

2013

Asset Forfeiture Report

(Covers 2012)



Grants and Community Services Division
Byrne JAG Unit

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD.....	4
INTRODUCTION.....	5
FORFEITURE PROCEEDINGS	5
FORFEITURE RECEIPTS.....	6
FORFEITURE ANALYSIS	6
USE OF FORFEITURE FUNDS.....	7
2010-2012 TREND ANALYSIS	11
SCOPE OF THE REPORT	12
APPENDIX A: LOCAL POLICE AND COUNTY ANALYSIS.....	13
APPENDIX B: MULTIJURISDICTIONAL TASK FORCE ANALYSIS	15



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF STATE POLICE
LANSING

RICK SNYDER
GOVERNOR

COL. KRISTE KIBBEY ETUE
DIRECTOR

June 27, 2013

Ms. Carol Morey Viventi, J.D.
Secretary of the Senate
Michigan Senate
P.O. Box 30036
Lansing, Michigan 48909

Mr. Gary Randall
Clerk of the House
Michigan House of Representatives
P.O. Box 30014
Lansing, Michigan 48909

Dear Ms. Viventi and Mr. Randall:

In accordance with MCL 333.7524a, I am pleased to present to the Michigan Legislature the 21st comprehensive report on asset forfeiture. Michigan's asset forfeiture program saves taxpayer money and deprives drug criminals of cash and property obtained through illegal activity. Michigan's law enforcement community has done an outstanding job of stripping drug dealers of illicit gain and utilizing these proceeds to expand and enhance drug enforcement efforts to protect our citizens.

During 2012, over \$26.5 million in cash and assets amassed by drug traffickers was forfeited. Extensive multi-agency teamwork is evident in this report. Considerable assets were obtained as the result of joint enforcement involving many agencies at the federal, state, and local levels.

Forfeiture funds were used to enhance law enforcement by providing resources for personnel, needed equipment, K-9 expenses, prevention programs, and matching funds to obtain federal grants. Michigan's recently amended Drug Forfeiture Statute allowed some agencies to contribute monies to non-profit organizations that assist in obtaining information for solving crimes.

I commend our law enforcement community for the tremendous job they have done and submit this report for your information and review.

Sincerely,


DIRECTOR

Attachment

FOREWORD

This is the 21st annual Asset Forfeiture Report pursuant to Michigan Compiled Laws 333.7524a. This report is a compilation of forfeiture report forms and additional data submitted to the Michigan State Police (MSP), Grants and Community Services Division, Byrne JAG Unit, by Michigan law enforcement and prosecutors. Of the 635 reports filed, 286 agencies reported receiving funds from forfeiture during 2012. More than \$26.5 million in cash and property was seized under the state statute or by federal law and put to use by Michigan law enforcement and prosecuting attorneys.

Michigan's recently amended statute changed how awarded funds can be expended by the recipient agency to include payments that enhance all law enforcement activities, rather than the previous statute which only permitted expenditures relevant to the agency's enhancement of drug law enforcement. Additionally, it is now permissible for forfeiture funds to be provided to nonprofit agencies whose primary activity is to assist law enforcement agencies with drug-related criminal investigations and obtaining information for solving crimes.

Collaboration and coordination are hallmarks of Michigan's effort to overcome drug trafficking in our communities. A significant portion of the assets seized from drug dealers was obtained as a result of local, state, and federal agencies working together. Michigan's multijurisdictional task forces are a good example of coordinated regional law enforcement aimed at dangerous drug dealers.

Nevertheless, while multijurisdictional task force efforts resulted in high dollar amount seizures, the largest burden for drug enforcement falls on the shoulders of the MSP, local police departments, and sheriffs' departments. Through hard work and determination, MSP and local agencies, with the support of local prosecutors in drug investigations and forfeiture proceedings, were responsible for 60 percent of all assets forfeited in Michigan in 2012.

INTRODUCTION

The primary goal of asset forfeiture is to deter and punish drug criminals by taking away the goods, property, and money obtained through illegal activity. The impact of this law is that it saves taxpayer money when forfeitures are utilized to support community drug enforcement and prevention.

The Michigan statute allows for the distribution of forfeited lights for plant growth or scales to elementary/secondary schools or institutions of higher education. In 2012, seizing agencies donated 79 plant growth lights and 81 scales to 22 elementary and secondary schools districts, with a combined estimated value of \$17,600.

