

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



# Survey of Criminal History Information Systems, 1992

## A Criminal Justice Information Policy Report

November 1993, NCJ-143500

143500

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice

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

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

Public Domain/OTJ/BJS

U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

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

Lawrence A. Greenfeld  
Acting Director

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

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

Copyright © SEARCH Group, Incorporated, 1993.

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

# Contents

List of data tables iv

Foreword v

Highlights 1

## Major findings 1

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

## Additional findings 3

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

Data tables 11

Methodology 60

# List of data tables

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

## Foreword

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

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

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

Lawrence A. Greenfeld  
Acting Director  
Bureau of Justice Statistics

# Highlights

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

## Major findings

### Level of automation of master name indexes and criminal history files

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

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

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

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

### Level of disposition reporting

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Level of felony flagging**

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

- Thirty States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico currently flag some or all felony convictions in their criminal history databases.
- An additional 14 States collect sufficient data to flag at least some previously unflagged felony convictions.

**Timeliness of trial court disposition data**

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

- The average number of days between the final court dispositions and receipt of that information by the State criminal history repositories is 43, ranging from less than one day in North Carolina to 180 days in Pennsylvania. The majority of States receive the data between 20 to 60 days.
- The average number of days between receipt of final trial court dispositions and entry of disposition data into the criminal history databases is 26, ranging from 0 in States where dispositions are entered either directly by the courts or by tape (eight States) to 365 in Minnesota. The majority of States enter the data in 10 days or less.

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

**Participation in the Interstate Identification Index (III)**

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

- As of December 31, 1992, 24 States (Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wyoming) reported that they currently participate (contribute arrest information to be used in the Index) in the Interstate Identification Index (III). The remaining 26 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands did not participate. The State of Illinois, however, has become a participant as of August 8, 1993. Since the tables reflect 1992 data, Illinois was not included; as of this date, however, the total participating States, including Illinois, is 25. The 25 States include the 12 largest States in the Nation and as a whole account for 71% of the Nation's population.
- Among the 24 participating States in 1992, an average of 65% of their criminal history files are available to III, ranging from 22% in Alaska to 100% in six States (Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Utah, Washington, Wyoming).

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Presale criminal history record checks on potential firearm purchasers**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

of Columbia to \$50.00 in New York.

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

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

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

#### **Additional findings**

##### **Status of State criminal history record files**

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Arrest records with fingerprints, 1992 (Table 6):*

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

**Completeness of arrest data in State criminal history repository**

*Arrest records with fingerprints, 1992 (Table 6):*

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

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

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

**Completeness of disposition data in State criminal history repository**

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

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

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

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

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

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

## State policies/practices on modifying felony convictions

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

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

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

record is also sealed if ordered by the court.

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

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

## Completeness of correctional data in State criminal history repository

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **Timeliness of data in State criminal history repository**

### **—Arrests**

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

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

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

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

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

## **—Admission to correctional facilities**

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

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

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

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

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

## Procedures to encourage arrest and disposition reporting

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

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

## Methods of linking arrests and dispositions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Data quality strategies

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Level of audit activity of State criminal history repository

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Presale criminal history record checks on potential firearm purchasers**

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

- Ten States and the Virgin Islands conduct records checks on firearm purchasers based on name and date of birth only. Delaware augments these data with the social security number and driver's license number of the potential purchaser. South Carolina also requires the additional information of the social security number.
- Seven jurisdictions require fingerprint checks under some circumstances. New York requires fingerprints for all checks; California requires fingerprints depending upon the type of application; Nebraska requires fingerprints for the purchase of automatic weapons; New Jersey and Oregon use fingerprints when identification is not made with a prior name and date of birth search; the District of Columbia and North Carolina

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **Data tables**



### Explanatory Notes for Table 1

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

\* State is fully manual.

... Not available.

NA Not applicable.

† Flag is set when arrest information is entered.

†† Flag is set when conviction information is entered.

\*\* Flag is set both at arrest and conviction.

<sup>a</sup>All automated records and approximately 50% of the manual records are contained in an automated master name index (MNI).

<sup>b</sup>Response indicates an increase from 95% reported in 1990.

<sup>c</sup>Traffic and misdemeanor cases are not included in the automated MNI.

<sup>d</sup>Response indicates an increase from 86% reported in 1990.

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

<sup>f</sup>Response indicates an increase from 70% reported in 1990.

<sup>g</sup>The manual file is not in the automated MNI.

<sup>h</sup>Approximately 20,000 names, name derivatives and aliases have been entered into a temporary, abbreviated automated MNI; however, the MNI is not usable at this time for a name search.

<sup>i</sup>The flag is generated on demand when an inquiry is made against the file.

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

<sup>k</sup>There are 760,000 records that are automated; a backlog consisting of 80,000 records is not yet on the MNI.

<sup>l</sup>The data field has been created, but the flag is not currently being set.

<sup>m</sup>Adding all records onto the automated MNI is in process.

<sup>n</sup>Manual records with no activity since 1971 are not on the MNI.

<sup>o</sup>The figure represents the number of subjects in the criminal history file; however, 28% of the database consists of civil purpose files.

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

<sup>q</sup>Only those with a date of birth of 1940 and later are included in the automated MNI.

<sup>r</sup>Effective July 1, 1993, the flag is now set at conviction.

<sup>s</sup>Response indicates an increase from 35% reported in 1990.

<sup>t</sup>The automated MNI contains all arrest subjects since 1972.

<sup>u</sup>Only recent additions to the file are flagged.

<sup>v</sup>Respondent is undertaking an ongoing data entry program to fully automate the MNI.

<sup>w</sup>Changes in court documents have resulted in not "all" cases having sufficient information to flag felonies.

<sup>x</sup>The Virgin Islands Record Bureau does not have a MNI; only a manual criminal history file is maintained.

<sup>y</sup>Currently, some arrest transactions are flagged indicating felony convictions. A felony flag that will appear in the identification segment of the record is currently being developed.

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

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

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

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

### Explanatory Notes for Table 2

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

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

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

<sup>c</sup>The total number of criminal history files has decreased due to the elimination of deceased records and purged records.

<sup>d</sup>The total number of criminal history files has been decreasing due to purging of old and duplicate records, as well as civil files that were erroneously given criminal identification numbers.

<sup>e</sup>The number of manual records has decreased from 1,500,000 in 1989 due to the purging of older, inactive files.

<sup>f</sup>Decrease in total files is the result of excluding traffic files which were assumed included in the 1989 figure.

<sup>g</sup>Respondent indicated that this figure includes many records which have since been purged because the records contained only nonserious offenses.

<sup>h</sup>Response is based on more accurate information which is now available.

<sup>i</sup>Variations in the figures for 1984, 1989 and 1992 are attributable to a five-year purge project in which 700,000 records were removed.

<sup>j</sup>The number of subjects reported for 1989 included outdated misdemeanor records which were purged when automation of the arrest data began in 1990.

<sup>k</sup>The lower number in 1992 is the result of purging inactive files.

<sup>l</sup>Utah now uses only the automated criminal history file.

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

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

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

... Not available.

#### Explanatory Notes for Table 3

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

<sup>a</sup>The figure represents the number of dispositions during the fiscal year (July-June) rather than the calendar year 1983.

<sup>b</sup>Since 1989, courts have noted a decrease in caseload, although Uniform Crime Reports show an increase in crime.

<sup>c</sup>The number reported is atypical due to a records improvement project which has resulted in a higher number of dispositions during this period.

<sup>d</sup>The number of reported dispositions has decreased due to personnel shortages.

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

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

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

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

... Not available.

#### Explanatory Notes for Table 4

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

<sup>a</sup>All automated records and approximately 50% of the manual records are contained in an automated master name index (MNI).

<sup>b</sup>Only the new arrest information is automated.

<sup>c</sup>Traffic and misdemeanor cases are not included in the automated MNI.

<sup>d</sup>A backlog of arrest cards for second/subsequent arrests is awaiting entry onto the automated criminal history file.

<sup>e</sup>More arrest information is being placed in the MNI than in 1989. New information is current, but adding the additional information to the prior MNI entries has not been completed.

<sup>f</sup>The manual file is not in the automated MNI.

<sup>g</sup>Approximately 20,000 names, name derivatives and aliases have been entered into a temporary, abbreviated automated MNI; however, the MNI is not usable at this time for a name search.

<sup>h</sup>There are 760,000 records that are automated; however, a backlog consisting of 80,000 records is not yet on the MNI.

<sup>i</sup>Adding all records onto the automated MNI is in process.

<sup>j</sup>Only those with a date of birth of 1940 and later are included in the automated MNI.

