Department of Criminology & Criminal Justice
and the
South Carolina Criminal Justice Academy

South Carolina Law Enforcement Census 2004



South Carolina Law Enforcement Census 2004

A Collaborative Research Project
Between the

Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, University of South Carolina

and the

South Carolina Criminal Justice Academy

Robert J. Kaminski, Ph.D.
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of South Carolina

William V. Pelfrey, Jr., Ph.D.
Department of Criminal Justice
University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee

March, 2005

Highlights i
Introduction 1
Methodology 2
Findings 4
Personnel 4
Figure 1. Distribution of Law Enforcement Agencies in South Carolina by 5 Number of Sworn Personnel 5
Figure 2. Average Number of Sworn Personnel by Agency Size: All 6 Agencies 6
Figure 3. Average Number of Sworn Personnel by Agency Size: Municipal Agencies 7
Figure 4. Average Number of Sworn Personnel: Sheriffs' Agencies 8
Figure 5. Average Number of Sworn Non-Jail Personnel: Sheriffs' Agencies 8
Table 1. Number of Certified or Sworn Personnel 9
Figure 6. Number of New Hires for Municipal Police Departments, FY '03 11
Figure 7. Number of New Hires for Sheriffs' Agencies in Prior Year 12
Table 2. Number of New Hires for Fiscal Year 2003 13
Figure 8. Full-time Administrative Personnel for Municipal Departments 15
Figure 9. Full-time Administrative Personnel for Sheriffs' Agencies 15
Table 3. Full-time Administrative Personnel 16
Weapons 18
Table 4. Weapons Issued to Officers by Agency 18
Services Provided 18
Table 5. Services Provided by Agency 19
Investigative Services 19
Table 6. Investigative Services Provided 19
Table 7. Relationship between Agency Size and Investigation of Homicides 20
Forensic Services 20
Table 8. Forensic Services Available 20
Table 9. Drug Analysis Services by Agency Size 21
Table 10. Crime Lab Services by Agency Size 21
911 System 22
Table 11. Who Manages Agency's 911 System? 22
Calls for Service 22
Figure 10. Average Number of Calls for Service by Agency Size 23
Figure 11. Average Number of Calls for Service Receiving an Officer 23
Figure 12: Average # of Calls for Service by Agency Size: Municipal PDs 24
Figure 13. Average # of Calls for Service Receiving a Police Officer by Agency Size: Municipal PDs 24
Figure 14. Average Number of Calls for Service by Agency Size: Sheriffs' agencies 25
Figure 15. Average Number of Calls for Service Receiving a Sheriffs' Deputy by Agency Size: Sheriffs' Agencies 25
Community Policing 26
Table 12. Community Policing Implementation 26
Mentally Ill Suspect Policies 27
Table 13. Issues Regarding Mentally Ill Suspects 27
Computers and Technology 28
Table 14. Usage and Availability of Computers and Technology 28

Vehicles and Transportation 29
Table 15. Vehicles or Transportation Devices 29
SWAT Teams and Dogs 30
Figure 16. Number of Agencies with SWAT Units by Agency Size 30
Training and Accreditation 31
Table 16. Accredited Law Enforcement Agencies in South Carolina 32
Drug Investigations and Drug Testing 33
Table 17. Drug Investigations 33
Table 18. Number of Personnel in Drug Unit 34
Table 19. Drug Testing Policies 34
Crime Mapping and Surveys 35
Table 20. Crime Mapping Capabilities and Interest 35
Table 21. Public Surveys 36
Terrorism and Home Security 36
Table 22. Terrorism Policies and Funding 37
Table 23. Terrorism Response Coordinator 37
Table 24. Terrorism Scenario Training 38
Operating Budget 38
Table 25. Annual Operating Budget, All Agencies 39
Figure 17. Average Annual Operating Budget by Agency Type 39
Table 26. Pay Categories and Their Availability 41
Salary 42
Table 27. Chief, Sheriff's Salary 42
Table 28. Deputy Chief or Assistant Chief's Salary 42
Table 29. Major's Salary 43
Table 30. Captain's Salary 43
Table 31. Lieutenant's Salary 43
Table 32. Sergeant's Salary 44
Table 33. Senior Patrol Officer's Salary 44
Table 34. Entry Level Patrol Officer's Salary 44
Appendix A: Participating Agencies 45
Appendix B: Census Personnel 49
Appendix C – Frequencies of All Variables 50

Highlights

The South Carolina Law Enforcement Census, conducted since the early 1980s, solicits information from agencies regarding their personnel, budgets, salaries, equipment, and a variety of other key issues, from community policing to terrorism. This document presents highlights from the full report, which is available at http://www.sccja.org or http://www.cas.sc.edu/crju/censusreport.html

Number and Percent of Responding Agencies, 2003

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Sheriff	32	18.7	18.7	18.7
	2 County Police	1	.6	.6	19.3
	3 Municipal Police	111	64.9	64.9	84.2
	4 State Agency	9	5.3	5.3	89.5
	5 Special Police	18	10.5	10.5	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

Personnel

In 2003, 171 of the approximately 290 (59%) law enforcement agencies contacted in South Carolina returned a completed survey. Most were municipal police departments (65%), followed by sheriffs' agencies (19%), special jurisdiction police (11%), and State law enforcement agencies (5%). Of the responding agencies only one was a county police department.[1]

As of October 15, 2003, 169 agencies reported they employed 8,422 sworn officers. The largest employers were municipal agencies, with 3,523 or 42% of the total, followed by sheriffs' (3,038; 36%), and state agencies (1,331; 16%).

These agencies reported hiring 1,042 new officers in 2002. Municipal agencies accounted for nearly half of the new hires (48%), sheriffs' offices accounted for 38%, special jurisdiction police accounted for 7%, and state agencies accounted for 5%. The lone county police department hired 19 new officers in 2002 (2%).

Overall, 80% (135) of the agencies reported having a written policy for drug testing its employees, and 66% indicated they randomly drug tested employees. Most sheriffs' agencies reported that they conducted random drug tests (91%), whereas about two-thirds (67%) of municipal agencies reported doing so. Thirty-seven percent (37%) of



[1] Municipal agencies include city, town, and village police; special jurisdiction police include airport and college and university police.

state agencies and 28% of special jurisdiction agencies indicated that they conducted random drug testing of employees. Nearly three-fourths (73%) of all agencies indicated that they drug tested applicants. Municipal police departments were most likely to do so (81%), followed by sheriffs' agencies (69%), special jurisdiction police (50%), and state agencies (38%). The one responding county police department reported that it did not conduct random drug tests of employees, but that new applicants were drug tested.

Approximately 90% of sheriffs' and municipal and special jurisdiction police agencies required new recruits to have a high school diploma or GED in 2003, whereas five or 63% of the state agencies required a two- or four-year college degree.

Sixty-nine percent (69%) of all agencies required new recruits to complete an average of 279 hours of field and classroom training beyond that provided by the state training academy. State and sheriffs' agencies were most likely to require additional training (78 and 73% respectively), followed by municipal police departments (69%) and special jurisdiction police (61%).

Minimum, Maximum, and Mean Entry-level Base Salary by Agency Type

Agency Type		Minimum	Maximum
Sheriff	Average	$24,333	$32,842
	Low	$20,000	$22,000
	High	$29,843	$47,368
County Police	Average	$26,413	$39,620
	Low	$26,413	$39,620
	High	$26,413	$39,620
Municipal Police	Average	$22,946	$29,697
	Low	$17,000	$17,000
	High	$32,098	$49,065
State Agency	Average	$23,126	$34,137
	Low	$19,272	$21,969
	High	$25,608	$40,108
Special Police	Average	$23,632	$36,731
	Low	$21,359	$21,679
	High	$29,024	$41,338

Minimum, Maximum, and Mean Agency Head Base Salary by Agency Type

Agency Type		Minimum	Maximum
Sheriff	Average	$52,118	$67,251
	Low	$34,743	$40,000
	High	$72,678	$104,000
County Police	Average	$57,669	$86,504
	Low	$57,669	$86,504
	High	$57,669	$86,504
Municipal Police	Average	$40,210	$54,864
	Low	$21,000	$20,800
	High	$69,032	$123,200
State Agency	Average	$54,708	$88,122
	Low	$28,534	$48,804
	High	$78,587	$116,617
Special Police	Average	$38,832	$61,427
	Low	$25,000	$32,000
	High	$70,993	$106,490

In 2003, 20% of agencies required annual or semiannual fitness testing of officers. Thirty-four percent (34%) and 18% of sheriffs' and municipal departments, respectively, required testing, compared to only one state agency and two special jurisdiction departments.

Budget and Pay

In the fiscal year 2003, 141 responding agencies reported total operating budgets of $503.1 million, ranging from a low of $7,680 to a high of $42.4 million. The average operating budgets for agencies of different sizes was as follows: small agencies (1-6 sworn personnel), $195,523; moderately small agencies (7-18 sworn personnel),

$624,796; medium-sized agencies (19-47 sworn personnel), $1,975,603 and large agencies (48-878 sworn), $10,311,854. Average budgets by agency type were: sheriffs' agencies, $160.9 million; municipal departments, $225.3 million; special jurisdiction police, $15.5 million; and state agencies, $89.3 million.

In 2003, minimum base annual salaries for entry-level law enforcement officers ranged from a low of $17,000 to a high of about $32,000, with an average of about $23,290. County police reported the highest average minimum salary ($26,413), followed by sheriffs' agencies ($24,333), special jurisdiction police ($23,632), state agencies ($23,126), and municipal police ($22,946).

Maximum base annual salaries ranged from a low of $17,000 to just over $49,000, with an average of $31,250. The highest average maximum annual salary for entry-level officers was reported by county police ($39,620), followed by special police ($36,731), state agencies ($34,137), sheriffs' agencies ($32,842), and municipal police ($29,697).

The average minimum base annual salaries increased with agency size. The average salary for the smallest agencies (1-6 sworn) was $21,016. For agencies with 7-18 sworn the average was $21,695; for those with 19-47 sworn it was $23,716. The average minimum base annual salary for the largest agencies (48-878 sworn) was $25,989.

For all agencies, the minimum base annual salaries for police chiefs, sheriffs, and directors ranged from a low of $21,000 to a high of $78,587, with an average minimum salary of $42,281. Maximum base annual salaries ranged from $20,800 to $123,200, with an average of $59,328. County police had the highest average minimum base salary ($57,669), followed by state agencies ($54,708), sheriffs' agencies ($52,118), municipal police ($40,210), and special police ($38,832).

State agencies had the highest average maximum base salary ($88,122) followed by county police ($86,504), sheriffs' agencies ($67,251), special police ($61,427), and municipal police ($54,864).

The average minimum base annual salaries for chiefs, sheriffs, and directors, increased with agency size. The average base annual salary for the smallest agencies (1-6 sworn) was $31,484. For agencies with 7-18 sworn personnel the average was $35,092; for those with 19-47 sworn personnel it was $46,865, and for the largest agencies, with 48-878 sworn personnel, the average was $58,436.

Mentally Ill Suspects

Just over half (56%) of all agencies had a policy regarding the handling of mentally ill suspects, and just under half (48%) provided training for their officers on handling mentally ill suspects.

Special police departments were most likely to provide such training (67%), followed by Sheriffs' agencies (63%), and municipal departments (46%). Only one of the responding eight state agencies provided training on the handling of mentally ill suspects, and the lone county police department reported that it does not provide training in this area.

Operations

Virtually all (97%) law enforcement agencies engaged in patrol activities. Eighty five percent (85%) listed traffic enforcement as a primary function. Nearly half (49%) were responsible for court security, 28% for serving civil process, and 23% for jail operations. Twenty-six percent engaged in tactical or SWAT operations.

In 2003, 87% of the agencies participated in a 9-1-1 emergency system. This was highest for municipal agencies (95%), followed by sheriffs' departments (90%), and special jurisdiction police (72%). Only one state agency participated in a 9-1-1 system.

Statewide, nearly half (48%) of the agencies operated a specialized drug-enforcement unit. Sheriffs' departments were most likely to do so (97%), followed by municipal police departments (43%). Two state agencies operated such units. Although special jurisdiction police indicated that they did not operate specialized drug-enforcement units, 17% reported that they were part of a multi-agency drug-enforcement taskforce.

Agencies that Conducted Training on the Handling of Mentally Ill Suspects



Community Policing

In 2003, 69% (117) of the law enforcement agencies in South Carolina reported having a community policing plan. In 35% of these agencies the plan was formal and written. For the remaining agencies with a community policing plan (65%), that plan was informal. However, among all agencies, 75% reported they actively encouraged officers to engage in problem-solving projects.

Twenty-seven percent (27%) of the departments reported they trained citizens in some form of community policing activity, while 48% formed some type of problem-solving partnership with a community group or other agency.

Eighty-four percent (84%) and 51% of sheriffs' and municipal agencies, respectively, used one or more school resource officers, as did the single responding county police department.

In 2003, both sheriffs' agencies and municipal departments were more likely to have informal community policing plans than formal, written plans.

A slightly greater proportion of sheriffs' agencies than municipal police departments reported having a formal, written plan (32% and 26%, respectively). Special police forces were the least likely to have formal, written community policing plans (6%). Eight of the nine responding state agencies did not have a community policing plan, while the one with a plan indicated it was formal and written. The lone county police department reported that it did not have a plan in 2003.

Proportion of Agencies with Formal, Informal, or No Community Policing Plans



Equipment

In 2003, 97% of all responding agencies reported they supplied their officers with semiautomatic sidearms. Regarding less-lethal weapons, 89% reported issuing a chemical agent, and 12% issued an electrical stun device.

Agencies reported operating 7,228 cars in 2003. Sixty-nine percent (5,018) were marked and 31% (2,262) were unmarked. Fourteen percent reported having car-mounted digital terminals, while 80% reported having in-car video cameras. Seventy-one percent of agencies allowed officers to take vehicles home.

Statewide, 11.3 % (19) of the agencies operated 89 motorcycles, and 65 agencies (38%) used bicycles.

Six agencies (4%) operated at least one plane, while 10 agencies (6%) operated one or more helicopters. Thirty two (19%) operated one or more boats.

Regarding animals, 8 agencies (5%) reported using one or more horses and 83 (49%) employed dogs for law enforcement purposes.

Computers and Information Technologies

Sixty-nine percent (118) of all agencies had a mainframe computer, 85% (145) used personal computers, and 46% (78) used laptops. Another 14% (24) reported using computers in cars, while 7% (12) used handheld computers. All but 2% of agencies (3) had internet access.

Forty-seven percent (80) of the responding agencies indicated they had crime mapping capabilities. Twenty-seven percent (45) reported they mapped calls for service to street address locations, 19% (32) mapped arrests to street

address locations, and 10% (17) mapped crime to beats or census tracts. Forty-nine percent (80) of the agencies made crime statistics or crime maps available to their officers, and 80% (133) indicated interest in geographic information systems training.

Terrorism

In 2003, 31% (52) of responding agencies had a written policy on terrorism response or prevention. State agencies were most likely to have a written policy (67%) followed by special police (56%), sheriffs' agencies (47%), and municipal departments (20%). The single county police department reported that it did not have a written policy.

Thirty-nine percent (64) indicated they requested funding for terrorism from federal sources, 28% (43) requested funding from state sources, and 14% (21) requested funding from city or county sources. Twenty-five agencies reported they received approximately $2.8 million in funding for terrorism response equipment, while 92 agencies indicated they did not receive such funding (56 agencies did not report whether they did or did not receive funding).

Agencies with a Written Policy on Terrorism Response or Prevention

Agency Type		Frequency	Percent
1 Sheriff	0 No	16	53.3
	1 Yes	14	46.7
	Total	30	100.0
3 Municipal Police	0 No	87	79.8
	1 Yes	22	20.2
	Total	109	100.0
4 State Agency	0 No	3	33.3
	1 Yes	6	66.7
	Total	9	100.0
5 Special Police	0 No	8	44.4
	1 Yes	10	55.6
	Total	18	100.0

Sixteen agencies indicated that they received about $273,500 in funding for terrorism response training, and 88 reported that they received no funding for training (67 agencies did not indicate whether or not they received funding). Thirty-seven percent of agencies indicated that they conducted scenario-based training where officers actually responded to hypothetical terrorist threats, including the use of weapons of mass destruction.

Introduction

The *South Carolina Law Enforcement Census* (hereafter, Census) is a unique and important research and information tool. Although the Census traditionally has been published every year, it has not been conducted over the past few years due to budget constraints. In 2003, funding became available to resume this research project. Since the early 1980s, the Department of Criminal Justice at the University of South Carolina has conducted the Census. By conducting mail and phone surveys with law enforcement agencies in South Carolina, the Census produced a comprehensive portrayal of many key issues for law enforcement. As the needs and issues facing law enforcement agencies have changed, the Census has similarly evolved. Rather than conducting exhaustive phone interviews, research staff conducting the present Census instead mailed a survey to all law enforcement agencies and requested their participation. Of the approximately 290 law enforcement agencies in the state that employ sworn law enforcement officers, 171 returned usable, completed surveys (about 60% of the sample). The agencies that took the time to participate should be commended for their willingness to extend the knowledge base in the State.

While previous versions of the Census concentrated on the minutiae of law enforcement, this iteration of the Census takes a different approach. Although we still report important figures such as the number of officers hired, numbers and types of vehicles employed, etc., we also inquired about terrorism prevention, homeland security funding, policies regarding the mentally ill, and community policing implementation. Questions regarding these issues will evolve with each iteration of the Census, which we anticipate conducting every two years, depending on funding.

The Census was developed to serve several purposes. Its primary mission is to inform the law enforcement community in South Carolina. Administrators can use the information to determine how their agency compares to other agencies in terms of manpower, salary, budget, equipment, and so forth. Informed requests can then be posed to city, county, or state administrators for funding increases or reallocation. The sections on important current issues, such as homeland security and policies regarding the mentally ill, can assist administrators in determining the position of their agency relevant to other agencies in the state. Further, information in the Census (such as found in the community policing and accreditation sections) can guide administrators in determining policy directions for the future. The Census also serves as a research vehicle for the faculty in the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice at the University of South Carolina (USC). Finally, the Census is intended to assist staff at the South Carolina Criminal Justice Academy in determining current and future training needs for law enforcement agencies in the state.

Methodology

The questions included in the Census were developed by faculty in the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice at USC, in conjunction with staff at the South Carolina Criminal Justice Academy. Some questions were drawn from national surveys conducted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, some from previous iterations of the Census, and others are original questions developed to address current concerns. A complete list of all law enforcement agencies in South Carolina was acquired from the Academy. Prior to mailing the survey, a pre-sensitization letter was distributed by the Academy to all law enforcement agencies in the State. The Census was then mailed, with a postage-paid return envelope and an explanatory cover letter

from the Academy. Agencies that did not respond were sent multiple requests soliciting their participation. Agencies that contacted research staff and indicated they did not receive (or had lost) the surveys were sent a second copy. After repeated requests for participation, approximately 60% of all agencies that currently employ sworn law enforcement personnel returned completed, usable surveys. A complete list of participating agencies is included in Appendix A of this report.

Since all agencies were included as participants, even though not all agencies completed surveys, the research methodology is considered a census, rather than a sample (which would begin with a process to choose a representative proportion of all existing agencies). Returned surveys were entered into a database and analyzed by research staff. Since not all agencies responded, it is important to point out that responses obtained from participating agencies may not necessarily be representative all law enforcement agencies in South Carolina. A review of the participating agencies indicates that they range widely from very small agencies (with just a few officers) to the largest agencies in the state. The largest agencies all participated, providing a comprehensive view of these units. The majority of the sheriffs' departments participated, encompassing the spectrum from the largest sheriffs' offices in the state to some of the smallest. The same is true for police departments—of the approximately 100 police departments that returned usable surveys, both the largest in the state through some of the smallest are included. Participating agencies cover a wide geographic and population range. A variety of other units including state agencies, departments of public safety, and university police departments also participated.[1] Although generalizing the findings of this Census to specific non-participating agencies should be done with caution, the findings may reasonably be considered representative of the law

[1] In this report *municipal* agencies include city, town, and village police; *special jurisdiction police* include airport and college and university police.

enforcement agencies in South Carolina. Note, also, that some agencies did not provide responses to specific questions in the Census. We highlight this fact in the text or in the tables when the proportion of agencies failing to answer a question is large, as the figures provided are unlikely to accurately reflect the population of law enforcement agencies in the State.

Findings

Personnel

Any law enforcement agency is defined by its personnel. This section of the report includes information on numbers of officers or deputies in an agency, hiring, number of administrators, and number of personnel in some specialized units. Some specialized units (i.e. community policing, SWAT, drug investigations) are discussed elsewhere in this report and are excluded from this section. In addition to simply stating numbers of officers, agency size is included as a descriptor for some variables.

In 2003, the number of certified or sworn personnel per agency varied widely, ranging from 1 to 878. Twenty-two agencies (12%) employed more than 100 officers. The agency with the largest number of sworn is the State Highway Patrol (n = 878), which is nearly twice the size of the next largest agency—the Richland County Sheriff's Office with 450 sworn deputies. (Because including the Highway Patrol when calculating statistics substantially skews obtained values, it is excluded from the following personnel figures.) The average number of sworn or certified law enforcement officers for all agencies statewide was 45 and the median was 19 (representing the 50^{th} percentile; half of the cases are above the median and half are below). Figure 1 displays graphically the distribution of law enforcement agencies in South Carolina by the number of

sworn officers and deputies (including the Highway Patrol). Clearly, smaller-sized agencies dominate.

Figure 1. Distribution of Law Enforcement Agencies in South Carolina by Number of Sworn Personnel



Figure 2 depicts the average number of sworn or certified personnel by agency size, with each size category representing approximately 25% of the reporting agencies. Small agencies (n = 40) are those that employed 6 or fewer sworn officers (category 1). Moderately small agencies (n = 44) employed 7-18 sworn (category 2), medium-sized agencies (n = 43) employed 19-47 (category 3), and large agencies (n = 41) employed 48-450 sworn (category 4). The graph

shows that small agencies employed an average of four sworn officers, moderately small agencies an average of 12 officers, medium-sized agencies 31, and large agencies an average of 135 sworn.

Figure 2. Average Number of Sworn Personnel by Agency Size: All Agencies



Notes: 1 = 1-6, 2 = 7-18, 3 = 19-47, 4 = 48-450 sworn; SC Highway Patrol excluded.

Figure 3 displays the average number of sworn or certified personnel by agency size for municipal police departments. Small police departments (n = 32) had, on average, only a few officers. Moderately small police departments (n = 34) averaged 12 officers, medium-sized agencies (n = 25) averaged 31 officers, while large police departments (n = 18) averaged 125 officers.

Figure 3. Average Number of Sworn Personnel by Agency Size: Municipal Agencies



Notes: 1 = small, 2 = moderately small, 3 = medium, 4 = large agency.

Figure 4 presents the same information for sheriffs' agencies. There were no reporting sheriffs' agencies with fewer than 6 sworn personnel in 2003. The two moderately small sheriffs' departments averaged 15 sworn, medium-sized agencies (n = 12) averaged 32, while large sheriffs' departments (n = 18) averaged 146 sworn personnel.

Excluding non-jail personnel presents a substantially different distribution of personnel for sheriffs' agencies. As shown in Figure 5, moderately small agencies had an average of 13 sworn or certified non-jail personnel, medium-sized agencies had an average of 6, while large sheriffs' agencies had an average of 44.

Figure 4. Average Number of Sworn Personnel: Sheriffs' Agencies



Notes: 1 = small, 2 = moderately small, 3 = medium, 4 = large agency.

Figure 5. Average Number of Sworn Non-Jail Personnel: Sheriffs' Agencies



Notes: 1 = small, 2 = moderately small, 3 = medium, 4 = large agency.

The following table displays the number of reported certified and sworn personnel for all agencies in South Carolina.

Table 1. Number of Certified or Sworn Personnel

# Sworn	# Agencies	Percent	Cumulative %
1	2	1.2	1.2
2	9	5.3	6.5
3	7	4.1	10.7
4	6	3.6	14.2
5	11	6.5	20.7
6	5	3.0	23.7
7	4	2.4	26.0
8	2	1.2	27.2
9	3	1.8	29.0
10	8	4.7	33.7
11	6	3.6	37.3
12	5	3.0	40.2
13	4	2.4	42.6
14	3	1.8	44.4
15	2	1.2	45.6
16	3	1.8	47.3
17	2	1.2	48.5
18	2	1.2	49.7
19	1	.6	50.3
20	2	1.2	51.5
21	2	1.2	52.7
22	1	.6	53.3
23	1	.6	53.8
24	2	1.2	55.0
25	4	2.4	57.4
26	2	1.2	58.6
27	2	1.2	59.8
28	2	1.2	60.9
29	1	.6	61.5
30	4	2.4	63.9
31	1	.6	64.5
32	1	.6	65.1
33	2	1.2	66.3
35	1	.6	66.9
36	3	1.8	68.6
37	2	1.2	69.8
38	1	.6	70.4
39	2	1.2	71.6
41	2	1.2	72.8
44	2	1.2	74.0

Table 1. – Continued

# Sworn	# Agencies	Valid %	Cumulative %
46	1	.6	74.6
47	1	.6	75.1
48	3	1.8	76.9
52	1	.6	77.5
54	1	.6	78.1
58	1	.6	78.7
59	1	.6	79.3
60	2	1.2	80.5
62	2	1.2	81.7
68	1	.6	82.2
73	1	.6	82.8
74	1	.6	83.4
78	2	1.2	84.6
80	1	.6	85.2
84	1	.6	85.8
90	1	.6	86.4
94	1	.6	87.0
106	1	.6	87.6
107	1	.6	88.2
109	1	.6	88.8
110	1	.6	89.3
113	1	.6	89.9
123	1	.6	90.5
127	1	.6	91.1
128	1	.6	91.7
133	1	.6	92.3
147	1	.6	92.9
175	1	.6	93.5
188	1	.6	94.1
211	1	.6	94.7
212	1	.6	95.3
228	1	.6	95.9
253	1	.6	96.4
270	1	.6	97.0
299	1	.6	97.6
363	2	1.2	98.8
450	1	.6	99.4
878	1	.6	100.0
Sub Total	169	100.0	
Missing	2		
Total	171		

Agencies also were asked how many new officers were hired in the past year. Approximately 15% of reporting agencies (a total of 25) reported zero new hires. Although the range of new hires was 1 to 62, the average was 6 and the median was 3. Thus, approximately half of reporting agencies indicated they hired fewer than 3 officers. Sheriffs' agencies hired an average of 12 officers, state agencies hired an average of 6, municipal departments an average of 5, special police an average of 4, and the single responding county police department reported hiring 19 officers. Small agencies hired an average of 1 officer, moderately small agencies hired an average of 2 officers, medium-sized agencies hired 5, and large agencies hired an average of 17 officers.

Figure 6 displays the average number of new hires by agency size for municipal police. Small departments hired an average of 1 new officer, moderately small departments hired an average of 3, medium-sized departments hired an average of 5, and large municipal departments hired an average of 15.

Figure 6. Number of New Hires for Municipal Police Departments, FY '03



Notes: 1 = small, 2 = moderately small, 3 = medium, 4 = large agency.

Figure 7 shows the average number of new hires by agency size for sheriffs' agencies. Small agencies responding to the survey apparently did not hire any sworn personnel in the prior year, moderately small agencies hired an average of 1, medium-sized agencies hired an average of 3, and large sheriffs' offices hired an average of 20.

Figure 7. Number of New Hires for Sheriffs' Agencies in Prior Year



Notes: 1 = small, 2 = moderately small, 3 = medium, 4 = large agency.

Table 2 on the next page displays the number of new hires for all agencies.

Table 2. Number of New Hires for Fiscal Year 2003

# New Hires	# Agencies	Percent	Cumulative %
0	25	14.6	14.6
1	23	13.5	28.1
2	32	18.7	46.8
3	24	14.0	60.8
4	13	7.6	68.4
5	6	3.5	71.9
6	6	3.5	75.4
7	4	2.3	77.8
8	4	2.3	80.1
9	1	.6	80.7
10	4	2.3	83.0
11	5	2.9	86.0
12	4	2.3	88.3
14	1	.6	88.9
15	3	1.8	90.6
16	1	.6	91.2
17	2	1.2	92.4
19	2	1.2	93.6
22	1	.6	94.2
23	2	1.2	95.3
27	1	.6	95.9
29	1	.6	96.5
35	2	1.2	97.7
40	1	.6	98.2
51	1	.6	98.8
59	1	.6	99.4
62	1	.6	100.0
Total	171	100.0	

In addition to being asked about new hires, agencies were asked whether experience and education affected starting salary. The majority of agencies indicated prior law enforcement experience affected starting salaries (80%, or 131 agencies), whereas a little over half (57%, or 87 agencies) indicated education level did affect starting salary.

An important component to any personnel discussion is a consideration of administrative staff. Participants were asked to provide the number of full-time administrators in their agency. It is important to note that agencies were allowed to define what "administrator" meant. This could lead to differing definitions. For example, some agencies may describe the most senior patrol officer on a shift as an administrator while other agencies may restrict the title administrator to a specific rank.

The number of administrators ranged from 0 to 52. Five agencies reported having no full-time administrator. The average was 5 and the median was 2. Thus, about half the agencies in South Carolina reported 2 or fewer full-time administrators. Small agencies reported an average of 1 full-time administrator; moderately small agencies reported 2, medium-sized agencies reported 4, and large agencies reported 13. Municipal and special police departments both indicated an average of 3 full-time administrators, sheriffs' agencies had an average of 9, state agencies an average of 13, and the county police department reported having 7 full-time administrators.

The following two figures present the average number of full-time administrative personnel for municipal police departments and sheriffs' agencies by agency size.

Figure 8. Full-time Administrative Personnel for Municipal Departments



Notes: 1 = small, 2 = moderately small, 3 = medium, 4 = large agency.

Figure 9. Full-time Administrative Personnel for Sheriffs' Agencies



Notes: 1 = small, 2 = moderately small, 3 = medium, 4 = large agency.

Table 3 presents the distribution of full-time administrators for all law enforcement agencies.

Table 3. Full-time Administrative Personnel

# Admin. Personnel	# Agencies	Percent	Cumulative %
0	5	3.0	3.0
1	55	33.1	36.1
2	29	17.5	53.6
3	13	7.8	61.4
4	17	10.2	71.7
5	9	5.4	77.1
6	5	3.0	80.1
7	8	4.8	84.9
8	3	1.8	86.7
9	2	1.2	88.0
10	2	1.2	89.2
11	1	.6	89.8
13	2	1.2	91.0
14	1	.6	91.6
15	2	1.2	92.8
16	1	.6	93.4
17	1	.6	94.0
19	2	1.2	95.2
23	1	.6	95.8
25	1	.6	96.4
27	1	.6	97.0
30	1	.6	97.6
32	1	.6	98.2
35	1	.6	98.8
44	1	.6	99.4
52	1	.6	100.0
Subtotal	166	100.0	
Missing	5		
Total	171		

When asked to indicate the number of technical support personnel, responses ranged from zero to 182. The average was 11, and the median indicates just over half of all agencies had 4 or fewer. One-fifth of participating agencies (30) indicated they had zero full-time technical support personnel. Twenty-five percent of agencies indicated they have more than 10 full-time technical support personnel.

Since a significant responsibility of many agencies, particularly sheriffs' offices, is the management of jails and the provision of court services, agencies were asked to report the number of full-time jail and court personnel. The majority of law enforcement agencies in South Carolina did not employ full-time jail personnel (76%, or 90). (Fifty-three agencies or 31% did not answer this question.) Of the 23 sheriffs' agencies answering the question, only 7 indicated they did not employ jail personnel (9 sheriffs' agencies did not answer). The number of full-time jail personnel in sheriffs' departments ranged from 0 to 306, with an average of 39. Eighty-four percent (63) of municipal police departments did not employ full-time jail personnel and 12 did. The number employed ranged from 1 to 33 with an average of 1.4. (Thirty-five municipal departments or 32% did not answer this question.)

