

POLICE PRACTICES

THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY

Edited by
JOHN F. HEAPHY

KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI
POLICE DEPARTMENT
POLICE FOUNDATION

With the assistance of the
POLICE EXECUTIVE RESEARCH FORUM

The Police Foundation is a privately funded, independent, nonprofit organization established by the Ford Foundation in 1970 and dedicated to supporting innovation and improvement in policing. This book is published by the Foundation as a service, in conjunction with the Kansas City, Missouri, Police Department and the Police Executive Research Forum.

Copyright © 1978, Police Foundation

Library of Congress Catalog Card No. LC 78-61459

CONTENTS

Preface	v
Acknowledgments	vii
Introduction	1
Section I: ANALYSIS	3
Section II: TALLY SHEETS AND SUMMARY DATA	19
Appendix A: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE AND ACCOMPANYING LETTER	A-1
Appendix B: CITY POPULATION GROUPS AND GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS	B-1

PREFACE

For too long, policing has been characterized by insularity and a lack of dialogue. Typically, police administrators know little about how their counterparts in similar sized cities are administering their departments. This report, a continuation of the 23-year tradition of the Kansas City General Administrative Survey of Police Practices, is an attempt to combat that insularity by providing comparative data on police agency practices ranging from salary schedules to the use of patrol resources. As such, the report is intended to promote the kind of healthy dialogue so essential to the improvement of policing.

There are striking differences among departments on a large number of survey items. This report does not attempt to interpret or explain these differences, but their existence and magnitude are indications of how much police departments vary in matters such as allocating resources. The purpose of this report is not to suggest by the figures provided that one department is performing more productively than another, and readers both within and without the criminal justice system should use caution in attempting to make comparisons among departments. That one department happens to pay its patrol officers less than another, or uses a mode of patrol different from another department, or has policies markedly at odds with the policies of other departments may be a reflection as much of local conditions outside the control of police administrators as of their internal decisions. Rather, the purpose of the report is to provide police officials and other government officials and researchers additional knowledge of police working conditions and practices. The extent to which existing conditions and practices are questioned will be the measure of this effort's success.

To be sure, some of the variability can be ascribed to differences in recordkeeping and reporting practices among the responding departments. The "science" of police administration lacks both a standard language and an administrative reporting system of true comparability. As such systems evolve, reports such as this will be even more useful in enabling police departments to learn from each other. It is our hope that by emphasizing the need we can encourage that development.

In these days of urban fiscal austerity it is imperative that administrators question the workings of their organizations in order that the greatest possible return be received on every dollar invested. The data presented in this report should further that questioning.

Patrick V. Murphy
President
Police Foundation

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report is entirely dependent on the voluntary collection and submission of data, at their own expense, by the participating police departments noted elsewhere in the report. We are most grateful for their cooperation. Past and current members of the Staff Research Unit of the Kansas City, Missouri, Police Department were responsible for collecting the data as they were received from individual departments. We thank especially James Milne and Officers Michael Lawless and Thomas Howell, as well as the executive leadership of the department during the past two years.

Thanks are due to the Police Executive Research Forum for providing an advisory board to the project. The board included police executives Lee P. Brown, Hugo J. Masini, Roy C. McLaren, and Wesley A. Pomeroy. Many helpful comments were received from Joseph H. Lewis, the Police Foundation's director of evaluation, and Sumner N. Clarren, a senior research associate at The Urban Institute.

Finally, special thanks are due to Alison Heckler of Editorial Experts, Inc., for her technical services, and to Police Foundation staff members Susan Michaelson and Karen Boston for both their ability and their endurance.

*John F. Heaphy
Assistant Director
Police Foundation*

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

The staff of the Kansas City, Missouri, Police Department first conducted the General Administrative Survey of Police Practices in 1951, and published it annually for the next 22 years. The survey, limited to departments serving cities having a population between 300,000 and 1,000,000, developed in response to the expressed needs of the Kansas City Police Department and other interested municipal law enforcement agencies for data on the administrative and operational characteristics of departments of similar size.

Because of budgetary constraints, the Kansas City department stopped conducting the full survey in 1973, but the department continued to receive requests for the survey. As a result, department administrators decided, in 1976, to conduct a modified, scaled-down version of the survey, but no definite plans were made to continue this modified version on a permanent basis.

The Police Foundation, realizing the value to the law enforcement community of a timely compilation of comparative administrative and operational data, approached the department with the idea of a joint endeavor in early 1977. It was agreed that the Foundation would compensate the department for its costs in fielding the survey and tabulating the data and that the Foundation would take responsibility for analyzing and publishing the data. The Police Executive Research Forum provided an advisory group on survey instrument design.

In addition to some changes in survey item content, the scope of the survey was extended to include all departments serving cities having more than 250,000 people. Survey questionnaires were sent to 56 police departments. Fifty of these departments elected to participate.* (See Appendix A for the questionnaire and its accompanying letter.)

Another change in this version of the survey is the addition of an analysis section to provide the reader with a frame of reference for interpreting individual statistics. Data in this section generally show the range and median values of the responses of all participating departments. Separate ranges and median values for various geographical regions and for various city population categories are provided when they are appropriate. The geographic designations employed here are those used by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in publishing its Uniform Crime Reports; city population figures are based on the individual departments' estimates of their cities' 1975 populations. Lists of participating departments, by city size and geographical area, appear in Appendix B.

Essentially, the purpose of this publication is to provide the reader with a broad statement of selected facets of current administrative and operational practices in the nation's larger police departments. It is intended primarily to help police administrators see what other police departments are doing that may be of interest to them. The compilation of survey item responses according to responding departments, which appears in Section Two, refers interested readers to the specific department in which a given practice can be found, so that they can request additional information directly. The publication should be useful also to researchers and students of contemporary policing, as well as to other observers of the police.

METHODOLOGY

The questionnaire used in this survey was developed by the Staff Research Unit (SRU) of the Kansas City, Missouri, Police Department. It is a modified version of the questionnaire used in 1973—the last year in which the full survey was conducted. Modifications were suggested by SRU personnel, Police Foundation staff, and an advisory group provided by the Police Executive Research Forum. A draft version of the survey was field-tested in the four police departments represented by the Forum advisory group members.

The SRU mailed survey questionnaires in late July 1977, requesting return by mid-August. SRU staff tallied the questionnaire responses from participating departments and sent

*The responses of the San Diego Police Department, included in the tally sheets and summary data in Section Two, are not a part of the analysis in Section One because of their late arrival.

the tally sheets to the Police Foundation late in September. The staff did not verify the reported data, except when responses were exceptionally out of the ordinary. Thus, virtually all of the data appear as they were reported by the participating departments.

The Police Foundation was responsible for the analysis of the data from the 49 responding departments, which appears in Section One.* By and large, the median is the statistic employed to describe a given condition nationally, regionally, or by size of reporting jurisdiction. Because of the wide variation in responses on many items, the median appeared to be the most representative statistic. All raw data, however, are included in this publication in Section Two (tally sheets and summary data) for those researchers or practitioners who wish to perform further analysis for their own purposes.

On certain items, the variation among departments is so great that an additional measure is provided for the purpose of clarity. The "range of the middle 50 percent," appearing in some tables, refers to raw reported numbers below and above which fell 25 percent of responding departments on the item in question.

CAUTIONS

A number of cautions on the interpretation and use of these data are in order. First, no suggestion is made or implied here that these data are in any way normative. Where the median and the range of responses on a particular item are presented, they are intended to be descriptive of current practice and to help the reader form a context for understanding any particular response. Given the embryonic state of the art with regard to police productivity measurement, it is difficult

at best to assess the meaning of a department's response being at, above, or below the median.

A second caution is necessitated by the lack of standard definitions for many of the terms used in the survey. Such phrases as "team policing" and "complaints substantiated" can have very different meanings in different departments. Similarly, the title "inspector" may be used in one department to denote an individual who functions as a detective while in another it refers to a high-ranking command person. This report makes no attempt to clarify all of these distinctions. This volume is intended as a guide to assist practitioners in filling their information needs; readers requiring clarification or elaboration should contact the responding department.

The variation in administrative data systems among departments is cause for a final caution in using this report. Clearly there does not exist a universally comparable system of administrative record-keeping among police departments. The meaning of "operating budget" in one department might be very different from its meaning in another. "Overtime costs" may or may not include the dollar costs of overtime compensated for by means of compensatory time off. Some departments routinely keep more detailed administrative data than others.

In sum, despite the limitations imposed by the lack of standard definitions and non-comparability of data systems in policing, it is hoped that this report will facilitate useful communication among the nation's police agencies. The wide variations in administrative practices documented herein indicate that there is much to discuss and much that can be learned from such discussions.

*As noted, San Diego is not included in the analysis section.

SECTION I: ANALYSIS

I. ADMINISTRATION: FINANCE

Table 1 shows considerable variation in the per capita costs of policing. Among 19 cities in the 500,000 to 1,000,000

TABLE 1
PER CAPITA COSTS OF POLICING

City Size and Region	No. of Depts.	Per Capita Costs		
		Low	Median	High
More than 1,000,000	3	\$36.57	\$82.99	\$140.03
500,000-999,999	19	33.85	55.98	129.52
Northeast	2	48.18	—	86.58
North Central	5	47.38	54.65	73.25
South	6	38.66	56.62	129.52
West	6	33.85	66.68	97.33
250,000-499,999	27	21.81	48.06	81.98
Northeast	4	49.59	52.58	71.66
North Central	7	29.34	42.87	52.53
South	10	21.81	38.94	57.66
West	6	42.54	53.29	81.98

population range, the low reported per capita cost is \$33.85, the high is \$129.52, and the median is \$55.98. The median is slightly lower among the 27 reporting cities in the 250,000 to 499,999 range—\$48.06—with a range from \$21.81 to \$81.98. There is a pronounced trend toward lower per capita costs in southern cities in this latter group. In each region and in each population range, the variation is extreme, the highs being consistently at least twice as much as the lows.

Table 2 shows the number of sworn officers per 1,000 people by city size and region of the country. Medians are slightly larger for cities in the 500,000 to 1,000,000 population range: 2.42 for the group as a whole, compared to 1.88 for the 250,000 to 499,999 group. For the most part, within these population groupings, there is little variation by region of the country.

TABLE 2
NUMBER OF SWORN OFFICERS PER 1,000 POPULATION

City Size and Region	No. of Depts.	No. of Officers Per 1,000 Population		
		Low	Median	High
More than 1,000,000	3	1.90	3.98	4.20
500,000-999,999	17	1.38	2.42	5.69
Northeast	2	2.78	—	3.14
North Central	4	1.85	2.52	3.72
South	5	1.46	2.48	5.69
West	6	1.38	2.28	2.56
250,000-499,999	25	1.37	1.88	3.92
Northeast	3	2.35	3.69	3.92
North Central	7	1.37	1.76	2.24
South	9	1.64	1.97	2.21
West	6	1.63	1.83	1.88

The surveyed departments were asked to report the minimum and the maximum annual salary paid for each of various ranks. The results appear in Table 3, in which the me-

dians of the minimum salaries and the medians of the maximum salaries for each rank have been computed.

For instance, the medians of the minimum salaries paid to police chiefs range from \$28,035 to \$30,638 annually for all 49 departments. Salaries on the lower end of this range are found more often in the smallest jurisdictions. The medians of the maximum salaries paid to police chiefs range from \$33,810 to \$42,564, with the smallest jurisdictions again on the lower end of the range. The medians for police captains, in many jurisdictions the highest civil service or "competitive" position, range from \$19,578 to \$22,393 for the minimum annual salaries in the three groups of cities, and from \$23,080 to \$24,888 for the maximum annual salaries. For experienced police officers, those with 15 or more years of service, medians of the annual salaries range from \$16,151 (minimum) to \$17,549 (maximum). For new recruits, the medians range from \$10,941 (minimum in the smallest southern jurisdictions) to \$15,796 (maximum in the larger responding jurisdiction). The medians generally tend to be higher for the larger jurisdictions.

TABLE 3
MEDIAN OF MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM
ANNUAL SALARIES: NON-DETECTIVE RANKS

City Size and Region	No. of Depts.	Medians of Annual Salaries	
		Minimum	Maximum
(Police Chief/ Superintendent of Police)			
More than 1,000,000	1	\$36,000	\$42,000
500,000-999,999	7	30,638	42,564
250,000-499,999	16	28,035	33,810
Northeast	2	28,720	31,969
North Central	5	28,116	31,179
South	6	25,702	34,656
West	3	33,072	40,224
(Lieutenant Colonel, Deputy Chief, Assistant Chief)			
More than 1,000,000	0		
500,000-999,999	12	24,984	33,120
Northeast	0		
North Central	2	24,984	27,720
South	5	24,888	36,204
West	5	27,132	32,964
250,000-499,999	21	22,854	27,280
Northeast	3	26,280	27,280
North Central	6	23,580	27,146
South	8	21,020	26,350
West	4	24,000	38,170
(Other Executive Ranks)			
More than 1,000,000	1	29,102	30,363
500,000-999,999	1	26,490	42,300
250,000-499,999	1	16,593	17,939

City Size and Region	No. of Depts.	Medians of Annual Salaries	
		Minimum	Maximum
(Major)			
More than 1,000,000	0	—	—
500,000-999,999	5	21,588	27,804
250,000-499,999	8	17,674	22,880
(Inspector)			
More than 1,000,000	1	25,528	26,634
500,000-999,999	3	27,791	31,969
250,000-499,999	5	22,956	25,524
(Other Inspectors)			
More than 1,000,000	1	24,184	25,231
500,000-999,999	2	21,984	24,203
250,000-499,999	3	20,579	23,193
(Other Top Command Ranks)			
More than 1,000,000	0	—	—
500,000-999,999	3	27,285	27,785
250,000-499,999	1	14,908	19,981
(Captain of Police)			
More than 1,000,000	1	\$22,393	\$23,362
500,000-999,999	11	20,556	24,888
Northeast	0	—	—
North Central	2	22,039	22,721
South	5	19,451	21,960
West	4	22,170	27,257
250,000-499,999	23	19,578	23,080
Northeast	3	22,080	22,813
North Central	6	20,697	23,243
South	9	18,588	20,640
West	5	24,540	29,240
(Police Lieutenant)			
More than 1,000,000	1	19,643	20,493
500,000-999,999	9	16,927	21,882
Northeast	0	—	—
North Central	0	—	—
South	5	16,927	20,340
West	4	18,577	23,796
250,000-499,999	23	17,784	19,968
Northeast	3	19,496	20,630
North Central	6	17,867	20,172
South	9	15,392	18,519
West	5	19,440	25,453
(Police Sergeant)			
More than 1,000,000	1	17,230	17,977
500,000-999,999	12	16,291	18,555
Northeast	0	—	—
North Central	3	16,908	17,981
South	5	14,980	16,354
West	4	16,068	21,186
250,000-499,999	24	15,632	17,719
Northeast	3	16,953	17,939
North Central	6	16,616	17,600
South	9	14,676	16,404
West	6	18,108	22,931

TABLE 3 (Cont.)

City Size and Region	No. of Depts.	Medians of Annual Salaries	
		Minimum	Maximum
(Corporal)			
More than 1,000,000	1	16,324	17,030
500,000-999,999	0		
250,000-499,999	4	12,379	14,542
(Officer, 15 yrs. or more)			
More than 1,000,000	1	16,151	16,279
500,000-999,999	6	16,554	17,414
250,000-499,999	5	16,943	17,549
(Officer, 10-15 years)			
More than 1,000,000	1	16,024	16,151
500,000-999,999	7	15,130	15,804
250,000-499,999	8	14,909	15,988
(Officer, 5-10 years)			
More than 1,000,000	1	15,896	16,024
500,000-999,999	9	14,652	15,564
250,000-499,999	9	14,046	14,088
(Officer, 2-5 years)			
More than 1,000,000	2	\$15,713	\$16,024
500,000-999,999	11	12,586	14,789
Northeast	0		
North Central	3	11,388	12,662
South	4	12,527	14,684
West	4	14,430	16,512
250,000-499,999	22	13,383	15,005
Northeast	3	13,374	14,250
North Central	5	13,728	15,143
South	8	11,346	13,155
West	6	14,836	19,163
(Officer, first year)			
More than 1,000,000	1	15,115	15,796
500,000-999,999	6	11,703	13,434
250,000-499,999	12	12,670	13,383
Northeast	2	12,947	13,659
North Central	2	12,921	13,850
South	5	10,941	11,964
West	3	14,067	14,684

The medians of minimum and maximum annual salaries for various detective ranks are presented in Table 4. For the basic detective rank, the medians for the three city groups range from \$13,337 (minimum annual salaries in cities of 250,000 to 499,999) to \$18,900 (maximum annual salaries in cities of 500,000 to 999,999).

TABLE 4
MEDIAN OF MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM
ANNUAL SALARIES: DETECTIVE RANKS

City Size and Region	No. of Depts.	Medians of Annual Salaries	
		Minimum	Maximum
		(Commanding Officer)	
More than 1,000,000	1	\$29,102	30,363
500,000-999,999	5	24,984	27,785
250,000-499,999	5	19,405	22,644
		(Captain)	
More than 1,000,000	1	22,393	23,362
500,000-999,999	6	20,730	25,176
250,000-499,999	10	18,537	20,280
Northeast	2	20,199	21,377
North Central	3	18,756	19,572
South	3	15,168	19,920
West	2	23,291	26,656
		(Lieutenant)	
More than 1,000,000	1	19,643	20,493
500,000-999,999	5	16,910	21,882
250,000-499,999	10	17,003	18,792
Northeast	2	18,371	19,554
North Central	3	17,244	17,868
South	3	13,297	18,240
West	2	20,600	23,640
		(Sergeant)	
More than 1,000,000	1	\$17,230	\$17,977
500,000-999,999	6	17,194	18,951
250,000-499,999	10	15,489	16,813
Northeast	2	16,643	17,617
North Central	3	15,756	17,222
South	3	12,038	15,840
West	2	17,454	20,369
		(Detective)	
More than 1,000,000	1	16,324	17,030
500,000-999,999	8	15,382	18,900
250,000-499,999	14	13,337	14,952
Northeast	2	14,065	15,440
North Central	4	14,029	15,611
South	6	12,131	13,930
West	2	16,398	18,695

The percentage of a department's salary budget used for overtime costs varies from zero to a high of 21.06, as Table 5 indicates. The median among 14 cities reporting in the 500,000 to 1,000,000 population range is 3.65 percent; in the 250,000 to 499,999 range it is 1.92 percent.

TABLE 5
OVERTIME IN SALARY BUDGET

City Size	No. of Depts.	Percentage of Salary Budget		
		Low	Median	High
More than 1,000,000	3	1.18	3.00	7.25
500,000-999,999	14	1.46	3.65	21.06
250,000-499,999	22	0.00	1.92	9.46

II. ADMINISTRATION: BENEFITS

This section summarizes the major fringe benefits provided to members of the departments surveyed.

Table 6 indicates the great variability in the number of days of sick leave provided annually to employees. In departments serving cities having between 500,000 and 1,000,000 people, for instance, the number of sick days provided annually ranges from a low of 12 to a high of 180, and the limit of sick leave accumulation ranges from a low of 90 to a high of 180. Interestingly, 16 departments report no limit at all on the amount of sick leave accumulation.

TABLE 6
ANNUAL SICK LEAVE PER YEAR AND
SICK LEAVE ACCUMULATION

Sick Leave Days Per Year				
City Size	No. of Depts.	Low	Median	High
More than 1,000,000	3	12	15	20
500,000-999,999	19 ^a	12	18	180
250,000-499,999	25	12	12	365

Sick Leave Days Accumulation				
City Size	No. of Depts.	Low	Median	High
More than 1,000,000	2 ^b	125	162.5	200
500,000-999,999	6 ^c	90	121	180
250,000-499,999	6 ^d	90	120	365

^aOne more department reports unlimited sick leave.

^bOne more department reports unlimited accumulation.

^cEight more departments report unlimited accumulation and two do not permit accumulation.

^dSeven more departments report unlimited accumulation and one does not permit accumulation.

Tables 7 and 8 indicate the range and median numbers of minimum and maximum days of paid vacation. Medians vary little according to city size, but there is great variability within population categories. For instance, the maximum annual paid vacation varies from a low of 15 days to a high of 30 days among 24 reporting departments serving cities having between 250,000 and 499,999 people.

TABLE 7
MINIMUM DAYS ANNUAL PAID VACATION

City Size	No. of Depts.	Minimum Vacation Days		
		Low	Median	High
More than 1,000,000	3	14	15	20
500,000-999,999	18	10	12	21
250,000-499,999	26	10	12	20

TABLE 8
MAXIMUM DAYS ANNUAL PAID VACATION

City Size	No. of Depts.	Maximum Vacation Days		
		Low	Median	High
More than 1,000,000	2	21	25.5	30 ^a
500,000-999,999	16 ^b	20	21	35
250,000-499,999	24 ^c	15	21	30

^aOne more department grants 21 days plus half of the officer's sick leave accumulation.

^bTwo more departments use a base of 20 and 30 days respectively and add days per years of service.

^cTwo more departments use a base of 10 and 12 days respectively and add days per years of service.

The number of paid holidays provided annually also varies considerably, ranging from 8 to 15 days in the 500,000 to 1,000,000 population group, and from 4 to 13 in the 250,000 to 499,999 group.

TABLE 9
PAID HOLIDAYS PER YEAR

City Size	No. of Depts.	Paid Holidays		
		Low	Median	High
More than 1,000,000	3	9	10	18
500,000-999,999	17	8	10	15
250,000-499,999	26	4	10	13

Table 10 compares city and employee contributions to the officer's retirement fund. The percentages reflect percentages of the officers' salaries, not percentages of the total contributions. For all three groups of cities, the medians of the cities' contributions range from 14 to 18 percent of the officers' salaries. There are considerable differences among departments, however; the low is 2.5 percent and the high 28.8 percent among 27 reporting departments in the 250,000 to 499,999 population group. The median of the police officers' contributions to their retirement fund is almost 7 percent of their salaries, and the range is much smaller than for the cities' contributions.

TABLE 10
PERCENTAGE CONTRIBUTION TO RETIREMENT FUND

City Size	No. of Depts.	City Contribution		
		Low	Median	High
More than 1,000,000	3	12 %	18%	54 %
500,000-999,999	13 ^a	6	15	53
250,000-499,999	27	2.5	14	28.8
Officer Contribution				
More than 1,000,000	3	5 %	6%	9 %
500,000-999,999	19	3	7	10.4
250,000-499,999	27	0	7	16.5

^aTwo more departments report "balance"; another department's contribution is determined annually by a city auditor; and a fourth department's contribution is paid by a tax levy.

Table 11 shows that the median age for retirement eligibility is slightly more than 50 years of age, while the median age for mandatory retirement is almost 65.

TABLE 11
MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM AGES
FOR RETIREMENT ELIGIBILITY

Age for Retirement Eligibility				
City Size	No. of Depts.	Low	Median	High
More than 1,000,000	2 ^a	45	50	55
500,000-999,999	16 ^b	40	50	55
250,000-499,999	20 ^c	38	51	62
Age for Mandatory Retirement				
City Size	No. of Depts.	Low	Median	High
More than 1,000,000	3	55	65	70
500,000-999,999	17 ^c	52	65	68
250,000-499,999	22 ^{b,d}	49	63	70

^aOne more department reports no limit.

^bThree more departments report no limit.

^cTwo more departments report no limit.

^dOne more department reports "after 30 years' service."

Table 12 indicates the number of years of service required for minimum and full retirement eligibility. Although the median minimum number of years of service for retirement is 20, some cities have no years-in-service requirement.

The median number of years of service required for full retirement eligibility, among those cities that have a requirement, ranges from 30 to 35 years for the three population groups.

TABLE 12
YEARS IN SERVICE FOR RETIREMENT ELIGIBILITY

City Size	Minimum Retirement Eligibility				Full Retirement Eligibility			
	No. of Depts.	Low	Median	High	No. of Depts.	Low	Median	High
More than 1,000,000	3	20	20	25	2 ^a	25	35.5	46
500,000-999,999	19	5	20	25	14 ^b	25	32	46
250,000-499,999	26 ^a	5	20	30	16 ^c	25	30	47

^aOne more department reports no years-in-service requirement.

^bTwo more departments report no years-in-service requirement.

^cSix more departments report no years-in-service requirement.

The major health care benefits provided by departments for both line-of-duty and off-duty injuries are presented in Table 13. As indicated, there is little variability among

departments in the extent of coverage for line-of-duty injuries; nearly all departments provide complete coverage.

TABLE 13
DEPARTMENT PROVISION FOR MAJOR HEALTH CARE: LINE-OF-DUTY AND OFF-DUTY INJURY OR ILLNESS

Care Type	City Size									
	More than 1,000,000		500,000-999,999				250,000-499,999			
			No. of Depts.	Percentage of Care Provided			No. of Depts.	Percentage of Care Provided		
	No. of Depts.	Percentage of Care Provided		Low	Median	High		Low	Median	High
Line-of-Duty										
Hospitalization	3	100%	19	99.5%	100%	100%	26 ^b	100%	100%	100%
Medical	3	100	19	99.5	100	100	26 ^b	100	100	100
Surgical	3	100	19	99.5	100	100	26 ^b	100	100	100
Off-Duty										
Hospitalization	3	0-100	11 ^a	50	100	100	18 ^c	80	100	100
Medical	3	100	10 ^b	50	90	100	17 ^d	80	90	100
Surgical	3	100	9 ^b	50	100	100	15 ^d	80	100	100

^aThree more departments have variable plans.

^bOne more department reports no provision.

^cFive more departments report no provision and one department has a variable plan.

^dSix more departments report no provision and two have variable plans.

III. PERSONNEL: DISTRIBUTION

Table 14 indicates the distribution of sworn personnel among the various units of the responding departments. The median allocated to patrol, for instance, is between 54 percent and 56 percent for the three groups of departments. But the range around the medians is considerable; there is a low of 39 percent and a high of 86 percent. For the next largest category

TABLE 14
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION
OF SWORN PERSONNEL BY UNIT

City Size	No. of Depts.	Percentage Per Unit		
		Low	Median	High
<u>Patrol</u>				
More than 1,000,000	3	40.72%	54.84%	62.05%
500,000-999,999	16	42.81	55.78	85.96
250,000-499,999	25	39.61	56.14	81.28
<u>Traffic</u>				
More than 1,000,000	3	0.66	4.31	17.73
500,000-999,999	15 ^a	0.82	6.93	16.64
250,000-499,999	21 ^b	0.78	6.47	14.33
<u>Tactical</u>				
More than 1,000,000	3	1.04	3.95	4.26
500,000-999,999	14 ^c	0.46	5.04	9.90
250,000-499,999	15 ^d	0.27	4.01	8.81
<u>Detective</u>				
More than 1,000,000	3	9.88	11.37	11.46
500,000-999,999	15 ^e	4.94	11.42	14.06
250,000-499,999	24 ^e	4.60	13.81	22.91
<u>Youth</u>				
More than 1,000,000	3	3.78	3.82	4.04
500,000-999,999	14 ^f	0.26	2.68	5.45
250,000-499,999	20 ^g	1.45	3.65	8.53
<u>Vice</u>				
More than 1,000,000	3	0.23	1.89	4.39
500,000-999,999	15 ^h	0.53	2.31	4.88
250,000-499,999	23 ⁱ	1.00	3.26	6.55
<u>Other Operations</u>				
More than 1,000,000	3	1.97	2.65	7.04
500,000-999,999	13 ^j	0.18	2.44	14.22
250,000-499,999	20 ^k	0.14	2.80	11.16
<u>Technical Services</u>				
More than 1,000,000	3	0.71	2.00	4.86
500,000-999,999	11 ^l	0.05	1.28	9.87
250,000-499,999	18 ^m	0.13	2.84	8.99
<u>Communications</u>				
More than 1,000,000	3	1.80	2.04	2.75
500,000-999,999	15 ⁿ	0.98	2.83	4.14
250,000-499,999	22 ^o	0.26	2.74	10.53

City Size	No. of Depts.	Percentage Per Unit		
		Low	Median	High
Internal Affairs				
More than 1,000,000	3	0.28%	0.29%	0.94%
500,000-999,999	16	0.34	0.87	2.32
250,000-499,999	22 ^p	0.31	0.65	1.85
Research and Development				
More than 1,000,000	3	0.26	0.75	0.89
500,000-999,999	16	0.07	0.35	1.14
250,000-499,999	22 ^q	0.21	0.61	3.76
Records				
More than 1,000,000	3	0.42	0.50	0.61
500,000-999,999	16	0.37	1.35	3.02
250,000-499,999	19 ^r	0.15	2.35	4.48
Chief's Office				
More than 1,000,000	3	0.04	1.43	2.06
500,000-999,999	16	0.07	0.51	1.69
250,000-499,999	24 ^s	0.26	0.64	3.60
Personnel				
More than 1,000,000	2 ^t	0.61	2.52	4.43
500,000-999,999	16	0.05	0.47	4.08
250,000-499,999	18 ^u	0.14	0.85	4.09
Other Administrative Units				
More than 1,000,000	3	2.31	5.06	13.12
500,000-999,999	15 ^v	0.18	4.22	11.90
250,000-499,999	23 ^w	0.19	1.77	9.54

^aOne more department does not have a traffic unit.

^bFour more departments do not have a traffic unit.

^cTwo more departments do not have a tactical unit.

^dNine more departments do not have a tactical unit.

^eOne more department does not have a detective unit.

^fTwo more departments do not have a youth unit.

^gFive more departments do not have a youth unit.

^hOne more department does not have a vice unit.

ⁱTwo more departments do not have a vice unit.

^jThree more departments do not have other operations units.

^kFour more departments do not have other operations units.

^lFive more departments do not have a technical services unit.

^mSix more departments do not have a technical services unit.

ⁿOne more department does not have a communications unit.

^oThree more departments do not have a communications unit.

^pThree more departments do not have an internal affairs unit.

^qThree more departments do not have a research and development unit.

^rFour more departments do not have a records unit, and one more department has a combined records and communications unit.

^sOne more department does not have anyone assigned to the chief's office.

^tOne more department does not have a personnel unit.

^uSeven more departments do not have a personnel unit.

^vOne more department does not have other administrative units.

^wTwo more departments do not have other administrative units.

of personnel—detectives—the medians for three city groups are between 11 and 14 percent of sworn personnel. The medians for the other police units are under 7 percent.

Wide differences also are apparent in the percentage of sworn personnel occupying various ranks in the responding departments. Table 15 indicates, for instance, that the median percentage of sworn personnel in the rank of police officer is between 70 and 77 percent for the three groups of departments, with a low of 54 percent and a high of almost 90 percent. The variation in the percentage of sworn personnel at the rank of sergeant is even more striking, ranging from a low of less than 4 percent to a high of 27 percent. Table 15 further indicates that the median percentage of personnel at the rank of sergeant increases as city size decreases.

TABLE 15
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION
OF SWORN PERSONNEL BY RANK

City Size	No. of Depts.	Percentage Per Rank		
		Low	Median	High
<u>Police Officer</u>				
More than 1,000,000	3	71.45%	77.26%	86.12%
500,000-999,999	17	59.20	71.66	89.60
250,000-499,999	25	54.05	70.93	80.50
<u>Inspector/Detectives</u>				
More than 1,000,000	2 ^a	0.08	5.37	10.65
500,000-999,999	13 ^b	0.64	11.99	21.92
250,000-499,999	15 ^c	0.15	14.41	28.20
<u>Sergeant</u>				
More than 1,000,000	3	6.08	7.86	20.52
500,000-999,999	17	3.76	12.60	22.73
250,000-499,999	24 ^d	7.74	13.79	27.09
<u>Lieutenant</u>				
More than 1,000,000	3	2.82	3.46	4.07
500,000-999,999	16 ^e	1.30	3.33	12.29
250,000-499,999	24 ^e	2.38	4.84	14.25
<u>Captain</u>				
More than 1,000,000	3	0.96	0.99	1.12
500,000-999,999	17	0.21	1.25	4.10
250,000-499,999	24 ^f	0.96	1.82	4.72
<u>Major</u>				
More than 1,000,000	2 ^g	0.37	0.38	0.38
500,000-999,999	13 ^h	0.24	0.52	1.96
250,000-499,999	14 ⁱ	0.20	0.63	1.18
<u>Other Administrative Personnel</u>				
More than 1,000,000	3	0.11	0.17	0.43
500,000-999,999	15 ^j	0.05	0.24	0.70
250,000-499,999	25	0.16	0.61	1.31

City Size	No. of Depts.	Percentage Per Rank		
		Low	Median	High
		Other Law Enforcement Personnel		
More than 1,000,000	2 ^k	2.34%	2.54%	2.73%
500,000-999,999	9 ^l	0.06	0.26	9.03
250,000-499,999	6 ^m	0.10	0.59	9.49

^aOne more department has no inspector/detectives.

^bFive more departments have no inspector/detectives.

^cTen more departments have no inspector/detectives.

^dOne more department has no sergeants.

^eOne more department has no lieutenants.

^fOne more department has no captains.

^gOne more department has no majors.

^hFour more departments have no majors.

ⁱEleven more departments have no majors.

^jTwo more departments do not have other administrative personnel.

^kOne more department does not have other law enforcement personnel.

^lEight more departments do not have other law enforcement personnel.

^mNineteen more departments do not have other law enforcement personnel.

The participating departments were asked to indicate how many of their investigations personnel are located at headquarters and how many are decentralized. Table 16 describes the amount of centralization (i.e., headquarters-based activity) in the detective function of the responding departments. Twenty-six of the 46 responding departments (56 percent) maintain a fully centralized detective operation. Among those departments that report some amount of decentralization, the median percentage of the decentralized detective function is between 15 and 34 percent for the three groups of departments.

TABLE 16
CENTRALIZATION/DECENTRALIZATION
OF INVESTIGATIVE PERSONNEL

City Size	No. of Depts.	No. Centralized	Median Percentage of Remainder Decentralized
More than 1,000,000	2	0	15.50%
500,000-999,999	18	11	33.76
250,000-499,999	26	15	19.28

TABLE 17
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION
OF SWORN PERSONNEL BY SHIFT

City Size	No. of Depts.	Percentage Per Shift		
		Low	Median	High
<u>Day</u>				
More than 1,000,000	2	33.33%	35.67%*	38.01%
500,000-999,999	17	25.12	33.86	44.68
250,000-499,999	22	19.39	33.19	41.94
<u>Evening</u>				
More than 1,000,000	2	33.33	34.45*	35.57
500,000-999,999	17	25.12	36.44	47.88
250,000-499,999	22	23.66	35.12	47.86
<u>Night</u>				
More than 1,000,000	2	26.42	29.88*	33.33
500,000-999,999	17	10.64	28.30	38.60
250,000-499,999	22	20.45	30.14	43.03
<u>Other</u>				
More than 1,000,000	2	0	0	0
500,000-999,999	4 ^a	2.83	7.48	24.63
250,000-499,999	6 ^b	0.85	11.64	26.83

*Mean

^aThirteen more departments do not use other shifts.

^bSeventeen more departments do not use other shifts.

Table 17 shows the distribution of law enforcement personnel over all shifts—day (usually 8:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.), evening (usually 4:00 P.M. to midnight), night (usually midnight to 8:00 A.M.), and other. The medians for the three basic shifts suggest that personnel generally are distributed fairly evenly throughout each 24-hour period. That not all departments allocate personnel in that manner is shown by the wide range of percentages for city groups and for shifts. For example, one department in a medium-size city assigns only 10.6 percent of its personnel to the night shift, whereas one department in a smaller city assigns 43 percent of its personnel to that shift. The range for the evening shift is between 23 and 48 percent, and the range for the day shift is between 19 and 45 percent. Of special note is the fact that 30 of the 41 responding departments report no “other” shift in addition to the basic day, evening, and night shifts.

Table 18 shows the median percentage of motor and foot beats for the day, evening, and night shifts. On all three shifts, in departments serving cities of all sizes surveyed, the median percentage of total beats covered by motor patrol exceeds 90 percent. Further, foot beats appear to be used more on the day shift than on the other two.

Departments were asked to estimate the percentage of regular beats typically uncovered as a result of court appearances, sick time, vacation, etc. Table 19 presents the medians of the percentages reported.

TABLE 18
MEDIAN PERCENTAGE OF MOTOR AND FOOT BEATS BY SHIFT

City Size	Day			Evening			Night		
	No. of Depts.	Motor	Foot	No. of Depts.	Motor	Foot	No. of Depts.	Motor	Foot
More than 1,000,000	2	90.10%*	9.90%*	2	90.86%*	9.14%*	2	92.31%*	7.69%*
500,000-999,999	14 ^a	92.08	7.92	12 ^c	93.41	6.59	8 ^d	95.99	4.01
250,000-499,999	16 ^b	90.29	9.71	12 ^d	90.58	9.42	8 ^e	93.22	6.78

*Mean

^aFive more departments use only motorized beats.

^bSeven more departments use only motorized beats.

^cSix more departments use only motorized beats.

^dTen more departments use only motorized beats.

^eFourteen more departments use only motorized beats.

TABLE 19
MEDIAN ESTIMATED PERCENTAGES OF UNCOVERED BEATS ON ALL SHIFTS

City Size	Day		Evening		Night		Other	
	No. of Depts.	Median Percentage	No. of Depts.	Median Percentage	No. of Depts.	Median Percentage	No. of Depts.	Median Percentage
More than 1,000,000	2	4.5*	2	3.8*	2	3*	0	—
500,000-999,999	9 ^a	10	9 ^b	11	9 ^a	10	2 ^c	8*
250,000-499,999	13 ^b	10	13 ^b	10	13 ^b	10	2 ^d	32*

*Mean

^aOne more department reports zero, and another department reports less than 5 percent.

^bTwo more departments report zero.

^cOne more department reports zero.

^dFive more departments report zero, and one more reports between 3.5 and 4 percent.

Among the responding departments serving cities having populations between 250,000 and 1,000,000, the median percentages of beats uncovered is 10 or 11 percent for the three basic shifts, with two departments reporting zero or slightly above. The mean percentages of uncovered beats for the two reporting departments serving cities having more than 1,000,000 people are markedly lower, ranging from 3 to 4.5 percent.