<sup>k</sup>The automated MNI contains all arrest subjects since 1972.

<sup>l</sup>Automated file was initiated in 1987. It contains only felonies and related misdemeanors.

<sup>m</sup>Respondent is undertaking an ongoing data entry program to fully automate the MNI.

<sup>n</sup>The Virgin Islands Record Bureau does not have a MNI; only a manual criminal history file is maintained.

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

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

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

... Not available.

NA Not applicable.



#### Explanatory Notes for Table 5

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

<sup>a</sup>Statutes are not currently enforced.

<sup>b</sup>Effective August 13, 1993, State law mandates reporting of all data categories on this table. At the close of 1992, however, no statutory requirements existed, although information was voluntarily submitted.

<sup>c</sup>The State law requirement applies to admission of persons sentenced to a period of confinement. When the inmate is released for work release, weekend leave, etc., during the period of confinement, additional fingerprints are not submitted.

<sup>d</sup>The charging agency has the responsibility to notify the repository of the disposition of every arrest, including those where no complaint is filed by the prosecutor.

<sup>e</sup>By administrative regulation, failure of the prosecutor to notify the repository of action taken on the case within 30 days after the arrest results in the case being closed and considered not filed.

<sup>f</sup>Data on the admission and release of sentenced felony offenders to State prisons or local jails is voluntarily submitted; State law does not require submission.

<sup>g</sup>Through an interpretation of the existing statute, it has been determined that the statute does not require that final court dispositions be submitted to the repository.

<sup>h</sup>Admission data only is required.

<sup>i</sup>Information is provided by the County Clerk of Court.

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

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

### Explanatory Notes for Table 6

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

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

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

... Not available.

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

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

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

<sup>d</sup> Arrest information is reported by fingerprint cards, terminal and court judgments.

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

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

<sup>g</sup> Arrest information is reported on fingerprint cards and on uniform arrest reports which may not include fingerprints.

<sup>h</sup> Arrest information is reported by fingerprint cards and criminal summonses.

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

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

<sup>k</sup> Figure is for fiscal year 1989 rather than calendar year 1989.

<sup>l</sup> Arrest information is reported by hard copies of the arrest report.

<sup>m</sup> Repository no longer receives fingerprint cards for nonserious charges.

<sup>n</sup> Arrest information is reported by terminal.

<sup>o</sup> Arrest information is reported by fingerprint cards, terminal, final dispositions, FBI abstracts and other documents.

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

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

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

<sup>s</sup> Resubmissions are rare.

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

<sup>u</sup> The repository is no longer returning unacceptable fingerprints.

<sup>v</sup> Arrest information is reported by fingerprint cards and court abstracts.

<sup>w</sup> The decrease in fingerprint cards submitted was due to a decrease in criminal arrests.

<sup>x</sup> The 1992 figure reflects a decrease in arrests.

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

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

<sup>aa</sup> Response is based on the results of an audit.

Table 6. Arrest records with fingerprints, 1989 and 1992

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

**Explanatory Notes for Table 7**

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

<sup>a</sup>Both the fingerprinting and the filing of charges are performed at the same unit.

<sup>b</sup>Police must release or charge an individual *before* sending fingerprints to the repository.

<sup>c</sup>Although the requirement exists, it is not enforced.

<sup>d</sup>The repository receives arraignment reports on all arraignments from the courts. If no arraignment is received within six months, the repository contacts the arresting agency.

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

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

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

... Not available.

### Explanatory Notes for Table 8

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

<sup>a</sup>Due to new reporting procedures, all prosecutor declinations are now reported to the repository; procedures are by agreement with the Department of Law.

<sup>b</sup>Pending legislation will require reporting of prosecutor declinations.

<sup>c</sup>Pending legislation will require reporting of felony trial court dispositions.

<sup>d</sup>Pending legislation will require that the fingerprints be submitted to the repository when subject is convicted after being brought to court by summons.

<sup>e</sup>Pending legislation will require that fingerprints be submitted to the repository when subject is not convicted after being brought to court by summons.

<sup>f</sup>Dispositions are not received on 30-40% of *all* arrests. It is unknown at what level the final disposition occurred.

<sup>g</sup>Prosecutors' position is that a declination is not a disposition; therefore, declinations are not reported.

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

<sup>i</sup>The response for 1992 is based on more accurate information that is now available to the repository.

<sup>j</sup>Figure represents *all* cases, not just felonies.

<sup>k</sup>Figure was determined by a data quality baseline audit.

<sup>l</sup>More accurate information is now available. The State repository is working with the courts to improve reporting.

<sup>m</sup>The charging agency has the responsibility to notify the repository of the disposition of every arrest, including those where no complaint is filed by the prosecutor.

<sup>n</sup>More accurate information is available.

<sup>o</sup>By administrative regulation, failure of the prosecutor to notify the repository of action taken on the case within 30 days after the arrest results in the case being closed and considered not filed.

<sup>p</sup>Through an interpretation of the existing statute, it has been determined that the statute does not require that final court dispositions be submitted to the repository.

<sup>q</sup>Due to manpower requirements, the project for obtaining missing dispositions was suspended for a few years. The repository is currently working on ways to obtain the missing dispositions.

<sup>r</sup>The decline is due to large contributors who are no longer reporting and some who are working toward electronic reporting.

<sup>s</sup>Decline in dispositions received is due to a personnel shortage.

<sup>t</sup>Respondent indicated that this figure reflects the percent of dispositions reported in 1987; more current figures were unavailable.

<sup>u</sup>Information is provided by County Clerk of Court.

<sup>v</sup>This is a relatively new statutory requirement.

<sup>w</sup>More information is available based on reports which were run off the criminal history file.

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

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

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

... Not available.

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



#### Explanatory Notes for Table 9

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

<sup>a</sup>Information regarding this type of modification is not reported to the State criminal history repository.

<sup>b</sup>The record is removed from the automated file and retained manually.

<sup>c</sup>Information regarding pardons was not previously reported to the State criminal history repository. Electronic reporting began June 30, 1993.

<sup>d</sup>This occurs only in cases where an offender is acquitted or the case is dismissed.

<sup>e</sup>Courts have the inherent authority to set aside convictions, although no State law exists that formalizes the practice.

<sup>f</sup>The record may be destroyed or retained with the action noted depending upon whether the charge was a misdemeanor or a felony and whether the record subject was convicted.

<sup>g</sup>State law does not provide for expungements, but courts have inherent authority to order a record expunged; in such cases, the record is destroyed.

<sup>h</sup>The record will also be sealed if ordered by the court.

<sup>i</sup>Set-asides occur only in cases where an appeal results in overturning the conviction. In these instances, the case is remanded to the sentencing court.

<sup>j</sup>The record is removed from the database and sealed.

<sup>k</sup>If a court order is received, the State criminal history repository complies with the order unless it is for a State police arrest, in which instance, the order is challenged.

<sup>l</sup>Set-aside provisions are applicable only to cases of first offense drug possession.

<sup>m</sup>Convictions are not expunged unless they are pardoned.

<sup>n</sup>This modification applies only in cases of specific controlled substances laws.

<sup>o</sup>This occurs only by appeal.

<sup>p</sup>Restoration of an offender's civil rights is accomplished only by a pardon.

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

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

<sup>†</sup> 1 Record is destroyed by State criminal history repository.

2 Record is retained with action noted on the record.

3 Record is returned to the court.

4 Record is sealed.

5 No action is taken.

6 Record is returned to submitting agency.

7 Record is returned to the Governor's Office.

8 Other

... Not available.

#### Explanatory Notes for Table 10

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

<sup>a</sup>If fingerprint cards are received from corrections, they are processed; there is no link, however, between corrections and the criminal history database.

<sup>b</sup>Response reported in 1990 was 90%.

<sup>c</sup>Response reported in 1990 was 100%.

<sup>d</sup>Response reported in 1990 was 90+%.

<sup>e</sup>Traditionally, the State central repository has received the fingerprints of admitted prisoners from State prisons and local jails; however, State law does not require the submission.

<sup>f</sup>Response reported in 1990 was 5%.

<sup>g</sup>Data on the admission of sentenced felony offenders to State prisons or local jails are voluntarily submitted; State law does not require the submission.

<sup>h</sup>Response reported in 1990 was 15%.

<sup>i</sup>Response reported in 1990 was 25%.

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

<sup>k</sup>The Virginia Department of Corrections has eliminated local jail classification of inmates.

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

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

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

... Not available.

#### Explanatory Notes for Table 11

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

<sup>a</sup>Statutory requirement to report the information is not currently enforced.

