

SUPPORTING STATEMENT

2016 Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) Survey

Overview

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) requests clearance to conduct the core 2016 Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) Survey. In each iteration of LEMAS, BJS draws a nationally-representative sample of state and local law enforcement agencies from its census of state and local law enforcement agencies, administers the LEMAS instrument, and produces national-level estimates about the organization and characteristics of law enforcement agencies. The proposed survey seeks to meet the immediate recommendations of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, while maintaining the ability to trend over time with the previous LEMAS waves. The 2016 LEMAS sample will consist of about 3,500 state, county and local general purpose law enforcement agencies (LEAs) in the United States, will be nationally-representative, and will preserve continuity between previous LEMAS waves on critical data elements about LEAs nationwide.

The LEMAS sampling frame consists of all state, county and local general purpose LEAs; the current frame has a roster of about 15,400 such agencies. The LEMAS excludes so-called special purpose agencies; see: Census of State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies, 2008 (NCJ 233982). The LEMAS substantive domains have evolved over time but generally include: the size, staffing, and specialization of agencies; personnel attributes including sex and race/ethnicity of sworn employees; hiring and training practices; measures of officer and agency activity such as the volume of calls for service; the extent to which agencies adhere to core principles of community policing; agency authorized and provided equipment; the adoption of technology; and agency policies and procedures.

The LEMAS is part of a suite of data collection efforts conducted by BJS that emphasize surveys of LEAs, called the Law Enforcement Core Statistics (LECS) program. Included in the LECS, is the Census of State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies (CSLLEA; OMB 1121-0346), Census of Federal Law Enforcement Officers (FLEO; OMB 1121-0346), and a new series of supplemental LEMAS questionnaires on specialized topics such as body-worn cameras. The first LEMAS supplement on body-worn cameras has received OMB approval (OMB 1121-0354) and is planned for administration in 2016. A follow-up to this survey is planned in late 2017.

The CSLLEA has been conducted every four years since 1992 and broadly serves as the universe list for the LEMAS sample. The CSLLEA provides the basis for distinguishing among various types of agencies by asking about the functions performed by the agencies (e.g., law enforcement, investigative, court security, jail management, and process serving). The CSLLEA identifies general purpose agencies (i.e., any public agency with one or more sworn officers whose patrol and enforcement responsibilities are primarily delimited by the boundaries of a municipal, county, or state government) and a variety of special purpose agencies (e.g., campus law enforcement, transportation, natural resources, etc.). The LEMAS sample is based on the universe of general purpose agencies.

The FLEO was conducted every two years from 1993 to 2008 and was conducted in 2014 and will be conducted again in 2016. It includes agencies that employed full-time officers with federal arrest authority who were also authorized (but not necessarily required) to carry firearms while on duty. Federal law enforcement agencies include the U.S. Customs and Border Protection; FBI; Secret Service; and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives.

Since 1987, BJS has implemented nine waves of LEMAS surveys. These surveys collected information about the changing aspects of law enforcement organization, resources, functions, personnel, salaries, training, collective bargaining, information systems, policies, and use of technology. Some topics have been covered in each wave; other topics have been dropped due to the changing priorities of law enforcement or difficulty in obtaining reliable answers.

A review of BJS programs by the National Research Council (NRC) recognized the crucial role the LEMAS surveys play in the BJS statistical programs, but criticized the program for its limited focus on administrative and managerial characteristics of agencies (Groves and Cork, 2009). The NRC report recommended several changes to this program. First, the academy recommended that BJS law enforcement surveys should collect more information about behavior and performance of law enforcement staff and agencies. Second, the NRC urged BJS to enhance the use of agency identifiers to facilitate the linkage of agency-specific organizational characteristics with agency specific-crime statistics and with the demographic characteristics of the jurisdictions served by each agency. Third, noting the lengthy instrument and the irregular schedule of past LEMAS surveys, the NRC recommended that BJS adopt a “core and supplement” design for a regularly scheduled program of agency surveys. The NRC suggested the consistent use of a limited number of core items that would be integrated with thematic supplements that would vary from wave to wave. The 2013 LEMAS was partially successful in implementing these recommendations. Some agency performance variables were included, but agency-level identifiers were only partially obtained. Additionally, the 2013 LEMAS administration failed to fully implement the core and supplement design. Instead it included both core and supplemental questions in one survey administration.

The 2016 LEMAS is the first step to fully implementing the core and supplement model. First, the 2016 core LEMAS will mirror more closely the 1997-2007 administrations of the LEMAS. The survey will include key items with long-term historical trends in past LEMAS administrations. Second, two LEMAS supplements are planned for administration. These LEMAS supplements will be on the use of body-worn cameras in law enforcement agencies and will be administered 1 year apart. This will allow for tracking of use and trends over time. Third, significant resources have been dedicated to research and development of future LEMAS administrations. The goal of the research and development phase is to identify LEMAS topical areas and to reduce the overall length and burden of the LEMAS core. Another goal of the research and development work is to better capture law enforcement performance. These tasks will be done by consulting existing research, policing scholars, and practitioners to identify the most relevant items that should be included in future administrations.

In December 2014, President Obama issued an executive order creating the President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing (Task Force) to “identify the best means to provide an effective partnership between law enforcement and local communities that reduces crime and increases

trust.”¹ The Task Force developed almost 60 recommendation to reduce crime and build trust between law enforcement and the communities they serve. One of these recommendations and the following action item specifically addressed the LEMAS:

2.5 Recommendation: All federal, state, local and tribal law enforcement agencies should report and make available to the public census data regarding the composition of their departments including race, gender, age and other relevant demographic data.

2.5.1 Action Item: The Bureau of Justice Statistics should add additional demographic questions to the Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) survey in order to meet the intent of this recommendation.

In order to meet this action item, the 2016 LEMAS includes new variables that measure sex and race/ethnicity for various staffing levels and citizenship requirements. In addition, the Task Force makes various recommendation that LEAs adopt policies or engage in specific practices. A number of these have historically been addressed in the LEMAS. Therefore, the inclusion of these items in the 2016 LEMAS can help inform the Task Force of the current status of these policies and practices.