Sixty-nine percent (86) of law enforcement agencies indicated they do not employ any full-time court operations personnel. The number employed ranged from 0 to 76 with a mean of 3. (Forty-seven agencies or 28% did not answer this question.) Of the 28 sheriffs' agencies answering the question (4 did not), only five indicated they did not employ any full-time court operations personnel. The number employed ranged from 0 to 76 with an average of 13. Only 13 municipal police departments reported employing full-time court operations personnel, while 83% (63) did

not. (Thirty-five or 32% did not answer the question.) The number employed ranged from 0 to 10 with an average of .5.

Weapons

A series of questions were asked concerning the weapons issued to law enforcement officers by their agencies. These questions were included to allow agencies to compare policies. An overwhelming number of agencies (97%) issue semi-automatic handguns to some or all of their officers. Very few agencies (4%) still issue revolvers. A majority of agencies issue chemical agents (e.g., pepper spray) and impact devices, such as batons and rubber bullets (89% and 62%, respectively). Relatively few agencies issue conducted energy devices (e.g., Taser) or rifles (12% and 14%, respectively). Failure by an agency to issue a weapon does not preclude its usage by its officers—officers may purchase and carry weapons, if allowed by their agency's policy.

Table 4. Weapons Issued to Officers by Agency

Weapons Issued	Yes	No
Revolvers	7	163
Semi-Automatic Handguns	164	6
Shotguns	125	65
Rifles	24	146
Conducted Energy Devices	21	149
Chemical Agents	151	151
Impact Devices	106	64
Other Weapons	7	162

Services Provided

The types of services provided by agencies varies significantly as a function of their jurisdiction, mission statements, and staffing. To determine the kinds of services provided by law enforcement agencies in South Carolina, a series of questions were developed. The vast majority

of agencies conduct patrol (two sheriffs' and three state agencies did not conduct routine patrol), and most agencies participate in traffic enforcement (97% and 85%, respectively). Sixty-eight (40%) of responding agencies dispatch calls for service; exactly half (16) of the sheriffs' agencies do so, and 36 (32%) of the municipal police departments dispatch calls. A significant minority of agencies: maintain search and rescue teams (33%), maintain SWAT or tactical teams (26%), serve civil warrants (28%), and run jails (23%). Seventeen of the 32 responding sheriffs' agencies (53%) and 23 of the 111 responding municipal police departments (21%) indicated they have primary responsibility for jail operations. A very small minority of agencies provide emergency medical services (6%). These are generally multi-purpose departments of safety which provide police, EMS, and fire services.

Table 5. Services Provided by Agency

Service	Provided	Not Provided
Patrol	166	5
Dispatching Calls for Service	68	103
Jail Operations	40	131
Search and Rescue	56	115
Traffic Enforcement	145	26
Emergency Medical Services	11	160
Tactical Operations/SWAT	45	126
Court Security	84	87
Serving Civil Warrants	48	123

Investigative Services

Table 6. Investigative Services Provided

Investigative Service	Provided	Not Provided
Investigations of Traffic Accidents	135	36
Investigations of Homicide or Suicide	142	29
Investigations of Other Violent Crime	149	22
Investigations of Property Crimes	154	17
Investigations of Arson	117	54

A primary role of most law enforcement agencies is the investigation of crime. This is true of agencies in South Carolina as well—approximately 20% (or fewer) of the law enforcement units in South Carolina do not conduct the investigations described above. Although there are a few large and medium sized agencies which do not participate in the types of investigations presented in Table 6, these agencies are generally state agencies with a narrowly defined mission. As shown in Table 7, those law enforcement agencies with a traditional policing mission which do not conduct the investigations described above are generally small police agencies.

Table 7. Relationship between Agency Size and Investigation of Homicides

Agency Size		# Agencies	Percent
1 1-6	0 no	13	32.5
	1 yes	27	67.5
	Total	40	100.0
2 7-18	0 no	8	18.2
	1 yes	36	81.8
	Total	44	100.0
3 19-47	0 no	5	11.6
	1 yes	38	88.4
	Total	43	100.0
4 48-878	0 no	3	7.1
	1 yes	39	92.9
	Total	42	100.0

Forensic Services

Table 8. Forensic Services Available

Forensic Service	Available	Not Available
Fingerprint Processing	82	89
Ballistics Testing	2	169
Crime Lab Services	21	150
Drug Analysis Lab	50	121

Generally, forensic services are infrequently available throughout the state (Table 8). Although many agencies have the capacity to process fingerprints (48%), most agencies have no further forensic capabilities. The following two tables are representative of the forensic services provided by agencies relative to agency size. While the majority of large and medium sized agencies provide some forensic services, the majority of small agencies do not. Only two county sheriffs' departments provide ballistics testing (in two of the most populous counties in the state).

Table 9. Drug Analysis Services by Agency Size

Agency Size			Frequency	Percent
1 1-6	Valid	0 no	37	92.5
		1 yes	3	7.5
		Total	40	100.0
2 7-18	Valid	0 no	36	81.8
		1 yes	8	18.2
		Total	44	100.0
3 19-47	Valid	0 no	26	60.5
		1 yes	17	39.5
		Total	43	100.0
4 48-878	Valid	0 no	21	50.0
		1 yes	21	50.0
		Total	42	100.0

Table 10. Crime Lab Services by Agency Size

Agency Size		# Agencies	Percent
1 1-6	0 no	40	100.0
2 7-18	0 no	43	97.7
	1 yes	1	2.3
	Total	44	100.0
3 19-47	0 no	38	88.4
	1 yes	5	11.6
	Total	43	100.0
4 48-878	0 no	27	64.3
	1 yes	15	35.7
	Total	42	100.0

911 System

Of the 171 agencies responding, 87% (144 agencies) indicated they use a 911 system. The following table describes who runs those 911 systems. While the city or county represents a slim majority, it is common for the agency to run the 911 system.

Table 11. Who Manages Agency's 911 System?

	Frequency	Percent
Your Agency	30	17.5
City or County	86	50.3
County Sheriff's Dept.	28	16.4
Other	5	2.9
Total	149	87.1

Calls for Service

Agencies were asked to provide the total number of calls for service for the fiscal year of 2003 (19 agencies or 11% did not answer this question). They also were asked to indicate how many of those calls for service received an officer (29 or 17% did not answer this question). Variation in total calls for service was substantial, ranging from a low of 9 to a high of 500,000. The average for all agencies was 28,802. Municipal police departments reported an average of 18,276 calls for service with a range of 9 to 182,016 calls. Sheriffs' agencies reported an average of 61,152 calls for service with a range of 100 to 410,537. The following four figures present calls for service and calls receiving an officer for police and sheriffs' departments, by agency size.

Figure 10. Average Number of Calls for Service by Agency Size



Notes: 1 = 1-6, 2 = 7-18, 3 = 19-47, 4 = 48-878 sworn.

Figure 11. Average Number of Calls for Service Receiving an Officer



Notes: 1 = 1-6, 2 = 7-18, 3 = 19-47, 4 = 48-878 sworn;
17% (29) of the agencies did not answer this question.

Figure 12: Average # of Calls for Service by Agency Size: Municipal PDs



Notes: 1 = small, 2 = moderately small, 3 = medium, 4 = large agency.

Figure 13. Average # of Calls for Service Receiving a Police Officer by Agency Size: Municipal PDs



Notes: 1 = small, 2 = moderately small, 3 = medium, 4 = large agency.

Figure 14. Average Number of Calls for Service by Agency Size: Sheriffs' Agencies



Notes: 1 = small, 2 = moderately small, 3 = medium, 4 = large agency.

Figure 15. Average Number of Calls for Service Receiving a Sheriffs' Deputy by Agency Size: Sheriffs' Agencies



Notes: 1 = small, 2 = moderately small, 3 = medium, 4 = large agency.

Community Policing

Community policing (CP) became popular in the 1980's and common-place in the 1990's. Recently, the popularity of community policing, or community oriented policing, has declined while the status of problem oriented policing has risen. Despite this shift in popularity, community policing is still a common, and often effective, set of ideas for law enforcement agencies. To determine the prevalence and popularity of community policing in South Carolina, a series of questions were included in the Census. The responses to these questions are presented in the following table.

Table 12. Community Policing Implementation

Question	Agencies Responding Yes	Agencies Responding No
Does agency participate in community policing?	112	56
Does agency have a COP plan?	117	49
Does agency have a specific COP unit?	38	133
Does agency have a Victim Assistance person?	126	33
Is Victim Assistance person an officer?	59	77
Does agency have a School Resource Officer?	83	86
Did agency conduct COP-citizen training last year?	45	125
Do officers conduct Problem Oriented Policing?	127	43
Did agency form formal Problem Oriented partnerships last year?	81	89

As indicated in the previous table, agencies were asked if they had a community policing plan. Of the 117 agencies which indicated they have a community policing plan, 41 (35%) indicated the plan was a written, formal policy. The remaining 76 agencies (65%) reported that the community policing plan was informal and not written. Of the 38 agencies that stated they had a specific community policing unit, each indicated how many officers were assigned to that unit. Just over half of the agencies (52%) had 3 or fewer officers assigned to a CP unit. Approximately

another third (32%) had 4 to 9 officers in a CP unit, while the remaining 4 agencies assigned 12 to 27 officers to a CP unit.

Respondents also were asked if their agency supplied one or more School Resource Officers (SROs), and if so, how many. (Note that 76 or nearly half (44%) of the reporting agencies did not indicate how many SROs they had. Thus the following figures must be viewed with caution as they are unlikely to reflect the true distribution of SROs across law enforcement agencies in South Carolina.) Eighty-three or just under half (49%) of the 169 agencies that answered this question indicated they assign one or more SRO officers. Of these agencies, about half (51%) had 1 or 2 SROs and about another third (31%) had 3 to 5. Of the remaining 15 agencies, 10 had 6 to 10 SRO officers, 4 had 12 to 19, and one agency reported having 55 SROs.

Mentally Ill Suspect Policies

As police agencies have become targets of litigation regarding their handling of mentally ill suspects, agencies have resorted to policies to inform officers concerning proper treatment of the mentally ill.

Table 13. Issues Regarding Mentally Ill Suspects

Question	Agencies Responding Yes	Agencies Responding No
Does agency have a policy regarding mentally ill suspects?	93	73
Does agency train officers in handling mentally ill suspects?	81	88
Was an officer assaulted by a mentally ill suspect last year?	43	105

Although over half of the agencies (56%) have a policy regarding the handling of mentally ill suspects, fewer than half of the responding agencies conduct training specific to this area (48%). This is particularly noteworthy as nearly a third of agencies (29%) reported that an officer was assaulted by a mentally ill suspect in the past year (note that 23% of the agencies did not respond to this question). That officers were assaulted by mentally ill suspects in almost a third of responding agencies suggests that more agencies should considering developing policies and training to address the handling of these suspects.

Computers and Technology

A series of questions were posed to agencies to ascertain the prevalence and usage of various technologies. Table 13 indicates whether the specific technology is in use, or available to officers.

Table 14. Usage and Availability of Computers and Technology

Is this technology employed by agency?	Yes	No
Desktop Computers	145	26
Mainframe Computer	118	53
Internet Access	168	3
Laptops in Field	78	93
Car-Mounted Digital Terminal	24	147
Hand-Held Digital Terminal	12	159
Radar Traffic Device	141	30
Laser Traffic Device	36	133
Smart Traffic Trailers	45	125
In-Car Video Cameras	136	35

Most agencies indicated that they use either desktop computers (85%) and/or a mainframe computer system (69%). The response to the internet access question indicates that virtually all agencies have some type of computer, with internet access, available to officers (98%). The

usage of laptop computers in the field is much less common, with fewer than half of all agencies indicating usage of these devices (46%). This will likely change over the years with the continuing decline in computer prices and the increased reliance on computer aided dispatch. Few agencies use either car or hand held digital terminals (14% and 7%, respectively). These devices are useful for quick exchange of information between dispatchers, officers, and investigators. However, they are expensive and difficult to integrate into routine patrol work. Most agencies (83%) use a radar device for identifying vehicles traveling over the speed limit. Laser and smart-trailers are less common (21% and 27%, respectively). Finally, 80% of reporting agencies indicate that they are currently using in-car video cameras.

Vehicles and Transportation

Vehicles and transportation devices represent one of the key tools for law enforcement officers. Although it is assumed that virtually all law enforcement agencies use patrol vehicles, there are variations in the other modes of transportation employed, as depicted in Table 15.

Table 15. Vehicles or Transportation Devices

Vehicle Type	Available	Not Available
Unmarked Cars	151	17
Take Home Cars	122	45
Motorcycles	19	149
Boats	32	139
Helicopters	10	161
Planes	6	165
Bikes	65	106
Horses	8	163
Other Vehicles	92	76

The vast majority of reporting agencies use some unmarked cars (90%), and most agencies (73%) provide take home cars to some officers or deputies. The use of motorcycles (11%), boats

(19%), and horses (5%) are relatively rare among reporting agencies. Surprisingly, bikes are used by 38% of reporting agencies. A few agencies have access to helicopters and planes, although these are typically in the largest agencies.

SWAT Teams and Dogs

Fifty or 30% of agencies reported maintaining Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) teams. Sheriffs' agencies are most likely to repot having such units, with 66% or 21 of the 32 agencies indicating they have them. Twenty-four of 107 municipal police departments (22%) reported having a SWAT unit, while 3 of the 9 state agencies, 1 of the 17 special police departments, and the county police department reported they operate SWAT units.

Figure 16. Number of Agencies with SWAT Units by Agency Size



Notes: 1 = 1-6, 2 = 7-18, 3 = 19-47, 4 = 48-450 sworn.

Although 105 or 61% of responding agencies did not indicate how many of their officers were assigned to a SWAT unit, the 54 agencies that did report figures indicated the size of their SWAT teams ranged from 1 to 30 officers (12 agencies indicated they had zero officers assigned). Over half (56%) of all SWAT teams had between 12 and 30 officers. Note that since so many reporting agencies did not answer this question, these figures are unlikely to reflect the true distribution of the number of officers assigned to SWAT units in South Carolina. Figure 16 above indicates the mean number of SWAT officers relative to the size of the agency.

Regarding dogs, 83 law enforcement agencies indicated they retain them (either for use in tracking suspects or locating drugs/weapons/explosive devices) while 88 agencies do not keep dogs. Nearly all sheriffs' agencies used dogs for law enforcement purposes (88%), while 46% of municipal police departments, a third of state agencies, and the county police department reported doing so. None of the responding special police departments indicated they used dogs.

Training and Accreditation

South Carolina is fortunate to have a single training academy to serve all law enforcement agencies in the state. However, post-academy training policies vary significantly among agencies. Several questions were posed regarding their post-academy training programs and the length of those programs.

A substantial majority, 116 of the 171 reporting agencies (69%), indicated that they require post-academy training. These post-academy training programs fall into two categories—classroom hours and supervised hours. The number of required classroom hours ranged from 2 to 440. The average number of classroom training hours was 48 and the median was about 40 hours. Thus,

about one fifth (22%) of agencies required no classroom training following the academy, about one forth (27%) required approximately 40 hours (or one week) of classroom training, and about another fourth of reporting agencies required either more than 40 hours of classroom training. The figures for the number of classroom training hours should be viewed with caution since 66 or 39% of the reporting agencies did not answer this question.

Even a greater proportion of agencies required a post-academy period of supervised hours, generally considered to be a probationary period during which new officers are evaluated and trained by senior officers. The range of supervised hours was substantial; the low was 4 hours and the high was 960 hours. Of the 119 agencies answering this question, all but 6 or 95% indicated they required supervised hours following completion of the academy. The mean number of required hours was 226 and the median was approximately 200 hours. The figures for the number of supervised hours should be viewed with caution since 52 or 30% of the reporting agencies did not answer this question.

When asked about accreditation, 22 (13%) of the 170 agencies indicated they are accredited by a national accrediting agency. Another 36 (24%) of 147 responding agencies indicated they are currently seeking accreditation by a national accrediting agency (24 or 14% did not answer this question). To recognize the diligence of those agencies that have gained accreditation, and to provide a resource to those agencies currently pursuing accreditation, the following list is provided.

Table 16. Accredited Law Enforcement Agencies in South Carolina

BUREAU OF PROTECTIVE SERVICES
CHARLESTON COUNTY AVIATION AUTH. POLICE DEPT.
CHARLESTON COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
CHARLESTON POLICE DEPARTMENT

Table 16. Continued

COLUMBIA POLICE DEPARTMENT
ESTILL POLICE DEPARTMENT
GOOSE CREEK POLICE DEPARTMENT
GREENVILLE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
GREENWOOD POLICE DEPARTMENT
GREER POLICE DEPARTMENT
ISLE OF PALMS POLICE DEPARTMENT
LEXINGTON COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
MAULDIN CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT
MEDICAL UNIV. OF SC DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
MOUNT PLEASANT POLICE DEPARTMENT
ORANGEBURG DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
RIDGELAND POLICE DEPARTMENT
ROCK HILL POLICE DEPARTMENT
SOCIETY HILL POLICE DEPARTMENT
SOUTH CAROLINA HIGHWAY PATROL
SPARTANBURG PUBLIC SAFETY DEPARTMENT
UNIV. OF SOUTH CAROLINA LAW ENFORCEMENT DIV.

Drug Investigations and Drug Testing

Drug investigations have long been an important responsibility of law enforcement agencies. Several questions were posed to agencies regarding the separation of drug investigations from traditional investigations. These findings are presented in Table 17. Just under half (48%) of agencies had a drug unit and just over half (55%) participated in a multiagency drug task force. The subsequent table describes how many personnel are assigned to drug units. The average number was 4 and the median was 2.

Table 17. Drug Investigations

Question	Yes	No
Is there a Drug Unit in Agency?	82	89
Agency participates in a Multiagency Drug Task Force?	93	75

Table 18. Number of Personnel in Drug Unit

# in Unit	# Agencies	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	14	14.9	14.9
1	20	21.3	36.2
2	16	17.0	53.2
3	8	8.5	61.7
4	8	8.5	70.2
5	2	2.1	72.3
6	4	4.3	76.6
7	4	4.3	80.9
8	5	5.3	86.2
9	2	2.1	88.3
10	3	3.2	91.5
12	4	4.3	95.7
15	2	2.1	97.9
21	1	1.1	98.9
22	1	1.1	100.0
Total	94	100.0	
Missing	77		
Total	171		

Notes: Figures should be viewed with caution as 77 or 45% of responding agencies did not answer this question.

A related set of questions was asked concerning the agency's internal drug testing. The following table describes those questions and the responses.

Table 19. Drug Testing Policies

	Yes	*No*
Drug Policy for Testing Employees	135	34
Drug Policy for Testing Applicants	124	45
Random Drug Testing	111	58
Probation Officers Drug Tested	6	163
Promotion Candidates Drug Tested	7	162
Drug Investigators Drug Tested	23	146
Non-Sworn Personnel Drug Tested	19	150
Post-Accident Drug Testing	69	100

A majority of agencies conducted random drug testing (66%), had an existing policy for testing current employees (80%), and regularly drug tested applicants for employment (73%). Few agencies conducted drug testing of promotion candidates (4%), probation officers (4%), non-sworn personnel (11%), or drug investigators (14%). Forty-one percent of agencies indicated they conducted drug tests following accidents.

Crime Mapping and Surveys

As the technological capacity of law enforcement agencies has evolved, and as the personal computer has become more powerful, crime mapping has become more prevalent among policing units. In 1996, the National Institute of Justice reported that nationally fewer than 10% of law enforcement agencies possessed any crime mapping capability.

Table 20. Crime Mapping Capabilities and Interest

Does your agency…	Yes	No
Have any crime mapping capabilities	80	89
Make crime statistics available to officers?	80	85
Map calls to street addresses?	45	124
Map arrests to street addresses?	32	137
Map crimes to beats or census tracts?	17	152
Have any interest in crime mapping training?	133	33

Based on the responses of the participants in the Census, it appears that crime mapping has become more common over the past few years. Nearly half (47%) of all participating agencies possess some crime mapping capacity. Although relatively few agencies map calls to a high level of specificity (by mapping calls to street addresses, mapping arrests to street addresses, or mapping crimes to beats or tracts), many agencies have some use for crime mapping. Additionally, a majority of agencies (80%) expressed interest in training in crime mapping.

An additional tool that law enforcement agencies may utilize is surveys of the public. Law enforcement agencies conduct surveys for a variety of reasons, ranging from public relations concerns to ascertaining community needs. We asked a series of questions pertaining to the use of surveys.

Table 21. Public Surveys

Does your agency…	Yes	No
Conduct surveys of the public?	80	90
Survey public satisfaction of the police?	58	112
Survey perceptions of crime?	45	125
Survey victims of crime?	36	134

Nearly half (47%) of responding agencies indicated they had conducted some type of public survey. About a third of agencies (34%) indicated they had asked residents about satisfaction with the police, 27% asked about perceptions of crime in the community, and 21% asked victims of crime about their experience.

Terrorism and Home Security

One of the most pressing issues for local law enforcement this decade is the threat of terrorism. Since September 11, 2001, local law enforcement has been tasked with the substantial responsibility of serving as the last line of defense in the fight to maintain homeland security. Although federal agencies may receive the most attention, local agencies play a significant role. To determine what practices and training efforts are currently underway in South Carolina, a series of questions regarding terrorism were developed and included in the survey.

Table 22. Terrorism Policies and Funding

Has your agency….	Yes	No
Developed a policy regarding terrorism threats or incidents?	52	115
Requested federal funding for terrorism response?	64	100
Requested state funding for terrorism response?	43	111
Requested city/county funding for terrorism response?	21	126

Just under one third (31%) of the agencies developed a formal policy specific to responding to terrorist threats. Fewer than half requested federal (39%), state (28%), or local (city or county) funding (14%) to prepare for a terrorism or weapons of mass destruction (WMD) response. It should be noted that not all agencies *need* to prepare for a response to terrorism. The cost of equipping and training every local law enforcement agency would be prohibitive. However, there should be some type of coordination regarding who is in charge in the event of a local threat or incident. To determine whether agencies have moved to this level of preparation, agencies were asked to indicate who coordinates their response to an incident.

Table 23. Terrorism Response Coordinator

Who Coordinates Terrorism Response?	Number	Percent
Chief or Sheriff	124	75
Fire or EMS Director	7	4
Task Force Director	7	4
Undetermined	7	4
Other	20	12

Overwhelmingly, the agency director is the point person in coordinating a response. In some cases, a fire or EMS director coordinates the response, and in several cases there is a task force or emergency response coordinator. When asked to describe the "Other" response, 10 (of the 20) respondents named a specific office such as the *Emergency Preparations Director* or the *Emergency Management Department*. The remainder of the answers included other local and

state law enforcement officers (e.g., County Sheriff, SLED Director) or specific officers within the agency (e.g., Captain of Patrol).

The next level of preparation concerns training—typically by responding to hypothetical scenarios. These exercises assist agencies by pointing to the weaknesses, overlaps, and deficits in their response plans. When asked if scenario-based training had been conducted by their agency, 63 (38%) indicated they had engaged in this type of training. The fire department, EMS, and other law enforcement agencies were frequently included in the scenarios. However, SLED, hospitals, and federal agencies reportedly were rarely included in these exercises.

Table 24. Terrorism Scenario Training

Question	Yes	No
Conducted training for terrorism/WMD response?	63	103
Was SLED involved in training scenario?	22	149
Was EMS involved in training scenario?	61	110
Was the Fire Department involved in training?	64	107
Were Hospitals involved in training scenario?	33	138
Other state or local law enforcement agencies involved in training scenario?	54	117
Were federal law enforcement agencies involved in training scenario?	18	153

Operating Budget

Over the past several years, tax revenues have declined across South Carolina while inflation and the push towards homeland security have driven the costs of law enforcement steadily higher. Thus in times of leaner state, county, and local budgets, the law enforcement community is being asked to do more with less funding. The following tables describe the operating, training, and overtime budgets of reporting agencies.

Table 25. Annual Operating Budget: All Agencies

	Budget Figure
Highest Reported Operating Budget	$42,412,489
Lowest Reported Operating Budget	$7,670
Mean Operating Budget	$3,567,810
Median Operating Budget	$1,083,272

Notes: Thirty (18%) agencies did not answer this question.

Figure 17. Average Annual Operating Budget by Agency Type



Notes: 1 = sheriff, 2 = county, 3 = municipal, 4 = state, 5 = special

The average operating budget for municipal police departments was approximately $2,400,000 with a median of $753,750 and range of $7,670 to $31 million. Sheriffs' agencies reported an average operating budget of about $6,200,000 with a median of $2,730,383 and range of $238,124 to $21,776,071. State agencies averaged nearly $17,900,000 with a median of $18,258,535 and a range of $533,273 to $42,412,489. Special police departments had an average

operating budget of about $1 million with a median of $637,246 and a range of $79,901 to $3,388,481, while the county police department reported an operating budget of just over $12 million.

Training budgets were much lower than total operating budgets, with 93% of agencies reporting a total training budget of less than $100,000. (Note that 34 or 20% of agencies did not answer this question.) Ten agencies reported training budgets of over $100,000, with two of those agencies reporting training budgets of over one million. Most agencies (61%) have a training budget of $10,000 or under. Only 20% of agencies have a training budget of $2,000 or less.

Municipal police departments reported an average training budget of $40,172 with a median of $5,600 and a range of zero dollars to $1,900,000. Sheriffs' agencies reported an average training budget of $37,570 with a median of $15,775 and a range of $1,500 to $345,000. The average for state agencies was $14,167, the median was $7,500, and the range was zero to $35,000. The average for special police departments was $209,039, the median was $11,260, and the range was $2,724,492, while the training budget for the county police department was reported as $7,671.

Overtime pay represents another significant component of total operating budgets (35 or 21% of agencies did not report overtime pay). Although the average overtime pay total for fiscal year 2003 was $102,245, the median $25,000. The range was zero to $2,100,000. However, only two agencies had overtime costs of over $1 million and only 18% of reporting agencies had overtime costs of over $100,000. Just over one third of agencies (36%) had overtime costs of $10,000 or less.

Municipal police Departments reported an average overtime pay total of $81,837 with a median of $13,696 and a range of zero dollars to $2,100,000. Sheriffs' agencies reported an average overtime pay total of $215,156 with median of $96,780 and a range of zero dollars to $808,240. The average for state agencies was $24,667, the median was $9,002, and the range was zero dollars to $80,000. Special jurisdiction police departments reported an average overtime pay total of $47,752 with a median of $30,000 and a range of zero to $144,946, while the county police department reported $443,791 in overtime costs.

In addition to such broad categories as operating and training budgets, some agencies make specific types of pay available to officers or sheriffs' deputies. Several questions were posed to agencies regarding these types of pay and their availability. As the following table indicates, relatively few agencies offer hazardous duty (1%), shift differential (7%), or education incentive pay (19%), while a larger number offer tuition assistance (38%) and merit pay (42%).

Table 26. Pay Categories and Their Availability

Pay Type	Yes	No
Hazardous Duty Pay Provided	2	167
Shift Differential Pay Provided	11	159
Education Incentive Pay Provided	32	138
Merit Pay Provided	71	97
Tuition Assistance Provided	64	103
Other Type of Pay Available	14	157

When asked to describe the "Other Type of Pay" category, several participants indicated they provide cost of living adjustments, some provide language incentive pay, several provide overtime pay, and several provide a Christmas bonus.

Salary

The largest component of most operating budgets is salary. Participating agencies were asked to indicate the minimum and maximum salaries for each of the most common positions in an agency. The following tables present the range of maximum salaries, the range of minimum salaries (the high and low in each category), the average salary and the median (the 50th percentile—half of the scores are above the median and half are below) salary figures for both the maximum salary figures and the minimum salary figures. It is important to keep in mind that not all agencies have all positions (i.e. Major, or Senior Patrolman). Additionally, some agencies elected not to provide all salary figures and some agencies indicated there is no "maximum salary" for certain, or all, positions.

Table 27. Chief, Sheriff's Salary

	Salary Figure
Range of Maximum Salaries	$20,800—123,200
Range of Minimum Salaries	$21,000—75,587
Mean Maximum Salary	$59,328
Median Maximum Salary	$55,703
Mean Minimum Salary	$42,281
Median Minimum Salary	$40,000

Notes: 37 agencies did not supply maximum and 43 did not supply minimum salary figures.

Table 28. Deputy Chief or Assistant Chief's Salary

	Salary Figure
Range of Maximum Salaries	$23,000—90,680
Range of Minimum Salaries	$21,000—63,681
Mean Maximum Salary	$51,289
Median Maximum Salary	$49,406
Mean Minimum Salary	$35,338
Median Minimum Salary	$36,435

Notes: 99 agencies did not supply maximum and 101 did not supply minimum salary figures.

Table 29. Major's Salary

	Salary Figure
Range of Maximum Salaries	$28,500—94,575
Range of Minimum Salaries	$21,395—60,371
Mean Maximum Salary	$50,117
Median Maximum Salary	$58,509
Mean Minimum Salary	$33,640
Median Minimum Salary	$39,528

Notes: 126 agencies did not supply maximum and 125 did not supply minimum salary figures.

Table 30. Captain's Salary

	Salary Figure
Range of Maximum Salaries	$21,000—77,392
Range of Minimum Salaries	$20,000—66,543
Mean Maximum Salary	$50,272
Median Maximum Salary	$50,208
Mean Minimum Salary	$34,574
Median Minimum Salary	$37,111

Notes: 88 agencies did not supply maximum and 90 did not supply minimum salary figures.

Table 31. Lieutenant's Salary

	Salary Figure
Range of Maximum Salaries	$21,000—66,656
Range of Minimum Salaries	$19,900—50,387
Mean Maximum Salary	$42,710
Median Maximum Salary	$45,000
Mean Minimum Salary	$30,528
Median Minimum Salary	$30,912

Notes: 63 agencies did not supply maximum and 67 did not supply minimum salary figures.

Table 32. Sergeant's Salary

	Salary Figure
Range of Maximum Salaries	$21,000—59,386
Range of Minimum Salaries	$19,900—40,277
Mean Maximum Salary	$37,716
Median Maximum Salary	$38,000
Mean Minimum Salary	$27,800
Median Minimum Salary	$27,500

Notes: 40 agencies did not supply maximum and 46 did not supply minimum salary figures.

Table 33. Senior Patrol Officer's Salary

	Salary Figure
Range of Maximum Salaries	$17,000—52,773
Range of Minimum Salaries	$19,000—41,359
Mean Maximum Salary	$33,801
Median Maximum Salary	$33,000
Mean Minimum Salary	$25,964
Median Minimum Salary	$25,484

Notes: 66 agencies did not supply maximum and 69 did not supply minimum salary figures; a Senior Patrol Officer is one with 3-5 years of experience

Table 34. Entry Level Patrol Officer's Salary

	Salary Figure
Range of Maximum Salaries	$17,000—49,065
Range of Minimum Salaries	$10,000—32,098
Mean Maximum Salary	$31,257
Median Maximum Salary	$30,664
Mean Minimum Salary	$23,192
Median Minimum Salary	$23,335

Notes: 41 agencies did not supply maximum and 31 did not supply minimum salary figures; salaries are for non-jail personnel only. The minimum starting salary of $10,000 is suspicious. Repeated calls to the relevant agency to verify the amount failed to elicit a reply. It is excluded from the data in the *Highlights* section; the next lowest minimum starting salary reported is $17,000.

Appendix A: Participating Agencies

Below is a complete list of agencies (in random order) which returned completed, usable surveys. The leaders of these agencies, and the personnel who assisted in the completion of the survey, deserve our thanks and commendation.

