

2014

Asset Forfeiture Report

(Covers 2013)



Grants and Community Services Division
Byrne JAG Unit

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD 4

INTRODUCTION 5

ASSET FORFEITURE PROCEEDINGS..... 5

ASSET FORFEITURE RECEIPTS 6

ASSET FORFEITURE ANALYSIS..... 6

USE OF ASSET FORFEITURE FUNDS..... 7

2011-2013 TREND ANALYSIS..... 11

SCOPE OF THE REPORT 12

APPENDIX A: LOCAL POLICE AND COUNTY SHERIFF ANALYSIS 13

APPENDIX B: MULTIJURISDICTIONAL TASK FORCE ANALYSIS..... 16



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF STATE POLICE
LANSING

RICK SNYDER
GOVERNOR

COL. KRISTE KIBBEY ETUE
DIRECTOR

July 21, 2014

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 22nd 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 law enforcement efforts to protect our citizens.

During 2013, over \$24.3 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.

Asset forfeiture funds were used to enhance law enforcement by providing resources for personnel, needed equipment, canine 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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Kriste Etue".

DIRECTOR

Attachment

FOREWORD

This is the 22nd annual Asset Forfeiture Report pursuant to Michigan Compiled Laws 333.7524a. This report is a compilation of asset 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, 277 agencies reported receiving funds from asset forfeiture during 2013. More than \$24.3 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.

In 2011 Michigan's Public Act 368 of 1978 was amended to allow law enforcement agencies to use asset forfeiture funds to 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 asset forfeiture funds to be provided to non-profit 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.

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 asset forfeitures are utilized to support enhancements to state and local law enforcement.

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 2013, seizing agencies donated 282 plant growth lights and 87 scales to 30 elementary and secondary schools districts, with a combined estimated value of \$67,431.

Due to the unpredictable nature of asset 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.

ASSET 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, 1,249 circuit court proceedings were instituted and 937 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 asset forfeiture process can be streamlined. Eighty-six percent (15,454) of the asset forfeitures in 2013 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.

ASSET FORFEITURE RECEIPTS

Proceeds available to criminal justice agencies through asset forfeitures in 2013 totaled \$20,229,080 after costs were subtracted and federal sharing percentages were added. All costs incurred in filing asset 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 asset 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 Asset Forfeiture by Michigan Statute	Federally Shared Asset Forfeitures	State and Local Shared Asset Forfeitures Received	Administrative Costs and Shared Asset Forfeitures Paid Out	Total Net Proceeds
Local Police Agencies	\$7,930,855	\$5,361,788	\$1,059,668	(\$1,244,647)	\$13,107,664
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	\$3,538,823	\$150,864	\$69,217	(\$516,444)	\$3,242,460
MSP	\$718,072	\$385,118	\$331,163	(\$67,963)	\$1,366,390
Sheriff's Departments	\$1,471,181	\$2,948,073	\$301,390	(\$2,208,078)	\$2,512,566
Total	\$13,658,931	\$8,845,843	\$1,761,438	(\$4,037,132)	\$20,229,080

Due to rounding, figures are not exact.

ASSET 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 2013 by categories of property that can be seized pursuant to Michigan's asset forfeiture statute:

Agencies	Real Property	Conveyances	Cash	Personal Property	Total Asset Forfeitures
Local Police Agencies	\$8,000	\$1,478,105	\$6,211,412	\$233,338	\$7,930,855
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	\$220,375	\$533,547	\$2,535,205	\$249,696	\$3,538,823
MSP	\$0	\$0	\$718,072	\$0	\$718,072
Sheriff's Departments	\$26,432	\$442,006	\$972,205	\$30,538	\$1,471,181
Total	\$254,807	\$2,453,658	\$10,436,894	\$513,572	\$13,658,931

2013 Figures: Amounts exclude any expense-related deductions or sharing percentages. Due to rounding, figures are not exact.

The forfeited real property listed on the above table included 11 single-family residential units and 1 unit of commercial real estate. Conveyances seized and forfeited in 2013 included 2,691 motor vehicles. Information available on forfeitures of cash and personal property is limited to the total value of forfeitures.