Information was gathered on the use of one- and two-officer units for both motor and foot beats among departments surveyed. As would be expected, some departments use exclusively one-officer units, some exclusively two-officer units, and others some combination of one- and two-officer units. Tables 20 and 21 indicate the number and percentage of reporting departments using exclusively one-officer or two-officer units for motor and foot beats respectively.

In general, these data show that, where an exclusively one- or two-officer staffing system is chosen, departments serving cities having populations between 250,000 and 499,999 are more likely to choose a one-officer system on most shifts for both motor and foot beats. Departments serving cities having between 500,000 and 1,000,000 people are equally likely to choose a one- or two-officer system on the evening and night shifts, but more likely to choose a one-officer system on the day shift, particularly for foot beats. There is little difference between motor beats and foot beats in numbers of either exclusively one-officer or exclusively two-officer units, although foot beats on the day shift are more likely than motor beats to have only one officer.

Table 22 shows the percentage mix of one- and two-officer units for those departments reporting use of both systems. These data show that, where a mixed system is used, one-officer units predominate on the day shift, although this predominance declines markedly through the evening and night shifts. Also of special note in these data is the great range of percentage mix among the departments.

TABLE 20
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF DEPARTMENTS
REPORTING EXCLUSIVELY ONE- OR TWO-OFFICER
MOTOR UNITS, BY SHIFT

Shift	City Size	No. of Depts.	Exclusively 1/O	Exclusively 2/O
Day Shift	More than 1,000,000	1	1 (100%)	0
	500,000-999,999	7	4 (57)	3 (43%)
	250,000-499,999	12	9 (75)	3 (25)
Evening Shift	More than 1,000,000	1	0	1 (100%)
	500,000-999,999	8	4 (50)	4 (50)
	250,000-499,999	10	6 (60)	4 (40)
Night Shift	More than 1,000,000	2	0	2 (100%)
	500,000-999,999	7	4 (57)	3 (43)
	250,000-499,999	12	5 (42)	7 (58)

TABLE 21
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF DEPARTMENTS
REPORTING EXCLUSIVELY ONE- OR TWO-OFFICER
FOOT UNITS, BY SHIFT

Shift	City Size	No. of Depts.	Exclusively 1/O	Exclusively 2/O
Day Shift	More than 1,000,000	1	0	1 (100%)
	500,000-999,999	11	7 (64%)	4 (36)
	250,000-499,999	16	13 (81)	3 (19)
Evening Shift	More than 1,000,000	1	0	1 (100%)
	500,000-999,999	10	5 (50)	5 (50)
	250,000-499,999	9	4 (44)	5 (56)
Night Shift	More than 1,000,000	1	0	1 (100%)
	500,000-999,999	6	3 (50)	3 (50)
	250,000-499,999	8	5 (63)	3 (37)

TABLE 22
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF ONE- AND TWO-OFFICER UNITS, BY SHIFT

Shift	City Size	No. of Depts.	One-Officer			Two-Officer		
			Low	Median	High	Low	Median	High
Day Shift	More than 1,000,000	2	16.04%	—	100.00%	0.00%	—	83.96%
	500,000-999,999	12	1.96	70.62	8.61	11.39	29.88	98.04
	250,000-499,999	13	35.71	76.47	96.88	3.12	23.53	64.28
Evening Shift	More than 1,000,000	2	0.00	—	10.28	89.71	—	100.00
	500,000-999,999	11	1.96	54.05	88.37	11.63	45.94	98.04
	250,000-499,999	15	10.34	63.83	96.00	4.00	36.17	89.66
Night Shift	More than 1,000,000	2	—	0.00	—	—	100.00	—
	500,000-999,999	11	1.96	39.06	80.95	19.05	60.94	98.04
	250,000-499,999	13	6.90	54.93	95.24	4.76	45.07	93.10

IV. PERSONNEL: COMPOSITION AND PROMOTION

As shown in Table 23, the percentage of civilians in the workforces of reporting departments varies considerably, with a low of 2 percent and a high of 34 percent. The median percentages for the groupings by city size and region vary between 6 and 28 percent.

TABLE 23
PERCENTAGE OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES
IN POLICE DEPARTMENTS

City Size and Region	No. of Depts.	Low	Median	High
More than 1,000,000	3	8.89%	10.59%	19.90%
500,000-999,999	16	2.06	20.62	27.37
Northeast	2	2.06	6.82*	11.58
North Central	4	8.27	19.89	27.37
South	4	11.46	21.96	25.17
West	6	17.86	20.84	23.38
250,000-499,999	24 ^a	5.08	19.48	34.44
Northeast	3	8.82	14.26	16.15
North Central	6 ^a	5.08	13.35	20.83
South	9	12.31	19.64	33.88
West	6	21.30	27.55	34.44

^aOne more department reports zero.

*Mean

Table 24 shows the distribution of female officers among the various ranks in the 40 responding departments. Because of the great variability in these numbers, the range of the middle 50 percent of the responding departments is indicated, as well as the low, median, and high numbers of female officers.

TABLE 24
RANGE AND MEDIAN NUMBERS
OF WOMEN OFFICERS, BY RANK^a

Rank	No. of Depts.	Number of Women Officers			
		Low	Median	High	Range of Middle 50 Percent
Police Officer	39	1	24	625	16-46
Inspector/Detective	12	1	5.5	17	2-8
Sergeant	22	1	1.5	32	1-2
Lieutenant	9	1	1	15	1-2
Captain	4	1	1	4	1
Other Law Enforcement Officers	1	—	1	—	—

^aOnly the 40 departments that reported any women officers at all are included in this table, and only those ranks for which there are women in those departments.

Only 22 of the 40 responding departments report women at the rank of sergeant, only four report women at the rank of captain, and none report women at the ranks above captain.

Tables 25, 26 and 27 indicate the number of black, Spanish-surnamed, and American Indian officers, respectively, at various ranks in the responding departments. As in

TABLE 25
RANGE AND MEDIAN NUMBERS
OF BLACK OFFICERS, BY RANK^a

Rank	No. of Depts.	Number of Black Officers			
		Low	Median	High	Range of Middle 50 Percent
Police Officer	38	1	46	1,653	23-94
Inspector/Detective	12	1	4	82	2-16
Sergeant	28	1	3	161	2-7
Lieutenant	14	1	2	42	1-6
Captain	11	1	1	17	1-3
Major	8	1	1	9	1-2
Above	9	1	1	3	1
Other Law Enforcement Officers	4	1	1.5	5	1-2

^aOnly the 38 departments that reported any black officers at all are included in this table.

TABLE 26
RANGE AND MEDIAN NUMBERS OF
SPANISH-SURNAMED OFFICERS, BY RANK^a

Rank	No. of Depts.	Number of Spanish-Surnamed Officers			
		Low	Median	High	Range of Middle 50 Percent
Police Officer	31	1	18	149	7-46
Inspector/Detective	6	1	8.5	29	8-9
Sergeant	18	1	3	10	2-5
Lieutenant	11	1	1	5	1-2
Captain	4	1	1	1	1
Major	2	1	1.5	2	—
Above	3	1	1	1	—
Other Law Enforcement Officers	1	—	3	—	—

^aOnly the 31 departments that reported any Spanish-surnamed officers at all are included in this table.

TABLE 27
RANGE AND MEDIAN NUMBERS OF
AMERICAN INDIAN OFFICERS, BY RANK^a

Rank	No. of Depts.	Number of American Indian Officers			
		Low	Median	High	Range of Middle 50 Percent
Police Officer	20	1	1.5	9	1-4
Inspector/Detective	1	—	1	—	—
Sergeant	5	1	3	3	—
Lieutenant	0	—	—	—	—
Captain	3	1	1	1	—
Major	0	—	—	—	—
Above	1	—	1	—	—

^aOnly the 25 departments that reported any American Indian officers at all are included in this table.

The vast majority of reporting departments require no college education at the police officer, supervisory, or command levels. As Table 28 shows, ten out of 49 reporting departments require some college education at the police officer level and four of the 46 departments require it at the command level. Only one department reported requiring a four-year degree at any level.

Although a college education is generally not a requirement among the responding departments, many departments provide incentive pay to encourage officers to earn college credits. Table 29 shows that 19 of the 43 responding departments (44 percent) provide some type of incentive pay for those officers earning college credit.

Among a number of items concerning promotional practices was a question about which city agency administers any promotional examinations that are used. Only nine departments administered their own promotional exams. The great majority of promotional exams are administered by either a city civil service commission (26 departments) or by a city personnel department (10 departments).

Table 24, the middle 50 percent range has been indicated because of the great variability in these numbers. For instance, Table 25 indicates that, among eleven departments reporting blacks at the rank of captain, one department has 17 blacks at that rank, but the middle 50 percent of those departments reported from one to three blacks at that rank.

Data were gathered on the use of lateral entry among the departments surveyed. Of the 49 departments responding to this item, 44 indicated that they do not permit lateral entry of any type. Of the five that do permit lateral entry, two allow it at the level of chief only, one at any rank above captain, one for both police officers and chief, and one department anywhere in the rank structure.

TABLE 29
INCENTIVE PAY FOR COLLEGE CREDIT

City Size	No. of Depts.	College Incentive Pay	
		Yes	No
More than 1,000,000	3	1	2
500,000-999,999	16	7	9
250,000-499,999	24	11	13

TABLE 28
COMPARISON OF COLLEGE EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS BY RANK

Rank	No. of Depts.	College Requirements								
		No	Yes*	9 hrs.	15 hrs.	45 hrs.	60 hrs.	1 yr.	2 yrs.	4 yrs.
Police Officer	49	39	1	1	1	1	3	1	2	—
Supervisor	46	43	1			—	1	—	1	—
Command Level	46	42	3			—	—	—	—	1

*Amount not reported.

TABLE 30
TYPES OF PROMOTIONAL PROCEDURES, BY RANK^a

For Promotion To	No. of Depts.	Written Exam	Oral Interview	Assessment Center	Psychological Evaluation	Performance Evaluation	Seniority
Detective	26 ^b	16	13	1		17	
Sergeant	45	44	20	2	3	25	7
Lieutenant	45	45	23	1	3	27	4
Captain	45	43	25	2	2	25	4

^aOne department may use more than one procedure.

^bOne additional department assigns personnel to the rank of detective.

TABLE 31
TIME IN GRADE FOR PROMOTION, BY NUMBER OF DEPARTMENTS^a

Rank	No. of Depts.	Time in Grade (Years)										
		0.5	1	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5	6	7
Police Officer to Detective	22		4	8	1	4	1	2	1	1		
Police Officer to Sergeant	47		6	9	1	19		7	1	4		
Sergeant to Lieutenant	46	1	23	16		2		2		1	1	
Lieutenant to Captain	44	1	23	16				2		1		1

^aData from 48 departments.

Table 30 summarizes the types of promotional procedures currently in use in the responding departments. The written exam is almost universal for promotion within the traditional ranks (excluding detective), but oral interviews and performance evaluations are used to some extent. Seniority appears to be a very minor factor among departments surveyed.

Table 31 indicates the time in grade required for eligibility for promotion to a higher grade. In general, promotion from police officer or detective to the rank of sergeant requires three or more years of service (31 of 47 responding departments), while promotion from lieutenant to captain or from sergeant to lieutenant requires only one or two years in rank.

V. EQUIPMENT

This section highlights some of the information responding departments provided about certain categories of equipment. Table 32, for instance, indicates that the number of

marked police vehicles per 100 sworn officers varies considerably, from a low of 4.5 to a high of 46.6. The medians for the three groups of departments are much more consistent, however, falling in the range of 11.9 to 16.4 marked units per 100 sworn officers.

TABLE 32
NUMBER OF MARKED UNITS
PER 100 SWORN OFFICERS

City Size	No. of Depts.	Marked Units/ 100 Sworn Officers			
		Low	Median	High	Range of Middle 50 Percent
More than 1,000,000	3	9.67	11.88	29.42	—
500,000–999,999	17	4.50	12.47	21.90	9.17–18.05
250,000–499,999	25	6.44	16.42	46.61	13.49–20.08

For unmarked units, the range is similarly broad. The low is 0.2 and the high 39.7 unmarked units per 100 sworn officers, with the range of the middle 50 percent falling between 6 and 19 (Table 33).

As Table 34 shows, the percentage of unmarked department automobiles also varies considerably, from a low of 3.8 to a high of 67.3 percent. The middle 50 percent range is between 39 and 53 percent.

TABLE 33
NUMBER OF UNMARKED UNITS
PER 100 SWORN OFFICERS

City Size	No. of Depts.	Unmarked Units/ 100 Sworn Officers			
		Low	Median	High	Range of Middle 50 Percent
More than 1,000,000	3	6.41	9.74	34.04	—
500,000-999,999	17	0.20	12.83	39.67	6.57-17.33
250,000-499,999	25	2.91	14.56	31.78	10.65-19.42

TABLE 34
PERCENTAGE OF UNMARKED UNITS

City Size	No. of Depts.	Percentage of Unmarked Units			
		Low	Median	High	Range of Middle 50 Percent
More than 1,000,000	3	39.86	45.05	53.63	—
50,000-999,999	18	3.80	46.53	67.30	39.10-53.17
250,000-499,999	26	18.87	45.99	65.94	41.14-51.92

Of the 49 responding departments, 24 reported that the department has no helicopters. Among those departments having helicopters, the middle 50 percent range is three to five in departments serving cities having between 500,000 and 1,000,000 people, and one to two in departments serving cities having between 250,000 and 499,999 people. Only six departments reported owning fixed-wing aircraft.

All 49 departments reported some use of computers. Thirty-nine departments indicated that they share at least some of their computer services with other units of government, and 16 reported that at least some of their computer services are solely for police use. (Some departments reported both types of arrangements.) Table 35 indicates, by city size, the variety of applications to which the computer is put among responding departments.

TABLE 35
COMPUTER SERVICES USED, BY CITY SIZE
AND NUMBER OF DEPARTMENTS

Service	More than 1,000,000	500,000- 999,999	250,000- 499,999
(No. of Depts.)	(3)	(19)	(27)
Stolen Auto	3	18	26
Stolen Property	3	16	20
License Registration	3	17	23
Warrants	3	19	23
Personnel	3	16	22
Modus Operandi	1	7	11
Criminal Index	1	14	18
Payroll	2	13	19
Police Calls	2	17	21
Traffic Accidents	2	14	19
Traffic Arrests	3	19	22
Other Arrests	3	17	20

VI. POLICE REVIEW

To the question "Does your department have some type of Police Review Board for reviewing officer conduct?" 69 percent of the 49 responding departments answered affirmatively. Data were not gathered on whether these review boards are composed of police, civilians, or a combination of the two.

Table 36 shows the range and median number of complaints per 100 sworn officers the departments received during 1976.

TABLE 36
RANGE AND MEDIAN NUMBERS OF COMPLAINTS
RECEIVED PER 100 SWORN OFFICERS

City Size and Region	No. of Depts.	Complaints/ 100 Sworn Officers		
		Low	Median	High
More than 1,000,000	1	—	29.47	—
500,000-999,999	15	1.32	20.26	62.75
Northeast	2	7.45	9.48	11.50
North Central	4	16.43	31.59	56.44
South	4	1.32	15.33	27.55
West	5	9.84	37.26	62.75
250,000-499,999	21	15.01	32.71	122.18
Northeast	3	19.28	21.52	38.52
North Central	6	15.14	34.61	82.65
South	8	15.01	27.46	54.22
West	4	23.88	90.99	122.18

The range of numbers of complaints received per 100 sworn officers is exceptionally broad, with departments reporting from a low of 1.3 to a high of 122.2 complaints per 100 sworn officers.

The median values of the percentage of substantiated complaints does not appear to vary considerably among departments serving different size jurisdictions. As Table 37 indicates, for the three population groups the median values are between 21 and 25 percent. The range however, is again considerable. The reported low is 2.8 and the high 66.9 percent for the 36 departments responding.

TABLE 37
PERCENTAGE OF SUBSTANTIATED COMPLAINTS

City Size and Region	No. of Depts.	Percentage of Complaints Substantiated		
		Low	Median	High
More than 1,000,000	<u>1</u>	—	<u>21.85</u>	—
500,000-999,999	<u>14</u>	<u>3.64</u>	<u>24.56</u>	<u>66.94</u>
Northeast	<u>2</u>	<u>31.98</u>	<u>35.33</u>	<u>38.68</u>
North Central	<u>4</u>	<u>9.42</u>	<u>10.73</u>	<u>38.81</u>
South	<u>3</u>	<u>3.64</u>	<u>61.76</u>	<u>65.05</u>
West	<u>5</u>	<u>9.26</u>	<u>17.13</u>	<u>66.94</u>
250,000-499,999	<u>21</u>	<u>2.80</u>	<u>23.15</u>	<u>64.04</u>
Northeast	<u>3</u>	<u>11.59</u>	<u>20.40</u>	<u>60.55</u>
North Central	<u>6</u>	<u>5.02</u>	<u>20.11</u>	<u>63.79</u>
South	<u>8</u>	<u>15.30</u>	<u>29.12</u>	<u>64.04</u>
West	<u>4</u>	<u>2.80</u>	<u>5.25</u>	<u>27.35</u>

Table 38 indicates the range and median number of incidents in which police discharged firearms, per 100 sworn officers. Among 31 reporting departments, the low is 0 and the high 10.1 incidents per 100 officers. The range of the middle 50 percent of reporting departments is relatively consistent, however, from approximately two to four incidents per 100 sworn officers.

TABLE 38
RANGE AND MEDIAN NUMBERS
OF INCIDENTS IN WHICH FIREARMS WERE DISCHARGED,
PER 100 SWORN OFFICERS

City Size and Region	No. of Depts.	Firearm Incidents			Range of Middle 50 percent
		Low	Median	High	
More than 1,000,000	<u>1</u>	—	<u>5.16</u>	—	—
500,000-999,999	<u>10</u>	<u>0.41</u>	<u>2.20</u>	<u>7.31</u>	<u>1.67-3.06</u>
Northeast	<u>1</u>	—	<u>2.23</u>	—	—
North Central	<u>3</u>	<u>3.06</u>	<u>3.92</u>	<u>6.34</u>	—
South	<u>3</u>	<u>1.59</u>	<u>2.17</u>	<u>7.31</u>	—
West	<u>3</u>	<u>0.41</u>	<u>1.42</u>	<u>1.67</u>	—
250,000-499,999	<u>20</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>3.20</u>	<u>10.14</u>	<u>2.46-4.19</u>
Northeast	<u>2</u>	<u>2.46</u>	<u>2.90</u>	<u>3.34</u>	—
North Central	<u>7</u>	<u>0.86</u>	<u>3.74</u>	<u>10.14</u>	—
South	<u>5</u>	<u>1.29</u>	<u>3.14</u>	<u>6.04</u>	—
West	<u>6</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>3.07</u>	<u>6.65</u>	—

VII. SPECIAL PROGRAMS

The questionnaire included a few items about special programs that departments might have adopted. For instance, among 49 responding departments, 71 percent reported using some type of system of priorities for criminal cases. Such systems as "early case closure," "case screening," and "solvability assessment" would be included in this category.

Thirty-eight percent of 48 responding departments indicated that they are using some variation of "team" or "neighborhood" policing. Among departments serving cities of between 250,000 and 499,999 people, however, this percentage is much higher: 13 out of 27 reporting departments (48 percent) indicated some use of this strategy.

Finally, 68 percent of 47 responding departments indicated that they employ some type of "decoy" operation, and 14 percent of 49 responding departments reported using civilians in responding to some types of calls for service.

*SECTION TWO:
TALLY SHEETS AND SUMMARY DATA
FOR INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPATING DEPARTMENTS*

GENERAL NOTES FOR THE TALLY SHEETS AND SUMMARY DATA

The number at the head of each column refers to the applicable question in the questionnaire.

N/A: The information is not available, either because of an omission on the questionnaire or because the department was unable to supply it.

—: The question or item is not applicable to a particular department; e.g., a department without a tactical unit cannot indicate the number of personnel assigned to it.

YOS: years of service

FAS: final annual salary

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

	2	3	4	5		6a
	1975 Estimated Population	Land Area (Square Miles)	Total Budget Last F Y (\$)	Salary Budget Last F Y (\$)	Salary Budget: Percentage of Total Budget	Overtime : Court-Related (\$)
AKRON	267,000	54.49	10,839,988	9,973,651	79.9	N/A
ALBUQUERQUE	270,000	94.00	11,487,222	10,212,604	88.9	N/A
ATLANTA	496,973	136.00	23,885,982	18,105,168	79.1	N/A
AUSTIN	300,400	109.00	12,936,170	10,549,351	81.2	N/A
BALTIMORE	860,974	86.00	93,216,665	82,211,267	88.2	1,125,106
BIRMINGHAM	300,100	100.00	11,785,182	10,095,871	86.0	5,000
BOSTON	615,000	48.00	53,247,160	48,328,760	90.8	N/A
BUFFALO	435,000	42.50	22,612,665	19,705,963	12.8	406,200
CHARLOTTE	281,417	104.00	10,864,650	9,045,385	83.3	82,167
CINCINNATI	426,245	77.62	22,389,534	20,214,414	90.3	N/A
CLEVELAND	741,340	75.66	37,785,944	21,469,996	56.8	compensatory time
COLUMBUS	583,980	174.06	27,667,557	23,558,416	85.0	N/A
DALLAS	867,700	341.20	50,166,333	43,173,459	86.1	N/A
DENVER	529,700	117.50	35,596,118	N/A	N/A	570,000
DETROIT	1,335,085	139.60	186,955,637	170,964,982	91.4	N/A
EL PASO	379,000	160.74	8,266,365	6,877,270	83.2	N/A
FORT WORTH	385,854	241.94	14,295,563	10,845,704	73.7	48,047
HONOLULU	704,500	607.00	34,659,791	29,718,304	85.7	N/A
HOUSTON	1,468,000	509.05	53,679,353	48,976,513	91.0	N/A
INDIANAPOLIS	500,000	90.00	27,324,014	14,503,520	53.1	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	592,925	765.80	31,947,744	21,216,727	66.0	N/A
JERSEY CITY	260,545	16.00	18,671,808	17,952,668	96.0	189,209
KANSAS CITY	507,409	316.83	28,403,593	23,788,122	83.8	297,073
LONG BEACH	375,000	52.00	30,741,117	N/A	N/A	N/A
MEMPHIS	850,000	280.89	32,861,179	28,149,439	86.0	186,821
MIAMI	353,000	34.34	20,233,000	17,837,640	88.0	N/A
MINNEAPOLIS	416,864	58.80	19,782,417	16,950,521	85.0	0

	2	3	4	5		6a
	1975 Estimated Population	Land Area (Square Miles)	Total Budget Last F Y (\$)	Salary Budget Last F Y (\$)	Salary Budget: Percentage of Total Budget	Overtime: Court-Related (\$)
NEW ORLEANS	609,556	196.10	33,783,832	29,759,809	88.1	291,274
NEWARK	382,402	23.60	20,341,861	18,417,609	90.0	188,504
NORFOLK	285,500	53.46	10,644,542	8,861,416	83.0	76,000
OAKLAND	361,000	59.00	20,095,094	17,507,112	87.0	366,000
OMAHA	391,389	83.52	13,085,348	9,374,885	72.0	N/A
PHILADELPHIA	1,950,098	129.71	161,834,387	152,807,725	94.2	4,297,052
PHOENIX	674,900	276.60	44,653,052	36,879,567	83.0	N/A
PITTSBURGH	512,000	55.50	24,668,782	11,782,428	47.8	N/A
PORTLAND	375,000	95.00	19,100,000	15,600,000	82.0	538,974
ROCHESTER	276,173	36.44	13,695,800	12,973,787	94.7	N/A
SACRAMENTO	260,713	94.39	18,126,384	15,797,769	87.2	291,107
ST. LOUIS	556,000	61.00	40,725,800	33,608,820	82.5	N/A
ST. PAUL	291,304	55.44	12,489,624	10,977,641	87.0	N/A
SAN DIEGO	766,100	319.50	30,853,013	27,448,390	89.0	331,475
SAN FRANCISCO	715,674	44.60	69,653,821	41,462,164	60.0	N/A
SAN JOSE	560,000	149.25	18,955,000	15,619,000	82.0	N/A
SEATTLE	507,000	83.64	34,234,083	25,230,111	73.6	376,281
TAMPA	300,000	84.45	17,297,000	15,500,000	81.0	0
TOLEDO	350,000	85.30	18,012,165	11,000,000	61.0	178,384
TUCSON	298,683	93.99	15,200,000	12,100,000	79.6	N/A
TULSA	361,000	175.00	11,884,793	11,117,018	93.5	N/A
WASHINGTON	729,100	68.26	94,431,200	79,245,800	84.0	1,926,970
WICHITA	265,503	98.12	7,788,681	6,249,694	80.0	N/A

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

	6b	6c	7	8	
	Overtime: Other (\$)	Overtime: Total (\$)	Number of Police Stations	Yes	Lateral Entry At What Levels?
AKRON	N/A	138,000	1		X
ALBUQUERQUE	N/A	551,433	1		X
ATLANTA	80,000	N/A	6		X
AUSTIN	N/A	526,441	1		X
BALTIMORE	886,232	2,011,338	10	X	any rank above captain
BIRMINGHAM	113,000	118,000	4		X
BOSTON	N/A	6,028,000	12		X
BUFFALO	1,364,000	1,864,000	14		X
CHARLOTTE	12,502	94,669	1		X
CINCINNATI	N/A	N/A	5		X
CLEVELAND	paid at retirement	N/A	7		X
COLUMBUS	N/A	1,268,900	12		X
DALLAS	N/A	629,445	5		X
DENVER	190,000	760,000	5		X
DETROIT	N/A	2,010,561	14		X
EL PASO	83,162	83,162	3		X
FORT WORTH	76,797	124,844	4		X
HONOLULU	N/A	762,149	7		X
HOUSTON	1,466,911	1,466,911	6		X
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	625,000	1	X	chief only
JACKSONVILLE	N/A	N/A	1		X
JERSEY CITY	126,139	315,348	5		X
KANSAS CITY	432,697	729,770	7		X
LONG BEACH	N/A	658,300	1	X	chief officers
MEMPHIS	334,254	521,076	5	X	all levels
MIAMI	N/A	219,360	1		X
MINNEAPOLIS	332,793	332,397	6		X

	6b	6c	7		8
	Overtime: Other (\$)	Overtime: Total (\$)	Number of Police Stations	Yes	Lateral Entry At What Levels?
NEW ORLEANS	5,974,843	6,266,117	9		X
NEWARK	454,358	642,862	5		X
NORFOLK	51,000	127,000	2		X
OAKLAND	717,981	1,083,981	1		X
OMAHA	N/A	610,717	1(+4 unmanned assembly areas)		X
PHILADELPHIA	6,782,331	11,079,383	23		X
PHOENIX	N/A	1,807,040	5		X
PITTSBURGH	N/A	1,783,500	10		X
PORTLAND	472,586	1,011,560	3		X
ROCHESTER	N/A	N/A	7		X
SACRAMENTO	311,562	602,669	1		X
ST. LOUIS	N/A	N/A	10		X
ST. PAUL	N/A	207,629	7		X
SAN DIEGO	1,578,450	1,909,925	3	X	police officer only
SAN FRANCISCO	N/A	750,000	9		X
SAN JOSE	N/A	214,000	1	X	police officer and chief only
SEATTLE	560,226	936,507	8		X
TAMPA	0	0	1		X
TOLEDO	N/A	426,293	2		X
TUCSON	N/A	320,000	2		X
TULSA	N/A	N/A	2		X
WASHINGTON	915,230	2,842,200	8		X
WICHITA	N/A	117,283	1		X

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

		9				10a	10b	10c
		Residency Requirement				For	Special Pay	For
	Yes	No	All LE	New Recruits	Other	Longevity	For College	Hazardous Duty
AKRON	X					Yes	No	No
ALBUQUERQUE		X				No	Yes	Yes
ATLANTA	X			X		Yes	Yes	No
AUSTIN		X				Yes	Yes	No
BALTIMORE		X				No	No	No
BIRMINGHAM	X			X		Yes	Yes	Yes
BOSTON	X		X	X		Yes	Yes	Yes
BUFFALO	X		X	X		Yes	No	No
CHARLOTTE	X		X			Yes	Yes	No
CINCINNATI	X				X	Yes	No	motorcycle only
CLEVELAND		X				Yes	No	Yes
COLUMBUS	X		X			Yes	No	No
DALLAS		X				Yes	Yes	Yes
DENVER		X				Yes	No	Yes
DETROIT	X		X	X	X	Yes	No	No
EL PASO	X		X	X	X	Yes	Yes	Yes
FORT WORTH		X				Yes	No	No
HONOLULU		X				No	No	Yes
HOUSTON		X				Yes	Yes	No
INDIANAPOLIS	X		X	X		Yes	Yes	Yes
JACKSONVILLE		X				Yes	Yes	No
JERSEY CITY		X				Yes	No	No
KANSAS CITY	X		X	X	X	No	Yes	No
LONG BEACH		X				No	No	Yes
MEMPHIS	X		X			Yes	Yes	Yes
MIAMI	X			X	X	Yes	No	Yes
MINNEAPOLIS		X				Yes	No	No

		9				10a	10b	10c
		Residency Requirement				For	Special Pay	For
	Yes	No	All LE	New Recruits	Other	Longevity	For College	Hazardous Duty
NEW ORLEANS	X			X		Yes	No	Yes
NEWARK	X			X		Yes	No	No
NORFOLK		X				Yes	Yes	No
OAKLAND		X				Yes	Yes	No
OMAHA	X		X			Yes	No	No
PHILADELPHIA	X		X	X		Yes	No	No
PHOENIX	X		X			No	No	Yes
PITTSBURGH	X		X			Yes	No	No
PORTLAND		X				No	No	motorcycle,bomb,SERT
ROCHESTER		X				Yes	Yes	solo motorcycle
SACRAMENTO	X		X			Yes	Yes	Yes
ST. LOUIS	X		X			No	Yes	No
ST. PAUL	X			X		Yes	No	motorcycle
SAN DIEGO		X				No	Yes	motorcycle
SAN FRANCISCO	X		X	X		No	No	motorcycle
SAN JOSE	X		X	X	X	No	Yes	Yes
SEATTLE	X		X		X	Yes	No	Yes
TAMPA		X				No	Yes	Yes
TOLEDO	X		X	X	X	Yes	No	No
TUCSON	X		X			Yes	No	Yes
TULSA		X				Yes	No	motorcycle
WASHINGTON	X		X			Yes	No	No
WICHITA	X		X			Yes	Yes	Yes

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

	10d	10e	11a	11b	11c	11d	11e
	Special Pay		Educational Level of Department				
	For Job Specialty	For Other Reasons	% High School	% 2 Years College	% Baccalaureate	% Masters	% Other
AKRON	No	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ALBUQUERQUE	Yes	No	33.06	50	15.72	1.2	0
ATLANTA	No	No	92	4	3	1	0
AUSTIN	No	No	92	26	5	0.4	0
BALTIMORE	No	No	56.6	31.3	10.8	1.0	0.3
BIRMINGHAM	Yes	Yes	63	24	9	3	1
BOSTON	Yes	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BUFFALO	No	No	100	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	No	No	59.2	26.3	14	.5	0
CINCINNATI	No	carrying gun off duty	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CLEVELAND	Yes	Merit pay	95.65	2.28	1.91	.16	0
COLUMBUS	No	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
DALLAS	Yes	No	12.40	45.44	40.18	1.98	0
DENVER	Yes	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
DETROIT	Yes	No	61.2	12.5	7.9	7.9	N/A
EL PASO	No	No	100	5	7	0	0
FORT WORTH	No	No	100	13.08	7.62	0.51	0
HONOLULU	No	No	100	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
HOUSTON	No	Yes	87	2.7	10	0.3	0
INDIANAPOLIS	Yes	No	74.6	15	10	0.4	0
JACKSONVILLE	Yes	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	No	No	51.5	40.0	7.0	1.5	0
KANSAS CITY	Yes	No	100	7.33	16.29	3.83	.16
LONG BEACH	No	Yes - POST	100	25	14	2	0
MEMPHIS	No	No	N/A	15.7	12.4	.9	.1
MIAMI	5% dispatch	No	70	18	11	1	0
MINNEAPOLIS	No	No	75	12	10	0	3

	10d Special Pay For Job Specialty	10e For Other Reasons	11a % High School	11b % 2 Years College	11c % Baccalaureate	11d % Masters	11e % Other
NEW ORLEANS	bomb squad	No	100	2	1.3	N/A	N/A
NEWARK	detectives	No	97	43	4.95	0.04	0.01
NORFOLK	Yes	No	100	18	N/A	N/A	N/A
OAKLAND	No	Yes	75	3	19	3	0
OMAHA	No	No	100	12	10	1	0
PHILADELPHIA	No	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
PHOENIX	Yes	No	100	5	4	1	0
PITTSBURGH	No	No	95	25	25	2	0
PORTLAND	detectives, criminalists	No	28(1976 recruits)	19(1976 recruits)	53(1976 recruits)	0	0
ROCHESTER	scuba squad	No	N/A	23.88	9.24	0.3	N/A
SACRAMENTO	No	No	25	35	38	2	0
ST. LOUIS	No	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ST. PAUL	K-9, traffic	No	72.5	16	11	0.5	0
SAN DIEGO	bilingual	No	100	30	15	5	2
SAN FRANCISCO	detectives	No	100	60	40	10	0
SAN JOSE	Yes	No	100	95	30	5	0
SEATTLE	Yes	No	67.39	17.17	13.71	1.73	N/A
TAMPA	No	No	100	38	20	4	1
TOLEDO	Yes - stress	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
TUCSON	No	No	N/A	2.70	20.31	1.74	0
TULSA	K-9	No	100	18.3	32.5	3.48	0.75
WASHINGTON	Yes	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
WICHITA	No	No	49	25	25	1	0

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

	12a	12b	12c
	Educational Requirements		
	1st Year Police Officers	Supervisors	Command Ranks
AKRON	No	No	No
ALBUQUERQUE	No	No	No
ATLANTA	No	No	No
AUSTIN	15 hrs. college within 2 yrs. on dept.	No	No
BALTIMORE	No	No	No
BIRMINGHAM	No	No	Yes
BOSTON	Yes	No	No
BUFFALO	No	No	No
CHARLOTTE	No	No	No
CINCINNATI	No	No	No
CLEVELAND	No	No	No
COLUMBUS	No	No	No
DALLAS	45 hrs.	No	No
DENVER	No	No	No
DETROIT	No	Yes	No
EL PASO	No	No	No
FORT WORTH	No	No	No
HONOLULU	No	Yes	Yes
HOUSTON	No	No	No
INDIANAPOLIS	No	No	No
JACKSONVILLE	No	No	No
JERSEY CITY	No	No	No
KANSAS CITY	No	No	No
LONG BEACH	No	No	No
MEMPHIS	2 yrs. college	No	No
MIAMI	No	No	No
MINNEAPOLIS	No	No	No

	12a	12b	12c
	Educational Requirements		
	1st year Police Officers	Supervisors	Command Ranks
NEW ORLEANS	No	No	No
NEWARK	No	No	No
NORFOLK	No	No	No
OAKLAND	No	No	No
OMAHA	No	No	Yes - chief only
PHILADELPHIA	No	No	No
PHOENIX	No	No	No
PITTSBURGH	No	No	No
PORTLAND	2 yrs. college within 5 yrs. on dept.	No	No
ROCHESTER	No	No	No
SACRAMENTO	Yes - 60 hrs.	No	No
ST. LOUIS	No	No	No
ST. PAUL	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAN DIEGO	No	Yes	Yes
SAN FRANCISCO	No	No	No
SAN JOSE	60 units college credit	No	No
SEATTLE	No	No	No
TAMPA	No	No	No
TOLEDO	1 yr. college within 2 yrs. on dept.	No	No
TUCSON	No	No	No
TULSA	9 hrs. (1974); BA by 1982	No	No
WASHINGTON	No	No	No
WICHITA	No	Yes	Yes

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

13

Additional Pay for Educational Level

	1 Year College	2 Years College	3 Years College	B.A. or B.S.	M.A. or M.S.
AKRON	No	No	No	No	No
ALBUQUERQUE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ATLANTA	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
AUSTIN	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
BALTIMORE	No	No	No	Yes-after 1 yr. exper.	No
BIRMINGHAM	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
BOSTON	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BUFFALO	No	No	No	No	No
CHARLOTTE	No	one pay step	No	two pay steps	No
CINCINNATI	No	No	No	No	No
CLEVELAND	No	No	No	No	No
COLUMBUS	No	No	No	No	No
DALLAS	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
DENVER	No	No	No	No	No
DETROIT	No	No	No	No	No
EL PASO	Yes	- applies toward receipt of advanced certificate which provides additional pay			
FORT WORTH	No	No	No	No	No
HONOLULU	No	No	No	No	No
HOUSTON	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
INDIANAPOLIS	30 hrs. - \$200	60 hrs. - \$400	90 hrs. - \$600	120 hrs. - \$800	No
JACKSONVILLE	Yes	Yes		Yes	
JERSEY CITY	No	No	No	No	No
KANSAS CITY	No	\$25/mo.	No	\$50/mo.	\$75/mo.
LONG BEACH	additional compensation for intermediate and advanced POST certificates (for service and education)				
MEMPHIS	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
MIAMI	No	No	No	No	No
MINNEAPOLIS	No	No	No	No	No

Additional Pay for Educational Level

	1 Year College	2 Years College	3 Years College	B.A. or B.S.	M.A. or M.S.
NEW ORLEANS	No	No	No	No	No
NEWARK	No	No	No	No	No
NORFOLK	No	Yes	No	No	No
OAKLAND	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
OMAHA	No	No	No	No	No
PHILADELPHIA	No	No	No	No	No
PHOENIX	No	No	No	No	No
PITTSBURGH	No	No	No	No	No
PORTLAND	No	No	No	No	No
ROCHESTER	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
SACRAMENTO	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
ST. LOUIS	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
ST. PAUL	No	No	No	No	No
SAN DIEGO	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SAN FRANCISCO	No	No	No	No	No
SAN JOSE	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SEATTLE	No	No	No	No	No
TAMPA	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
TOLEDO	No	No	No	No	No
TUCSON	No	No	No	No	No
TULSA	No	No	No	No	No
WASHINGTON	No	No	No	No	No
WICHITA	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

