely, the property officer receiving the property into the property room system is not necessarily concerned about why the officer submits the evidence. He or she is directly concerned, however, with how the item is stored, secured, and ultimately purged after it is received. Each group of employees has a different stake in the various tasks and duties. Following the same logic, the investigating officer doesn't care about any of those issues as long as the item is ready for his or her use as a court exhibit, and has all of the chain-of-custody documentation in order.

Sound evidence-handling policies and procedures need to provide direct guidance for several different audiences. In theory there should be three separate documents that guide employees in the various processes directly related to their functions in the property and evidence process.

Continued on Page 16
Development of appropriate written procedures is critical not only because of their reference value to managers and property officers, but as a measuring rod to determine that tasks are appropriately completed. In today’s litigious society it seems wise that policies and procedures be reviewed on a regular structured basis with the goal of constant update and improvement. Written directives need to be divided into several different documents. Following is a structured process for developing appropriate General Orders, Packaging Manual, and Property Manual for your agency.

The following diagram illustrates an appropriate division between the types of guidance that should be documented in policies and procedures based upon the needs of their intended audiences.

Listed beneath each of the topics below are some typical issues that would probably be dealt with using the policy and procedures format directly above it:

The General Orders are documents that apply to every department employee all of the time; they emphasize policy statements. They also include the specific procedures that are necessary for each policy implementation. They would include such requirements as that every employee who receives property must process it into the property management system prior to the end of the same shift, and document the transaction with a Property Report.

The Packaging Manual would apply to all employees, but only when they are performing duties that directly involve submitting property or evidence into the property room. It may include how to document each type of evidence, including numbering, and how to package each type of evidence.

The Property Manual is in the same format as the General Orders, with the exception of lacking general “policy” statements, but it applies directly to actions by the employees specifically assigned to the property and evidence function. Its content generally is not of interest to, nor needed by, employees with other assignments in the department. It would include such requirements as an access log being maintained of everyone entering the property room, or how to release evidence.

The first documents that should be developed are General Orders for the handling of property and evidence for employees finding or otherwise receiving any property on behalf of the department. Most often these are personnel outside of the property function. The term “submitting employee” or “submitting officer” is often used, since their primary function related to the property is to “submit” it to the department property and evidence system. This document is “general information” in that it applies to all department employees. It presents the department’s policy statement and a set of procedures to ensure that all property is accounted for responsibly from that point until its final disposition. It defines all employees’ responsibilities regarding the receipt and handling of evidence as it is submitted into the system, and on any future contact, such as checking it out for forensic testing or for court.

There is no particular need for the General Orders to document what happens inside the property room, since that doesn’t apply to most employees, and it will be dealt with in the specialized Property Manual. A General Order may not need to duplicate security, audit, or inventory practices that are defined in the Property Manual, but it should discuss those items that the officers would be responsible for, including their responsibility to comply with all requirements of the Packaging Manual as they submit the property. Those issues may include submission of evidence, temporary storage, temporary removal, and the officers responsible in the purging process.

Continued on Page 19
Storing Ammunition

Joe,

I’ve searched the CFR’s and the O.C.G.A. of Georgia, and can not locate any specific guidance for the storage of ammunition as evidence, and property. This department does not have a central fire suppression system, and my E/P room is located below the first floor. My E/P room could be considered “hardened” in a loose term. I do know that in the military, I had specific guidelines for the storage of ammunition, and how to handle that waste stream.

What has been your knowledge and experience in this instance?

Thanks,

Officer Lawrence Harry
Evidence Custodian
Brunswick, Georgia Police Dept.

Harry,

I was recently in Texas doing a class and sitting with two co-instructors both from a 1,000+ person department. Consensus is – we know of no storage standards for property rooms.

Generally, the local fire marshal may have some local regulations. Was it large quantities in the military? If so, that’s probably why they had some guidance. Usually, in police departments, the quantities are much smaller. Some departments will just store ammo on one shelf, others on a specific shelf, or even keep small quantities in the package with the gun.

IAPE is currently working with the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) to develop standards for future use in property rooms.

We’ll keep you posted with updates -

Joe

*More “Mail” on Page 24*
Got CD/DVD problems?

Digital TraQ is your answer

Store them electronically
Your servers or our cloud

Saves officer time
Easier to upload than to burn a CD or DVD

Makes it easy for Investigators & Prosecutors
Easy to search, view, and play videos, audio files, and still images

Secures evidence
Chain of custody
Audit log of all users

Integrates with Evidence TraQ & Your Body Cam
Store in the same database as all your other evidence

“Just last year the number of CD/DVDs that we took in went up by 75%.”
Burleson (TX) P.D.
Gayla Robison
Property Supervisor

“CDs & DVDs only take up 1% of our space, but they take over 20% of our time.”
Alameda County S.O.
Sheryl Samuels
Property Technician

“My imaging tech was completely overwhelmed, and we could not fill the second position, Digital TraQ not only eliminated CD’s it freed up my imaging tech and I could redeploy the second position.”
Prince William County (VA) PD
Deputy Commander
LT Ross Randlett (Ret.)
General Orders - Submission of Evidence

• Policy should require that all property and evidence be documented and packaged in accordance with the department Packaging Manual.

**NOTE:** Some departments opt to discuss packaging in the department’s General Orders. However, most officers don’t carry around a binder of policies in their vehicles. It is preferable that the General Orders merely require compliance with the Packaging Manual maintained in the packaging area.

• Policy should define Property Room “Right of Refusal” requiring that all property and evidence that isn’t packaged and documented in the established manner will be returned to the submitting officer for correction.

• Policy should require that all improperly packaged or documented property and evidence that is returned to the employee shall be corrected and returned to the property room during the employee’s next scheduled work shift. It should advise that failure to correct it in a timely manner will result in progressive discipline. Incidents of major importance (large quantities of currency or narcotics, or hazardous item) may result in a special call-in of the employee or other process to correct the issue most expeditiously.

General Orders - Temporary Storage

• Policy should mandate that when any property and evidence is seized it shall be secured in a temporary locker by the end of the submitting employee’s shift.

• Policy should mandate that property and evidence can never be stored in an employee’s locker, vehicle, desk, file cabinet, etc., whether prior to booking into the system or when checked out for any purpose.

**NOTE:** An exception for this rule may be resident troopers/deputies that only go to their headquarters periodically. In such cases, increased security should be provided in their vehicle or their home or local office.

• Policy should ensure that NO evidence is commingled with any other evidence, and especially that from another case.

• Policy should provide guidance for a safe and otherwise appropriate location to store biohazards, bulk items, explosives, vehicles, etc.

General Orders - Temporary Removal

• Policy should require that when any property and evidence is signed out for court, crime lab, other agency, investigation, or any other temporary purpose that there are protocols in place to ensure the item is properly signed out, and is returned in the prescribed time. (Travel time from the end of the court day is recommended as the return timeline for evidence.)

**NOTE:** Evidence not returned in the prescribed time needs to be dealt with immediately.

General Orders - Purging Guidelines

• Policy should require that investigating officers fulfill their responsibilities dealing in the prompt disposition of property and evidence.

• Policy should define specific time limits on property room requests for review of property and evidence for disposition, and require “second requests” to be routed through supervisors for action.

Packaging Manual

The next document for the efficient operation of a property room is a Packaging Manual, which should be a step-by-step (photo based) document on the correct methods for documenting and packaging property and evidence. Chapter 3 - Packaging provides a detailed explanation and examples from a packaging manual.

Property Procedures Manual

The last, also critically important document that needs to be developed, is a Property Manual of policy and procedures for the property and evidence function of the department. That document memorializes and explains all of the various tasks, procedures, and responsibilities of Property Room personnel. This manual is a comprehensive, “how-to” document that can answer all questions and allocate all responsibilities for the property room staff. It allows everyone in the unit to know who is responsible for what.

Every law enforcement agency handles property room functions slightly differently. There is no generic document that meets all departmental needs. The following “Property Manual Elements,” however, provide an outline of items that need to be addressed in a Property Procedures Manual.

Continued on Page 20
Property Manual Elements

Hours of Operation/Scheduling

• Define both public and staff hours
• Define special call-out requirements for employees (e.g., for after-hour entrance to property room, large amounts of drugs, etc.)
• Define special call-out procedures for employees (on-call status, pagers, cell phones, etc.)
• Define minimum staffing levels, vacation coverages, illness, etc.
• Define the chain of command

Responsibilities of Property Officers/Supervisor/Manager

• Define the duties and responsibilities for each employee position assigned to the unit
• Define the duties and responsibilities of the supervisor and manager
• Define who is responsible for review and update of policies, and schedule of when it will be done

Receipt of Submitted Evidence

• Require evidence to be removed from temporary lockers within a specific time (i.e., end of property officer’s workday)
• Require evidence to be documented and stored by a certain time (i.e., end of day)
• Require evidence to be returned to the submitting officer if not properly documented or packaged
• Describe appropriate process for return of evidence
• Establish time limits and protocols for tracking returned items
• Identify specific information from the property record that is to be validated by the property officer when receiving property into the property room (examples):
  – Names
  – Address(es)
  – Phone
  – Crime Type
  – Property Descriptions
  – Item Numbers
  – Firearm Serial Numbers

Packaging and Storage Standards

• Define acceptable packaging standards (Packaging Manual) that meet the needs of both the crime lab and storage conditions
• Require the property officer to ensure that submitted evidence complies with the Packaging Manual

Documentation

• Identify all of the necessary description data required to complete a “Chain of Custody” form, including (examples only):
  – Brief Description
  – Make/Brand
  – Full Description
  – Model Numbers
  – Serial Numbers
  – Location in Property Room

• Require that proper tracking documentation (chain of evidence) must include:
  – Person receiving/transporting person(s)
  – Date/time received
  – Dates/times of movement
  – Discrepancies in packaging or markings
  – Person authorizing movement/transfer
  – Person releasing property/evidence

• Require that proper tracking documentation (paper trail) must include:
  – When evidence is released to owner, auction company, etc.
  – Authorizing person
  – Person releasing
  – Person receiving
  – Date/times of release/transfer

Notifications

• Memorialize procedures for proper and timely notifications to be made to the owner(s) of property
• Memorialize procedure which ensures that notification makes recipient responsible to retrieve the property by a specific date
• Memorialize requirements for information that is needed when property is released to owner/other:
  – Full and complete description of property
  – Printed name and address (for future reference)
  – Signature of receiving person
  – Copy of government ID
  – Signature of releasing employee

Continued on Page 22
Maximize Your Space And Protect Your Property And Evidence

PROPERTY & EVIDENCE STORAGE SOLUTIONS

- TEMPORARY EVIDENCE LOCKERS
- EVIDENCE ROOM INTAKE
- SPACE SAVING FILE STORAGE
- DOUBLE YOUR PROPERTY & EVIDENCE ROOM STORAGE
- CRIME LAB FURNITURE

Visit Our Websites To See All Of Our Public Safety Products
**Property Room Design/Layout**
- Memorialize where specific types of evidence are to be stored and in what order (without this, any new employee could pick any storage location that they thought was best)
- Memorialize shelving numbering system (diagram)

**Storage of Property and Evidence - Special Requirements**
- Memorialize storage requirements/locations for special items, such as:
  - Alcohol
  - Ammunition
  - Bicycles
  - Biological Evidence
  - Currency
  - Homicide Evidence
  - Found Property
  - Jewelry/Other Valuables
  - Firearms
  - Property for Safekeeping
  - Items Requiring Freezing/Refrigeration

**Disposition of Property (Purging)**
- Memorialize policies that:
  - Require regular review of all property and evidence for review and purging
  - Specify a time requirement for review of all evidence. For example:
    - Misdemeanors – every six months/one year
    - Felonies – every 12 months or Statute of Limitations
    - Found Property – every 3 months
    - Safekeeping – every 60 days

**Property for Safekeeping**
- Memorialize time limits to retain Property for Safekeeping
- Memorialize time limits for owners to retrieve property after notification
- Require maintaining tickler file of “Notification Letters Sent”
- Establish a policy that allows finders to recover their items
- Establish policy or local code that authorizes the seizure of abandoned funds

**Currency Handling and Control**
- Limit who has access to the currency vault
- Develop strict policies for handling of currency from initial seizure through the release/transfer of the item
- Develop a policy that defines whether or not currency counts will be validated when they are received in the property room
- Require a two-person policy when opening, validating and transferring currency
- Memorialize actions to take place when a shortage of money is discovered
- Identify the position responsible for transferring cash to the bank, and set a time or amount threshold
- Require that currency is always transported with armed personnel