Due to the unpredictable nature of forfeiture levels and trends, asset forfeitures will never replace state and local law enforcement appropriations. However, these funds serve as an important supplement and adjunct to enhance ongoing enforcement programs.

FORFEITURE PROCEEDINGS

State law provides two processes by which property can be forfeited:

1. If the property value is in excess of \$50,000 or the property was not seized under certain circumstances, a court proceeding must be instituted in circuit court to legally forfeit the property. Last year, 1,177 circuit court proceedings were instituted and 678 were concluded.
2. More often, the property seized can be forfeited administratively. Unless the drug dealer or another party can provide evidence of a valid legal interest in the property, the forfeiture process can be streamlined. Eighty-nine percent (9,148) of the forfeitures in 2012 were filed administratively. Drug dealers do not contest many of these cases, as they often do not have a sufficient legitimate source of income to have legally obtained the property seized.

FORFEITURE RECEIPTS

Proceeds available to criminal justice agencies through asset forfeitures in 2012 totaled a net amount of \$22,368,143 after costs were subtracted and federal sharing percentages were added into the total. All costs incurred in filing forfeiture claims may be deducted from the awarded amount. Michigan statute allows for sharing between agencies when more than one law enforcement agency is involved in the investigation. Through the United States Attorney's Office in Michigan's eastern and western districts, federal law enforcement agencies shared forfeitures with state and local agencies. State statutes do not require the disclosure of federal sharing amounts; therefore, some entities may choose not to disclose shared federal amounts in their reports.

The following sections provide information regarding each reporting agency's source of gross proceeds and net gains after administrative costs.

Agencies	Gross Forfeiture by Michigan Statute	Federally Shared Forfeitures	State and Local Shared Forfeitures Received	Administrative Costs and Shared Forfeitures Paid Out	Total Net Proceeds
Local Police Agencies	\$7,823,629	\$5,030,404	\$1,038,303	(\$1,639,182)	\$12,253,154
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	\$3,948,810	\$846,906	\$84,187	(\$381,496)	\$4,498,407
MSP	\$463,890	\$753,921	\$46,651	(\$92,408)	\$1,172,054
Sheriff's Departments	\$1,541,529	\$3,783,868	\$1,121,341	(\$2,002,210)	\$4,444,528
Total	\$13,777,858	\$10,415,099	\$2,290,482	(\$4,115,296)	\$22,368,143

Due to rounding, figures are not exact.

FORFEITURE ANALYSIS

For purposes of this report, all forfeited items are classified as real property, conveyances, personal property, or cash. Real property consists of single-family residences, multi-family residences, industrial, commercial, and agricultural properties. Conveyances are considered automobiles, vessels, and aircraft. Personal property is considered all personal effects. Cash also includes negotiable instruments.

The table below provides gross intake dollars in 2012 by categories of property that can be seized pursuant to Michigan's forfeiture statute:

	Real Property	Conveyances	Cash	Personal Property	Total Forfeitures
Local Police Agencies	\$23,522	\$1,962,545	\$5,585,486	\$252,076	\$7,823,629
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	\$98,947	\$526,591	\$2,892,236	\$431,036	\$3,948,810
MSP	\$0	\$0	\$463,890	\$0	\$463,890
Sheriff's Departments	\$53,406	\$545,759	\$903,060	\$39,304	\$1,541,529
Total	\$175,875	\$3,034,895	\$9,844,672	\$722,416	\$13,777,858

2012 Figures: Amounts exclude any expense-related deductions or sharing percentages.
Due to rounding, figures are not exact.

Law enforcement agencies seized and forfeited 23 single-family residential units; 1 parcel of land; 2,724 motor vehicles; and, 1 vessel in the 2012 reporting year.

USE OF FORFEITURE FUNDS

Under Michigan law, forfeiture funds are to be used to enhance law enforcement. Michigan law enforcement agencies have applied forfeiture funds to improve their departments in various ways. Agencies reported that forfeiture funds provide resources to pay for methamphetamine lab clean-up costs, education and drug awareness supplies, personnel to participate in multijurisdictional drug teams, canine expenses, training, and state fees for data retrieval, to name a few.

The reporting agencies are requested to show the use of forfeiture funds in 13 broad categories of personnel, overtime, vehicles, equipment, informant fees, buy money, grant matching funds, prevention and outreach, animal care/accessories, nonprofit organizations, supplies, training, and other expenses.

