



Survey of Criminal History Information Systems, 1992

A Criminal Justice Information Policy Report

November 1993, NCJ-143500

143500

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/OJP/BJS

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.

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Bureau of Justice Statistics

Lawrence A. Greenfeld
Acting Director

Acknowledgments. This report was prepared by SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics, Dr. Francis J. Carney Jr., Chairman, and Gary R. Cooper, Executive Director. The project director and author of the report was Sheila J. Barton, Director, Law and Policy Program. Data programming assistance was provided by Julie K. Gutierrez, Manager, Software Services. Support was provided by Jane L. Bassett, Publishing Assistant; Twyla R. Cunningham, Manager, Corporate Communications; Amir A. Holmes, Law and Policy Intern; and Teresa E. Nyberg, Executive Secretary. The federal project monitor was Carol G. Kaplan, Assistant Deputy Director, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Report of work performed under BJS Cooperative Agreement No. 92-BJ-CX-K012, awarded to SEARCH Group, Incorporated, 7311 Greenhaven Drive, Suite 145, Sacramento, California 95831. Contents of this document do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Bureau of Justice Statistics or the U.S. Department of Justice.

Copyright © SEARCH Group, Incorporated, 1993.

The U.S. Department of Justice authorizes any person to reproduce, publish, translate or otherwise use all or any part of the copyrighted material in this publication with the exception of those items indicating they are copyrighted or reprinted by any source other than SEARCH Group, Incorporated.

Contents

List of data tables iv

Foreword v

Highlights 1

Major findings 1

- Level of automation of master name indexes and criminal history files 1
- Level of disposition reporting 1
- Level of felony flagging 2
- Timeliness of trial court disposition data 2
- Participation in the Interstate Identification Index (III) 2
- Presale criminal history record checks on potential firearm purchasers 3

Additional findings 3

- Status of State criminal history record files 3
- Completeness of arrest data in State criminal history repository 4
- Completeness of disposition data in State criminal history repository 5
- State policies/practices on modifying felony convictions 6
- Completeness of correctional data in State criminal history repository 6
- Timeliness of data in State criminal history repository 7
 - Arrests 7
 - Admission to correctional facilities 7
- Procedures to encourage arrest and disposition reporting 8
- Methods of linking arrests and dispositions 8
- Data quality strategies 9
- Level of audit activity of State criminal history repository 9
- Presale criminal history record checks on potential firearm purchasers 10

Data tables 11

Methodology 60

List of data tables

1. Overview of State criminal history record systems, 1992 13
2. Number of subjects (individual offenders) in State criminal history file, 1984, 1989 and 1992 15
3. Number of final dispositions reported to State criminal history repository, 1983, 1989 and 1992 17
4. Automation of master name index and criminal history file, 1989 and 1992 19
5. Data required by State law to be submitted to State criminal history repository, 1992 21
6. Arrest records with fingerprints, 1989 and 1992 23
7. Notice to State criminal history repository of release of arrested persons without charging, 1989 and 1992 25
8. Completeness of prosecutor and court disposition reporting to State criminal history repository, 1989 and 1992 27
9. Policies/practices of State criminal history repository regarding modification of felony convictions, 1992 29
10. Fingerprinting of incarcerated offenders and linkage to records maintained by State criminal history repository, 1992 31
11. Probation and parole data in State criminal history repository, 1989 and 1992 33
12. Average number of days to process arrest data submitted to State criminal history repository, 1989 and 1992 35
13. Average number of days to process disposition data submitted to State criminal history repository, 1989 and 1992 37
14. Average number of days to process correctional admission data submitted to State criminal history repository, 1989 and 1992 39
15. Procedures employed by State criminal history repository to encourage complete arrest and disposition reporting, 1992 41
16. Methods used to link disposition information to arrest/charge information on criminal history record, 1992 43
17. Procedures followed when linkage cannot be made between court or correctional information and arrest information in the criminal history database, 1992 45
18. Strategies employed by State criminal history repository to ensure accuracy of data in criminal history database, 1992 47
19. Audit activities of State criminal history repository, 1989 and 1992 49
20. Data quality audits of State criminal history repository, 1992 51
21. State participation in the Interstate Identification Index (III), 1989 and 1992 53
22. Procedures for presale criminal history record checks on potential firearm purchasers, 1989 and 1992 55
23. Search methods used in conducting criminal history checks on potential firearm purchasers, 1992 57
24. Costs of implementing and operating programs for presale criminal history record checks on potential firearm purchasers, 1992 59

Foreword

The quality and availability of the Nation's criminal history records is the focus of the *Survey of Criminal History Information Systems, 1992*. This report provides a snapshot of conditions as of December 31, 1992.

While the survey is a follow-up to a similar data quality survey conducted in 1990, the data contained in this report stands on its own in providing readers with a comprehensive review of the status of criminal history records maintained by State criminal history repositories. All 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands participated in the survey.

Findings of the survey are presented in a series of tables and summary highlights. The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) hopes that the report will be useful to State criminal history repository administrators, criminal justice practitioners and policymakers on all levels of government. BJS gratefully acknowledges the continuing contributions of each of the State criminal history repository administrators who provided data for this survey.

Lawrence A. Greenfeld
Acting Director
Bureau of Justice Statistics

Highlights

Note to Readers: This is a report of the results of the 1992 Follow-up Data Quality Survey of State criminal history repositories. Data from earlier surveys are also reported in the tables that follow. Caution should be used in drawing comparisons between the results of earlier surveys and the survey reported here. Since the last national data quality survey, the U.S. Justice Department has implemented assistance programs dedicated to improving criminal history records. As a result, States have been able to focus new resources on the condition of their records and in many cases, simply know more about their records today than in the past. A number of State repositories have also suffered fiscal cutbacks and have had to shift priorities away from certain criminal history information management tasks. For these and other reasons, comparisons between the data sets may not be as accurate a reflection of the Nation's criminal history records as the current data standing alone.

Major findings

Level of automation of master name indexes and criminal history files

Overview of State criminal history record systems, 1992 (Table 1):

- Forty-eight States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico have automated at least some records in either the criminal history record file or the master name index.
- Fifteen States (Alabama, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Michigan, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wyoming) and Puerto Rico have fully automated criminal history files and master name indexes.
- Thirty-nine States and Puerto Rico have fully automated master name indexes. Eleven States and the District of Columbia do not have fully automated master name indexes. The Virgin Islands does not maintain a master name index.
- Four States (Maine, New Mexico, Vermont, West Virginia) and the Virgin Islands have no automated criminal history files.
- Two jurisdictions, West Virginia and the Virgin Islands, have no automated criminal history information, either a master name index or criminal history files.

Automation of master name index and criminal history file, 1992 (Table 4):

- Of those States maintaining partially automated criminal history files, when an offender with a prior manual record is arrested, the manual record is subsequently automated in 29 States. In four States (Delaware, Hawaii, Maryland, Minnesota) and the District of Columbia, only the new arrest information is automated.

Level of disposition reporting

Overview of State criminal history record systems, 1992 (Table 1):

- Eleven States (Alaska, Connecticut, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Carolina, Vermont, Wyoming), representing approximately 13% of the Nation's population (based on 53 jurisdictions) and 14% of the Nation's criminal history records, report that 80% or more arrests within the past five years in the criminal history database have final dispositions recorded.
- A total of 18 jurisdictions, representing approximately 41% of the Nation's population and 40% of the Nation's criminal history records, report that 70% or more arrests within the past five years in the criminal history database have final dispositions recorded.

- A total of 23 jurisdictions, representing approximately 51% of the Nation's population and 46% of the Nation's criminal history records, report that 60% or more arrests within the past five years in the criminal history database have final dispositions recorded.

- Overall, the figures are lower when arrests older than five years are considered. Nine States (Alaska, Hawaii, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, New Jersey, North Carolina, Vermont, Virginia) report that 80% or more arrests in the entire criminal history database have final dispositions recorded. A total of 16 jurisdictions report that 70% or more arrests in the entire criminal history database have final dispositions. A total of 19 jurisdictions report 60% or more arrests in the entire criminal history database have final dispositions.

Number of final dispositions reported to State criminal history repository, 1992 (Table 3):

- The 33 jurisdictions providing data on the number of final dispositions reported to their criminal history repositories indicated that over 4.7 million final dispositions were reported in 1992. The responding States and the District of Columbia represent approximately 69% of the Nation's population.

Level of felony flagging

Overview of State criminal history record systems, 1992 (Table 1):

- Thirty States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico currently flag some or all felony convictions in their criminal history databases.

- An additional 14 States collect sufficient data to flag at least some previously unflagged felony convictions.

Timeliness of trial court disposition data

Average number of days to process disposition data submitted to State criminal history repository, 1992 (Table 13):

- The average number of days between the final court dispositions and receipt of that information by the State criminal history repositories is 43, ranging from less than one day in North Carolina to 180 days in Pennsylvania. The majority of States receive the data between 20 to 60 days.

- The average number of days between receipt of final trial court dispositions and entry of disposition data into the criminal history databases is 26, ranging from 0 in States where dispositions are entered either directly by the courts or by tape (eight States) to 365 in Minnesota. The majority of States enter the data in 10 days or less.

- Twenty-nine States and the District of Columbia indicate that they have backlogs in entering disposition data into the criminal history database.

Participation in the Interstate Identification Index (III)

State participation in the Interstate Identification Index (III), 1992 (Table 21):

- As of December 31, 1992, 24 States (Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wyoming) reported that they currently participate (contribute arrest information to be used in the Index) in the Interstate Identification Index (III). The remaining 26 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands did not participate. The State of Illinois, however, has become a participant as of August 8, 1993. Since the tables reflect 1992 data, Illinois was not included; as of this date, however, the total participating States, including Illinois, is 25. The 25 States include the 12 largest States in the Nation and as a whole account for 71% of the Nation's population.

- Among the 24 participating States in 1992, an average of 65% of their criminal history files are available to III, ranging from 22% in Alaska to 100% in six States (Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Utah, Washington, Wyoming).

- Among the 29 nonparticipating jurisdictions in 1992, 28 indicated plans to participate in III within five years. The Virgin Islands' projected participation date is unknown at this time.

- The most frequently cited reason for not participating in III is "insufficient resources to convert records/system," which 15 jurisdictions cite.

- Ten States and the District of Columbia do not presently meet III standards.

- Seven States report that they have "too few automated records" to participate.

- Six States report incompatible software or hardware as reasons underlying their current inability to participate in III.

- Other reasons cited for nonparticipation include "legal/policy considerations" (three States); "incompatible record formats" (one State); and "lack of personnel resources" (one State).

Presale criminal history record checks on potential firearm purchasers

Procedures for presale criminal history record checks on potential firearm purchasers, 1992 (Table 22):

- Seventeen States (California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Virginia, Wisconsin), the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands report that they currently conduct

records checks of their State criminal history repository in connection with the sale of firearms.

- Ten States require criminal history records checks on purchasers for all firearms. Five States require checks for handgun purchases only; two States require checks for handguns and other specially designated firearms; and Delaware and the District of Columbia require checks for other designated categories.

- The number of presale checks for firearms conducted in 1992 ranged from 300 in the Virgin Islands to 630,000 in California.

- All States conducting records checks examine State criminal history repository records. In addition, three States (California, New York, North Carolina) and the District of Columbia also check FBI Identification Division records. Seven States augment their records checks by also checking III, and 11 States check NCIC hot files. California checks other databases containing information relating to the noncriminal firearms prohibitions, such as mental health. Oregon also checks the Western Identification Network (WIN) and the State records of nearby States for firearm purchasers.

- The fees charged for conducting records checks for potential firearm purchasers vary among the 11 jurisdictions reporting information and by the complexity of the search procedure. Name search fees range from \$2.00 in Illinois and Virginia to \$14.00 in California. The fees for fingerprint searching range from \$2.50 in the District

of Columbia to \$50.00 in New York.

- Conducting records checks on firearm purchasers is viewed as a criminal justice activity by 13 States, the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands. Three States classify it as a noncriminal justice activity, while one State classifies it as both.

Search methods used in conducting criminal history checks on potential firearm purchasers, 1992 (Table 23):

- Seven jurisdictions require fingerprint checks under some circumstances. New York requires fingerprints for all checks; California requires fingerprints depending upon the type of application; Nebraska requires fingerprints for the purchase of automatic weapons; New Jersey and Oregon use fingerprints when identification is not made with a prior name and date of birth search; the District of Columbia and North Carolina also require fingerprints in addition to the name and date of birth of the potential purchaser.

Additional findings

Status of State criminal history record files

Overview of State criminal history record systems, 1992 (Table 1):

- Forty-six States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico have master name indexes which contain names of all record subjects in the criminal history file.

Number of subjects (individual offenders) in State criminal history file, 1992 (Table 2):

- Over 47.3 million subjects (individual offenders) were in the criminal history files of the State criminal history repositories on December 31, 1992.
- Seventy-seven percent of the criminal history records maintained by the State criminal history repositories are automated. Approximately 11 million records, or 23% of the records, are not automated.

Automation of master name index and criminal history file, 1992 (Table 4):

- Forty-eight States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico have automated at least some records in either the criminal history record file or the master name index.
- Two jurisdictions, West Virginia and the Virgin Islands, have no automated criminal history information, either a master name index or criminal history files.
- Thirty-nine States and Puerto Rico have fully automated master name indexes. Eleven States and the District of Columbia do not have fully automated master name indexes. Of those 12 jurisdictions, nine States and the District of Columbia have partially automated master name indexes; however, although Maine has entered information into a temporary automated master name index, it is not currently usable. West Virginia has a manual master name index. The Virgin Islands does not maintain a master name index.

- Of those States maintaining partially automated criminal history files, when an offender with a prior manual record is arrested, the manual record is subsequently automated in 29 States. In four States (Delaware, Hawaii, Maryland, Minnesota) and the District of Columbia, only the new arrest information is automated.

Data required by State law to be submitted to State criminal history repository, 1992 (Table 5):

- Thirty-five States and the District of Columbia require prosecutors to report to State criminal history repositories their decisions to decline prosecution in criminal cases.
- Forty-three States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands require felony trial courts to report the dispositions of felony cases to the State criminal history repository.
- State prison admission and release information on felony cases must be reported to the State criminal history repository in 36 States and Puerto Rico.
- Admission and release data on felons housed in local correctional facilities must, by statute, be reported to the State criminal history repository in 26 States and Puerto Rico.
- The reporting of probation information is mandated in 35 States and the District of Columbia, while the same jurisdictions and one additional State require the reporting of parole information.

Arrest records with fingerprints, 1992 (Table 6):

- During 1992, over 6.2 million arrest fingerprint cards were submitted to the State criminal history repositories.
- All except two States (Alaska, Vermont) and Puerto Rico have legal requirements that fingerprints and arrest data for felony arrests must be submitted to the State criminal history repository.
- Arrests in 41 States, the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands, representing 84% of the Nation's population, are 100% fingerprint-supported. In nine States and Puerto Rico, less than 100% of the arrests in the criminal history files are fingerprinted-supported.
- In the large majority of jurisdictions (45), 13% or less of the fingerprint cards received are returned as unacceptable. Only two of the 47 responding jurisdictions indicated a rate higher than that. Some States have indicated that a policy of not returning fingerprints has been adopted.

Completeness of arrest data in State criminal history repository

Arrest records with fingerprints, 1992 (Table 6):

- All except two States (Alaska, Vermont) and Puerto Rico have legal requirements that fingerprints and arrest data for felony arrests must be submitted to the State criminal history repository.

Notice to State criminal history repository of release of arrested persons without charging, 1992 (Table 7):

- More than half of the States (29) require law enforcement agencies to notify the State criminal history repository when an arrested person is released without formal charging but after the fingerprints have been obtained and submitted. In Michigan and North Carolina, police must release or charge a suspect *prior* to sending fingerprints to the State criminal history repository.
- Little information was reported on the percent of fingerprint submissions for which the repository is notified that the arrestee has not been charged. What information is available indicated a significant variance throughout the States, ranging from as low as 1% in Alabama to as high as 99% in Hawaii.

Completeness of disposition data in State criminal history repository

Completeness of prosecutor and court disposition reporting to State criminal history repository, 1992 (Table 8):

- Twenty States (Alaska, Arkansas, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, South Carolina, Virginia, Wyoming) report that final felony trial court dispositions in 80% or more of the cases in their States are received by the State criminal history repositories. Four of those States (Connecticut, Maryland,

Oregon, South Carolina) estimate that they receive notice in 100% of the cases.

- A total of 26 States, or six additional States (Idaho, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, Washington, West Virginia) report that final felony trial court dispositions in 70% or more of the cases in their States are received by the State criminal history repositories.
- A total of 31 States, or five additional States (Delaware, Missouri, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota) report that final felony trial court dispositions in 60% or more of the cases in their States are received by the State criminal history repositories.
- A total of 35 States, or four additional States (Illinois, Louisiana, Nevada, Utah) report that final felony trial court dispositions in 50% or more of the cases in their States are received by the State criminal history repositories.
- Of the respondents indicating that there is either a legal requirement for prosecutors to notify the State criminal history record repository of declinations to prosecute or where the information is reported voluntarily, 12 repositories estimate that they receive notice in 80% or more of such cases. Four States (Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, South Carolina) estimate that they receive notice in 100% of the cases.

- Of the 13 jurisdictions providing data on the cases where fingerprints are obtained of persons who are brought to court by summons on felony charges and have not previously been fingerprinted in connection with the case or where such information is submitted voluntarily, only four (District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, North Dakota) estimate that in 50% or more of the cases where the offender is *convicted*, fingerprints are actually obtained. In the remaining nine States, 20% or less are actually obtained.

- In the seven jurisdictions providing data on the cases where fingerprints are obtained of persons who are brought to court by summons on felony charges and have not previously been fingerprinted in connection with the case or where such information is submitted voluntarily, two (District of Columbia, New Jersey) estimate that in 50% or more of the cases where the offender is *not convicted*, fingerprints are actually obtained. In the remaining five States (Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Mexico, West Virginia), 5% or less are actually obtained.

State policies/practices on modifying felony convictions

Policies/practices of State criminal history repository regarding modification of felony convictions, 1992 (Table 9):

- **Expungements:** Twenty-three States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands have statutes that provide for the expungement of felony convictions. In 11 States, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, the record is destroyed by the State criminal history repository. In 10 States and the District of Columbia, the record is retained with the action noted on the record. In Louisiana, the record is either destroyed or retained with the action noted depending upon whether the charge was a misdemeanor or a felony and whether the record subject was convicted. In Oregon, the record is retained with the action noted and sealed. Vermont returns the record to the court; New Hampshire seals the record; three States (Kentucky, Ohio, Washington) return the record to the submitting agency; and Florida removes the record from the automated database and retains it manually.

- **Setting aside of convictions:** Forty-two States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands have statutes which provide for setting aside felony convictions. In 36 jurisdictions, the record is retained with the action noted; five jurisdictions destroy the record; in Missouri, the record is returned to the court; and in Oregon, the record is retained with the action noted and sealed. In Minnesota, where the record is retained with the action noted, the

record is also sealed if ordered by the court.

- **Pardons:** Forty-eight States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands have statutes that provide for the awarding of a pardon. In 44 of those jurisdictions, the criminal history record is retained with the action noted. In three jurisdictions (Rhode Island, South Dakota, Virgin Islands), the record is destroyed. In Minnesota, where the record is retained with the action noted, the record is also sealed if ordered by the court. Vermont returns the record to the Governor's Office. In Tennessee, although the State law provides for pardons, that information is not forwarded to the State criminal history repository. Georgia also has not previously received pardon information, but was scheduled to begin receiving the information in 1993.

- **Restoration of civil rights:** Forty-three States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands have legal provisions for the restoration of a convicted felon's civil rights. In the majority of those jurisdictions (35), the record is retained with the action noted. In three jurisdictions (Rhode Island, South Dakota, Virgin Islands), the record is destroyed. In Minnesota, where the record is retained with the action noted, the record is also sealed if ordered by the court. In Delaware and Georgia, although the State law provides for the restoration of civil rights, that information is not forwarded to the State criminal history repository. In two States (Missouri, Texas), no action is taken by the repository.

Completeness of correctional data in State criminal history repository

Fingerprinting of incarcerated offenders and linkage to records maintained by State criminal history repository, 1992 (Table 10):

- In 33 States, there is a legal requirement (State statute or State administrative regulation having the force of law) that the State prison system must fingerprint admitted prisoners and send the fingerprints to the State criminal history repository.

- About half of the States, a total of 23, have the same legal requirement for reporting by local jails.

- In 39 States where State correctional facilities are legally required to report information or the information is reported voluntarily, almost all of the respondents (37) estimate that in at least 90% of the cases, admission information is reported to the State repository. Twenty-seven of those States estimate that 100% of the admissions are reported to the repository. Only two States estimate a reporting rate of less than 90%. The estimate for Virginia is 85%, while Washington estimates 20-30% of the admissions are reported to the repository.

- For reporting from local jails where required by law or completed voluntarily, seven States report that 90% or more of the admissions are reported to the State repositories. Six States report rates of 50-70%, and an additional four States report rates of less than 50%.

- In 40 of the States, fingerprints received from State and local correctional facilities are processed by the State criminal history record repository to establish positive identification of incarcerated offenders and to ensure that correctional information is linked to the proper records. In one State, New York, correctional information is updated on-line; fingerprints are requested only when an on-line match cannot be made.

Probation and parole data in State criminal history repository, 1992 (Table 11):

- Of the 35 States where reporting of probation data is legally required or voluntarily reported, nine estimate that 100% of the cases in which probation is ordered are reported to the State criminal history repository. An additional 10 States report that in at least 50% of the cases, the State criminal history repository receives probation information. Seven States report that information is received in less than 50% of the cases.

- Twelve States and the District of Columbia, where reporting of parole data is legally required or voluntarily reported, estimate that parole information is reported in 100% of the cases. In an additional 11 States, parole information is reported in 60% or more of the cases. Four States report receiving parole information in 10% or less of the cases.

Timeliness of data in State criminal history repository

—Arrests

Average number of days to process arrest data submitted to State criminal history repository, 1992 (Table 12):

- The average number of days between arrest and receipt of arrest data and fingerprints by the State criminal history repositories is 13, ranging from less than one day in the District of Columbia (where the Metropolitan Police Department is both the repository and the arresting agency) up to 34 days in Missouri. The majority receive the data between five to 14 days.

- The average number of days between receipt of fingerprints by the State criminal history repository and entry into the master name index by the State criminal history repositories is 19, ranging from 0 to one day in North Dakota to 270 days in Louisiana. The majority of States enter the data in five days or less.

- The average number of days between receipt of fingerprints and entry of arrest data into the criminal history databases is 32, ranging from 0 to one day in Delaware and North Dakota to 630 in Louisiana. The majority of States enter the data in six days or less.

- Twenty-four States and the District of Columbia indicate that they have backlogs in entering arrest data into the criminal history database.

—Admission to correctional facilities

Average number of days to process correctional admission data submitted to State criminal history repository, 1992 (Table 14):

- The average number of days between the admission of offenders to State correctional facilities and receipt of the information by the State criminal history repository is 45, ranging from one day in Texas to 730 in Colorado. Most States receive the information in 25 days or less.

- The average number of days between the admission of offenders to local jails and receipt of the information by the State criminal history repository is 20, ranging from one day in the Virgin Islands to an average of 60 days in Mississippi. Most jurisdictions receive the information in 10 days or less.

- The average number of days between receipt of correctional admissions information by the State criminal history repository and entry into the criminal history databases is 19, ranging from 0 in Maryland to 365 days in Louisiana. Most States enter the information in five days or less; all but two enter the information in 30 days or less.

- Sixteen States indicate that they have backlogs in entering the correctional information into the criminal history databases.

Procedures to encourage arrest and disposition reporting

Procedures employed by State criminal history repository to encourage complete arrest and disposition reporting, 1992 (Table 15):

- Fifteen States and Puerto Rico generate lists of arrests with missing dispositions as a means of monitoring disposition reporting.
- Twenty-eight States report using field visits to encourage complete arrest and disposition reporting.
- Thirty-six States generate form letters as a method of encouraging complete arrest and disposition reporting.
- The method most used to encourage complete arrest and disposition reporting is telephone calls (38 States, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands).
- Other States report using operational bulletins, training, audits and personal contact as methods to encourage complete arrest and disposition reporting.

