

146866

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this ~~copyrighted~~ material has been granted by

Public Domain/LEAA

U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the ~~copyright~~ owner.

COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT

an assessment of capabilities and needs



146866
978971



COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT
An Assessment Of
Capabilities And Needs



National Sheriffs' Association
Washington, D.C. 20036
Ferris E. Lucas, Executive Director

Advisory Board Members

Sheriff Belvin Bergeron
Port Allen, Louisiana

Sheriff Peter Pitchess
Los Angeles, California

Sheriff Dale Carson
Jacksonville, Florida

Sheriff Charles Von Wald
Rochester, Minnesota

Sheriff Robert Gladney
Angleton, Texas

Sheriff Michael Wolke
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Director John McCool
Newark, Delaware

Project Staff

Andrew McKean
Project Director

E.L. Gibson, Project Monitor
Law Enforcement Assistance
Administration, Washington, D.C.

Philip Lynn
Assistant Project Director

Dr. Robert H. Shumway
Professor, George Washington
University, Washington, D.C.
Statistical Advisor

Roberta Libster
Administrative Assistant

Neal Miller, Attorney at Law
Washington, D.C.
Consultant, Mandate Study

This project was supported by grant number 76-DF-99-0069 of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended. Views expressed in this report are those of the authors, and do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Government or any of its agencies or departments or the National Sheriffs' Association.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		xii
SUMMARY		xiv
CHAPTER	I	INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER	II	THE OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF: AN ANALYSIS OF ITS CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY MANDATE.....	25
CHAPTER	III	PERSONNEL.....	48
CHAPTER	IV	BUDGET.....	82
CHAPTER	V	FACILITIES.....	113
CHAPTER	VI	EQUIPMENT.....	126
CHAPTER	VII	RECORDS.....	131
CHAPTER	VIII	DATA PROCESSING.....	143
CHAPTER	IX	AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.....	148
CHAPTER	X	PATROL.....	162
CHAPTER	XI	CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION.....	176
CHAPTER	XII	SPECIALIZED LAW ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS.....	187
CHAPTER	XIII	TRAFFIC.....	193
CHAPTER	XIV	IDENTIFICATION.....	201
CHAPTER	XV	LABORATORY SERVICES.....	204
CHAPTER	XVI	COMMUNICATIONS.....	220
CHAPTER	XVII	JAIL/CORRECTIONS.....	227
CHAPTER	XVIII	INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF PRISONERS.....	256
CHAPTER	XIX	THE NEEDS OF COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT.....	258

LIST OF TABLES

Table Number		Page Number
I-1	Project Coverage of County Sheriffs by Geographic Division and Regions.....	16
I-2	Geographic Divisions and Regions.....	22
II-1	Constitutional Status and Statutory Responsibilities of Sheriff Departments by State, 1976.....	29
II-2	Sheriffs' Term of Office and Tenure Specifications by State, 1977.....	33
II-3	Distribution of States by Sheriffs' Tenure and Term Specifications.....	35
II-4	State-authorized Selection Standards Applicable to Sheriffs' Agencies Law Enforcement Personnel by State, 1976.....	36
III-1	Profile of County Sheriffs by Age, Years as Sheriff and Total Years in Law Enforcement.....	54
III-2	County Sheriff Agencies Annual 1976 Salary Data.....	55
III-3	County Sheriff Agencies 1976 Salary Data by Geographic Division.....	56
III-4	County Sheriff Agencies 1976 Starting Salary Data in Various Positions.....	57
III-5	1976 Median Salary of County Sheriffs, Median Starting Salary of Deputies and Jailers by State.....	58
III-6	County Sheriff Agencies 1976 Starting Salary Data in Various Positions Northeastern States.....	60
III-7	County Sheriff Agencies 1976 Starting Salary in Various Positions North Central States.....	61
III-8	County Sheriff Agencies 1976 Starting Salary in Various Positions Southern States.....	62

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table Number		Page Number
III- 9	County Sheriff Agencies 1976 Starting Salary in Various Positions Western States.....	63
III-10	The 1976 Rate of Total and Sworn Employees Per 1,000 Inhabitants in County Sheriffs' Agencies by Geographic Division with Sub-urban and Rural County Breakdown.....	64
III-11	The 1976 Rate of Total and Sworn Law Enforcement Employees Per 1,000 Inhabitants in County Sheriffs' Agencies.....	65
III-12	Percent of County Sheriff Agencies Which Provide Fringe Benefits to Employees.....	67
III-13	Percent of County Sheriff Agencies Wherein Employees Are Regulated by Established Regulations or Program.....	68
III-14	Major Assignment of County Sheriff Sworn Employees.....	69
III-15	Major Assignment of County Sheriff Civilian Employees.....	70
III-16	Percent of County Sheriff Agencies Which Provide Pay Differentials for Job Assignments or Duty Hours.....	71
III-17	Profile of Chiefs and/or Director of County Police Departments by Age, Years as Chief of Department and Total Years in Law Enforcement.....	72
III-18	County Police Department Annual 1976 Salary Data.....	73
III-19	County Police Department 1976 Starting Salary Data in Various Positions.....	74
III-20	Major Assignment of County Police Department Sworn Personnel.....	75
III-21	Major Assignment of County Police Department Civilian Personnel.....	76

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table Number		Page Number
III-22	Percent of County Police Departments Wherein Employees Are Regulated by Established Regulations or Program.....	77
III-23	Profile of Independent City Sheriffs by Age, Years as Sheriff and Total Years in Law Enforcement.....	78
III-24	Independent City Sheriff Agencies Annual 1976 Salary Data.....	79
III-25	Independent City Sheriff Agencies 1976 Starting Salary Data for Various Positions.....	80
III-26	Major Assignment of Independent City Sheriff Sworn Employees.....	81
IV- 1	Median County Budget, Median Total Dollars Received From the County, Median Income Re- ceived in Addition to Monies Received from the County and Median Total Budget for County Sheriffs by Suburban and Rural Counties and National and Geographic Division.....	83
IV- 2	Mean County Sheriff Agencies Expenditures for Various Functions and Mean Total Expenditures by Suburban and Rural County and National and Geographic Division.....	85
IV- 3	Mean Suburban County Sheriff Agencies Expen- ditures for Various Functions and Total Ex- penditures by State.....	86
IV- 4	Mean Rural County Sheriff Agencies Expendi- tures for Various Functions and Total Expen- ditures by State.....	88
IV- 5	Percent of Suburban and Rural County Sheriffs Who Prepare Their Budget Request and Percent of County Sheriffs Who Receive Assistance from a County, Regional or State Planning Agency in Preparing Their Budget.....	90

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table Number		Page Number
IV- 6	Percent of County Sheriffs' Agencies Which Received Funding for Law Enforcement Programs from Various Sources.....	93
IV- 7	Percent of Suburban County Sheriffs' Agencies Which Received Funding for Law Enforcement Programs from Various Sources.....	94
IV- 8	Percent of Rural County Sheriffs' Agencies Which Received Funding for Law Enforcement Programs from Various Sources.....	96
IV- 9	Number of Suburban County Sheriffs' Agencies for Which Funding Was Received for Various Programs by State.....	98
IV-10	Number of Rural County Sheriffs' Agencies for Which Funding Was Received for Various Programs by State.....	100
IV-11	Number of County Sheriffs' Agencies for Which Funding Was Received for Various Programs or Functions by Suburban and Rural County and Geographic Division.....	102
IV-12	Percent of Suburban County Sheriff Agencies Which Reported the Need for Additional Funds in Various Categories.....	104
IV-13	Percent of Rural County Sheriff Agencies Which Reported the Need for Additional Funds in Various Categories.....	106
V- 1	Percent of Sheriffs' Agencies Which Have Various Types of Facilities, by Suburban and Rural Agency and by National and Geographic Division.....	114
V- 2	Age of Agency Headquarters by Suburban and Rural Agencies and by National and Geographic Division.....	118
V- 3	Overall Quality Ratings of Agency Headquarters by Suburban Rural Sheriff and by National and Geographic Division.....	120

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table Number		Page Number
VI- 1	Percent of Sheriffs Reporting the Availability of Various Forms of Equipment on an In-House Basis by Rural and Suburban Sheriffs and by National and Geographic Division.....	127
VII- 1	Percent of County Sheriffs' Agencies Which Compile Statistical Summaries Covering Various Categories.....	136
VII- 2	Percent of Suburban County Sheriffs' Agencies Which Compile Statistical Summaries Covering Various Categories.....	137
VII- 3	Percent of Rural County Sheriffs' Agencies Which Compile Statistical Summaries Covering Various Categories.....	138
VII- 4	Percent of County Sheriffs' Agencies by Geographic Division Which Compile Statistical Summaries Covering Various Categories (Northeastern States).....	139
VII- 5	Percent of County Sheriffs' Agencies by Geographic Division Which Compile Statistical Summaries Covering Various Categories (North Central States).....	140
VII- 6	Percent of County Sheriffs' Agencies by Geographic Division Which Compile Statistical Summaries Covering Various Categories (Southern States).....	141
VII- 7	Percent of County Sheriffs' Agencies by Geographic Division Which Compile Statistical Summaries Covering Various Categories (Western States).....	142
VIII- 1	Percent of County Agencies Which Have a National Crime Information Center (NCIC) Terminal or a State Crime Information Center Terminal by Geographic Division.....	144

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table Number		Page Number
VIII- 2	Percent of County Agencies By State Which Have a National Crime Information Center (NCIC) or State Crime Information Center Terminal in Their Agency.....	145
IX- 1	Structure of Government of the Nation's Counties by State.....	150
IX- 2	County in Mean Square Miles, Mean Road Miles in Jurisdiction Served and Mean Inland Water Area Served in County Sheriffs' Agencies' Jurisdiction by Rural and Suburban County and by Geographic Division.....	153
IX- 3	Percent of County Sheriffs' Agencies Which Assign Personnel to Various Functions.....	155
IX- 4	Percent of County Sheriffs' Agencies Which Assign Personnel to Various Functions by Geographic Division.....	156
IX- 5	Percent of County Police Departments Which Assign Personnel to Various Functions.....	157
IX- 6	Percent of County Police Departments Which Have Responsibilities in Various Functions....	158
IX- 7	Percent of Independent City Sheriffs Which Have Responsibilities in Various Functions....	160
IX- 8	Percent of Independent City Sheriffs Which Assign Personnel to Various Functions.....	161
X- 1	Percentage of County Sheriffs Which Have Primary Responsibility for All Patrol/ Investigative Functions in the County Excluding Municipal Police Areas, or, the Agency Which Has Primary Responsibility Other Than the County Sheriff, by Rural and Suburban County and by Geographic Division....	163

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table Number		Page Number
X- 2	Percentage of County Sheriffs Whose Jurisdiction Is Divided into Patrol Areas. Of These, the Percentage Which Utilize Permanent Personnel Assignments and the Percentage Using Selected Methods for Establishing Patrol Areas by Rural and Geographic Division.....	165
X- 3	Average Number of Patrol Cars and Patrol Officers Normally In-Service During High Crime Time, Sheriffs' Agencies by Suburban and Rural and Geographic Division.....	169
X- 4	Activities Routinely Performed by Sheriffs' Deputies Who Are Exclusively Assigned to Patrol. Percentage of Sheriffs by Rural and Suburban County and Geographic Division.....	171
XI- 1	Percent of County Sheriffs' Agencies with a Specialized Criminal Investigation Component.....	178
XII- 1	Percent of Suburban County Sheriffs' Agencies Which Have Various Specialized Law Enforcement Programs.....	189
XII- 2	Percent of Rural County Sheriffs' Agencies Which Have Various Specialized Law Enforcement Programs.....	190
XIII- 1	Mean Percent of Man Hours Spent in Traffic Control and Enforcement and Selected Operational Methods Utilized by Agencies with Separate Traffic Units, for County Sheriffs by Rural and Suburban County and Geographic Division.....	195
XV- 1	County Sheriffs' Agencies In-House Criminalistics Laboratory Capability.....	206
XV- 2	Laboratory Facilities Primarily Used by Sheriffs' Agencies by Suburban and Rural Counties.....	208

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table Number	Page Number
XV-3	County Sheriffs' Agencies' Analytical Lab Capabilities Available on an In-House Basis or Through State Facilities (Northeastern States).....209
XV-4	County Sheriffs' Agencies' Analytical Lab Capabilities Available on an In-House Basis or Through State Facilities (North Central States).....210
XV-5	County Sheriffs' Agencies' Analytical Lab Capabilities Available on an In-House Basis or Through State Facilities (Southern States).....211
XV-6	County Sheriffs' Agencies' Analytical Lab Capabilities Available on an In-House Basis or Through State Facilities (Western States).....212
XV-7	Average Time Between Submission of Evidence to the Laboratory Primarily Used and Receipt of Results, by State.....213
XV-8	County Sheriffs' Agencies Utilizing a Mobile Crime Laboratory.....216
XV-9	County Police Departments' Analytical Lab Capabilities Available on an In-House Basis or Through State Facilities.....218
XVI-1	Percent of County Sheriffs' Agencies with Centralized Communications Center Servicing Patrol and/or Investigative Functions Which Utilize a Centralized Emergency Telephone Number.....222
XVII-1	Percent of County Sheriffs responsible for the Operation of the County Jail, and the Use of Their Agencies for Primary Jail Operation, by Nation and Geographic Division..229

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table Number		Page Number
XVII-2	Percent of Sheriffs' Agencies with New Jails Under Construction or Capital Funds Approved for Construction; Mean Number of Beds Added, Mean Total Cost, and Mean Cost Per Inmate or New Construction, by National and Geographic Division.....	234
XVII-3	Mean Number of Inmates Which Jails Are Designed to Hold, Mean Number of Inmates Under Incarceration and Percent Composition of Inmate Population, by National and Geographic Division.....	237
XVII-4	Average Number and Average Rate Per Inmate of Full Time Jail/Corrections Employees by Number of Inmates, by Suburban and Rural Agency and National and Geographic Division...	246
XVII-5	Percent of County Jails Which Have Various Inmate Programs by Rural and Suburban County Jail and by National and Geographic Division.....	249

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table Number		Page Number
XVII-2	Percent of Sheriffs' Agencies with New Jails Under Construction or Capital Funds Approved for Construction; Mean Number of Beds Added, Mean Total Cost, and Mean Cost Per Inmate or New Construction, by National and Geographic Division.....	234
XVII-3	Mean Number of Inmates Which Jails Are Designed to Hold, Mean Number of Inmates Under Incarceration and Percent Composition of Inmate Population, by National and Geographic Division.....	237
XVII-4	Average Number and Average Rate Per Inmate of Full Time Jail/Corrections Employees by Number of Inmates, by Suburban and Rural Agency and National and Geographic Division...	246
XVII-5	Percent of County Jails Which Have Various Inmate Programs by Rural and Suburban County Jail and by National and Geographic Division.....	249

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A nationwide study of this nature can succeed only with the wholehearted cooperation and support of many law enforcement agencies and representatives. At this time the National Sheriffs' Association salutes its partners in this endeavor.

The sheriffs and county chiefs of police by their participation and submission of the detailed and vital information in the survey made this study possible. The Advisory Board of the project, members of the National Sheriffs' Association Executive Committee and Board of Directors, together with State Directors and State Sheriff Association representatives provided the acumen and experience of extensive law enforcement service to the direction of the study.

The Uniform Crime Reporting Section of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington, D.C., furnished abundant information relative to law enforcement strength and population data, thus eliminating the duplication in the collection of data from individual agencies. The Ocean Data Systems, Inc., Rockville, Maryland, demonstrated enthusiastic interest and professional skill in handling the data processing tasks of the study.

On behalf of my county law enforcement associates and the National Sheriffs' Association, I wish to express deep appreciation for the efforts of all who made this project, and its benefits to county law enforcement, possible.

Ferris E. Lucas
Executive Director
National Sheriffs' Association

SUMMARY

This report analyzes the capabilities and needs of county law enforcement in the United States. The information utilized in this study is the product of survey data submitted by 60 percent of all county law enforcement agencies in the country -- 1,893 sheriffs, 28 county police departments and 19 independent city sheriffs.

This report deals primarily with county sheriffs in the United States as they are predominantly the primary law enforcement agent at the county level. County police departments and independent city sheriffs are also included to complete the analysis, and where feasible are examined separately.

The sheriff in the United States is generally an elected official who has responsibility for law enforcement, corrections, court security, transportation of prisoners and the service of civil and criminal processes. He is a constitutional officer of the state in most cases and in others his authority is derived through state statute.

The total number of employees, suburban and rural counties, as reported by county sheriffs' agencies in this study is 88,788. The estimated total for the nation is 126,754 employees.

The 28 county police departments in the study listed a total of 16,197 employees and 19 independent city sheriffs' agencies listed a total of 794 employees.

Data relative to county sheriffs' agencies show the national sworn employee rate per 1,000 inhabitants is 1.4. This rate for suburban counties as a group is 2.2 and for rural counties as a group is 1.1.

While the complement of sworn officers in county sheriffs' agencies range from one to 5,640, the national median is 13.

The median salary for county sheriffs is \$13,800. Only 25 percent of the county sheriffs represented receive salaries in excess of \$17,576 per annum. Data indicates the median annual starting salary for a deputy sheriff in the nation is \$8,760 and \$7,979 for a jailer. The information also shows that 25 percent of sheriffs' deputies start at salaries in excess of \$10,000 and 25 percent of the jailers start at a salary of \$9,500 or more.

In data concerning county police departments there is a considerably smaller number of departments represented. The median salary for a county police department's chief is \$24,000 and 25 percent of this group receive in excess of \$31,000 per annum. The median starting salary for a patrolman is \$10,140, while 25 percent of these agencies report a patrolman's starting salary at \$11,909 or more.

Independent city sheriffs provided information which shows that the median sheriff's salary is \$18,614 and 25 percent of this group earn in excess of \$22,240. The median starting salary for deputies in this group is \$7,900, with 25 percent of the

agencies indicating a starting salary of \$8,040 or more. Jailers in this group start at approximately the same salary as do sheriffs' deputies.

The mean total expenditure for county sheriff's offices is \$1,395,662. This figure for suburban county sheriffs is \$4,010,537 and for the rural county sheriff it is \$283,048. The mean total budget for county police departments is \$13,567,031, and \$537,820 for independent city sheriffs. As envisioned by law enforcement practitioners, data verifies that salary and fringe benefits require the largest percentage of available funds. In regard to operational activities, the expenditures for patrol/investigative functions and for jail/correctional operations are by far the most costly.

County law enforcement officials generally assess their facilities as inadequate. More than one-half of headquarters facilities throughout the nation are 20 years or older, and about one-third are more than 50 years of age. Usually county law enforcement agencies are equipped when needed with radar, shot-guns, gas rifles, hand-carried radios and riot gear. Frequently the rural agency reporting the lack of certain specialized equipment states that the equipment is available through other agencies.

Adequate in-house recordkeeping is an absolute necessity if the law enforcement agency is to provide any analysis and presentation of information concerning its operations. The compilation

of data is vital for management of the agency as well as to the law enforcement executive in meeting his responsibility to keep the public informed. Nationally, 75 percent of sheriffs and 84 percent of county police departments report that their records are subject to staff review for quality control and uniformity. Most agencies compile a statistical summary on criminal offenses committed, arrests, and in a variety of other operational or functional categories. Many large suburban agencies utilize in-house computer capabilities to process records while a much smaller representation among the rural counties have such capability.

Support services, such as communications and fingerprint identification units, exist within county law enforcement agencies at the suburban county level, and generally in those rural counties where needed. In-house laboratory capabilities exist within a limited number of large suburban agencies. Most agencies, both suburban and rural, primarily use the state crime laboratory.

In most counties, the sheriff serves as the primary law enforcement officer in his jurisdiction. Some 80 percent of suburban county sheriffs and 92 percent of rural county sheriffs provide patrol services. When the sheriff does not provide the primary patrol/investigative service, these functions are handled by the county police departments in some suburban counties and by a state police organization in rural counties. In some of

of the eastern states the state police organization performs the patrol duties outside the municipal areas. The Northeastern geographic division shows a markedly lower frequency of primary patrol responsibilities by the sheriffs' agencies than the other areas of the nation.

Data reveals that about 86 percent of all county sheriffs perform criminal investigations in their counties. In the small percentage of cases where the sheriff is not primarily responsible for this function, it is typically the duty of a municipal police department, the state police or highway patrol or a county police department.

The use of specialized investigative units is more common among suburban sheriffs. Eighty percent of suburban sheriffs and only 33 percent of rural sheriffs report the use of specialized investigative units.

County police departments, where available, are almost always the primary law enforcement agency responsible for criminal investigations in their jurisdiction. On the other hand, independent city sheriffs do not perform this function.

About two-thirds of all county sheriffs are primarily responsible for traffic control and enforcement activities within their jurisdiction. These sheriffs indicate that, on average, about one-quarter of the "street" personnel's manhours are devoted to this function even though only about 25 percent of all sheriffs maintain separate traffic units in their agencies.

Where the sheriff is not responsible for traffic control and enforcement, this duty is most typically that of the state police or highway patrol.

Nearly all county police departments perform traffic functions and about half maintain separate traffic units. Independent city sheriffs are not, however, responsible for traffic control and enforcement activities and generally rely on municipal police departments for this function.

The law enforcement responsibilities of the sheriff are typically diversified, and the sheriff's deputy, particularly in rural counties, is more of a generalist than a specialist in providing law enforcement services. In addition to duties in the areas of patrol, criminal investigation and traffic, just over half of sheriffs indicate, for example, that they enforce law in county and state parks and game reserves, and in regard to state water sport regulations. Over one-third enforce environmental laws and fish and game laws. And about 20 percent have assigned duties relative to the coroner's office.

Specialized law enforcement programs designed to combat specific crime problems or to assist agencies in administrative or operational areas are becoming increasingly apparent, particularly as agencies are provided with financial and technical assistance.

Among sheriffs, suburban agencies and particularly the larger suburban agencies are more likely to utilize specialized

units in such areas as research and planning, budgeting and legal assistance. As well, special programs are also most common in regard to community crime prevention, specialized traffic enforcement, SWAT or tactical squads, "target" hardening, community and human relations and school safety and liaison.

County police departments, as with the larger suburban sheriffs' agencies, are also more likely to utilize these and other specialized programs.

Even though suburban county participation in special law enforcement programs outstrips that of rural agencies, rural counties often require such programs but are typically without the manpower or finances to implement such efforts.

The operation and administration of the county jail has historically been the responsibility of the sheriff. This is the case today. However, the county jail is frequently under the control of a state corrections administration in the rural counties of the northeastern states. Also, when utilized, regional corrections agencies and independent county departments of corrections are more common in the suburban counties of the Northeast and rural southern counties. Nationally, 13 percent of suburban counties and seven percent of rural counties have new jail facilities under construction. The suburban county sheriffs, representing 372 agencies, report a total of 65,000 county jail inmates while some 1,100 rural county sheriffs list a total of 18,826 inmates. It is to be noted that these figures

relate to a one-day inmate count which was recorded as of the day the agency completed the questionnaire in this study.

While overcrowded jail conditions may exist in some rural counties, the study shows the average number of inmates as reported in these jails does not exceed the average rated inmate capacity of the jail. Some 18 percent of 390 suburban county sheriffs indicate that an overcrowded condition exists in their jails, and that this overcrowding is approximately 28 percent beyond the jails rated capacity.

In most counties throughout the nation the sheriff is primarily responsible as a sole agent for the transportation of prisoners interstate. Of the agencies participating in this study, sheriffs, county police departments and independent city sheriffs report that they return more than 11,600 prisoners annually from another state. Nationally, the average cost per return is \$420 per prisoner which includes transportation and manpower costs.

The needs of county law enforcement agencies in this country are in effect those of the office of the sheriff since he is the primary law enforcement officer on the county level in about 90 percent of all cases.

In order to understand the needs of sheriffs it is first necessary to recognize that about 80 percent of all sheriffs' agencies are rural in nature. And, it is typically the case to find small agencies operating on limited budgets yet being required to

provide the same basic services as their larger suburban counterparts to populations which are often broadly dispersed over large land areas.

In such situations, the most critical problem affecting the delivery of professional law enforcement services is most commonly the lack of an adequate tax base and financial support for sheriffs' operations.

Notwithstanding the increased availability of funding assistance from federal and state sources, these agencies continue to be adversely affected by a lack of available finances.

The deficiencies which result from this state of affairs are broadly based in reduced capabilities on both administrative and operational levels. However, the most common and significant deficiencies include the following:

- The lack of adequate manpower, particularly in terms of sworn personnel, to efficiently and effectively provide an acceptable level of law enforcement services.

The lack of sworn personnel is most critical in terms of reduced and often unacceptable levels of patrol manpower and timely response to calls for service. In addition, it also has adverse effects on the development and delivery of law enforcement programs and support operations.

- The lack of adequate salaries and fringe benefit packages for personnel which is commensurate with the level of training, skills and abilities required of a professional law enforcement officer.

While findings do not suggest broad inadequacies in the calibre of personnel as a result, salary levels do not generally enhance the attraction or retention of personnel nor the furtherance of personnel satisfaction with job performance.

- The lack of adequate facilities in regard to both law enforcement operations and jails.

While inadequate headquarters facilities form a substantial problem the most pressing concern involves the widespread inadequacies associated with jail facilities. Stricter standards for jail facilities and the success of inmate litigation against sheriffs over jail facilities and services has caused a situation which nears the chaotic in many states.

- The lack of adequate levels of support operations for the delivery of law enforcement services and the operation of jails.

In largest measure, inadequacies in support operations involve the compilation of records on criminal offenses and law enforcement activities and their application to data processing. In addition, specialized law enforcement and jail programs are not as available as should be expected.

While individual county law enforcement agencies can more precisely and specifically identify needs, the foregoing are the most predominant and indicative of the general needs of county law enforcement on a cross-section of the nation.

This document is not intended nor does it attempt to provide specific prescriptions for county law enforcement in order to meet needs in broad categories or classifications of agencies. This is not possible due to the wide diversity between agencies in regard to such matters as the nature of crime and calls for service, as well as the nature of community attitudes, priorities and resources.

It is advocated that the individual county law enforcement administrator utilize the data provided in this document as

basic resource documentation for what should be an ongoing internal assessment of agency capabilities, needs, performance and community response.

These data are intended and should only be used for broad general comparisons between agencies. They should not be used as conclusive evidence or sole justification that deficiencies or needs exist within specific agencies simply because resources are or are not available. Such conclusions can only be drawn by agency executives after intensive assessment at the local level.

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

Law enforcement in the United States has evolved primarily from the structure of services provided by county government, and particularly from the office of the sheriff as rooted in common law practices. Municipal and state law enforcement services and, more recently, the county police force, have developed as expansions and appendages of the sheriff's role as primary law enforcement officer in this country.

Yet, with the rapid development of the nation's municipalities and their constant growth, municipal law enforcement operations have come to serve the greatest majority of the nation's population. Correspondingly, high density living and urbanization have placed the greatest burden upon larger municipal governments in the expenditure of resources for crime control and prevention. In the course of this evolution, rural and suburban law enforcement services and responsibilities have received less attention and concern. In particular, federal funding provided through the Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1968 has reflected the generally lower priority which has been placed on altered and upgraded law enforcement systems in the rural and suburban environments.

However, the level and composition of crime and service demand factors has not remained the same in rural and suburban counties over the past decade. While the volume of crime remains

highest in urban areas, crime has increased at a more rapid rate in rural America as shown by information published through the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Uniform Crime Reporting program. This trend is particularly apparent in the increased rate of property crime.

Quantitative documentation does not exist on changes in non-criminal service demand factors for the same ten-year period. However, indications from county law officers across the country have surfaced at seminars, conferences and workshops on state and national levels. The general consensus has reflected the growing concern among these individuals with the ability of county law enforcement programs to meet the increased and generally changing character of demands placed on their agencies. Such demands come not only from the public, but also from other elements of the criminal justice community and associated agencies on a local, state and national level.

The sheriff is frequently the most affected by these and other changes in the criminal justice system due to the unique and diversified character of the office. Typically, the sheriff is not only accountable to the public through the electoral process, but also responsible for law enforcement, court and correctional operations. The diversified nature of sheriffs' duties, as a result, generally renders itself to a wider variety of influence than most municipal law enforcement agencies.

The problems and issues related to sheriffs' agencies in the rural communities are also somewhat different from those associated

with urban areas. Frequently confronted with vast expanses of land area, large but dispersed populations and low tax bases upon which to provide services, the sheriff's agencies in rural areas cannot generally adopt operational structures that are suitable for larger urban agencies.

Also, attention to and solutions for problems and needs peculiar to county law enforcement have not heretofore been addressed on a systematic basis. While standards for criminal justice have been produced, their implementation in the realm of county law enforcement has been hampered by the lack of a comprehensive body of knowledge on the needs and capabilities of existing agencies. Without the availability of a state of the art review in county law enforcement, agencies wishing to implement standards and upgrade programs, services and operations have lacked requisite information upon which to define or measure current capabilities.

B. Project Origins

During the National Sheriffs' Association 1975 Annual Informative Conference, sheriffs throughout the country discussed their most pressing needs. Like other officials in their counties, the sheriffs in attendance were attempting to identify programs and departmental strategies that would confront the crime problems and agency needs associated with their respective operations. This concern was particularly acute among officials from counties with large rural and suburban populations where rising crime and changing communities are placing new and expanding pressures on

sheriffs' agencies.

It was emphasized that there is a special need for comparative data in respect to what other jurisdictions have done and are currently doing to solve similar law enforcement problems. Additionally, it was recognized that more information was needed on such typical issues as contract law enforcement, personnel allocation, measures of officer and departmental productivity, and the sharing of sheriffs' and police facilities and communications equipment.

With this impetus a resolution was adopted by the Association to secure grant funding for a study which would:

... establish and maintain an up-to-date repository of information relative to all facets of jurisdiction, legal authority, and operation of sheriffs' offices in the United States with such additional data concerning law enforcement and corrections generally as may be pertinent.

In August 1976, a grant request in this regard was approved by the National Institute for Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), U.S. Department of Justice. Project staff was subsequently retained and work commenced on October 1, 1976.

C. Project Goals

The primary aim of this study is to produce a quantitative assessment of the needs and capabilities of county law enforcement agencies throughout the United States.

Where possible, the study is designed to provide assessments of adequacy in light of changing service demand factors upon county law enforcement agencies, as well as in regard to guidelines advocated by the Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals.

Specifically, the project is designed to accomplish the following objectives:

- To compile and analyze the constitutional and statutory duties of the office of the sheriff in the United States.
- To compile a descriptive analysis of the capabilities of sheriffs and county law enforcement agencies throughout the country in providing law enforcement, court and correctional services.
- To provide a general assessment of the most prominent needs of sheriffs and county law enforcement agencies where appropriate, in view of currently advocated national standards and changing trends and demand factors in county law enforcement.
- To establish at the National Sheriffs' Association, a repository of information on sheriff and county law enforcement services and operations, to be made available to responsible individuals in or

concerned with the nation's criminal justice system.

This document is intended to meet a wide variety of data requirements that are necessary for planning and management purposes on local, state and national levels, and for a diversified audience in the criminal justice field. Descriptive, analytical and comparative data presented on state, regional and national bases are particularly designed for ready reference by the individual sheriff and county police chief, as well as by other county officials, state and federal planners, researchers and numerous others in the criminal justice field.

Additionally, a substantial amount of information is available to county law enforcement executives who are seeking information on planning and operational concerns among similarly situated departments in their own state, region or throughout the country.

While cross comparison can provide useful insight to administrators and others, it should be emphasized that direct one-to-one comparisons in relationship to manpower levels, equipment availabilities or other matters should be approached with the utmost caution. Differences in community structures, population composition, economic profile, and citizen perspectives and demands are only a few of the factors that effect law enforcement agency capabilities and services. The use of these data for other than general comparisons should therefore be avoided

without further examination of specific environments and circumstances which affect these findings.

One should also note two elements of this study which will be of interest.

First, the analysis of the office of the sheriff on constitutional and statutory bases provides the first composite picture of the sheriff's office on individual state as well as a national level. Variances between states that directly affect the major duties and responsibilities of the sheriff are reviewed together with an overview of the "typical" nature and composition of the office in the nation as a whole.

Secondly, this study has been designed to provide a comprehensive repository of information on county law enforcement that will be updated and maintained at the National Sheriffs' Association. The demand for general information on a wide variety of issues and interest areas affecting sheriffs has been sought by agency executives, planners and researchers over the years. For the first time, this study will provide these and other interests with requisite data upon which to ascertain the status of county law enforcement operations.

Finally, it is foreseen that the availability of this data base will preclude the need for innumerable individual studies of a similar nature which have attempted to gather this information on more restricted sampling or analytical bases.

D. Project Methodology

The major thrust of this study is the development of descriptive data concerning county law enforcement agencies' capabilities.

The primary mechanism for the development of these data is a comprehensive self-administered mail questionnaire. In addition, data was gathered through a review of relevant literature, and on-site and telephone interviews with sheriffs' agencies and county law enforcement departments. These approaches were designed and utilized in the following series of steps.

1. Literature review. Initial orientation of the project and its staff involved a compilation and review of information which might be useful to the current effort.

First, literature involving broad quantitative assessments of county law enforcement services was identified and reviewed. Five major studies¹ were reviewed and cross correlated to determine the scope and similarity of data which were available. This review revealed that, while some useful information exists, none of these major surveys collected systematic information relating to the capabilities and needs of county law enforcement agencies.

¹The Police Services Study; Study of the Office of the Sheriff in the Southern United States; Law Enforcement Personnel Practice Study; Police Chief Executive Study; 1975 Safe Streets Act Questionnaire.

Additionally, it was determined that few efforts have been made to establish the magnitude of agencies' known problems and identifiable needs or the degree to which agencies maintain solutions to these problems. Much information contained in these surveys does, however, pertain to education, training and the compensation of enforcement personnel. This is particularly the case in relation to the Law Enforcement Personnel Practice Survey conducted by the National Planning Association. It became apparent that, with the exception of law enforcement training, the County Law Enforcement study would have to rely on a comprehensive approach to original data collection. Information on training in relation to county and other law enforcement agencies was considered adequate enough, however, that additional data would not be required in this survey.

In addition to a review of available literature, a search was made through the computerized services of LEAA's Information System's Division on projects which had been funded to county law enforcement agencies. Compilations of funding categories were developed by state from this information. These data were utilized to suggest needs and funding preferences of states and regions and were also used to help establish areas of inquiry both for the questionnaire and for later on-site interviews.

2. The sheriff's mandate. The duties and responsibilities of the office of sheriff vary considerably from state to state and have been in a process of change during the past several decades. For example, most sheriffs have full responsibility for enforcement, detention and some courtroom duties, but some have only

limited responsibilities in one or more of these areas.

This phase of the study was designed to describe the constitutional and statutory role of the sheriff in each state; how that role has changed in the past decade; and trends that are likely to occur in the future.

In order to accomplish this study element, requests were made of each NSA State Director and State Sheriffs' Association for copies of the state constitutional mandates regarding the duties of his office. Additionally, it was requested that statutory amendments be included and that any current trends affecting the office be noted.

The project staff compiled these responses and performed an independent search of state constitutions for verification. In addition, a lawyer was retained as a project consultant to analyze and compile these data. The final product of this project element is presented separately in Chapter II.

3. Initial questionnaire design. The self-administered mail questionnaire is the primary data collection mechanism of this study. Therefore, as in similar survey efforts of this magnitude, extensive effort was made to insure that the substance, presentation, format and wording of the instrument were completely adequate from the perspective of the respondent population.

Development of an instrument that was both responsive to survey data requirements and to the potential respondent was a significant undertaking due to the immense variations between

sheriffs and other county law enforcement agencies in the country. In order to maximize returns, several basic approaches were utilized in regard to construction.

First, a single questionnaire which could be applicable to all variances between agencies was utilized rather than an approach which would tailor one or more separate questionnaires to the differences between departments.

Second, forced-choice response approaches were utilized throughout in order to speed the time required to complete the questionnaire. Open-ended questions were used in only a few instances in order to tap qualitative data such as the views and attitudes of respondents on specific matters.

Due to the questionnaire length, a technique was also employed whereby respondents could skip large segments of the questionnaire that did not apply. This was particularly useful to those sheriffs' agencies which do not perform the primary law enforcement and investigative functions, and/or which do not administer the county jail or detention center in their county.

To assist in return of questionnaires, a self-addressed postage paid questionnaire booklet was designed which has been successfully utilized in similar survey efforts of this scope.

Based on these basic approaches, a draft questionnaire was developed covering all potential areas of inquiry.

4. Questionnaire finalization. Review and finalization of the draft questionnaire involved a series of steps including perusal and suggestions from a rather wide variety of audiences.

First, the draft questionnaire underwent approximately six comprehensive reviews by individual staff members. Following each individual review session, a joint staff meeting was convened to incorporate changes and resolve possible problems.

Following the series of staff reviews, copies of the draft were submitted to the Project Advisory Board, the NSA Board of Directors and Executive Committee. As law enforcement practitioners with extensive professional backgrounds, these individuals provided a useful "sounding board" for this review process.

Next, draft questionnaires were site tested in approximately one dozen agencies of various sizes in the eastern United States. Staff administered the questionnaire to agency executives and other departmental personnel to determine, on a first-hand basis, the responsiveness and utility of both individual areas of inquiry and the structure of specific questions. Topical areas of interest were also explored with each sheriff in order to provide insights into issues affecting the office of sheriff now and in the future.

A revised questionnaire was subsequently reviewed in its entirety by the Project Advisory Board during its first meeting with the project staff. This critical review provided many useful insights into the structure and content of specific topics.

A technical review on a question by question basis was undertaken in a joint session between project staff and a professional survey statistician. The primary focus of this effort was the identification of potential problems in interpretation of questions and response availabilities.

Based on the results of the foregoing consultations, a finalized draft was submitted to LEAA and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Following a joint project staff - OMB review, approval was given and a finalized version of the questionnaire was developed and printed.

5. Follow-up procedures. By nature, a self-administered mailed questionnaire does not typically yield a high response rate. However, the chances of experiencing a relatively high response in this instance were enhanced by the fact that the NSA was administering the study in an effort "by and for sheriffs". Even though this proved to be the case, a series of follow-up procedures was developed and subsequently initiated which in largest measure capitalized on the various influence centers affecting sheriffs.