The 2016 LEMAS has been enhanced from the previous wave (last fielded in 2013). The 2016 LEMAS will employ a revised sampling plan to improve the efficiency and precision of national estimates. The survey instrument has been modified to include (1) improved formatting, (2) additional demographic variables to meet Recommendation 2.5.1 of the President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing, and (3) incorporating key items from 1997-2013 LEMAS waves to examine trends. The 2016 LEMAS questionnaire is provided in Attachment 1. In addition, the agency and jurisdiction identifiers recommended by the NRC for linking LEMAS information to data from the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s (FBI) Uniform Crime Reporting Program (UCR) and census-based demographic data (such as data from the American Community Survey) will be retained in the 2016 LEMAS and future BJS surveys of LEAs.²

BJS used a technical review panel (TRP) of experts to review the 2016 LEMAS core survey instrument. The TRP, which consisted of 11 experts, met in December 2015. Based on reviewer feedback questions were clarified and some items were dropped to reduce burden. Additionally, as past LEMAS waves often used an arbitrary date of reference that wasn’t convenient for police departments to base financial figures and personnel counts on, this was changed. The TRP recommended changing the reference period to reflect the fiscal year including June 30, 2016, and agencies will be asked for the exact dates of their fiscal period. We used June 30, 2016 as the primary date as based on 2013 LEMAS results the majority of LEAs have a fiscal period ending December or June.

BJS will use web-based data collection in the 2016 LEMAS to promote high response rates, rapid data collection, and simplified data verification and report preparation. The survey administration will use best practices in survey data collection technology to establish shorter

¹ <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/12/18/executive-order-establishment-presidents-task-force-21st-century-policin>

² These identifiers were first added in the 2007 LEMAS survey data file.

cycles for future surveys of LEAs (e.g., LEMAS supplemental surveys, CSLLEA). BJS has selected the Research Triangle Institute (RTI) International to act as the data collection agent for this program. RTI will collect various paradata (e.g., respondent response mode, time required to answer each question, total time for survey completion, the time interval between respondent access to the survey and completion of the survey, etc.) that will allow BJS to evaluate the impact of promoting online data collection. This information will also enable BJS to develop strategies to encourage greater online data collection for future LEMAS surveys.

A. Justification

1. Necessity of Information Collection

Under Title 42, United States Code, Section 3732 (Attachment 2), the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) is directed to collect and analyze statistical information concerning the operation of the criminal justice system at the federal, state, and local levels. State, county and local general purpose LEAs are the primary point of entry into the criminal justice system. LEAs play a crucial gate keeping function in receiving reports of offenses, investigating crimes and making arrests.

In the United States, local LEAs are numerous and diverse. In 2013, there were 15,388 local police agencies, sheriff's departments and primary state police agencies. Almost half of these organizations had fewer than 10 sworn personnel (46.8%) but the largest 409 (2.7%) agencies employed half of all sworn personnel. The functions, policies, and practices of local and county LEAs are determined and implemented by local governments with limited state-level coordination and oversight. State LEAs are few in number, large in size and typically emphasize a limited range of law enforcement functions, such as traffic enforcement. Because of the diversity and number of independent state, local and county governments, there is no organizational basis for systematically collecting and regularly reporting changes in the characteristics of their LEAs or the personnel those agencies employ, except for BJS-sponsored surveys of LEAs.³

In 2012, approximately \$126 billion was spent by federal, state and local governments on police-related activities.⁴ Sizeable investments by local governments have led to new debates about the appropriate size, function, and control over these activities in the current economic and social climate. Furthermore, the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing (2015; Task Force) identified best practices for law enforcement agencies and federal organizations in order to reduce crime while building trust in our communities. These recommendations with their respective action items were organized around six pillars: building trust and legitimacy, policy and oversight, technology and social media, community policing and crime reduction, officer training and education, and officer safety and wellness. These pillars cover a number of important issues, such as:

³ The FBI collects some data on police personnel in its Uniform Crime Reporting Program, but these data differ from those collected by the LEMAS surveys in a number of ways that will be discussed later in this statement.

⁴ Justice Expenditure and Employment Extracts 2012 - Preliminary, NCJ 248628.

- Pillar One—Building Trust and Legitimacy: LEAs should adopt procedural justice as the guiding principle for policies and practices to guide their interactions with rank and file officers and with the citizens they serve. LEAs should also establish a culture of transparency and accountability by engaging in non-enforcement activities, tracking and analyzing the level of trust in communities, and creating a workforce that encompasses diversity to improve understanding of the communities they serve.
- Pillar Two—Policy and Oversight: Policies must reflect community values and LEAs should collaborate with community members to develop policies and practices. LEAs should have comprehensive policies on use of force, mass demonstrations, racial profiling, searches and external investigations of officer-involved shootings and in-custody deaths.
- Pillar Three—Technology and Social Media: LEAs must have the ability to identify, assess and evaluate new technology for adoption to improve their effectiveness. The Department of Justice should establish national standards for auditory and visual data and less-lethal technology. LEAs should implement technologies based on these recommendations and the needs of their communities.
- Pillar Four—Community Policing & Crime Reduction: Community policing should be the guiding philosophy for all stakeholders. LEAs should work with community members to identify problems and collaborate on solutions. LEAs should adopt policies and strategies that enforce community policing.
- Pillar Five—Training & Education: Law enforcement officers and leaders should be training and capable to address a wide variety of challenges, such as terrorism, evolving technologies, and growing mental health crisis.
- Pillar Six—Officer Wellness & Safety: Support and proper implementation of officer wellness and safety is a multi-partner effort. Policies should be put in place that require officers to wear seat belts and bullet-proof vests.

Given this significant scope, diversity, function, and expenditures, collecting data on issues related to law enforcement personnel and functions is of critical concern to BJS. Developing and maintaining an accurate picture of the nation’s law enforcement workforce is paramount to understanding the current state of policing in the United States. As such, the 2016 LEMAS incorporates a number of measures that address action items from all six pillars. Table 1 outlines the Task Force items that will be measured by the 2016 LEMAS.