Methods of linking arrests and dispositions

Methods used to link disposition information to arrest/charge information on criminal history record, 1992 (Table 16):

- Thirty-six States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands utilize methods for linking disposition information and arrest/charge information which also permit the linking of dispositions to particular charges and/or specific counts.

• All but one jurisdiction report using at least one of the following methods for linking disposition information and arrest/charge information on criminal history records, and nearly every jurisdiction indicates their use of multiple mechanisms to ensure linkage. The figures presented below, consequently, greatly exceed the total number of jurisdictions responding to this survey.

– Thirty-seven States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico employ a unique tracking number for the individual subject. Massachusetts indicates that present plans call for a unique tracking number, although it is not currently implemented.

– Thirty-five States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico use a unique arrest event identifier to link disposition and arrest/charge information on State criminal history records.

– Twenty-three States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico utilize a unique charge identifier in linking disposition and arrest/charge information.

– Thirty-six States and the District of Columbia use the arrest date, while 39 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands use the subject's name as a method to link disposition information with arrest/charge information.

– Twenty-nine States and the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico report using the subject's name and the reporting agency's case number as the mechanism to link disposition information and arrest/charge information.

– Individual States also report using methods such as the court case number, the Criminal Justice Information System case number, unique constructs of numbers and fingerprint verification.

Procedures followed when linkage cannot be made between court or correctional information and arrest information in the criminal history database, 1992 (Table 17):

• Forty-eight jurisdictions report that they sometimes receive final court dispositions that cannot be linked to arrest information in the criminal history record database. The jurisdictions vary considerably in the percentage of court dispositions that cannot be linked to arrest cycles in the criminal history database, ranging from less than 1% in Georgia to 100% in Colorado. Five jurisdictions (Massachusetts, Nevada, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Wyoming) report that all final court dispositions can be linked to the arrest cycle in the criminal history database. Of the remaining 31 jurisdictions that report a figure, the average rate of unlinked dispositions is 21%; however, more than half (18) report that 10% or less final court dispositions cannot be linked.

• Forty jurisdictions report that they sometimes receive correctional information that cannot be linked to arrest information in the criminal history record database. The jurisdictions vary considerably in the percentage of court dispositions that cannot be linked to arrest cycles in the criminal history database, ranging from less than 1% in Georgia and Michigan to 100% in Colorado and South Carolina. Although the

average for the 22 jurisdictions that report a figure is 18%, more than half (12) report that 5% or less of the correctional information received cannot be linked.

- The jurisdictions use a variety of procedures when a linkage cannot be established. Six States create "dummy" arrest segments from court disposition records; six States create "dummy" court segments from custody records; nine States enter court information into the database without any linkage to a prior arrest; 16 States enter custody information into the database without any linkage to a prior court disposition; 29 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico do not enter the unlinked court information; 17 States and Puerto Rico do not enter unlinked custody information; and 16 States and the Virgin Islands utilize other procedures, such as contacting or returning the information to the originating or contributing agency (six jurisdictions) or using temporary or pending files until a match can be established (six States).

Data quality strategies

Strategies employed by State criminal history repository to ensure accuracy of data in criminal history database, 1992 (Table 18):

- In order to prevent the entry and storage of inaccurate data and to detect and correct inaccurate entries in the criminal history database, a large majority of the jurisdictions, a total of 48 States, the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands, complete a manual review of incoming source documents or reports.

- Other methods used most frequently include computer edit and verification programs employed by 41 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico and manual review of transcripts before dissemination performed in 33 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

- Manual double-checking before data entry is completed in 21 States, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

- Eighteen States and the District of Columbia perform random sample comparisons of the State criminal history repository files with stored documents.

- Thirteen States and the District of Columbia generate error lists which are returned to the reporting agencies.

- Sixteen jurisdictions use various methods, such as establishment of a task force, periodic audits of reporting agencies or of the repository, and comparison of data in the criminal history database to data in the automated fingerprint identification system.

Level of audit activity of State criminal history repository

Audit activities of State criminal history repository, 1992 (Table 19):

- Forty-seven States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico maintain transaction logs to provide an audit trail of all inquiries, responses and record updates or modifications.

- Less than half of the repositories, a total of 22 States and the District of Columbia, report that the State criminal history repository or some other agency performed random sample audits of user agencies to ensure accuracy and completeness of repository records and to ensure that the agencies comply with applicable laws and regulations.

Data quality audits of State criminal history repository, 1992 (Table 20):

- During the past five years, an audit of the State criminal history repository's database (other than ongoing systematic sampling) has been conducted in 23 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico to determine the level of accuracy and completeness of the criminal history file.

- Of the jurisdictions where audits have been performed, in 17 States and the District of Columbia, another agency conducted the audit; in three States and Puerto Rico, the repository conducted its own audit; and in three States, the audits were conducted with a combination of outside agencies and the repositories.

- In 16 of the States and the District of Columbia where audits were conducted, changes were made as a result of the audit to improve data quality of the records.

- Thirty-seven States and the District of Columbia also have data quality audits planned or scheduled for the next three years.

- Forty-six States and the District of Columbia have initiatives underway at the repository or contributing agencies to improve data quality. Initiatives include audit activities (16); automation changes (16); disposition or arrest reporting enhancements (9); felony flagging (2); fingerprint enhancements (7); agency interfaces (6); legislation (3); plan development (5); establishment of task forces/working groups (6); implementation or improvement of tracking numbers (7); and training (8).

Presale criminal history record checks on potential firearm purchasers

Search methods used in conducting criminal history checks on potential firearm purchasers, 1992 (Table 23):

- Ten States and the Virgin Islands conduct records checks on firearm purchasers based on name and date of birth only. Delaware augments these data with the social security number and driver's license number of the potential purchaser. South Carolina also requires the additional information of the social security number.

- Seven jurisdictions require fingerprint checks under some circumstances. New York requires fingerprints for all checks; California requires fingerprints depending upon the type of application; Nebraska requires fingerprints for the purchase of automatic weapons; New Jersey and Oregon use fingerprints when identification is not made with a prior name and date of birth search; the District of Columbia and North Carolina

also require fingerprints in addition to the name and date of birth of the potential purchaser.

- All jurisdictions have minimum data elements which must be submitted to conduct the records search. All require name and date of birth. In addition, nine jurisdictions also require sex; six also require race; four also require social security number; and the Virgin Islands also requires place of birth and a picture identification.

- All but two of the jurisdictions that conduct records searches on firearm purchasers use the computer-based "soundex" searching capability. This enables the computer to identify likely candidates based on the phonetic sound of the name, rather than only the spelling.

- The statutes in 15 States authorize the release of information to individual firearms dealers, although in one State, Illinois, the information may be released to in-state firearms dealers only.

Costs of implementing and operating programs for presale criminal history record checks on potential firearm purchasers, 1992 (Table 24):

- Most of the jurisdictions conducting presale records checks were unable to specifically quantify start-up costs of their programs. Of the six that could, the costs ranged from \$55,000 in Delaware to \$638,600 in Florida. The average cost of the six programs is \$327,600.

- Of the 10 jurisdictions responding, the annual operating costs of the programs ranged from \$7,000 in Nebraska to \$7,547,000 in California. The average annual operating cost is \$1,118,970.

- Programs that are not fee-supported or that are not totally supported by the fees are generally supplemented by the operating budgets or general funds of the jurisdiction.

Data tables

Explanatory Notes for Table 1

The notes below expand on the data in Table 1. The explanatory information was provided by the respondent.

* State is fully manual.

... Not available.

NA Not applicable.

† Flag is set when arrest information is entered.

†† Flag is set when conviction information is entered.

** Flag is set both at arrest and conviction.

^aAll automated records and approximately 50% of the manual records are contained in an automated master name index (MNI).

^bResponse indicates an increase from 95% reported in 1990.

^cTraffic and misdemeanor cases are not included in the automated MNI.

^dResponse indicates an increase from 86% reported in 1990.

^eMore arrest information is being placed in the MNI than in 1989, which has resulted in a backlog that should be cleared in 12-18 months. New information is current, but adding the additional information to prior MNI entries has not been completed.

^fResponse indicates an increase from 70% reported in 1990.

^gThe manual file is not in the automated MNI.

^hApproximately 20,000 names, name derivatives and aliases have been entered into a temporary, abbreviated automated MNI; however, the MNI is not usable at this time for a name search.

ⁱThe flag is generated on demand when an inquiry is made against the file.

^jThere are 2.5 million records in the criminal history file, which is court-based; these records are not on the MNI. There are 760,000 records that are arrest/fingerprint-based; these records are on the MNI.

^kThere are 760,000 records that are automated; a backlog consisting of 80,000 records is not yet on the MNI.

^lThe data field has been created, but the flag is not currently being set.

^mAdding all records onto the automated MNI is in process.

ⁿManual records with no activity since 1971 are not on the MNI.

^oThe figure represents the number of subjects in the criminal history file; however, 28% of the database consists of civil purpose files.

^pMost of the current dispositions contain a felony or misdemeanor flag for each offense; however, the programs to flag the identification segment for an inquiry with purpose code "F" have not been developed.

^qOnly those with a date of birth of 1940 and later are included in the automated MNI.

^rEffective July 1, 1993, the flag is now set at conviction.

^sResponse indicates an increase from 35% reported in 1990.

^tThe automated MNI contains all arrest subjects since 1972.

^uOnly recent additions to the file are flagged.

^vRespondent is undertaking an ongoing data entry program to fully automate the MNI.

^wChanges in court documents have resulted in not "all" cases having sufficient information to flag felonies.

^xThe Virgin Islands Record Bureau does not have a MNI; only a manual criminal history file is maintained.

^yCurrently, some arrest transactions are flagged indicating felony convictions. A felony flag that will appear in the identification segment of the record is currently being developed.

Table 1. Overview of State criminal history record systems, 1992

| State | Percent of record subjects in master name index | Fully automated master name index | Number of subjects (individual offenders) in State criminal history file | | Percent of arrests in database which have final dispositions recorded | | System flags subjects with felony convictions | System has information to identify unflagged felony convictions |
|----------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|------------|---|-----------------------------|---|---|
| | | | Total | Automated | All arrests | Arrests within past 5 years | | |
| Total | | | 47,307,900 | 36,404,800 | | | | |
| Alabama | 100% | Yes | 1,300,000 | 1,300,000 | 25% | 40% | All† | |
| Alaska | 100 | Yes | 180,500 | 130,500 | 84 | 86 | All†† | |
| Arizona | 100 | Yes | 631,000 | 342,600 | ... | 57 | All† | |
| Arkansas | 100 | No ^a | 417,600 | 132,600 | ... | ... | All†† | |
| California | 100 | Yes | 4,675,400 | 3,675,400 | ... | 70 | Some†† | All |
| Colorado | 100% | Yes | 575,700 | 575,700 | 11% | ... | Some** | All |
| Connecticut | 100 | Yes | 648,700 | 325,600 | ... | 95% | | |
| Delaware | 100 ^b | Yes | 237,300 | 158,000 | 50 | 62 | | Some |
| District of Columbia | 100 | No ^c | 456,100 | 101,100 | ... | ... | Some†† | Some |
| Florida | 100 | Yes | 2,671,700 | 2,671,700 | 52 | 32 | Some** | Some |
| Georgia | 100% | Yes | 1,445,000 | 1,445,000 | 54% | 45% | All†† | |
| Hawaii | 100 | Yes | 309,600 | 309,600 | 87 | ... | All†† | |
| Idaho | 100 | Yes | 132,300 | 76,200 | ... | 45 | All†† | |
| Illinois | 88 ^d | Yes | 2,493,200 | 2,193,200 | 52 | ... | All†† | |
| Indiana | 100 | No ^e | 735,800 | 667,800 | 30 | 40-50 | | |
| Iowa | 100% | Yes | 377,000 | 226,200 | 90% | 90% | | All |
| Kansas | 100 | Yes | 599,600 | 137,800 | ... | ... | Some†† | Some |
| Kentucky | 100 ^f | No ^g | 530,500 | 424,500 | 30 | 30 | | Some |
| Louisiana | 100 | Yes | 1,591,500 | 579,400 | ... | ... | | All |
| Maine | 68 | No ^h | 300,000 | 0 | 90 | 97 | | Some |
| Maryland | 100% | Yes | 1,050,900 | 563,200 | 70% | 70% | Some ⁱ | All |
| Massachusetts | ... | No ^k | 2,500,000 | 2,500,000 | 95 | 98 | | Some |
| Michigan | 100 | Yes | 939,900 | 939,900 | 71 | 74 | | Some |
| Minnesota | 100 | Yes | 232,500 | 157,500 | 50 | 70 | Some ^l | All |
| Mississippi | 100 | No | 350,000+ | 26,000 | 20-30 | 50 | | |
| Missouri | 100% | Yes | 647,700 | 473,900 | 50% | 65% | All†† | |
| Montana | 100 | Yes | 107,100 | 107,100 | ... | ... | All† | |
| Nebraska | 100 | No ^m | 124,000 | 117,000 | 75 | 55 | Some†† | |
| Nevada | 100 | Yes | 102,800 | 102,800 | 40 | 40 | | All |
| New Hampshire | 100 | Yes | 253,900 | 173,900 | 50 | 50 | All† | |
| New Jersey | 100% | Yes | 1,187,400 | 987,400 | 90% | 85% | All†† | |
| New Mexico | 100 | Yes | 201,000 | 0 | 15 | 20 | | Some |
| New York | 88 ⁿ | Yes | 4,123,500 ^o | 3,575,600 | 63 | 74 | All† | |
| North Carolina | 100 | Yes | 529,800 | 459,300 | 87 | 85 | Some††† | Some |
| North Dakota | 100 | No ^q | 212,900 | 54,200 | 60 | 90 | Some ^{tr} | Some |
| Ohio | 100% ^s | No ^t | 2,444,400 | 820,000 | ... | ... | Some ^{tu} | Some |
| Oklahoma | 100 | Yes | 600,000 | 360,000 | 50% | 50% | | Some |
| Oregon | 100 | Yes | 661,800 | 661,800 | ... | ... | Some†† | |
| Pennsylvania | 100 | Yes | 1,414,500 | 1,414,500 | ... | 65 | All† | |
| Puerto Rico | 100 | Yes | 64,100 | 64,100 | 71 | 71 | All†† | |
| Rhode Island | 100% | Yes | 186,700 | 186,700 | ... | ... | | |
| South Carolina | 100 | Yes | 695,900 | 629,200 | 71% | 80% | Some†† | All |
| South Dakota | 100 | Yes | 125,000 | 70,500 | 60 | 60 | | All |
| Tennessee | 100 | No ^v | 590,000 | 165,000 | ... | ... | | |
| Texas | 100 | Yes | 4,277,700 | 4,277,700 | 39 | ... | | Some |
| Utah | 100% | Yes | 325,000 | 325,000 | 50% | 55% | All†† | |
| Vermont | 100 | Yes | 130,000 | 0 | 95 | 85 | | Some ^w |
| Virginia | 100 | Yes | 874,500 | 615,900 | 82 | ... | All** | |
| Virgin Islands | NA ^x | NA* | 11,300 | 0 | ... | ... | | |
| Washington | 100 | Yes | 643,300 | 643,300 | 70 | 68 | All†† | |
| West Virginia | 100% | No* | 750,000 | 0 | ... | 75% | | |
| Wisconsin | 100 | Yes | 574,800 | 393,300 | ... | ... | Some†† | Some ^y |
| Wyoming | 100 | Yes | 67,100 | 67,100 | 78% | 83 | | Some |

Note: Percentages and numbers reported are results of estimates. Numbers have been rounded to the nearest 100. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number. The figures contained in the column "Number of subjects (individual offenders) in State criminal history file" apply only to the

criminal history file, including partially automated files, and do not include the master name index. Final dispositions include release by police without charging, declination to proceed by prosecutor, or final trial court disposition.

Explanatory Notes for Table 2

The notes below expand on the data in Table 2. The explanatory information was provided by the respondent.

^aThis figure does not include the District of Columbia, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Tennessee and the Virgin Islands, for which 1984 data were not reported. It also does not include Nevada, which did not have a repository in 1984. Except for Massachusetts and Vermont, for which corrected data were submitted, the data in this column are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Technical Report: State Criminal Records Repositories* (October 1985), Table 1. The numbers have been rounded to the nearest 100.

^bThis figure does not include the Virgin Islands, for which 1989 data were not reported. Except for Arkansas, Massachusetts, Missouri and Puerto Rico, for which corrected data were submitted, the data in this column are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems* (March 1991), Table 2.

^cThe total number of criminal history files has decreased due to the elimination of deceased records and purged records.

^dThe total number of criminal history files has been decreasing due to purging of old and duplicate records, as well as civil files that were erroneously given criminal identification numbers.

^eThe number of manual records has decreased from 1,500,000 in 1989 due to the purging of older, inactive files.

^fDecrease in total files is the result of excluding traffic files which were assumed included in the 1989 figure.

^gRespondent indicated that this figure includes many records which have since been purged because the records contained only nonserious offenses.

^hResponse is based on more accurate information which is now available.

ⁱVariations in the figures for 1984, 1989 and 1992 are attributable to a five-year purge project in which 700,000 records were removed.

^jThe number of subjects reported for 1989 included outdated misdemeanor records which were purged when automation of the arrest data began in 1990.

^kThe lower number in 1992 is the result of purging inactive files.

^lUtah now uses only the automated criminal history file.

Table 2. Number of subjects (individual offenders) in State criminal history file, 1984, 1989 and 1992

| State | Number of subjects in manual and automated files | | Number of subjects in manual and automated files, 1992 | | | Percent of automated files | | Percent change in total files | |
|-----------------------|--|-------------------------|--|------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|------|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| | 1984 | 1989 | Total | Manual file | Automated file | 1989 | 1992 | 1984-89 | 1989-92 |
| Total | 30,367,500 ^a | 42,476,400 ^b | 47,307,900 | 10,903,100 | 36,404,800 | | 77% | 40% | 11% |
| Alabama | 900,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,300,000 | 0 | 1,300,000 | 50% | 100% | 11% | 30% |
| Alaska | 124,400 | 143,000 | 180,500 | 50,000 | 130,500 | 86 | 72 | 15 | 21 |
| Arizona | 500,400 | 742,100 | 631,000 | 288,400 | 342,600 | 39 | 54 | 48 | -15 ^c |
| Arkansas | 550,100 | 480,000 | 417,600 | 285,000 | 132,600 | 0 | 32 | -13 | -15 ^d |
| California | 3,600,000 | 4,500,000 | 4,675,400 | 1,000,000 ^e | 3,675,400 | 67 | 79 | 25 | 4 |
| Colorado | 336,800 | 489,000 | 575,700 | 0 | 575,700 | 100% | 100% | 45% | 18% |
| Connecticut | 50,000 | 401,400 | 648,700 | 323,100 | 325,600 | 58 | 50 | 703 | 62 ^f |
| Delaware | 206,000 | 600,000 | 237,300 | 79,300 | 158,000 | 83 | 67 | 191 | -60 ^f |
| District of Columbia | ... | 427,000 | 456,100 | 355,000 | 101,100 | 0 | 22 | ... | 7 |
| Florida | 1,651,700 | 2,427,900 | 2,671,700 | 0 | 2,671,700 | 95 | 100 | 47 | 10 |
| Georgia | 782,000 | 1,055,000 | 1,445,000 | 0 | 1,445,000 | 100% | 100% | 35% | 37% |
| Hawaii | 203,600 | 270,500 | 309,600 | 0 | 309,600 | 100 | 100 | 33 | 14 |
| Idaho | 137,100 | 105,000 | 132,300 | 56,100 | 76,200 | 100 | 57 | -23 | 26 |
| Illinois | 1,900,000 | 2,152,300 | 2,493,200 | 300,000 | 2,193,200 | 86 | 88 | 13 | 16 |
| Indiana | 375,000 | 670,000 | 735,800 | 68,000 | 667,800 | 10 | 91 | 79 | 10 |
| Iowa | 275,000 | 300,000 | 377,000 | 150,800 | 226,200 | 43% | 60% | 9% | 26% |
| Kansas | 400,000 | 520,000 | 599,600 | 461,800 | 137,800 | 3 | 23 | 30 | 15 |
| Kentucky | 297,000 | 535,100 | 530,500 | 106,000 | 424,500 | 72 | 79 | 80 | -1 |
| Louisiana | 261,400 | 1,449,000 | 1,591,500 | 1,012,100 | 579,400 | 33 | 36 | 454 | 10 |
| Maine | 285,000 ^g | 270,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -5 | 11 |
| Maryland | 250,000 | 649,300 | 1,050,900 | 487,700 | 563,200 | 69% | 54% | 160% | 62% |
| Massachusetts | 1,740,000 | 2,260,000 | 2,500,000 | 0 | 2,500,000 | 21 | 100 | 30 | 11 |
| Michigan | 668,800 | 771,800 | 939,900 | 0 | 939,900 | 100 | 100 | 15 | 22 |
| Minnesota | 143,000 | 190,600 | 232,500 | 75,000 | 157,500 | 61 | 68 | 33 | 22 |
| Mississippi | ... | 350,000 | 350,000 ^h | 324,000 | 26,000 | 0 | 7 | ... | ... |
| Missouri | 503,000 | 593,000 | 647,700 | 173,800 | 473,900 | 81% | 73% | 91% | -32% |
| Montana | 70,700 | 86,000 | 107,100 | 0 | 107,100 | 100 | 100 | 22 | 25 |
| Nebraska | 180,000 | 300,000 | 124,000 ^c | 7,000 | 117,000 | 40 | 94 | 67 | -59 |
| Nevada | no repository | 31,300 | 102,800 | 0 | 102,800 | 100 | 100 | ... | 228 |
| New Hampshire | 135,000 | 155,000 | 253,900 | 80,000 | 173,900 | 93 | 68 | 15 | 39 |
| New Jersey | 1,000,000 | 1,090,200 | 1,187,400 | 200,000 | 987,400 | 77% | 83% | 9% | 9% |
| New Mexico | ... | 207,000 | 201,000 ^h | 201,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ... | -3 |
| New York ⁱ | 4,000,000 | 3,812,100 | 4,123,400 | 547,800 | 3,575,600 | 82 | 88 | -5 | 8 |
| North Carolina | 307,800 | 432,800 | 529,800 | 70,500 | 459,300 | 83 | 87 | 41 | 22 |
| North Dakota | 179,500 | 202,000 | 212,900 | 158,700 | 54,200 | 21 | 25 | 13 | 5 |
| Ohio | 1,641,300 | 2,315,700 | 2,444,400 | 1,624,400 | 820,000 | 25% | 34% | 41% | 6% |
| Oklahoma | ... | 500,000 | 600,000 | 240,000 | 360,000 | 33 | 60 | ... | 20 |
| Oregon | 337,600 | 548,500 | 661,800 | 0 | 661,800 | 100 | 100 | 63 | 21 |
| Pennsylvania | 1,053,300 | 1,265,800 | 1,414,500 | 0 | 1,414,500 | 39 | 100 | 20 | 12 |
| Puerto Rico | ... | 45,400 | 64,100 | 0 | 64,100 | 100 | 100 | ... | 45 |
| Rhode Island | ... | 156,900 | 186,700 | 0 | 186,700 | 100% | 100% | ... | 19% |
| South Carolina | 383,900 | 572,900 | 695,900 | 66,700 | 629,200 | 87 | 90 | 49% | 21 |
| South Dakota | 150,000 | 144,000 ^j | 125,000 | 54,500 | 70,500 | 0 | 56 | -6 | -13 |
| Tennessee | ... | 500,000 | 590,000 | 425,000 | 165,000 | 0 | 28 | ... | 18 |
| Texas | 3,001,000 | 3,789,500 | 4,277,700 | 0 | 4,277,700 | 99 | 100 | 26 | 13 |
| Utah | 226,300 | 430,200 | 325,000 ^k | 0 | 325,000 | 77% | 100% | 90% | -25% ^l |
| Vermont | 100,000 | 118,000 | 130,000 | 130,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 10 |
| Virginia | 570,000 | 744,000 | 874,500 | 258,600 | 615,900 | 56 | 70 | 31 | 18 |
| Virgin Islands | ... | ... | 11,300 | 11,300 | 0 | ... | 0 | ... | ... |
| Washington | 275,000 | 474,100 | 643,300 | 0 | 643,300 | 100 | 100 | 72 | 36 |
| West Virginia | 192,100 | 650,000 | 750,000 | 750,000 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 238% | 15% |
| Wisconsin | 371,600 | 491,000 | 574,800 | 181,500 | 393,300 | 55 | 68 | 32 | 17 |
| Wyoming | 52,100 | 62,000 | 67,100 | 0 | 67,100 | 84 | 100 | 19 | 8 |

Note: The numbers reported are results of estimates. Numbers have been rounded to the nearest 100. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number. Numbers reported in the "Total" and "Automated file" columns include subjects whose records are partially automated, but do not include the master name index.