ABBEVILLE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
AIKEN COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
AIKEN DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
AIKEN TECH, COLLEGE OF PUBLIC SAFETY
ANDERSON COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
ANDERSON POLICE DEPARTMENT
BAMBERG COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
BAMBERG POLICE DEPARTMENT
BARNWELL CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT
BEAUFORT COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
BEAUFORT POLICE DEPARTMENT
BENEDICT COLLEGE CAMPUS SAFETY POLICE DEPARTMENT
BENNETTSVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT
BERKELEY COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
BISHOPVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT
BOB JONES UNIV. CAMPUS POLICE
BONNEAU POLICE DEPARTMENT
BOWMAN POLICE DEPARTMENT
BRIARCLIFFE ACRES POLICE DEPARTMENT
BURNETTOWN POLICE DEPARTMENT
CALHOUN COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
CALHOUN FALLS POLICE DEPARTMENT
CAYCE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
CENTRAL POLICE DEPARTMENT
CHAPIN POLICE DEPARTMENT
CHARLESTON COUNTY AVIATION AUTH. POLICE DEPARTMENT
CHARLESTON COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
CHARLESTON POLICE DEPARTMENT
CHERAW POLICE DEPARTMENT
CHEROKEE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
CHESTER COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
CHESTER POLICE DEPARTMENT
CHESTERFIELD POLICE DEPARTMENT
CLEMSON UNIV. POLICE DEPARTMENT
CLINTON POLICE DEPARTMENT

CLOVER POLICE DEPARTMENT
COASTAL CAROLINA UNIV. DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
COLUMBIA METRO AIRPORT POLICE
COLUMBIA POLICE DEPARTMENT
DENMARK POLICE DEPARTMENT
DILLON COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
DILLON POLICE DEPARTMENT
DORCHESTER COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
DUE WEST POLICE DEPARTMENT
DUNCAN POLICE DEPARTMENT
EDGEFIELD COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
EDISTO BEACH POLICE DEPARTMENT
ELGIN POLICE DEPARTMENT
ERSKINE COLLEGE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
ESTILL POLICE DEPARTMENT
FAIRFIELD SHERIFF'S OFFICE
FLORENCE POLICE DEPARTMENT
FOLLY BEACH PUBLIC SAFETY DEPT.
FOREST ACRES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FORT LAWN POLICE DEPARTMENT
FORT MILL POLICE DEPARTMENT
FOUNTAIN INN POLICE DEPARTMENT
FRANCIS MARION UNIV. PUBLIC SAFETY
GEORGETOWN POLICE DEPARTMENT
GOOSE CREEK POLICE DEPARTMENT
GREENVILLE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
GREENWOOD COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFF.
GREENWOOD POLICE DEPARTMENT
GREER POLICE DEPARTMENT
HAMPTON COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
HAMPTON POLICE DEPARTMENT
HANAHAN POLICE DEPARTMENT
HARDEEVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT
HARTSVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT
HEMINGWAY POLICE DEPARTMENT
HOLLY HILL POLICE DEPARTMENT
HONEA PATH POLICE DEPARTMENT
HORRY COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT
HORRY COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
IRMO POLICE DEPARTMENT
ISLE OF PALMS POLICE DEPARTMENT
IVA POLICE DEPARTMENT
JACKSON POLICE DEPARTMENT
JAMESTOWN POLICE DEPARTMENT
JASPER COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

JOHNSONVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT
JONESVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT
KERSHAW COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
KINGSTREE POLICE DEPARTMENT
LAKE CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT
LAKE VIEW POLICE DEPARTMENT
LANCASTER COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
LANCASTER POLICE DEPARTMENT
LANDER UNIVERSITY POLICE DEPARTMENT
LANDRUM POLICE DEPARTMENT
LANE POLICE DEPARTMENT
LATTA POLICE DEPARTMENT
LAURENS CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT
LEE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT.
LEXINGTON COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
LIBERTY POLICE DEPARTMENT
LINCOLNVILLE POLICE
LORIS POLICE DEPARTMENT
MANNING POLICE DEPARTMENT
MARION COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
MARION POLICE DEPARTMENT
MAULDIN CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT
MCCOLL POLICE DEPARTMENT
MCCORMICK POLICE DEPARTMENT
MEDICAL UNIV. OF SC DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
MIDLANDS TECHNICAL COLLEGE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
MONCKS CORNER POLICE DEPARTMENT
MOUNT PLEASANT POLICE DEPARTMENT
MYRTLE BEACH POLICE DEPARTMENT
NEWBERRY CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT
NEWBERRY COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
NICHOLS POLICE DEPARTMENT
NINETY SIX POLICE DEPARTMENT
NORTH AUGUSTA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
NORTH CHARLESTON POLICE DEPARTMENT
NORTH MYRTLE BEACH DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
NORTH POLICE DEPARTMENT
OCONEE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
ORANGEBURG COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
ORANGEBURG DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
PACOLET POLICE DEPARTMENT
PENDLETON POLICE DEPARTMENT
PERRY POLICE DEPARTMENT
PICKENS COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
PROSPERITY POLICE DEPARTMENT
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA

RICHLAND COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT
RIDGELAND POLICE DEPARTMENT
RIDGEVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT
ROCK HILL POLICE DEPARTMENT
SAINT MATTHEWS POLICE DEPARTMENT
SALLEY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
SALUDA COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
SALUDA POLICE DEPARTMENT
SC BUREAU OF PROTECTIVE SERVICES
SC DDSN COASTAL REGION
SC DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
SC EMPLOYMENT SECURITY COMM. OF PUBLIC SAFETY
SC HIGHWAY PATROL
SC STATE ETHICS COMMISSION
SC STATE PARK SERVICE
SC DEPT. OF HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL
SCRANTON POLICE DEPARTMENT
SENECA POLICE DEPARTMENT
SIMPSONVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT
SOCIETY HILL POLICE DEPARTMENT
SPARTANBURG PUBLIC SAFETY DEPARTMENT
SPARTANBURG TECH. COLLEGE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
SPRINGDALE POLICE DEPARTMENT
SUMMERTON POLICE DEPARTMENT
SUMMERVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT
SUMTER COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
SWANSEA POLICE DEPARTMENT
TEGA CAY POLICE DEPARTMENT
THE CITADEL DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
TIMMONSVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT
TRAVELERS REST POLICE DEPARTMENT
TRIDENT TECH, COLLEGE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
TURBEVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT
UNION COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
UNION PUBLIC SAFETY
USC AIKEN PUBLIC SAFETY
USC LAW ENFORCEMENT DIVISION
VANCE POLICE DEPARTMENT
WALHALLA POLICE DEPARTMENT
WALTERBORO POLICE DEPARTMENT
WARE SHOALS POLICE DEPARTMENT
WEST COLUMBIA POLICE DEPARTMENT
YEMASSEE POLICE DEPARTMENT
YORK COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

Appendix B: Census Personnel

Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, University of South Carolina

2004 Census Coordinator and Final Report author: Robert J. Kaminski, Ph.D.

2003 Census Coordinator and Final Report author: William V. Pelfrey, Jr., Ph.D. (now at the Department of Criminal Justice, University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee)

Census Graduate Assistant: D. Michele White, M.S.

Department Chair: Geoffrey P. Alpert, Ph.D.

South Carolina Criminal Justice Academy

Academy Director: William R. Neill

Census Liaison: Lauren Davidson

Appendix C – Frequencies of All Variables

LE_TYPE3 agency type - recoded to match BJS

Statistics

LE_TYPE3 agency type - recoded to match BJS

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		2.88
Median		3.00
Minimum		1
Maximum		5
Sum		493

LE_TYPE3 agency type - recoded to match BJS

			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	Sheriff	32	18.7	18.7	18.7
	2	County Police	1	.6	.6	19.3
	3	Municipal Police	111	64.9	64.9	84.2
	4	State Agency	9	5.3	5.3	89.5
	5	Special Police	18	10.5	10.5	100.0
	Total		171	100.0	100.0	

SIZE Agency Size - All Agencies

Statistics

SIZE Agency Size - All Agencies

N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		49.83
Median		19.00
Minimum		1
Maximum		878
Sum		8422

NSIZE Quartiles, all agencies

SIZE Agency Size - All Agencies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	1.2	1.2	1.2
	2	9	5.3	5.3	6.5
	3	7	4.1	4.1	10.7
	4	6	3.5	3.6	14.2
	5	11	6.4	6.5	20.7
	6	5	2.9	3.0	23.7
	7	4	2.3	2.4	26.0
	8	2	1.2	1.2	27.2
	9	3	1.8	1.8	29.0
	10	8	4.7	4.7	33.7
	11	6	3.5	3.6	37.3
	12	5	2.9	3.0	40.2
	13	4	2.3	2.4	42.6
	14	3	1.8	1.8	44.4
	15	2	1.2	1.2	45.6
	16	3	1.8	1.8	47.3
	17	2	1.2	1.2	48.5
	18	2	1.2	1.2	49.7
	19	1	.6	.6	50.3
	20	2	1.2	1.2	51.5
	21	2	1.2	1.2	52.7
	22	1	.6	.6	53.3
	23	1	.6	.6	53.8
	24	2	1.2	1.2	55.0
	25	4	2.3	2.4	57.4
	26	2	1.2	1.2	58.6
	27	2	1.2	1.2	59.8
	28	2	1.2	1.2	60.9
	29	1	.6	.6	61.5
	30	4	2.3	2.4	63.9
	31	1	.6	.6	64.5
	32	1	.6	.6	65.1
	33	2	1.2	1.2	66.3
	35	1	.6	.6	66.9
	36	3	1.8	1.8	68.6
	37	2	1.2	1.2	69.8
	38	1	.6	.6	70.4
	39	2	1.2	1.2	71.6
	41	2	1.2	1.2	72.8
	44	2	1.2	1.2	74.0
	46	1	.6	.6	74.6
	47	1	.6	.6	75.1
	48	3	1.8	1.8	76.9
	52	1	.6	.6	77.5
	54	1	.6	.6	78.1
	58	1	.6	.6	78.7
	59	1	.6	.6	79.3
	60	2	1.2	1.2	80.5
	62	2	1.2	1.2	81.7
	68	1	.6	.6	82.2
	73	1	.6	.6	82.8
	74	1	.6	.6	83.4
	78	2	1.2	1.2	84.6
	80	1	.6	.6	85.2
	84	1	.6	.6	85.8
	90	1	.6	.6	86.4
	94	1	.6	.6	87.0
	106	1	.6	.6	87.6
	107	1	.6	.6	88.2
	109	1	.6	.6	88.8
	110	1	.6	.6	89.3
	113	1	.6	.6	89.9
	123	1	.6	.6	90.5
	127	1	.6	.6	91.1
	128	1	.6	.6	91.7
	133	1	.6	.6	92.3
	147	1	.6	.6	92.9
	175	1	.6	.6	93.5
	188	1	.6	.6	94.1
	211	1	.6	.6	94.7
	212	1	.6	.6	95.3
	228	1	.6	.6	95.9
	253	1	.6	.6	96.4
	270	1	.6	.6	97.0
	299	1	.6	.6	97.6
	363	2	1.2	1.2	98.8
	450	1	.6	.6	99.4
	878	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

Statistics

NSIZE Quartiles, all agencies

N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		2.51
Median		3.00
Minimum		1
Maximum		4
Sum		425

NSIZE Quartiles, all agencies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 1-6	40	23.4	23.7	23.7
	2 7-18	44	25.7	26.0	49.7
	3 19-47	43	25.1	25.4	75.1
	4 48-878	42	24.6	24.9	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

FIELD_FT field operations full

Statistics

FIELD_FT field operations full

N	Valid	160
	Missing	11
Mean		43.42
Median		15.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		593
Sum		6947

FIELD_FT field operations full

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	2	1.2	1.3	1.3
	1	7	4.1	4.4	5.6
	2	9	5.3	5.6	11.3
	3	13	7.6	8.1	19.4
	4	4	2.3	2.5	21.9
	5	5	2.9	3.1	25.0
	6	4	2.3	2.5	27.5
	7	3	1.8	1.9	29.4
	8	6	3.5	3.8	33.1
	9	6	3.5	3.8	36.9
	10	5	2.9	3.1	40.0
	11	3	1.8	1.9	41.9
	12	3	1.8	1.9	43.8
	13	4	2.3	2.5	46.3
	14	5	2.9	3.1	49.4
	15	3	1.8	1.9	51.3
	16	2	1.2	1.3	52.5
	18	1	.6	.6	53.1
	19	1	.6	.6	53.8
	20	3	1.8	1.9	55.6
	21	3	1.8	1.9	57.5
	22	2	1.2	1.3	58.8
	23	1	.6	.6	59.4
	24	2	1.2	1.3	60.6
	25	2	1.2	1.3	61.9
	26	1	.6	.6	62.5
	27	2	1.2	1.3	63.8
	28	3	1.8	1.9	65.6
	29	2	1.2	1.3	66.9
	30	1	.6	.6	67.5
	31	1	.6	.6	68.1
	32	3	1.8	1.9	70.0
	33	4	2.3	2.5	72.5
	35	2	1.2	1.3	73.8
	36	2	1.2	1.3	75.0
	41	1	.6	.6	75.6
	44	2	1.2	1.3	76.9
	45	1	.6	.6	77.5
	48	1	.6	.6	78.1
	53	1	.6	.6	78.8
	55	2	1.2	1.3	80.0
	56	1	.6	.6	80.6
	58	2	1.2	1.3	81.9
	66	1	.6	.6	82.5
	70	1	.6	.6	83.1
	71	2	1.2	1.3	84.4
	74	1	.6	.6	85.0
	75	1	.6	.6	85.6
	78	1	.6	.6	86.3
	80	1	.6	.6	86.9
	83	1	.6	.6	87.5
	86	1	.6	.6	88.1
	87	1	.6	.6	88.8
	97	1	.6	.6	89.4
	100	1	.6	.6	90.0
	120	1	.6	.6	90.6
	123	1	.6	.6	91.3
	130	1	.6	.6	91.9
	170	1	.6	.6	92.5
	177	1	.6	.6	93.1
	179	1	.6	.6	93.8
	187	1	.6	.6	94.4
	199	1	.6	.6	95.0
	211	1	.6	.6	95.6
	246	1	.6	.6	96.3
	249	1	.6	.6	96.9
	276	1	.6	.6	97.5
	281	1	.6	.6	98.1
	292	1	.6	.6	98.8
	371	1	.6	.6	99.4
	593	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	160	93.6	100.0	
Missing	System	11	6.4		
Total		171	100.0		

FIELD_PT field part

Statistics

FIELD_PT field part		
N	Valid	101
	Missing	70
Mean		4.05
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		87
Sum		409

FIELD_PT field part

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	51	29.8	50.5	50.5
	1	19	11.1	18.8	69.3
	2	7	4.1	6.9	76.2
	3	5	2.9	5.0	81.2
	4	2	1.2	2.0	83.2
	5	3	1.8	3.0	86.1
	6	3	1.8	3.0	89.1
	7	2	1.2	2.0	91.1
	9	2	1.2	2.0	93.1
	11	1	.6	1.0	94.1
	13	1	.6	1.0	95.0
	33	1	.6	1.0	96.0
	34	1	.6	1.0	97.0
	42	1	.6	1.0	98.0
	68	1	.6	1.0	99.0
	87	1	.6	1.0	100.0
	Total	101	59.1	100.0	
Missing	System	70	40.9		
Total		171	100.0		

CERTIFIE number of certified or sworn personnel

Statistics

CERTIFIE number of certified or sworn personnel		
N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		49.83
Median		19.00
Minimum		1
Maximum		878
Sum		8422

CERTIFIE number of certified or sworn personnel

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	1.2	1.2	1.2
	2	9	5.3	5.3	6.5
	3	7	4.1	4.1	10.7
	4	6	3.5	3.6	14.2
	5	11	6.4	6.5	20.7
	6	5	2.9	3.0	23.7
	7	4	2.3	2.4	26.0
	8	2	1.2	1.2	27.2
	9	3	1.8	1.8	29.0
	10	8	4.7	4.7	33.7
	11	6	3.5	3.6	37.3
	12	5	2.9	3.0	40.2
	13	4	2.3	2.4	42.6
	14	3	1.8	1.8	44.4
	15	2	1.2	1.2	45.6
	16	3	1.8	1.8	47.3
	17	2	1.2	1.2	48.5
	18	2	1.2	1.2	49.7
	19	1	.6	.6	50.3
	20	2	1.2	1.2	51.5
	21	2	1.2	1.2	52.7
	22	1	.6	.6	53.3
	23	1	.6	.6	53.8
	24	2	1.2	1.2	55.0
	25	4	2.3	2.4	57.4
	26	2	1.2	1.2	58.6
	27	2	1.2	1.2	59.8
	28	2	1.2	1.2	60.9
	29	1	.6	.6	61.5
	30	4	2.3	2.4	63.9
	31	1	.6	.6	64.5
	32	1	.6	.6	65.1
	33	2	1.2	1.2	66.3
	35	1	.6	.6	66.9
	36	3	1.8	1.8	68.6
	37	2	1.2	1.2	69.8
	38	1	.6	.6	70.4
	39	2	1.2	1.2	71.6
	41	2	1.2	1.2	72.8
	44	2	1.2	1.2	74.0
	46	1	.6	.6	74.6
	47	1	.6	.6	75.1
	48	3	1.8	1.8	76.9
	52	1	.6	.6	77.5
	54	1	.6	.6	78.1
	58	1	.6	.6	78.7
	59	1	.6	.6	79.3
	60	2	1.2	1.2	80.5
	62	2	1.2	1.2	81.7
	68	1	.6	.6	82.2
	73	1	.6	.6	82.8
	74	1	.6	.6	83.4
	78	2	1.2	1.2	84.6
	80	1	.6	.6	85.2
	84	1	.6	.6	85.8
	90	1	.6	.6	86.4
	94	1	.6	.6	87.0
	106	1	.6	.6	87.6
	107	1	.6	.6	88.2
	109	1	.6	.6	88.8
	110	1	.6	.6	89.3
	113	1	.6	.6	89.9
	123	1	.6	.6	90.5
	127	1	.6	.6	91.1
	128	1	.6	.6	91.7
	133	1	.6	.6	92.3
	147	1	.6	.6	92.9
	175	1	.6	.6	93.5
	188	1	.6	.6	94.1
	211	1	.6	.6	94.7
	212	1	.6	.6	95.3
	228	1	.6	.6	95.9
	253	1	.6	.6	96.4
	270	1	.6	.6	97.0
	299	1	.6	.6	97.6
	363	2	1.2	1.2	98.8
	450	1	.6	.6	99.4
	878	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

NONJAIL number of nonjail certified

Statistics

NONJAIL	number of nonjail certified	
N	Valid	168
	Missing	3
Mean		13.29
Median		4.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		230
Sum		2233

NONJAIL number of nonjail certified

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	34	19.9	20.2	20.2
	1	23	13.5	13.7	33.9
	2	16	9.4	9.5	43.5
	3	6	3.5	3.6	47.0
	4	7	4.1	4.2	51.2
	5	7	4.1	4.2	55.4
	6	6	3.5	3.6	58.9
	7	4	2.3	2.4	61.3
	8	2	1.2	1.2	62.5
	9	7	4.1	4.2	66.7
	10	10	5.8	6.0	72.6
	11	6	3.5	3.6	76.2
	12	1	.6	.6	76.8
	13	2	1.2	1.2	78.0
	14	1	.6	.6	78.6
	16	3	1.8	1.8	80.4
	18	2	1.2	1.2	81.5
	19	3	1.8	1.8	83.3
	20	2	1.2	1.2	84.5
	21	2	1.2	1.2	85.7
	22	2	1.2	1.2	86.9
	24	2	1.2	1.2	88.1
	25	2	1.2	1.2	89.3
	29	1	.6	.6	89.9
	32	1	.6	.6	90.5
	34	1	.6	.6	91.1
	36	2	1.2	1.2	92.3
	37	1	.6	.6	92.9
	38	1	.6	.6	93.5
	41	1	.6	.6	94.0
	43	1	.6	.6	94.6
	59	1	.6	.6	95.2
	66	1	.6	.6	95.8
	70	1	.6	.6	96.4
	83	1	.6	.6	97.0
	114	1	.6	.6	97.6
	134	1	.6	.6	98.2
	136	1	.6	.6	98.8
	153	1	.6	.6	99.4
	230	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	168	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.8		
Total		171	100.0		

POPN population in jurisdiction

Statistics

POPN population in jurisdiction		
N	Valid	162
	Missing	9
Mean		103353.84
Median		7000.00
Minimum		97
Maximum		4012012
Sum		16743322

POPN population in jurisdiction

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	97	1	.6	.6	.6
	210	1	.6	.6	1.2
	300	1	.6	.6	1.9
	420	1	.6	.6	2.5
	490	1	.6	.6	3.1
	500	1	.6	.6	3.7
	510	1	.6	.6	4.3
	533	1	.6	.6	4.9
	573	1	.6	.6	5.6
	585	1	.6	.6	6.2
	642	1	.6	.6	6.8
	700	1	.6	.6	7.4
	720	1	.6	.6	8.0
	875	1	.6	.6	8.6
	900	1	.6	.6	9.3
	904	1	.6	.6	9.9
	950	2	1.2	1.2	11.1
	1000	1	.6	.6	11.7
	1100	1	.6	.6	12.3
	1181	1	.6	.6	13.0
	1188	1	.6	.6	13.6
	1200	5	2.9	3.1	16.7
	1318	1	.6	.6	17.3
	1400	1	.6	.6	17.9
	1500	2	1.2	1.2	19.1
	1600	1	.6	.6	19.8
	1700	1	.6	.6	20.4
	2000	1	.6	.6	21.0
	2100	1	.6	.6	21.6
	2200	2	1.2	1.2	22.8
	2315	1	.6	.6	23.5
	2450	2	1.2	1.2	24.7
	2500	3	1.8	1.9	26.5
	2720	1	.6	.6	27.2
	2800	1	.6	.6	27.8
	2981	1	.6	.6	28.4
	3000	6	3.5	3.7	32.1
	3009	1	.6	.6	32.7
	3200	1	.6	.6	33.3
	3500	4	2.3	2.5	35.8
	3522	1	.6	.6	36.4
	3865	1	.6	.6	37.0
	3900	1	.6	.6	37.7
	4000	5	2.9	3.1	40.7
	4500	4	2.3	2.5	43.2
	4600	1	.6	.6	43.8
	4860	1	.6	.6	44.4
	5000	2	1.2	1.2	45.7
	5300	1	.6	.6	46.3
	5500	1	.6	.6	46.9

6000	2	1.2	1.2	48.1
6017	1	.6	.6	48.8
6200	1	.6	.6	49.4
7000	2	1.2	1.2	50.6
7587	1	.6	.6	51.2
7600	1	.6	.6	51.9
8177	1	.6	.6	52.5
8200	1	.6	.6	53.1
9600	1	.6	.6	53.7
10000	6	3.5	3.7	57.4
10084	1	.6	.6	58.0
10580	1	.6	.6	58.6
11000	1	.6	.6	59.3
12000	2	1.2	1.2	60.5
12150	1	.6	.6	61.1
12937	1	.6	.6	61.7
13000	2	1.2	1.2	63.0
13064	1	.6	.6	63.6
14000	1	.6	.6	64.2
14235	1	.6	.6	64.8
15150	1	.6	.6	65.4
16000	1	.6	.6	66.0
16050	1	.6	.6	66.7
17000	1	.6	.6	67.3
17500	1	.6	.6	67.9
17800	1	.6	.6	68.5
19432	1	.6	.6	69.1
20000	1	.6	.6	69.8
20678	1	.6	.6	70.4
21000	1	.6	.6	71.0
21116	1	.6	.6	71.6
22071	1	.6	.6	72.2
24000	1	.6	.6	72.8
25337	1	.6	.6	73.5
26000	2	1.2	1.2	74.7
30000	5	2.9	3.1	77.8
31000	1	.6	.6	78.4
33000	2	1.2	1.2	79.6
35000	1	.6	.6	80.2
35350	1	.6	.6	80.9
37000	1	.6	.6	81.5
39000	1	.6	.6	82.1
52000	1	.6	.6	82.7
53200	1	.6	.6	83.3
53500	1	.6	.6	84.0
62220	1	.6	.6	84.6
63000	1	.6	.6	85.2
65000	1	.6	.6	85.8
67271	1	.6	.6	86.4
84000	1	.6	.6	87.0
86069	1	.6	.6	87.7
94000	1	.6	.6	88.3
100000	1	.6	.6	88.9
108000	1	.6	.6	89.5
113000	1	.6	.6	90.1
114000	1	.6	.6	90.7

	118520	1	.6	.6	91.4
	120000	1	.6	.6	92.0
	142552	1	.6	.6	92.6
	150000	1	.6	.6	93.2
	174000	1	.6	.6	93.8
	175000	1	.6	.6	94.4
	196629	1	.6	.6	95.1
	200000	1	.6	.6	95.7
	224000	1	.6	.6	96.3
	250000	1	.6	.6	96.9
	300000	1	.6	.6	97.5
	379616	1	.6	.6	98.1
	4000000	2	1.2	1.2	99.4
	4012012	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	162	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		171	100.0		

OPSEARCH search and rescue

Statistics

OPSEARCH search and rescue

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.33
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		56

OPSEARCH search and rescue

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	115	67.3	67.3	67.3
	1 yes	56	32.7	32.7	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

OPTRAFFI traffic enforcement

Statistics

OPTRAFFI traffic enforcement

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.85
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		145

OPTRAFFI traffic enforcement

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	26	15.2	15.2	15.2
	1 yes	145	84.8	84.8	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

OPACCID accident investigation

Statistics

OPACCID accident investigation

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.79
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		135

OPACCID accident investigation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	36	21.1	21.1	21.1
	1 yes	135	78.9	78.9	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

OPPATROL patrol

Statistics

OPPATROL patrol

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.97
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		166

OPPATROL patrol

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	5	2.9	2.9	2.9
	1 yes	166	97.1	97.1	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

OPEMS emergency medical services

Statistics

OPEMS emergency medical services

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.06
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		11

OPEMS emergency medical services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	160	93.6	93.6	93.6
	1 yes	11	6.4	6.4	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

OPPRINT fingerprint processing

Statistics

OPPRINT fingerprint processing

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.48
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		82

OPPRINT fingerprint processing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	89	52.0	52.0	52.0
	1 yes	82	48.0	48.0	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

OPBAL ballistics testing

Statistics

OPBAL ballistics testing		
N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.01
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		2

OPBAL ballistics testing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	169	98.8	98.8	98.8
	1 yes	2	1.2	1.2	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

OPCAD dispatching calls for service

Statistics

OPCAD dispatching calls for service		
N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.40
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		68

OPCAD dispatching calls for service

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	103	60.2	60.2	60.2
	1 yes	68	39.8	39.8	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

OPLAB crime lab services

Statistics

OPLAB crime lab services		
N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.12
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		21

OPLAB crime lab services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	150	87.7	87.7	87.7
	1 yes	21	12.3	12.3	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

OPCOURT court security

Statistics

OPCOURT court security		
N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.49
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		84

OPCOURT court security

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	87	50.9	50.9	50.9
	1 yes	84	49.1	49.1	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

OPJAIL jail operations

Statistics

OPJAIL jail operations

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.23
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		40

OPJAIL jail operations

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	131	76.6	76.6	76.6
	1 yes	40	23.4	23.4	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

OPWARR serving civil warrants

Statistics

OPWARR serving civil warrants

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.28
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		48

OPWARR serving civil warrants

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	123	71.9	71.9	71.9
	1 yes	48	28.1	28.1	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

OPSWAT tactical operations swat

Statistics

OPSWAT tactical operations swat

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.26
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		45

OPSWAT tactical operations swat

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	126	73.7	73.7	73.7
	1 yes	45	26.3	26.3	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

OPDRUG drug analysis lab

Statistics

OPDRUG drug analysis lab

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.29
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		50

OPDRUG drug analysis lab

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	121	70.8	70.8	70.8
	1 yes	50	29.2	29.2	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

INVDEATH investigations of homicide or suicide

Statistics

INVDEATH investigations of homicide or suicide

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.83
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		142

INVDEATH investigations of homicide or suicide

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	29	17.0	17.0	17.0
	1 yes	142	83.0	83.0	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

INVVIOL investigations of other violent crimes

Statistics

INVVIOL investigations of other violent crimes

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.87
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		149

INVVIOL investigations of other violent crimes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	22	12.9	12.9	12.9
	1 yes	149	87.1	87.1	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

INVARSON investigations of arson

Statistics

INVARSON investigations of arson

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.68
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		117

INVARSON investigations of arson

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	54	31.6	31.6	31.6
	1 yes	117	68.4	68.4	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

INVPROP investigations of property crimes

Statistics

INVPROP investigations of property crimes

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.90
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		154

INVPROP investigations of property crimes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	17	9.9	9.9	9.9
	1 yes	154	90.1	90.1	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

SHIFROTA shift rotations

Statistics

		SHIFROTA shift rotations
N	Valid	171
	Missing	0

SHIFROTA shift rotations

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		8	4.7	4.7	4.7
	ON,2 OFF,3 ON,2 OFF,2 ON,3 OFF	1	.6	.6	5.3
	1 MONTH ON 1ST,2ND,OR 3RD	1	.6	.6	5.8
	1 WEEK	1	.6	.6	6.4
	12 HOUR SHIFTS, ROTATES EVERY 2 WKS	1	.6	.6	7.0
	2 3-DAY WEEKENDS/MONTH	1	.6	.6	7.6
	2 O,2 OFF,3 ON,2 OFF,2 ON,3 OFF	1	.6	.6	8.2
	2 OFF,2 ON,3 OFF,2 ON,2 OFF,3 ON	1	.6	.6	8.8
	2 ON,2 OFF-3 ON,2 OFF	1	.6	.6	9.4
	2 ON,2 OFF, EVERY OTHER WEEKEND	1	.6	.6	9.9
	2 ON,2 OFF,2 ON,3 OFF	2	1.2	1.2	11.1
	2 ON,2 OFF,3 OFF,2 ON	1	.6	.6	11.7
	2 ON,2 OFF,3 ON-2 OFF,2 ON,3 OFF	3	1.8	1.8	13.5
	2 ON,2 OFF,3 ON, THEN OPPOSITE	1	.6	.6	14.0
	2 ON,2 OFF,3 ON, THEN ROTATE	1	.6	.6	14.6
	2 ON,2 OFF,3 ON,2 OFF	1	.6	.6	15.2
	2 ON,2 OFF,3 ON,2 OFF,1 ON,3 OFF	1	.6	.6	15.8
	2 ON,2 OFF,3 ON,2 OFF,2 ON,3 OFF	24	14.0	14.0	29.8
	2 ON,2 OFF,3 ON,2 OGG,2 ON,3 OFF	1	.6	.6	30.4
	2 ON,2 OFF,3 ON,3 OFF	1	.6	.6	31.0
	2 ON,2 OFF,3 ON;2 OFF,2 ON,3 OFF	1	.6	.6	31.6
	2 ON,3 OFF-2 OFF,3 ON	1	.6	.6	32.2
	2 ON,3 OFF,3 ON,2 OFF-ON14,OFF16	1	.6	.6	32.7
	2 ON,3 OFF,3 ON,2 OFF	3	1.8	1.8	34.5
	2 ON,3 OFF,3 ON,2 OFF,2	1	.6	.6	35.1