The original bulk mailing of the project questionnaire was made on May 30, 1977 to the nation's 3,134 county and independent city sheriffs and county police departments. Prior to the mailing, however, letters of introduction to the project effort were sent to all law enforcement agencies in the study as well as separate letters to NSA State Directors, Executive Board, Board of Directors and the State Sheriffs' Associations. These letters were designed

to bring attention to the study and solicit respondent support in completing the forthcoming questionnaire.

Following the original mailing, the official NSA publication The National Sheriff published an article concerning the study. The article highlighted the need for the study and requested the support of all sheriffs. All respondents were asked to return the completed questionnaire within three weeks to NSA headquarters. At the end of this first cut-off period, approximately 20 percent of agencies had responded. At this time, follow-up procedures commenced to insure the greatest return by the final closing date. While project staff prepared and cross checked questionnaire returns for data processing, the following follow-up procedures were also performed.

- A personal letter was sent from the Executive Director of NSA to each non-responding county agency.
- Postcards with personal reminders were sent to each non-respondent on two separate occasions within a three month period.
- Telephonic contact with individual sheriffs, NSA State Directors and Directors of State Sheriffs' Associations was made during site visits throughout the country.
- Personal letters of appeal were also sent to non-respondents in each state by individual NSA state

Directors, who in many cases helped in subsequent questionnaire mailings of their individual constituents. Personal letters were also sent to specific subgroups of non-respondents by members of the NSA Board of Directors.

- Presentations in regard to the project were made at individual and multi-state gatherings of State Sheriffs' Associations by the NSA Executive Director.
- Finally, in the case of two states which had not provided necessary responses, direct telephone interviews using short form questionnaires were conducted by the project staff.

At the close of data collection efforts, 60 percent of the survey population had returned questionnaires. Table I-1 provides a summary of the extent of questionnaire coverage by suburban and rural county for each state, by geographic division and region.

Independent city sheriffs exist in municipalities which are not part of a county. There are 38 such cities in the United States excluding the District of Columbia, these being Baltimore, Maryland, St. Louis, Missouri and 36 cities in Virginia.

TABLE I-1

PROJECT COVERAGE OF COUNTY SHERIFFS
BY GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND REGIONS

Area	No. Of Counties		Total Number Of Counties	Respondents		Total Respond- ents	% Cov- erage
	Subur- ban	Rural		Subur- ban	Rural		
NORTHEAST	94	119	213	61	74	135	63
New England	22	45	67	10	33	43	64
Connecticut*	5	3	8	3	2	5	63
Maine	2	14	16	1	9	10	63
Massachusetts	10	4	14	5	3	8	57
New Hampshire	1	9	10	0	7	7	70
Rhode Island*	4	1	5	1	1	2	40
Vermont	0	14	14	0	11	11	79
Middle Atlantic	72	74	146	51	41	92	43
New Jersey	17	4	21	12	2	14	67
New York	27	31	58	24	25	49	84
Pennsylvania	28	39	67	15	14	29	43
NORTH CENTRAL	184	867	1051	155	598	753	72
East North Central	134	303	437	114	228	342	78
Illinois	23	79	102	20	56	76	75
Indiana	31	61	92	24	40	64	70
Michigan	25	58	83	25	56	81	98
Ohio	39	49	88	33	40	73	83
Wisconsin	16	56	72	12	36	48	67
West North Central	50	564	1064	41	370	411	67
Iowa	8	91	99	6	62	68	69
Kansas	7	97	114	6	71	77	74
Minnesota	15	72	87	14	67	81	93
Missouri	14	100	114	10	42	52	46
Nebraska	4	89	93	3	57	60	65
North Dakota	1	52	53	1	31	32	60
South Dakota	1	63	64	1	40	41	64
SOUTH	285	1098	1383	171	505	676	49
South Atlantic	126	422	548	83	231	314	57
Delaware	1	2	3	1	1	2	67
Florida	24	43	67	22	28	50	75
Georgia	31	128	159	20	51	71	45
Maryland	9	14	23	8	12	20	87
North Carolina	19	81	100	12	52	64	64
South Carolina	9	37	46	5	26	31	67

TABLE I-1 (Continued)

	No. Of Counties		Total Number Of Counties	Respondents		Total Respond- ents	% Cov- erage
	Subur- ban	Rural		Subur- ban	Rural		
South Atlantic Con't							
Virginia	23	72	95	12	41	53	56
West Virginia	10	45	55	3	20	23	42
East South Central	65	299	364	33	97	130	36
Alabama	18	49	67	11	15	26	39
Kentucky	17	103	120	7	33	40	33
Mississippi	7	75	82	1	29	30	37
Tennessee	23	72	95	14	20	34	36
West South Central	94	377	471	55	177	232	49
Arkansas	10	65	75	5	24	29	39
Louisiana	17	48	65	12	33	45	69
Oklahoma	14	63	77	10	26	36	47
Texas	53	201	254	28	94	122	48
WEST	65	346	411	56	226	282	69
Mountain	26	252	278	19	150	169	61
Arizona	2	12	14	2	9	11	79
Colorado	12	51	63	10	37	47	75
Idaho	1	43	44	1	25	26	59
Montana	2	54	56	1	28	29	52
Nevada	2	15	17	1	8	9	53
New Mexico	2	30	32	1	15	16	50
Utah	5	24	29	3	13	16	55
Wyoming	0	23	23	0	15	15	65
Pacific	39	94	133	37	76	113	85
Alaska	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
California	25	33	58	23	25	48	83
Hawaii	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Oregon	6	30	36	6	28	34	94
Washington	8	31	39	8	23	31	79

* There are no organized counties in Rhode Island or Connecticut, however there are eight sheriffs in Connecticut and five in Rhode Island.

6. Field interviews. As previously stated, the primary data collection mechanism of this project involved the use of a mailed questionnaire. However, in order to fulfill the full range of data requirements in this study, field interviews were also required. These were necessary in order to generate the qualitative assessments of sheriffs that could not be adequately surveyed in the questionnaire. Not only were interviews used to tap the perceptions and opinions of sheriffs on various issues and problems, but they were also beneficial in adding perspective to the purely quantitative data collected in the questionnaire.

As a result, staff conducted 36 personal interviews with a cross section of sheriffs' agencies in the four geographic regions. Among the topics explored with each agency in open-ended questioning were the following:

- The adequacy of departmental resources in various operational areas and the causes for any deficiencies.
- The role of federal and state funding in the operation of the agency, including the adequacy and source of such funding.
- The use of any program strategies to meet specific needs of the department or the community.
- The adequacy of the jail facility and services and the causes for any insufficiencies, as well

as the possible effects of other agencies (e.g. state jail standards commission, state department of corrections) on the operation/adequacy of the jail.

- The ways, if any, in which the agency executive perceived changes over the next 15 years and the major problem facing law enforcement in that jurisdiction.

7. Data analysis. Primary data analysis for this project commenced following the generation of computer tabulation of responses to the survey questionnaire.

Project staff performed the coding and verification of questionnaire returns. Key punching, programming and the generation of machine readable information was the responsibility of a data processing subcontractor, while project staff provided the parameters for the generation of tabular data.

E. Definitions

Throughout this report reference is made to various geographic designations, the suburban and rural nature of counties and to several types of statistical presentations in tabular data, all of which require some degree of explanation.

1. Geographic designations. Table I-2 presents the composition of the four geographic divisions and their respective regions as utilized in this report. Roman numeral designations

for the four geographic divisions are commonly utilized in tabular presentations and correspond to the state-by-state breakdown as presented in Table I-2.

2. Suburban and rural counties. Reference is also made most frequently to the nature of counties based on suburban and rural character or composition.

A suburban county is one that in part or in whole comprises a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA), has a core city with 50,000 or more inhabitants and is contiguous with a county or counties which share certain metropolitan characteristics.

A rural county is one that is not part of an SMSA and which does not have a core city with an excess of 50,000 inhabitants.

3. Statistical measures. Three types of statistical measures are utilized in this report -- mean, median and quartile measures of central tendency or location. The use of any one or combination of these measures is dictated by the nature and composition of the data under consideration. Every attempt has been made to utilize the statistical presentation which most accurately reflects the nature of the data being analyzed.

The mean, also referred to as the average, is the most commonly utilized approach in this report and generally the most readily understood among readers. The mean is simply the sum of all items in a set of data divided by the number of items summed.

When small sets of data are not being considered, and when very large and very small numbers are not part of the same set of data, the mean is typically used since it most accurately presents the central measure of the data presentation. Where this is not the case however, another mechanism such as the median may better display the central measure of a data set.

The median is the central value of a set of data that has been arranged in order of increasing size. For an odd number of items the median is the middle item, while for an even number of items the median is the mean of the two middle items.

Mean and median are used according to the degree to which they can most accurately characterize the central measure of a data set. In other cases, information on the distribution of a data set may be necessary in order to make an accurate data presentation. In such cases quartile measures may be utilized.

Quartiles divide a data set into four equal parts. When data are ordered by increasing size, the first quartile is the value below which one-fourth of the items fall, the second quartile is the median, and the third quartile is the value below which three-fourths of the items fall. Values presented at these fixed points provide valuable information on the extent to which a data set is distributed, and some indication of the range of data values.

TABLE I-2
GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS AND REGIONS

<p>I. <u>NORTHEAST DIVISION</u></p> <p>1. <u>New England Region</u></p> <p>Connecticut Maine Massachusetts New Hampshire Rhode Island Vermont</p> <p>2. <u>Middle Atlantic Region</u></p> <p>New Jersey New York Pennsylvania</p>	<p>III. <u>SOUTHERN DIVISION</u></p> <p>5. <u>South Atlantic Region</u></p> <p>Delaware Florida Georgia Maryland North Carolina South Carolina Virginia West Virginia</p> <p>6. <u>East South Central Region</u></p> <p>Alabama Kentucky Mississippi Tennessee</p> <p>7. <u>West South Central Region</u></p> <p>Arkansas Louisiana Oklahoma Texas</p>
<p>II. <u>NORTH CENTRAL DIVISION</u></p> <p>3. <u>East North Central Region</u></p> <p>Illinois Indiana Michigan Ohio Wisconsin</p> <p>4. <u>West North Central Region</u></p> <p>Iowa Kansas Minnesota Missouri Nebraska North Dakota South Dakota</p>	<p>IV. <u>WESTERN DIVISION</u></p> <p>8. <u>Mountain Region</u></p> <p>Arizona Colorado Idaho Montana Nevada New Mexico Utah Wyoming</p> <p>9. <u>Pacific Region</u></p> <p>Alaska California Hawaii Oregon Washington</p>

F. Organization of the Report

This report is organized in a manner so as to provide the reader with the easiest reference to specific areas of interest in county law enforcement. As such, each chapter is devoted exclusively to one specific area of law enforcement administration or operation.

The report emphasizes data relative to sheriffs since the largest percentage of law enforcement, court and correctional duties at the county level are the responsibility of the sheriff. Each chapter begins with a review of information on the office of the sheriff and is thereafter followed by information on county police departments and independent city sheriffs where these latter agencies maintain such authority and responsibility.

The second chapter in this report introduces the office of the sheriff by presenting an analysis of the constitutional and statutory responsibilities of the sheriff around the country.

Chapters III through VIII present information on various administrative concerns involving personnel, budget, facilities, equipment, records and data processing.

Data relative to operational components of county law enforcement agencies begin in Chapter IX with a discussion of agency responsibilities. Patrol and criminal investigation are the subjects of Chapters X and XI, respectively, while

specialized law enforcement programs are covered in Chapter XII and traffic in Chapter XIII.

Technical service operations are the subject of Chapters XIV, XV and XVI with a review of identifications, laboratory services and communications.

Operational concerns are concluded in Chapter XVII with an analysis of jail/correctional functions, and some additional information on the interstate transportation of fugitives is provided in Chapter XVIII.

The report is concluded in Chapter XIX by a review of the most prominent needs facing county law enforcement.

CHAPTER II THE OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF:
AN ANALYSIS OF ITS CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY MANDATE

A general profile of the sheriff in the United States depicts that he is truly unique in the criminal justice community. Although the sheriff's responsibilities vary from state to state according to state law and from county to county according to custom and special laws, he is, in a general sense, an active functionary in all three branches of the criminal justice system. He is responsible for county policing, for the county jail/corrections and for county court duties such as process serving and providing court security. Because of his varied roles and responsibilities, he is thoroughly engrossed in interagency relationships at all levels of government.

The purpose of this presentation is to describe the sheriff's role by reviewing common law tradition, constitutional and statutory mandates and current practice. Section A discusses the common law background of the sheriff's mandate. Section B details the jurisdictional configurations of sheriffs' agencies in this country. Section C considers the importance of constitutional status for sheriffs. Section D reviews the selection, term and tenure of sheriffs; and Section E describes their law enforcement, jail administration, court and other

duties. Section F provides a brief analysis of the sheriffs' mandate.

A. Common Law Background

The powers and responsibilities exercised by sheriffs today are, in essence, those assigned to the sheriff through common law tradition. According to Maitland, the sheriff was originally the local representative of the shire appointed to represent the king's interest.¹ The term sheriff derives from "shire" meaning county and "reeve" meaning keeper. At common law, disorder is a "breach of the king's peace," and the sheriff is therefore responsible for "preserving the peace". The sheriff was also the shire treasurer through his responsibility to "collect the king's revenue".

The present day responsibilities for court service and jail administration are also derived from common law tradition. The sheriff's "tourn" (or court) had criminal jurisdiction and was held twice a year. The sheriff was therefore responsible for the custody of accused persons from the time of arrest to the adjournment of court.

In the United States, the common law derivation of the office of sheriff is an important factor in defining the sheriff's role. State constitutions are written with the understanding that common law and other elements of previous practice should be used to interpret references in the constitution

to the office of sheriff. There are, for example, several states in which the sheriff is responsible for preventive patrol and investigative functions in his county without having an explicit statutory or constitutional mandate for law enforcement duties. In these states, it is held that since the sheriff is a constitutionally established officer, this means that he is vested with those responsibilities which come from the common law tradition. It is largely recognized that the sheriff is endowed with the powers and duties imposed upon him by common law.

B. Jurisdictional Configurations

There are in excess of 3,000 counties in the United States. There is a county sheriff in almost all of these counties. There are exceptions to this statement, however, inasmuch as there is one sheriff in New York City, who covers the five counties (or boroughs); and there are two sheriffs in New Orleans covering Orleans Parish, one of whom is responsible for the criminal area and the other for the civil area. Sheriffs also exist at the municipal level in several other jurisdictions. There is a sheriff in Baltimore, Maryland, which is an independent city, as is the case in several independent cities in the state of Virginia. The sheriff exists as the chief law enforcement officer in the consolidated areas of Duval County, Florida (Jacksonville) and Clark County, Nevada (Las Vegas). In Hawaii, the sheriff is a state officer appointed by the chief justice.

C. Constitutional Status of Sheriffs

The sheriff is a constitutionally designated officer in 35 states. (See Table II-1) The constitutions of two additional states, Missouri and Wyoming, mention the sheriff but do not establish nor define the office. In the absence of court interpretation, no firm conclusion can be made as to whether the sheriff is a constitutional officer in these states.

Most typically, the constitutional provision describes the method of selection, as well as the term and tenure of the sheriff. In only five states does the constitutional provision designate specific duties, and in none of these are the sheriffs' responsibilities described in full. Three states designate the sheriff as county tax collector. Since tax collection is not commonly a function of the sheriff, it is probable that the constitutional conventions in these states mentioned it in order to make their intent clear. The constitutions of five states specify that the sheriffs' duties are to be prescribed by law.

Whether the office of sheriff is a constitutionally designated position is held to be important for two main reasons. First, constitutional status ensures that the office cannot be abolished without a vote of the electorate. In the majority of states where the method of selection and tenure conditions are specified in the constitution, these too cannot be changed or

TABLE II-1
 CONSTITUTIONAL STATUS AND STATUTORY
 RESPONSIBILITIES OF SHERIFF DEPARTMENTS
 BY STATE, 1976

State	Sheriff is a Constitutional Officer	Statutory Authority of Sheriff			
		Law Enforcement	Jail	Court Service	Judicial Process
Alabama	•	•	•	•	•
Alaska					
Arizona	•	•	•	•	•
Arkansas	•	•	•	•	•
California	•	•	•	•	•
Colorado	•	•	•	•	•
Connecticut	•	•	•		•
Delaware	•			•	•
Florida	•	•	•	•	•
Georgia		•	•	•	•
Hawaii		a/			•
Idaho	•	•	•	•	•
Illinois	•	•	•	•	•
Indiana	•	•	•	•	•
Iowa		•	•	•	•
Kansas		•	•	•	•
Kentucky	•	•	b/	•	•
Louisiana	•	•	•	•	•
Maine	•	•	•	•	•
Maryland	•	•	•	•	•
Massachusetts	•		•	•	•
Michigan	•		•	•	•
Minnesota		•	•	•	•
Mississippi	•	•	•	•	•
Missouri	• c/	•	•	•	•
Montana	•	•	•	•	•
Nebraska		•	•	•	•
Nevada		•	•	•	•
New Hampshire	•	•	•	•	•
New Jersey	•		•	•	•
New Mexico		•	•	•	•
New York	•	•	d/	•	•
North Carolina	•	•	•	•	•
North Dakota	•	•	•	•	•
Ohio		•	•	•	•
Oklahoma	•	•	•	•	•
Oregon	•	•	•	•	•
Pennsylvania	•		e/		•
Rhode Island		•		•	•
South Carolina	•	•	•	•	•

TABLE II-1 (Continued)

State	Sheriff is a Constitutional Officer	Statutory Authority of Sheriff			
		Law Enforcement	Jail	Court Service	Judicial Process
South Dakota		•	•	•	•
Tennessee	•	•	•	•	•
Texas	•	•	•	•	•
Utah		•	•	•	•
Vermont	•		•	•	•
Virginia	•	•	•	•	•
Washington	•	•	•	•	•
West Virginia	•	•	•	•	•
Wisconsin	•	•	•	•	•
Wyoming	• <u>c/</u>	•	•	•	•

a/ The state sheriff is appointed by the chief justice. The sheriff has police powers only "upon specific authorization and direction of the chief justice."

b/ Only in counties of the first class (Fayette) and in interim periods when an elected jailer is not in office.

c/ The office of sheriff is mentioned but not established or defined.

d/ Except in New York and Westchester Counties.

e/ In certain small counties only.

modified without a vote of the electorate. Second, as described in the section above, the existence of a constitutional provision implies that the responsibilities of the sheriff are those defined by common law.

The existence of a constitutional provision establishing the office of sheriff does not mean, however, that individual counties cannot alter the sheriff's office or its functions. Seven states have constitutional provisions that permit local referendums to modify county government.

In several jurisdictions, modifications of the sheriffs' functions have come about through constitutional amendments that enable the establishment of unified city/county governments. In most cases these consolidations have led to the establishment of a single law enforcement department. In San Francisco, California; Denver, Colorado and Nashville, Tennessee; for example, the former city departments are now serving the city/county area. In Duval County (Jacksonville), Florida, and Clark County (Las Vegas), Nevada, the sheriff is responsible for the unified police department. In Marion County (Indianapolis), Indiana, the sheriff's department and the police department perform police functions and share jurisdictional responsibilities.

There has not, in the recent past, been any diminution in the number of states where the sheriff is a constitutional

officer. In fact, there has been an increase of two states with constitutional status for the sheriff.²

D. Methods of Selection, Term and Tenure Specifications and Qualification Standards for Sheriffs

Traditionally, the American sheriff has been an elected official. In 35 states this status is established by state constitution. In 14 states, state law specifies that he be elected. The only two statewide exceptions are Rhode Island and Hawaii. In Rhode Island, sheriffs are appointed by the governor and serve at his pleasure. In Hawaii, as mentioned above, the state sheriff is appointed by the chief justice.

State law almost unanimously calls for the election of sheriffs. In the following metropolitan jurisdictions, the sheriff is appointed: New York City; King County (Seattle), Washington; Multnomah County (Portland), Oregon; Nassau County, New York; and Dade County (Miami), Florida.

The term and tenure of sheriffs is also specified by state law in all states except Rhode Island and Hawaii. In 33 states the sheriff has a four-year term and is not restricted in the number of terms for which he may run. In one state the sheriff has a six-year term of office and the tenure is unlimited. Table II-2 displays the term and tenure of sheriffs by state.

From the point of view of many observers, short terms and restrictions on the number of terms that may be served put undue burdens on sheriffs and make it difficult for continuity and

TABLE II-2
 SHERIFFS' TERM OF OFFICE AND TENURE
 SPECIFICATIONS BY STATE, 1977

State	Term of Office In Years	Tenure
Alabama	4	unlimited
Alaska	-	--
Arkansas	4	unlimited
California	4	unlimited
Colorado	4	unlimited
Connecticut	4	unlimited
Delaware	2	1 term
Florida	4	unlimited
Georgia	4	unlimited
Hawaii	indefinite	unlimited
Idaho	4	unlimited
Illinois	4	unlimited
Indiana	4	2 terms
Iowa	4	unlimited
Kansas	4	unlimited
Kentucky	4	1 term
Louisiana	4	unlimited
Maine	2	unlimited
Maryland	4	unlimited
Massachusetts	6	unlimited
Michigan	4	unlimited
Minnesota	4	unlimited
Mississippi	4	unlimited
Missouri	4	unlimited
Montana	4	unlimited
Nebraska	4	unlimited
Nevada	4	unlimited
New Hampshire	2	unlimited
New Jersey	3	unlimited
New Mexico	2	2 terms
New York	3	unlimited
North Carolina	4	unlimited
North Dakota	4	unlimited
Ohio	4	unlimited
Oklahoma	2	unlimited
Oregon	4	unlimited
Pennsylvania	4	unlimited
Rhode Island	indefinite	unlimited
South Carolina	4	unlimited
South Dakota	4	unlimited
Tennessee	2	3 terms
Texas	4	unlimited
Utah	4	unlimited
Vermont	4	unlimited
Virginia	4	unlimited
Washington	4	unlimited
West Virginia	4	2 terms
Wisconsin	2	unlimited
Wyoming	4	unlimited

Source: National Sheriffs' Association, 1976 Directory of Sheriffs of the United States (1976) (with current revisions).

professional development to occur. A recent study of law enforcement chief executives concludes that the high turnover that police chiefs experience is detrimental to professional law enforcement.³

In the last 16 years there has been a clear movement in the direction of longer terms and no tenure restrictions. Seven states have lengthened the term of office to four years, and four states have removed tenure restrictions during that time. (See Table II-3).

There has also been a movement in the direction of establishing minimum qualifications for sheriffs. Standards such as law enforcement experience, graduation from a training program and minimum education levels have been established in some states. This legislation is of two kinds: laws that apply to law enforcement personnel generally and that do not make an explicit exception of sheriffs; and laws that especially establish standards for sheriffs.

During the past 20 years numerous states have established some form of minimum standards as they relate to law enforcement qualifications and training. Many of these standards as they relate to law enforcement include age, educational level, physical requirements and specifications concerning prior criminal record. In 28 states, as shown in Table II-4, these basic standards are mandatory. Of these 28 states, 17 explicitly exclude the sheriff. Since sheriffs are elected officials and often are constitutional officers, court decisions may be required in order to determine whether these standards are enforceable for sheriffs, as well as for appointed law enforcement officials. Even if these standards

TABLE II-3

DISTRIBUTION OF STATES BY
SHERIFFS' TENURE AND TERM SPECIFICATIONS1960 and 1976

<u>Tenure and Length of Term</u>	<u>1960^{a/}</u>	<u>1976^{a/}</u>
Total Number of States with <u>Unlimited</u> Tenure	<u>37</u>	<u>41</u>
2 year-term	10	5
3 year-term	2	2
4 year-term	24	33
6 year-term	1	1
Total Number of States with <u>Limited</u> Tenure	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>
2 year-term	5	3
4 year-term	5	3

a/ Excluding Alaska, Hawaii and Rhode Island. The office of sheriff does not exist in Alaska and is an appointed office with indefinite terms in Hawaii and Rhode Island.

Sources: Everett M. King, Sheriff's Manual, 1960, pps. 41-42; National Sheriffs' Association, Directory Sheriffs in the United States, 1976.

TABLE II-4

STATE-AUTHORIZED SELECTION STANDARDS APPLICABLE TO
SHERIFFS' AGENCIES LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL
BY STATE, 1976

State	S e l e c t i o n S t a n d a r d s						Exceptions ^{a/}
	Status of Selection Standards	Age Requirements	No Felony Conviction	Physical Exam	Height/Weight Requirements	Educational Level Specifications	
Alabama	Mandatory	x	x	x	x	x	Sheriffs Sheriffs & Deputies Sheriffs Sheriffs Sheriffs Sheriffs Sheriffs Sheriffs
Arizona	Mandatory		x	x	x	x	
Arkansas ^{b/}							
California	Mandatory		x	x		x	
Colorado	Varies	x	x			x	
Connecticut			----- no state standards -----				
Delaware	Mandatory		x				
Florida	Mandatory	x	x	x		x	
Georgia	Mandatory	x	x	x		x	
Hawaii ^{c/}							
Idaho	Mandatory	x	x	x		x	
Illinois			----- no state standards -----				
Indiana	Mandatory		x	x	x	x	
Iowa	Mandatory	x	x	x		x	
Kansas	Mandatory		x	x		x	
Kentucky			----- no state standards -----				
Louisiana ^{c/}							
Maine	Mandatory			x			
Maryland	Mandatory	x	x	x		x	
Massachusetts ^{b/}							
Michigan	Varies	x	x	x		x	
Minnesota	Mandatory		x	x			

TABLE II-4 (Continued)

State	Selection Standards						Exceptions ^{a/}
	Status of Selection Standards	Age Requirements	No Felony Conviction	Physical Exam	Height/Weight Requirements	Educational Level Specifications	
Mississippi <u>c/</u>							
Missouri <u>c/</u>							
Montana	Mandatory	x	x	x	x	x	Sheriffs
Nebraska	Mandatory	x	x	x		x	
Nevada	Mandatory	x		x	x	x	Sheriffs & Undersheriffs
New Hampshire							
New Jersey	Mandatory	x	x	x		x	
New Mexico							
New York	Mandatory	x		x	x*	x	Sheriffs & Undersheriffs
North Carolina	Mandatory	x	x	x		x	Sheriff
North Dakota	Voluntary	x	x	x		x	
Ohio	Mandatory	x	x				Sheriffs
Oklahoma	Varies	x	x	x	x	x	
Oregon	Mandatory	x	x	x		x	
Pennsylvania <u>b/</u>							
Rhode Island	Mandatory		x				
South Carolina	Mandatory	x	x	x	x**	x	Sheriffs
South Dakota <u>b/</u>							
Tennessee	Voluntary	x	x	x		x	Sheriffs
Texas	Mandatory	x	x	x		x	Sheriffs
Utah	Varies	x	x	x	x	x	Sheriffs
Vermont							
Virginia							
Washington							
West Virginia <u>c/</u>							
Wisconsin	Mandatory	x	x	x		x	Sheriffs
Wyoming	Mandatory	x	x	x		x	Sheriffs

a/ The states listed here exclude sheriffs from these standards. b/ NASDLET Survey not responded to. c/ No state standards and training commission in the state. *Weight requirements only. **Height requirements only. Source: NASDLET, Survey of State Directors of Law Enforcement Training, 1976.

are held to apply to sheriffs, it would still have to be determined whether law enforcement incumbents who run for and are elected to the office of sheriff would be excluded from the standards by virtue of a grandfather clause.

Some states have enacted mandatory standards explicitly for the office of sheriff. In Idaho, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Kansas, sheriffs are required to complete a basic course of instruction before assuming office. California requires that newly elected sheriffs have four years of law enforcement experience. In Oregon, sheriffs must have either a high school diploma plus four years of law enforcement or have completed two years of college.

Those in favor of standards argue that certain minimum levels of experience, education and training are highly desirable for the complex administrative responsibilities that sheriffs face. A recent study recommends that minimum qualifications be adopted for elected as well as appointed law enforcement chief executives. Those standards, according to the study, should encompass minimum levels of experience, training and education.⁴

E. Responsibilities Of Sheriffs' Agencies

Sheriffs' responsibilities vary considerably between and within states. The purpose of this section is to describe the differences in the state laws relevant to functions of sheriffs' agencies and to detail, to the extent possible, the differences in actual practice between jurisdictions.

1. Law enforcement. The common law role of the sheriff is "conservator of the peace" and "chief law enforcement officer of the county" has been maintained in most counties in the country. Ninety-three percent of all county sheriffs perform law enforcement functions.

The statutory authorization to perform law enforcement functions is not necessarily synonymous with actual practice in a given state. The statutes of 42 states give the sheriffs' agencies explicit authorization to perform patrol and investigative functions (Table II-1). But in Connecticut and Delaware, where the sheriffs have such authority, it is not utilized. Conversely, in Michigan, North Carolina and Pennsylvania, sheriffs perform law enforcement functions without explicit statutory mandate. As discussed in Section B, explicit statutory mandates are not required in states where the sheriff is a constitutional officer and the common law responsibilities of the sheriff have not been countermanded by statutory law.

There are a few differences between states concerning the jurisdictional limitations on the exercise of authority. In many instances, statutory authorization exists for one sheriff to contract with incorporated cities and towns for police protection. The power to arrest also varies, with some states permitting statewide arrests, others restricting arrests to the sheriff's agency county and/or adjacent counties, while still others permit arrests outside the county only while in "hot pursuit".

One law enforcement authority, unique to sheriffs, is the common law power of posse comitatus, as explained in American Jurisprudence:

As a general rule, the sheriff may summon to his assistance any person when he deems it necessary to effect an arrest. For the purpose of performing his duty to arrest offenders and commit them to custody, he may command all of the male population of his county to attend him, in other words, the posse comitatus or power of the county.⁵

The sheriff's authority to summon a posse is explicitly defined in statutes of at least 19 states and in one state constitution. It is probable, however, that the power would be held to exist in all states in which the sheriff is a constitutional officer by virtue of common law tradition.

The law enforcement functions that sheriffs' agencies perform vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Most sheriffs' agencies perform criminal investigation, patrol, traffic and accident functions. The results of a recent survey show that 91 percent of all sheriffs' agencies with ten or more employees perform routine patrol, and 93 percent investigate felonies.⁶ Eighty percent of these agencies perform traffic and accident functions.

2. Jail administration. At common law, the sheriff's responsibility to conserve the peace was considered broadly to

include not only the arrest of violators but also their detention and trial. The sheriff's present responsibility as jailer derives from this definition of conservator of the peace.

Historically, the sheriff in the United States has been responsible for operating local jails. In several states, constitutional provisions establishing the office of sheriff have been interpreted by state courts to imply that the responsibility for local jails is part of the common law duties of the sheriff. In only one known state court decision has it been held that the administration of jails is not part of the sheriff's common law duties.

Statutory authorization for the sheriff as jailer exists in 45 of 49 states. Approximately 86 percent of the sheriffs' agencies in these 45 states operate at least one jail.⁷ The four states in which the sheriff has no jail responsibilities are Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, and Rhode Island. The state departments of corrections administer regional jails in two of these states and share that responsibility with independent local agencies in the other two.

In three states, the statutes limit the number of sheriffs responsible for running the jails. In Kentucky the sheriff is responsible for the jail in only "counties of the first class." At the present time, only Fayette County falls into this category. Jails in the remaining counties are administered by elected jailers. In Pennsylvania, the sheriff operates the jail in only the 43 small counties of the seventh and eighth classes. In

New Jersey the sheriff's authority over jails is limited to counties of the second and fifth classes.

In eight states, large independent metropolitan area jails are the sole exceptions to the sheriff's responsibilities for jails. In New York City, for example, the municipal department of corrections is responsible for all the jails.⁸ Other city jurisdictions with independent jail facilities include St. Louis, Missouri and Denver, Colorado.

In eight states, the sheriff's jail responsibilities are somewhat limited. In Colorado, Maine and New Hampshire, the sheriff is only responsible for the detention of pretrial detainees. In New Hampshire local independent jails house convicted misdemeanants; in the other states the correctional system houses those inmates. In Maryland, North Carolina and South Carolina, sheriffs are responsible for pretrial and short-sentence detention only. In Georgia, the state houses convicted misdemeanants from 42 counties by contract with the sheriffs in those counties. In California, state prisoners are often housed in the county jail on a reimbursement basis. In New Orleans, Louisiana, the parish jail can maintain inmates up to five years.

In the remaining 27 states, the sheriff is the primary officer responsible for the detention of pretrial detainees and of misdemeanants. The few exceptions in these states include Caddo Parish, Louisiana and Hines and Yazoo Counties, Mississippi. For the most part, city jails in these states only handle

individuals charged with and convicted of municipal violations.

In most states there are separate detention and post-conviction facilities for juveniles. These facilities are typically administered by county or state agencies. Where separate facilities are not available, the sheriff separates juveniles from adult offenders.⁹

In three states, convicted female misdemeanants are not kept in county jails as are the male offenders but are transferred to the state correctional system. Conversely, in one state male prisoners with sentences of one month or longer are remanded to the custody of state corrections while only female prisoners with sentences of six months or more are transferred to the state system.¹⁰

One significant legislative trend is that of establishing state jail standards commissions. According to a recent American Bar Association survey, jail standards commissions in 15 states are empowered to establish standards, inspect jails and close noncomplying facilities. Another eight states have some form of jail inspection law, although they lack the power to enforce compliance of state standards.¹¹

In several states, sheriffs anxious to improve conditions have encouraged and supported the development of jail commissions. The recommendations of these commissions provide sheriffs with the leverage to convince voters and county commissioners to allocate funds for the necessary improvements.

3. Court duties. In all 49 states in which the office of sheriff exists, the sheriff is responsible for performing court related functions. These functions may include acting as bailiff; attending court; serving summonses, warrants or civil process; and enforcing money decrees such as those relating to garnishment and sale of property.

As a court officer the sheriff is usually responsible to the general trial court of the state. In a few states, the sheriff of the county where the state capitol is located has served also as an officer of the highest court of the state. But this apparently no longer occurs even where such statutory responsibilities remain.

The sheriff's general role as guardian of the court is manifested in various ways in different states. In a few states, such as Mississippi, the sheriff is charged with the management of the county courthouse. In 45 states the sheriff or his deputy is required to attend court or act as bailiff. In all 49 states, the sheriff is responsible for process service of one kind or another (Table II-1).

F. Summary

The sheriff is a unique public officer whose office dates to pre-Norman England and whose responsibilities are civil as well as criminal. The power to act in all three branches of the criminal justice system is supported by common law precedent. The responsibility of "conservator of the peace" is backed up by the unique

power to summon a posse.

The office of sheriff exists in all states except Alaska. In all other states except Hawaii sheriffs are county officers. Although Hawaii has counties, the sheriff is a state officer responsible to the chief justice of the state. In some jurisdictions sheriffs also exist at the municipal level either as officers parallel to the county sheriff (e.g, in Baltimore and St. Louis) or as officers of combined city/county governments.

The sheriff is a constitutionally designated officer in 35 states. The constitutions of two additional states, Missouri and Wyoming, mention the sheriff but do not establish or define the office. In the absence of court interpretation, no firm conclusion can be made as to whether the sheriff is a constitutional officer in those states. Only a few state constitutions specify any duties of the sheriff, and these are generally taken to be additional responsibilities rather than limitations to the common law duties of the sheriff.

Most typically, the sheriff is an elected officer who serves a four-year term with no restrictions on the number of terms that he can serve. The sheriff is appointed in only eleven counties. These include the counties of Rhode Island and a few metropolitan counties that operate under home rule statutes. In the last 15 years several states have lengthened the term of office to four years and removed tenure restrictions. This trend in recent years in the direction of longer terms and unlimited tenure has been bolstered by the argument that these revisions encourage

professionalism. This reason is also given to promote minimum qualification standards for sheriffs.

Sheriffs perform law enforcement in 93 percent of the counties. In some cases their responsibility is limited by practice to the patrolling of unincorporated territories, while in others sheriffs play some role in the policing of municipalities. Most sheriffs' agencies perform full police services; some of the smaller agencies investigate criminal complaints but do not patrol. Approximately ten percent of all sheriffs' agencies do not have traffic and accident functions. In counties in which sheriffs do not perform patrol and investigative functions, either independent county departments are established, or there is coverage by the state police function in unincorporated territories.

Sheriffs function as jailers in 45 states. In 26 of these states, sheriffs are responsible for all, or virtually all, of the state's jail administration. In 11 states varying numbers of jails are administered by independent or state agencies. In the remaining eight states, the sheriffs' jails are limited to the incarceration of pretrial detainees only or of pretrial detainees and short-term misdemeanants only.

In 49 states the sheriff is a court officer, and performs process service of one kind or another. In 45 states the sheriff or his deputy is required to attend court or act as bailiff. Statutes of many states also assign sheriffs with various other court related and miscellaneous duties.

NOTES

1. F. W. Maitland, The Constitutional History of England, (Cambridge, 1965).
2. In 1970 there were 33 states in which the sheriff is a constitutional officer. According to an ACIR study, Advisory Commission on Inter-governmental Relations, State-Local Relations in the Criminal Justice System, (1971), p. 26.
3. The Police Chief Executive Committee of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, The Police Chief Executive Report, (Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1976).
4. Ibid, p. 25.
5. American Jurisprudence, (The Lawyers Cooperative Publishing Company/Bancroft-Whitney Company, 1973), Vol. 70, p. 152.
6. National Manpower Survey, 1975. National Planning Association, unpublished.
7. Government Operations Division of the Bureau of the Census, unpublished summary table, 1976.
8. The New York City Sheriff is legally responsible for the operation of the jail, but this function is performed by the city department of corrections under contract with the city sheriff.
9. National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service, Criminal Justice Agencies (Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1974)... Such segregation is required by the federal Juvenile Justice Act of 1974.
10. ACA Directory - 1976, (American Correctional Association, 1976).
11. Statewide Jail Standards and Inspection Systems Project, Survey and Handbook on State Standards and Inspection Legislation for Jails and Juvenile Detention Facilities. (American Bar Association Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services, 1974), pp. 5 & 6.

CHAPTER III PERSONNEL

In order to gauge the efficiency of his agency and to reach a logical conclusion regarding the strengths and weaknesses of his overall performance, the county law enforcement executive must have available sound information concerning his administrative and operational functions.

Often the results of past self-analyses within an individual agency are not an adequate base for further development. Frequently, however, compilation of data in relation to state, regional and national averages as well as experience of comparable agencies will afford the local county administrator valuable directions and guidelines for his analysis.

