

U.S. Department of Justice
Bureau of Justice Statistics



Bureau of Justice Statistics Technical Report

State Criminal Records Repositories

A State central repository is a State agency that maintains comprehensive files of criminal history record information covering persons who are processed by the criminal justice system. For 15 years the repositories have been the focus of a data-gathering effort more massive and more coordinated than any other in criminal justice. There has been extensive Federal involvement in the planning and financing of the development of repositories, automation of their data bases, interstate exchange and indexing of criminal record information, and development of statistical capabilities.

This report presents the results of a survey of the administrators of State central repositories conducted in December of 1984 by SEARCH Group, Inc. Fifty-three jurisdictions were asked for information about their central repositories: the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Responses were received from 47 States. (Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and the three non-State jurisdictions did not respond.) Nevada had no central repository in December 1984.

Size and growth of data bases

The States were asked to provide counts or estimates of the number of subject records held and of the number of arrests and final dispositions reported to the central repository in the years 1981-83. A "subject record" is a record pertaining to a specific

Nine years ago in the "Privacy and Security Planning Instructions" issued by the National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service (the predecessor agency of the Bureau of Justice Statistics), the Federal Government provided guidelines to the States recommending the establishment of centralized criminal history record repositories to serve the needs of all criminal justice agencies in the States. The purpose was to simplify the problem of disposition reporting and to ensure that criminal justice agencies used and disseminated the most current and accurate data available. Completeness and accuracy of criminal history record information are important both for operational criminal justice use and for offender-based transaction statistics reported to BJS.

person who has entered the criminal justice system.

Forty-four States provided counts or estimates of the number of subject records maintained in central repository data bases (table 1). These States reported an estimated total of about 35 million subject records. This does not necessarily mean, however, that 35 million Americans have criminal records maintained in State

October 1985

This BJS technical report presents findings of a survey of State repository administrators conducted in December of 1984 by SEARCH Group Inc. This survey provides the first composite picture of the number of subject records in State repositories, the number of arrests and final dispositions reported each year, the extent of automation of repository data, the legal requirements on law enforcement agencies for disposition reporting, and the production of statistical reports by the repositories. Such information should be useful to those who administer the State repositories, to criminal justice practitioners generally, to those who influence State policy on repositories, and to the research community.

Steven R. Schlesinger
Director

repositories, since two or more records may exist for the same person. The American criminal justice system is decentralized, with the powers to make and enforce criminal law vested in each State. Accordingly, a person will have a separate record in each different State where he or she has been involved with the criminal justice system. Moreover, in a single State one person may have multiple records because of failure to make positive identification

Table 1. Number of subject records in State criminal history repositories, 1984

| Responding States | Estimated number of subject records in repository data bases |
|-------------------|--|
| Total | 34,676,603* |
| Alabama | 900,000* |
| Alaska | 124,416 |
| Arizona | 500,449 |
| Arkansas | 550,114 |
| California | 3,600,000* |
| Colorado | 336,829 |
| Connecticut | 30,000* |
| Delaware | 206,014 |
| Florida | 1,651,671 |
| Georgia | 782,000* |
| Hawaii | 203,582 |
| Idaho | 137,136 |
| Illinois | 1,900,000* |
| Indiana | 375,000* |
| Iowa | 275,000* |
| Kansas | 400,000* |
| Kentucky | 297,000* |
| Louisiana | 261,406 |
| Maine | 285,000* |
| Maryland | 250,000* |
| Massachusetts | 6,000,000* |
| Michigan | 668,819 |
| Minnesota | 143,000* |
| Missouri | 503,000* |
| Montana | 70,670 |
| Nebraska | 180,000* |
| New Hampshire | 135,000* |
| New Jersey | 1,000,000* |
| New York | 4,000,000* |
| North Carolina | 306,724 |
| North Dakota | 179,544 |
| Ohio | 1,541,309* |
| Oregon | 337,644 |
| Pennsylvania | 1,053,339 |
| South Carolina | 383,934 |
| South Dakota | 150,000* |
| Texas | 3,000,960 |
| Utah | 226,278 |
| Vermont | 150,000* |
| Virginia | 570,000* |
| Washington | 275,000* |
| West Virginia | 192,100 |
| Wisconsin | 371,565 |
| Wyoming | 52,100 |

NOTE: The District of Columbia, Oklahoma, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and the Virgin Islands did not respond to the questionnaire. Mississippi and New Mexico did not report the number of records in the State repository. Nevada does not have a State repository.
*Estimate provided by Survey respondents.

or linkage when arrests occurred in different jurisdictions within the State. Finally, the number of records may be inflated through failure to purge the records of those who die.