**Narcotics Handling and Destruction**
- Limit who has access to narcotics vault
- Develop strict policies for handling of narcotics, from receipt through the destruction of the item
- Require a two-person policy when preparing narcotics for destruction
- Identify who is responsible for the destruction process
- Identify the position responsible for transferring narcotics to destruction site
- Identify who is responsible for witnessing the actual destruction of narcotics (should be someone outside the function – such as from an inspection unit)
- Require a written report that describes the destruction process (parties involved and actions taken)

**Weapons Handling and Destruction**
- Limit who has access to firearms vault
- Develop strict policies for handling of firearms, from receipt through the destruction of the item
- Require all firearms be examined upon receipt to determine if the firearms are loaded
- Require all firearms be examined to determine if the firearm’s serial number matches property records and ensure the firearm is not stolen or wanted
- Require a two-person policy when preparing firearms for destruction
Weapons Handling and Destruction - (cont’d)

- Identify who is responsible for transferring firearms to destruction site
- Identify who is responsible for the destruction process
- Identify who is responsible for witnessing the actual destruction of firearms (should be someone outside the function – inspection unit)
- Require a written report that describes the destruction process (parties involved and actions taken)

Auctions

- Memorialize the schedule of auction
- Identify who is responsible for setting up auction
- Define the actual auction process, whether internal or external
- Prohibit personnel involved in the property function and investigators involved with the property from bidding on the items

Property Diversion

- Require that all transactions are approved by a command-level police administrator and a second party outside the department, such as an official in the purchasing department or city manager’s office
- Specify how property is tracked and documented to the end user
- Require that each transaction (each item) is approved and signed for by the end user

Inventories

- Require that the property room is inventoried on an annual basis (if this is not possible, the policy should dictate that firearms, currency, and narcotics are completely accounted for at least every year)
- Require the results of the inventory to be forwarded to the chief of police within a limited time deadline
- Memorialize policies that define how missing/lost evidence is documented and investigated

Facility

- Identify who is responsible for examining the property room for safety and environmental issues

Alarms and Security/Keys

- Memorialize who is responsible for:
  – Issuing keys
  – Changing locks/keys with personnel changes
  – Changing employee PIN numbers
  – Changing combination locks
  – Duplicating keys
  – Auditing keys
  – Auditing and maintaining alarms
  – Inventory of keys and access cards
- Memorialize when locks and keys are to be changed

Excerpts - Policies & Procedures - cont’d.

The preceding information was a reprint (with permission) of Chapter 2 from Property and Evidence by the Book, 2nd Edition, co-authored by Joseph T. Latta, IAPE Executive Director and IAPE Director Emeritus Gordon Bowers.

The book in its entirety is currently available in print or as a downloadable SD card, and also includes printable forms.

For either option, see Page 8, or go to: http://home.iape.org/books.html for online ordering.
Cell Phone Destruction

Hi Joe -

I was looking for some information on how agencies are dealing with the destruction of cell phones. As a drug enforcement agency we seized hundreds of cell phones each year and despite our best efforts we can't always get them returned before the suspects disappear. Because of the lithium batteries our normal destruction source won't take them. We don't want to turn them in to be recycled due to data security reasons. Do you know of any resources for the destruction of cell phones?

Detective Patrick Lally
Westbrook, Maine

Patrick -

You name the options and that's the way we are doing it. FYI we are currently working with NIST who is trying to answer questions such as yours. NIST is wanting to provide our industry scientific answers for electronic cigs (vaping), batteries, cell phones, etc.

NIST has the collective ability to research questions in the scientific world and identify accepted standards. This is far sounder than simply going with what someone has told us might work. Hopefully the research will be complete by the end of the year, and we will send the results out in our newsletters as they become available.

As far as options or things we have seen or heard of... Possibly remove the battery and take it to your county recycling center, if there is one close by. Since you are a state entity, I'm guessing that some of the counties may have a recycle center that may offer small-electronics recycling. It would require someone to remove the batteries.

Hopefully an answer will be coming soon. See the following with a good search and a link for disposal.

- Joe

There are a number of facilities that recycle lithium batteries. We may recommend Retrieve Technologies for U.S. customers to recycle lithium batteries.

Link: www.RetrievTech.com

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) does not regulate the disposal of batteries in small quantities; large quantities are regulated under the Universal rules of Hazardous Waste regulations (40 CFR PART 273). Lithium batteries are not currently being collected by manufacturers for recycling. Lithium batteries are currently disposed of after their use. While there are no federal regulations for disposal of lithium batteries, individual states or localities can establish their own guidelines for battery disposal, and should be contacted for any disposal guidelines that they may have.

Batteries for commercial use should be in a discharged condition prior to their disposal. Generally, a primary lithium cell is considered to be discharged once its voltage reaches 2 volts or less under a current of C/100 (C is the rated capacity of the battery in ampere-hours). Once discharged, large quantities of lithium batteries can be shipped to a hazardous waste facility for incineration. There are a few companies that recycle lithium batteries. The cost is quite significant to do this compared to incineration.

The shipment of live or discharged lithium batteries is governed by the Department of Transportation (DOT) in their Code of Federal Regulations (49 CFR), paragraph 173.185(j).
Incineration of lithium cells and batteries by consumers is not recommended. Incineration should be done at a properly permitted facility that can handle this waste. Contact your waste handler if you are unsure whether or not a facility can handle the batteries.

Regulations and laws pertaining to the recycling and disposal of lithium batteries vary from country to country as well as by state and local governments. The European governments have more stringent regulations on the disposal of lithium batteries. You will need to check the laws and regulations where you live.

Remember that before any type of disposal the batteries should be discharged completely. Tape the contacts with electrical tape and package so as to prevent contacts accidentally coming together at any time. These batteries can be incinerated if you have a large quantity and they will need to be packaged as lithium ion batteries. Incineration must be performed by an approved and permitted waste treatment facility that handles lithium ion batteries. If you are not sure if your waste facility can handle lithium ion batteries, contact them and verify if they are permitted or not.

For home disposal, many stores offer free recycling of rechargeable batteries. If no outlet is available in your area, it is safe to dispose of these batteries in your regular trash. As always, check with your local laws to make sure that this is acceptable.

Hi Joe -

What is my responsibility as an evidence tech to notify defendants to pick up their property?

Does it lie with me or are they to notify us stating they want their property?

Part 2 of my question – it if lies with them, how soon after the case is complete may I dispose of their property if I have not heard from them?

Glory Ann Boland
Property & Evidence Tech
Blaine, Minnesota

Glory Ann,

Thanks for your questions.

I would say that in the vast, vast majority of departments notifications are handled by the department regarding when an owner can claim. More often than not, these notifications are handled by the property room. As far as time limits for anything, it is generally a department policy and not codified in state or local statues.

If you do the notification, you may get rid of the property a lot quicker as opposed to waiting for them to contact you.

Regards,
Joe

“Mail” continued on Page 45
WHEN MONEY IS WORTH MORE MONEY!

... OR IS IT?

Submitted by: Cris Gonzales

Every agency comes across currency in some form or manner. Evidence, safekeeping, found property or even abandoned – it comes in all forms. Those forms typically manifest as foreign currency both coin and paper, counterfeits, U.S. currency, and collectible money. After they have been sitting around in a vault or hopefully other secure manner, what should or could be done with them? And do you document the final disposition in such a manner that it would pass scrutiny years later by an auditor, internal affairs, or other person looking into these high-risk transactions?

Keeping in mind the best practices for handling and security of currency, here are a few ideas that might help you with the disposition and conversion of foreign and collectible currencies.

Foreign Money

Depending on your agency’s location, you may get very little to extremely large amounts of foreign monies. Many banks throughout the U.S. will not take foreign coin and all of them should be verifying any foreign bills brought in for deposit, which could take hours. So, once you have obtained the necessary releases and/or satisfied the requirement for the agency to keep or deposit the currency, what could you do to avoid having the currency pile up in the evidence room? Listed below is an option that could alleviate questions into where the money went.

Step 1 – Make a spreadsheet which details the case number, description of currency, face value (if able to determine), and make a column for received value. You may want to consider limiting the number of cases to about 20-25 due to the amount of time it could take the bank to verify the foreign bills.

Step 2 – List the 20-25 cases that have approval for disposition, including coin. Even though you know the bank will not take the coin, listing it and what happens to it shows the complete transparency of all cases that you are working to dispose of.

Step 3 – Have a supervisor endorse the spreadsheet, acknowledging that at least two persons will be leaving the facility with the paper currency to convert it to U.S. funds for deposit. Remember the coins will not be accepted by the bank; they will be left behind for further disposition.

Step 4 – Document under the received value column for each case as the bank converts the money.

Step 5 – Document under the received value column for any paper bills not able to be converted or rejected by the bank and any coin with a code or verbiage that shows that currency to be worthless and send it to be auctioned or destroyed.

Step 6 – Scan the final document(s) into the property room computer (if computer has capability) and file a copy into the case file for the long-term record. Plus, complete any digital entries in the computer such as: “Case converted to $5.25 U.S. dollars” or “Foreign coins sent to auction, no value”.

This process has been field tested for over three years with scrutiny from an internal auditor and internal affairs investigator, and has been found to be very thorough in documenting exactly what was done with the money in every case.

Collectible Money

This process is very similar to the above process, but differs in that what do you do when you have a collection of 50 silver dollars that is definitely worth more than $50. Many agencies have tried to use the “get three quotes” option, but by the time you get them, the price will change because of the precious metals market. Here again is a process that could help with the documentation and disposition of these types of currency.

Step 1 – Make sure you have obtained all the necessary releases, approvals, or requirements met for your governmental agency to keep the money. You DO NOT want to ever convert prior to this because if you do, then you would be obligated to pay the person contesting...
Collectible Money - Step 1 – cont’d.

your process the higher amount you obtained, rather than just the actual money, plus any damages awarded by the courts. Also, if you have a trusted company that your agency can sell items to, then you will be able to accept a good offer from them on the spot.

Step 2 – Make the spreadsheet of 20-25 cases with the same columns as the Foreign Money spreadsheet. Make a new column of money not worth converting, but which will then need to be deposited at face value.

Step 3 – Have a supervisor endorsement to remove the monetary items off site.

Step 4 – Document in the columns the received value for each case and any non-converted U.S. amounts. Example would be $300 received for 40 silver dollars and then you would have $10 left in U.S. currency to deposit as normal.

Step 5 – Add info into digital and physical case files. This process has also been tested for over three years and both auditors and investigators have been able to see every transaction, movement, and all disposition of the money moved.

Conclusion

While these options are by no means the only way to document these types of transactions, it does allow for an idea with a lot of detail and transparency. Your agency may have a perfectly solid process and may or may not want to adopt portions of this plan to help strengthen money movement concerns or issues.

Ultimately our goal of evidence management is best practices and accountability. When it comes to money management, it’s best to be thorough to eliminate the appearance of any wrongdoing.

If you have questions on this process or would like a copy of what a completed spreadsheet would look like, please feel free to contact me at cris.gonzales@sheriff.pima.gov or reach out to one of your IAPE representatives.

Sergeant Cris Gonzales #1272
Pima County Sheriff’s Department
School Resource Officer (SRO) Supervisor

HAVE SOMETHING TO SHARE WITH IAPE?

Please feel free to submit informational, procedural, or other articles pertinent to Property and Evidence Management for consideration of future publication to:

http://home.iape.org/

We are always glad to hear about departmental successes and like to share them for the benefit of all Property and Evidence Management departments and technicians.
CERTIFIED PROPERTY AND EVIDENCE SPECIALIST

Requirements
There are 5 criteria that must be met in order to become a Certified Property & Evidence Specialist (CPES):

1. Applicant must have attended and completed the IAPE two-day "Property & Evidence Management Course", or completed the web-based video course.
2. Applicant must have served in Property function for:
   a. One year as a full time assignment,  OR  b. A total of 2,080 hours (one year equivalent) as a part time assignment
   NOTE: The applicant's Police chief, Sheriff, CEO or his/her designee must sign the application
3. Submit application and testing fee.
4. Achieve a satisfactory grade on the CPES online test.
5. Be a current dues paid member of IAPE and must remain a member during the period of certification.

Procedures - Here are the steps to apply:
1. Complete the CPES Application.
2. Ask your Chief, Sheriff, or CEO to sign the application verifying your experience in the Property function.
3. Send the completed application along with your payment (personal check or U.S. Postal Service Money Order) payable to "IAPE" in the amount of $175.00. A credit card can be used for payment. Mail the form to the address on the application.

