CONSENT AGENDA ITEM NO.

CITY OF SAN ANTONIO INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM POLICE DEPARTMENT

TO:

Mayor and City Council

FROM:

Albert A. Ortiz, Chief of Police

THROUGH: Terry M. Brechtel, City Manager

COPIES:

Christopher J. Brady, Assistant City Manager; File

SUBJECT:

Drug Testing Services Contract for the San Antonio Police Department

DATE:

August 19, 2004

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this ordinance is to authorize the renewal and extension of a contract with Alcohol and Drug Tests, Inc., to provide random and reasonable suspicion drug testing services for the City's Police Department, for a one year period from October 1, 2004 through September 30, 2005 at a cost of \$50,000.

Staff recommends approval.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Drug Interdiction Program, which calls for the mandatory drug testing of officers, was agreed upon as part of the collective bargaining agreement (Article 33, Sec. 2) in November 1999. A Request for Proposal (RFP) was created with the assistance of the City Attorney's Office and Police Department personnel in March 2001. The RFP was advertised in April 2001 with three firms responding. The three proposals were rated and the selection process finalized in May 2001. The process included a scored review by an ad hoc committee that included representatives of the San Antonio Police Department, the San Antonio Police Officers association and a representative of the San Antonio Metropolitan Health District, which oversees the City's employee drug testing program. Contract negotiations began with Alcohol and Drug Tests, Inc., selected as the most responsive and highest rated proposal, and were completed in August 2001. The contract was executed on September 30, 2001.

Alcohol and Drug Tests, Inc. has met all requirements and standards of the contract and therefore an extension of the contract is recommended. The contract contains a clause allowing renewal for three separate one-year term extensions upon approval by city council. This will be the third and final extension for this contract.

POLICY ANALYSIS

This Ordinance will allow for continuation of a program agreed upon by the San Antonio Police Officers Association (SAPOA) and the City of San Antonio via the Collective Bargaining Agreement of 1999.

FISCAL IMPACT

This activity is provided for in the Police Department's General Fund budget in the amount of \$50,000.

COORDINATION

This ordinance request has been coordinated with Asset Management, Finance, City Attorney's Office, and the Office of Management and Budget.

SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENTS

The City of San Antonio Ethics Ordinance Required Disclosures form is attached.

Albert A. Ortiz

Chief of Police

Christopher J. Brady

Assistant City Manager

Approved:

City Manager

City Manager

City of San Antonio Discretionary Contracts Disclosure*

For use of this form, see City of San Antonio Ethics Code, Part D, Sections 1&2
Attach additional sheets if space provided is not sufficient.
State"Not Applicable" for questions that do not apply.

* This form is required to be supplemented in the event there is any change in the information under (1), (2), or (3) below, before the discretionary contract is the subject of council action, and no later than five (5) business days after any change about which information is required to be filed.

Disclosure of Parties, Owners, and Closely Related Persons

For the purpose of assisting the City in the enforcement of provisions contained in the City Charter and the Code of Ethics, an individual or business entity seeking a discretionary contract from the City is required to disclose in connection with a proposal for a discretionary contract:

(1) the identity of any individual who would be a party to the discretionary contract:
none
(2) the identity of any <u>business entity</u> ¹ that would be a party to the discretionary contract:
none
and the name of:
(A) any individual or business entity that would be a subcontractor on the discretionary contract;
none
none
and the name of:
(B) any individual or business entity that is known to be a partner, or a parent or subsidiary business entity, of any individual or business entity who would be a party to the discretionary contract;
none

¹ A business entity means a sole proprietorship, partnership, firm, corporation, holding company, joint-stock company, receivership, trust, unincorporated association, or any other entity recognized by law.

(3) the identity of any lobbyist or public relations firm employed for purposes relating to the discretionary contract being sought by any individual or business entity who would be a party to the discretionary contract.					
none					
Political Contributions Any individual or business entity seeking a discretionary contract from the city must disclose in connection with a proposal for a discretionary contract all political contributions totaling one hundred dollars (\$100) or more within the past twenty-four (24) months made directly or indirectly to any current or former member of City Council, any candidate for City Council, or to any political action committee that contributes to City Council elections, by any individual or business entity whose identity must be disclosed under (1), (2) or (3) above. Indirect contributions by an individual include, but are not limited to, contributions made by the individual's spouse, whether statutory or common-law. Indirect contributions by an entity include, but are not limited to, contributions made through the officers, owners, attorneys, or registered lobbyists of the entity.					
To Whom Made: **M OWE**	Ar	mount:	Date of C	ontribution:	
Disclosures in Proposals Any individual or business entity seeking a discretionary contract with the city shall disclose any known facts which, reasonably understood, raise a question ² as to whether any city official or employee would violate Section 1 of Part B, Improper Economic Benefit, by participating in official action relating to the discretionary contract.					
none					
Signature:	Title: PRE	SIDENT	Dat	e:	
Judy WILLIAMSON	Company:	SIDENT TESTS, INC	0	8.06.04	
Judy WILLIAMSON	HVD	TESTS, INC	-	,	

² For purposes of this rule, facts are "reasonably understood" to "raise a question" about the appropriateness of official action if a disinterested person would conclude that the facts, if true, require recusal or require careful consideration of whether or not recusal is required.