Table 1. Task Force recommendations and corresponding 2016 LEMAS items.

Task Force Recommendations	Related questions from 2016 LEMAS
1.3.1- Make policies and activity information (e.g. traffic stops, arrests) available online.	Q. 37 Asks if agencies provide crime statistics, stop and arrest data on their website Q. 18 Asks agencies to report summary counts of calls for service data
1.5.1- Engage communities in the process of developing and evaluating policies and procedures 4.1- LEAs should adopt policies to reinforce importance of community engagement 4.5- Emphasize co-production of public safety	Q. 27 Captures if agencies used community surveys to inform policies, procedures, and other agency activities
1.5.4 LEAs should have policies dealing with vulnerable populations	Q. 46 Captures agency policies dealing with the homeless, mentally ill, domestic disputes and juveniles
1.7- LEAs should conduct annual community surveys	Q. 26 Asks if agencies have conducted community surveys
1.8- LEAs should be diverse on race, gender, language, and other officer characteristics 2.5.1- BJS should add additional demographic questions to the LEMAS	Q. 13-16 Investigate the sex and race composition of the department including those recently hired and separated from the department
2.2- LEAs should have policies on use of force	Q. 31 Asks what kinds of force or weapons are authorized for use Q. 44 Asks if use of force records are computerized Q. 46 Asks if policies exist on use of deadly force/firearms discharge and use of less- lethal force Q 47 Asks if investigations by an outside law enforcement body is necessary under certain use of force scenarios
2.6.1- Incentivize partnerships between LEAs and universities	Q. 25 Asks if the agency has conducted problem-solving partnerships with universities
2.7.1- LEAs should have policies dealing with mass demonstrations	Q. 46 Asks if the agency has a policy on addressing mass demonstrations
2.8- Recommend that LEAs have civilian oversight	Q. 47 Asks if the agency has a civilian oversight committee Q. 48 Asks if the civilian oversight committee has independent investigative authority Q. 49 Asks if civilian complaints regarding use of force must be investigated outside the officers immediate chain of command

Table 1. Task Force recommendations and corresponding 2016 LEMAS items (cont.)

Task Force Recommendations	Related questions from 2016 LEMAS
2.13- Adopt policies that prohibit profiling	Q. 46 Asks if the agency has policies on racial profiling/unbiased policing, stop and frisk, and cultural awareness training
3.5- LEAs should adopt policies and practices for technology-based community engagement	Q. 38 Asks if the agency is engaged in the use of social media platforms to communicate with the public
3.6- There should be support for more development of less-than-lethal technology	Q. 31 Addresses the use of existing less-than-lethal technology including conducted energy weapons and blunt force projectiles
4.2- Community policing should be infused throughout the culture	Q. 2 Asks how many officers are engaged in community policing Q. 11 Asks if the agency considers community relations skills during pre-hiring practices Q. 20 Asks if the agency has community policing in their mission statement Q. 21 Asks what proportion of officers received eight hours of community policing training Q. 22 Asks if the agency maintains a community policing plan and if analysis is used to support community problems Q. 50 Asks if the agency has a specialized unit to engage in community policing
5.2- LEAs should engage community members in the training process	Q. 27 Asks if the agency uses community survey information to help develop training
6.4 & 6.6- Every officer should be provided with a ballistic vest	Q. 28 Asks how the agency funds the acquisition of body armor Q. 33 Asks if the agency requires officers to wear protective body armor
6.6 LEAs should encourage the use of seatbelts	Q. 34 Asks if the agency requires employees to wear seat belts while in agency-owned vehicles

The 2016 LEMAS focuses on a core set of questions about the characteristics of LEAs.⁵ In addition to measuring a number of issues addressed by the Task Force, the LEMAS also seeks to measure other important components, policies and practices of LEAs. Attachment 3 provides a

⁵ The past LEMAS surveys have not, and the proposed 2016 LEMAS will not, collect information about the nature of criminal behavior or injuries to sworn personnel. These two information needs are addressed by the FBI. In its UCR and Supplemental Homicide Reporting (SHR) Programs, the FBI collects detailed information about the nature of crimes reported to state and local LEAs. In its Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted (LEOKA) and SHR Programs, the FBI collects detailed information about the number of law enforcement officers killed or assaulted. The 2016 LEMAS will include FBI ORI codes that can be used to link LEMAS data on agency characteristics with FBI data on known offenses, arrest, as well as officers killed or assaulted.

list of each survey item by category domain and whether the specific item has been included in prior BJS LEA surveys.

Some questions in the 2013 LEMAS did not make it into the 2016 LEMAS instrument due to these modifications. The primary reasons being: 1) some content was specialized and not determined to be 'core'; 2) some questions need further testing due to inconsistent reporting; 3) the items cannot be trended over time; and 4) items needed to be dropped in order to allow for the demographic variables to be expanded while maintaining a similar burden as in past waves. Specialized content pertaining to retirement benefits, furloughs and pay freezes since 2010 were dropped. This content was added in 2013 in order to examine impact of the recession. Use of force counts, vehicle pursuit counts and the number of sworn who have a 4-year college degree were also included for the first time in 2013. These data were burdensome to produce by agencies and require further testing due to inconsistencies in how agencies responded to these data. Some detailed questions in regards to the use of research and statistics and items included in specific policies (e.g., foot pursuits) were also omitted in order to alleviate burden due to the expanded demographic questions. There are still included questions about the utilization of these services but specific details were not deemed to be core items.

Another item dropped from the 2016 LEMAS but included in previous waves was the salary schedule for chief executive, first-line supervisor and entry-level officer or deputy. This item was dropped for two primary reasons: 1) The average annual salary ranges have not changed since 2003; and 2) the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) publishes similar salary ranges for these positions. BJS plans on revising this item in the research and development phase in order to better capture the true salaries being applied for these positions rather than the posted schedule.