The following information relates only to those agencies that completed a specific section within the report, which explained how forfeiture funds were used to enhance law enforcement efforts. The report requested information regarding the percentage of funds used or to be used within identified categories. The number of agencies reporting use of forfeiture funds within each category is listed.

1. **Personnel:** Forfeiture funds are used to fund community policing officers, drug team personnel, street-level enforcement teams, and support personnel.

Local Police Agencies	25
MSP	1
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	17
Sheriff's Departments	8

2. **Overtime:** Drug investigations are often culminated in the late evening/early morning hours. Expertise for evidence collection, raid entry teams, and K-9 handlers are examples of frequently used personnel that require overtime payment.

Local Police Agencies	19
MSP	0
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	4
Sheriff 's Departments	1

3. **Vehicles:** The increasing cost of vehicles has been a major factor in increased police department operating cost budgets. The use of forfeiture funds has offset some of these costs.

Local Police Agencies	40
MSP	0
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	15
Sheriff 's Departments	8

4. **Equipment:** Law enforcement is seeing rapid changes in technology to assist them with their assigned duties. Records management systems, mobile data terminals, live stream video, evidence collection enhancements, are examples of expenditures from this category.

Local Police Agencies	123
MSP	1
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	20
Sheriff's Departments	26

5. **Federal Grant Match:** These funds help increase the number of police, investigators, and prosecutors dedicated to drug crime enforcement. multijurisdictional task forces rely heavily on federal funds to operate and most of these funds require a cash match. The expenditure of funds in this category is often reported as personnel costs.

Local Police Agencies	5
MSP	1
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	13
Sheriff's Departments	0

6. **Informant Fees:** A small proportion of net proceeds are used for informant fees to assist in solving complex drug cases, but this is a frequent use of forfeiture funds for law enforcement agencies.

Local Police Agencies	26
MSP	0
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	14
Sheriff's Departments	6

7. **Buy Money:** Making cases against drug dealers requires resources for undercover agents to make drug purchases, often over a period of time. Enforcement budgets may be inadequate for this expenditure. Forfeiture funds fill this gap and provide needed resources, especially for local police agencies.

Local Police Agencies	39
MSP	0
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	20
Sheriff's Departments	15

8. **Training:** The majority of sworn personnel assigned to multijurisdictional task forces require formal narcotic investigative training. Forfeiture funds can assist agencies with these costs. Local agencies and sheriff departments are providing more training for personnel to keep current with new technological advances.

Local Police Agencies	43
MSP	0
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	14
Sheriff's Departments	12

9. **Crime Prevention and Outreach:** MSP troopers, local police officers, and sheriffs' deputies are providing education and awareness programs throughout the state. The MSP Teaching, Educating, And Mentoring program (T.E.A.M.) is an example of a program taught in schools by law enforcement personnel.

Local Police Agencies	16
MSP	0
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	1
Sheriff's Departments	2

10. **Animal Costs and Accessories:** Canines have proven to be a valuable asset to law enforcement. Local police agencies, sheriff's departments, and MSP reported spending forfeiture funds on medical and maintenance costs for their canine programs.

Local Police Agencies	41
MSP	1
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	1
Sheriff's Departments	7

11. **Supplies:** Supplies are considered operational items that cost under \$5,000. This often includes computers, copier leases, cellular telephones, and vehicle and building maintenance. Multijurisdictional task forces are normally not included in the participating agency's budget and often use forfeiture funds to support their supply expenditures.

Local Police Agencies	42
MSP	1
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	19
Sheriff's Departments	9

12. **Nonprofit Organizations:** Local police agencies and sheriff's departments reported contributing a percentage of their forfeiture funds to a local crime alert organization.

Local Police Agencies	14
MSP	0
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	2
Sheriff's Departments	2

13. **Other:** The following examples were taken from the narrative box for reporting forfeiture expenses in the "Other" category: building and utility costs for narcotic unit operations; update department dispatch center; cellular telephone bills for the department; purchased drug drop box for prescription drugs; drug awareness kits; marijuana extradition costs; uniform expenses; vehicle purchases; off-site storage units for toxic materials; dispatching consortium fees; aviation fees; and, evidence collection materials.

Local Police Agencies	34
MSP	1
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	16
Sheriff's Departments	16

Prosecuting attorneys generally receive a percentage of each forfeiture as a fee for completing the proceeding. As a result, prosecutors reported zero net proceeds. Also, some prosecutors return the entire forfeiture to the agency initiating the proceeding.