USE OF ASSET FORFEITURE FUNDS

Under Michigan law, asset forfeiture funds are to be used to enhance law enforcement. Michigan law enforcement agencies expend asset forfeiture funds to improve their departments in various ways. Agencies reported that asset 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 asset 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 asset 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 asset forfeiture funds within each category is listed.

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

Local Police Agencies	22
MSP	1
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	22
Sheriff's Departments	6

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

Local Police Agencies	22
MSP	0
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	5
Sheriff 's Departments	2

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

Local Police Agencies	52
MSP	0
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	18
Sheriff 's Departments	12

4. **Equipment:** Law enforcement is seeing rapid changes in technology to assist agencies in working more efficiently and effectively. Records management systems, mobile data terminals, live stream video, and evidence collection enhancements are examples of expenditures from this category.

Local Police Agencies	149
MSP	1
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	16
Sheriff's Departments	28

5. **Federal Grant Match:** These funds help increase the number of police, investigators, and prosecutors dedicated to drug 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	14
Sheriff's Departments	1

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 asset forfeiture funds for law enforcement agencies.

Local Police Agencies	27
MSP	0
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	15
Sheriff's Departments	4

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

Local Police Agencies	36
MSP	0
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	18
Sheriff's Departments	10

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

Local Police Agencies	49
MSP	1
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	19
Sheriff's Departments	12

9. **Crime Prevention and Outreach:** Local police officers and sheriffs' deputies are providing education and awareness programs throughout the state. These efforts may include presentations to schools and community groups.

Local Police Agencies	17
MSP	0
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	0
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 one multijurisdictional task force reported spending asset forfeiture funds on medical and maintenance costs for their canine programs.

Local Police Agencies	36
MSP	0
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	1
Sheriff's Departments	11

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 asset forfeiture funds to support their supply expenditures.

Local Police Agencies	36
MSP	0
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	18
Sheriff's Departments	10

12. **Nonprofit Organizations:** Local police agencies, sheriff's departments, and one multijurisdictional task force reported contributing a percentage of their asset forfeiture funds to local crime alert organizations.

Local Police Agencies	21
MSP	0
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	1
Sheriff's Departments	3

13. **Other:** The following examples were taken from the narrative box for reporting asset forfeiture expenses in the "Other" category: building and utility costs for narcotic unit operations; cellular telephone bills for the department; global positioning tracker services; extradition costs; drug awareness kits; vehicle purchases; off-site storage units for toxic materials; dispatching consortium fees; aviation fees; and, evidence collection materials.

Local Police Agencies	56
MSP	1
Multijurisdictional Task Forces	20
Sheriff's Departments	14

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

2011-2013 TREND ANALYSIS

Total net proceeds, including gross asset forfeitures; shared federal, state, and local forfeitures; administrative costs; and shared asset forfeitures paid out, are as follows:

Year	Local Police Agencies	Multijurisdictional Task Forces	MSP	Sheriff's Departments	Total Net Proceeds
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
2013	\$13,107,664	\$3,242,460	\$1,366,390	\$2,512,566	\$20,229,080

SCOPE OF THE REPORT

This year, the asset forfeiture survey from MSP was sent to 688 criminal justice agencies statewide. Ninety-two 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 Asset Forfeitures	Agencies Submitting a Report with NO Asset Forfeitures	Agencies that DID NOT Submit a Report
Local Police Agencies (493)	199	262	32
Multijurisdictional Task Forces (28)	28	0	0
MSP (1)	1	0	0
Sheriff's Departments (83)	44	31	8
Prosecuting Attorneys (83)	0	71	12
Total	272	364	52

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

- Asset 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 asset forfeiture proceedings involve multiple agencies and a portion may have been inadvertently left out due to a misunderstanding of which agency would report the asset forfeiture.
- Agencies may have reported after the deadline for data computation.
- Federally-shared asset forfeitures do not fall within the guidelines of the statute.