ON,3 OFF				
2 ON2 OFF	1	.6	.6	35.7
3-2,2-3	1	.6	.6	36.3
3 ON,1 OFF,3 ON,3 OFF,1 ON,3 OFF	1	.6	.6	36.8
3 ON,2 OFF-1 WK,2 ON,3 OFF-1 WK	1	.6	.6	37.4
3 ON,2 OFF-2 ON,3 OFF	1	.6	.6	38.0
3 ON,2 OFF	1	.6	.6	38.6
3 ON,2 OFF,2 ON	2	1.2	1.2	39.8
3 ON,2 OFF,2 ON,3 OFF	18	10.5	10.5	50.3
3 ON,2 OFF,2 ON,3 OFF,2 ON	2	1.2	1.2	51.5
3 ON,2 OFF,2 ON,3 OFF,2 ON,2 OFF	2	1.2	1.2	52.6
3 ON,2 OFF,3 OFF,2 ON	1	.6	.6	53.2
3 ON,2 OFF,7 ON,2 OFF	1	.6	.6	53.8
3 ON,2 OFF,WORK EVERY OTHER WEEKEND	1	.6	.6	54.4
3 ON,2OFF,2 ON,3 OFF	1	.6	.6	55.0
3 ON,3 OFF	4	2.3	2.3	57.3
3 ON,3 OFF,2 ON,2 OFF	3	1.8	1.8	59.1
3 ON,3 OFF,4 ON,2 OFF	1	.6	.6	59.6
3 ON,3OFF	1	.6	.6	60.2
3 OR 4 ON,2 OR 3 OFF	1	.6	.6	60.8
4 DAYS/WEEK	1	.6	.6	61.4
4 ON,1 OFF,2 ON,4 OFF,1 ON,2 OFF	1	.6	.6	62.0
4 ON,2 OFF	8	4.7	4.7	66.7
4 ON,3 OFF	4	2.3	2.3	69.0
4 ON,3 OFF,3 ON,1 OFF,3 ON,3 OFF,4	1	.6	.6	69.6
4 ON,3 OFF,3 ON,3 OFF	1	.6	.6	70.2
4 ON,4 OFF	3	1.8	1.8	71.9
4 ON,7 OFF,4 ON,3 OFF,3 ON,1 OFF,3	1	.6	.6	72.5
5 12-HR DAYS,2 12-HR DAYS	1	.6	.6	73.1
5 DAYS PER WEEK	1	.6	.6	73.7
5 DAYS/WEEK	2	1.2	1.2	74.9
5 ON,2 OFF	22	12.9	12.9	87.7
5 ON,3 OFF,5 ON,3 OFF,5 ON,4 OFF	1	.6	.6	88.3
50 HOURS PER WEEK	1	.6	.6	88.9
7 ON,2 OFF-8 ON,4 OFF	1	.6	.6	89.5
7 ON,2 OFF,3 ON,2 OFF	1	.6	.6	90.1
7 ON,2 OFF,8 ON,4 OFF	1	.6	.6	90.6
7AM-3PM,3PM-11PM	1	.6	.6	91.2
8-5 ONLY	1	.6	.6	91.8
DAYS MON-FRI,EVENINGS TUES-SAT	1	.6	.6	92.4
FIXED SHIFTS, 1ST,2ND,3RD	1	.6	.6	93.0
FRI-SAT-SUN OFF,12 HR EVERY OTHER	1	.6	.6	93.6
MO,TUES,FRI,SAT,SUN,WE	1	.6	.6	94.2

D,THURS				
MONDAY-FRIDAY	4	2.3	2.3	96.5
NO REGULAR SHIFTS	1	.6	.6	97.1
NO SET ROTATION	1	.6	.6	97.7
PERMANENT SHIFTS	1	.6	.6	98.2
SHIFTS VARY	1	.6	.6	98.8
STRAIGHT SHIFTS	1	.6	.6	99.4
SUN-SAT 9P-5A,MON-WED 9A-5P	1	.6	.6	100.0
Total	171	100.0	100.0	

SHIFHOUR shift rotations in hours

Statistics

SHIFHOUR shift rotations in hours		
N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		2.44
Median		3.00
Minimum		1
Maximum		4
Sum		414

SHIFHOUR shift rotations in hours

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 8 hour	46	26.9	27.1	27.1
	2 10 hour	12	7.0	7.1	34.1
	3 12 hour	104	60.8	61.2	95.3
	4 other	8	4.7	4.7	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

HOUROTHE

Statistics

		HOUROTHE
N	Valid	171
	Missing	0

HOUROTHE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		162	94.7	94.7	94.7
	11	1	.6	.6	95.3
	3 9-HOUR,2 8-HOUR	1	.6	.6	95.9
	7.5	1	.6	.6	96.5
	8.5	4	2.3	2.3	98.8
	NO REGULAR SHIFTS	1	.6	.6	99.4
	SCHEDULE WILL CHANGE	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

AVGDAY average number officers on duty DAY

Statistics

AVGDAY average number officers on duty DA`		
N	Valid	167
	Missing	4
Mean		5.95
Median		3.00
Minimum		1
Maximum		60
Sum		994

AVGDAY average number officers on duty DAY

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	39	22.8	23.4	23.4
	2	35	20.5	21.0	44.3
	3	20	11.7	12.0	56.3
	4	13	7.6	7.8	64.1
	5	11	6.4	6.6	70.7
	6	8	4.7	4.8	75.4
	7	5	2.9	3.0	78.4
	8	6	3.5	3.6	82.0
	9	3	1.8	1.8	83.8
	10	2	1.2	1.2	85.0
	11	2	1.2	1.2	86.2
	12	5	2.9	3.0	89.2
	13	1	.6	.6	89.8
	14	1	.6	.6	90.4
	15	1	.6	.6	91.0
	16	2	1.2	1.2	92.2
	17	1	.6	.6	92.8
	18	1	.6	.6	93.4
	19	1	.6	.6	94.0
	20	1	.6	.6	94.6
	21	1	.6	.6	95.2
	22	1	.6	.6	95.8
	24	2	1.2	1.2	97.0
	33	1	.6	.6	97.6
	35	1	.6	.6	98.2
	41	1	.6	.6	98.8
	50	1	.6	.6	99.4
	60	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	167	97.7	100.0	
Missing	System	4	2.3		
Total		171	100.0		

AVGNIGHT average number officers on duty NIGHT

Statistics

AVGNIGHT average number officers on duty NIGH

N	Valid	162
	Missing	9
Mean		5.34
Median		3.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		38
Sum		865

AVGNIGHT average number officers on duty NIGHT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	3	1.8	1.9	1.9
	1	36	21.1	22.2	24.1
	2	32	18.7	19.8	43.8
	3	22	12.9	13.6	57.4
	4	12	7.0	7.4	64.8
	5	10	5.8	6.2	71.0
	6	11	6.4	6.8	77.8
	7	3	1.8	1.9	79.6
	8	5	2.9	3.1	82.7
	9	3	1.8	1.9	84.6
	10	4	2.3	2.5	87.0
	11	3	1.8	1.9	88.9
	12	4	2.3	2.5	91.4
	13	1	.6	.6	92.0
	14	1	.6	.6	92.6
	15	1	.6	.6	93.2
	16	1	.6	.6	93.8
	17	1	.6	.6	94.4
	18	1	.6	.6	95.1
	19	1	.6	.6	95.7
	20	1	.6	.6	96.3
	24	2	1.2	1.2	97.5
	35	2	1.2	1.2	98.8
	38	2	1.2	1.2	100.0
	Total	162	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		171	100.0		

CALLS total calls for service fiscal 2003

Statistics

CALLS total calls for service fiscal 2003

N	Valid	152
	Missing	19
Mean		28801.68
Median		6000.00
Minimum		9
Maximum		500000
Sum		4377855

CALLS total calls for service fiscal 2003

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	9	1	.6	.7	.7
	19	1	.6	.7	1.3
	20	1	.6	.7	2.0
	22	1	.6	.7	2.6
	30	1	.6	.7	3.3
	48	1	.6	.7	3.9
	50	2	1.2	1.3	5.3
	53	1	.6	.7	5.9
	97	1	.6	.7	6.6
	100	1	.6	.7	7.2
	125	1	.6	.7	7.9
	129	1	.6	.7	8.6
	200	1	.6	.7	9.2
	221	1	.6	.7	9.9
	228	1	.6	.7	10.5
	250	1	.6	.7	11.2
	300	1	.6	.7	11.8
	329	1	.6	.7	12.5
	350	1	.6	.7	13.2
	360	1	.6	.7	13.8
	400	1	.6	.7	14.5
	425	1	.6	.7	15.1
	460	1	.6	.7	15.8
	498	2	1.2	1.3	17.1
	500	2	1.2	1.3	18.4
	675	1	.6	.7	19.1
	744	1	.6	.7	19.7
	750	1	.6	.7	20.4
	800	2	1.2	1.3	21.7
	879	1	.6	.7	22.4
	1000	2	1.2	1.3	23.7
	1142	1	.6	.7	24.3
	1200	2	1.2	1.3	25.7
	1300	1	.6	.7	26.3
	1338	1	.6	.7	27.0

1400	1	.6	.7	27.6
1426	1	.6	.7	28.3
1436	1	.6	.7	28.9
1459	1	.6	.7	29.6
1460	1	.6	.7	30.3
1500	1	.6	.7	30.9
1600	1	.6	.7	31.6
1647	1	.6	.7	32.2
1668	1	.6	.7	32.9
1755	1	.6	.7	33.6
1800	2	1.2	1.3	34.9
1951	1	.6	.7	35.5
2257	1	.6	.7	36.2
2300	1	.6	.7	36.8
2434	1	.6	.7	37.5
2500	2	1.2	1.3	38.8
2600	1	.6	.7	39.5
3000	3	1.8	2.0	41.4
3200	1	.6	.7	42.1
3700	1	.6	.7	42.8
3925	1	.6	.7	43.4
3968	1	.6	.7	44.1
4075	1	.6	.7	44.7
4089	1	.6	.7	45.4
4200	1	.6	.7	46.1
4713	1	.6	.7	46.7
5000	1	.6	.7	47.4
5400	1	.6	.7	48.0
5426	1	.6	.7	48.7
5969	1	.6	.7	49.3
6000	2	1.2	1.3	50.7
6247	1	.6	.7	51.3
6500	3	1.8	2.0	53.3
6937	1	.6	.7	53.9
6950	1	.6	.7	54.6
7950	1	.6	.7	55.3
8000	1	.6	.7	55.9
8356	1	.6	.7	56.6
8564	1	.6	.7	57.2
9000	1	.6	.7	57.9
9291	1	.6	.7	58.6
9644	1	.6	.7	59.2
9743	1	.6	.7	59.9
10000	2	1.2	1.3	61.2
10220	1	.6	.7	61.8
10461	1	.6	.7	62.5
11065	1	.6	.7	63.2
11525	1	.6	.7	63.8
12395	1	.6	.7	64.5
12890	1	.6	.7	65.1
13471	1	.6	.7	65.8
13640	1	.6	.7	66.4
14745	1	.6	.7	67.1
14962	1	.6	.7	67.8
15000	1	.6	.7	68.4
17617	1	.6	.7	69.1

	18001	1	.6	.7	69.7
	20546	1	.6	.7	70.4
	22205	1	.6	.7	71.1
	23936	1	.6	.7	71.7
	24000	1	.6	.7	72.4
	24826	1	.6	.7	73.0
	25000	1	.6	.7	73.7
	25314	1	.6	.7	74.3
	25890	1	.6	.7	75.0
	26197	1	.6	.7	75.7
	31731	1	.6	.7	76.3
	32284	1	.6	.7	77.0
	32996	1	.6	.7	77.6
	36000	1	.6	.7	78.3
	37811	1	.6	.7	78.9
	38657	1	.6	.7	79.6
	40181	1	.6	.7	80.3
	42668	1	.6	.7	80.9
	46079	1	.6	.7	81.6
	46189	1	.6	.7	82.2
	46781	1	.6	.7	82.9
	49824	1	.6	.7	83.6
	50546	1	.6	.7	84.2
	53427	1	.6	.7	84.9
	53860	1	.6	.7	85.5
	58375	1	.6	.7	86.2
	66054	1	.6	.7	86.8
	67855	1	.6	.7	87.5
	68057	1	.6	.7	88.2
	69529	1	.6	.7	88.8
	75873	1	.6	.7	89.5
	76186	1	.6	.7	90.1
	78314	1	.6	.7	90.8
	78928	1	.6	.7	91.4
	79392	1	.6	.7	92.1
	88983	1	.6	.7	92.8
	102424	1	.6	.7	93.4
	115348	1	.6	.7	94.1
	119009	1	.6	.7	94.7
	136573	1	.6	.7	95.4
	150000	1	.6	.7	96.1
	168000	1	.6	.7	96.7
	168013	1	.6	.7	97.4
	182016	1	.6	.7	98.0
	226010	1	.6	.7	98.7
	410537	1	.6	.7	99.3
	500000	1	.6	.7	100.0
	Total	152	88.9	100.0	
Missing	System	19	11.1		
Total		171	100.0		

DISPATCH total calls receiving an officer

Statistics

DISPATCH total calls receiving an officer

N	Valid	142
	Missing	29
Mean		21920.05
Median		4456.50
Minimum		9
Maximum		254047
Sum		3112647

DISPATCH total calls receiving an officer

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	9	1	.6	.7	.7
	16	1	.6	.7	1.4
	20	1	.6	.7	2.1
	22	1	.6	.7	2.8
	30	2	1.2	1.4	4.2
	48	1	.6	.7	4.9
	50	1	.6	.7	5.6
	53	1	.6	.7	6.3
	80	2	1.2	1.4	7.7
	97	1	.6	.7	8.5
	100	1	.6	.7	9.2
	125	1	.6	.7	9.9
	129	1	.6	.7	10.6
	150	1	.6	.7	11.3
	200	1	.6	.7	12.0
	221	1	.6	.7	12.7
	225	1	.6	.7	13.4
	300	2	1.2	1.4	14.8
	303	1	.6	.7	15.5
	323	1	.6	.7	16.2
	329	1	.6	.7	16.9
	345	1	.6	.7	17.6
	360	1	.6	.7	18.3
	400	1	.6	.7	19.0
	498	1	.6	.7	19.7
	500	2	1.2	1.4	21.1
	603	1	.6	.7	21.8
	680	1	.6	.7	22.5
	744	1	.6	.7	23.2
	750	1	.6	.7	23.9
	800	2	1.2	1.4	25.4
	879	1	.6	.7	26.1
	1000	2	1.2	1.4	27.5
	1142	1	.6	.7	28.2
	1160	1	.6	.7	28.9

1200	1	.6	.7	29.6
1250	1	.6	.7	30.3
1336	1	.6	.7	31.0
1338	1	.6	.7	31.7
1400	1	.6	.7	32.4
1426	1	.6	.7	33.1
1459	1	.6	.7	33.8
1460	1	.6	.7	34.5
1600	1	.6	.7	35.2
1647	1	.6	.7	35.9
1693	1	.6	.7	36.6
1800	2	1.2	1.4	38.0
1951	1	.6	.7	38.7
2000	1	.6	.7	39.4
2323	1	.6	.7	40.1
2450	1	.6	.7	40.8
2500	1	.6	.7	41.5
2600	1	.6	.7	42.3
2800	1	.6	.7	43.0
3000	1	.6	.7	43.7
3200	1	.6	.7	44.4
3337	1	.6	.7	45.1
3700	1	.6	.7	45.8
3892	1	.6	.7	46.5
3925	1	.6	.7	47.2
3968	1	.6	.7	47.9
4075	1	.6	.7	48.6
4124	1	.6	.7	49.3
4200	1	.6	.7	50.0
4713	1	.6	.7	50.7
5000	2	1.2	1.4	52.1
5426	1	.6	.7	52.8
5575	1	.6	.7	53.5
5776	1	.6	.7	54.2
5969	1	.6	.7	54.9
6177	1	.6	.7	55.6
6600	1	.6	.7	56.3
6720	1	.6	.7	57.0
7151	1	.6	.7	57.7
7265	1	.6	.7	58.5
7950	1	.6	.7	59.2
8000	1	.6	.7	59.9
8564	1	.6	.7	60.6
8579	1	.6	.7	61.3
9000	2	1.2	1.4	62.7
9125	1	.6	.7	63.4
9200	1	.6	.7	64.1
9202	1	.6	.7	64.8
9743	1	.6	.7	65.5
10220	1	.6	.7	66.2
10461	1	.6	.7	66.9
11065	1	.6	.7	67.6
11232	1	.6	.7	68.3
12050	1	.6	.7	69.0
12443	1	.6	.7	69.7
13392	1	.6	.7	70.4

	15040	1	.6	.7	71.1
	17617	1	.6	.7	71.8
	21000	1	.6	.7	72.5
	23869	1	.6	.7	73.2
	23936	1	.6	.7	73.9
	24826	1	.6	.7	74.6
	25890	1	.6	.7	75.4
	26197	1	.6	.7	76.1
	29480	1	.6	.7	76.8
	30280	1	.6	.7	77.5
	32284	1	.6	.7	78.2
	32904	1	.6	.7	78.9
	32996	1	.6	.7	79.6
	35000	1	.6	.7	80.3
	36000	1	.6	.7	81.0
	36261	1	.6	.7	81.7
	37811	1	.6	.7	82.4
	38651	1	.6	.7	83.1
	40181	1	.6	.7	83.8
	45795	1	.6	.7	84.5
	47426	1	.6	.7	85.2
	48614	1	.6	.7	85.9
	52000	1	.6	.7	86.6
	53427	1	.6	.7	87.3
	53860	1	.6	.7	88.0
	58184	1	.6	.7	88.7
	58375	1	.6	.7	89.4
	62424	1	.6	.7	90.1
	66054	1	.6	.7	90.8
	67855	1	.6	.7	91.5
	72614	1	.6	.7	92.3
	79392	1	.6	.7	93.0
	88983	1	.6	.7	93.7
	108274	1	.6	.7	94.4
	115348	1	.6	.7	95.1
	119009	1	.6	.7	95.8
	120000	1	.6	.7	96.5
	144000	1	.6	.7	97.2
	164588	1	.6	.7	97.9
	168013	1	.6	.7	98.6
	174689	1	.6	.7	99.3
	254047	1	.6	.7	100.0
	Total	142	83.0	100.0	
Missing	System	29	17.0		
Total		171	100.0		

NODISPA total calls which received no officer

Statistics

NODISPA total calls which received no officer		
N	Valid	127
	Missing	44
Mean		7982.57
Median		10.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		547795
Sum		1013787

NODISPA total calls which received no officer

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	61	35.7	48.0	48.0
	3	1	.6	.8	48.8
	6	1	.6	.8	49.6
	10	2	1.2	1.6	51.2
	12	1	.6	.8	52.0
	20	2	1.2	1.6	53.5
	25	1	.6	.8	54.3
	40	1	.6	.8	55.1
	50	1	.6	.8	55.9
	70	1	.6	.8	56.7
	75	1	.6	.8	57.5
	91	1	.6	.8	58.3
	100	4	2.3	3.1	61.4
	111	1	.6	.8	62.2
	115	1	.6	.8	63.0
	176	1	.6	.8	63.8
	195	1	.6	.8	64.6
	200	3	1.8	2.4	66.9
	217	1	.6	.8	67.7
	248	1	.6	.8	68.5
	250	2	1.2	1.6	70.1
	400	2	1.2	1.6	71.7
	421	1	.6	.8	72.4
	564	1	.6	.8	73.2
	752	1	.6	.8	74.0
	922	1	.6	.8	74.8
	1000	2	1.2	1.6	76.4
	1028	1	.6	.8	77.2
	1210	1	.6	.8	78.0
	1345	1	.6	.8	78.7
	1375	1	.6	.8	79.5
	1445	1	.6	.8	80.3
	1451	1	.6	.8	81.1
	1800	1	.6	.8	81.9
	2300	1	.6	.8	82.7
	3120	1	.6	.8	83.5
	3761	1	.6	.8	84.3
	3868	1	.6	.8	85.0
	4000	1	.6	.8	85.8
	4374	1	.6	.8	86.6
	5000	1	.6	.8	87.4
	5013	1	.6	.8	88.2
	6000	1	.6	.8	89.0
	6314	1	.6	.8	89.8
	9764	1	.6	.8	90.6
	9928	1	.6	.8	91.3
	11079	1	.6	.8	92.1
	13003	1	.6	.8	92.9
	17428	1	.6	.8	93.7
	18002	1	.6	.8	94.5
	23734	1	.6	.8	95.3
	23873	1	.6	.8	96.1
	32000	1	.6	.8	96.9
	40000	1	.6	.8	97.6
	48834	1	.6	.8	98.4
	156490	1	.6	.8	99.2
	547795	1	.6	.8	100.0
	Total	127	74.3	100.0	
Missing	System	44	25.7		
Total		171	100.0		

CALLS911 participate in 911 service

Statistics

CALLS911 participate in 911 service		
N	Valid	166
	Missing	5
Mean		.87
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		144

CALLS911 participate in 911 service

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	22	12.9	13.3	13.3
	1 yes	144	84.2	86.7	100.0
	Total	166	97.1	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.9		
Total		171	100.0		

RUNS911 who runs your 911 system

Statistics

RUNS911 who runs your 911 system		
N	Valid	149
	Missing	22
Mean		2.05
Median		2.00
Minimum		1
Maximum		4
Sum		306

RUNS911 who runs your 911 system

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 your agency	30	17.5	20.1	20.1
	2 city or county	86	50.3	57.7	77.9
	3 county sheriffs	28	16.4	18.8	96.6
	4 other	5	2.9	3.4	100.0
	Total	149	87.1	100.0	
Missing	System	22	12.9		
Total		171	100.0		

TRAFFUNI dedicated traffic unit

Statistics

TRAFFUNI dedicated traffic unit

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.36
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		62

TRAFFUNI dedicated traffic unit

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	109	63.7	63.7	63.7
	1 Yes	62	36.3	36.3	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

RCHECKS conduct road checks

Statistics

RCHECKS conduct road checks

N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		.84
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		143

RCHECKS conduct road checks

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	27	15.8	15.9	15.9
	1 Yes	143	83.6	84.1	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

COPINV cop involved

Statistics

COPINV cop involved

N	Valid	168
	Missing	3
Mean		.67
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		112

COPINV cop involved

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	56	32.7	33.3	33.3
	1 yes	112	65.5	66.7	100.0
	Total	168	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.8		
Total		171	100.0		

COPPLA cop plan

Statistics

COPPLA cop plan

N	Valid	168
	Missing	3
Mean		.49
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		83

COPPLA cop plan

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	85	49.7	50.6	50.6
	1 yes	83	48.5	49.4	100.0
	Total	168	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.8		
Total		171	100.0		

COPUNIT cop unit

Statistics

COPUNIT cop unit

N	Valid	164
	Missing	7
Mean		.19
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		31

COPUNIT cop unit

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	133	77.8	81.1	81.1
	1 Yes	31	18.1	18.9	100.0
	Total	164	95.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	4.1		
Total		171	100.0		

COPOFF cop officers number

Statistics

COPOFF cop officers number

N	Valid	61
	Missing	110
Mean		3.41
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		36
Sum		208

COPOFF cop officers number

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	23	13.5	37.7	37.7
	1	10	5.8	16.4	54.1
	2	9	5.3	14.8	68.9
	3	3	1.8	4.9	73.8
	4	4	2.3	6.6	80.3
	5	3	1.8	4.9	85.2
	6	1	.6	1.6	86.9
	8	2	1.2	3.3	90.2
	9	1	.6	1.6	91.8
	12	1	.6	1.6	93.4
	14	1	.6	1.6	95.1
	20	1	.6	1.6	96.7
	27	1	.6	1.6	98.4
	36	1	.6	1.6	100.0
	Total	61	35.7	100.0	
Missing	System	110	64.3		
Total		171	100.0		

VICTIMS have a victim assistance person

Statistics

VICTIMS have a victim assistance person

N	Valid	159
	Missing	12
Mean		.79
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		126

VICTIMS have a victim assistance person

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	33	19.3	20.8	20.8
	1 Yes	126	73.7	79.2	100.0
	Total	159	93.0	100.0	
Missing	System	12	7.0		
Total		171	100.0		

VICTOFF is victim assistance person an officer

Statistics

VICTOFF is victim assistance person an officer

N	Valid	136
	Missing	35
Mean		.43
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		59

VICTOFF is victim assistance person an officer

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	77	45.0	56.6	56.6
	1 Yes	59	34.5	43.4	100.0
	Total	136	79.5	100.0	
Missing	System	35	20.5		
Total		171	100.0		

SRO SRO

Statistics

SRO SRO		
N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		.49
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		83

SRO SRO

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	86	50.3	50.9	50.9
	1 Yes	83	48.5	49.1	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

SRONUMB number of SRO

Statistics

SRONUMB number of SRO		
N	Valid	95
	Missing	76
Mean		3.78
Median		2.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		55
Sum		359

SRONUMB number of SRO

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	10	5.8	10.5	10.5
	1	22	12.9	23.2	33.7
	2	20	11.7	21.1	54.7
	3	13	7.6	13.7	68.4
	4	11	6.4	11.6	80.0
	5	3	1.8	3.2	83.2
	6	6	3.5	6.3	89.5
	7	1	.6	1.1	90.5
	8	1	.6	1.1	91.6
	10	2	1.2	2.1	93.7
	12	2	1.2	2.1	95.8
	15	2	1.2	2.1	97.9
	19	1	.6	1.1	98.9
	55	1	.6	1.1	100.0
	Total	95	55.6	100.0	
Missing	System	76	44.4		
Total		171	100.0		

ATTORNEY in house attorney

Statistics

ATTORNEY in house attorney

N	Valid	168
	Missing	3
Mean		.31
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		52

ATTORNEY in house attorney

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	116	67.8	69.0	69.0
	1 Yes	52	30.4	31.0	100.0
	Total	168	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.8		
Total		171	100.0		

PSYCHOLO access to psychologist

Statistics

PSYCHOLO access to psychologist

N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		.61
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		104

PSYCHOLO access to psychologist

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	66	38.6	38.8	38.8
	1 Yes	104	60.8	61.2	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

COUNSELI provide counseling to officers

Statistics

COUNSELI provide counseling to officers

N	Valid	167
	Missing	4
Mean		.66
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		110

COUNSELI provide counseling to officers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	57	33.3	34.1	34.1
	1 Yes	110	64.3	65.9	100.0
	Total	167	97.7	100.0	
Missing	System	4	2.3		
Total		171	100.0		

SPANISH spanish speaking officer

Statistics

SPANISH spanish speaking officer

N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		.36
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		61

SPANISH spanish speaking officer

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	109	63.7	64.1	64.1
	1 Yes	61	35.7	35.9	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

CADET officer cadet program

Statistics

CADET officer cadet program		
N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		.16
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		28

CADET officer cadet program

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	142	83.0	83.5	83.5
	1 Yes	28	16.4	16.5	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

CADETNUM number of cadets

Statistics

CADETNUM number of cadets		
N	Valid	37
	Missing	134
Mean		8.46
Median		9.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		25
Sum		313

CADETNUM number of cadets

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	11	6.4	29.7	29.7
	1	2	1.2	5.4	35.1
	3	1	.6	2.7	37.8
	4	1	.6	2.7	40.5
	6	2	1.2	5.4	45.9
	8	1	.6	2.7	48.6
	9	1	.6	2.7	51.4
	10	3	1.8	8.1	59.5
	11	2	1.2	5.4	64.9
	12	4	2.3	10.8	75.7
	15	3	1.8	8.1	83.8
	18	1	.6	2.7	86.5
	20	1	.6	2.7	89.2
	22	2	1.2	5.4	94.6
	23	1	.6	2.7	97.3
	25	1	.6	2.7	100.0
	Total	37	21.6	100.0	
Missing	System	134	78.4		
Total		171	100.0		

MENTILL policy on handling mentally ill

Statistics

MENTILL policy on handling mentally ill

N	Valid	166
	Missing	5
Mean		.56
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		93

MENTILL policy on handling mentally ill

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 No	73	42.7	44.0	44.0
	1 Yes	93	54.4	56.0	100.0
	Total	166	97.1	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.9		
Total		171	100.0		

MENTILL2 agency conduct training on mentally ill

Statistics

MENTILL2 agency conduct training on mentally ill

N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		.48
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		81

MENTILL2 agency conduct training on mentally ill

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 No	88	51.5	52.1	52.1
	1 Yes	81	47.4	47.9	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

MENTILL3 number of officers who received ment ill training

Statistics

MENTILL3 number of officers who received ment ill training

N	Valid	122
	Missing	49
Mean		15.96
Median		2.50
Minimum		0
Maximum		228
Sum		1947

MENTILL3 number of officers who received ment ill training

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	52	30.4	42.6	42.6
	1	1	.6	.8	43.4
	2	8	4.7	6.6	50.0
	3	3	1.8	2.5	52.5
	4	4	2.3	3.3	55.7
	5	2	1.2	1.6	57.4
	6	6	3.5	4.9	62.3
	8	3	1.8	2.5	64.8
	9	2	1.2	1.6	66.4
	10	3	1.8	2.5	68.9
	11	1	.6	.8	69.7
	12	2	1.2	1.6	71.3
	13	3	1.8	2.5	73.8
	15	2	1.2	1.6	75.4
	20	4	2.3	3.3	78.7
	21	1	.6	.8	79.5
	23	1	.6	.8	80.3
	25	2	1.2	1.6	82.0
	27	1	.6	.8	82.8
	30	2	1.2	1.6	84.4
	35	2	1.2	1.6	86.1
	36	2	1.2	1.6	87.7
	38	1	.6	.8	88.5
	40	1	.6	.8	89.3
	41	1	.6	.8	90.2
	45	1	.6	.8	91.0
	47	1	.6	.8	91.8
	50	1	.6	.8	92.6
	59	2	1.2	1.6	94.3
	60	1	.6	.8	95.1
	90	1	.6	.8	95.9
	94	1	.6	.8	96.7
	100	1	.6	.8	97.5
	109	1	.6	.8	98.4
	220	1	.6	.8	99.2
	228	1	.6	.8	100.0
	Total	122	71.3	100.0	
Missing	System	49	28.7		
Total		171	100.0		

MENTILL4 assaults against officers by mentally ill

Statistics

MENTILL4 assaults against officers by mentally ill

N	Valid	148
	Missing	23
Mean		.99
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		21
Sum		146

MENTILL4 assaults against officers by mentally ill

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	105	61.4	70.9	70.9
	1	13	7.6	8.8	79.7
	2	10	5.8	6.8	86.5
	3	5	2.9	3.4	89.9
	4	5	2.9	3.4	93.2
	5	6	3.5	4.1	97.3
	7	1	.6	.7	98.0
	10	2	1.2	1.4	99.3
	21	1	.6	.7	100.0
	Total	148	86.5	100.0	
Missing	System	23	13.5		
Total		171	100.0		

FIREARMS firearms issued to officers

Statistics

FIREARMS firearms issued to officers

N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		.96
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		163

FIREARMS firearms issued to officers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	6	3.5	3.6	3.6
	1 Yes	163	95.3	96.4	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

REVOLVER revolvers issued

Statistics

REVOLVER revolvers issued

N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		.04
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		7

REVOLVER revolvers issued

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	163	95.3	95.9	95.9
	1 Yes	7	4.1	4.1	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

SEMIAUTO semi-automatics issued

Statistics

SEMIAUTO semi-automatics issued

N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		.96
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		164

SEMIAUTO semi-automatics issued

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	6	3.5	3.5	3.5
	1 Yes	164	95.9	96.5	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

RIFLES rifles issued

Statistics

RIFLES rifles issued

N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		.14
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		24

RIFLES rifles issued

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	146	85.4	85.9	85.9
	1 Yes	24	14.0	14.1	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

SHOTGUNS shotguns issued

Statistics

SHOTGUNS shotguns issued

N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		.74
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		125

SHOTGUNS shotguns issued

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	45	26.3	26.5	26.5
	1 Yes	125	73.1	73.5	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

CARBINES carbines

Statistics

CARBINES carbines

N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		.14
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		23

CARBINES carbines

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	147	86.0	86.5	86.5
	1 yes	23	13.5	13.5	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

ELECTRIC electronic devices issued

Statistics

ELECTRIC electronic devices issued

N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		.12
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		21

ELECTRIC electronic devices issued

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	149	87.1	87.6	87.6
	1 Yes	21	12.3	12.4	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

CHEMICAL chemical agents issued

Statistics

CHEMICAL chemical agents issued

N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		.89
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		151

CHEMICAL chemical agents issued

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	19	11.1	11.2	11.2
	1 Yes	151	88.3	88.8	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

IMPACT impact devices issued

Statistics

IMPACT impact devices issued

N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		.62
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		106

IMPACT impact devices issued

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	64	37.4	37.6	37.6
	1 Yes	106	62.0	62.4	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

OTHERWEA other weapons issued

Statistics

OTHERWEA other weapons issued

N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		.07
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		5
Sum		12

OTHERWEA other weapons issued

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	162	94.7	95.3	95.3
	1 Yes	7	4.1	4.1	99.4
	5	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

CARS

Statistics

CARS		
N	Valid	168
	Missing	3
Mean		43.02
Median		12.50
Minimum		0
Maximum		546
Sum		7228