2010-2012 TREND ANALYSIS

Total net proceeds are presented by the year of each annual report.

Year	Local Police Agencies	Multijurisdictional Task Forces	MSP	Sheriff's Departments	Total Net Proceeds
2010	\$14,609,285	\$3,206,614	\$448,836	\$3,022,106	\$21,286,841
2011	\$15,538,831	\$4,162,716	\$1,179,842	\$4,846,105	\$25,727,494
2012	\$12,253,154	\$4,498,407	\$1,172,054	\$4,444,528	\$22,368,143

SCOPE OF THE REPORT

This year, the forfeiture survey from MSP was sent to 691 criminal justice agencies statewide. Ninety-four percent (635) of the agencies that received the request filed the form. See the following chart for specific information:

Agencies	Agencies Submitting a Report Including Forfeitures	Agencies Submitting a Report with NO Forfeitures	Agencies that DID NOT Submit a Report
Local Police Agencies (498)	209	246	41
Multijurisdictional Task Forces (28)	28	0	0
MSP (1)	1	0	0
Sheriff's Departments (83)	48	29	6
Prosecuting Attorneys (83)	0	74	9
Total	286	349	56

Please note this report is not considered to be inclusive of all forfeitures within Michigan for the following reasons:

- Forfeitures seized in previous years, yet awarded in the reporting year, may have inadvertently been left out of the reports.
- Not all entities reported, and individuals preparing the reports may not have been aware of all proceeds required for disclosure.
- Many forfeiture proceedings involve multiple agencies and a portion may have been inadvertently left out due to a misunderstanding of which agency would report the forfeiture.
- Agencies may have reported after the deadline for data computation.
- Federally-shared forfeitures do not fall within the guidelines of the statute.

APPENDIX A: LOCAL POLICE AND COUNTY ANALYSIS

Asset forfeitures, by their very nature, are inconsistent from year to year. This report does not necessarily reflect this fact when an analysis is prepared on overall data. Therefore, this office has added an additional section analyzing the reports submitted by county. Presented in the following pages is a county-by-county summary of the reports submitted to MSP.

County	Local Police			Sheriffs & Prosecutors		
	2011	2012	Change	2011	2012	Change
Alcona	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,450	\$480.00	-\$970
Alger	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Allegan	\$1,480	\$14,940	+\$13,460	\$30,621	\$25,240	-\$5,381
Alpena	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Antrim	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Arenac	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,430	\$303.00	-\$5,127
Baraga	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Barry	\$5,771	\$2,534	-\$3,237	\$0	\$480	+480
Bay	\$59,879	\$24,978	-\$34,901	\$0	\$0	\$0
Benzie	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,920	\$0	-\$1,920
Berrien	\$109,548	\$73,063	-\$36,485	\$88,458	\$47,837	-\$40,621
Branch	\$1,854	\$2,751	+\$897	\$808	\$3,960	+\$3,152
Calhoun	\$281,078	\$144,565	-\$136,513	\$23,731	\$500	-\$23,231
Cass	\$0	\$0	\$0	*	*	*
Charlevoix	\$2,294	\$1,645	649	\$39,900	\$14,846	-\$25,054
Cheboygan	\$2,941	\$227	-\$2,714	\$21,775	\$8,415	-\$13,360
Chippewa	\$1,100	\$9,510	+\$8,410	\$0	\$0	\$0
Clare	\$0	\$199	+\$199	\$17,351	\$3,420	-\$13,931
Clinton	\$860	\$1,227	+\$367	\$15,541	\$5,562	-\$9,979
Crawford	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Delta	\$596	\$1,502	+\$906	\$5,107	\$3,152	\$1,955
Dickinson	\$0*	\$1,081	+\$1,081	*	*	*
Eaton	\$401	\$1,543	+\$1,142	\$42,061	\$0	-\$42,061
Emmett	\$3,055	\$8,945	+5,890	\$585	\$560	-\$25
Genesee	\$275,369	\$109,131	-\$166,238	\$53,356	\$0	-\$53,356
Gladwin	\$7,793	\$2,396	-\$5,397	\$2,550	\$300	-\$2,250
Gogebic	\$0	\$2,643	+\$2,643	\$0	\$1,060	+\$1,060
Grand Traverse	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Gratiot	\$110	\$905	+\$795	\$0	\$0	\$0
Hillsdale	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,674	\$7,866	+\$4,192
Houghton	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,930	\$0	-\$2,930
Huron	\$819	\$1200	+\$381	\$3,546	\$9,862	+\$6,316
Ingham	\$326,753	\$463,024	+\$136,271	\$27,939	\$12,646	-\$15,293
Ionia	\$2,825	\$0	-\$2,825	\$223	\$10,181	+\$9,958
Iosco	\$250	\$1,095	+845	\$0	\$0	\$0
Iron	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Isabella	\$91,263	\$8,772	-\$82,491	\$118	\$1,018	+\$900
Jackson	\$280,838	\$84,431	-\$196,007	\$51,874	\$20,833	-\$31,041
Kalamazoo	\$784,949	\$296,559	-\$488,390	\$8,891	\$11,778	+2,887
Kalkaska	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Kent	\$449,147	\$643,241	+\$194,094	\$685,760	\$597,396	-\$88,364
Keweenaw	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,160	+\$2,160