APPENDIX A: LOCAL POLICE AND COUNTY SHERIFF 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			County Sheriff		
	2012	2013	Change	2012	2013	Change
Alcona	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$480	\$484	\$4
Alger	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,499	\$2,499
Allegan	\$14,940	\$0	(\$14,940)	\$25,240	\$0	(\$25,240)
Alpena	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Antrim	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Arenac	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$303	\$2,300	\$1,997
Baraga	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Barry	\$2,534	\$2,153	(\$381)	\$480	\$3,570	\$3,090
Bay	\$24,978	\$90,348	\$65,370	\$0	\$156	\$156
Benzie	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Berrien	\$73,063	\$96,819	\$23,756	\$47,837	\$38,682	(\$9,155)
Branch	\$2,751	\$1,450	(\$1,301)	\$3,960	\$2,893	(\$1,067)
Calhoun	\$144,565	\$177,792	\$33,227	\$500	\$56,295	\$55,795
Cass	\$0	\$14,175	\$14,175	*	*	*
Charlevoix	\$1,645	\$6,153	\$4,508	\$14,846	\$4,696	(\$10,150)
Cheboygan	\$227	\$0	(\$227)	\$8,415	(\$767)	(\$9,182)
Chippewa	\$9,510	\$9,999	\$489	\$0	\$8,660	\$8,660
Clare	\$199	\$0	(\$199)	\$3,420	\$0	(\$3,420)
Clinton	\$1,227	\$1,635	\$408	\$5,562	\$1,294	(\$4,268)
Crawford	\$0	\$2,573	\$2,573	\$0	\$1,400	\$1,400
Delta	\$1,502	\$4,908	\$3,406	\$3,152	\$725	(\$2,427)
Dickinson	\$1,081	\$0	(\$1,081)	*	\$250	*
Eaton	\$1,543	\$816	(\$727)	\$0	\$10,603	\$10,603
Emmett	\$8,945	\$12,151	\$3,206	\$560	\$555	(\$5)
Genesee	\$109,131	\$66,788	(\$42,343)	\$0	\$13,536	\$13,536
Gladwin	\$2,396	\$2,895	\$499	\$300	\$365	\$65
Gogebic	\$2,643	\$0	(\$2,643)	\$1,060	\$1,865	\$805
Grand Traverse	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$235	\$235
Gratiot	\$905	\$0	(\$905)	\$0	\$0	\$0
Hillsdale	\$0	\$372	\$372	\$7,866	\$8,671	\$805
Houghton	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$14,439	\$14,439
Huron	\$1,200	\$2,795	\$1,595	\$9,862	\$8,099	(\$1,763)

* See Appendix B: Multijurisdictional Task Force Analysis.

County	Local Police			County Sheriff		
	2012	2013	Change	2012	2013	Change
Ingham	\$463,024	\$2,394,212	\$1,931,188	\$12,646	\$16,596	\$3,950
Ionia	\$0	\$230	\$230	\$10,181	\$1,230	(\$8,951)
Iosco	\$1,095	\$3,667	\$2,572	\$0	\$0	\$0
Iron	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Isabella	\$8,772	\$45,528	\$36,756	\$1,018	\$535	(\$483)
Jackson	\$84,431	\$37,796	(\$46,635)	\$20,833	\$10,134	(\$10,699)
Kalamazoo	\$296,559	\$270,805	(\$25,754)	\$11,778	\$3,367	(\$8,411)
Kalkaska	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Kent	\$643,241	\$427,664	(\$215,577)	\$597,396	\$666,897	\$69,501
Keweenaw	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,160	\$508	(\$1,652)
Lake	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,932	\$16,632	\$5,700
Lapeer	\$4,206	\$30,504	\$26,298	\$13,870	\$24,115	\$10,245
Leelanau	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Lenawee	\$5,528	\$6,407	\$879	\$3,100	\$0	(\$3,100)
Livingston	\$334,202	\$74,959	(\$259,243)	\$98,214	\$121,805	\$23,591
Luce	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Mackinac	\$1,251	\$0	(\$1,251)	\$0	\$0	\$0
Macomb	\$2,567,249	\$2,717,538	\$150,289	\$1,860,951	\$158,832	(\$1,702,119)
Manistee	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Marquette	\$13,407	\$1,485	(\$11,922)	\$1,160	\$0	(\$1,160)
Mason	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,061	\$0	(\$8,061)
Mecosta	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,479	\$1,778	\$299
Menominee	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Midland	\$3,882	\$0	(\$3,882)	\$11,466	\$20,241	\$8,775
Missaukee	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Monroe	\$38,795	\$15,269	(\$23,526)	\$77,549	\$56,382	(\$21,167)
Montcalm	\$1,200	\$3,614	\$2,414	\$0	\$0	\$0
Montmorency	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Muskegon	\$11,329	\$19,625	\$8,296	\$2,050	\$0	(\$2,050)
Newaygo	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$400	\$400
Oakland	\$1,464,545	\$1,402,635	(\$61,910)	\$504,543	\$361,163	(\$143,380)
Oceana	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,855	\$0	(\$7,855)
Ogemaw	\$0	\$500	\$500	\$0	\$3,462	\$3,462
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	\$0	\$0	\$0
Presque Isle	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