<sup>b</sup>Although parole information is reported to the repository, the repository does not record or maintain it.

<sup>c</sup>The first figure represents information relating to admission to supervision; the second figure represents information relating to release from supervision. The 1992 figures are based on more accurate information now available to the repository.

<sup>d</sup>The State repository is working with the appropriate agencies to improve reporting, which has decreased over the past years.

<sup>e</sup>Probation and revocation of probation information is received via the court.

<sup>f</sup>Response is based on the results of a baseline audit.

<sup>g</sup>Probation information is derived from the sentencing information from the courts. No information is received directly from probation agencies at this time.

<sup>h</sup>Reports showing parole are being eliminated in anticipation of the automated reporting system.

<sup>i</sup>Currently, probation information is received on final disposition reports from the courts. This procedure is currently under review.

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

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

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

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

... Not available.

# Explanatory Notes for Table 12

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

<sup>a</sup>Workload has increased and personnel has decreased, resulting in a longer amount of time to enter data.

<sup>b</sup>The repository is not the usual data entry point for arrest information into the criminal history database. Arresting agencies enter the data directly; therefore, arrest data are in the criminal history database prior to the receipt of the fingerprint cards. Arrest data are entered in approximately two days but are not fingerprint-supported until approximately 15 days.

<sup>c</sup>Data reported is for 1991. No data is available for 1992.

<sup>d</sup>Master name index entries and criminal history file entries occur simultaneously. Data reported is for 1991. No data is available for 1992.

<sup>e</sup>Normal processing time would be three to four days up to one week.

<sup>f</sup>The backlog has consistently averaged about one month.

<sup>g</sup>Increase in turnaround of arrest data and fingerprint submissions from the local agency is due to lack of staff at the local agency. Both state and local agencies have experienced economic reductions.

<sup>h</sup>Increase in time is due to backlogs and lack of staff.

<sup>i</sup>The current processing time of 15-20 days is slower than preferred, but with the present staff and workload, this is not considered a backlog.

<sup>j</sup>Backlog is primarily due to a personnel shortage.

<sup>k</sup>Information is entered upon request only, unless the offense is a serious felony. This procedure is being followed pending the elimination of an automated fingerprint identification system (AFIS) backlog. When the backlog is eliminated, posting should occur within 72 hours.

<sup>l</sup>An increase in crime has resulted in greater workloads; at the same time, there is also a lack of personnel.

<sup>m</sup>Arrest data on repeat offenders are entered weekly. Due to a lack of personnel, new arrest data are entered in about 60 days.

<sup>n</sup>Fingerprinting is performed at the repository. It takes approximately two weeks to microfiche the arrest data.

<sup>o</sup>Currently, there is a two-week backlog on repeat offender cases only.

<sup>p</sup>Respondent indicated that 30 days is the optimum processing time. Currently, the repository has approximately 30,000 cards which have been name-searched and are ready for entry into the criminal history database, and approximately 15,000 cards which have not been either name-searched or entered into the database.

<sup>q</sup>There are approximately 19,000 cards at various stages of entry.

<sup>r</sup>Response is based on a recently completed data quality audit.

<sup>s</sup>As of December 31, 1992, there was a backlog of 32,966 fingerprint arrest cards for second and subsequent arrests.

<sup>t</sup>As a result of conducting local agency audits since 1989, the average time between arrest and receipt of fingerprint cards and arrest data at the repository has been determined to be 10 days.

<sup>u</sup>Respondent anticipates that the sizeable backlog that currently exists will be resolved in 1993.

<sup>v</sup>The present backlog is due to implementation of an automated fingerprint identification system (AFIS) and will be worked out within a few months.

<sup>w</sup>Figure is for first arrests. The increase since 1989 in the average days to enter arrest data into the criminal history database is due to loss of personnel, especially fingerprint technicians, and to an increase in the number of fingerprint cards received.

<sup>x</sup>A change in the "unable to classify" fingerprint policy, the increased number of fingerprints received and the lack of resources, specifically fingerprint technicians, have caused the backlog.

<sup>y</sup>More accurate information is now known.

<sup>z</sup>The increase in time to enter arrest data into the database is due to the enormous growth of the backlog.

<sup>aa</sup>Normal processing time would be one week.

<sup>bb</sup>The backlog has been caused by an increased workload due to growth in the statutorily required applicant background processing.

<sup>cc</sup>Arrest data are not currently entered into the court-based criminal history file.

<sup>dd</sup>Normal processing time would be one week or less.

<sup>ee</sup>There is a backlog; however, newly received cards are processed as a priority.

<sup>ff</sup>A more thorough analysis of the maximum processing time has been conducted, resulting in a more accurate estimate for 1992.

<sup>gg</sup>Response is based on the results of a baseline audit.

<sup>hh</sup>Figure represents receipt time for 1991 arrests.

<sup>ii</sup>Due to the procurement of an AFIS, no data entry was done from August 1 to December 31, 1992. The backlog is being reduced rapidly and should be completed by September 1993.

<sup>jj</sup>The target processing time is three days.

<sup>kk</sup>Arrest data received in the form of arrest fingerprint cards are entered into the automated, temporary criminal history record file within two days of receipt. The names and aliases are placed in the master name index at that time. The fingerprint cards are then placed in a backlog for fingerprint search/identification processing. As of December 31, 1992, approximately 35,000 fingerprint cards were awaiting processing.

<sup>ll</sup>Arrest fingerprints for purposes of bail hearings are sent by facsimile and have priority; they are entered within two hours.

<sup>mm</sup>The repository supports a statewide facsimile network for the transmission of arrest fingerprints for persons awaiting arraignment. The network handles about half of the statewide arrest fingerprint volume; fingerprints are typically processed, and the rap sheet updated or created, within two hours. Priority work is handled within seven days of receipt.

<sup>nn</sup>Increase in time is due to heavy submissions and less personnel to accomplish the task.

<sup>oo</sup>First offenders are current; processing time is two to three days. The processing time for offenders with prior records takes about two weeks because there are more repeat offenders and more coding is required.

<sup>pp</sup>Increase in time is the result of a personnel shortage.

<sup>qq</sup>A backlog of 5,000-7,000 cards per month exists. Respondent anticipates that the AFIS implementation will reduce processing time to three days.

<sup>rr</sup>A backlog of approximately one month currently exists.

<sup>ss</sup>Increase is due to personnel cutbacks and added workload.

<sup>tt</sup>The increased time is due to a backlog resulting from the increased submission of applicant cards that the repository is now required to process.

<sup>uu</sup>Normal processing time would be one to two days.

<sup>vv</sup>A backlog of approximately 31,400 misdemeanor upgrade cards exists.

<sup>ww</sup>Increase is due to an increase in submission of data.

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

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

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

... Not available.

NA Not applicable.



# Explanatory Notes for Table 13

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

<sup>a</sup>Increased time is the result of court backlogs.

<sup>b</sup>Workload has increased and personnel has decreased, resulting in a longer period of time to enter data.

<sup>c</sup>The 1992 estimate is based on more accurate information as a result of a baseline data quality assessment.

<sup>d</sup>A backlog of one week exists for misdemeanor dispositions.

<sup>e</sup>Disposition information is held for 30 days to ensure that the arrest card is received at the State criminal history repository (SCR).

<sup>f</sup>Normal processing time would be two weeks; with the commencement of automation in July 1990, the backlog will be eliminated.

<sup>g</sup>Increase in time is due to lack of staff at the local agencies.

<sup>h</sup>Increase in time is due to lack of staff.

<sup>i</sup>The SCR operates under a court order to process dispositions within 90 days. Respondent indicated that with the present and foreseeable staff levels and the volume of documents the SCR handles, 40 days is normal processing time.

<sup>j</sup>Backlog is due primarily to a personnel shortage at the repository and/or at contributing agencies.

<sup>k</sup>Final trial court dispositions are currently not received by the repository. This is scheduled to occur electronically in 1993. Dispositions will be received weekly and posted within 72 hours.

<sup>l</sup>Dispositions are entered directly by the courts.

<sup>m</sup>Disposition data is current since 1988; there does exist a pre-1988 backlog.

<sup>n</sup>Court does not enter all dispositions.

<sup>o</sup>Repository is in the process of developing software and automation upgrades that will allow entry of historical and current dispositions. All available dispositions will be entered at that time.

<sup>p</sup>Respondent indicated that a backlog of approximately 100,000 transactions exists; in 1991, with the completion of automation of the courts in Florida, processing time could be reduced to four to six weeks.

<sup>q</sup>Current dispositions are entered within 24 hours of receipt by the repository. A backlog of 1986 dispositions is also being processed and will be eliminated by June 30, 1993.