Since by far the largest expenditure of agency funds goes for salaries, personnel data must be considered one of the most vital elements in any evaluation and presentation of the agency's law enforcement capabilities. Accordingly, in this study special efforts have been made to compile and provide practical tables covering pertinent personnel data for the convenience and use of county law enforcement administrators.

This section of the report contains a brief profile of the sheriff in connection with the factors of age, time in office and total years in law enforcement. Details regarding salaries, rate of personnel, identification of major personnel assignments, and

fringe benefits are furnished for the individual sheriff, chief, and criminal justice planner specifically as guidelines and definitely not as recommendations of what should or should not exist. These data are displayed in Tables III-1 through III-16. The estimation of personnel needs is a local level matter, requiring that all variables affecting local law enforcement service be taken into consideration when establishing the required number of persons to discharge the agency responsibilities at an accepted professional level.

A. County Sheriffs' Agencies

Information collected in this study covering 60 percent of the county sheriffs in the United States shows these agencies to have 21,467 sworn employees in the rural counties and 47,698 sworn employees in the suburban counties, for a national total of 69,165. The rural counties reported a total of 4,099 civilian employees and the suburban counties reported a total of 15,524 civilian employees, for a national total of 19,623. The total number of employees, suburban and rural counties, as reported by county sheriffs is 88,788.

An estimate for the number of rural county sheriffs; sworn personnel is 37,181, and civilians estimated at 7,100 for a total of 44,281. The number of sworn suburban county personnel is estimated at 62,082 and civilian personnel at 20,391, for a total of 82,473. The estimated total county sheriff employees in the United States is 126,754. The estimated figures are based on a ratio estimation on suburban and rural agencies

separately for the four geographic divisions with the number of agencies responding in this study as the independent variable.

Some 1,735 county sheriffs in the United States provided information relative to the use of auxiliary or part-time personnel. Of this group 77 percent indicate they utilized some part-time personnel, either paid or volunteer in 1976. The average number of reserves, auxiliaries or volunteers is 33.

Of the part-time personnel utilized by sheriffs in the year 1976 the highest category is auxiliary or reserve deputies with a national average of 25 such deputies per agency. The next category is part-time deputies which average nine; and in "all other functions" the average is six.

Information furnished relative to compensation indicates the hourly wage rate for paid auxiliary/reserve deputies is \$3.11 per hour as the national median.

Results of this study indicate 42 percent of the county sheriffs in the United States have an overtime policy. Of these agencies with an overtime policy 45 percent pay their employees time-and-a-half; 32 percent utilize time-off or compensatory time; and 22 percent pay straight time for service beyond regular work hours. Less than one percent of these agencies indicate paying double time for overtime work.

There are some 1,700 sheriffs' agencies which provide data concerning the compensation of deputy's time in court

beyond regular working hours. Of this group 37 percent indicate they compensate deputies in some way for such services. Overtime pay is provided by 63 percent of these agencies and 37 percent provide compensatory time off.

Based on information furnished by county sheriffs throughout the country it was determined the mean cost to add one deputy in 1976 including salary, training, fringe benefits and uniform costs is \$10,872.

B. County Police Departments

Twenty-eight county police departments contributed information to this study. These departments are in the states of Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina and Virginia.

Table III-17 of this report contains a profile of the chief/director of county police departments by age, years as agency head and total years of law enforcement experience. Tables III-18 and III-19 provide salary information for the ranking department officials and the starting salaries for other positions in the department.

The county police departments reported a total of 12,771 sworn officers of which 12,648 are primarily assigned to law enforcement duties, and only seven sworn officers are primarily assigned to clerical duties. Table III-20 and Table III-21

provide information concerning the major assignment of sworn and civilian personnel. Table III-22 provides data on the use of established personnel regulations.

Of the county police departments contributing information, 39 percent provided pay differential to those officers assigned to detective squads, 22 percent to night shift personnel, 20 percent to motorcycle officers and 15 percent of these agencies have a pay differential covering tactical squad personnel. Eight departments indicated the bomb squad personnel receive pay differentials.

Of these county police departments 82 percent have an overtime policy. Of this group 30 percent pay their personnel straight time for overtime, 52 percent pay a rate of time-and-a-half and 17 percent provide compensatory time-off. Of all county police departments represented in this study 79 percent indicated they compensate officers for time spent in court beyond regular hours and this compensation is in the form of overtime pay.

All county police departments contributing information indicated they have programs covering paid vacations, sick leave, uniform allowance and pension funds. Of these agencies 96 percent provide some type of coverage for hospitalization insurance. Of this group, 85 percent indicated they have a major medical program, 84 percent a life insurance program and 59 percent have some form of disability insurance program.

Of the county police departments 61 percent indicated they utilize part-time personnel paid or unpaid in 1976. The mean number of auxiliary or reserve police officers utilized by county police departments in 1976 was 81 and the mean number used for the same period in other positions was 53.

C. Independent City Sheriffs

The independent city sheriff exists in those municipalities that are not part of a county. There are a total of 38 independent cities, excluding the District of Columbia, which are in Maryland, Missouri and Virginia.

Nineteen independent city sheriffs contributed to this study. Table III-23 provides a profile concerning the sheriff. Table III-24 sets forth salary information for the sheriff, undersheriff, division director and bureau head, and Table III-25 covers starting salaries for various positions. Because of a small number of agencies represented, which have all of the above named positions, the salary data does not show as wide a range as could be expected of information relative to a large number of agencies.

These agencies reported having a total of 758 sworn employees and 36 civilian employees. The major assignment of sworn personnel is listed in Table III-26. Of the 36 civilian personnel, three are assigned primarily to jail/corrections duties, three are assigned to process serving functions and 30 are assigned to clerical duties.

TABLE III-1

PROFILE OF COUNTY SHERIFFS BY AGE, YEARS AS
SHERIFF AND TOTAL YEARS IN LAW ENFORCEMENT

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>1st Quartile</u>	<u>3rd Quartile</u>
I. National			
1) Age	48	40	56
2) Years As Sheriff	7	2	10
3) Total Years In Law Enforcement	16	9	23
II. National Suburban Counties			
1) Age	50	43	56
2) Years As Sheriff	7	2	10
3) Total Years In Law Enforcement	20	12	27
III. National Rural Counties			
1) Age	48	40	55
2) Years As Sheriff	7	2	10
3) Total Years In Law Enforcement	15	8	21

TABLE III-2

COUNTY SHERIFF AGENCIES
ANNUAL 1976 SALARY DATA

Position	Mean	Median	1st Quartile	3rd Quartile
1) Sheriff	\$15,157	\$13,800	\$11,000	\$17,576
2) Undersheriff	12,139	10,800	9,000	14,000
3) Division Director	12,806	14,760	11,688	18,600
4) Bureau Head	12,146	13,500	11,500	18,316

TABLE III-3
COUNTY SHERIFF AGENCIES 1976
SALARY DATA BY GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION

Position	Mean	Median	1st Quartile	3rd Quartile
NORTHEASTERN STATES				
1) Sheriff	\$16,217	\$15,500	\$11,331	\$19,500
2) Undersheriff	12,739	12,009	9,760	14,800
3) Division Director	12,678	15,250	10,500	18,000
4) Bureau Head	13,797	14,100	10,500	20,000
NORTH CENTRAL STATES				
1) Sheriff	13,888	13,000	10,600	15,800
2) Undersheriff	11,740	10,889	9,060	13,492
3) Division Director	12,572	14,500	11,568	18,316
4) Bureau Head	11,260	13,200	11,232	16,100
SOUTHERN STATES				
1) Sheriff	15,904	15,000	11,906	18,500
2) Undersheriff	11,299	10,100	8,424	12,764
3) Division Director	10,937	13,393	10,500	16,248
4) Bureau Head	9,938	12,500	10,000	14,500
WESTERN STATES				
1) Sheriff	16,221	13,000	10,740	19,073
2) Undersheriff	14,648	12,000	9,975	17,100
3) Division Director	16,633	17,000	13,808	21,789
4) Bureau Head	17,449	18,600	13,000	23,982

TABLE III-4

COUNTY SHERIFF AGENCIES 1976
STARTING SALARY DATA IN VARIOUS POSITIONS

Position	Mean	Median	1st Quartile	3rd Quartile
1) Captain	\$12,372	\$12,422	\$10,500	\$15,532
2) Lieutenant	11,663	12,000	10,200	14,424
3) Sergeant	10,938	10,944	9,600	12,800
4) Detective	10,286	10,548	9,384	12,084
5) Deputy	8,930	8,760	7,716	10,080
6) Matron	6,889	7,032	5,852	8,520
7) Chief Jailer	9,847	9,528	7,440	12,000
8) Jailer	7,894	7,979	6,600	9,500
9) Bailiff	6,721	8,040	6,322	9,744

TABLE III-5

1976 MEDIAN SALARY OF COUNTY SHERIFFS, MEDIAN
STARTING SALARY OF DEPUTIES AND JAILERS BY STATE

State	Sheriff	Deputy	Jailer
Alabama	\$15,000	\$8,100	\$6,300
Arizona	19,500	9,528	7,820
Arkansas	15,000	7,800	6,000
California	28,303	12,312	10,488
Colorado	10,500	8,406	7,368
Connecticut	11,500	---	N/A
Delaware	6,000	9,500	N/A
Florida	23,629	9,300	7,384
Georgia	14,400	8,040	6,924
Hawaii	N/A	N/A	N/A
Idaho	10,800	8,400	8,100
Illinois	15,500	9,600	8,400
Indiana	11,110	8,700	7,200
Iowa	13,400	10,000	9,060
Kansas	10,080	7,320	6,600
Kentucky	16,000	7,700	N/A
Louisiana	26,640	7,392	7,207
Maine	8,500	7,540	7,644
Maryland	12,500	8,448	8,000
Massachusetts	19,800	10,228	10,600
Michigan	14,600	10,179	9,141
Minnesota	16,500	10,092	8,444
Mississippi	12,000	7,200	6,600
Missouri	14,500	7,200	6,000
Montana	11,295	10,080	7,632
Nebraska	9,768	8,400	7,200
Nevada	12,000	9,000	10,032

TABLE III-5 (Continued)

State	Sheriff	Deputy	Jailer
New Hampshire	\$13,500	\$8,600	\$9,000
New Jersey	21,000	8,750	8,700
New Mexico	9,980	7,260	5,760
New York	17,900	8,978	8,425
North Carolina	14,757	7,656	7,000
North Dakota	10,300	8,700	7,320
Ohio	12,700	9,500	8,600
Oklahoma	9,240	6,720	6,060
Oregon	16,224	10,284	9,504
Pennsylvania	13,000	8,000	7,488
Rhode Island	12,800	---	N/A
South Carolina	14,479	8,216	6,489
South Dakota	11,500	8,400	6,000
Tennessee	16,069	7,800	6,800
Texas	11,750	8,400	7,680
Utah	12,360	8,400	7,476
Virginia	14,124	7,500	8,034
Vermont	10,500	7,800	6,340
Washington	15,500	12,285	9,600
West Virginia	10,000	7,200	5,700
Wisconsin	14,000	10,080	9,900
Wyoming	10,872	9,690	8,100

N/A - Not Applicable.

TABLE III-6

COUNTY SHERIFF AGENCIES 1976
STARTING SALARY DATA IN VARIOUS POSITIONS
NORTHEASTERN STATES

Position	Mean	Median	1st Quartile	3rd Quartile
1) Captain	\$11,775	\$12,500	\$11,034	\$15,000
2) Lieutenant	11,430	11,550	10,000	13,457
3) Sergeant	10,611	10,228	9,122	11,635
4) Detective	10,067	10,000	9,334	11,500
5) Deputy	8,980	8,778	7,780	9,879
6) Matron	7,462	7,353	5,870	8,800
7) Chief Jailer	11,151	10,034	8,400	14,170
8) Jailer	8,809	8,425	7,525	9,600
9) Bailiff	6,220	6,594	5,200	9,000

TABLE III-7

COUNTY SHERIFF AGENCIES 1976
STARTING SALARY DATA IN VARIOUS POSITIONS
NORTH CENTRAL STATES

Position	Mean	Median	1st Quartile	3rd Quartile
1) Captain	\$12,378	\$12,240	\$10,420	\$15,196
2) Lieutenant	11,756	12,250	10,500	14,504
3) Sergeant	11,426	11,247	10,000	13,000
4) Detective	10,987	11,212	10,044	12,688
5) Deputy	9,319	9,316	8,100	10,452
6) Matron	6,903	6,960	5,452	8,715
7) Chief Jailer	10,090	9,900	7,800	12,066
8) Jailer	8,214	8,360	6,960	9,900
9) Bailiff	6,728	8,300	6,564	9,960

TABLE III-8

COUNTY SHERIFF AGENCIES 1976
STARTING SALARY DATA IN VARIOUS POSITIONS
SOUTHERN STATES

Position	Mean	Median	1st Quartile	3rd Quartile
1) Captain	\$10,942	\$11,400	\$10,000	\$13,584
2) Lieutenant	10,158	10,713	9,493	12,264
3) Sergeant	9,319	9,765	8,628	11,000
4) Detective	8,940	9,500	8,520	10,404
5) Deputy	8,062	8,008	7,200	9,000
6) Matron	6,273	6,564	5,580	7,774
7) Chief Jailer	8,747	8,600	6,962	10,536
8) Jailer	7,053	7,080	6,191	8,040
9) Bailiff	6,064	7,356	6,000	8,424

TABLE III-9

COUNTY SHERIFF AGENCIES 1976
STARTING SALARY DATA IN VARIOUS POSITIONS
WESTERN STATES

Position	Mean	Median	1st Quartile	3rd Quartile
1) Captain	\$15,467	\$16,416	\$13,500	\$19,653
2) Lieutenant	14,135	14,500	12,600	17,059
3) Sergeant	12,478	12,696	10,920	14,329
4) Detective	11,419	11,664	10,344	13,332
5) Deputy	9,923	10,000	8,544	11,172
6) Matron	7,660	7,680	6,600	9,288
7) Chief Jailer	11,416	11,297	8,646	14,424
8) Jailer	8,735	9,288	7,499	10,320
9) Bailiff	8,804	10,661	9,732	12,500

TABLE III-10

THE 1976 RATE OF TOTAL AND SWORN EMPLOYEES
PER 1000 INHABITANTS IN COUNTY
SHERIFFS' AGENCIES BY GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION
WITH SUBURBAN AND RURAL COUNTY BREAKDOWN

	Sworn Employees			Total Employees		
	Rate (Mean)	1st Quartile	3rd Quartile	Rate (Mean)	1st Quartile	3rd Quartile
NATIONAL	1.4	0.5	1.5	1.7	0.7	1.9
Suburban	2.2	0.8	2.1	2.8	0.9	2.5
Rural	1.1	0.5	1.3	1.4	0.7	1.6
NORTHEAST	1.4	0.5	1.4	1.7	0.6	1.6
Suburban	2.7	0.9	2.4	3.1	0.9	2.8
Rural	0.8	0.4	0.9	0.9	0.5	1.1
NORTH CENTRAL	1.2	0.5	1.2	1.6	0.7	1.5
Suburban	2.5	0.7	2.0	3.5	0.8	2.5
Rural	0.8	0.4	1.1	1.1	0.6	1.3
SOUTH	1.2	0.5	1.2	1.5	0.7	1.7
Suburban	1.9	0.8	2.1	2.2	0.9	2.3
Rural	1.0	0.5	1.3	1.3	0.7	1.5
WEST	2.0	1.0	2.2	2.5	1.4	2.7
Suburban	2.1	1.3	2.4	2.8	1.7	3.1
Rural	2.0	1.0	2.2	2.4	1.3	2.6

TABLE III-11

THE 1976 RATE OF TOTAL AND SWORN LAW ENFORCEMENT EMPLOYEES
PER 1000 INHABITANTS IN COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES

	Sworn Employees			Total Employees		
	Rate (Mean)	1st Quartile	3rd Quartile	Rate (Mean)	1st Quartile	3rd Quartile
Alabama	1.0	0.6	1.4	1.2	0.9	1.5
Arizona	1.9	1.7	2.0	2.7	2.1	2.8
Arkansas	0.8	0.4	1.0	0.9	0.7	1.0
California	2.3	1.6	2.4	3.0	2.2	3.1
Colorado	2.3	1.2	2.5	2.9	1.5	3.5
Connecticut*	---	---	---	---	---	---
Delaware*	---	---	---	---	---	---
Florida	2.1	1.4	2.6	2.5	1.9	3.1
Georgia	1.0	0.5	1.2	1.1	0.6	1.4
Idaho	3.4	1.1	3.0	3.6	1.5	3.0
Illinois	1.1	0.6	1.4	1.4	0.9	1.7
Indiana	0.7	0.3	0.7	0.9	0.5	0.9
Iowa	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.9	0.5	0.9
Kansas	1.4	0.5	1.3	1.8	0.9	2.1
Kentucky	0.5	0.3	0.6	0.6	0.4	0.7
Louisiana	2.1	1.4	2.5	2.1	1.4	2.5
Maine	0.9	0.5	0.9	0.9	0.5	0.9
Maryland	0.6	0.4	0.9	0.8	0.5	1.0
Massachusetts	0.9			0.9		
Michigan	1.3	0.7	1.4	1.6	0.9	1.8
Minnesota	1.4	0.5	1.1	1.8	0.8	1.4
Mississippi	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.5
Missouri	1.6	0.3	0.7	1.9	0.4	0.9
Montana	1.2	0.7	1.5	1.8	1.0	2.4
Nebraska	1.1	0.5	1.2	1.6	0.7	1.9
Nevada	4.3	2.6	5.4	4.6	2.6	5.8
New Hampshire	0.8	0.3	0.8	1.0	0.3	1.1
New Jersey*	---	---	---	---	---	---
New Mexico	2.1	0.7	2.3	2.7	1.0	2.6
New York	1.8	0.7	1.7	2.0	0.8	1.8
North Carolina	0.9	0.6	1.0	1.1	0.7	1.2
North Dakota	0.9	0.4	1.3	1.1	0.5	1.5
Ohio	1.2	0.6	0.9	1.7	0.7	1.2
Oklahoma	1.2	0.6	1.2	1.4	0.7	1.6
Oregon	1.3	1.0	1.6	1.6	1.2	1.9

TABLE III-11 (Continued)

	Sworn Employees			Total Employees		
	Rate (Mean)	1st Quartile	3rd Quartile	Rate (Mean)	1st Quartile	3rd Quartile
Pennsylvania*	---	---	---	---	---	---
Rhode Island*	---	---	---	---	---	---
South Carolina	0.8	0.6	1.0	1.0	0.8	1.1
South Dakota	0.8	0.3	1.1	1.1	0.4	1.3
Tennessee	0.9	0.4	1.0	1.2	0.5	1.6
Texas	2.1	0.7	2.0	2.0	2.6	2.5
Utah	1.2	0.8	1.3	1.5	0.9	2.2
Virginia	1.0	0.7	1.2	1.1	0.8	1.3
Vermont	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2
Washington	1.3	0.9	1.4	1.6	1.2	1.9
West Virginia	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.8	0.5	0.9
Wisconsin	2.0	1.0	1.7	3.5	1.1	1.9
Wyoming	2.3	1.1	2.8	2.8	1.2	3.8

* All or a majority of sheriffs in these states advised they do not have primary patrol/investigation responsibility.

TABLE III-12

PERCENT OF COUNTY SHERIFF
 AGENCIES WHICH PROVIDE FRINGE BENEFITS
 TO EMPLOYEES

Benefits	Number Of Agencies	Percent Which Provide Benefits
1) Paid Vacation	1798	97
2) Sick Leave	1776	89
3) Uniform Paid Or Uniform Allowance	1792	88
4) Pension (Other Than Social Security)	1784	83
5) Provide Insurance	1722	84
a. Hospitalization		95
b. Major Medical		88
c. Disability		58
d. Life Insurance		69

TABLE III-13

PERCENT OF COUNTY SHERIFF AGENCIES WHEREIN EMPLOYEES
ARE REGULATED BY ESTABLISHED REGULATIONS OR PROGRAM

Regulation Or Program	Number Of Agencies	Percent Of Agencies Participating
1) State Civil Service	1276	13
2) County Civil Service	1302	19
3) Merit Board Regulations	1269	16
4) Formal Work Agreement And/Or Contract	1323	29
5) Other	931	28

TABLE III-14

MAJOR ASSIGNMENT OF COUNTY SHERIFF
SWORN EMPLOYEES

Assignment	Total Number Employees	Mean	Median	Range
1) Law Enforcement	45,219	28	8	1 - 3,265
2) Jail/ Corrections	16,644	12	5	1 - 1,444
3) Bailiffs And Court Officers	4,832	4	2	1 - 814
4) Process Servers	2,932	3	2	1 - 231
5) Clerical	2,663	2	2	1 - 95
6) Other Assignments	2,800	3	3	1 - 547
7) Total	69,165	41	13	1 - 5,640

TABLE III-15

MAJOR ASSIGNMENT OF COUNTY SHERIFF
CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

Assignment	Total Number Employees	Mean	Median	Range
1) Law Enforcement	2,089	2	4	1 - 153
2) Jail/ Corrections	5,611	5	3	1 - 648
3) Bailiffs And Court Officers	966	1	2	1 - 279
4) Process Servers	720	1	2	1 - 279
5) Clerical	7,425	6	2	1 - 1086
6) Other Assignments	4,179	4	3	1 - 279
7) Total	19,623	12	5	1 - 2093

TABLE III-16

PERCENT OF COUNTY SHERIFF AGENCIES WHICH PROVIDE
PAY DIFFERENTIALS FOR JOB ASSIGNMENTS OR DUTY HOURS

Assignment	Number Of Agencies	Percent With Pay Differential
1) Night Shift	1664	10
2) Motorcycle Patrol	1373	2
3) Detective	1476	18
4) Tactical Squad	1353	2

TABLE III-17

PROFILE OF CHIEFS AND/OR DIRECTOR OF COUNTY
POLICE DEPARTMENTS BY AGE, YEARS AS CHIEF OF DEPARTMENT
AND TOTAL YEARS IN LAW ENFORCEMENT

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>1st Quartile</u>	<u>3rd Quartile</u>
1) Age	45	42	48
2) Years As Chief/ Director	4	2	6
3) Total Years In Law Enforcement	20	19	22

TABLE III-18

COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT ANNUAL 1976 SALARY DATA

Position	Mean	Median	1st Quartile	3rd Quartile
1) Chief/ Director	\$ 25,986	\$ 24,000	\$ 17,184	\$ 31,501
2) Deputy Chief	23,942	20,450	15,478	28,405
3) Division Director	23,259	19,500	14,961	28,500
4) Bureau Head	25,619	23,316	14,156	34,112

TABLE III-19
 COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT 1976
 STARTING SALARY DATA IN VARIOUS POSITIONS

Position	Mean	Median	1st Quartile	3rd Quartile
1) Captain	\$15,887	\$15,012	\$11,520	\$18,873
2) Lieutenant	14,836	14,443	11,121	16,594
3) Sergeant	12,763	11,712	9,780	14,652
4) Detective	10,917	9,654	8,910	12,263
5) Patrolman	10,191	10,140	8,131	11,909
6) Matron	7,827	6,492	6,238	7,303
7) Chief Jailer	13,454	9,168	7,653	10,944
8) Jailer	8,688	7,303	6,492	9,945
9) Bailiff	---	---	---	---

TABLE III-20

MAJOR ASSIGNMENT OF COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT
SWORN PERSONNEL

Assignment	Total Number Employees	Mean	Median	Range
1) Law Enforcement	12,648	452	143	12 - 3,723
2) Jail/ Corrections	83	4	1	1 - 71
3) Bailiffs And Court Officers	1	---	1	---
4) Process Servers	2	---	2	---
5) Clerical	7	---	1	1 - 6
6) Other Assignments	30	2	5	5 - 19
7) Total	12,771	456	143	12 - 3,723

TABLE III-21

MAJOR ASSIGNMENT OF COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT
CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

Assignment	Total Number Employees	Mean	Median	Range
1) Law Enforcement	1311	60	28	4 - 437
2) Jail/ Corrections	51	3	2	2 - 43
3) Bailiffs And Court Officers	0	0	0	---
4) Process Servers	0	0	0	---
5) Clerical	1128	49	18	3 - 486
6) Other Assignments	788	34	6	1 - 355
7) Total	3426	122	25	2 - 923

TABLE III-22

PERCENT OF COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENTS WHEREIN EMPLOYEES
ARE REGULATED BY ESTABLISHED REGULATIONS OR PROGRAM

Regulation Or Program	Number Of Agencies	Percent Of Agencies Participating
1) State Civil Service	23	17
2) County Civil Service	24	58
3) Merit Board Regulations	27	40
4) Formal Work Agreement	25	24
5) Other	16	25

TABLE III-23

PROFILE OF INDEPENDENT CITY SHERIFFS
 BY AGE, YEARS AS SHERIFF, AND
 TOTAL YEARS IN LAW ENFORCEMENT

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>1st Quartile</u>	<u>3rd Quartile</u>
1) Age	54	45	59
2) Years As Sheriff	10	4	16
3) Total Years In Law Enforcement	18	12	18

TABLE III-24

INDEPENDENT CITY SHERIFF
AGENCIES ANNUAL 1976 SALARY DATA

Position	Mean	Median	1st Quartile	3rd Quartile
1) Sheriff	\$18,525	\$18,614	\$13,990	\$22,240
2) Undersheriff	12,597	12,091	10,104	14,500
3) Division Director	12,400	11,500	11,500	12,000
4) Bureau Head	10,104	10,104	10,104	10,104

TABLE III-25

INDEPENDENT CITY SHERIFF AGENCIES 1976
STARTING SALARY DATA FOR VARIOUS POSITIONS

Position	Mean	Median	1st Quartile	3rd Quartile
1) Captain	\$12,586	\$12,000	\$11,316	\$13,128
2) Lieutenant	10,887	10,967	10,104	11,160
3) Sergeant	7,822	9,168	8,600	9,168
4) Detective	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5) Deputy	8,047	7,900	7,032	8,040
6) Matron	7,402	7,032	7,000	8,040
7) Chief Jailer	10,697	10,992	7,032	12,000
8) Jailer	7,931	7,500	7,032	8,040
9) Bailiff	8,116	8,040	7,032	8,040

TABLE III-26

MAJOR ASSIGNMENT OF INDEPENDENT CITY SHERIFF
SWORN EMPLOYEES

Assignment	Total Number Employees	Mean	Median	Range
1) Law Enforcement	80	7	1	1 - 70
2) Jail/ Corrections	385	28	20	2 - 138
3) Bailiffs And Court Officers	122	8	6	1 - 22
4) Process Servers	47	3	1	1 - 18
5) Clerical	24	2	2	1 - 5
6) Other Assignments	100	9	9	3 - 46
7) Total	758	40	24	1 - 166

CHAPTER IV BUDGET

A. County Sheriffs' Agencies

Table IV-1 sets forth the median county budget, the median total dollars received from the county for sheriffs' agencies, the median income received in addition to that received from the county and median sheriff's budget by rural and suburban counties and by national and geographic division. As expected, the medians mentioned above are lower in each category for rural as compared with suburban counties. The highest median county budget is reported by counties in the Western Division. The lowest is reported by rural counties in the North Central states. The highest median agency budget is also reported by suburban counties in the Western Division and the lowest is also reported by rural agencies in the North Central states.

Generally, rural county sheriffs reported larger budgetary increases than did suburban sheriffs. The median average percent increase of rural county sheriffs' budgets from the year 1971 to 1975 was 97 percent, from 1972 to 1975 it was 71 percent and from 1973 to 1975 it was 47 percent. The average percent increase of suburban county sheriffs' budgets from the year 1971 to 1975 was 87 percent, from 1972 to 1975 it was 66 percent and from 1973 to 1975 it was 39 percent.

TABLE IV-1

MEDIAN COUNTY BUDGET, MEDIAN TOTAL DOLLARS RECEIVED FROM THE COUNTY, MEDIAN INCOME RECEIVED IN ADDITION TO MONIES RECEIVED FROM THE COUNTY AND MEDIAN TOTAL BUDGET FOR COUNTY SHERIFFS BY SUBURBAN AND RURAL COUNTIES AND NATIONAL AND GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION

	Median County Budget Exclud- ing Schools & Highway Am'ts	Median Total Dollars Rec'd From The County For Sheriffs Agencies	Median Income Rec'd In Addition To That Rec'd From The County	Median Total Budget
National	\$2,051,721	\$198,859	\$28,000	\$219,176
Suburban	13,435,645	906,518	92,000	1,026,000
Rural	1,418,397	134,665	18,722	152,438
Northeast	14,000,000	341,993	40,835	356,609
Suburban	22,500,000	859,368	74,000	947,600
Rural	5,797,548	194,500	31,000	210,560
North Central	1,444,478	153,990	24,000	173,893
Suburban	8,576,405	842,029	80,424	946,363
Rural	1,116,211	112,227	18,000	128,881
South	1,783,080	198,377	26,500	229,000
Suburban	6,499,337	600,000	60,000	671,000
Rural	1,391,623	144,000	17,400	173,000
West	3,821,735	303,787	37,200	312,000
Suburban	53,000,000	3,791,482	305,000	4,167,612
Rural	2,149,007	194,673	21,000	202,246

The mean expenditure by geographic division is highest, \$11,012,583, among suburban agencies in the Western Division. Tables IV-2, IV-3, and IV-4 give expenditures for various functions and mean total expenditures by rural and suburban counties and state and geographical division.

The average percentage of sheriffs' budgets allocated to salary and fringe benefits is higher among suburban county sheriffs as compared with rural county sheriffs. The following percentages of sheriffs' budgets are allocated to salary and fringe benefits:

<u>Division</u>	<u>Suburban</u>	<u>Rural</u>
Northeast	66%	57%
North Central	68%	60%
South	66%	61%
West	73%	66%

Nationally, 68 percent of suburban sheriffs' budgets were allocated to salary and fringe benefits and 62 percent of rural sheriffs' budgets were allocated for such purposes.

The percentage of agencies who prepare their budget request is shown by rural and suburban counties and by state in Table IV-5. Nationally, 89 percent of the 1,284 rural agencies responding to this matter prepare their budget request as compared with 95 percent of 414 suburban counties who indicate that they do so.

TABLE IV-2

MEAN COUNTY SHERIFF AGENCIES EXPENDITURES FOR VARIOUS
FUNCTIONS AND MEAN TOTAL EXPENDITURES BY SUBURBAN AND RURAL
COUNTY AND NATIONAL AND GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION

	Patrol/ Investi- gative Opera- tions In Mean Dollars	Jail/ Correc- tional Opera- tions In Mean Dollars	Civil & Court Opera- tions In Mean Dollars	Tax Collec- tion In Mean Dollars	Other Func- tional Respon- sibili- ties In Mean Dollars	Total Mean Expendi- tures
National	\$707,429	\$407,597	\$220,113	\$19,493	\$21,657	\$1,395,662
Suburban	2,087,314	1,229,367	512,197	41,125	24,493	4,010,537
Rural	178,055	83,955	29,726	13,227	20,325	283,048
Northeast	388,348	838,810	321,596	0	24,306	1,078,853
Suburban	767,264	1,704,229	528,909	0	29,883	1,995,802
Rural	156,788	168,110	69,215	0	20,961	336,560
North						
Central	301,594	207,269	105,824	15,325	18,466	603,896
Suburban	881,962	606,624	296,405	55,765	17,623	1,910,752
Rural	123,614	82,880	12,916	2,946	18,759	184,046
South	597,864	205,884	143,117	28,011	23,907	1,064,552
Suburban	1,478,284	549,515	309,111	42,047	26,869	2,698,651
Rural	182,888	52,949	33,097	23,758	22,444	292,893
West	1,759,966	948,469	424,693	8,237	23,249	3,526,203
Suburban	5,689,511	3,316,885	1,039,867	12,463	27,847	11,012,583
Rural	282,189	105,474	32,254	7,611	20,265	439,714

TABLE IV-3

MEAN SUBURBAN COUNTY SHERIFF AGENCIES EXPENDITURES FOR VARIOUS FUNCTIONS AND TOTAL EXPENDITURES BY STATE

State	Patrol/ Investigative Operations In Mean Dollars	Jail/ Correctional Operations In Mean Dollars	Civil & Court Operations In Mean Dollars	Tax Collection In Mean Dollars	Other Functional Responsibili- ties In Mean Dollars	Total Mean Expenditures
Alabama	\$1,118,584	\$389,736	\$379,519	0	0	\$1,670,009
Alaska *	--	--	--	--	--	--
Arizona	5,522,919	2,228,121	1,111,139	0	30,864	11,399,187
Arkansas	207,753	158,270	31,927	104,631	70,676	573,257
California	10,585,736	6,189,042	1,565,560	0	41,248	21,038,924
Colorado	892,991	1,106,908	376,817	0	8,838	2,259,932
Connecticut	0	0	25,000	0	0	25,000
Delaware **	--	--	--	--	--	--
Florida	4,734,057	1,144,810	583,060	0	34,183	7,298,475
Georgia	392,857	359,929	157,047	10,000	35,562	952,687
Hawaii *	--	--	--	--	--	--
Idaho	635,955	152,258	99,200	0	3,660	1,253,413
Illinois	967,136	326,832	109,195	0	31,216	1,318,964
Indiana	739,688	563,018	295,692	25,111	39,279	1,446,785
Iowa	559,344	298,672	407,000	0	1,527	1,356,267
Kansas	331,626	204,005	0	67,206	8,815	649,184
Kentucky **	--	--	--	--	--	--
Louisiana	490,452	600,792	218,454	70,627	31,170	1,379,496
Maine	185,000	176,000	0	0	0	361,000
Maryland	687,080	236,503	176,915	0	50,309	627,372
Massachusetts	0	4,881,854	375,572	0	0	5,542,312
Michigan	1,596,049	1,678,041	366,331	0	10,708	3,563,362
Minnesota	921,929	533,951	634,204	6,850	21,645	2,487,466
Mississippi **	--	--	--	--	--	--
Missouri	620,163	154,750	454,807	0	0	587,307
Montana **	--	--	--	--	--	--

TABLE IV-3 (Continued)

State	Patrol/ Investigative Operations In Mean Dollars	Jail/ Correctional Operations In Mean Dollars	Civil & Court Operations In Mean Dollars	Tax Collection In Mean Dollars	Other Functional Responsibili- ties In Mean Dollars	Total Mean Expenditures
Nebraska	\$497,061	\$257,669	\$212,000	\$36,000	\$8,020	\$1,896,000
Nevada	11,421,088	2,531,450	0	0	86,582	22,610,761
New Hampshire**	--	--	--	--	--	--
New Jersey	884,500	627,372	987,890	0	46,145	2,135,918
New Mexico	1,894,093	0	174,483	49,852	3,741	2,492,616
New York	1,038,170	1,458,964	654,420	0	30,082	1,917,384
North Carolina	683,968	340,780	355,326	0	5,131	1,516,582
North Dakota**	--	--	--	--	--	--
Ohio	419,072	171,177	88,471	169,942	23,271	648,824
Oklahoma	190,754	247,120	141,980	43,000	31,523	680,800
Oregon	2,471,646	672,521	1,743,856	0	13,833	3,500,145
Pennsylvania	109,020	102,167	183,131	0	18,576	306,909
Rhode Island*	--	--	--	--	--	--
South Carolina	951,387	195,650	81,809	0	8,823	1,238,469
South Dakota	0	166,667	0	0	3,376	504,317
Tennessee	634,958	186,064	61,349	43,200	20,100	2,179,390
Texas	444,801	642,665	338,546	5,712	13,868	1,518,895
Utah	1,619,049	587,103	250,766	0	7,483	2,922,460
Vermont *	--	--	--	--	--	--
Virginia	185,193	438,535	250,963	0	12,208	647,616
Washington	2,151,764	388,653	96,192	0	19,001	3,681,528
West Virginia	270,000	200,000	60,000	120,000	0	650,000
Wisconsin	966,671	630,994	741,102	0	4,637	3,533,098
Wyoming *	--	--	--	--	--	--

* Not Applicable.

** Not Available.

TABLE IV-4

MEAN RURAL COUNTY SHERIFF AGENCIES EXPENDITURES FOR VARIOUS FUNCTIONS AND TOTAL EXPENDITURES BY STATE

State	Patrol/ Investigative Operations In Mean Dollars	Jail/ Correctional Operations In Mean Dollars	Civil & Court Operations In Mean Dollars	Tax Collection In Mean Dollars	Other Functional Responsibili- ties In Mean Dollars	Total Mean Expenditures
Alabama	\$96,052	\$37,444	\$18,250	\$ 0	\$59,177	\$122,870
Alaska *	--	--	--	--	--	--
Arizona	353,773	122,246	26,548	5,716	10,373	770,128
Arkansas	60,025	24,303	12,250	24,143	26,134	96,418
California	972,178	341,282	119,772	39,261	26,885	1,367,413
Colorado	90,992	29,843	6,578	0	6,320	133,438
Connecticut**	--	--	--	--	--	--
Delaware **	--	--	--	--	--	--
Florida	568,503	201,081	140,496	0	16,549	868,402
Georgia	121,481	47,017	25,387	34,105	53,372	202,765
Hawaii *	--	--	--	--	--	--
Idaho	79,524	17,208	10,500	2,125	7,733	137,228
Illinois	134,089	60,487	15,457	0	20,162	209,769
Indiana	97,029	48,004	8,179	16	18,983	193,283
Iowa	72,029	22,597	15,496	2,667	25,916	121,856
Kansas	65,638	477,349	3,650	2,683	10,266	104,843
Kentucky	60,525	0	10,931	20,525	7,250	80,284
Louisiana	332,080	50,874	38,427	40,108	25,596	575,886
Maine	96,409	105,783	4,000	0	31,756	237,145
Maryland	198,239	126,158	83,904	0	30,727	372,850
Massachusetts	0	336,147	0	0	0	336,147
Michigan	234,083	79,743	12,168	0	24,980	287,712
Minnesota	171,347	47,937	19,414	6,571	20,971	251,998
Mississippi	76,717	25,863	5,060	0	5,140	113,895

TABLE IV-4 (Continued)

State	Patrol/ Investigative Operations In Mean Dollars	Jail/ Correctional Operations In Mean Dollars	Civil & Court Operations In Mean Dollars	Tax Collection In Mean Dollars	Other Functional Responsibili- ties In Mean Dollars	Total Mean Expenditures
Missouri	\$37,478	\$17,909	\$4,739	\$ 0	\$10,575	\$61,968
Montana	56,940	21,310	12,966	10,661	16,361	135,712
Nebraska	35,046	21,586	4,535	706	17,558	60,446
Nevada	197,280	25,730	0	0	17,562	272,485
New Hampshire	146,983	0	21,778	0	0	269,080
New Jersey	234,710	510,305	470,809	0	1,376	1,167,308
New Mexico	52,250	21,407	1,855	0	29,658	159,924
New York	269,451	215,322	38,807	0	21,320	503,008
North Carolina	286,445	65,278	51,278	0	30,043	392,737
North Dakota	64,913	16,787	13,000	2,700	13,636	114,066
Ohio	81,857	33,005	14,828	0	7,498	183,219
Oklahoma	19,666	10,439	3,049	25	7,850	34,493
Oregon	267,844	150,002	34,883	9,719	22,014	405,560
Pennsylvania	25,831	73,276	38,585	0	32,606	119,133
Rhode Island*	---	---	---	---	---	---
South Carolina	258,777	43,998	8,000	0	10,756	221,478
South Dakota	28,921	19,668	34,766	6,624	15,448	70,782
Tennessee	143,701	46,348	21,929	190,011	12,781	422,720
Texas	59,109	23,646	5,409	1,676	14,269	114,893
Utah	78,714	16,461	19,877	0	44,564	150,108
Vermont	12,808	19,788	1,733	0	15,324	33,812
Virginia	191,777	78,394	39,906	0	26,830	233,011
Washington	273,011	82,830	17,505	0	14,967	420,478
West Virginia	25,547	15,077	10,950	28,274	10,800	78,600
Wisconsin	324,101	87,164	15,468	0	24,921	467,279
Wyoming	116,676	77,836	2,200	0	32,695	216,585

* Not Applicable.