* See Appendix B: Multijurisdictional Task Force Analysis.

County	Local Police			County Sheriff		
	2012	2013	Change	2012	2013	Change
Roscommon	\$360	\$0	(\$360)	\$6,114	\$10,270	\$4,156
Saginaw	\$217,078	\$139,115	(\$77,963)	\$79,726	\$43,750	(\$35,976)
Sanilac	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Schoolcraft	\$0	\$1,245	\$1,245	\$0	\$0	\$0
Shiawassee	\$2,068	\$691	(\$1,377)	\$17,790	\$733	(\$17,057)
St. Clair	\$60,149	\$277,998	\$217,849	\$62,127	\$0	(\$62,127)
St. Joseph	\$8,457	\$2,696	(\$5,761)	\$44,694	\$0	(\$44,694)
Tuscola	\$391	\$141	(\$250)	\$92	\$0	(\$92)
Van Buren	\$600	\$10,244	\$9,644	\$93,078	\$40,162	(\$52,916)
Washtenaw	\$249,423	\$39,582	(\$209,841)	\$263,914	\$141,138	(\$122,776)
Wayne	\$5,366,928	\$6,052,871	\$685,943	\$485,908	\$633,893	\$147,985
Wexford	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
MSP						
MSP Statewide	\$1,179,842	\$718,072	(\$461,770)			

* See Appendix B: Multijurisdictional Task Force Analysis.

APPENDIX B: MULTIJURISDICTIONAL TASK FORCE ANALYSIS

Bay Area Narcotics Enforcement Team (B.A.Y.A.N.E.T.)			Flint Area Narcotics Group (F.A.N.G.)		
Counties: Bay, Isabella, Midland, and Saginaw			County: Genesee		
	2012	\$175,156		2012	\$436,306
	2013	\$113,818		2013	\$108,946
	Change:	(\$61,338)		Change:	(\$327,360)

Cass County Drug Team			Huron Undercover Narcotics Team (H.U.N.T.)		
County: Cass*			Counties: Alcona, Alpena, Montmorency, and Presque Isle		
	2012	\$35,368		2012	\$16,288
Gross	2013	(\$12,351)		2013	\$11,964
	Change:	(\$47,719)		Change:	(\$4,324)

Central Michigan Enforcement Team (C.M.E.T.)			Jackson Narcotics Enforcement Team (J.N.E.T.)		
Counties: Ionia, Mecosta, Montcalm, Newaygo, and Osceola			County: Jackson		
	2012	\$73,799		2012	\$118,800
	2013	\$87,325		2013	\$134,661
	Change:	\$13,526		Change:	\$15,861

County of Macomb Enforcement Team (C.O.M.E.T.)			Kingsford, Iron Mountain, Norway, Dickinson County Drug Enforcement Team* (K.I.N.D.)		
County: Macomb			County: Dickinson		
	2012	\$505,673		2012	\$4,600
	2013	\$126,337		2013	\$0
	Change:	(\$379,336)		Change:	(\$4,600)