CPES Online Test Once your application and testing fee have been received, and your job experience verified, you will be sent an e-mail that will give you your login information and the time frame for your Online Certification Test. You will need a computer that has access to the Internet for sixty (60) minutes. You will be immediately notified of the outcome of your test once you complete it. Should you be unsuccessful in your first attempt, you will be given one more opportunity to take another version of the test, included in your initial fee. After successful completion of your test you will be mailed your official IAPE Certified Property and Evidence Specialist certificate within several weeks.

CORPORATE CERTIFIED PROPERTY AND EVIDENCE SPECIALIST

Requirements - There are 5 criteria that must be met in order to become a Corporate Certified Property & Evidence Specialist (CCPES):

1. Applicant must have attended and completed the IAPE two-day "Property & Evidence Management Course", or completed the web-based video course.
2. Applicant must have served in Property function for:
   a. One year as a full time assignment,  OR  b. A total of 2,080 hours (one year equivalent) as a part time assignment
   NOTE: The applicant’s CEO or his/her designee must sign the application
3. Submit application and testing fee.
4. Achieve a satisfactory grade on the CCPES online test.
5. Be a current dues paid member of IAPE and must remain a member during the period of certification.

Procedures - Here are the steps to apply:
1. Complete the CCPES Application.
2. Ask your CEO to sign the application verifying your experience in the Property function.
3. Send the completed application along with your payment (personal check or U.S. Postal Service Money Order) payable to "IAPE" in the amount of $225.00. A credit card can be used for payment. Mail the form to the address on the application.

CCPES Online Test Once your application and testing fee have been received, and your job experience verified, you will be sent an e-mail that will give you your login information and the time frame for your Online Certification Test. You will need a computer that has access to the Internet for sixty (60) minutes. You will be immediately notified of the outcome of your test once you complete it. Should you be unsuccessful in your first attempt, you will be given one more opportunity to take another version of the test, included in your initial fee. After successful completion of your test you will be mailed your official IAPE Corporate Certified Property and Evidence Specialist certificate within several weeks.

QUESTIONS?
Payment & Billing:  1-800-449-4273 Ext.3    Certification & Testing:  1-800-449-4273 Ext.4
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION for PROPERTY and EVIDENCE, Inc.

RE-CERTIFICATION APPLICATION

www.iape.org

TYPE OF CERTIFICATION REQUESTED

- Certified Property and Evidence Specialist (CPES) (for Law Enforcement)
- Corporate Certified Property and Evidence Specialist (CCPES) (for Private Industry)

Applicant’s Full Name _________________________________________________________________________
Please print legibly

Employer _____________________________________________________
- Police
- Sheriff
- Other

Mailing Address ____________________________________________________________________________
Street City State / Zip

Business Telephone (_____) ________________________    E-Mail __________________________________
Required for Online Test

Attendance at IAPE Property & Evidence Management Class (or On-Line Equivalent)
within the last 5 years

- Attended Class ________________________________
- Completed Video Course _______________
  Month / Year / City                                                                                Month / Year

Current Dues Paid Member of IAPE  Yes  No  If dues are not current, call 1-800-449-4273 to re-apply.

Recertification Fee

- CPES Fee: $100 USD (Law Enforcement)
- CCPES Fee: $100 USD (Private Industry)

- Enclosed is a check or Money Order made out to IAPE

Please charge to:  - MasterCard  - Visa  - AmEx  - Discover

__________________________________________________________ Card Number
Expires (Month / Year) Security Code

Signature: ______________________________________________________ Date: ____________________

E-Mail for Payment Receipt: ____________________________________  NOTE: E-mail Address Required

Mail completed application & payment to:  7474 Figueroa Street, Suite 125 • Los Angeles, California 90041
**CPES RECERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS**

CPES initial certification is valid for a period of 5 years. To maintain certification, CPES designees must complete continuing training during the five year period. The IAPE Board of Directors has established the following criteria for recertification:

- Continued dues paid membership in IAPE
- Completion of continuing education through 1 of 2 options:
  1. Attendance of another 2 day “Property & Evidence Management” course during the 5 year period (for a class schedule go to: http://iape.org/classes/classRegistration.php)
- Submission of a Recertification Application along with payment ($100) and proof of completion of required training.

**NOTE:** Recertification is for another 5 year period.
(Recertification application can be found at: http://www.iapevideo.com/learnmore.php)

Questions: Billing or payment for recertification or classes, call IAPE at: 1-800-449-4273

For technical questions regarding the online classes, please contact: Kiley Associates at 1-631-628-2823 or e-mail: bkiley@kileyassociates.com

**IAPE AVAILABLE TO TALK ABOUT OUR TRAINING**

We are always glad to hear from you and respond to whatever questions you may have about any of our training programs, including certification, accreditation, and even our new supervisor’s training classes.

It is important to us that we address concerns and issues that affect the day-to-day operations of your property room, and to know that we are meeting your needs.

Feel free to contact us at any time:

http://home.iape.org/ • 1.800.449.4273
A Utah State Auditor’s Office report highlighted shortcomings in how many police departments store and manage their evidence. The report, released to the public on Wednesday, analyzed the evidence organization practices of seven police agencies from across the state. Auditors also combed through the department’s evidence lockers and released their findings.

Agencies selected for the report were done at random, but investigators were sure to include departments of varying sizes, according to Utah State Auditor John Dougall. Auditors found that out of the departments analyzed, five of the seven agencies had missing money, firearms, controlled substances or drug paraphernalia from their evidence lockers, according to the report.

One department, which has a jurisdiction population of under 30,000 people and 20-30 full-time police officers, reported they had over 66 missing items from their evidence locker. Those items consist of money, firearms, controlled substances or drug paraphernalia; however the report did not specify the exact number of each type of item reported missing.

Auditors found that the items reported lost included heroin, cocaine, methamphetamine, money and a firearm. Officials at the departments surmised that the missing items were likely destroyed, disposed of, transferred to other agencies or returned to their owners. However, the report notes that due to a lack of inventory records, investigators were unable to determine if the missing items were gone due to poor record keeping, theft or other reasons.

Other evidence was found to be marked as destroyed when it was actually in the evidence lockup, while other pieces of evidence were believed to be in an evidence lockup when it was actually destroyed.

The report comes less than a year after the lone evidence technician at the Weber County Sheriff’s Office was fired and later charged with evidence tampering after she was found high on meth while on duty in the evidence room, according to charging documents. She was suspended and later terminated from the department. Utah State Auditor John Dougall said Wednesday afternoon that the audit of evidence lockers from around the state began months before Follum’s arrest.

The report went on to detail how departments had “inadequate controls” over how they stored evidence, and found “weak controls and, in some cases, a lack of controls over property storage.” Auditors advised the agencies to regularly conduct full inventory inspections and implement multiple requirements before entering an evidence room.

Another topic in the report found that some agencies fail to properly deposit seized money. Two agencies audited were found to have $175,000 and $300,000 stored in their respective evidence rooms, and other agencies had money that had been in evidence for 10 years or more. Another agency reportedly didn’t keep their seized money in a locked safe, and instead stored money in five cardboard boxes.

“We found that some sampled agencies are storing money in property rooms, delaying deposits for months or, in some cases, even years,” the audit said. Auditors also found that some agencies were not properly returning property to the rightful owners. The review indicates that most of the agencies audited, six out of the seven, destroy found property rather than returning it to the finder if the property goes unclaimed.

The review also found that most agencies do not issue receipts for property taken without a warrant, which is against state law. However, auditors found that all agencies analyzed did provide receipts if a search warrant was issued.

With each bullet point, the review gave suggestions to agencies for tighter security and additional oversight of their evidence lockups.

Dougall said that since their audit, some agencies have already began to make improvements based on his office’s recommendations. He went on to say that the state auditor’s office currently has two ongoing audits regarding law enforcement agencies in the state, but could not elaborate further on what aspect or aspects were under audit.

However, Dougall did confirm that one of the ongoing audits stemmed from findings in the report.

LINK TO STORY HERE
Deep inside a six-story, brown and tan state building in Norfolk, not far from the waterfront, you’ll find thousands of sealed bags stored in a locked vault.

Each bag is labeled with a unique identification number and holds its own set of evidence — powders, tablets, capsules, injectables, patches, plants and liquids of all shapes, sizes and quantities — waiting to be examined.

Scientists will eventually poke, prod, dilute and separate the substances to figure out what they are and if they are illegal. They’ll scribble notes about what they find in the course of their testing — prescription drugs, synthetic opioids or fentanyl derivatives, wrapped in a plastic baggies or stored in orange pill bottles — and present their results to law enforcement.

But that process is taking months and tying up the criminal justice system as the state agency responsible for doing the testing, the Department of Forensic Science, struggles to keep up with the increasing number of cases submitted.

The defendants facing charges for the seized drugs are also waiting — sometimes in jail — for the test results needed for their court cases to move forward.

Without that record, trials are delayed, and prosecutors must decide whether to push to keep the defendant in custody — perhaps unnecessarily, if the drug turns out not to be illegal — or release them on bond while they wait for the testing. Letting a drug-addicted defendant out risks having them use again — which sometimes proves fatal.

As of May 1, 2019, there was a backlog of 11,794 controlled substances cases, according to a statistics provided by Linda Jackson, director of the Department of Forensic Science.

Drug submissions increased 27% between 2015 and 2018, and during that same time period, the backlog grew nearly 250%. And in fiscal year 2018, it took an average of four months for a scientist to finish testing evidence in a single case.

Jackson said the main reason for the backlog is the significant rise in cases since 2015, and her department is doing its best to handle the increase by hiring more scientists and requiring overtime.

The Workload

Not only have the labs’ work increased, but it’s become more complicated.

As the makeup of drugs seized has gotten more complex, identifying them takes more time, said Brian Meinweiser, controlled substances supervisor at Norfolk’s Eastern Laboratory.

He added that there aren’t enough examiners to handle the backlog, and training a new one takes around 10 months. And the scientists already on the payroll spend hours a week testifying in court, which takes time away from the lab.

Meinweiser considers it a success if the turnaround time is under three months in his lab.

In April, the turnaround time for the four labs was 113 days — almost four months.

He said his counterparts in the western and northern labs have been racking up cases — the northern lab’s backlog is around seven or eight months — and the forensic science department transfers the cases across the state so each lab has around the same workload.

In 2017, 28% of prescription opioid cases submitted to the department came from the western part of the state, even though it only makes up 5% of the state’s population. That area also led the way in amount of methamphetamine submitted at 30%.

Lt. Jason Robinson, who leads a regional drug task force from the Virginia State Police office in Wytheville, said that while meth submitted hasn’t decreased, the number of clandestine meth labs has dropped over the years.
“People are still using meth; it’s just that they aren’t making it. It’s cheaper, more profitable to buy it,” he said over the phone.

In the 15 western counties he covers, opioids remain a problem, although Robinson said the state’s prescription monitoring program, which allows prescribers and pharmacists to track prescriptions, is helping reduce the amount of opioids seized.

For Meinweiser, who has been with the department for 13 years, he sees the drug backlog steadying soon, at least in Norfolk.

“There’s always something. You get caught up, something happens, and you fall behind again,” he said.

In 2017, cocaine and heroin were the most-submitted drugs in Region 5, which includes the Eastern Shore, all of Hampton Roads and seven counties immediately to the west.

Testing and Testifying

Because examiners work on cases in the order they were received, the evidence brought in by police officers is given a case number and placed in storage until someone is ready to test it.

An examiner starts by taking out the sealed bag of evidence, conducts an inventory and removes anything that won’t be tested. A 1998 state policy eased the burden on scientists by saying they don’t have to test items with residue, such as a smoking device, if there are accompanying weighable drugs in the case.

The examiner weighs each piece — the weight could affect the type of charge the defendant receives — and compares it to a “standard,” or a pure sample manufactured and purchased legally to serve as a benchmark in drug testing.

As they work, the scientist is noting the substance’s color, markings, number of pieces, the container it’s in and what tests have been performed.

If there are 15 tablets bearing different markings, for example, each one has to be tested. The evidence could also contain synthetic opioids or illicit fentanyl, each with a different chemical makeup.

More and more, that’s what examiners like Meinweiser are seeing. The percentage of illicit fentanyl cases submitted rose 2,212% between 2013 and 2017.

“Because of the mixture, there’s obviously more drugs in there, more standards to run, and typically the mixtures we’re seeing with the opioids, there’s different fentanyl derivatives,” Meinweiser said.