... Not available.

Explanatory Notes for Table 3

The notes below expand on the data in Table 3. The explanatory information was provided by the respondents.

^aThe figure represents the number of dispositions during the fiscal year (July-June) rather than the calendar year 1983.

^bSince 1989, courts have noted a decrease in caseload, although Uniform Crime Reports show an increase in crime.

^cThe number reported is atypical due to a records improvement project which has resulted in a higher number of dispositions during this period.

^dThe number of reported dispositions has decreased due to personnel shortages.

Table 3. Number of final dispositions reported to State criminal history repository, 1983, 1989 and 1992

| State | Number of dispositions reported | | | Percent change | |
|----------------------|---------------------------------|---------|----------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | 1983 | 1989 | 1992 | 1983-89 | 1989-92 |
| Alabama | ... | 35,000 | 192,000 | | 449% |
| Alaska | 16,600 | 40,800 | 26,400 | 146 % | -35 |
| Arizona | 59,900 | 112,500 | 112,200 | 88 | <-1 |
| Arkansas | 4,000 | 7,000 | 18,000 | 75 | 157 |
| California | 590,000 | 850,000 | 1,011,300 | 44 | 19 |
| Colorado | 24,600 ^a | ... | ... | | |
| Connecticut | 110,300 | 142,900 | 139,800 | 30% | -2% |
| Delaware | 20,800 | 74,000 | 92,000 | 256 | 24 |
| District of Columbia | ... | ... | 13,600 | | |
| Florida | 171,300 | 110,000 | 173,400 | -36 | 58 |
| Georgia | ... | 260,000 | ... | | |
| Hawaii | 21,800 | 54,800 | 56,000 | 151% | 2% |
| Idaho | ... | ... | 20,000 | | 11 |
| Illinois | ... | 135,000 | 149,400 | | |
| Indiana | 30,900 | 20,000 | 44,600 | -35 | 123 |
| Iowa | ... | 23,000 | ... | | |
| Kansas | 24,700 | 28,900 | 41,300 | 17% | 43% |
| Kentucky | 25,200 | 6,000 | ... | -76 | |
| Louisiana | 19,500 | 30,000 | 21,100 | 54 | -30 |
| Maine | 15,000 | 30,000 | 27,800 ^b | 100 | -7 |
| Maryland | ... | 436,600 | 500,100 | | 14% |
| Massachusetts | ... | ... | 270,000 | | |
| Michigan | 54,700 | ... | 307,400 ^c | | |
| Minnesota | 24,000 | 45,000 | 103,000 | 88% | 129 |
| Mississippi | ... | ... | ... | | |
| Missouri | ... | ... | ... | | |
| Montana | ... | 9,600 | ... | | |
| Nebraska | 16,200 | 12,400 | 25,900 | -24% | 109% |
| Nevada | ... | 20,000 | 29,700 | | 48 |
| New Hampshire | 32,200 | ... | ... | | |
| New Jersey | 95,600 | 200,000 | 250,000 | 109% | 25% |
| New Mexico | ... | 2,600 | 9,800 | | 277 |
| New York | ... | 443,000 | 500,000 | | 13 |
| North Carolina | 50,000 | 60,000 | 65,000 | 20 | 8 |
| North Dakota | 2,300 | 4,000 | 6,200 | 74 | 55 |
| Ohio | 40,400 | 65,000 | ... | 61% | |
| Oklahoma | ... | ... | 15,000 | | |
| Oregon | 50,400 | ... | ... | | |
| Pennsylvania | 56,600 | 74,200 | 219,000 | 31 | 195% |
| Puerto Rico | ... | ... | ... | | |
| Rhode Island | ... | ... | ... | | |
| South Carolina | 62,400 ^a | ... | ... | | |
| South Dakota | ... | ... | ... | | |
| Tennessee | ... | ... | ... | | |
| Texas | 113,100 | ... | ... | | |
| Utah | 20,000 | ... | ... | | |
| Vermont | ... | 18,700 | ... | | |
| Virginia | 104,400 | 141,600 | 228,100 | 36% | 61% |
| Virgin Islands | ... | ... | ... | | |
| Washington | 41,800 | ... | ... | | |
| West Virginia | 12,800 | 38,000 | 6,000 | 197% | -84% ^d |
| Wisconsin | 49,000 | 58,800 | 90,800 | 20 | 54 |
| Wyoming | 13,700 | 6,000 | 9,000 | -56 | 50 |

Note: Final dispositions include release by the police without charging, decline to proceed by prosecutor, or final trial court disposition. Numbers reported are the results of estimates. Numbers have been rounded to the nearest 100. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number. Except for Maine, North Carolina, Pennsylvania and Virginia, for which corrected data were submitted, the data in the column for 1983 are taken from

Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Technical Report: State Criminal Records Repositories* (October 1985), Table 3. The data in the column for 1989 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems* (March 1991), Table 3.

... Not available.

Explanatory Notes for Table 4

The notes below expand on the data in Table 4. The explanatory information was provided by the respondent.

^aAll automated records and approximately 50% of the manual records are contained in an automated master name index (MNI).

^bOnly the new arrest information is automated.

^cTraffic and misdemeanor cases are not included in the automated MNI.

^dA backlog of arrest cards for second/subsequent arrests is awaiting entry onto the automated criminal history file.

^eMore arrest information is being placed in the MNI than in 1989. New information is current, but adding the additional information to the prior MNI entries has not been completed.

^fThe manual file is not in the automated MNI.

^gApproximately 20,000 names, name derivatives and aliases have been entered into a temporary, abbreviated automated MNI; however, the MNI is not usable at this time for a name search.

^hThere are 760,000 records that are automated; however, a backlog consisting of 80,000 records is not yet on the MNI.

ⁱAdding all records onto the automated MNI is in process.

^jOnly those with a date of birth of 1940 and later are included in the automated MNI.

^kThe automated MNI contains all arrest subjects since 1972.

^lAutomated file was initiated in 1987. It contains only felonies and related misdemeanors.

^mRespondent is undertaking an ongoing data entry program to fully automate the MNI.

ⁿThe Virgin Islands Record Bureau does not have a MNI; only a manual criminal history file is maintained.

Table 4. Automation of master name index and criminal history file, 1989 and 1992

| State | Master name index is automated | | Criminal history file is automated | | Prior manual record is automated if offender is re-arrested | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|---|-----------------|
| | 1989 | 1992 | 1989 | 1992 | 1989 | 1992 |
| Alabama | Yes | Yes | Partial | Yes | Yes | |
| Alaska | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes |
| Arizona | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes |
| Arkansas | Partial | Partial ^d | No | Partial | Partial | Yes |
| California | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | No | No |
| Colorado | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | Yes |
| Connecticut | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes |
| Delaware | Partial | Yes | Partial | Partial | No ^b | No ^b |
| District of Columbia | Partial | Partial ^c | No | Partial | Partial | No ^b |
| Florida | Yes | Yes | Partial | Yes | Yes | |
| Georgia | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | |
| Hawaii | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | No ^b |
| Idaho | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial ^d | | Yes |
| Illinois | Partial | Yes | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes |
| Indiana | Yes | Partial ^e | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes |
| Iowa | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes |
| Kansas | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | No | Yes |
| Kentucky | Partial | Partial ^f | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes |
| Louisiana | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes |
| Maine | No | Partial ^g | No | No | | No |
| Maryland | Yes | Yes ^h | Partial | Partial | ... | No ^b |
| Massachusetts | Yes | Yes ^h | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Michigan | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | |
| Minnesota | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | No | No ^b |
| Mississippi | No | Partial | No | Yes | | No |
| Missouri | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes |
| Montana | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | |
| Nebraska | Partial | Partial ⁱ | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes |
| Nevada | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | |
| New Hampshire | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes |
| New Jersey | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes |
| New Mexico | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| New York | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes |
| North Carolina | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes |
| North Dakota | Partial | Partial ^j | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes |
| Ohio | Partial | Partial ^k | Partial | Partial | No | No |
| Oklahoma | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes |
| Oregon | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | |
| Pennsylvania | Yes | Yes | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Puerto Rico | Yes | Yes | Yes ^l | Yes ^l | ... | |
| Rhode Island | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | |
| South Carolina | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes |
| South Dakota | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes |
| Tennessee | Partial | Partial ^m | No | Partial | | Yes |
| Texas | Yes | Yes | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Utah | Yes | Yes | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Vermont | Yes | Yes | No | No | | |
| Virginia | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes |
| Virgin Islands | NA | NA ⁿ | ... | No | | |
| Washington | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | |
| West Virginia | No | No | No | No | | |
| Wisconsin | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes |
| Wyoming | Yes | Yes | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Note: Except for Puerto Rico, for which additional information has been submitted, the data in the columns for 1989 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems* (March 1991), Table 4.

... Not available.

NA Not applicable.

Explanatory Notes for Table 5

The notes below expand on the data in Table 5. The explanatory information was provided by the respondent.

^aStatutes are not currently enforced.

^bEffective August 13, 1993, State law mandates reporting of all data categories on this table. At the close of 1992, however, no statutory requirements existed, although information was voluntarily submitted.

^cThe State law requirement applies to admission of persons sentenced to a period of confinement. When the inmate is released for work release, weekend leave, etc., during the period of confinement, additional fingerprints are not submitted.

^dThe charging agency has the responsibility to notify the repository of the disposition of every arrest, including those where no complaint is filed by the prosecutor.

^eBy administrative regulation, failure of the prosecutor to notify the repository of action taken on the case within 30 days after the arrest results in the case being closed and considered not filed.

^fData on the admission and release of sentenced felony offenders to State prisons or local jails is voluntarily submitted; State law does not require submission.

^gThrough an interpretation of the existing statute, it has been determined that the statute does not require that final court dispositions be submitted to the repository.

^hAdmission data only is required.

ⁱInformation is provided by the County Clerk of Court.

Table 5. Data required by State law to be submitted to State criminal history repository, 1992

| State | Prosecutor declinations | Felony dispositions by courts with felony jurisdiction | Admission/release of felons | | Probation information | Parole information |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| | | | State prisons | Local jails | | |
| Alabama | X | X | X | | X | X |
| Alaska | | | | | | |
| Arizona | X | X | X ^a | X ^a | X ^a | X ^a |
| Arkansas ^b | | | | | | |
| California | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Colorado | X | X | X | X ^c | X | X |
| Connecticut | | X | | | | |
| Delaware | X | X | X | | X | X |
| District of Columbia | X | X | | | X | X |
| Florida | X | X | X | X | | X |
| Georgia | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Hawaii | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Idaho | | X | X | | X | X |
| Illinois | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Indiana | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Iowa | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Kansas | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Kentucky | X | X | X | | X | X |
| Louisiana | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Maine | X ^d | X | | | | |
| Maryland | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Massachusetts | | | | | | |
| Michigan | X | X | X | | | |
| Minnesota | X | X | X | | X | X |
| Mississippi | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Missouri | X ^e | X | X | | X | X |
| Montana | X | X | | | | |
| Nebraska | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Nevada | X | X | | | | |
| New Hampshire ^f | | X | | | | |
| New Jersey | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| New Mexico ^g | | | | | | |
| New York | X | X | X | X ^h | X | X |
| North Carolina | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| North Dakota | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Ohio | | X | X | X | X | X |
| Oklahoma | | | | | | |
| Oregon | | X | | | | |
| Pennsylvania | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Puerto Rico | | X | X | X | | |
| Rhode Island | | | | | | |
| South Carolina | X ⁱ | X | | | | |
| South Dakota | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Tennessee | | | X | X | X | X |
| Texas | X | X | X | | X | X |
| Utah | X | X | X | | X | X |
| Vermont | | X | | | X | X |
| Virginia | | X | X | X | X | X |
| Virgin Islands | | X | | | | |
| Washington | X | X | X | | X | X |
| West Virginia | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Wisconsin | | X | X | X | X | X |
| Wyoming | X | X | X | X | X | X |

Explanatory Notes for Table 6

The notes below expand on the data in Table 6. The explanatory information was provided by the respondents.

Note: Percentages and numbers reported are results of estimates. Numbers have been rounded to the nearest 100. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number. The total arrest fingerprint cards submitted to State criminal history repositories in 1989 and in 1992 was calculated using the mid-point of the range where a range appears in the underlying data. Except as noted in the explanatory notes, arrest information is reported to all State criminal history repositories by fingerprint cards only.

Except for Maryland and Wisconsin, for which corrected data were submitted, the data in the columns for 1989 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems* (March 1991), Table 6.

... Not available.

^a A change in procedure now allows the use of a court disposition as an arrest document when no arrest fingerprint card is received.

^b State does not have a legal requirement that fingerprints and arrest data for all felony arrests must be submitted to the State criminal history repository.

^c The State repository retains all fingerprint cards. Approximately 20% of the cards submitted are of such poor quality that they are not entered into the automated fingerprint identification system (AFIS), but they are retained as manual paper cards.

^d Arrest information is reported by fingerprint cards, terminal and court judgments.

^e All disseminated arrests are fingerprint-based, with the exception of in-house bookings at the California Department of Corrections (CDC). Those bookings are based on a hook-up to the original fingerprint submitted by CDC. Dummy arrests are not disseminated and are considered statistical data only, not criminal history data.

^f Due to resource constraints, submission of certain fingerprints have been discouraged; these include subsequent traffic arrests from the same agency (driving under the influence, hit and run, vehicular homicide excepted), and failure to appear and/or contempt of court when fingerprints were submitted for the original charges.

^g Arrest information is reported on fingerprint cards and on uniform arrest reports which may not include fingerprints.

^h Arrest information is reported by fingerprint cards and criminal summonses.

ⁱ In some cases of minor offenses, State law and/or policy does not require information to be supported by fingerprints; information is entered from criminal summonses that are not supported by fingerprints. The decrease in the percent of arrest events in the criminal history file from 1989 is the result of more accurate figures based on a recent data quality audit.

^j The Metropolitan Police Department also serves as the central repository for criminal records for the District of Columbia; fingerprinting, therefore, is performed by the Police Department/repository.

^k Figure is for fiscal year 1989 rather than calendar year 1989.

^l Arrest information is reported by hard copies of the arrest report.

^m Repository no longer receives fingerprint cards for nonserious charges.

ⁿ Arrest information is reported by terminal.

^o Arrest information is reported by fingerprint cards, terminal, final dispositions, FBI abstracts and other documents.

^p Approximately 50% of the fingerprints received are unacceptable; however, none are returned. Approximately 40% do get resubmitted.

^q The practice of returning most unacceptable fingerprints has been discontinued due to the low rate of resubmissions. This percentage is for agencies which have persons in custody or under supervision, i.e., the Department of Corrections and Probation and Parole.

^r Approximately 70% of all persons charged with a criminal offense are summoned to appear in court. In 1987, the fingerprint law was changed to provide that persons being summoned instead of arrested are to be fingerprinted. Prior to the change, the law mandated that a person had to be "in custody charged with the commission of a crime" to be fingerprinted. Training is ongoing to bring the submission rate into compliance.

^s Resubmissions are rare.

^t Although arrests are fingerprint-supported, the arrests are not linked to the case cycle; therefore, the criminal history file is not fingerprint-supported.

^u The repository is no longer returning unacceptable fingerprints.

^v Arrest information is reported by fingerprint cards and court abstracts.

^w The decrease in fingerprint cards submitted was due to a decrease in criminal arrests.

^x The 1992 figure reflects a decrease in arrests.

^y Approximately 8% of the fingerprints submitted are unacceptable, but none are returned; a jacket is created to store the fingerprint card.

^z Arrest information is reported on an arrest/custody form which need not be accompanied by fingerprints.

^{aa} Response is based on the results of an audit.

Table 6. Arrest records with fingerprints, 1989 and 1992

| State | Number of arrest fingerprint cards submitted to State criminal history repository | | Percent change, 1989-92 | Quality of fingerprint submissions | | | | Percent of arrest events in criminal history files which are fingerprint-supported | |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|-------------------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|--|------------------|
| | 1989 | 1992 | | Percent of arrest fingerprint cards returned by State criminal history repository as unacceptable | | Percent of returned fingerprints resubmitted and accepted | | 1989 | 1992 |
| | | | | 1989 | 1992 | 1989 | 1992 | | |
| Total | 6,012,400 | 6,255,800 | 4% | | | | | | |
| Alabama | 292,900 | 197,200 | -33% | 4% | 3% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 99% ^a |
| Alaska ^b | 15,900 | 12,000 | -25 | 18-20 | 0 ^c | 0 | 0 | 75 ^d | 39 |
| Arizona | 101,900 | 110,000 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 1 | ... | 100 | 100 |
| Arkansas | 23,000 | 32,400 | 41 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 100 | 100 |
| California | 1,000,000 | 1,100,000 | 10 | 0 | 0 | | | 100 | 100 ^e |
| Colorado | 137,000 | 130,700 | -5% ^f | 8-15% | 3% | 0% | 0-1% | 100% | 100% |
| Connecticut | 97,100 | 114,000 | 17 | <1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 75 ^g | 100 |
| Delaware | 40,000 | 50,000 | 25 | <1 | 0 | 0 | | 95 ^h | 90 ⁱ |
| District of Columbia ^j | 10,000 ^k | 42,700 | 327 | | 1 | | 0 | 95 ^l | 100 |
| Florida | 585,400 | 507,000 ^m | -13 | 6 | 0-1 | 25 | 30-50 | 100 | 100 |
| Georgia | 330,000 | 346,500 | 5% | 4% | 1% | 0% | 0-5% | 100% | 100% |
| Hawaii | 52,700 | 52,600 | <-1 | ... | 0 | ... | | 98 ⁿ | 100 |
| Idaho | 27,300 | 28,200 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 10 | | 100 | 100 |
| Illinois | 200,300 | 404,800 | 102 | 0 | 0 | | | 100 | 100 |
| Indiana | 46,400 | 52,300 | 13 | 15 | 40 | 5 | 10 | 100 | 100 |
| Iowa | 30,000 | 47,300 | 58% | 7% | 2% | <1% | 0% | 100% | 100% |
| Kansas | 46,800 | 62,100 | 33 | 0 | 0 | | ... | 10-75 ^o | 0-65 |
| Kentucky | 22,500 | 41,300 | 84 | 10-15 | 0 ^p | 90-95 | | 98 | 100 |
| Louisiana | 179,000 | ... | ... | 10 | 5 ^q | 90 | 3 ^q | 100 | 100 |
| Maine | 6,500 | 7,300 | 12 | <1 | 0-1 | 50 | 50 | 30 ^r | 30 |
| Maryland | 103,000 | 105,300 | -31% | 0% | 1-2% | | ... | 100% | 100% |
| Massachusetts | 50,000-55,000 | 60,000 | 9-20 | 5-10 | 5 | ... | 15% | 0 ^t | 0 |
| Michigan | 116,800 | 124,100 | 6 | 0 | 0 | | | 100 | 100 |
| Minnesota | 26,500 | 35,600 | 34 | 3 | 2-3 | <1% | 50 | 100 | 100 |
| Mississippi | 9,000 | 8,400 | -7 | 50 | ... | 75 | ... | 100 | 100 |
| Missouri | 92,000 | 91,900 | <-1% | 10% | 0-1% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 100% |
| Montana | 12,000 | 26,000 | 117 | 5 | 0 ^u | 1 | | 100 | 100 |
| Nebraska | 13,700 | 18,500 | 35 | 25 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 100 |
| Nevada | 36,300 | 53,700 | 48 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 25 | 100 | 100 |
| New Hampshire | 9,300 | ... | ... | 0 | ... | | ... | 25-35 ^v | 50 |
| New Jersey | 145,700 | 123,300 | -15% ^w | 8% | 2% | 4% | 50% | 100% | 100% |
| New Mexico | 26,200 | 33,600 | 28 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 98 | 100 |
| New York | 520,100 | 496,500 ^x | -5 | <5 | 0-5 | 100 | 100 | 90 | 99 |
| North Carolina | 63,200 | 75,000 | 19 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 100 | 100 |
| North Dakota | 5,000 | 7,000 | 40 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 100 |
| Ohio | 114,500 | 140,900 | 23% | 5% | 5% | 1% | | 100% | 100% |
| Oklahoma | 60,000 | 59,500 | <-1 | 17 | 8 | 10 | ... | 100 | 100 |
| Oregon | 92,100 | 106,000 | 15 | <1 | ... | <1 | ... | 100 | 100 |
| Pennsylvania | 166,700 | 168,100 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 75 | | 100 | 100 |
| Puerto Rico ^b | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 0 |
| Rhode Island | 30,000 | ... | ... | 1% | ... | ... | ... | 100% | 100% |
| South Carolina | 154,400 | 161,900 | 5% | 5 | 1 | 2% | 0% | 100 | 100 |
| South Dakota | 17,600 | 20,000 | 14 | 5-7 | 0 ^y | <1 | | 100 | 100 |
| Tennessee | 75,000 | 90,000 | 20 | 5 | 12 | 25 | 1-2 | 100 | 100 |
| Texas | 398,400 | 450,000 | 13 | 0 | 0 | | | 100 | 100 |
| Utah | 50,200 | 53,500 | 7% | 0% | 5% | | ... | 100% | 100% |
| Vermont ^b | 9,000 | 7,000 | -22 | 35-45 | 30 | 20% | 10 | 35-40 ^z | 20 ^{aa} |
| Virginia | 110,000 | 134,100 | 22 | 20 | 1 | 90 | 5 | 100 | 100 |
| Virgin Islands | ... | 300 | ... | ... | 3 | ... | 0 | ... | 100 |
| Washington | 131,600 | 160,600 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 3 | ... | 100 | 100 |
| West Virginia | 37,200 | ... | ... | 5% | ... | 1% | ... | 100% | 100% |
| Wisconsin | 78,600 | 96,500 | 23% | ... | 13% | ... | ... | 100 | 100 |
| Wyoming | 11,100 | 10,100 | -9 | 0 | 1 | | 0% | 100 | 100 |

Explanatory Notes for Table 7

The notes below expand on the data in Table 7. The explanatory information was provided by the respondent.

^aBoth the fingerprinting and the filing of charges are performed at the same unit.

^bPolice must release or charge an individual *before* sending fingerprints to the repository.

^cAlthough the requirement exists, it is not enforced.

^dThe repository receives arraignment reports on all arraignments from the courts. If no arraignment is received within six months, the repository contacts the arresting agency.