County	Local Police			Sheriffs & Prosecutors		
	2011	2012	Change	2011	2012	Change
Lake	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,722	\$10,932	+\$9,210
Lapeer	\$12,354	\$4,206	-\$8,148	\$15,397	\$13,870	-\$1,527
Leelanau	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$180,424	\$0	-\$180,424
Lenawee	\$3,734	\$5,528	+\$1,794	\$1,003	\$3,100	+\$2,097
Livingston	\$159,851	\$334,202	+\$174,351	\$148,170	\$98,214	-\$49,956
Luce	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$290	\$0	\$0
Mackinac	\$1,231	\$1,251	+\$20	\$500	\$0	-\$500
Macomb	\$2,115,105	\$2,567,249	+\$452,144	\$504,097	\$1,860,951	+\$1,356,854
Manistee	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Marquette	\$11,542	\$13,407	+\$1,865	\$2,000	\$1,160	-\$840
Mason	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,061	+\$8,061
Mecosta	\$87	\$0	\$0	\$1,435	\$1,479	
Menominee	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Midland	\$4,030	\$3,882	-\$148	\$0	\$11,466	+\$11,466
Missaukee	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Monroe	\$29,332	\$38,795	+\$9,463	\$147,970	\$77,549	-\$70,421
Montcalm	\$0	\$1,200	+\$1,200	\$0	\$0	\$0
Montmorency	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$800	\$0	-\$800
Muskegon	\$7,313	\$11,329	+\$4,016	\$0	\$2,050	+\$2,050
Newaygo	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,956	\$0	-\$1,956
Oakland	\$2,234,936	\$1,464,545	-\$770,391	\$646,488	\$504,543	-\$141,945
Oceana	\$910	\$0	-\$910	\$4,373	\$7,855	+3,482
Ogemaw	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Ontonagon	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Osceola	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Oscoda	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Otsego	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Ottawa	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$300	\$0	-\$300
Presque Isle	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Roscommon	\$1,776	\$360	-\$1,416	\$24,285	\$6,114	-\$18,171
Saginaw	\$245,251	\$217,078	-\$28,173	\$16,359	\$79,726	+\$63,367
Sanilac	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Schoolcraft	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Shiawassee	\$938	\$2,068	+\$1,130	\$16,426	\$17,790	+\$1,364
St. Clair	\$63,486	\$60,149	-\$3,337	*	\$62,127	\$62,127
St. Joseph	\$3,871	\$8,457	+\$4,586	\$126,250	\$44,694	-\$81,556
Tuscola	\$3,200	\$391	-\$2,809	\$2,583	\$92	-\$2,491
Van Buren	\$1,112	\$600	-\$512	\$37,992	\$93,078	+\$55,086
Washtenaw	\$72,473	\$249,423	+\$176,950	\$96,217	\$263,914	\$167,697
Wayne	\$7,956,121	\$5,366,928	-\$2,619,193	\$1,588,179	\$485,908	-\$1,102,271
Wexford	\$600	\$0	-\$600	\$0	\$0	\$0
MSP				* See Task Force		
Statewide	\$1,179,842	\$1,172,054	-\$7,428			

APPENDIX B: MULTIJURISDICTIONAL TASK FORCE ANALYSIS

B.A.Y.A.N.E.T.		F.A.N.G.	
Counties: Bay, Isabella, Midland, and Saginaw		County: Genesee	
	2011: \$162,098		2011: \$954,980
	2012: \$175,156		2012: \$436,306
	Change: +\$13,058		Change: -\$518,674