Sometimes, if the substance is especially complex, examiners have to custom order standards to compare the evidence to, which can take several weeks or months. Finally, after all the tests have been completed, the examiner finishes their notes, issues a “certificate of analysis” for the prosecutor and investigating officer, seals up the evidence bag and returns it to the police.

But in between the inventorying and the testing, examiners are often waiting to testify in court. A 2009 U.S. Supreme Court ruling in the case of Melendez-Diaz v. Massachusetts increased the number of witness subpoenas staff received, meaning more time spent out of the lab. The court said a defendant has the right to cross-examine the examiner who tested drugs. In the past, prosecutors often submitted the scientists’ written reports to juries without testimony.

While Meinweiser said he’ll only spend 15-20 minutes on the stand, he’ll sometimes wait hours for his turn to testify. In 2017, the controlled-substances staff received 7,360 subpoenas and made more than 500 court appearances, resulting in about 66 days away from the lab. And unlike Meinweiser, who enjoys a relatively short commute to any courthouse in Hampton Roads, some of his counterparts in western Virginia sometimes have to drive hours to testify.

To save time, the state department has asked for its examiners to be able to testify remotely via video. In a survey of law-enforcement officials, attorneys and medical examiners last year, 68% said they’d be interested in allowing examiners to testify remotely. Jackson said defense attorneys were more likely to answer “no.”
Elliott Bender, a Richmond-based criminal defense attorney, said it might work for bench trials but would be tougher to execute with a jury.

“Anytime you have video testimony it’s going to send a weird signal to a jury,” he said, adding jurors could have doubts about the examiner’s location and qualifications.

### The Waiting Game

Bender said he’s had clients sit in jail for seven or nine months, waiting for evidence to be tested. In some of his cases, evidence turns out not to be illegal drugs.

“At nine months, your client is saying, ‘I want to go home,’” Bender said.

When the backlog was over five months, Meinweiser got a lot of phone calls.

“The judges didn’t want to hold people in jail that long,” he said. He said judges were conflicted, because they also feared letting defendants out of jail meant they could use again, and possibly overdose, before the lab results came back.

Such a case came across the desk of Williamsburg-James City County Commonwealth’s Attorney Nate Green last year. With agreement from the defense, a judge released a defendant on bond and ordered him to attend a drug treatment program, but the defendant fatally overdosed on heroin before the examiner could issue a report. Green said while the defendant wasn’t a flight risk or a danger to the public, he was a danger to himself.

“We’re not giving them the death penalty by letting them out and letting them use heroin again and kill themselves,” he said.

Del. Mike Mullin, who works as a criminal defense attorney in Newport News, tells his clients that’s just how the judicial system works right now.

“When someone’s waiting for trial on a charge like this, that could be their livelihood. That could be their reputation in society. That could be their feeling of security,” he said. “It’s not something that either side can sort of hurry up,” he said he tells defendants. “It’s just one of those things you have to deal with at the moment.”

Green said he has to carefully schedule preliminary hearings and grand juries, as there’s always a chance the certificate of analysis hasn’t been issued in time for a hearing. “It just makes us think about where on the assembly line of justice we put this case,” he said.

### Solutions

To address some of the backlog, the department received money to hire six more forensic scientists in the fiscal 2019 budget.

But it still wouldn’t be enough to manage the caseload, so in August, the governor agreed to let the department use an additional $1.66 million now that it wasn’t scheduled to get until 2020. It will go to hire an additional six scientists, two evidence specialists and two forensic administrative specialists; purchase two pieces of equipment needed to handle the increase; and pay to have some of the backlogged evidence tested at a commercial laboratory. About 380 cases have been outsourced so far, with 75 cases a week being sent out for analysis, Jackson said.

Between the additional staff and the outsourcing, the department has been able to reduce the backlog by about 2,000 cases in five months. Still, the department is expecting a 10% increase in submissions in 2019, according to a 2018 annual forensic science department report. And, according to the 2018 annual report, the state is evaluating policy changes that would limit submissions and testing.

In the short term, there’s another solution: making scientists work longer hours. In fall 2017 and 2018, the department required all controlled-substances examiners to put in overtime. They did it again this year between January 1 and May 30, this time asking for an additional 40 hours of work.

“We have to worry about burnout in our job too,” Meinwieser said. “We obviously have to get everything right, and if people are tired or they are burned out, it’s not going to help anything.”

**LINK TO STORY HERE**
https://pilotonline.com/news/government/virginia/article_815f3f9a-703a-11e9-860d-b7d2e34aa190.html
The Ohio Attorney General’s Office Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) is notifying law enforcement of a potential officer safety issue related to a substance recently submitted to the BCI Athens office from the Lawrence County Drug Task Force and tested by the BCI London laboratory. The substance appeared to be Marijuana bud material, however, after testing, it was found to actually be a mixture of Tramadol, Heroin, and Fentanyl. There were also trace amounts of Methamphetamine included in the mixture. A substance similar in appearance has also been reported in Toledo, Ohio and Canada.
Give us your bumpers, your couches, and your rolls of carpet. We’ve got a solution.

Storing evidence isn’t always as easy as putting it in a locker or on a shelf. With the amount and size of evidence specimens increasing and long-term space diminishing, many police departments and public safety buildings are turning to Spacesaver’s ActivRAC® and Xtend® High-Bay mobile racking systems. From boxes to bumpers, couches to carpet, we’ll work with you to store every object in your evidence inventory safely and effectively.

At Spacesaver, our public safety storage solutions are designed to meet the many needs of an industry with a common goal: to protect and serve. Learn more about our Public Safety solutions at www.storageforgood.com
Birmingham, Alabama began impounding Bird scooters in September, 2018, two weeks after the city asked the rideshare company to remove the illegal vehicles. Dozens of the dockless electric scooters landed in the Southside and Red Mountain communities of Birmingham on August 28. The scooters are located and rented through the Bird app.

“Birmingham welcomes innovation and innovators. But, in order to create the environment for creativity and progress to thrive, businesses need to follow processes that promote fairness,” Birmingham spokesperson Rick Journey said in a statement. “In this case, a competing firm has approached city officials with a thoughtful proposal. We cannot let another company operate without approval when a competitor is using the proper channels to enter our market. Innovation and free enterprise rely on an even chance for each competing firm to succeed and allowing Bird to continue in its current form would violate that basic principle.”

For placing scooters illegally on Birmingham city sidewalks, Bird could be charged up to $500 a day for each scooter. The city hasn’t said how much the impounding and storage of the scooters could cost Bird.

“We gave the company a period of time to comply with the notification they received from the city,” he said in an email. “We observed the scooters were still located at various areas around the city and in use by citizens. We confirmed though the BPD Business Compliance Unit that the owners of Bird had not obtained the proper license to operate, and we began to remove the scooters from the public areas.”

Homewood opted to remove and impound about 38 scooters from city sidewalks the first week, said police Sgt. John Carr. Bird was scheduled to pick them up and receive a citation for doing business without a license. Fines and court costs for the citation total $371.

While Bird has declined to release any ridership data for Birmingham, scooter riders can often be seen in Avondale, Lakeview, downtown and the University of Alabama at Birmingham campus.

**Commentary**

With the advent of the e-scooter, business entrepreneurs around the world have jumped into action and have invested millions of dollars in bringing this relatively new and clean technology to our communities for a very inexpensive method of travel. However, like everything else in life some will love them and some will hate the idea.

As the property room custodian, be on lookout (BOLO) for possibly becoming the e-scooter custodian or the e-custodian removal service! Over the last 12 months, city after city has accepted and banned these e-scooters. Whether legalized or not, you will have some of them stop by for a visit in your property room, just like bicycles. The unknown now is how many are you going to get.

**IAPE says: BE PREPARED!**
This two-day course provides a unique training opportunity for Law Enforcement Personnel responsible for, or actively involved in, the operation, supervision or management of a Property and Evidence Unit.

**Special attention will be given to:**

- DNA Storage / Handling (NIJ / NIST)
- Accreditation Standards
- Management Concepts
- Policies & Procedures
- Packaging Standards
- Chain of Custody (Documentation)
- Automation / Bar Coding
- Purging and Disposition
- Auctions / Diversion
- Destruction Processes
- Audits / Inventories
- Design and Layout Criteria
- Environmental Concerns
- Space Standards
- Storage / Shelving
- Firearm Storage / Handling
- Narcotics Storage / Handling
- Currency Protocols
- Bio-Hazards
- Case Studies / Liabilities

**Training Format**
The class is an intensive 16 hour classroom-style course designed to maximize learning sound property room concepts. Extensive PowerPoint and video collections illustrate properly designed facilities and systems.

**Keeping Up and Staying Ahead**
Training has been designed to help recognize and avoid the pitfalls that can lead to court challenges, lawsuits, poor press relations, disciplinary action, termination and indictments.

**Instructors**
Instructors are recognized experts in the field, with both professional and academic credentials.

**Certification of Attendance**
Students will receive a Certificate of Attendance, in addition to the class materials and valuable knowledge received in the class.

**Class Composition and Size**
Limited-size classes of both sworn and civilian personnel involved in the operation, supervisors, managers, and administrators of the property function. Classes fill up quickly - Sign Up Early!

**Tuition Fee**
Course fee includes tuition, membership, student workbook, CD of forms and property manuals. Discount tuitions are available to returning members and when additional students from the same agency attend the same class.

**Transportation and Lodging**
Training is usually held at hosting department’s training facility or at the listed hotel. Transportation, food, and lodging are the responsibility of each participant.

**Exchange Ideas**
Network with property room professionals from agencies across the United States and Canada.
# International Association for Property and Evidence, Inc.

## Evidence Log

**Tuition Rates for 2019**

- **$375** Non-Member Rate *
- **$350** Additional Attendee *
- **$325** IAPE Current Member Rate (1st time attending)
- **$300** IAPE Current Member Rate (Previously attended)
- **$300** IAPE Current Member, Add’tl. Attendee *(includes IAPE 1 year membership & Evidence Log)*
- **$50** Annual Membership Only *(incls. subscription to Evidence Log)*

---

**Hotel Reservation Information**

- When making reservations, ask the hotel for the *International Association for Property and Evidence, Inc.* participant’s special discount rate.
- To be guaranteed a room at the discount rate, make reservations 30 days in advance.
- Training sessions from 8 a.m. - 4:30 p.m. daily.
- Questions ??? Call (800) 449-IAPE (4273)

**Registration Information**

- Complete registration form online a minimum of two weeks prior to the training session, and pay by credit card. *If not paying by credit card, you will be invoiced and remit a check, money order or purchase order, payable to: IAPE Training.*

**Send to the following NEW address:**

International Association for Property & Evidence, Inc.  
Attn: Training Division  
7474 Figueroa Street, Suite 125  
Los Angeles, California 90041

- Refunds will be made with 14 days notice.
- Substitutions may be made at any time.

**TUITION RATES FOR 2019**

---

**BOLO BE ON THE LOOKOUT**

**UPCOMING PROPERTY & EVIDENCE CLASSES**

**2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 16 &amp; 17</td>
<td>Columbia, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 23 &amp; 24</td>
<td>Winter Haven, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 29 &amp; 30</td>
<td>Commerce City, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>South San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 14 &amp; 15</td>
<td>Gwinette, GA <strong>FULL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 21 &amp; 22</td>
<td>Minneapolis, MN <strong>FULL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 11 &amp; 12</td>
<td>Nashville Intl’ Airport, TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 24 &amp; 25</td>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>Kingston, ON (Canada)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 16 &amp; 17</td>
<td>Sterling Heights, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 29 &amp; 30</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 4 &amp; 5</td>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 14 &amp; 15</td>
<td>St, Peters, MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Burbank, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 24 &amp; 25</td>
<td>Las Vegas, NV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9 &amp; 10</td>
<td>Anchorage, AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 24 &amp; 25</td>
<td>Valhalla, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 29 &amp; 30</td>
<td>Edmond, OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 20 &amp; 21</td>
<td>Hurst, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 9 &amp; 10</td>
<td>Fairfax, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 24 &amp; 25</td>
<td>Harris County, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 19 &amp; 20</td>
<td>New Bern, NC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*We are always adding new classes... like Gilbert, Rhode Island and Kenosha, Wisconsin (dates TBA) - plus more across the country.*

*Check website for updates and don’t forget about our Supervisor’s Classes!!!*

Please click here to go to website for: **Membership / Registration Form**

You can also sign up to take an online class. We offer the full management course, plus four other modules.