With concerns about police use of force and deaths in police custody or the process of arrest, one might ask why the core LEMAS does not focus on these topics. Instead of burdening the core LEMAS with additional questions about a sensitive topic, BJS previously used another vehicle to collect data on deaths in the process of arrest (Arrest Related Deaths (ARD) program, OMB 1121-0249); BJS is using the LEMAS Body Worn Camera (BWC) supplement (OMB 1121-0354) to field questions about citizen complaints about police use of force. By connecting citizen complaints with the BWC, BJS can examine hypotheses about the use of BWC and complaints about police use of force. Additionally, BJS and the FBI are collaborating on data collection activities related to police use of force to include officer-involved shootings, incidents with police that result in serious bodily injury to a subject, and incidents that result in a subject's death. This joint FBI-BJS effort will lead to the development of an incident-based data collection from law enforcement agencies on police use of force.

The first page of the 2016 LEMAS captures basic descriptive information about the name, address and agency ORI code needed to link these responses to past and future law enforcement organizational surveys. Information about the person completing the survey is also captured. This information directly addresses the NRC's recommendation for linking LEMAS information to data from UCR and census-based demographic data, as well as to other BJS LEA surveys, such as the 2016 LEMAS Body-Worn Camera Supplement and the follow-up survey in 2017.

Section I: Descriptive Information

The first section of the survey provides key classifying information of LEAs that is essential for comparisons across agencies that are of similar staffing levels and budgets. This section captures the number of full- and part-time sworn personnel in each agency. Staffing is further disaggregated by primary job duties which facilitates understanding of the command structure and composition of respondent agencies. We additionally distinguish between full-time sworn authorized staffing and actual staffing, which can be compared in order to assess LEAs budget constraints. The number of sworn and nonsworn reserves is also captured. Lastly, we collect financial data on LEAs including the start and end dates of the fiscal budget, total operating budget and total funds received from forfeiture assets. Budgetary resources and constraints can inform if LEAs are able to address the recommendations of the Task Force.

Section II: Personnel Information

Section II contains questions that are designed to gather information about the hiring practices of agencies and demographics of LEA staff. This section directly responds to Task Force recommendation 2.5 and action item 2.5.1. Minimum education requirements, citizenship status of new hires, and the number of bilingual staff are asked to obtain a more comprehensive look at the diversity of LEAs. Demographic questions were also expanded to meet the Task Force recommendation. Historically, the race and sex composition of the full-time sworn personnel has been asked in every wave of LEMAS. Beginning in 2013, sex composition by supervisory authority within the department (i.e., chief executive, intermediate supervisors, and first-line supervisors) was added. This has been expanded to also include race. The number of new-hires and separations disaggregated by race, Hispanic Origin, and sex during the fiscal period is also included for the first time in 2016. These questions have been formatted to match the race and sex matrix for full time sworn officers in order to ease burden on the agency.

Section II also measures various screening techniques commonly employed by agencies (e.g. background checks, personal attributes, and physical attributes). A separate set of questions ask about the number of academy, field and in-service training hours required for new recruits and non-probationary sworn officers. Similar questions have been included in the 2000, 2003, and 2013 LEMAS administrations. A question on the authorization of collective bargaining (disaggregated by sworn and nonsworn staff) is also included.

Section III: Operations

This section explores agency activity and types of patrol activity. Law enforcement agencies measure activity through a number of metrics and the LEMAS survey has been designed to capture the most common activity: calls-for-service (asked in six previous LEMAS waves). Task Force action item 1.3.1 calls for LEAs to provide access to law enforcement data on the agency's website. In addition to asking if this data is provided on the agency's website, the LEMAS also includes a question that asks agencies to include counts on their calls for service data as a method of verifying how readily available it is.

Inherent to community policing are methods of patrol that allow officers to have better engagement with the community such as by foot, bicycle, Segway and horse. Therefore, Section III also explores the use of different types of patrol units (e.g. automobile, motorcycle, and foot

patrol) commonly used by agencies, which has also been included in six previous waves of the LEMAS.

Section IV: Community Policing

The Task Force references the importance of community policing throughout the report. Since 1999, the LEMAS has included a set of items related to this important topic. The questions were developed in conjunction with the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS). These items include the nature of an agency's mission statement, use of problem-solving techniques, engagement in community collaboration and problem-solving partnerships, officer patrol assignments, surveys of residents and actions taken in response to those surveys, and community policing training. The inclusion of these items in four prior waves of LEMAS surveys will permit the 2016 LEMAS to document the trends in these items over a 19-year period. Just as important, these items address Task Force recommendations under pillars one and four. Specially, if LEAs are working with community partners, surveying the public to assess problems and if they are utilizing this information to solve these problems.

Section V: Equipment

Section V explores various dimensions of agency equipment including the types of equipment provided to officers and how this equipment is funded. These questions refer to firearms and less-lethal weapons, agency vehicles, and cameras. Additionally, policies pertaining to the use and funding of body armor is also included. These questions have historically been included in LEMAS, for at least seven waves. These items help address Task Force recommendations from pillars two, three and six. New to the 2016 is a question on the requirement of field officers to wear a seat belt, which was included to inform recommendation 6.6.

Section V also investigates the types of weapons or actions that are authorized for use (e.g., OC spray, baton, and neck restraints). This question has been asked in seven previous LEMAS waves. The Task Force stressed the importance of collecting data on use of force (recommendation 7.3) and since 2013, the LEMAS has asked agencies to document which types of weapons and actions require documentation when used. Finally, Section V gathers information on the number and type of vehicles (e.g., marked cars, unmarked cars, and armored vehicles) that are currently in service. The inclusion of armored vehicles in 2016 mirrors past LEMAS waves (1990-1997) and allows us to examine militarization of police. Another item in this section that allows us to look at this important issue is the use of secondary firearms, including fully and semi-automatic rifles.

Finally, this section includes a question that asks agencies to provide counts for various forms of video cameras, which was discussed in Task Force recommendation 3.3 under pillar three.