	14		15		16		17	
	Incentive Pay for Police Related Course Work Only		Uniforms Furnished By:		Leather Furnished By:		Yearly Uniform/Leather Allowance (\$)	Sidearm Furnished By:
	Yes	No	Officer	Department	Officer	Department		Officer Department
AKRON	N/A	N/A	X	X	X	X	200	X X
ALBUQUERQUE	X		X			X	0	X
ATLANTA		X		X		X	125	X
AUSTIN		X		X		X	200	X
BALTIMORE	N/A	N/A		X	X	X	0	X
BIRMINGHAM		X		X		X	0	X
BOSTON	X		X			X	250	X
BUFFALO		X	X		X		250	X X
CHARLOTTE	X			X		X	0	X
CINCINNATI	N/A	N/A		X		X	0	X
CLEVELAND	N/A	N/A		X		X	150	X
COLUMBUS	N/A	N/A		X		X	0	X
DALLAS		X		X		X	0	X
DENVER	N/A	N/A		X		X	200	X optional
DETROIT	N/A	N/A		X		X	0	X
EL PASO		X		X		X	280	X
FORT WORTH		X		X		X	100	X
HONOLULU	N/A	N/A		X		X	1/2 of two uniforms	X
HOUSTON	X			X		X	0	X
INDIANAPOLIS		X		X		X	600	X
JACKSONVILLE	X			X		X	0	X
JERSEY CITY	N/A	N/A	X		X		350	X
KANSAS CITY		X		X		X	0	X
LONG BEACH		X		X		X	0	X
MEMPHIS		X		X		X	150	X
MIAMI	N/A	N/A		X	X		0	X
MINNEAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	X		X		0	X

	14		15		16		17	
	Incentive Pay for Police Related Course Work Only		Uniforms Furnished By:		Leather Furnished By:		Sidearm Furnished By:	
	Yes	No	Officer	Department	Officer	Department	Yearly Uniform/Leather Allowance (\$)	Officer Department
NEW ORLEANS	N/A	N/A	X		X		200	X
NEWARK	N/A	N/A	X		X		350	X
NORFOLK	X			X		X	0	X
OAKLAND	X		X			X	250	X
OMAHA	N/A	N/A	X		X		249.84	X
PHILADELPHIA	N/A	N/A		X		X	150	X
PHOENIX	N/A	N/A		X		X	300	X
PITTSBURGH		X	X			X	200	X
PORTLAND		X		X		X	0	X
ROCHESTER		X		X		X	0	X
SACRAMENTO		X	X			X	300	X
ST. LOUIS		X		X		X	0	X
ST. PAUL	N/A	N/A	X		X		220	X
SAN DIEGO		X	X		X		0	X
SAN FRANCISCO		X		X		X	0	X
SAN JOSE		X	X			X	150	X
SEATTLE	N/A	N/A	X		X		200	X
TAMPA	X			X		X	100	X
TOLEDO	N/A	N/A		X		X		X
TUCSON	N/A	N/A		X		X	0	X
TULSA	X			X		X	155	X
WASHINGTON	N/A	N/A		X		X	0	X
WICHITA		X		X		X	175	X

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

	18			19			20		
	Type of Sidearm			Type of Ammunition			Required to be Armed Off-Duty?		
	Revolver	Semi-Automatic	Caliber			Yes	No	Optional	
AKRON	X		.38	.38 special	158 gr. jacketed soft pt.	X			
ALBUQUERQUE	X		.38	158 gr., .38 holl. pt. semi-jacket				X	
ATLANTA	S & W		.38	.38 special				X	
AUSTIN	X		.357/.38	158 gr. jacketed soft pt.		X			
BALTIMORE	X		.38	158 gr. semi-wad cutter		X			
BIRMINGHAM	X		.38	.38		X			
BOSTON	X		.38	150 gr. lead semi-wad C/W			X		
BUFFALO	X		.38 or magnum	lead or copper jacket		X			
CHARLOTTE	X		.357 magnum	.38 special				X	
CINCINNATI	X		.38	158 gr. soft pt., 39 special					
CLEVELAND	X		.38	158 gr. round nose				X	
COLUMBUS	X		.38	158 gr. Winchester holl. pt.		X			
DALLAS	S & W; Colt		.38	W W Super .38 special		X			
DENVER	X		.38	W W (plus P) 1109 jacketed holl. pt.		X			
DETROIT	.38 special	9 MM	.38/9 MM	158 gr.		X			
EL PASO	X		.38 or .357	.38 caliber factory loads		X			
FORT WORTH	S & W		.38	158 gr., .38 holl. pt.				X	
HONOLULU	S & W		.38	.38; 125 & 95 semi-jacket holl. pt.		X			
HOUSTON	.357 or larger	.38 or larger	.357 or .38	no magnum loads		X			
INDIANAPOLIS	X		.357 magnum	magnum holl. pt.		X			
JACKSONVILLE	.38		.38	.38 special holl. pt. WW Super				X	
JERSEY CITY	S & W; Colt	S & W, model 39/9MM	.38	158 gr. lead holl. pt. 855		X			
KANSAS CITY	X		.38 special	.38 special, copper jacket, 125 gr.				X	
LONG BEACH	.38	9 MM	.38/9MM	109 gr. lead (no holl. pt., etc.)				X	
MEMPHIS	X		.38 special	.38 special		X			
MIAMI	X		.38	158 gr. semi-wad cutter holl. pt. MV1060				X	
MINNEAPOLIS	X		.38 special	.38 special LHP				X	

18

Type of Sidearm

	Revolver	Semi-Automatic
NEW ORLEANS	S & W, Colt, Ruger	
NEWARK	X	
NORFOLK	X	
OAKLAND	X	
OMAHA	S & W; Colt	
PHILADELPHIA	S & W	
PHOENIX	X	
PITTSBURGH	X	
PORTLAND	X	
ROCHESTER	Stainless S & W 64D	
SACRAMENTO	X	
ST. LOUIS	X	
ST. PAUL	X	
SAN DIEGO	.38	9 MM (optional)
SAN FRANCISCO	X	
SAN JOSE	X	
SEATTLE	X	
TAMPA	X	
TOLEDO	X	
TUCSON	S & W	
TULSA	X	
WASHINGTON	S & W; Colt	
WICHITA	X	

19

Type of Ammunition

Caliber	
.38	S & W .38 special plus P
.38	158 gr. Remington
.38 special	125 gr. semi-jacket holl. pt. Remington
.357 magnum	158 gr. lead
.38	158 gr. holl. pt.
.38	.38 caliber semi-wad cutter
.38	super velocity
.38	.38 caliber
.38	WW (plus P) 110 gr. HJ holl. pt.
.38	speer .38 special plus P
.38	.38 caliber 158 gr. holl. pt.
.38	.38 special 158 gr. lead holl. pt.
.38 or .357	110 gr. copper jacket soft pt. super velocity
.38/9MM	.357 magnum 158 gr. lead
.357	.357 magnum 158 gr. lead
.357	.357 and .38 S & W
.38	R.P., .38 special P holl. pt.
.38	90 and 125 plus P holl. pt.
.38	.38 holl. pt. high speed
.38	.38 special normas
.357	.38 special
.38	158 gr. lead holl. pt.
.38	S & W .38 jacketed soft pt.

20

Required to be Armed
Off-Duty?

Yes	No	Optional
X		
X		
		X
		X
	X	
		X
		X
		X
		X
		X
X		
	X	
		X
		X
X		
X		
X		
X		
		X
X		
X		

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

21

Incidents Involving
Firearms in 1976

AKRON	4
ALBUQUERQUE	33
ATLANTA	25
AUSTIN	N/A
BALTIMORE	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	37
BOSTON	43
BUFFALO	N/A
CHARLOTTE	16
CINCINNATI	25
CLEVELAND	13 (April-December)
COLUMBUS	33
DALLAS	43
DENVER	N/A
DETROIT	289
EL PASO	8
FORT WORTH	N/A
HONOLULU	6
HOUSTON	N/A
INDIANAPOLIS	15
JACKSONVILLE	N/A
JERSEY CITY	N/A
KANSAS CITY	48
LONG BEACH	0
MEMPHIS	91
MIAMI	44
MINNEAPOLIS	16

22

% of Officer's Salary for
Retirement Contribution

% By Officer

% By City

7	14
7	17.75
6	6
6	6
5	30
10.5	9
7	N/A
3	7-15
6	5 (+5 by state)
7	14.2
7	15.4
7	15.34
9	15
3.5	balance (as needed)
5	53.82
6	18
7.67	11
10.4 retirement; 1.8 post-retirement	varies: 7-13
9	18
3	tax levy
4	15
7 (but according to age)	16.37
7	13
9	18
7	7
8.5	2.5
6	21

21

Incidents Involving
Firearms in 1976

NEW ORLEANS	N/A
NEWARK	50
NORFOLK	19
OAKLAND	22
OMAHA	20
PHILADELPHIA	N/A
PHOENIX	27
PITTSBURGH	N/A
PORTLAND	7
ROCHESTER	16
SACRAMENTO	16
ST. LOUIS	131
ST. PAUL	52
SAN DIEGO	27
SAN FRANCISCO	N/A
SAN JOSE	N/A
SEATTLE	16
TAMPA	N/A
TOLEDO	31
TUCSON	15
TULSA	N/A
WASHINGTON	66
WICHITA	19

22

% of Officer's Salary for
Retirement Contribution

% By Officer	% By City
7	6
6.73-7.98	6.73-7.98
0	18.35
6-10.5	pre-1976: 71.22; 1976: 25
7.25	8.55
6	12
8	det. yrly. by auditor's review
6.5	N/A
7	7
3	(older: 39.8) 23.8
9	22.08
7	21.45
6	998'82
8-1.6	14.4-28.8
7.5	post-'76: 53; pre-'76:71
6.69	23.28
6	6.3
8-25	9-40
7	14
8.0	13.62
7.5	11
7	balance (as needed)
6	28.5

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

	23a	23b	23c
	Minimum Retirement Provisions		
	Years of Service	Age	Benefits
AKRON	25	52	50% high 3 yrs., 2% per YOS add'l. max. 66%; hosp. & life insurance
ALBUQUERQUE	25	none	62½% x avg. high 3 yrs.
ATLANTA	25	55	N/A
AUSTIN	none	62	1.75% x avg. high 5 of last 10 yrs. x YOS
BALTIMORE	25	50	50% x avg. high 3 yrs. + 1.7% per yr. ea. yr. over 25 YOS, or less 7.5% ea. yr. of age under 50
BIRMINGHAM	20	none	55% FAS
BOSTON	20	55	2.5% x avg. 3 yrs. x YOS
BUFFALO	20	none	50% FAS
CHARLOTTE	10	55	1.55% avg. 4 yrs. x YOS
CINCINNATI	25	52	50% FAS
CLEVELAND	15	52	1.5% x YOS x avg. last 3 yrs.; min. 15 YOS, max. 25 YOS
COLUMBUS	15	52	1.5% x avg. high 3 yrs. x YOS
DALLAS	20	50	50% x avg. high 5 yrs.
DENVER	25	none	50% FAS
DETROIT	25	none	2/3 FAS
EL PASO	20	45	50% FAS
FORT WORTH	30	55	1-5/6% x avg. high 5 yrs. x YOS
HONOLULU	25	none	62½% x avg. high 3 yrs.
HOUSTON	20	55	30% FAS at 20 YOS + 2% every YOS thereafter
INDIANAPOLIS	20	55	50% FAS
JACKSONVILLE	25	50	50%
JERSEY CITY	25	none	50% x avg. last 3 yrs.
KANSAS CITY	25	46	2% x avg. high 3 yrs. x YOS
LONG BEACH	20	50	2%
MEMPHIS	25	46	56.25% FAS
MIAMI	20	50	2.5% FAS x YOS
MINNEAPOLIS	20	50	40-50% top police officer's pay

23a

23b

23c

Minimum Retirement Provisions

	Years of Service	Age	Benefits
NEW ORLEANS	16	50	40% to 64-2/3% FAS
NEWARK	25	43	50% avg. last 3 yrs.
NORFOLK	25	55	avg. highest YOS, less 0.5% per mo. earlier than normal svc. retirement
OAKLAND	20	41	40% FAS
OMAHA	25	55	N/A
PHILADELPHIA	20	45	2.5% FAS x YOS
PHOENIX	20	41	50% avg. last 5 yrs.
PITTSBURGH	20	50	50% FAS
PORTLAND	20	55	2% FAS x YOS
ROCHESTER	20	none	50% FAS
SACRAMENTO	5	50	8.75% FAS
ST. LOUIS	20	55	1/50 avg. high 3 yrs. x YOS
ST. PAUL	20	50	40% FAS
SAN DIEGO	20	50	2% x avg. high 3 yrs. x YOS
SAN FRANCISCO	25	50	55% FAS
SAN JOSE	20	55	2.5% per YOS
SEATTLE	5	none	5% FAS
TAMPA	20	46	50%
TOLEDO	15	52	1.5% x YOS
TUCSON	20	none	50% of last 60 mos.
TULSA	20	38	50%
WASHINGTON	20	40	50% FAS
WICHITA	20	none	50% avg. last 3 yrs.

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

	24a	24b	24c
	Maximum Retirement Provisions		
	Years of Service	Age	Benefits
AKRON	33	52	N/A
ALBUQUERQUE	none	62	2.5% x avg. high 3 yrs. x YOS
ATLANTA	35	65	N/A
AUSTIN	none	65	1.75% x avg. high 5 of last 10 yrs. x YOS, increased 5% per year after age 62
BALTIMORE	N/A	60	same as minimum
BIRMINGHAM	none	70	70% FAS
BOSTON	32	55	80% x avg. 3 yrs.
BUFFALO	37.5	62	10 x 1/50 of last yr. + 1/2 pay of last yr. + annuity
CHARLOTTE	30	none	1.55% x avg. 4 yrs. x YOS
CINCINNATI	33	70	2% x YOS, maximum 66%
CLEVELAND	33	52	2% x YOS x last 3 yrs.
COLUMBUS	25	none	2% x avg. high 3 yrs. x YOS, maximum 66%
DALLAS	46	65	85% x avg. high 5 yrs. after 35 YOS
DENVER	45	63	50% FAS
DETROIT	25	55	2/3 FAS
EL PASO	28	49	70% FAS
FORT WORTH	none	68	1 5/6% x avg. high 5 yrs. x YOS
HONOLULU	32	none	80% of high 3 yrs.
HOUSTON	46	65	30% FAS at 20 YOS + 2% for every YOS thereafter
INDIANAPOLIS	32	65	74% FAS
JACKSONVILLE	none	65	65%
JERSEY CITY	30	none	60% x avg. last 3 yrs.
KANSAS CITY	30	65	2% x avg. high 3 yrs. x YOS
LONG BEACH	39	60	75%
MEMPHIS	35	60	66.25% FAS
MIAMI	25	60	2.5% FAS x YOS
MINNEAPOLIS	25	65	50% top police officer's pay

24a

24b

24c

Maximum Retirement Provisions

	Years of Service	Age	Benefits
NEW ORLEANS	30	68	80%-100% FAS
NEWARK	47	65	2% YOS x avg. last 3 yrs. at 30 YOS; add'l. 1% avg. last 3 yrs. per YOS
NORFOLK	none	62	based on avg. highest x YOS
OAKLAND	none	65	66 2/3% FAS
OMAHA	none	62	N/A
PHILADEPHIA	none	70	2.5% FAS x YOS
PHOENIX	30	56	50% avg. last 5 yrs. pay + 1% per YOS over 20; maximum 60%
PITTSBURGH	none	65	50% FAS
PORTLAND	30	64	2% FAS x YOS (60% max.)
ROCHESTER	none	70	75% FAS
SACRAMENTO	none	60	75% FAS
ST. LOUIS	none	65	2% avg. high 3 yrs. x YOS
ST. PAUL	25	50	50% FAS
SAN DIEGO	44	65	2% x avg. high 3 yrs. x YOS; bonus for service over age 50
SAN FRANCISCO	30	65	75% FAS
SAN JOSE	none	65	75%
SEATTLE	30	60	60% FAS
TAMPA	none	none	65% at 25 YOS
TOLEDO	25	52	2% x YOS, or \$1,650, whichever is greater
TUCSON	30	none	60% of last 60 mos.
TULSA	30	70	75%
WASHINGTON	44	64	20 YOS, 50% FAS; 25 YOS, 65% FAS; 30+ YOS, 80% FAS
WICHITA	none	none	N/A

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

25

Non-Service Connected Disability Pension

AKRON	after 5 YOS, 2% per YOS of FAS
ALBUQUERQUE	2% x FAS x YOS, 10 yrs. min.
ATLANTA	2% FAS x YOS; max. 25 YOS
AUSTIN	1.75% x avg. high 5 yrs. x YOS, eligible after 10 YOS
BALTIMORE	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	after 5 YOS, 2% x FAS x YOS, max. 60% FAS; min. 25% FAS
BOSTON	non-veteran (15 yrs.); 2.5% x avg. 3 yrs. x 15 YOS; veteran (10 yrs.); 2.5% x avg. 3 yrs. x 10 YOS
BUFFALO	33-1/3% FAS
CHARLOTTE	after 10 YOS, 1.55% x avg. 4 yrs. x YOS + 15 annuity
CINCINNATI	2% x YOS, max. 50%, eligible after 5 YOS
CLEVELAND	2% x YOS x last 3 yrs.
COLUMBUS	2% x avg. high 3 yrs. x YOS, max. according to disability
DALLAS	
DENVER	50% FAS
DETROIT	5 YOS; 20% FAS
EL PASO	50% FAS
FORT WORTH	1-5/6% x avg. high 5 yrs. x YOS
HONOLULU	10 YOS; 25%, 1% additional per yr. above 15
HOUSTON	after 10 YOS, full pension; before 10 yrs., return of contribution
INDIANAPOLIS	10%, 30%, or 50% of 10-yr. patrolman's salary
JACKSONVILLE	N/A
JERSEY CITY	40% of salary at time of accident
KANSAS CITY	2% FAS x YOS (10 yr. min.)
LONG BEACH	none
MEMPHIS	25% FAS after FAS
MIAMI	N/A
MINNEAPOLIS	under 20 YOS, 40% of 20 yr. pension; over 20 YOS, 50% of 25 yr. pension

Non-Service Connected Disability Pension

NEW ORLEANS	30% to 50% FAS
NEWARK	33% to 66-2/3% avg. last 3 yrs.
NORFOLK	2% x avg. high 3 yrs. x YOS
OAKLAND	5 to 9 YOS, 20% FAS; 10 to 15 YOS, 33-1/3% FAS; 15 + 2% FAS x YOS
OMAHA	10-15 yrs., 20% of avg. monthly salary; 15-20 yrs., 30%; 20-25 yrs., 40%; over 25 yrs., 50%
PHILADELPHIA	25% of basic pay
PHOENIX	none except sick time and vacation time accrued
PITTSBURGH	50% FAS after 10 YOS
PORTLAND	under 20 YOS, 20% patrolman's salary; over 10 YOS, 2% FAS x YOS
ROCHESTER	none
SACRAMENTO	1.5% FAS x YOS (min. 25%)
ST. LOUIS	after 10 YOS, 1/50 avg. high 3 yrs. x YOS
ST. PAUL	after 10 YOS, 40% FAS
SAN DIEGO	50% x avg. high 3 yrs.
SAN FRANCISCO	33-1/3% FAS at 10 YOS + 1.444% per YOS up to 25
SAN JOSE	0-2 YOS, none; over 2 YOS, 32% + 1% per YOS
SEATTLE	50% FAS + 5% FAS; each child not to exceed 60% FAS
TAMPA	2% x YOS, after 10 YOS
TOLEDO	over 5 YOS, max. 2% x YOS
TUCSON	weekly accident program; \$100/wk. for 26 wks.
TULSA	over 15 YOS, 5% x YOS
WASHINGTON	40% FAS at 5 YOS + 2% for each additional YOS
WICHITA	after 7 YOS, 30% FAS + 1% each year over 7, max. 50%

Service Connected Disability Pension

AKRON	N/A
ALBUQUERQUE	2% x FAS x YOS, min. \$150/month
ATLANTA	2% FAS x YOS up to 25 yrs.; 1.5% x FAS x YOS over 25
AUSTIN	1.75% x avg. high 5 yrs. x YOS
BALTIMORE	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	70% FAS
BOSTON	72% FAS
BUFFALO	75% FAS
CHARLOTTE	after 1 YOS, 1.55% x avg. 4 yrs. x YOS + 15% annuity
CINCINNATI	66% maximum
CLEVELAND	66-2/3% FAS, total, 2% x YOS x last 3 yrs. earnings, partial
COLUMBUS	66% x FAS max.; under 25 YOS, 50% x avg. high 3 yrs.; over 25 YOS, 66% x avg. high 3 yrs.
DALLAS	choice of several plans
DENVER	50% FAS or 1 year pay + sick leave
DETROIT	2/3 FAS
EL PASO	50% FAS
FORT WORTH	1-5/6% x. avg. high 5 yrs. x YOS
HONOLULU	up to 66-2/3%
HOUSTON	full pension
INDIANAPOLIS	same, generally 50%
JACKSONVILLE	N/A
JERSEY CITY	2/3 salary at time of accident
KANSAS CITY	60% FAS
LONG BEACH	50% of high 3 yrs. + percentage
MEMPHIS	50% FAS
MIAMI	66-2/3% avg. FAS or 66-2/3% FAS
MINNEAPOLIS	under 20 YOS, 40% of 20-yr. pension; over 20 YOS, 50% of 25-yr. pension

Service Connected Disability Pension

NEW ORLEANS	50% FAS
NEWARK	30% to 70% x avg. last 3 yrs.
NORFOLK	66-2/3% x avg. high 3 yrs.
OAKLAND	75% FAS
OMAHA	50% of avg. monthly salary + all reasonable medical expenses
PHILADELPHIA	70% of basic pay
PHOENIX	state pays 66-2/3% avg. wage for life; city pays 33-1/3% until normal retirement (20 yrs.)
PITTSBURGH	50% FAS
PORTLAND	60% patrolman's pay
ROCHESTER	75% FAS
SACRAMENTO	50% FAS
ST. LOUIS	75% to 100% avg. last 3 yrs. FAS
ST. PAUL	40% FAS
SAN DIEGO	50% of avg. monthly earnings for highest 3-yrs.
SAN FRANCISCO	not less than 50% nor more than 90%
SAN JOSE	50% + 2.5%/YOS over 20; max. 75%
SEATTLE	50% FAS + 5% FAS/each child, not to exceed 60% FAS
TAMPA	65% for total disability
TOLEDO	66% FAS
TUCSON	industrial compensations 66.6% of base pay
TULSA	50% of last 30 mos. (total pension)
WASHINGTON	2.5% of FAS x YOS, min. 66-2/3%, max. 70%
WICHITA	75% for total disability

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

26

Widow's Pension

AKRON	\$200 mo.
ALBUQUERQUE	1/3 FAS under 5 YOS, 1/2 FAS after 5 YOS; max. \$300 per month
ATLANTA	1/2 pension member would have received
AUSTIN	none, except under column 27
BALTIMORE	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	40% FAS before retirement, 45% FAS if member eligible to retire
BOSTON	on-duty: 100% FAS, off-duty: approx. 66% of eligible amount
BUFFALO	one mos. pay per YOS; max. 3 yrs. salary
CHARLOTTE	member over age 50, full pension; member under 50, lump sum
CINCINNATI	\$200 mo.
CLEVELAND	\$200 mo.
COLUMBUS	\$200 mo.
DALLAS	choice of several plans
DENVER	33-1/3% FAS
DETROIT	non-duty: varies with length of service; duty related: 5/11 of 2/3 FAS per year
EL PASO	33-1/3% FAS + longevity
FORT WORTH	75% x avg. high 5 yrs.
HONOLULU	50%
HOUSTON	full pension
INDIANAPOLIS	30% of 10-yr. patrolman's salary
JACKSONVILLE	2/3 of member's pension
JERSEY CITY	3-1/2 times salary + paid-in benefits to pension plan
KANSAS CITY	40% FAS
LONG BEACH	Yes - unspecified
MEMPHIS	2% FAS x YOS after 15 YOS; before 15 YOS, return of contribution
MIAMI	40%
MINNEAPOLIS	23.5% top patrolman's FAS

Widow's Pension

NEW ORLEANS	\$2,000 + \$200 per month
NEWARK	3.5% FAS + pension contribution and interest
NORFOLK	50% x avg. high 3 yrs. accidental death
OAKLAND	10 + 33-1/3% FAS
OMAHA	35% of avg. mo.
PHILADELPHIA	4 options, plus \$8,000 city, \$1,000 F.O.P.
PHOENIX	2/3 member's pension
PITTSBURGH	25% FAS
PORTLAND	50% FAS (limit 30 yrs.)
ROCHESTER	50% FAS
SACRAMENTO	50% FAS
ST. LOUIS	25% to 50% FAS (avg. last 3 yrs.)
ST. PAUL	20% FAS
SAN DIEGO	1/2 FAS per mo. for life
SAN FRANCISCO	full pension
SAN JOSE	2% FAS + 0.75%/YOS over 2 YOS, max. 37
SEATTLE	50% FAS if active member of dept.
TAMPA	50% FAS
TOLDEO	\$150/mo. for life
TUCSON	66% retirement pension
TULSA	full pension (in combination with children)
WASHINGTON	40% FAS (min. step 6)
WICHITA	50% FAS

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

26

Surviving Children's Pension

AKRON	\$60/mo.
ALBUQUERQUE	1/4 FAS; max. of widow & children not exceeding \$300/mo.
ATLANTA	widow's share if there is no widow
AUSTIN	none
BALTIMORE	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	10% FAS, max. 50% for spouse & children
BOSTON	N/A
BUFFALO	widow's share if there is no widow
CHARLOTTE	\$200/child, max. 3 children
CINCINNATI	\$65/mo. under 18 years old
CLEVELAND	\$65/mo. to age 18 (age 21 if in school, life if handicapped)
COLUMBUS	\$65/mo. until age 22, graduation, or leaving school
DALLAS	choice of several plans
DENVER	\$50/mo.
DETROIT	6/11 of 2/3 FAS per yr. (under 18)
EL PASO	33-1/3% FAS + longevity but not more than 50% FAS for widow & children combined
FORT WORTH	\$20/mo. under 18 years old
HONOLULU	widow or widower w/children: 66-2/3%
HOUSTON	\$50/mo. under 21 years old
INDIANAPOLIS	\$20 of 10-yr. patrolman's salary, under 18 years old
JACKSONVILLE	\$15/mo. under age 18
JERSEY CITY	1st child-20%, 2nd child-15% (until 18)
KANSAS CITY	\$25/mo. until age 18
LONG BEACH	Yes
MEMPHIS	minors receive benefits if widow remarries
MIAMI	none
MINNEAPOLIS	7.83% of top patrolman's FAS

Surviving Children's Pension

NEW ORLEANS	\$75 mo./child
NEWARK	15% FAS
NORFOLK	66-2/3% x avg. high 3 yrs.
OAKLAND	1 child-25% FAS; 2-40% FAS; 3-50% FAS
OMAHA	if spouse marries or dies before officer, pension goes into trust for minor children
PHILADELPHIA	same as widow
PHOENIX	1/9 of member's pension for each child
PITTSBURGH	25% FAS
PORTLAND	1-25% FAS; 2-40% FAS; 3 or more 50% FAS
ROCHESTER	50% FAS
SACRAMENTO	50% FAS
ST. LOUIS	10% FAS (avg. last 3 YOS)
ST. PAUL	5% FAS
SAN DIEGO	reduce allowance and/or remainder of contribution
SAN FRANCISCO	full pension
SAN JOSE	1 child-25% FAS, 2-37.5%, 3 or more 50%
SEATTLE	5% FAS/each child, total widow + children not to exceed 60%
TAMPA	7.5% FAS/child
TOLEDO	\$50/mo. to age 18 or until marriage
TUCSON	1/9 of monthly amount of retirement pension
TULSA	full pension (in combination with widow)
WASHINGTON	spouse living \$83/mo./child, max. 3 children; spouse not living, \$100/mo./child, max. 3 children
WICHITA	10% FAS/child, not to exceed 75%

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

26

Other Death Benefits (Pension)

AKRON
ALBUQUERQUE
ATLANTA
AUSTIN
BALTIMORE
BIRMINGHAM
BOSTON
BUFFALO
CHARLOTTE
CINCINNATI
CLEVELAND
COLUMBUS
DALLAS
DENVER
DETROIT
EL PASO
FORT WORTH
HONOLULU
HOUSTON
INDIANAPOLIS
JACKSONVILLE
JERSEY CITY
KANSAS CITY
LONG BEACH
MEMPHIS
MIAMI
MINNEAPOLIS

total contributions refunded to beneficiary

pension fund pays hospital insurance

\$75/month for dependent parents, if no spouse or child

\$20,000 + \$250 widow and \$200 child

dependent parents same as children

Other Death Benefits (Pension)

NEW ORLEANS
 NEWARK
 NORFOLK
 OAKLAND
 OMAHA
 PHILADELPHIA
 PHOENIX
 PHOENIX
 PITTSBURGH
 PORTLAND
 ROCHESTER
 SACRAMENTO
 ST. LOUIS
 ST. PAUL
 SAN DIEGO
 SAN FRANCISCO
 SAN JOSE
 SEATTLE
 TAMPA
 TOLEDO
 TUCSON
 TULSA
 WASHINGTON
 WICHITA

guardian may receive surviving spouse's pension

\$10,000 life

\$100 x YOS, max. \$1,000; w/o beneficiary, estate gets 6 mos. salary + contribution
 75% FAS
 contributions returned to estate, if no beneficiaries
 both survivors' benefits cannot exceed 65% FAS

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

27

Death Benefits Other Than Pension
Natural Death

AKRON	\$4,000 + 24 wks. pay
ALBUQUERQUE	amount equal to yearly salary
ATLANTA	none
AUSTIN	\$2,000 + contribution + interest
BALTIMORE	1 yr. salary, min. \$11,000
BIRMINGHAM	life insurance, proportionate to member's salary
BOSTON	none
BUFFALO	\$10,000 city + optional social security
CHARLOTTE	\$5,000 retirement system insurance policy; \$1,500 burial
CINCINNATI	F.O.P. death benefit club \$10,000; F.O.P. member \$750; city \$1,000
CLEVELAND	term insurance policy paid by officer
COLUMBUS	\$10,000 city (double indemnity accidental) + death benefit club
DALLAS	pay for remaining vacation up to 720 hrs.
DENVER	none
DETROIT	\$4,900 plus voluntary life insurance policies
EL PASO	\$6,000 city; \$25,000 police officers' ass'n.
FORT WORTH	\$20,000 city; \$250 police officers' ass'n., \$500/child
HONOLULU	public employees insurance, private insurance
HOUSTON	after 10 YOS, full pension
INDIANAPOLIS	\$1,000
JACKSONVILLE	50%
JERSEY CITY	\$5,000 city insurance policy
KANSAS CITY	\$5,000, 10,000 accidental
LONG BEACH	none
MEMPHIS	term insurance, \$0.22/\$1,000 of salary
MIAMI	6 mos. salary + \$15,000 insurance + \$20,000 city, \$40,000 F.O.P. + \$1,000 PBA/same + \$50,000 workmen's compensation
MINNEAPOLIS	\$5,000 life insurance

Death Benefits Other Than Pension
Natural Death

NEW ORLEANS	\$2,000 city + \$3,000 state
NEWARK	\$5,000 life insurance
NORFOLK	50% FAS, lump sum
OAKLAND	none
OMAHA	5-25 yrs., 20% of monthly salary; over 25: 35%
PHILADELPHIA	\$8,000 city ins. policy, \$1,000 F.O.P. if a member
PHOENIX	\$4,000 city ins. policy
PITTSBURGH	25% FAS after 20 YOS
PORTLAND	under 20 YOS, pension contribution; over 20 YOS, 50% FAS
ROCHESTER	\$2,500 + \$600 police union
SACRAMENTO	\$1,000 life insurance
ST. LOUIS	pension contribution + interest
ST. PAUL	\$5,000
SAN DIEGO	amount of member's contribution + 1 mo. pay per yr. FAS, max.; min., 6 mo. pay
SAN FRANCISCO	N/A
SAN JOSE	\$5,000 + optional plans
SEATTLE	\$1,000 Seattle police relief ass'n. + optional programs
TAMPA	\$12,500
TOLEDO	\$10,000 city
TUCSON	F.O.P., \$20,000; city, 2 X FAS
TULSA	1% of \$12,000 or less salary, or 1.5% of \$12,000 + salary by city
WASHINGTON	\$300 funeral expense
WICHITA	N/A

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

27

Death Benefits Other Than Pension
Line-of-Duty Death

AKRON	\$8,000 + \$18,000 workmen's compensation + 24 wks. pay
ALBUQUERQUE	amount equal to yearly salary
ATLANTA	1 yr. pay
AUSTIN	\$2,000 + contributions + interest + \$10,000 from state
BALTIMORE	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	term insurance & accidental death & dismemberment insurance
BOSTON	\$50,000 federal benefit
BUFFALO	\$10,000 city + 50% FAS from state + optional social security
CHARLOTTE	\$5,000 retirement system policy; \$25,000 state ins. policy
CINCINNATI	same + \$1,000 hundred club, state F.O.P. \$1,000
CLEVELAND	Ohio pays full salary until time member would have retired less \$200 paid by retirement system
COLUMBUS	\$10,000 city (double indemnity accidental) + death benefit club
DALLAS	\$500 funeral; salary due plus weekly benefits; \$20,000 from state; monthly payments for children
DENVER	state compensation
DETROIT	\$4,900 plus \$10,000 plus voluntary life ins. + awards from civic govt. org.
EL PASO	\$12,000 city; \$10,000 state; \$25,000 police officers' ass'n.
FORT WORTH	\$20,000 state; \$10,000 benevolent fund
HONOLULU	fed. benefits, union relief fund, private insurance, public employees insurance
HOUSTON	full pension; \$20,000 state; \$16,000 city
INDIANAPOLIS	\$1,000
JACKSONVILLE	50%
JERSEY CITY	1/2 pay for widow
KANSAS CITY	\$20,000
LONG BEACH	100% + cash payoff
MEMPHIS	term insurance + union offers additional coverage
MIAMI	\$1,000 P.B.A./same + \$50,000 workmen's compensation
MINNEAPOLIS	\$50,000 state

Death Benefits Other Than Pension
Line-of-Duty Death

NEW ORLEANS	\$2,000 + \$10,000 state + \$5,000/child
NEWARK	\$15,000 life insurance
NORFOLK	none
OAKLAND	2/3 FAS
OMAHA	same
PHILADELPHIA	same, plus \$10,000 city and \$10,000 scholarship for children and \$1,000 for chamber of commerce
PHOENIX	burial fees up to \$1,000; \$25,000 city ins. policy
PITTSBURGH	25% FAS + full salary for 9.6 yrs.
PORTLAND	same
ROCHESTER	\$5,000 + \$600 police union
SACRAMENTO	\$40,000
ST. LOUIS	50% FAS (avg. last 3 yrs.)
ST. PAUL	\$25,000 state
SAN DIEGO	50% avg. last 3 yrs.
SAN FRANCISCO	N/A
SAN JOSE	\$5,000 + 5,000 AD & D + workmen's compensation
SEATTLE	optional programs
TAMPA	\$25,000
TOLEDO	state pays full salary to widow until time the member would have retired
TUCSON	fed. govt., \$50,000; F.O.P., \$20,000; city, 2 x FAS
TULSA	same + workmen's compensation
WASHINGTON	\$50,000 lump sum payment, \$300 funeral expense
WICHITA	N/A

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

	28a	28b	29a
	Annual Paid Sick Leave (days)	Leave Accumulation Limit (days)	Vacation Leave Policy YOS, days/year; etc.
AKRON	15	120	1-6,10; 7-13,15; 14-20,20; 20+, 25
ALBUQUERQUE	12	no limit	1-5,12.6; 5-10,15; 10-15,18; 15+, 20.1
ATLANTA	13	N/A	0-10,10; 11-20,19; 21+, 20
AUSTIN	12	no limit	1-5,12; 5-10,13.5; 10-15,15; 15-20,16.5; 20+, 18
BALTIMORE	unlimited	N/A	1-5,10; 6-14,15; 15-19,18; 20+, 20
BIRMINGHAM	12	no limit	1-12,12; 12-25,18; 25+, 24
BOSTON	15	no limit	1-4.5,10; 4.5-9.5,15; 9.5+, 20
BUFFALO	183	no limit	1-4,10; 5,15; 6,16,7,17; 8,18; 9,19; 10,20; 11,21; 12,22; 12,23; 14,24,15+25
CHARLOTTE	12	no limit	1-9,10; 9-14,15; 14-19,18; 19+, 20
CINCINNATI	13	no limit	1-3,10; 4-8,13; 9-13,15; 14-18,18; 19+, 23
CLEVELAND	15	no limit	1-7,10; 8-11,15; 12-21,20; 22+, 25
COLUMBUS	12	no limit	1-5,15; 6-13,22; 14-19,25; 20+, 28
DALLAS	30	150	1-9, up to 12; 9-19, up to 15; 19+, up to 20
DENVER	18	90	1-10,18; 10+ 21
DETROIT	12 current, 5 reserve	125	10 days per 6 mos.
EL PASO	15	120	1-10,12; 10-15,15; 15-20,18; 20+, 21
FORT WORTH	15	no limit	15 days/yr.
HONOLULU	21	no limit	21/yr.
HOUSTON	15	no limit	1-15,15; after 15 YOS, 1 additional day/YOS, 30 days max.
INDIANAPOLIS	90	non-cumulative	1-10,11; 10-20,28; 20+, 35
JACKSONVILLE	15	90	0-4,10; 4-9,12; 9-14,18; 14-19,20; 19+, 24
JERSEY CITY	365	365	1,12; 1-5,25; 5+, 30
KANSAS CITY	30	no limit	1-5,12; 5-12,10; 12+, 20
LONG BEACH	12	no limit	0-5,12; /additional day/yr. until 20 max.
MEMPHIS	12-30	14	1-5,10; 6-15,10+1 day/YOS over 5; 17-25,20+ 1 day/2YOS over 15
MIAMI	12	no limit	0-5,12; /additional day/yr. until 20 max.
MINNEAPOLIS	12	no limit	0-7,12; 7-15,16; 15-20,21; 20+, 26

