

## The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

## Office of the Inspector General

November 15, 2010

JOHN W. McCORMACK STATEOFFICE BUILDING ONE ASHBURTON PLACE ROOM 1311 BOSTON, MA 02108 TEL: (617) 727-2440 FAX: (617) 723-2334

Chief Mark Gagnon Amesbury Police Department 280 Exchange Street Amesbury, MA 01331

## Dear Chief Gagnon:

As you know, the Massachusetts Office of the Inspector General (OIG) reviewed the Amesbury Police Department's (APD) July 2009 receipt of a \$25,036 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant from the U.S. Department of Justice under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA).

The OIG is reviewing ARRA-related grants to identify potential vulnerabilities to fraud, waste, and abuse and other risks that could negatively impact the accountability, transparency, and anti-fraud mandates contained in the statutory language and interpretive guidance of ARRA. This review should not be construed as an investigation of the program or a comprehensive programmatic review. The OIG intends these reviews to assist recipients of ARRA funding to identify and address risks.

According to the APD's original grant application, the APD intended to purchase Tasers, a tactical pole camera, rake and break bars, ammunition, and targets. This was later changed, with the approval of the DOJ, so that the APD ultimately purchased just Tasers and \$2.100 of Taser holsters with its ARRA funds.

The APD made two separate purchases of Tasers. Originally the APD purchased 17 directly from the manufacturer, Taser International, for \$17,706.80. Later, the APD purchased seven more Tasers, for \$5,109.20, from Interstate Arms Corporation. As legally required, the APD used the procurement practices outlined in M.G.L. Ch. 30B (Chapter 30B), the state's Uniform Procurement Act. Based on the OIG review, the APD complied with Chapter 30B, with two technical exceptions:

 For both Taser purchases, the APD determined that Taser International, and later Interstate Arms, were at the time of each purchase the only sources for the Tasers. Chapter 30B requires that this type of sole source determination be made in writing and documented in the procurement file; the APD failed to do this. Chief Mark Gagnon November 15, 2010 Page 2

2) Under Chapter 30B the Chief Procurement Officer (CPO) is in charge of procuring all supplies and services on behalf of the town. While the CPO may delegate this authority to another employee by providing the OIG with notice of this delegation, there is no record of a delegation to any APD employee on file with the OIG. In the future, to comply with Chapter 30B, either the city's CPO must conduct procurements, or a delegation of authority to an employee in the APD must be made, and a copy of such must be submitted to the OIG. I have enclosed a delegation form for this purpose. Helpful and practical free guidance and training can be found on the OIG website. Specifically, step-by-step procurement information is available in an OIG manual, <u>Municipal, County, District, and Local Authority Procurement of Supplies, Services, and Real Property</u> (the Chapter 30B manual), available at <a href="http://www.mass.gov/ig/igpubl.htm">http://www.mass.gov/ig/igpubl.htm</a>. In addition, an introductory Online Bidding Basics training course is available on the OIG's website at <a href="http://www.mass.gov/ig/mcppo/bb\_online.htm">http://www.mass.gov/ig/mcppo/bb\_online.htm</a>.

In conclusion, the OIG review of the APD's ARRA-funded Byrne Grant found that the funds were spent appropriately, but that the APD should follow Chapter 30B more carefully in the future. I appreciate your cooperation in this review of ARRA funding. Please do not hesitate to contact my office with any questions or concerns you may have regarding this review.

Sincerely,

Gregory Sullivan Inspector General

Gregory W. Sullivan

cc: Mayor Thatcher W. Kezer III

Enclosure