Approximately 4 million arrests were reported in 1983 to the repositories in the 39 States that provided information, covering 83% of the Nation's population (table 2); and almost 2 million final dispositions were reported in the same year to the 30 States with data, covering 59% of the Nation's population (table 3). Both the number of arrests and of final dispositions

Table 2. Number of arrests reported to State criminal history repositories, 1981-83

| Responding States | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------|------------------------|
| Total | 3,979,065 | 4,046,147 | 4,043,777 ^a |
| Alabama | 117,854 | 137,930 | 146,913 |
| Alaska | 16,713 | 20,740 | 18,453 |
| Arizona | 55,364 | 55,146 | 52,361 |
| Arkansas | 17,246 | 14,187 | 10,863 |
| California | 787,180 | 673,653 | 687,744 |
| Colorado ^{b,c} | 68,900 | 77,000 | 76,800 |
| Connecticut | 104,308 | 105,399 | 104,419 |
| Delaware | 42,855 | 44,299 | 43,986 |
| Florida | 393,556 | 449,761 | 399,100 |
| Hawaii ^b | 22,063 | 21,414 | 21,025 |
| Idaho | 43,475 | 38,965 | 38,349 |
| Illinois ^c | 263,704 | 244,799 | 246,749 |
| Indiana | 54,438 | 48,724 | 49,999 |
| Iowa | 26,073 | 28,064 | 29,171 |
| Kansas | 29,113 | 32,170 | 32,898 |
| Kentucky | ... | ... | 46,355 |
| Louisiana | 108,856 | 114,523 | 109,512 |
| Maine | 6,456 | 6,368 | 5,609 |
| Massachusetts ^b | 235,000 | 230,000 | 220,000 |
| Michigan | 126,004 | 129,245 | 131,364 |
| Minnesota | 15,697 | 18,026 | 20,338 |
| Missouri | 39,976 | 40,535 | 46,088 |
| Montana | 20,886 | 21,695 | 26,176 |
| Nebraska | 12,472 | 11,605 | 11,656 |
| New Hampshire | 38,017 | 35,852 | 33,638 |
| New Jersey | 88,375 | 91,572 | 94,108 |
| New York | 351,665 | 385,839 | 394,839 |
| North Carolina | 52,241 | 62,562 | 44,482 |
| North Dakota | 2,073 | 2,345 | 4,077 |
| Ohio | 92,923 | 93,844 | 89,710 |
| Oregon | 64,231 | 67,493 | 64,333 |
| Pennsylvania | 116,648 | 127,570 | 138,440 |
| South Carolina ^c | 97,404 | 105,145 | 113,747 |
| South Dakota ^c | 12,780 | 15,117 | 16,515 |
| Texas | 329,738 | 369,420 | 381,695 |
| Utah | 26,076 | 28,784 | 25,523 |
| Washington | 57,634 | 61,009 | 61,980 |
| West Virginia | 25,071 | 18,956 | 35,866 |
| Wyoming | 16,000 ^b | 16,391 | 15,253 |

NOTE: In addition to the nonresponding States and territories (the District of Columbia, Oklahoma, Nevada, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Tennessee and Virgin Islands), the other States not included in this table did not report the number of arrests.
^aExcludes Kentucky, for which data were not reported in 1981 or 1982.
^bEstimate provided by survey respondent.
^cFiscal year, July-June.
...not available.

reported to repositories showed a slight increase between 1981 and 1983.

A very large majority of the records in State central repositories pertain to adults. More than half of the responding States (26) indicated that they had no juvenile records or that records pertaining to juveniles are not retained. Of the other 20 respondents, only two indicated that juvenile records make up as much as 5% of the data base.

Data base automation

Much of the information contained in central repository data bases and, more particularly, much of the information pertaining to offenders who are currently active, is contained in automated files. Thirty-five States now have at least some automated criminal history record information (CHRI) (table 4). Steady gains are being made

in increased automation of criminal records. Among the survey respondents, 27 States had at least partially automated CHRI as of 1981. Three States began automation during 1982 (Louisiana, Montana, New Hampshire). Three more began automating CHRI in 1983 (Arizona, Connecticut, Wyoming). Two additional States (Idaho, Pennsylvania) began automation in 1984. Among the 11 States reporting that they currently have only manual CHRI, 3 stated that automation plans are under way (Maine, Vermont, and Wisconsin).