	28a	28b	29a
	Annual Paid Sick Leave (days)	Leave Accumulation Limit (days)	Vacation Leave Policy YOS, days/year; etc.
NEW ORLEANS	24	no limit	21 days
NEWARK	N/A	N/A	20-29 working days
NORFOLK	12	no limit	1-15,12; 15+, 18
OAKLAND	90	non-cumulative	1-15,15; 16-20,18; 21+, 20
OMAHA	18	90	under 5 yrs., 15; over 5 yrs., 21
PHILADELPHIA	20	200	1-10,14; 10+, 21
PHOENIX	15	no limit	0-5,12; 5-15,15; 15-20,18; 20+, 21
PITTSBURGH	14	112	1-10,10; 10-15,15; 15+, 20
PORTLAND	13	208	0-4,10; 5-9,15; 10-14-17.5; 15-19,20; 20-24,22.5; 25+, 25
ROCHESTER	180	non-cumulative	1-3,12; 4-8,16; 9-14,18; 15,19,20,20+25
SACRAMENTO	12	no limit	1-4,10; 5-14,15; 15+ 20
ST. LOUIS	20	180	1-11,15; 12-20,20; 21+, 25
ST. PAUL	15	no limit	10-22
SAN DIEGO	13	no limit	1-5,10; 6-11,15; 16+, 20
SAN FRANCISCO	13	130	1-5,10; 5-15,15; 15+ 20
SAN JOSE	12	no limit	0-5,10; 5-15,15; 15+ 20
SEATTLE	180 per incident	non-cumulative	1-5,12; 5-10,15; 10-15,16; 15-20,18; 20-30, +1 day/YOS
TAMPA	12	no limit	12 days/yr. + 1 day/yr. for every 5 YOS
TOLEDO	15	no limit	1,11; 2-9,16; 10-14,21; 15-29,26
TUCSON	N/A	120	1-10. 50 days' pay; 10-15,. 58 days' pay; 15+, .77 days' pay
TULSA	12	no limit	1-4,10; 5-7,12; 8-16,20
WASHINGTON	13	no limit	1-3,13; 3-15,20; 15+, 26
WICHITA	12	no limit	1-9,10; 10-19,15; 20+, 20

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

	30c		31		32a			32b
	Group Health Insurance % By Officer	% By City or Department	Dental Insurance Yes	No	Number of Motorcycles	Make	Number of Scooters	Make
AKRON	0	100	N/A	N/A	15	Harley-Davidson	24	Cushman
ALBUQUERQUE	50	50		X	23	Harley-Davidson	0	-
ATLANTA	50	50		X	61	Harley-Davidson	17	Harley-Davidson
AUSTIN	0	100		X	12	Harley-Davidson	0	-
BALTIMORE	15	85		X	98	(6-3-wheel/6 2-wheel) Moto-Guzzi Honda (*others N/A)	14	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	5	95		X	26	Honda	20	Cushman
BOSTON	25	75	Optional		70	Harley-Davidson	2	Cushman
BUFFALO	0	100	X		50	Harley-Davidson	26	Honda
CHARLOTTE	0	100		X	0		5	Cushman
CINCINNATI	0	100		X	7	Harley-Davidson	20	Honda
CLEVELAND	0	100		X	(3-wheel) 44	Harley-Davidson	112	Cushman
COLUMBUS	0	100	X		30	Harley-Davidson	0	-
DALLAS	0	100		X	(3-wheel) 35	Harley-Davidson,	28	Harley-Davidson
DENVER	N/A	N/A		X	(29,6) 63	Kawasaki Harley-Davidson,	30	Honda, Kawasaki
DETROIT	2	98		X	15	Kawasaki Harley-Davidson	175	Honda

	30c		31			32a		32b
	Group Health Insurance % By Officer	% By City or Department	Dental Insurance Yes No		Number of Motorcycles	Make	Number of Scooters	Make
EL PASO	0	100		X	27	Harley-Davidson	9	Cushman
FORT WORTH	0	100		X	13	Harley-Davidson,	11	Cushman
HONOLULU	N/A	N/A	for minor depen.		(2,11) 45	Honda Harley-Davidson	36 (27,6,3)	Harley-Davidson, Cushman, Vespa
HOUSTON	0	100		X	20	Harley-Davidson	0	-
INDIANAPOLIS	80	20		X	50	Harley-Davidson	0	-
JACKSONVILLE	0	100		X	11	Harley-Davidson,	N/A	Cushman
JERSEY CITY	0	100	X		91	Honda, Moto-Guzzi Harley-Davidson,	0	-
KANSAS CITY	0	100		X	35	Harley-Davidson,	31	Cushman
LONG BEACH	0	100	X		(26,7,2) 10	Honda, Kawasaki Harley-Davidson	15	Cushman
MEMPHIS	33	66		X	38	Harley-Davidson,	12	Cushman
MIAMI	20	80		X	(17,11,10) 40	Honda, Kawasaki Harley-Davidson	32	W. Coaster, Honda, Harley-Davidson
MINNEAPOLIS	0	100		X	0	Harley-Davidson	0	-
NEW ORLEANS	0	100		X	70	Harley-Davidson,	37	Cushman
NEWARK	0	100		X	(55,15) 28	Honda Harley-Davidson	4	N/A
NORFOLK	0	100		X	17 (12,5)	Harley-Davidson, Honda	8	Cushman

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

	30c		31		Number of Motorcycles	32a		32b
	Group Health % By Officer	Insurance % By City or Department	Dental Insurance Yes	No		Make	Number of Scooters	Make
OAKLAND	0	100	X		42	Harley-Davidson	0	-
OMAHA	0	100		X	28 (6,22)	Harley-Davidson, Honda	9	Cushman
PHILADELPHIA	0	100		X	56	Harley-Davidson	12	Cushman
PHOENIX	options avail.	100		X	106 (79,26,1)	Harley-Davidson, Moto-Guzzi, Kawasaki	0	-
PITTSBURGH	0	100	X		45	Harley-Davidson	2	Cushman
PORTLAND	0	100	X		30	Harley-Davidson, Kawasaki	0	-
ROCHESTER	0	100	X		13	Harley-Davidson	25	Cushman
SACRAMENTO	0	100	X		45	Harley-Davidson, Moto-Guzzi, Kawasaki	0	-
ST. LOUIS	0	100		X	15	Harley-Davidson	7	Cushman
ST. PAUL	0	100		X	8	Harley-Davidson, Honda	5	Cushman
SAN DIEGO	0	100		X	35 (15,20)	Harley-Davidson, Honda	19	Cushman
SAN FRANCISCO	100	0		X	15 (91,40,19)	Harley-Davidson Honda, Vespa	148 (65,83)	Harley-Davidson, Cushman
SAN JOSE	0	100	X		30	Honda, Kawasaki	8	Otis
SEATTLE	0	100	X		38 (37,1)	Harley-Davidson Honda	55	Cushman

	30c		31		Number of Motorcycles	32a		32b
	Group Health Insurance % By Officer	% By City or Department	Dental Insurance Yes	No		Make	Number of Scooters	Make
TAMPA	0	100		X	16	Harley-Davidson	0	-
TOLEDO	0	100		X	3 (3-wheel)	Harley-Davidson	6	Cushman
TUCSON	25	75	X		33 (28,5)	Moto-Guzzi, Harley-Davidson	0	-
TULSA	0	100		X	5	Kawasaki	13	Harley-Davidson
WASHINGTON	Several plans available			X	14	Harley-Davidson	464	Vespa, Honda
WICHITA	25	75	X		0		10	Cushman

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

32c

32d

33

Patrol Wagons

	Total No.	Day Shift	Evening Shift	Night Shift	Other	Number of Marked Cars	Number of Unmarked Cars	Fleet Maintenance By:
AKRON	4	4	4	4	-	70	66	city
ALBUQUERQUE	0	-	-	-	-	115	125	department
ATLANTA	21	14	14	11	-	200	216	city
AUSTIN	0	-	-	-	-	84	101	city
BALTIMORE	29	18	18	18	varies	521	224	city
BIRMINGHAM	3	2	2	1	1	109	211	city
BOSTON	22	13	13	13	-	177	114	department
BUFFALO	8	2	4	2	-	N/A	N/A	city
CHARLOTTE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	113	91	department
CINCINNATI	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	85	42	city
CLEVELAND	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	242	249	city
COLUMBUS	19	12	12	10	1	225	225	city
DALLAS	5	2	2	2	-	358	319	city
DENVER	3	1	2	2	-	155	316	department
DETROIT	18	15	15	14	2	666	546	city
EL PASO	0	-	-	-	-	127	89	department
FORT WORTH	4	2	1	0	0	138	147	city
HONOLULU	7	7	7	7	-	76	3	department
HOUSTON	20	20	20	20	-	823	952	department
INDIANAPOLIS	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	535	120	city
JACKSONVILLE	0	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A	city
JERSEY CITY	1	1	1	1	-	62	53	city
KANSAS CITY	14	14	14	14	-	140	250	department
LONG BEACH	1	0	1	0	0	68	55	city
MEMPHIS	3	1	1	1	-	246	209	city
MIAMI	40	40	37	35	-	218	106	city
MINNEAPOLIS	0	-	-	-	-	106	69	city

32c

32d

33

Patrol Wagons

	Total No.	Day Shift	Evening Shift	Night Shift	Other	Number of Marked Cars	Number of Unmarked Cars	Fleet Maintenance By:
NEW ORLEANS	9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	291	599	department
NEWARK	4	4	4	4	-	133	136	city
NORFOLK	4	4	4	4	-	63	70	city
OAKLAND	4	3	3	3	1	105	100	city
OMAHA	2	2	2	2	-	74	57	department
PHILADELPHIA	153	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	750	497	city
PHOENIX	15	15	15	15	0	354	280	city
PITTSBURGH	37	37	37	37	-	64	63	city
PORTLAND	2	1	1	1	-	86	20	city
ROCHESTER	2	2	2	2	-	93	132	department
SACRAMENTO	3	1	1	1	-	92	78	city
ST. LOUIS	18	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	229	260	department + contractor
ST. PAUL	1	1	1	0	-	103	72	police-fire services
SAN DIEGO	5	5	5	5	-	231	122	department
SAN FRANCISCO	12	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	153	206	city
SAN JOSE	3	1	2	1	-	164	102	private contractor
SEATTLE	1	1	1	1	-	147	118	city
TAMPA	4	2	2	2	-	275	139	city
TOLEDO	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	117	130	city
TUCSON	0	-	-	-	-	138	107	department & city
TULSA	0	-	-	-	-	169	93	city
WASHINGTON	25	17	17	17	0	310	199	department
WICHITA	2	1	1	0	-	66	68	city

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

34

Marked Vehicles
On-Duty & Off-Duty

AKRON	No
ALBUQUERQUE	Yes (limited)
ATLANTA	No
AUSTIN	No
BALTIMORE	No
BIRMINGHAM	No
BOSTON	No
BUFFALO	No
CHARLOTTE	No
CINCINNATI	No
CLEVELAND	No
COLUMBUS	No
DALLAS	No
DENVER	No
DETROIT	No
EL PASO	No
FORT WORTH	No
HONOLULU	No
HOUSTON	No
INDIANAPOLIS	Yes
JACKSONVILLE	Yes
JERSEY CITY	No
KANSAS CITY	No
LONG BEACH	No
MEMPHIS	No
MIAMI	No
MINNEAPOLIS	No

35

Liability Insurance on Vehicles Provided by:

city
city
city - up to \$1,000
city
city
officer
city
city
city
city
department
city
city
city, over \$100,000
officer
officer
department
city
city
city
city
department
city
city
city
city

34

Marked Vehicles
On-Duty & Off-Duty

NEW ORLEANS	Yes
NEWARK	No
NORFOLK	No
OAKLAND	No
OMAHA	No
PHILADELPHIA	No
PHOENIX	No
PITTSBURGH	No
PORTLAND	No
ROCHESTER	Yes
SACRAMENTO	No
ST. LOUIS	No
ST. PAUL	No
SAN DIEGO	Yes (captains)
SAN FRANCISCO	No
SAN JOSE	No
SEATTLE	No
TAMPA	No
TOLEDO	No
TUCSON	No
TULSA	No
WASHINGTON	No
WICHITA	No

35

Liability Insurance on Vehicles Provided By:

city
city
city
city
city
city
city
city
city
city
department
city
city
city
city
city
city
city
officer
city
city

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

	36a	36b	37a	37b	37c	38	39	
	Number of Aircraft		Aircraft Used For			Use of Computer		Computer On-Line Want/Warrant
	Fixed-Wing	Helicopters	Patrol	Traffic	Search & Rescue	Yes	No	Yes No
AKRON	0	0	-	-	-	X		X
ALBUQUERQUE	1	0	X	X	X	X		X
ATLANTA	0	5	X	X	X	X		X
AUSTIN	0	0	-	-	-	X		
BALTIMORE	0	5	X	-	-	X		X
BIRMINGHAM	0	1	X	X	X	X		X
BOSTON	0	0	-	-	-	X		
BUFFALO	0	0	-	-	-	X		
CHARLOTTE	0	1	X	-	X	X		
CINCINNATI	0	0	-	-	-	X		
CLEVELAND	0	0	-	-	-	X		
COLUMBUS	0	4	X	X	X	X		X
DALLAS	1	8	X	X	X	X		
DENVER	0	3	X	X	X	X		
DETROIT	2	9	X	X	X	X		
EL PASO	0	0	-	-	-	X		
FORT WORTH	0	2	X	X	X	X		
HONOLULU	0	1	X	X	X	X		
HOUSTON	0	16	X	-	X	X		
INDIANAPOLIS	0	3	X	X	X	X		
JACKSONVILLE	1	6	X			X		X
JERSEY CITY	0	0	-	-	-	X		
KANSAS CITY	0	5	X	X	X	X		
LONG BEACH	0	2	X	X	X	X		
MEMPHIS	0	5	X	X	X	X		
MIAMI	0	0	-	-	-	X		
MINNEAPOLIS	0	0	-	-	-	X		X

	36a	36b	37a	37b	37c	38	39	
	Number of Aircraft		Aircraft Used For			Use of Computer		Computer On-Line Want/Warrant
	Fixed-Wing	Helicopters	Patrol	Traffic	Search & Rescue	Yes	No	Yes No
NEW ORLEANS	0	0	-	-	-	X		X
NEWARK	0	0	-	-	-	X		
NORFOLK	0	0	-	-	-	X		X
OAKLAND	0	2	X	X	-	X		
OMAHA	0	0	-	-	-	X		
PHILADELPHIA	0	2	X	X	X	X		
PHOENIX	2	7	X	X	X	X		
PITTSBURGH	0	0	-	-	-	X		
PORTLAND	0	0	-	-	-	X		X
ROCHESTER	0	0	-	-	-	X		
SACRAMENTO	0	0	-	-	-	X		X
ST. LOUIS	0	0	-	-	-	X		
ST. PAUL	0	0	-	-	-	X		
SAN DIEGO	0	0	-	-	-	X		
SAN FRANCISCO	0	2	not in use		-	X		
SAN JOSE	0	0	-	-	-	X		
SEATTLE	0	2	X	X	X	X		
TAMPA	1	2	X	X	X	X		
TOLEDO	0	0	-	-	-	X		
TUCSON	0	4	X	X	X	X		
TULSA	0	0	-	-	-	X		
WASHINGTON	0	4	X	X	X	X		
WICHITA	0	2	X		X	X		

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

40

42

	Computer:		Areas in Computer System					Modus Operandi	Criminal Index
	Police Controlled	Shared	Stolen Autos	Stolen Property	License Registration	Warrants	Personnel		
AKRON		X	X	X	X	X	X		
ALBUQUERQUE		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
ATLANTA		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
AUSTIN		X	X	X					X
BALTIMORE	X		X	X	X	X	X		X
BIRMINGHAM		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
BOSTON		X	X	X	X	X	X		
BUFFALO		X	X		X	X	X		X
CHARLOTTE	X		X		X		X		
CINCINNATI	X		X	X	X	X			
CLEVELAND		X	X	X	X	X	X		X
COLUMBUS		X				X	X	X	X
DALLAS		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
DENVER	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
DETROIT		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
EL PASO		X			X	X	X		X
FORT WORTH		X	X	X	X	X	X		
HONOLULU		X	X	X	X	X	X		X
HOUSTON		X	X	X	X	X	X		X
INDIANAPOLIS	X		X	X	X	X	X		X
JACKSONVILLE		X	X	X	X	X	X		X
JERSEY CITY	X		X			X	X		X
KANSAS CITY	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
LONG BEACH		X	X	X	X	X		X	X
MEMPHIS		X	X	X	X	X			
MIAMI	X		X	X	X	X	X		X
MINNEAPOLIS		X	X		X		X		X

40

42

	Computer:		Stolen Autos	Stolen Property	Areas in Computer System			Modus Operandi	Criminal Index
	Police Controlled	Shared			License Registration	Warrants	Personnel		
NEW ORLEANS		X	X		X	X			
NEWARK	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
NORFOLK		X	X	X	X	X			X
OAKLAND		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
OMAHA		X	X	X	X	X	X		X
PHILADELPHIA	X		X	X	X	X	X		
PHOENIX		X	X	X	X	X	X		X
PITTSBURGH		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
PORTLAND	X		X				X	X	X
ROCHESTER		X	X		X	X	X	X	X
SACRAMENTO		X	X	X		X	X	X	X
ST. LOUIS		X	X			X	X		X
ST. PAUL		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
SAN DIEGO		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
SAN FRANCISCO		X	X	X	X	X			
SAN JOSE		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
SEATTLE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
TAMPA		X	X	X	X	X	X		
TOLEDO	X	X	X	X	X	X			
TUCSON	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
TULSA	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
WASHINGTON	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
WICHITA		X	X	X	X	X	X		

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

42

43

	Payroll	Areas in Police Calls	Computer System Traffic Accidents	Traffic Arrests	Other Arrests	Minimum	Salary Chief of Police (\$)	Maximum (\$)
AKRON	X			X	X	27,955		31,179
ALBUQUERQUE	X		X	X	X	Open	Open (Current	34,424)
ATLANTA	X	X	X	X	X	27,872		35,828
AUSTIN		X	X	X	X	-	Over	30,000
BALTIMORE		X		X	X			
BIRMINGHAM	X	X	X	X	X	28,995		35,000
BOSTON	X	X	X	X	X			
BUFFALO		X	X	X	X			
CHARLOTTE		X				27,237		34,764
CINCINNATI	X	X		X	X	28,785		31,848
CLEVELAND	X			X		36,715		37,210
COLUMBUS	X	X	X	X	X	-		31,054
DALLAS	X	X	X	X	X	29,460		45,300
DENVER	X	X	X	X	X	-		40,922
DETROIT		X	X	X	X	-		42,900
EL PASO	X	X	X	X		23,342		31,272
FORT WORTH	X	X	X	X	X	32,500		Negotiable
HONOLULU	X	X	X	X	X	34,541		-
HOUSTON	X			X	X	36,000		42,000
INDIANAPOLIS	X	X	X	X	X	23,168		-
JACKSONVILLE	X	X	X	X				
JERSEY CITY			X	X	X	28,380		29,390
KANSAS CITY		X	X	X	X	30,372		37,896
LONG BEACH	X			X	X	38,400		58,800
MEMPHIS	X	X		X	X	29,880		N/A
MIAMI	X	X			X	43,625		43,625
MINNEAPOLIS	X	X				-		36,972

	Payroll	Areas in Computer System Police Calls Traffic Accidents Traffic Arrests Other Arrests
NEW ORLEANS		X X X X
NEWARK		X X X X
NORFOLK	X	X X X X
OAKLAND	X	X X X X
OMAHA	X	X X X X
PHILADELPHIA	X	X X X X
PHOENIX	X	X X X X
PITTSBURGH	X	X X X X
PORTLAND	X	X X X X
ROCHESTER	X	X X X X
SACRAMENTO	X	X X X X
ST. LOUIS		X X X X
ST. PAUL	X	X X X X
SAN DIEGO	X	X X X X
SAN FRANCISCO		X X X X
SAN JOSE	X	X X X X
SEATTLE		X X X X
TAMPA	X	X X X X
TOLEDO		X X X X
TUCSON	X	X X X X
TULSA		X X X X
WASHINGTON		X X X X
WICHITA		X X X X

	Salary Chief of Police Minimum (\$) Maximum (\$)
	28,500 28,500
	24,168 35,724
	- 45,720
	28,116 30,936
	30,638 38,667
	- 39,431
	29,060 34,549
	33,072 40,224
	35,854 35,854
	29,636 38,680
	31,032 37,632
	50,688 -
	37,428 45,516
	44,328 44,328
	- 28,100
	- 28,412
	26,544 32,268
	23,592 33,072
	44,726 47,437
	23,165 30,884

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

43

Salary

Commissioner of Police
Minimum (\$) Maximum (\$)

Superintendent of Police
Minimum (\$) Maximum (\$)

Other - Chief
Executive (Specify)

AKRON
ALBUQUERQUE
ATLANTA
AUSTIN
BALTIMORE
BIRMINGHAM
BOSTON
BUFFALO
CHARLOTTE
CINCINNATI
CLEVELAND
COLUMBUS
DALLAS
DENVER
DETROIT
EL PASO
FORT WORTH
HONOLULU
HOUSTON
INDIANAPOLIS
JACKSONVILLE
JERSEY CITY
KANSAS CITY
LONG BEACH
MEMPHIS
MIAMI
MINNEAPOLIS

N/A

N/A

29,500

29,500

-

3,000

2,400

2,400

Deputy Commissioner

Superintendent-in-Chief
Deputy Commissioner

Division Chief
Executive Deputy Chief

Deputy Director

			43	
			Salary	
	Commissioner of Police		Superintendent of Police	Other - Chief
	Minimum (\$)	Maximum (\$)	Minimum (\$)	Executive (Specify)
NEW ORLEANS			30,252	42,564
NEWARK				Police Director
NORFOLK				
OAKLAND				
OMAHA				
PHILADELPHIA	35,000	35,000		
PHOENIX				
PITTSBURGH				28,916
PORTLAND				
ROCHESTER				
SACRAMENTO				
ST. LOUIS				
ST. PAUL				
SAN DIEGO				
SAN FRANCISCO				
SAN JOSE				
SEATTLE				
TAMPA				
TOLEDO				
TUCSON				
TULSA				
WASHINGTON				
WICHITA				

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

43

Salary

	Other Chief Executive Minimum (\$)	Maximum (\$)	1st Deputy Superintendent Minimum (\$)	Maximum (\$)	Lieutenant Colonel Minimum (\$)
AKRON					
ALBUQUERQUE					
ATLANTA					
AUSTIN					
BALTIMORE	-	31,001			
BIRMINGHAM					
BOSTON	-	31,839			
BUFFALO	22,900	22,900			20,296
CHARLOTTE					
CINCINNATI					26,199
CLEVELAND					
COLUMBUS					
DALLAS					
DENVER	-	29,712			
DETROIT	-	37,900			
EL PASO					
FORT WORTH					
HONOLULU					
HOUSTON					
INDIANAPOLIS					
JACKSONVILLE					
JERSEY CITY					24,984
KANSAS CITY					
LONG BEACH					
MEMPHIS	22,900	N/A			
MIAMI					
MINNEAPOLIS					

43

Salary

Other Chief Executive
Minimum (\$) Maximum (\$)

1st Deputy Superintendent
Minimum (\$) Maximum (\$)

Lieutenant Colonel
Minimum (\$)

NEW ORLEANS
NEWARK
NORFOLK
OAKLAND
OMAHA
PHILADELPHIA
PHOENIX
PITTSBURGH
PORTLAND
ROCHESTER
SACRAMENTO
ST. LOUIS
ST. PAUL
SAN DIEGO
SAN FRANCISCO
SAN JOSE
SEATTLE
TAMPA
TOLEDO
TUCSON
TULSA
WASHINGTON
WICHITA

34,618 36,500

26,136 36,768

25,532

24,221

18,420

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

43

Salary

	Lieutenant Colonel Maximum (\$)	Deputy Chief		Assistant Chief	
		Minimum (\$)	Maximum (\$)	Minimum (\$)	Maximum (\$)
AKRON		24,128	26,873		
ALBUQUERQUE		21,798	27,581		
ATLANTA		19,162	24,596		
AUSTIN		-	20,664	-	23,820
BALTIMORE					
BIRMINGHAM		21,652	26,291		
BOSTON					
BUFFALO	20,296				
CHARLOTTE				21,340	27,237
CINCINNATI	27,419				
CLEVELAND					
COLUMBUS		-	26,312		
DALLAS		22,980	25,140	24,264	36,204
DENVER					
DETROIT		-	33,600		
EL PASO					
FORT WORTH		22,854	25,740		
HONOLULU		32,814	-	22,308	33,276
HOUSTON		-	29,124	-	34,932
INDIANAPOLIS		18,913	-	20,131	-
JACKSONVILLE					
JERSEY CITY		26,280	27,280		
KANSAS CITY	27,720			24,984	27,720
LONG BEACH		24,000	44,000	24,000	44,000
MEMPHIS		21,250	N/A		
MIAMI				37,685	37,685
MINNEAPOLIS		25,320	28,236		

43

Salary

Lieutenant Colonel
Maximum (\$)

Deputy Chief
Minimum (\$) Maximum (\$)

Assistant Chief
Minimum (\$) Maximum (\$)

NEW ORLEANS		24,888	35,016		
NEWARK		22,391	23,748		
NORFOLK		17,400	25,380		
OAKLAND		-	34,440		
OMAHA		22,224	24,348		
PHILADELPHIA		28,000	28,000		
PHOENIX				24,148	30,638
PITTSBURGH					
PORTLAND		-	33,782		
ROCHESTER		26,591	28,329		
SACRAMENTO		26,604	32,340		
ST. LOUIS	25,532			27,144	27,144
ST. PAUL		23,033	30,015		
SAN DIEGO		26,880	33,168	26,280	33,936
SAN FRANCISCO		-	42,648		
SAN JOSE		27,132	32,964	27,132	32,964
SEATTLE				34,200	36,919
TAMPA	26,409				
TOLEDO		-	24,367		
TUCSON					
TULSA		20,700	28,824	20,700	28,824
WASHINGTON		32,614	39,242	38,670	43,825
WICHITA	24,534				

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

43

Salary

	Other Command Level - 2		Captain of Police		Lieutenant of Police
	Minimum (\$)	Maximum (\$)	Minimum (\$)	Maximum (\$)	Minimum (\$)
AKRON			20,779	23,171	17,950
ALBUQUERQUE			17,087	23,298	14,683
ATLANTA			14,313	18,382	12,844
AUSTIN			18,588	18,972	16,128
BALTIMORE		22,725	19,451	21,430	16,927
BIRMINGHAM			18,699	25,043	15,392
BOSTON			21,886	23,713	19,032
BUFFALO			17,687	17,687	16,332
CHARLOTTE			-	16,721	21,340
CINCINNATI			22,580	23,638	19,322
CLEVELAND	27,285	27,785	23,521	24,021	20,277
COLUMBUS			-	23,088	-
DALLAS			19,800	21,960	18,132
DENVER			-	25,080	-
DETROIT					-
EL PASO			15,446	19,812	13,297
FORT WORTH			19,578	22,269	17,251
HONOLULU			17,268	25,464	15,888
HOUSTON			-	23,316	-
INDIANAPOLIS			14,596	-	13,489
JACKSONVILLE			18,252	19,152	15,864
JERSEY CITY			22,080	23,080	19,980
KANSAS CITY			20,556	21,420	
LONG BEACH			27,156	33,528	22,668
MEMPHIS			17,712	N/A	15,768
MIAMI			22,032	31,020	19,044
MINNEAPOLIS			20,616	23,316	17,784

Salary

	Other Command Level - 2		Captain of Police		Lieutenant of Police
	Minimum (\$)	Maximum (\$)	Minimum (\$)	Maximum (\$)	Minimum (\$)
NEW ORLEANS			17,688	24,888	15,276
NEWARK			18,318	19,675	16,282
NORFOLK			13,800	19,920	12,576
OAKLAND			-	30,924	-
OMAHA			18,756	19,572	17,244
PHILADELPHIA			22,393	23,362	19,643
PHOENIX			20,904	26,603	16,910
PITTSBURGH			-	19,166	-
PORTLAND	14,908	19,981	26,782	29,240	23,237
ROCHESTER			22,420	22,813	19,496
SACRAMENTO			24,540	29,832	19,440
ST. LOUIS			20,254	20,254	18,200
ST. PAUL			25,264	25,888	21,443
SAN DIEGO			21,708	27,072	13,828
SAN FRANCISCO			-	29,328	-
SAN JOSE			23,436	28,488	20,244
SEATTLE	25,908	27,912	25,908	27,912	22,512
TAMPA			19,359	21,105	17,017
TOLEDO			-	22,233	-
TUCSON			19,800	24,072	17,964
TULSA			15,168	20,640	14,376
WASHINGTON			23,975	27,569	20,235
WICHITA			13,087	17,397	11,685

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

43

Salary

	Lieutenant of Police Maximum (\$)	Sergeant of Police		Corporal	
		Minimum (\$)	Maximum (\$)	Minimum (\$)	Maximum (\$)
AKRON	19,968	15,475	17,222		
ALBUQUERQUE	19,931	12,567	17,087		
ATLANTA	16,432	11,362	14,521		
AUSTIN	16,512	14,676	15,060		
BALTIMORE	18,621	14,980	16,354		
BIRMINGHAM	20,613	13,291	17,805		
BOSTON	20,963	16,549	18,350		
BUFFALO	16,332				
CHARLOTTE	-	-	16,721		
CINCINNATI	20,377	17,018	17,567		
CLEVELAND	20,777	17,480	17,980		
COLUMBUS	20,259	-	17,763		
DALLAS	20,340	16,488	18,744		
DENVER	22,008	-	19,344		
DETROIT	25,965	-	22,750		
EL PASO	17,087	12,038	15,446	11,477	14,685
FORT WORTH	19,799	15,509	17,927		
HONOLULU	23,316	14,652	21,372		
HOUSTON	20,112	-	17,556		
INDIANAPOLIS	-	12,714	-		
JACKSONVILLE	16,656	13,788	14,472		
JERSEY CITY	20,980	17,880	18,880		
KANSAS CITY	-	16,908	19,536		
LONG BEACH	27,972	19,476	24,012		
MEMPHIS	N/A	14,844	N/A		
MIAMI	26,784	16,452	23,136		
MINNEAPOLIS	20,772	18,192	19,932		

Salary

	Lieutenant of Police Maximum (\$)	Sergeant of Police		Corporal	
		Minimum (\$)	Maximum (\$)	Minimum (\$)	Maximum (\$)
NEW ORLEANS	21,492	10,860	15,276		
NEWARK	17,639	14,927	15,874		
NORFOLK	18,240	10,872	15,840	9,864	14,400
OAKLAND	26,904	23,388	23,976		
OMAHA	17,868	15,756	16,368		
PHILADELPHIA	20,493	17,230	17,977	16,324	17,030
PHOENIX	21,881	14,102	18,366		
PITTSBURGH	17,424	-	15,840		
PORTLAND	25,453	19,405	21,886		
ROCHESTER	20,630	16,953	17,939		
SACRAMENTO	28,704	16,812	24,768		
ST. LOUIS	18,200	16,094	16,640	14,690	14,690
ST. PAUL	23,114	18,400	20,638		
SAN DIEGO	23,568	16,320	20,520		
SAN FRANCISCO	24,984	-	21,864		
SAN JOSE	24,612	17,484	21,264		
SEATTLE	24,276	18,876	21,108		
TAMPA	18,519	15,116	16,508	13,282	13,856
TOLEDO	20,103	16,213	17,634		
TUCSON	21,828	15,504	18,852		
TULSA	19,344	15,036	16,404	13,620	15,036
WASHINGTON	24,285	17,507	21,885		
WICHITA	15,521				

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

43

Salary

	Police Officer Minimum (\$)	(15 yrs. or more) Maximum (\$)	Police Officer Minimum (\$)	(10-15 yrs.) Maximum (\$)	Police Officer (5-10 yrs.) Minimum (\$)
AKRON	-	-	12,708	14,851	12,708
ALBUQUERQUE	14,088	14,088	14,088	14,088	14,046
ATLANTA	N/A	12,844	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	-	-	-	-	-
BALTIMORE	-	-	-	-	-
BIRMINGHAM	-	-	-	-	-
BOSTON	14,800	15,818	14,600	15,818	14,250
BUFFALO	13,650	13,650	13,650	13,650	13,650
CHARLOTTE	13,757	13,757	13,757	13,757	13,757
CINCINNATI	-	15,143	-	15,143	-
CLEVELAND	15,189	15,569	15,129	15,189	15,069
COLUMBUS	-	15,579	-	15,579	-
DALLAS	14,604	16,284	14,364	15,804	14,124
DENVER	-	-	-	16,200	-
DETROIT	-	19,271	-	19,271	-
EL PASO	-	12,634	-	-	-
FORT WORTH	13,559	14,079	13,299	13,559	13,039
HONOLULU	18,024	18,780	16,560	18,024	14,652
HOUSTON	-	-	-	-	-
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	11,773
JACKSONVILLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	12,576
JERSEY CITY	-	14,900	-	14,900	-
KANSAS CITY	16,068	16,068	16,068	16,068	12,612
LONG BEACH	-	-	-	-	-
MEMPHIS	-	-	13,824	-	13,152
MIAMI	19,992	19,992	19,044	19,992	18,132
MINNEAPOLIS	17,544	18,060	17,280	17,544	16,428

Salary

	Police Officer Minimum (\$)	(15 yrs. or more) Maximum (\$)	Police Officer Minimum (\$)	(10-15 yrs.) Maximum (\$)	Police Officer (5-10 yrs.) Minimum (\$)
NEW ORLEANS	9,852	13,848	9,852	13,848	9,852
NEWARK	-	-	-	-	-
NORFOLK	-	13,200	12,576	13,200	10,872
OAKLAND	-	-	-	-	-
OMAHA	14,868	14,868	14,868	14,868	14,868
PHILADELPHIA	16,151	16,279	16,024	16,151	15,896
PHOENIX	-	15,537	-	15,537	14,788
PITTSBURGH	-	-	-	14,400	-
PORTLAND	-	18,851	-	18,851	-
ROCHESTER	15,599	15,599	15,599	15,599	15,599
SACRAMENTO	20,220	21,240	18,804	21,240	17,496
ST. LOUIS	14,560	14,560	13,858	14,560	13,156
ST. PAUL	16,943	17,549	16,520	17,126	16,111
SAN DIEGO	17,892	17,892	17,892	17,892	17,892
SAN FRANCISCO	-	-	-	-	-
SAN JOSE	-	-	-	-	-
SEATTLE	18,202	18,545	17,858	18,202	17,515
TAMPA	-	12,707	-	12,177	-
TOLEDO	-	15,408	-	15,408	-
TUCSON	15,504	15,504	15,504	15,504	15,504
TULSA	11,232	13,008	11,232	13,008	11,232
WASHINGTON	17,919	18,562	17,274	17,919	15,596
WICHITA	-	12,355	-	12,355	-

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

43

Salary

	Police Officer (5-10 yrs.) Maximum (\$)	Police Officer (2-5 yrs.)		Police Officer (1st yr.)	
		Minimum (\$)	Maximum (\$)	Minimum (\$)	Maximum (\$)
AKRON	14,060	12,708	13,353	12,708	12,708
ALBUQUERQUE	14,088	10,406	11,641	9,443	9,443
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10,049
AUSTIN	-	12,516	13,272	10,836	11,964
BALTIMORE	-	11,963	14,044	10,403	11,443
BIRMINGHAM	-	11,461	15,392	10,991	11,461
BOSTON	15,618	12,550	14,600	11,201	12,219
BUFFALO	13,650	13,650	13,650	13,650	13,650
CHARLOTTE	13,757	11,048	13,757	11,048	11,048
CINCINNATI	15,143	13,509	15,143	-	13,509
CLEVELAND	15,129	12,000	15,069	10,500	10,500
COLUMBUS	15,579	-	10,836	-	9,089
DALLAS	15,564	13,092	15,324	11,820	13,020
DENVER	15,030	-	13,872	-	12,432
DETROIT	19,271	15,657	17,929	-	14,521
EL PASO	-	10,485	12,634	9,989	10,485
FORT WORTH	13,299	12,688	13,039	12,584	12,636
HONOLULU	16,560	12,996	14,652	11,544	-
HOUSTON	15,648	-	14,604	-	13,512
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	10,666	N/A	9,836	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	N/A	11,400	N/A	10,872	N/A
JERSEY CITY	14,900	12,300	14,100	-	11,300
KANSAS CITY	16,068	10,908	12,012	10,392	10,392
LONG BEACH	-	16,608	19,476	15,732	-
MEMPHIS	-	12,228	-	8,544	-
MIAMI	19,044	14,904	18,132	14,196	14,904
MINNEAPOLIS	17,280	15,024	16,428	12,816	-

Salary

	Police Officer (5-10 yrs.) Maximum (\$)	Police Officer (2-5 yrs.)		Police Officer (1st yr.)	
		Minimum (\$)	Maximum (\$)	Minimum (\$)	Maximum (\$)
NEW ORLEANS	13,848	9,852	13,848	9,852	13,848
NEWARK	-	13,374	14,250	12,500	13,374
NORFOLK	12,576	9,384	10,872	8,952	-
OAKLAND	20,988	18,396	20,340	-	17,724
OMAHA	14,868	13,728	14,868	12,216	12,732
PHILADELPHIA	16,024	15,769	15,896	15,115	15,796
PHOENIX	15,537	12,585	14,788	11,585	12,585
PITTSBURGH	13,711	-	13,023	-	12,334
PORTLAND	18,851	16,064	18,851	14,067	14,684
ROCHESTER	15,599	14,741	15,599	13,394	13,945
SACRAMENTO	21,240	13,608	21,240	14,400	15,120
ST. LOUIS	13,858	11,388	12,662	10,972	10,972
ST. PAUL	16,717	15,512	16,097	13,626	14,968
SAN DIEGO	17,892	14,195	17,892	12,876	15,552
SAN FRANCISCO	-	-	18,916	-	15,948
SAN JOSE	-	15,864	18,360	15,108	15,864
SEATTLE	17,858	17,172	17,515	13,848	14,928
TAMPA	11,668	-	11,204	-	10,696
TOLEDO	15,408	-	15,408	-	14,441
TUCSON	15,504	13,392	15,504	12,756	13,392
TULSA	13,008	11,232	13,008	11,232	11,232
WASHINGTON	17,274	13,924	15,596	12,890	12,890
WICHITA	12,355	-	12,355	9,327	-