<sup>r</sup>Figure is based on results of a data quality audit.

<sup>s</sup>As of December 31, 1992, there was a backlog of approximately 43,300 dispositions.

<sup>t</sup>Respondent anticipates that the sizeable backlog that currently exists will be resolved in 1993.

<sup>u</sup>Due to changes in personnel, timeliness of court reporting has decreased. The State repository is working on an educational approach to decrease the time for receipt of court dispositions.

<sup>v</sup>The backlog is due to AFIS implementation; the normal processing time is two weeks.

<sup>w</sup>The increase since 1989 in the average number of days between receipt of final trial court dispositions and entry of data into the database is due to the loss of personnel, the increase in the number of dispositions and the increase in the number of dispositions which were returned due to insufficient information.

<sup>x</sup>More accurate information is now known.

<sup>y</sup>The increase in time is due to backlogs and lack of staff.

<sup>z</sup>Increase in time is due to the reduction in data entry personnel.

<sup>aa</sup>Ten days would be normal processing time.

<sup>bb</sup>Information is maintained in a holding file; it is merged with the criminal record when an inquiry is received.

<sup>cc</sup>Dispositions are by tape entry upon receipt.

<sup>dd</sup>Disposition data are entered directly into the criminal history file from court terminals.

<sup>ee</sup>Response is based on the results of a baseline audit.

<sup>ff</sup>Response is based on the results of a baseline audit. Increased workloads and personnel decrease have resulted in the increase in time.

<sup>gg</sup>Courts rarely submit disposition data to the repository.

<sup>hh</sup>Figure is for 1991 dispositions.

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

<sup>jj</sup>The greater length of time is due to a backlog of court dispositions and an overall increase in records.

<sup>kk</sup>Normal processing time would be one week.

<sup>ll</sup>Increase in time is due to the increased volume in the courts and the reduction in their staff.

<sup>mm</sup>Normal processing time would be one to two weeks.

<sup>nn</sup>A current backlog of approximately 100,000 dispositions exists.

<sup>oo</sup>A sampling of dispositions showed the increase in time; priorities placed on work received have also contributed to the increase.

<sup>pp</sup>The State repository is updated daily by the State Office of Court Administration for courts in large metropolitan areas; town and village courts remain a paper-based process.

<sup>qq</sup>Backlog is due to manual records and processing of town and village court dispositions, which was taken over by the repository from the State Office of Court Administration in 1992.

<sup>rr</sup>Data are entered the same day they are received.

<sup>ss</sup>Increase in time is due to a personnel shortage.

<sup>tt</sup>Respondent indicated that a backlog of about 35,000 dispositions currently exists; normal processing time would be one to two days.

<sup>uu</sup>Backlog is due to manually submitted dispositions that require research and verification.

<sup>vv</sup>Backlog is due to rejected data from the magnetic tape that must be manually entered.

<sup>ww</sup>A one-month backlog currently exists.

<sup>xx</sup>Increase in time is due to a change in procedure for receiving disposition data from the Unified Judicial System.

<sup>yy</sup>Respondent indicated that significant additional funding has been received to eliminate the backlog within the next year.

<sup>zz</sup>This backlog has been significantly reduced over the past year.

<sup>aaa</sup>There may be a backlog of 500-1,000 dispositions; normal processing time would be the same day.

<sup>bbb</sup>Disposition reports are held for 10-12 days to ensure that the fingerprint cards have been received and processed.

<sup>ccc</sup>There is a 20,000-document backlog; optimum processing time would be one week.

<sup>ddd</sup>Funds are currently being expended to decrease the backlog.

<sup>eee</sup>Reduction in personnel resulted in processing delays.

<sup>fff</sup>Some dispositions require clarification, which creates a backlog.

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

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

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

... Not available.

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

NA Not applicable.

# Explanatory Notes for Table 14

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

<sup>a</sup>Workload has increased and personnel has decreased, resulting in a longer amount of time to enter data.

<sup>b</sup>Respondent indicated that normal processing time would be one week.

<sup>c</sup>The backlog has consistently averaged approximately one month.

<sup>d</sup>Information is entered directly by the prison system.

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

<sup>f</sup>Information is entered into an automated corrections system as it occurs. The information is then extracted by the repository on a current basis.

<sup>g</sup>Respondent indicated that a backlog of approximately 60,000-70,000 transactions exists.

<sup>h</sup>Software enhancements that will permit automated receipt and processing of correctional data are currently being developed and tested.

<sup>i</sup>Correctional data are not currently captured on the criminal history record.

<sup>j</sup>Response is based on a recently completed data quality audit.

<sup>k</sup>The existing fingerprint backlog includes correctional fingerprints and is due to inadequate staff resources.

<sup>l</sup>Correctional information is entered only if an arrest is made by the Indiana State Police.

<sup>m</sup>Backlog is due primarily to personnel shortages.

<sup>n</sup>The increase since 1989 in the average number of days between receipt of correctional data and entry into the criminal history database is due to the loss of personnel.

<sup>o</sup>More accurate information is now known.

<sup>p</sup>Increase in time is due to the reduction in data entry personnel.

<sup>q</sup>There has been a significant increase in convictions and resulting incarcerations since 1989; that increase, along with large annual budget cuts, has resulted in the growing backlog.

<sup>r</sup>The repository has fewer resources to comply with legislatively mandated services.

<sup>s</sup>The 1992 estimate is the result of a more thorough analysis of processing time.

<sup>t</sup>Response is based on the results of a baseline audit.

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

<sup>v</sup>At present, information is not entered, but it is reported to the FBI Identification Division.

<sup>w</sup>Respondent indicated that normal processing time would be one to two weeks; a backlog of two to three months currently exists.

<sup>x</sup>Response is based on an audit sample.

<sup>y</sup>The increase is due to manpower allocation based on work priorities.

<sup>z</sup>The longer period of time in 1992 reflects a change in procedure. Correctional data are entered on-line. Fingerprints are requested only when an on-line match cannot be made.

<sup>aa</sup>System places priority on entry of arrest and disposition data which are processed before incarceration data.

<sup>bb</sup>Increase is due to the volume of persons entering detention and the lack of personnel.

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

<sup>dd</sup>The longer period of time in 1992 is the result of personnel shortages.

<sup>ee</sup>Increase in time is due to personnel shortages and changes in priorities.

<sup>ff</sup>Respondent indicated that normal processing time would be two weeks.

<sup>gg</sup>The increased time is due to a backlog resulting from increased submission of applicant cards that the State repository is now required to process.

<sup>hh</sup>Respondent indicated that a 7-10 day backlog exists.