Downriver Area Narcotics Organization (D.R.A.N.O.)			Livingston and Washtenaw Narcotics Enforcement Team (L.A.W.N.E.T.)		
County: Wayne			Counties: Livingston and Washtenaw		
	2012	\$127,188		2012	\$200,324
	2013	\$65,647		2013	\$116,424
	Change:	(\$61,541)		Change:	(\$83,900)

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

** In 2012, all asset forfeiture proceeds were divided among the participating agencies. In 2013, asset forfeitures were reported through the Dickinson County Sheriff's Department instead of through the K.I.N.D. Drug Enforcement Team. See Appendix A.

Mid-Michigan Area Group Narcotics Enforcement Team (M.A.G.N.E.T.)	Region of Irish Hills Narcotics Office (Previously O.M.N.I. #3) (R.H.I.N.O.)
Counties: Shiawassee and Gratiot	Counties: Hillsdale, Lenawee, and Monroe
2012 \$34,254	2012 \$58,856
2013 \$30,894	2013 \$74,486
Change: (\$3,360)	Change: \$15,630

Monroe Area Narcotics Team and Investigative Services (M.A.N.T.I.S.)	Straits Area Narcotics Enforcement (S.A.N.E.)
Counties: Monroe	Counties: Charlevoix, Cheboygan, Chippewa, Emmett, Luce, Mackinac, and Otsego
2012 \$50,702	2012 \$26,880
2013 \$77,529	2013 \$41,030
Change: \$26,827	Change: \$14,150

Metropolitan Enforcement Team (M.E.T.)	Sanilac County Drug Task Force
County: Kent	County: Sanilac
2012 \$149,336	2012 \$8,653
2013 \$210,434	2013 \$13,744
Change: \$61,098	Change: \$5,091

Oakland County Narcotic Enforcement Team (N.E.T.)*	St. Clair County Drug Task Force
County: Oakland	County: St. Clair
Gross 2012 \$1,400,000	2012 \$146,997
Gross 2013 \$752,594	2013 \$123,776
Change: (\$647,406)	Change: (\$23,221)

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

Oakland County Violent Gang Task Force	State, Sheriffs, Chiefs Enforcement Narcotics Team (S.S.C.E.N.T.)
Counties: Oakland	Counties: Lake, Manistee, Mason, and Oceana
2012 \$50,291	2012 \$33,764
2013 \$6,271	2013 \$16,019
Change: (\$44,020)	Change: (\$17,745)

Strike Team Investigative Narcotics Group (S.T.I.N.G.)	Tri-County Metro Narcotics Squad (Tri County Metro)
Counties: Arenac, Crawford, Iosco, Ogemaw, Oscoda, and Roscommon	Counties: Clinton, Eaton, and Ingham
2012 \$21,932	2012 \$148,638
2013 \$19,479	2013 \$222,251
Change: (\$2,453)	Change: \$73,613

Southwestern Enforcement Team (S.W.E.T.)	Upper Peninsula Substance Enforcement Team (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
2012 \$462,851	2012 \$51,406
2013 \$376,612	2013 \$12,369
Change: (\$86,239)	Change: (\$39,037)

Traverse Narcotics Team (T.N.T.)	West Michigan Enforcement Team (W.E.M.E.T.)
Counties: Antrim, Benzie, Grand Traverse, Kalkaska, Leelanau, Missaukee, and Wexford	Counties: Allegan, Muskegon, and Ottawa
2012 \$154,731	2012 \$204,937
2013 \$147,319	2013 \$201,896
Change: (\$7,412)	Change: (\$3,041)

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

Thumb Narcotics Unit (T.N.U.)			Western Wayne Narcotics (W.W.N.)		
Counties: Huron, Lapeer, Sanilac, and Tuscola			County: Wayne		
	2012	\$74,710		2012	\$218,779
	2013	\$91,167		2013	\$71,418
	Change:	\$16,457		Change:	(\$147,361)

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