Five States (Alaska, Hawaii, Oregon, Utah, Washington) reported complete automation of State-held CHRI. Thirty States reported partial automation in varying degrees. The most common form of partial automation, reported by 11 States, is "day one" conversion of records of active subjects. Starting on the date that the

Table 3. Number of final dispositions reported to State criminal history repositories, 1981-83

| Responding States | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Total | 1,813,770 | 1,791,738 | 1,874,825 ^a |
| Alaska ^b | 14,000 | 18,500 | 16,600 |
| Arizona | 63,085 | 67,338 | 59,856 |
| Arkansas | 4,933 | 5,079 | 3,964 |
| California ^{b,c} | 590,000 | 590,000 | 590,000 |
| Colorado ^{b,c} | 19,800 | 17,800 | 24,600 |
| Connecticut | 144,918 | 115,360 | 110,293 |
| Delaware | 21,226 | 22,735 | 20,845 |
| Florida | 217,092 | 153,815 | 171,269 |
| Hawaii | 21,536 | 20,866 | 21,811 |
| Indiana | 17,138 | 34,124 | 30,866 |
| Kansas | 23,844 | 22,669 | 24,701 |
| Kentucky | ... | ... | 25,215 |
| Louisiana | 21,928 | 14,526 | 19,482 |
| Maine | 2,281 | 1,505 | 1,941 |
| Michigan | 53,439 | 54,160 | 54,692 |
| Minnesota | 16,832 | 19,623 | 24,021 |
| Nebraska | ... | ... | 16,195 |
| New Hampshire | 36,009 | 35,186 | 32,198 |
| New Jersey | 91,765 | 90,271 | 95,594 |
| North Carolina | 32,803 | 66,436 | 66,202 |
| North Dakota | 1,144 | 1,513 | 2,296 |
| Ohio ^b | 41,815 | 42,247 | 40,370 |
| Oregon | 45,433 | 43,038 | 50,353 |
| South Carolina ^c | 128,518 | 131,929 | 162,412 |
| Texas | 84,305 | 97,874 | 113,090 |
| Utah ^b | 20,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| Washington | 37,244 | 39,808 | 41,825 |
| West Virginia ^b | 3,877 | 4,141 | 12,788 |
| Wisconsin ^b | 43,405 | 45,995 | 49,036 |
| Wyoming ^b | 15,400 | 15,200 | 13,720 |

NOTE: For survey purposes, "final disposition" was defined as "police have elected not to refer the matter to a prosecutor, ... prosecutor has elected not to commence criminal proceedings, or ... judicial decision has been rendered." In addition to the nonresponding States and territories (the District of Columbia, Oklahoma, Nevada, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Tennessee and Virgin Islands), the other States not included in this table did not report the number of dispositions.
^aExcludes Kentucky and Nebraska, for which data were not reported in 1981 or 1982.
^bEstimate provided by survey respondent.
^cFiscal year, July-June.
...not available.

automated system becomes operational, all new arrests reported to the repository are entered into the automated system. In addition, any previous manual record pertaining to the subject of a new arrest is automated at the time of the new arrest. Five other States follow the "day one" conversion procedure and, in addition, automate the manual records of the subjects of CHRI inquiries. Six additional States use "day one" conversion and also have, or have had, programs resulting in bulk conversion of a portion of their inactive manual records.

Two States perform only partial conversions of existing manual records of active subjects. Delaware does not automate data relating to arrests prior to 1972. Pennsylvania converts data on no more than three prior arrests when automating a record.

Six States create and maintain automated records for only certain active persons. Alabama, Minnesota, and New Hampshire automate new arrests only for subjects who have no

prior manual record. If a manual record exists, it is maintained and is updated by adding the new arrest. Ohio follows a similar policy, but prior manual records may be automated if they are short. Iowa automates subject records only where an FBI number is available; records of other subjects are maintained in a manual system. Before 1985, Virginia did not automate records of first arrests. Such records were maintained manually; they would be automated when a second arrest occurred. In 1985 Virginia began to automate records of all new arrests.