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

43

Salary

	Commanding Officer, Detectives		Captain of Detectives		Lieutenant of Detectives
	Minimum (\$)	Maximum (\$)	Minimum (\$)	Maximum (\$)	Minimum (\$)
AKRON			20,779	23,171	17,950
ALBUQUERQUE					
ATLANTA					
AUSTIN					
BALTIMORE					
BIRMINGHAM					
BOSTON					
BUFFALO	20,296	20,296	17,687	17,687	16,332
CHARLOTTE					
CINCINNATI					
CLEVELAND	27,285	27,785	23,521	24,021	20,278
COLUMBUS	-	26,312	-	23,088	-
DALLAS					
DENVER					
DETROIT					
EL PASO			15,446	19,812	13,297
FORT WORTH					
HONOLULU	18,780	27,804	17,268	25,464	15,888
HOUSTON	-	29,124	-	23,316	
INDIANAPOLIS					
JACKSONVILLE					
JERSEY CITY			22,080	23,080	19,980
KANSAS CITY	24,984	27,720	20,556	21,420	
LONG BEACH					
MEMPHIS	20,460	-	17,712	-	15,768
MIAMI					
MINNEAPOLIS					

Salary

	Commanding Officer, Detectives		Captain of Detectives		Lieutenant of Detectives
	Minimum (\$)	Maximum (\$)	Minimum (\$)	Maximum (\$)	Minimum (\$)
NEW ORLEANS	19,500	27,444	17,688	24,888	15,276
NEWARK	22,391	23,748	18,318	19,675	16,762
NORFOLK			13,800	19,920	12,576
OAKLAND					
OMAHA	22,224	24,348	18,756	19,572	17,244
PHILADELPHIA	29,102	30,363	22,393	23,362	19,643
PHOENIX			20,904	26,603	16,910
PITTSBURGH	-	23,809			
PORTLAND	19,405	21,886	26,782	29,240	23,237
ROCHESTER					
SACRAMENTO					
ST. LOUIS					
ST. PAUL					
SAN DIEGO	24,108	29,220	21,912	26,544	18,996
SAN FRANCISCO					
SAN JOSE					
SEATTLE					
TAMPA					
TOLEDO	-	22,233	-	22,233	-
TUCSON			19,800	24,072	17,964
TULSA	16,536	22,644	15,168	20,640	14,376
WASHINGTON	32,614	39,242	23,975	27,569	20,235
WICHITA	13,087	17,397	13,087	17,397	11,685

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

43

Salary

	Lieutenant of Detectives	Sergeant of Detectives		Detectives	
	Maximum (\$)	Minimum (\$)	Maximum (\$)	Minimum (\$)	Maximum (\$)
AKRON	19,968	15,475	17,222		
ALBUQUERQUE					
ATLANTA				10,907	13,936
AUSTIN					
BALTIMORE					
BIRMINGHAM					
BOSTON					
BUFFALO	16,332	14,973	14,973	14,295	14,295
CHARLOTTE					
CINCINNATI				15,842	16,355
CLEVELAND	20,778	17,481	17,981	10,500	15,570
COLUMBUS	20,259	-	17,763	-	15,579
DALLAS				16,488	18,744
DENVER				-	18,240
DETROIT					
EL PASO	17,087	12,038	15,446	10,981	13,925
FORT WORTH				13,975	16,263
HONOLULU	23,316			14,652	21,372
HOUSTON	20,112			-	17,556
INDIANAPOLIS				12,437	-
JACKSONVILLE				-	13,188
JERSEY CITY	20,980	17,880	18,880	15,151	16,151
KANSAS CITY		16,908	19,536	10,908	16,068
LONG BEACH					
MEMPHIS	-	14,844	-	12,228	-
MIAMI					
MINNEAPOLIS	21,156	22,932	-	19,056	22,068

Salary

	Lieutenant of Detectives		Sergeant of Detectives		Detectives	
	Maximum (\$)		Minimum (\$)	Maximum (\$)	Minimum (\$)	Maximum (\$)
NEW ORLEANS	21,492		10,860	15,276	10,673	13,848
NEWARK	18,129		15,407	16,354	12,980	14,730
NORFOLK	18,240		10,872	15,840	9,984	13,800
OAKLAND						
OMAHA	17,868		15,756	16,368	12,216	14,868
PHILADELPHIA	20,493		17,230	17,977	16,324	17,030
PHOENIX	21,881		14,102	18,366	-	15,537
PITTSBURGH	17,424				-	15,840
PORTLAND	25,453		19,405	21,886	19,405	21,886
ROCHESTER						
SACRAMENTO						
ST. LOUIS						
ST. PAUL						
SAN DIEGO	23,016		16,488	19,908	14,292	17,256
SAN FRANCISCO					20,814	21,864
SAN JOSE						
SEATTLE			19,392	21,600	17,688	19,056
TAMPA					13,282	13,856
TOLEDO	20,103		16,213	17,634	-	15,408
TUCSON	21,828		15,504	18,852	13,392	15,504
TULSA	19,344		15,036	16,404	13,620	15,036
WASHINGTON	24,285		17,507	21,885	16,112	20,946
WICHITA	15,521				9,866	13,087

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

44a

Court Time Compensation

AKRON	compensatory time
ALBUQUERQUE	time and 1/2
ATLANTA	compensatory time
AUSTIN	time and 1/2
BALTIMORE	time and 1/2, 2 hrs. min.
BIRMINGHAM	straight time
BOSTON	time and 1/2
BUFFALO	time and 1/2, 4 hrs. min.
CHARLOTTE	straight time, 2 hrs. min.
CINCINNATI	compensatory time, 3 hrs. min.; 1-1/2 compensatory time after 1100 hrs.
CLEVELAND	compensatory time
COLUMBUS	time and 1/2 over 40 hrs.; double time on 2nd day off
DALLAS	time and 1/2
DENVER	3 hrs. pay per appearance, maximum 6 hrs.
DETROIT	minimum 4-1/2 hrs. (converted) paid at 1-1/2 over 3 hrs.
EL PASO	time and 1/2, 3 hrs. min.
FORT WORTH	time and 1/2, 2 hrs. min.
HONOLULU	time and 1/2, compensatory time or pay
HOUSTON	time and 1/2
INDIANAPOLIS	straight time, depending on availability of funds
JACKSONVILLE	time and 1/2
JERSEY CITY	time and 1/2
KANSAS CITY	time and 1/2, 2 hrs. min.
LONG BEACH	time and 1/2, cash or compensatory time
MEMPHIS	compensatory time
MIAMI	time and 1/2, pay or compensatory time
MINNEAPOLIS	4 hrs. compensatory time

Court Time Compensation

NEW ORLEANS	time and 1/2
NEWARK	straight time, min. 3 hrs.
NORFOLK	\$5 first hr. then hourly rate, max. \$12 for all over 1 hr.
OAKLAND	time and 1/2
OMAHA	time and 1/2 or 2 hrs. straight time, whichever is greater
PHILADELPHIA	time and 1/2, min. 4 hrs.
PHOENIX	time and 1/2 or compensatory time
PITTSBURGH	time and 1/2
PORTLAND	time and 1/2
ROCHESTER	straight time, min. 2 hrs.
SACRAMENTO	time and 1/2
ST. LOUIS	compensatory time, first 40 hrs.
ST. PAUL	time and 1/2
SAN DIEGO	time and 1/2 on callback (patrol officer and sergeant only)
SAN FRANCISCO	straight time or compensatory time, 4 hrs. day
SAN JOSE	time and 1/2
SEATTLE	straight time or compensatory time, min. 4 hrs.
TAMPA	variable scale with time and 1/2 over rank requirements
TOLEDO	time and 1/2 or compensatory time and 1/2
TUCSON	time and 1/2 or compensatory time (if used within one month)
TULSA	time and 1/2 or compensatory time
WASHINGTON	compensatory time for first appearance; after that, time and 1/2
WICHITA	time and 1/2, min. 2 hrs.

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

44b

Overtime Compensation

AKRON	time and 1/2
ALBUQUERQUE	time and 1/2
ATLANTA	compensatory time
AUSTIN	time and 1/2
BALTIMORE	time and 1/2
BIRMINGHAM	straight time
BOSTON	time and 1/2 (holidays double time)
BUFFALO	time and 1/2, 4 hours min.
CHARLOTTE	compensatory time
CINCINNATI	time and 1/2
CLEVELAND	compensatory time
COLUMBUS	time and 1/2 over 40 hours; double time 2nd day off
DALLAS	time and 1/2
DENVER	time and 1/2 or compensatory time at chief's discretion
DETROIT	time and 1/2
EL PASO	time and 1/2
FORT WORTH	time and 1/2
HONOLULU	time and 1/2; compensatory time or pay
HOUSTON	time and 1/2 or compensatory time and 1/2
INDIANAPOLIS	straight time, depending on availability of funds
JACKSONVILLE	time and 1/2
JERSEY CITY	time and 1/2
KANSAS CITY	time and 1/2
LONG BEACH	time and 1/2, cash or compensatory time
MEMPHIS	time and 1/2 over 50 hrs.
MIAMI	time and 1/2, pay or compensatory time
MINNEAPOLIS	time and 1/2 compensatory

44b

Overtime Compensation

NEW ORLEANS	time and 1/2
NEWARK	time and 1/2
NORFOLK	compensatory time and straight time
OAKLAND	time and 1/2
OMAHA	time and 1/2 or 2 hrs. straight time, whichever is greater
PHILADELPHIA	time and 1/2
PHOENIX	time and 1/2 or compensatory time
PITTSBURGH	time and 1/2
PORTLAND	time and 1/2
ROCHESTER	time and 1/2 except training, which is straight time
SACRAMENTO	time and 1/2
ST. LOUIS	straight time
ST. PAUL	time and 1/2
SAN DIEGO	time and 1/2 or compensatory time
SAN FRANCISCO	straight time or compensatory time
SAN JOSE	time and 1/2
SEATTLE	time and 1/2 or compensatory time
TAMPA	time and 1/2
TOLDEO	time and 1/2 or compensatory time and 1/2
TUCSON	time and 1/2 or compensatory time (if used within one month)
TULSA	time and 1/2 or compensatory time
WASHINGTON	same as court time if off-duty; if tour of duty continued, then compensatory time
WICHITA	time and 1/2 over 160 hrs. in 28-day pay period

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

45a

Procedures for Promotion to Detective

	Written Examination	Oral Interview	Interview By	Assessment Center	Psychological Evaluation	Performance Evaluation	Appointment By
AKRON							Chief
ALBUQUERQUE		X	Det. Super.			X	
ATLANTA	Not Available						
AUSTIN	Not Applicable						
BALTIMORE	X		C.I.D.				Commissioner
BIRMINGHAM	Not Applicable						
BOSTON		X				X	Commander
BUFFALO							Commissioner
CHARLOTTE	Not Applicable					X	
CINCINNATI	X					X	
CLEVELAND							Chief of Police
COLUMBUS						X	Dir. Public Safety
DALLAS	Not Applicable						
DENVER						X	Chief
DETROIT							
EL PASO	X						
FORT WORTH	X	X				X	
HONOLULU	X	X	Interview Board			X	
HOUSTON	X					X	
INDIANAPOLIS							Chief
JACKSONVILLE						X	City
JERSEY CITY							N/A
KANSAS CITY		X	Detective C.O.'s				N/A
LONG BEACH						X	
MEMPHIS	Not Applicable						
MIAMI	Not Applicable						
MINNEAPOLIS	X	X				X	

45a

Procedures for Promotion to Detective

	Written Examination	Oral Interview	Interview By	Assessment Center	Psychological Evaluation	Performance Evaluation	Appointment By
NEW ORLEANS	Not Applicable						Police Director
NEWARK							
NORFOLK						X	
OAKLAND	Not Applicable						Gen. Invest. Bur. Cmdr.
OMAHA	Not Applicable						
PHILADELPHIA	X						
PHOENIX							
PITTSBURGH	X						
PORTLAND	X						
ROCHESTER		X					
SACRAMENTO	Not Applicable						
ST. LOUIS	Not Applicable						
ST. PAUL	Not Applicable						C.O. & Chief of Det.
SAN DIEGO		X					
SAN FRANCISCO	X						
SAN JOSE	Not Applicable						
SEATTLE	X						
TAMPA							
TOLEDO						X	Chief
TUCSON	X						
TULSA	X						
WASHINGTON	X						Chief
WICHITA	X						

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

45b

Procedures for Promotion to Sergeant

	Written Examination	Oral Interview	Interview By	Assessment Center	Psychological Evaluation	Performance Evaluation	Other (Specify)
AKRON	X					X	
ALBUQUERQUE	X	X	Int. Ext. & Board		X	X	
ATLANTA	Not Applicable						
AUSTIN	X					X	Efficiency Score
BALTIMORE	X	X				X	Seniority
BIRMINGHAM	X					X	
BOSTON	X	X	Panel of Dept. Eval.	X	X		
BUFFALO	Not Applicable						
CHARLOTTE		X				X	
CINCINNATI	X					X	
CLEVELAND	X						
COLUMBUS	X						Dir. Pub. Safety
DALLAS	X						
DENVER	X	X				X	
DETROIT	X	X	3 Members Other PD's			X	Seniority, Coll., Vets.
EL PASO	X						
FORT WORTH	X	X				X	Longevity
HONOLULU	X	X	Interview Board			X	Training & Exper.
HOUSTON	X					X	Seniority
INDIANAPOLIS	X	X				X	
JACKSONVILLE	X						
JERSEY CITY	X						
KANSAS CITY	X			X			
LONG BEACH	X	X	3 Member Board				Dept. Appraisal
MEMPHIS	Not Applicable						
MIAMI	X				X		
MINNEAPOLIS	X	X				X	

Procedures for Promotion to Sergeant

	Written Examination	Oral Interview	Interview By	Assessment Center	Psychological Evaluation	Performance Evaluation	Other (Specify)
NEW ORLEANS	X						
NEWARK	X						Longevity
NORFOLK	X	X	Chief Dep. & Maj.				
OAKLAND	X	X				X	
OMAHA	X	X					
PHILADELPHIA	X				X	X	Physical Exam
PHOENIX	X	X	Bd. Capt. & Lt.				
PITTSBURGH	X						
PORTLAND	X	X					
ROCHESTER	X						
SACRAMENTO	X	X					
ST. LOUIS	X					X	
ST. PAUL	X					X	
SAN DIEGO	X	X				X	CO & Recommendations
SAN FRANCISCO	X						
SAN JOSE	X	X					
SEATTLE	X					X	
TAMPA	X					X	
TOLEDO	X	X				X	Seniority
TUCSON	X	X	Local Civilians				
TULSA	X					X	
WASHINGTON	X					X	
WICHITA	Not Applicable						

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

45c

Procedures for Promotion to Lieutenant

	Written Examination	Oral Interview	Interview By	Assessment Center	Psychological Evaluation	Performance Evaluation	Other (Specify)
AKRON	X					X	
ALBUQUERQUE	X	X	Int. & Ext. Bds.		X	X	
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A				
AUSTIN	X					X	Longevity
BALTIMORE	X	X				X	Seniority*
BIRMINGHAM	X					X	
BOSTON	X	X	Dept. Evaluators	X		X	
BUFFALO	X						
CHARLOTTE	N/A	N/A	N/A				
CINCINNATI	X					X	
CLEVELAND	X						
COLUMBUS	X						
DALLAS	X						
DENVER	X	X				X	
DETROIT	X	X	3 Mem. other PD's			X	
EL PASO	X	X					
FORT WORTH	X	X				X	
HONOLULU	X	X	Interview Board			X	
HOUSTON	X					X	Seniority
INDIANAPOLIS	X	X				X	
JACKSONVILLE	X						
JERSEY CITY	X						
KANSAS CITY	N/A	N/A	N/A				
LONG BEACH	X	X	3 Member Board			X	
MEMPHIS	N/A	N/A	N/A				
MIAMI	X				X		
MINNEAPOLIS	X	X				X	

45c

Procedures for Promotion to Lieutenant

	Written Examination	Oral Interview	Interview By	Assessment Center	Psychological Evaluation	Performance Evaluation	Other (Specify)
NEW ORLEANS	X					X	
NEWARK	X						
NORFOLK	X	X	Ch., Dep., Ch., Maj.				
OAKLAND	X	X				X	
OMAHA	X	X			X	X	Physical Exam
PHILADELPHIA	X						
PHOENIX	X	X	Bd. of Majs. & Cpts.				
PITTSBURGH	X						
PORTLAND	X	X					
ROCHESTER	X						
SACRAMENTO	X	X					
ST. LOUIS	X					X	
ST. PAUL	X	X				X	
SAN DIEGO	X	X				X	
SAN FRANCISCO	X						
SAN JOSE	X	X					
SEATTLE	X	X	Civil Service			X	
TAMPA	X					X	
TOLEDO	X	X				X	
TUCSON	X	X	Local Civilians			X	
TULSA	X					X	
WASHINGTON	X					X	
WICHITA	X	X				X	

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

45d

Procedures for Promotion to Captain

	Written Examination	Oral Interview	Interview By	Assessment Center	Psychological Evaluation	Performance Evaluation	Other (Specify)
AKRON	X					X	
ALBUQUERQUE						X	App't. by Chief
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A				
AUSTIN	X						
BALTIMORE	X	X				X	Longevity
BIRMINGHAM	X	X				X	Seniority*
BOSTON	X	X	Dept. Evaluation	X		X	
BUFFALO	X						
CHARLOTTE		X				X	
CINCINNATI	X					X	
CLEVELAND	X					X	
COLUMBUS	X						
DALLAS	X						
DENVER	X	X				X	
DETROIT	N/A	N/A	N/A				
EL PASO	X	X					
FORT WORTH	X	X				X	
HONOLULU	X	X	Interview Board			X	
HOUSTON	X					X	
INDIANAPOLIS	X	X				X	Seniority
JACKSONVILLE	X						
JERSEY CITY	X						
KANSAS CITY	X			X			
LONG BEACH	X	X					
MEMPHIS	N/A	N/A	N/A				
MIAMI	X				X		
MINNEAPOLIS	X	X					

Procedures for Promotion to Captain

	Written Examination	Oral Interview	Interview By	Assessment Center	Psychological Evaluation	Performance Evaluation	Other (Specify)
NEW ORLEANS	X	X				X	
NEWARK	X						
NORFOLK	X	X	Ch., Dep. Ch., Maj.				
OAKLAND	X	X				X	
OMAHA	X	X			X	X	Physical Exam
PHILADELPHIA	X	X					
PHOENIX	X	X	Bd. of Ass't Ch. & Maj.				
PITTSBURGH	X						
PORTLAND	X	X					
ROCHESTER	X						
SACRAMENTO	X	X					
ST. LOUIS	X					X	
ST. PAUL	X					X	
SAN DIEGO	X	X				X	
SAN FRANCISCO	X						
SAN JOSE	X	X					
SEATTLE	X	X	Civil Service			X	
TAMPA	X					X	
TOLEDO	X	X				X	
TUCSON	X	X	Local civilians			X	
TULSA	X	X				X	
WASHINGTON	X	X	Bd. designated by Ch.			X	
WICHITA						X	

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

46

Written Promotional Exams Provided by

	Federal Civil Service Commission	State Civil Service	City Civil Service	Police Department	City Personnel Department	Other (Specify)
AKRON			X			
ALBUQUERQUE					X	
ATLANTA	-	-	-	-	-	-
AUSTIN		X				
BALTIMORE			X			
BIRMINGHAM			X			
BOSTON			X			
BUFFALO		X	X			
CHARLOTTE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CINCINNATI					X	
CLEVELAND			X			
COLUMBUS			X			
DALLAS			X			
DENVER			X			
DETROIT				X		
EL PASO				X		
FORT WORTH					X	
HONOLULU			X			
HOUSTON		X	X			
INDIANAPOLIS				X		
JACKSONVILLE			X		X	
JERSEY CITY		X				
KANSAS CITY				X		
LONG BEACH			X			
MEMPHIS	-	-	-	-	-	-
MIAMI			X			Univ. of Chicago
MINNEAPOLIS			X			

Written Promotional Exams Provided By:

	Federal Civil Service Commission	State Civil Service	City Civil Service	Police Department	City Personnel Department	Other (Specify)
NEW ORLEANS			X			
NEWARK		X				
NORFOLK			X			
OAKLAND			X			
OMAHA					X	
PHILADELPHIA					X	
PHOENIX				X	X	
PITTSBURGH			X			
PORTLAND			X			
ROCHESTER		X				
SACRAMENTO						Varies
ST. LOUIS				X		
ST. PAUL			X			
SAN DIEGO			X		X	
SAN FRANCISCO			X			
SAN JOSE				X	X	
SEATTLE			X			
TAMPA			X			
TOLEDO			X			
TUCSON			X	X		
TULSA					X	
WASHINGTON	X					
WICHITA				X		

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

	47a	47b	47c	47d	48
	Police Officer To Detective	Time in Grade for Promotion (In Years) P.O. & Det. To Sergeant	Sergeant to Lieutenant	Lieutenant To Captain	Number of Hours In Workweek
AKRON	0	2	2	2	40
ALBUQUERQUE	N/A	2	2	N/A	N/A
ATLANTA	0	2	3	5	40
AUSTIN	-	2	2	2	40
BALTIMORE	0	3	1	1	40
BIRMINGHAM	-	3	1	1	N/A
BOSTON	1	3	1	1	40
BUFFALO	2	-	3	1	42.5
CHARLOTTE	-	3	-	1	41.25
CINCINNATI	3	3	1	1	40
CLEVELAND	0	1	1	1	40
COLUMBUS	0	5	1	1	40
DALLAS	-	3	1	1	40
DENVER	3	4	1	1	40
DETROIT	-	2	1	-	40
EL PASO	2.5	3	1	2	40
FORT WORTH	2	2	2	2	40
HONOLULU	5	5	3	1	N/A
HOUSTON	2	2	2	2	40
INDIANAPOLIS	0	5	2	2	40
JACKSONVILLE	2	4	1	1	40
JERSEY CITY	0	Vets-1 Others-3	1	1	40
KANSAS CITY	1	4	-	-	40
LONG BEACH	-	3	2	1	40
MEMPHIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	40
MIAMI	0	2-3	2	2	40
MINNEAPOLIS	-	5	2	2	40

	47a	47b	47c	47d	48
	Police Officer To Detective	Time in Grade for Promotion (In Years)	Sergeant To Lieutenant	Lieutenant To Captain	Number of Hours In Workweek
		P.O. & Det. To Sergeant			
NEW ORLEANS	-	3	2	2	40
NEWARK	0	Veterans-1 Others-3	1	1	40
NORFOLK	-	3	2	2	45.5
OAKLAND	N/A	3	2	2	42.5
OMAHA	0	4	2	2	40
PHILADELPHIA	1	2	1	1	40
PHOENIX	0	4(3 w/36 hrs. Coll.)	2(1 w/36 hrs. Coll.)	2(1 w/36 hrs. Coll.)	40
PITTSBURGH	4	4	4	4	40
PORTLAND	4.5	4.5	2	2	40
ROCHESTER	2	3	1	1	38.9
SACRAMENTO	2	3	2	2	40
ST. LOUIS	3	3	1	1	40
ST. PAUL	3	4	4	4	
SAN DIEGO	3	4	2	2	40
SAN FRANCISCO	3	1	.5	.5	40
SAN JOSE	-	4	3	2	40
SEATTLE	0	3	2	2	40
TAMPA	2	3	1	1	42.5
TOLEDO	0	3	2	2	40
TUCSON	2	3	1	1	40
TULSA	4	1	1	1	40
WASHINGTON	2	3	1	1	40
WICHITA	315 with B.A.	-	5 with B.A.	0	40

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

49

	Number of Regular Patrol Beats Per Shift (Motor)								Number of Regular Patrol Beats Per Shift (Foot)							
	Day		Evening		Night		Other		Day		Evening		Night		Other	
	1-Off	2-Off	1-Off	2-Off	1-Off	2-Off	1-Off	2-Off	1-Off	2-Off	1-Off	2-Off	1-Off	2-Off	1-Off	2-Off
AKRON	8	3	0	11	0	11	0	11	5	0	0	11	0	11	0	11
ALBUQUERQUE	31	8	48	8	43	5	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
ATLANTA	15	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	50	0	40	0	40	0	20	0	0	4	0	2	0	2	0	0
BALTIMORE	133	36	184	45	133	36	75	22	147	0	157	0	20	0	1	0
BIRMINGHAM	34	7	8	42	7	25	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
BOSTON	0	92	0	122	0	0	0	66	30	80	0	0	0	0	0	0
BUFFALO	0	40	0	50	0	50	-	-	Varies		Mostly		Motorized		-	-
CHARLOTTE	0	10	0	10	0	10	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
CINCINNATI	60	2	59	5	68	7	-	-	2	0	2	0	2	0	-	-
CLEVELAND	0	50	0	50	0	50	0	50	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
COLUMBUS	56	14	58	18	59	19	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	2	-	-
DALLAS	85	37	101	54	47	40	-	-	7	0	7	0	3	0	-	-
DENVER	45	18	0	63	1	14	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
DETROIT	30	120	18	125	0	110	0	0	0	37	0	32	0	20	-	-
EL PASO	15	11	3	23	0	26	-	-	0	3	0	3	0	0	-	-
FORT WORTH	32	32	-	46	16	39	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
HONOLULU	119	0	119	0	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	0
HOUSTON	109	0	0	109	0	109	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
INDIANAPOLIS	Team		Policies		-		Number of Beats		Varies							
JACKSONVILLE	81	0	81	0	81	0	-	-	4	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
JERSEY CITY	All Evening and Night Beats (Motor) - 100% 2-Off;								All Foot Beats - 100% 1-Off							
KANSAS CITY	69	0	69	0	69	0	-	-	5	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
LONG BEACH	N/A - Varies According to Calls For Services															
MEMPHIS	8	32	8	44	8	32	-	-	0	4	0	5	0	0	-	-
MIAMI	15	15	15	19	15	15	0	0	16	0	6	0	0	0	0	1
MINNEAPOLIS	0	27	0	27	0	27	14	15	15	0	4	0	2	0	0	0

	Number of Regular Patrol Beats Per Shift (Motor)								Number of Regular Patrol Beats Per Shift (Foot)							
	Day		Evening		Night		Other		Day		Evening		Night		Other	
	1-Off	2-Off	1-Off	2-Off	1-Off	2-Off	1-Off	2-Off	1-Off	2-Off	1-Off	2-Off	1-Off	2-Off	1-Off	2-Off
NEW ORLEANS	50	50	47	50	0	51	-	-	2	1	1	3	0	0	-	-
NEWARK		All	Motor Beats - 100% 2-Off;							All	Foot	Beats - 100%	1-Off			
NORFOLK	41	0	41	0	41	0	-	-	1	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
OAKLAND	35	0	35	0	35	0	-	-	17	0	0	0	2	0	-	-
OMAHA	52	0	48	10	33	10	-	-	1	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
PHILADELPHIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
PHOENIX	57	13	57	13	57	13	-	-	0	10	0	5	0	0	-	-
PITTSBURGH	0	61	0	61	0	61	-	-	0	21	0	97	0	28	-	-
PORTLAND	26	6	40	12	20	7	-	-	0	2	0	4	0	0	-	-
ROCHESTER	25	0	35	0	0	42	0	14	5	0	5	0	0	6	0	0
SACRAMENTO	28	2	14	25	0	19	-	-	3	0	2	1	2	0	-	-
ST. LOUIS	80	15	77	23	68	22	9	0	12	0	12	0	0	0	0	0
ST. PAUL	20	8	8	25	6	12	-	-	5	0	3	1	0	0	-	-
SAN DIEGO	49	15	49	15	49	15	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
SAN FRANCISCO	42	36	29	66	23	38	-	-	13	1	0	6	2	1	-	-
SAN JOSE	93	0	117	0	63	0	-	-	2	0	2	0	0	0	-	-
SEATTLE	49	9	36	30	19	52	-	-	0	0	4	4	4	8	-	-
TAMPA	26	10	27	16	20	8	2	0	3	0	3	1	2	0	-	-
TOLEDO	17	16	19	22	19	16	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
TUCSON	24	0	24	0	24	0	-	-	2	0	0	1	0	0	-	-
TULSA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A
WASHINGTON	50	81	46	75	45	76	-	-	0	7	0	4	0	2	-	-
WICHITA	35	0	45	0	35	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

50

51a

	Number of Accident Investigation Personnel				Number of Traffic Enforcement Personnel, Law Enforcement			
	Day	Evening	Night	Other	Solo Motorcycles	3-Wheel Motorcycles	Motor Scooters	Radar Units
AKRON	6	6	6	26	11	11	10	3
ALBUQUERQUE	-	-	-	-	21	0	0	0
ATLANTA	-	-	-	-	10	5	0	0
AUSTIN	5	0	0	0	6	4	0	0
BALTIMORE	5	5	5	0	36	24	0	16
BIRMINGHAM	3	3	0	0	18	0	21	10
BOSTON	1	1	1	0	60	2	0	0
BUFFALO	4	4	2	0	12	4	20	4
CHARLOTTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CINCINNATI	-	-	-	-	0	7	0	10
CLEVELAND	12	12	12	0	0	0	0	4
COLUMBUS	6	5	3	0	0	21	0	21
DALLAS	12	12	5	0	30	11	0	35
DENVER	4	0	8	10	26	16	0	6
DETROIT	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	0	53	Varies
EL PASO	9	10	11	0	22	7	0	3
FORT WORTH	26	22	0	0	13	3	12	7
HONOLULU	10	10	10	0	36	6	0	8
HOUSTON	47	59	34	0	43	20	0	24
INDIANAPOLIS	6	6	3	2	35	15	0	6
JACKSONVILLE	-	-	-	-	11	13	1	9
JERSEY CITY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KANSAS CITY	5	5	5	0	35	0	3	8
LONG BEACH	-	-	-	-	10	5	0	2
MEMPHIS	10	12	10	0	32	0	10	0
MIAMI	2	2	2	0	40	32	0	-
MINNEAPOLIS	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	2

50

Number of Accident
Investigation Personnel
Day Evening Night Other

NEW ORLEANS	14	5	3	0
NEWARK	-	-	-	-
NORFOLK	-	-	-	-
OAKLAND	4	0	0	0
OMAHA	6	6	3	0
PHILADELPHIA	Total of 58			
PHOENIX	-	-	-	-
PITTSBURGH	-	-	-	-
PORTLAND	30	35	10	0
ROCHESTER	-	-	-	-
SACRAMENTO	-	-	-	-
ST. LOUIS	-	-	-	-
ST. PAUL	6	0	0	0
SAN DIEGO	12	17	8	42
SAN FRANCISCO	13	15	3	0
SAN JOSE	15	0	0	0
SEATTLE	8	7	0	0
TAMPA	-	-	-	-
TOLEDO	2	2	2	2
TUCSON	6	8	4	2
TULSA	42	37	9	0
WASHINGTON	4	3	2	0
WICHITA	3	4	2	0

51a

Number of Traffic Enforcement Personnel, Law Enforcement
Solo 3-Wheel Motor Radar
Motorcycles Motorcycles Scooters Units

NEW ORLEANS	46	0	28	1
NEWARK	28	0	0	6
NORFOLK	0	5	0	0
OAKLAND	30	0	0	0
OMAHA	31	(Solo and Car)	0	2
PHILADELPHIA	56		12	0
PHOENIX	60	2	0	5
PITTSBURGH	35	10	2	0
PORTLAND	30	0	0	4
ROCHESTER	9	15	0	2
SACRAMENTO	41	1	0	7
ST. LOUIS	15	37	7	9
ST. PAUL	2	8	0	7
SAN DIEGO	31	0	0	8
SAN FRANCISCO	47	9	0	0
SAN JOSE	30	0	0	23
SEATTLE	30	0	0	10
TAMPA	-	-	-	-
TOLEDO	0	2	4	10
TUCSON	28	5	0	0
TULSA	4	10	1	16
WASHINGTON	0	0	2	18
WICHITA	0	0	0	16

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

	51b				52a	52b	52c	52d
	Number of Traffic Enforcement Personnel, Civilian				Investigations Personnel at Headquarters			
	Solo Motorcycles	3-Wheel Motorcycles	Motor Scooters	Radar Units	Criminal	Vice	Intelligence	Hit & Run
AKRON	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ALBUQUERQUE	0	2	0	0	98	5	7	3
ATLANTA	8	0	0	0	128	19	27	7
AUSTIN	-	-	-	-	110	5	0	0
BALTIMORE	-	-	-	-	279	(Incl. Vice & Intelligence)		0
BIRMINGHAM	0	0	6	0	50	16	0	1
BOSTON	-	-	-	-	80	16	2	0
BUFFALO	-	-	-	-	60	20	8	4
CHARLOTTE	0	0	2	0	15	15	0	0
CINCINNATI	-	-	-	-	31	22	10	3
CLEVELAND	-	-	-	-	221	7	31	9
COLUMBUS	-	-	-	-	95	20	13	14
DALLAS	0	4	0	0	139	41	16	10
DENVER	0	0	22 (Jeeps)	0	94	35	16	23
DETROIT	-	-	-	-	380	216	25	2
EL PASO	-	-	-	-	86	8	2	9
FORT WORTH	0	0	16	0	40	9	6	6
HONOLULU	-	-	-	-	119	71	13	30
HOUSTON	-	-	-	-	1	54	26	18
INDIANAPOLIS	-	-	-	-	20	15	6	2
JACKSONVILLE	-	-	-	-	122	31	15	6
JERSEY CITY	-	-	-	-	135	12	12	0
KANSAS CITY	0	31	0	0	140	13	14	0
LONG BEACH	0	0	20	0	75	45	10	5
MEMPHIS	-	-	-	-	178	20	12	33
MIAMI	-	-	-	-	100	18	14	3
MINNEAPOLIS	-	-	-	-	155	9	3	4

51b

Number of Traffic Enforcement Personnel, Civilian

	Solo Motorcycles	3-Wheel Motorcycles	Motor Scooters	Radar Unit
--	---------------------	------------------------	-------------------	---------------

52a

52b

52c

52d

Investigations Personnel at Headquarters

Criminal	Vice	Intelligence	Hit & Run
----------	------	--------------	-----------

NEW ORLEANS	0	0	7	0	136	21	14	5
NEWARK	-	-	-	-	131	37	9	8
NORFOLK	-	-	-	-	106	24	7	3
OAKLAND	-	-	-	-	91	14	17	3
OMAHA	6	0	9	0	92	17	4	0
PHILADELPHIA	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
PHOENIX	0	7	0	0	168	31	14	10
PITTSBURGH	-	-	-	-	139	35	0	0
PORTLAND	-	-	-	-	88	15	12	16
ROCHESTER	-	-	-	-	40	29	3	4
SACRAMENTO	-	-	-	-	94	3	3	2
ST. LOUIS	-	-	-	-	113	23	21	0
ST. PAUL	-	-	-	-	86	6	0	5
SAN DIEGO	0	0	16	0	109	24	15	7
SAN FRANCISCO	0	90	0	0	120	41	12	14
SAN JOSE	0	0	8	0	119	0	15	13
SEATTLE	0	43	0	0	134	38	10	15
TAMPA	-	-	-	-	62	26	3	3
TOLEDO	0	0	2	0	94	22	4	3
TUCSON	-	-	-	-	81	5	17	2
TULSA	-	-	-	-	62	8	4	2
WASHINGTON	0	0	2-5 Cadets	0	205	96	34	5
WICHITA	-	-	-	-	72	9	0	2

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

	52a	52b	52c	52d	53		54a	54b	54c	54d
	Investigations		Personnel (Decentralized)		Low Priority Case Procedure		Day	Number of Mobile Evidence Technicians		
	Criminal	Vice	Intelligence	Hit & Run	Yes	No		Evening	Night	Other
AKRON	-	-	-	-	X		-	-	-	-
ALBUQUERQUE	-	-	-	-	X		7	7	7	0
ATLANTA	-	-	-	-		X	2	3	1	0
AUSTIN	-	-	-	-	X		7	1	1	0
BALTIMORE	-	-	-	-	X		5	5	5	0
BIRMINGHAM	16	0	0	0	X		4	3	4	0
BOSTON	128	0	0	0		X	1	0	0	0
BUFFALO	120	0	0	0		X	4	2	2	0
CHARLOTTE	40	0	0	0	X		12	12	12	0
CINCINNATI	105	0	0	0	X		-	-	-	-
CLEVELAND	0	40	0	0	X		12	12	12	0
COLUMBUS	-	-	-	-	X		3	3	3	0
DALLAS	105	0	0	0		X	5	5	4	0
DENVER	45	4	12	0	X		4	4	2	0
DETROIT	205	16	0	0		X	8	10	3	0
EL PASO	8	0	0	0		X	-	-	-	-
FORT WORTH	28	0	0	0	X		4	4	3	0
HONOLULU	-	-	-	-		X	3	3	3	0
HOUSTON	5	0	0	0	X		6	6	6	0
INDIANAPOLIS	-	-	-	-	X		1	1	1	0
JACKSONVILLE	-	-	-	-	X		4	5	4	0
JERSEY CITY	-	-	-	-		X	2	2	2	0
KANSAS CITY	41	0	0	7	X		8	7	7	0
LONG BEACH	-	-	-	-	X		2	2	0	0
MEMPHIS	-	-	-	-	X		7	8	6	0
MIAMI	-	-	-	-	X		2	3	2	1
MINNEAPOLIS	23	0	0	0			6	4	4	4