*(See Page 12 for all video titles.)*
Traffic stops by Maricopa County sheriff's deputies have fallen 52% from 2015 to 2018, according to figures provided by the department. The dramatic decline – from 31,700 stops to 15,200 – raises questions about whether officers are missing evidence of illegal drugs, burglaries and other crimes that are sometimes discovered when pulling over motorists. Penzone conceded officers may be missing criminal activity but emphasized it’s unacceptable for them to back away from their bread-and-butter duties.

The latest publicly available traffic-stop analysis for the agency by Arizona State University criminal justice researchers found deputies have made improvements but are still more likely to search and arrest Hispanic drivers than white drivers. The agency has been under court supervision since a judge concluded in 2013 that sheriff’s deputies racially profiled Latinos in Arpaio’s traffic patrols that targeted immigrants. Figures only go back to 2015 because the agency adopted a new record-keeping system, and earlier figures don’t contain enough detail to make a comparison.

The overhaul includes retraining officers on making constitutional stops, establishing an alert system to spot problematic behavior by officers, equipping deputies with body cameras and holding interventions with officers flagged for having statistical differences from their peers in how they treated Latinos.

The judge in the profiling case also ordered an extensive overhaul of the agency’s internal affairs operations, which under Arpaio’s leadership had been criticized for biased decision-making that allowed sheriff’s officials to escape accountability. While the agency is improving its compliance with the overhaul, the traffic-stop analysis covering encounters with motorists from July 2016 through June 2017 still found Hispanic drivers are more likely to be searched and arrested by deputies than white drivers. The average length of stops for Hispanic drivers is three minutes longer than for white drivers.

State Senator John Kavanagh, a former police officer who is an ally of Arpaio, said the traffic stop decrease means taxpayers aren’t getting everything they paid for. Kavanagh doesn’t blame officers for making fewer stops but rather an oversight system that he said accuses deputies of being racist. He said it was easy to predict the result of officers facing what they see as unfair scrutiny: “You get less work.”

Kathy Brody, one of the American Civil Liberties Union attorneys leading the profiling case against the sheriff’s office, said she wasn’t advocating for the sheriff’s office to make more traffic stops, but said the trend is a poor reflection on the agency.

“Our view is that they should be pulling people over for things that can cause a danger to the community,” Brody said.

John Shjarback, a criminal justice professor at the University of Texas at El Paso, said it’s normal to see a drop in enforcement numbers after a major court decision or a major event involving a police agency, such as a high-profile shooting involving officers. He also said it’s an open question among researchers about whether such drops in enforcement lead to increases in crime.

David A. Harris, a law professor at the University of Pittsburgh, who studies racial profiling and wrote a book on the subject, said such decreases are the result of agencies moving away from blanket-enforcement approaches that emphasize the volume of arrests, not the quality of arrests.

Harris feels officers are being forced to do better work. “Now, they actually have to think about whether that’s a good idea, and I don’t think that’s a bad idea at all,” he said.

Joe Clure, executive director of the Arizona Police Association, which advocates on issues affecting officers, said Maricopa County sheriff’s deputies have complained to him for years about the court supervision. Clure said deputies’ self-preservation instincts kick in when they think they are being unfairly scrutinized.

“It’s just human nature,” Clure said. “You don’t want to do anything to get caught under the microscope.” The hundreds of internal affairs investigations that have been launched also are discouraging sheriff’s patrol deputies and jail officers from taking the initiative in their work, according to Clure. Detention officers, for instance, are doing fewer searches of inmates and cells because they fear being targeted in protracted internal investigations that could make it harder for them to find work at other police agencies.

“Now, they actually have to think about whether that’s a good idea, and I don’t think that’s a bad idea at all,” he said.

Harris feels officers are being forced to do better work. “Now, they actually have to think about whether that’s a good idea, and I don’t think that’s a bad idea at all,” he said.

David A. Harris, a law professor at the University of Pittsburgh, who studies racial profiling and wrote a book on the subject, said such decreases are the result of agencies moving away from blanket-enforcement approaches that emphasize the volume of arrests, not the quality of arrests.

Harris feels officers are being forced to do better work. “Now, they actually have to think about whether that’s a good idea, and I don’t think that’s a bad idea at all,” he said.

John Shjarback, a criminal justice professor at the University of Texas at El Paso, said it’s normal to see a drop in enforcement numbers after a major court decision or a major event involving a police agency, such as a high-profile shooting involving officers. He also said it’s an open question among researchers about whether such drops in enforcement lead to increases in crime.

David A. Harris, a law professor at the University of Pittsburgh, who studies racial profiling and wrote a book on the subject, said such decreases are the result of agencies moving away from blanket-enforcement approaches that emphasize the volume of arrests, not the quality of arrests.

Harris feels officers are being forced to do better work. “Now, they actually have to think about whether that’s a good idea, and I don't think that's a bad idea at all,” he said.
SafeStore offers complete, documented **Chain of Custody** protection and storage of all evidence or sensitive material, from the smallest DNA sample to whole aircraft wreckage. We also specialize in high profile items like the Unabomber Cabin. Call **866-890-SAFE** to speak with one of our storage specialists.
It’s not uncommon for something be missing in our property rooms. After teaching hundreds of evidence classes from coast to coast and providing auditing service to over 100 clients, I have identified the one item that may be missing in most departments. This missing item is inadequate policies and procedures for the day-to-day operations. The first question for us to ask is, if the evidence custodian were to win the lottery tomorrow and never come back, is there a procedures manual in place that can walk that new employee through every task and duty that is performed in the property room?

After reviewing hundreds of policies, I have identified over 50 topics that are frequently missed or forgotten entirely! I would encourage you to read the article beginning on page 13 in this edition of the Evidence Log and then use the list below that identifies those topics that really need to be included.

**STAFFING AND DUTIES**
Responsibilities/Duties/Tasks of The Property Officer/Evidence Custodian

**TRAINING**
- Required training both external (classroom) and internal topics such as firearm safety, bloodborne pathogens, and computer software.
- Training requirement for new supervisors and managers.

**DEPARTMENT DIRECTIVES**
- Person(s) required to update policies and procedures in the property room.
- Frequency of updates.

**SECURITY**
- Policy that defines who has access to the property room.
- Any requirement to change locks, keys, combinations, and PIN numbers with changes of personnel.
- Any requirement to immediately report the loss of keys or PIN numbers.
- Define who should have access to the property room.
- Prohibition on duplicating keys to the property room.
- After-hours entry into the property room – Property and evidence unit personnel.
- After-hours entry – Non-property and evidence unit personnel / emergency entry.
- A written requirement that any visitors in the property room shall be escorted continuously. Necessity to maintain an access log and duration.

**PROPERTY AND EVIDENCE INTAKE**
- Requirement that all submitted property or evidence be removed from lockers and stored within an established time frame.
- Written guidance on how to handle property and evidence that is not properly documented and/or packaged. Protocols on what tasks the property officer is required to do when receiving property and evidence (examination of packaging/seals for correctness, validation of descriptions, documentation, etc.).
- Definition of who is responsible for finding owners in Found Property and Safekeeping cases.
- Upon intake of guns, guns are checked for loaded status and correct serial numbers.
- Guidance on whether money is counted at time of submittal.

**PROPERTY AND EVIDENCE UNIT STORAGE LOCATIONS AND LAYOUT**
- Defining in policy where different types of evidence are to be stored.

*Continued on Next Page*
DOCUMENTATION OF MOVEMENT OF PROPERTY AND EVIDENCE (FINAL AND TEMPORARY)

• Policy outlining who can check out evidence from the property room.
• Any special requirements for checking out guns, money and drugs.
• Requirements for tracking items that are temporarily released from property room (court, lab, investigations).
• Release procedures and information required when returning property to owners.
• Release of firearms and prohibited person checks.
• Currency transfers to finance or bank.

DOCUMENTATION DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY AND EVIDENCE

• Policy that defines when evidence is to be reviewed for purging / release.
• Purging protocols (step by step on how to review case for final disposition).
• Defining what the property room is responsible for in purging process.
• Defining what the case officer is responsible for in purging process.
• Time limits for case officers to respond to all inquiries from the property room regarding dispositions.

SECTION 13 DOCUMENTATION DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY AND EVIDENCE

Protocols on entire auction process (staging to transfer).

SECTION 14 DIVERSION OF PROPERTY TO DEPARTMENT USE

Protocols and approval processes on how to divert property / evidence to department use.

SECTION 15 DESTRUCTION OF PROPERTY AND EVIDENCE

• Specific requirement that mandates that guns, drugs, and money that are awaiting removal (disposal) are to always be secured with the highest level of security.
• Staging processes for property and evidence pending destruction.
• Explicit instructions on how and where all types of evidence are to be destroyed.
• Department mandates that outline any witness requirements for high-profile evidence.
• Auditing requirement for drugs awaiting destruction.
• Destruction process/method for destroying general property and evidence.
• Written mandates that require an after-action report to document all drug and gun destructions.
• Explicit guidance in the handling prescription medication from drop-boxes.
• Destruction guidance in the removal of biohazards from the inventory.

AUDIT AND INSPECTIONS

• Policy that mandates audits.
• Policy that defines the frequency of audits.
• Policy that outlines who is responsible for audits.
• Guidance on what is expected and how to conduct.
• Topics for audit.
• Necessity for supervisor and/or managers to conduct periodic inspection, and topics for review.

INVENTORIES

• Policy that mandates inventories.
• Direction on when audits are to be conducted (annually, with change of personnel, other).
• Methodology for conducting inventories.
• Protocols on how to document missing or lost items.

I would strongly suggest that the above 50 items be compared against existing policies and considering inclusion in any of your property room policies.
The following was shared with us by Valerie Newsom, Evidence Custodian for the Anacortes Police Department in Washington State.

Hi, Joe,

In my head I can hear your voice talking about these things that came into our evidence room, either in the quarterly magazine or in a class.

THE STICK

A homeless man uses a three-foot stick to threaten an elderly couple in their van as they are attempting to park at a city-owned park.

The homeless man perceives they are encroaching on “his” territory, approaches them, and tells them to move or he’ll strike their van with his stick, which he then starts tapping on the ground in a threatening manner. They come in to APD to report such. Officers have a pretty good idea who the homeless man is and go to the location finding him camped out with said stick. The stick is then confiscated as evidence and the homeless man booked into jail on felony harassment charges to which he pleads guilty. So, what about the stick? I sent the det. sgt. an email, and he said he didn’t see why the defendant couldn’t have his stick back. So I then set about to track down the still-homeless defendant as our state RCW states we must notify the owner “in writing” and then wait 60 days for them to claim it.

After a couple of letters were mailed to the defendant’s Department of Licensing address and returned and then to his general delivery address and returned as unclaimed, my supervisor finally gave me permission to dispose of the stick, which I did on yesterday’s date.

THE STONES

Another homeless man gets booked on his warrants.

The officer booked an extremely heavy backpack (guesstimate 50 pounds) as Safekeeping.

Description: One backpack containing miscellaneous personal property. I noted there was no other explanation nor inventory of contents.

So, I faxed a letter to the jail to give to the arrestee, letting him know how to go about claiming his backpack when he gets out.

The man comes in and this is how my narrative reads:

JOHN DOE was ID’d via his WADL, signed the Release and Receipt form and was given a copy. DOE then removed all of the contents from his backpack and searched through them on our window counter to ensure all items he expected to be there were still there. He was specifically looking for some opals which were in a small white plastic container wrapped in duct tape. He showed me the rocks which contained what he claimed to be opals, pointing out the shiny objects within the rocks to me. I noted the backpack had been very heavy and could now see it contained numerous cloth bags containing various rocks. DOE said he is a rock collector. Satisfied that all of his possessions were there, DOE then left the station.

Joe, I think it’s just the humor of what we occasionally deal with that struck me today, especially since these two events as described above were completed within a day of one another.

NOTE: Had the “opals” been missing, I’m not sure what would have happened, other than him complaining to a sergeant, but I think it would be a good example of why officers “should” give a complete inventory.
WE GET MAIL...

Vape Pens

Hello -

I was wondering what agencies are doing across the country with vape pens? We know that they have been known to explode if left as a whole with the battery, but if the battery doesn't come off, how do we take and store? We can't really break them into pieces and break personal property if we don't know whether they actually contain drugs. So we are just looking for best practices.

Thank you.
Amanda Eisenschenk
Administrative Assistant
Watford City Police Dept,
North Dakota

Thanks for your question, Amanda -

You name the options for handling this, and that’s the way we are doing it.