** Not Available.

TABLE IV-5

PERCENT OF SUBURBAN AND RURAL COUNTY SHERIFFS WHO PREPARE THEIR BUDGET REQUEST
AND PERCENT OF COUNTY SHERIFFS WHO RECEIVE ASSISTANCE FROM A COUNTY,
REGIONAL OR STATE PLANNING AGENCY IN PREPARING THEIR BUDGET

State	Suburban Agencies Who Prepare Their Budget Request		Rural Agencies Who Prepare Their Budget Request		Suburban Agencies Who Receive Assistance in Pre- paring Their Budget		Rural Agencies Who Receive Assistance In Preparing Their Budget	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Alabama	11	73	14	43	10	10	14	7
Alaska *	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Arizona	2	100	9	100	2	50	9	11
Arkansas	5	100	20	90	5	40	21	29
California	23	96	24	100	23	35	24	8
Colorado	10	100	35	97	10	20	35	14
Connecticut	1	0	2	0	1	100	1	0
Delaware	1	100	1	100	1	0	1	0
Florida	22	100	28	100	22	14	28	7
Georgia	17	88	36	78	18	22	38	13
Hawaii *	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Idaho	1	100	24	100	1	0	24	17
Illinois	19	100	54	91	19	11	52	21
Indiana	23	100	36	100	23	9	36	19
Iowa	6	100	56	100	6	33	52	8
Kansas	5	80	63	54	5	40	63	13
Kentucky	3	67	13	38	3	0	14	14
Louisiana	10	70	25	72	11	0	28	7
Maine	1	100	9	100	1	100	9	22
Maryland	8	100	11	91	8	50	11	18
Massachusetts	5	100	2	100	5	20	2	0
Michigan	24	96	53	98	25	24	52	8
Minnesota	12	92	64	91	12	8	64	14
Mississippi	1	100	28	100	1	0	27	19

TABLE IV-5 (Continued)

State	Suburban Agencies Who Prepare Their Budget Request		Rural Agencies Who Prepare Their Budget Request		Suburban Agencies Who Receive Assistance In Preparing Their Budget		Rural Agencies Who Receive Assistance In Preparing Their Budget	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Missouri	9	100	38	100	8	25	39	18
Montana	1	100	28	100	1	0	28	0
Nebraska	3	100	56	96	3	0	52	8
Nevada	1	100	8	100	1	0	8	0
New Hampshire	0	--	7	100	0	--	7	29
New Jersey	11	100	2	100	9	33	2	0
New Mexico	1	100	14	86	1	0	12	67
New York	24	100	24	100	24	21	24	33
North Carolina	12	100	51	96	12	25	52	33
North Dakota	1	100	30	100	1	0	30	10
Ohio	33	100	39	100	33	3	37	5
Oklahoma	9	100	23	100	9	11	22	9
Oregon	6	100	27	100	6	17	27	11
Pennsylvania	14	93	13	85	14	14	13	23
Rhode Island	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	0
South Carolina	5	100	24	96	5	20	24	21
South Dakota	1	100	37	86	1	0	37	22
Tennessee	12	92	15	100	11	45	15	47
Texas	25	84	83	60	25	12	75	16
Utah	3	100	12	100	3	33	12	8
Vermont	--	--	11	82	--	--	11	36
Virginia	11	100	39	100	11	36	39	44
Washington	8	100	23	100	8	13	22	5
West Virginia	1	100	20	75	1	0	18	22
Wisconsin	11	100	36	94	11	9	35	11
Wyoming	--	--	15	100	--	--	14	14

* Not Applicable.

Sixteen percent of 1,262 rural counties nationally report that they receive assistance from a county, regional or state planning agency in preparing their budget. Nineteen percent of 412 suburban counties responding to this matter indicate that they receive such assistance.

Table IV-6 shows the percentage of county sheriffs by rural and suburban counties and by geographic division who indicate that they received monies from state, regional or federal agencies during 1976 or the last fiscal year. Tables IV-7 and IV-8 indicate, by state and rural and suburban agencies, the percentage of county sheriffs who receive monies from various state, regional or federal agencies. Nationally, 50 percent of suburban and 43 percent of rural agencies responding to this matter indicate that they receive funding from LEAA. Thirty-six percent of suburban agencies and 33 percent of rural agencies who responded to this matter receive funding from a state planning agency.

Tables IV-9, IV-10 and IV-11 show for what purposes the monies were received by rural and suburban county, state and geographic division. The largest number of suburban agencies in any one category receive funding for communications equipment. The largest number of rural agencies receive funding for training expenses.

Seventy-one percent of 403 suburban agencies nationally felt that their last year's budget allocations were insufficient

TABLE IV-6

PERCENT OF COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES WHICH RECEIVED
FUNDING FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS FROM VARIOUS SOURCES

Agency Which Provides Funding	Percent Nationally By Suburban And Rural Agencies		Percent Suburban By Division				Percent Rural By Division			
	9	8	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Number of Agencies	280	751	28	105	100	47	39	312	263	137
LEAA	50	43	39	47	49	68	41	37	47	47
Highway Safety Admin.	2	1	4	3	2	2	3	2	--	3
CETA	18	18	18	19	24	4	20	18	19	16
Unidentified Federal	1	*	--	--	3	--	--	*	1	--
Other Federal	12	18	4	14	9	17	13	14	12	40
State Planning Agency	36	33	32	41	37	23	31	36	32	28
State Highway Safety Dept.	7	4	11	7	7	6	--	5	3	6
State Crime Commission	5	4	--	6	5	4	3	7	3	1
State Standard And Training Commission	6	4	--	5	4	15	3	3	4	9
Unidentified State	2	2	--	1	4	2	5	1	3	4
Other	18	12	43	19	10	17	31	8	10	23
City Government	*	1	--	1	--	--	--	*	*	3
Regional Council Of Gov'ts	3	4	4	1	6	--	3	*	9	1
Private	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	4	2	4	7	4	--	3	2	3	1

* Less than one percent.

TABLE IV-7

PERCENT OF SUBURBAN COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES WHICH RECEIVED FUNDING FOR
LAW ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS FROM VARIOUS SOURCES

State	No. Of Agencies	LEAA	High-way Safety Admin	CETA	Un-ident-ified Federal	Other Federal	State Plan-ning Agen-cy	State High-way Safe-ty Dept	State Crime Comm	State Stan-dard & Train Comm	Un-ident-ified State	Other State	City Gov't	Reg. Coun-cil OF Gov't	Pri-vate	Other
All Suburban Counties	280	50	2	18	1	12	36	7	5	6	2	18	**	3		4
Alabama	8	25	12	50		12	50									
Arizona	2	50					50	50	50	50		50				
Arkansas	3	67					33									
California	20	70	5			5	35		5	25		15				
Colorado	5	80				20										
Connecticut	1											100				
Delaware	1			100												
Florida	17	77		23		6	23	18		18		29				12
Georgia	10	70		40		10	10		10	10						
Hawaii*																
Idaho	1			100		100										
Illinois	14	36	7	7		7	57		14	14		14				7
Indiana	19	42	5	5		10	53	10	5							5
Iowa	6	33					83		17			17				17
Kansas	4	25		25		50	50									25
Kentucky	1	100														
Louisiana	10	50		40		20	40				10					
Maine	1			100			100									
Maryland	2	50	50					50	50							
Massachusetts	5	80		20								40		20		
Michigan	21	57	5	38		14	29					48		5		
Minnesota	9	67		22		22	22		11			11	11			5
Mississippi***	--															
Missouri	4						100	50		50						
Montana	1						100									
Nebraska	2	50					50									

TABLE IV-7 (Continued)

State	No. Of Agencies	LEAA	Highway Safety Admin	CETA	Un-identified Federal	Other Federal	State Planning Agency	State Highway Safety Dept	State Crime Comm	State Standard & Train Comm	Un-identified State	Other State	City Gov't	Reg. Council Of Gov't	Private	Other
Nevada	1	100														
New Hampshire***																
New Jersey	5	20		60		20	20									
New Mexico***																
New York	15	40	7				40	20				53				7
North Carolina	10	80		20			20		10							
North Dakota***																
Ohio	16	50		44		12	6				6	6				12
Oklahoma	5			20		20	60				20					20
Oregon	6	67				33	17	33				50				
Pennsylvania	1						100									
Rhode Island*																
South Carolina	4	50					75					25		25		
South Dakota	1	100														
Tennessee	6	33					50	33	33					33		
Texas	14	7		29	21	21	57				14			21		7
Utah	3	100				100										
Vermont*																
Virginia	8	50					50	12				50				
Washington	8	62		12		12				12	12	12				
West Virginia	1	100														
Wisconsin	9	56				33	44	33	11	33		33				
Wyoming*																

* Not Applicable.
 ** Less than one percent.
 *** No information available.

TABLE IV-8

PERCENT OF RURAL COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES WHICH RECEIVED FUNDING FOR
LAW ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS FROM VARIOUS SOURCES

State	No. Of Agencies	LEAA	High-way Safety Admin	CETA	Unident-ified Federal	Other Fed-eral	State Plan-ning Agen-cy	State High-way Safe-ty Dept	State Crime Comm.	State Stan-dard & Train Comm.	Unident-ified State	Other State	City Gov't	Reg. Coun-cil Of Gov't	Pri-vate	Other
All Rural Counties	751	43	1	18	**	18	33	4	4	4	2	12	1	4		2
Alabama	5	20		40		40	60									
Arizona	8	37	12			12	75			25				12		
Arkansas	16	56		31		6	25		6							
California	21	33		9		67	14			38	5	57	5			
Colorado	11	54		36		18	18					9				
Connecticut	1						100									
Delaware *																
Florida	13	85		23		8					8	15				
Georgia	21	67		24	5	9	9		14	19	5	9				
Hawaii*																
Idaho	14	43		29		36	36									
Illinois	30	20		27		7	63		7	7						
Indiana	27	15		15		11	85	8								
Iowa	31	10				23	35	3	39		3	3	3			
Kansas	27	44	11	15		26	22	4	4			4				4
Kentucky	1			100												
Louisiana	25	48		20		40	36				4	28		4		8
Maine	5	80		20			40									
Maryland	9	22				22	67	11				44				
Massachusetts	2	50		50												
Michigan	30	30		33		20	13	3	3	3		20				3
Minnesota	31	45		26		7	32		10	3	3	13				3
Mississippi	18	78		22			17	6				6				
Missouri	28	46		7		18	57					4				4
Montana	18	33		6		28	56		6	6	6	17	6			
Nebraska	17	29			6	6	18	41	12							

TABLE IV-8 (Continued)

State	No. Of Agencies	LEAA	High-way Safety Admin	CETA	Un-ident-ified Fed-eral	Other Fed-eral	State Plan-ning Agen- cy	State High- way Safe- ty Dept	State Crime Comm.	State Stan- dard & Train Comm.	Un-ident-ified State	Other State	City Gov't	Reg. Coun- cil Of Gov't	Pri- vate	Other
Nevada	7	71				29	29				14					
New Hampshire	6	50	17			17	50							17		
New Jersey*																
New Mexico	5	80		40		20										
New York	12	25		17		17	33			92						
North Carolina	44	68		9	2	2	20	2		9	2	4		9		4
North Dakota	21	48		10		10	48				5					5
Ohio	24	62		46		17	4					8				
Oklahoma	13			69		23	38		8					8		
Oregon	20	30	10	20		65	15	30				65	10			
Pennsylvania	6	33		67		33						17				
Rhode Island																
South Carolina	14	71		29		21	14				7	7		7		
South Dakota	22	86		4		14	14		4			4				
Tennessee	10	30		20		20	70	10				10		10		
Texas	37	11		3		8	49						3	43		
Utah	9	44				89	56					11				
Vermont	7	43					29		14	14	29					14
Virginia	27	52		8		8	37	4			8	22				11
Washington	15	60	7	27		13	20	13		7	13	13		7		7
West Virginia	9			33		11	67	22	22							
Wisconsin	24	29	8	21		8	25	17	4	25		33		4		
Wyoming	9	100		11		22										4

TABLE IV-9

NUMBER OF SUBURBAN COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES FOR WHICH FUNDING WAS RECEIVED
FOR VARIOUS PROGRAMS BY STATE

State	No Funding Received	Communi- cations Equip- ment	Vehi- cles	Compu- ter Equip- ment	Other Capital Equip- ment	Person- nel Expenses	Train- ing Expenses	Techni- cal Assist- ance	Confer- ences	Re- search and Plan- ning	Other
Alabama	1	4	2	1	1	5	1	0	1	0	0
Alaska *	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Arizona	0	1	0	0	2	1	2	0	2	1	1
Arkansas	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
California	1	11	6	4	12	14	14	5	3	5	8
Colorado	2	4	2	1	3	4	3	1	1	1	1
Connecticut	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Delaware	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	3	14	4	7	6	12	7	4	4	4	6
Georgia	4	7	4	1	1	8	7	2	5	2	3
Hawaii *	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Idaho	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
Illinois	2	7	6	4	3	6	9	1	1	3	2
Indiana	1	18	1	11	6	3	16	2	4	2	6
Iowa	0	5	2	1	1	3	5	2	2	0	0
Kansas	1	3	2	0	3	2	2	2	2	0	0
Kentucky	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Louisiana	1	7	7	0	1	9	9	1	3	1	1
Maine	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0
Maryland	4	2	1	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	2
Massachusetts	0	0	2	0	2	5	3	0	0	1	0
Michigan	2	14	10	2	8	17	15	2	3	3	6
Minnesota	1	4	3	2	3	2	4	2	0	0	1
Mississippi**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

TABLE IV-9 (Continued)

State	No Funding Received	Communications Equipment	Vehicles	Computer Equipment	Other Capital Equipment	Personnel Expenses	Training Expenses	Technical Assistance	Conferences	Research and Planning	Other
Missouri	3	4	2	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	1
Montana	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Nebraska	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	0
Nevada	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
New Hampshire**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
New Jersey	2	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
New Mexico	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New York	2	6	6	3	4	9	9	4	4	3	7
North Carolina	1	3	4	0	3	7	9	1	2	1	1
North Dakota**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Ohio	9	7	1	3	0	8	6	2	1	2	4
Oklahoma	2	1	1	1	2	3	1	1	1	1	1
Oregon	0	3	4	0	5	5	5	1	3	1	0
Pennsylvania	8	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Rhode Island	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
South Carolina	1	1	2	0	1	4	2	0	1	1	2
South Dakota	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
Tennessee	1	5	6	1	3	4	7	2	2	1	3
Texas	5	11	4	4	4	7	11	3	4	4	1
Utah	0	1	2	0	1	3	2	1	1	1	0
Vermont*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Virginia	2	4	4	2	4	3	5	2	1	0	3
Washington	0	2	1	1	4	4	4	2	1	0	1
West Virginia	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
Wisconsin	0	3	0	2	5	6	8	2	5	2	2
Wyoming*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

* - Not Applicable.

** - Data Not Available.

TABLE IV-10

NUMBER OF RURAL COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES FOR WHICH FUNDING WAS RECEIVED
FOR VARIOUS PROGRAMS BY STATE

State	No Funding Received	Communi- cations Equip- ment	Vehi- cles	Compu- ter Equip- ment	Other Capital Equip- ment	Person- nel Expens- es	Train- ing Expens- es	Techni- cal Assist- ance	Confer- ences	Re- search and Plan- ning	Other
Alabama	3	3	4	0	3	2	3	0	0	0	1
Alaska*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Arizona	1	7	2	1	3	4	6	1	1	1	2
Arkansas	1	6	4	1	5	10	1	1	0	1	3
California	1	13	10	0	7	13	17	4	4	2	10
Colorado	8	5	2	0	2	5	9	1	1	3	1
Connecticut	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Delaware*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Florida	4	15	3	0	2	3	3	1	1	1	2
Georgia	8	6	7	2	2	17	16	3	5	2	2
Hawaii*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Idaho	4	7	3	0	4	11	7	0	0	0	4
Illinois	1	17	10	3	2	17	21	7	3	3	8
Indiana	1	32	2	5	3	7	16	0	1	0	3
Iowa	5	28	9	2	4	16	13	5	3	3	7
Kansas	16	26	5	3	8	7	10	2	2	1	3
Kentucky	5	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Louisiana	3	12	10	1	4	18	20	3	7	4	4
Maine	0	5	1	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	1
Maryland	0	4	6	0	4	5	7	0	3	0	1
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Michigan	2	9	5	1	5	16	12	1	3	2	4
Minnesota	11	20	6	2	5	12	17	2	3	0	9
Mississippi	5	13	11	3	0	7	4	1	0	0	0

000

TABLE IV-10 (Continued)

State	No Funding Received	Commu- nica- tions Equip- ment	Vehi- cles	Compu- ter Equip- ment	Other Capital Equip- ment	Person- nel Expen- ses	Train- ing Expen- ses	Techni- cal Assist- ance	Confer- ences	Re- search and Plan- ning	Other
Missouri	2	22	1	8	4	12	8	1	2	0	5
Montana	0	14	4	3	11	4	13	1	3	2	1
Nebraska	14	6	7	0	4	16	4	2	1	1	3
Nevada	0	4	4	1	2	1	3	2	1	0	2
New Hampshire	1	4	1	0	4	1	2	2	2	0	0
New Jersey	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Mexico	2	4	2	0	0	4	3	0	0	1	2
New York	4	6	1	5	4	5	3	2	2	2	2
North Carolina	2	24	17	3	12	32	31	2	8	3	7
North Dakota	3	11	2	2	7	13	12	3	3	2	6
Ohio	6	13	1	2	3	11	5	2	0	2	2
Oklahoma	5	4	0	0	1	9	2	0	0	0	4
Oregon	4	10	11	0	6	14	9	1	2	0	5
Pennsylvania	2	3	2	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	1
Rhode Island*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
South Carolina	1	9	5	1	3	9	3	1	4	2	3
South Dakota	4	22	2	0	10	3	15	0	4	0	1
Tennessee	3	5	4	1	0	4	9	2	4	0	2
Texas	18	37	8	9	9	13	19	8	9	8	8
Utah	1	1	2	1	1	3	5	1	2	0	3
Vermont	0	5	1	1	4	4	8	2	1	1	0
Virginia	1	27	6	2	8	7	21	5	8	2	4
Washington	1	9	2	0	8	9	5	1	0	0	4
West Virginia	7	8	1	2	4	2	3	2	1	1	1
Wisconsin	2	3	1	1	6	7	20	2	5	1	5
Wyoming	3	8	2	0	5	3	4	0	1	1	1

*-Not Applicable.

TABLE IV-11

NUMBER OF COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES FOR WHICH FUNDING WAS RECEIVED
FOR VARIOUS PROGRAMS OR FUNCTIONS BY SUBURBAN AND RURAL
COUNTY AND GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION

Program Or Function	Number Of Agencies Nationally For Which Funding Was Received For Various Programs Or Function		Number Of Suburban Agencies For Which Funding Was Received For Various Programs Or Function				Number Of Rural Agencies For Which Funding Was Received For Various Programs Or Function			
	9	8	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
No Funding	63	166	14	20	25	4	8	67	66	25
Communications Equipment	164	489	10	67	61	26	23	209	175	82
Vehicles	92	189	10	27	40	15	8	51	86	44
Computer Equipment	57	67	6	26	18	7	6	29	26	6
Other Capital Equipment	94	181	8	30	28	28	14	61	57	49
Personnel Expenses	168	363	19	52	65	32	15	137	140	71
Training Expenses	180	394	15	68	64	33	18	153	142	81
Technical Assistance	47	74	5	15	16	11	6	27	29	12
Conferences	68	102	7	21	26	14	7	30	50	15
Research And Planning	43	52	6	12	15	10	3	15	24	10
Other	69	139	11	22	24	12	35	43	56	5

to effectively operate their agency. Sixty-six percent of 1,227 rural county sheriffs nationally indicated their budget was insufficient. Tables IV-12 and IV-13 indicate the percentage of rural and suburban agencies who note that additional funding is needed in various categories.

B. County Police Departments

Information furnished by county police departments in this study relative to total county budgets, excluding schools and highway monies, indicates the mean county budget during 1976 or the last fiscal year was \$116,437,390 and the median was \$27,151,000. The mean total dollars received from the county was \$12,657,743 and the median amount received was \$3,137,846. The mean "other income" was \$589,372 and the median was \$96,000. The mean total budget for county police departments was \$13,567,031, which includes funds received from the county and other income such as grants, contracts and fees. The median county police departments' budget was \$3,152,846.

The median average percent increase of county police departments' budgets from the year 1971 to 1975 was 132 percent, from 1972 to 1975 it was 103 percent, and from 1973 to 1975 it was 42 percent.

The mean total expenditure for 1976 or the last fiscal year was \$15,749,136. The mean expenditure for patrol/investigative operations was \$12,422,890, the mean for jail/correctional

TABLE IV-12

PERCENT OF SUBURBAN COUNTY SHERIFF AGENCIES WHICH REPORTED
THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDS IN VARIOUS CATEGORIES

State	No. Agencies	Over-all Needs	Salary	More Pers/General	More Pers/Deputies	More Pers/Corr	More Pers/Other	Training	Tech Asst Res & Plan	Comm. Equip	Vehicles	Computer Equip	Other Cap Equip	Jail Facility	Pol. Facility	Patrol	Investigation	Juvenile	Corrections	Judicial	Other
Alabama	11	9	9	64	9	--	--	--	9	9	36	--	45	9	9	--	--	--	--	--	--
Alaska*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Arizona	2	--	50	50	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	50	--	50	--	--	--	--	--	--
Arkansas	4	--	25	100	--	--	--	25	--	--	50	--	--	--	25	--	--	--	--	--	25
California	13	8	8	31	15	--	--	8	23	--	--	--	--	8	8	31	23	--	15	--	31
Colorado	7	71	--	14	14	--	--	--	--	--	--	14	29	14	--	29	29	--	43	--	71
Connecticut	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	100	--	100	100	--	100	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Delaware**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Florida	11	18	9	27	27	9	--	--	18	27	18	--	27	--	--	27	9	--	9	9	18
Georgia	16	12	25	44	19	6	--	--	--	6	12	--	31	--	6	6	--	--	19	--	6
Hawaii*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Idaho*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Illinois	17	12	18	47	18	12	12	12	--	--	12	6	47	6	--	12	12	--	29	6	6
Indiana	19	5	47	21	16	5	5	16	--	5	26	--	42	5	--	10	10	--	21	--	--
Iowa	5	20	--	20	--	--	--	--	20	20	20	--	20	--	--	20	20	--	--	--	40
Kansas	5	20	60	20	--	--	--	20	--	--	40	--	20	--	--	--	20	--	--	--	--
Kentucky	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	50	50	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Louisiana	8	37	25	12	12	12	--	--	--	12	12	--	25	--	12	50	25	--	12	--	12
Maine	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	100	100	--	--	--	100
Maryland	8	--	12	37	37	--	--	12	--	--	37	12	12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	12
Massachusetts	4	25	25	50	--	--	--	25	25	--	--	--	50	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Michigan	18	17	--	22	22	6	11	6	6	--	6	6	11	--	6	39	17	--	22	--	22
Minnesota	3	--	--	67	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	33	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	33
Mississippi	1	--	--	--	100	--	--	--	--	--	100	--	100	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

* Not applicable

** Not available

TABLE IV-12 (Continued)

State	No. Agencies	Over-all Needs	Salary	More Pers/General	More Pers/Deputies	More Pers/Corr	More Pers/Other	Training	Tech Asst Res & Plan	Comm. Equip	Vehicles	Computer Equip	Other Cap Equip	Jail Facility	Pol. Facility	Patrol	Investigation	Juvenile	Corrections	Judicial	Other
Missouri	6	67	67	17	17	--	--	17	--	--	50	--	17	--	--	--	--	--	33	--	--
Montana*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Nebraska	3	--	33	33	--	--	--	67	--	--	--	--	67	--	--	67	67	--	--	--	--
Nevada	1	--	--	--	100	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	100	--	--	--	--	--	100	--	--
New Hampshire**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
New Jersey	6	17	17	17	--	17	--	17	--	50	17	--	17	--	--	--	17	--	--	17	17
New Mexico	1	--	--	100	--	--	--	100	100	--	--	--	100	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
New York	15	7	7	53	13	7	7	7	--	13	7	--	20	7	--	13	7	--	33	--	7
North Carolina	8	--	12	25	12	--	--	25	12	37	12	--	37	12	--	37	50	--	--	--	12
North Dakota	1	--	--	100	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Ohio	24	17	37	62	17	4	--	21	--	4	17	4	17	12	4	17	17	--	17	4	3
Oklahoma	6	17	17	17	17	--	--	17	--	17	17	--	33	--	--	--	17	--	--	--	--
Oregon	4	25	--	75	--	--	--	--	--	25	--	--	25	--	--	25	25	--	--	--	50
Pennsylvania	5	20	20	80	--	--	20	20	--	--	60	--	60	--	--	--	--	--	--	20	20
Rhode Island*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
South Carolina	3	67	33	100	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	33	--	67	--	--	--	--	--	--
South Dakota*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Tennessee	8	--	--	--	62	--	--	12	12	--	25	12	37	--	--	--	12	--	--	25	12
Texas	19	21	26	42	10	10	--	10	--	5	26	--	37	--	--	16	5	5	26	--	5
Utah	3	--	33	100	--	--	--	33	--	--	33	--	33	--	--	--	33	--	66	--	--
Vermont*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Virginia	4	--	--	50	--	--	--	--	--	--	25	--	50	--	--	25	--	--	--	--	25
Washington	7	--	--	57	14	--	--	14	14	14	14	--	43	--	--	29	14	--	14	--	--
West Virginia	1	--	--	--	100	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	100	--	--
Wisconsin	5	40	--	40	20	--	--	20	--	--	--	--	20	--	--	40	40	--	--	--	--
Wyoming*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

* Not applicable ** Not available

TABLE IV-13

PERCENT OF RURAL COUNTY SHERIFF AGENCIES WHICH REPORTED
THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDS IN VARIOUS CATEGORIES

State	No. Agencies	Over-all Needs	Salary	More Pers/General	More Pers/Deputies	More Pers/Corr	More Pers/Other	Training	Tech Asst Res & Plan	Comm Equip	Vehi-cles	Com-puter Equip	Other Cap Equip	Jail Facil-ity	Pol. Facil-ity	Pa-trol	In-ves-tiga-tion	Juv-enile	Cor-rec-tions	Judi-cial	Other
Alabama	8	--	25	87	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	50	--	--	12	--	--	--	--	--
Alaska*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Arizona	8	12	37	62	--	--	--	--	--	--	50	--	37	12	12	--	--	--	12	--	12
Arkansas	16	--	12	31	19	--	--	6	--	19	19	--	19	--	--	6	12	--	6	--	6
California	8	12	12	37	12	--	--	12	--	--	12	--	12	--	--	12	12	--	25	12	12
Colorado	25	28	36	36	20	4	--	4	--	8	32	4	36	--	--	8	12	4	12	--	--
Connecticut	2	--	--	50	--	--	--	100	--	--	--	--	50	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Delaware**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Florida	9	11	11	22	11	11	--	--	--	--	--	11	33	--	--	22	22	--	--	--	--
Georgia	20	10	60	45	10	--	--	5	--	5	15	--	35	5	--	--	10	--	5	--	5
Hawaii*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Idaho	15	27	47	13	7	--	--	20	--	13	20	--	20	7	13	13	13	7	7	--	7
Illinois	41	5	51	24	10	5	2	12	2	7	12	--	41	7	--	12	5	--	12	2	7
Indiana	22	14	59	50	32	9	4	18	--	9	27	4	23	4	--	4	--	--	14	--	4
Iowa	22	18	18	32	14	--	4	14	9	18	14	--	41	--	4	--	--	--	4	--	--
Kansas	46	6	43	37	4	2	2	6	--	11	15	2	52	4	2	11	11	--	6	--	2
Kentucky	8	12	12	--	50	--	--	--	--	25	25	--	12	--	--	--	12	--	--	--	--
Louisiana	15	--	27	47	7	7	7	--	--	7	20	7	27	--	7	20	20	13	--	--	20
Maine	6	--	33	17	--	--	--	33	17	--	33	--	33	--	17	50	50	--	17	--	--
Maryland	9	33	22	44	--	--	--	--	--	--	22	11	33	--	--	--	--	--	11	--	--
Massachusetts	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	100	--	--
Michigan	44	7	14	27	14	2	--	11	--	4	9	4	25	2	2	27	4	2	11	--	14
Minnesota	34	6	29	38	12	--	--	21	3	3	15	--	38	6	6	6	3	--	--	--	6
Mississippi	22	27	36	32	4	--	9	4	4	4	27	--	36	--	4	--	--	--	4	4	4

* Not applicable ** Not available

TABLE IV-13 (Continued)

State	No. Agencies	Over-all Needs	Salary	More Pers/General	More Pers/Deputies	More Pers/Corr	More Pers/Other	Training	Tech Asst Res & Plan	Comm. Equip	Vehicles	Computer Equip	Other Cap Equip	Jail Facility	Pol. Facility	Patrol	Investigation	Juvenile	Corrections	Judicial	Other
Missouri	31	13	39	45	13	3	6	13	3	16	13	--	23	3	--	6	6	--	16	--	--
Montana	16	--	12	56	6	--	--	25	--	6	19	--	25	12	6	12	19	--	6	--	19
Nebraska	27	7	44	48	22	4	--	--	--	33	7	--	33	4	--	15	4	--	7	--	4
Nevada	5	20	--	40	20	--	20	--	--	--	20	--	40	20	--	20	--	--	20	--	--
New Hampshire	2	--	--	100	--	--	--	--	--	--	50	--	100	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
New Jersey	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	100	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	100
New Mexico	12	33	17	17	--	--	--	42	8	25	17	--	50	--	--	8	--	--	25	--	8
New York	18	11	6	44	6	6	--	11	--	6	11	--	22	11	--	6	--	--	22	--	6
North Carolina	31	13	16	55	3	3	--	16	--	3	26	--	32	--	3	6	13	--	13	--	6
North Dakota	20	10	40	65	5	--	--	5	--	--	10	--	30	5	--	5	5	--	5	5	5
Ohio	30	13	43	30	17	--	--	13	--	7	23	--	47	13	3	10	10	--	3	--	3
Oklahoma	18	39	56	39	6	--	--	6	--	11	6	--	50	11	--	28	6	--	6	--	28
Oregon	27	9	14	38	9	5	--	--	--	9	24	--	33	9	--	19	19	--	19	--	5
Pennsylvania	6	33	17	50	17	--	--	--	--	--	17	--	33	17	17	--	--	--	--	--	17
Rhode Island*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
South Carolina	16	19	56	37	6	--	--	25	6	19	12	--	25	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	25
South Dakota	15	27	27	20	33	7	7	--	--	--	7	--	20	--	7	13	13	--	20	--	13
Tennessee	11	9	36	27	36	9	--	--	--	--	36	--	18	9	18	18	27	--	18	--	9
Texas	56	7	36	37	7	4	4	18	4	2	18	--	25	5	--	5	4	--	9	--	4
Utah	6	17	50	33	--	--	--	33	--	--	17	--	67	--	--	17	17	--	17	--	17
Vermont	10	--	10	10	10	--	--	20	--	30	20	--	40	--	--	30	20	--	10	--	10
Virginia	20	15	10	45	15	10	--	10	--	15	10	--	20	--	5	--	--	--	5	--	5
Washington	18	11	--	44	17	--	6	--	--	11	11	--	28	--	6	17	6	--	6	6	6
West Virginia	15	20	20	60	20	--	13	13	--	20	27	--	40	--	--	--	--	--	13	--	7
Wisconsin	17	6	12	47	12	--	6	18	--	--	12	--	41	12	--	12	12	--	12	--	6
Wyoming	12	--	58	42	8	--	--	8	--	--	33	--	42	--	--	--	8	--	17	--	--

* Not applicable

** Not available

operations \$439,863, the mean for civil and court operations was \$350,000 and \$146,537 was the mean for other functional responsibilities. None of the county police departments which participated in this study report expenditures for tax collection.

The average percentage of county police departments' budgets allocated to salary and fringe benefits is 76 percent.

Twenty-seven of the 28 county police departments responding to this question indicated they prepare their department's budget request. Seven of the 27 county police departments responding to this matter reported they receive assistance from a county, regional or state planning agency in preparing their budget.

Twenty-six county police departments note that they receive funding for law enforcement programs or operations from a state, regional or federal agency. Seventy-seven percent receive monies from LEAA, 31 percent from state planning agencies, 27 percent from state highway safety departments, 19 percent from the Federal Highway Safety Department, 12 percent from state standard and training commissions, eight percent from other federal agencies, eight percent from other state agencies, four percent from the Comprehensive Employment Training Act and four percent indicated they receive funds from other sources.

The following identifies the categories for which county police departments received funding during the last budget year from state, regional or federal agencies:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Number of Agencies</u>
Training Expenses	23
Personnel Expenses	16
Communications Equipment	15
Vehicles	15
Technical Assistance	11
Other Capital Equipment	10
Conferences	10
Computer Equipment	7
Other	6
Research and Planning	5

Fourteen of the 25 county police departments responding to this matter indicated their 1976 or last fiscal year's budget was insufficient to effectively operate their department. The following represents the percentage of county police departments which indicate the need for additional funding for various programs or functions:

More Personnel (General)	-	57%
Other Capital Equipment	-	43%
Communications Equipment	-	29%
Overall Needs	-	21%
Salary	-	21%

More Personnel (Officers)	-	21%
Vehicles	-	21%
Training	-	14%
Patrol	-	14%
Juvenile	-	14%
Police Facility	-	7%
Investigation	-	7%
Other	-	7%

C. Independent City Sheriffs

Information furnished by independent city sheriffs in this study relative to total city budgets, excluding schools and highway monies, indicates the mean city budget during 1976 or the last fiscal year was \$22,613,366 and the median was \$8,099,000. The mean total budget for the city sheriffs' agencies was \$537,820 and the median was \$166,000. This budget is composed of funds received from the city and other income such as grants, contracts and fees. The mean dollars received from the city was \$516,938 and the median was \$432,411. The mean for "other income" was \$185,456 and \$40,000 for the median.

The average percent increase of independent city sheriffs' budgets from the year 1971 to 1975 was 95 percent, from 1972 to 1975 it was 76 percent and from 1973 to 1975, 76 percent.

The mean total agency expenditure was \$736,896. The mean expenditure for jail/correctional operations was \$642,617, the

mean expenditure for civil and court operations was \$151,313, and the mean expenditure for other functional responsibilities was \$63,755.

The average percentage of independent city sheriffs' budgets allocated to salary and fringe benefits is 74 percent.

All eighteen independent city sheriffs responding to this matter indicated that they prepare their budget request. Five of these agencies indicate that they receive assistance from a city, regional or state planning agency relative to budget preparation.

Eight independent city sheriffs reported they receive funding for law enforcement programs or operations during their last budget year from a state, regional or federal agency. Of this group two agencies indicated they receive monies from LEAA, four from a state planning agency, seven from other state agencies and three from city governments.

Six of the eight agencies mentioned above receive funding for communications equipment, four for vehicles, three for capital equipment, nine for personnel expenses, five for training expenses, one for technical assistance, two for conferences and four receive funding for other purposes.

Fifty-nine percent or ten of the 17 independent city sheriffs who responded to this matter reported that their last year's budget allocations were sufficient to effectively operate

their agency. Seven agencies estimated that their last year's budget was not sufficient.

The following represents the percentage of independent city sheriffs' agencies which indicated the need for additional funding for various programs or functions:

More Personnel	-	72%
Training	-	29%
Vehicles	-	29%
Other Capital Equipment	-	29%
Headquarters Facility	-	29%
Salaries	-	14%
Communications Equipment	-	14%
Corrections	-	14%

CHAPTER V FACILITIES

Law enforcement facilities on a national basis vary widely, from the one room office to massive multi-million dollar complexes available in some of the larger urban areas. An overview of facility availabilities reflects these wide differences as well as some commonly available facilities among sheriffs' agencies around the country.

A. County Sheriffs' Agencies

Table V-1 presents a composite view of the availability of eleven types of facilities which are associated with law enforcement agencies. The table indicates the percentage of responding sheriffs having these various facilities, and is presented by geographic division, the nation as a whole and by suburban and rural agency designation.

As Table V-1 indicates, on a nationwide basis, there is a marked difference between rural and suburban agencies. As might be expected, rural agencies more frequently indicate the lack of some of these eleven facilities. Nevertheless, a substantial portion of these rural agencies indicate that they have secured evidence storage areas, interrogation rooms and conference/briefing rooms. The least noted facilities among rural agencies are gymnasiums, indoor pistol ranges and training academies.