	52a	52b	52c	52d	53		54a	54b	54c	54d
	Investigations Personnel (Decentralized)				Low Priority Case Procedure		Number of Mobile Evidence Technicians			
	Criminal	Vice	Intelligence	Hit & Run	Yes	No	Day	Evening	Night	Other
NEW ORLEANS	-	-	-	-	X		3	3	3	0
NEWARK	0	21	0	0	X		11	4	4	0
NORFOLK	-	-	-	-		X	2	2	2	0
OAKLAND	-	-	-	-	X		4	4	4	0
OMAHA	-	-	-	-	X		1 Off. 3	Civl. 4	3	0
PHILADELPHIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		X	6	6	6	0
PHOENIX	-	-	-	-	X		5	4	4	0
PITTSBURGH	-	-	-	-		X	6	2	0	0
PORTLAND	-	-	-	-	X		3	4	2	0
ROCHESTER	56	0	0	0	X		4	3	2-3	0
SACRAMENTO	-	-	-	-	X		6	5	4	0
ST. LOUIS	136	0	0	0		X	3	3	3	0
ST. PAUL	-	-	-	-	X		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAN DIEGO	40	0	0	0	X		4	on call	on call	0
SAN FRANCISCO	-	-	-	-	X		4	2	1 on call	0
SAN JOSE	-	-	-	-	X		4	2	2	on call
SEATTLE	30	0	0	0	X		-	-	-	-
TAMPA	-	-	-	-		X	4	4	4	0
TOLEDO	8	0	0	0	X		2	1	0	0
TUCSON	13	0	0	1	X		3	2	1	0
TULSA	-	-	-	-	X		3	3	3	0
WASHINGTON	217	96	0	0	X		8	6	3	0
WICHITA	-	-	-	-	X		2	2	2	0

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

	55 Team Policing		56 Decoys, Etc.		57 % of Manpower Shortages				58a Patrol Bureau Sergeants			
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Day	Evening	Night	Other	Day	Evening	Night	Other
AKRON		X	N/A	N/A	3	3	3	0	5	5	5	10
ALBUQUERQUE	X		X		0	0	0	0	8	10	8	0
ATLANTA	X		X		0	0	0	0	19	16	16	0
AUSTIN		X		X	20	20	20	0	7	7	7	2
BALTIMORE		X	X		0	0	0	0	58	67	52	as required
BIRMINGHAM		X	X		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15	20	12	0
BOSTON		X	X		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	40	60	0	0
BUFFALO		X		X	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0
CHARLOTTE	X		X		1	2	2	0	20	10	10	20
CINCINNATI	X		X		22	6	6	0	17	16	18	0
CLEVELAND		X	X		1	2	6	1	25	24	24	12
COLUMBUS		X	X		25	15	15	0	19	20	18	0
DALLAS		X	X		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	44	50	30	17
DENVER		X	X		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	12	12	12	0
DETROIT	X		X		4	5.5	4	0	133	87	60	0
EL PASO		X		X	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	9	8	10	0
FORT WORTH	X		X		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	7	7	0
HONOLULU		X	X		10	11	10	0	28	28	28	0
HOUSTON		X	X		5	2	2	0	28	27	25	0
INDIANAPOLIS	X			X	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE		X	X		10	10	10	0	12	12	12	0
JERSEY CITY		X	X		3.5-4	3.5-4	3.5-4	0	9	9	9	0
KANSAS CITY		X	X		5	5	5	0	39	43	35	3
LONG BEACH	X		X		0	0	0	0	12	15	10	0
MEMPHIS		X	X		12	12	5	12	12	0	0	0
MIAMI		X	X		9	7	9	0	16	17	14	14
MINNEAPOLIS	X		X		1	2	2	0	24	24	24	3

	55 Team Policing		56 Decoys, Etc.		57 % of Manpower Shortages				58a Patrol Bureau Sergeants			
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Day	Evening	Night	Other	Day	Evening	Night	Other
NEW ORLEANS		X	X		25	25	25	0	33	27	25	3
NEWARK		X	X		6.6	7.1	11.5	50	4	4	3	3
NORFOLK		X	X		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7	7	7	0
OAKLAND		X	X		31	18	18	0	6	6	6	0
OMAHA	X		X		10	10	10	0	9	9	8	0
PHILADELPHIA		X	X		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
PHOENIX		X	X		Below 5	0	Below 5	0	24	29	24	17
PITTSBURGH	X		X		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	28	26	23	0
PORTLAND		X	X		20	20	20	0	13	15	8	0
ROCHESTER	X		X		5 (Max.)	5 (Max.)	5 (Max.)	0	9	13	9	0
SACRAMENTO	X		X		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	9	6	0
ST. LOUIS	X		X		15	15	15	15	26	26	26	5
ST. PAUL	X		X		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	10	10	0
SAN DIEGO	X		X		6	6	6	6	15	19	15	0
SAN FRANCISCO	X		X		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20	15	12	0
SAN JOSE		X	X		5	5	5	0	17	14	14	0
SEATTLE		X	X		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	13	16	16	2
TAMPA		X	X		0	0	0	0	10	12	6	2
TOLEDO	X		X		20	24	3	14	14	15	13	2
TUCSON	X			X	12	12	12	0	12	13	8	0
TULSA		X	X		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	10	7	6
WASHINGTON		X	X		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	136	101	101	0
WICHITA		X	X		10	10	10	0	-	-	-	-

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

58b

	Day	Patrol Evening	Bureau Night	Lieutenants Other
AKRON	2	1	1	2
ALBUQUERQUE	3	3	2	0
ATLANTA	6	5	5	0
AUSTIN	1	1	1	1
BALTIMORE	32	11	11	as req.
BIRMINGHAM	4	4	4	0
BOSTON	40	0	60	0
BUFFALO	20	20	20	0
CHARLOTTE	-	-	-	-
CINCINNATI	15	0	0	0
CLEVELAND	14	13	13	0
COLUMBUS	5	5	5	0
DALLAS	6	6	5	8
DENVER	4	4	4	0
DETROIT	46	25	16	0
EL PASO	5	4	3	0
FORT WORTH	6	1	0	0
HONOLULU	6	6	6	0
HOUSTON	4	6	5	0
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	4	4	4	0
JERSEY CITY	8	6	4	0
KANSAS CITY	-	-	-	-
LONG BEACH	2	2	2	4
MEMPHIS	8-16	12-20	8-16	0
MIAMI	3	3	3	2
MINNEAPOLIS	6	6	6	3

58c

	Day	Patrol Evening	Bureau Night	Captains * Other
	3	1	1	3
	1	1	1	0
	6	0	0	0
	1	1	1	1
	1	as req.	as req.	as req.
	4	4	0	0
	19	0	6	0
	18	10	10	0
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	5	1	1	0
	6	5	5	1
	1	1	1	0
	0	0	0	2
	4	0	0	0
	22	1	1	0
	3	0	0	0
	3	0	0	0
	5	1	1	0
	5	0	0	0
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	8	2	1	0
	5	5	5	7
	1	1	1	1
	4	4	4	0
	1	1	1	1
	7	1	0	0

* Detroit uses the rank of inspector rather than captain. In this and all subsequent tables, wherever "captain" appears it should be read as "inspector" for Detroit.

58b

	Day	Patrol Evening	Bureau Night	Lieutenants Other
NEW ORLEANS	11	7	9	5
NEWARK	6	3	2	3
NORFOLK	2	2	2	0
OAKLAND	2	2	2	0
OMAHA	2	2	2	0
PHILADELPHIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
PHOENIX	4	4	4	1
PITTSBURGH	9	12	8	0
PORTLAND	4	4	3	0
ROCHESTER	7	7	7	0
SACRAMENTO	4	4	4	0
ST. LOUIS	9	9	9	1
ST. PAUL	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAN DIEGO	5	6	5	0
SAN FRANCISCO	11	10	9	0
SAN JOSE	4	3	3	4
SEATTLE	4	4	4	1
TAMPA	4	4	4	0
TOLEDO	5	5	5	1
TUCSON	3	3	2	0
TULSA	4	2	2	0
WASHINGTON	44	33	33	0
WICHITA	7	8	7	0

58c

	Day	Patrol Evening	Bureau Night	Captains Other
	10	0	0	0
	7	0	0	1
	2	0	0	0
	1	1	1	1
	1	1	1	0
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	4	0	0	0
	1	1	1	0
	4	1	0	0
	7	1	1	0
	1	1	1	0
	9	9	1	1
	0	0	0	0
	3	1	1	0
	10	0	0	0
	1	1	0	0
	1	1	1	2
	2	2	2	0
	2	1	1	0
	1	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
	12	8	8	0
	1	1	1	0

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

58d

Other High Ranks in Patrol Bureau

Other High Ranks in Patrol Bureau

	Rank	Day	Evening	Night	Other		Rank	Day	Evening	Night	Other
AKRON	Major	3	0	0	0						
ALBUQUERQUE											
ATLANTA	Major	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A						
AUSTIN											
BALTIMORE											
BIRMINGHAM	Deputy Chief	1	0	0	0						
BOSTON	Deputy Super.	23	0	0	0						
BUFFALO	Inspector	10	8	6	0						
CHARLOTTE	not stated	7	0	0	0						
CINCINNATI	Assistant Chief	1	0	0	0						
CLEVELAND	Deputy Inspector	5	0	0	0	Acting Deputy Insp.	0	1	0	0	
COLUMBUS	Deputy Chief	1	0	0	0						
DALLAS	not stated	0	0	0	6						
DENVER	Division Chief	1	0	0	0						
DETROIT	Commander	13	1	0	0						
EL PASO	not stated	1	0	0	0						
FORT WORTH	Deputy Chief	1	0	0	0						
HONOLULU	Major	4	0	0	-						
HOUSTON	Assistant Chief	1	0	0	0	Deputy Chief	3	0	0	0	
INDIANAPOLIS											
JACKSONVILLE											
JERSEY CITY	Deputy Chief	2	1	1	0						
KANSAS CITY	Major	5	0	0	0	Lieutenant Colonel	1	1	0	0	
LONG BEACH											
MEMPHIS	Inspector	4	0	0	0						
MIAMI	not stated	1	0	0	0						
MINNEAPOLIS	not stated	3	1	1	1						

Other High Ranks in Patrol Bureau

	Rank	Day	Evening	Night	Other
NEW ORLEANS	Major	1	0	0	0
NEWARK	Inspector	2	0	1	0
NORFOLK	Major	1	1	1	0
OAKLAND	Deputy Chief	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
OMAHA	Deputy Chief	1	0	0	0
PHILADELPHIA					
PHOENIX	Assistant Chief	1	0	0	0
PITTSBURGH	Inspector	9	0	0	0
PORTLAND	Deputy Chief	1	0	0	0
ROCHESTER	Major	4	0	0	0
SACRAMENTO	not stated	1	0	0	0
ST. LOUIS	Lieutenant Colonel	4	0	0	0
ST. PAUL	Deputy Chief	2	0	0	0
SAN DIEGO	Inspector	2	1	0	0
SAN FRANCISCO	Deputy Chief	4	0	0	0
SAN JOSE	Deputy Chief	1	0	0	0
SEATTLE	not stated	0	0	0	2
TAMPA	Major	1	0	0	0
TOLEDO					
TUCSON					
TULSA	not stated	1	0	0	0
WASHINGTON	Deputy Chief	1	0	0	0
WICHITA	Colonel	1	0	0	0

Other High Ranks in Patrol Bureau

	Rank	Day	Evening	Night	Other
	Deputy Chief	1	0	1	0
	Deputy Chief	1	0	0	0
	Major	2	1	1	0
	Deputy Chief	1			
	Major	0	1	0	0
	Captain	2	0	0	0
	Inspector	8	1	1	0

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

59

	Yes	No	Rotating Shifts			Other
			Fixed	Weekly	Monthly	
AKRON	X				X	
ALBUQUERQUE		X	X			
ATLANTA		X	X			
AUSTIN	X					
BALTIMORE	X					Every 28 days
BIRMINGHAM		X				Every 28 days
BOSTON		X				
BUFFALO	X					Days fixed, nights alternate
CHARLOTTE	X					Each of 10 police teams chooses its own schedule
CINCINNATI	X					Every 28 days
CLEVELAND	X				X	
COLUMBUS		X				
DALLAS		X				
DENVER		X				
DETROIT	X				X	
EL PASO	X				X	
FORT WORTH		X				
HONOLULU	X					Alternates 10 and 11 weeks
HOUSTON		X				
INDIANAPOLIS	X					Some fixed, some rotate--team policing
JACKSONVILLE	X				X	
JERSEY CITY	X		X			
KANSAS CITY		X				
LONG BEACH		X				
MEMPHIS		X				
MIAMI		X				
MINNEAPOLIS	X		X		X	

	Yes	No	Rotating Shifts			Other
			Fixed	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly
NEW ORLEANS	X				X	
NEWARK	X			X		
NORFOLK	X		X			
OAKLAND	X					X
OMAHA		X				
PHILADELPHIA	X			X		
PHOENIX		X	X			
PITTSBURGH	X				X	Vehicle assignments-rotate; foot-fixed
PORTLAND		X				
ROCHESTER		X				
SACRAMENTO	X					Yearly
ST. LOUIS	X					21 days
ST. PAUL		X				
SAN DIEGO	X		X			X
SAN FRANCISCO		X	X			
SAN JOSE		X				Every 4 months, no forced rotation
SEATTLE		X				
TAMPA	X					Every 28 days
TOLEDO	X				X	
TUCSON	X					X
TULSA	X		X			Semi-annually
WASHINGTON	X					Biweekly
WICHITA	X				X	

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

60

Shift Assignment

	Officer's Choice	Department Assignment	Seniority
AKRON	X	X	
ALBUQUERQUE	X	X	X
ATLANTA		X	
AUSTIN			
BALTIMORE			
BIRMINGHAM			X
BOSTON		X	
BUFFALO		X	
CHARLOTTE	X	X	X
CINCINNATI	X	X	
CLEVELAND			
COLUMBUS	X		X
DALLAS			X
DENVER	X		X
DETROIT			
EL PASO			
FORT WORTH	X		X
HONOLULU			
HOUSTON	X	X	X
INDIANAPOLIS			
JACKSONVILLE			
JERSEY CITY	X	X	X
KANSAS CITY		X	
LONG BEACH	X	X	X
MEMPHIS			X
MIAMI		X	
MINNEAPOLIS	X		

Shift Assignment

	Officer's Choice	Department Assignment	Seniority
NEW ORLEANS			
NEWARK			
NORFOLK			
OAKLAND		X	
OMAHA			X
PHILADELPHIA		X	
PHOENIX	X		X
PITTSBURGH		X	
PORTLAND			X
ROCHESTER	X		X
SACRAMENTO	X	X	X
ST. LOUIS			
ST. PAUL			X
SAN DIEGO	X	X	X
SAN FRANCISCO			X
SAN JOSE	X		X
SEATTLE	X	X	
TAMPA			
TOLEDO			X
TUCSON			
TULSA			X
WASHINGTON		X	
WICHITA			

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

	61 Use of Civilians for Some Calls-For-Service No-Always Officers	61 Sometimes Civilians	62 Police Review Board Yes	62 No	63a Received	63b 1976 Number of Complaints Investigated	63c Substantiated
AKRON	X			X	N/A	N/A	N/A
ALBUQUERQUE	X		X		606	37	17
ATLANTA	X		X		193	193	N/A
AUSTIN	X		X		141	141	46
BALTIMORE	X		X		N/A	N/A	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	X			X	360	360	132
BOSTON	X		X		222	222	71
BUFFALO		For Non-Stress Call, Com. Serv.	X		N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	X		X		89	89	57
CINCINNATI	X			X	349	349	104
CLEVELAND	X			X	319	305	38
COLUMBUS	X			X	438	438	170
DALLAS	X		X		206	199	134
DENVER	X			X	586	586	315
DETROIT	X		X		1652	1652	361
EL PASO	X		X		257	257	89
FORT WORTH	X		X		203	203	47
HONOLULU	X		X		242	242	162
HOUSTON	X		X		N/A	N/A	N/A
INDIANAPOLIS	X		X		N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	X		X		N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	X			X	207	207	24
KANSAS CITY	X		X		692	692	66
LONG BEACH	X		X		N/A	N/A	N/A
MEMPHIS	X		X		343	343	N/A
MIAMI		Pub. Ser. Aides-Reps. Traf. N/Emer.	X		366	366	56
MINNEAPOLIS	X			X	307	307	23

	61 Use of Civilians for Some Calls-For-Service No-Always Officers	Sometimes Civilians	62 Police Review Board Yes	No	63a Received	63b 1976 Number of Complaints Investigated	63c Substantiated
NEW ORLEANS	X			X	306	306	189
NEWARK	X			X	289	228	175
NORFOLK	X		X		160	160	41
OAKLAND		X	X		N/A	396	95
OMAHA		Imp. Vehicles, Criminalistics		X	175	175	25
PHILADELPHIA	X		X		N/A	N/A	N/A
PHOENIX		X		X	159	159	21
PITTSBURGH	X		X		106	106	41
PORTLAND		Telephone Report-taking	X		705	705	40
ROCHESTER	X		X		250	250	51
SACRAMENTO		X	X		117	117	32
ST. LOUIS	X		X		467	467	44
ST. PAUL	X		X		424	424	110
SAN DIEGO	X		X		1029	1029	11
SAN FRANCISCO	X			X	1057	1051	180
SAN JOSE	X			X	N/A	N/A	N/A
SEATTLE	X		X		421	158	39
TAMPA	X			X	116	116	24
TOLEDO	X		X		199	199	10
TUCSON		X	X		415	370	20
TULSA	X			X	N/A	N/A	N/A
WASHINGTON	X		X		55	55	2
WICHITA	X		X		58	58	37

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Patrol

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain*	Major**	Above	Other LE
AKRON	0	214	0	23	6	5	-	0	-
ALBUQUERQUE	2	230	0	26	9	3	-	1	-
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	1	242	-	23	4	4	1	0	-
BALTIMORE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	5	307	-	65	13	4	-	1	-
BOSTON	65	1110	219	235	56	25	11	-	4
BUFFALO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	5	405	-	62	-	12	2	1	-
CINCINNATI	14	477	106	94	20	5	-	0	-
CLEVELAND	1	888	0	85	40	17	8	0	0
COLUMBUS	6	459	-	54	15	3	0	0	-
DALLAS	35	964	1	127	21	0	-	0	5
DENVER	10	562	1	64	14	4	-	1	0
DETROIT	43	2397	-	384	83	16	13	2	4
EL PASO	2	202	0	28	12	3	1	0	-
FORT WORTH	24	411	28	38	3	3	-	1	-
HONOLULU	13	746	0	150	29	9	4	0	-
HOUSTON	8	1031	1	82	17	6	-	2	-
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	147	493	3	49	41	11	-	1	0
KANSAS CITY	26	463	0	101	-	22	5	0	-
LONG BEACH	6	281	0	44	14	3	1	0	-
MEMPHIS	6	432	2	15	61	21	1	1	0
MIAMI	51	308	-	61	11	4	1	0	-
MINNEAPOLIS	8	366	0	73	40	6	5	1	-

*See footnote pertaining to column 58c.

**Detroit and San Francisco use the rank of commander rather than major. Boston uses the rank of deputy superintendent rather than major. El Paso uses the rank of inspector rather than major. Long Beach uses the rank of deputy chief rather than major. Memphis uses the rank of chief inspector rather than major.

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Patrol

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain*	Major**	Above	Other LE
NEW ORLEANS	2	600	-	95	36	10	1	0	0
NEWARK	7	777	4	58	58	9	1	1	-
NORFOLK	6	272	0	30	12	2	0	0	16
OAKLAND	0	301	0	24	5	4	-	1	-
OMAHA	1	248	-	26	6	3	-	1	-
PHILADELPHIA	0	4300	0	221	119	41	20	5	104
PHOENIX	49	782	0	98	21	5	1	1	-
PITTSBURGH	0	951	9	72	27	3	-	-	-
PORTLAND	12	283	0	30	9	3	1	1	-
ROCHESTER	1	302	28	38	22	11	1	1	-
SACRAMENTO	13	207	-	25	12	3	1	0	-
ST. LOUIS	13	1023	-	130	32	9	3	1	0
ST. PAUL	2	248	-	33	9	0	-	2	0
SAN DIEGO	13	468	-	57	17	7	3	1	30
SAN FRANCISCO	N/A	805	0	122	38	12	1	1	0
SAN JOSE	2	367	-	44	13	2	-	1	0
SEATTLE	6	500	0	45	13	5	1	1	0
TAMPA	4	272	0	42	12	6	2	0	42
TOLEDO	1	303	-	45	17	4	-	0	-
TUCSON	6	263	-	45	8	1	0	0	-
TULSA	0	273	16	33	8	0	1	0	0
WASHINGTON	60	2234	220	346	106	28	7	1	-
WICHITA	-	203	18	-	21	5	1	1	-

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Traffic

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
AKRON	0	42	0	3	0	0	-	0	-
ALBUQUERQUE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	1	6	-	1	1	1	1	0	-
BALTIMORE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	0	28	-	4	2	1	-	0	-
BOSTON	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BUFFALO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	2	0	-	0	-	0	0	0	-
CINCINNATI	4	3	3	1	2	0	-	0	-
CLEVELAND	1	12	0	2	1	0	0	0	-
COLUMBUS	0	66	-	6	1	1	0	0	-
DALLAS	22	138	0	24	4	2	-	0	1
DENVER	28	91	23	15	5	1	-	1	0
DETROIT	2	28	-	6	1	0	0	0	0
EL PASO	20	77	0	7	4	1	0	0	-
FORT WORTH	13	51	0	4	1	-	0	0	-
HONOLULU	76	83	0	14	2	1	1	0	-
HOUSTON	34	443	0	40	9	3	-	1	-
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KANSAS CITY	16	88	0	15	-	3	1	0	-
LONG BEACH	71	19	0	3	1	1	0	0	-
MEMPHIS	10	75	1	38	11	4	0	0	0
MIAMI	8	64	-	9	3	1	1	0	-
MINNEAPOLIS	0	31	0	4	1	1	0	0	-

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Traffic

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
NEW ORLEANS	22	122	-	14	5	1	1	0	0
NEWARK	1	71	0	8	4	1	1	1	-
NORFOLK	109	29	2	1	0	1	0	0	5
OAKLAND	6	44	0	4	1	0	-	0	-
OMAHA	8	27	-	7	2	1	-	0	-
PHILADELPHIA	0	294	0	24	9	2	1	0	4
PHOENIX	18	94	0	11	2	1	0	0	-
PITTSBURGH	0	90	0	3	3	0	-	-	-
PORTLAND	3	63	0	9	2	1	0	0	-
ROCHESTER	4	36	5	0	1	0	0	0	-
SACRAMENTO	28	51	-	8	2	1	0	1	-
ST. LOUIS	1	59	-	3	1	0	0	0	0
ST. PAUL	4	10	-	5	1	1	-	0	0
SAN DIEGO	8	143	-	17	4	1	0	0	0
SAN FRANCISCO	N/A	103	9	23	4	1	1	0	0
SAN JOSE	49	47	-	6	1	0	-	0	0
SEATTLE	45	58	12	13	3	1	1	0	100
TAMPA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOLEDO	31	41	-	5	2	1	-	0	-
TUCSON	0	28	-	3	0	0	0	0	-
TULSA	0	67	8	9	3	0	1	0	0
WASHINGTON	3	62	5	15	3	1	0	1	-
WICHITA	-	2	0	-	1	0	0	0	-

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Tactical

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
AKRON	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ALBUQUERQUE	1	32	0	6	1	1	-	0	-
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BALTIMORE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	0	33	-	5	1	0	-	0	-
BOSTON	9	0	0	10	2	1	0	-	0
BUFFALO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	5	27	-	3	-	2	1	0	-
CINCINNATI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CLEVELAND	0	4	0	3	2	0	0	0	0
COLUMBUS	0	33	-	6	1	0	0	0	-
DALLAS	5	91	0	14	4	2	-	0	1
DENVER	4	71	9	11	3	0	-	0	0
DETROIT	0	186	-	31	6	1	0	0	1
EL PASO	0	20	0	2	0	0	0	0	-
FORT WORTH	0	0	27	0	0	0	-	0	-
HONOLULU	1	29	0	2	1	1	1	0	-
HOUSTON	0	25	0	3	1	0	-	0	-
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	1	76	0	0	0	1	-	0	0
KANSAS CITY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LONG BEACH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MEMPHIS	1	41	0	10	4	1	0	0	0
MIAMI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MINNEAPOLIS	0	33	0	10	3	1	0	0	-

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Tactical

[illegible]

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Detective

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
AKRON	5	0	77	21	7	1	-	1	-
ALBUQUERQUE	12	0	83	17	5	1	-	1	-
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	8	13	-	78	13	3	1	0	-
BALTIMORE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	8	10	-	32	6	3	-	2	-
BOSTON	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BUFFALO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CINCINNATI	4	3	31	6	2	1	-	1	-
CLEVELAND	1	0	198	35	14	1	0	0	0
COLUMBUS	0	121	-	17	5	1	0	0	-
DALLAS	20	105	13	23	8	3	-	0	1
DENVER	17	10	126	12	4	2	-	1	0
DETROIT	26	193	-	338	54	17	2	1	1
EL PASO	16	0	76	11	6	1	1	0	-
FORT WORTH	8	32	0	5	4	1	-	1	-
HONOLULU	7	1	100	5	12	1	1	0	-
HOUSTON	30	5	286	0	22	4	-	1	-
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	1	43	71	10	19	5	-	1	0
KANSAS CITY	17	2	114	25	-	2	5	5	-
LONG BEACH	14	36	1	29	3	1	0	0	-
MEMPHIS	17	39	0	114	13	8	1	0	0
MIAMI	74	66	-	24	6	3	1	0	-
MINNEAPOLIS	14	16	3	15	47	4	0	1	-

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Detective

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
NEW ORLEANS	12	107	-	17	10	2	1	1	0
NEWARK	11	2	139	8	16	4	1	1	-
NORFOLK	6	5	58	15	3	1	0	0	8
OAKLAND	22	17	1	74	7	1	-	1	-
OMAHA	22	40	-	39	7	3	-	1	-
PHILADELPHIA	0	633	0	58	49	13	4	3	6
PHOENIX	27	0	168	28	6	1	1	0	-
PITTSBURGH*	0	155	0	3	2	0	-	-	-
PORTLAND	36	1	99	15	4	1	0	1	-
ROCHESTER	9	18	9	9	3	0	1	0	-
SACRAMENTO	0	41	-	21	4	1	0	1	-
ST. LOUIS	18	215	-	27	3	2	1	1	0
ST. PAUL	5	4	-	52	7	3	-	1	0
SAN DIEGO	17	100	-	27	8	3	1	1	0
SAN FRANCISCO	N/A	3	138	0	10	0	2	1	0
SAN JOSE	8	25	-	64	7	1	-	1	0
SEATTLE	18	0	95	22	6	3	1	1	0
TAMPA	5	0	65	6	0	4	1	0	0
TOLEDO	14	49	-	13	6	2	-	0	-
TUCSON	7	73	-	11	2	0	0	0	-
TULSA	2	0	62	15	6	0	1	0	0
WASHINGTON	17	8	156	27	9	4	0	1	-
WICHITA	-	0	45	-	6	1	1	1	-

*In Pittsburgh, the detective unit also includes vice and youth personnel.

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Youth

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
AKRON	1	0	18	2	1	0	-	0	-
ALBUQUERQUE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	0	0	-	10	1	0	0	0	-
BALTIMORE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	1	8	-	4	1	0	-	0	-
BOSTON	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BUFFALO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CINCINNATI	2	12	7	2	1	0	-	0	-
CLEVELAND	1	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0
COLUMBUS	0	35	-	4	0	1	0	0	-
DALLAS	17	48	2	9	4	1	-	0	0
DENVER	33	5	54	7	3	2	-	1	0
DETROIT	2	177	-	20	2	1	0	0	0
EL PASO	3	23	24	3	2	1	0	0	-
FORT WORTH	7	9	1	0	1	0	-	0	-
HONOLULU	4	21	11	1	3	1	1	0	-
HOUSTON	7	93	1	9	3	1	-	0	-
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KANSAS CITY	4	0	17	2	-	1	0	0	-
LONG BEACH	9	31	0	10	2	1	1	0	-
MEMPHIS	1	1	0	4	0	1	0	0	0
MIAMI	14	26	-	4	1	1	1	0	-
MINNEAPOLIS	5	20	0	12	4	1	0	0	-

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Youth

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
NEW ORLEANS	4	36	-	4	1	1	1	0	0
NEWARK	8	0	21	2	2	0	1	0	-
NORFOLK	1	0	18	2	0	1	0	0	5
OAKLAND	4	25	0	3	1	1	-	0	-
OMAHA	1	5	-	2	1	0	-	0	-
PHILADELPHIA	0	277	0	15	9	2	1	0	9
PHOENIX	16	29	0	9	3	3	0	1	-
PITTSBURGH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PORTLAND	4	20	0	4	2	1	0	0	-
ROCHESTER	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SACRAMENTO	0	7	-	3	1	0	0	0	-
ST. LOUIS	2	58	-	7	0	1	0	0	0
ST. PAUL	3	1	-	16	1	1	-	0	0
SAN DIEGO	6	27	-	3	1	0	0	0	0
SAN FRANCISCO	N/A	8	29	2	2	1	0	0	0
SAN JOSE	9	10	-	28	2	2	-	0	0
SEATTLE	3	0	23	4	1	1	0	0	0
TAMPA	0	15	0	3	1	1	0	0	0
TOLEDO	2	21	-	8	2	1	-	0	-
TUCSON	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TULSA	4	0	11	1	0	0	0	0	0
WASHINGTON	6	36	26	10	3	1	0	1	-
WICHITA	-	1	12	-	1	1	0	0	-

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Vice

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
AKRON	0	0	7	2	1	0	-	0	-
ALBUQUERQUE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	0	4	-	0	1	0	0	0	-
BALTIMORE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	1	5	-	10	3	1	-	0	-
BOSTON	1	1	15	2	1	0	0	-	0
BUFFALO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	0	12	-	2	-	1	0	0	-
CINCINNATI	3	9	16	4	2	1	-	0	-
CLEVELAND	0	39	0	8	0	1	0	0	0
COLUMBUS	0	10	-	3	1	0	0	0	-
DALLAS	8	41	0	9	3	1	-	0	0
DENVER	4	8	24	4	0	1	-	0	0
DETROIT	11	171	-	48	10	2	0	0	1
EL PASO	1	2	9	1	2	1	0	0	-
FORT WORTH	3	21	0	3	1	1	-	0	-
HONOLULU	2	56	9	4	1	1	1	0	-
HOUSTON	2	44	0	6	2	1	-	0	-
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KANSAS CITY	2	18	1	4	-	1	0	0	-
LONG BEACH	3	31	0	6	2	1	0	0	-
MEMPHIS	1	10	0	8	2	0	0	0	0
MIAMI	8	22	-	6	2	1	1	0	-
MINNEAPOLIS	1	11	0	4	2	0	0	0	-

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Vice

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
NEW ORLEANS	5	16	-	3	1	1	0	0	0
NEWARK	1	2	44	9	2	1	0	0	-
NORFOLK	1	0	17	2	1	1	0	0	3
OAKLAND	2	14	0	2	1	0	-	0	-
OMAHA	1	12	-	3	1	0	-	0	-
PHILADELPHIA	0	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
PHOENIX	3	31	0	6	2	1	0	0	-
PITTSBURGH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PORTLAND	3	23	0	3	0	1	0	0	-
ROCHESTER	1	22	4	1	0	1	0	0	-
SACRAMENTO	0	12	-	3	1	0	0	0	-
ST. LOUIS	2	7	-	3	0	1	0	0	0
ST. PAUL	0	0	-	5	1	0	-	0	0
SAN DIEGO	3	21	-	3	1	0	0	0	0
SAN FRANCISCO	N/A	24	25	1	1	1	0	0	0
SAN JOSE	3	12	-	3	0	1	-	0	0
SEATTLE	3	0	28	6	2	2	1	0	0
TAMPA	0	0	30	3	1	1	0	0	0
TOLEDO	0	18	-	2	1	1	-	0	-
TUCSON	6	21	-	2	2	1	0	0	-
TULSA	2	0	23	4	1	1	0	0	0
WASHINGTON	7	4	73	14	3	1	1	0	-
WICHITA	-	0	7	-	1	1	0	0	-

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Other Operations Units

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
AKRON	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ALBUQUERQUE	10	5	7	2	0	0	-	0	-
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	28	42	-	10	2	1	0	1	-
BALTIMORE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	12	43	-	4	2	3	-	1	-
BOSTON	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BUFFALO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CINCINNATI	2	0	2	0	0	5	-	0	-
CLEVELAND	16	167	0	17	5	0	0	0	0
COLUMBUS	0	23	-	4	0	1	0	0	-
DALLAS	31	39	8	13	4	2	-	2	0
DENVER	63	1	14	6	1	0	-	0	0
DETROIT	14	101	-	29	5	2	2	0	1
EL PASO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FORT WORTH	30	29	0	1	5	1	-	0	-
HONOLULU	0	27	0	7	2	0	0	0	-
HOUSTON	22	47	0	6	2	0	-	0	-
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	0	15	0	1	1	1	-	0	0
KANSAS CITY	11	51	3	13	-	5	5	1	-
LONG BEACH	48	4	0	11	1	1	0	0	-
MEMPHIS	61	83	2	58	24	8	2	0	0
MIAMI	34	19	-	9	1	1	0	1	-
MINNEAPOLIS	4	4	1	3	5	0	0	0	-

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Other Operations Units

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
NEW ORLEANS	2	25	-	5	0	2	0	0	0
NEWARK	0	0	0	9	1	0	1	3	-
NORFOLK	7	28	0	2	1	0	0	0	5
OAKLAND	14	3	0	2	0	0	-	0	-
OMAHA	12	2	-	2	1	1	-	0	-
PHILADELPHIA	0	479	0	39	13	4	0	1	10
PHOENIX	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	-
PITTSBURGH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PORTLAND	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	-
ROCHESTER	10	21	1	7	1	1	0	0	-
SACRAMENTO	27	21	-	4	2	0	0	0	-
ST. LOUIS	6	0	-	17	1	0	1	0	0
ST. PAUL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAN DIEGO	86	73	-	7	0	2	2	2	0
SAN FRANCISCO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAN JOSE	11	34	-	3	1	0	-	0	0
SEATTLE	24	0	8	2	1	0	0	0	1
TAMPA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
TOLEDO	2	17	-	4	2	3	-	0	-
TUCSON	3.5	0	-	0	0	1	0	0	-
TULSA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
WASHINGTON	7	0	24	9	2	1	9	0	-
WICHITA	-	0	10	-	1	1	0	0	-

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Technical Services

[illegible]

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Technical Services

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
NEW ORLEANS	79	125	-	14	6	3	1	0	0
NEWARK	4	4	1	2	1	1	0	0	-
NORFOLK	18	6	0	2	2	0	0	0	4
OAKLAND	6	0	0	0	0	0		0	-
OMAHA	11	24	-	9	1	-	-	1	-
PHILADELPHIA	0	38	2	7	2	1	0	0	5
PHOENIX	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PITTSBURGH	0	0	1	0	0	0	-	-	-
PORTLAND	12	53	0	4	0	1	0	0	-
ROCHESTER	6	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	-
SACRAMENTO	36	3	-	2	0	0	0	1	-
ST. LOUIS	0	25	-	1	1	0	0	0	0
ST. PAUL	-	-	-	-	-				
SAN DIEGO	65	10	-	3	1	0	0	0	0
SAN FRANCISCO	N/A	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAN JOSE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SEATTLE	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TAMPA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOLEDO	6	16	-	3	2	1	-	0	-
TUCSON	23	14	-	5	2	1	0	0	-
TULSA	6	27	6	6	0	0	0	0	0
WASHINGTON	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	-
WICHITA	-	0	13	-	1	1	0	1	-

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Communications

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
AKRON	0	24	0	6	1	0	-	0	-
ALBUQUERQUE	57	0	0	5	1	0	-	0	-
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	34	0	-	4	1	0	0	0	-
BALTIMORE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	47	1	-	2	1	0	-	0	-
BOSTON	87	58	0	18	3	0	1	-	0
BUFFALO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	13	16	-	0	-	1	0	0	-
CINCINNATI	44	38	15	6	4	0	-	1	-
CLEVELAND	56	36	0	15	3	1	0	0	0
COLUMBUS	20	33	-	5	3	1	0	0	-
DALLAS	73	52	0	9	3	1	-	0	0
DENVER	45	32	1	7	1	0	-	0	13
DETROIT	81	13	-	17	6	1	0	0	71
EL PASO	33	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	-
FORT WORTH	40	18	0	5	1	0	-	0	-
HONOLULU	98	25	0	1	5	1	1	0	-
HOUSTON	82	67	0	8	1	1	-	0	-
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	2	32	0	6	1	0	-	0	0
KANSAS CITY	56	5	0	5	-	1	1	0	-
LONG BEACH	42	3	0	6	1	1	0	0	-
MEMPHIS	41	27	1	0	5	1	0	0	0
MIAMI	50	12	-	6	1	0	0	0	-
MINNEAPOLIS	17	16	0	5	2	0	0	0	-

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Communications

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
NEW ORLEANS	33	33	-	3	3	2	0	0	0
NEWARK	4	44	0	4	4	1	0	0	-
NORFOLK	56	16	0	2	1	1	0	0	1
OAKLAND	45	1	0	5	1	0	-	0	-
OMAHA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PHILADELPHIA	0	86	0	14	4	4	0	0	32
PHOENIX	82	47	0	13	5	1	0	0	-
PITTSBURGH	14	42	0	8	1	0	-	-	-
PORTLAND	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ROCHESTER *	54	16	0	6	0	1	1	1	-
SACRAMENTO	59	0	-	5	1	0	0	0	-
ST. LOUIS	108	28	-	4	1	0	0	0	0
ST. PAUL	16	41	-	7	1	0	-	0	5
SAN DIEGO	70	0	-	5	4	1	0	0	0
SAN FRANCISCO	N/A	29	0	7	2	1	0	0	0
SAN JOSE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SEATTLE	71	12	0	5	1	0	0	0	0
TAMPA	29	8	0	3	1	1	0	0	0
TOLEDO	7	31	-	5	1	1	-	0	-
TUCSON	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TULSA	27	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0
WASHINGTON	75	131	0	16	6	0	1	0	-
WICHITA	-	0	0	-	1	0	0	0	-

*In Rochester, the communications and records units are combined.