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

State	Average number of days between admission of offender and receipt of data from:				Average number of days between receipt of correctional data and entry into criminal history database		Backlog of entering data into criminal history database	
	State prisons		Local jails		1989	1992	1989	1992
	1989	1992	1989	1992				
Alabama	7	3	NA	NA	3	5 <sup>a</sup>	No	No
Alaska	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Arizona	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Arkansas	10	7	NA	5	60	30	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes <sup>c</sup>
California	30	...	30	...	10-20	...	No	Yes <sup>d</sup>
Colorado	3	730 <sup>e</sup>	7	10	2	2	No	No
Connecticut	...	NA	...	NA	...	NA <sup>d</sup>	...	NA
Delaware	7	7	NA	NA	NA <sup>d</sup>	NA <sup>d</sup>	No	...
District of Columbia	0 <sup>f</sup>	NA	0 <sup>f</sup>	NA	NA	NA	No	NA
Florida	3-5	...	NA	...	540	...	Yes <sup>g</sup>	Yes <sup>h</sup>
Georgia	14	5	NA	NA	252	1	Yes	No
Hawaii	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	Yes <sup>i</sup>
Idaho	7	33 <sup>j</sup>	NA	NA	7	...	No	Yes <sup>k</sup>
Illinois	1	...	1-5	...	1	...	No	No
Indiana	14	30-60	14-365	...	NA <sup>l</sup>	30-60	NA	Yes <sup>m</sup>
Iowa	7	5	7	5	7	10 <sup>n</sup>	No	Yes <sup>m</sup>
Kansas	3-5	30 <sup>o</sup>	...	...	1	...	No	Yes <sup>m</sup>
Kentucky	30	10	NA	NA	2	30 <sup>p</sup>	No	Yes <sup>m</sup>
Louisiana	14	at least 183 <sup>q</sup>	14	...	14	365 <sup>q</sup>	No	Yes <sup>r</sup>
Maine	14	10	14	10	1	1	No	No
Maryland	1	31	7	7	0	0	No	No
Massachusetts	NA	30	NA	30	NA	1	NA	No
Michigan	7-10	...	NA	NA	5	10 <sup>s</sup>	No	No
Minnesota	7	23 <sup>t</sup>	NA	NA	14	10	No	No
Mississippi	7	30-60	NA	30-90	NA <sup>d</sup>	NA <sup>d</sup>	NA	...
Missouri	30	10-14	NA	NA	2-3	2-3	No	No
Montana	...	NA	NA	NA	1	...	No	Yes <sup>u</sup>
Nebraska	28	30 <sup>o</sup>	56	...	7	30 <sup>p</sup>	No	No
Nevada	10	10	...	NA	60	NA <sup>v</sup>	Yes <sup>b</sup>	No
New Hampshire	30	30	...	NA	1-2	2	No	No
New Jersey	7-21	7	7-21	7	60-90	1	Yes <sup>w</sup>	No
New Mexico	28	30 <sup>x</sup>	NA	30	2	5 <sup>y</sup>	No	No
New York	7-14	...	7-14	...	14	0-21 <sup>z</sup>	No	Yes <sup>aa</sup>
North Carolina	30	30	15-20	...	15-20	12	No	Yes <sup>mm</sup>
North Dakota	7	7	30	30	<1	<1	No	No
Ohio	14-90	25	NA	...	2	30 <sup>bb</sup>	No	Yes <sup>cc</sup>
Oklahoma	14	7	NA	NA	2	2	No	No
Oregon	7	10 <sup>dd</sup>	NA	NA	1	2 <sup>ee</sup>	No	No
Pennsylvania	14	...	30	...	NA <sup>i</sup>	...	NA	Yes
Puerto Rico	...	...	...	...	...	6	...	No
Rhode Island	...	...	...	...	1	...	No	No
South Carolina	10	7	10	7	56	10	Yes <sup>ff</sup>	No
South Dakota	30	30	7	5-14	1-2	2	No	No
Tennessee	7	...	...	...	1	...	No	No
Texas	2	1	NA	NA	1	1	No	No
Utah	14	30-60 <sup>gg</sup>	NA	30-60	7	148 <sup>gg</sup>	No	No
Vermont	14-21	NA	14-21	NA	...	NA	Yes <sup>hh</sup>	NA
Virginia	42-56	42-56	42-56	42-56	5	5	No	No
Virgin Islands	...	NA	...	1	...	1	...	No
Washington	14	30	NA	NA	7	1	No	No
West Virginia	5-10	14	5-10	NA	1-2	3	No	No
Wisconsin	7	...	7	...	14	...	No	Yes <sup>k</sup>
Wyoming	7	10-12	NA	7-10	7	7-10	No	No

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

... Not available.

NA Not applicable.

#### Explanatory Notes for Table 15

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

<sup>a</sup>Previously used field visits have been eliminated due to funding reductions.

<sup>b</sup>The practice of using telephone calls has been changed; everything must now be in written form.

<sup>c</sup>The repository also uses microfilm and microfiche. Re-instituting a procedure of generating lists of arrests for which final dispositions have not been received is under consideration.

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

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

<sup>f</sup>The repository also participates in the training of all new recruits at the Criminal Justice Academy.

<sup>g</sup>The repository also conducts work sessions with contributors and seeks their cooperative efforts in establishing better reporting procedures.

<sup>h</sup>The practice of field visits was in place from 1987 through the spring of 1992; at that time, personnel who were performing the task were no longer available, and the field visits were stopped.

<sup>i</sup>A new rule will be going into effect that will change the procedures employed.

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

<sup>k</sup>Previously used form letters have been replaced by personal contact.

<sup>l</sup>The repository also conducts seminars with court officials and requests their cooperation in submitting dispositions to the repository.

<sup>m</sup>The repository also employs training.

<sup>n</sup>Generating lists of arrests for which dispositions were not recorded and the use of form letters were discontinued due to the backlog in entering disposition data at the repository.

<sup>o</sup>The repository will also be using audits that will include surveys and field visits in the future.

<sup>p</sup>Field visits have been discontinued due to lack of staff.

<sup>q</sup>The repository is currently developing the capability to generate computer lists of missing dispositions.

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

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

#### Explanatory Notes for Table 16

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

<sup>a</sup>Court case number.

<sup>b</sup>The repository uses a number constructed of the unique arrest-event identifier, the arrest date and the originating agency identifier (ORI). This replaced the computer-assigned unique tracking number previously used.

<sup>c</sup>Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) case number.

<sup>d</sup>Fingerprint verification.

<sup>e</sup>The former method used for linking disposition data was discontinued in 1992; effective January 1, 1993, a new disposition tracking number was instituted.

<sup>f</sup>Case numbers.

<sup>g</sup>Present plans call for a unique tracking number.

<sup>h</sup>Date of birth and social security number.

<sup>i</sup>Pending.

<sup>j</sup>Agency ORI.

<sup>k</sup>The method for linking dispositions to particular charges applies only when there is a single count; it is not applicable for multiple counts.

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

<sup>m</sup>Planned system enhancement.

<sup>n</sup>Date of birth, place of birth and social security number pending.

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

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

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

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



### Explanatory Notes for Table 17

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

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

<sup>b</sup>Response is based on a data quality assessment and indicates an increase from 10% reported in 1990.

<sup>c</sup>Data are entered temporarily into a separate database, known as the nonfingerprint-based arrest and disposition (NFAD) file.

<sup>d</sup>Response indicates a decrease from 30% reported in 1990.

<sup>e</sup>Response indicates a decrease from 20% reported in 1990.

<sup>f</sup>"No record" dispositions are destroyed after one year; "no arrest on record" dispositions are filed separately after six weeks.

<sup>g</sup>Court data is available on-line using a name search in the "temporary disposition" file.

<sup>h</sup>Response indicates an increase from 20% reported in 1990.

<sup>i</sup>Information is maintained in a manual file until a match can be made.

<sup>j</sup>Response indicates an increase from <1% reported in 1990.

<sup>k</sup>Response indicates an increase from "all data received is linked" reported in 1990.

<sup>l</sup>Linkage is accomplished through a unique identifying number and field edits.

<sup>m</sup>Response indicates a decrease from 5% reported in 1990.

<sup>n</sup>Data are entered and held in a "pending" file.

<sup>o</sup>Response reported in 1990 was 5%.

<sup>p</sup>Response reported in 1990 was 2%.

<sup>q</sup>Response indicates a decrease from 15% reported in 1990.

<sup>r</sup>Response indicates an increase from 5% reported in 1990.

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

<sup>t</sup>The arresting agency is contacted, and an attempt is made to link the data based on information in that agency's files.

<sup>u</sup>Response reported in 1990 was 6%.

<sup>v</sup>Response reported in 1990 was 20%.

<sup>w</sup>Response reported in 1990 was <5%.

<sup>x</sup>Custody information is entered on the rap sheet as a separate entry but includes the court docket number as a linkage to the court record.

<sup>y</sup>The unlinked court data are computerized for linking to arrest data when processed; the unlinked court records are not accessible to the field.

<sup>z</sup>This percentage is specific to disposition data received in 1992.

<sup>aa</sup>Response indicates an increase from 6% reported in 1990.

<sup>bb</sup>Response reported in 1990 was 6%.

<sup>cc</sup>Response indicates a decrease from 20% reported in 1990.

<sup>dd</sup>Response represents an increase from "all data received is/will be linked" reported in 1990.

<sup>ee</sup>Response reported in 1990 was "all data received is linked."

<sup>ff</sup>Response indicates a decrease from 30% reported in 1990.

<sup>gg</sup>Return correspondence to the contributor.

<sup>hh</sup>Response indicates a decrease from 1% reported in 1990.

<sup>ii</sup>Response reported in 1990 was 30-50%.

<sup>jj</sup>Response indicates an increase from 5% reported in 1990.

<sup>kk</sup>This procedure is used as long as there is a fingerprint card on file to support the arrest.

<sup>ll</sup>Response reported in 1990 was 2%.

<sup>mm</sup>Response represents a decrease from 10% reported in 1990.

<sup>nn</sup>Response reported in 1990 was 0%.

<sup>oo</sup>Response indicated an increase from 5% reported in 1990.

<sup>pp</sup>Response indicates an increase from 2% reported in 1990.

<sup>qq</sup>The information is either returned to the submitting agency or filed until an arrest fingerprint card is received; the disposition or custody information is entered only when the arrest information is received.

<sup>rr</sup>An attempt is made to locate fingerprint card data.

<sup>ss</sup>Response indicates a decrease from 30% reported in 1990.