FYI, we are currently working with (NIST https://www.nist.gov/) who are trying to definitively answer questions such as yours. They are wanting to provide our industry scientific answers. This discussion also includes other items such as lithium batteries. NIST has the collective ability to research questions in the scientific world and identify accepted standards. This is far sounder than simply going with what someone has told us might work.

Hopefully the research will be done by end of year. As we get them we will send out information in our newsletters.

Presently, here are some of the options or things we have seen and/or heard of:

1. Photos only, same as we do with hypodermic needles in many jurisdictions. Consider meeting with your local prosecutor and get approval as this type of item is rarely if ever needed for court. In other words - would a photo suffice?

2. Remove battery when possible and store both items separately.

3. Store in a small, closed paint can.

Hope some of this helps.
Good luck to you -

Regards,
Joe
CONGRATULATIONS!

to all of our most recently designated
Certified Property & Evidence Specialists

Watson, Nicole  Parker Police Department  Colorado
Fox, Katherine  Ohio State University Police Dept.  Ohio
Navarro, Michael  San Luis Police Department  Arizona
Santana, Marco  San Luis Police Department  Arizona
Arana, Domingo  Aurora Police Department  Colorado
Rogers, Brandelyn  Groveland Police Department  Florida
Hill, Debra  North Port Police Department  Florida
Oliveraz, Alyssa  Saint Paul Police Department  Minnesota
Lemon, Gina  Saint Paul Police Department  Minnesota
Neetz, Lisa  Portland Police Bureau  Oregon
Penry, Loni  Greenlee Cty Sheriff’s Office  Arizona
Richardson, Sarah  Indiana Univ. Police Department  Indiana
Farrell, Jacob  Pasco Sheriff’s Office  Florida
Huelskamp, Marjorie  Douglas County Sheriff’s Office  Nebraska
Kolinski, Nathan  Green Bay Police Department  Wisconsin
Stovern, Kari  Duluth Police Department  Minnesota
Lepley, Mackenzie  Billings Police Department  Montana
Silva, Tommy  Mesa Police Department  Arizona
Smith, Joel  Mesa Police Department  Arizona
Everett, Stuart  Champaign Cty Sheriff’s Office  Ohio
Murphy, Ondrea  Maggie Valley Police Department  North Carolina
Supler, Sarahanne  West Fargo Police Department  North Dakota
Zecher, Nicholas  Henderson Cty Sheriff’s Office  North Carolina
Kiramba, Sandra  Int’l. Criminal Court, The Hague  Netherlands
Margitic, Tamara  Int’l. Criminal Court, The Hague  Netherlands
Kofrc, Edin  Int’l. Criminal Court, The Hague  Netherlands
Hornbarger, Cathy  Chesterfield Cty Police Department  Virginia
Winchester, Ben  Portland Police Bureau  Oregon
Garcia, Marisela  Int’l. Criminal Court, The Hague  Netherlands
Bahl, Monica  Int’l. Criminal Court, The Hague  Netherlands
**CONGRATULATIONS!**

*to all of our most recently designated Certified Property & Evidence Specialists*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arroyos, Valeria</td>
<td>City of Anthony Police Department</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson, Joel</td>
<td>Billings Police Department</td>
<td>Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beasley, Barbara</td>
<td>Petersburg Police Department</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglin, Marguerite</td>
<td>Aurora Police Department</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andres, Crystal</td>
<td>St. Louis Cty Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy, Charles</td>
<td>Dinwiddie Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard, Jennifer</td>
<td>Routt Cty Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mittleider, Michael</td>
<td>Aurora Police Department</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trommer, Meredith</td>
<td>Dept of Forensic Sciences</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krupp, Monica</td>
<td>Johnson Cty Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyd, Diane</td>
<td>Oregon State Police</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdivia, Hayley</td>
<td>Kansas Bureau of Investigation</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simleness, Karen</td>
<td>Oregon State Police</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warne, Shelley</td>
<td>Oregon State Police</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaver, April</td>
<td>Oregon State Police</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garritson, Sharon</td>
<td>Oregon State Police</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, L. Scott</td>
<td>South Dakota Highway Patrol</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graziano, Carol-jo</td>
<td>Albemarle Cty Police Department</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypes, Linda</td>
<td>Pasco Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison, Kelly</td>
<td>Oregon State Police</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarrell, Lauren</td>
<td>Oregon State Police</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreno, Angel</td>
<td>Oregon State Police</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker, Tricia</td>
<td>Oregon State Police</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Rhiannon</td>
<td>City of Arvada Police Department</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris, Brett</td>
<td>City of Arvada Police Department</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander, Mark</td>
<td>Oregon State Police</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffmann, Cindy</td>
<td>Maryland State Police - Forensic Sciences Division</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinseth, Kathleen</td>
<td>Iowa DCI Crime Lab</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominy, Roberta</td>
<td>Osceola County Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>Florida</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence Management for Supervisors

IAPE is proud to offer Property and Evidence Management training class for SUPERVISORS. The course was developed for anyone that is assuming the responsibility of the property and evidence unit. The focus is to help supervisors to significantly improve and enhance their expertise and overall confidence in managing and maintain both evidence room personnel and the overall success of their property units processes and procedures.

NOTE: There is no prerequisite required to attend these classes.

KEY BENEFITS & TOPICS (One Day class)

- **Supervisor Focused:** We provide targeted topics and discussion that help make you a successful property room supervisor in both managing people and evidence. Interact with your classmates to come up with a solution to a problem, how to deal with a non-productive employees and more.

- **Managing Staff:** Learn about personality types, leadership traits, emotional intelligence, how to deal with performance management issues to improve employee performance.

- **Audit and Evaluation:** Prevent crises before they happen. Learn how to audit and evaluate your own operations and systems for continued success.

- **Crisis Management:** You will not only learn how to prevent crisis, but also be given tools and skills to consider when you're in the middle of a crisis.

- **Investigative Process:** Property investigative processes when dealing with missing guns, drugs and money (criminal vs administrative clearing of UTL).

- **FREE Property & Evidence by the Book | 2nd Edition (electronic version).**

**COST:** Members: $195. / Non-Members: $245.

**CHECK for ONLINE REGISTRATION:**
http://home.iape.org/classes.html#supervisor-class
As an IAPE expert in the field, I have witnessed and promoted the importance of the IAPE Property and Evidence Management Course and Certification. I have prompted the importance and worth of the training for almost 15 years and have had the opportunity of hosting the training. I believe that encouragement of employees to obtain the training and certification in the evidence management field will allow them to grow and develop their knowledge and understanding within this profession and, in the long-run, will develop your agency.

High employee turnover should be worrisome to any agency. Simply consider the expense to recruit, interview, and train new employees. As the economy improves and the job market grows, employees have more options, which makes employee retention even more challenging. Career development programs can help with retention because employees can develop a sense of loyalty for agencies who invest in them.

At the Virginia Department of Forensic Science in the Evidence Receiving Section, we have identified the Entry Level I position and the Level II position in the evidence section. The Level II position requires an employee to obtain experience through time on the job, demonstrate their knowledge, and obtain additional training. One of the training components we have incorporated into the requirements for the Level II position is that the employee attend the IAPE Property and Evidence Management Course and then become a certified property and evidence specialist through IAPE. Once the employee completes all the requirements, they are eligible to receive a ten percent increase in salary. Having the IAPE certification requirement in the Level II position enhanced their knowledge and skills in evidence management.

Through this training and certification, we have seen a decrease in employee turnover in full-time positions and an increase in employee knowledge, work ethic, and confidence. In the beginning, we were not attracting property and evidence professionals from police agencies, but now we are attracting them here at the Virginia Department of Forensic Science. Bottom line: developing a career-development plan in the property and evidence room is a great way to educate, train, motivate, empower, reward, and retain your employees. A great way to start this, is the IAPE Property and Evidence Management Course and Certification.

If your department has achieved IAPE Accreditation status or received some other accolade or recognition for your department’s management of property and evidence - please let us know! Our members would like to hear about the successes of their contemporaries...

We are all here to learn from one another!

Send your submissions to IAPE Director, Joseph Latta: jlatta@iape.org
LIST OF DEPARTMENTS THAT HAVE ACHIEVED
IAPE ACCREDITATION / REACCREDITATION STATUS

IN ACCREDITATION STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parker, Colorado Police Department</td>
<td>Rutherford County, Tennessee Sheriffs’ Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallahassee, Florida Police Department</td>
<td>Houston Forensic Science Center, Houston, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layton, Utah Police Department</td>
<td>U.S. Probation Office, South District, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Springs, Wyoming Police Department</td>
<td>Mount Pleasant, South Carolina Police Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hague – Int’l Criminal Courts, The Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HAVE ACHIEVED REACCREDITATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parker, Colorado Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallahassee, Florida Police Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FORMERLY ACCREDITED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis, Minnesota Police Department</td>
<td>U.S. Secret Service – Washington Field Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Secret Service Forensic Services Division, Washington, DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LIST OF AGENCIES & DEPARTMENTS IN PROCESS OF ACCREDITATION / REACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Highway Patrol, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood Village, Colorado Police Dept.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REACCREDITATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Layton, Utah Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Springs, Wyoming Police Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information, please contact:

Steve Campbell, IAPE Property and Evidence Room Accreditation Program Manager,
at scampbell@iape.org or (425) 985-7338

2nd Quarter, 2019

IAPE (www.iape.org), which was founded in 1993, is the world’s largest professional association of individuals whose responsibilities include the storage of items of property and/or criminal evidence. IAPE is a chartered IRS 501.c.3, not-for-profit association whose national and international membership exceeds four thousand individuals.

IAPE exists to promote professional standards and continuous progress in the processing, storage and appropriate disposition of evidence and all other property coming into the custody of law enforcement-related agencies, seeking to maximize both the integrity of the agency and the probative value of the evidence.

IAPE will develop and maintain industry standards, and provide educational opportunities and other professional resources. IAPE commits to initiating and supporting cooperative efforts with public, private and government organizations and entities with compatible missions, and will engage in lawful non-profit business, educational and scientific endeavors in furtherance of its Vision.

More than 25,000 students have attended the two-day IAPE “Property and Evidence Management” class. Also, many have completed the recently introduced online, on-demand version of that class. Over two thousand of its members have completed the experience, training, and testing necessary to achieve the status of Certified Property and Evidence Specialist (CPES).
Name of Agency: ____________________________________________________________
Address of Agency: ________________________________________________________
   Street ______________________ City ______________________ State / Zip _________
Agency Contact: ___________________________ Phone (_____) _________________
   First Name __________________ Last Name __________________
E-Mail Address: ____________________________________________________________

Does your department have at least 1 current IAPE member? (Required)  
   Yes ☐  No ☐
   If NOT, please call IAPE directly at (800) 449-4273 to apply.

Has at least 1 employee attended an IAPE class in person or online in the last 3 years? (Required)  
   Yes ☐  No ☐
   If YES, please list employee’s name and dates he/she attended:
   Employee: ___________________________  Class Dates: ________________________
   First Name __________________ Last Name __________________
   If NOT, please call IAPE directly at (800) 449-4273 to register for a class.

Non-refundable Application Fee of $500 is due at time of application.
   Enclosed ☐ is Check # ______ made payable to IAPE.  Mail to:  IAPE, P.O. Box 652, Hot Springs, SD 57747
   Charge to Credit Card # ____________________________  Exp. Date: __________
      ☐ VISA  ☐ Mastercard  ☐ Discover Card  ☐ American Express
      Month & Year
   Name on Card: ___________________________  3-Digit Security Code: __________
      First Name __________________ Last Name __________________
   Authorized Signature on Card: ____________________________________________
   (back of card)
   ☐ Please include e-mail address to request an IAPE Invoice: __________________

By signing below, you and your agency agree to the “IAPE Guidelines for Achieving and Maintaining IAPE Property and Evidence Room Accreditation ©”

Signature: _____________________________________________________________  Date: __________________
The December 2018 update of the International Association of Property and Evidence (IAPE) Professional Standards discusses the National Integrated Ballistic Information Network (NIBIN) and the importance of addressing NIBIN recommendations when writing retention policies in your property room. If you are tasked with the managing and upkeep of a property room, there are several questions you should ask yourself before considering NIBIN: (1) Do you have evidence or found property firearms in your property room? (2) Do you have fired cartridge cases in your property room that have been submitted as evidence or found property? (3) Are these items collecting dust on your shelves? (4) Are you destroying firearms without test firing them? If the answer to any of these four questions are yes, we highly suggest you consider a NIBIN policy for your agency and develop NIBIN procedures for your property room.

