



AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE
AUDIT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MEETING OF: DECEMBER 6, 2007

DEPARTMENT: CITY AUDITOR'S OFFICE
DIRECTOR: RADFORD SNELDING

Consent Discussion

SUBJECT: Discussion and possible action of Audit of Metropolitan Police - Funding

Fiscal Impact:

No Impact Augmentation Required
 Budget Funds Available

Amount:
Funding Source:
Dept./Division:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

To discuss the possibility of performing a joint audit with Clark County on the funding of the Metropolitan Police Department.

RECOMMENDATION:

Continue to pursue a joint audit with Clark County.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

None

Motion made by STEVE WOLFSON to Approve the report on the Audit of Metropolitan Police - Funding and move the entry Metropolitan Police - Funding to its own separate agenda item without closing the audit and requiring a report therein

Passed For: 4; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 1
JOSE TRONCOSO, MICHAEL W. KERN, PAUL WORKMAN, STEVE WOLFSON; (Against -None); (Abstain-None); (Did Not Vote-None); (Excused-LARRY BROWN)

Minutes:

Mr. Snelding stated he spoke with Clark County Auditor Jerry Carol and forwarded previous related documents to him. Mr. Carol has reviewed the information with management from the County, but he has not received feedback from him. He suggested keeping this item on the agenda but deleting it from the open audits/projects, as it has been on the agenda for several years, two sheriffs' ago. As a result, a review of the funding formula may be totally different with the current sheriff. Mr. Snelding will follow up with the County to see if they would like to participate in this and with Metropolitan Police on how they would like to handle this change.

Member Wolfson asked how the item became an agenda item. Mr. Snelding explained that a large part of the budget goes to Metro for policing services. He confirmed that the formula is set by statute. Staff believed that this area was a good place to review the data and see if the

CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF: DECEMBER 6, 2007

standards were accurate. Initially, staff spoke with Metro and reviewed their data then decided to run tests to see if the input was identical to the output. Quality was the concern, as that is the determining factor for funding. Thereafter, Metro decided not to have the City perform the audit, as possible findings could cost the County additional monies. Metro preferred the City and County work together on the audit.

Mr. Snelding advised Member Wolfson that the County auditor has been somewhat responsive, as there has been a change in staffing. Some studies have been done in trying to find out if Clark County has an interest in participating with the City on this audit.

Assistant City Attorney Fedlein believed that the statutes states when the sheriff merges with any police department, the City pays their proportional share. He explained to the Committee that the formula previously used to calculate the City's portion (tires, fuel, salaries and equipment) has always been disputed. It was his opinion that this formula should continue being utilized by the auditor, even though the City has no control over it. The City pays approximately 43 to 47 percent of the costs involved. Although the response has been minimal, Member Wolfson felt it was wise to continue efforts and should there be discrepancies the City Council needs to be informed.

Chairman Kern asked what was Mr. Snelding's recommendation. Mr. Snelding stated that staff would like to close "Metro Police - Funding" and remove from the open audits/projects until there is direction as to what the County would allow the City to do. However, he preferred to continue working with the Committee, as it is important to gain assurance based on some valid investigations, that the data being collected is good and that the division of funding does not hurt the City.

Chairman Kern expressed concern that if the audit was closed, would the City lose the opportunity to go back and recover monies. Mr. Snelding did not believe so. Member Wolfson also noted that if the item will be on the agenda as a separate item, it would become more important and discussion would increase. After further clarification as to Mr. Snelding's recommendation, the decision was to have the item as a reoccurring item on the agenda with discussion and possible action, but the audit would not be closed.