CARS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	.6	.6	.6
	1	4	2.3	2.4	3.0
	2	13	7.6	7.7	10.7
	3	14	8.2	8.3	19.0
	4	8	4.7	4.8	23.8
	5	12	7.0	7.1	31.0
	6	9	5.3	5.4	36.3
	7	3	1.8	1.8	38.1
	8	3	1.8	1.8	39.9
	9	4	2.3	2.4	42.3
	10	5	2.9	3.0	45.2
	11	4	2.3	2.4	47.6
	12	4	2.3	2.4	50.0
	13	4	2.3	2.4	52.4
	14	3	1.8	1.8	54.2
	15	2	1.2	1.2	55.4
	16	1	.6	.6	56.0
	17	2	1.2	1.2	57.1
	18	2	1.2	1.2	58.3
	19	1	.6	.6	58.9
	20	4	2.3	2.4	61.3
	21	1	.6	.6	61.9
	22	1	.6	.6	62.5
	23	1	.6	.6	63.1
	24	1	.6	.6	63.7
	25	1	.6	.6	64.3
	26	1	.6	.6	64.9
	27	3	1.8	1.8	66.7
	28	3	1.8	1.8	68.5
	29	2	1.2	1.2	69.6
	30	1	.6	.6	70.2
	31	2	1.2	1.2	71.4
	32	1	.6	.6	72.0
	33	1	.6	.6	72.6
	34	1	.6	.6	73.2
	36	2	1.2	1.2	74.4
	39	2	1.2	1.2	75.6
	40	2	1.2	1.2	76.8
	43	2	1.2	1.2	78.0
	46	1	.6	.6	78.6
	47	2	1.2	1.2	79.8
	48	1	.6	.6	80.4
	51	1	.6	.6	81.0
	52	2	1.2	1.2	82.1
	56	1	.6	.6	82.7
	61	1	.6	.6	83.3
	63	2	1.2	1.2	84.5
	69	1	.6	.6	85.1
	73	1	.6	.6	85.7
	77	1	.6	.6	86.3
	92	1	.6	.6	86.9
	93	1	.6	.6	87.5
	94	1	.6	.6	88.1
	100	1	.6	.6	88.7
	105	2	1.2	1.2	89.9
	110	1	.6	.6	90.5
	116	1	.6	.6	91.1
	121	1	.6	.6	91.7
	131	1	.6	.6	92.3
	148	1	.6	.6	92.9
	162	2	1.2	1.2	94.0
	219	1	.6	.6	94.6
	226	1	.6	.6	95.2
	255	1	.6	.6	95.8
	277	1	.6	.6	96.4
	298	1	.6	.6	97.0
	321	1	.6	.6	97.6
	328	1	.6	.6	98.2
	343	1	.6	.6	98.8
	450	1	.6	.6	99.4
	546	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	168	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.8		
Total		171	100.0		

MARKCARS marked cars number

Statistics

MARKCARS marked cars number		
N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		29.69
Median		9.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		358
Sum		5018

MARKCARS marked cars number

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	5	2.9	3.0	3.0
	1	14	8.2	8.3	11.2
	2	13	7.6	7.7	18.9
	3	14	8.2	8.3	27.2
	4	14	8.2	8.3	35.5
	5	10	5.8	5.9	41.4
	6	6	3.5	3.6	45.0
	7	3	1.8	1.8	46.7
	8	3	1.8	1.8	48.5
	9	9	5.3	5.3	53.8
	10	5	2.9	3.0	56.8
	11	1	.6	.6	57.4
	12	1	.6	.6	58.0
	13	4	2.3	2.4	60.4
	14	3	1.8	1.8	62.1
	15	3	1.8	1.8	63.9
	16	1	.6	.6	64.5
	17	2	1.2	1.2	65.7
	18	2	1.2	1.2	66.9
	19	2	1.2	1.2	68.0
	20	4	2.3	2.4	70.4
	21	2	1.2	1.2	71.6
	22	1	.6	.6	72.2
	25	2	1.2	1.2	73.4
	28	4	2.3	2.4	75.7
	29	1	.6	.6	76.3
	30	2	1.2	1.2	77.5
	31	1	.6	.6	78.1
	32	2	1.2	1.2	79.3
	33	3	1.8	1.8	81.1
	37	1	.6	.6	81.7
	39	1	.6	.6	82.2
	43	2	1.2	1.2	83.4
	50	1	.6	.6	84.0
	52	2	1.2	1.2	85.2
	53	2	1.2	1.2	86.4
	55	1	.6	.6	87.0
	66	1	.6	.6	87.6
	68	2	1.2	1.2	88.8
	69	1	.6	.6	89.3
	70	1	.6	.6	89.9
	72	1	.6	.6	90.5
	75	1	.6	.6	91.1
	80	1	.6	.6	91.7
	86	1	.6	.6	92.3
	100	1	.6	.6	92.9
	110	1	.6	.6	93.5
	131	1	.6	.6	94.1
	146	1	.6	.6	94.7
	157	1	.6	.6	95.3
	175	1	.6	.6	95.9
	190	1	.6	.6	96.4
	193	1	.6	.6	97.0
	223	1	.6	.6	97.6
	237	1	.6	.6	98.2
	242	1	.6	.6	98.8
	350	1	.6	.6	99.4
	358	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

UNMARKCA unmarked cars

Statistics

UNMARKCA unmarked cars		
N	Valid	168
	Missing	3
Mean		13.46
Median		4.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		188
Sum		2262

UNMARKCA unmarked cars

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	17	9.9	10.1	10.1
	1	31	18.1	18.5	28.6
	2	21	12.3	12.5	41.1
	3	12	7.0	7.1	48.2
	4	6	3.5	3.6	51.8
	5	7	4.1	4.2	56.0
	6	7	4.1	4.2	60.1
	7	6	3.5	3.6	63.7
	8	5	2.9	3.0	66.7
	9	3	1.8	1.8	68.5
	10	4	2.3	2.4	70.8
	11	7	4.1	4.2	75.0
	12	3	1.8	1.8	76.8
	13	2	1.2	1.2	78.0
	14	3	1.8	1.8	79.8
	15	2	1.2	1.2	81.0
	18	2	1.2	1.2	82.1
	19	1	.6	.6	82.7
	20	1	.6	.6	83.3
	22	1	.6	.6	83.9
	23	1	.6	.6	84.5
	24	3	1.8	1.8	86.3
	25	2	1.2	1.2	87.5
	26	1	.6	.6	88.1
	30	1	.6	.6	88.7
	31	2	1.2	1.2	89.9
	33	1	.6	.6	90.5
	39	1	.6	.6	91.1
	40	1	.6	.6	91.7
	44	1	.6	.6	92.3
	52	2	1.2	1.2	93.5
	62	1	.6	.6	94.0
	80	3	1.8	1.8	95.8
	84	1	.6	.6	96.4
	86	1	.6	.6	97.0
	87	1	.6	.6	97.6
	100	1	.6	.6	98.2
	105	1	.6	.6	98.8
	120	1	.6	.6	99.4
	188	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	168	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.8		
Total		171	100.0		

MOTORCYC motorcycles

Statistics

MOTORCYC motorcycles

N	Valid	168
	Missing	3
Mean		.53
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		16
Sum		89

MOTORCYC motorcycles

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	149	87.1	88.7	88.7
	1	2	1.2	1.2	89.9
	2	6	3.5	3.6	93.5
	3	1	.6	.6	94.0
	4	1	.6	.6	94.6
	5	5	2.9	3.0	97.6
	6	2	1.2	1.2	98.8
	15	1	.6	.6	99.4
	16	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	168	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.8		
Total		171	100.0		

VEHICLES other vehicles

Statistics

VEHICLES other vehicles

N	Valid	164
	Missing	7
Mean		5.54
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		205
Sum		908

VEHICLES other vehicles

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	76	44.4	46.3	46.3
	1	25	14.6	15.2	61.6
	2	18	10.5	11.0	72.6
	3	9	5.3	5.5	78.0
	4	6	3.5	3.7	81.7
	5	6	3.5	3.7	85.4
	6	2	1.2	1.2	86.6
	7	2	1.2	1.2	87.8
	9	2	1.2	1.2	89.0
	10	5	2.9	3.0	92.1
	15	1	.6	.6	92.7
	17	1	.6	.6	93.3
	19	1	.6	.6	93.9
	20	1	.6	.6	94.5
	24	1	.6	.6	95.1
	25	1	.6	.6	95.7
	30	1	.6	.6	96.3
	31	1	.6	.6	97.0
	33	1	.6	.6	97.6
	46	1	.6	.6	98.2
	65	1	.6	.6	98.8
	142	1	.6	.6	99.4
	205	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	164	95.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	4.1		
Total		171	100.0		

PLANES

Statistics

PLANES		
N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.04
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		6

PLANES

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	165	96.5	96.5	96.5
	1 Yes	6	3.5	3.5	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

CHOPPERS

Statistics

CHOPPERS		
N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.06
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		10

CHOPPERS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	161	94.2	94.2	94.2
	1 Yes	10	5.8	5.8	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

BOATS

Statistics

BOATS		
N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.19
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		32

BOATS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	139	81.3	81.3	81.3
	1 Yes	32	18.7	18.7	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

HORSES

Statistics

HORSES		
N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.05
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		8

HORSES

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	163	95.3	95.3	95.3
	1 Yes	8	4.7	4.7	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

BIKES

Statistics

BIKES		
N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.38
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		65

BIKES

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	106	62.0	62.0	62.0
	1 Yes	65	38.0	38.0	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

DOGS

Statistics

DOGS		
N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.49
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		83

DOGS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	88	51.5	51.5	51.5
	1 Yes	83	48.5	48.5	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

CARSHOME take home cars

Statistics

CARSHOME take home cars

N	Valid	167
	Missing	4
Mean		.73
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		122

CARSHOME take home cars

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	45	26.3	26.9	26.9
	1 Yes	122	71.3	73.1	100.0
	Total	167	97.7	100.0	
Missing	System	4	2.3		
Total		171	100.0		

MAINFRAM mainframe computer used by agency

Statistics

MAINFRAM mainframe computer used by agency

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.69
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		118

MAINFRAM mainframe computer used by agency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	53	31.0	31.0	31.0
	1 Yes	118	69.0	69.0	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

PC

Statistics

PC

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.85
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		145

PC

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	26	15.2	15.2	15.2
	1 Yes	145	84.8	84.8	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

LAPTOP laptop in field

Statistics

LAPTOP laptop in field

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.46
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		78

LAPTOP laptop in field

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	93	54.4	54.4	54.4
	1 Yes	78	45.6	45.6	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

CARPC car mounted digital terminal

Statistics

CARPC car mounted digital terminal

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.14
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		24

CARPC car mounted digital terminal

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	147	86.0	86.0	86.0
	1 Yes	24	14.0	14.0	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

HANDPC hand held digital terminal

Statistics

HANDPC hand held digital terminal

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.07
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		12

HANDPC hand held digital terminal

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	159	93.0	93.0	93.0
	1 Yes	12	7.0	7.0	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

RADAR radar traffic device

Statistics

RADAR radar traffic device

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.82
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		141

RADAR radar traffic device

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	30	17.5	17.5	17.5
	1 Yes	141	82.5	82.5	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

LASERS laser traffic device

Statistics

LASERS laser traffic device

N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		.21
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		36

LASERS laser traffic device

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	133	77.8	78.7	78.7
	1 Yes	36	21.1	21.3	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

TRAILERS smart trailers traffic

Statistics

TRAILERS smart trailers traffic

N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		.26
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		45

TRAILERS smart trailers traffic

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	125	73.1	73.5	73.5
	1 Yes	45	26.3	26.5	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

VIDEOCAM in car video cameras

Statistics

VIDEOCAM in car video cameras

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.80
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		136

VIDEOCAM in car video cameras

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	35	20.5	20.5	20.5
	1 Yes	136	79.5	79.5	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

OTHTRAFF other traffic devices

Statistics

OTHTRAFF other traffic devices		
N	Valid	165
	Missing	6
Mean		.19
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		31

OTHTRAFF other traffic devices

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	134	78.4	81.2	81.2
	1 Yes	31	18.1	18.8	100.0
	Total	165	96.5	100.0	
Missing	System	6	3.5		
Total		171	100.0		

INTERNET internet access

Statistics

INTERNET internet access		
N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.98
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		168

INTERNET internet access

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	3	1.8	1.8	1.8
	1 Yes	168	98.2	98.2	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

GYM gym membership or inhouse

Statistics

GYM gym membership or inhouse

N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		.41
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		69

GYM gym membership or inhouse

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	101	59.1	59.4	59.4
	1 Yes	69	40.4	40.6	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

FITNESS conduct fitness tests regularly

Statistics

FITNESS conduct fitness tests regularly

N	Valid	167
	Missing	4
Mean		.20
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		33

FITNESS conduct fitness tests regularly

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	134	78.4	80.2	80.2
	1 Yes	33	19.3	19.8	100.0
	Total	167	97.7	100.0	
Missing	4	3	1.8		
	System	1	.6		
	Total	4	2.3		
Total		171	100.0		

EDUCREQ education requirements for new recruits

Statistics

EDUCREQ education requirements for new recruits

N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		3.70
Median		4.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		4
Sum		625

EDUCREQ education requirements for new recruits

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	3	1.8	1.8	1.8
	1 four year degree	7	4.1	4.1	5.9
	2 two year degree	6	3.5	3.6	9.5
	3 some college but no degree	6	3.5	3.6	13.0
	4 high school or ged	147	86.0	87.0	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

SWAT

Statistics

SWAT		
N	Valid	167
	Missing	4
Mean		.30
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		50

SWAT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	117	68.4	70.1	70.1
	1 Yes	50	29.2	29.9	100.0
	Total	167	97.7	100.0	
Missing	System	4	2.3		
Total		171	100.0		

SWATNUM number of swat officers

Statistics

SWATNUM number of swat officers		
N	Valid	66
	Missing	105
Mean		10.85
Median		11.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		30
Sum		716

SWATNUM number of swat officers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	12	7.0	18.2	18.2
	1	1	.6	1.5	19.7
	2	3	1.8	4.5	24.2
	3	1	.6	1.5	25.8
	4	2	1.2	3.0	28.8
	6	1	.6	1.5	30.3
	7	3	1.8	4.5	34.8
	8	3	1.8	4.5	39.4
	9	1	.6	1.5	40.9
	10	5	2.9	7.6	48.5
	11	3	1.8	4.5	53.0
	12	7	4.1	10.6	63.6
	13	1	.6	1.5	65.2
	14	4	2.3	6.1	71.2
	16	6	3.5	9.1	80.3
	17	3	1.8	4.5	84.8
	20	2	1.2	3.0	87.9
	22	1	.6	1.5	89.4
	25	3	1.8	4.5	93.9
	28	1	.6	1.5	95.5
	30	3	1.8	4.5	100.0
	Total	66	38.6	100.0	
Missing	System	105	61.4		
Total		171	100.0		

NEWHIRES number of new hires last year

Statistics

NEWHIRES number of new hires last year

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		6.09
Median		3.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		62
Sum		1042

NEWHIRES number of new hires last year

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	25	14.6	14.6	14.6
	1	23	13.5	13.5	28.1
	2	32	18.7	18.7	46.8
	3	24	14.0	14.0	60.8
	4	13	7.6	7.6	68.4
	5	6	3.5	3.5	71.9
	6	6	3.5	3.5	75.4
	7	4	2.3	2.3	77.8
	8	4	2.3	2.3	80.1
	9	1	.6	.6	80.7
	10	4	2.3	2.3	83.0
	11	5	2.9	2.9	86.0
	12	4	2.3	2.3	88.3
	14	1	.6	.6	88.9
	15	3	1.8	1.8	90.6
	16	1	.6	.6	91.2
	17	2	1.2	1.2	92.4
	19	2	1.2	1.2	93.6
	22	1	.6	.6	94.2
	23	2	1.2	1.2	95.3
	27	1	.6	.6	95.9
	29	1	.6	.6	96.5
	35	2	1.2	1.2	97.7
	40	1	.6	.6	98.2
	51	1	.6	.6	98.8
	59	1	.6	.6	99.4
	62	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

ADMINFUL admin personnel full at agency in fiscal 2003

Statistics

ADMINFUL admin personnel full at agency in fiscal 2003

N	Valid	166
	Missing	5
Mean		5.02
Median		2.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		52
Sum		833

ADMINFUL admin personnel full at agency in fiscal 2003

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	5	2.9	3.0	3.0
	1	55	32.2	33.1	36.1
	2	29	17.0	17.5	53.6
	3	13	7.6	7.8	61.4
	4	17	9.9	10.2	71.7
	5	9	5.3	5.4	77.1
	6	5	2.9	3.0	80.1
	7	8	4.7	4.8	84.9
	8	3	1.8	1.8	86.7
	9	2	1.2	1.2	88.0
	10	2	1.2	1.2	89.2
	11	1	.6	.6	89.8
	13	2	1.2	1.2	91.0
	14	1	.6	.6	91.6
	15	2	1.2	1.2	92.8
	16	1	.6	.6	93.4
	17	1	.6	.6	94.0
	19	2	1.2	1.2	95.2
	23	1	.6	.6	95.8
	25	1	.6	.6	96.4
	27	1	.6	.6	97.0
	30	1	.6	.6	97.6
	32	1	.6	.6	98.2
	35	1	.6	.6	98.8
	44	1	.6	.6	99.4
	52	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	166	97.1	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.9		
Total		171	100.0		

ADMINPAR admin part time

Statistics

ADMINPAR admin part time

N	Valid	93
	Missing	78
Mean		1.84
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		100
Sum		171

ADMINPAR admin part time

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	76	44.4	81.7	81.7
	1	7	4.1	7.5	89.2
	3	1	.6	1.1	90.3
	5	3	1.8	3.2	93.5
	7	1	.6	1.1	94.6
	8	2	1.2	2.2	96.8
	9	1	.6	1.1	97.8
	14	1	.6	1.1	98.9
	100	1	.6	1.1	100.0
	Total	93	54.4	100.0	
Missing	System	78	45.6		
Total		171	100.0		

FIELDFUL field operations full

Statistics

FIELDFUL field operations full

N	Valid	160
	Missing	11
Mean		43.42
Median		15.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		593
Sum		6947

FIELD_FT field operations full

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	2	1.2	1.3	1.3
	1	7	4.1	4.4	5.6
	2	9	5.3	5.6	11.3
	3	13	7.6	8.1	19.4
	4	4	2.3	2.5	21.9
	5	5	2.9	3.1	25.0
	6	4	2.3	2.5	27.5
	7	3	1.8	1.9	29.4
	8	6	3.5	3.8	33.1
	9	6	3.5	3.8	36.9
	10	5	2.9	3.1	40.0
	11	3	1.8	1.9	41.9
	12	3	1.8	1.9	43.8
	13	4	2.3	2.5	46.3
	14	5	2.9	3.1	49.4
	15	3	1.8	1.9	51.3
	16	2	1.2	1.3	52.5
	18	1	.6	.6	53.1
	19	1	.6	.6	53.8
	20	3	1.8	1.9	55.6
	21	3	1.8	1.9	57.5
	22	2	1.2	1.3	58.8
	23	1	.6	.6	59.4
	24	2	1.2	1.3	60.6
	25	2	1.2	1.3	61.9
	26	1	.6	.6	62.5
	27	2	1.2	1.3	63.8
	28	3	1.8	1.9	65.6
	29	2	1.2	1.3	66.9
	30	1	.6	.6	67.5
	31	1	.6	.6	68.1
	32	3	1.8	1.9	70.0
	33	4	2.3	2.5	72.5
	35	2	1.2	1.3	73.8
	36	2	1.2	1.3	75.0

	41	1	.6	.6	75.6
	44	2	1.2	1.3	76.9
	45	1	.6	.6	77.5
	48	1	.6	.6	78.1
	53	1	.6	.6	78.8
	55	2	1.2	1.3	80.0
	56	1	.6	.6	80.6
	58	2	1.2	1.3	81.9
	66	1	.6	.6	82.5
	70	1	.6	.6	83.1
	71	2	1.2	1.3	84.4
	74	1	.6	.6	85.0
	75	1	.6	.6	85.6
	78	1	.6	.6	86.3
	80	1	.6	.6	86.9
	83	1	.6	.6	87.5
	86	1	.6	.6	88.1
	87	1	.6	.6	88.8
	97	1	.6	.6	89.4
	100	1	.6	.6	90.0
	120	1	.6	.6	90.6
	123	1	.6	.6	91.3
	130	1	.6	.6	91.9
	170	1	.6	.6	92.5
	177	1	.6	.6	93.1
	179	1	.6	.6	93.8
	187	1	.6	.6	94.4
	199	1	.6	.6	95.0
	211	1	.6	.6	95.6
	246	1	.6	.6	96.3
	249	1	.6	.6	96.9
	276	1	.6	.6	97.5
	281	1	.6	.6	98.1
	292	1	.6	.6	98.8
	371	1	.6	.6	99.4
	593	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	160	93.6	100.0	
Missing	System	11	6.4		
Total		171	100.0		

FIELDPAR field part

Statistics

FIELDPAR field part		
N	Valid	101
	Missing	70
Mean		4.05
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		87
Sum		409

FIELDPAR field part

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	51	29.8	50.5	50.5
	1	19	11.1	18.8	69.3
	2	7	4.1	6.9	76.2
	3	5	2.9	5.0	81.2
	4	2	1.2	2.0	83.2
	5	3	1.8	3.0	86.1
	6	3	1.8	3.0	89.1
	7	2	1.2	2.0	91.1
	9	2	1.2	2.0	93.1
	11	1	.6	1.0	94.1
	13	1	.6	1.0	95.0
	33	1	.6	1.0	96.0
	34	1	.6	1.0	97.0
	42	1	.6	1.0	98.0
	68	1	.6	1.0	99.0
	87	1	.6	1.0	100.0
	Total	101	59.1	100.0	
Missing	System	70	40.9		
Total		171	100.0		

TECHFULL technical support full

Statistics

TECHFULL technical support full		
N	Valid	147
	Missing	24
Mean		10.97
Median		4.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		182
Sum		1613

TECHFULL technical support full

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	30	17.5	20.4	20.4
	1	22	12.9	15.0	35.4
	2	9	5.3	6.1	41.5
	3	5	2.9	3.4	44.9
	4	8	4.7	5.4	50.3
	5	7	4.1	4.8	55.1
	6	7	4.1	4.8	59.9
	7	7	4.1	4.8	64.6
	8	4	2.3	2.7	67.3
	9	5	2.9	3.4	70.7
	10	1	.6	.7	71.4
	11	5	2.9	3.4	74.8
	12	4	2.3	2.7	77.6
	13	2	1.2	1.4	78.9
	14	2	1.2	1.4	80.3
	15	1	.6	.7	81.0
	16	2	1.2	1.4	82.3
	17	1	.6	.7	83.0
	18	1	.6	.7	83.7
	19	1	.6	.7	84.4
	20	1	.6	.7	85.0
	21	2	1.2	1.4	86.4
	22	2	1.2	1.4	87.8
	23	1	.6	.7	88.4
	24	4	2.3	2.7	91.2
	25	1	.6	.7	91.8
	26	1	.6	.7	92.5
	29	2	1.2	1.4	93.9
	31	1	.6	.7	94.6
	35	1	.6	.7	95.2
	40	1	.6	.7	95.9
	48	1	.6	.7	96.6
	54	1	.6	.7	97.3
	94	1	.6	.7	98.0
	105	1	.6	.7	98.6
	132	1	.6	.7	99.3
	182	1	.6	.7	100.0
	Total	147	86.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	14.0		
Total		171	100.0		

TECHPART tech part

Statistics

TECHPART tech part		
N	Valid	98
	Missing	73
Mean		1.29
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		10
Sum		126

TECHPART tech part

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	57	33.3	58.2	58.2
	1	16	9.4	16.3	74.5
	2	9	5.3	9.2	83.7
	3	4	2.3	4.1	87.8
	4	2	1.2	2.0	89.8
	5	2	1.2	2.0	91.8
	6	3	1.8	3.1	94.9
	7	1	.6	1.0	95.9
	8	1	.6	1.0	96.9
	9	1	.6	1.0	98.0
	10	2	1.2	2.0	100.0
	Total	98	57.3	100.0	
Missing	System	73	42.7		
Total		171	100.0		

JAILFULL jail operations full time

Statistics

JAILFULL jail operations full time		
N	Valid	118
	Missing	53
Mean		8.39
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		306
Sum		990

JAILFULL jail operations full time

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	90	52.6	76.3	76.3
	1	2	1.2	1.7	78.0
	2	1	.6	.8	78.8
	4	4	2.3	3.4	82.2
	5	1	.6	.8	83.1
	6	1	.6	.8	83.9
	9	1	.6	.8	84.7
	16	2	1.2	1.7	86.4
	17	1	.6	.8	87.3
	18	1	.6	.8	88.1
	20	2	1.2	1.7	89.8
	24	1	.6	.8	90.7
	27	1	.6	.8	91.5
	33	1	.6	.8	92.4
	34	1	.6	.8	93.2
	37	2	1.2	1.7	94.9
	38	1	.6	.8	95.8
	50	1	.6	.8	96.6
	69	1	.6	.8	97.5
	89	1	.6	.8	98.3
	99	1	.6	.8	99.2
	306	1	.6	.8	100.0
	Total	118	69.0	100.0	
Missing	System	53	31.0		
Total		171	100.0		

JAILPART jail part

Statistics

JAILPART jail part		
N	Valid	83
	Missing	88
Mean		.17
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		6
Sum		14

JAILPART jail part

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	77	45.0	92.8	92.8
	1	4	2.3	4.8	97.6
	4	1	.6	1.2	98.8
	6	1	.6	1.2	100.0
	Total	83	48.5	100.0	
Missing	System	88	51.5		
Total		171	100.0		

COURTFUL court operations full time

Statistics

COURTFUL court operations full time

N	Valid	124
	Missing	47
Mean		3.31
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		76
Sum		410

COURTFUL court operations full time

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	86	50.3	69.4	69.4
	1	9	5.3	7.3	76.6
	2	4	2.3	3.2	79.8
	3	2	1.2	1.6	81.5
	4	3	1.8	2.4	83.9
	5	2	1.2	1.6	85.5
	6	3	1.8	2.4	87.9
	7	1	.6	.8	88.7
	8	1	.6	.8	89.5
	9	3	1.8	2.4	91.9
	10	2	1.2	1.6	93.5
	13	1	.6	.8	94.4
	16	1	.6	.8	95.2
	19	1	.6	.8	96.0
	20	1	.6	.8	96.8
	24	1	.6	.8	97.6
	55	1	.6	.8	98.4
	62	1	.6	.8	99.2
	76	1	.6	.8	100.0
	Total	124	72.5	100.0	
Missing	System	47	27.5		
Total		171	100.0		

COURTPAR court part

Statistics

COURTPAR court part

N	Valid	88
	Missing	83
Mean		.84
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		20
Sum		74

COURTPAR court part

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	76	44.4	86.4	86.4
	1	4	2.3	4.5	90.9
	2	1	.6	1.1	92.0
	3	1	.6	1.1	93.2
	5	1	.6	1.1	94.3
	7	2	1.2	2.3	96.6
	13	2	1.2	2.3	98.9
	20	1	.6	1.1	100.0
	Total	88	51.5	100.0	
Missing	System	83	48.5		
Total		171	100.0		

ACCREDIT accredited with national agency

Statistics

ACCREDIT accredited with national agency

N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		.13
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		22

ACCREDIT accredited with national agency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	148	86.5	87.1	87.1
	1 Yes	22	12.9	12.9	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

ACCRSEEK seeking accreditation with national agency

Statistics

ACCRSEEK seeking accreditation with national agency

N	Valid	147
	Missing	24
Mean		.24
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		36

ACCRSEEK seeking accreditation with national agency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	111	64.9	75.5	75.5
	1 Yes	36	21.1	24.5	100.0
	Total	147	86.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	14.0		
Total		171	100.0		

INTERTRA internal training required

Statistics

INTERTRA internal training required

N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		.69
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		117

INTERTRA internal training required

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	52	30.4	30.8	30.8
	1 Yes	117	68.4	69.2	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

CLASSHRS classroom hours required beyond academy

Statistics

CLASSHRS classroom hours required beyond academy

N	Valid	105
	Missing	66
Mean		48.13
Median		40.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		440
Sum		5054

CLASSHRS classroom hours required beyond academy

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	23	13.5	21.9	21.9
	2	1	.6	1.0	22.9
	4	3	1.8	2.9	25.7
	6	1	.6	1.0	26.7
	8	5	2.9	4.8	31.4
	12	3	1.8	2.9	34.3
	15	2	1.2	1.9	36.2
	16	2	1.2	1.9	38.1
	20	4	2.3	3.8	41.9
	24	3	1.8	2.9	44.8
	25	2	1.2	1.9	46.7
	28	1	.6	1.0	47.6
	34	1	.6	1.0	48.6
	36	1	.6	1.0	49.5
	40	28	16.4	26.7	76.2
	60	4	2.3	3.8	80.0
	80	10	5.8	9.5	89.5
	120	3	1.8	2.9	92.4
	156	1	.6	1.0	93.3
	160	2	1.2	1.9	95.2
	200	1	.6	1.0	96.2
	280	1	.6	1.0	97.1
	320	1	.6	1.0	98.1
	360	1	.6	1.0	99.0
	440	1	.6	1.0	100.0
	Total	105	61.4	100.0	
Missing	System	66	38.6		
Total		171	100.0		

FTOHOURS supervised hours required beyond academy

Statistics

FTOHOURS supervised hours required beyond academy

N	Valid	119
	Missing	52
Mean		226.09
Median		200.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		960
Sum		26905

FTOHOURS supervised hours required beyond academy

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	6	3.5	5.0	5.0
	1	1	.6	.8	5.9
	4	1	.6	.8	6.7
	8	1	.6	.8	7.6
	10	1	.6	.8	8.4
	12	1	.6	.8	9.2
	16	1	.6	.8	10.1
	24	1	.6	.8	10.9
	25	1	.6	.8	11.8
	36	1	.6	.8	12.6
	40	12	7.0	10.1	22.7
	60	2	1.2	1.7	24.4
	70	1	.6	.8	25.2
	80	12	7.0	10.1	35.3
	86	1	.6	.8	36.1
	100	1	.6	.8	37.0
	120	6	3.5	5.0	42.0
	160	4	2.3	3.4	45.4
	168	2	1.2	1.7	47.1
	180	2	1.2	1.7	48.7
	200	2	1.2	1.7	50.4
	216	1	.6	.8	51.3
	240	7	4.1	5.9	57.1
	252	2	1.2	1.7	58.8
	280	2	1.2	1.7	60.5
	300	1	.6	.8	61.3
	301	1	.6	.8	62.2
	308	1	.6	.8	63.0
	318	1	.6	.8	63.9
	320	15	8.8	12.6	76.5
	336	4	2.3	3.4	79.8
	360	3	1.8	2.5	82.4
	383	1	.6	.8	83.2
	400	4	2.3	3.4	86.6
	420	1	.6	.8	87.4
	432	1	.6	.8	88.2
	450	1	.6	.8	89.1
	480	3	1.8	2.5	91.6
	492	1	.6	.8	92.4
	513	1	.6	.8	93.3
	560	3	1.8	2.5	95.8
	564	1	.6	.8	96.6
	640	1	.6	.8	97.5
	672	1	.6	.8	98.3
	840	1	.6	.8	99.2
	960	1	.6	.8	100.0
	Total	119	69.6	100.0	
Missing	System	52	30.4		
Total		171	100.0		

IN_SERVE Total Inservice Training Hours

Statistics

IN_SERVE Total Inservice Training Hours		
N	Valid	104
	Missing	67
Mean		279.32
Median		242.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1000
Sum		29049