Table 7. Notice to State criminal history repository of release of arrested persons without charging, 1989 and 1992

| State | If an arrestee is not charged after submission of fingerprints, State law requires notification of repository | | Percent of fingerprint submissions for which repository is notified that arrestee has not been charged | |
|-----------------------------------|---|------------------|--|------|
| | 1989 | 1992 | 1989 | 1992 |
| Alabama | Yes | Yes | <1% | 1% |
| Alaska | No | No | | |
| Arizona | No | Yes | | ... |
| Arkansas | No | No | <1 | |
| California | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| Colorado | Yes | Yes | 10% | ... |
| Connecticut | No | No | | |
| Delaware | No | No | | |
| District of Columbia ^a | | | | |
| Florida | No | No | ... | |
| Georgia | Yes | Yes | 100% | ... |
| Hawaii | Yes | Yes | 90+ | 99% |
| Idaho | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| Illinois | Yes | Yes | 0 | ... |
| Indiana | Yes | Yes | 50 | ... |
| Iowa | Yes | Yes | ... | 98% |
| Kansas | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| Kentucky | No | Yes | | ... |
| Louisiana | No | No | | |
| Maine | Yes | Yes | <1% | 3 |
| Maryland | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| Massachusetts | No | No | | |
| Michigan ^b | | Yes | | ... |
| Minnesota | Yes | Yes | 80% | 80% |
| Mississippi | No | No | 10 | |
| Missouri | No | No | | |
| Montana | Yes | Yes | ... | |
| Nebraska | Yes | Yes | 10% | 40% |
| Nevada | Yes | Yes | 90 | 80 |
| New Hampshire | No | No | | |
| New Jersey | No | No | | |
| New Mexico | No | No | | |
| New York | No | Yes | | ... |
| North Carolina ^b | No | No | | |
| North Dakota | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| Ohio | No | No | | |
| Oklahoma | No | No | | |
| Oregon | No | No | | |
| Pennsylvania | Yes | Yes | ... | |
| Puerto Rico | No | No | ... | |
| Rhode Island | No | No | | |
| South Carolina | No | No | 75% | |
| South Dakota | Yes | Yes | 1 | |
| Tennessee | No | No | | ... |
| Texas | No | Yes | | ... |
| Utah | No | No | | |
| Vermont | Yes | Yes ^c | 100% ^d | |
| Virginia | No | No | | |
| Virgin Islands | ... | No | | |
| Washington | No | Yes | | ... |
| West Virginia | Yes | Yes | 60% | ... |
| Wisconsin | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| Wyoming | Yes | Yes | 60 | 80% |

Note: Percentages reported are results of estimates. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number. Except for Florida and Puerto Rico, for which corrected data were received, the data in the columns for 1989 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal Information Systems* (March 1991), Table 7.

... Not available.

Explanatory Notes for Table 8

The notes below expand on the data in Table 8. The explanatory information was provided by the respondents.

^aDue to new reporting procedures, all prosecutor declinations are now reported to the repository; procedures are by agreement with the Department of Law.

^bPending legislation will require reporting of prosecutor declinations.

^cPending legislation will require reporting of felony trial court dispositions.

^dPending legislation will require that the fingerprints be submitted to the repository when subject is convicted after being brought to court by summons.

^ePending legislation will require that fingerprints be submitted to the repository when subject is not convicted after being brought to court by summons.

^fDispositions are not received on 30-40% of *all* arrests. It is unknown at what level the final disposition occurred.

^gProsecutors' position is that a declination is not a disposition; therefore, declinations are not reported.

^hIn 1989, the repository was receiving 100% of all dispositions that occurred in the automated District Court systems; these dispositions were placed in the automated disposition "pending posting" file, but they lacked sufficient elements to match them with arrest records. The estimate for 1992 reflects the number of dispositions reported that do match arrests.

ⁱThe response for 1992 is based on more accurate information that is now available to the repository.

^jFigure represents *all* cases, not just felonies.

^kFigure was determined by a data quality baseline audit.

^lMore accurate information is now available. The State repository is working with the courts to improve reporting.

^mThe charging agency has the responsibility to notify the repository of the disposition of every arrest, including those where no complaint is filed by the prosecutor.

ⁿMore accurate information is available.

^oBy administrative regulation, failure of the prosecutor to notify the repository of action taken on the case within 30 days after the arrest results in the case being closed and considered not filed.

^pThrough an interpretation of the existing statute, it has been determined that the statute does not require that final court dispositions be submitted to the repository.

^qDue to manpower requirements, the project for obtaining missing dispositions was suspended for a few years. The repository is currently working on ways to obtain the missing dispositions.

^rThe decline is due to large contributors who are no longer reporting and some who are working toward electronic reporting.

^sDecline in dispositions received is due to a personnel shortage.

^tRespondent indicated that this figure reflects the percent of dispositions reported in 1987; more current figures were unavailable.

^uInformation is provided by County Clerk of Court.

^vThis is a relatively new statutory requirement.

^wMore information is available based on reports which were run off the criminal history file.

Table 8. Completeness of prosecutor and court disposition reporting to State criminal history repository, 1989 and 1992

| State | Percent of cases in which State criminal history repository is notified of: | | | | Percent of cases in which fingerprints are received by State criminal history repository when subject is: | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|---|------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| | Prosecutor declinations | | Final felony trial court dispositions | | Convicted after summons | | Not convicted after summons | |
| | 1989 | 1992 | 1989 | 1992 | 1989 | 1992 | 1989 | 1992 |
| Alabama | <1% | <1% | 30% | 20% | ... | NA | ... | NA |
| Alaska | NA | 95 ^a | 85 | 90 | 75% | ... | NA | NA |
| Arizona | ... | ... | ... | ... | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arkansas | 15 | NA ^b | 35 | 90 ^c | NA | NA ^d | NA | NA ^e |
| California | ... | ... | 85 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Colorado | <15% | 0% ^B | 100% | 0-1% ^h | 100% | ... | 100% | ... |
| Connecticut | NA | NA | 100 | 100 | ... | NA | ... | NA |
| Delaware | 50 | 90 | ... | 65 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| District of Columbia | 0 | ... | 5 | ... | 97-99 | 100% | 97-99 | 100% |
| Florida | 60 | 80 | 50 | 80 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Georgia | 100% | 90+ ⁱ | 85% | 90+% | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Hawaii | ... | ... | ... | 80 ^j | ... | NA | NA | NA |
| Idaho | 100 | ... | 80 | 71 ^k | NA | ... | NA | ... |
| Illinois | 50 | 68 | 50 | 52 | 0% | ... | NA | NA |
| Indiana | 50 | 55 | 75 | 30-40 ^l | 0 | 0% | NA | NA |
| Iowa | NA | 98% | ... | 95% | ... | NA ^d | NA | NA |
| Kansas | 35-40% | ... | 80% | ... | ... | NA ^d | ... | NA ^e |
| Kentucky | NA | 100 | 75-80 | 90 | NA | ... | NA | ... |
| Louisiana | 50 | 30 | 50 | 50 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Maine | <1 | ... ^m | 100 | 99 | 2% | 5% | 1% | 1% |
| Maryland | ... | 100% | 82% | 100% | ... | 50% | NA | NA |
| Massachusetts | NA | 100 | 100 | 98 | NA | 10 | NA | 0% |
| Michigan | NA | ... | 64 | 70 | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Minnesota | 70% | 40 ⁿ | 99 | 99 | 7% | 20 | 0% | 2 |
| Mississippi | 30 | NA | 25 | NA | ... | NA | ... | NA |
| Missouri | 80% | 5-10% ^o | 60% | 68% | ... | <1% | ... | NA |
| Montana | ... | NA | 80 | 70 | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Nebraska | 100 | ... | 50 | 75 | NA | 10 | NA | NA |
| Nevada | 90 | 75 | 65 | 50 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| New Hampshire | NA | NA | 80 | 80 | ... | NA | ... | NA |
| New Jersey | 90% | 90% | 95% | 95% | 85% | 70% | 85% | 70% |
| New Mexico ^p | NA | 5 | 5 | 15 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| New York | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | NA |
| North Carolina | NA | 85 | 93 | 85 ^q | NA | ... | NA | NA |
| North Dakota | 80 | ... | 80 | 90 | 50 | 50 | NA | NA |
| Ohio | NA | NA | 55% | 35% ^r | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Oklahoma | NA | NA | 80 | 60 ^s | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Oregon | NA | NA | 60 ^t | 100 | 50% | ... | NA | NA |
| Pennsylvania | 80% | 65% | ... | 65 | 70 | ... | NA | ... |
| Puerto Rico | ... | NA | ... | NA | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Rhode Island | 1% | ... | ... | ... | 10% | NA | 10% | NA |
| South Carolina | 80 | 100% ^u | 100% | 100% | 90 | NA | 5 | NA |
| South Dakota | 1 | ... | 75 | 60-75 | 50 | NA | 50 | NA |
| Tennessee | NA | NA | 5 | 35-40 | ... | NA | ... | NA |
| Texas | 0 | 0 ^v | 40 | 40 ^v | NA | ... ^v | NA | ... ^v |
| Utah | 0% | 45% | 60% | 55% ^w | ... | ... | ... | NA |
| Vermont | 100 | ... | 100 | ... | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Virginia | NA | ... | 95 | 96 | ... | ... | ... | NA |
| Virgin Islands | ... | ... | ... | 35 | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Washington | 40 | ... | 7 | 75-80 | 5-10% | 5-10% | NA | ... |
| West Virginia | 85% | 75% | 85% | 75% | 2% | 5% | 0% | 5% |
| Wisconsin | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Wyoming | 60 | 80 | 60 | 80 | 5 | NA | NA | NA |

Note: Percentages reported are results of estimates. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number. The data in the columns for 1989 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems* (March 1991), Table 8.

... Not available.

NA Not applicable. (Not required to be submitted.)

Explanatory Notes for Table 9

The notes below expand on the data in Table 9. The explanatory information was provided by the respondents.

^aInformation regarding this type of modification is not reported to the State criminal history repository.

^bThe record is removed from the automated file and retained manually.

^cInformation regarding pardons was not previously reported to the State criminal history repository. Electronic reporting began June 30, 1993.

^dThis occurs only in cases where an offender is acquitted or the case is dismissed.

^eCourts have the inherent authority to set aside convictions, although no State law exists that formalizes the practice.

^fThe record may be destroyed or retained with the action noted depending upon whether the charge was a misdemeanor or a felony and whether the record subject was convicted.

^gState law does not provide for expungements, but courts have inherent authority to order a record expunged; in such cases, the record is destroyed.

^hThe record will also be sealed if ordered by the court.

ⁱSet-asides occur only in cases where an appeal results in overturning the conviction. In these instances, the case is remanded to the sentencing court.

^jThe record is removed from the database and sealed.

^kIf a court order is received, the State criminal history repository complies with the order unless it is for a State police arrest, in which instance, the order is challenged.

^lSet-aside provisions are applicable only to cases of first offense drug possession.

^mConvictions are not expunged unless they are pardoned.

ⁿThis modification applies only in cases of specific controlled substances laws.

^oThis occurs only by appeal.

^pRestoration of an offender's civil rights is accomplished only by a pardon.

Table 9. Policies/practices of State criminal history repository regarding modification of felony convictions, 1992

| State | Expungements | | Sei-asides | | Pardons | | Restoration of Civil Rights | |
|----------------------|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | State law provides for expungement of felony convictions | How records are treated by State criminal history repository † | State law provides for sei-asides of felony convictions | How records are treated by State criminal history repository † | State law provides for pardons of felons | How records are treated by State criminal history repository † | State law provides for restoration of felons' civil rights | How records are treated by State criminal history repository † |
| Alabama | Yes | 1 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| Alaska | | | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| Arizona | | | Yes | 2 | | | Yes | 2 |
| Arkansas | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| California | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| Colorado | | | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| Connecticut | | | | | Yes | 2 | | |
| Delaware | | | | | Yes | 2 | Yes | 8 ^a |
| District of Columbia | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| Florida | | 8 ^b | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| Georgia | | | Yes | 2 | Yes | 8 ^c | Yes | 8 ^a |
| Hawaii | | | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| Idaho | | | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| Illinois | | | | | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| Indiana | Yes | 1 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| Iowa | Yes | 1 ^d | Yes | 1 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| Kansas ^e | Yes | 2 | | | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| Kentucky | Yes | 6 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| Louisiana | Yes | 1, 2 ^f | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| Maine | | | | | Yes | 2 | | |
| Maryland | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| Massachusetts | | 1 ^g | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| Michigan | | | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | | |
| Minnesota | | 1 ^g | Yes | 2, 4 ^h | Yes | 2, 4 ^h | Yes | 2, 4 ^h |
| Mississippi | Yes | 1 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| Missouri | | | Yes | 3 ⁱ | Yes | 2 | Yes | 5 |
| Montana | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| Nebraska | | | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| Nevada | | | Yes | 2 | | | Yes | 2 |
| New Hampshire | Yes | 4 ^j | Yes | ... | Yes | 2 | | |
| New Jersey | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| New Mexico | | 1 ^k | Yes ^l | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| New York | | | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| North Carolina | | | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| North Dakota | | | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | | |
| Ohio | Yes | 6 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| Oklahoma | | | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| Oregon | Yes | 2, 4 | Yes | 2, 4 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| Pennsylvania | Yes ^m | 1 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | ... |
| Puerto Rico | Yes | 1 ⁿ | Yes | 1 ⁿ | Yes | 2 | Yes | ... |
| Rhode Island | Yes | 1 | Yes | 1 | Yes | 1 | Yes | 1 |
| South Carolina | | | Yes ^o | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes ^p | 2 |
| South Dakota | Yes | 2 | Yes | 1 | Yes | 1 | Yes | 1 |
| Tennessee | Yes | 2 | | | Yes | 8 ^a | | |
| Texas | | | | | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| Utah | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 5 |
| Vermont | Yes | 3 | Yes | ... | Yes | 7 | | |
| Virginia | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| Virgin Islands | Yes | 1 | Yes | 1 | Yes | 1 | Yes | 1 |
| Washington | Yes | 6 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| West Virginia | | | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | ... |
| Wisconsin | | | | | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |
| Wyoming | | | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes | 2 |

† 1 Record is destroyed by State criminal history repository.
 2 Record is retained with action noted on the record.
 3 Record is returned to the court.
 4 Record is sealed.

5 No action is taken.
 6 Record is returned to submitting agency.
 7 Record is returned to the Governor's Office.
 8 Other
 ... Not available.

Explanatory Notes for Table 10

The notes below expand on the data in Table 10. The explanatory information was provided by the respondents.

^aIf fingerprint cards are received from corrections, they are processed; there is no link, however, between corrections and the criminal history database.

^bResponse reported in 1990 was 90%.

^cResponse reported in 1990 was 100%.

^dResponse reported in 1990 was 90+%.

^eTraditionally, the State central repository has received the fingerprints of admitted prisoners from State prisons and local jails; however, State law does not require the submission.

^fResponse reported in 1990 was 5%.

^gData on the admission of sentenced felony offenders to State prisons or local jails are voluntarily submitted; State law does not require the submission.

^hResponse reported in 1990 was 15%.

ⁱResponse reported in 1990 was 25%.

^jInformation from the Department of Correctional Services is now updated on-line. Fingerprints are requested only in those cases where a match cannot be made on-line. Effective September 1993, correctional data is no longer required to be submitted to the repository pursuant to a statutory change.

^kThe Virginia Department of Corrections has eliminated local jail classification of inmates.

Table 10. Fingerprinting of incarcerated offenders and linkage to records maintained by State criminal history repository, 1992

| State | Law requires fingerprinting of admitted prisoners and sending fingerprints to repository | | Percent of admitted prisoners for whom repository receives fingerprints | | Repository uses fingerprints to make positive identification and to link correctional data with proper records |
|----------------------------|--|-------------|---|-----------------|--|
| | State prisons | Local jails | State prisons | Local jails | |
| Alabama | Yes | | 100% | | Yes |
| Alaska ^a | | | | | |
| Arizona | | | | | |
| Arkansas | | | 98 | 90% | Yes |
| California | Yes | Yes | 99 | ... | Yes |
| Colorado | Yes | Yes | 100% | 100% | Yes |
| Connecticut | | | | | |
| Delaware | Yes | | 100 | | Yes |
| District of Columbia | | | | | Yes |
| Florida | Yes | | ... | ^c | |
| Georgia | Yes | | 100% | | Yes |
| Hawaii | | | | | |
| Idaho | Yes | | 100 | ^d | Yes |
| Illinois | Yes | Yes | ... | ... | Yes |
| Indiana | Yes | Yes | 90 | 50% | Yes |
| Iowa | Yes | Yes | 100% | 30% | Yes |
| Kansas ^e | | | 100 | ... | Yes |
| Kentucky | Yes | | 100 | | Yes |
| Louisiana | Yes | Yes | 98 | 50 | Yes |
| Maine | | | 100 | 5 | Yes |
| Maryland | | | 100% | 50% | Yes |
| Massachusetts | | | 100 | 50 | Yes |
| Michigan | Yes | | 100 | | Yes |
| Minnesota | Yes | | 100 | | Yes |
| Mississippi | Yes | Yes | 100 | ... | |
| Missouri | Yes | | 99% | | Yes |
| Montana | | | 100 | | Yes |
| Nebraska | Yes | Yes | 98 | ... | Yes |
| Nevada | | | 100 | | |
| New Hampshire ^g | | | 100 | ... | |
| New Jersey | Yes | Yes | 98% | 70% | Yes |
| New Mexico | | Yes | ... | ... | Yes |
| New York | Yes | Yes | 100 | ... | Yes |
| North Carolina | Yes | Yes | 100 | | Yes |
| North Dakota | Yes | Yes | 100 | 10 | Yes |
| Ohio | Yes | Yes | 100% | 60% | Yes |
| Oklahoma | Yes | Yes | 100 | ... | Yes |
| Oregon | | | 100 | | Yes |
| Pennsylvania | | | 95 | | |
| Puerto Rico | | | | | |
| Rhode Island | Yes | Yes | ... | ... | Yes |
| South Carolina | | | 100% | 95% | Yes |
| South Dakota | Yes | Yes | 100 | 95 | Yes |
| Tennessee | Yes | Yes | ... | ... | |
| Texas | Yes | | 100 | | Yes |
| Utah | Yes | Yes | 95% | 95% | Yes |
| Vermont | | | | | Yes |
| Virginia | Yes | Yes | 85 | 15 ^k | Yes |
| Virgin Islands | | | | | |
| Washington | Yes | Yes | 20-30 | ... | Yes |
| West Virginia | Yes | Yes | 98% | 95% | Yes |
| Wisconsin | Yes | | ... | | Yes |
| Wyoming | Yes | Yes | 100 | 95 | Yes |

Note: The figures in the columns represent the estimated percent of fingerprint cards received from State prisons and local jails both in States where a legal requirement exists to fingerprint incarcerated individuals and send the fingerprints to the repository and in States where the procedure is carried out voluntarily. The absence of a response indicates that the information is neither mandated by a State legal requirement nor is it voluntarily submitted. Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.

... Not available.

Explanatory Notes for Table 11

The notes below expand on the data in Table 11. The explanatory information was provided by the respondents.

^aStatutory requirement to report the information is not currently enforced.

^bAlthough parole information is reported to the repository, the repository does not record or maintain it.

^cThe first figure represents information relating to admission to supervision; the second figure represents information relating to release from supervision. The 1992 figures are based on more accurate information now available to the repository.

^dThe State repository is working with the appropriate agencies to improve reporting, which has decreased over the past years.

^eProbation and revocation of probation information is received via the court.

^fResponse is based on the results of a baseline audit.

^gProbation information is derived from the sentencing information from the courts. No information is received directly from probation agencies at this time.

^hReports showing parole are being eliminated in anticipation of the automated reporting system.

ⁱCurrently, probation information is received on final disposition reports from the courts. This procedure is currently under review.

Table 11. Probation and parole data in State criminal history repository, 1989 and 1992

| State | Percent of cases where admission to and release from supervision is reported to repository | | | |
|------------------------|---|---------------------|--------|--------------------|
| | Probation | | Parole | |
| | 1989 | 1992 | 1989 | 1992 |
| Alabama | | 100% | | 100% |
| Alaska | | | | |
| Arizona | | 0 ^a | | 0 ^a |
| Arkansas | 10% | 80 | 100% | 98 |
| California | 85 | ... | 100 | ... |
| Colorado | 0% | <1% | 100% | 100% |
| Connecticut | | | | |
| Delaware | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| District of Columbia | 0 | | 0 | 100 ^b |
| Florida | 85 | | 85 | |
| Georgia | 100% | 90/10% ^c | 100% | 90/2% ^c |
| Hawaii | ... | | ... | |
| Idaho | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Illinois | 50 | ... | 50 | ... |
| Indiana | 75 | 60 ^d | 1 | 60 ^d |
| Iowa | ... | 0% | ... | 0% |
| Kansas | 98% | 100 | 90% | ... |
| Kentucky | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Louisiana | 98 | 100 | 95 | 100 |
| Maine ^c | | | | |
| Maryland | 40% | 100% | 40% | 100% |
| Massachusetts | | 100 | | 100 |
| Michigan | | | | |
| Minnesota | 99 | 85 ^f | 99 | 85 ^f |
| Mississippi | ... | 0-10 | ... | 0-10 |
| Missouri | 100% | 99% | 100% | 99% |
| Montana | | | | |
| Nebraska | 50 | 45-50 ^g | 100 | 98 |
| Nevada | ... | ... | | |
| New Hampshire | | | | |
| New Jersey | 40% | 80% | 90% | 80% ^h |
| New Mexico | | | | |
| New York | 100 | ... | 100 | ... |
| North Carolina | 100 | | 100 | 100 |
| North Dakota | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Ohio | 50% | 50% | 95% | 95% |
| Oklahoma | | | | |
| Oregon | 25 | | 25 | |
| Pennsylvania | 90 | ... | 90 | ... |
| Puerto Rico | ... | | ... | |
| Rhode Island | ... | | ... | |
| South Carolina | 100% | 100% | | |
| South Dakota | 80 | 80 | 98% | 95% |
| Tennessee | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Texas | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 |
| Utah | 75% | ... | 100% | ... |
| Vermont | 10 | 15% | 50 | 60% |
| Virginia | | | | |
| Virgin Islands | ... | | ... | |
| Washington | | 100 | | 100 |
| West Virginia | 85% | 90% | 90% | 90% |
| Wisconsin ⁱ | ... | | ... | ... |
| Wyoming | 10 | 10 | 100 | 100 |

Note: The figures reported in this table are from States in which there is a legal requirement that probation/parole information must be reported to the State criminal history repository or States where the information is voluntarily reported. The absence of a response indicates that the State neither statutorily mandates that the information is reported nor is the information voluntarily reported. See Table 5 for States which have a legal requirement that probation/parole information must be reported to the repository.

Percentages reported are the results of estimates. Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number. Except for Mississippi, for which corrected data were submitted, the data in the columns for 1989 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems* (March 1991), Table 11.

... Not available.

Explanatory Notes for Table 12

The notes below expand on the data in Table 12. The explanatory information was provided by the respondents.