Section VI: Technology

The LEMAS has included a section on technology since the first wave. The Task Force includes a pillar (three) that focuses on this subject. The 2016 LEMAS includes items about the use of web-tools to facilitate interaction with the public (e.g., providing crime statistics or submitting complaints about officers) as well as social media as an avenue for communicating with the community. A series of questions also asks about how computers are used within the agency (e.g., for purposes of intelligence gathering and social network analysis). Questions also ask

about specific types of technologies such as fingerprinting, license plate readers, and gunshot detection. This section further explores if agencies maintain their own databases of specific kinds of events and activities (e.g., arrests and calls for service) and the availability of information systems when officers are in the field. Agencies are also asked to report the primary method of transmitting criminal incidents from the field. This section also asks agencies if they have an operational early intervention system (included in LEMAS 2000-2007), which promotes officer wellness (recommendation 6.1).

Section VII: Policies and Procedures

Previous versions of the LEMAS had questions on various types of agency policies (e.g., the use of force, civilian complaints, and off-duty employment). This section has been revised and now incorporates these historically relevant policies as well as policies that are relevant to contemporary policing concerns. New policies included in the 2016 LEMAS include: stop-and-frisk, body-worn cameras, and cultural awareness training. Knowledge of agency policies on these topics is the first step in understanding how agencies are addressing contemporary policing challenges. In 2003 and 2007, the LEMAS included questions about the use and functions of a civilian oversight committee, and the 2016 LEMAS will include these same items. These items support Task Force recommendation 2.8. The 2016 LEMAS also includes a new item to assess the requirement that use of force incidents be investigated by an external law enforcement agency. This item was specifically developed in response to Task Force recommendation 2.2.2 and will be able to assess which agencies are currently using external investigation on use of force incidents.

Section VIII: Special Problems/Tasks

Section VIII explores the degree of specialization within departments to understand how agencies address specific kinds of problems or tasks. Responses are disaggregated by whether or not agencies have designated full-time positions dedicated to these problems, designated as-needed personnel to address the issue, no specific personnel to address the issue, or the agency does not have the issue to address. Issues were identified based on their salience to the Task Force recommendations and current events. With these items we will be able to further identify the resources put toward important topics such as community policing, militarization and school safety.

The LEMAS will be administered from August 2016 through April 2017. During this 9-month period, the instrument will be administered to all law enforcement agencies selected in the sample.

2. Needs and Uses

BJS employs various methods to capture data to better understand the criminal justice system. For example, BJS captures data on crime from resident surveys, inmate surveys and the collection of administrative data. Data collections on agency characteristics are primarily conducted through establishment surveys, and this is the primary data collection vehicle for the law enforcement core collections. The LEMAS is the only systematic establishment survey that produces national estimates of personnel, resources, policies, and practices of the most common types of LEAs.

BJS Needs and Uses

BJS has used, and will continue to use, the LEMAS surveys to produce information available from no other source. With the core and supplement design, BJS will better engage with other federal agencies on important law enforcement issues. For example, BJS has partnered with the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) to better understand the implementation of body-worn cameras in LEAs. BJA has begun administering grants to LEAs so they can implement a body-worn camera program. BJS is helping to evaluate this grant program and will continue to assist in research in this field to improve how these grants are administered. Additional work is planned to survey prosecutors. The expanded demographic variables and pre-employment hiring practices in the LEMAS will allow us to further examine how LEAs are increasing diversity. These data are needed to understand the extent to which law enforcement personnel are representative of the communities they serve and to determine if the working conditions of these personnel are sufficient and appropriate for the responsibilities they assume. These data can inform BJA and COPS on how hiring practices can be modified in order to increase diversity.

Without LEMAS, BJS will be unable to describe the number and types of officers in state, county and local LEAs and to report to the nation the activities and functions LEAs perform. In addition, this survey provides BJS with systematic knowledge about the resources, policies practices, and organizational responses used to meet the challenges faced by contemporary LEAs. Comparisons of the 2016 LEMAS data with those from prior LEMAS surveys will also provide important information on how LEAs have changed over time including the adoption of new technology, instituting policies to address issues of contemporary importance (e.g., militarization of police and dealing with mentally ill persons), adopting community policing practices and changing diversity in law enforcement.

The list below details the type of information that will be available through the 2016 LEMAS data:

- Number of full-time and part-time sworn officers and non-sworn employees
- Number/percentages of officers assigned to positions such as patrol, community relations, and school resource officer
- Number of full-time and part-time/seasonal reserve officers
- Number of sworn and non-sworn personnel by task scope (e.g., administration, field operations, and court operations)
- Average total operating budget
- Average total forfeiture assets
- Prevalence of hiring practices and educational requirements for new officers
- Average academy, field, and in-service training hours
- Average number of sworn and non-sworn staff who are bilingual
- Sex, race and Hispanic origin of full-time sworn personnel, the chief executive, intermediate and first line supervisors
- Sex, race and Hispanic origin of new hires and separations in the past fiscal year
- Rates of calls for service per officer
- Rates/percentages of agencies that engage in key community policing activities
- Rates/percentages of agencies that authorize the use of specific kinds of weapons or force actions, and how those weapons or actions are documented
- Prevalence of secondary weapons authorized

- Percent of agencies that require body armor and seat belt usage
- Average number of video cameras utilized regularly
- Percent of agencies who are using body worn cameras
- Prevalence of content provided by an agency's website and use of social media
- Percent of agencies that maintain computerized files for various types of data
- Prevalence of written policies and procedures
- Prevalence of civilian review board
- Percent of agencies who use external investigation for use of force incidents
- Prevalence of specialized units designed to address specific problems

These characteristics can be disaggregated to produce estimates by agency size and type based on the stratification procedure.