IN_SERVE Total Inservice Training Hours

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	5	2.9	4.8	4.8
	9	1	.6	1.0	5.8
	16	1	.6	1.0	6.7
	24	2	1.2	1.9	8.7
	35	1	.6	1.0	9.6
	36	1	.6	1.0	10.6
	38	1	.6	1.0	11.5
	40	3	1.8	2.9	14.4
	48	1	.6	1.0	15.4
	52	1	.6	1.0	16.3
	55	1	.6	1.0	17.3
	65	1	.6	1.0	18.3
	76	1	.6	1.0	19.2
	80	9	5.3	8.7	27.9
	90	1	.6	1.0	28.8
	100	1	.6	1.0	29.8
	104	1	.6	1.0	30.8
	110	1	.6	1.0	31.7
	120	3	1.8	2.9	34.6
	128	1	.6	1.0	35.6
	132	1	.6	1.0	36.5
	160	4	2.3	3.8	40.4
	180	1	.6	1.0	41.3
	185	1	.6	1.0	42.3
	188	1	.6	1.0	43.3
	200	2	1.2	1.9	45.2
	228	1	.6	1.0	46.2
	240	4	2.3	3.8	50.0
	244	1	.6	1.0	51.0
	256	1	.6	1.0	51.9
	272	1	.6	1.0	52.9
	276	1	.6	1.0	53.8
	280	3	1.8	2.9	56.7
	300	1	.6	1.0	57.7
	308	1	.6	1.0	58.7
	318	1	.6	1.0	59.6
	320	3	1.8	2.9	62.5
	324	1	.6	1.0	63.5
	326	1	.6	1.0	64.4
	328	1	.6	1.0	65.4
	335	1	.6	1.0	66.3
	336	2	1.2	1.9	68.3
	340	2	1.2	1.9	70.2
	360	3	1.8	2.9	73.1
	376	1	.6	1.0	74.0
	400	1	.6	1.0	75.0
	423	1	.6	1.0	76.0
	428	1	.6	1.0	76.9
	440	3	1.8	2.9	79.8
	472	1	.6	1.0	80.8
	480	2	1.2	1.9	82.7
	516	1	.6	1.0	83.7
	520	2	1.2	1.9	85.6
	553	1	.6	1.0	86.5
	556	1	.6	1.0	87.5
	560	1	.6	1.0	88.5
	600	4	2.3	3.8	92.3
	661	1	.6	1.0	93.3
	712	1	.6	1.0	94.2
	724	1	.6	1.0	95.2
	730	1	.6	1.0	96.2
	760	1	.6	1.0	97.1
	856	1	.6	1.0	98.1
	960	1	.6	1.0	99.0
	1000	1	.6	1.0	100.0
	Total	104	60.8	100.0	
Missing	System	67	39.2		
Total		171	100.0		

OFFICQUI officers that left or retired agency

Statistics

OFFICQUI officers that left or retired agency		
N	Valid	166
	Missing	5
Mean		5.56
Median		3.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		80
Sum		923

OFFICQUI officers that left or retired agency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	26	15.2	15.7	15.7
	1	34	19.9	20.5	36.1
	2	21	12.3	12.7	48.8
	3	19	11.1	11.4	60.2
	4	11	6.4	6.6	66.9
	5	10	5.8	6.0	72.9
	6	7	4.1	4.2	77.1
	7	2	1.2	1.2	78.3
	8	5	2.9	3.0	81.3
	9	2	1.2	1.2	82.5
	10	4	2.3	2.4	84.9
	11	4	2.3	2.4	87.3
	12	2	1.2	1.2	88.6
	13	3	1.8	1.8	90.4
	14	3	1.8	1.8	92.2
	15	1	.6	.6	92.8
	16	1	.6	.6	93.4
	18	1	.6	.6	94.0
	20	2	1.2	1.2	95.2
	21	1	.6	.6	95.8
	22	1	.6	.6	96.4
	25	2	1.2	1.2	97.6
	35	1	.6	.6	98.2
	39	1	.6	.6	98.8
	57	1	.6	.6	99.4
	80	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	166	97.1	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.9		
Total		171	100.0		

OFFOTHLE officers left for other le agency

Statistics

OFFOTHLE officers left for other le agency

N	Valid	159
	Missing	12
Mean		2.37
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		31
Sum		377

OFFOTHLE officers left for other le agency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	44	25.7	27.7	27.7
	1	39	22.8	24.5	52.2
	2	26	15.2	16.4	68.6
	3	15	8.8	9.4	78.0
	4	11	6.4	6.9	84.9
	5	4	2.3	2.5	87.4
	6	9	5.3	5.7	93.1
	7	2	1.2	1.3	94.3
	8	5	2.9	3.1	97.5
	11	1	.6	.6	98.1
	13	1	.6	.6	98.7
	14	1	.6	.6	99.4
	31	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	159	93.0	100.0	
Missing	System	12	7.0		
Total		171	100.0		

OFFSALAR percentage went to other le for higher salary

Statistics

OFFSALAR percentage went to other le for higher salary

N	Valid	130
	Missing	41
Mean		45.92
Median		50.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		100
Sum		5970

OFFSALAR percentage went to other le for higher salary

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	46	26.9	35.4	35.4
	1	4	2.3	3.1	38.5
	2	2	1.2	1.5	40.0
	10	1	.6	.8	40.8
	20	2	1.2	1.5	42.3
	25	2	1.2	1.5	43.8
	33	4	2.3	3.1	46.9
	40	1	.6	.8	47.7
	43	1	.6	.8	48.5
	50	14	8.2	10.8	59.2
	60	1	.6	.8	60.0
	66	2	1.2	1.5	61.5
	70	1	.6	.8	62.3
	75	3	1.8	2.3	64.6
	80	3	1.8	2.3	66.9
	90	6	3.5	4.6	71.5
	92	1	.6	.8	72.3
	95	1	.6	.8	73.1
	99	7	4.1	5.4	78.5
	100	28	16.4	21.5	100.0
	Total	130	76.0	100.0	
Missing	System	41	24.0		
Total		171	100.0		

OFFRETIR officers who retired

Statistics

OFFRETIR officers who retired		
N	Valid	154
	Missing	17
Mean		1.31
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		38
Sum		201

OFFRETIR officers who retired

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	93	54.4	60.4	60.4
	1	39	22.8	25.3	85.7
	2	7	4.1	4.5	90.3
	3	3	1.8	1.9	92.2
	4	4	2.3	2.6	94.8
	6	1	.6	.6	95.5
	7	2	1.2	1.3	96.8
	10	1	.6	.6	97.4
	16	1	.6	.6	98.1
	19	1	.6	.6	98.7
	20	1	.6	.6	99.4
	38	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	154	90.1	100.0	
Missing	System	17	9.9		
Total		171	100.0		

HEALTHIN provide health insurance to retired officers

Statistics

HEALTHIN provide health insurance to retired officers

N	Valid	165
	Missing	6
Mean		333.87
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		55000
Sum		55088

HEALTHIN provide health insurance to retired officers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	76	44.4	46.1	46.1
	1 Yes	88	51.5	53.3	99.4
	55000	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	165	96.5	100.0	
Missing	System	6	3.5		
Total		171	100.0		

HLTHINSY health insurance function of years worked

Statistics

HLTHINSY health insurance function of years worked

N	Valid	100
	Missing	71
Mean		650.64
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		39000
Sum		65064

HLTHINSY health insurance function of years worked

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	34	19.9	34.0	34.0
	1 Yes	64	37.4	64.0	98.0
	26000	1	.6	1.0	99.0
	39000	1	.6	1.0	100.0
	Total	100	58.5	100.0	
Missing	System	71	41.5		
Total		171	100.0		

MAXCHIEF chief or sheriff max annual base salary

Statistics

MAXCHIEF chief or sheriff max annual base salary

N	Valid	134
	Missing	37
Mean		59328.44
Median		55703.00
Minimum		20800
Maximum		123200
Sum		7950011

MAXCHIEF chief or sheriff max annual base salary

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	20800	1	.6	.7	.7
	22000	1	.6	.7	1.5
	23000	1	.6	.7	2.2
	26000	2	1.2	1.5	3.7
	27000	1	.6	.7	4.5
	31000	1	.6	.7	5.2
	31200	1	.6	.7	6.0
	32000	6	3.5	4.5	10.4
	32100	1	.6	.7	11.2
	34000	4	2.3	3.0	14.2
	35000	3	1.8	2.2	16.4
	35500	1	.6	.7	17.2
	37000	1	.6	.7	17.9
	37590	1	.6	.7	18.7
	39000	1	.6	.7	19.4
	40000	9	5.3	6.7	26.1
	41000	1	.6	.7	26.9
	41812	1	.6	.7	27.6
	42000	2	1.2	1.5	29.1
	42500	1	.6	.7	29.9
	43500	1	.6	.7	30.6
	45000	5	2.9	3.7	34.3
	46000	1	.6	.7	35.1
	48000	2	1.2	1.5	36.6
	48640	1	.6	.7	37.3
	48804	2	1.2	1.5	38.8
	49000	1	.6	.7	39.6
	50000	4	2.3	3.0	42.5
	50406	1	.6	.7	43.3
	50690	1	.6	.7	44.0
	50972	1	.6	.7	44.8
	52000	1	.6	.7	45.5
	53000	1	.6	.7	46.3
	54038	1	.6	.7	47.0
	54277	1	.6	.7	47.8
	54974	1	.6	.7	48.5

55000	1	.6	.7	49.3
55406	1	.6	.7	50.0
56000	1	.6	.7	50.7
58000	1	.6	.7	51.5
59386	3	1.8	2.2	53.7
59400	1	.6	.7	54.5
59614	1	.6	.7	55.2
60000	2	1.2	1.5	56.7
60234	1	.6	.7	57.5
60354	1	.6	.7	58.2
60761	1	.6	.7	59.0
61750	1	.6	.7	59.7
62923	1	.6	.7	60.4
64000	1	.6	.7	61.2
65000	2	1.2	1.5	62.7
65464	1	.6	.7	63.4
65551	1	.6	.7	64.2
67458	1	.6	.7	64.9
68000	1	.6	.7	65.7
69086	1	.6	.7	66.4
71187	1	.6	.7	67.2
71553	1	.6	.7	67.9
72000	2	1.2	1.5	69.4
72254	1	.6	.7	70.1
72966	1	.6	.7	70.9
73112	1	.6	.7	71.6
73881	1	.6	.7	72.4
74525	1	.6	.7	73.1
75000	2	1.2	1.5	74.6
76246	1	.6	.7	75.4
76415	1	.6	.7	76.1
76484	1	.6	.7	76.9
77500	1	.6	.7	77.6
78291	1	.6	.7	78.4
78500	1	.6	.7	79.1
79500	1	.6	.7	79.9
80000	2	1.2	1.5	81.3
80257	1	.6	.7	82.1
82265	1	.6	.7	82.8
83034	1	.6	.7	83.6
83574	1	.6	.7	84.3
83783	1	.6	.7	85.1
85000	1	.6	.7	85.8
86504	1	.6	.7	86.6
87000	1	.6	.7	87.3
87084	1	.6	.7	88.1
87915	2	1.2	1.5	89.6
88129	1	.6	.7	90.3
89261	1	.6	.7	91.0
90000	1	.6	.7	91.8
92513	1	.6	.7	92.5
94589	1	.6	.7	93.3
98928	1	.6	.7	94.0
101744	1	.6	.7	94.8
101878	1	.6	.7	95.5
103547	1	.6	.7	96.3

	104000	1	.6	.7	97.0
	104604	1	.6	.7	97.8
	106490	1	.6	.7	98.5
	116617	1	.6	.7	99.3
	123200	1	.6	.7	100.0
	Total	134	78.4	100.0	
Missing	System	37	21.6		
Total		171	100.0		

MINCHIEF

Statistics

MINCHIEF

N	Valid	128
	Missing	43
Mean		42280.62
Median		40000.00
Minimum		21000
Maximum		78587
Sum		5411919

MINCHIEF

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	21000	1	.6	.8	.8
	25000	4	2.3	3.1	3.9
	26000	2	1.2	1.6	5.5
	26378	1	.6	.8	6.3
	27000	3	1.8	2.3	8.6
	28000	5	2.9	3.9	12.5
	28534	1	.6	.8	13.3
	29000	3	1.8	2.3	15.6
	29500	1	.6	.8	16.4
	30000	6	3.5	4.7	21.1
	30888	1	.6	.8	21.9
	31000	1	.6	.8	22.7
	31231	1	.6	.8	23.4
	31440	1	.6	.8	24.2
	31471	1	.6	.8	25.0
	32000	4	2.3	3.1	28.1
	32089	1	.6	.8	28.9
	32099	1	.6	.8	29.7
	32500	1	.6	.8	30.5
	33000	1	.6	.8	31.3
	33275	1	.6	.8	32.0
	33981	1	.6	.8	32.8
	34000	1	.6	.8	33.6
	34313	1	.6	.8	34.4
	34743	1	.6	.8	35.2

35000	7	4.1	5.5	40.6
35568	1	.6	.8	41.4
36000	2	1.2	1.6	43.0
36004	1	.6	.8	43.8
36207	1	.6	.8	44.5
37000	1	.6	.8	45.3
38000	1	.6	.8	46.1
38478	1	.6	.8	46.9
39000	1	.6	.8	47.7
39055	1	.6	.8	48.4
40000	4	2.3	3.1	51.6
40508	1	.6	.8	52.3
40630	1	.6	.8	53.1
42000	1	.6	.8	53.9
42400	1	.6	.8	54.7
42413	1	.6	.8	55.5
43024	1	.6	.8	56.3
43800	1	.6	.8	57.0
44400	1	.6	.8	57.8
44500	1	.6	.8	58.6
44945	1	.6	.8	59.4
44972	1	.6	.8	60.2
45000	1	.6	.8	60.9
45115	1	.6	.8	61.7
46172	1	.6	.8	62.5
46654	1	.6	.8	63.3
46822	1	.6	.8	64.1
47000	1	.6	.8	64.8
47376	1	.6	.8	65.6
47519	1	.6	.8	66.4
47694	1	.6	.8	67.2
47700	1	.6	.8	68.0
47702	1	.6	.8	68.8
47759	1	.6	.8	69.5
48000	1	.6	.8	70.3
50000	3	1.8	2.3	72.7
50830	1	.6	.8	73.4
51148	1	.6	.8	74.2
51769	1	.6	.8	75.0
51941	1	.6	.8	75.8
52000	1	.6	.8	76.6
52100	1	.6	.8	77.3
52125	1	.6	.8	78.1
52208	1	.6	.8	78.9
52229	1	.6	.8	79.7
53000	1	.6	.8	80.5
53227	1	.6	.8	81.3
53423	1	.6	.8	82.0
55000	1	.6	.8	82.8
55236	1	.6	.8	83.6
55723	1	.6	.8	84.4
56820	1	.6	.8	85.2
57326	1	.6	.8	85.9
57669	1	.6	.8	86.7
59519	1	.6	.8	87.5
60000	3	1.8	2.3	89.8

	60354	1	.6	.8	90.6
	61599	1	.6	.8	91.4
	62587	1	.6	.8	92.2
	63446	1	.6	.8	93.0
	63758	1	.6	.8	93.8
	65000	1	.6	.8	94.5
	65728	1	.6	.8	95.3
	67442	1	.6	.8	96.1
	67563	1	.6	.8	96.9
	69032	1	.6	.8	97.7
	70993	1	.6	.8	98.4
	72678	1	.6	.8	99.2
	78587	1	.6	.8	100.0
	Total	128	74.9	100.0	
Missing	System	43	25.1		
Total		171	100.0		

MAXASST assistant chief or chief deputy

Statistics

MAXASST assistant chief or chief deputy

N	Valid	72
	Missing	99
Mean		51289.39
Median		49406.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		90680
Sum		3692836

MAXASST assistant chief or chief deputy

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	5	2.9	6.9	6.9
	23000	1	.6	1.4	8.3
	25000	1	.6	1.4	9.7
	26000	1	.6	1.4	11.1
	27000	1	.6	1.4	12.5
	28000	1	.6	1.4	13.9
	30000	1	.6	1.4	15.3
	32000	1	.6	1.4	16.7
	32100	1	.6	1.4	18.1
	33157	1	.6	1.4	19.4
	34000	1	.6	1.4	20.8
	35000	1	.6	1.4	22.2
	36000	1	.6	1.4	23.6
	37000	2	1.2	2.8	26.4
	38000	1	.6	1.4	27.8
	40000	2	1.2	2.8	30.6

	40200	1	.6	1.4	31.9
	41140	1	.6	1.4	33.3
	42000	1	.6	1.4	34.7
	43113	1	.6	1.4	36.1
	45006	1	.6	1.4	37.5
	45983	1	.6	1.4	38.9
	46668	1	.6	1.4	40.3
	47243	1	.6	1.4	41.7
	48000	2	1.2	2.8	44.4
	48804	4	2.3	5.6	50.0
	50008	1	.6	1.4	51.4
	55244	1	.6	1.4	52.8
	55571	1	.6	1.4	54.2
	56309	1	.6	1.4	55.6
	56624	1	.6	1.4	56.9
	58509	1	.6	1.4	58.3
	59401	1	.6	1.4	59.7
	60000	2	1.2	2.8	62.5
	60036	1	.6	1.4	63.9
	61645	1	.6	1.4	65.3
	63419	1	.6	1.4	66.7
	63752	1	.6	1.4	68.1
	65000	2	1.2	2.8	70.8
	65062	1	.6	1.4	72.2
	66010	1	.6	1.4	73.6
	67550	1	.6	1.4	75.0
	69475	1	.6	1.4	76.4
	70114	1	.6	1.4	77.8
	71221	1	.6	1.4	79.2
	71254	1	.6	1.4	80.6
	72254	3	1.8	4.2	84.7
	72528	1	.6	1.4	86.1
	73509	1	.6	1.4	87.5
	74848	1	.6	1.4	88.9
	78000	1	.6	1.4	90.3
	81110	1	.6	1.4	91.7
	86400	1	.6	1.4	93.1
	86985	1	.6	1.4	94.4
	87915	2	1.2	2.8	97.2
	89154	1	.6	1.4	98.6
	90680	1	.6	1.4	100.0
	Total	72	42.1	100.0	
Missing	System	99	57.9		
Total		171	100.0		

MINASST

Statistics

MINASST

N	Valid	70
	Missing	101
Mean		35338.24
Median		36435.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		63681
Sum		2473677

MINASST

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	6	3.5	8.6	8.6
	21000	1	.6	1.4	10.0
	22000	1	.6	1.4	11.4
	23000	1	.6	1.4	12.9
	25000	2	1.2	2.9	15.7
	26000	1	.6	1.4	17.1
	26378	3	1.8	4.3	21.4
	27051	1	.6	1.4	22.9
	27437	1	.6	1.4	24.3
	28000	4	2.3	5.7	30.0
	28500	1	.6	1.4	31.4
	29000	2	1.2	2.9	34.3
	29508	1	.6	1.4	35.7
	30000	1	.6	1.4	37.1
	30004	1	.6	1.4	38.6
	30795	1	.6	1.4	40.0
	31625	1	.6	1.4	41.4
	33000	2	1.2	2.9	44.3
	33335	1	.6	1.4	45.7
	33500	1	.6	1.4	47.1
	34569	1	.6	1.4	48.6
	36176	1	.6	1.4	50.0
	36694	1	.6	1.4	51.4
	38000	1	.6	1.4	52.9
	39053	1	.6	1.4	54.3
	39055	2	1.2	2.9	57.1
	39520	1	.6	1.4	58.6
	39531	1	.6	1.4	60.0
	40000	1	.6	1.4	61.4
	40025	1	.6	1.4	62.9
	40588	1	.6	1.4	64.3
	40638	1	.6	1.4	65.7
	41097	1	.6	1.4	67.1
	41256	1	.6	1.4	68.6
	43368	1	.6	1.4	70.0
	44136	1	.6	1.4	71.4
	45000	1	.6	1.4	72.9
	45531	1	.6	1.4	74.3

	46317	1	.6	1.4	75.7
	46556	1	.6	1.4	77.1
	48023	1	.6	1.4	78.6
	48250	1	.6	1.4	80.0
	49898	1	.6	1.4	81.4
	50000	1	.6	1.4	82.9
	50872	1	.6	1.4	84.3
	51000	1	.6	1.4	85.7
	51809	1	.6	1.4	87.1
	52000	1	.6	1.4	88.6
	52655	1	.6	1.4	90.0
	54000	1	.6	1.4	91.4
	54827	1	.6	1.4	92.9
	55000	1	.6	1.4	94.3
	55565	1	.6	1.4	95.7
	57491	1	.6	1.4	97.1
	63552	1	.6	1.4	98.6
	63681	1	.6	1.4	100.0
	Total	70	40.9	100.0	
Missing	System	101	59.1		
Total		171	100.0		

MAXMAJOR

Statistics

MAXMAJOR		
N	Valid	45
	Missing	126
Mean		50117.44
Median		58509.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		94575
Sum		2255285

MAXMAJOR

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	8	4.7	17.8	17.8
	28500	1	.6	2.2	20.0
	29100	1	.6	2.2	22.2
	33000	2	1.2	4.4	26.7
	35000	1	.6	2.2	28.9
	40000	1	.6	2.2	31.1
	43113	1	.6	2.2	33.3
	45000	1	.6	2.2	35.6
	45025	1	.6	2.2	37.8
	47500	1	.6	2.2	40.0
	55000	2	1.2	4.4	44.4
	56136	1	.6	2.2	46.7
	57896	1	.6	2.2	48.9
	58509	1	.6	2.2	51.1
	61241	1	.6	2.2	53.3
	61259	1	.6	2.2	55.6
	61963	1	.6	2.2	57.8
	63418	1	.6	2.2	60.0
	64441	1	.6	2.2	62.2
	65000	1	.6	2.2	64.4
	66010	1	.6	2.2	66.7
	66167	1	.6	2.2	68.9
	66828	1	.6	2.2	71.1
	69000	1	.6	2.2	73.3
	72254	2	1.2	4.4	77.8
	72528	1	.6	2.2	80.0
	73236	1	.6	2.2	82.2
	73569	1	.6	2.2	84.4
	74848	1	.6	2.2	86.7
	77834	1	.6	2.2	88.9
	81600	1	.6	2.2	91.1
	83783	2	1.2	4.4	95.6
	87915	1	.6	2.2	97.8
	94575	1	.6	2.2	100.0
	Total	45	26.3	100.0	
Missing	System	126	73.7		
Total		171	100.0		

MINMAJOR

Statistics

MINMAJOR		
N	Valid	46
	Missing	125
Mean		33640.46
Median		39527.50
Minimum		0
Maximum		60371
Sum		1547461

MINMAJOR

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	9	5.3	19.6	19.6
	21395	1	.6	2.2	21.7
	27500	1	.6	2.2	23.9
	28000	1	.6	2.2	26.1
	29000	1	.6	2.2	28.3
	30000	2	1.2	4.3	32.6
	30795	1	.6	2.2	34.8
	31625	1	.6	2.2	37.0
	34000	1	.6	2.2	39.1
	37178	1	.6	2.2	41.3
	37521	1	.6	2.2	43.5
	38972	1	.6	2.2	45.7
	39000	1	.6	2.2	47.8
	39055	1	.6	2.2	50.0
	40000	1	.6	2.2	52.2
	40588	1	.6	2.2	54.3
	40839	1	.6	2.2	56.5
	41256	1	.6	2.2	58.7
	41309	1	.6	2.2	60.9
	41804	1	.6	2.2	63.0
	42324	1	.6	2.2	65.2
	42701	1	.6	2.2	67.4
	44111	1	.6	2.2	69.6
	45000	1	.6	2.2	71.7
	45298	1	.6	2.2	73.9
	46000	1	.6	2.2	76.1
	48401	1	.6	2.2	78.3
	49898	1	.6	2.2	80.4
	50000	1	.6	2.2	82.6
	50626	1	.6	2.2	84.8
	51000	1	.6	2.2	87.0
	51809	1	.6	2.2	89.1
	53423	2	1.2	4.3	93.5
	55596	1	.6	2.2	95.7
	57643	1	.6	2.2	97.8
	60371	1	.6	2.2	100.0
	Total	46	26.9	100.0	
Missing	System	125	73.1		
Total		171	100.0		

MAXCAP

Statistics

MAXCAP		
N	Valid	83
	Missing	88
Mean		50272.30
Median		50208.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		77392
Sum		4172601

MAXCAP

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	3	1.8	3.6	3.6
	21000	1	.6	1.2	4.8
	27500	1	.6	1.2	6.0
	28000	1	.6	1.2	7.2
	29100	1	.6	1.2	8.4
	30000	1	.6	1.2	9.6
	32000	1	.6	1.2	10.8
	33000	1	.6	1.2	12.0
	34840	1	.6	1.2	13.3
	35000	3	1.8	3.6	16.9
	37171	1	.6	1.2	18.1
	38000	2	1.2	2.4	20.5
	40000	1	.6	1.2	21.7
	40108	1	.6	1.2	22.9
	40852	1	.6	1.2	24.1
	41968	1	.6	1.2	25.3
	42000	1	.6	1.2	26.5
	42337	1	.6	1.2	27.7
	42430	1	.6	1.2	28.9
	43000	1	.6	1.2	30.1
	43876	1	.6	1.2	31.3
	43976	1	.6	1.2	32.5
	44063	1	.6	1.2	33.7
	44203	1	.6	1.2	34.9
	45000	1	.6	1.2	36.1
	46868	1	.6	1.2	37.3
	48007	1	.6	1.2	38.6
	48083	1	.6	1.2	39.8
	48804	4	2.3	4.8	44.6
	49617	1	.6	1.2	45.8
	50000	3	1.8	3.6	49.4
	50208	1	.6	1.2	50.6
	51083	1	.6	1.2	51.8
	53082	1	.6	1.2	53.0
	55229	1	.6	1.2	54.2

	55244	1	.6	1.2	55.4
	55390	1	.6	1.2	56.6
	55571	1	.6	1.2	57.8
	55786	1	.6	1.2	59.0
	56192	1	.6	1.2	60.2
	56779	1	.6	1.2	61.4
	57188	1	.6	1.2	62.7
	57234	1	.6	1.2	63.9
	57367	1	.6	1.2	65.1
	57653	1	.6	1.2	66.3
	57897	1	.6	1.2	67.5
	59873	1	.6	1.2	68.7
	60015	1	.6	1.2	69.9
	60758	1	.6	1.2	71.1
	61000	1	.6	1.2	72.3
	61378	1	.6	1.2	73.5
	61500	1	.6	1.2	74.7
	61579	1	.6	1.2	75.9
	62185	1	.6	1.2	77.1
	62549	1	.6	1.2	78.3
	63044	1	.6	1.2	79.5
	63523	1	.6	1.2	80.7
	64165	1	.6	1.2	81.9
	64299	1	.6	1.2	83.1
	65495	1	.6	1.2	84.3
	65624	1	.6	1.2	85.5
	65961	1	.6	1.2	86.7
	67163	1	.6	1.2	88.0
	67891	1	.6	1.2	89.2
	71400	1	.6	1.2	90.4
	72000	1	.6	1.2	91.6
	72254	4	2.3	4.8	96.4
	73572	1	.6	1.2	97.6
	74101	1	.6	1.2	98.8
	77392	1	.6	1.2	100.0
	Total	83	48.5	100.0	
Missing	System	88	51.5		
Total		171	100.0		

MINCAPT

Statistics

MINCAPT		
N	Valid	81
	Missing	90
Mean		34574.07
Median		37111.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		66543
Sum		2800500

MINCAPT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	4	2.3	4.9	4.9
	20000	1	.6	1.2	6.2
	21395	1	.6	1.2	7.4
	21679	1	.6	1.2	8.6
	24000	1	.6	1.2	9.9
	25000	1	.6	1.2	11.1
	25989	1	.6	1.2	12.3
	26278	1	.6	1.2	13.6
	26378	1	.6	1.2	14.8
	26500	1	.6	1.2	16.0
	27000	1	.6	1.2	17.3
	27437	1	.6	1.2	18.5
	27500	1	.6	1.2	19.8
	27950	1	.6	1.2	21.0
	28000	2	1.2	2.5	23.5
	28367	1	.6	1.2	24.7
	29000	1	.6	1.2	25.9
	29976	1	.6	1.2	27.2
	30000	1	.6	1.2	28.4
	31340	1	.6	1.2	29.6
	31380	1	.6	1.2	30.9
	31411	1	.6	1.2	32.1
	31652	1	.6	1.2	33.3
	31833	1	.6	1.2	34.6
	32000	1	.6	1.2	35.8
	32575	1	.6	1.2	37.0
	33476	1	.6	1.2	38.3
	33531	1	.6	1.2	39.5
	34291	1	.6	1.2	40.7
	34740	1	.6	1.2	42.0
	34979	1	.6	1.2	43.2
	35358	1	.6	1.2	44.4
	36500	1	.6	1.2	45.7
	36552	1	.6	1.2	46.9
	36694	1	.6	1.2	48.1
	36911	1	.6	1.2	49.4

	37111	1	.6	1.2	50.6
	37141	1	.6	1.2	51.9
	37211	1	.6	1.2	53.1
	37421	1	.6	1.2	54.3
	37463	1	.6	1.2	55.6
	37852	1	.6	1.2	56.8
	37918	1	.6	1.2	58.0
	38000	1	.6	1.2	59.3
	38126	1	.6	1.2	60.5
	38207	1	.6	1.2	61.7
	38435	1	.6	1.2	63.0
	38938	1	.6	1.2	64.2
	39055	1	.6	1.2	65.4
	39520	1	.6	1.2	66.7
	39562	1	.6	1.2	67.9
	40000	3	1.8	3.7	71.6
	40010	1	.6	1.2	72.8
	40516	1	.6	1.2	74.1
	41000	2	1.2	2.5	76.5
	41050	1	.6	1.2	77.8
	41355	1	.6	1.2	79.0
	43000	1	.6	1.2	80.2
	43274	1	.6	1.2	81.5
	43985	1	.6	1.2	82.7
	44408	1	.6	1.2	84.0
	44418	1	.6	1.2	85.2
	44634	1	.6	1.2	86.4
	44681	1	.6	1.2	87.7
	45000	1	.6	1.2	88.9
	45032	1	.6	1.2	90.1
	45386	1	.6	1.2	91.4
	45665	2	1.2	2.5	93.8
	45832	1	.6	1.2	95.1
	45928	1	.6	1.2	96.3
	47184	1	.6	1.2	97.5
	47302	1	.6	1.2	98.8
	66543	1	.6	1.2	100.0
	Total	81	47.4	100.0	
Missing	System	90	52.6		
Total		171	100.0		

MAXLIEUT

Statistics

MAXLIEUT

N	Valid	108
	Missing	63
Mean		42710.10
Median		45000.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		66656
Sum		4612691

MAXLIEUT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	3	1.8	2.8	2.8
	21000	1	.6	.9	3.7
	24500	1	.6	.9	4.6
	25500	2	1.2	1.9	6.5
	26000	2	1.2	1.9	8.3
	26300	1	.6	.9	9.3
	26500	1	.6	.9	10.2
	27000	1	.6	.9	11.1
	28000	2	1.2	1.9	13.0
	28500	1	.6	.9	13.9
	29000	2	1.2	1.9	15.7
	29100	1	.6	.9	16.7
	29500	2	1.2	1.9	18.5
	30000	1	.6	.9	19.4
	30100	1	.6	.9	20.4
	30140	1	.6	.9	21.3
	31000	1	.6	.9	22.2
	32000	1	.6	.9	23.1
	32182	1	.6	.9	24.1
	33000	2	1.2	1.9	25.9
	34000	1	.6	.9	26.9
	35000	2	1.2	1.9	28.7
	35741	1	.6	.9	29.6
	36000	1	.6	.9	30.6
	36229	1	.6	.9	31.5
	37062	1	.6	.9	32.4
	37139	1	.6	.9	33.3
	38000	1	.6	.9	34.3
	38917	1	.6	.9	35.2
	39000	2	1.2	1.9	37.0
	39935	1	.6	.9	38.0
	40000	1	.6	.9	38.9
	40108	2	1.2	1.9	40.7
	40658	1	.6	.9	41.7
	41063	1	.6	.9	42.6
	42000	1	.6	.9	43.5