TABLE V-1

PERCENT OF SHERIFFS' AGENCIES WHICH HAVE VARIOUS TYPES OF FACILITIES, BY SUBURBAN AND RURAL AGENCY AND BY NATIONAL AND GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION

Facility Type	Percent National By Suburban And Rural		Percent Suburban By Division				Percent Rural By Division			
	9	8	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Average Number Of Agencies	426	1324	57	149	164	56	71	570	468	215
Interrogation Room	71	57	53	79	65	84	53	60	56	54
Gymnasium	11	3	15	11	6	23	7	4	2	3
Indoor Pistol Range	10	4	5	19	2	11	1	7	1	4
Outdoor Pistol Range	32	22	23	34	21	66	25	19	16	38
Assembly Hall	31	16	37	30	26	46	33	15	12	20
Conference Briefing Room	67	44	67	69	58	84	51	45	41	48
Sheriff/Police Garage	41	26	42	61	25	32	40	39	9	23
Training Academy	19	6	19	21	12	36	9	5	5	9
Officers Locker Room	53	24	60	58	36	77	31	26	19	25
Maintenance Shop	28	12	33	29	24	31	13	12	11	13
Evidence Storage Area	90	82	74	96	88	98	76	84	79	85

The same pattern, in terms of most available and least available of agency facilities, holds true among suburban agencies even though the percentage of agencies reporting the availability of these particular facilities is higher in each case. Suburban agencies also note a significantly higher number of officers' locker rooms, sheriffs' garages and outdoor pistol ranges.

A comparison of availabilities between geographic divisions shows the most apparent differences to exist among rural agencies in the Northeast and West, as opposed to those in the South and North Central. Specifically, rural agencies in Divisions I and IV show a greater number of facilities in almost all regards even though in some areas the differences are not substantial.

While these general differences can be recognized, it should be noted that not all agencies, whether suburban or rural, require the same types or degrees of facilities. It would be the exception, for example, to find a separate sheriff's garage in a small rural agency. Similarly, such agencies typically utilize such facilities as gymnasiums, police training academies, maintenance shops and pistol ranges on a shared basis with other jurisdictions or on an "as needed" basis from available sources in the community.

Sheriffs' offices vary generally in the manner in which they occupy overall office facilities. Data reveal that nearly 70 percent of all sheriffs occupy separate office space.

Separate office space, however, may or may not be incorporated with other offices in a municipal office building or joint city/county office complex. Fifty-five percent of suburban and 49 percent of rural sheriffs noted that they hold office space in a facility with other municipal offices. Fifteen percent of suburban and 21 percent of rural sheriffs indicate the use of a joint city/county office complex.

In the minority are the four percent of sheriffs which indicate that their offices are located in either the city hall or in their private residence.

District or outlying substations are also used by 30 percent of all suburban and 12 percent of rural agencies. These are most frequently utilized in western counties where land areas are typically greater than in other geographic divisions in the nation.

The hours of operation of these facilities were explored in the survey questionnaire. Data provided indicate the hours in which the agency headquarters is officially manned and opened to the public. Nationally, about 75 percent of all suburban and rural agencies are open on a 24-hour basis with just less than one-fourth open only during regular business hours. In only a very small percentage of the cases, and almost exclusively among rural agencies, are sheriff's agencies open on no regularly scheduled basis.

While these data indicate that about 25 percent of sheriffs' agencies have less than a 24-hour manned office capability, all agencies provide service on a 24-hour basis. In the case of very small rural agencies, for example, a general procedure utilizes a 24-hour emergency telephone number with a direct link to duty personnel.

The age of sheriffs' agencies facilities provides additional perspective to the general facility capabilities of the county sheriff. Table V-2 presents a summary of these data on a suburban and rural basis by geographic division, and with regard to six categories of age ranging from less than five years old to more than one hundred years old. This information pertains to the agency's primary facility, where more than one exists, and does not take into account major renovation or refurbishments that may have taken place since the original construction. Nevertheless, these data are of interest as indicators of age and, subsequently, the degree to which physical structures may accommodate the advantages of modern design concepts.

Nationally, on the basis of all responding agencies, data reveal that more than half of all headquarters facilities are over 20 years old and about one-third are more than 50 years old. In only about five percent of all cases are agency facilities more than 100 years of age.

TABLE V-2

AGE OF AGENCY HEADQUARTERS BY SUBURBAN AND
RURAL AGENCIES AND BY NATIONAL AND GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION

Age Of Headquarters	Percent National By Suburban And Rural		Percent Suburban By Division				Percent Rural By Division			
	9	8	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Number Of Agencies	410	1267	50	150	154	56	115	558	427	217
Less Than 5 Years	11	16	6	12	15	5	5	16	15	20
5 to 10 Years	17	11	22	18	15	14	9	10	11	11
11 to 20 Years	23	15	10	25	22	34	9	16	16	14
21 to 50 Years	22	24	20	19	25	25	12	21	29	28
51 to 100 Years	23	28	28	23	21	21	41	29	26	27
Over 100 Years	4	6	14	3	3	0	23	8	3	1

There is a slight predominance of the older facilities among rural agencies and a greater percentage of newer facilities among suburban agencies.

Geographically, the Northeast sector of the United States has the largest portion of the oldest facilities, particularly the agencies of the rural Northeast where 64 percent of respondents report agency headquarters in excess of 50 years in age.

In part, this geographical difference may be due to the fact that New England is the area which formed the beginnings of organized law enforcement in this country. The fact that some older facilities still remain in use may be a reasonable expectation in this regard.

While the age of facilities does provide some insight into relative adequacy, it can be misleading if taken as a positive index by itself. Many older facilities which are kept in good repair and which are subjected to periodic improvement can serve their function adequately for an extensive period of time. This could be the case in rural areas where community requirements do not change as rapidly as they do in suburban and urban environments. Conversely, newer facilities can fall into disrepair or become rapidly outdated in densely populated and highly changeable, growth oriented communities.

Table V-3 provides some added perspective to the adequacy of law enforcement facilities from the viewpoint of the sheriff.

TABLE V-3

OVERALL QUALITY RATINGS OF AGENCY HEADQUARTERS BY SUBURBAN
RURAL SHERIFF AND BY NATIONAL AND GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION

Sheriffs' Rating Of Headquarters	Percent National By Suburban And Rural		Percent Suburban By Division				Percent Rural By Division			
	9	8	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Number Of Agencies	429	1370	60	149	164	56	73	593	480	224
Excellent	11	12	13	13	10	7	7	14	9	12
Good	25	25	30	23	23	32	25	23	28	23
Only Adequate	25	30	20	27	24	25	36	31	31	25
Inadequate	39	33	37	36	43	36	33	31	31	40

Very few noteworthy differences exist between rural and suburban agencies within or between the four geographic divisions of the country or within the nation as a whole. Among all agencies responding, however, just over one-third rate their facility as either "excellent" or "good," while the remaining two-thirds report an adequate to inadequate rating.

It is important to note that one-third of all agency administrators feel that their facilities are inadequate, with suburban agencies making this judgment slightly more frequently than their rural counterparts.

B. County Police Departments

Twenty-eight county police departments provided information on the level and nature of facilities at their departments. Of these, the following percentage of departments reported having these various forms of equipment on an in-house basis:

Interrogation Room	-	79%
Gymnasium	-	29%
Indoor Pistol Range	-	25%
Outdoor Pistol Range	-	50%
Assembly Hall	-	57%
Conference/Briefing Room	-	82%
Sheriff/Police Garage	-	39%
Training Academy	-	54%
Officer's Locker Room	-	71%

Maintenance Shop	-	36%
Secured Evidence Storage Area	-	96%

As these data indicate, county police departments have a rather high percentage of availabilities in the areas in which data were reported. In particular, facilities such as gymnasiums, pistol ranges and training academies are in relatively greater availability than is commonly the case among suburban county law enforcement agencies.

Seventy-six percent of county police departments report that their agency headquarters is located in a separate police office. Separate facilities are in some cases, however, located as part of a city or county office complex. This latter situation is reported by just over half of all county police departments.

In addition to the above facilities, 54 percent of departments state that they maintain district substations, precincts or barracks.

Information on the age of county police department headquarters discloses that 29 percent are less than five years old. An additional 18 percent are between five and ten years old, and 21 percent are between 11 and 20 years old. Beyond this, 18 percent of agencies report a facility which is between 21 and 50 years old, and four agencies or 14 percent note that their facility is between 51 and 100 years old.

Three-fourths of all county police departments indicate that their agency headquarters is officially manned and open to the public on a 24-hour basis. The remaining 25 percent maintain their headquarters facility on this level during regular business hours.

The rating of agency headquarters facilities by county police department administrators reveals 18 percent indicate that they feel their headquarters are "excellent". At the other extreme, 30 percent feel that their facility is "inadequate" while just over one-fourth each note that their headquarters is "good" or "only adequate".

C. Independent City Sheriffs

Eighteen independent city sheriffs provided information in the same respects in the area of facilities. Information concerning the availability of various types of facilities reveals some marked differences as compared with both county sheriffs and county police departments. Mainly, these differences reflect the limited law enforcement responsibilities of most city sheriffs. Specifically, the following percentage of responding city sheriffs noted the availability of these facilities:

Interrogation Room	-	23%
Gymnasium	-	-0-
Indoor Pistol Range	-	-0-
Outdoor Pistol Range	-	12%

Assembly Hall	-	6%
Conference/Briefing Room	-	41%
Sheriff/Police Garage	-	17%
Training Academy	-	18%
Officer's Locker Room	-	12%
Maintenance Shop	-	12%
Secured Evidence Storage Area	-	39%

In no case does an independent city sheriff operate out-lying substations, barracks or precincts.

Most, or about 70 percent, of agency headquarters are located in separate offices. However, many of these, as well as the offices of the remaining respondents, are in a facility with other city or city/county agencies.

In regard to the age of headquarters facilities, 11 percent of respondents each indicate that their facility is less than five years old and the same percent report their headquarters are between five and ten years old. Twenty-two percent of agencies each report that their facility falls in one of the three age brackets of between 11 to 20 years, 21 to 50, or 51 to 100 years old.

Fifty percent of the 18 agencies also note that their headquarters facility is officially manned and open to the public on a 24-hour basis. The remaining half indicate that they are open during regular business hours only.

Finally, in rating the quality of their overall headquarters facility, 17 percent of independent city sheriffs consider it "excellent". Conversely, 22 percent rate their headquarters as "inadequate" while one-third and 28 percent of respondents respectively rate their headquarters as "good" or "only adequate".

CHAPTER VI EQUIPMENT

Equipment available and needed for law enforcement operations varies substantially with regard to the particular environment or community being served. Certain forms of equipment such as handguns, nightsticks and handcuffs are available to nearly all law enforcement officers. In other cases the availability of certain additional forms of equipment is reliant on the discretion of the agency executive or upon the availability of funding or other local factors which may be beyond the control of a particular agency.

A. County Sheriffs' Agencies

Table VI-1 lists some of the most prominent optional law enforcement equipment generally available across the country and presents the percentage of responding agencies which have these types of equipment on an in-house basis.

A general comparison of national totals for suburban and rural sheriffs' agencies reveals that a markedly higher percentage of suburban sheriffs maintain equipment of all types listed.

The most common forms of equipment among both suburban and rural agencies are shotguns, hand-carried radios, rifles, gas rifles and grenades, blood-alcohol testing equipment and riot gear. In addition, more than half of the responding suburban agencies indicated that they also have submachine guns and mobile

TABLE VI-1

PERCENT OF SHERIFFS REPORTING THE AVAILABILITY OF
 VARIOUS FORMS OF EQUIPMENT ON AN IN-HOUSE BASIS
 BY RURAL AND SUBURBAN SHERIFFS AND BY
 NATIONAL AND GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION

	Percent National By Suburban And Rural		Percent Suburban By Geographic Division				Percent Rural By Geographic Division			
	9	8	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Average Number of Agencies	407	1264	52	143	156	56	68	541	448	207
Rifles	83	66	84	88	73	93	69	69	58	72
Riot or Shotgun Gas Rifles/ Grenades	95	89	91	99	93	98	85	92	84	90
Submachine Guns	81	58	85	86	72	91	68	57	53	64
Riot Gear	66	39	57	68	61	85	46	37	38	47
Portable Public Address	81	55	83	87	72	91	62	57	52	54
Portable Emergency Lighting	78	52	81	83	69	89	53	52	46	63
Lie Detector	47	29	52	47	36	75	30	28	26	40
K-9	29	8	18	23	25	66	6	5	9	17
Blood Alcohol Testing	22	12	10	24	20	36	17	11	11	17
Fixed Radar	65	57	39	74	62	71	57	58	53	64
Mobile Radar	35	27	37	46	24	33	27	34	17	30
Hand Carried Radios	57	43	44	74	42	61	45	55	26	48
Mobile Command Post	93	88	79	97	95	95	77	88	89	87
Fixed Command Post	29	20	34	28	20	55	28	20	19	22
	35	21	40	31	32	51	34	21	19	24

radar equipment.

The least frequently available forms of equipment in both suburban and rural jurisdictions are mobile and fixed command posts, lie detectors and K-9 units.

In terms of geographical differences rural agencies, and to a lesser degree suburban agencies in the South, less frequently report the availability of many forms of equipment. In many cases, these differences are not significant, even though there is an overall pattern of reduced availabilities in the Southern Division of the country.

This is also the case with regard to suburban sheriffs in the northeastern United States. However, it should be pointed out that the role of the sheriff in this area in terms of law enforcement service functions is somewhat more limited than the role of sheriffs overall in the South. This may in part account for some differences in this geographic area.

It should be pointed out that even though an agency does not have a certain type of equipment or capability, that equipment may be available through another law enforcement agency when needed. In some cases, for example, it is not cost effective or justifiable to maintain in-house equipment from another municipal, county or state agency.

Based on survey data it is evident that most forms of equipment listed are available when needed to the largest percentage of all sheriffs' agencies. While there is still a difference

between suburban and rural agencies, the significance of overall equipment shortfalls is greatly reduced in the light of this information.

The comparatively lower availability of most forms of equipment in the Southern Division of the country, as previously noted, is still evident in this data presentation.

B. County Police Departments

Of all the law enforcement agencies responding to this study, county police departments appear to be the best equipped on the basis of this survey inventory.

For example, of all 28 agencies responding, 100 percent reported having portable police radios, blood-alcohol testing equipment and shotguns on an in-house basis. Twenty-five percent more county police departments report having lie detectors than do sheriffs, as well as 20 percent more departments with K-9 units. Of all other types of equipment inventoried, an average of ten percent more county police departments indicate that these various forms of equipment are available to them.

C. Independent City Sheriffs

As outlined in another section of this report, independent city sheriffs are infrequently involved in or primarily responsible for criminal investigation and law enforcement services. Their duties generally pertain to service to the court, in terms of the service of papers and courtroom security, as well as

operation of the jail. As a consequence, the equipment of personnel assigned to these functions varies from that of the full law enforcement officer.

For example, of 18 offices responding to the questionnaire, 59 percent indicated the availability of hand-carried radios, 41 percent have shotguns, 39 percent have riot gear and 28 percent maintain rifles. Other equipment is relatively uncommon, and such items as radar and lie detectors are generally not available. Not more than 20 percent of all other independent city sheriffs responding indicate the availability of any of the other forms of equipment listed in Table VI-1.

The availability of equipment from other agencies, of course, greatly increases the equipment potential for these agencies. However, the need for such equipment is quite limited due to the normal duties of the office and would only be required in cases of unusual events or circumstances.

CHAPTER VII RECORDS

Internal services of the law enforcement agency is the heart of the effort which provides both the administrative and operational information. Accurate information, vital to the success of any agency, is essential in order to provide past experience, current status and a projection as to future direction. The quality of the information compiled within an individual agency logically corresponds to the quality of planning, personnel assignments and general administration of the agency. Regardless of agency size, the law enforcement administrator knows only too well the value of usable information to identify his needs and plot the future course of his agency to fulfill the law enforcement requirements of the public. The sheriff and county chief of police who insist on centralized records with staff review to insure adherence to their standards in recordkeeping relative to all phases of responsibility will have a wealth of information at their fingertips for both operational and administrative use.

Accountability to the public is one of the prime responsibilities of the law enforcement administrator. Only with adequate records can an agency properly inform the public regarding its operations. To meet this responsibility the agency administrator must have the essential elements of information covering his operation reduced to a statistical presentation of

current status and appropriate trends. In addition to the need for information at the local level the county law enforcement administrator is currently faced with a relatively new phenomenon, which is a constant flow of information from his agency to the state level. Most states throughout the nation have an ongoing crime information system utilized daily at the operational level and also utilized to collect crime data on a regular basis. It is obvious that the individual law enforcement agency must participate in these systems to benefit from the services provided, and to do so the agency must have a valid contribution of information. This contribution of information is nothing more than a by-product of data compiled within the agency for the agency use.

The following tables provide information collected in this study to show the percentage of agencies which compile statistical summaries on various records. Information which shows some agencies do not compile data relative to certain categories should not be accepted in an unfavorable sense. In many situations the data is representative of sheriffs who do not have responsibility for patrol/investigative functions and are limited to process serving and/or jail operations. The data presented strongly reflect the extent of agencies which have centralized records and compile statistical data on various categories of information.

A. County Sheriffs' Agencies

Nationally, 75 percent of the county sheriffs' agencies in the study indicated their records are subject to staff review for quality control and uniformity. Eighty-four percent of the suburban county sheriffs' agencies and 73 percent of the rural county sheriffs' agencies utilize such reviews.

Tables VII-1 through VII-7 contain information relative to the percent of county sheriffs' agencies which compile statistical summaries concerning various categories. It is noted a high percentage of agencies compile information through which to analyze data relative to complaints received and arrest. Only about one-half the agencies compile summaries on the type of court dispositions. It is realized that law enforcement agencies at times will experience difficulty in obtaining final court dispositions on criminal cases. It is however apparent the law enforcement administrator must have the case disposition information, to complete a study of his agency's overall operation. Numerous questions can be answered through data compiled within the agency and this is achieved only through complete records. These include such questions as whether criminal charges are being downgraded, whether unsuccessful prosecutions are the result of poor law enforcement procedures and whether additional training is needed relative to the handling of certain types of criminal matters.

B. County Police Departments

Of the 28 county police departments represented in this study, 96 percent maintain centralized records, and 87 percent of these agencies prepare an annual report concerning the agency's activities.

Eighty-six percent of the county police departments indicated their records systems are subject to staff review for quality control and uniformity.

A percentage of these county police departments which compile statistical summaries in the following categories are listed below:

Number of complaints received	- 93%
Number of criminal arrests	- 100%
Number of juvenile arrests	- 96%
Number of offenses solved	- 100%
Number of prisoners jailed	- 50%
Number of traffic summonses served	- 81%
Number of civil processes served	- 11%
Number of criminal processes served	- 44%
Number of traffic accidents investigated	- 96%
Number of parking tickets issued	- 64%
Number of miles traveled by patrol	- 86%
Number of persons arrested on warrants	- 75%
Number of hours spent by officers in court	- 54%
Type of court dispositions	- 50%

C. Independent City Sheriffs

Of the independent city sheriffs participating in this study 70 percent indicated they do not maintain centralized records and 71 percent indicated they do not prepare an agency annual report.

The records keeping function for the independent city sheriff's office is unique in that it covers specific areas of responsibility for which other common criminal records keeping is not applicable. Seventy-five percent of these agencies responding indicated they maintain records on prisoners, civil and criminal processes; however, only 25 percent of the agencies maintain information as to the number of hours spent by officers in court and the type of court dispositions.

TABLE VII-1

PERCENT OF COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES WHICH COMPILE
STATISTICAL SUMMARIES COVERING VARIOUS CATEGORIES

N A T I O N A L				
	Total Agencies	% N/A to Agency	% Which Compile Summaries	% Which Do Not Compile Summaries
1. Number of complaints received	1710	15	74	12
2. Number of criminal arrests	1719	9	87	4
3. Number of juvenile arrests	1705	10	83	7
4. Number of offenses solved/"cleared"	1702	10	80	10
5. Number of prisoners jailed	1721	7	89	4
6. Number of traffic summonses served	1680	18	63	19
7. Number of civil processes served	1712	8	82	10
8. Number of criminal processes served	1704	9	81	10
9. Number of traffic accidents investigated	1678	18	67	14
10. Number of parking tickets issued	1595	42	26	32
11. Number of miles traveled by patrol	1683	11	71	17
12. Number of persons arrested on warrants	1708	9	78	13
13. Number of hours spent by officers in court	1667	16	32	52
14. Type of court dispositions	1675	13	55	31

N/A = Not applicable

TABLE VII-2

PERCENT OF SUBURBAN COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES WHICH COMPILE
STATISTICAL SUMMARIES COVERING VARIOUS CATEGORIES

SUBURBAN COUNTIES				
	Total Agencies	% N/A to Agency	% Which Compile Summaries	% Which Do Not Compile Summaries
1. Number of complaints received	415	12	80	8
2. Number of criminal arrests	419	7	89	4
3. Number of juvenile arrests	418	10	83	7
4. Number of offenses solved/"cleared"	414	8	84	8
5. Number of prisoners jailed	419	6	91	3
6. Number of traffic summonses served	408	15	65	19
7. Number of civil processes served	419	5	88	7
8. Number of criminal processes served	416	6	86	8
9. Number of traffic accidents investigated	400	21	66	14
10. Number of parking tickets issued	389	37	33	30
11. Number of miles traveled by patrol	410	10	80	10
12. Number of persons arrested on warrants	417	6	84	9
13. Number of hours spent by officers in court	413	10	48	42
14. Type of court dispositions	405	11	57	32

TABLE VII-3

PERCENT OF RURAL COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES WHICH COMPILE
STATISTICAL SUMMARIES COVERING VARIOUS CATEGORIES

RURAL COUNTIES				
	Total Agencies	% N/A to Agency	% Which Compile Summaries	% Which Do Not Compile Summaries
1. Number of complaints received	1295	15	72	13
2. Number of criminal arrests	1300	9	86	4
3. Number of juvenile arrests	1287	11	82	7
4. Number of offenses solved/"cleared"	1288	11	78	11
5. Number of prisoners jailed	1302	7	89	4
6. Number of traffic summonses served	1272	19	62	19
7. Number of civil processes served	1293	9	80	11
8. Number of criminal processes served	1288	10	79	11
9. Number of traffic accidents investigated	1278	18	67	15
10. Number of parking tickets issued	1206	43	23	33
11. Number of miles traveled by patrol	1273	12	69	19
12. Number of persons arrested on warrants	1291	10	75	14
13. Number of hours spent by officers in court	1254	18	26	55
14. Type of court dispositions	1270	14	55	31

TABLE VII-4

PERCENT OF COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES
BY GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION WHICH COMPILE
STATISTICAL SUMMARIES COVERING VARIOUS CATEGORIES

NORTHEASTERN STATES (130)			
	% N/A to Agency	% Which Compile Summaries	% Which Do Not Compile Summaries
1. Number of complaints received	31	65	3
2. Number of criminal arrests	25	71	4
3. Number of juvenile arrests	27	66	7
4. Number of offenses solved/"cleared"	27	64	9
5. Number of prisoners jailed	17	81	2
6. Number of traffic summonses served	34	57	9
7. Number of civil processes served	10	82	8
8. Number of criminal processes served	15	79	6
9. Number of traffic accidents investigated	36	55	8
10. Number of parking tickets issued	44	37	19
11. Number of miles traveled by patrol	26	67	7
12. Number of persons arrested on warrants	12	80	7
13. Number of hours spent by officers in court	20	53	27
14. Type of court dispositions	20	61	19

TABLE VII-5

PERCENT OF COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES
BY GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION WHICH COMPILE
STATISTICAL SUMMARIES COVERING VARIOUS CATEGORIES

NORTH CENTRAL STATES (743)			
	% N/A to Agency	% Which Compile Summaries	% Which Do Not Compile Summaries
1. Number of complaints received	12	77	11
2. Number of criminal arrests	7	89	4
3. Number of juvenile arrests	8	84	8
4. Number of offenses solved/"cleared"	9	79	12
5. Number of prisoners jailed	5	92	3
6. Number of traffic summonses served	11	74	16
7. Number of civil processes served	7	84	9
8. Number of criminal processes served	7	82	11
9. Number of traffic accidents investigated	8	86	7
10. Number of parking tickets issued	35	31	33
11. Number of miles traveled by patrol	9	74	17
12. Number of persons arrested on warrants	8	77	15
13. Number of hours spent by officers in court	15	30	56
14. Type of court dispositions	11	56	33

TABLE VII-6

PERCENT OF COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES
BY GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION WHICH COMPILE
STATISTICAL SUMMARIES COVERING VARIOUS CATEGORIES

SOUTHERN STATES (659)			
	% N/A to Agency	% Which Compile Summaries	% Which Do Not Compile Summaries
1. Number of complaints received	17	67	15
2. Number of criminal arrests	10	87	4
3. Number of juvenile arrests	12	80	7
4. Number of offenses solved/"cleared"	11	80	8
5. Number of prisoners jailed	8	86	5
6. Number of traffic summonses served	25	52	23
7. Number of civil processes served	10	79	11
8. Number of criminal processes served	11	78	10
9. Number of traffic accidents investigated	27	49	23
10. Number of parking tickets issued	49	16	36
11. Number of miles traveled by patrol	15	67	18
12. Number of persons arrested on warrants	12	76	12
13. Number of hours spent by officers in court	19	26	55
14. Type of court dispositions	17	54	30

TABLE VII-7

PERCENT OF COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES
 BY GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION WHICH COMPILE
 STATISTICAL SUMMARIES COVERING VARIOUS CATEGORIES

WESTERN STATES (281)			
	% N/A to Agency	% Which Compile Summaries	% Which Do Not Compile Summaries
1. Number of complaints received	8	83	8
2. Number of criminal arrests	5	92	3
3. Number of juvenile arrests	5	90	4
4. Number of offenses solved/"cleared"	5	86	8
5. Number of prisoners jailed	4	93	3
6. Number of traffic summonses served	13	64	23
7. Number of civil processes served	7	85	8
8. Number of criminal processes served	7	83	10
9. Number of traffic accidents investigated	18	62	19
10. Number of parking tickets issued	42	29	29
11. Number of miles traveled by patrol	6	77	17
12. Number of persons arrested on warrants	7	80	12
13. Number of hours spent by officers in court	12	39	49
14. Type of court dispositions	9	56	35

CHAPTER VIII DATA PROCESSING

The most widely recognized computer systems in law enforcement are the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) of the FBI and the State Crime Information Systems operated in the various states throughout the nation. Virtually all law enforcement agencies are serviced by these systems. If an individual sheriff's office or an individual county police department does not have a terminal within its department, the agency is frequently serviced through a state police agency or other law enforcement agency in the immediate area.

The basic information contained in the NCIC and State Criminal Information Systems pertains to wanted persons, missing persons, stolen vehicles, stolen license plates, stolen property, stolen and recovered guns, stolen boats and stolen securities.

Nationally, 60 percent of the 1,814 sheriffs participating in this study indicated they have an NCIC or State Crime Information System terminal at their headquarters. (See Tables VIII-1 through VIII-2.)

A. County Sheriffs' Agencies

Of the sheriffs providing information in this study only ten percent indicated they process records in a local computerized system. Of these sheriffs who have computer capability 85 percent advised they share the system with other county

TABLE VIII-1

PERCENT OF COUNTY AGENCIES WHICH HAVE A
NATIONAL CRIME INFORMATION CENTER (NCIC) TERMINAL
OR A STATE CRIME INFORMATION CENTER TERMINAL
BY GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION

	Northeast (Percent)	North Central (Percent)	South (Percent)	West (Percent)
Total	48	63	54	72
Suburban Counties	63	86	72	91
Rural Counties	36	58	50	67

TABLE VIII-2

PERCENT OF COUNTY AGENCIES WHICH HAVE
A NATIONAL CRIME INFORMATION CENTER
(NCIC) OR STATE CRIME INFORMATION CENTER
TERMINAL IN THEIR AGENCY

State	Total No. Of Agencies Responding	Percent With Terminal	Suburban		Rural	
			No. Of Agen- cies	Percent	No. Of Agen- cies	Percent
Alabama	26	42	11	64	15	27
Alaska*	--	--	--	--	--	--
Arizona	11	100	2	100	9	100
Arkansas	28	11	5	20	23	9
California	46	100	22	100	24	100
Colorado	47	47	10	80	37	37
Connecticut*	--	--	--	--	--	--
Delaware*	--	--	--	--	--	--
Florida	50	98	22	100	28	96
Georgia	77	40	24	67	53	28
Hawaii*	2	100	0	--	2	100
Idaho	26	81	1	100	25	80
Illinois	76	46	20	80	56	34
Indiana	64	42	24	67	40	27
Iowa	67	58	6	83	61	56
Kansas	77	77	6	83	71	76
Kentucky	40	10	8	--	32	12
Louisiana	45	96	12	92	33	97
Maine	10	80	1	--	9	89
Maryland	26	42	14	57	12	25
Massachusetts	8	38	5	20	3	67
Michigan	81	51	25	92	56	32
Minnesota	81	99	14	100	67	98
Mississippi	29	69	1	100	28	68
Missouri	51	41	10	80	41	32
Montana	29	72	1	100	28	71
Nebraska	58	33	3	100	55	29
Nevada	9	100	1	100	8	100
New Hampshire	7	14	--	--	7	14
New Jersey	14	50	12	50	2	50
New Mexico	16	25	1	100	15	20
New York	50	76	26	96	24	54
North Carolina	66	88	13	100	53	85
North Dakota	30	80	--	--	30	80
Ohio	72	87	33	88	39	87
Oklahoma	34	26	9	33	25	24
Oregon	34	73	6	100	28	68
Pennsylvania	27	22	13	46	14	--
Rhode Island*	--	--	--	--	--	--
South Carolina	31	77	6	100	25	72
South Dakota	39	41	1	100	38	39
Tennessee	32	37	14	50	18	28
Texas	121	65	28	93	93	57
Utah	16	25	3	67	13	15
Vermont	11	9	--	--	11	9
Virginia	70	29	12	67	40	25
Washington	30	90	8	100	22	86
West Virginia	22	27	3	67	19	21
Wisconsin	47	100	11	100	36	100
Wyoming	15	80	--	--	15	80

* - Alaska does not have county law enforcement. Sheriffs in Connecticut, Delaware and Rhode Island are not involved in active patrol/investigative functions. The New Castle County Police Department in the state of Delaware has full law enforcement communications capabilities.

and/or city agencies and 15 percent indicated the system is used solely by their agency. Information obtained in this study shows that 119 sheriffs in suburban counties throughout the United States utilize computer systems for the processing of records. Of these agencies 53 handle personnel data, 74 handle payroll information, 76 agencies handle crime incidence activity, 85 agencies utilize data processing for wants and warrants, 31 agencies utilize such systems for outstanding parking citations and 63 agencies use such systems for criminal history file data. Of those sheriffs representing suburban counties 41 indicated systems are used for on-line booking, 42 were involved in jail/inmate accounting and 18 in computer assisted dispatching. Three such agencies indicated they use the computer capability for files other than those listed above.

As logically envisioned the rural sheriff throughout the United States is less likely to have a sophisticated computerized system to assist him with records. Of the rural sheriffs, 66 indicated they utilize a local computerized system for processing of records. Of this group 24 agencies use such systems for personnel data, 29 for payroll information, 47 for crime incidence activity, 42 for wants and warrants, seven for outstanding parking citations and 31 for criminal history file information.

Of the rural sheriffs three indicated a use of such systems for on-line booking, one for jail/inmate accounting and six for computer assisted dispatching.

B. County Police Departments

Of the 28 county police departments furnishing information in this study 15 indicated they utilize a computer for processing of records. Data furnished show that nine agencies process personnel data, seven process payroll information, 14 crime incidence activity, 11 concerning wants and warrants, four on outstanding parking citations and nine agencies utilize such systems for criminal history file data. Of these agencies three county police departments indicated they utilize a computer for on-line booking, one agency for jail/inmate accounting and two such agencies for computer assisted dispatching.

C. Independent City Sheriffs

Two independent city sheriffs' agencies reported the use of a local computerized system in which personnel and payroll data is processed.

One agency indicated the use of a computer system for jail/inmate accounting.

CHAPTER IX AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES

The form of government existing in a county has a significant bearing on the office of sheriff not only because it defines the power and responsibility structure within which the sheriff operates, but also because the structure of the office itself may vary by government type. Depending on a county's form of government, the sheriff may be one of several co-equal officials or he may be responsible to an elected executive. In a few cases, sheriffs in counties with elected executives are appointed rather than elected.

There are three basic county government types as listed by the National Association of Counties.¹ The first type, the commission form, is structured around a central governing body. The members of the governing body (typically called commissioners or supervisors) are generally elected within districts of the county. Although most of their responsibilities are administrative, they do adopt a county budget and pass resolutions and ordinances concerning responsibility that state law leaves to the county.

The second form of government, that of the commission-administrator, differs from the first form in that here the commission appoints an administrator. The administrator is generally responsible for supervising county employees and

preparing a budget. In some counties the administrator has full executive and appointive responsibilities; in others he assists the governing body in its responsibilities.

The third variation in county government structure is the council-elected executive government. In contrast to the other two forms, county governments of this type have distinct legislative and executive branches. The elected executive is the head of the executive branch and is responsible for all administrative functions; the county council functions as the legislature. Although this structure exists in some small counties and throughout the state of Arkansas, it is usually associated with urban counties that have a considerable number of administrative functions to be performed at the county level. Table IX-1 displays the distribution of county governments by state and by the county government structure utilized.

The commission form is employed by 77 percent of the nation's counties.² More than 18 percent utilize the commission-administrator type and almost five percent use the council-elected executive structure. Most states prescribe the form of county government to be utilized. In some of these states home rule provisions allow either specified counties or counties within a specified minimum of population to determine their own government structure. The remaining states leave government structure as a matter of local option.

TABLE IX-1

STRUCTURE OF GOVERNMENT OF THE NATION'S COUNTIES BY STATE

State	Total Number Of Counties	Commission Form	Elected Executive Form	Council/ Administrative Form
U.S. Total	3049	2400	146	503
Alabama	67	64	0	3
Arizona	14	2	0	12
Arkansas	75	0	75	0
California	58	10	1	47
Colorado	63	49	13	1
Connecticut*	--	--	--	--
Delaware	3	1	1	1
Florida	67	36	1	30
Georgia	159	136	1	22
Hawaii	4	0	4	0
Idaho	44	44	0	0
Illinois	102	90	1	11
Indiana	92	91	1	0
Iowa	99	99	0	0
Kansas	105	104	0	1
Kentucky	120	119	1	0
Louisiana	64	41	3	20
Maine	16	16	0	0
Maryland	23	4	7	12
Massachusetts	14	13	1	0
Michigan	83	68	1	14
Minnesota	87	74	0	13
Mississippi	82	79	0	3
Missouri	114	111	2	1
Montana	56	52	1	3
Nebraska	93	93	0	0
Nevada	17	11	0	6
New Hampshire	10	9	0	1
New Jersey	21	5	3	13
New Mexico	32	14	0	18
New York	58	41	15	2
North Carolina	100	2	0	98
North Dakota	53	53	0	0
Ohio	88	62	0	26
Oklahoma	77	77	0	0
Oregon	36	31	1	4

TABLE IX-1 (Continued)

State	Total Number Of Counties	Commission Form	Elected Executive Form	Council/ Administrative Form
Pennsylvania	67	54	4	9
Rhode Island*	--	--	--	--
South Carolina	46	14	0	32
South Dakota	64	64	0	0
Tennessee	95	87	2	6
Texas	254	254	0	0
Utah	29	29	0	0
Vermont	14	14	0	0
Virginia	95	11	0	84
Washington	39	37	1	1
West Virginia	55	54	0	1
Wisconsin	72	59	6	7
Wyoming	23	22	0	1

* Connecticut and Rhode Island do not have organized county governments.

Information previously set forth in this report indicates the number of county law enforcement agencies which are limited to responsibilities of serving processes and/or administrative of the county jail; and those agencies involved with the full law enforcement services, including the patrol and investigative functions. The county law enforcement administrator generally is called on to provide services in virtually all spheres of criminal justice and related matters. The following tables provide data collected in this study relative to a number of specialized services rendered by county law enforcement agencies. These tables show the number of agencies responding and the percent of those agencies which provide such services.

A. County Sheriffs' Agencies

Vast land areas to cover continues to be a problem to county sheriffs in providing law enforcement services. Table IX-2 contains information relative to county square miles, total road miles in the jurisdiction served and inland water area. The data shows both suburban and rural agencies have large areas to cover. Nationally the suburban counties average 1,001 square miles, with 1,853 jurisdiction road miles and 155 square miles of inland water area. The rural counties report an average of 1,213 county square miles, 1,530 jurisdiction road miles and 145 square miles of inland water area. The inland water area is understated as a number of agencies in both the suburban and rural counties did not furnish information in this data category.

TABLE IX-2

COUNTY IN MEAN SQUARE MILES, MEAN ROAD MILES IN
 JURISDICTION SERVED AND MEAN INLAND WATER AREA SERVED
 IN COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES JURISDICTION BY RURAL
 AND SUBURBAN COUNTY AND BY GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION

	County In Mean Square Miles	Mean Total Road Miles In Jurisdiction Served	Mean Inland Water Area In Square Miles
National	1162	1615	148
Suburban	1001	1853	155
Rural	1213	1530	145
Northeast States	997	1805	66
Suburban	877	2100	48
Rural	1084	1566	81
North Central States	807	1548	74
Suburban	607	1808	49
Rural	859	1472	80
Southern States	701	1377	251
Suburban	672	1775	342
Rural	711	1213	219
Western States	3164	2198	160
Suburban	2993	1963	42
Rural	3210	2266	193

Sheriffs' agencies are called on to provide a very wide range of services, in addition to fulfilling their general law enforcement responsibilities. Tables IX-3 and IX-4 show the percent of agencies which assign personnel to various functions. Nationally, 51 percent of the county sheriffs' agencies assign personnel to enforcement of laws in county or state parks, game preserves and enforcement of water sport regulations, while 38 percent are involved with environmental laws.

B. County Police Departments

Information furnished by 28 county police departments in this study shows the mean square miles covered by these agencies is 517 with a mean road miles covered at 1,574. The mean for square miles of inland water area is 46.

Tables IX-5 shows the percent of county police departments which assign personnel to various functions in addition to general police duties. Sixty-one percent of these agencies assign personnel to enforcement of laws in county or state parks, or game preserves; and, to matters concerning water sport regulations. One-fourth of the county police departments assign personnel to the enforcement of fish and game laws.