<sup>tt</sup>Enter all custody segments linked to a dummy arrest.

<sup>uu</sup>Response indicates an increase from 5% reported in 1990.

<sup>vv</sup>Contact is made with the arresting agency or with corrections.

<sup>ww</sup>Response indicates an increase from 1% reported in 1990.

<sup>xx</sup>Response represents an increase from "all data received is linked" reported in 1990.

<sup>yy</sup>This part of the system is currently under review.

<sup>zz</sup>This procedure is used if the court submission includes fingerprints that can be linked to an existing criminal history.

<sup>aaa</sup>Response reported in 1990 was 10%.

<sup>bbb</sup>Response reported in 1990 was 5%.

<sup>ccc</sup>Response reported in 1990 was 15%.

<sup>ddd</sup>Courts are contacted.

<sup>eee</sup>Response reported in 1990 was 10%.

<sup>fff</sup>Response reported in 1990 was 30-40%.

<sup>ggg</sup>Response indicates a decrease from 15-20% reported in 1990.

<sup>hhh</sup>Response reported in 1990 was 1-2%.

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

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

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

... Not available.

NA Not applicable.

\* All data received can be linked.

### Explanatory Notes for Table 18

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

<sup>a</sup>The procedure of random sample comparisons has been discontinued due to staff shortages.

<sup>b</sup>Periodic audits of random samples.

<sup>c</sup>On-site audits of procedures.

<sup>d</sup>Comparison of data in criminal history database to data in automated fingerprint identification system (AFIS).

<sup>e</sup>Key verification.

<sup>f</sup>Verification after data entry.

<sup>g</sup>Obtain missing information from courts and arresting agencies by telephone.

<sup>h</sup>Third-party, independent audits.

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

<sup>j</sup>Complete quality control function on all criminal history record entries.

<sup>k</sup>A redesign of the computerized criminal history system has eliminated manual assembly of records and provided automated records without manual review.

<sup>l</sup>Ongoing audit review of case jackets.

<sup>m</sup>Data Quality Task Force.

<sup>n</sup>Ad hoc computer file searched for erroneous data.

<sup>o</sup>Error lists are no longer used due to poor response rates. Contributors are now contacted directly by telephone to verify and correct information.

<sup>p</sup>Return copies of fingerprint cards that contain incomplete or incorrect information.

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

<sup>r</sup>Field staff returns errors to agencies.

<sup>s</sup>The manual review follows a computer edit procedure which indicates the criminal history files and dispositions that do not match to an arrest.

<sup>t</sup>Call courts.

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

<sup>v</sup>Current assessment may alter existing methods.

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

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

#### Explanatory Notes for Table 19

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

<sup>a</sup>Log is maintained for inquiries only.

<sup>b</sup>Since June 30, 1992, however, the Georgia Crime Information Center (GCIC) auditors have had to reduce the scope of their audits to satisfy National Crime Information Center (NCIC) audit frequency requirements.

<sup>c</sup>Audits were completed in conjunction with the baseline audit completed in August 1992.

<sup>d</sup>Record transaction log only.

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

<sup>f</sup>On-site audits have not been conducted. The 1989 response was based on in-house audits.

<sup>g</sup>A baseline audit of the repository is currently being undertaken. This will be completed before audits of other agencies begin.

<sup>h</sup>In-house audits are conducted to check the accuracy and completeness of information entered into the criminal history files.

<sup>i</sup>Random sampling is conducted daily on incoming fingerprint card submissions; specific agencies are not isolated.

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

<sup>k</sup>Except for modifications.

<sup>l</sup>Field staff works with agencies on data quality.

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

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

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

#### Explanatory Notes for Table 20

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

<sup>a</sup>Audit has not been finalized.

<sup>b</sup>Establishment of the Data Quality Unit.

<sup>c</sup>No formal audit has been conducted; however, all information is reviewed by specialists to ensure accuracy and completeness as part of a daily function.

<sup>d</sup>The Massachusetts criminal record improvement plan calls for the development of fingerprint-supported criminal records.

<sup>e</sup>Use of noncriminal justice record check fees to improve the criminal history system.

<sup>f</sup>A comprehensive outside audit of the central repository and its associated reporting agencies is being planned for 1994. In-house auditing at the central repository to improve data quality is being incorporated.

<sup>g</sup>Repository is currently in the process of selecting a vendor to conduct an audit of the repository.

<sup>h</sup>Helpline implemented.

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

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

... Not available.

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

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



#### Explanatory Notes for Table 21

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

<sup>a</sup>Database does not yet include a custody/supervision segment.

<sup>b</sup>State plans to participate within the next 12 months.

<sup>c</sup>Response is the result of a data quality audit.

<sup>d</sup>As of December 31, 1992, Illinois was not a III participant; however, Illinois became a participant on August 8, 1993.

<sup>e</sup>State plans to participate by fall 1993.

<sup>f</sup>Disposition information is lacking.

<sup>g</sup>This figure represents the percentage of records established since 1990.

<sup>h</sup>State is in the process of preparing for III participation as a result of grant funds.

<sup>i</sup>The criminal history files also consist of 28% civil purpose files.

<sup>j</sup>The criminal history record system is undergoing a complete redesign; III participation is planned for mid-1993.

<sup>k</sup>Participation is expected in 1994.

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

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

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

... Not available.

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

### Explanatory Notes for Table 22

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

<sup>a</sup>Criminal history check conducted by the local agency, not the State criminal history repository.

<sup>b</sup>The amount varies depending upon application type.

<sup>c</sup>Other databases containing information relating to the noncriminal firearms prohibitions, such as mental health.

<sup>d</sup>Figure is for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1992.

<sup>e</sup>All firearms except shotguns and antiques.

<sup>f</sup>Shotguns and rifles only; handguns owned by retired police personnel who reside in the District of Columbia.

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

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

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

<sup>j</sup>The State criminal history repository does not do "gun checks"; a unit within the Maryland State Police conducts the searches. The answers which follow reflect the Maryland State Police procedures.

<sup>k</sup>Fiscal year 1989 (July-June) rather than calendar year 1989.

<sup>l</sup>An additional 50,000 checks were conducted for licenses to carry concealed weapons.

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

<sup>n</sup>For renewal only.

<sup>o</sup>State and Federal applicant fingerprint cards are required for all new applicants.

<sup>p</sup>Long guns in New York City.

<sup>q</sup>Name searches by licensing authorities are not permitted.

<sup>r</sup>Fee includes a surcharge of \$25.

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

<sup>t</sup>There currently exists no state firearm purchase statutes. Some large cities, e.g., Cleveland, have city ordinances which require registration of firearms. The 1991 report should have noted that distinction.

<sup>u</sup>The Oregon law became effective January 1, 1990.

<sup>v</sup>Respondent indicated that the Western Identification Network (WIN) and the State records of Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Utah and Wyoming are also checked.

<sup>w</sup>Checks are conducted after the purchase.

<sup>x</sup>Currently, only fingerprints of persons applying to carry a concealed handgun are being searched for a prior record.

<sup>y</sup>Effective September 1993, fee is \$8.

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

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

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

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

\* Record checks are mandated by State law.

... Not available.

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

### Explanatory Notes for Table 23

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

<sup>a</sup>An applicant fee is required.

<sup>b</sup>Pending legislation would permit release of information to firearms dealers.

<sup>c</sup>The type of search depends on the application or clearance requested.

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

<sup>e</sup>In-state firearms dealers only.

<sup>f</sup>State law permits disclosure of recent felony convictions, *i.e.*, up to two years after completion of correctional supervision.

<sup>g</sup>Disclosure is permitted pursuant to policy which considers conviction data public information.

<sup>h</sup>Fingerprints are required for automatic weapons.

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

<sup>j</sup>Fingerprint search is made only if identification is *not* made with prior name/date of birth search.

<sup>k</sup>The Puerto Rico Police is the only agency authorized to provide the information to the firearms dealers.

<sup>l</sup>Police Departments will respond to firearms dealers, not the State repository. State repository responds only if needed.

<sup>m</sup>State law does not permit the confirmation that an individual does or does not have a felony conviction. The direct response to a firearms dealer either approves the sale or the sale is "not approved at this time."

<sup>n</sup>Effective in 1991, firearms dealers are advised only of approval or denial number. Reasons for disqualification are not provided.

<sup>o</sup>Dealer must provide a set of fully rolled fingerprints, a signed and notarized waiver and a \$15 processing fee.