Reporting of dispositions

Much of the data that is maintained by a State central repository consists of dispositions that are reported to the repository by the various agencies that comprise the criminal justice system in the State. There are differences among the States in the reporting of dispositions by the several parts of the criminal justice system, both in the scope of reporting and in whether such

Table 4. Extent of automated name indexes and criminal histories on State repositories, 1984

| Responding States | Automated name index | Automated criminal histories |
|-------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|
| Alabama | Yes | Partial |
| Alaska | Yes | Yes |
| Arizona | Yes | Partial |
| Arkansas | Partial | Partial |
| California | Yes | Partial |
| Colorado | Yes | Partial |
| Connecticut | Yes | Partial |
| Delaware | Yes | Partial |
| Florida | Yes | Partial |
| Georgia | Yes | Partial |
| Hawaii | Yes | Yes |
| Idaho | Yes | Partial |
| Illinois | Partial | Partial |
| Indiana | Partial | No |
| Iowa | Yes | Partial |
| Kansas | Partial | No |
| Kentucky | Partial | Partial |
| Louisiana | Yes | Partial |
| Maine | No | No |
| Maryland | Yes | Partial |
| Massachusetts | No | No |
| Michigan | Partial | Partial |
| Minnesota | Yes | Partial |
| Mississippi | No | No |
| Missouri | Yes | Partial |
| Montana | No | Partial |
| Nebraska | Partial | Partial |
| New Hampshire | Yes | Partial |
| New Jersey | Partial | Partial |
| New Mexico | Partial | No |
| New York | Partial | Partial |
| North Carolina | Yes | Partial |
| North Dakota | No | No |
| Ohio | Partial | Partial |
| Oregon | Yes | Yes |
| Pennsylvania | Yes | Partial |
| South Carolina | Yes | Partial |
| South Dakota | Partial | No |
| Texas | Yes | Partial |
| Utah | Partial | Yes |
| Vermont | No | No |
| Virginia | Yes | Partial |
| Washington | Yes | Yes |
| West Virginia | No | No |
| Wisconsin | Yes | No |
| Wyoming | Partial | Partial |

NOTE: The District of Columbia, Oklahoma, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and Virgin Islands did not respond to questionnaire. Nevada does not have a State repository.

reporting is mandatory or voluntary (table 5).

Two States, Connecticut and Montana, do not include correctional dispositions in their criminal history records. Virginia does not include local corrections dispositions. Wisconsin does not include conditional release disposition data.

Reporting of court dispositions is mandatory in 35 States, either by statute or by administrative policy. Only 17 States have mandatory reporting of parole and probation release data. Reporting of law enforcement dispositions is mandatory in 34 States.

Thirty-one States mandate reporting of State corrections admissions; 29 mandate reporting of releases from State corrections. Twenty-three States mandate the reporting of prosecutorial dispositions. Local corrections reporting is mandatory in 21 States.

Respondents were asked to estimate the percentages of dispositions that are reported to the repository. The resulting data do not permit firm conclusions to be drawn. For most disposition categories, fewer than half of the responding States were able to provide estimates and these show very wide variations from State to State.

A few generalizations, however, can be drawn from the responses. The highest reporting percentages are found in reporting from State corrections agencies; overall, they are estimated to report nearly 95% of dispositions. The lowest overall reporting percentages are for law enforcement dispositions, prosecution dispositions, and local corrections; it is estimated that only about half of these dispositions are reported.

Not surprisingly, the average reporting percentages are substantially higher in States with mandatory reporting than in States where reporting is voluntary. This is true of each disposition category.

Data base quality

According to the repository administrators, there has been a significant and continuing trend of improvement in the completeness and accuracy of data bases maintained by the repositories. With regard to the percentages of dispositions that are reported to the repository, 32 States reported significant improvement in the recent past, or anticipated improvement in the near future, or both. Nineteen of these States noted past improvement in reporting percentages, and 26 identified ongoing or planned activities expected to have a significant positive impact.

With regard to the accuracy of records in the repository, 35 States reported recent improvement, anticipated future improvement, or both. Of these, 23 noted significant improvement in data accuracy in recent years, and 27 identified current activities or plans expressly designed to improve accuracy or expected to provide improvement as a byproduct.