Since 1987, BJS has published 32 reports on data obtained from previous LEMAS surveys to describe characteristics of different types of LEAs (e.g., local police departments and sheriff's offices). These reports are often cited in textbooks, research articles and public discussions as the authoritative source on the characteristics of state and local LEAs. BJS staff have also used LEMAS data to produce reports on thematic issues such as use of force complaints (Hickman and Piquero, 2009), women in law enforcement (Langton, 2010), the comparison of campus and city police operations (Bromley and Reaves, 1998), and use of technology (Reaves, 2015). Attachment 4 provides a complete listing of publications derived from LEMAS data.

Uses of the LEMAS Data by Others

The information generated from the LEMAS surveys is widely used by the law enforcement professional and research communities. A systematic review of the literature identified 114 peer-reviewed studies using LEMAS data published between 1987 and 2013 (Matusiak, Campbell, and King, 2014). The private publications authored by independent researchers tend to use the LEMAS data in conjunction with other sources of information to address specific topics such as police arrest decisions, police use-of-control and professionalism (Shjarback & White, 2015; Schuck & Rabe-Hemp, 2014), predictors of officer turnover (Smith, Wareham, & Lambert, 2014), law enforcement uses of geographic information systems, and law enforcement responses to specific issues such as hate crimes, gangs, intimate partner violence, human trafficking (Farrell, 2014) and terrorism (Randol, 2013).⁶ Some have used LEMAS data to examine racial and/or gender representation within departments (Hur, 2013; Bies et al., 2015; Barrick, Hickman & Strom, 2014; Gustafson, 2013; Sharp, 2014), in addition to organizational trends such as early intervention (EI) systems (Shjarback, 2014), structure (Schuck & Rabe-Hemp, 2014; Willits, 2014), and unionization (DeCarlo & Jenkins, 2015; Schuck, 2014) and the coinciding impacts on clearance rates (Walfield, 2015; Roberts & Roberts, 2015), departmental practices, and the police-community relationship (Perez & Bromley, 2015; Cave, Telep & Grieco, 2015). In contrast, others simply refer to the LEMAS data to obtain accurate counts of sworn officers (Chalfin & McCrary, 2013). The LEMAS data are also used by justice department officials (U.S. Department of Justice, 2011) and in widely read publications by professional law enforcement organizations (Melekian, 2012) as authoritative statistics on law enforcement trends.

⁶ Beginning with the first LEMAS survey, BJS has provided free access to public-use data files at National Archive of Criminal Justice Data at the University of Michigan (<https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/NACJD/series/92/studies>).

State, county, and local LEA staff frequently use the information obtained from the LEMAS surveys; these are often individuals from the same agencies that complete the LEMAS surveys. While some users are interested in summary statistics or national averages provided by BJS published reports, BJS frequently answers inquiries from law enforcement personnel about aspects of a select number of agencies that are interested in comparisons to similar jurisdictions. For instance, the Phoenix Police Department may want to compare itself with the Dallas Police Department or a sheriff's office in Florida may want to know how many other similarly sized sheriff's offices in the state have a gang unit or a use of force policy. The existence of specialized units or the adoption of new technology are two aspects of the LEMAS surveys, which have been of regular interest to law enforcement personnel, many of whom are considering creating new units or purchasing similar equipment for their agencies.

Two other frequent users of the LEMAS data are the media and the public. The BJS Law Enforcement Statistics Unit answers hundreds of calls every year from the public or from reporters. These calls often concern details that can be answered only with information from BJS surveys of general purpose LEAs.

The revised design of the 2016 LEMAS will enhance the use of these data by law enforcement professionals and researchers. First, by archiving data files with consistent agency identification numbers for each agency, analysts outside of BJS can more easily examine changes in particular agencies or groups of agencies over time. Second, the 2016 LEMAS results will be linked, through ORI and FIPS codes, with data from the FBI's UCR and LEOKA and the Census Bureau.

Anticipated Products

BJS anticipates producing multiple reports from the 2016 LEMAS. Detailed information on the reports to be produced is discussed under 16. Project Schedule and Publication Plan.

In addition to the planned analytical reports, BJS will evaluate the feasibility of an on-line data tool using all the data from the 2016 LEMAS so that law enforcement professionals, law enforcement researchers and the general public can have immediate access to information about individual LEAs as well as summary information by agency type, size, or location.

At the time of the initial publication from the 2016 LEMAS, BJS will release fully-documented data files for public use through the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data at the University of Michigan.

3. Use of Information Technology

The 2016 LEMAS instrument has been designed for online data collection that will export survey data and paradata in various data formats specified by BJS. This software will allow RTI to send an email to respondents explaining the LEMAS program and containing a hyperlink to the questionnaire. Additionally, the software allows for real-time online tracking of respondents thereby allowing BJS to track the completion of each agency's responses.

Agencies may have a number of reasons why they do not respond via the internet, for example some might not have reliable internet access and others might find it difficult to complete online because of the complexity of the requested data or the need to involve multiple people in preparing the response. Agencies that require paper access will have multiple methods of receiving paper versions of the instrument. Hard copies will be sent via mail during routine non-response follow-up. Hard copies will also be sent via fax during later non-response follow-up. Finally, agencies will be able to download a PDF version of the survey from the survey site that can be printed or e-mailed to agency staff. Respondents can then survey in hard copy and transcribe it to the online survey instrument, scan and return the completed form via mail or e-mail.

The dataset and supporting documentation will be made available without charge at the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data at the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) and at Data.gov. Access to these data permits analysts to identify the specific responses of individual agencies and to conduct statistical analyses about general purpose law agencies. These data will have agency- and jurisdiction-specific identifiers that will permit public use in combination with other data files with similar identifiers.

The BJS-produced findings from the 2016 LEMAS will be provided to the public in electronic format. These reports will be available on the BJS website as PDF files. BJS may also produce a web-based, data analysis tool for the 2016 LEMAS to increase the ease with which the public can access information about specific agencies or types of agencies.