NIBIN is a national database managed and overseen by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF, 2018). There are a total of 175 nationwide NIBIN sites where trained personnel process firearms evidence (ATF, 2018). As of May 2018, the ATF reported that NIBIN partners have processed 99,000 NIBIN leads and 110,000 NIBIN hits, with over 3.3 million cartridge cases in the system (ATF, 2018). NIBIN is the only national network that acts as a screening tool for firearms and ballistic evidence to assist detectives with investigative leads in criminal investigations and assist with strategic crime analysis (ATF, 2018, Fact Sheet).

NIBIN is an investigative tool to allow agencies to share and search evidence in their jurisdiction, in neighboring jurisdictions, and nationwide (ATF, 2018, Fact Sheet). Entering NIBIN evidence into the system in a timely fashion may allow investigators to arrest a suspect before they re-offend. In addition, NIBIN entry and adherence to agency policies also prevent a violent crime from going cold by providing timely, relevant, and actionable intelligence to investigators (ATF, 2018, Fact Sheet). Across the country, police agencies are reporting great results in using NIBIN to solve criminal cases (Givens, 2018).

In our personal experience, and in speaking with many highly qualified property and evidence technicians across the county, the technicians may not have heard of NIBIN or may not be familiar with policies and procedures that can assist their own agencies with meeting standards for NIBIN. Many police agencies across the county are either not using NIBIN, or not using it consistently (Givens, 2018). In fact, New Jersey and Delaware are the only two states which require that all cartridge cases get entered into the NIBIN system (Givens, 2018). Consider this: your property room impounds a found property firearm. A kind citizen brings the firearm into your lobby and lets you know he/she found it in the restroom of a local fast-food restaurant. An NCIC query shows that the weapon is clear, with no record. After the specified retention time to hold found property for your agency passes, and no one comes to claim the firearm, the firearm is then staged for destruction and destroyed by your department-authorized vendor. But what if this firearm was used in a homicide in an outside jurisdiction? How would you ever know? Is it even feasible to consider that you just did the unthinkable, and destroyed homicide evidence?

**What can be entered into NIBIN?**

To use NIBIN, technicians enter fired cartridge cases that have been found on a crime scene or fired cartridge cases from test fires of recovered firearms. Unique tool marks on the fired cartridge case act as a fingerprint. When a firearm is discharged, the firearm leaves unique markings on the fired cartridge case, and just like a fingerprint, no two firearms leave the same marks (ATF, 2018). According to the ATF, only firearm evidence and fired cartridge cases related to a criminal investigation can be entered into NIBIN (ATF, 2018, Fact Sheet). Most semi-automatic weapons are NIBIN eligible, some rifles and shotguns are eligible, but most if any revolvers are not. For guidance or clarification, agencies should reach out to their state laboratory for submission guidelines and best practices for packaging and submitting firearm evidence.

**How does it work?**

Explaining how NIBIN works can be described with a simple example. A crime scene investigator responds to a homicide scene in a major metropolitan city. A victim has one penetrating gunshot wound to the chest and there is one .45 caliber fired cartridge case on the scene with no suspect in custody. The crime scene investigator collects the fired cartridge case and submits it to the state lab to be entered into NIBIN.

*Continued on Next Page*
The state laboratory enters the fired cartridge case into NIBIN system. The system compares individual markings on the fired cartridge case to other previously submitted fired cartridge cases. The NIBIN system generates an "unconfirmed hit". A trained technician requests the physical evidence and manually verifies the match with a comparison microspore to “confirm” the hit. A report is generated and the fired cartridge case matches another fired cartridge case from a shooting the previous year, in the same major metropolitan city. There was no suspect arrested. Investigators now know that the same firearm was used on both shooting scenes.

Several weeks later, investigators in a neighboring agency arrest a suspect in an armed robbery. The investigators find a .45 caliber, semi-automatic pistol in the suspect's waistband. The firearm is collected and since this agency's property and evidence room has a NIBIN policy in place, the evidence firearm is sent to the state laboratory for test firing. The state laboratory test fires the weapon and enters the fired cartridge case into the NIBIN system. There is a "match" to the fired cartridge cases submitted from the two shootings in the major metropolitan city. Detectives now have an investigative lead, a homicide weapon, and a possible suspect! But what if the neighboring agency did not have a NIBIN policy and the firearm was left sitting on a shelf for months, years, or decades? What if the firearm was melted down during their annual firearm destruction? How can your agency and property room ensure they are never faced with this liability?

The authors suggest following these nine simple steps to start the discussion on developing a NIBIN policy for your agency and property room:

1. Speak with your state lab or the agency who will be processing NIBIN evidence. Ask them what firearms are eligible, what calendar years apply, what submission guidelines are, and devise a plan on the best way to streamline the evidence backlog.
2. Meet with your chain of command to discuss the need for changes.
3. Develop a spreadsheet of all firearms in your property room to track action steps that need to be taken.
4. Decide who will forensically process the firearm and who will make the decision for forensic processing, if it is needed. Does the police department have the capabilities to process the firearm for latent prints and DNA prior to sending it to the lab? If so, this will save the time of the lab professionals and streamline the NIBIN entry.
5. Ensure the serial numbers have been cleared and speak with the investigator to inquire if an ATF Trace is needed.
6. Decide who will make the decision on what firearms get sent. Do all fired cartridge cases, found property and evidence firearms, and all staged-for-destruction firearms automatically get sent? Or is it the decision of the investigator? Also, check with your state laboratory so you do not inundate them with backlogged evidence.
7. Who will complete all the required paperwork? Property staff or the investigators?
8. Implement a reasonable timeframe for transporting the firearms and firearm-related evidence to the state lab. The goal is to have the evidence delivered and entered as quickly as possible.
9. Ensure reports received from the state laboratory are forwarded to investigations in a timely fashion so that followup can be initiated.

As we have seen over the past decade, technology, as it pertains to evidence, is becoming more innovative and changing at a rapid pace. As property and evidence technicians, it is our responsibility to make sure we are impounding and processing the evidence to reflect the change in modern times. If you do not have a NIBIN policy in your agency, start the research and generate the conversation with your chain of command. After all, you could be unintentionally destroying valuable evidence in a criminal case.

REFERENCES

I am applying for IAPE membership - Fee: $50 USD

For accounting purposes, our Federal ID # is 88-0296739

Applications submitted January 1st through October 31st will be applied for the current year. Applications submitted in November and December will be applied to the following year.

Name of Applicant: ______________________________________________________
Please print legibly first     middle     last

Title / Rank ______________________________      E-Mail __________________________________________

Name of Agency _________________________________   Business Phone (_______)____________________

Business Address  ____________________________________________________________________________
Street                        City                                        State / Zip

Residence Address  ____________________________________________________________________________
Street                        City                                        State / Zip

Signature of Applicant: ____________________________________________

Name of Sponsor:     _______________________________________________
Please print legibly

☐ I don’t currently know an active IAPE Member.   Please accept my application.

Have you previously been a member of IAPE?  ☐ No    ☐ Yes   If “Yes”, when? Date: _____________

Active Members - (a) The following persons shall be eligible for active membership: (1) Property/evidence officers, technicians, specialists, clerks, or custodians directly assigned to the property/evidence function, or supervisors having actual supervision of the property/evidence function, and receiving salaries from any legally constituted national, state, provincial, county, municipal, or other duly constituted law enforcement agency/jurisdiction including railroad police system, or public police or sheriffs department. Active members retain their active status upon retirement, provided there is no interruption in membership.

Associate Members - (a) Any person not eligible for active membership, but qualified by training and experience in law enforcement activity, or by professional attainments in police science or administration, shall be eligible for associate membership in the association. (b) Associate members shall have all the privileges of active membership, except for holding office and voting. (c) The following classes of persons are eligible and qualify for associate membership: (1) Personnel employed by a public law enforcement agency. (2) Employees of city, county, state, provincial, and national agencies with technical responsibility for law enforcement related storage of property/evidence. (3) Prosecuting attorneys and their deputies of city, county, state, provincial, territorial, and national governments. (4) Employees of accredited colleges and universities engaged in teaching, research and other phases of criminal justice. (5) Staff or employees of crime institutes, governmental research bureaus, coordinating councils, law enforcement associations, and similar agencies engaged in research involving the property/evidence storage function. (6) Persons who have made a significant contribution to the field of law enforcement property and evidence. (7) Any retired member of a law enforcement agency.
Academy of Forensic Nursing founding members contribute to the establishment of evidence management guidelines

By: Patricia M. Speck, Kathy Gill-Hopple, Rachell A. Ekroos & Diana Faugno

This article originally appeared in the Summer 2019 issue of Evidence Technology Magazine.

<https://read.nxtbook.com/wordsmith/evidence_technology/summer_2019/resources_for_evidence_manage.html>

Forensic nursing is a nursing specialty (ANA, 1995) reflecting a theoretical nursing framework of practice that is scientifically sound and supported by published evidence (Speck & Peters, 1999). Forensic nurses work in a variety of practice settings providing nursing care to patients who intersect with legal systems. For years, sexual assault victims sought care in emergency departments, to be overlooked or passed-by for patients who had emerging physical needs (Speck & Aiken, 1995) (Speck & Patton, 2010). Little was understood about the emergent condition of the sexually assaulted patient, and often, patients left the emergency department without receiving care (Aiken & Speck, 1991).

Significant advances occurred over the last 40 years, including the emergence of forensic nursing in 1992 (Lynch, 1990). When health care and legal systems intersect (Speck & Peters, 1999), the responsibility for management of evidence of crime rests solely on the institution and the health care providers specially trained to gather, handle, and transfer the evidence (OVW, 2013). These items include not only sexual assault evidence collection kits (SAEKs), but also foreign objects removed from bodies, clothing, trace evidence, body fluids, and other items attached to patients they serve (OVC, 2016). However, registered nurses in health care settings are rarely aware of standards that influence evidence handling, relying instead on word-of-mouth and organizational listservs.

Several Academy of Forensic Nursing charter members are working closely with the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) to ensure the methodologies and techniques used to gather, process, and handle evidence incorporate the science supporting the procurement and handling of evidence in health care settings.

Sound nursing foundations and principles are implemented in the handling of items – including evidence – where the handling ultimately affects the item’s meaningfulness, relevance, and admissibility in a courtroom. These forensic nursing authors often teach nurses that their professional nursing and forensic nursing expertise is useful to judicial proceedings, first as a fact witness and then as subject-matter expert or expert witnesses.

The process begins with the registered nurse, who observes, documents, and reports findings (ANA, 2018) for the purposes of gathering information for the medical diagnosis determined by a physician or nurse practitioner. Handling the samples in medical settings requires using forensically sound standards for samples ultimately used as evidence in an adjudicated case. This reflects the essence and use of the nursing skills of accountability (signing off to another), safety (avoiding self-contamination and giving the right dose to the right person at the right time), and knowledge of health and health outcomes defined in nursing as biopsychosocial and spiritual – all health-related concepts (ANA, 2010). Appropriate safeguards must exist throughout the nursing process of assessment, nursing diagnosis, planning, intervention, and evaluation (ADPIE), to provide assurance to the patient and the system that the lifecycle of samples holding potential probative value is forensically sound. The forensic and legal systems will call these samples evidence. The nursing professional will call them samples collected at the request of the patient. The fact is, even though it is called evidence during investigation and adjudication, the sample may or may not hold probative value once analyzed as an item of evidence.

Evidence-based, research-informed forensic nursing skills were desperately needed when President George W. Bush signed “Advancing Justice Through DNA Technology” in 2003, setting aside over $1 billion for the initiative. The purpose was to eliminate SAEK backlogs, strengthen crime and laboratory capacity, stimulate research and development, and provide training (CRS, 2003).

Continued on Next Page
Despite this focus on DNA technology that would convict and exonerate the accused, there was one problem: If the health care provider did not understand the nuances of evidence collection while providing trauma-informed and patient-centered care, the victim/patient often did not follow through (Darnell et al., 2015). Herein lies the conundrum.