- ^aWorkload has increased and personnel has decreased, resulting in a longer amount of time to enter data.
- ^bThe repository is not the usual data entry point for arrest information into the criminal history database. Arresting agencies enter the data directly; therefore, arrest data are in the criminal history database prior to the receipt of the fingerprint cards. Arrest data are entered in approximately two days but are not fingerprint-supported until approximately 15 days.
- ^cData reported is for 1991. No data is available for 1992.
- ^dMaster name index entries and criminal history file entries occur simultaneously. Data reported is for 1991. No data is available for 1992.
- ^eNormal processing time would be three to four days up to one week.
- ^fThe backlog has consistently averaged about one month.
- ^gIncrease in turnaround of arrest data and fingerprint submissions from the local agency is due to lack of staff at the local agency. Both state and local agencies have experienced economic reductions.
- ^hIncrease in time is due to backlogs and lack of staff.
- ⁱThe current processing time of 15-20 days is slower than preferred, but with the present staff and workload, this is not considered a backlog.
- ^jBacklog is primarily due to a personnel shortage.
- ^kInformation is entered upon request only, unless the offense is a serious felony. This procedure is being followed pending the elimination of an automated fingerprint identification system (AFIS) backlog. When the backlog is eliminated, posting should occur within 72 hours.
- ^lAn increase in crime has resulted in greater workloads; at the same time, there is also a lack of personnel.
- ^mArrest data on repeat offenders are entered weekly. Due to a lack of personnel, new arrest data are entered in about 60 days.
- ⁿFingerprinting is performed at the repository. It takes approximately two weeks to microfiche the arrest data.
- ^oCurrently, there is a two-week backlog on repeat offender cases only.
- ^pRespondent indicated that 30 days is the optimum processing time. Currently, the repository has approximately 30,000 cards which have been name-searched and are ready for entry into the criminal history database, and approximately 15,000 cards which have not been either name-searched or entered into the database.
- ^qThere are approximately 19,000 cards at various stages of entry.
- ^rResponse is based on a recently completed data quality audit.
- ^sAs of December 31, 1992, there was a backlog of 32,966 fingerprint arrest cards for second and subsequent arrests.
- ^tAs a result of conducting local agency audits since 1989, the average time between arrest and receipt of fingerprint cards and arrest data at the repository has been determined to be 10 days.
- ^uRespondent anticipates that the sizeable backlog that currently exists will be resolved in 1993.
- ^vThe present backlog is due to implementation of an automated fingerprint identification system (AFIS) and will be worked out within a few months.
- ^wFigure is for first arrests. The increase since 1989 in the average days to enter arrest data into the criminal history database is due to loss of personnel, especially fingerprint technicians, and to an increase in the number of fingerprint cards received.
- ^xA change in the "unable to classify" fingerprint policy, the increased number of fingerprints received and the lack of resources, specifically fingerprint technicians, have caused the backlog.
- ^yMore accurate information is now known.
- ^zThe increase in time to enter arrest data into the database is due to the enormous growth of the backlog.
- ^{aa}Normal processing time would be one week.
- ^{bb}The backlog has been caused by an increased workload due to growth in the statutorily required applicant background processing.
- ^{cc}Arrest data are not currently entered into the court-based criminal history file.
- ^{dd}Normal processing time would be one week or less.
- ^{ee}There is a backlog; however, newly received cards are processed as a priority.
- ^{ff}A more thorough analysis of the maximum processing time has been conducted, resulting in a more accurate estimate for 1992.
- ^{gg}Response is based on the results of a baseline audit.
- ^{hh}Figure represents receipt time for 1991 arrests.
- ⁱⁱDue to the procurement of an AFIS, no data entry was done from August 1 to December 31, 1992. The backlog is being reduced rapidly and should be completed by September 1993.
- ^{jj}The target processing time is three days.
- ^{kk}Arrest data received in the form of arrest fingerprint cards are entered into the automated, temporary criminal history record file within two days of receipt. The names and aliases are placed in the master name index at that time. The fingerprint cards are then placed in a backlog for fingerprint search/identification processing. As of December 31, 1992, approximately 35,000 fingerprint cards were awaiting processing.
- ^{ll}Arrest fingerprints for purposes of bail hearings are sent by facsimile and have priority; they are entered within two hours.
- ^{mm}The repository supports a statewide facsimile network for the transmission of arrest fingerprints for persons awaiting arraignment. The network handles about half of the statewide arrest fingerprint volume; fingerprints are typically processed, and the rap sheet updated or created, within two hours. Priority work is handled within seven days of receipt.
- ⁿⁿIncrease in time is due to heavy submissions and less personnel to accomplish the task.
- ^{oo}First offenders are current; processing time is two to three days. The processing time for offenders with prior records takes about two weeks because there are more repeat offenders and more coding is required.
- ^{pp}Increase in time is the result of a personnel shortage.
- ^{qq}A backlog of 5,000-7,000 cards per month exists. Respondent anticipates that the AFIS implementation will reduce processing time to three days.
- ^{rr}A backlog of approximately one month currently exists.
- ^{ss}Increase is due to personnel cutbacks and added workload.
- ^{tt}The increased time is due to a backlog resulting from the increased submission of applicant cards that the repository is now required to process.
- ^{uu}Normal processing time would be one to two days.
- ^{vv}A backlog of approximately 31,400 misdemeanor upgrade cards exists.
- ^{ww}Increase is due to an increase in submission of data.

Table 12. Average number of days to process arrest data submitted to State criminal history repository, 1989 and 1992

| State | Average number of days between arrest and receipt of arrest data and fingerprints | | Average number of days between receipt of fingerprints and entry of data into: | | | | Backlog of entering data into criminal history database | |
|----------------------|---|--------------------|---|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|--|--------------------|
| | 1989 | 1992 | Master name index | | Criminal history database | | 1989 | 1992 |
| | | | 1989 | 1992 | 1989 | 1992 | | |
| Alabama | 7 | 10 | 3 | 5 ^a | 3 | 5 ^a | No | No |
| Alaska | 14 | 15 ^b | 7 | 15 | 7 | 15 ^b | No | No |
| Arizona | 17 | 14 ^c | 17 | 11 ^d | 17 | 11 ^d | No | No |
| Arkansas | 30 | 5 | 60 | 30 | 60 | 30 | Yes ^e | Yes ^f |
| California | 21 | 25-30 ^g | 15-20 | 60 ^h | 15-20 | 72 ^h | No ⁱ | Yes ^j |
| Colorado | 7 | 10 | 2 | 1-2 | 2 | ... | No | Yes ^j |
| Connecticut | 7 | 10 | 7 | 60 ^l | 7 | 60 ^l | No | Yes ^m |
| Delaware | 2-3 | 5 | 2-3 | 2-3 | ... | 0-1 | No | No |
| District of Columbia | <1 | <1 | <1 | 1 | NA ⁿ | 1 | No | Yes ^o |
| Florida | 3-5 | 3-10 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | Yes ^p | Yes ^q |
| Georgia | 3-4 | 2 | 252 | 1 | 252 | 1 | Yes | No |
| Hawaii | 7 | 7-30 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | No | No |
| Idaho | 6 | 30 ^r | 7 | 5 | 7 | 5 | No | Yes ^s |
| Illinois | 1-5 | 10 ^t | 1 | ... | 1 | ... | No | Yes ^u |
| Indiana | 7 | 7 | 60 | 30 | 7-21 | 30-60 | Yes ^v | Yes ^j |
| Iowa | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 90 ^w | No | Yes ^x |
| Kansas | 3-5 | 10 ^y | 1 | ... | 1 | ... | No | Yes ^j |
| Kentucky | 14 | 10 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | No | No |
| Louisiana | 7 | 5 | 365 | 270 | 365 | 630 ^z | Yes ^{aa} | Yes ^{bb} |
| Maine | 14 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | No | No |
| Maryland | 7 | 6-10 | 3 | 1 | 60 | 5 | Yes | No |
| Massachusetts | 28 | 14 | 300 | 14 | 300 | NA ^{cc} | Yes ^{dd} | Yes ^{ee} |
| Michigan | 7 | ... | 5 | 10 ^{ff} | 5 | 10 ^{ff} | No | No |
| Minnesota | 14 | 28 ^{gg} | 14 | 1 | 14 | 1 | No | No |
| Mississippi | 21 | ... | 2 | ... | 2 | ... | No | No |
| Missouri | 30 | 34 ^{hh} | 3 | 2-3 | 3 | 2-3 | No | No |
| Montana | ... | ... | 1-7 | ... | 1 | ... | No | Yes ⁱⁱ |
| Nebraska | 30 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | No | No |
| Nevada | 10 | 10 | 60 | 2 | 60 | 2 | Yes ^{jj} | Yes ^{kk} |
| New Hampshire | ... | 30 | ... | 2 | 1-2 | 2 | ... | No |
| New Jersey | 7-14 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | No | No |
| New Mexico | 21 | 20 | 2 | 2 | NA | NA | No | No |
| New York | 7 | 0-7 | <1-14 ^{ll} | 0-7 | <1-14 ^{ll} | 0-7 | No | Yes ^{mmm} |
| North Carolina | 7 | 5 | 15-20 | 12 | 15-20 | 12 | No | Yes ^j |
| North Dakota | 7-10 | 7-10 | <1 | 0-1 | <1 | 0-1 | No | No |
| Ohio | 14 | 25 ⁿⁿ | 14 | 10 | 14 | 35 ⁿⁿ | No ^{oo} | Yes ^j |
| Oklahoma | 7-14 | 30 | 5 | 180 ^{pp} | 2 | 180 ^{pp} | No | Yes ^j |
| Oregon | 14 | 3-5 | 1-10 | 2 | 1-10 | 2 | No | No |
| Pennsylvania | 5 | 7 | 7-112 | 14 | 7-112 | 14 | Yes ^{qq} | No |
| Puerto Rico | ... | 1 | ... | 5 | ... | 5 | ... | No |
| Rhode Island | 30 | ... | 3 | ... | 3 | ... | No | Yes ^{rr} |
| South Carolina | 5 | 10 ^{ss} | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | No | No |
| South Dakota | 7-14 | 5-14 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | No | No |
| Tennessee | 7-14 | 14 | 2 | 14 | 2 | 14 | No | Yes ^j |
| Texas | 14 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 14 | 6 | No | Yes ^{rr} |
| Utah | 7-14 | 14 | 7 | 14 ^{tt} | 7 | 14 ^{tt} | No | No |
| Vermont | 7 | 14-21 | 7-10 | 10 | 7-10 | ... | Yes ^{uu} | Yes ^j |
| Virginia | 3-5 | 3-5 | 5 | 2-4 | 5 | 5-7 | No | No |
| Virgin Islands | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | No | No |
| Washington | 5-42 | 14 | 5-10 | 7 | 5-10 | 7 | No | Yes ^{vv} |
| West Virginia | 3-10 | 14 | 3-4 | 3 | 3-4 | 10 ^{ww} | No | No |
| Wisconsin | 2-3 | 29 | 14 | ... | 14 | ... | No | Yes |
| Wyoming | 7 | 10 | 7 | 5-7 | 7 | 5-7 | No | No |

Note: Numbers have been rounded to the nearest whole number.
 The data in the columns for 1989 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics,
*Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information
 Systems* (March 1991), Table 12.

... Not available.
 NA Not applicable.

Explanatory Notes for Table 13

The notes below expand on the data in Table 13. The explanatory information was provided by the respondents.

- ^aIncreased time is the result of court backlogs.
- ^bWorkload has increased and personnel has decreased, resulting in a longer period of time to enter data.
- ^cThe 1992 estimate is based on more accurate information as a result of a baseline data quality assessment.
- ^dA backlog of one week exists for misdemeanor dispositions.
- ^eDisposition information is held for 30 days to ensure that the arrest card is received at the State criminal history repository (SCR).
- ^fNormal processing time would be two weeks; with the commencement of automation in July 1990, the backlog will be eliminated.
- ^gIncrease in time is due to lack of staff at the local agencies.
- ^hIncrease in time is due to lack of staff.
- ⁱThe SCR operates under a court order to process dispositions within 90 days. Respondent indicated that with the present and foreseeable staff levels and the volume of documents the SCR handles, 40 days is normal processing time.
- ^jBacklog is due primarily to a personnel shortage at the repository and/or at contributing agencies.
- ^kFinal trial court dispositions are currently not received by the repository. This is scheduled to occur electronically in 1993. Dispositions will be received weekly and posted within 72 hours.
- ^lDispositions are entered directly by the courts.
- ^mDisposition data is current since 1988; there does exist a pre-1988 backlog.
- ⁿCourt does not enter all dispositions.
- ^oRepository is in the process of developing software and automation upgrades that will allow entry of historical and current dispositions. All available dispositions will be entered at that time.
- ^pRespondent indicated that a backlog of approximately 100,000 transactions exists; in 1991, with the completion of automation of the courts in Florida, processing time could be reduced to four to six weeks.
- ^qCurrent dispositions are entered within 24 hours of receipt by the repository. A backlog of 1986 dispositions is also being processed and will be eliminated by June 30, 1993.
- ^rFigure is based on results of a data quality audit.
- ^sAs of December 31, 1992, there was a backlog of approximately 43,300 dispositions.
- ^tRespondent anticipates that the sizeable backlog that currently exists will be resolved in 1993.
- ^uDue to changes in personnel, timeliness of court reporting has decreased. The State repository is working on an educational approach to decrease the time for receipt of court dispositions.
- ^vThe backlog is due to AFIS implementation; the normal processing time is two weeks.
- ^wThe increase since 1989 in the average number of days between receipt of final trial court dispositions and entry of data into the database is due to the loss of personnel, the increase in the number of dispositions and the increase in the number of dispositions which were returned due to insufficient information.
- ^xMore accurate information is now known.
- ^yThe increase in time is due to backlogs and lack of staff.
- ^zIncrease in time is due to the reduction in data entry personnel.
- ^{aa}Ten days would be normal processing time.
- ^{bb}Information is maintained in a holding file; it is merged with the criminal record when an inquiry is received.
- ^{cc}Dispositions are by tape entry upon receipt.
- ^{dd}Disposition data are entered directly into the criminal history file from court terminals.
- ^{ee}Response is based on the results of a baseline audit.
- ^{ff}Response is based on the results of a baseline audit. Increased workloads and personnel decrease have resulted in the increase in time.
- ^{gg}Courts rarely submit disposition data to the repository.
- ^{hh}Figure is for 1991 dispositions.
- ⁱⁱDue to the procurement of an automated fingerprint identification system (AFIS), no data entry was done from August 1 to December 31, 1992. The backlog is being reduced rapidly and should be completed by September 1993.
- ^{jj}The greater length of time is due to a backlog of court dispositions and an overall increase in records.
- ^{kk}Normal processing time would be one week.
- ^{ll}Increase in time is due to the increased volume in the courts and the reduction in their staff.
- ^{mm}Normal processing time would be one to two weeks.
- ⁿⁿA current backlog of approximately 100,000 dispositions exists.
- ^{oo}A sampling of dispositions showed the increase in time; priorities placed on work received have also contributed to the increase.
- ^{pp}The State repository is updated daily by the State Office of Court Administration for courts in large metropolitan areas; town and village courts remain a paper-based process.
- ^{qq}Backlog is due to manual records and processing of town and village court dispositions, which was taken over by the repository from the State Office of Court Administration in 1992.
- ^{rr}Data are entered the same day they are received.
- ^{ss}Increase in time is due to a personnel shortage.
- ^{tt}Respondent indicated that a backlog of about 35,000 dispositions currently exists; normal processing time would be one to two days.
- ^{uu}Backlog is due to manually submitted dispositions that require research and verification.
- ^{vv}Backlog is due to rejected data from the magnetic tape that must be manually entered.
- ^{ww}A one-month backlog currently exists.
- ^{xx}Increase in time is due to a change in procedure for receiving disposition data from the Unified Judicial System.
- ^{yy}Respondent indicated that significant additional funding has been received to eliminate the backlog within the next year.
- ^{zz}This backlog has been significantly reduced over the past year.
- ^{aaa}There may be a backlog of 500-1,000 dispositions; normal processing time would be the same day.
- ^{bbb}Disposition reports are held for 10-12 days to ensure that the fingerprint cards have been received and processed.
- ^{ccc}There is a 20,000-document backlog; optimum processing time would be one week.
- ^{ddd}Funds are currently being expended to decrease the backlog.
- ^{eee}Reduction in personnel resulted in processing delays.
- ^{fff}Some dispositions require clarification, which creates a backlog.

Table 13. Average number of days to process disposition data submitted to State criminal history repository, 1989 and 1992

| State | Average number of days between final trial court disposition and receipt of data | | Average number of days between receipt of final trial court disposition and entry of data into database | | Backlog of entering data into criminal history database | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|---|---------------------|---|--------------------|
| | 1989 | 1992 | 1989 | 1992 | 1989 | 1992 |
| Alabama | 7 | 90 ^a | 3 | 5 ^b | No | No |
| Alaska | 14 | 35 ^c | 2 | 21 ^c | No | Yes ^d |
| Arizona | 57 | 24 | 45 | 24 | No ^e | No |
| Arkansas | 60 | 40 | 60 | 2 | Yes ^f | No |
| California | 30 | 0-120 ^g | 40 | 80 ^h | No ⁱ | Yes ^j |
| Colorado | 42 | ... ^k | 1 | ... ^k | No | Yes ^j |
| Connecticut | 14-28 | 14-28 | 42-84 | 42-84 | ... ^m | Yes ^j |
| Delaware | 14 | 14 | NA ^l | NA ^l | No ^m | Yes ⁿ |
| District of Columbia | NA | ... | 21 | 5-7 | ... | Yes ^j |
| Florida | 180 | 45 | 180 | ... ^o | Yes ^p | Yes ^o |
| Georgia | 30 | 10 | 952 | 1 | Yes | Yes ^q |
| Hawaii | ... | 30 | NA | 10 | No | Yes ^j |
| Idaho | 35 | 148 ^r | 730 | ... | Yes | Yes ^s |
| Illinois | ... | 40-45 | 1 | ... | No | Yes ^t |
| Indiana | 30 | 30-60 ^u | 42 | 60-90 | Yes ^v | Yes ^j |
| Iowa | ... | 20 | 14 | 20 ^w | No | Yes ^j |
| Kansas | 7-14 | 90 ^x | 2 | 30 ^y | No | Yes ^j |
| Kentucky | 60-90 | 90 | 10-14 | 30 ^z | No | Yes |
| Louisiana | 30 | ... | 365 | ... | Yes ^{aa} | Yes |
| Maine | 14 | 10 | 1 | 1 ^{bb} | No | No |
| Maryland | 14 | 14 | 0 ^{cc} | 0 ^{cc} | No | No |
| Massachusetts | 2 | 2 | 7-10 | 0 ^{dd} | No | No |
| Michigan | 1-7 | ... | 5 | 0-5 | No | No |
| Minnesota | 28 | 31 ^{ee} | 56 | 365 ^{ff} | Yes ^j | Yes ^j |
| Mississippi ^{gg} | 42-56 | | 7-180 | | Yes | |
| Missouri | ... | 88 ^{hh} | 2-3 | 4-5 | No | No |
| Montana | ... | ... | 2 | ... | No | Yes ⁱⁱ |
| Nebraska | 365 | 30-60 | 14 | 30 ^{jj} | No | Yes ^j |
| Nevada | 30 | 30 | 90 | 5 | Yes ^{kk} | No |
| New Hampshire | 7 | 30 ^{ll} | 1 | 2 | No | No |
| New Jersey | 7 | 7 | 60-90 | 5 | Yes ^{mm} | Yes ⁿⁿ |
| New Mexico | 60 | 30 | 1 | 10 ^{oo} | No | No |
| New York | NA | 0-180 | 0 ^l | 0-180 ^{pp} | No | Yes ^{qq} |
| North Carolina | 15 | 1 | 15 | 0 | No ^{aa} | No |
| North Dakota | 30 | 30 | <1 | 0-1 | No | No |
| Ohio | 21-60 | ... | 0 ^{rr} | 3 | No | No |
| Oklahoma | 14 | 30 ^{ss} | 14 | 30 ^{ss} | No | No |
| Oregon | ... | 7 | 30-90 | 0 | Yes ^{tt} | Yes ^{uu} |
| Pennsylvania | 180 | 180 | 2 | 0 | No | Yes ^{vv} |
| Puerto Rico | ... | 4 | ... | 6 | ... | No |
| Rhode Island | ... | ... | 2 | ... | No | Yes ^{ww} |
| South Carolina | 14 | 10 | 30 | 10 | Yes ^{kk} | No |
| South Dakota | 30 | 30 | 2-3 | 14 ^{xx} | No | No |
| Tennessee | 28-42 | ... | 2 | ... | No | Yes ^j |
| Texas | 28 | 28 | 730 | 30 | Yes ^{yy} | Yes ^{zz} |
| Utah | 180 | 30-60 | 14 | 7 | No | No |
| Vermont | 10 | 10 | 3 | 5 | Yes ^{aaa} | No |
| Virginia | 90-120 | 90-120 | 5 | 5 | No | No |
| Virgin Islands | ... | 7-90 | ... | 2 | ... | No |
| Washington | 60 | 60 | 28 | 30 | No | Yes ^j |
| West Virginia | 20-30 | 30 | 10-15 | 42 | No ^{bbb} | Yes |
| Wisconsin | 14 | 56 | 60-90 | ... | Yes ^{ccc} | Yes ^{ddd} |
| Wyoming | 7 | 20 | 3 | 7-10 ^{ccc} | No | Yes ^{fff} |

Note: Numbers have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

... Not available.

The data in the columns for 1989 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems* (March 1991), Tables 12 and 13.

NA Not applicable.

Explanatory Notes for Table 14

The notes below expand on the data in Table 14. The explanatory information was provided by the respondents.

^aWorkload has increased and personnel has decreased, resulting in a longer amount of time to enter data.

^bRespondent indicated that normal processing time would be one week.

^cThe backlog has consistently averaged approximately one month.

^dInformation is entered directly by the prison system.

^eIn the past, the repository received daily reports from corrections; corrections has modified their reporting procedures, however, and delays have resulted. The repository is currently working with corrections regarding the reporting procedures. State law requires reporting within 24 hours.

^fInformation is entered into an automated corrections system as it occurs. The information is then extracted by the repository on a current basis.

^gRespondent indicated that a backlog of approximately 60,000-70,000 transactions exists.

^hSoftware enhancements that will permit automated receipt and processing of correctional data are currently being developed and tested.

ⁱCorrectional data are not currently captured on the criminal history record.

^jResponse is based on a recently completed data quality audit.

^kThe existing fingerprint backlog includes correctional fingerprints and is due to inadequate staff resources.

^lCorrectional information is entered only if an arrest is made by the Indiana State Police.

^mBacklog is due primarily to personnel shortages.

ⁿThe increase since 1989 in the average number of days between receipt of correctional data and entry into the criminal history database is due to the loss of personnel.

^oMore accurate information is now known.

^pIncrease in time is due to the reduction in data entry personnel.

^qThere has been a significant increase in convictions and resulting incarcerations since 1989; that increase, along with large annual budget cuts, has resulted in the growing backlog.

^rThe repository has fewer resources to comply with legislatively mandated services.

^sThe 1992 estimate is the result of a more thorough analysis of processing time.

^tResponse is based on the results of a baseline audit.

^uDue to the procurement of an automated fingerprint identification system (AFIS), no data entry was done from August 1 to December 31, 1992. The backlog is being reduced rapidly and should be completed by September 1993.

^vAt present, information is not entered, but it is reported to the FBI Identification Division.

^wRespondent indicated that normal processing time would be one to two weeks; a backlog of two to three months currently exists.

^xResponse is based on an audit sample.

^yThe increase is due to manpower allocation based on work priorities.

^zThe longer period of time in 1992 reflects a change in procedure. Correctional data are entered on-line. Fingerprints are requested only when an on-line match cannot be made.

^{aa}System places priority on entry of arrest and disposition data which are processed before incarceration data.

^{bb}Increase is due to the volume of persons entering detention and the lack of personnel.

^{cc}There is a delay in entering correctional data except when subject is a first-time submission; for all others, entry is made only when the record is updated.

^{dd}The longer period of time in 1992 is the result of personnel shortages.

^{ee}Increase in time is due to personnel shortages and changes in priorities.

^{ff}Respondent indicated that normal processing time would be two weeks.

^{gg}The increased time is due to a backlog resulting from increased submission of applicant cards that the State repository is now required to process.

^{hh}Respondent indicated that a 7-10 day backlog exists.