4. Efforts to Identify Duplication

Based on our knowledge of the federal statistical system, in general, and law enforcement surveys in particular, BJS has determined that the 2016 LEMAS includes measures of the number of law enforcement personnel that are also included in three ongoing surveys by other Federal agencies.⁷

1. The FBI annually collects information from LEAs about the number and sex of sworn and nonsworn personnel as part of the “Number of Full-Time Law Enforcement Employees” (OMB No. 1110-0004).
2. The BLS “Occupational Employment Survey” (OMB No. 1220-0042) samples employers yearly about the number, race and Hispanic origin of employees in three Protective Service Occupation subcategories: 1) police and sheriff’s patrol officers, 2) detectives and criminal investigators, and 3) first line supervisors of police and detectives.
3. The United States Census Bureau tabulates and publishes Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) information on the sex, race and ethnicity of sworn and non-sworn employees of state and local governments who work in a protective service. This information is available for geographies that represent worksite and residence. This information has been based on decennial census and more recently on the American Community Survey (OMB No. 0607-0810 & 0607-0936).

⁷ BJS’ Census of State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies, from which the LEMAS sample is drawn, also includes measures of the number of law enforcement personnel.

BJS has identified four variables—the number of male sworn, male nonsworn, female sworn, and female nonsworn personnel—that are collected and reported by the FBI survey and by BJS in the CSLLEA and LEMAS surveys. The items about personnel in the FBI survey are collected in conjunction with annual data collections of hundreds of items about reported offenses and about assaults on law enforcement officers. The FBI uses these data to report on offense, arrest, and assault rates per sworn personnel.

In the five years (1992, 1996, 2000, 2004 and 2008) for which both the FBI survey and the BJS CSLLEA were conducted, the FBI collected data from 3,600 to 5,200 fewer agencies (24.9%) and reported about 100,000 fewer total personnel (10.0%). These differences are due in part to the different criteria for inclusion of agencies and personnel in these two surveys. The FBI survey is limited to personnel paid “with law enforcement funds” while the BJS surveys include all personnel regardless of what funds pay their salaries. In addition, the BJS survey captures all agencies that employ the equivalent (i.e., two part-time staff) of at least one full-time sworn personnel; while the FBI requires at least one full-time sworn staff member. Lastly, the FBI survey is limited to agencies that report to the FBI’s UCR program during a particular year (see Reaves, 2011).

Personnel items included in the LEMAS surveys are used to produce national estimates of personnel and to provide the basis for computing the percentages of sworn personnel by race and ethnicity, by law enforcement function, and by current and newly hired personnel. LEMAS also collects information about part-time, seasonal, and volunteer employees of LEAs.

To summarize, BJS and FBI data collections differ on several key measures:

- Definition of law enforcement officer that varies depending upon how the officer is funded at the agency
- Scope of agencies considered for inclusion in data collection efforts
- Data collection goals
- BJS includes additional demographic variables for sworn personnel

These design elements lead to differences in the estimated number of total sworn officers, which persist over time across various waves of data collection. The number of duplicate data collection items in the BJS and FBI data collection is small, and the information collected is necessary to meet the goals of each survey.

Turning to the Occupational Employment Survey, both the BJS and BLS surveys report information about the number of law enforcement employees and the proportion by race and Hispanic origin. The BLS survey emphasizes comparisons of the number of positions and their compensation among many occupation types across different geographical areas of the country. The samples and employee definitions used in these two surveys vary due to the differing purposes of the surveys. In law enforcement surveys the distinction between sworn and nonsworn is crucial, but this distinction can only be assumed in the BLS occupational sub-codes. Moreover, many law enforcement employees, such as forensic scientists or crime analysts, are unlikely to fit into any BLS occupational codes for protection service occupations. Lastly, the

BLS only publish race and Hispanic origin proportions and do not separate Hispanic origin from race in their reports.

As with the FBI survey, the number of duplicate items in the BJS and BLS surveys is small, and the items are needed for the internal purposes of the survey. The BJS annual data are collected and reported at the agency level and at the national level separately for sheriff's departments and local and county police departments. The BLS data are collected at the employer level and three-year averages are reported at the SMSA level and the national level with no distinction among federal, state or local LEAs.

The EEO tabulations based upon the decennial census, and more recently the American Community Survey, provide national estimates on the number of sworn and nonsworn personnel involved in protective services for state and local governments. The dataset contains breakdowns by sex, race, and Hispanic origin. The EEO tabulations suffer from the same limitations as the Occupational Employment Survey, namely it is impossible to fully understand the law enforcement related job codes that may be subsumed under the "protective service" heading. This dataset also provides geographic rather than agency staffing estimates. Estimates are provided for location of employment or residence rather than the law enforcement agency. LEMAS data reflect place of work rather than location of work or place of residence. EEO data are insufficient to disaggregate the number of sworn officers working in local law enforcement versus Sheriff's offices.

BJS has identified three federally-sponsored surveys with varying samples and measures of employees that can be used to estimate the number of sworn law enforcement personnel in the United States. However, only BJS has a primary goal of creating national estimates of the number of LEAs and number of sworn and nonsworn personnel. Furthermore, the LEMAS is the only data source that provides demographic characteristics of full-time sworn by supervisory position based on the employing agency rather than residents. This allows for national estimates at all jurisdiction levels: local, county, and state. BJS is scheduled to release a report comparing these differences, titled *National Sources of Law Enforcement Employee Data*, is scheduled to be released by BJS in April 2016.

5. Efforts to Minimize Burden

Efforts to minimize burden are focused on two areas: instrument design and support services. First, in December 2015 and January 2016, BJS obtained feedback on a draft instrument from an expert panel. This panel was comprised of eleven individuals with expertise in law enforcement and included both law enforcement practitioners as well as policing scholars that were known for using LEMAS data in the past. The outcome of this expert panel resulted in minor changes to the 2016 LEMAS instrument, since the majority of the instrument (over 90%) included that were tested in previous LEMAS waves. The majority of changes were related to reducing the overall burden of the survey. Burden was reduced by clarifying question wording to better reflect the current state of policing, minimizing response categories, streamlining the reporting reference period to the agency's fiscal year, and dropping some items that no longer have utility.