From the earliest collaborations, the Sexual Assault Response Team (SART) had difficulty with sharing information, role conflicts (Ekroos et al., 2019), and autonomy limitations (Maier, 2012). These misunderstandings, among other factors, contributed to the lack of sustainability in forensic nursing programs serving patients who complained of sexual assault. Also, education of forensic nurses was not taking place in nursing programs, but instead was provided by non-nurses during the first decades of forensic nursing care (Speck & Aiken, 1992). This resulted in the mislabeling of forensic nurses as “evidence collectors” (Ekroos, 2019). These early nurses were “flying by the seat of their pants” (personal conversation between Drs. Speck and Ledray, 2013). Evidence handling was never an early issue for forensic nurses because law enforcement would take the SAEK when it was sealed, and laboratories would develop the evidence posthaste. However, as the numbers of victims increased, the numbers of untested SAEKs greatly increased. During the forensic science development of standards and funding priorities, particularly in technical working groups, the occasional token nurse was a participant (personal conversation with Dr. Speck). The science eventually trickled down to the masses of practicing forensic nurses who also wanted to effect change and participate in federal processes. Advocates supported the activity, and within ten years of defined forensic nursing practice, nurses were participating in the development of multidisciplinary standards (OVW, 2004). Recent activities include the NIJ SAFER Working Group:

“The SAFER Working Group, which convened over the course of more than two years, consisted of subject matter experts empaneled by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) and representing victims, victim advocates, forensic nurses specializing in sexual assault, medical examiners, forensic laboratories, law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and the judiciary. The working group considered issues relating to evidence collection; prioritization of evidence and time periods for collection; evidence inventory, tracking and auditing technology solutions; investigative and policy considerations; and communication strategies. With the diversity of backgrounds and views, the SAFER Working Group successfully reached substantial agreement on a variety of complex issues.”


The collaborative activities around the SAFER legislation identified gaps in evidence management affecting forensic nursing and SART team members alike. Consequently, there are significant documents to guide forensic nurses in hospitals and health care systems developing agency policies and procedures in compliance with recommendations. There is also a Department of Justice (DOJ) funded National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) group meeting regularly to establish evidence management guidelines. The rollout is planned for October 2-4, 2019 in Gaithersburg, Maryland, outside Washington, DC. For more information and to register, visit: https://www.nist.gov/news-events/events/2019/10/evidencemanagement-symposium

A variety of evidence management guidelines follow and may be useful in forensic nursing practices with patients who experience violence. These guidelines are also useful to other professionals in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professionals who benefit from Guidelines and Best Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Forensic Nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Correctional Nursing Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Forensic Clinical Nurse Specialist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued from Previous Page
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Evidence management guidelines allow forensic nurses in the variety of different nursing roles to apply principles in work settings to ensure compliance with basic principles of evidence management. The legal support for current activities in forensic nursing practices includes a variety of laws, guidelines, and protocols, seen in Table 2.

### Table 2

**Legislation and purpose**

(see below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>LEGISLATION</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994, amended 2013</td>
<td>Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act</td>
<td>Amends the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (VAWA) to add or expand definitions, grant expansion related to non-disclosure, sharing information, and establishes biennial conference funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013, reauthorized 2017</td>
<td>SAFER Act</td>
<td>The SAFER Act supports efforts to audit, test, and reduce the backlog of DNA evidence in sexual assault cases and bring perpetrators to justice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004, Reauthorized 2008, 2014</td>
<td>Debbie Smith Act</td>
<td>The Debbie Smith Act intends to eliminate the backlog of untested and unaforensic DNA evidence by providing the resources to process evidence and add these samples to the national DNA database.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990, amended 2013</td>
<td>Clery Act</td>
<td>The Clery Act requires greater transparency and timely warnings from colleges and universities about crimes that are committed on campus, including crimes of sexual violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Title IX</td>
<td>Title IX prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex by educational institutions that receive federal funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990, amended 2013</td>
<td>Campus SaVE Act</td>
<td>Campus SaVE amends the Clery Act to increase transparency requirements in colleges to address sexual violence, including stalking, intimidation, dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault and hate crimes that happen on and around campuses. It guarantees rights for survivors, establishes disciplinary proceedings, and requires education programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Victims of Crime Act</td>
<td>VCCA helps victims deal with the tangible costs of surviving a crime, such as medical bills, counseling services, and lost wages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>The Justice for All Act</td>
<td>The Justice for All Act of 2004 was enacted to protect crime victims’ rights, eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, and improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of federal, state, and local crime laboratories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>The Survivor’s Bill of Rights Act</td>
<td>The Survivor’s Bill of Rights establishes statutory rights for survivors/victims to obtain a medical forensic exam for evidence collection, storage of evidence for the duration of the case statute of limitations and notification of SAEBK destruction and the results of the forensic exams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Useful to practitioners is the Forensic Compliance website (EVAWI) that provides information designed to:

(a) communicate the requirements of the Violence Against Women Act (as reauthorized in 2005 and 2013); and,

(b) offer recommended practices for implementation.

The goal is to highlight examples of communities striving to achieve a higher standard of the “spirit of the law,” rather than simply meeting the “letter of the law” for VAWA forensic compliance.

Other guidelines useful to providers include:

(see below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>GUIDELINE AND LINK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>OVC</td>
<td>Sexual Assault Response Team (SART) Toolkit (<a href="https://www.ngvro.org/sarts/toolkit">https://www.ngvro.org/sarts/toolkit</a>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Guidelines for Evidence Management are developing, and the workgroup hopes nurses will embrace the science of handling samples, a.k.a. evidence, to ensure that the outcomes result in justice for all. As the evidence is assembled by nurses working with the experts in evidence management, join us in Gaithersburg, Maryland for the NIST meeting – free – October 2019!
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June 26, 2019

**High-ranking officer resigns after allegations of missing money**

The Georgia Bureau of Investigation is investigating allegations a drug task force commander misappropriated funds. Flint Circuit Drug Task Force commander Maj. Chad Rosborough has turned in his badge, gun, SUV and more after agents questioned Rosborough’s handling of money seized by the task force...

June 20, 2019

**Feds seize over $1 billion of cocaine in historic bust in Philadelphia**

Federal officials made a massive cocaine bust in Philadelphia, seizing an estimated 16.5 tons of the drug from a ship on June 20, 2019 -- with a street value of over $1 billion, officials said...

June 15, 2019

**Police officer admits he stole drugs from evidence locker**

A Kawartha Lakes police officer has pleaded guilty to one count of breach of trust and admitted he stole drugs from the police force’s evidence room in 2018, which compromised eight ongoing investigations...

June 15, 2019

**DNA evidence exonerates man who spent 35 years behind bars for murder**

Lawyers for a Taunton, Massachusetts man who has spent 35 years in prison for the murder of his great aunt are asking for a new trial to vacate his conviction.

“For the last 35 years, he has been confined to a prison cell, without family, without friends for a crime he didn’t commit,” said Radha Natarajan, of The New England Innocence Project....

June 15, 2019

**Former police officer loses appeal of federal conviction for stealing drug money**

A former Pennsylvania police officer serving time in federal prison for stealing cash while on duty had his felony theft convictions upheld by a federal appeals court this week. Tyson Baker, 44, appealed his conviction to the federal Bureau of Prisons.

Three judges upheld Baker’s conviction, even though Baker claimed at trial that he only intended to keep the stolen money temporarily, however, prosecutors pointed out there was no way for him to return the cash once he took it.

*Continued on Next Page*
June 15, 2019
DNA leads to arrest of Marine veteran in 1976 slaying of woman
Using genealogical DNA evidence, a Marine veteran was arrested in New Orleans on murder charges in the 43-year-old cold case killing of a woman who disappeared from a Costa Mesa, California restaurant. Eddie Lee Anderson, 66, was taken into custody May 24 at his home in suburban New Orleans on suspicion of murder in the 1976 killing...

June 15, 2019
Hawaii not only department with recent officer busts
With two retired Hawaii Police Department officers facing criminal charges, Hawaii Island is the latest county under public scrutiny. Three of the four counties in the state have had police misconduct probes and indictments handed down by the Justice Department in the last three years. The latest involves the former Honolulu Police chief and his wife, a deputy city prosecutor...

June 15, 2019
Women are suing Austin, Travis County for failing to prosecute sexual assault
A class action lawsuit alleges Central Texas authorities engage in gender discrimination by failing to adequately investigate and prosecute sexual assaults. Last year, three named plaintiffs launched a class action lawsuit against the City of Austin, Travis County and several local officials, for failing to adequately investigate...

June 15, 2019
DNA site that helps cold-case sleuths curbs access for cops
The genealogy database that helped authorities track down the alleged Golden State Killer and dozens of other suspects has changed a key policy over privacy concerns, a move that could hamper future criminal investigations...

June 15, 2019
Former Causeway cop gets 4 years in prison for stealing guns, cash and drugs
A former Lake Pontchartrain Causeway police officer has been sentenced to four years in prison for stealing guns, cash and drugs from the evidence room he supervised.

William “Billy” Jones Jr., 46, was found guilty and sentenced to four years at hard labor for malfeasance in office and four years on each of two counts of theft of a firearm. A jury found Jones guilty of the charges on May 23. He was accused of stealing $6,300 in cash, cocaine, and two guns from the evidence room he supervised three years ago...
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Dear Joe,

My name is Officer Chris Harvey and I assist Officer Anthony Morello with the management of our police department’s evidence room. We managed to get some money freed up this year in our budget to buy some evidence-related items.

Consequently, we are researching the idea of possibly having an evidence rejection locker/station setup when one of our officers submits a piece of evidence incorrectly/incompletely.

Would you be able to help us out, (or point us in the right direction), regarding the best procedure for an evidence rejection locker/station setup?

Also, if you could forward any related purchases you recommend, that would be much appreciated as well.

Thank you,
Officer Christopher Harvey

Dear Officer Harvey,

The rejection of evidence, sometimes referred to as the Right of Refusal, is typically placed into a Trouble Locker. First and foremost it is important to establish a policy that instructs officers that any improperly packaged or documented evidence will be returned to the submitting employee via the Trouble or Rejection Locker.

To answer your questions there is a myriad of ways that this can be accomplished that is driven by how much you can afford. Below is a list of several options:

**Electronic Lockers**

Electronic lockers are generally a typical manufactured evidence locker that with some type of electronic locks that provide access (i.e. electronic keypad and pin number or swipe card).

**Manufactured Evidence Lockers - With Keyways**

Most new evidence lockers are completely keyless. In this custom design, a selected number have had a keyway installed. The master key may be retained by the watch commander or officer in charge (OIC), under lock and key. When the removal occurs, the OIC opens the lockers for the submitting officer to retrieve. (This is not a preferred method as other personnel may have access to the evidence.)

**Manufactured Evidence Lockers Mechanical Lock**

Manufactured evidence lockers with a user-installed mechanical combination lock that can be reset after each use by the property officer.

**School or Gym Lockers**

For departments with limited budgets, the utilization of a gym locker with a Set Your Own Word Combination Padlock is frequently utilized. The evidence officer sets the combination (word) and sends an email to the officer needing to correct his/her evidence. After the item is corrected, the property officer then resets the numbers.

Regards,
Joe
This page is designed for members who would like to publicize upcoming property and evidence related events. Please contact us via the website if you have something to include for the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Association Websites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Association for Property &amp; Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.iape.org">www.iape.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Association for Property and Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.azape.org">www.azape.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Association for Property &amp; Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.cape-inc.us">www.cape-inc.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Association of Property &amp; Evidence Technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.capet.wildapricot.org">www.capet.wildapricot.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property &amp; Evidence Association of Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.peaf.net">www.peaf.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Association of Property and Evidence Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.iapem.org">www.iapem.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina Association of Property &amp; Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.ncape.net">www.ncape.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Association of Property, Evidence &amp; Identification Technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.tapeit.net">www.tapeit.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina Association of Property &amp; Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.southcarolinascape.org">www.southcarolinascape.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property and Evidence Association of Florida**

**EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE**

*When:* August 26 - 28, 2019  
*Where:* Wyndham Orlando Resort  
Orlando, Florida  

*For more info. & details:* www.peaf.net

**North Carolina Association of Property & Evidence Technicians**

**FALL TRAINING CONFERENCE**

*When:* September 30 - October 2, 2019  
*Where:* DoubleTree by Hilton at Biltmore  
Asheville, North Carolina  

*For more info. & details, visit:* www.ncape.net

**Texas Association of Property, Evidence & Identification Technicians**

**ANNUAL CONFERENCE**

*When:* October 15 - 18, 2019  
*Where:* Embassy Suites Hotel  
San Marcos, Texas  

*For more info. & details:* www.tapeit.net

You can always let IAPE know about upcoming conferences or other training events we might be able to help you publicize.

Please go to: www.iapeakevideo.com/cart_classes/index.php for the most current schedule of upcoming IAPE classes.
GET READY!

IAPE WILL BE ROLLING OUT A NEW FEATURE IN THE COMING MONTHS...

WAIT? WHAT?? STAY TUNED...
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If you need to contact us or submit materials via the USPS, IAPE has a new mailing address:

7474 Figueroa Street • Suite 125 • Los Angeles, California 90041