Table 14. Average number of days to process correctional admission data submitted to State criminal history repository, 1989 and 1992

| State | Average number of days between admission of offender and receipt of data from: | | | | Average number of days between receipt of correctional data and entry into criminal history database | | Backlog of entering data into criminal history database | |
|----------------------|---|---------------------------|----------------|-------|--|-------------------|--|-------------------|
| | State prisons | | Local jails | | 1989 | 1992 | 1989 | 1992 |
| | 1989 | 1992 | 1989 | 1992 | | | | |
| Alabama | 7 | 3 | NA | NA | 3 | 5 ^a | No | No |
| Alaska | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arizona | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Arkansas | 10 | 7 | NA | 5 | 60 | 30 | Yes ^b | Yes ^c |
| California | 30 | ... | 30 | ... | 10-20 | ... | No | Yes ^d |
| Colorado | 3 | 730 ^e | 7 | 10 | 2 | 2 | No | No |
| Connecticut | ... | NA | ... | NA | ... | NA | ... | NA |
| Delaware | 7 | 7 | NA | NA | NA ^d | NA ^d | No | ... |
| District of Columbia | 0 ^f | NA | 0 ^f | NA | NA | NA | No | NA |
| Florida | 3-5 | ... | NA | ... | 540 | ... | Yes ^g | Yes ^h |
| Georgia | 14 | 5 | NA | NA | 252 | 1 | Yes | No |
| Hawaii | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | Yes ⁱ |
| Idaho | 7 | 33 ^j | NA | NA | 7 | ... | No | Yes ^k |
| Illinois | 1 | ... | 1-5 | ... | 1 | ... | No | No |
| Indiana | 14 | 30-60 | 14-365 | ... | NA ^l | 30-60 | NA | Yes ^m |
| Iowa | 7 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 10 ⁿ | No | Yes ^m |
| Kansas | 3-5 | 30 ^o | ... | ... | 1 | ... | No | Yes ^m |
| Kentucky | 30 | 10 | NA | NA | 2 | 30 ^p | No | Yes ^m |
| Louisiana | 14 | at least 183 ^q | 14 | ... | 14 | 365 ^q | No | Yes ^r |
| Maine | 14 | 10 | 14 | 10 | 1 | 1 | No | No |
| Maryland | 1 | 31 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | No | No |
| Massachusetts | NA | 30 | NA | 30 | NA | 1 | NA | No |
| Michigan | 7-10 | ... | NA | NA | 5 | 10 ^s | No | No |
| Minnesota | 7 | 23 ^t | NA | NA | 14 | 10 | No | No |
| Mississippi | 7 | 30-60 | NA | 30-90 | NA ^d | NA ^d | NA | ... |
| Missouri | 30 | 10-14 | NA | NA | 2-3 | 2-3 | No | No |
| Montana | ... | NA | NA | NA | 1 | ... | No | Yes ^u |
| Nebraska | 28 | 30 ^o | 56 | ... | 7 | 30 ^p | No | No |
| Nevada | 10 | 10 | ... | NA | 60 | NA ^v | Yes ^b | No |
| New Hampshire | 30 | 30 | ... | NA | 1-2 | 2 | No | No |
| New Jersey | 7-21 | 7 | 7-21 | 7 | 60-90 | 1 | Yes ^w | No |
| New Mexico | 28 | 30 ^x | NA | 30 | 2 | 5 ^y | No | No |
| New York | 7-14 | ... | 7-14 | ... | 14 | 0-21 ^z | No | Yes ^{aa} |
| North Carolina | 30 | 30 | 15-20 | ... | 15-20 | 12 | No | Yes ^{mm} |
| North Dakota | 7 | 7 | 30 | 30 | <1 | <1 | No | No |
| Ohio | 14-90 | 25 | NA | ... | 2 | 30 ^{bb} | No | Yes ^{cc} |
| Oklahoma | 14 | 7 | NA | NA | 2 | 2 | No | No |
| Oregon | 7 | 10 ^{dd} | NA | NA | 1 | 2 ^{cc} | No | No |
| Pennsylvania | 14 | ... | 30 | ... | NA ⁱ | ... | NA | Yes |
| Puerto Rico | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 6 | ... | No |
| Rhode Island | ... | ... | ... | ... | 1 | ... | No | No |
| South Carolina | 10 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 56 | 10 | Yes ^{ff} | No |
| South Dakota | 30 | 30 | 7 | 5-14 | 1-2 | 2 | No | No |
| Tennessee | 7 | ... | ... | ... | 1 | ... | No | No |
| Texas | 2 | 1 | NA | NA | 1 | 1 | No | No |
| Utah | 14 | 30-60 ^{gg} | NA | 30-60 | 7 | 14 ^{gg} | No | No |
| Vermont | 14-21 | NA | 14-21 | NA | ... | NA | Yes ^{hh} | NA |
| Virginia | 42-56 | 42-56 | 42-56 | 42-56 | 5 | 5 | No | No |
| Virgin Islands | ... | NA | ... | 1 | ... | 1 | ... | No |
| Washington | 14 | 30 | NA | NA | 7 | 1 | No | No |
| West Virginia | 5-10 | 14 | 5-10 | NA | 1-2 | 3 | No | No |
| Wisconsin | 7 | ... | 7 | ... | 14 | ... | No | Yes ^k |
| Wyoming | 7 | 10-12 | NA | 7-10 | 7 | 7-10 | No | No |

Note: Numbers have been rounded to the nearest whole number.
 The data in the columns for 1989 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics,
*Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information
 Systems* (March 1991), Table 13.

... Not available.
 NA Not applicable.

Explanatory Notes for Table 15

The notes below expand on the data in Table 15. The explanatory information was provided by the respondents.

^aPreviously used field visits have been eliminated due to funding reductions.

^bThe practice of using telephone calls has been changed; everything must now be in written form.

^cThe repository also uses microfilm and microfiche. Re-instituting a procedure of generating lists of arrests for which final dispositions have not been received is under consideration.

^dThe repository also employs training, publishes operational bulletins, and publishes requirements in the Georgia Crime Information Council Rules and Superior Court Clerks' Rules. Field visits, which were previously employed to encourage complete arrest and disposition reporting, have been discontinued due to lack of funding.

^eThe module to generate lists of arrests for which final dispositions have not been recorded was activated July 1, 1993. The repository also uses audits and communications requests to encourage complete reporting.

^fThe repository also participates in the training of all new recruits at the Criminal Justice Academy.

^gThe repository also conducts work sessions with contributors and seeks their cooperative efforts in establishing better reporting procedures.

^hThe practice of field visits was in place from 1987 through the spring of 1992; at that time, personnel who were performing the task were no longer available, and the field visits were stopped.

ⁱA new rule will be going into effect that will change the procedures employed.

^jThe practice of generating lists of arrests with no dispositions was discontinued because the procedure was taking too much computer time to generate the report, and users experienced response time problems when the report was prepared from the criminal history record database.

^kPreviously used form letters have been replaced by personal contact.

^lThe repository also conducts seminars with court officials and requests their cooperation in submitting dispositions to the repository.

^mThe repository also employs training.

ⁿGenerating lists of arrests for which dispositions were not recorded and the use of form letters were discontinued due to the backlog in entering disposition data at the repository.

^oThe repository will also be using audits that will include surveys and field visits in the future.

^pField visits have been discontinued due to lack of staff.

^qThe repository is currently developing the capability to generate computer lists of missing dispositions.

Table 15. Procedures employed by State criminal history repository to encourage complete arrest and disposition reporting, 1992

| State | Lists of arrests with no dispositions generated to monitor disposition reporting | Field visits | Form letters | Telephone calls |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Alabama | X | X | X | X |
| Alaska | | X | X | X |
| Arizona ^a | | | X | X |
| Arkansas | X | X | X | X |
| California | | X | X | |
| Colorado | X | X | X | X |
| Connecticut | | | X | X |
| Delaware | | | X | X |
| District of Columbia ^b | | | | |
| Florida ^c | | X | X | X |
| Georgia ^d | | | | |
| Hawaii | X | | | |
| Idaho | | | | X |
| Illinois | X | X | X | X |
| Indiana | | | X | |
| Iowa | X | | X | |
| Kansas ^e | | X | X | X |
| Kentucky | | X | X | |
| Louisiana | | | X | X |
| Maine ^f | | X | X | X |
| Maryland ^g | | | | |
| Massachusetts | | | | X |
| Michigan ^h | X | | | |
| Minnesota | | X | X | X |
| Mississippi | | | | |
| Missouri | | X | | X |
| Montana ⁱ | | | | X |
| Nebraska | | X | X | X |
| Nevada ^j | | X | X | X |
| New Hampshire | | | X | X |
| New Jersey | X | X | | X |
| New Mexico | | | X | X |
| New York | X | X | X | X |
| North Carolina | X | X | X | X |
| North Dakota ^k | X | X | | X |
| Ohio ^l | | X | X | X |
| Oklahoma ^m | | X | X | X |
| Oregon ⁿ | | X | | X |
| Pennsylvania ^o | X | | X | X |
| Puerto Rico | X | | | X |
| Rhode Island | X | | X | |
| South Carolina | | X | X | X |
| South Dakota | | | X | X |
| Tennessee | | | | |
| Texas | | X | X | X |
| Utah | | X | X | X |
| Vermont ^p | | | X | X |
| Virginia ^q | | | X | X |
| Virgin Islands | | | | X |
| Washington | X | X | X | X |
| West Virginia ^m | | X | X | X |
| Wisconsin | | X | | |
| Wyoming | X | X | X | X |

Explanatory Notes for Table 16

The notes below expand on the data in Table 16. The explanatory information was provided by the respondents.

^aCourt case number.

^bThe repository uses a number constructed of the unique arrest-event identifier, the arrest date and the originating agency identifier (ORI). This replaced the computer-assigned unique tracking number previously used.

^cCriminal Justice Information System (CJIS) case number.

^dFingerprint verification.

^eThe former method used for linking disposition data was discontinued in 1992; effective January 1, 1993, a new disposition tracking number was instituted.

^fCase numbers.

^gPresent plans call for a unique tracking number.

^hDate of birth and social security number.

ⁱPending.

^jAgency ORI.

^kThe method for linking dispositions to particular charges applies only when there is a single count; it is not applicable for multiple counts.

^lThe unified court system has allowed the repository's process control number that is unique to the arrest event to be placed on its automated system. In the majority of cases, this tracking number works; the name serves as the backup to query for state identification (SID) number, date of arrest and ORI to make the link.

^mPlanned system enhancement.

ⁿDate of birth, place of birth and social security number pending.

Table 16. Methods used to link disposition information to arrest/charge information on criminal history record, 1992

| State | Unique tracking number for individual subject | Unique arrest event identifier | Unique charge identifier | Arrest date | Subject name | Name and reporting agency case number | Other |
|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|
| Alabama* | | X | X | X | X | X | |
| Alaska | X | X | | X | X | | X ^a |
| Arizona* | X | X | X | X | X | X | |
| Arkansas* | X | | | X | X | X | |
| California | X | X | X | X | X | X | |
| Colorado* | | X ^b | | X ^a | | | |
| Connecticut* | | | | X | X | X | |
| Delaware* | X | X | X | X | X | X | X ^c |
| District of Columbia* | X | X | X | X | X | X ^d | X ^c |
| Florida* | X | X | X | X | X | X | |
| Georgia* | X | X | | | | | |
| Hawaii* | X | X | X | X | X | | |
| Idaho* | X | X | | | X | | |
| Illinois | | X | | | | | X ^a |
| Indiana* | X | X | X | X | X | X | X ^d |
| Iowa ^e | | | | X | X | X | |
| Kansas* | X | X | | X | X | X | |
| Kentucky* | X | X | X | X | X | X | |
| Louisiana | | | | X | X | X | |
| Maine* | X | X | | X | X | X | |
| Maryland* | X | | X | | | | X ^f |
| Massachusetts* ^g | | | | | | | |
| Michigan | X | | | | | | |
| Minnesota | | | X | | X | X | |
| Mississippi* | | | | X | X | X | X ^h |
| Missouri* | X | X | X | X | X | | |
| Montana* | | X ⁱ | | X | X | X | |
| Nebraska* | X | X | X | X | X | X | X ^j |
| Nevada* | | X | X | | | | |
| New Hampshire* | X | | | X | X | | |
| New Jersey* | X | X | X | X | X | X | |
| New Mexico | X | | X | X | X | X | |
| New York* | X | X | X | X | X | X | |
| North Carolina | X | X | | X | X | | |
| North Dakota | X | X | | X | X | X | |
| Ohio* | X | X | X | X | X | X | X ^a |
| Oklahoma | X | | | | | | |
| Oregon* ^k | X | X | X | X | X | X | |
| Pennsylvania* | X | X | X | | X | | |
| Puerto Rico* | X | X | X | | X | X | |
| Rhode Island* | X | | | | X | | |
| South Carolina* | X | X | | X | X ^l | X | |
| South Dakota | | X | | X | X ^l | | |
| Tennessee | X | | | X | X | X | |
| Texas* ^m | X ^m | X ^m | X ^m | X | X | | |
| Utah* | X | | | | | | |
| Vermont* | X | X | X | X | X | X | |
| Virginia* | X | X | | | | | |
| Virgin Islands* | | | | | X | | X ⁿ |
| Washington* | X | X | X | X | X | X | |
| West Virginia | X | X | | | | | |
| Wisconsin* | | X | | X | X | X | |
| Wyoming* | X | X | X | X | X | X | |

Note: Repositories were asked to list all methods which may be utilized to link disposition information. Matching of several items of information may be used to confirm that the appropriate link is being made. Also, if information of one type is missing, repositories may look to other types of information contained on the disposition report.

*Method(s) utilized by the repository for linking disposition information and arrest/charge information also permit the linking of dispositions to particular charges and/or specific counts.

Explanatory Notes for Table 17

The notes below expand on the data in Table 17. The explanatory information was provided by the respondents.

^aThe repository creates an arrest segment whenever a final disposition is received for which an arrest segment does not already exist. The current system software precludes the entry of disposition information without a corresponding arrest segment. Based on a recent baseline data quality assessment, this issue is now under review.

^bResponse is based on a data quality assessment and indicates an increase from 10% reported in 1990.

^cData are entered temporarily into a separate database, known as the nonfingerprint-based arrest and disposition (NFAD) file.

^dResponse indicates a decrease from 30% reported in 1990.

^eResponse indicates a decrease from 20% reported in 1990.

^f"No record" dispositions are destroyed after one year; "no arrest on record" dispositions are filed separately after six weeks.

^gCourt data is available on-line using a name search in the "temporary disposition" file.

^hResponse indicates an increase from 20% reported in 1990.

ⁱInformation is maintained in a manual file until a match can be made.

^jResponse indicates an increase from <1% reported in 1990.

^kResponse indicates an increase from "all data received is linked" reported in 1990.

^lLinkage is accomplished through a unique identifying number and field edits.

^mResponse indicates a decrease from 5% reported in 1990.

ⁿData are entered and held in a "pending" file.

^oResponse reported in 1990 was 5%.

^pResponse reported in 1990 was 2%.

^qResponse indicates a decrease from 15% reported in 1990.

^rResponse indicates an increase from 5% reported in 1990.

^sUse of creating a "dummy" arrest segment has been replaced by the use of a tracking number that will interface with courts, corrections and the central repository. The interface will be completed in approximately one year.

^tThe arresting agency is contacted, and an attempt is made to link the data based on information in that agency's files.

^uResponse reported in 1990 was 6%.

^vResponse reported in 1990 was 20%.

^wResponse reported in 1990 was <5%.

^xCustody information is entered on the rap sheet as a separate entry but includes the court docket number as a linkage to the court record.

^yThe unlinked court data are computerized for linking to arrest data when processed; the unlinked court records are not accessible to the field.

^zThis percentage is specific to disposition data received in 1992.

^{aa}Response indicates an increase from 6% reported in 1990.

^{bb}Response reported in 1990 was 6%.

^{cc}Response indicates a decrease from 20% reported in 1990.

^{dd}Response represents an increase from "all data received is/will be linked" reported in 1990.

^{ee}Response reported in 1990 was "all data received is linked."

^{ff}Response indicates a decrease from 30% reported in 1990.

^{gg}Return correspondence to the contributor.

^{hh}Response indicates a decrease from 1% reported in 1990.

ⁱⁱResponse reported in 1990 was 30-50%.

^{jj}Response indicates an increase from 5% reported in 1990.

^{kk}This procedure is used as long as there is a fingerprint card on file to support the arrest.

^{ll}Response reported in 1990 was 2%.

^{mm}Response represents a decrease from 10% reported in 1990.

ⁿⁿResponse reported in 1990 was 0%.

^{oo}Response indicated an increase from 5% reported in 1990.

^{pp}Response indicates an increase from 2% reported in 1990.

^{qq}The information is either returned to the submitting agency or filed until an arrest fingerprint card is received; the disposition or custody information is entered only when the arrest information is received.

^{rr}An attempt is made to locate fingerprint card data.

^{ss}Response indicates a decrease from 30% reported in 1990.

^{tt}Enter all custody segments linked to a dummy arrest.

^{uu}Response indicates an increase from 5% reported in 1990.

^{vv}Contact is made with the arresting agency or with corrections.

^{ww}Response indicates an increase from 1% reported in 1990.

^{xx}Response represents an increase from "all data received is linked" reported in 1990.

^{yy}This part of the system is currently under review.

^{zz}This procedure is used if the court submission includes fingerprints that can be linked to an existing criminal history.

^{aaa}Response reported in 1990 was 10%.

^{bbb}Response reported in 1990 was 5%.

^{ccc}Response reported in 1990 was 15%.

^{ddd}Courts are contacted.

^{eee}Response reported in 1990 was 10%.

^{fff}Response reported in 1990 was 30-40%.

^{ggg}Response indicates a decrease from 15-20% reported in 1990.

^{hhh}Response reported in 1990 was 1-2%.

Table 17. Procedures followed when linkage cannot be made between court or correctional information and arrest information in the criminal history database, 1992

| State | Create a 'dummy' segment | | Enter information without linkage to arrest/charge data | | Enter no information without linkage | | Other | Estimated percent of dispositions received which cannot be linked to arrest/charge information | |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|--|--------------------------|
| | Arrest assumed from court disposition | Court disposition assumed from correctional data | From courts | From correctional agencies | From courts | From correctional agencies | | Final court dispositions | Correctional information |
| Alabama | | | | | X | | | 70% | * |
| Alaska | X ^a | | | | | | | 25 ^b | |
| Arizona | | | | | | | X ^c | ... | ... |
| Arkansas | | | | X | X | | | 15 ^d | 15% ^e |
| California | X | | | X | | | X ^f | 25 | 1 |
| Colorado | | | | X | X | | X ^g | 100% | 100% ^h |
| Connecticut | | | | | X | | X ⁱ | 5 ^j | 7 ^j |
| Delaware | X | X | | | | | | 5 | 5 |
| District of Columbia | | | | | X | | | 2 ^k | |
| Florida | | | | | X | | X ^l | 25 | |
| Georgia | | X | | X | | | | <1% ^k | <1% ^m |
| Hawaii | | | | | X | | | ... | * |
| Idaho | | | | X | X | | | ... | ... |
| Illinois | | | | X | X | | X ⁿ | ... | ... |
| Indiana | | | | X | X | | | 10 ^o | 50 ^r |
| Iowa ^s | | | | | | | X ^t | ... | ... |
| Kansas | X | X | X | X | | | | ... | ... |
| Kentucky | | | | | X | X | | ... | ... |
| Louisiana | | | | X | | | | 20% | 2% |
| Maine | | | X | | | | X ^x | 70 | ... |
| Maryland | | | X | | | X | | 70% | 70% |
| Massachusetts | | | | | | | | * | * |
| Michigan | | | X | X | | | X ^y | 22 ^z | <1 |
| Minnesota | | | | | X | X | | 25 ^{aa} | ... |
| Mississippi | | | | | X | X | | 5-10 ^{cc} | ... |
| Missouri | | | | | X | X | | 1% ^{dd} | ... |
| Montana | | | | X | X | | | ... | ... |
| Nebraska | | | | | X | X | | 25 ^{ff} | 5% |
| Nevada | | | | | X | | | ... | ... |
| New Hampshire | | | X | | | | X ^{gg} | 50 ⁱⁱ | 10 ^{jj} |
| New Jersey | | X ^{kk} | | | X | X | | 10% | 5% |
| New Mexico | | | | | X | X | X ^{gg} | ... | ... |
| New York | | | X | X | | | | 2 | 0-1 |
| North Carolina | | | | X | X | | | 5 ^{mm} | ... |
| North Dakota | | | X | X | | | | 10 ^{oo} | 10 ^{pp} |
| Ohio | | | | | | | X ^{qq} | 1% | 5% |
| Oklahoma | | | | | X | X | | 1 | 1 |
| Oregon | | | | | X | X | X ^{rr} | ... | ... |
| Pennsylvania | | | | | X | X | | ... | ... |
| Puerto Rico | | | | | X | X | | * | * |
| Rhode Island | | | | | X | X | | ... | ... |
| South Carolina | | | | X | X | | X ^{tt} | 10% ^{uu} | 100% ^{uu} |
| South Dakota | | | | | X | X | X ^{vv} | 5 ^{ww} | 1 ^{xx} |
| Tennessee | | | | | | | | ... | ... |
| Texas ^{yy} | X ^{zz} | X | | | | | | 5 | 2 |
| Utah | | | | | X | X | | ... | ... |
| Vermont | | | X | | | | | ... | ... |
| Virginia | | | | X | X | | | 5% | 4% |
| Virgin Islands | | | | | | | X ^{ddd} | * | * |
| Washington | X | | X | | | X | | ... | ... |
| West Virginia | | | | | X | X | X ^{vv} | <10% ^{ggg} | <10% ^{ggg} |
| Wisconsin | | | | | X | X | | ... | ... |
| Wyoming | | | | | | | | * | * |

Note: Percentages reported are results of estimates. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

NA Not applicable.

* All data received can be linked.

... Not available.

Explanatory Notes for Table 18

The notes below expand on the data in Table 18. The explanatory information was provided by the respondents.

^aThe procedure of random sample comparisons has been discontinued due to staff shortages.

^bPeriodic audits of random samples.

^cOn-site audits of procedures.

^dComparison of data in criminal history database to data in automated fingerprint identification system (AFIS).

^eKey verification.

^fVerification after data entry.

^gObtain missing information from courts and arresting agencies by telephone.

^hThird-party, independent audits.

ⁱThe procedure of sending error lists to reporting agencies was discontinued due to increased fingerprint submissions and lack of staff. In addition, booking agencies receiving the reports lacked the manpower to respond.

^jComplete quality control function on all criminal history record entries.

^kA redesign of the computerized criminal history system has eliminated manual assembly of records and provided automated records without manual review.

^lOngoing audit review of case jackets.

^mData Quality Task Force.

ⁿAd hoc computer file searched for erroneous data.

^oError lists are no longer used due to poor response rates. Contributors are now contacted directly by telephone to verify and correct information.

^pReturn copies of fingerprint cards that contain incomplete or incorrect information.

^qAll new subjects have record sent via telecommunications to arresting agency with a message to note the state identification (SID) number assigned and to proofread the data entered into the state system; all repeat offenders' fingerprints are identified before filing.

^rField staff returns errors to agencies.

^sThe manual review follows a computer edit procedure which indicates the criminal history files and dispositions that do not match to an arrest.

^tCall courts.

^uDue to increased submissions, repository is no longer able to manually double-check entries, to use computer edit and verification programs or to manually review the transcript before dissemination. Other procedures have been initiated.

^vCurrent assessment may alter existing methods.