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Internal Affairs

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
AKRON	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ALBUQUERQUE	1	0	0	2	1	1	-	0	-
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	1	0	-	2	1	0	0	0	-
BALTIMORE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	2	0	-	6	1	0	-	0	-
BOSTON	3	0	2	4	0	0	1	-	0
BUFFALO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	1	1	-	3	-	6	1	0	-
CINCINNATI	0	0	0	3	0	1	-	0	-
CLEVELAND	1	26	0	12	4	2	1	0	0
COLUMBUS	3	0	-	6	1	1	0	0	-
DALLAS	2	5	0	4	1	1	-	0	0
DENVER	1	0	4	7	3	1	-	0	0
DETROIT	13	10	-	32	5	2	0	1	0
EL PASO	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	-
FORT WORTH	1	0	0	4	0	1	-	0	-
HONOLULU	2	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	-
HOUSTON	2	5	0	0	2	1	-	0	-
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	0	1	0	2	2	1	-	0	0
KANSAS CITY	4	10	0	2	-	0	1	0	-
LONG BEACH	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	-
MEMPHIS	3	1	1	6	2	1	0	0	0
MIAMI	3	4	-	5	1	0	0	0	-
MINNEAPOLIS	1	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	-

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Internal Affairs

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
NEW ORLEANS	4	2	-	2	1	0	0	0	4
NEWARK	1	0	2	1	8	2	3	1	-
NORFOLK	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	-	3
OAKLAND	1	4	0	1	0	0	-	0	-
OMAHA	1	0	-	2	1	0	-	1	-
PHILADELPHIA	0	13	0	3	4	0	1	0	1
PHOENIX	2	14	0	6	3	0	1	0	-
PITTSBURGH	0	0	10	0	0	0	-	-	-
PORTLAND	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	-
ROCHESTER	1	2	2	1	0	1	1	0	-
SACRAMENTO	0	0	-	1	1	0	0	0	-
ST. LOUIS	8	8	-	13	3	2	1	1	0
ST. PAUL	0	0	-	2	0	1	-	0	0
SAN DIEGO	1	0	-	3	1	0	0	0	0
SAN FRANCISCO	N/A	0	12	9	1	1	0	0	0
SAN JOSE	1	1	-	2	1	0	-	0	0
SEATTLE	2	0	1	5	2	1	1	0	0
TAMPA	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
TOLEDO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TUCSON	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TULSA	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
WASHINGTON	5	1	0	27	4	3	0	1	-
WICHITA	-	0	1	-	1	0	1	0	-

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Research & Development

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
AKRON	0	0	0	0	1	0	-	0	-
ALBUQUERQUE	4	2	0	1	0	0	-	0	-
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	3	2	-	0	0	0	0	0	-
BALTIMORE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	4	1	-	1	0	0	-	0	-
BOSTON	6	4	0	0	1	0	0	-	0
BUFFALO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	2	1	-	1	-	0	0	0	-
CINCINNATI	13	25	5	3	2	1	-	0	-
CLEVELAND	1	2	0	3	1	0	0	0	0
COLUMBUS	1	2	-	1	0	0	0	0	-
DALLAS	9	2	0	2	2	1	-	0	0
DENVER	2	3	0	1	0	1	-	0	0
DETROIT	18	21	-	11	6	1	1	0	7
EL PASO	1	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	-
FORT WORTH	4	8	2	1	1	0	-	1	-
HONOLULU	8	2	0	5	2	1	1	0	-
HOUSTON	15	14	2	3	1	1	-	0	-
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	1	5	1	6	4	1	-	1	0
KANSAS CITY	4	10	0	3	-	1	0	0	-
LONG BEACH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MEMPHIS	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
MIAMI	2	2	-	2	2	0	1	0	-
MINNEAPOLIS	2	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	-

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Research & Development

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
NEW ORLEANS	7	5	-	3	0	1	0	0	0
NEWARK	2	2	0	1	3	1	0	0	-
NORFOLK	5	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
OAKLAND	4	4	0	0	1	0	-	0	-
OMAHA	1	1	-	2	1	0	-	0	-
PHILADELPHIA	4	10	2	5	2	1	0	0	-
PHOENIX	10	6	0	1	0	0	0	1	-
PITTSBURGH	0	0	0	0	1	0	-	-	-
PORTLAND	4	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	-
ROCHESTER	9	1	0	3	3	1	0	0	-
SACRAMENTO	7	1	-	1	1	0	0	0	-
ST. LOUIS	14	4	-	1	1	0	0	0	0
ST. PAUL	3	0	-	1	1	0	-	0	0
SAN DIEGO	4	1	-	2	1	0	0	0	0
SAN FRANCISCO	N/A	10	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
SAN JOSE	14	2	-	3	1	0	-	0	0
SEATTLE	7	5	0	2	1	0	0	0	0
TAMPA	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOLEDO	1	3	-	1	0	1	-	0	-
TUCSON	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TULSA	1	4	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
WASHINGTON	24	0	0	3	2	1	0	1	-
WICHITA	-	1	0	-	0	1	0	0	-

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Records

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
AKRON	12	0	0	1	0	0	-	0	-
ALBUQUERQUE	71	10	0	7	1	1	-	0	-
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	27	0	-	4	1	0	0	0	-
BALTIMORE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	38	0	-	0	0	1	-	0	-
BOSTON	52	26	0	6	0	0	0	-	0
BUFFALO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	41	2	-	6	-	1	0	0	-
CINCINNATI	64	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	-
CLEVELAND	45	24	0	5	1	1	1	0	0
COLUMBUS	36	2	-	2	0	0	0	0	-
DALLAS	130	38	6	9	5	2	-	0	0
DENVER	45	12	0	5	1	1	-	0	0
DETROIT	20	18	-	3	0	1	0	0	0
EL PASO	17	4	11	4	2	0	0	0	-
FORT WORTH	28	10	8	0	1	1	-	0	-
HONOLULU	55	2	6	8	1	1	1	0	-
HOUSTON	71	6	0	5	2	1	-	0	-
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KANSAS CITY	67	6	0	8	-	1	0	0	-
LONG BEACH	80	10	0	5	1	1	0	0	-
MEMPHIS	56	5	0	2	6	0	0	0	0
MIAMI	44	1	-	1	1	0	0	0	-
MINNEAPOLIS	42	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	-

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Records

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
NEW ORLEANS	44	17	-	5	1	1	0	0	0
NEWARK	63	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	-
NORFOLK *	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
OAKLAND	32	9	0	3	1	1	-	0	-
OMAHA	61	15	-	8	1	0	-	0	-
PHILADELPHIA	0	37	0	3	6	0	0	0	1
PHOENIX	118	4	0	5	0	1	0	1	-
PITTSBURGH	6	12	0	0	0	0	-	-	-
PORTLAND	91	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	-
ROCHESTER	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SACRAMENTO	46	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-
ST. LOUIS	119	14	-	1	0	0	0	0	0
ST. PAUL	30	11	-	3	1	1	-	0	0
SAN DIEGO	53	0	-	0	1	0	0	0	0
SAN FRANCISCO	N/A	23	0	11	4	1	0	0	0
SAN JOSE	98	16	-	5	0	1	-	0	0
SEATTLE	79	3	0	3	1	1	0	0	0
TAMPA	70	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0
TOLEDO	39	16	-	4	2	1	-	0	-
TUCSON	116.5	6	-	7	1	1	0	0	-
TULSA	43	9	10	2	1	1	0	0	0
WASHINGTON	117	66	0	13	3	1	1	0	-
WICHITA	-	0	0	-	8	1	0	0	-

* In Norfolk, records unit is combined with the communications unit.

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Chief's Office

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
AKRON	1	1	0	1	0	0	-	1	-
ALBUQUERQUE	8	1	0	0	2	0	-	1	-
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	4	1	-	0	1	0	0	1	-
BALTIMORE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	1	0	-	2	0	1	-	0	-
BOSTON	17	6	0	2	0	0	0	-	0
BUFFALO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	5	2	-	0	-	0	1	1	-
CINCINNATI	5	0	2	1	1	0	-	2	-
CLEVELAND	0	6	0	3	2	1	0	1	0
COLUMBUS	2	0	-	1	0	0	1	1	-
DALLAS	9	5	0	2	1	0	-	0	6
DENVER	1	0	1	0	0	0	-	0	0
DETROIT	35	74	-	24	5	5	0	1	0
EL PASO	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	-
FORT WORTH	11	2	0	0	0	0	-	0	-
HONOLULU	5	0	0	1	0	0	5	2	-
HOUSTON	17	30	2	4	2	1	-	1	-
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KANSAS CITY	22	2	2	7	-	2	1	2	-
LONG BEACH	10	11	0	6	4	0	0	1	-
MEMPHIS	4	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	1
MIAMI	7	4	-	2	1	0	0	1	-
MINNEAPOLIS	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	-

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Chief's Office

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
NEW ORLEANS	10	3	-	3	0	0	0	0	0
NEWARK	3	5	1	0	1	6	1	3	-
NORFOLK	5	1	0	1	0	1	4	3	0
OAKLAND	2	0	0	1	0	0	-	1	-
OMAHA	2	0	-	1	0	0	-	1	-
PHILADELPHIA	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0
PHOENIX	4	3	0	1	0	1	4	2	-
PITTSBURGH	8	20	2	0	2	0	-	-	-
PORTLAND	6	3	0	2	2	0	0	1	-
ROCHESTER	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	-
SACRAMENTO	2	0	-	3	2	1	0	1	-
ST. LOUIS	5	5	-	2	1	1	0	0	1
ST. PAUL	4	0	-	0	1	6	-	1	0
SAN DIEGO	1	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAN FRANCISCO	N/A	3	0	1	1	0	0	2	1
SAN JOSE	1	0	-	2	0	2	-	1	1
SEATTLE	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	1
TAMPA	2	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	1
TOLEDO	1	0	-	0	1	0	-	1	-
TUCSON	3	0	-	0	0	0	2	1	-
TULSA	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	1
WASHINGTON	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	-
WICHITA	-	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	-

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Personnel

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
AKRON	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ALBUQUERQUE	6	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	-
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	6	6	-	3	2	1	0	0	-
BALTIMORE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	5	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	-
BOSTON	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	-	0
BUFFALO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	1	1	-	1	-	0	0	0	-
CINCINNATI	4	3	3	5	1	1	-	1	-
CLEVELAND	0	3	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
COLUMBUS	52	9	-	3	2	1	0	0	-
DALLAS	12	19	0	5	2	1	-	0	0
DENVER	9	3	0	1	0	0	-	0	0
DETROIT	40	145	-	70	16	3	0	0	0
EL PASO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FORT WORTH	4	1	0	2	0	1	-	1	-
HONOLULU	10	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	-
HOUSTON	11	12	0	3	1	1	-	0	-
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KANSAS CITY	29	22	6	16	-	3	3	0	-
LONG BEACH	37	10	0	6	2	1	0	0	-
MEMPHIS	7	4	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
MIAMI	8	7	-	3	1	0	0	0	-
MINNEAPOLIS	3	6	0	0	3	1	0	0	-

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Personnel

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
NEW ORLEANS	22	2	-	2	3	1	0	3	0
NEWARK	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NORFOLK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
OAKLAND	7	22	0	3	2	0	-	0	-
OMAHA	3	0	-	0	1	0	-	0	-
PHILADELPHIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PHOENIX	4	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	-
PITTSBURGH	2	1	0	0	0	0	-	-	-
PORTLAND	5	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	-
ROCHESTER	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	-
SACRAMENTO	5	4	-	1	1	1	0	0	-
ST. LOUIS	9	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	0
ST. PAUL	2	0	-	0	1	0	-	0	0
SAN DIEGO	10	2	-	3	0	0	0	0	0
SAN FRANCISCO	N/A	7	0	3	2	1	0	0	0
SAN JOSE	5	14	-	3	1	1	-	1	0
SEATTLE	10	12	1	5	2	0	0	1	0
TAMPA	9	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
TOLEDO	0	0	-	1	0	0	-	0	-
TUCSON	3	1	-	1	0	0	0	0	-
TULSA	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WASHINGTON	26	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	-
WICHITA	-	0	1	-	2	1	0	0	-

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Other Administrative Units

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
AKRON	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ALBUQUERQUE	34	17	0	8	3	1	-	1	-
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	29	0	-	0	0	0	0	1	-
BALTIMORE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	3	22	-	2	1	1	-	1	-
BOSTON	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BUFFALO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	5	2	-	2	-	3	1	1	-
CINCINNATI	9	8	1	3	4	2	-	0	-
CLEVELAND	26	206	0	15	8	1	0	0	1
COLUMBUS	98	8	-	22	6	5	5	0	-
DALLAS	47	15	0	10	4	2	-	0	0
DENVER	96	18	26	7	4	2	-	1	0
DETROIT	91	65	-	30	8	2	1	1	15
EL PASO	7	2	4	0	3	1	1	0	-
FORT WORTH	1	0	0	3	0	1	-	0	-
HONOLULU	35	19	8	12	5	3	3	4	-
HOUSTON	215	308	0	39	10	4	-	6	-
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	8	41	1	11	7	1	-	5	1
KANSAS CITY	6	69	4	11	-	4	2	1	-
LONG BEACH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MEMPHIS	53	20	1	20	15	1	0	0	0
MIAMI	35	10	-	7	2	0	1	0	-
MINNEAPOLIS	11	6	0	3	0	1	0	1	-

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Other Administrative Units

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
NEW ORLEANS	262	60	-	18	5	2	0	0	0
NEWARK	38	8	0	8	0	0	1	0	-
NORFOLK	2	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	2
OAKLAND	84	48	0	8	4	2	-	1	-
OMAHA	4	11	-	8	3	0	-	2	-
PHILADELPHIA	912	217	2	69	53	7	1	4	39
PHOENIX	47	11	0	7	3	1	0	0	-
PITTSBURGH	0	4	0	1	0	0	-	-	-
PORTLAND	4	3	0	0	1	1	0	1	-
ROCHESTER	21	9	3	0	0	1	0	0	-
SACRAMENTO	7	1	-	1	1	2	0	1	-
ST. LOUIS	271	166	-	17	4	5	-	1	27
ST. PAUL	66	13	-	9	5	0	-	1	0
SAN DIEGO	7	70	-	1	3	2	1	1	0
SAN FRANCISCO	N/A	29	9	9	3	0	0	0	0
SAN JOSE	16	0	-	2	1	0	-	0	0
SEATTLE	29	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
TAMPA	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	1
TOLEDO	1	2	-	6	1	2	-	4	-
TUCSON	11.5	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-
TULSA	0	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0
WASHINGTON	179	101	0	46	12	4	7	5	-
WICHITA	-	0	1	-	6	0	0	1	-

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Distribution of Personnel, by Unit - Totals

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
AKRON	25	371	0	65	19	8	-	4	-
ALBUQUERQUE	206	297	90	74	23	8	-	4	-
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	180	316	-	136	33	11	3	3	-
BALTIMORE	N/A	2871	-	380	107	19	9	24	-
BIRMINGHAM	126	471	-	141	32	15	-	5	-
BOSTON	253	1300	241	284	64	25	13	-	4
BUFFALO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	112	473	-	81	-	28	7	4	-
CINCINNATI	159	578	190	127	39	17	-	5	-
CLEVELAND	175	1413	202	204	83	26	10	1	2
COLUMBUS	236	885	-	136	36	15	6	1	-
DALLAS	578	1570	30	276	70	21	-	2	14
DENVER	295	851	282	148	41	16	-	6	13
DETROIT	583	3777	-	1085	215	59	20	6	124
EL PASO	158	379	126	65	37	9	4	1	-
FORT WORTH	185	592	66	66	18	10	-	5	-
HONOLULU	348	1011	139	211	64	22	21	6	-
HOUSTON	695	2161	298	220	79	27	-	12	-
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	160	706	76	85	66	20	-	8	1
KANSAS CITY	462	778	147	223	-	49	24	5	-
LONG BEACH	321	436	1	127	32	11	3	1	-
MEMPHIS	338	743	8	283	153	51	4	2	1
MIAMI	373	545	-	140	33	12	8	2	-
MINNEAPOLIS	111	509	4	136	112	16	5	4	-

Distribution of Personnel by Unit - Totals

	Civilian	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
NEW ORLEANS	508	1202	-	194	74	28	5	3	4
NEWARK	145	1011	212	116	108	28	12	12	-
NORFOLK	217	358	99	59	21	9	4	3	53
OAKLAND	229	492	1	130	24	9	-	4	-
OMAHA	128	385	-	109	26	8	-	7	-
PHILADELPHIA	918	6676	6	471	268	77	29	13	212
PHOENIX	401	1158	168	208	51	17	8	6	-
PITTSBURGH	30	1275	21	88	36	3	-	-	-
PORTLAND	186	472	99	75	25	10	2	4	-
ROCHESTER	125	470	56	67	32	17	4	3	-
SACRAMENTO	229	362	-	82	30	9	1	5	-
ST. LOUIS	577	1728	-	228	50	22	6	5	28
ST. PAUL	135	328	-	133	29	13	-	5	5
SAN DIEGO	344	915	-	131	42	16	7	5	30
SAN FRANCISCO	511	1136	236	199	74	21	4	4	1
SAN JOSE	217	558	-	169	29	10	-	4	1
SEATTLE	315	669	170	127	36	15	6	5	102
TAMPA	127	329	100	60	18	18	6	3	56
TOLEDO	105	576	-	101	38	20	-	5	-
TUCSON	181	421	-	79	15	5	2	1	-
TULSA	90	381	148	76	23	7	3	2	1
WASHINGTON	537	2833	507	558	164	47	26	14	-
WICHITA	-	207	108	-	50	13	3	5	-

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Distribution of Women and Minorities by Rank - Women Officers

	% Personnel above P.O.	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
AKRON	20.69	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ALBUQUERQUE	21.9	22	7	0	0	0	-	0	-
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	37.1	5	-	0	0	0	0	0	-
BALTIMORE	15.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	21.2	29	-	0	0	0	-	0	-
BOSTON	32.6	27	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
BUFFALO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	20.2	17	-	0	-	0	0	0	-
CINCINNATI	39.5	8	8	0	0	0	-	0	-
CLEVELAND	27.2	51	14	2	0	1	0	0	0
COLUMBUS	18.0	21	-	0	0	0	0	0	-
DALLAS	20.82	74	1	1	1	0	-	0	0
DENVER	37.2	51 *	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	N/A	N/A
DETROIT	24.7	625	-	32	15	4	0	0	N/A
EL PASO	40.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
FORT WORTH	21.8	16	0	0	2	0	-	0	-
HONOLULU	31.4	22	1	1	0	0	0	0	-
HOUSTON	22	125	15	0	0	0	-	0	-
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	25	2	0	0	0	0	-	0	0
KANSAS CITY	36.75	26	2	1	-	0	0	0	-
LONG BEACH	28.6	20	0	2	0	0	0	0	-
MEMPHIS	40	46	0	5	2	0	0	0	0
MIAMI	25.1	46	-	1	0	0	0	0	-
MINNEAPOLIS	35.2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	-

* This figure is the total number of women officers; breakdown by rank is not available for Denver.

Distribution of Women and Minorities by Rank - Women Officers

	% Personnel above P.O.	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
NEW ORLEANS	20.4	37	-	2	0	0	0	0	0
NEWARK	32.5	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	-
NORFOLK	41	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
OAKLAND	25	14	0	0	0	0	-	0	-
OMAHA	28	11	-	0	0	0	-	0	-
PHILADELPHIA	13.8	87	0	3	2	1	0	0	0
PHOENIX	17	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	-
PITTSBURGH	10.4	69	0	0	0	0	-	-	-
PORTLAND	31	31	0	2	1	0	0	0	-
ROCHESTER	27.58	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	-
SACRAMENTO	26	8	-	1	0	0	0	0	-
ST. LOUIS	16.8	46	-	2	0	0	0	0	0
ST. PAUL	36	1	-	2	0	0	-	0	0
SAN DIEGO	20	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAN FRANCISCO	32	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAN JOSE	27	28	-	1	0	0	-	0	0
SEATTLE	22.8	28	N/A	4	1	0	0	0	0
TAMPA	45	18	4	1	0	0	0	0	0
TOLEDO	22.1	9	-	1	0	0	-	0	-
TUCSON	19.92	24	-	1	0	0	0	0	-
TULSA	41	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
WASHINGTON	46	284	17	7	1	0	0	0	-
WICHITA	46	8	5	-	0	1	0	0	-

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Distribution of Women and Minorities by Rank - Black Officers

	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
AKRON	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ALBUQUERQUE	1	0	0	0	0	-	1	-
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	13	-	7	2	0	0	0	-
BALTIMORE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	31	-	2	0	0	-	0	-
BOSTON	83	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
BUFFALO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	76	-	10	-	1	0	0	-
CINCINNATI	64	61	2	1	0	-	0	-
CLEVELAND	170	39	3	0	1	0	0	0
COLUMBUS	53	-	3	1	0	1	0	-
DALLAS	96	0	2	0	0	-	0	1
DENVER	78	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	N/A	N/A
DETROIT	1555	-	161	42	17	9	2	N/A
EL PASO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
FORT WORTH	23	1	2	0	0	-	0	-
HONOLULU	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
HOUSTON	113	5	2	0	0	-	0	-
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	39	16	6	1	0	-	0	0
KANSAS CITY	112	13	16	-	3	1	1	-
LONG BEACH	15	0	3	1	0	1	0	-
MEMPHIS	163	0	19	6	2	0	0	0
MIAMI	60	-	12	0	0	1	0	-
MINNEAPOLIS	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	-

Distribution of Women and Minorities by Rank - Black Officers

	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
NEW ORLEANS	183	-	6	2	0	0	1	0
NEWARK	169	82	7	8	1	1	0	-
NORFOLK	33	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
OAKLAND	94	0	7	0	0	-	1	-
OMAHA	24	-	2	1	0	-	0	-
PHILADELPHIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
PHOENIX	47	0	3	0	0	0	1	-
PITTSBURGH	34	0	0	0	0	-	-	-
PORTLAND	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	-
ROCHESTER	45	1	1	2	1	0	0	-
SACRAMENTO	31	-	0	1	0	0	0	-
ST. LOUIS	218	-	41	10	5	2	1	0
ST. PAUL	14	-	0	0	0	-	1	0
SAN DIEGO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAN FRANCISCO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAN JOSE	16	-	0	0	0	-	0	0
SEATTLE	25	N/A	1	0	0	0	0	1
TAMPA	10	3	2	0	1	0	0	5
TOLEDO	55	-	2	0	1	-	0	-
TUCSON	11	-	0	0	0	0	0	-
TULSA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
WASHINGTON	1653	3	130	27	6	4	3	-
WICHITA	17	1	-	0	0	0	0	-

*This figure is the total number of black officers; breakdown by rank is not available for Denver

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Distribution of Women and Minorities by Rank - Spanish Surname Officers

	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
AKRON	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ALBUQUERQUE	50	29	10	3	0	-	1	-
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	31	-	4	1	0	0	0	-
BALTIMORE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BOSTON	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BUFFALO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	1	-	0	-	0	0	0	-
CINCINNATI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CLEVELAND	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
COLUMBUS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DALLAS	68	0	2	0	1	-	0	0
DENVER	149*	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	N/A	N/A
DETROIT	17	-	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
EL PASO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
FORT WORTH	25	0	1	1	0	-	0	-
HONOLULU	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
HOUSTON	119	9	7	5	0	-	0	-
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	16	5	1	0	0	-	0	0
KANSAS CITY	16	0	0	-	0	0	0	-
LONG BEACH	23	0	3	0	0	0	0	-
MEMPHIS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MIAMI	89	-	10	3	0	1	0	-
MINNEAPOLIS	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	-

*This figure is the total number of Spanish surname officers; breakdown by rank is not available for Denver.

Distribution of Women and Minorities by Rank - Spanish Surname Officers

	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
NEW ORLEANS	31	-	2	2	0	0	0	0
NEWARK	25	8	1	0	0	0	0	-
NORFOLK	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
OAKLAND	38	0	1	0	0	-	0	-
OMAHA	7	-	0	0	0	-	0	-
PHILADELPHIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
PHOENIX	101	0	7	0	1	0	0	-
PITTSBURGH	2	0	0	0	0	-	-	-
PORTLAND	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	-
ROCHESTER	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
SACRAMENTO	46	-	5	0	1	0	0	-
ST. LOUIS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ST. PAUL	4	-	2	1	0	-	0	0
SAN DIEGO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAN FRANCISCO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAN JOSE	60	-	4	1	0	-	1	0
SEATTLE	6	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
TAMPA	18	9	6	1	0	2	1	3
TOLEDO	14	-	0	0	0	-	0	-
TUCSON	63	-	2	1	1	0	0	-
TULSA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
WASHINGTON	18	0	3	1	0	0	0	-
WICHITA	3	0	-	0	0	0	0	-

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Distribution of Women and Minorities by Rank - American Indian Officers

	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
AKRON	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ALBUQUERQUE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	0	-	0	0	1	0	0	-
BALTIMORE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BOSTON	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BUFFALO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	3	-	0	-	0	0	0	-
CINCINNATI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CLEVELAND	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
COLUMBUS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DALLAS	3	0	0	0	0	-	0	0
DENVER	9*	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	N/A	N/A
DETROIT	4	-	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
EL PASO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
FORT WORTH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HONOLULU	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
HOUSTON	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	-
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KANSAS CITY	1	0	0	-	0	0	0	-
LONG BEACH	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
MEMPHIS	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MIAMI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MINNEAPOLIS	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	-

*This figure is the total number of American Indian officers; breakdown by rank is not available for Denver.

Distribution of Women and Minorities by Rank - American Indian Officers

	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
NEW ORLEANS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NEWARK	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NORFOLK	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
OAKLAND	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
OMAHA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PHILADELPHIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
PHOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
PITTSBURGH	1	0	0	0	0	-	-	-
PORTLAND	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	-
ROCHESTER	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SACRAMENTO	5	-	3	0	0	0	0	-
ST. LOUIS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ST. PAUL	1	-	3	0	0	-	1	0
SAN DIEGO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAN FRANCISCO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAN JOSE	3	-	3	0	0	-	0	0
SEATTLE	6	N/A	1	0	1	0	0	0
TAMPA	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOLEDO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TUCSON	1	-	1	0	0	0	0	-
TULSA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
WASHINGTON	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
WICHITA	1	1	-	0	0	0	0	-

1977 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
OF MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Distribution of Women and Minorities by Rank - Other Minority Officers

	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
AKRON	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ALBUQUERQUE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BALTIMORE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BOSTON	2	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
BUFFALO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CINCINNATI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CLEVELAND	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
COLUMBUS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DALLAS	2	0	0	0	0	-	0	0
DENVER	8 *	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	N/A	N/A
DETROIT	2	-	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
EL PASO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
FORT WORTH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HONOLULU	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
HOUSTON	2	0	0	0	0	-	0	-
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KANSAS CITY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LONG BEACH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MEMPHIS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MIAMI	1	-	0	0	0	0	0	-
MINNEAPOLIS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

* This figure is the total number of other minority officers; breakdown by rank is not available for Denver.

Distribution of Women and Minorities by Rank - Other Minority Officers

	Police Officer	Inspector Detective	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Major	Above	Other LE
NEW ORLEANS	2	-	0	0	0	0	0	0
NEWARK	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	-
NORFOLK	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
OAKLAND	29	0	2	1	0	-	0	-
OMAHA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PHILADELPHIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
PHOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
PITTSBURGH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PORTLAND	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
ROCHESTER	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SACRAMENTO	16	-	0	1	0	0	0	-
ST. LOUIS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ST. PAUL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAN DIEGO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAN FRANCISCO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAN JOSE	6	-	0	0	0	-	0	0
SEATTLE	15	N/A	0	1	0	0	0	0
TAMPA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOLEDO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TUCSON	2	-	0	0	0	0	0	-
TULSA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
WASHINGTON	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
WICHITA	2	0	-	0	0	0	0	-

SUMMARY DATA

	Per Capita Costs	Officers per 1000 Population	Civilians: % of Total Personnel	Overtime: % of Total Budget	Personnel In Each Unit			
					% Patrol	% Traffic	% Tactical	% Detective
AKRON	\$40.60	1.75	5.08	1.38	53.10	9.64	-	22.91
ALBUQUERQUE	42.54	1.84	29.34	5.40	54.23	-	8.06	21.57
ATLANTA	48.06	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	43.06	1.67	26.39	4.99	54.58	1.99	-	21.51
BALTIMORE	108.27	3.96	N/A	2.45	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	39.27	2.21	15.95	1.17	58.73	5.27	5.87	7.98
BOSTON	86.58	3.14	11.58	12.47	85.96	-	0.67	-
BUFFALO	51.98	N/A	N/A	9.46	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	38.61	2.11	15.89	1.05	81.28	-	5.56	-
CINCINNATI	52.53	2.24	14.26	N/A	73.43	0.94	-	4.60
CLEVELAND	50.97	2.62	8.27	N/A	53.48	0.82	0.46	12.78
COLUMBUS	47.38	1.85	17.95	5.39	49.21	6.86	3.71	13.34
DALLAS	57.82	2.28	22.57	1.46	56.38	8.52	5.65	7.72
DENVER	67.20	2.56	17.86	N/A	47.60	10.02	6.93	11.42
DETROIT	140.03	4.20	8.89	1.18	54.84	0.66	4.26	11.46
EL PASO	21.81	1.64	20.28	1.21	39.61	14.33	3.54	15.30
FORT WORTH	37.05	1.96	19.64	1.15	63.94	7.40	3.57	5.68
HONOLULU	49.20	2.09	19.10	2.56	63.64	6.85	2.31	8.14
HOUSTON	36.57	1.90	19.90	3.00	40.72	17.73	1.04	11.37
INDIANAPOLIS	54.65	N/A	N/A	4.31	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	53.88	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	71.66	3.69	14.26	1.76	62.16	-	8.00	15.49
KANSAS CITY	55.98	2.42	27.37	3.07	48.20	8.73	-	12.48
LONG BEACH	81.98	1.63	34.44	N/A	56.14	3.93	-	11.46
MEMPHIS	36.66	1.46	21.35	1.85	42.81	10.36	4.50	14.06
MIAMI	57.32	2.06	33.88	1.23	52.88	10.71	-	13.74
MINNEAPOLIS	47.46	1.88	12.37	1.96	62.47	4.71	5.98	10.94

	Per Capita Costs	Officers per 1000 Population	Civilians: % of Total Personnel	Overtime: % of Total Budget	Personnel In Each Unit			
					% Patrol	% Traffic	% Tactical	% Detective
NEW ORLEANS	55.42	2.48	25.17	21.06	49.14	9.47	3.84	9.20
NEWARK	53.19	3.92	8.82	3.49	60.57	5.74	7.20	11.41
NORFOLK	37.28	2.12	26.37	1.43	54.78	6.27	-	14.85
OAKLAND	55.66	1.83	25.76	6.19	50.76	7.42	-	15.30
OMAHA	33.43	1.37	19.31	6.51	53.08	6.92	-	16.82
PHILADELPHIA	82.99	3.98	10.59	7.25	62.05	4.31	3.95	9.88
PHOENIX	66.16	2.39	19.88	4.90	56.19	6.68	9.90	12.62
PITTSBURGH	48.18	2.78	2.06	15.14	74.63	6.75	-	11.24
PORTLAND	50.93	1.83	21.30	6.48	47.60	10.92	2.62	17.61
ROCHESTER	49.59	2.35	16.15	N/A	62.10	6.47	4.01	6.16
SACRAMENTO	69.53	1.88	31.85	3.81	50.61	12.86	3.88	13.88
ST. LOUIS	73.25	3.72	21.82	0.00	57.96	3.05	6.29	12.05
ST. PAUL	42.87	1.76	20.83	1.89	56.92	3.31	-	13.64
SAN DIEGO	40.27	1.50	23.09	6.96	50.87	14.40	-	12.22
SAN FRANCISCO	97.33	2.34	23.38	1.81	58.45	8.42	6.27	9.19
SAN JOSE	33.85	1.38	21.96	1.37	55.38	7.00	4.54	12.71
SEATTLE	67.52	2.23	21.80	3.71	50.00	16.64	8.32	11.33
TAMPA	57.66	1.97	17.71	0.00	63.73	-	8.81	12.88
TOLEDO	51.46	2.11	12.43	3.88	49.86	6.62	0.27	9.46
TUCSON	50.89	1.75	25.71	2.64	60.61	5.93	3.63	16.44
TULSA	32.92	1.78	12.31	N/A	51.64	13.73	1.72	13.10
WASHINGTON	129.52	5.69	11.46	3.59	70.91	2.10	5.54	4.94
WICHITA	29.34	1.44	-	1.88	65.01	0.78	-	14.10

SUMMARY DATA

	Patrol Beat Allocation				1 - Officer/2 - Officer Units			
	% Day	% Evening	% Night	% Other	Day		Evening	
					% 1-Officer	% 2-Officer	% 1-Officer	% 2-Officer
AKRON	19.51	26.83	26.83	26.83	81.25	18.75	0.00	100.00
ALBUQUERQUE	27.27	39.16	33.57	-	79.49	20.51	85.71	14.28
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	34.18	26.58	26.58	12.66	92.59	7.41	95.24	4.76
BALTIMORE	31.92	39.09	19.09	9.90	88.61	11.39	88.37	11.63
BIRMINGHAM	33.33	40.65	26.02	-	82.93	17.07	16.00	84.00
BOSTON	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BUFFALO	28.57	35.71	35.71	-	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00
CHARLOTTE	33.33	33.33	33.33	-	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00
CINCINNATI	30.92	31.88	37.20	-	96.88	3.12	92.42	7.58
CLEVELAND	25.12	25.12	25.12	24.63	1.96	98.04	1.96	98.04
COLUMBUS	29.66	36.44	33.90	-	80.00	20.00	67.44	32.56
DALLAS	33.86	42.52	23.62	-	71.32	28.68	66.67	33.33
DENVER	44.68	44.68	10.64	-	71.43	28.57	0.00	100.00
DETROIT	38.01	35.57	26.42	-	16.04	83.96	10.28	89.71
EL PASO	34.52	34.52	30.95	-	51.72	48.28	10.34	89.66
FORT WORTH	19.39	37.58	43.03	-	100.00	0.00	74.19	25.81
HONOLULU	31.65	31.65	31.65	5.05	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
HOUSTON	33.33	33.33	33.33	-	100.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	34.41	32.79	32.79	-	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
JERSEY CITY	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
KANSAS CITY	34.90	32.55	32.55	-	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
LONG BEACH	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MEMPHIS	31.20	40.42	28.37	-	18.18	81.82	14.04	85.96
MIAMI	39.32	34.19	25.64	0.85	67.39	32.61	52.50	47.50
MINNEAPOLIS	32.06	23.66	22.14	22.14	35.71	64.28	12.90	87.10

	Patrol Beat Allocation				1 - Officer/2 - Officer Units			
	% Day	% Evening	% Night	% Other	Day		Evening	
					% 1-Officer	% 2-Officer	% 1-Officer	% 2-Officer
NEW ORLEANS	40.39	39.61	20.00	-	50.48	49.51	49.00	51.00
NEWARK	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NORFOLK	33.87	33.06	33.06	-	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
OAKLAND	41.94	28.22	29.84	-	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
OMAHA	34.42	37.66	27.92	-	100.00	0.00	82.76	17.24
PHILADELPHIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
PHOENIX	35.75	33.33	30.92	-	68.92	31.08	73.91	26.09
PITTSBURGH	25.15	47.88	26.97	-	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00
PORTLAND	29.06	47.86	23.08	-	76.47	23.53	71.43	28.57
ROCHESTER	22.73	30.30	36.36	10.61	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
SACRAMENTO	34.38	43.75	21.88	-	93.94	6.06	38.10	61.90
ST. LOUIS	33.65	35.22	28.30	2.83	85.98	14.02	79.46	20.54
ST. PAUL	37.50	42.04	20.45	-	75.76	24.24	29.73	70.27
SAN DIEGO	33.33	33.33	33.33	-	76.56	23.44	76.56	23.44
SAN FRANCISCO	35.80	39.30	24.90	-	59.78	40.22	28.71	71.29
SAN JOSE	34.30	42.96	22.74	-	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
SEATTLE	26.98	34.42	38.60	-	84.48	15.52	54.05	45.94
TAMPA	33.05	39.83	25.42	1.69	74.36	25.64	63.83	36.17
TOLEDO	30.28	37.61	32.11	-	51.52	48.48	46.34	53.66
TUCSON	34.67	33.33	32.00	-	100.00	0.00	96.00	4.00
TULSA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
WASHINGTON	35.75	32.38	31.86	-	36.23	63.77	36.80	63.20
WICHITA	30.43	39.13	30.43	-	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00

SUMMARY DATA

Personnel in Each Unit (continued)

	% Youth	% Vice	% Other Operations	% Technical Services	% Commu- nications	% Internal Affairs	% R & D	% Records	% Chief's Office
AKRON	4.50	2.14	-	8.99	6.64	-	0.21	0.21	0.64
ALBUQUERQUE	-	-	2.82	0.00	1.21	0.81	0.60	3.83	0.81
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	2.19	1.00	11.16	1.59	1.00	0.60	0.40	1.00	0.60
BALTIMORE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	1.96	2.86	7.98	2.71	0.60	1.05	0.30	0.15	0.45
BOSTON	-	0.98	-	1.14	4.14	0.36	0.26	1.66	0.41
BUFFALO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	-	2.53	-	1.69	2.87	1.85	0.34	1.52	0.67
CINCINNATI	2.30	3.35	0.73	-	6.69	0.42	3.76	-	0.63
CLEVELAND	0.26	2.47	9.74	0.00	2.83	2.32	0.31	1.65	0.67
COLUMBUS	3.71	1.30	2.59	0.65	3.89	0.74	0.28	0.37	0.28
DALLAS	3.23	2.72	3.43	1.51	3.28	0.55	0.35	3.02	0.71
DENVER	5.30	2.73	1.62	3.02	3.98	1.10	0.37	1.40	0.07
DETROIT	3.78	4.39	2.65	4.86	2.04	0.94	0.89	0.42	2.06
EL PASO	8.53	2.42	-	5.15	0.80	0.64	0.80	3.38	0.32
FORT WORTH	1.45	3.43	4.76	0.13	3.17	0.66	1.72	2.64	0.26
HONOLULU	2.58	4.88	2.44	-	2.24	0.34	0.75	1.29	0.54
HOUSTON	3.82	1.89	1.97	2.00	2.75	0.29	0.75	0.50	1.43
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	-	-	1.87	-	4.05	0.62	1.87	-	-
KANSAS CITY	1.63	1.96	6.36	3.83	0.98	1.06	1.14	1.22	1.30
LONG BEACH	7.36	6.55	2.78	0.16	1.80	0.33	-	2.78	3.60
MEMPHIS	0.48	1.61	14.22	1.28	2.73	0.88	0.08	1.04	0.40
MIAMI	4.53	4.40	4.26	0.41	2.61	1.37	0.96	0.41	1.10
MINNEAPOLIS	4.71	2.16	1.65	-	2.93	0.64	0.51	0.25	0.38

Personnel in Each Unit (continued)

	% Youth	% Vice	% Other Operations	% Technical Services	% Commu- nications	% Internal Affairs	% R & D	% Records	% Chief's Office
NEW ORLEANS	2.85	1.39	2.12	9.87	2.72	0.60	0.60	1.59	0.40
NEWARK	1.73	3.87	0.93	0.60	3.54	1.13	0.47	0.40	1.13
NORFOLK	4.29	3.96	5.94	2.31	3.46 *	0.66	0.50	-	1.65
OAKLAND	4.54	2.58	0.76	-	1.06	0.76	0.76	2.12	0.30
OMAHA	1.50	2.99	1.12	6.54	-	0.75	0.75	4.48	0.37
PHILADELPHIA	4.04	0.23	7.04	0.71	1.80	0.28	0.26	0.61	0.04
PHOENIX	2.78	2.48	0.18	-	4.08	1.48	0.50	0.68	0.68
PITTSBURGH	-	-	-	0.07	3.58	0.70	0.07	0.84	1.69
PORTLAND	3.93	3.93	0.14	8.44	-	0.58	0.44	0.73	1.16
ROCHESTER	-	4.31	4.78	3.54	3.85*	1.08	1.23	-	0.31
SACRAMENTO	2.24	3.26	5.51	1.22	1.43	0.41	0.61	-	1.43
ST. LOUIS	3.19	0.53	0.92	1.31	1.60	1.35	0.29	0.72	0.48
ST. PAUL	2.53	1.17	-	-	10.53	0.58	0.39	3.12	1.56
SAN DIEGO	2.70	2.18	7.50	1.22	0.87	0.35	0.35	0.09	-
SAN FRANCISCO	2.51	3.10	-	1.01	2.33	1.37	0.78	2.33	0.48
SAN JOSE	5.45	2.08	4.93	0.00	-	0.52	0.78	2.85	0.78
SEATTLE	2.57	3.45	1.06	0.00	1.59	0.88	0.71	0.71	0.71
TAMPA	3.39	5.93	0.34	0.00	2.20	0.34	-	0.68	1.02
TOLEDO	4.32	2.97	3.51	2.97	5.14	-	0.68	3.11	0.27
TUCSON	-	4.97	0.19	4.21	-	-	-	2.87	0.57
TULSA	1.87	4.52	-	6.08	0.94	0.31	0.94	3.59	0.78
WASHINGTON	1.86	2.31	1.08	0.05	3.71	0.87	0.17	2.02	0.10
WICHITA	3.92	2.35	3.13	4.18	0.26	0.78	0.52	2.35	0.26

*In Norfolk and Rochester, the communications and records units are combined.