Sixty-seven percent of the departments have responsibilities relative to the serving of criminal processes, (Table IX-6) 43 percent in licensing and permits, and 36 percent have responsibilities relative to gun registration matters.

TABLE IX-3

PERCENT OF COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES WHICH
ASSIGN PERSONNEL TO VARIOUS FUNCTIONS

	National		Suburban		Rural	
	Number Of Agencies	Percent	Number Of Agencies	Percent	Number Of Agencies	Percent
1) Coroner's Office Duties	1746	21	420	14	1310	24
2) Personal Pro- tection For City, County Or State Officials	1727	41	420	39	1307	42
3) Enforcement Of Environmental Laws	1719	38	416	26	1303	41
4) Enforcement Of Fish And Game Laws	1729	37	417	25	1312	40
5) Enforcement Of Laws In County Or State Parks Or Game Pre- serves	1735	51	419	43	1316	54
6) Enforcement Of County Or State Water Sport Regulations	1735	51	419	43	1316	54

TABLE IX-4

PERCENT OF COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES WHICH
 ASSIGN PERSONNEL TO VARIOUS FUNCTIONS
 BY GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION

	Northeast States		North Central States		Southern States		Western States	
	Number Of Agencies	%	Number Of Agencies	%	Number Of Agencies	%	Number Of Agencies	%
1) Coroner's Office Duties	127	11	713	23	614	15	276	36
2) Personal Protection For City, County Or State Officials	126	42	714	40	610	39	277	49
3) Enforcement Of Environmental Laws	125	24	711	43	609	32	274	42
4) Enforcement Of Fish And Game Laws	125	26	716	42	611	25	277	53
5) Enforcement Of Laws In County Or State Parks Or Game Preserves	126	39	721	56	612	40	276	67
6) Enforcement Of County Or State Water Sport Regulations	126	39	721	56	612	40	276	67

TABLE IX-5

PERCENT OF COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENTS WHICH
ASSIGN PERSONNEL TO VARIOUS FUNCTIONS

	Number Of Agencies Represented	Percent Of Agencies
1) Coroner's Office Duties	28	18
2) Personal Protection For City, County Or State Officials	28	57
3) Enforcement Of Environmental Laws	28	32
4) Enforcement Of Fish And Game Laws	28	25
5) Enforcement Of Laws In County Or State Parks Or Game Preserves	28	61
6) Enforcement Of County Or State Water Sport Regulations	28	61

TABLE IX-6

PERCENT OF COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENTS WHICH
HAVE RESPONSIBILITIES IN VARIOUS FUNCTIONS

	Number Of Agencies Represented	Percent Of Agencies
1) Provide Bailiffs To The Court	28	7
2) Serve Civil Court Processes	28	14
3) Serve Criminal Court Processes	27	67
4) Tax Collection	28	4
5) Gun Registration	28	36
6) Licensing And Permits	28	43
7) Eviction	28	11

C. Independent City Sheriffs

Independent city sheriffs' agencies participating in this study report they are not responsible for licensing and permit matters (Tables IX-7 and IX-8) while all have responsibilities in the serving of civil court processes, 89 percent provide bailiffs to the court and 82 percent have responsibilities in eviction matters.

NOTES

1. New County, U.S.A., From America's Counties Today, (National Association of Counties, 1973) pp. 12-30.
2. National Association of Counties, The County Yearbook 1977, (National Association of Counties and International City Management Association, 1977) pp. 3-4.

TABLE IX-7

PERCENT OF INDEPENDENT CITY SHERIFFS WHICH
HAVE RESPONSIBILITIES IN VARIOUS FUNCTIONS

	Number Of Agencies Represented	Percent Of Agencies
1) Provide Bailiffs To The Court	18	89
2) Serve Civil Court Processes	17	100
3) Serve Criminal Court Processes	18	83
4) Tax Collection	16	19
5) Gun Registration	16	6
6) Licensing And Permits	16	0
7) Eviction	17	82

TABLE IX-8

PERCENT OF INDEPENDENT CITY SHERIFFS WHICH
ASSIGN PERSONNEL TO VARIOUS FUNCTIONS

	Number Of Agencies Represented	Percent Of Agencies
1) Coroner's Office Duties	15	7
2) Personal Protection For City, County Or State Officials	16	25
3) Enforcement Of Environmental Laws	15	0
4) Enforcement Of Fish And Game Laws	15	7

CHAPTER X PATROL

The delivery of law enforcement services is generally perceived as the primary function of police agencies. However, in the case of sheriffs' agencies this is typically only one of three areas of responsibility spanning law enforcement, court service and corrections.

Patrol, as generically regarded, is one of the principle functions in the process of fulfilling law enforcement service responsibilities. But here, as in other areas of responsibility, the delivery of services can be and frequently is provided in a variety of ways.

A. County Sheriffs' Agencies

First, the underlying statutory authority for law enforcement service varies from state to state as a separate section of this report documents. Where the sheriff does not legally or operationally function as the primary law enforcement officer for his jurisdiction, a number of other agencies are typically used in their place.

Table X-1 provides information on the composition of law enforcement delivery in the nation as well as in four geographic divisions in suburban and rural counties.

TABLE X-1

PERCENTAGE OF COUNTY SHERIFFS WHICH HAVE PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY FOR ALL PATROL/INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTIONS IN THE COUNTY EXCLUDING MUNICIPAL POLICE AREAS, OR, THE AGENCY WHICH HAS PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY OTHER THAN THE COUNTY SHERIFF, BY RURAL AND SUBURBAN COUNTY AND BY GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION

	Percent National By Suburban And Rural		Percent Suburban By Division				Percent Rural By Division			
	9	8	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Number of Agencies	437	1391	60	153	166	58	73	593	502	223
Sheriff Departments With Primary Law Enforcement Responsibility	83	92	28	98	86	93	45	97	92	97
Agency Which Has Primary Responsibility In Lieu of County Sheriff										
Number of Agencies	74	111	43	3	23	4	40	18	40	7
Of These, Percent That	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1) County Law Enforce- ment Department	19	5	2	33	52	0	0	0	12	0
2) State Police Department	44	65	60	33	17	25	85	33	64	33
3) State Highway Department	3	17	2	0	4	0	2	44	17	33
4) Municipal Highway Department(s)	18	2	21	0	9	50	5	0	0	0
5) Combination	4	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6) Other	4	1	2	33	4	0	2	0	0	0

On a national level, these data reveal that the sheriff serves as the primary law enforcement officer in his jurisdiction in the vast majority of cases -- 83 percent in suburban counties and 92 percent in the case of rural counties.

In the minority of cases where another agency performs this function it most typically falls upon the state police or highway patrol. Additionally, among suburban agencies, county police and municipal police agencies assume this responsibility in nearly 40 percent of the cases among the survey respondents.

Differences in geographic divisions are only apparent in regard to the northeastern United States. Here sheriffs' agencies, and particularly suburban agencies have a markedly lower frequency of primary responsibility for law enforcement services. In the majority of cases this authority is assumed by the state police in this area of the nation.

1. Utilization and nature of patrol areas. The utilization of defined patrol areas or beats is a mechanism that may be utilized in the deployment and management of patrol manpower. Table X-2 presents the percentage of agencies which responded that they divide their jurisdiction into such patrol areas. Here, as in the remainder of the discussion in this section, "respondents" include only those who indicated that they have primary law enforcement responsibility in their county.

TABLE X-2

PERCENTAGE OF COUNTY SHERIFFS WHOSE JURISDICTION IS DIVIDED INTO PATROL AREAS. OF THESE, THE PERCENTAGE WHICH UTILIZE PERMANENT PERSONNEL ASSIGNMENTS AND THE PERCENTAGE USING SELECTED METHODS FOR ESTABLISHING PATROL AREAS. BY RURAL AND SUBURBAN SHERIFFS AND GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION

	Percent National By Suburban And Rural		Percent Suburban By Division				Percent Rural By Division			
	9	8	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Number of Agencies	359	1234	17	148	140	54	33	564	424	213
Sheriffs Whose Jurisdiction Are Divided Into Patrol Areas	80	41	88	79	76	96	85	32	39	60
Of These, Sheriffs Which:										
Number of Agencies	287	506	15	117	106	52	28	180	165	128
Of These, Percent	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1) Make Permanent Person- nel Assignments To Patrol Areas	20	36	20	28	52	46	36	36	62	53
2) Establish Patrol Areas By:										
a) Incidence of Calls- For-Service	90	82	90	82	70	84	82	68	74	67
b) Population Density	90	61	90	77	75	89	61	64	70	71
c) Natural Barriers	90	81	90	61	76	87	81	64	77	76
d) Other Method(s)	20	11	20	14	11	23	11	18	11	11

As Table X-2 indicates, 80 percent of suburban and 41 percent of rural sheriffs who perform patrol say that they utilize patrol areas. While there is no considerable geographic variance in response to this question among suburban sheriffs, rural sheriffs in the North Central and Southern Divisions of the nation reflect a noticeably lower use of this technique. Only 32 percent and 39 percent of sheriffs in these respective areas use patrol beats as opposed to 85 percent and 60 percent of rural sheriffs in the Northeast and Western Divisions of the country respectively.

Permanent personnel assignments to established patrol areas are not particularly characteristic of rural or suburban sheriffs who provided data on the subject, although there is some exception to this in both the Southern and Western Divisions of the nation. In some cases these permanent patrol areas reflect assignments which are made on the basis of a deputy's area of residence. Such resident assignments are more common in jurisdictions which cover large areas or which are difficult to traverse. In such situations, deputies who operate in a radius from their home constitute something similar to an operational substation, or a permanent patrol area assignment.

Agencies which utilize patrol areas may use a number of different methods for establishing their boundaries. The incidence of "calls for service," population density and the existence of natural barriers such as lakes and rivers, are

three of the more frequently used approaches for establishing patrol area configurations.

As Table X-2 indicates, the largest percentage of the nation's suburban sheriffs' agencies and a smaller yet significantly high percentage of rural sheriffs utilize one or more of these approaches if they have designated patrol areas.

Geographic differences in the use of any one of these methods are recognizable in both suburban and rural counties even though there are no extreme variations in methods used. Depending upon the nature of the agency and the jurisdiction served, one or more of these approaches may be most suited. Alternative methods may in fact be preferred or incorporated with these techniques, as is the case with 20 percent of suburban agencies and 11 percent of rural agencies responding.

2. Availability of patrol vehicles and officers. The number of patrol vehicles and patrol officers available to a department is frequently utilized as a relative index of general patrol capabilities. These availabilities among agencies, of course, vary widely according to need, and direct comparisons between agencies should be made with the utmost of caution. With this understanding, Table X-3 presents a broad overview of patrol force availabilities in terms of both patrol vehicles and patrol personnel available during high crime time. In most cases, high crime time is during

the evening and early morning hours although some variation exists between jurisdictions.

Nationally, Table X-3 reveals that sheriffs in suburban counties maintain an average of ten patrol cars and 12 patrol officers on the street during high crime time, or about three times the average of rural agencies. The contrast between suburban and rural agencies in this regard is heightened, as one might expect, by the larger populations served by suburban sheriffs.

There is some marked difference among suburban sheriffs as a group however, in terms of the availability of both patrol vehicles and patrolmen. In particular, agencies in the Northeastern Division field the lowest average number of vehicles and men, while the West has over twice the average in both respects for the nation's suburban sheriffs.

Suburban sheriffs in these two divisions present a contrast with national averages which is not evident among rural sheriffs. No significant variances exist in fact in any division among rural sheriffs.

3. Composition of patrol activities. As previously noted, the number of patrol vehicles and patrol officers available to any given agency varies greatly depending largely upon service demand factors and other facets of the jurisdiction in question. Service demand factors can include not only calls for service by citizens but other types of duties and

TABLE X-3

AVERAGE NUMBER OF PATROL CARS AND PATROL OFFICERS NORMALLY IN-SERVICE DURING HIGH CRIME TIME, SHERIFFS' AGENCIES BY SUBURBAN AND RURAL AND GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION

	National Average By Suburban And Rural		Suburban Average By Division				Rural Average By Division			
	9	8	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Number Of Agencies	437	1391	60	153	166	58	73	593	502	223
Number Of Patrol Officers In-Service During High Crime Time	12	4	11	8	12	27	4	3	5	4
Number Of Patrol Cars In Service During High Crime Time	10	3	8	6	10	21	4	3	4	4

responsibilities which are within the purview of the office of the sheriff. The patrol officer is the most visible of an agency's sworn personnel and can be called upon to serve a wide variety of functions if required.

Table X-4 presents a list of some of the most typical areas of responsibility which may be placed upon patrol officers. This listing is not intended to be all-inclusive but only representative of the most significant duties which form the nucleus of the function often loosely referred to as "patrol".

In comparing national data for suburban and rural sheriffs' agencies, one finds that a greater percentage of rural sheriffs indicate that they "routinely" perform nearly all functions listed. This lends support to the concept that rural sheriffs' deputies are more frequently called upon to perform a wider variety of tasks than are their suburban counterparts. Rural agencies must more frequently require their patrol officers to be "generalists" rather than being able to separate their officers into specialized functions.

Nationally, for example, the service of warrants on a routine basis is performed by 64 percent of suburban agencies' patrol officers in comparison with 86 percent of rural agencies. Civil process service is also performed routinely by 33 percent more rural than suburban agencies. As well, 20 percent and 15 percent more rural sheriffs' deputies, respectively,

TABLE X-4

ACTIVITIES ROUTINELY PERFORMED BY SHERIFFS' DEPUTIES WHO ARE EXCLUSIVELY ASSIGNED TO PATROL. PERCENTAGE OF SHERIFFS BY RURAL AND SUBURBAN COUNTY AND GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION

	Percent National By Suburban And Rural		Percent Suburban By Division*				Percent Rural By Division*			
	9	8	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
1. Warrant Service	64	86	76	58	72	52	73	82	93	84
2. Civil Process Service	44	77	41	42	58	11	54	75	85	72
3. Traffic Control	68	66	94	86	57	38	67	79	50	65
4. Traffic Accident Investigation	63	66	100	89	41	36	79	87	40	60
5. Prisoner Transportation	54	74	59	52	62	33	64	74	80	66
6. Criminal Investigation	72	87	94	72	73	63	82	84	89	90
7. Juvenile Offenses	74	78	88	79	68	75	70	78	75	86
8. Nuisance Calls	94	92	94	96	93	92	88	92	92	94

* Average No. Suburban Agencies-352
Average No. Rural Agencies-1185

routinely perform prisoner transportation and criminal investigation duties than do suburban sheriffs' agencies.

On the other hand, other duties such as traffic control and traffic accident investigation, as well as the handling of juvenile offenses and "nuisance" calls, are routinely performed by patrol officers on a generally equal basis, whether rural or suburban.

Only in the case of civil process service and traffic accident investigation do a significantly larger percentage of suburban sheriffs' agencies report that they do not perform these duties at all through patrol officers.

Comparisons between geographic divisions yield some differences within both rural and suburban sheriffs' agencies.

Within rural agencies, for example, warrant and civil process service are less frequently performed by patrol officers on a routine basis in the Northeast than in other divisions of the country. Similarly, traffic control and traffic accident investigation are less frequently performed by rural Southern sheriffs' agencies than in other divisions.

Among suburban sheriffs' agencies, it is generally the case in the Western Division of the country that patrol officers less frequently perform most of the activities surveyed on a routine basis.

Several explanations exist for the various national, divisional, suburban and rural differences which have been mentioned. In some cases, and most typically among the larger suburban agencies, some functions are assumed by specialized units within the agency. In other cases, alternative law enforcement agencies, whether municipal, county, or state, assume primary responsibility for specific functions. The utilization of state police or highway patrol for traffic accident investigation is a frequent example of this. And finally, some agencies are not required by state statute or through local arrangement to perform certain duties, such as the service of civil and criminal process from the courts.

B. County Police Departments

Where separate county law enforcement departments have been established, they almost uniformly assume the primary responsibility for patrol and criminal investigation within their jurisdiction.

Of the 28 county police departments responding to the questionnaire, 21 are suburban and seven are rural departments. Of these, all but one suburban departments indicated that they have primary law enforcement responsibility. In the case of the one exception, that responsibility was under the control of a municipal police department.

Only one agency in each of the suburban and rural classifications indicated that it did not utilize patrol areas for the management of patrol personnel. Even though such patrol areas are widely used among county police departments, only about half of the suburban and 20 percent of the rural departments assign patrol personnel to these areas on a permanent basis. In about 90 percent of all departments patrol areas are established by utilizing data on the incidence of calls for service and population density and by means of natural barriers and boundaries.

The volume of patrol vehicles and patrol personnel assigned to these patrol areas varies greatly from the volume associated with suburban sheriffs' agencies. County police departments responding indicate an average of 67 vehicles and 109 patrol officers available during high crime time. This compares sharply with an average of ten vehicles and 12 patrol officers available during the same hours among suburban sheriffs' agencies.

With few exceptions, the activities performed routinely by officers assigned exclusively to patrol in county police departments compare closely with similar personnel in county sheriffs' agencies. The exceptions fall in the area of civil process service and prisoner transportation.

Only one county police department among all respondents indicated that its patrol officers perform civil process

service compared with 44 percent of suburban and 77 percent of rural sheriffs' deputies in patrol assignments. As well, 41 percent of county police departments indicate routine activity in relation to prisoner transportation, as compared to 54 percent of suburban sheriffs and 74 percent of rural sheriffs' agencies.

In other areas surveyed the routine activities of patrol officers in county police departments and county sheriffs' agencies are quite similar.

C. Independent City Sheriffs

As compared with county sheriffs' agencies and county police departments, independent city sheriffs hold no responsibility as primary agents in the area of patrol and criminal investigation.

Of the 19 independent city sheriffs surveyed, 17 rely on municipal police departments, and one each rely on county police departments and the state police to perform these functions.

CHAPTER XI CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION

Criminal investigation has been one of the most popularized of all law enforcement functions. The "science" of the investigative process has frequently however, been less fact than fiction. The variety of approaches utilized in the investigative process as well as the range of methods employed in organizing and managing criminal investigations is partial testimony to this fact.

Recently internal and external evaluations of the criminal investigation function have provided data upon which law enforcement administrators may make a more informed appraisal of their investigative operations.

The data presented here provide some insights into the general composition of criminal investigation operations among the nation's county law enforcement agencies. This information will be of value in establishing the current state of the art and subsequent directions for change.

A. County Sheriffs' Agencies

In all, 1,587 county sheriffs provided inputs to this section of the survey, indicating that they perform criminal investigations. Of this total, 360 or 23 percent were suburban and 1,227 or 77 percent rural county sheriffs.

Based on the total respondent population of 1,846 county sheriffs to the overall survey, these data reveal that approximately 86 percent of all county sheriffs perform criminal investigations. Where this function is not performed by the sheriff, it is generally the responsibility of the state police or highway patrol, a state bureau of criminal investigation or the function of municipal or county police departments in the same county as the sheriff.

1. Special investigative units. Table XI-1 provides data on the availability of specialized investigative units to sheriffs' agencies which provided survey information, as well as the degree to which personnel in those units are exclusively assigned to the investigation of various types of crime.

Nationally, there is a striking difference between suburban and rural agencies in the use of special investigative units. Eighty percent of suburban and 33 percent of rural agencies report having criminal investigators for specialized assignments.

Suburban and rural sheriffs in the Northeastern and Western Divisions of the United States more frequently report the use of such units, although the survey populations from these areas on which these percentages were constructed are smaller than in the other two divisions.

As these data suggest, whether or not an agency utilizes specialized investigators depends upon the suburban/rural

TABLE XI-1

PERCENT OF COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES WITH A
SPECIALIZED CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION COMPONENT

	Percent Nationally By Suburban And Rural		Percent Suburban By Division				Percent Rural By Division			
	9	8	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Number of Agencies	360	1227	17	150	140	53	33	560	419	215
Agencies Which Use A Specialized Criminal Investigation Component	80	33	100	79	73	96	59	27	36	37
Of These, Departments In Which Investigators Are Exclusively Assigned To These Functions										
Number of Agencies	288	405	17	119	102	51	19	151	151	80
Of These, Percent That	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1) Crimes Against Persons	68	60	71	63	68	80	50	58	61	62
2) Crimes Against Property	69	60	71	64	68	80	50	57	61	64
3) Vice	62	51	71	57	63	70	44	46	56	55
4) Narcotics/Dangerous Drugs	79	62	76	74	82	84	44	57	66	71
5) Juvenile	69	49	94	67	65	72	50	46	52	47
6) Organized Crime	50	39	50	42	56	57	23	35	44	44
7) Fugitive Squad	40	25	47	33	40	52	20	25	28	23
8) Other	52	35	75	47	54	53	50	32	35	36

character and size of the agency. In addition, the nature of the community and its criminal activity have direct bearing on the need for such organizational entities. These observations can also be made in relation to the structures of any investigative staff responsibilities for specific categories of crime.

For example, the same table reveals that among both suburban and rural sheriffs' agencies on a national basis, the most common of specialized investigative assignments is in the area of narcotics and dangerous drugs.

Among suburban agencies only, the second most commonly cited are assignments in the areas of juvenile offenses and crimes against property with 69 percent of agencies noting the incidence of assignments in each of these areas. Sixty-eight percent make assignments in the area of crimes against persons, 62 percent in regard to vice offenses, 52 percent in other unspecified categories of crime, 50 percent in the field of organized crime and 40 percent to fugitive squads.

Among rural agencies, crimes against persons, crimes against property, and vice are also most frequently cited as areas where special assignments are made. Least characteristic of rural as opposed to suburban agencies is the use of juvenile and fugitive squads.

The most noticeable difference between geographic divisions involve suburban sheriffs in the northeastern and western states. Again, even though there are fewer respondents from these areas

upon which to draw conclusions, these two divisions show consistently higher percentages of sheriffs who make specialized assignments of all types for investigative purposes.

2. Organization of criminal investigation. A number of other characteristics can be presented concerning the general process and nature of criminal investigations in sheriffs' agencies.

For example, the investigative process can be handled to various extents by the patrol officer. The basic on the scene collection of information loosely referred to as the "preliminary investigation" is one element of this process. Data provided by respondent agencies reveals that nearly all sheriffs' agencies provide for the conduct of preliminary investigations by patrol officers. Ninety-nine percent of suburban and 97 percent of rural agencies indicate that this procedure is followed.

Of other characteristics upon which data was sought, the second most frequently employed is specialized training for criminal investigators. Seventy-two percent of all suburban and 61 percent of all rural agencies stated that their investigators receive specialized training.

Ninety-four percent of suburban and 81 percent of rural agencies in the northeastern United States note that they require specialized training in this area, which is noticeably higher than in any of the three other geographic divisions in the country.

Another area of interest which was the subject of questionnaire data gathering, is the degree to which case management procedures are utilized in criminal investigations. Case management refers to such procedures as the limitation of manpower or time allocated to cases, or the selected "opening" of cases according to priority, seriousness or the likelihood of solution.

Case management was the third most frequently utilized of procedures among the seven areas in which data was gathered. Sixty-five percent of suburban and 44 percent of rural agencies responded that such procedures were utilized in their criminal investigations.

Of all four geographic divisions, suburban sheriffs in the Western states and rural sheriffs in the Northeast most frequently cite the use of case management procedures with 88 percent of the former and 66 percent of the latter answering in the affirmative.

The selection of criminal investigators is a subject which was also reviewed in the survey. Specifically, sheriffs were asked if positions in criminal investigation units were filled by competitive means from a list of eligibles. To this, just less than a third of all respondents answered "yes", of which 46 percent were suburban and 27 percent rural sheriffs.

In 30 percent of all cases, county sheriffs also answered that their criminal investigators are organized by rank.

Again suburban sheriffs more frequently employ this approach, with 55 percent indicating that they use this procedure as opposed to 25 percent of rural sheriffs.

Sheriffs in the Northeast are more likely to note the use of organization by rank, with 71 percent and 44 percent of suburban and rural respondents in these areas respectively indicating the use of this arrangement.

The two least frequently mentioned mechanisms for conducting criminal investigations are the use of an intelligence gathering unit and a major crimes unit.

In the former case only 18 percent of all sheriffs responding -- 37 percent suburban and 12 percent rural -- state that an intelligence unit is available.

However, a disproportionately high 75 percent of suburban sheriffs in the western states note the availability of a unit of this type.

In regard to "major crimes" units, only nine percent of all sheriffs state that these are used, 23 percent of these being suburban and five percent rural agencies.

Finally, sheriffs were asked to indicate the agency(s) which routinely assists them in major fraud/embezzlement investigations.

In this respect, the most frequently indicated is a state bureau of investigation which is cited by 51 percent of all

responding sheriffs. This is more frequently the case among rural sheriffs who indicate this alternative in 55 percent of cases as compared with 36 percent of suburban sheriffs.

Second most frequently cited is the use of the state police which is noted by 26 percent of all sheriffs, or 21 percent and 27 percent of suburban and rural sheriffs, respectively.

The only other sources commonly used are the F.B.I., and the county or state district attorney. However, no more than eight percent of all respondents indicate the use of these agencies.

The only significant difference in geographic divisions along these lines involves the use of county and state district attorneys by suburban sheriffs in the western states. Here, of suburban sheriffs, 42 percent and 23 percent respectively indicate the use of a county or state district attorney.

B. County Police Departments

Twenty-six county police departments provided information on their activities in the area of criminal investigation. Six of these were rural departments and 20 were suburban.

All county police departments responding indicate that they perform criminal investigations. As well, all but one suburban and one rural department utilize a specialized investigation division or component which is solely devoted to this function.

In terms of officer assignments in these units, rural departments reveal a lower frequency in making specialized assignments than do suburban departments.

For example, most frequently cited in connection with specialized assignments are investigations in the areas of vice, narcotics and dangerous drugs, and juvenile offenses. Sixty percent of rural departments state that they make exclusive use of personnel in these areas as compared with suburban departments where 89 percent make assignments to vice and narcotics/dangerous drugs and 74 percent to juvenile offenses.

Forty percent of rural departments assign investigative personnel to "crimes against property" or to other types of crime investigations while 74 percent and 87 percent of suburban departments make similar assignments.

Least frequently noted among rural departments are assignments to "crimes against persons" and organized crime where only one of the six respondents indicates personnel assignments. Additionally, none of the rural respondents notes the use of fugitive squads.

In the same three areas among suburban departments, 74 percent of the departments specialize investigations in regard to crimes against persons, 68 percent in the area of organized crime and 32 percent in the utilization of fugitive squads.

Other factors associated with criminal investigations among county police departments show less marked dissimilarity between rural and suburban departments, and may be summarized on the basis of all respondents.

Of the 27 county police departments reporting, all but one indicate that patrol officers conduct preliminary investigations. Seventy-four percent state that their criminal investigators are organized by rank, 72 percent that case management procedures are utilized by the criminal investigation unit and 69 percent that they utilize an intelligence gathering unit.

Less frequently noted is the use of specialized training for criminal investigators which is employed by 48 percent of respondents. In the case of 37 percent of departments, investigative positions are filled by competitive means and 30 percent report that they have a "major crimes" unit.

In the case of departments which assist county police departments in the area of fraud/embezzlement investigations, respondents most often note the use of the F.B.I. This source of assistance was selected by 44 percent of county police departments. An additional 12 percent of departments noted the use of the state police, a state bureau of investigation or the state district attorneys office in these matters.

C. Independent City Sheriffs

In no instance among the survey respondents do independent city sheriffs indicate responsibility for criminal investigations. This responsibility is most commonly assigned to a municipal police department, county sheriff or county police department or to the state police or highway patrol.

CHAPTER XII SPECIALIZED LAW ENFORCEMENT

Within the past ten years law enforcement in general has been introduced to highly sophisticated administration and operational procedures. Previously, only the very large agencies had the financial capability of hiring professionals for technical assistance or could afford to groom in-house personnel through education for top management positions.

With the advent of the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the U.S. Department of Justice, funding for technical assistance and education was within the reach of law enforcement agencies of various sizes. During this period the leading law enforcement academies strengthened their advanced management programs which instilled in law enforcement a basis to embark on a professional management path. At the same time numerous law enforcement officers were given the opportunity to attend colleges and universities at the undergraduate and graduate level throughout the nation. Many officers received degrees in criminal justice, administration, education, law and the sciences.

Today, large law enforcement agencies in the nation enjoy a cadre of highly educated administrators with extensive law enforcement experience. From the effort of this reservoir of expertise has come many innovative specialized law enforcement

programs. New programs in professional management, legal counsel, community relations and community crime prevention, crisis intervention and numerous other categories have greatly aided effective law enforcement. Various approaches in the operational area, such as the formation and use of tactical squads and target hardening programs, have been instituted as solutions to specific crime problems.

Efforts were made to obtain specific information in this study to show the extent of specialized law enforcement programs now being utilized in county law enforcement agencies. Tables XII-1 and XII-2 show the number of agencies which provided data in various specialized law enforcement program categories and the percent of those agencies which utilize such programs. It is apparent that the suburban county participation in specialized law enforcement programs far outstrip rural county participation. A logical point of view is that the rural county agencies represent a significant number of agencies which are relatively limited in manpower and finances and which cannot institute such programs, even though the need for such efforts may be apparent.

A. County Sheriffs' Agencies

Information concerning suburban county sheriffs' agencies as a group shows 40 percent have a research and planning program, 54 percent have a budgeting function within their agencies

TABLE XII-1

PERCENT OF SUBURBAN COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES WHICH
HAVE VARIOUS SPECIALIZED LAW ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS

	AGENCY PERSONNEL SIZE										
	1 to 3	4 to 6	7 to 10	11 to 20	21 to 50	51 to 100	101 to 300	301 to 500	501 to 1000	1001 and over	All Agen- cies
Number of Agencies	2	10	13	44	86	75	84	21	15	4	354
Program	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1) Research And Planning	(1)	20	--	11	26	32	68	80	73	100	40
2) Budgeting		20	30	23	40	54	76	95	100	100	54
3) Legal Advisor		20	30	12	21	25	37	55	40	100	29
4) Community Crime Prevention		40	16	33	50	59	67	85	66	100	55
5) Selective Traffic Enforcement		10	7	11	22	29	39	55	46	100	29
6) SWAT Or Tactical Squad		--	7	4	20	29	55	75	80	75	33
7) "Target" Hardening Program		10	7	9	26	42	50	72	50	100	36
8) Community Relations/ Human Relations Program		20	--	26	42	44	54	70	66	100	44
9) School Safety/ School Liaison		--	8	14	39	50	60	80	46	100	44
10) Press Liaison		--	--	2	19	31	38	47	60	100	27
11) Court Liaison		--	--	14	23	23	43	52	66	100	29
12) Crisis Interven- tion Unit		--	--	10	5	5	7	5	20	100	7
13) Other		--	--	--	50	--	--	--	25	--	8

(1) Insufficient data available concerning agencies with 1-3 employees.

TABLE XII-2

PERCENT OF RURAL COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES WHICH
HAVE VARIOUS SPECIALIZED LAW ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS

	AGENCY PERSONNEL SIZE							
	1 to 3	4 to 6	7 to 10	11 to 20	21 to 50	51 to 100	101 to 300	All Agen- cies
Number Of Agencies	118	199	248	337	228	43	15	1188
Program	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1) Research And Planning	4	4	8	18	22	26	71	14
2) Budgeting	14	15	22	33	43	54	85	29
3) Legal Advisor	16	16	25	31	25	21	35	24
4) Community Crime Prevention	14	18	25	32	48	52	64	31
5) Selective Traf- fic Enforcement	6	6	12	13	17	22	21	12
6) SWAT Or Tactical Squad	1	3	3	4	16	25	66	7
7) "Target" Hardening Program	5	5	11	12	27	34	35	14
8) Community Relations/ Human Relations Program	12	15	20	28	33	41	40	24
9) School Safety/ School Liaison	12	10	17	27	40	56	53	24
10) Press Liaison	1	3	5	10	19	30	35	10
11) Court Liaison	6	6	10	13	28	42	35	14
12) Crisis Inter- vention Unit	--	2	2	3	4	2	--	2
13) Other	--	--	--	25	--	--	--	7

and 55 percent have a community crime prevention program. Only seven percent of these agencies indicate they have a crisis intervention unit.

Data relative to rural county sheriffs' agencies as a group show 14 percent have a research and planning function, 29 percent have a budgeting function, 31 percent have a community crime prevention program, and two percent of these agencies have a crisis intervention unit.

B. County Police Departments

The following shows the number of police departments which furnished information in this segment of the study and the percentage of those departments which have these particular programs or functions:

Program or Function	Number of Departments	Percent Which Have Program or Function
1) Research and Planning	14	57
2) Budgeting	16	31
3) Legal Advisor	17	24
4) Community Crime Prevention	14	57
5) Selective Traffic Law Enforcement	17	24
6) S.W.A.T. or Tacti- cal Squad	18	44
7) Target Hardening Program	19	21
8) Community Relations/ Human Relations Program	16	31
9) School Safety/ School Liaison	17	47
10) Press Liaison	19	21
11) Court Liaison	21	24
12) Crisis Intervention Unit	26	4

CHAPTER XIII TRAFFIC

Traffic control and the enforcement of traffic law are common elements among the responsibilities generally associated with most law enforcement agencies. As the network of streets and highways has developed and vehicular traffic has increased, particularly over the past four decades, the responsibilities of law enforcement and the allocation of police manpower to this traffic function has also shown a marked increase.

As is the case with other areas of law enforcement responsibility, traffic control and enforcement can be shared with a number of law enforcement agencies within a jurisdiction. The relationship of traffic control and management to law enforcement agencies is also frequently interrelated with other non-enforcement units of government such as public works, state highway and engineering departments, as well as planning agencies and local, state and federal traffic safety organizations.

Data presented in this section should be viewed from the perspective which these and other agencies have on the management of the traffic function within law enforcement agencies.

A. County Sheriffs' Agencies

Of the 1,855 sheriffs' agencies responding to the survey questionnaire, two-thirds indicate that traffic control and

enforcement activities are part of their agencies' realm of responsibilities. Of these, 86 percent are sheriffs from rural counties and 24 percent from suburban counties.

Table XIII-1 provides an overview of some information associated with all agencies involved in traffic enforcement, as well as those departments which maintain separate units for this specific purpose.

1. Manpower expended on traffic control and enforcement.

Of all sheriffs' agencies responding in the national sample, suburban sheriffs indicate that on average about 26 percent of their "street" personnel's hours are devoted to traffic control and enforcement activities. At the same time, rural sheriffs note that somewhat more, or 34 percent, of their street personnel's hours are similarly occupied.

A divisional breakdown by geographic area, however, reveals a substantial difference between agencies. Among suburban agencies, sheriffs in the Northeast indicate that on average 51 percent of their street personnel's time is devoted to traffic while only an average of 12 percent of deputies' time is similarly expended among sheriffs' agencies of the western states.

Among rural sheriffs' agencies the highest average time expended is again in the Northeastern Division and the lowest in the Western Division.

TABLE XIII-1

MEAN PERCENT OF MAN HOURS SPENT IN TRAFFIC CONTROL AND ENFORCEMENT AND SELECTED OPERATIONAL METHODS UTILIZED BY AGENCIES WITH SEPARATE TRAFFIC UNITS, FOR COUNTY SHERIFFS BY RURAL AND SUBURBAN COUNTY AND GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION

	National		Suburban				Rural			
	9	8	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Mean Percent of Available Man Hours Spent on Traffic Control and Enforcement Activities	26	34	51	31	21	12	44	38	30	27
Number of Agencies	290	941	17	134	100	39	27	481	261	172
Percent of Agencies With A Separate Traffic Unit	24	6	41	23	15	41	22	7	4	6
Number of Agencies	70	56	7	31	15	16	6	34	10	10
Of These, Percent That:	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1) Utilize Beats	30	13	22	30	17	59	0	12	9	20
2) Utilize Shift Plans	73	56	89	74	55	94	83	58	42	62
3) Utilize Motorcycles/ Scooters	20	2	11	13	28	29	0	0	5	3
4) Routinely Issue Parking Citations	28	23	11	34	14	47	20	25	18	23
5) Routinely Respond to Calls-for-Service	58	72	89	64	55	29	67	77	60	74
6) Deploy Traffic Unit Strategically	69	48	89	70	56	76	67	54	31	52

2. Organization of separate traffic units. The incidence of separate traffic units within sheriffs' agencies is relatively low from a national level. Among the 290 suburban agencies reporting, just less than one-quarter maintain individual traffic units, while among 941 rural agencies their availability is only six percent.

Again, among suburban agencies, the northeastern and western state agencies diverge significantly from the national norm. In both of these areas the incidence of separate traffic units is 41 percent among sheriffs. Northeastern sheriffs also show the highest percentage of separate units among rural agencies. Interpretation of these data however, must be made with caution due to the relatively small sample population available in these geographic divisions.

Of those agencies which have separate traffic units, Table XIII-1 presents the percentage which utilize certain operational methods. Three of these methods are utilized by a relatively significant percentage of all agencies responding.

First, 73 percent of suburban and 56 percent of rural agencies use shift plans for their traffic units, in a manner similar to most patrol units. Sixty-nine percent of suburban and 48 percent of rural agencies also deploy their officers on a strategic basis such as in accordance with traffic flow or accident incidence analysis. In addition to their traffic responsibilities, 58 percent of suburban and 72 percent of rural

agencies state that their traffic officers also routinely respond to calls for service.

Operational methods most frequently employed by traffic units are motorcycles or motorscooters, the utilization of fixed "beats" for traffic personnel and the routine issuance of parking citations. Only one-third of suburban and one-fourth of rural agencies report activity in any of these areas.

3. Other operational practices. Law enforcement agencies which do not have specialized traffic units may participate in various types of traffic oriented practices. For example, data supplied by responding sheriffs indicate that 76 percent of suburban and 68 percent of rural sheriffs routinely maintain liaison with the agency responsible for highway safety. Whether this agency is a separate highway department, department of public works, county engineer or other agency, such liaison is necessary for highway design and improvement as well as in the day-to-day control of traffic.

The availability of a traffic accident records system, which is kept in a centralized location separate from the agency law enforcement records system, is frequently required where traffic management becomes a routine agency concern. Nationwide, survey findings reveal that 62 percent of suburban and 57 percent of rural agencies have actually implemented such a records system.