Table 18. Strategies employed by State criminal history repository to ensure accuracy of data in criminal history database, 1992

| State | Manual review of incoming source documents or reports | Manual double-checking before data entry | Computer edit and verification programs | Manual review of criminal record transcripts before dissemination | Random sample comparisons of State criminal history repository files with stored documents | Error lists returned to reporting agencies | Other |
|---------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|--|----------------|
| Alabama | X | X | X | X | | | |
| Alaska | X | | X | X | X | | |
| Arizona | X | | X | | X | | |
| Arkansas | X | | X | X | | | |
| California ^a | X | X | X | | | X | |
| Colorado | X | | X | X | | | X ^b |
| Connecticut | X | X | X | X | | | |
| Delaware | X | | X | X | X | X | |
| District of Columbia | X | | X | X | X | X | X ^c |
| Florida | X | X | X | | | | |
| Georgia | X | | X | | X | | |
| Hawaii | X | | X | | | X | X ^d |
| Idaho | X | | X | | | | |
| Illinois | | | X | X | X | X | X ^e |
| Indiana | X | X | X | X | | | X ^f |
| Iowa | X | | X | | | | |
| Kansas | X | X | X | X | X | | |
| Kentucky | X | X | | X | | | |
| Louisiana | X | | X | | | | |
| Maine | X | X | | X | | X | X ^g |
| Maryland | X | X | X | X | X | X | X ^h |
| Massachusetts | | | | X | X | X | |
| Michigan | X | | X | | X | | |
| Minnesota | X | | X | X | | | |
| Mississippi | X | | | X | | | |
| Missouri | X | | X | X | X | | |
| Montana | X | | X | X | X | | |
| Nebraska | X | X | | X | | | |
| Nevada ¹ | X | | X | X | | | X ^j |
| New Hampshire | X | | | X | | X | |
| New Jersey | X | X ^k | X | | X | | X ^l |
| New Mexico | X | X | | | | | |
| New York | X | | X | X | | | X ^m |
| North Carolina | X | X | X | X | | X | |
| North Dakota | X | | X | | | | |
| Ohio | X | X | X | X | X | | |
| Oklahoma | X | | X | X | | | |
| Oregon | X | X | X | | | | X ⁿ |
| Pennsylvania ^o | X | X | X | | X | | X ^p |
| Puerto Rico | | X | X | X | | | |
| Rhode Island | X | X | X | X | | | |
| South Carolina | X | | X | X | | | |
| South Dakota | X | X | X | X | X | | X ^q |
| Tennessee | X | X | X | | X | | |
| Texas | X | | X | | | | X ^r |
| Utah | X ^s | | X | X | | | |
| Vermont | X | X | X | X | | | |
| Virginia | X | | X | X | X | X | |
| Virgin Islands | X | X | | X | | | X ^t |
| Washington ^u | X | | | | | X | X ^f |
| West Virginia | X | | | X | | X | |
| Wisconsin ^v | X | | X | X | | X | |
| Wyoming | X | X | X | X | X | | |

Explanatory Notes for Table 19

The notes below expand on the data in Table 19. The explanatory information was provided by the respondents.

^aLog is maintained for inquiries only.

^bSince June 30, 1992, however, the Georgia Crime Information Center (GCIC) auditors have had to reduce the scope of their audits to satisfy National Crime Information Center (NCIC) audit frequency requirements.

^cAudits were completed in conjunction with the baseline audit completed in August 1992.

^dRecord transaction log only.

^eAll court records are compared with arrest information, and any inconsistencies are resolved before entry on the rap sheet. If problems occur frequently with a particular department, a visit to provide training is recommended.

^fOn-site audits have not been conducted. The 1989 response was based on in-house audits.

^gA baseline audit of the repository is currently being undertaken. This will be completed before audits of other agencies begin.

^hIn-house audits are conducted to check the accuracy and completeness of information entered into the criminal history files.

ⁱRandom sampling is conducted daily on incoming fingerprint card submissions; specific agencies are not isolated.

^jA transaction log is maintained for one year on all inquiries, responses, etc., on every message crossing the Tennessee Enforcement Information System (TEIS). This capability will be expanded in the near future with a total replacement of the State message switch system.

^kExcept for modifications.

^lField staff works with agencies on data quality.

Table 19. Audit activities of State criminal history repository, 1989 and 1992

| State | Transaction logs maintained to provide audit trail of inquiries, responses, record updates, modifications | | Random sample audits of user agencies conducted to ensure data quality and compliance with laws | |
|----------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|
| | 1989 | 1992 | 1989 | 1992 |
| Alabama | Yes | Yes ^a | Yes | Yes |
| Alaska | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Arizona | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Arkansas | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| California | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Colorado | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |
| Connecticut | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Delaware | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |
| District of Columbia | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |
| Florida | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Georgia | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes ^b |
| Hawaii | Yes | Yes | No | Yes ^c |
| Idaho | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Illinois | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |
| Indiana | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Iowa | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Kansas | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Kentucky | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| Louisiana | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Maine | Yes | Yes ^d | No | No ^e |
| Maryland | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |
| Massachusetts | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Michigan | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Minnesota | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Mississippi | No | No | No | No |
| Missouri | Yes | Yes | Yes | No ^f |
| Montana | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Nebraska | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Nevada | Yes | Yes | No | No ^g |
| New Hampshire | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| New Jersey | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| New Mexico | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| New York | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| North Carolina | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| North Dakota | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Ohio | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes ^h |
| Oklahoma | No | No | No | No |
| Oregon | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Pennsylvania | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes ⁱ |
| Puerto Rico | ... | Yes | ... | No |
| Rhode Island | No | No | No | No |
| South Carolina | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| South Dakota | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Tennessee | Yes | Yes ^j | No | Yes |
| Texas | Yes | Yes ^k | No | No ^l |
| Utah | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Vermont | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Virginia | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Virgin Islands | ... | No | ... | No |
| Washington | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| West Virginia | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Wisconsin | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Wyoming | Yes | Yes | No | No |

Note: Except for Wisconsin, for which corrected data were submitted, the data in the columns for 1989 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems* (March 1991), Table 18.

Explanatory Notes for Table 20

The notes below expand on the data in Table 20. The explanatory information was provided by the respondents.

^aAudit has not been finalized.

^bEstablishment of the Data Quality Unit.

^cNo formal audit has been conducted; however, all information is reviewed by specialists to ensure accuracy and completeness as part of a daily function.

^dThe Massachusetts criminal record improvement plan calls for the development of fingerprint-supported criminal records.

^eUse of noncriminal justice record check fees to improve the criminal history system.

^fA comprehensive outside audit of the central repository and its associated reporting agencies is being planned for 1994. In-house auditing at the central repository to improve data quality is being incorporated.

^gRepository is currently in the process of selecting a vendor to conduct an audit of the repository.

^hHelpline implemented.

Table 20. Data quality audits of State criminal history repository, 1992

| State | State criminal history repository database audited for accuracy and completeness within last 5 years | Agency which performed audit | Changes to improve data quality were made as a result of audit† | Data quality audits are planned or scheduled for next 3 years | Initiatives are underway to improve data quality† |
|----------------------|--|------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Alabama | | | | X | X |
| Alaska | X | Other Agency | 4, 6, 9, 10 | X | 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10 |
| Arizona | X | Other Agency | 1, 2, 11 | X | 1, 11 |
| Arkansas | | | | X | 1, 7, 11 |
| California | | | | X | 1, 2 |
| Colorado | X | Repository | | X | 5 |
| Connecticut | | | | | 2, 5 |
| Delaware | X ^a | Other Agency | | X | 2, 5, 6 |
| District of Columbia | X | Other Agency | 2, 11 | X | 2, 5, 6, 10 |
| Florida | | | | X | 2, 11 |
| Georgia | X | Other Agency | X | X | X |
| Hawaii | X | Other Agency | 1, 2 | X | 1, 12 ^b |
| Idaho | X | Other Agency | 8 | | 8, 9 |
| Illinois | X | Other Agency | 1, 3 | X | 11 |
| Indiana | X | Other Agency | | | |
| Iowa | X | Other Agency | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11 | X | 3, 4, 5, 6, 10 |
| Kansas | | | | X | 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10 |
| Kentucky | | | | X | X |
| Louisiana | | | | X | X |
| Maine ^c | | | | X | 11 |
| Maryland | X | Other Agency | 8 | X | 8 |
| Massachusetts | | | | | 5 ^d |
| Michigan | | | | X | |
| Minnesota | X | Other Agency | | | 2, 6, 9, 12 ^e |
| Mississippi | | | | X | 1, 2, 5 |
| Missouri | | | | X ^f | 1 |
| Montana | X | Other Agency | 1 | | 10 |
| Nebraska | | | | X | 2 |
| Nevada | | | | X | 1 |
| New Hampshire | | | | X | 1, 10 |
| New Jersey | X | Other Agency | 1, 2 | X | 1, 7, 11 |
| New Mexico | | | | X | 2 |
| New York | X | Other Agency, Repository | 2, 6 | X | 1, 9, 11 |
| North Carolina | X | Repository | | | |
| North Dakota | | | | X | 2 |
| Ohio | | | | | |
| Oklahoma | | | | X | 2 |
| Oregon ^g | | | | X | 1 |
| Pennsylvania | | | | X | 1 |
| Puerto Rico | X | Repository | X | X | 1, 3, 8, 9 |
| Rhode Island | X | Repository | 2 | X | 2 |
| South Carolina | | | | ... | 3 |
| South Dakota | | | | | 3, 10, 11 |
| Tennessee | X | Other Agency, Repository | | X | 3, 9 |
| Texas | X | Other Agency | 2, 7 | X | 1 |
| Utah | X | Other Agency | X | X | X |
| Vermont | X | Other Agency | | | |
| Virginia | X | Other Agency | 3, 11, 12 ^h | | 3 |
| Virgin Islands | | | | | |
| Washington | X | Other Agency, Repository | | X | X |
| West Virginia | | | | | 2 |
| Wisconsin | | | | X | 1 |
| Wyoming | | | | | 2, 3 |

... Not available.

- † 1 Audit/audit functions/procedures
- 2 Automation conversion/redesign/enhancements
- 3 Disposition/arrest reporting procedures/enhancements
- 4 Felony flagging
- 5 Fingerprint card/system conversion/enhancements
- 6 Inter-agency/local agency interface

- 7 Legislation
- 8 Plan/strategy development
- 9 Task force/advisory group establishment
- 10 Tracking number implementation/improvement
- 11 Training seminars/policy and procedures manuals
- 12 Other

Explanatory Notes for Table 21

The notes below expand on the data in Table 21. The explanatory information was provided by the respondents.

^aDatabase does not yet include a custody/supervision segment.

^bState plans to participate within the next 12 months.

^cResponse is the result of a data quality audit.

^dAs of December 31, 1992, Illinois was not a III participant; however, Illinois became a participant on August 8, 1993.

^eState plans to participate by fall 1993.

^fDisposition information is lacking.

^gThis figure represents the percentage of records established since 1990.

^hState is in the process of preparing for III participation as a result of grant funds.

ⁱThe criminal history files also consist of 28% civil purpose files.

^jThe criminal history record system is undergoing a complete redesign; III participation is planned for mid-1993.

^kParticipation is expected in 1994.

Table 21. State participation in the Interstate Identification Index (III), 1989 and 1992

| State | State currently participates in III | | Percent of criminal history files available to III | | State plans to participate within 5 years | Reason(s) why State does not participate in III [†] |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|------|--|-----------------|---|--|
| | 1989 | 1992 | 1989 | 1992 | | |
| Alabama | No | No | | | Yes | 5, 6 |
| Alaska | No | Yes | | 22% | | |
| Arizona | No | No | | | Yes | 5 ^a |
| Arkansas | No | No | | | Yes ^b | 3, 4 |
| California | Yes | Yes | 33% | 40-50 | | |
| Colorado | Yes | Yes | 100% | 100% | | |
| Connecticut | Yes | Yes | 40 | 55 | | |
| Delaware | Yes | Yes | 75 | 17 ^c | | |
| District of Columbia | No | No | | | Yes | 3, 4, 5, 6 |
| Florida | Yes | Yes | 95 | 100 | | |
| Georgia | Yes | Yes | 65% | 68% | | |
| Hawaii | No | No | | | Yes | 4, 5 |
| Idaho | Yes | Yes | 80 | 100 | | |
| Illinois ^d | No | No | | | Yes ^c | 4 |
| Indiana | No | No | | | Yes | 3, 4 |
| Iowa | No | No | | | Yes | 3, 4, 5 |
| Kansas | No | No | | | Yes | 1, 2, 3, 5 |
| Kentucky | No | No | | | Yes | 5 ^f |
| Louisiana | No | No | | | Yes | 3, 4, 5 |
| Maine | No | No | | | Yes | 4, 7 |
| Maryland | No | No | | | Yes | 4, 6 |
| Massachusetts | No | No | | | Yes | 5 |
| Michigan | Yes | Yes | 40% | 48% | | |
| Minnesota | Yes | Yes | 47 | 75 | | |
| Mississippi | No | No | | | Yes | 4, 5 |
| Missouri | Yes | Yes | 20% | 33% | | |
| Montana | No | Yes | | 88 ^g | | |
| Nebraska | No | No | | | Yes | 2, 5 |
| Nevada | No | No | | | Yes | 4 |
| New Hampshire | No | No | | | Yes | 4 ^h |
| New Jersey | Yes | Yes | 70% | 98% | | |
| New Mexico | No | No | | | Yes | |
| New York | Yes | Yes | 35 | 57 ⁱ | | |
| North Carolina | Yes | Yes | 62 | 81 | | |
| North Dakota | No | No | | | Yes | 4 ^j |
| Ohio | Yes | Yes | 34% | 50% | | |
| Oklahoma | No | No | | | Yes | 2 |
| Oregon | Yes | Yes | 31 | 36 | | |
| Pennsylvania | Yes | Yes | 20 | 30 | | |
| Puerto Rico | ... | No | ... | | Yes | ... |
| Rhode Island | No | No | | | Yes | 2 |
| South Carolina | Yes | Yes | 62% | 63% | | |
| South Dakota | No | No | | | Yes | 2 |
| Tennessee | No | No | | | Yes | |
| Texas | Yes | Yes | 25 | 29 | | |
| Utah | No | Yes | | 100% | | |
| Vermont | No | No | | | Yes | 2, 3, 4 |
| Virginia | Yes | Yes | 50% | 67 | | |
| Virgin Islands | ... | No | | | ... | ... |
| Washington | No | Yes | | 100 | | |
| West Virginia | No | No | | | Yes | 4 ^k |
| Wisconsin | No | No | | | Yes | 4 ^k |
| Wyoming | Yes | Yes | 60% | 100% | | |

Note: Percentages reported are results of estimates. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number. The data in the columns for 1989 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems* (March 1991), Table 20.

... Not available.

- † 1 Incompatible record formats
- 2 Incompatible software/hardware
- 3 Too few automated records
- 4 Insufficient resources to convert records/system
- 5 Cannot meet III standards
- 6 Legal/policy considerations
- 7 Lack of personnel resources

Explanatory Notes for Table 22

The notes below expand on the data in Table 22. The explanatory information was provided by the respondents.

^aCriminal history check conducted by the local agency, not the State criminal history repository.

^bThe amount varies depending upon application type.

^cOther databases containing information relating to the noncriminal firearms prohibitions, such as mental health.

^dFigure is for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1992.

^eAll firearms except shotguns and antiques.

^fShotguns and rifles only; handguns owned by retired police personnel who reside in the District of Columbia.

^gEffective January 1, 1992, Illinois instituted a point-of-sale firearm system, in addition to the existing program that provides for the issuance of firearm owner identification (FOID) cards. The figure for 1989 represents checks conducted for the FOID card system only, while the 1992 figure represents checks for both the FOID card and the point-of-sale systems.

^hGun checks are conducted primarily by the county sheriffs' offices. The exceptions are in cases when a nonresident or a State professional law enforcement officer requiring a handgun for official purposes applies for a permit. Under those circumstances, the State Commissioner of Public Safety issues the permit. Legislation effective July 1, 1991, requires that the agency check the State repository records prior to issuing a permit.

ⁱMaine law allows the State criminal history repository to disseminate adult conviction data to anyone for any purpose. There is no State requirement that gun dealers and store owners check the records of individuals who purchase firearms. The purchaser must fill out forms to meet Federal requirements which ask, among other things, whether the person is a convicted felon. Some gun dealers do check the records of the State criminal history repository to verify those answers; however, the repository has no responsibility in determining whether individuals are eligible to purchase a firearm.

^jThe State criminal history repository does not do "gun checks"; a unit within the Maryland State Police conducts the searches. The answers which follow reflect the Maryland State Police procedures.

^kFiscal year 1989 (July-June) rather than calendar year 1989.

^lAn additional 50,000 checks were conducted for licenses to carry concealed weapons.

^mCriminal history checks are conducted by the local agencies, not the State criminal history repository. Information included in the 1991 report (*Survey of Criminal History Information Systems*) should have noted that distinction.

ⁿFor renewal only.

^oState and Federal applicant fingerprint cards are required for all new applicants.

^pLong guns in New York City.

^qName searches by licensing authorities are not permitted.

^rFee includes a surcharge of \$25.

^sRespondent indicated that criminal history checks are conducted by local law enforcement agencies by name, race, sex, date of birth, and social security number. Fingerprints can be submitted to the State criminal history repository if the local agency finds a "hit".

^tThere currently exists no state firearm purchase statutes. Some large cities, e.g., Cleveland, have city ordinances which require registration of firearms. The 1991 report should have noted that distinction.

^uThe Oregon law became effective January 1, 1990.

^vRespondent indicated that the Western Identification Network (WIN) and the State records of Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Utah and Wyoming are also checked.

^wChecks are conducted after the purchase.

^xCurrently, only fingerprints of persons applying to carry a concealed handgun are being searched for a prior record.

^yEffective September 1993, fee is \$8.

Table 22. Procedures for presale criminal history record checks on potential firearm purchasers, 1989 and 1992

| State | Presale record checks are conducted by State criminal history repository on potential firearm purchasers | | Type of firearms regulated, 1992 [†] | Number of firearm checks | | Type of records checked, 1992 | Fee charged, 1992 | | Gun check considered criminal justice (CJ) or noncriminal justice (NCJ) activity, 1992 |
|---------------------------|--|------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--|
| | 1989 | 1992 | | 1989 | 1992 | | Name Search | Fingerprint Search | |
| Alabama ^a | | | | | | | | | |
| Alaska | | | | | | | | | |
| Arizona | | | | | | | | | |
| Arkansas | | | | | | | | | |
| California* | Yes | Yes | A | 333,000 | 630,000 | State, NCIC, III, Other ^c | \$14 | \$27-120 ^b | CJ |
| Colorado | | | | | | | | | |
| Connecticut* | Yes | Yes | A | 30,800 | 45,000 ^d | State, III | | | CJ |
| Delaware* | Yes | Yes | HO ^e | | 12,200 | State, NCIC, III | | | CJ |
| District of Columbia | Yes | Yes | O ^f | 300 | 5,200 | State, NCIC, FBI-ID | 5 | 2.50 | CJ |
| Florida* | | Yes | A | | 272,700 | State, NCIC, III | 5 | | CJ |
| Georgia | | | | | | | | | |
| Hawaii ^a | | | | | | | | | |
| Idaho | | | | | | | | | |
| Illinois* | Yes | Yes | A | 200,000 | 469,600 ^g | State, NCIC, III | 2 | | CJ |
| Indiana* | Yes | Yes | H | 60,000 | 101,700 | State | | | CJ/NCJ |
| Iowa ^h | | | | | | | | | |
| Kansas | | | | ... | | | | | |
| Kentucky | | | | | | | | | |
| Louisiana | | | | | | | | | |
| Maine | Yes ⁱ | Yes ⁱ | A | ... | 6,400 | State | | | NCJ |
| Maryland ^j | | | | | | | | | |
| Massachusetts* | Yes | Yes | A | 35,200 37,400 ^k | 40,000 ^l | State | | | CJ |
| Michigan ^m | | | | | | | | | |
| Minnesota ^a | | | | | | | | | |
| Mississippi | | | | | | | | | |
| Missouri ^m | | | | | | | | | |
| Montana | | | | | | | | | |
| Nebraska* | | Yes | HO | | 3,100 | State, NCIC | 10 | 10 | CJ |
| Nevada | | | | | | | | | |
| New Hampshire | | | | | | | | | |
| New Jersey* | Yes | Yes | A | 25,100 | 23,000 | State | 8 ⁿ | 12 ^o | NCJ |
| New Mexico | | | | | | | | | |
| New York* | Yes | Yes | HO ^p | 27,600 | 28,000 | State, FBI-ID | 9 | 50 ^r | NCJ |
| North Carolina* | Yes ^s | Yes ^s | H | <200 ^o | ... | State, NCIC, III, FBI-ID | | | CJ |
| North Dakota | | | | | | | | | |
| Ohio ^t | | | | | | | | | |
| Oklahoma | | | | | | | | | |
| Oregon* | Yes | Yes | H | 0 ^u | 36,700 | State, Other ^v | | | CJ |
| Pennsylvania | | | | 159,800 | | | | | |
| Puerto Rico | | | | | | | | | |
| Rhode Island* | Yes | Yes ^w | A | 800-1,000 | ... | State, NCIC | 5 | | CJ |
| South Carolina | Yes | Yes ^w | H | 47,400 | 53,000 | State, NCIC, III | | | CJ |
| South Dakota ^m | | | | | | | | | |
| Tennessee ^x | | | | | | | | | |
| Texas | | | | | | | | | |
| Utah | | | | | | | | | |
| Vermont | | | | | | | | | |
| Virginia* | Yes | Yes | A | 9,800 | 191,500 | State, NCIC | 2 | | CJ |
| Virgin Islands* | | Yes | A | ... | 300 | State | 5 | | CJ |
| Washington | | | | 24,800 | | | | | |
| West Virginia | | | | | | | | | |
| Wisconsin | | Yes | H | | 36,200 | State, NCIC | 5 ^y | | CJ |
| Wyoming | | | | | | | | | |

Note: As used in the responses on this table, "III" designates the Interstate Identification Index, a cooperative Federal-State system for the exchange of criminal history records. Numbers reported are results of estimates. Numbers have been rounded to the nearest 100.

Except for Kansas, Pennsylvania and Washington, for which corrected data have been submitted, the data in the columns for 1989 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems* (March 1991), Table 21.

... Not available.

- † A All firearms
- H Handguns only
- HO Handguns and other specially designated firearms
- O Other

* Record checks are mandated by State law.

Explanatory Notes for Table 23

The notes below expand on the data in Table 23. The explanatory information was provided by the respondents.

^aAn applicant fee is required.

^bPending legislation would permit release of information to firearms dealers.

^cThe type of search depends on the application or clearance requested.

^dUnder Florida's public record law, anyone can pay a fee and obtain a computerized criminal history (CCH). In 1991, however, Florida established a Firearm Purchase Program (FPP) that requires firearms dealers to obtain approval for each firearm sale based upon a CCH check of the purchaser. The FPP provides the dealer with either approval or disapproval for each sale; no details are given regarding the criminal history information.

^eIn-state firearms dealers only.

^fState law permits disclosure of recent felony convictions, *i.e.*, up to two years after completion of correctional supervision.

^gDisclosure is permitted pursuant to policy which considers conviction data public information.

^hFingerprints are required for automatic weapons.

ⁱState law provides that dissemination of the information to in-state firearms dealers will be allowed in 1995 for handguns if the criminal history files are 85% automated by that time.

^jFingerprint search is made only if identification is *not* made with prior name/date of birth search.

^kThe Puerto Rico Police is the only agency authorized to provide the information to the firearms dealers.

^lPolice Departments will respond to firearms dealers, not the State repository. State repository responds only if needed.

^mState law does not permit the confirmation that an individual does or does not have a felony conviction. The direct response to a firearms dealer either approves the sale or the sale is "not approved at this time."

ⁿEffective in 1991, firearms dealers are advised only of approval or denial number. Reasons for disqualification are not provided.

^oDealer must provide a set of fully rolled fingerprints, a signed and notarized waiver and a \$15 processing fee.