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

State	Data elements used in search of criminal history database	Minimum elements required to search master name index	Soundex can be used in name search	Present law permits giving felony conviction information to firearms dealers
Alabama				Yes <sup>a</sup>
Alaska				
Arizona <sup>b</sup>				
Arkansas <sup>b</sup>				
California	Name, DOB, Fingerprints <sup>c</sup>	Name, DOB, Sex	Yes	
Colorado				Yes
Connecticut	Name, DOB only	Name, DOB	Yes	...
Delaware	Name, DOB, SSN, DL Number	Name, DOB, Sex, Race,	Yes	
District of Columbia	Name, DOB, Fingerprints	Name, DOB, Sex, Race, SSN	Yes	
Florida	Name, DOB only	Name, DOB, Sex, Race	Yes	d
Georgia				
Hawaii				Yes
Idaho				
Illinois	Name, DOB only	Name, DOB, Sex	Yes	Yes <sup>c</sup>
Indiana	Name, DOB only	Name, DOB	Yes	
Iowa				
Kansas				Yes
Kentucky				
Louisiana				
Maine	Name, DOB only	Name, DOB	Yes	Yes
Maryland				
Massachusetts	Name, DOB only	Name, DOB	Yes	Yes <sup>f</sup>
Michigan				Yes <sup>g</sup>
Minnesota				
Mississippi				
Missouri				Yes <sup>a</sup>
Montana				Yes <sup>a</sup>
Nebraska	Name, DOB, Fingerprints <sup>h</sup>	Name, DOB, SSN	Yes	1
Nevada				Yes
New Hampshire				
New Jersey	Fingerprints <sup>i</sup>	Name, DOB, SSN	Yes	
New Mexico				
New York	Fingerprints only	Name, DOB, Sex	Yes	
North Carolina	Name, DOB, Fingerprints	Name, DOB, Sex, Race	Yes	
North Dakota				
Ohio				
Oklahoma				Yes
Oregon	Fingerprints <sup>j</sup>	Name, DOB	Yes	
Pennsylvania				
Puerto Rico				k
Rhode Island	Name, DOB only	Name, DOB	Yes	l
South Carolina	Name, DOB, SSN	Name, DOB		Yes
South Dakota				
Tennessee				
Texas				
Utah				
Vermont				Yes <sup>m</sup>
Virginia	Name, DOB only	Name, DOB, Sex, Race	Yes	
Virgin Islands	Name, DOB only	Name, DOB, POB, SSN, Picture ID		
Washington				
West Virginia				
Wisconsin	Name, DOB only	Name, DOB, Sex, Race	Yes	n
Wyoming				Yes <sup>o</sup>

... Not available.

**Explanatory Notes for Table 24**

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

<sup>a</sup>The various firearms programs have been in place since 1972.

<sup>b</sup>Also includes reimbursement costs for mandated mental health reporting.

<sup>c</sup>The Nebraska State Patrol will take over the program in 1995; at that time, there will be start-up costs.

<sup>d</sup>Effective September 1993, fee is \$8.

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

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

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

<sup>†</sup>Revenue generated from fees covers the costs of operating the program.

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

... Not available.



# Methodology

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Bureau of Justice Statistics reports

(Revised November 1993)

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

BJS maintains these mailing lists:

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

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

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

## National Crime Victimization Survey

Highlights from 20 years of surveying crime victims: The National Crime Victimization Survey, 1973-92, NCJ-144525, 10/93

Criminal victimization in the U.S.:

1991 (final), NCJ-139563, 1/93

1973-90 trends, NCJ-139564, 1/93

Crime and older Americans information package, NCJ-140091, 4/93, \$15

Crime victimization in city, suburban, and rural areas, NCJ-135943, 6/92

School crime, NCJ-131645, 9/91

Teenage victims, NCJ-128129, 5/91

Female victims of violent crime,

NCJ-126826, 1/91

The Nation's two crime measures: Uniform Crime Reports and the National Crime Survey, NCJ-122705, 4/90

Redesign of the National Crime Survey, NCJ-111457, 3/89

The seasonality of crime victimization, NCJ-111033, 6/89

Victimization and fear of crime: World perspectives, NCJ-93872, 1/85, \$9.15

The National Crime Survey: Working papers, Vol. I, History, NCJ-75374, 8/82

Vol. II, Methodology, NCJ-90307, 12/84, \$9.90

### BJS bulletins

Criminal victimization 1992, NCJ-144776, 11/93

Crime and the Nation's households, 1992, NCJ-142388, 9/93

The crime of rape, NCJ-96777, 3/85

Measuring crime, NCJ-75710, 2/81

### BJS special reports

Elderly victims, NCJ-138330, 10/92

Handgun crime victims, NCJ-123559, 7/90

Black victims, NCJ-122562, 4/90

Hispanic victims, NCJ-120507, 1/90

The redesigned National Crime Survey:

Selected new data, NCJ-114746, 1/89

Motor vehicle theft, NCJ-109978, 3/88

Violent crime trends, NCJ-107217, 11/87

Robbery victims, NCJ-104638, 4/87

Violent crime by strangers and non-strangers, NCJ-103702, 1/87

Preventing domestic violence against women, NCJ-102037, 8/86

Crime prevention measures, NCJ-100438, 3/86

The use of weapons in committing crimes, NCJ-99643, 1/86

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

## BJS technical reports

New directions for NCS, NCJ-115571, 3/89

Series crimes: Report of a field test,

NCJ-104615, 4/87

## Corrections

### BJS bulletins and special reports

Capital punishment 1992, NCJ-145031, 11/93

HIV in U.S. prisons and jails, NCJ-143292, 9/93

Prisoners in 1992, NCJ-141874, 5/93

Drug enforcement and treatment in prisons, 1990, NCJ-134724, 7/92

Women in prison, NCJ-127991, 4/91

Violent State prisoners and their victims, NCJ-124133, 7/90

Prison rule violators, NCJ-120344, 12/89

Recidivism of prisoners released in 1983, NCJ-116261, 4/89

Drug use and crime: State prison inmate survey, 1986, NCJ-111940, 7/88

Time served in prison and on parole, 1984, NCJ-108544, 12/87

Profile of State prison inmates, 1986, NCJ-109926, 1/88

Imprisonment in four countries, NCJ-103967, 2/87

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

Correctional populations in the U.S.:

1991, NCJ-142729, 8/93

1990, NCJ-134946, 7/92

Survey of State prison inmates, 1991, NCJ-136949, 5/93

Census of State and Federal correctional facilities, 1990, NCJ-137003, 6/92

Prisons and prisoners in the United States, NCJ-137002, 4/92

National Corrections Reporting Program:

1990, NCJ-141879, 5/93

1989, NCJ-136222, 11/92

1988, NCJ-134929, 4/92

State and Federal institutions, 1926-86:

Race of prisoners admitted, NCJ-125618, 6/91

Historical statistics on prisoners, NCJ-111098, 6/88

## Census of jails and survey of jail inmates

### BJS bulletins and special reports

Jail inmates, 1992, NCJ-143284, 8/93

Drunk driving: 1989 Survey of Inmates of Local Jails, NCJ-134728, 9/92

Women in jail, 1989, NCJ-134732, 3/92

Drugs and jail inmates, NCJ-130836, 8/91

Profile of jail inmates, 1989, NCJ-129097, 4/91

Population density in local jails, 1988, NCJ-122299, 3/90

Census of local jails, 1988, NCJ-121101, 2/90

Census of local jails, 1988:

Summary and methodology, vol. I, NCJ-127992, 3/91

Data for individual jails in the Northeast, Midwest, South, West, vols. II-V, NCJ-130759-130762, 9/91

Census of local jails, 1983: Selected findings, methodology, summary tables, vol. V, NCJ-112795, 11/88

## Probation and parole

### BJS bulletins and special reports

Probation and parole:

1990, NCJ-133285, 11/91

1989, NCJ-125833, 11/90

Recidivism of young parolees, NCJ-104916, 5/87

## Juvenile corrections

Children in custody: Census of public and private juvenile detention, correctional, and shelter facilities, 1975-85, NCJ-114065, 6/89

Survey of youth in custody, 1987 (special report), NCJ-113365, 9/88

## Expenditure and employment

Justice expenditure and employment:

1990 (BJS bulletin), NCJ-135777, 9/92

1988 (full report), NCJ-125619, 8/91

Extracts, 1984, '85, '86, NCJ-124139, 8/91

Justice variable pass-through data, 1990:

Anti-drug abuse formula grants (BJS technical report), NCJ-133018, 3/92

## Courts

### BJS bulletins

Felony sentences in State courts, 1990, NCJ-140186, 3/93

Pretrial release of felony defendants, 1990, NCJ-139550, 11/92

Prosecutors in State courts, 1990, NCJ-134500, 3/92

Pretrial release of felony defendants, 1988, NCJ-127202, 2/91

Felony sentences in State courts, 1988, NCJ-126923, 12/90

Criminal defense for the poor, 1986, NCJ-112919, 9/88

### BJS special reports

Murder in families, NCJ-143498, 9/93

Murder in large urban counties, 1988, NCJ-140614, 3/93

Recidivism of felons on probation, 1986-89, NCJ-134177, 2/92

Felony case processing in State courts, 1986, NCJ-121753, 2/90

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

National Judicial Reporting Program, 1988, NCJ-135945, 1/93

The prosecution of felony arrests:

1988, NCJ-130914, 2/92

1987, NCJ-124140, 9/90

Felons sentenced to probation in State courts, 1986, NCJ-124944, 11/90

Felony defendants in large urban counties, 1988, NCJ-122385, 4/90

Profile of felons convicted in State courts, 1986, NCJ-120021, 1/90

Felony laws of 50 States and the District of Columbia, 1986, NCJ-105066, 2/88, \$14.60

State court model statistical dictionary:

Supplement, NCJ-98326, 9/85

1st edition, NCJ-62320, 9/80, \$10.60

## Privacy and security

Criminal justice information policy:

Use and management of criminal history record information: A comprehensive report, NCJ-143501, 11/93

Survey of criminal history information systems, 1992, NCJ-143500, 11/93

Report of the National Task Force on Criminal History Record Disposition

Reporting, NCJ-135836, 6/92

Attorney General's program for improving the Nation's criminal history records:

BJS implementation status report, NCJ-134722, 3/92

Identifying felons who attempt to purchase firearms, NCJ-128131, 3/91, \$9.90

Assessing completeness and accuracy of criminal history record information:

Audit guide, NCJ-133651, 2/92

Forensic DNA analysis: Issues, NCJ-128567, 6/91

Statutes requiring use of criminal history record information, NCJ-129896, 6/91

Original records of entry, NCJ-125626, 12/90

Strategies for improving data quality, NCJ-115339, 5/89

Public access to criminal history record information, NCJ-111458, 11/88

Juvenile records and recordkeeping systems, NCJ-112815, 11/88

Automated fingerprint identification systems: Technology and policy issues, NCJ-104342, 4/87

Criminal justice "hot" files, NCJ-101850, 12/86

Expert witness manual, NCJ-77927, 9/81, \$11.50

## BJS/SEARCH conference proceedings:

National conference on improving the quality of criminal history information: NCJ-133532, 2/92

Criminal justice in the 1990's: The future of information management, NCJ-121697, 5/90, \$7.70

Juvenile and adult records: One system, one record? NCJ-114947, 1/90

Open vs. confidential records, NCJ-113560, 1/88

Compendium of State privacy and security legislation:

1992, NCJ-137058, 7/92

1992 full report (1,500pp, microfiche \$2, hard copy, NCJ-139126, \$184), 7/92

## Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics

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

BJS bulletins and special reports

Census of State and local law enforcement agencies 1992, NCJ-142972, 7/93

Drug enforcement by police and sheriffs' departments, 1990, NCJ-134505, 5/92

State and local police departments, 1990, NCJ-133284, 2/92

Sheriffs' departments, 1990, NCJ-133283, 2/92

Police departments in large cities, 1987, NCJ-119220, 8/89

Profile of State and local law enforcement agencies, 1987, NCJ-113949, 3/89

## Drugs & crime

Drugs, crime, and the justice system:

A national report, NCJ-133652, 5/93

Technical appendix, NCJ-139578, 6/93

Catalog of selected Federal publications on illegal drug and alcohol abuse, NCJ-139562, 6/93

Drugs and crime facts: 1992, NCJ-135561, 3/93

State drug resources: 1992 national directory, NCJ-134375, 5/92

Federal drug data for national policy, NCJ-122715, 4/90

## Federal justice statistics

Federal criminal case processing, 1982-91, with preliminary data for 1992, NCJ-144526, 11/93

Compendium of Federal justice statistics:

1990, NCJ-143499, 9/93

1989, NCJ-134730, 5/92

The Federal civil justice system (BJS bulletin), NCJ-104769, 8/87

## Federal offenses and offenders

### BJS special reports

Prosecuting criminal enterprises: Federal offenses and offenders, NCJ-142524, 11/93

Federal sentencing in transition, 1986-90, NCJ-134727, 6/92

Immigration offenses, NCJ-124546, 8/90

Federal criminal cases, 1980-87, NCJ-118311, 7/89

Drug law violators, 1980-86, NCJ-111763, 6/88

Pretrial release and detention: The Bail Reform Act of 1984, NCJ-109929, 2/88

## General

### BJS bulletins and special reports

BJS telephone contacts, '94, NCJ-143707, 11/93

Patterns of robbery and burglary in 9 States, 1984-88, NCJ-137368, 11/92

Forgery and fraud-related offenses in 6 States, 1983-88, NCJ-132445, 1/92

Tracking offenders, 1988, NCJ-129861, 6/91

International crime rates, NCJ-110776, 5/88

### BJS discussion papers:

Performance measures for the criminal justice system: Papers from the BJS-Princeton Project, NCJ-143505, 10/93

Local prosecution of organized crime: The use of State RICO statutes, NCJ-143502, 10/93

Felony sentencing and jail characteristics, NCJ-142523, 6/93

Using NIBRS data to analyze violent crime: National Incident-Based Reporting System (Technical Report), NCJ-144785, 11/93

Directory of automated criminal justice information systems, 1993: Vol. 1, Law enforcement, NCJ-142645, 9/93, \$5

Vol. 2, Corrections, courts, probation/parole, prosecution, NCJ-142646, 9/93, \$4

Sourcebook of criminal justice statistics, 1992, NCJ-143496, 9/93, \$6

BJS statistical programs, FY 1993, NCJ-139373, 1/93

State justice sourcebook of statistics and research, NCJ-137991, 9/92

Violent crime in the U.S., NCJ-127855, 3/91

BJS data report, 1989, NCJ-121514, 1/9

Please put me on the mailing list for:

- ☐ **Law enforcement reports** — National data on State and local police and sheriffs' departments: operations, equipment, personnel, salaries, spending, policies, and programs
- ☐ **Federal statistics** — Federal case processing: investigation through prosecution, adjudication, sentencing, incarceration
- ☐ **Drugs and crime** — Sentencing and time served by drug offenders, drug use at time of crime by jail inmates and State prisoners, and other quality data on drugs, crime, and law enforcement

- ☐ **Justice expenditure and employment** — Spending and staffing by Federal/State/local governments and by function (police, courts, corrections, etc.)
- ☐ **Privacy and security of criminal history information and information policy** — New State legislation; maintaining and releasing intelligence and investigative records; data quality
- ☐ **BJS bulletins & special reports** — Timely reports of the most current justice data
- ☐ **State felony courts** — Defendant demographics and criminal history; pretrial release, prosecution, adjudication, and sentencing; State felony laws; indigent defense

- ☐ **Corrections reports** — Results of sample surveys and censuses of jails, prisons, parole, probation, and other corrections data
- ☐ **National Crime Victimization Survey reports** — The only ongoing national survey of crime victims
- ☐ **Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics** (annual) — Broad-based data from 150+ sources (400+ tables, 100+ figures, subject index, annotated bibliography, addresses of sources)
- ☐ Send me a signup form for the **NIJ Catalog** (free 6 times a year), which abstracts both private and government criminal justice publications and lists upcoming conferences and training sessions in the field.

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

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

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

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

Street or box: \_\_\_\_\_

City, State, ZIP: \_\_\_\_\_

Daytime phone number: \_\_\_\_\_

Criminal justice interest: \_\_\_\_\_

Please put organization \_\_\_\_\_

and title here if you used \_\_\_\_\_

home address above: \_\_\_\_\_

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

Place  
first-class  
stamp  
here

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

*Want on-line access to*

## **The Automated Index of Criminal Justice Information Systems?**

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

### **What is the SEARCH-BBS?**

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

### **On-line Access to the Automated Index**

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

### **How to Reach Us**

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

#### **1. Set your system parameters to:**

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

#### **2. Dial 916/392-4640**

#### **3. Log on to the SEARCH-BBS**

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

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

## **Questions about drugs and crime?**

**Call 1-800-666-3332**

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

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

**Call 1-800-732-3277**

Bureau of Justice Statistics  
Clearinghouse  
Box 6000  
Rockville, MD 20850

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

1-301-738-8895

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

Official Business  
Penalty for Private Use \$300

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

*Washington, D.C. 20531*