Agencies responding show that 15 percent of the nation's suburban sheriffs and four percent of the rural sheriffs use

specialized accident investigators as a separate unit or section within their agency. In most cases, as one may expect, only the most active of agencies in the area of traffic would have such an availability. Traffic accident investigation in such circumstances can be a highly time-consuming activity and frequently requires specialized training. Data reveal that suburban sheriffs in the northeastern and western states have a higher frequency of availability along these lines than the national average. Here 23 percent and 31 percent of respondents, respectively, indicate that specialized traffic investigators are utilized.

In another area, traffic accident reporting is an activity which may be engaged in by law enforcement agencies irrespective of their size. Such reporting may be made to one or more central agencies. Four of which were included in the survey questionnaire. Of the four agencies, nationally the highest percentage of sheriffs, 71 percent of suburban and 73 percent rural indicate that they report to the state department of motor vehicles. Second most utilized is the state police or highway patrol, with 70 percent of suburban and 63 percent of rural sheriffs indicating that reports are sent to these agencies.

State traffic safety bureaus collect data from 53 percent and 46 percent of suburban and rural sheriffs, respectively, while 31 percent of suburban and 17 percent of rural respondents indicate reporting to the National Safety Council.

While the pattern of reporting to various agencies differs noticeably between geographic divisions, the overall percentage of both suburban and rural agencies which furnish such information to at least one of these organizations is relatively high throughout the country.

B. County Police Departments

Six rural and 20 suburban county police departments provided information on this section of the questionnaire.

The percentage of total available manhours which they report their officers expend on traffic control and enforcement is quite similar to that of sheriffs, with a mean of 32 percent among suburban and 40 percent among rural departments.

Ten of the 20 suburban departments and two of the six rural departments state that they maintain a separate traffic unit or section within their department. Of these ten suburban departments which do, all indicate that their personnel are deployed on the basis of traffic flow, accident analysis or some other strategy. Seven of the ten use motorcycles, six use shift plans and routinely respond to calls for service and five note that they utilize beats and routinely issue parking citations.

Of the two rural departments with separate traffic units, both say they use shift plans and deploy their personnel strategically, while only one uses motorcycles or issues parking citations routinely. In neither case do these departments use beat plans or routinely respond to calls for service.

In terms of other types of traffic accidents, 37 percent of suburban departments use specialized accident investigation units while none of the rural departments report such units.

Eighty-nine percent and 80 percent of suburban and rural departments, respectively, note that they maintain liaison with agencies responsible for highway safety engineering. Fourteen of the 20 suburban and two of the four rural departments say that they keep separate traffic accident reports in a centralized location separate from the departments law enforcement records system.

In regard to reporting procedures for traffic accident data, little suburban-rural differences are definable. Of all departments reporting, 76 percent provide such data to the state police or highway patrol, 65 percent to the state department of motor vehicles, 57 percent to the National Safety Council and 52 percent to a state traffic safety bureau.

C. Independent City Sheriffs

As is the case with patrol/investigative operations, independent city sheriffs do not maintain responsibility for traffic control and enforcement activities. These responsibilities are assigned to municipal police departments, to county sheriffs or county police departments or to state police or highway patrol.

CHAPTER XIV IDENTIFICATION

The primary objective of the investigative phase of law enforcement operations is the positive identification of the perpetrator, arrest and subsequent presentment in a court of law. Means for the positive identification of an individual are relatively limited in criminal investigations. By far, the most common method, and the one which is least subject to contradiction is the use of fingerprints.

The following section presents information on the availability of fingerprint and photographic identification among county law enforcement agencies.

A. County Sheriffs' Agencies

Of the 1,586 sheriffs in the United States providing information in this matter, 96 percent submit fingerprint cards to a state identification bureau.

With regard to the identification function 90 percent of the agencies indicate they have a photographic capability, 92 percent have a fingerprinting capability while 28 percent indicate they have a fingerprint identification capability. Twenty-two percent of the agencies indicate they have a modus operandi file capability in-house. With regard to photographic and fingerprinting capability eight percent of the agencies

indicate that the fingerprint identification function is through the state agency only. With regard to a modus operandi file capability 54 percent of the sheriffs note that it is through a state agency only, and 23 percent report that the modus operandi file capability is not available.

Of the sheriffs responding in this matter 22 percent have a fingerprint identification bureau or unit within their agency. Ninety-one percent also indicate that they have a policy to determine who is fingerprinted or photographed. Of this group 68 percent reveal that fingerprinting takes place at the time of the arrest/booking and 32 percent that fingerprints are taken sometime following the arrest/booking procedure.

Except for some of the larger sheriffs' agencies, the individual agency does not have the capability to classify fingerprints and make comparisons of prints obtained through criminal investigation. Of 1,443 sheriffs only 19 percent indicate they have a fingerprint classification and comparison capability.

Of the county sheriffs submitting information, 98 percent of suburban and 95 percent of rural state that they submit fingerprint cards to a state identification bureau. Additionally, 49 percent of suburban and 14 percent of rural county sheriffs indicate that they have a fingerprint identification bureau or unit.

B. County Police Departments

Of the 26 county police departments submitting information in this matter, all indicate that they submit fingerprint cards to a state identification bureau. These agencies note that they have a photographic and fingerprinting capability on an in-house basis and 77 percent also have an in-house fingerprint identification capability. Of these agencies, 58 percent have a modus operandi file capability in-house; while 17 percent indicate that this file capability is available only through the state; and 25 percent that the capability is not available at all.

Of these county police departments, 63 percent have a fingerprint identification bureau or unit. All county police departments responding indicate they have a policy to determine who is fingerprinted or photographed. Of this group 92 percent note that their policy is to take fingerprints at the time of the arrest/booking and eight percent sometime following the arrest/booking procedure. The capability of classifying and making fingerprint comparison is available among 64 percent of the responding county police departments.

C. Independent City Sheriffs

The independent city sheriffs participating in this study did not provide information concerning the identification function, since this function is usually handled by other law enforcement agencies within the cities.

CHAPTER XV LABORATORY SERVICES

When properly collected, handled and analyzed, physical evidence can provide some of the best concrete information for the furtherance of criminal investigations and for the determination of guilt or innocence in a court of law. In fact, the value of physical evidence which can stand on its own in court proceedings has gained ever greater importance as restrictions have increased on the manner in which evidence and convictions may be obtained.

The importance of adequate facilities and services in the conduct of criminalistics analyses cannot be over emphasized. In this respect, the following section of the report provides some insight into the nature and scope of laboratory services available to county law enforcement.

A. County Sheriffs' Agencies

A markedly few county sheriffs' agencies are equipped with an in-house criminalistics laboratory. The percentage of agencies with an in-house laboratory does, however, vary significantly among the four geographic divisions. Rural and suburban designations also affect whether or not a county agency operates its own laboratory.

Only three percent of all 1,232 rural agencies which responded to this matter have a criminalistics laboratory, while

13 percent of the 358 suburban agencies have such facilities. Fewer rural agencies in the Northeast, North Central, South and Western Divisions have their own laboratory than do suburban agencies in these respective divisions as revealed in Table XV-1.

Of the nine geographic regions, seven show fewer in-house laboratory facilities in rural as compared with suburban counties. No participating suburban agencies in the East South Central have an in-house laboratory whereas a small percentage of rural agencies utilize an in-house laboratory. Among rural agencies the percentages among the nine geographic regions remain below seven percent whereas a wider percentage spread is evident between suburban agencies. In particular, 39 percent of suburban agencies in the Pacific region report utilizing an in-house crime laboratory.

Eighty-nine percent of all county sheriffs report that they primarily use the laboratory facilities of a state agency, with three percent primarily using their own facilities. Four percent report using another local agency. Four percent also indicate primary reliance upon the F.B.I., and less than one percent of all county sheriffs rely upon another federal agency.

When allowing for a rural and suburban breakdown, ten percent of all suburban agencies in this study primarily use their own laboratory facilities compared with one percent of rural agencies. Ninety-three percent of rural county sheriffs utilize the facilities of a state agency while only 77 percent of

TABLE XV-1

COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES
IN-HOUSE CRIMINALISTICS LABORATORY CAPABILITY

	Suburban		Rural	
	Number Of Agencies	Percent	Number Of Agencies	Percent
Total	358	13	1232	3
Northeast	17	18	33	6
New England	1	--	15	7
Middle Atlantic	16	19	18	6
North Central	148	10	560	2
East North Central	108	12	220	5
West North Central	40	5	340	*
South	140	7	424	3
South Atlantic	62	14	205	4
East South Central	26	--	71	1
West South Central	52	2	148	1
West	53	36	215	6
Mountain	17	29	143	6
Pacific	36	39	72	6

* Less than one percent.

suburban agencies fall into this category. Percentages for agencies primarily utilizing the laboratory services of the F.B.I. or other federal agency do not vary according to rural and suburban designations. Table XV-2 portrays these data by geographic divisions.

Table XV-3 through Table XV-6 show the percent of sheriffs agencies that have various lab capabilities available to them on an in-house basis or through state facilities. Percentages do not add to 100 because contributing agency data was restricted to in-house or state laboratory availability.

A relatively small percentage of county sheriffs' agencies are charged by the laboratory they primarily use. Six percent of rural agencies pay for service as do seven percent of all suburban agencies. Two significant deviations from this pattern can be noted: (1) In the Western Division no suburban agencies reported paying for laboratory services; and (2) twenty-two percent of rural agencies in the Northeast pay for such services.

The mean average time between submission of evidence to the laboratory primarily utilized and receipt of results is 16 days for rural agencies and 15 days for suburban agencies. This average varies by state and rural and suburban counties as shown in Table XV-7. The average time between submission of evidence to the laboratory primarily utilized and receipt of results ranges from one to 200 days.

TABLE XV-2

LABORATORY FACILITIES PRIMARILY USED BY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES
BY SUBURBAN AND RURAL COUNTIES

Laboratory Facilities Primarily Used By Sheriffs Agencies	Percent Suburban Agencies By Division				Percent Rural Agencies By Division			
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Number Of Agencies	17	149	140	53	33	553	416	214
In-House Crime Laboratory	% 18	% 7	% 5	% 28	% --	% 1	% 2	% 2
Another Local Agency	18	11	6	6	9	2	3	2
A State Agency	47	80	84	57	73	96	93	88
Federal Bureau Of Investigation	18	2	4	9	18	1	2	8
Other Federal Agency	--	--	*	--	--	*	*	--

* Less than one percent.

TABLE XV-3

COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES' ANALYTICAL LAB CAPABILITIES
AVAILABLE ON AN IN-HOUSE BASIS OR THROUGH STATE FACILITIES

NORTHEASTERN STATES

Capability	Suburban			Rural		
	Number Of Agencies	Percent In-House	Percent Available Thru State Agency	Number Of Agencies	Percent In-House	Percent Available Thru State Agency
1) Drugs & Narcotics	17	29	65	32	38	63
2) Toxicology	17	24	71	30	10	90
3) Serology	17	24	65	30	10	87
4) Blood Alcohol	17	35	53	31	13	87
5) Documents	15	20	73	31	13	77
6) Firearms And Ammunition	16	38	50	31	10	90
7) Powder Residue	16	31	63	31	10	90
8) Toolmarks	17	29	65	31	13	84
9) Explosives	17	24	65	31	10	87
10) Hair	17	24	71	30	7	87
11) Fibers	17	24	65	30	7	90
12) Wood	16	19	69	30	7	90
13) Soil And Minerals	17	24	65	30	3	93
14) Glass	17	24	65	30	7	93
15) Metallurgy	17	18	71	30	7	93
16) Paint, Plastics, Rubbers	17	24	71	29	7	93
17) Petroleum Products	17	24	65	30	7	93
18) Trace Element Analysis	17	29	59	30	7	90
19) Footprints And Tiremarks	17	47	47	32	28	72

TABLE XV-4

COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES' ANALYTICAL LAB CAPABILITIES
AVAILABLE ON AN IN-HOUSE BASIS OR THROUGH STATE FACILITIES

NORTH CENTRAL STATES

Capability	Suburban			Rural		
	Number Of Agencies	Percent In- House	Percent Avail- able Thru State Agency	Number Of Agencies	Percent In- House	Percent Avail- able Thru State Agency
1) Drugs & Narcotics	142	23	76	542	11	88
2) Toxicology	138	5	91	523	4	94
3) Serology	135	5	90	509	1	97
4) Blood Alcohol	140	17	81	540	12	86
5) Documents	141	6	89	527	3	93
6) Firearms And Ammunition	141	9	90	534	2	97
7) Powder Residue	142	10	89	531	2	96
8) Toolmarks	142	13	86	532	4	95
9) Explosives	142	6	92	530	1	96
10) Hair	142	6	92	525	*	98
11) Fibers	142	6	92	524	*	98
12) Wood	142	5	93	523	1	97
13) Soil And Minerals	141	4	94	525	*	97
14) Glass	141	4	94	521	1	96
15) Metallurgy	142	5	92	517	1	95
16) Paint, Plastics, Rubbers	141	5	91	527	*	97
17) Petroleum Products	142	4	92	523	*	96
18) Trace Element Analysis	142	8	89	520	1	96
19) Footprints And Tiremarks	143	20	78	536	13	86

* Less than one percent.

TABLE XV-5

COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES' ANALYTICAL LAB CAPABILITIES
AVAILABLE ON AN IN-HOUSE BASIS OR THROUGH STATE FACILITIES
SOUTHERN STATES

Capability	Suburban			Rural		
	Number Of Agencies	Percent In-House	Percent Avail-able Thru State Agency	Number Of Agencies	Percent In-House	Percent Avail-able Thru State Agency
1) Drugs & Narcotics	138	10	89	419	5	94
2) Toxicology	135	5	89	397	2	95
3) Serology	131	6	89	391	1	96
4) Blood Alcohol	137	14	83	415	13	85
5) Documents	135	8	88	398	3	93
6) Firearms And Ammunition	135	8	89	411	4	95
7) Powder Residue	135	10	86	410	3	95
8) Toolmarks	134	10	87	407	4	94
9) Explosives	134	5	87	406	*	96
10) Hair	134	6	89	412	1	96
11) Fibers	133	5	89	410	1	96
12) Wood	133	5	89	408	--	95
13) Soil And Minerals	133	4	88	412	1	95
14) Glass	133	5	86	406	*	95
15) Metallurgy	131	3	89	399	1	94
16) Paint, Plastics, Rubbers	133	3	87	404	1	95
17) Petroleum Products	132	4	89	400	1	95
18) Trace Elements Analysis	133	4	89	402	1	95
19) Footprints And Tiremarks	135	22	75	414	10	89

* Less than one percent.

TABLE XV-6

COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES' ANALYTICAL LAB CAPABILITIES
AVAILABLE ON AN IN-HOUSE BASIS OR THROUGH STATE FACILITIES

WESTERN STATES

Capability	Suburban			Rural		
	Number Of Agencies	Percent In- House	Percent Avail- able Thru State Agency	Number Of Agencies	Percent In- House	Percent Avail- able Thru State Agency
1) Drugs & Narcotics	52	46	52	211	15	84
2) Toxicology	52	29	60	201	3	94
3) Serology	51	27	67	198	3	93
4) Blood Alcohol	50	32	62	208	13	85
5) Documents	53	34	58	202	4	84
6) Firearms And Ammunition	52	33	58	206	5	81
7) Powder Residue	52	38	50	207	6	80
8) Toolmarks	52	35	56	206	7	78
9) Explosives	52	25	58	203	5	76
10) Hair	52	25	63	208	1	85
11) Fibers	52	25	63	204	1	85
12) Wood	52	21	67	205	1	85
13) Soil And Minerals	52	23	67	204	2	84
14) Glass	52	23	65	206	2	83
15) Metallurgy	52	15	63	202	1	82
16) Paint, Plastics, Rubbers	52	25	65	204	1	82
17) Petroleum Products	52	23	67	203	1	83
18) Trace Elements Analysis	52	27	60	202	1	81
19) Footprints And Tiremarks	53	57	40	205	18	70

TABLE XV-7

AVERAGE TIME BETWEEN SUBMISSION OF EVIDENCE TO THE
LABORATORY PRIMARILY USED AND RECEIPT OF RESULTS, BY STATE

State	All Counties		Suburban		Rural	
	Number Of Agencies	Avg. Days Between Submission Of Evidence & Receipt Of Results	Number Of Agencies	Avg. Days Between Submission Of Evidence & Receipt Of Results	Number Of Agencies	Avg. Days Between Submission Of Evidence & Receipt Of Results
Alabama	23	11	9	14	14	9
Arizona	10	10	1	7	9	10
Arkansas	23	16	4	15	19	16
California	42	8	19	7	23	8
Colorado	38	31	6	49	32	28
Connecticut*	--	--	--	--	--	--
Delaware*	--	--	--	--	--	--
Florida	48	27	22	23	26	30
Georgia	55	29	11	15	48	16
Hawaii*	--	--	--	--	--	--
Idaho	29	19	--	--	24	19
Illinois	67	14	16	13	51	15
Indiana	56	18	23	16	33	20
Iowa	60	10	6	7	54	11
Kansas	65	16	6	7	59	16
Kentucky	15	16	3	30	12	13
Louisiana	38	11	10	14	28	10
Maine	8	12	1	14	7	11
Maryland	8	16	2	12	6	17
Massachusetts*	--	--	--	--	--	--
Michigan	73	9	23	10	50	8
Minnesota	75	11	12	10	63	11
Mississippi	24	28	1	8	23	29
Missouri	41	17	9	7	32	20
Montana	24	20	1	10	23	21
Nebraska	49	9	3	16	46	8
Nevada	7	4	1	2	6	5
New Hampshire	5	9	--	--	5	9
New Jersey*	--	--	--	--	--	--
New Mexico	15	14	1	8	14	15
New York	31	19	15	18	16	20
North Carolina	58	16	10	13	48	16
North Dakota	29	8	--	--	29	8
Ohio	67	9	30	11	37	7
Oklahoma	25	20	7	10	18	23
Oregon	31	9	6	9	25	8

TABLE XV-7 (Continued)

State	All Counties		Suburban		Rural	
	Number Of Agencies	Avg. Days Between Submission Of Evidence & Receipt Of Results	Number Of Agencies	Avg. Days Between Submission Of Evidence & Receipt Of Results	Number Of Agencies	Avg. Days Between Submission Of Evidence & Receipt Of Results
Pennsylvania*	--	--	--	--	--	--
Rhode Island*	--	--	--	--	--	--
South Carolina	28	8	5	9	23	8
South Dakota	34	12	1	7	33	13
Tennessee	24	12	10	9	14	14
Texas	90	23	23	26	67	22
Utah	15	24	3	13	12	27
Vermont	2	45	--	--	2	45
Virginia	38	18	7	15	31	19
Washington	25	18	8	23	17	15
West Virginia	16	24	2	48	14	21
Wisconsin	41	19	8	15	33	19
Wyoming	13	13	--	--	13	13

*Not Applicable

County sheriffs favorably rated the capabilities of the laboratory primarily used by their agency. Nationally, 47 percent rated the laboratory facilities as "excellent", 41 percent "good", ten percent "only adequate" and one percent rated the laboratory as "inadequate". While these percentages vary somewhat between rural and suburban agencies and geographic divisions, the ratings are nearly always favorable.

Twenty-seven percent of the 1,558 county sheriffs responding to this matter indicate that they are required by law, regulation or departmental policy to submit evidence to a state laboratory. Nineteen percent of county sheriffs in the Western Division, 22 percent in the Northeast, 25 percent in the North Central Division and 35 percent in the South have such requirements.

Suburban sheriffs' agencies utilize mobile crime labs more frequently than do rural agencies. This is evident in the Northeast, North Central, South and Western geographic Divisions (See Table XV-8). The most striking feature revealed in Table XV-8 is the 42 percent of suburban agencies in the Western Division which report they utilize a mobile crime lab. Within this same division, it is also significant to note that 59 percent of the suburban counties in the Mountain region have their own mobile crime lab. Of the rural agencies responding to this matter, the New England, Middle Atlantic and East South Central regions show no mobile crime labs in use.

TABLE XV-8

COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES UTILIZING
A MOBILE CRIME LABORATORY

	Suburban		Rural	
	Number Of Agencies	Percent	Number Of Agencies	Percent
Total	359	21	1228	3
Northeast States	17	12	33	--
New England States	1	--	15	--
Middle Atlantic States	16	13	18	--
North Central States	149	19	560	3
East North Central States	109	16	220	6
West North Central States	40	30	340	1
Southern States	140	17	420	4
South Atlantic States	62	31	205	6
East South Central States	26	12	70	--
West South Central States	52	4	145	2
Western States	53	42	215	5
Mountain States	17	59	143	5
Pacific	36	33	72	4

B. County Police Departments

Four of the twenty-seven county police departments responding to this matter indicated that they have their own in-house criminalistics laboratory. (See Table XV-9.)

Seventeen county police departments primarily utilize the laboratory facilities of a state agency; four primarily use their own in-house crime laboratory; three utilize another local agency; and three primarily utilize the laboratory services of the F.B.I.

Only one county police department reported being charged by the laboratory it primarily used.

The mean average time between submission of evidence to the laboratory primarily used and receipt of results is 18 days. The number of days between the submission of evidence and receipt of results ranges from one to 90 days as reported by 25 county police departments.

Eight county police departments are required by law, regulation or departmental policy to submit evidence to a state laboratory. Nineteen departments indicate that they did not have such requirements.

Fifteen county police departments rate the capabilities of the laboratory primarily used as "excellent"; 11 departments rate the facilities as "good"; and one department rated the capabilities of the laboratory primarily used as "only adequate".

TABLE XV-9

COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENTS' ANALYTICAL LAB CAPABILITIES
AVAILABLE ON AN IN-HOUSE BASIS OR THROUGH STATE FACILITIES

Capability	Number Of Agencies	Percent In- House	Available Thru State Agency	Not Available Thru Either In-House Or State Lab
1) Drugs & Narcotics	27	18	74	7
2) Toxicology	27	7	85	7
3) Serology	27	7	81	11
4) Blood Alcohol	27	7	85	7
5) Documents	27	7	74	18
6) Firearms And Ammunition	27	11	70	18
7) Powder Residue	27	22	63	15
8) Toolmarks	27	18	63	18
9) Explosives	27	7	78	15
10) Hair	27	7	78	15
11) Fibers	27	7	78	18
12) Wood	27	4	74	22
13) Soil And Minerals	27	7	74	18
14) Glass	27	7	74	18
15) Metallurgy	27	4	70	26
16) Paint, Plastics, Rubbers	27	7	74	18
17) Petroleum Products	27	4	74	22
18) Trace Element Analysis	27	7	74	18
19) Footprints And Tiremarks	27	18	63	18

Of the 27 county police departments responding to this matter, 14 indicate that they have a mobile crime laboratory.

C. Independent City Sheriffs

The independent city sheriffs who participated in this study indicate they do not have crime laboratory capabilities.

CHAPTER XVI LAW ENFORCEMENT COMMUNICATIONS

The ability to communicate is of great importance in any field of endeavor. Communications capability in law enforcement is vital to the ability of the agency to function. Through the communications function the agency receiving information relating to law enforcement matters, deploys personnel and maintains a flow of information within the agency; and, between agencies at various levels of government.

Information collected in this study concerning law enforcement communications is relative to those agencies which have a centralized communications center servicing the patrol and/or investigative functions.

A. County Sheriffs' Agencies

Nationally, 91 percent of the 1,544 sheriffs providing information have centralized communications servicing the patrol and investigative functions in their agencies. Of the suburban county sheriffs 96 percent indicate having such capability and 89 percent of the rural sheriffs also report having a centralized communications center.

In regard to the number of telephone trunks utilized in the communications centers, the national average is five telephone

trunks while the suburban sheriffs average seven and the rural sheriffs average four.

Some 570 county sheriffs in the United States indicate they utilize a central emergency telephone number within their agencies. Of this group 301 county sheriffs advise that their emergency phone number is centralized with the fire department, 148 of these being suburban counties and 56 rural counties. There are 236 county sheriffs who have a centralized emergency phone number linked to the local civil defense organization, and of these agencies 58 are suburban counties and 178 are rural counties.

Based on information furnished in this study there are 47 suburban county sheriffs and 116 rural county sheriffs who utilize a standardized "911" emergency phone number.

Table XVI-1, provides information concerning the percent of agencies with centralized communications which use an emergency phone number and the percent of those agencies which use the "911" telephone number.

Information was collected in this study relative to the radio communications link capabilities of county law enforcement agencies. Of 1,374 sheriffs throughout the nation 89 percent indicate they have a radio communications link with the state police or highway patrol, 96 percent with local townships and cities, 69 percent with civil defense organizations and 72 percent with local fire departments. There are 407 county sheriffs who indicate they have other radio link capabilities with various agencies which include the federal forestry service, rescue squad

TABLE XVI-1

PERCENT OF COUNTY SHERIFFS' AGENCIES
WITH CENTRALIZED COMMUNICATIONS CENTER SERVICING
PATROL AND/OR INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTIONS WHICH UTILIZE
A CENTRALIZED EMERGENCY TELEPHONE NUMBER

Agency Personnel Size	Number Of Agencies	Percent Of Agencies With Centralized Communications	Number Of Agencies With Emergency Telephone Number	Percent Of Agencies Using 911 Number
1 - 3	118	71	26	12
4 - 6	212	83	74	18
7 - 10	256	93	106	24
11 - 20	389	92	141	28
21 - 50	315	95	123	37
51 - 100	117	98	49	29
101 - 300	99	97	55	31
301 - 500	21	95	10	30
501 - 1000	15	93	9	11
1001 - Over	4	100	1	0

and ambulance services, federal agencies and central police radio networks. Of the 339 suburban county sheriffs' agencies, 86 percent note a radio communications link with the state police or highway patrol, 96 percent with local townships and cities, 77 percent with the civil defense organizations and 67 percent with local fire departments. Rural county sheriffs indicate that they maintain radio communications link capabilities with other agencies in a large percentage of cases. Ninety-one percent report, for example, that they have communications links with state police or highway patrol, 96 percent with local townships and cities, 66 percent with civil defense organizations and 74 percent with local fire departments.

There were more than 1,300 county sheriffs furnishing information relative to centralized law enforcement communications of which 80 percent indicate that their communications/dispatch unit compiles complaint cards on calls for service. Of this number 100 percent record the time the complaint was received, 95 percent the nature of the complaint, 90 percent the time a unit was dispatched, 89 percent the time the unit arrived at the scene and 85 percent record the time the unit was back in service. Some 84 percent of these agencies also note that the complaint card carries information relative to the status of reports required.

Eighty-nine percent of 328 suburban county sheriffs indicate that their communications/dispatch unit compiles complaint cards on calls for service, while 77 percent of the 992 rural county

sheriffs report that such a procedure is utilized.

Of the 1,300 agencies which furnished information in this matter, 78 percent advise that they have the ability to provide historical data on telephone calls received and radio transmissions.

Only 32 percent of the sheriffs indicate they utilize recording equipment in obtaining and maintaining this historical data. It is assumed that a majority of the agencies having this capability rely on a typed or handwritten log. It is interesting to note that 59 percent of the suburban sheriffs indicate they use recording equipment. It is logical to assume that the larger suburban agencies have both the need and the financial ability to utilize recording equipment while the rural agencies, especially those that are smaller, do not have the urgent need and/or the financial capability to obtain such equipment.

Of the suburban county sheriffs responding, 62 percent advise that they use priority response codes when dispatching units to calls for service while 50 percent of the rural county sheriffs indicate they use such codes.

Nationally, both suburban and rural sheriffs utilize an average of two radio channels for law enforcement communications. There are 763 county sheriffs in the United States which report that they also have separate tactical radio frequencies available. Of this number of agencies the average is two such

frequencies available.

Efforts were made in this study to determine the extent of use by county law enforcement agencies of mobile digital terminals linked to a computer system within their agency. The mobile digital terminal in a patrol vehicle or other mobile unit provides the user with the ability to make inquiries against certain operational files as well as the ability of central communications to transmit to the operating unit via the mobile digital terminal. There are 54 sheriffs in the United States who indicate that they have mobile digital terminals in operation in their agency, with an average of 12 such terminals per agency. It is noted that one county sheriff's office in the state of Florida has 65 mobile digital terminals which are transferable between various motorized units.

Information furnished by 1,383 sheriffs indicate that 79 percent monitor burglary/robbery alarm systems in their communications center. Of this group 85 percent of suburban and 79 percent of rural agencies conduct such monitoring.

B. County Police Departments

All 25 county police departments contributing to this portion of the study have centralized communications servicing the patrol/investigative functions. These departments average 14 telephone trunks utilized in the communications center and 63 percent advise that they utilize an emergency telephone number. Of this group, 96 percent indicate they have the ability to

provide historical data on communications and 88 percent utilize recording equipment. Sixty percent of the county police departments represented indicate they use priority response codes in dispatching units for service. These agencies average three radio channels for normal law enforcement communications and have available an average of three channels for tactical use.

Of the county police departments reporting, 12 percent indicate they have mobile digital terminal capability and 80 percent advise that they monitor burglary/robbery alarm systems in their communications center.

C. Independent City Sheriffs

The independent city sheriffs' agencies participating in this study do not maintain a centralized communications center servicing the primary patrol/investigative functions. Communications data were not collected from these agencies.

CHAPTER XVII JAILS/CORRECTIONS

Operation and administration of county jails together with law enforcement and court services functions on the county level have historically been the responsibility of the county sheriff.

In recent times however, local jails have more often been considered part of the broader correctional system rather than as simply short-term holding facilities for misdemeanants and lower felons. Consequently, county jails have been the target for increased security and various change movements. Facilities, programs and administrative practices and procedures have been subject to review and experimentation.

One result has been the development of a generally diverse network of local jails. Unfortunately, there has been very limited general information regarding the composition and nature of these jails on a national basis.

The responses of a large percentage of the country's sheriffs in this survey provide a needed and comprehensive view of the status of those local jails.

A. County Sheriffs' Agencies

Table XVII-1 reveals that county sheriffs operate the primary county jail in nearly 90 percent of all cases whether in suburban or rural counties. In the remainder of cases, depending upon constitutional or statutory authority, the county

TABLE XVII-1

PERCENT OF COUNTY SHERIFFS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE OPERATION OF THE COUNTY JAIL, AND THE USE OF THEIR AGENCIES FOR PRIMARY JAIL OPERATION, BY NATION AND GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION

	Percent National By Suburban And Rural		Percent Suburban By Division				Percent Rural By Division			
	9	8	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Number of Agencies	439	1390	58	154	169	58	71	594	502	223
Sheriffs Which Operate A County Jail	89	88	69	96	88	91	68	89	87	93
Agency Operating Jail In Lieu of Sheriff										
Number of Agencies	48	167	18	6	20	5	23	65	65	16
Of These, Percent That	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1) Board of County Commissioners	57	15	67	33	55	60	39	0	26	0
2) Different County Jail	6	44	0	0	15	0	9	78	17	75
3) Regional Corrections Agency	4	6	0	17	5	0	0	3	12	0
4) Municipal Corrections Agency	4	5	0	17	5	0	4	5	3	19
5) State Department of Corrections	4	6	11	0	0	0	43	0	1	0
6) Other Agency	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0

sheriff may not be responsible for the county jail. Where the authority does not exist for its operation a number of situations may preclude the sheriffs' responsibility for the jail. For example, the jail may have been closed by court order; a regional jail or the jail of another county may be utilized; or passage of a local option may have placed jail responsibilities in the hands of an independent administrator or county department of corrections.

1. Responsibility for jail operations. Table XVII-1 provides some information on the incidence of jail operation by the county sheriff, and where the sheriff is not responsible, these data indicate the percentage of cases in which other agencies have assumed this responsibility.

It is interesting to note that in many cases where administrative responsibility for jail operations has been transferred to another agency, the legal authority and responsibility for jail operations and security remain with the sheriff as the country's primary law enforcement officer.

A significant difference exists in the Northeastern Division of the country where about 70 percent of the jails are operated by the sheriff. Where the sheriff does not operate the jail, most typically the responsibility rests with a separate board of commissioners in the case of suburban counties, and with

either a board of commissioners or the state department of corrections in the case of rural counties.

Nationally, of all alternate forms of responsibility where the sheriff does not operate the jail, the board of commissioners is most frequently noted by suburban agencies, and the use of a different county jail by rural departments.

Alternate county jails are more commonly used in rural counties of the north central and western United States.

Responsibility for jail operations goes to regional corrections agencies more often in suburban counties of the Northeast and rural southern counties while municipal agencies are more often used for this purpose in the suburban Northeast and rural western states.

Control by state departments of corrections is more common in the rural northeastern counties of the nation where sheriffs do not operate the jail.

2. Jail facilities. The actual location of jail facilities may vary depending on such factors as inmate capacity or the assignment of other law enforcement functions to the sheriff.

Eighty-five percent of rural sheriffs and 89 percent of suburban sheriffs responding to the survey indicate that their jail is located in the sheriff's building. This is most

common among rural sheriffs in the North Central and Western Divisions where 91 percent and 93 percent respectively provide this response.

In addition to the primary jail, the sheriff may operate one or more other facilities which may be used primarily as additional jails, as centers which are oriented to various program needs, or as individual units for segregating various categories of inmates.

Data reveal that the most prevalent of all forms of additional facilities are temporary lock-ups or holding facilities. Approximately one-third of 1,530 sheriffs responding state that they utilize such lock-ups separately from the primary jail. This is the case in both suburban and rural agencies with little significant differences between geographic divisions of the country.

Nationally, the second most prevalent additional facility is the satellite jail located separately from the primary jail and typically in outlying areas of the county. Thirteen percent of suburban and five percent of rural county sheriffs report that they operate satellite jails.

A disproportionately high percentage of sheriffs in western states use satellite jails, in many cases due to the large size of many western counties and consequent longer travel time. Here, 38 percent of suburban sheriffs and 17 percent of rural sheriffs responding to the questionnaire

note the use of satellite jail facilities. Other than the western sheriffs, only suburban sheriffs in the northeastern United States show a significant use of satellite jails with 19 percent of sheriffs in this area indicating their use.

The prison farm is the only other type of facility which has any noticeable usage. Ten percent of the 439 suburban and only one percent of all 1,390 rural sheriffs reporting note the operation of a prison farm. These are most commonly reported by the suburban county sheriffs in the Northeast and West where 22 percent and 43 percent respectively indicate their usage.

When asked if they utilize state road camps or public work camps, not more than one percent of all sheriffs noted these availabilities.

In addition to these facilities, 87 agencies, or about six percent of all respondents, states that they maintain other types of facilities for programmatic or related purposes.

As reported by these 87 agencies, the most prevalent other facility is a center for work release. Seventy-six percent of rural and 61 percent of suburban agencies in this group indicate the use of such centers, while 27 percent and 22 percent of suburban and rural sheriffs respectively note the availability of separate juvenile facilities. Less prevalent among this group is the availability of half way houses which were cited by four of the 41 suburban agencies and only one of the 46 rural sheriffs.

The construction of new jail facilities was also a subject which was explored in the survey questionnaire. Nationally, 332 suburban and 1,194 rural sheriffs provided information on this subject.

Table XVII-2 provides a summary of data on the percentage of sheriffs' agencies with new jail facilities under construction and those which indicate that capital funds have been approved for construction within the next five years. Table XVII-2 also presents the mean number of inmate beds that will be added by the construction, the mean total cost of the construction, and an average of construction cost per inmate bed.

Nationally, these data reveal that 13 percent of suburban and seven percent of rural agencies currently have new jail construction underway. An additional nine percent and eight percent of suburban and rural sheriffs respectively note that capital funds have been approved for construction.

The mean number of inmate beds that will be added by these construction projects is substantially higher in suburban counties. However, the cost per additional inmate bed is only slightly higher in suburban than in rural counties -- or about \$54,000 in suburban as compared with approximately \$52,000 in rural counties.

Among suburban sheriffs in the four geographic divisions, the West shows the highest percentage of new construction as

TABLE XVII-2

PERCENT OF SHERIFFS' AGENCIES WITH NEW JAILS UNDER CONSTRUCTION OR CAPITAL FUNDS APPROVED FOR CONSTRUCTION; MEAN NUMBER OF BEDS ADDED, MEAN TOTAL COST, AND MEAN COST PER INMATE OR NEW CONSTRUCTION, BY NATIONAL AND GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION

	National By Suburban And Rural		Suburban Agencies By Division				Rural Agencies By Division			
	9	8	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Number Of Agencies	332	1114	37	130	126	39	43	488	391	192
Percent Of Agencies With New Jail Under Construction	% 13	% 7	% 3	% 11	% 14	% 25	% 8	% 6	% 7	% 7
Percent Of Agencies With Capital Funds Approved For Construction	9	8	11	6	9	18	9	7	7	15
Mean Number Of Beds Added By New Construction	169	25	115	244	138	144	29	21	31	24
Mean Total Cost Of New Construction (In 1,000's Of Dollars)	9068	1294	8997	17413	5256	5441	1391	1157	1134	1688
Mean Cost Per In- Mate Bed Based On New Construction (In 1,000's Of Dollars)	53.7	51.8	78.2	71.4	38.1	37.8	48.0	55.1	36.6	70.3

well as the highest percentage of agencies in which capital funds have been approved for construction. While the Northeast reveals the lowest rate of new construction, it is second highest among the four geographic divisions in approved funding projects.

Again, among suburban agencies, the largest construction efforts based on added bed space are in the Northcentral Division with an average of 244 inmate beds being added per construction project.

The highest mean cost of construction among suburban agencies is in the northeastern United States even though it has the lowest percentage of projects underway. The lowest construction costs are in the West where the mean expenditure per inmate bed is \$37,800. The West also indicates the highest rate of new jail construction.

Among rural counties there is less contrast in the rate of new construction between geographic divisions even though rural western sheriffs, as their suburban counterparts, report a higher mean rate of approved construction projects over the next five years.

The largest construction projects among rural sheriffs appear to be in the southern and northeastern counties of the nation where the average number of additional beds added is about 30 per agency.

Unlike suburban sheriffs the highest reported mean cost of construction among rural sheriffs is in the western states which average \$70,300 per additional inmate bed. The lowest construction cost is in the South which reports an average of \$36,600 per inmate bed.

In addition, other data provided reveal that additional bed space was added to jail facilities in 11 percent of all suburban jails and seven percent of rural jails during 1977. This was the result of measures taken by the sheriffs other than actual construction, such as increasing the rate of inmates per cell or utilizing jail space in alternative ways to accommodate more inmates.