Overall, only 7 of 44 repositories responding to questions in this portion

Table 5. Requirements for reporting dispositions to State criminal history repositories, mandatory vs. voluntary, 1984

| Responding States | Law enforcement | Courts | Prosecution | State corrections | Local corrections | Parole | Probation |
|----------------------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Alabama | Mandatory | Mandatory | Voluntary | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory |
| Alaska | Mandatory | Voluntary | Voluntary | Mandatory | Mandatory | Voluntary | Voluntary |
| Arizona | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary |
| Arkansas | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary |
| California | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Voluntary | Voluntary |
| Colorado | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory |
| Connecticut ^{a,b} | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory |
| Delaware | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory |
| Florida | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory |
| Georgia | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory |
| Hawaii | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory |
| Idaho | Mandatory | Mandatory | Voluntary | Mandatory | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary |
| Illinois | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory |
| Indiana | Mandatory | Mandatory | Voluntary | Mandatory | Mandatory | Voluntary | Voluntary |
| Iowa | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Voluntary | Voluntary |
| Kansas | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | ... | ... | ... |
| Kentucky | Mandatory | Voluntary | Voluntary | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory |
| Louisiana | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory |
| Maine | Mandatory | Mandatory | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary |
| Maryland | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory |
| Massachusetts | Mandatory | Mandatory | ... | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory |
| Michigan | Mandatory | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary |
| Minnesota | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory |
| Mississippi | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Mandatory | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary |
| Missouri | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary |
| Montana ^b | Mandatory | Mandatory | Voluntary | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Nebraska | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory |
| N. Hampshire ^a | Mandatory | Mandatory | ... | Both ^c | Mandatory | Voluntary | Voluntary |
| New Jersey | Voluntary | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | ... | Mandatory |
| New Mexico | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary |
| New York | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Both ^c | Mandatory | Voluntary | Voluntary |
| N. Carolina | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| N. Dakota | Mandatory | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary |
| Ohio | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary |
| Oregon | Voluntary | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary |
| Pennsylvania | Voluntary | Mandatory | Voluntary | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory |
| S. Carolina | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary |
| S. Dakota | Voluntary | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary |
| Texas | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary |
| Utah | Mandatory | Mandatory | Voluntary | Mandatory | Voluntary | Mandatory | Voluntary |
| Vermont | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary |
| Virginia ^{a,d} | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | ... | Mandatory | Mandatory |
| Washington ^e | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Voluntary | ... | ... | ... |
| W. Virginia | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Voluntary | Voluntary | Voluntary |
| Wisconsin | Mandatory | Mandatory | Voluntary | Mandatory | Voluntary | Mandatory | Voluntary |
| Wyoming | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Mandatory | Voluntary | Mandatory | Mandatory |

NOTE: The District of Columbia, Oklahoma, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and the Virgin Islands did not respond to the questionnaire. Nevada did not then have a State repository in operation.

^aDispositions are reported by the courts.

^bCorrections disposition data are not included in Criminal History Record Information.

^cAdmissions data are mandatory; release data are voluntary.

^dLocal corrections disposition data are not included in Criminal History Record Information.

^eAll corrections disposition data for Criminal History Record Information are reported through State Department of Corrections.

^fAdmissions data only. ...not available.

of the survey did not indicate current progress in improving completeness or accuracy.

A wide variety of activities were cited as reasons for improvement or expected improvement. There was considerable overlap between the stated means of achieving increased completeness and improved accuracy, suggesting that improvements in both areas often go hand in hand. Increased automation was one of the most frequently cited reasons for improve-

ment. Initiating or increasing the automation of repository data was mentioned in eight responses. Automation of information processing by source agencies and automated reporting were mentioned by 13 States, with three specific mentions of prosecution management systems.

Interagency cooperation among State-level agencies with common information goals was a second theme. Active involvement of the State court administrator's office as the primary

collection agency for court dispositions was cited eight times as the reason for improvements in both quantity and quality of disposition reporting. Reconciliation of different State-level data bases with overlapping content was cited in four responses.

Periodic audits were noted as a source of improvement a total of 12 times, with 6 responses mentioning audits of the repository data base and 6 mentioning audits of source agencies. Other frequently cited reasons for improvement included increased editing and quality control at the repository, systematic flagging and solicitation of missing dispositions, training of source agency personnel, changes in reporting laws, and implementation of a tracking number system for arrest and disposition reporting.

Statistical utilization

The survey requested information about the utilization of criminal history data bases for statistical purposes. The responses indicated that 17 central repositories currently produce statistical outputs on a routine basis, and 11 repositories have current capabilities of producing, or have at some time produced, nonroutine statistical outputs (table 6). Twelve repositories reported plans for future statistical activities utilizing criminal history record information. Overall, the central repositories in 20 States are producing or have produced statistical outputs derived in some way from criminal history record. Eight of these repositories report plans for expanded activity in the future. Four central repositories that have not to date undertaken statistical activities noted future plans in this area.