SUMMARY DATA

	Personnel in Each Unit (continued)		Personnel In Each Rank							
	% Personnel	% Other Admin.	% Police Officer	% Inspector Detective	% Sergeant	% Lieutenant	% Captain	% Major	% Above	% Other LE
AKRON	-	-	79.44	-	13.92	4.07	1.71	-	0.86	-
ALBUQUERQUE	-	6.06	59.88	18.14	14.92	4.64	1.61	-	0.81	-
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	2.39	0.20	62.95	-	27.09	6.57	2.19	0.60	0.60	-
BALTIMORE	N/A	N/A	84.19	-	11.14	3.14	0.56	0.26	0.70	-
BIRMINGHAM	-	4.07	70.93	-	21.23	4.82	2.26	-	0.75	-
BOSTON	0.05	-	67.32	12.48	14.71	3.31	1.29	0.67	-	0.21
BUFFALO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	0.34	1.52	79.76	-	13.66	-	4.72	1.18	0.67	-
CINCINNATI	1.46	1.88	60.46	19.87	13.28	4.08	1.78	-	0.52	-
CLEVELAND	0.31	11.90	72.80	10.41	10.51	4.28	1.34	0.52	0.05	0.10
COLUMBUS	1.39	4.26	82.02	-	12.60	3.34	1.39	0.56	0.09	-
DALLAS	1.36	1.56	79.17	1.51	13.92	3.53	1.06	-	0.10	0.71
DENVER	0.29	4.27	62.71	20.78	10.91	3.02	1.18	-	0.44	0.96
DETROIT	4.43	2.31	71.45	-	20.52	4.07	1.12	0.38	0.11	2.34
EL PASO	-	1.77	61.03	20.29	10.47	5.96	1.45	0.64	0.16	-
FORT WORTH	0.66	0.53	78.20	8.72	8.72	2.38	1.32	-	0.66	-
HONOLULU	0.34	3.66	68.59	9.43	14.31	4.34	1.49	1.42	0.41	-
HOUSTON	0.61	13.12	77.26	10.65	7.86	2.82	0.96	-	0.43	-
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	-	6.96	73.39	7.90	8.84	6.86	2.08	-	0.83	0.10
KANSAS CITY	4.08	7.42	63.46	11.99	18.19	-	4.00	1.96	0.41	-
LONG BEACH	3.11	-	71.36	0.16	20.78	5.24	1.80	0.49	0.16	-
MEMPHIS	0.56	4.58	59.68	0.64	22.73	12.29	4.10	0.32	0.16	0.08
MIAMI	1.51	2.75	74.86	-	19.23	4.53	-	1.10	0.27	-
MINNEAPOLIS	1.27	1.40	64.76	0.51	17.30	14.25	2.04	0.64	0.51	-

	Personnel in Each Unit (continued)		Personnel in Each Rank							
	% Personnel	% Other Admin.	% Police Officer	% Inspector Detective	% Sergeant	% Lieutenant	% Captain	% Major	% Above	% Other LE
NEW ORLEANS	0.73	5.63	79.60	-	12.85	4.90	1.85	0.33	0.20	0.26
NEWARK	-	1.13	67.44	14.14	7.74	7.20	1.87	0.80	0.80	-
NORFOLK	0.16	1.16	59.08	16.34	9.74	3.46	1.48	0.66	0.50	8.74
OAKLAND	4.09	9.54	74.54	0.15	19.70	3.64	1.36	-	0.61	-
OMAHA	0.19	4.48	71.96	-	20.37	4.86	1.50	-	1.31	-
PHILADELPHIA	-	5.06	86.12	0.08	6.08	3.46	0.99	0.37	0.17	2.73
PHOENIX	0.37	1.36	71.66	10.40	12.87	3.16	1.05	0.50	0.37	-
PITTSBURGH	0.07	0.35	89.60	1.48	6.18	2.53	0.21	-	-	-
PORTLAND	1.16	0.87	68.70	14.41	10.92	3.64	1.46	0.29	0.58	-
ROCHESTER	0.15	2.00	72.42	8.63	10.32	4.93	2.62	0.62	0.46	-
SACRAMENTO	1.43	1.22	73.88	-	16.73	6.12	1.84	0.20	1.02	0.20
ST. LOUIS	0.05	10.69	83.60	-	11.03	2.42	1.06	0.29	0.24	1.35
ST. PAUL	0.19	5.46	63.94	-	25.92	5.65	2.53	-	0.97	0.97
SAN DIEGO	0.44	6.81	79.84	-	11.43	3.66	1.40	0.61	0.44	2.62
SAN FRANCISCO	0.78	2.98	67.82	14.09	11.88	4.42	1.25	0.24	0.24	0.06
SAN JOSE	2.59	0.39	72.37	21.92	3.76	1.30	0.52	-	0.13	-
SEATTLE	1.86	0.18	59.20	15.04	11.24	3.18	1.33	0.53	0.44	9.03
TAMPA	0.51	1.02	55.76	16.95	10.17	3.05	3.05	1.02	0.51	9.49
TOLEDO	0.14	2.03	77.84	-	13.65	5.14	2.70	-	0.68	-
TUCSON	0.38	0.19	80.50	-	15.10	2.87	0.96	0.38	0.19	-
TULSA	-	0.78	59.44	23.09	11.86	3.59	1.09	0.47	0.31	0.16
WASHINGTON	0.12	4.22	68.28	12.22	13.45	3.95	1.13	0.63	0.34	-
WICHITA	1.04	2.09	54.05	28.20	-	13.05	3.39	-	1.30	-

SUMMARY DATA

Motor/Foot Beats

	Day		Evening		Night		Other	
	% Motor	% Foot	% Motor	% Foot	% Motor	% Foot	% Motor	% Foot
AKRON	68.75	31.25	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
ALBUQUERQUE	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	-	-
ATLANTA	65.22	34.78	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	92.59	7.41	95.24	4.76	95.24	4.76	100.00	0.00
BALTIMORE	53.48	46.52	59.43	40.57	89.42	10.58	98.98	1.02
BIRMINGHAM	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	-	-
BOSTON	45.54	54.46	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
BUFFALO*	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	-	-
CHARLOTTE	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	-	-
CINCINNATI	96.88	3.12	96.97	3.03	97.40	2.60	-	-
CLEVELAND	98.04	1.96	98.04	1.96	98.04	1.96	100.00	0.00
COLUMBUS	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	97.50	2.50	-	-
DALLAS	94.57	5.43	95.68	4.32	96.67	3.33	-	-
DENVER	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	-	-
DETROIT	80.21	19.79	81.71	18.28	84.62	15.38	-	-
EL PASO	89.66	10.34	89.66	10.34	100.00	0.00	-	-
FORT WORTH	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	-	-
HONOLULU	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
HOUSTON	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	-	-
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	95.29	4.70	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	-	-
JERSEY CITY	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
KANSAS CITY	93.24	6.76	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	-	-
LONG BEACH	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MEMPHIS	90.91	9.09	91.23	8.77	100.00	0.00	-	-
MIAMI	65.22	34.78	85.00	15.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
MINNEAPOLIS	64.28	35.71	87.10	12.90	93.10	6.90	100.00	0.00

Motor/Foot Beats

	Day		Evening		Night		Other	
	% Motor	% Foot	% Motor	% Foot	% Motor	% Foot	% Motor	% Foot
NEW ORLEANS	97.09	2.91	96.04	3.96	100.00	0.00	-	-
NEWARK	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NORFOLK	97.62	2.38	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	-	-
OAKLAND	67.31	32.69	100.00	0.00	94.59	5.40	-	-
OMAHA	98.11	1.89	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	-	-
PHILADELPHIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
PHOENIX	86.49	13.51	92.75	7.25	100.00	0.00	-	-
PITTSBURGH	73.49	26.51	38.61	61.39	68.54	31.46	-	-
PORTLAND	94.12	5.88	92.86	7.14	100.00	0.00	-	-
ROCHESTER	83.33	16.67	87.50	12.50	87.50	12.50	100.00	0.00
SACRAMENTO	90.91	9.09	92.86	7.14	90.48	9.52	-	-
ST. LOUIS	88.78	11.21	89.28	10.71	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
ST. PAUL	84.85	15.15	89.19	10.81	100.00	0.00	-	-
SAN DIEGO	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	-	-
SAN FRANCISCO	84.78	15.22	94.06	5.94	95.31	4.69	-	-
SAN JOSE	97.89	2.10	98.32	1.68	100.00	0.00	-	-
SEATTLE	100.00	0.00	89.19	10.81	85.54	14.46	-	-
TAMPA	92.31	7.69	91.49	8.51	93.33	6.67	100.00	0.00
TOLEDO	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	-	-
TUCSON	92.31	7.69	96.00	4.00	100.00	0.00	-	-
TULSA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
WASHINGTON	94.93	5.07	96.80	3.20	98.37	1.63	-	-
WICHITA	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	-	-

*Buffalo's motor and foot beats vary, but are mostly motorized.

SUMMARY DATA

Placement of Investigations Personnel

	Criminal Investigators		Vice Officers		Intelligence Investigators		Hit & Run Investigators	
	% Head- quarters	% Decen- tralized	% Head- quarters	% Decen- tralized	% Head- quarters	% Decen- tralized	% Head- quarters	% Decen- tralized
AKRON	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ALBUQUERQUE	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
ATLANTA	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
AUSTIN	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	-	-	-	-
BALTIMORE	100.00	0.00	-	-	-	-	-	-
BIRMINGHAM	75.76	24.24	100.00	0.00	-	-	100.00	0.00
BOSTON	38.46	61.54	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	-	-
BUFFALO	33.33	66.67	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
CHARLOTTE	27.27	72.73	100.00	0.00	-	-	-	-
CINCINNATI	22.79	77.20	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
CLEVELAND	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
COLUMBUS	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
DALLAS	56.97	43.03	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
DENVER	67.62	32.37	89.74	10.26	57.14	42.86	100.00	0.00
DETROIT	64.96	35.04	93.10	6.90	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
EL PASO	91.49	8.51	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
FORT WORTH	58.82	41.18	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
HONOLULU	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
HOUSTON	16.67	83.33	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
INDIANAPOLIS	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
JACKSONVILLE	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
JERSEY CITY	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
KANSAS CITY	77.35	22.65	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
LONG BEACH	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
MEMPHIS	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
MIAMI	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
MINNEAPOLIS	87.08	12.92	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00

Placement of Investigations Personnel

	Criminal Investigators		Vice Officers		Intelligence Investigators		Hit & Run Investigators	
	% Head- quarters	% Decen- tralized	% Head- quarters	% Decen- tralized	% Head- quarters	% Decen- tralized	% Head- quarters	% Decen- tralized
NEW ORLEANS	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
NEWARK	100.00	0.00	63.79	36.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
NORFOLK	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
OAKLAND	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
OMAHA	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
PHILADELPHIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
PHOENIX	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
PITTSBURGH	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	-	-	-	-
PORTLAND	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
ROCHESTER	41.67	58.33	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
SACRAMENTO	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
ST. LOUIS	45.38	54.62	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	-	-
ST. PAUL	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	-	-	100.00	0.00
SAN DIEGO	73.15	26.84	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
SAN FRANCISCO	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
SAN JOSE	100.00	0.00	-	-	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
SEATTLE	81.71	18.29	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
TAMPA	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
TOLEDO	92.16	7.84	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
TUCSON	86.17	13.83	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	66.67	33.33
TULSA	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
WASHINGTON	48.58	51.42	50.00	50.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
WICHITA	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	-	-	100.00	0.00

SUMMARY DATA

Placement of Investigations Personnel (continued)

	Total Investigations Personnel		Marked Units Per 100 Sworn Officers	Unmarked Units Per 100 Sworn Officers	% Unmarked Units	Incidents w/Firearms Per 100 Sworn Officers	Complaints Per 100 Sworn Officers	% Complaints Substantiated
	% Headquarters	% Decentralized						
AKRON	N/A	N/A	14.99	14.13	48.53	0.86	N/A	N/A
ALBUQUERQUE	100.00	0.00	23.18	25.20	52.08	6.65	122.18	2.80
ATLANTA	100.00	0.00	N/A	N/A	51.92	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	100.00	0.00	16.73	20.12	54.59	N/A	28.09	32.62
BALTIMORE	100.00	0.00	15.28	6.57	30.07	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIRMINGHAM	80.72	19.28	16.42	31.78	65.94	5.57	54.22	36.67
BOSTON	43.36	56.64	9.17	5.90	39.18	2.23	11.50	31.98
BUFFALO	43.40	56.60	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CHARLOTTE	42.86	57.14	19.06	15.34	44.61	2.70	15.01	64.04
CINCINNATI	38.60	61.40	8.89	4.39	33.07	2.62	36.51	29.80
CLEVELAND	87.01	12.99	12.47	12.83	50.71	N/A	16.43	11.91
COLUMBUS	100.00	0.00	20.85	20.85	50.00	3.06	40.59	38.81
DALLAS	66.24	33.76	18.05	16.09	47.12	2.17	10.39	65.05
DENVER	73.36	26.64	11.42	23.29	67.09	N/A	43.18	53.75
DETROIT	73.82	26.18	11.88	9.74	45.05	5.16	29.47	21.85
EL PASO	92.92	7.08	20.45	14.33	41.20	1.29	41.38	34.63
FORT WORTH	68.54	31.46	18.23	19.42	51.58	N/A	26.82	23.15
HONOLULU	100.00	0.00	5.16	0.20	3.80	0.41	16.42	66.94
HOUSTON	95.19	4.81	29.42	34.04	53.63	N/A	N/A	N/A
INDIANAPOLIS	100.00	0.00	N/A	N/A	18.32	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	100.00	0.00	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JERSEY CITY	100.00	0.00	6.44	5.51	46.09	N/A	21.52	11.59
KANSAS CITY	77.67	22.39	11.42	20.39	64.10	3.92	56.44	9.54
LONG BEACH	100.00	0.00	11.13	9.00	44.72	0.00	N/A	N/A
MEMPHIS	100.00	0.00	19.76	16.79	45.93	7.31	27.55	N/A
MIAMI	100.00	0.00	29.94	14.56	32.72	6.04	50.27	15.30
MINNEAPOLIS	88.14	11.86	13.49	8.78	39.43	2.04	39.06	7.49

Placement of Investigations Personnel (continued)

	Total Investigations Personnel		Marked	Unmarked	%	Incidents	Complaints	%
	%	%	Units Per	Units Per	Unmarked	w/Firearms	Per 100	Complaints
	Headquarters	Decentralized	100 Sworn	100 Sworn	Units	Per 100	Sworn	Substantiated
			Officers	Officers		Sworn Officers	Officers	
NEW ORLEANS	100.00	0.00	19.27	39.67	67.30	N/A	20.26	61.76
NEWARK	89.80	10.19	8.87	9.07	50.56	3.34	19.28	60.55
NORFOLK	100.00	0.00	10.40	11.55	52.63	3.14	26.40	25.62
OAKLAND	100.00	0.00	15.91	15.15	48.78	3.33	N/A	N/A
OMAHA	100.00	0.00	13.83	10.65	43.51	3.74	32.71	14.28
PHILADELPHIA	N/A	N/A	9.67	6.41	39.86	N/A	N/A	N/A
PHOENIX	100.00	0.00	21.90	17.33	44.16	1.67	9.84	13.21
PITTSBURGH	100.00	0.00	4.50	4.43	49.61	N/A	7.45	38.68
PORTLAND	100.00	0.00	12.52	2.91	18.87	1.02	102.62	5.67
ROCHESTER	57.58	42.42	14.33	20.34	58.67	2.46	38.52	20.40
SACRAMENTO	100.00	0.00	18.78	15.92	45.88	3.26	23.88	27.35
ST. LOUIS	53.58	46.42	11.08	12.58	53.17	6.34	22.59	9.42
ST. PAUL	100.00	0.00	20.08	14.04	41.14	10.14	82.65	25.94
SAN DIEGO	79.49	20.51	20.16	10.64	34.56	2.36	89.79	1.07
SAN FRANCISCO	100.00	0.00	9.13	12.30	57.38	N/A	62.75	17.13
SAN JOSE	100.00	0.00	21.27	13.23	38.34	N/A	N/A	N/A
SEATTLE	86.78	13.22	13.01	10.44	44.53	1.42	37.26	9.26
TAMPA	100.00	0.00	46.61	23.56	33.57	N/A	19.66	20.69
TOLEDO	93.89	6.11	15.81	17.57	52.63	4.19	26.89	5.02
TUCSON	88.24	11.76	26.39	20.46	43.67	2.87	79.35	4.82
TULSA	100.00	0.00	26.36	14.51	35.50	N/A	N/A	N/A
WASHINGTON	52.07	47.93	7.47	4.80	39.10	1.59	1.32	3.64
WICHITA	100.00	0.00	17.23	17.75	50.75	4.96	15.14	63.79

SUMMARY DATA

1-Officer/2-Officer Units (continued)

	Night		Other		Total	
	% 1-Officer	% 2-Officer	% 1-Officer	% 2-Officer	% 1-Officer	% 2-Officer
AKRON	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	15.85	84.15
ALBUQUERQUE	89.58	10.42	-	-	85.31	14.68
ATLANTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUSTIN	95.24	4.76	100.00	0.00	94.94	5.06
BALTIMORE	80.95	19.05	77.55	22.45	85.96	14.04
BIRMINGHAM	21.88	78.12	-	-	39.84	60.16
BOSTON	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BUFFALO	0.00	100.00	-	-	0.00	100.00
CHARLOTTE	0.00	100.00	-	-	0.00	100.00
CINCINNATI	90.91	9.09	-	-	93.24	6.76
CLEVELAND	1.96	98.04	0.00	100.00	1.48	98.52
COLUMBUS	73.75	26.25	-	-	73.30	26.69
DALLAS	55.56	44.44	-	-	65.62	34.38
DENVER	6.67	93.33	-	-	32.62	67.38
DETROIT	0.00	100.00	-	-	9.76	90.24
EL PASO	0.00	100.00	-	-	21.43	78.57
FORT WORTH	54.93	45.07	-	-	70.91	29.09
HONOLULU	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
HOUSTON	0.00	100.00	-	-	33.33	66.67
INDIANAPOLIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JACKSONVILLE	100.00	0.00	-	-	100.00	0.00
JERSEY CITY	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
KANSAS CITY	100.00	0.00	-	-	100.00	100.00
LONG BEACH	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MEMPHIS	20.00	80.00	-	-	17.02	82.98
MIAMI	50.00	50.00	0.00	100.00	57.26	42.74
MINNEAPOLIS	6.90	93.10	48.28	51.72	26.72	73.28

1-Officer/2-Officer Units (continued)

	Night		Other		Total	
	% 1-Officer	% 2-Officer	% 1-Officer	% 2-Officer	% 1-Officer	% 2-Officer
NEW ORLEANS	0.00	100.00	-	-	39.22	60.78
NEWARK	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NORFOLK	100.00	0.00	-	-	100.00	0.00
OAKLAND	100.00	0.00	-	-	100.00	0.00
OMAHA	76.74	23.26	-	-	87.01	12.99
PHILADELPHIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
PHOENIX	79.69	20.31	-	-	73.91	26.09
PITTSBURGH	0.00	100.00	-	-	0.00	100.00
PORTLAND	74.07	25.92	-	-	73.50	26.50
ROCHESTER	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	53.03	46.97
SACRAMENTO	9.52	90.48	-	-	51.04	48.96
ST. LOUIS	75.56	24.44	100.00	0.00	81.13	18.87
ST. PAUL	33.33	66.67	-	-	47.73	52.27
SAN DIEGO	76.56	23.44	-	-	76.56	23.44
SAN FRANCISCO	39.06	60.94	-	-	42.41	57.59
SAN JOSE	100.00	0.00	-	-	100.00	0.00
SEATTLE	27.71	72.29	-	-	52.09	47.91
TAMPA	73.33	26.67	100.00	0.00	70.34	29.66
TOLEDO	54.28	45.71	-	-	50.46	49.54
TUCSON	100.00	0.00	-	-	98.67	1.33
TULSA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
WASHINGTON	36.58	63.41	-	-	36.53	63.47
WICHITA	100.00	0.00	-	-	100.00	0.00

*APPENDIX A:
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE AND
ACCOMPANYING LETTER*

July 27, 1977

Dear Chief:

Attached you will find the questionnaire for the 1977 General Administrative Survey of Municipal Police Departments. This survey is being conducted cooperatively by the Kansas City, Missouri Police Department and the Police Foundation.

For twenty-two consecutive years, the Staff Research Unit of our department conducted this survey, ending in 1973. Virtually hundreds of requests for continuation of this document, along with financial assistance from the Police Foundation, again make the survey possible.

Two copies of the questionnaire are enclosed; one is for your records. Initial computation of the survey will be done by our Staff Research Unit. The format and printing will be accomplished through the facilities of the Police Foundation, and they will see that each participating agency receives copies.

We would appreciate it if you would return your questionnaire by August 15, 1977, in order that we may complete the survey and return the results to you as soon as possible.

Assuring you of our appreciation for your continued cooperation, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Marvin L. Van Kirk
Chief of Police

INSTRUCTIONS

One person from the department should be responsible for coordinating the completion of this questionnaire amongst the various elements who complete sections.

Name _____

Assignment _____

Telephone Number _____

Please ensure that specific answers are given to each question and that no booklets are attached.

Spell out not available or not applicable when appropriate.

Return the questionnaire by August 15, 1977, to:

Captain William D. Dycus
Kansas City, Missouri Police Department
Staff Research Unit
1125 Locust
Kansas City, Missouri 64106

July, 1977

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

(Cities 250,000 Population and above
and members of Police Executive Research Forum)

* * * * *

KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI POLICE DEPARTMENT
(Staff Research Unit)

In cooperation with
THE POLICE FOUNDATION

GENERAL INFORMATION SECTION

1. Name of city: _____
2. Your city's 1975 estimated population: _____
3. Land area in square miles: _____
4. Total budget for last fiscal year (1976 if calendar year is used excluding any federal, state or private funds):

5. Salary budget for last fiscal year (1976 if calendar year is used):

(Amount) (Percentage)
6. Overtime expenditure for last fiscal year:
 - a. Court related _____
 - b. Other _____
 - c. Total _____
7. Number of police stations including headquarters _____
8. Does your department permit lateral entry?
Yes _____ No _____
(If yes, please specify at what levels entry is permitted)

9. Does your department have a residency requirement for law enforcement personnel?

Yes _____ No _____

All Law Enforcement _____

New recruits _____

Other _____

10. Does your department offer any of the following special pay categories?

a. Longevity _____

b. College _____

c. Hazardous duty _____

d. Specialty _____

e. Other _____

HIGHER EDUCATION

11. What is the average educational level of L.E. personnel?

a. High school _____ %

b. 2 years college _____ %

c. Baccalaureate degree _____ %

d. Masters degree _____ %

e. Other _____

12. Does your department have college educational requirements for the following? (If so, please specify):

a. 1st year police officer _____

b. Supervisors _____

c. Command ranks _____

13. Does your department provide additional pay for the following levels of higher education?

☐ 1 year college

☐ 2 years college

☐ 3 years college

☐ B.A. or B.S.

☐ M.A. or M.S.

14. Does educational incentive pay have to be from police-related course work?

Yes _____ No _____

UNIFORMS AND LEATHER

15. Uniforms furnished by: ☐ Officer ☐ Department
Leather furnished by: ☐ Officer ☐ Department

16. Yearly department allowance to officers for leather and uniforms: \$

17. Sidearms furnished by: ☐ Officer ☐ Department

18. Type of sidearm used by your department:

Revolver, Caliber _____ Semi-Automatic, Caliber _____

19. Ammunition used by your department:

Type _____

20. Does your department policy require officers to be armed off duty?

Yes _____ No _____ Optional _____

21. Number of incidents in 1976 involving use of firearm by department member:

RETIREMENT SYSTEM

22. Annual contribution to retirement:

_____ % by Officer _____ % by City

23. Minimum retirement provisions:

a. Years of service _____

b. Age _____

c. Benefits _____

24. Maximum retirement provisions:

a. Years of service _____

b. Age _____

c. Benefits _____

DISABILITY PENSION—ILLNESS AND INJURY

25. Specific non-service connected disability benefits (FORMULA):

Specific service connected disability benefits (FORMULA):

DEATH BENEFITS: PENSION

26. Widow _____

Surviving Children _____

Other _____

DEATH BENEFITS OTHER THAN PENSION

27. From natural death _____

From line-of-duty _____

BENEFITS

28. Sick leave policy

a. Annual days paid sick leave _____

b. Limit of accumulation (days) _____

29. Vacation Leave Policy

a. Annual amount of vacation leave in working days (Please specify increases in vacation days with length of service):

b. Number of paid holidays per year: _____

30. Health care provided for officers by the department:

a. Line-of-duty—Injury or illness

Hospitalization _____%

Medical _____%

Surgical _____%

b. Off-duty—Injury or illness

Hospitalization _____%

Medical _____%

Surgical _____%

c. Group health insurance

Paid by officer _____%

Paid by city or department _____%

31. Does your department provide dental insurance? Yes _____ No _____

VEHICLE FLEET

32. Number of police vehicles:

a. Motorcycles _____

Make _____

b. Scooters _____

Make _____

c. Patrol wagon _____

Day shift _____

Evening shift _____

Night shift _____

Other _____

d. Marked cars _____

Unmarked cars _____

33. Maintenance of police motor fleet performed by: _____

34. Does your department issue marked police vehicles for both on-duty and off-duty use?

Yes _____ No _____

35. Liability insurance on police vehicles furnished by:

City _____ Officer _____

Department _____ Other (Please specify) _____

AIRCRAFT

36. Total number of aircraft

a. Number of fixed-wing aircraft _____

b. Number of helicopters _____

37. Deployment of aircraft (Check all boxes that apply)

a. Patrol ☐

b. Traffic ☐

c. Search and rescue ☐

COMPUTER OPERATIONS

38. Does your department use computers?

Yes _____ No _____

39. Does your computer have police want/warrant files on line?

Yes _____ No _____

40. Is your computer totally dedicated to police operations or is it shared with non-police agencies?

Police controlled _____ Shared _____

42. Areas in computer system: (Check all boxes that apply)

- ☐ Stolen autos
- ☐ Stolen property
- ☐ License registration
- ☐ Warrants
- ☐ Personnel
- ☐ Modus Operandi
- ☐ Criminal index

- ☐ Payroll
- ☐ Police calls
- ☐ Traffic accidents
- ☐ Traffic arrests
- ☐ Other arrests

SALARY

43. Uniformed ranks salary schedule: (Please fill in salaries next to ranks appropriate to your department)

a. Other than Detective Ranks

Base Annual Salary

	Maximum Salary	Minimum Salary
Chief of Police		
Commissioner of Police		
Superintendent of Police		
Other (Specify)		
1st Deputy Superintendent		
Lieutenant Colonel		
Deputy Chief		
Assistant Chief		
Other (Specify)		
Major		
Inspector		
Other (Specify)		
Police Commander		
Deputy Inspector		
Other (Specify)		
Captain of Police		
Lieutenant of Police		
Sergeant of Police		
Corporal		
Police Officer (15 years or more)		
Police Officer (10-15 years)		
Police Officer (5-10 years)		
Police Officer (2-5 years)		
Police Officer (1st year)		

b. Detective Ranks	Base Annual Salary	
	Maximum Salary	Minimum Salary
Commanding Officer, Detectives	_____	_____
Captain of Detectives	_____	_____
Lieutenant of Detectives	_____	_____
Sergeant of Detectives	_____	_____
Detectives	_____	_____

44. At what rate does your department compensate for the following? (Time and a half, doubletime, compensatory time)

a. Court time _____

b. Overtime _____

PROMOTIONAL POLICY (PROCESS)

45. Which of the following evaluations are necessary for promotion in your department? (Please check all boxes that apply):

- a. For promotion to detective
- ☐ Written examination
 - ☐ Oral interview (Specify by whom) _____
 - ☐ Assessment center
 - ☐ Psychological evaluation
 - ☐ Performance evaluation
 - ☐ Appointment by _____
- b. For promotion to sergeant
- ☐ Written examination
 - ☐ Oral interview (Specify by whom) _____
 - ☐ Assessment center
 - ☐ Psychological evaluation
 - ☐ Performance evaluation
 - ☐ Other (Specify) _____
- c. For promotion to lieutenant
- ☐ Written examination
 - ☐ Oral interview (Specify by whom) _____
 - ☐ Assessment center
 - ☐ Psychiatric evaluation
 - ☐ Performance evaluation

d. For promotion to captain

- ☐ Written examination
- ☐ Oral interview
- ☐ Assessment center
- ☐ Psychological evaluation
- ☐ Performance evaluation

46. Written promotional examinations are provided by: (Please check appropriate box)

- ☐ Federal Civil Service Commission
- ☐ State Civil Service
- ☐ City Civil Service
- ☐ Police Department
- ☐ City Personnel Department
- ☐ Other (Please specify):

47. Time in grade required for eligibility to next higher rank: (In years)

- a. Police Officer to Detective _____
- b. Police Officer and Detective to Sergeant _____
- c. Sergeant to Lieutenant _____
- d. Lieutenant to Captain _____

OPERATIONAL DATA

48. Number of hours worked by officers per week:

49. Number of regular patrol beats per shift:

	DAY		EVENING		NIGHT		OTHER	
	1*	2**	1*	2**	1*	2**	1*	2**
Motor _____								
Foot _____								

*1 One officer assigned

**2 Two officers assigned

50. Number of accident investigation personnel:

Day	Evening	Night	Other
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

51. Number of traffic enforcement personnel:

	<u>Solo Motorcycles</u>	<u>3-Wheel Motorcycles</u>	<u>Motor Scooters</u>	<u>Radar Units</u>
a. Law enforcement	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Civilian	_____	_____	_____	_____

52. Number of investigations personnel and placement:

	<u>Headquarters</u>	<u>Decentralized</u>
a. Criminal Investigations	_____	_____
b. Vice	_____	_____
c. Intelligence	_____	_____
d. Hit and Run	_____	_____

53. Does your department have a procedure whereby cases with a low probability of solution (i.e., no physical evidence, no suspect information, etc.) are not actively investigated?

Yes _____ No _____

54. Number of mobile evidence technicians per shift:

a. Day shift _____

b. Evening shift _____

c. Night shift _____

d. Other _____

55. Does your department use a "team" or "neighborhood" policing system?

Yes _____ No _____

56. Does your department use decoy or other proactive, arrest-oriented personnel?

Yes _____ No _____

57. Manpower shortages (sickness, injury, special assignment, etc.) may prevent the full deployment of patrol officers as ideally expressed in your beat plan. What percentage of patrol assignments are not manned as a result of the above conditions on a monthly basis? Estimate percentages:

<u>Day</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Other</u>
_____ %	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %

58. Patrol bureau deployment of personnel

a. Number of sergeants:

Day shift _____

Evening shift _____

Night shift _____

Other _____

b. Number of lieutenants

Day shift _____

Evening shift _____

Night shift _____

Other _____

c. Number of captains:

Day shift _____

Evening shift _____

Night shift _____

Other _____

d. Number of higher ranks: (Please specify)

Day shift _____

Evening shift _____

Night shift _____

Other _____

59. Does your department utilize rotation of patrol shifts?

Yes _____ No _____

Type of rotation

- ☐ Fixed
- ☐ Weekly
- ☐ Monthly
- ☐ Quarterly
- ☐ Other (Specify)

60. If shift is fixed, how is officer selected for his shift?

- ☐ Officer's choice
- ☐ Department assignment
- ☐ Seniority
- ☐ Other (Specify)

61. Do uniformed officers respond to all calls for service or are civilians used to respond to "cold" crime scenes and/or for report-taking?

Officers always _____

Civilians for specific assignments _____

REVIEW PROCESS

62. Does your department have some type of Police Review Board for reviewing officer conduct?

Yes _____ No _____

63. Police service complaints: (Internal Affairs, Office of Citizen Complaints, etc.)

a. Number of complaints received in 1976 _____

b. Number of complaints investigated in 1976 _____

c. Number of complaints substantiated in 1976 _____

DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONNEL BY UNIT

	<u>Civilian</u>	<u>Police Officers</u>	<u>Inspectors¹ Detectives</u>	<u>Sergeants</u>	<u>Lieutenants</u>	<u>Captains</u>	<u>Majors²</u>	<u>Above³</u>	<u>Other L.E.⁴</u>
<u>Unit</u>									
Operations	Patrol								
	Traffic								
	Tactical								
	Detective								
	Youth								
	Vice								
	Other Oper. Units								
Administration	Tech. Services								
	Communications								
	Internal Affairs								
	Research & Devel.								
	Records								
	Chief's Office								
	Personnel								
	Other Admin. Units								
	Totals								
	What Percentage of Law Enforcement Personnel are above the basic Police Officer rank?								

Distribution of Women and Minorities by Rank

Women Officers									
Black Officers									
Spanish Officers									
American Indian Officers									
Other Minority Officers									

1. Inspectors, titled investigators (include commander officers under appropriate title).

2. Inspectors-command level.

3. Deputy Chiefs, Asst. Chiefs, Lt. Cols., Chiefs, etc.

4. Master patrol officer, police agents, etc.

*APPENDIX B:
CITY POPULATION GROUPS AND GEOGRAPHIC
REGIONS OF PARTICIPATING DEPARTMENTS*

More than 1,000,000 (all regions)

Detroit
Houston
Philadelphia

500,000 - 999,999

Northeast
Boston
Pittsburgh

North Central
Cleveland
Columbus
Indianapolis
Kansas City
St. Louis

South
Baltimore
Dallas
Jacksonville
Memphis
New Orleans
Washington

West
Denver
Honolulu
Phoenix
San Diego*
San Francisco
San Jose
Seattle

250,000 - 499,999

Northeast
Buffalo
Jersey City
Newark
Rochester

North Central
Akron
Cincinnati
Minneapolis
Omaha
St. Paul
Toledo
Wichita

South
Atlanta
Austin
Birmingham
Charlotte
El Paso
Fort Worth
Miami
Norfolk
Tampa
Tulsa

West
Albuquerque
Long Beach
Oakland
Portland
Sacramento
Tucson

*The responses for the San Diego Police Department, although they are included in the tally sheets and summary data sheets, are not a part of the analysis appearing in Section One, because of their late arrival.