CASS COUNTY DRUG TEAM		H.U.N.T.	
County: Cass		Counties: Alcona, Alpena, Montmorency, and Presque Isle	
	2011: \$39,832		2011: \$38,757
Gross	2012: \$35,368*		2012: \$16,288
	Change: -\$4,464		Change: -\$22,469

C.M.E.T.		J.N.E.T.	
Counties: Ionia, Mecosta, Montcalm, Newaygo, and Osceola		County: Jackson	
	2011: \$126,105		2011: \$158,412
	2012: \$73,799		2012: \$118,800
	Change: -\$52,306		Change: -\$39,612

C.O.M.E.T.		K.I.N.D. DRUG ENFORCEMENT TEAM	
County: Macomb		County: Dickinson	
	2011: \$163,573		2011: \$40,382
	2012: \$505,673		2012: \$4,600
	Change: +\$342,100		Change: -\$35,782

D.R.A.N.O.		L.A.W.N.E.T	
County: Wayne		County: Livingston and Washtenaw	
	2011: \$358,855		2011: \$270,167
	2012: \$127,188		2012: \$200,324
	Change: -\$231,667		Change: -\$69,843

* All forfeiture proceeds were divided among the participating agencies. See Appendix A.

M.A.G.N.E.T.		O.M.N.I. #3	
Counties: Shiawassee and Gratiot		Counties: Hillsdale, Lenawee, and Monroe	
2011:	\$34,254	2011:	\$488,628
2012:	\$33,125	2012:	\$58,856
Change:	-\$1,129	Change:	-\$429,772

M.A.N.T.I.S.		S.A.N.E.	
Counties: Monroe		Counties: Charlevoix, Cheboygan, Chippewa, Emmett, Luce, Mackinac, and Otsego	
2010:	\$26,128	2011:	\$75,191
2011:	\$50,702	2012:	\$26,880
Change:	+\$24,574	Change:	-\$48,311

M.E.T.		SANILAC CO. DRUG TASK FORCE	
County: Kent		County: Sanilac	
2011:	\$157,485	2011:	\$3,546
2012:	\$149,336	2012:	\$8,653
Change:	-\$8,149	Change:	+\$5,107

N.E.T.		ST. CLAIR CO. DRUG TASK FORCE	
County: Oakland		County: St. Clair	
Gross	2011: \$1,400,000*	2011:	\$145,406
Gross	2012: \$908,317*	2012:	\$146,997
Change:	-\$491,683	Change:	+\$1,591

S.S.C.E.N.T.	
Counties: Lake, Manistee, Mason, and Oceana	
2011:	\$52,855
2012:	\$33,764
Change:	-\$19,091

* All forfeiture proceeds were divided among the participating agencies. See Appendix A

S.T.I.N.G.	TRI COUNTY METRO
Counties: Arenac, Crawford, Iosco, Ogemaw, Oscoda, and Roscommon	Counties: Clinton, Eaton, and Ingham
2011: \$14,310	2011: \$120,544
2012: \$21,932	2012: \$148,638
Change: +\$7,622	Change: +\$28,094

S.W.E.T.	U.P.S.E.T.
Counties: Barry, Kalamazoo, Branch, St. Joseph, Calhoun, Cass, and Van Buren	Counties: Alger, Baraga, Delta, Dickinson, Gogebic, Houghton, Iron, Keweenaw, Marquette, Menominee, Ontonagon, and Schoolcraft
2011: \$447,769	2011: \$66,713
2012: \$462,851	2012: \$51,406
Change: +\$15,082	Change: -\$15,307

T.N.T.	W.E.M.E.T.
Counties: Antrim, Benzie, Grand Traverse, Kalkaska, Leelanau, Missaukee, and Wexford	Counties: Allegan, Muskegon, and Ottawa
2011: \$107,971	2011: \$313,652
2012: \$154,731	2012: \$204,937
Change: +\$46,760	Change: -\$108,751

T.N.U.	W.W.N.
Counties: Huron, Lapeer, Sanilac, and Tuscola	County: Wayne
2011: \$17,650	2011: \$242,605
2012: \$74,710	2012: \$218,779
Change: +\$57,060	Change: -\$23,826

Oakland Co. Violent Gang Task Force	
Counties: Oakland	
2011:	\$3,311
2012:	\$50,291
Change:	+\$46,980