Although nearly half of the responding repositories noted current or past statistical activity, the reported overall level of activity was quite low. Of the repositories reporting routine statistical outputs, most identified only one or two such reports. Of 32 routine statistical reports identified in the responses, 25 consist of management and administrative statistics for use in direct support of repository operations, rather than for analysis of the data's substance. They include such reports as activity volume by type of transaction, contributing agency, or individual employee; counts of receipts and rejections (fingerprints, dispositions); and data base size and growth. In addition, a number of error listings, missing data listings, and exception reports were identified.

Of the repositories that reported

Table 6. Statistical reports from State criminal history repositories, 1984

| Responding States | Statistical data produced | |
|-------------------|---------------------------|---------|
| | Routine | Special |
| Alabama | No | No |
| Alaska | No | No |
| Arizona | No | No |
| Arkansas | Yes | No |
| California | Yes | Yes |
| Colorado | Yes | Yes |
| Connecticut | No | No |
| Delaware | Yes | Yes |
| Florida | No | No |
| Georgia | Yes | Yes |
| Hawaii | No | No |
| Idaho | Yes | No |
| Illinois | Yes | Yes |
| Indiana | Yes | No |
| Iowa | No | No |
| Kansas | No | No |
| Kentucky | No | No |
| Louisiana | No | No |
| Maine | Yes | Yes |
| Maryland | No | No |
| Massachusetts | No | No |
| Michigan | No | No |
| Minnesota | No | Yes |
| Mississippi | No | No |
| Missouri | No | No |
| Montana | No | No |
| Nebraska | Yes | No |
| New Hampshire | No | No |
| New Jersey | No | No |
| New Mexico | Yes | No |
| New York | Yes | Yes |
| North Carolina | Yes | Yes |
| North Dakota | No | No |
| Ohio | No | No |
| Oregon | No | No |
| Pennsylvania | No | Yes |
| South Carolina | No | No |
| South Dakota | Yes | No |
| Texas | Yes | No |
| Utah | No | Yes |
| Vermont | No | No |
| Virginia | Yes | No |
| Washington | No | No |
| West Virginia | No | No |
| Wisconsin | Yes | No |
| Wyoming | No | No |

NOTE: The District of Columbia, Oklahoma, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and the Virgin Islands did not respond to the questionnaire. Nevada did not then have a State repository in operation.

special statistical outputs, only four indicated extensive activity. North Carolina identified several types of special reports that were generated in response to specific outside requests. California, Colorado, and New York indicated both the ability to respond to a wide range of information requests and a high volume of activity in producing nonroutine statistical reports. California estimated that it responds to 350 information requests each year.

With the exception of New Hampshire, Pennsylvania and Washington, those repositories that indicated that statistical outputs could be made available at all stated that they are

generally available to all categories of potential users.

Part of the reason why there is not greater use of central repository data for substantive statistical analysis is because the primary function of the repository is to collect, organize, and disseminate information pertaining to individuals. Where resources are limited, as is often the case, this work must be given priority. A number of repositories indicated that maintenance of general operations, automation of records, and improvement of reporting and response take precedence over the development of specific statistical capabilities.

Because the administrators were asked to describe only statistical reports produced by the repository itself and not those produced by others from the repository's data base, it seems likely that the responses do not present a complete picture of statistical utilization of repository data. In this regard, it is noteworthy that those repositories reporting the most extensive statistical activities are in States where the central repository and the State's Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) are parts of the same agency and where SAC activities are included in the repository's response. Also, four repositories that reported no statistical products at all noted specifically that in their States statistical work is done by the SAC, not the repository.

These reports suggest a greater potential for substantive statistical analysis based on repository data than might at first appear from the survey's findings. Because many States still lack automation of criminal history data bases and even those with automation suffer from incomplete disposition reporting, the development of a 50-State statistical base appears to be many years off. For the near future, a more fruitful approach will be studies based on data from a small number of States with reliable and comparable data.

Bureau of Justice Statistics Technical Reports are prepared principally by BJS staff. This report was written by John Hennessey, SEARCH Group Inc., and John Jones, BJS computer systems specialist. It was edited by Joseph M. Bessette, deputy director for data analysis, assisted by Marianne Zawitz. Marilyn Marbrook, publications unit chief, administered production, assisted by Millie Baldea, Tina Dorsey, and Joyce Stanford. Herb Koppel also provided editing assistance.

October 1985, NCJ-99017