	42078	1	.6	.9	44.4
	42139	1	.6	.9	45.4
	42160	1	.6	.9	46.3
	42469	1	.6	.9	47.2
	43296	1	.6	.9	48.1
	44711	1	.6	.9	49.1
	45000	2	1.2	1.9	50.9
	45074	1	.6	.9	51.9
	45100	1	.6	.9	52.8
	45644	1	.6	.9	53.7
	46749	1	.6	.9	54.6
	46854	1	.6	.9	55.6
	47458	1	.6	.9	56.5
	48083	1	.6	.9	57.4
	48360	1	.6	.9	58.3
	48800	1	.6	.9	59.3
	48804	5	2.9	4.6	63.9
	49000	1	.6	.9	64.8
	49629	1	.6	.9	65.7
	49868	1	.6	.9	66.7
	50000	1	.6	.9	67.6
	50208	1	.6	.9	68.5
	50267	1	.6	.9	69.4
	50400	1	.6	.9	70.4
	50950	1	.6	.9	71.3
	51000	1	.6	.9	72.2
	51721	1	.6	.9	73.1
	51912	1	.6	.9	74.1
	52105	1	.6	.9	75.0
	52244	1	.6	.9	75.9
	53151	1	.6	.9	76.9
	53490	1	.6	.9	77.8
	53602	1	.6	.9	78.7
	54400	1	.6	.9	79.6
	54435	1	.6	.9	80.6
	54980	1	.6	.9	81.5
	55035	1	.6	.9	82.4
	55663	1	.6	.9	83.3
	55931	1	.6	.9	84.3
	56252	1	.6	.9	85.2
	56472	1	.6	.9	86.1
	56563	1	.6	.9	87.0
	56690	1	.6	.9	88.0
	57613	1	.6	.9	88.9
	57903	1	.6	.9	89.8
	58520	1	.6	.9	90.7
	59386	3	1.8	2.8	93.5
	60966	1	.6	.9	94.4
	61235	1	.6	.9	95.4
	61249	2	1.2	1.9	97.2
	61609	1	.6	.9	98.1
	63288	1	.6	.9	99.1
	66656	1	.6	.9	100.0
	Total	108	63.2	100.0	
Missing	System	63	36.8		
Total		171	100.0		

MINLIEUT

Statistics

MINLIEUT

N	Valid	104
	Missing	67
Mean		30527.87
Median		30912.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		50387
Sum		3174898

MINLIEUT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	3	1.8	2.9	2.9
	19900	1	.6	1.0	3.8
	21395	1	.6	1.0	4.8
	21619	1	.6	1.0	5.8
	21679	1	.6	1.0	6.7
	22500	1	.6	1.0	7.7
	23319	1	.6	1.0	8.7
	24000	1	.6	1.0	9.6
	24500	1	.6	1.0	10.6
	24800	1	.6	1.0	11.5
	25000	2	1.2	1.9	13.5
	25500	1	.6	1.0	14.4
	25879	1	.6	1.0	15.4
	25989	1	.6	1.0	16.3
	26000	5	2.9	4.8	21.2
	26090	1	.6	1.0	22.1
	26278	1	.6	1.0	23.1
	26300	1	.6	1.0	24.0
	26378	1	.6	1.0	25.0
	26473	1	.6	1.0	26.0
	26800	1	.6	1.0	26.9
	26875	1	.6	1.0	27.9
	27000	1	.6	1.0	28.8
	27437	1	.6	1.0	29.8
	27808	1	.6	1.0	30.8
	28000	5	2.9	4.8	35.6
	28275	1	.6	1.0	36.5
	28313	1	.6	1.0	37.5
	28500	1	.6	1.0	38.5
	28526	1	.6	1.0	39.4
	28527	1	.6	1.0	40.4
	28764	1	.6	1.0	41.3
	29055	1	.6	1.0	42.3

29185	1	.6	1.0	43.3
30000	3	1.8	2.9	46.2
30097	1	.6	1.0	47.1
30114	1	.6	1.0	48.1
30250	1	.6	1.0	49.0
30875	1	.6	1.0	50.0
30949	1	.6	1.0	51.0
31194	1	.6	1.0	51.9
31646	1	.6	1.0	52.9
31799	1	.6	1.0	53.8
31949	1	.6	1.0	54.8
32000	1	.6	1.0	55.8
32099	1	.6	1.0	56.7
32198	1	.6	1.0	57.7
32200	1	.6	1.0	58.7
32240	1	.6	1.0	59.6
32325	1	.6	1.0	60.6
32406	1	.6	1.0	61.5
33093	1	.6	1.0	62.5
33392	1	.6	1.0	63.5
33510	1	.6	1.0	64.4
33531	1	.6	1.0	65.4
33600	1	.6	1.0	66.3
33643	1	.6	1.0	67.3
33661	1	.6	1.0	68.3
34000	2	1.2	1.9	70.2
34549	1	.6	1.0	71.2
34608	1	.6	1.0	72.1
34624	1	.6	1.0	73.1
34829	1	.6	1.0	74.0
35000	2	1.2	1.9	76.0
35173	1	.6	1.0	76.9
35617	1	.6	1.0	77.9
36000	1	.6	1.0	78.8
36290	1	.6	1.0	79.8
36400	1	.6	1.0	80.8
36654	1	.6	1.0	81.7
37000	1	.6	1.0	82.7
37218	1	.6	1.0	83.7
37830	1	.6	1.0	84.6
37965	1	.6	1.0	85.6
38000	2	1.2	1.9	87.5
38288	1	.6	1.0	88.5
38469	1	.6	1.0	89.4
38863	1	.6	1.0	90.4
38916	1	.6	1.0	91.3
39055	1	.6	1.0	92.3
39957	1	.6	1.0	93.3
40180	1	.6	1.0	94.2
40331	1	.6	1.0	95.2
40405	1	.6	1.0	96.2
40747	1	.6	1.0	97.1
41359	1	.6	1.0	98.1
42749	1	.6	1.0	99.0
50387	1	.6	1.0	100.0
Total	104	60.8	100.0	

Missing	System	67	39.2
Total		171	100.0

MAXSGT

Statistics

MAXSGT		
N	Valid	131
	Missing	40
Mean		37715.64
Median		38000.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		59386
Sum		4940749

MAXSGT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	.6	.8	.8
	21000	2	1.2	1.5	2.3
	22000	1	.6	.8	3.1
	23500	1	.6	.8	3.8
	24000	2	1.2	1.5	5.3
	24500	2	1.2	1.5	6.9
	25000	3	1.8	2.3	9.2
	25500	2	1.2	1.5	10.7
	25515	1	.6	.8	11.5
	25600	1	.6	.8	12.2
	26000	5	2.9	3.8	16.0
	26500	1	.6	.8	16.8
	27000	2	1.2	1.5	18.3
	27122	1	.6	.8	19.1
	27785	1	.6	.8	19.8
	28000	2	1.2	1.5	21.4
	28500	1	.6	.8	22.1
	29000	2	1.2	1.5	23.7
	29100	1	.6	.8	24.4
	29117	1	.6	.8	25.2
	29500	1	.6	.8	26.0
	30000	3	1.8	2.3	28.2
	30500	1	.6	.8	29.0
	31000	2	1.2	1.5	30.5
	31774	1	.6	.8	31.3
	31998	1	.6	.8	32.1
	32000	2	1.2	1.5	33.6
	33000	1	.6	.8	34.4
	33832	1	.6	.8	35.1
	33925	1	.6	.8	35.9

34000	1	.6	.8	36.6
34034	1	.6	.8	37.4
35000	6	3.5	4.6	42.0
35256	1	.6	.8	42.7
35942	1	.6	.8	43.5
36000	1	.6	.8	44.3
37000	2	1.2	1.5	45.8
37241	1	.6	.8	46.6
37775	1	.6	.8	47.3
37927	1	.6	.8	48.1
37966	1	.6	.8	48.9
38000	2	1.2	1.5	50.4
38188	1	.6	.8	51.1
38810	1	.6	.8	51.9
38884	1	.6	.8	52.7
39040	1	.6	.8	53.4
39271	1	.6	.8	54.2
39516	1	.6	.8	55.0
39660	1	.6	.8	55.7
40105	1	.6	.8	56.5
40108	6	3.5	4.6	61.1
40300	1	.6	.8	61.8
40502	1	.6	.8	62.6
41059	1	.6	.8	63.4
41089	1	.6	.8	64.1
41495	2	1.2	1.5	65.6
41558	1	.6	.8	66.4
41998	1	.6	.8	67.2
43451	1	.6	.8	67.9
43947	1	.6	.8	68.7
44332	1	.6	.8	69.5
44678	1	.6	.8	70.2
44845	1	.6	.8	71.0
44983	1	.6	.8	71.8
45000	2	1.2	1.5	73.3
45024	1	.6	.8	74.0
45275	1	.6	.8	74.8
45472	1	.6	.8	75.6
46313	1	.6	.8	76.3
46628	1	.6	.8	77.1
46720	1	.6	.8	77.9
46833	1	.6	.8	78.6
47000	1	.6	.8	79.4
47023	1	.6	.8	80.2
47045	1	.6	.8	80.9
47600	1	.6	.8	81.7
47729	1	.6	.8	82.4
47772	1	.6	.8	83.2
48000	1	.6	.8	84.0
48252	1	.6	.8	84.7
48339	1	.6	.8	85.5
48574	1	.6	.8	86.3
48804	2	1.2	1.5	87.8
49920	1	.6	.8	88.5
50252	1	.6	.8	89.3
50321	1	.6	.8	90.1

	50550	1	.6	.8	90.8
	50576	1	.6	.8	91.6
	50887	1	.6	.8	92.4
	51200	1	.6	.8	93.1
	51521	1	.6	.8	93.9
	52525	1	.6	.8	94.7
	52773	1	.6	.8	95.4
	53480	1	.6	.8	96.2
	54714	1	.6	.8	96.9
	55296	1	.6	.8	97.7
	56492	1	.6	.8	98.5
	59386	2	1.2	1.5	100.0
	Total	131	76.6	100.0	
Missing	System	40	23.4		
Total		171	100.0		

MINSGT

Statistics

MINSGT

N	Valid	125
	Missing	46
Mean		27800.25
Median		27500.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		40277
Sum		3475031

MINSGT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	.6	.8	.8
	19900	1	.6	.8	1.6
	20000	1	.6	.8	2.4
	21000	3	1.8	2.4	4.8
	21200	1	.6	.8	5.6
	21359	1	.6	.8	6.4
	21395	1	.6	.8	7.2
	21679	4	2.3	3.2	10.4
	22000	2	1.2	1.6	12.0
	22360	1	.6	.8	12.8
	22551	1	.6	.8	13.6
	22602	1	.6	.8	14.4
	22900	1	.6	.8	15.2
	22960	1	.6	.8	16.0
	23000	2	1.2	1.6	17.6
	23500	2	1.2	1.6	19.2
	23515	1	.6	.8	20.0

23780	1	.6	.8	20.8
23892	1	.6	.8	21.6
24000	6	3.5	4.8	26.4
24200	1	.6	.8	27.2
24310	1	.6	.8	28.0
24378	1	.6	.8	28.8
24500	1	.6	.8	29.6
24865	1	.6	.8	30.4
24952	1	.6	.8	31.2
25000	5	2.9	4.0	35.2
25072	1	.6	.8	36.0
25364	1	.6	.8	36.8
25500	1	.6	.8	37.6
25874	1	.6	.8	38.4
25935	1	.6	.8	39.2
25996	1	.6	.8	40.0
26000	3	1.8	2.4	42.4
26027	1	.6	.8	43.2
26200	1	.6	.8	44.0
26280	1	.6	.8	44.8
26329	1	.6	.8	45.6
26601	1	.6	.8	46.4
26982	1	.6	.8	47.2
27000	1	.6	.8	48.0
27091	1	.6	.8	48.8
27456	1	.6	.8	49.6
27500	1	.6	.8	50.4
27550	1	.6	.8	51.2
27731	1	.6	.8	52.0
27924	1	.6	.8	52.8
28000	4	2.3	3.2	56.0
28020	1	.6	.8	56.8
28545	1	.6	.8	57.6
28766	1	.6	.8	58.4
28800	1	.6	.8	59.2
28912	1	.6	.8	60.0
29000	3	1.8	2.4	62.4
29328	1	.6	.8	63.2
29684	1	.6	.8	64.0
29952	1	.6	.8	64.8
29990	1	.6	.8	65.6
30000	4	2.3	3.2	68.8
30484	1	.6	.8	69.6
31222	1	.6	.8	70.4
31312	1	.6	.8	71.2
31349	1	.6	.8	72.0
31363	1	.6	.8	72.8
31500	1	.6	.8	73.6
31674	1	.6	.8	74.4
31704	1	.6	.8	75.2
31927	1	.6	.8	76.0
32000	3	1.8	2.4	78.4
32032	1	.6	.8	79.2
32256	1	.6	.8	80.0
32420	1	.6	.8	80.8
32727	1	.6	.8	81.6

	33000	2	1.2	1.6	83.2
	33081	1	.6	.8	84.0
	33492	1	.6	.8	84.8
	33937	1	.6	.8	85.6
	34000	1	.6	.8	86.4
	34092	1	.6	.8	87.2
	34198	1	.6	.8	88.0
	34466	1	.6	.8	88.8
	34528	1	.6	.8	89.6
	34700	1	.6	.8	90.4
	35000	1	.6	.8	91.2
	35090	1	.6	.8	92.0
	35182	1	.6	.8	92.8
	35297	1	.6	.8	93.6
	35900	1	.6	.8	94.4
	36107	1	.6	.8	95.2
	36128	1	.6	.8	96.0
	36816	1	.6	.8	96.8
	37377	1	.6	.8	97.6
	37675	1	.6	.8	98.4
	38974	1	.6	.8	99.2
	40277	1	.6	.8	100.0
	Total	125	73.1	100.0	
Missing	System	46	26.9		
Total		171	100.0		

MAXOFFIC entry level law enforcement officer non jail

Statistics

MAXOFFIC entry level law enforcement officer non ja

N	Valid	130
	Missing	41
Mean		31256.53
Median		30664.00
Minimum		17000
Maximum		49065
Sum		4063349

MAXOFFIC entry level law enforcement officer non jail

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	17000	1	.6	.8	.8
	18500	1	.6	.8	1.5
	20000	5	2.9	3.8	5.4
	21000	2	1.2	1.5	6.9
	21679	1	.6	.8	7.7
	21900	1	.6	.8	8.5
	21969	1	.6	.8	9.2
	22000	7	4.1	5.4	14.6
	22557	1	.6	.8	15.4
	23000	5	2.9	3.8	19.2
	23500	1	.6	.8	20.0
	24000	6	3.5	4.6	24.6
	24500	3	1.8	2.3	26.9
	24977	1	.6	.8	27.7
	25000	3	1.8	2.3	30.0
	25215	1	.6	.8	30.8
	25330	1	.6	.8	31.5
	25500	1	.6	.8	32.3
	26000	2	1.2	1.5	33.8
	26500	1	.6	.8	34.6
	26520	1	.6	.8	35.4
	26795	1	.6	.8	36.2
	27300	1	.6	.8	36.9
	27978	1	.6	.8	37.7
	28000	4	2.3	3.1	40.8
	28200	1	.6	.8	41.5
	28433	1	.6	.8	42.3
	28500	1	.6	.8	43.1
	28690	1	.6	.8	43.8
	28912	1	.6	.8	44.6
	29000	2	1.2	1.5	46.2
	29600	1	.6	.8	46.9
	29744	1	.6	.8	47.7
	30509	1	.6	.8	48.5
	30545	1	.6	.8	49.2
	30552	1	.6	.8	50.0

30776	1	.6	.8	50.8
31319	2	1.2	1.5	52.3
31927	1	.6	.8	53.1
32000	1	.6	.8	53.8
32456	1	.6	.8	54.6
32596	1	.6	.8	55.4
32956	1	.6	.8	56.2
33323	1	.6	.8	56.9
33347	1	.6	.8	57.7
33515	1	.6	.8	58.5
33758	1	.6	.8	59.2
33781	1	.6	.8	60.0
33950	1	.6	.8	60.8
34000	1	.6	.8	61.5
34403	1	.6	.8	62.3
34481	1	.6	.8	63.1
34565	1	.6	.8	63.8
35000	1	.6	.8	64.6
35336	1	.6	.8	65.4
35388	1	.6	.8	66.2
35738	1	.6	.8	66.9
36000	1	.6	.8	67.7
36026	1	.6	.8	68.5
36181	1	.6	.8	69.2
36757	1	.6	.8	70.0
37000	1	.6	.8	70.8
37312	1	.6	.8	71.5
37723	2	1.2	1.5	73.1
37884	1	.6	.8	73.8
38000	1	.6	.8	74.6
38396	1	.6	.8	75.4
38400	1	.6	.8	76.2
38448	1	.6	.8	76.9
38520	1	.6	.8	77.7
38601	1	.6	.8	78.5
38686	1	.6	.8	79.2
38694	1	.6	.8	80.0
38834	1	.6	.8	80.8
38854	1	.6	.8	81.5
39411	1	.6	.8	82.3
39620	1	.6	.8	83.1
39738	1	.6	.8	83.8
40000	1	.6	.8	84.6
40105	1	.6	.8	85.4
40108	8	4.7	6.2	91.5
40520	1	.6	.8	92.3
40691	1	.6	.8	93.1
41338	1	.6	.8	93.8
43329	1	.6	.8	94.6
43952	1	.6	.8	95.4
44249	1	.6	.8	96.2
44685	1	.6	.8	96.9
45885	1	.6	.8	97.7
46151	1	.6	.8	98.5
47368	1	.6	.8	99.2
49065	1	.6	.8	100.0

	Total	130	76.0	100.0
Missing	System	41	24.0	
Total		171	100.0	

MINOFFIC*

Statistics

MINOFFIC

N	Valid	140
	Missing	31
Mean		23192.41
Median		23337.50
Minimum		10000
Maximum		32098
Sum		3246937

* The minimum starting salary of $10,000 is suspicious. Repeated calls to the relevant agency to verify the amount failed to elicit a reply. This value is excluded from the data in the *Highlights* section.

MINOFFIC

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	10000	1	.6	.7	.7
	17000	1	.6	.7	1.4
	17160	1	.6	.7	2.1
	17500	2	1.2	1.4	3.6
	17712	1	.6	.7	4.3
	18000	3	1.8	2.1	6.4
	18500	2	1.2	1.4	7.9
	19000	4	2.3	2.9	10.7
	19197	1	.6	.7	11.4
	19272	1	.6	.7	12.1
	19500	3	1.8	2.1	14.3
	19900	1	.6	.7	15.0
	19984	1	.6	.7	15.7
	20000	9	5.3	6.4	22.1
	20057	1	.6	.7	22.9
	20124	1	.6	.7	23.6
	20145	1	.6	.7	24.3
	20606	1	.6	.7	25.0
	21000	8	4.7	5.7	30.7
	21359	1	.6	.7	31.4
	21395	1	.6	.7	32.1
	21500	1	.6	.7	32.9
	21600	1	.6	.7	33.6
	21679	7	4.1	5.0	38.6
	21756	1	.6	.7	39.3

21792	1	.6	.7	40.0
21940	1	.6	.7	40.7
21949	1	.6	.7	41.4
22000	3	1.8	2.1	43.6
22215	1	.6	.7	44.3
22500	1	.6	.7	45.0
22675	1	.6	.7	45.7
22805	1	.6	.7	46.4
22973	2	1.2	1.4	47.9
23000	1	.6	.7	48.6
23044	1	.6	.7	49.3
23175	1	.6	.7	50.0
23500	3	1.8	2.1	52.1
23576	1	.6	.7	52.9
23754	1	.6	.7	53.6
23890	1	.6	.7	54.3
23939	1	.6	.7	55.0
23994	1	.6	.7	55.7
24000	10	5.8	7.1	62.9
24121	1	.6	.7	63.6
24403	1	.6	.7	64.3
24565	1	.6	.7	65.0
24653	1	.6	.7	65.7
24705	1	.6	.7	66.4
24718	1	.6	.7	67.1
24800	1	.6	.7	67.9
24874	1	.6	.7	68.6
24986	1	.6	.7	69.3
25000	5	2.9	3.6	72.9
25072	1	.6	.7	73.6
25300	1	.6	.7	74.3
25400	1	.6	.7	75.0
25608	2	1.2	1.4	76.4
25730	1	.6	.7	77.1
25791	1	.6	.7	77.9
25896	1	.6	.7	78.6
25923	1	.6	.7	79.3
26000	2	1.2	1.4	80.7
26023	1	.6	.7	81.4
26120	1	.6	.7	82.1
26326	1	.6	.7	82.9
26413	1	.6	.7	83.6
26600	1	.6	.7	84.3
27000	1	.6	.7	85.0
27139	1	.6	.7	85.7
27463	1	.6	.7	86.4
27574	1	.6	.7	87.1
27639	1	.6	.7	87.9
27656	1	.6	.7	88.6
27726	1	.6	.7	89.3
27747	1	.6	.7	90.0
27776	1	.6	.7	90.7
27789	1	.6	.7	91.4
28229	1	.6	.7	92.1
28499	1	.6	.7	92.9
28516	1	.6	.7	93.6

	28804	1	.6	.7	94.3
	28891	1	.6	.7	95.0
	29000	1	.6	.7	95.7
	29024	1	.6	.7	96.4
	29491	1	.6	.7	97.1
	29843	1	.6	.7	97.9
	30766	1	.6	.7	98.6
	31918	1	.6	.7	99.3
	32098	1	.6	.7	100.0
	Total	140	81.9	100.0	
Missing	System	31	18.1		
Total		171	100.0		

MAXSENIO senior patrolman 3 to 5 years experience

Statistics

MAXSENIO senior patrolman 3 to 5 years experience

N	Valid	105
	Missing	66
Mean		33800.95
Median		33000.00
Minimum		17000
Maximum		52773
Sum		3549100

MAXSENIO senior patrolman 3 to 5 years experience

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	17000	1	.6	1.0	1.0
	19958	1	.6	1.0	1.9
	21000	1	.6	1.0	2.9
	22000	2	1.2	1.9	4.8
	22300	1	.6	1.0	5.7
	22800	1	.6	1.0	6.7
	23000	4	2.3	3.8	10.5
	23296	1	.6	1.0	11.4
	24000	4	2.3	3.8	15.2
	24500	2	1.2	1.9	17.1
	24900	1	.6	1.0	18.1
	25000	1	.6	1.0	19.0
	25100	1	.6	1.0	20.0
	25153	1	.6	1.0	21.0
	25500	1	.6	1.0	21.9
	25515	1	.6	1.0	22.9
	26000	2	1.2	1.9	24.8
	26500	1	.6	1.0	25.7
	26725	1	.6	1.0	26.7

26938	1	.6	1.0	27.6
27000	1	.6	1.0	28.6
27268	1	.6	1.0	29.5
28000	2	1.2	1.9	31.4
29100	1	.6	1.0	32.4
29713	1	.6	1.0	33.3
29801	1	.6	1.0	34.3
30000	3	1.8	2.9	37.1
30389	1	.6	1.0	38.1
30638	1	.6	1.0	39.0
30893	1	.6	1.0	40.0
30974	1	.6	1.0	41.0
31260	1	.6	1.0	41.9
31415	1	.6	1.0	42.9
32000	3	1.8	2.9	45.7
32500	1	.6	1.0	46.7
32519	1	.6	1.0	47.6
33000	3	1.8	2.9	50.5
33323	1	.6	1.0	51.4
33515	1	.6	1.0	52.4
33758	1	.6	1.0	53.3
33913	1	.6	1.0	54.3
34000	2	1.2	1.9	56.2
34303	1	.6	1.0	57.1
35000	1	.6	1.0	58.1
36507	1	.6	1.0	59.0
36560	1	.6	1.0	60.0
36667	1	.6	1.0	61.0
37548	1	.6	1.0	61.9
37723	1	.6	1.0	62.9
37884	1	.6	1.0	63.8
38019	1	.6	1.0	64.8
38686	1	.6	1.0	65.7
38912	1	.6	1.0	66.7
39260	1	.6	1.0	67.6
39749	1	.6	1.0	68.6
40000	3	1.8	2.9	71.4
40108	6	3.5	5.7	77.1
40373	1	.6	1.0	78.1
40524	1	.6	1.0	79.0
40691	1	.6	1.0	80.0
40789	1	.6	1.0	81.0
40988	1	.6	1.0	81.9
42000	1	.6	1.0	82.9
43197	1	.6	1.0	83.8
43212	2	1.2	1.9	85.7
43326	1	.6	1.0	86.7
43952	1	.6	1.0	87.6
44115	1	.6	1.0	88.6
44489	1	.6	1.0	89.5
44612	1	.6	1.0	90.5
44685	1	.6	1.0	91.4
45165	1	.6	1.0	92.4
45885	1	.6	1.0	93.3
46584	1	.6	1.0	94.3
47368	1	.6	1.0	95.2

	48000	1	.6	1.0	96.2
	48339	1	.6	1.0	97.1
	48804	1	.6	1.0	98.1
	50887	1	.6	1.0	99.0
	52773	1	.6	1.0	100.0
	Total	105	61.4	100.0	
Missing	System	66	38.6		
Total		171	100.0		

MINSENIO

Statistics

MINSENIO

N	Valid	102
	Missing	69
Mean		25964.19
Median		25483.50
Minimum		19000
Maximum		41359
Sum		2648347

MINSENIO

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	19000	1	.6	1.0	1.0
	19500	2	1.2	2.0	2.9
	19900	1	.6	1.0	3.9
	20000	3	1.8	2.9	6.9
	21000	4	2.3	3.9	10.8
	21065	1	.6	1.0	11.8
	21379	1	.6	1.0	12.7
	21395	1	.6	1.0	13.7
	21500	2	1.2	2.0	15.7
	21679	4	2.3	3.9	19.6
	22000	1	.6	1.0	20.6
	22124	1	.6	1.0	21.6
	22215	1	.6	1.0	22.5
	22235	1	.6	1.0	23.5
	22353	1	.6	1.0	24.5
	22760	2	1.2	2.0	26.5
	22763	1	.6	1.0	27.5
	23000	5	2.9	4.9	32.4
	23180	1	.6	1.0	33.3
	23500	1	.6	1.0	34.3
	23515	1	.6	1.0	35.3
	23576	1	.6	1.0	36.3
	23888	1	.6	1.0	37.3
	24000	1	.6	1.0	38.2

	24373	1	.6	1.0	39.2
	24500	2	1.2	2.0	41.2
	24700	1	.6	1.0	42.2
	24960	1	.6	1.0	43.1
	25000	2	1.2	2.0	45.1
	25032	1	.6	1.0	46.1
	25200	1	.6	1.0	47.1
	25215	1	.6	1.0	48.0
	25301	1	.6	1.0	49.0
	25328	1	.6	1.0	50.0
	25639	1	.6	1.0	51.0
	26473	1	.6	1.0	52.0
	26660	1	.6	1.0	52.9
	26897	1	.6	1.0	53.9
	27000	2	1.2	2.0	55.9
	27157	1	.6	1.0	56.9
	27274	1	.6	1.0	57.8
	27448	1	.6	1.0	58.8
	27500	1	.6	1.0	59.8
	27552	2	1.2	2.0	61.8
	27712	1	.6	1.0	62.7
	27776	1	.6	1.0	63.7
	28000	5	2.9	4.9	68.6
	28058	1	.6	1.0	69.6
	28370	1	.6	1.0	70.6
	28392	1	.6	1.0	71.6
	28499	1	.6	1.0	72.5
	28632	1	.6	1.0	73.5
	28727	1	.6	1.0	74.5
	28876	1	.6	1.0	75.5
	29000	1	.6	1.0	76.5
	29016	1	.6	1.0	77.5
	29141	1	.6	1.0	78.4
	29232	1	.6	1.0	79.4
	29325	1	.6	1.0	80.4
	29491	1	.6	1.0	81.4
	29615	1	.6	1.0	82.4
	29741	1	.6	1.0	83.3
	29744	1	.6	1.0	84.3
	30000	4	2.3	3.9	88.2
	30264	1	.6	1.0	89.2
	30855	1	.6	1.0	90.2
	31000	1	.6	1.0	91.2
	31091	1	.6	1.0	92.2
	31176	1	.6	1.0	93.1
	31345	1	.6	1.0	94.1
	31510	1	.6	1.0	95.1
	31969	1	.6	1.0	96.1
	33276	1	.6	1.0	97.1
	35182	1	.6	1.0	98.0
	35388	1	.6	1.0	99.0
	41359	1	.6	1.0	100.0
	Total	102	59.6	100.0	
Missing	System	69	40.4		
Total		171	100.0		

EDUCSALA does education affect entry salary

Statistics

EDUCSALA does education affect entry salary

N	Valid	155
	Missing	16
Mean		153.00
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		23628
Sum		23715

EDUCSALA does education affect entry salary

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	67	39.2	43.2	43.2
	1 Yes	87	50.9	56.1	99.4
	23628	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	155	90.6	100.0	
Missing	System	16	9.4		
Total		171	100.0		

EXPSALA does experience affect entry salary

Statistics

EXPSALA does experience affect entry salary

N	Valid	164
	Missing	7
Mean		1837.69
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		301250
Sum		301381

EXPSALA does experience affect entry salary

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	32	18.7	19.5	19.5
	1 Yes	131	76.6	79.9	99.4
	301250	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	164	95.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	4.1		
Total		171	100.0		

OPBUDGET agency operating budget fiscal 2003

Statistics

OPBUDGET agency operating budget fiscal 2003

N	Valid	141
	Missing	30
Mean		3567809.8
Median		1083272.0
Minimum		7670
Maximum		42412489
Sum		503061188

OPBUDGET agency operating budget fiscal 2003

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	7670	1	.6	.7	.7
	28000	1	.6	.7	1.4
	50000	2	1.2	1.4	2.8
	56123	1	.6	.7	3.5
	60000	1	.6	.7	4.3
	79682	1	.6	.7	5.0
	79901	1	.6	.7	5.7
	97999	1	.6	.7	6.4
	100000	4	2.3	2.8	9.2
	125000	1	.6	.7	9.9
	164441	1	.6	.7	10.6
	165000	2	1.2	1.4	12.1
	167000	1	.6	.7	12.8
	180000	1	.6	.7	13.5
	196625	1	.6	.7	14.2
	213045	1	.6	.7	14.9
	222844	1	.6	.7	15.6
	226938	1	.6	.7	16.3
	237335	1	.6	.7	17.0
	238124	1	.6	.7	17.7
	250000	1	.6	.7	18.4
	264926	1	.6	.7	19.1
	280000	1	.6	.7	19.9
	286359	1	.6	.7	20.6
	294000	1	.6	.7	21.3
	300000	2	1.2	1.4	22.7
	301250	1	.6	.7	23.4
	330000	1	.6	.7	24.1
	350000	1	.6	.7	24.8
	354000	1	.6	.7	25.5
	366900	1	.6	.7	26.2
	386187	1	.6	.7	27.0
	409934	1	.6	.7	27.7
	423661	1	.6	.7	28.4
	483139	1	.6	.7	29.1
	500000	1	.6	.7	29.8