Table 23. Search methods used in conducting criminal history checks on potential firearm purchasers, 1992

| State | Data elements used in search of criminal history database | Minimum elements required to search master name index | Soundex can be used in name search | Present law permits giving felony conviction information to firearms dealers |
|-----------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|--|
| Alabama | | | | Yes ^a |
| Alaska | | | | |
| Arizona ^b | | | | |
| Arkansas ^b | | | | |
| California | Name, DOB, Fingerprints ^c | Name, DOB, Sex | Yes | |
| Colorado | | | | Yes |
| Connecticut | Name, DOB only | Name, DOB | Yes | ... |
| Delaware | Name, DOB, SSN, DL Number | Name, DOB, Sex, Race, | Yes | |
| District of Columbia | Name, DOB, Fingerprints | Name, DOB, Sex, Race, SSN | Yes | |
| Florida | Name, DOB only | Name, DOB, Sex, Race | Yes | d |
| Georgia | | | | |
| Hawaii | | | | Yes |
| Idaho | | | | |
| Illinois | Name, DOB only | Name, DOB, Sex | Yes | Yes ^c |
| Indiana | Name, DOB only | Name, DOB | Yes | |
| Iowa | | | | |
| Kansas | | | | Yes |
| Kentucky | | | | |
| Louisiana | | | | |
| Maine | Name, DOB only | Name, DOB | Yes | Yes |
| Maryland | | | | |
| Massachusetts | Name, DOB only | Name, DOB | Yes | Yes ^f |
| Michigan | | | | Yes ^g |
| Minnesota | | | | |
| Mississippi | | | | |
| Missouri | | | | Yes ^a |
| Montana | | | | Yes ^a |
| Nebraska | Name, DOB, Fingerprints ^h | Name, DOB, SSN | Yes | Yes ⁱ |
| Nevada | | | | Yes |
| New Hampshire | | | | |
| New Jersey | Fingerprints ^j | Name, DOB, SSN | Yes | |
| New Mexico | | | | |
| New York | Fingerprints only | Name, DOB, Sex | Yes | |
| North Carolina | Name, DOB, Fingerprints | Name, DOB, Sex, Race | Yes | |
| North Dakota | | | | |
| Ohio | | | | |
| Oklahoma | | | | Yes |
| Oregon | Fingerprints ^j | Name, DOB | Yes | |
| Pennsylvania | | | | |
| Puerto Rico | | | | k |
| Rhode Island | Name, DOB only | Name, DOB | Yes | l |
| South Carolina | Name, DOB, SSN | Name, DOB | | Yes |
| South Dakota | | | | |
| Tennessee | | | | |
| Texas | | | | |
| Utah | | | | |
| Vermont | | | | Yes ^m |
| Virginia | Name, DOB only | Name, DOB, Sex, Race | Yes | |
| Virgin Islands | Name, DOB only | Name, DOB, POB, SSN, Picture ID | | |
| Washington | | | | |
| West Virginia | | | | |
| Wisconsin | Name, DOB only | Name, DOB, Sex, Race | Yes | n |
| Wyoming | | | | Yes ^o |

... Not available.

Explanatory Notes for Table 24

The notes below expand on the data in Table 24. The explanatory information was provided by the respondents.

^aThe various firearms programs have been in place since 1972.

^bAlso includes reimbursement costs for mandated mental health reporting.

^cThe Nebraska State Patrol will take over the program in 1995; at that time, there will be start-up costs.

^dEffective September 1993, fee is \$8.

Table 24. Costs of implementing and operating programs for presale criminal history record checks on potential firearm purchasers, 1992

| State | Start-up costs to implement program* | Annual costs of operating program* | Fee charged by repository to conduct search | | Funding sources for programs not supported by fees |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|--|
| | | | Name | Fingerprint | |
| Alabama | | | | | |
| Alaska | | | | | |
| Arizona | | | | | |
| Arkansas | | | | | |
| California | ... ^a | \$7,547,000 ^b | \$14 [†] | \$27-120 [†] | |
| Colorado | | | | | |
| Connecticut | | | | | |
| Delaware | \$55,000 | 82,000 | | | ... |
| District of Columbia | ... | 99,000 | 5 | 2.50 | Operating budget |
| Florida | 638,600 | 1,600,000 | 5 | | Operating Trust Fund |
| Georgia | | | | | |
| Hawaii | | | | | |
| Idaho | | | | | |
| Illinois | 249,400 | 258,200 | 2 [†] | | |
| Indiana | ... | ... | | | ... |
| Iowa | | | | | |
| Kansas | | | | | |
| Kentucky | | | | | |
| Louisiana | | | | | |
| Maine | ... | ... | | | State General Fund |
| Maryland | | | | | |
| Massachusetts | ... | 430,000 | | | ... |
| Michigan | | | | | |
| Minnesota | | | | | |
| Mississippi | | | | | |
| Missouri | | | | | |
| Montana | | | | | |
| Nebraska | 0 ^c | 7,000 | 10 | 10 | State Patrol Budget |
| Nevada | | | | | |
| New Hampshire | | | | | |
| New Jersey | ... | ... | 8 [†] | 12 [†] | |
| New Mexico | | | | | |
| New York | ... | ... | | 50 [†] | |
| North Carolina | 0 | 0 | | | |
| North Dakota | | | | | |
| Ohio | | | | | |
| Oklahoma | | | | | |
| Oregon | 408,000 | 434,600 | | | General Fund |
| Pennsylvania | | | | | |
| Puerto Rico | | | | | |
| Rhode Island | ... | ... | 5 [†] | | |
| South Carolina | ... | ... | | | Application fees |
| South Dakota | | | | | |
| Tennessee | | | | | |
| Texas | | | | | |
| Utah | | | | | |
| Vermont | | | | | |
| Virginia | 343,700 | 475,100 | 2 | | General Fund |
| Virgin Islands | ... | ... | 5 | | General Fund |
| Washington | | | | | |
| West Virginia | | | | | |
| Wisconsin | 270,900 | 256,800 | 5 ^d | | ... |
| Wyoming | | | | | |

Note: Costs have been rounded to the nearest whole dollar.

[†]Revenue generated from fees covers the costs of operating the program.

*Includes costs for personnel, equipment, facilities, training and other costs specified by respondents.

... Not available.

Methodology

This report is based upon the results from a survey conducted of the administrators of the State criminal history record repositories in January 1993. A total of 53 jurisdictions were surveyed, including the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Responses were received from all 53 jurisdictions.

The survey instrument consisted of 48 questions, many of which were multi-part. The survey was designed to collect comprehensive data in 12 topical areas, as follows:

- current quality and quantity of records in the criminal history databases;
- participation of the States in the Interstate Identification Index;
- State repository search methods and policies regarding current procedures for performing criminal history checks for firearms purchases;
- ability of State repositories to participate in a system in which convicted felons are uniquely and easily identified by some form of a targeted database;
- level of fingerprint-supported arrest reporting to the State repositories and the processing and timeliness of the information that is entered into criminal history record databases;
- level of prosecutor-reported information in criminal history databases;
- level and timeliness of disposition reporting by the courts to the State central repositories;
- types and timeliness of information reported to the repositories by correctional facilities;
- level of probation/parole-related information in the criminal history databases;
- extent to which the records in the criminal history databases contain final disposition information;
- ability of the State repositories to link reported disposition data to arrest data in the criminal history record databases; and
- level of audit activity in the States and the strategies employed by the State repositories to ensure accuracy of the data in the criminal history record databases.

Following the receipt of the responses, all data was automated. Extensive telephone follow-up was undertaken. Survey respondents were then requested to respond to particular questions relating to the current data compared to data from earlier surveys. Respondents were also permitted a final review of the data after it was placed in the tables which appear in this report.

Numbers and percentages shown in the tables were rounded. Numbers were rounded to the nearest 100. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number.

In the analyses of the tables, averages and totals were calculated using the mid-point of the range where ranges appear in the underlying data. In instances where the result is .5, when it followed an even number, the number was rounded down to the even number (e.g., 4.5 became 4); in instances where the .5 followed an odd number, the number was rounded up to the next even number (e.g., 1.5 became 2).

Data reported for 1983 and 1984 were taken from U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Technical Report: State Criminal Records Repositories* (October 1985). As shown in the tables in this report, the numbers were rounded to the nearest 100. Data reported for 1989 was taken from U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Survey of Criminal History Information Systems* (March 1991).

Bureau of Justice Statistics reports

(Revised November 1993)

Call toll-free 800-732-3277 to order BJS reports, to be added to one of the BJS mailing lists, or to speak to a reference specialist in statistics at the Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse, P.O. Box 179, Dept. BJS-236, Annapolis Junction, MD 20701-0179. For drugs and crime data, call the Drugs & Crime Data Center & Clearinghouse, 1600 Research Blvd., Rockville, MD 20850, toll-free 800-666-3332.

BJS maintains these mailing lists:

- Law enforcement reports
- Federal statistics
- Drugs and crime data
- Justice expenditure and employment
- Privacy and security of criminal histories and criminal justice information policy
- BJS bulletins and special reports
- State felony courts
- Corrections
- National Crime Victimization Survey
- Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics (annual)

Single copies of reports are free; use NCJ number to order. Postage and handling are charged for bulk orders of single reports. For single copies of multiple titles, up to 10 titles are free; 11-40 titles \$10; more than 40, \$20; libraries call for special rates.

Public-use tapes of BJS data sets and other criminal justice data are available from the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (formerly CJAIN), P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI 48106 (toll-free 800-999-0960).

National Crime Victimization Survey

Highlights from 20 years of surveying crime victims: The National Crime Victimization Survey, 1973-92, NCJ-144525, 10/93
Criminal victimization in the U.S.: 1991 (final), NCJ-139563, 1/93
1973-90 trends, NCJ-139564, 1/93
Crime and older Americans information package, NCJ-140091, 4/93, \$15
Crime victimization in city, suburban, and rural areas, NCJ-135943, 6/92
School crime, NCJ-131645, 9/91
Teenage victims, NCJ-128129, 5/91
Female victims of violent crime, NCJ-126826, 1/91
The Nation's two crime measures: Uniform Crime Reports and the National Crime Survey, NCJ-122705, 4/90
Redesign of the National Crime Survey, NCJ-111457, 3/89
The seasonality of crime victimization, NCJ-111033, 6/88
Victimization and fear of crime: World perspectives, NCJ-93872, 1/85, \$9.15
The National Crime Survey: Working papers, Vol. I, History, NCJ-75374, 8/82
Vol. II, Methodology, NCJ-90307, 12/84, \$9.90

BJS bulletins

Criminal victimization 1992, NCJ-144776, 11/93
Crime and the Nation's households, 1992, NCJ-143288, 9/93
The crime of rape, NCJ-96777, 3/85
Measuring crime, NCJ-75710, 2/81

BJS special reports

Elderly victims, NCJ-138330, 10/92
Handgun crime victims, NCJ-123559, 7/90
Black victims, NCJ-122562, 4/90
Hispanic victims, NCJ-120507, 1/90
The redesigned National Crime Survey: Selected new data, NCJ-114746, 1/89
Motor vehicle theft, NCJ-109978, 3/88
Violent crime trends, NCJ-107217, 11/87
Robbery victims, NCJ-104638, 4/87
Violent crime by strangers and non-strangers, NCJ-103702, 1/87
Preventing domestic violence against women, NCJ-102037, 8/86
Crime prevention measures, NCJ-100438, 3/86
The use of weapons in committing crimes, NCJ-99643, 1/86

*U.S. G.P.O.: 1993-301-151:80020

BJS technical reports

New directions for NCS, NCJ-115571, 3/89
Series crimes: Report of a field test, NCJ-104615, 4/87

Corrections

BJS bulletins and special reports

Capital punishment 1992, NCJ-145031, 11/93
HIV in U.S. prisons and jails, NCJ-143292, 9/93
Prisoners in 1992, NCJ-141874, 5/93
Drug enforcement and treatment in prisons, 1990, NCJ-134724, 7/92
Women in prison, NCJ-127991, 4/91
Violent State prisoners and their victims, NCJ-124133, 7/90
Prison rule violators, NCJ-120344, 12/89
Recidivism of prisoners released in 1983, NCJ-116261, 4/89
Drug use and crime: State prison inmate survey, 1986, NCJ-111940, 7/88
Time served in prison and on parole, 1984, NCJ-108544, 12/87
Profile of State prison inmates, 1986, NCJ-109926, 1/88
Imprisonment in four countries, NCJ-103967, 2/87

Prisoners at midyear 1993 (press release), NCJ-143960, 9/93

Correctional populations in the U.S.:

1991, NCJ-142729, 8/93
1990, NCJ-134946, 7/92
Survey of State prison inmates, 1991, NCJ-136949, 5/93
Census of State and Federal correctional facilities, 1990, NCJ-137003, 6/92
Prisons and prisoners in the United States, NCJ-137002, 4/92
National Corrections Reporting Program: 1990, NCJ-141879, 5/93
1989, NCJ-138222, 11/92
1988, NCJ-134929, 4/92
State and Federal institutions, 1926-86: Race of prisoners admitted, NCJ-125618, 6/91
Historical statistics on prisoners, NCJ-111098, 6/88

Census of jails and survey of jail inmates

BJS bulletins and special reports

Jail inmates, 1992, NCJ-143284, 8/93
Drunk driving: 1989 Survey of Inmates of Local Jails, NCJ-134728, 9/92
Women in jail, 1989, NCJ-134732, 3/92
Drugs and jail inmates, NCJ-130836, 6/91
Profile of jail inmates, 1989, NCJ-129097, 4/91
Population density in local jails, 1988, NCJ-122299, 3/90
Census of local jails, 1988, NCJ-121101, 2/90
Census of local jails, 1988: Summary and methodology, vol. I, NCJ-127992, 3/91
Data for individual jails in the Northeast, Midwest, South, West, vols. II-V, NCJ-130759-130762, 9/91
Census of local jails, 1983: Selected findings, methodology, summary tables, vol. V, NCJ-112795, 11/88

Probation and parole

BJS bulletins and special reports

Probation and parole: 1990, NCJ-133285, 11/91
1989, NCJ-125833, 11/90
Recidivism of young parolees, NCJ-104916, 5/87

Juvenile corrections

Children in custody: Census of public and private juvenile detention, correctional, and shelter facilities, 1975-85, NCJ-114065, 6/89
Survey of youth in custody, 1987 (special report), NCJ-113365, 9/88

Expenditure and employment

Justice expenditure and employment: 1990 (BJS bulletin), NCJ-135777, 9/92
1988 (full report), NCJ-125619, 8/91
Extracts, 1984, '85, '86, NCJ-124139, 8/91
Justice variable pass-through data, 1990: Anti-drug abuse formula grants (BJS technical report), NCJ-133018, 3/92

Courts

BJS bulletins

Felony sentences in State courts, 1990, NCJ-140186, 3/93
Pretrial release of felony defendants, 1990, NCJ-139550, 11/92
Prosecutors in State courts, 1990, NCJ-134500, 3/92
Pretrial release of felony defendants, 1988, NCJ-127202, 2/91
Felony sentences in State courts, 1988, NCJ-126923, 12/90
Criminal defense for the poor, 1986, NCJ-112919, 9/88

BJS special reports

Murder in families, NCJ-143498, 9/93
Murder in large urban counties, 1988, NCJ-140614, 3/93
Recidivism of felons on probation, 1986-89, NCJ-134177, 2/92
Felony case processing in State courts, 1986, NCJ-121753, 2/90

Felony defendants in large urban counties, 1990: National Pretrial Reporting Program, NCJ-141872, 5/93
National Judicial Reporting Program, 1988, NCJ-135945, 1/93

The prosecution of felony arrests:

1988, NCJ-130914, 2/92
1987, NCJ-124140, 9/90
Felons sentenced to probation in State courts, 1986, NCJ-124944, 11/90
Felony defendants in large urban counties, 1988, NCJ-122385, 4/90

Profile of felons convicted in State courts,

1986, NCJ-120021, 1/90
Felony laws of 50 States and the District of Columbia, 1986, NCJ-105066, 2/88, \$14.60
State court model statistical dictionary: Supplement, NCJ-98326, 9/85
1st edition, NCJ-62320, 9/80, \$10.60

Privacy and security

Criminal justice information policy: Use and management of criminal history record information: A comprehensive report, NCJ-143501, 11/93
Survey of criminal history information systems, 1992, NCJ-143500, 11/93
Report of the National Task Force on Criminal History Record Disposition Reporting, NCJ-135836, 6/92
Attorney General's program for improving the Nation's criminal history records: BJS implementation status report, NCJ-134722, 3/92
Identifying felons who attempt to purchase firearms, NCJ-128131, 3/91, \$9.90

Assessing completeness and accuracy of criminal history record information:

Audit guide, NCJ-133651, 2/92
Forensic DNA analysis: Issues, NCJ-128567, 6/91
Statutes requiring use of criminal history record information, NCJ-129896, 6/91
Original records of entry, NCJ-125626, 12/90
Strategies for improving data quality, NCJ-115339, 5/89
Public access to criminal history record information, NCJ-111458, 11/88
Juvenile records and recordkeeping systems, NCJ-112815, 11/88
Automated fingerprint identification systems: Technology and policy issues, NCJ-104342, 4/87
Criminal justice "hot" files, NCJ-101850, 12/86
Expert witness manual, NCJ-77927, 9/81, \$11.50

BJS/SEARCH conference proceedings:

National conference on improving the quality of criminal history information: NCJ-133532, 2/92
Criminal justice in the 1990's: The future of information management, NCJ-121697, 5/90, \$7.70
Juvenile and adult records: One system, one record? NCJ-114947, 1/90
Open vs. confidential records, NCJ-113560, 1/88
Compendium of State privacy and security legislation: 1992, NCJ-137058, 7/92
1992 full report (1,500pp, microfiche \$2, hard copy, NCJ-139126, \$184), 7/92

Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics

LEMAS, 1990: Data for individual agencies with 100 or more officers, NCJ-134436, 9/92

BJS bulletins and special reports

Census of State and local law enforcement agencies 1992, NCJ-142972, 7/93
Drug enforcement by police and sheriffs' departments, 1990, NCJ-134505, 5/92
State and local police departments, 1990, NCJ-133284, 2/92
Sheriffs' departments, 1990, NCJ-133283, 2/92
Police departments in large cities, 1987, NCJ-119220, 8/89
Profile of State and local law enforcement agencies, 1987, NCJ-113949, 3/89

Drugs & crime

Drugs, crime, and the justice system:

A national report, NCJ-133652, 5/93
Technical appendix, NCJ-139578, 6/93
Catalog of selected Federal publications on illegal drug and alcohol abuse, NCJ-139562, 6/93
Drugs and crime facts: 1992, NCJ-135561, 3/93
State drug resources: 1992 national directory, NCJ-134375, 5/92
Federal drug data for national policy, NCJ-122715, 4/90

Federal justice statistics

Federal criminal case processing, 1982-91, with preliminary data for 1992, NCJ-144526, 11/93
Compendium of Federal justice statistics: 1990, NCJ-143499, 9/93
1989, NCJ-134730, 5/92
The Federal civil justice system (BJS bulletin), NCJ-104769, 8/87

Federal offenses and offenders

BJS special reports

Prosecuting criminal enterprises: Federal offenses and offenders, NCJ-142524, 11/93
Federal sentencing in transition, 1986-90, NCJ-134727, 6/92
Immigration offenses, NCJ-124546, 8/90
Federal criminal cases, 1980-87, NCJ-118311, 7/89
Drug law violators, 1980-86, NCJ-111763, 6/88
Pretrial release and detention: The Bail Reform Act of 1984, NCJ-109929, 2/88

General

BJS bulletins and special reports

BJS telephone contacts, '94, NCJ-143707, 11/93
Patterns of robbery and burglary in 9 States, 1984-88, NCJ-137368, 11/92
Forgery and fraud-related offenses in 6 States, 1983-88, NCJ-132445, 1/92
Tracking offenders, 1988, NCJ-129861, 6/91
International crime rates, NCJ-110776, 5/88

BJS discussion papers:

Performance measures for the criminal justice system: Papers from the BJS-Princeton Project, NCJ-143505, 10/93
Local prosecution of organized crime: The use of State RICO statutes, NCJ-143502, 10/93
Felony sentencing and jail characteristics, NCJ-142523, 6/93

Using NIBRS data to analyze violent crime:

National Incident-Based Reporting System (Technical Report), NCJ-144785, 11/93
Directory of automated criminal justice information systems, 1993: Vol. 1, Law enforcement, NCJ-142645, 9/93, \$5
Vol. 2, Corrections, courts, probation/parole, prosecution, NCJ-142646, 9/93, \$4
Sourcebook of criminal justice statistics, 1992, NCJ-143496, 9/93, \$6
BJS statistical programs, FY 1993, NCJ-139373, 1/93

State justice sourcebook of statistics and research,

NCJ-137991, 9/92
Violent crime in the U.S., NCJ-127855, 3/91
BJS data report, 1989, NCJ-121514, 1/91
Publications of BJS, 1985-89: Microfiche library, PRO30014, 5/90, \$190
Bibliography, TBO30013, 5/90, \$17.50
Publications of BJS, 1971-84: Microfiche library, PRO30012, 10/86, \$203
Bibliography, TBO30012, 10/86, \$17.50
Report to the Nation on crime and justice: Second edition, NCJ-105506, 6/88

See order form on last page

Please put me on the mailing list for:

- Law enforcement reports** — National data on State and local police and sheriffs' departments: operations, equipment, personnel, salaries, spending, policies, and programs
- Federal statistics** — Federal case processing: investigation through prosecution, adjudication, sentencing, incarceration
- Drugs and crime** — Sentencing and time served by drug offenders, drug use at time of crime by jail inmates and State prisoners, and other quality data on drugs, crime, and law enforcement
- Justice expenditure and employment** — Spending and staffing by Federal/State/local governments and by function (police, courts, corrections, etc.)
- Privacy and security of criminal history information and information policy** — New State legislation; maintaining and releasing intelligence and investigative records; data quality
- BJS bulletins & special reports** — Timely reports of the most current justice data
- State felony courts** — Defendant demographics and criminal history; pretrial release, prosecution, adjudication, and sentencing; State felony laws; indigent defense
- Corrections reports** — Results of sample surveys and censuses of jails, prisons, parole, probation, and other corrections data
- National Crime Victimization Survey reports** — The only ongoing national survey of crime victims
- Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics** (annual) — Broad-based data from 150+ sources (400+ tables, 100+ figures, subject index, annotated bibliography, addresses of sources)
- Send me a sign-up form for the **NIJ Catalog** (free 6 times a year), which abstracts both private and government criminal justice publications and lists upcoming conferences and training sessions in the field.

To be added to any BJS mailing list, please fill in this page and **fax to (410) 792-4358** or fold, stamp, and mail to the Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse at the address below.

You will receive an annual renewal card. If you do not return it, we must drop you from the mailing list.

To order copies of recent BJS reports, attach a list of titles and NCJ order numbers.

Name: _____

Title: _____

Organization: _____

Street or box: _____

City, State, ZIP: _____

Daytime phone number: _____

Criminal justice interest: _____

Please put organization _____

and title here if you used _____

home address above: _____

U.S. Department of Justice
Bureau of Justice Statistics
Washington, D.C. 20531

Place
first-class
stamp
here

Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse
P.O. Box 179, Dept. BJS-236
Annapolis Junction, MD 20701-0179

Want on-line access to
**The Automated Index of
Criminal Justice Information Systems?**

*Then call the SEARCH-BBS!
916/392-4640*

What is the SEARCH-BBS?

The SEARCH-BBS is an electronic bulletin board system available free to criminal justice professionals nationwide • It's a national forum and communications network that gives you access to on-line databases, an events calendar, downloadable software, indispensable justice publications, electronic mail message areas, and the Internet • The SEARCH-BBS is a service of SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics, and is funded by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice

On-line Access to the Automated Index

Selecting hardware and software for your agency can be a complex and frustrating task • The SEARCH-BBS helps by providing on-line access to the Automated Index of Criminal Justice Information Systems, a database containing profiles of automated criminal justice agencies and descriptions of computerized information systems designed specifically for use by justice agencies • The Automated Index database enables you to quickly identify public domain and commercial software systems that meet specific needs, and to identify agencies with practical experience with those systems • Agencies and vendors can update the Automated Index with information about their organizations and software products

How to Reach Us

Any justice professional with a computer, a modem and a communications package can reach the SEARCH-BBS 24 hours a day, 7 days a week • The SEARCH-BBS supports modems of 1200, 2400, 4800 and 9600 bits per second (v.32 and v.42 compatible)

1. Set your system parameters to:

- ✓ 8 data bits
- ✓ 1 stop bit
- ✓ No parity

2. Dial 916/392-4640

3. Log on to the SEARCH-BBS

The menu-driven system is easy to use, and first-time callers may register on-line

For more information, call SEARCH at 916/392-2550

**Questions about drugs
and crime?**

Call 1-800-666-3332

Drugs & Crime Data Center
& Clearinghouse
1600 Research Boulevard
Rockville, MD 20850

**To order this report
or ask about other BJS
crime and justice data:**

Call 1-800-732-3277

Bureau of Justice Statistics
Clearinghouse
Box 6000
Rockville, MD 20850

Or call the BJS section of the
NCJRS electronic bulletin board
for the latest data releases:

1-301-738-8895

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Bureau of Justice Statistics

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use \$300

BULK RATE
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
DOJ/BJS
Permit No. G-91

Washington, D.C. 20531