3. Inmate population. Table XVII-3 provides information on the design capacity of jails as well as the number and composition of inmates incarcerated as reported by sheriffs in the survey sample.

The 372 suburban sheriffs reporting indicate a total of 65,235 inmates while 1,131 rural sheriffs report 18,826 inmates under incarceration at the time the survey instrument was completed.

Nationally, these data indicate that suburban sheriffs' jails are on average designed to hold 182 inmates while rural jails have an average design capacity of 34 inmates.

TABLE XVII-3

MEAN NUMBER OF INMATES WHICH JAILS ARE DESIGNED TO HOLD,
MEAN NUMBER OF INMATES UNDER INCARCERATION AND PERCENT
COMPOSITION OF INMATE POPULATION, BY NATIONAL AND
GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION

	National By Suburban And Rural		Suburban Agencies By Division				Rural Agencies By Division			
	9	8	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Number Of Agencies	372	1131	35	141	143	53	44	504	390	193
Mean Number Of In- mates Jail Designed To Hold	182	34	146	121	141	496	49	25	40	39
Mean Number Of In- mates Under Incar- ceration	187	17	132	116	144	547	27	11	21	21
Percent Composition Of Inmate Population:	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1) Pre-trial	48	33	47	50	50	45	30	34	36	28
2) Awaiting Sentencing	6	12	6	10	7	4	11	13	12	13
3) Serving Sentence	35	39	38	27	24	46	48	41	29	50
4) On Appeal	1	1	1	1	3	0	1	1	3	0
5) Awaiting Extra- dition	1	2	0	1	1	0	1	2	2	2
6) Awaiting Trans- fer To State	5	7	4	4	12	1	2	4	12	3
7) Other	4	5	3	7	4	3	7	5	6	3

Suburban jails, on a national average, maintain an inmate population which is just above their rated capacity while rural agencies average only half their rated capacity.

Nationally, the composition of the inmate populations among responding sheriffs varies somewhat by rural and suburban agency. Among the nations' suburban agencies, nearly half of all those incarcerated are in a pre-trial status and just over one-third are serving sentences. The remainder fall into such categories as those awaiting sentencing, on appeal, awaiting extradition or transfer to the state corrections system or in some other miscellaneous confinement status.

This compares with one-third of inmates on a pre-trial status and nearly 40 percent serving sentences in rural sheriffs' jails.

Suburban sheriffs show some dissimilarities in inmate capacity as well as the mean number of inmates incarcerated. Suburban sheriffs in the North Central United States indicate the smallest average jail capacity at 121 inmates while the West indicates the highest average capacity at 496 inmates.

It should be noted however, that the western average in both rated inmate capacity and actual number of inmates is skewed upward by virtue of the extremely large correctional system in Los Angeles County, California, and, by the smaller number of suburban sheriffs in this geographic division.

In addition to the suburban Western Division the southern suburban sheriffs indicate an average inmate population which is slightly higher than their jails' rated capacity.

In terms of inmate composition among suburban sheriffs, individual geographic patterns quite clearly resemble the overall national picture for suburban sheriffs, with the exception of inmates serving sentences. In this case, the North Central and Southern Divisions are somewhat lower and the Northeastern and Western Divisions somewhat higher in the percentage of inmates in this status.

Among rural sheriffs, those in the Northeast indicate the highest average rated capacity for jails of 49 inmates and the North Central with the lowest or about 25 inmates. In no division among rural sheriffs does the average number of inmates under incarceration exceed the average rated inmate capacity of the jail. This is not to say that overcrowded situations do not exist in some circumstances, but only that average capacity and average inmate populations do not exceed one another. A close examination of jail overcrowding will be made later in this section.

Rural sheriffs reveal some differences in regard to the percentage of inmates serving sentences. The Western Division shows the highest or an average of 50 percent of its total inmates serving sentences, and the South the lowest average of 29 percent of all inmates.

The Southern Division, in both rural and suburban classifications, also indicates the highest average percentage of inmates awaiting transfer to the state correctional system. At 12 percent of their average total inmate populations, this is nearly two and one-half times the national average for rural sheriffs' jails.

In regard to jail overcrowding, a specific effort was made to identify the extent and level of overcrowding among reporting sheriffs. In particular, analyses were made between information on the design capacity of county jails as compared with reported inmate population. Where reported population exceeded the designed capacity, an overcrowded situation was deemed to exist. Where an overcrowded situation was identified, the degree of overcrowding was also established through further analysis of inmate population size as compared with design capacity of the jail.

Data was provided in this area by 1,221 rural and 390 suburban county sheriffs. On the national level, suburban sheriffs reported overcrowded conditions in 18 percent of all cases while rural sheriffs reported overcrowding in only four percent of all jails. In both suburban and rural departments the median percentage overcrowding was about 28 percent over the jails' rated capacity.

When these figures are correlated with reported jail construction which is currently underway, it is found that there

is a substantially higher rate of new construction in comparison with the number of reported overcrowdings among suburban sheriffs than among rural sheriffs. In suburban counties there is a 27 percent rate of new construction based on the number of overcrowded jails as opposed to 13 percent similar rate in rural counties.

Further analysis reveals a rather sharp contrast between the overcrowding conditions among the four geographic divisions of the country.

The Southern Division of the nation in particular reveals the more frequent and more serious overcrowded facilities. Of all 125 reported overcrowdings nationally, fully 46 percent are found in suburban and rural counties in the southern United States. Twenty-eight agencies or 19 percent of suburban sheriffs and 29 agencies or seven percent of rural agencies in the South report overcrowding. The median percent overcrowding among rural southern sheriffs is also the highest in the nation, falling at the 40 percent level.

The second largest number of overcrowded jails occurs in the northeastern United States where 17 of 148 suburban agencies and 16 of 530 rural agencies report overcrowding. The West, with 17 of 53 suburban agencies and six of 207 rural agencies noting overcrowded jails is third nationally, while the Northeast reveals the fewest such situations with eight of 40

suburban and four of 48 rural agencies experiencing overcrowded conditions.

Several other areas of information can be presented in regard to jail inmate populations. The first of these involves the segregation of inmate populations according to such basic criteria as age, pre-trial/post-trial status and medical or physical problems.

Along these lines, a clear majority of 96 percent of all respondents segregate inmates by age. Generally this means the segregation of adults from juveniles.

Additionally, 79 percent of suburban and 70 percent of rural sheriffs segregate according to medical or physical problems of inmates. The only significant difference from this national average is among suburban agencies in the West where 96 percent engage in this practice.

A lesser percentage of the nations' jails are capable of segregation on the basis of pre-trial/post-trial status. Forty-six percent of suburban and 35 percent of rural sheriffs state that this practice is followed. Geographically, suburban sheriffs in the Northeast report an 82 percent incidence in trial status segregation as do 73 percent of rural sheriffs in the same division. This practice is also more prevalent in the suburban western counties where 60 percent of sheriffs segregate inmates in this manner.

In addition to practices and policies associated with inmate segregation, the costs of incarceration were ascertained on the basis of a daily per diem rate. Per diem inmate costs are commonly available to jail administrators since they are frequently used to recoup costs incurred in housing inmates from other institutions or jurisdictions. Typically these costs are based on total annual jail budgets excluding capital improvements, and pro rated by inmate day based on total inmate days served during a given year.

Rounding to the nearest dollar, the mean daily cost to house jail inmates on a national level is \$13.00 for suburban and \$9.00 for rural jails.

Among suburban jails, those in the Northeast report the highest daily costs at \$24.00, followed by the West at \$17.00 per day, the North Central Division which indicates a cost of \$13.00, and the South with a \$10.00 mean per diem.

Rural sheriffs' jails in the Northeast are again the highest in the four geographic divisions, reporting a mean of \$19.00 per inmate day. Then follows the West at about \$10.00, the North Central Division at \$9.00 and the South with the lowest average of \$8.00 per inmate day.

As noted, per diem costs are frequently employed in regaining monies for housing inmates from state institutions. Thirty-seven percent of all suburban and 27 percent of all

rural agencies report that they in fact house state prisoners. Little significant variation from this rate exists between agencies in suburban and rural areas or among the four geographic divisions. The average number of state inmates housed in county jails, however, varies substantially. Suburban and rural southern jails and suburban western jails house the largest average number.

In regard to inmate populations, data was collected in relation to inmate escapes during calendar year 1976. In all, 31 percent of the 1,548 county sheriffs providing data in this area of inquiry reported a total of 1,717 inmate escapes.

Thirty-nine percent of suburban jails reported 920 of the total inmate escapes while 29 percent of rural jails indicated escapes totalling 797 prisoners. A slightly higher percentage of jails in both suburban and rural southern counties, 42 percent and 38 percent respectively, reported escapes. This is also the case in suburban jails of the western states where 62 percent of the 53 agencies reporting indicated escapes during 1976.

The rural southern jails and suburban western jails also accounted for the largest overall percentage of all escapes reported. Specifically, 38 percent of the 407 southern rural jails accounted for 444 of the total reported escapes while 33 western suburban jails reported 537 escapes.

It is important to recognize in respect to these data that the largest majority of escapes occur at minimum security facilities or in program or work activities outside institutions where they are classified as "walk-aways". Escapes from maximum or medium security facilities such as the primary county jail are relatively uncommon in terms of total reported escapes.

4. Jail Capabilities. Jail "capabilities" are generically incorporated in this section as availabilities in terms of personnel, inmate programs, medical treatment as well as the availability of various forms of assistance from state agencies.

One of the primary concerns of sheriffs responsible for jail administration is the provision of adequate staffing for security, supervision and programming. Data was provided through the survey questionnaire from 330 suburban and 918 rural sheriffs on the subject of jail staffing levels.

Table XVII-4 presents these data in terms of the average number and average rate of full-time jail/correctional employees according to ten gradations of inmate population size, and in respect to the four geographic divisions.

Of all counties responding, suburban departments average three correctional employees for every ten inmates while rural jails average four employees for every ten inmates. Among the four geographic divisions, the northeastern counties reveal a noticeably higher rate of correctional employees with an

TABLE XVII-4

AVERAGE NUMBER AND AVERAGE RATE PER INMATE OF FULL TIME
JAIL/CORRECTIONS EMPLOYEES BY NUMBER OF INMATES, BY SUBURBAN
AND RURAL AGENCY AND NATIONAL AND GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION

Number Of Inmates	Number Of Agencies		Full Time Jail/Corrections Employees			
			Average Number		Avg Rate Per Inmate	
	9	8	9	8	9	8
0 - 3	8	168	3.0	1.3	1.2	0.6
4 - 6	9	141	2.1	2.5	0.4	0.5
7 - 10	6	129	1.6	4.2	0.2	0.5
11 - 20	41	228	4.4	4.1	0.3	0.2
21 - 50	77	190	9.0	6.7	0.2	0.2
51 - 100	71	47	18.4	14.4	0.2	0.2
101 - 300	74	13	51.2	19.6	0.2	0.1
301 - 500	19	1	149.2	71.0	0.3	0.1
501 - 1000	15	1	182.4	--	0.2	--
1000 - Over	10	0	522.4	--	0.2	--
All Counties	330	918	50.9	4.7	0.3	0.4
<hr/>						
Geographic Division						
Northeast	36	46	65.1	11.5	0.5	0.5
North Central	125	379	35.1	3.9	0.2	0.4
South	124	331	30.9	4.1	0.2	0.3
West	45	162	138.7	5.8	0.2	0.3

average of one for every two inmates in both suburban and rural jails. The lowest employee-inmate ratios, on the other hand, are evident in suburban jails of the North Central, Southern and Western Divisions.

Data displayed by inmate population size reveals a generally lower rate of jail employees among rural counties as the size of the inmate population increases. This trend is not apparent in the data presented for suburban county jails where a rate of between two and three correctional employees for every ten inmates remains relatively constant.

The size of jail/correctional staffs is of course greatly dependent upon the number of inmates housed by the institution. However, staff size as well as the nature of staff responsibilities varies in accordance with the number and nature of programs and services provided to inmates.

With regard to services, jail medical treatment availabilities are among the most significant. These may be provided in one or more ways, several of which were explored through the survey questionnaire. Nationally, among both suburban and rural sheriffs the most prominent service is the utilization of a physician on-call during fixed hours. Seventy-eight percent of suburban and 74 percent of rural agencies indicate the use of this practice.

Sixty percent of suburban and 53 percent of rural jails also utilize local hospital emergency rooms and out-patient treatment facilities when necessary.

A visiting physician and/or nurse is used during fixed hours by about 56 percent of all suburban sheriffs while just over 20 percent of rural sheriffs report the use of this procedure.

Full or part-time clinic staffs are among the least commonly available of medical treatment services in county jails. Only about three percent of rural jails have either available. Among suburban sheriffs, 28 percent report full-time and 21 percent report the availability of part-time clinic staffs. Both full-time and part-time clinic staffs are more prevalent among suburban jails in the Northeast and Western Divisions of the United States.

Jail inmate programming can involve a variety of activities and functions, depending substantially upon the size and composition of the jail inmate population. Table XVII-5 provides information on the availability of 18 programs based on information provided by an average of 353 suburban and 1,106 rural sheriffs' jails.

A review of national statistics on agencies which report the availability of these programs reveals a marked difference between suburban and rural jails.

TABLE XVII-5

PERCENT OF COUNTY JAILS WHICH HAVE VARIOUS
INMATE PROGRAMS BY RURAL AND SUBURBAN COUNTY
JAIL AND BY NATIONAL AND GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION

Jail Program	Percent National By Suburban And Rural		Percent Suburban By Division				Percent Rural By Division			
	9	8	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Average Number Of Jails	353	1106	34	137	132	49	42	494	386	184
Work Release	30	14	44	31	23	38	26	15	8	21
In-House Counseling	28	5	61	27	17	37	12	5	3	9
Television	27	20	39	30	23	44	51	19	16	20
Library Resources	20	8	43	21	11	22	16	9	5	10
Religious Services	20	8	18	21	20	17	16	9	9	4
Dayroom	20	14	20	17	17	44	28	14	11	19
Weekend Sentencing	19	11	23	22	16	14	20	10	9	15
Educational Programs	15	2	29	14	11	24	7	2	1	5
Gameroom	14	10	29	14	13	28	48	8	7	12
Organized Sports	13	1	35	11	6	18	7	0	0	2
Pre-Trial Intervention	12	2	15	15	11	8	5	3	1	4
Substance Abuse	11	2	21	12	6	16	3	2	1	4
Vocational Training	10	1	14	10	6	16	5	1	1	3
Volunteer Workers	9	3	9	12	6	11	5	3	3	4
Hobby/Craft	7	1	24	4	3	14	5	1	1	0
Furlough	7	1	15	7	4	14	7	1	1	4
Contractual Counseling	6	2	18	5	4	10	2	2	1	2

Among suburban agencies, between 25 and 30 percent indicate the use of work release and in-house counseling services as well as the availability of television. Twenty percent provide library resources, religious services and dayrooms. Less than one in five suburban agencies nationally, however, utilize such programs as weekend sentencing, educational programs, pre-trial intervention, vocational training or other activities/services listed in Table XVII-5.

The most prevalent of availabilities in rural jails on the national level are the use of television and day rooms for activity as well as work release and weekend sentencing on the programmatic level. In no other instance do more than ten percent of agencies provide programs and activities listed.

A review of programs by divisional breakdown reveals a more substantial percentage of availabilities in the Northeast and Western Divisions among both suburban and rural county jails.

Finally, in the realm of jail capabilities it is necessary to examine the degree to which jail resources are augmented by both technical and financial assistance from the state level. In most cases, where such assistance exists, it is made available through the state department of corrections or related state authority.

In this area of study 376 suburban and 1164 rural sheriffs provided responses. Of these, 19 percent of the suburban and

ten percent of the rural agencies indicated that either technical or financial assistance is provided to their jail operations.

Of these agencies receiving such assistance, the largest percentage indicate that it comes in the area of jail staff training. Sixty-five percent of all agencies receiving assistance indicate that it comes in the form of technical assistance for training and 46 percent in financial training aid.

In the area of jail administration, 27 percent of agencies report technical aid and 18 percent note financial assistance.

Technical assistance is provided to 34 percent of agencies and financial aid to 32 percent of jails in regard to jail construction.

Eight percent of agencies report technical and 31 percent note financial help in regard to salaries.

In the area of operations and maintenance, 29 percent of agencies receive both financial and technical aid.

And, in regard to community corrections and related special projects 23 percent receive technical and 20 percent get financial aid.

Finally, sheriffs were asked to rate their overall county jail facilities in regard to needs and capabilities. Although

slight differences exist between geographic divisions in the country as well as in rural/suburban agencies, an overall national summary provides a rather fair representation of opinion.

Of 1,566 sheriffs responding 14 percent rated their facilities as "excellent", 29 percent as "good", 25 percent as "only adequate" and 33 percent rated their facilities as "inadequate".

B. County Police Deapartments

Overall, county police departments have evolved in response to specific needs for law enforcement services. Their operations have most generally not included any jails/corrections responsibilities on the county level except service in a temporary holding capacity for individuals awaiting transfer to a county sheriff's jail facility. Only in a small number of cases has full countywide jail/corrections responsibilities been incorporated with the primary law enforcement duties of these agencies.

Specifically, of 28 county police departments providing responses to this element of the survey, only four indicated that they operate the primary jail in the county.

Data on jail operations provided by these four agencies represents too small a sample to present in terms of general findings or conclusions and is therefore not included here.

A general assessment of these specific jail operations, however, reveals that they closely parallel those of suburban sheriffs' agencies throughout the country.

C. Independent City Sheriffs

Somewhat in line with county sheriffs, independent city sheriffs are more frequently responsible for the operation of the primary county jail. For example, of the 19 independent city sheriffs responding, 11 or 58 percent stated that they have such responsibility. Eight of the 11 also noted that their operations included the use of other facilities, principally lock-ups or holding facilities and to a lesser degree the operation of a prison farm. All but two of the primary jails are located in the sheriff's agency building.

Of ten departments, only one reported the current construction of new jail facilities although two more departments reported that construction funds have been approved to begin facilities within the next five years. The total construction cost for these new facilities is reported as \$3.2 million and will add an average of 40 new beds. Aside from new construction, very little additional bedspace was added during 1976.

The average design capacity of the 11 reporting sheriffs' jails is 141 inmates although they range greatly in size from a low of eight to a high of 600 inmates.

The composition of the jail inmate populations generally resembles that of county sheriffs. For example, nearly 30 percent of inmates are reported to be in a pre-trial status while 23 percent are serving sentences. Twenty-four percent are awaiting sentencing and an additional 15 percent are awaiting transfer to a state system. The remainder are on appeal, awaiting extradition or in some other status.

In all, city sheriffs reported housing 1,514 inmates at the time of the questionnaire completion in mid-1977. The mean number of inmates in these facilities is reported as 138, which is rather close to the mean design capacity of 141 as previously noted.

In terms of inmate procedures, most city sheriffs report the segregation of prisoners. All but one department segregates inmates by age while 73 percent also segregate according to pre- or post-trial status, or in accordance with whether there is a medical or physical problem.

The average cost to house inmates in the reporting city sheriffs' jails is \$5.86 although a high of \$17.00 was reported.

Six of 11 jails report that they house convicted state inmates, not including those who are awaiting transportation to the state system. At the time of this mid-1977 reporting, 86 such state inmates were being held in these institutions.

Inmate escapes are relatively uncommon among reporting city sheriffs with only one sheriff reporting two escapes in 1976.

Medical treatment is reportedly available most commonly through a visiting physician and/or nurse during fixed hours. However, about half of all reporting sheriffs note the use of a full-time in-house clinic staff.

Ninety percent of city sheriffs note that they receive some form of financial or technical assistance from the state system. Most common among these forms of assistance is financial aid for salaries and training, as well as aid in the area of jail administration or for special project purposes and programs.

City sheriffs reported fewer jail programs available as compared with county sheriffs. The most frequently reported program is work release which is conducted by seven city sheriffs while in-house counseling is available through five departments and library resources in four.

CHAPTER XVIII INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF PRISONERS

Most county sheriffs in the United States are the responsible official concerning the interstate transportation of prisoners.

Reports from 1,132 nationwide respondents, including county sheriffs, independent city sheriffs and county police departments, shows the average number of fugitives and prisoners returned in 1976 from other states per agency is 10. These agencies returned a total of 11,673 prisoners. By region, the average number of returns per agency is as follows, North Central - 8, South - 11, Northeast - 13 and West - 14.

Of those county sheriffs who participate in interstate transportation of prisoners, 77 percent indicate they are the sole agency in the county that handles transports. Eighty-three percent of the 23 county police departments and 80 percent of the 15 independent city sheriffs surveyed report they are the sole agency in the city handling the interstate transportation of prisoners.

Of all participating agencies eighty-four percent in the North Central Division are the sole agency handling interstate prisoner transports, 78 percent in the West, 77 percent in the South but only 23 percent in the Northeast.

Of the total number of fugitives returned 75 percent waived extradition. This figure varies somewhat by division. Eighty percent waived extradition in the North Central Division, 75 percent in the West, 73 percent in the South and only 62 percent in the Northeast.

Transportation costs, which include air fare, meals and lodging, are highest in the Northeast. The following average transportation costs were reported: Northeast \$350; West \$320; North Central \$291; and South \$289. Nationally, the transportation costs average is \$302. The national average for manpower costs is \$157. Here again the Northeast Division is the highest, reporting an average cost of \$174 for escort salaries. The Western Division reports an average cost of \$144, the South \$162 and the North Central Division \$159.

Nationally, the total average cost per return, including both transportation and manpower costs, is \$420. The average total cost per return is similar among the four geographic divisions. The highest total cost per return is \$473 in the Northeast Division. In the South, North Central and Western Divisions the total average cost per return is \$414, \$410 and \$427 respectively.

Of the agencies providing information in this matter, only one agency reported one minor injury had occurred to personnel during the interstate transportation of prisoners.

CHAPTER XIX NEEDS OF COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT

The nature and capabilities of county law enforcement in this country varies dramatically, as has been shown, from the one man sheriff's agency in the rural area to the suburban agencies with personnel numbering in the thousands. The task of presenting the capabilities of these agencies as a group, where such dramatic differences as these exist, has been one of immense potential proportions as well as difficulties.

Given both a limited time frame and budget, decisions have had to be continuously made in regard to the nature and breadth of information being gathered and inquiry being made. Similarly, restrictions were required on the scope and depth of data presentations and analytical applications applied to information thus generated.

The intent, and hopefully the result, of these decisions has been a report which is broad enough to incorporate an extensive and diverse national county law enforcement population yet with sufficient depth to provide useful data to individual agencies for planning and internal assessment.

The many problems associated with the specification of capabilities for the nation's county law enforcement agencies are even further complicated where needs must be assessed. In largest measure this is due to the multiple and widely varied

differences between agencies and the communities in which they function. The nature of crime and calls for service in communities varies as do community attitudes, priorities and resources. Agencies which are seemingly analogous in terms of capabilities and needs therefor may not require the same type of remedies or solutions.

For this reason primarily, this document was not intended nor does it try to provide specific prescriptions to meet needs in broad categories or classifications of agencies. Rather, it is advocated that the individual county law enforcement administrator utilize the data provided in this document as basic resource documentation for what should be an ongoing internal assessment of agency capabilities, needs, performance and community response.

These data are intended and should only be used for broad general comparisons between agencies and not as conclusive evidence or sole justification that deficiencies or needs exist solely because resources are or are not available. This can only be done through an intensive assessment at the local level.

From a national perspective however, a number of commonalities surface in the data presented which are clear indications of need and which encompass county law enforcement agencies on a broad scale.

A. Budgets

By far, the most pervasive problem facing county law enforcement agencies is the lack of adequate funds. To understand the basis for this problem it is helpful to recognize that about 80 percent of county sheriffs' jurisdictions are rural in nature. In many circumstances there is a lack of an adequate tax base from which to derive sufficient funds for law enforcement services. And, where funds are available, there is often substantial competition from other county agencies for their acquisition. These problems were voiced by many of the survey respondents, one of which states, "We are a small outfit in a poor county and we cannot afford to keep up with some of the modern methods."

And again, another sheriff comments that:

Assessing the needs of the county sheriff is not too difficult. The difficulty comes in convincing the county board (of commissioners) of the needs of the office.

Moreover, in response to the survey questionnaires' inquiry as to the adequacy of funding, 71 percent of suburban and 67 percent of rural sheriffs indicate that their budgets are not adequate to run their agencies. This is in spite of the fact that 50 percent of suburban and 43 percent of rural sheriffs indicate that they received funding from outside sources, particularly the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice.

A general feeling among law enforcement authorities is that the smaller agencies are ignored and do not receive their share of the funds available. While this is true in a general sense it is interesting to note that of eight county law enforcement agencies in the United States which employ 1,000 or more employees 50 percent of these agencies indicate that there are not adequate funds with which to provide required services.

Where adequate funds do not exist or cannot be obtained, the impact is generally felt throughout an agency. Agency administrators are forced to limit or curtail services in specific areas, the most common of which pertain to manpower, salary and fringe benefits and jail operations.

B. Personnel

A most apparent need in county law enforcement throughout the nation is additional manpower, particularly among sworn personnel.

While it is absolutely necessary to conduct a study at the local level to determine the needs of law enforcement strength, the national rate of 1.4 county sheriff sworn employees per 1,000 inhabitants identifies an obvious deficiency. This information cannot be compared with the average rate of 2.0 police officers in the nation's cities as published by the F.B.I. in Crime in the United States, Uniform Crime Reports - 1976. The personnel needs of county law enforcement agencies are different than their municipal counterparts.

Historically, the county has been faced with vast land areas and the inherent problems of providing law enforcement services on a timely basis. Undermanned rural sheriffs' agencies are often restricted to responding only to calls for service with little resources designated for preventive patrol or innovative law enforcement programs. Agencies of various sizes in this study indicated the need for additional personnel for support, operational law enforcement duties and for jail/corrections duties.

One sheriff, for example, summarizes this fact in stating that:

This department serves a rural agricultural county which is beginning to feel the rural crime increase and is faced with trying to combat it with one-half enough men and inadequate as well as outdated equipment.

The agency staffed with one, two or three sworn officers cannot possibly provide professional services to the county. It is not uncommon to find a lone sheriff working 75 to 80 hours per week covering an area numbering in the hundreds of square miles. To bring about adequate staffing, this situation requires the full support of the public.

There is a need for the law enforcement administrator to keep informed relative to the population growth of his county and the growth rate of neighboring counties. Numerous sheriffs have indicated the sudden population increase in their

jurisdictions and the resulting increased demand for law enforcement services has created an unmanageable situation.

An annual assessment of personnel requirements should be made in every sheriff's agency. It is quite obvious that the very small county agency is in need of personnel if it is to provide law enforcement services on a 24-hour basis. The needs of the large agency are not as apparent but may very well be as urgent as those of the small agency. The administrator of the large agency must justify his current use of personnel and specifically identify his needs relative to law enforcement, jail/corrections, specialists and support personnel.

Many law enforcement agencies have studied the utilization of sworn personnel in specialized duties and clerical functions, with the view of utilizing civilian personnel in positions which do not require a sworn officer. Information collected in this study indicates that county sheriffs' agencies, with the exception of a small number of large agencies, do not utilize civilians to any significant degree but utilize sworn personnel in support services. Some administrators justify this practice based on the position that their clerical personnel are called on to handle a variety of duties, which require the deputy sheriff status.

C. Salaries

It is a general consensus among law enforcement practitioners, that the sheriff and his staff are underpaid, and

working conditions including the number of work hours are less than favorable when compared to private business or industry.

Several large suburban county sheriffs and chiefs of county police departments receive adequate salaries. However, the national median salary of \$13,800 annually for a county sheriff and the median starting salary of \$8,760 for a deputy clearly shows that the great majority of personnel in sheriffs' agencies throughout the nation are underpaid.

As one sheriff states:

Deputies in our department are underpaid. About three to five deputies quit to take jobs in local industry which pay almost twice the salary of a deputy sheriff. The department is continually having to take the time and money to train new employees. Our deputies must maintain one or two part-time jobs in order to meet the responsibilities of their families.

And again, another sheriff notes:

I have countywide law enforcement in this county and my major problems are inadequate salary and lack of a pension system. It is almost impossible to keep qualified officers. The small cities and towns in the county which hire law enforcement personnel cannot pay the salaries necessary to maintain qualified people.

There is a vital need for funds at the county level to establish salaries which are not only attractive to recruits but also to maintain experienced personnel in the field of county law enforcement. The citizenry of both suburban and rural counties are entitled to and should demand professional law

enforcement services as is expected of other professionals such as doctors and educators.

To achieve and maintain professional law enforcement in the counties the salaries of the sheriff and staff must be commensurate with the position's authority, responsibility and level of service rendered. The county salaries must also be competitive with the major influence of salary standards within the area.

D. Records

A high percentage of agencies with centralized communications indicate they compile complaint cards on calls for service which initiates the law enforcement action, records the expenditure of time and is the predication of the law enforcement report. It is interesting to note less than one-third of these agencies report the use of recording equipment with regard to the capability of providing historical data on telephone calls received and radio transmissions. The need for such equipment must be determined by the agency head based on the success of current procedures and the degree to which demands are made to generate verbatim historical data. In an era in which the law administrator is called upon to be responsible for the action of subordinates, and produce detailed records concerning law enforcement action, it appears a significant number of agencies are in need of such recording equipment.

A substantial percentage of agencies which have centralized communications centers servicing the patrol/investigative function have some type of emergency telephone number for use by the public. Of the county sheriffs' agencies represented in this study, 47 suburban and 116 rural agencies report the use of the "911" telephone number. This study does not endorse or advocate the use of any specific emergency telephone system, company or equipment. However, the law enforcement administrator is urged to explore, where needed, the use of equipment which will record incoming emergency calls and identify the location from which the calls are made.

The law enforcement administrator of today must be a planner. Plans are specifically required relative to how tasks will be accomplished for which his agency is responsible, both on an immediate and long term basis. To accomplish any degree of successful planning the agency must have usable information concerning its current status as to crime incidence, arrests, clearances, personnel activities, equipment and facilities status as well as budgetary availabilities. Additionally, an important consideration in relation to data collection and utilization involves the generation and use of court disposition.

However, information compiled in this study shows that about one-half of county law enforcement agencies throughout the nation do not prepare statistical summaries relative to court dispositions. Information on final disposition of cases by the court is vital to the understanding of agency

effectiveness. The law enforcement administrator must know for example if criminal charges are being downgraded, if the accused pleads guilty to the charge or is tried by the court and determined to be innocent or guilty. The agency head must have reliable information concerning the percentage of unsuccessful prosecutions and whether such situations are attributable to poor law enforcement practices or to situations that result from decisions made by the prosecutor and/or the court. While information should provide historical data concerning all essential elements of information, trend data and summary statistics must also be made available through which to identify the agency's successes and weaknesses. This can be accomplished through a records system within the agency which has basic records keeping standards set by the agency head. Proper controls must be established to insure that uniformity in record keeping is being met by all personnel within the agency. Frequent procedural changes in records management should be avoided which only render the data base useless as a mechanism for analysis and planning.

Some law enforcement officials, especially in the very small agencies, take the position that they cannot afford the clerical help if only on a part-time basis, to maintain a complete records system. The fact is that they cannot afford not to.

E. Jails/Corrections

In order to understand the current problems and needs associated with county jails, it is important to recognize the general historical perspective from which today's jails have evolved.

Briefly it can be said that until recently jails and corrections have not been regarded in the same context from either administrative or programmatic levels. In part this has been due to the fact that jail operations have historically been fragmented between counties and consequently administered at the local level by many different sheriffs. This is in contrast to the typical state system of corrections with a centralized administrative body, a concentration of facilities and a relatively integrated organizational structure.

Another, and perhaps the most significant of reasons for the traditional split between jails and the "correctional" enterprise, is the fact that the local or county jail is typically designed for and perceived as a short-term facility for incarceration generally housing inmates for one year or less. As such, it has generally been considered that "rehabilitative" programming, which is geared toward longer term exposure, is not suited for the local jail environment.

Both of these traditional concepts of the county jail have however, undergone substantial change.

First, while the local county jail is by far the most common of short term holding facilities in the country, consolidation of local facilities under a city/county corrections department is becoming increasingly visible. The cost-benefits associated with this approach in terms of both administration and operations are often substantial and difficult to ignore particularly where smaller counties with small tax bases are

involved. At about \$55,000 nationally per inmate bed for new jail construction, assistance from outside sources is typically imperative. This is even more apparent where new construction is mandated and where state funding incentives encourage such consolidation by off-setting the financial burden of participating jurisdictions.

In regard to regionalization as with other factors which tend to remove the jail from local control, state systems of corrections have come to focus more attention on and control over the local jail, whether it be through inspections, minimum requirements for personnel or other mechanisms.

State jail standards commissions, additionally, have played a significant role in pressing for uniformity in the adequacy and compliance of local jails with state and federal guidelines. Many forced closings or stringent restrictions have been placed on local jails through this mechanism as reported in this study as well as through other sources.

Local jails are also being increasingly called upon to house inmates with longer sentences. Of all counties reporting in this survey questionnaire for example, 30 percent state that they are holding inmates from the state system of corrections not including those inmates awaiting transfer to the state system. These inmates account for over 13,500 prisoners being held in local jails which responded to this study. As a consequence, sheriffs and other jail administrators are required not only to provide

for the needs of short term detainees, but also to respond to the needs of inmates being held for much longer periods of time.

State courts have played a substantial role in the changes associated with local jails both in this and related matters.

For example, in a number of states where the state system of corrections has become overcrowded, court orders have placed local jails in a position where they must accept overflows from the state system and forced them to retain for an indefinite period inmates awaiting transfer to the state. But in many cases, local jails are even less equipped and prepared to accept this burden than the state system of corrections.

Responding to the needs for better facilities and services in local jails, inmates have been extremely active and often successful in litigation against sheriffs and other local jail administrators. The issues involved in such litigation are rather diverse and range from such matters as the quality of jail facilities, jail safety, availability of medical services, adequacy of food, recreational and program availabilities, and the capability of a jail to segregate inmates according to various criteria. But, whatever the reason, these suits and the threat of additional litigation is placing tremendous pressure on the sheriff and the county jail.

As a result of these and other factors, county jails can no longer be regarded in a provincial context, or as simple holding

facilities for short term inmates only. The jail has evolved in great measure as an extension of the overall correctional enterprise. This is becoming increasingly the case in both administrative and programmatic terms.

Yet the pressures which have served to place jails and sheriffs in this context have in many regards overlooked the capability of the county jail to respond in a timely and appropriate manner. Data collected through the survey questionnaire and site visits support the conclusion that the operation of the county jail is one of the most significant problems facing the sheriff in this country as well as one of the most difficult to solve.

For example, of 1,566 sheriffs participating in this study, one-third rated their overall jail facility as "inadequate" and another one-fourth as "only adequate". From the opposite perspective only 14 percent rated their facility as "excellent" and 29 percent as "good".

The cause for this generally low rating relates primarily to a lack of space. In some cases this pertains directly to overcrowded situations. More often, the problems associated with space relate to the inadequacy of space for inmate programmatic and service requirements.

Sheriffs interviewed most often relate the lack of adequate space with reduced capabilities in the areas of recreational programs and counseling, as well as the capability of separating

prisoners according to adjudicative status or other criteria. To a lesser but still significant degree a lack of space adversely affects medical availabilities and jail security. But, by and large, a lack of space is linked with the reduced availability of jail programs.

A review of data provided on the availability of inmate programs reveals that not more than 30 percent of suburban and 20 percent of rural jails report the availability of 17 listed jail programs. Clearly, programmatic capabilities in both suburban and rural jails are well below that which should be expected.

As previously indicated, the capabilities of jails that presently exist are more closely linked to older concepts of security and custody than they are to current concepts of jails which interrelate security with correctional programming. In many cases, only new construction can provide adequate space for such programs due to the age of many facilities. An examination of new jails under construction nevertheless, reveals that only 13 percent of suburban and seven percent of rural agencies are currently involved in new jail construction.

The causes for jail inadequacies are similar to those related to law enforcement problems. In particular, more sheriffs cite the lack of adequate funds, resulting from the low county tax bases, than any other single factor affecting their jail.

Aside from the lack of adequate funds, jail inadequacies are also attributed to a lack of political support on the part of county administrative bodies. Increased crime is a third factor as are problems associated with court operations, such as sentencing practices, the lack of a speedy trial and bail problems.

As we look into the 1980's, the county law enforcement administrator of today must be cognizant of population change estimates of his area. Professional planning and research must now address the anticipated changes if county law enforcement is to provide adequate services in the future, especially in those counties which will experience a rapid population growth. Not every county in the United States will increase population over the next ten years, but our recent past clearly indicates that many rural counties of today surrounding the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas may very well be part of the megalopolis of tomorrow.

The county sheriff in the nation currently faced with inadequate jail facilities, and especially conditions which contribute to a lack of space, is in need of immediate support by county, state and federal authorities.

F. Conclusion

The needs of county law enforcement across the country which have been cited are traditionally based and widely felt. Inadequacies in such major areas as patrol manpower, salaries

and jail operations are in largest measure related to inadequate funding at the local level.

While the unavailability of funds is the root cause of the majority of county law enforcement inadequacies, the failure to meet local needs to some extent is due to the lack of adequate law enforcement management.

In the face of stiff competition for funds among county agencies, county law enforcement administrators have frequently failed to present an adequate case for additional revenues with which to bring their operation up to acceptable levels. In essence, this failure is typically due to a lack of adequate communication and information exchange between the law enforcement executive and the public.

Much too often the county law enforcement executive is placed in a position where funds are being requested but without sufficient documentation and hard facts to support much needed budget requests. The inability to provide substantiation and evincive arguments for budget requests is most typically based on a failure to develop and maintain adequate records of law enforcement services and operations.

As noted in regard to "records" in this chapter, the duties, responsibilities, nature and level of law enforcement services and operations must be adequately documented and continuously monitored if the law enforcement executive is to properly keep track of the efficiency and effectiveness of his resource

expenditures. The law enforcement executive should continuously provide both legislative bodies and the general public with information on the nature and level of services and activities performed by his agency and relate this directly to the adequacy of resources available. The agency executive can thereby be in a position to show what the effects of inadequate resources have on the public and what additional resources will provide.

With this body of information, the agency executive can require that he, the public and the county governing body act collectively to set requisite priorities for law enforcement services. Only through such mutual cooperation and communication can the county law enforcement executive constructively fashion law enforcement services within the confines imposed by community demands and resource availabilities.