500767	1	.6	.7	30.5
508000	1	.6	.7	31.2
528648	1	.6	.7	31.9
533273	1	.6	.7	32.6
572715	1	.6	.7	33.3
590422	1	.6	.7	34.0
607787	1	.6	.7	34.8
628968	1	.6	.7	35.5
637246	1	.6	.7	36.2
640471	1	.6	.7	36.9
650000	2	1.2	1.4	38.3
660000	1	.6	.7	39.0
674654	1	.6	.7	39.7
687011	1	.6	.7	40.4
727985	1	.6	.7	41.1
745100	1	.6	.7	41.8
762400	1	.6	.7	42.6
800000	1	.6	.7	43.3
800764	1	.6	.7	44.0
811000	1	.6	.7	44.7
815420	1	.6	.7	45.4
854981	1	.6	.7	46.1
893673	1	.6	.7	46.8
912555	1	.6	.7	47.5
952543	1	.6	.7	48.2
1050000	1	.6	.7	48.9
1051333	1	.6	.7	49.6
1083272	1	.6	.7	50.4
1086379	1	.6	.7	51.1
1105162	1	.6	.7	51.8
1142224	1	.6	.7	52.5
1300000	1	.6	.7	53.2
1306406	1	.6	.7	53.9
1309254	1	.6	.7	54.6
1324219	1	.6	.7	55.3
1370000	1	.6	.7	56.0
1382142	1	.6	.7	56.7
1390016	1	.6	.7	57.4
1510258	1	.6	.7	58.2
1577988	1	.6	.7	58.9
1642811	1	.6	.7	59.6
1743478	1	.6	.7	60.3
1800562	1	.6	.7	61.0
1855934	1	.6	.7	61.7
1858563	1	.6	.7	62.4
1920648	1	.6	.7	63.1
1923500	1	.6	.7	63.8
1977184	1	.6	.7	64.5
2048900	1	.6	.7	65.2
2055359	1	.6	.7	66.0
2100500	1	.6	.7	66.7
2135576	1	.6	.7	67.4
2200000	1	.6	.7	68.1
2240893	1	.6	.7	68.8
2263048	1	.6	.7	69.5
2398260	1	.6	.7	70.2

	2447325	1	.6	.7	70.9
	2700000	1	.6	.7	71.6
	2744954	1	.6	.7	72.3
	2760765	1	.6	.7	73.0
	2900000	1	.6	.7	73.8
	3115289	1	.6	.7	74.5
	3267699	1	.6	.7	75.2
	3284685	1	.6	.7	75.9
	3308585	1	.6	.7	76.6
	3388481	1	.6	.7	77.3
	3500000	1	.6	.7	78.0
	3583967	1	.6	.7	78.7
	3688385	1	.6	.7	79.4
	3954777	1	.6	.7	80.1
	4119479	1	.6	.7	80.9
	4237186	1	.6	.7	81.6
	4801309	1	.6	.7	82.3
	5344544	1	.6	.7	83.0
	5604770	1	.6	.7	83.7
	5843302	1	.6	.7	84.4
	5890939	1	.6	.7	85.1
	6173000	1	.6	.7	85.8
	6303360	1	.6	.7	86.5
	6628680	1	.6	.7	87.2
	7713360	1	.6	.7	87.9
	8000000	1	.6	.7	88.7
	8384485	1	.6	.7	89.4
	11843185	1	.6	.7	90.1
	12063029	1	.6	.7	90.8
	13459683	1	.6	.7	91.5
	14100000	1	.6	.7	92.2
	14829302	1	.6	.7	92.9
	18000000	1	.6	.7	93.6
	18258535	1	.6	.7	94.3
	18417366	1	.6	.7	95.0
	19000000	1	.6	.7	95.7
	19824268	1	.6	.7	96.5
	21500000	1	.6	.7	97.2
	21776071	1	.6	.7	97.9
	24496599	1	.6	.7	98.6
	31000000	1	.6	.7	99.3
	42412489	1	.6	.7	100.0
	Total	141	82.5	100.0	
Missing	System	30	17.5		
Total		171	100.0		

OVERTIME overtime pay total

Statistics

OVERTIME overtime pay total

N	Valid	136
	Missing	35
Mean		102244.79
Median		25000.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		2100000
Sum		13905291

OVERTIME overtime pay total

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	23	13.5	16.9	16.9
	200	1	.6	.7	17.6
	500	1	.6	.7	18.4
	1000	2	1.2	1.5	19.9
	1265	1	.6	.7	20.6
	1482	1	.6	.7	21.3
	2000	2	1.2	1.5	22.8
	3000	2	1.2	1.5	24.3
	4000	2	1.2	1.5	25.7
	4500	1	.6	.7	26.5
	5000	3	1.8	2.2	28.7
	6000	2	1.2	1.5	30.1
	7000	1	.6	.7	30.9
	7969	1	.6	.7	31.6
	8000	1	.6	.7	32.4
	8300	1	.6	.7	33.1
	8640	1	.6	.7	33.8
	9000	1	.6	.7	34.6
	10000	2	1.2	1.5	36.0
	12000	2	1.2	1.5	37.5
	12001	1	.6	.7	38.2
	12432	1	.6	.7	39.0
	12500	1	.6	.7	39.7
	13192	1	.6	.7	40.4
	14199	1	.6	.7	41.2
	14438	1	.6	.7	41.9
	15000	1	.6	.7	42.6
	15955	1	.6	.7	43.4
	17863	1	.6	.7	44.1
	18004	1	.6	.7	44.9
	20000	4	2.3	2.9	47.8
	22561	1	.6	.7	48.5
	24000	1	.6	.7	49.3
	25000	4	2.3	2.9	52.2
	26000	1	.6	.7	52.9

28986	1	.6	.7	53.7
30000	3	1.8	2.2	55.9
34084	1	.6	.7	56.6
36301	1	.6	.7	57.4
37431	1	.6	.7	58.1
37500	1	.6	.7	58.8
38000	1	.6	.7	59.6
40000	1	.6	.7	60.3
41000	1	.6	.7	61.0
42474	1	.6	.7	61.8
43274	1	.6	.7	62.5
44000	1	.6	.7	63.2
46480	1	.6	.7	64.0
48318	1	.6	.7	64.7
49000	1	.6	.7	65.4
50000	1	.6	.7	66.2
51400	1	.6	.7	66.9
53129	1	.6	.7	67.6
55125	1	.6	.7	68.4
56044	1	.6	.7	69.1
58695	1	.6	.7	69.9
63000	1	.6	.7	70.6
65857	1	.6	.7	71.3
70000	1	.6	.7	72.1
72519	1	.6	.7	72.8
76151	1	.6	.7	73.5
77673	1	.6	.7	74.3
80000	1	.6	.7	75.0
82700	1	.6	.7	75.7
82766	1	.6	.7	76.5
85643	1	.6	.7	77.2
90000	1	.6	.7	77.9
90400	1	.6	.7	78.7
93000	1	.6	.7	79.4
94014	1	.6	.7	80.1
96000	1	.6	.7	80.9
99545	1	.6	.7	81.6
101077	1	.6	.7	82.4
102107	1	.6	.7	83.1
104000	1	.6	.7	83.8
110000	2	1.2	1.5	85.3
114122	1	.6	.7	86.0
144946	1	.6	.7	86.8
151867	1	.6	.7	87.5
157000	1	.6	.7	88.2
203006	1	.6	.7	89.0
206048	1	.6	.7	89.7
209203	1	.6	.7	90.4
220179	1	.6	.7	91.2
244900	1	.6	.7	91.9
342715	1	.6	.7	92.6
443791	1	.6	.7	93.4
450000	1	.6	.7	94.1
558718	1	.6	.7	94.9
570000	1	.6	.7	95.6
596928	1	.6	.7	96.3

	726118	1	.6	.7	97.1
	808240	1	.6	.7	97.8
	905808	1	.6	.7	98.5
	1378008	1	.6	.7	99.3
	2100000	1	.6	.7	100.0
	Total	136	79.5	100.0	
Missing	System	35	20.5		
Total		171	100.0		

TRAINBUD training budget

Statistics

TRAINBUD training budget

N	Valid	137
	Missing	34
Mean		56128.00
Median		7000.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		2724492
Sum		7689536

TRAINBUD training budget

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	10	5.8	7.3	7.3
	400	1	.6	.7	8.0
	500	2	1.2	1.5	9.5
	537	1	.6	.7	10.2
	900	1	.6	.7	10.9
	1000	4	2.3	2.9	13.9
	1095	1	.6	.7	14.6
	1200	1	.6	.7	15.3
	1500	4	2.3	2.9	18.2
	2000	3	1.8	2.2	20.4
	2500	5	2.9	3.6	24.1
	2600	1	.6	.7	24.8
	3000	9	5.3	6.6	31.4
	3300	1	.6	.7	32.1
	3460	1	.6	.7	32.8
	3500	2	1.2	1.5	34.3
	4000	3	1.8	2.2	36.5
	4500	1	.6	.7	37.2
	5000	6	3.5	4.4	41.6
	5355	1	.6	.7	42.3
	5500	1	.6	.7	43.1
	5600	1	.6	.7	43.8
	6000	3	1.8	2.2	46.0
	6125	1	.6	.7	46.7

	6300	1	.6	.7	47.4
	6500	2	1.2	1.5	48.9
	6600	1	.6	.7	49.6
	7000	1	.6	.7	50.4
	7500	2	1.2	1.5	51.8
	7671	1	.6	.7	52.6
	7985	1	.6	.7	53.3
	8000	4	2.3	2.9	56.2
	8450	1	.6	.7	56.9
	9600	1	.6	.7	57.7
	10000	5	2.9	3.6	61.3
	10500	1	.6	.7	62.0
	10570	1	.6	.7	62.8
	11000	2	1.2	1.5	64.2
	11520	1	.6	.7	65.0
	12000	1	.6	.7	65.7
	13000	1	.6	.7	66.4
	14000	1	.6	.7	67.2
	14840	1	.6	.7	67.9
	15000	5	2.9	3.6	71.5
	16550	1	.6	.7	72.3
	16900	1	.6	.7	73.0
	17741	1	.6	.7	73.7
	18000	1	.6	.7	74.5
	19500	1	.6	.7	75.2
	20000	4	2.3	2.9	78.1
	24100	1	.6	.7	78.8
	25000	1	.6	.7	79.6
	25556	1	.6	.7	80.3
	26000	1	.6	.7	81.0
	27500	1	.6	.7	81.8
	28000	1	.6	.7	82.5
	29059	1	.6	.7	83.2
	30000	2	1.2	1.5	84.7
	35000	2	1.2	1.5	86.1
	36000	1	.6	.7	86.9
	38377	1	.6	.7	87.6
	40000	2	1.2	1.5	89.1
	43675	1	.6	.7	89.8
	49300	1	.6	.7	90.5
	50000	1	.6	.7	91.2
	66523	1	.6	.7	92.0
	72400	1	.6	.7	92.7
	102911	1	.6	.7	93.4
	152585	1	.6	.7	94.2
	154000	1	.6	.7	94.9
	188072	1	.6	.7	95.6
	200000	1	.6	.7	96.4
	245187	1	.6	.7	97.1
	246000	1	.6	.7	97.8
	345000	1	.6	.7	98.5
	1900000	1	.6	.7	99.3
	2724492	1	.6	.7	100.0
	Total	137	80.1	100.0	
Missing	System	34	19.9		
Total		171	100.0		

HAZPAY hazardous duty pay provided

Statistics

HAZPAY hazardous duty pay provided		
N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		23.54
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		4000
Sum		4002

HAZPAY hazardous duty pay provided

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	167	97.7	98.2	98.2
	1 Yes	2	1.2	1.2	99.4
	4000	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

SHIFTPAY shift differential pay

Statistics

SHIFTPAY shift differential pay		
N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		.06
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		11

SHIFTPAY shift differential pay

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	159	93.0	93.5	93.5
	1 Yes	11	6.4	6.5	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

EDUCPAY education incentive pay

Statistics

EDUCPAY education incentive pay		
N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		.19
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		32

EDUCPAY education incentive pay

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	138	80.7	81.2	81.2
	1 Yes	32	18.7	18.8	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

MERITPAY merit pay

Statistics

MERITPAY merit pay		
N	Valid	168
	Missing	3
Mean		.42
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		71

MERITPAY merit pay

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	97	56.7	57.7	57.7
	1 Yes	71	41.5	42.3	100.0
	Total	168	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.8		
Total		171	100.0		

TUITION tuition assistance

Statistics

TUITION tuition assistance		
N	Valid	167
	Missing	4
Mean		.38
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		64

TUITION tuition assistance

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	103	60.2	61.7	61.7
	1 Yes	64	37.4	38.3	100.0
	Total	167	97.7	100.0	
Missing	System	4	2.3		
Total		171	100.0		

OTHERPAY other pay

Statistics

OTHERPAY other pay		
N	Valid	22
	Missing	149
Mean		2.82
Median		1.00
Minimum		1
Maximum		6
Sum		62

OTHERPAY other pay

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	14	8.2	63.6	63.6
	6	8	4.7	36.4	100.0
	Total	22	12.9	100.0	
Missing	System	149	87.1		
Total		171	100.0		

CUSTDETH in custody deaths during fiscal 2003

Statistics

CUSTDETH in custody deaths during fiscal 2003

N	Valid	167
	Missing	4
Mean		.04
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		2
Sum		6

CUSTDETH in custody deaths during fiscal 2003

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	162	94.7	97.0	97.0
	1	4	2.3	2.4	99.4
	2	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	167	97.7	100.0	
Missing	System	4	2.3		
Total		171	100.0		

CUSTDISC in custody deaths producing disciplinary action

Statistics

CUSTDISC in custody deaths producing disciplinary action

N	Valid	156
	Missing	15
Mean		.00
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		0
Sum		0

CUSTDISC in custody deaths producing disciplinary action

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	156	91.2	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	15	8.8		
Total		171	100.0		

RESERVES reserve officer program

Statistics

RESERVES reserve officer program

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.58
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		100

RESERVES reserve officer program

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	71	41.5	41.5	41.5
	1 Yes	100	58.5	58.5	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

RESRVNUM reserve officers

Statistics

RESRVNUM reserve officers		
N	Valid	101
	Missing	70
Mean		6.21
Median		3.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		44
Sum		627

RESRVNUM reserve officers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	11	6.4	10.9	10.9
	1	14	8.2	13.9	24.8
	2	21	12.3	20.8	45.5
	3	9	5.3	8.9	54.5
	4	5	2.9	5.0	59.4
	5	7	4.1	6.9	66.3
	6	4	2.3	4.0	70.3
	7	2	1.2	2.0	72.3
	8	4	2.3	4.0	76.2
	9	3	1.8	3.0	79.2
	10	5	2.9	5.0	84.2
	11	1	.6	1.0	85.1
	12	2	1.2	2.0	87.1
	13	2	1.2	2.0	89.1
	16	2	1.2	2.0	91.1
	18	1	.6	1.0	92.1
	19	2	1.2	2.0	94.1
	25	1	.6	1.0	95.0
	26	1	.6	1.0	96.0
	27	1	.6	1.0	97.0
	34	1	.6	1.0	98.0
	37	1	.6	1.0	99.0
	44	1	.6	1.0	100.0
	Total	101	59.1	100.0	
Missing	System	70	40.9		
Total		171	100.0		

RESRVFUL reserve officers become full time officers

Statistics

RESRVFUL reserve officers become full time officers

N	Valid	114
	Missing	57
Mean		.52
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		59

RESRVFUL reserve officers become full time officers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	55	32.2	48.2	48.2
	1 Yes	59	34.5	51.8	100.0
	Total	114	66.7	100.0	
Missing	System	57	33.3		
Total		171	100.0		

AUXILOFF auxillary officers

Statistics

AUXILOFF auxillary officers		
N	Valid	166
	Missing	5
Mean		.04
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		6

AUXILOFF auxillary officers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	160	93.6	96.4	96.4
	1 Yes	6	3.5	3.6	100.0
	Total	166	97.1	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.9		
Total		171	100.0		

AUXILNUM auxillary officers numbers

Statistics

AUXILNUM auxillary officers numbers

N	Valid	24
	Missing	147
Mean		2.50
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		43
Sum		60

AUXILNUM auxillary officers numbers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	18	10.5	75.0	75.0
	1	2	1.2	8.3	83.3
	2	1	.6	4.2	87.5
	4	1	.6	4.2	91.7
	9	1	.6	4.2	95.8
	43	1	.6	4.2	100.0
	Total	24	14.0	100.0	
Missing	System	147	86.0		
Total		171	100.0		

TERRORIS terrorism policy

Statistics

TERRORIS terrorism policy

N	Valid	167
	Missing	4
Mean		.31
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		52

TERRORIS terrorism policy

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 No	115	67.3	68.9	68.9
	1 Yes	52	30.4	31.1	100.0
	Total	167	97.7	100.0	
Missing	System	4	2.3		
Total		171	100.0		

TERFED terrorism federal funding requested

Statistics

TERFED terrorism federal funding requested

N	Valid	164
	Missing	7
Mean		.39
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		64

TERFED terrorism federal funding requested

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	100	58.5	61.0	61.0
	1 Yes	64	37.4	39.0	100.0
	Total	164	95.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	4.1		
Total		171	100.0		

TERSTATE terrorism state funding

Statistics

TERSTATE terrorism state funding

N	Valid	154
	Missing	17
Mean		.28
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		43

TERSTATE terrorism state funding

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	111	64.9	72.1	72.1
	1 Yes	43	25.1	27.9	100.0
	Total	154	90.1	100.0	
Missing	System	17	9.9		
Total		171	100.0		

TERLOCAL terrorism city or county funding

Statistics

TERLOCAL terrorism city or county funding

N	Valid	147
	Missing	24
Mean		.14
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		21

TERLOCAL terrorism city or county funding

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	126	73.7	85.7	85.7
	1 Yes	21	12.3	14.3	100.0
	Total	147	86.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	14.0		
Total		171	100.0		

TERFUND1 terrorism funding equipment

Statistics

TERFUND1 terrorism funding equipment

N	Valid	115
	Missing	56
Mean		26176.57
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		550000
Sum		3010305

TERFUND1 terrorism funding equipment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	92	53.8	80.0	80.0
	1000	1	.6	.9	80.9
	2000	1	.6	.9	81.7
	6000	1	.6	.9	82.6
	6969	1	.6	.9	83.5
	10000	1	.6	.9	84.3
	15000	1	.6	.9	85.2
	30000	2	1.2	1.7	87.0
	32161	1	.6	.9	87.8
	50000	1	.6	.9	88.7
	60000	1	.6	.9	89.6
	95675	1	.6	.9	90.4
	98000	1	.6	.9	91.3
	110000	1	.6	.9	92.2
	120000	1	.6	.9	93.0
	122500	1	.6	.9	93.9
	146000	1	.6	.9	94.8
	200000	1	.6	.9	95.7
	225000	2	1.2	1.7	97.4
	375000	1	.6	.9	98.3
	500000	1	.6	.9	99.1
	550000	1	.6	.9	100.0
	Total	115	67.3	100.0	
Missing	System	56	32.7		
Total		171	100.0		

TERFUND2 terrorism funding training

Statistics

TERFUND2 terrorism funding training

N	Valid	104
	Missing	67
Mean		2630.68
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		73647
Sum		273591

TERFUND2 terrorism funding training

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	88	51.5	84.6	84.6
	200	1	.6	1.0	85.6
	315	1	.6	1.0	86.5
	500	2	1.2	1.9	88.5
	1000	2	1.2	1.9	90.4
	3594	1	.6	1.0	91.3
	4180	1	.6	1.0	92.3
	5968	1	.6	1.0	93.3
	10000	1	.6	1.0	94.2
	15000	1	.6	1.0	95.2
	20690	1	.6	1.0	96.2
	25000	1	.6	1.0	97.1
	50000	1	.6	1.0	98.1
	61997	1	.6	1.0	99.0
	73647	1	.6	1.0	100.0
	Total	104	60.8	100.0	
Missing	System	67	39.2		
Total		171	100.0		

TERRCOO1 who coordinates terrorism wmd response (1)

Statistics

TERRCOO1 who coordinates terrorism wmd response (1)

N	Valid	166
	Missing	5
Mean		1.89
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		6
Sum		314

TERRCOO1 who coordinates terrorism wmd response (1)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	.6	.6	.6
	1 Chief Sheriff	124	72.5	74.7	75.3
	2 Fire EMS chief	7	4.1	4.2	79.5
	3 task force director	7	4.1	4.2	83.7
	5 undetermined	7	4.1	4.2	88.0
	6 other	20	11.7	12.0	100.0
	Total	166	97.1	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.9		
Total		171	100.0		

TERRCOO2 who coordinates terrorism wmd response (2)

Statistics

TERRCOO2 who coordinates terrorism wmd response (2)

N	Valid	28
	Missing	143
Mean		2.79
Median		2.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		6
Sum		78

TERRCOO2 who coordinates terrorism wmd response (2)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	.6	3.6	3.6
	2 Fire Chief EMS	17	9.9	60.7	64.3
	3 Task Force Director	4	2.3	14.3	78.6
	4 mayor	2	1.2	7.1	85.7
	6 other	4	2.3	14.3	100.0
	Total	28	16.4	100.0	
Missing	System	143	83.6		
Total		171	100.0		

TERRSCEN conducted terrorism scenario training

Statistics

TERRSCEN conducted terrorism scenario training

N	Valid	166
	Missing	5
Mean		.38
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		63

TERRSCEN conducted terrorism scenario training

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	103	60.2	62.0	62.0
	1 Yes	63	36.8	38.0	100.0
	Total	166	97.1	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.9		
Total		171	100.0		

TERRFIRE fire department involved in terrorism scenario training

Statistics

TERRFIRE fire department involved in terrorism scenario training

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.37
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		64

TERRFIRE fire department involved in terrorism scenario training

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	107	62.6	62.6	62.6
	1 Yes	64	37.4	37.4	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

TERREMS ems involved in scenarios

Statistics

TERREMS ems involved in scenarios

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.36
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		61

TERREMS ems involved in scenarios

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	110	64.3	64.3	64.3
	1 Yes	61	35.7	35.7	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

TERHOSPI hospitals involved in scenarios

Statistics

TERHOSPI hospitals involved in scenarios

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.19
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		33

TERHOSPI hospitals involved in scenarios

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	138	80.7	80.7	80.7
	1 Yes	33	19.3	19.3	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

TERSLED SLED involved in scenarios

Statistics

TERSLED SLED involved in scenarios

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.13
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		22

TERSLED SLED involved in scenarios

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	149	87.1	87.1	87.1
	1 Yes	22	12.9	12.9	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

TERAGENC other state or local agencies involved in scenarios

Statistics

TERAGENC other state or local agencies involved in scenarios

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.32
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		54

TERAGENC other state or local agencies involved in scenarios

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	117	68.4	68.4	68.4
	1 Yes	54	31.6	31.6	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

TERFEDAG federal agencies involved in scenarios

Statistics

TERFEDAG federal agencies involved in scenarios

N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.11
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		18

TERFEDAG federal agencies involved in scenarios

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	153	89.5	89.5	89.5
	1 Yes	18	10.5	10.5	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

DRUGTEST drug policy for testing employees

Statistics

DRUGTEST drug policy for testing employees

N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		.80
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		135

DRUGTEST drug policy for testing employees

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	34	19.9	20.1	20.1
	1 Yes	135	78.9	79.9	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

TESTAPPS applicants for employment drug tested

Statistics

TESTAPPS applicants for employment drug tested

N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		.73
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		124

TESTAPPS applicants for employment drug tested

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	45	26.3	26.6	26.6
	1 Yes	124	72.5	73.4	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

TESTPROB probabation officers drug tested

Statistics

TESTPROB probabation officers drug tested

N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		.04
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		6

TESTPROB probabation officers drug tested

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	163	95.3	96.4	96.4
	1 Yes	6	3.5	3.6	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

TESTPROM candidates for promotion drug tested

Statistics

TESTPROM candidates for promotion drug tested

N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		.04
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		7

TESTPROM candidates for promotion drug tested

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	162	94.7	95.9	95.9
	1 Yes	7	4.1	4.1	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

TESTVICE drug investigators drug tested

Statistics

TESTVICE drug investigators drug tested

N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		.14
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		23

TESTVICE drug investigators drug tested

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	146	85.4	86.4	86.4
	1 Yes	23	13.5	13.6	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

TESTNON nonsworn personnel drug tested

Statistics

TESTNON nonsworn personnel drug tested

N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		.11
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		19

TESTNON nonsworn personnel drug tested

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	150	87.7	88.8	88.8
	1 Yes	19	11.1	11.2	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

TESTRAND random drug testing

Statistics

TESTRAND random drug testing

N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		.66
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		111

TESTRAND random drug testing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	58	33.9	34.3	34.3
	1 Yes	111	64.9	65.7	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

TESTACCI post accident drug testing

Statistics

TESTACCI post accident drug testing		
N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		.41
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		69

TESTACCI post accident drug testing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	100	58.5	59.2	59.2
	1 Yes	69	40.4	40.8	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

DRUGUNIT drug unit in agency

Statistics

DRUGUNIT drug unit in agency		
N	Valid	171
	Missing	0
Mean		.48
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		82

DRUGUNIT drug unit in agency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	89	52.0	52.0	52.0
	1 Yes	82	48.0	48.0	100.0
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

DRUGNUMB drug unit numbers

Statistics

DRUGNUMB drug unit numbers

N	Valid	94
	Missing	77
Mean		4.03
Median		2.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		22
Sum		379

DRUGNUMB drug unit numbers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	14	8.2	14.9	14.9
	1	20	11.7	21.3	36.2
	2	16	9.4	17.0	53.2
	3	8	4.7	8.5	61.7
	4	8	4.7	8.5	70.2
	5	2	1.2	2.1	72.3
	6	4	2.3	4.3	76.6
	7	4	2.3	4.3	80.9
	8	5	2.9	5.3	86.2
	9	2	1.2	2.1	88.3
	10	3	1.8	3.2	91.5
	12	4	2.3	4.3	95.7
	15	2	1.2	2.1	97.9
	21	1	.6	1.1	98.9
	22	1	.6	1.1	100.0
	Total	94	55.0	100.0	
Missing	System	77	45.0		
Total		171	100.0		

DRUGTASK multiagency drug task force

Statistics

DRUGTASK multiagency drug task force

N	Valid	168
	Missing	3
Mean		.55
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		93

DRUGTASK multiagency drug task force

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	75	43.9	44.6	44.6
	1 Yes	93	54.4	55.4	100.0
	Total	168	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.8		
Total		171	100.0		

SUPERVIS who supervises agency

Statistics

SUPERVIS who supervises agency		
N	Valid	155
	Missing	16
Mean		2.39
Median		2.00
Minimum		1
Maximum		4
Sum		371

SUPERVIS who supervises agency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 city or county manager	49	28.7	31.6	31.6
	2 city or county council	31	18.1	20.0	51.6
	3 mayor	40	23.4	25.8	77.4
	4 other	35	20.5	22.6	100.0
	Total	155	90.6	100.0	
Missing	System	16	9.4		
Total		171	100.0		

SUPERSYS years supervisory system in place

Statistics

SUPERSYS years supervisory system in place

N	Valid	162
	Missing	9
Mean		2.70
Median		3.00
Minimum		1
Maximum		3
Sum		437

SUPERSYS years supervisory system in place

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 1-5 years	17	9.9	10.5	10.5
	2 6-10 years	15	8.8	9.3	19.8
	3 11 or more years	130	76.0	80.2	100.0
	Total	162	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		171	100.0		

EVALUATO who evaluates agency

Statistics

EVALUATO who evaluates agency		
N	Valid	149
	Missing	22
Mean		2.57
Median		3.00
Minimum		1
Maximum		4
Sum		383

EVALUATO who evaluates agency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 city or county manager	43	25.1	28.9	28.9
	2 city or county council	27	15.8	18.1	47.0
	3 mayor	30	17.5	20.1	67.1
	4 other	49	28.7	32.9	100.0
	Total	149	87.1	100.0	
Missing	System	22	12.9		
Total		171	100.0		

MANGRACE race of city or county manager

Statistics

MANGRACE race of city or county manage

N	Valid	141
	Missing	30
Mean		1.09
Median		1.00
Minimum		1
Maximum		4
Sum		153

MANGRACE race of city or county manager

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 white	131	76.6	92.9	92.9
	2 black	9	5.3	6.4	99.3
	4 other	1	.6	.7	100.0
	Total	141	82.5	100.0	
Missing	System	30	17.5		
Total		171	100.0		

COPPLAN agency have a cop plan

Statistics

COPPLAN agency have a cop plan

N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		2.07
Median		2.00
Minimum		1
Maximum		3
Sum		349

COPPLAN agency have a cop plan

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 yes formally written	41	24.0	24.3	24.3
	2 yes not formally written	76	44.4	45.0	69.2
	3 no	52	30.4	30.8	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

COP1 Formal CP Plan

Statistics

COP1 Formal CP Plan

N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		.24
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		41

COP1 Formal CP Plan

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	128	74.9	75.7	75.7
	1 Formal CP Plan	41	24.0	24.3	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	-9	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

COP2 Informal CP Plan

Statistics

COP2 Informal CP Plan		
N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		.45
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		76

COP2 Informal CP Plan

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	93	54.4	55.0	55.0
	1 Informal CP Plan	76	44.4	45.0	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	-9	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

COP3 No CP Plan

Statistics

COP3 No CP Plan		
N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		.31
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		52

COP3 No CP Plan

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	117	68.4	69.2	69.2
	1 No CP Plan	52	30.4	30.8	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	-9	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

COPTRAIN cop training of citizens in past year

Statistics

COPTRAIN cop training of citizens in past year

N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		.26
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		45

COPTRAIN cop training of citizens in past year

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	125	73.1	73.5	73.5
	1 Yes	45	26.3	26.5	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

POPTRAIN pop conducted by officers

Statistics

POPTRAIN pop conducted by officers

N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		.75
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		127

POPTRAIN pop conducted by officers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	43	25.1	25.3	25.3
	1 Yes	127	74.3	74.7	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

POPPART pop partnerships formed

Statistics

POPPART pop partnerships formed

N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		.48
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		81

POPPART pop partnerships formed

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	89	52.0	52.4	52.4
	1 Yes	81	47.4	47.6	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

SURVSATI survey public satisfaction with police

Statistics

SURVSATI survey public satisfaction with police

N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		.34
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		58

SURVSATI survey public satisfaction with police

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	112	65.5	65.9	65.9
	1 Yes	58	33.9	34.1	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

SURVCRIM survey perceptions of crime

Statistics

SURVCRIM survey perceptions of crime

N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		.26
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		45

SURVCRIM survey perceptions of crime

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	125	73.1	73.5	73.5
	1 Yes	45	26.3	26.5	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

SURVVICT survey victimization experiences

Statistics

SURVVICT survey victimization experiences

N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		.21
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		36

SURVVICT survey victimization experiences

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	134	78.4	78.8	78.8
	1 Yes	36	21.1	21.2	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

SURVNONE no surveys conducted

Statistics

SURVNONE no surveys conducted

N	Valid	170
	Missing	1
Mean		.53
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		90

SURVNONE no surveys conducted

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	80	46.8	47.1	47.1
	1 Yes	90	52.6	52.9	100.0
	Total	170	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		171	100.0		

CRIMSTAT crime statistics available to officers

Statistics

CRIMSTAT crime statistics available to officers

N	Valid	165
	Missing	6
Mean		.48
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		80

CRIMSTAT crime statistics available to officers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	85	49.7	51.5	51.5
	1 Yes	80	46.8	48.5	100.0
	Total	165	96.5	100.0	
Missing	System	6	3.5		
Total		171	100.0		

MAPCALLS map calls to street address

Statistics

MAPCALLS map calls to street address

N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		.27
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		45

MAPCALLS map calls to street address

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	124	72.5	73.4	73.4
	1 Yes	45	26.3	26.6	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

MAPARRES map arrests to street address

Statistics

MAPARRES map arrests to street address

N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		.19
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		32

MAPARRES map arrests to street address

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	137	80.1	81.1	81.1
	1 Yes	32	18.7	18.9	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

MAPCRIME map crimes to beats or tracts

Statistics

MAPCRIME map crimes to beats or tracts

N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		.10
Median		.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		17

MAPCRIME map crimes to beats or tracts

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	152	88.9	89.9	89.9
	1 Yes	17	9.9	10.1	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

MAPNONE no crime mapping capabilities

Statistics

MAPNONE no crime mapping capabilities

N	Valid	169
	Missing	2
Mean		.53
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		89

MAPNONE no crime mapping capabilities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	80	46.8	47.3	47.3
	1 Yes	89	52.0	52.7	100.0
	Total	169	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		171	100.0		

GISTRAIN gis training interest

Statistics

GISTRAIN	gis training interest	
N	Valid	166
	Missing	5
Mean		.80
Median		1.00
Minimum		0
Maximum		1
Sum		133

GISTRAIN gis training interest

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	33	19.3	19.9	19.9
	1 Yes	133	77.8	80.1	100.0
	Total	166	97.1	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.9		
Total		171	100.0		