We expect that many respondents will make use of the online survey software to complete the survey. A number of web-based system functions will be in place to ease the burden of survey completion. RTI will use an intelligent log-in program for data collection, which will store agency information and responses, allowing for multi-session, non-sequential completion of the survey instrument. Since many agencies, particularly the larger ones, will need to seek out multiple information sources within their organizations to answer different sections, this will reduce the burden on them by facilitating data entry from different sources. It will also reduce the burden by allowing them to stop response entry pending confirmation of information from others in the agency. Help icons located next to each survey question will link respondents to item-specific information, additional guidance, and helpdesk contact information to facilitate requests for assistance.

The online system will also provide a glossary of terms for respondent reference. In addition, a help desk will be staffed during normal business hours (east coast time) and will be available to respondents through a toll-free number. Respondents will also receive a hard copy questionnaire, along with directions, by mail. Additionally, respondents will be able to access a PDF version of the survey online, which can be printed. Once complete, this paper version of the survey can be used to enter data through the web-based survey instrument or can be returned via email, fax, or mail.

In addition, project staff from RTI will be available to assist respondents throughout the data collection period. A data collection manager will oversee the help desk. When not available, calls to the help desk will be routed automatically to another survey team member for immediate response. Voice-mail will be available outside of regular business hours and a dedicated LEMAS help e-mail address will be provided with the introductory letter and survey packet. The office and cell-phone numbers, as well as the e-mail address for the survey principal investigator, will also be provided to respondents to insure timely communications.

6. Consequences of Less Frequent Collection

Based in part on recommendations from the NRC (Groves and Cork, 2011) and the Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing (Melekian, 2012), BJS has determined that it is necessary to improve the frequency of its law enforcement data collections and to establish a more regular schedule of future surveys of general purpose LEAs. To this end, a significant portion of BJS's law enforcement data collection efforts have been combined into the Law Enforcement Core Statistics (LECS), which is comprised of the CSLLEA, LEMAS core, LEMAS topical supplements, and the survey of Federal Law Enforcement Agencies (FLEO). These data collection efforts will now share a common alternating schedule that will serve to reduce burden and increase the timeliness of data collection. Table 2 shows the data collection schedule for these core projects.

Table 2. Data collection schedule for the Law Enforcement Core Statistics (LECS) program, 2016-2023

Collection	Start of Data Collection
2016 LEMAS Body-Worn Camera Supplement	April 2016
2016 LEMAS core	August 2016
2017 LEMAS Body-Worn Camera Supplement	August 2017
2018 CSLLEA & FLEO	August 2018
2019 LEMAS Supplement (TBD)	August 2019
2020 LEMAS core	August 2020
2021 LEMAS Supplement (TBD)	August 2021
2022 CSLLEA & FLEO	August 2022
2023 LEMAS Supplement (TBD)	August 2023

LECS was designed to provide regularity of the data collections while simultaneously not overburdening agencies with survey requests. Conducting multiple surveys in a single year may lead to lower response rates and result in less precise and biased estimates for key survey items. Under the LECS model and beginning with the 2016 LEMAS core, only one of the core collections (i.e., LEMAS core, LEMAS supplement, or CSLLEA/FLEO) will be administered per year in order to reduce burden on agencies that will be selected with certainty for each collection. Furthermore, the proposed data collection schedule will allow for reliable indicators of officer staffing, and changes in staffing, every two years.

The LEMAS data collection efforts, and the required consultation with experts in the field of both practice and research, will be used to identify the topical areas for the LEMAS supplemental surveys. The supplements are designed to provide more timely and actionable information to agencies on topics that are of contemporary concern and are designed to be conducted every 2-years. Less frequent collection of LEMAS supplemental data will hinder our ability to address relevant issues in law enforcement and to assist other agencies such as BJA, NIJ and COPS with their grant programs.

7. Special Circumstances

No special circumstances have been identified for this project.

8. Adherence to 5 CFR 1320.8(d) and Outside Consultations

The research under this clearance is consistent with the guidelines in 5 CFR 1320.6. The 60-day notice for public commentary was published in the Federal Register, Volume 81, Number 25, pages 6539-6540 on February 8, 2016 (Attachment 5). The 30-day notice for public commentary was published in the Federal Register, Volume 81, Number 71, pages 21903-21904, on April 13, 2016 (Attachment 6). In response to the 60-day notice, we received a suggestion that the LEMAS should ask about the administrative structure of law enforcement agencies and staffing levels within. We responded with the items that addressed these comments (questions 4 and 51) and the commenter was satisfied. No public comments were received in response to the 30-day notice.

BJS shared a copy of a draft LEMAS survey instrument with law enforcement practitioners and research scholars with 1) a known interest in law enforcement and 2) a history of publishing research that had used LEMAS data in the past. The eleven expert reviewers (Table 3) were given an electronic draft of the survey instrument and asked to comment on question wording, and response categories, as well as overall structure and layout. Responses were primarily received as written annotations within the document.

Table 3. Expert Reviewers for the 2016 LEMAS Instrument

Christine Famega, Ph.D., Associate Professor Dept. of Criminal Justice California State University, San Bernardino San Bernardino, CA 92407	Steve Forker, Administrative Services Director Fresno County Sheriff's Office Fresno, CA 93724
Matt Hickman, Ph.D., Associate Professor Dept. of Criminal Justice Seattle University Seattle, WA 98122	Nola Joyce, Deputy Commissioner Philadelphia Police Department Philadelphia, PA 19106
William King, Ph.D., Associate Professor College of Criminal Justice Sam Houston State University Huntsville, TX 77341	Edward Maguire, Ph.D., Professor Justice, Law and Criminology American University Washington, DC 20016
Clint Teel, Lieutenant Planning and Research Oklahoma City Police Department Oklahoma City, OK 73104	Erik Robey, Community and Legislative Liaison Harford County Sheriff's Office Bel Air, MD 21014
Rachel Tolber, Sargent Redlands Police Department Redlands, CA 92373	Jason Umberger, Chief of Police Swatara Township Police Department Harrisburg, PA 17111
Charles Wellford, Ph.D., Professor Emeritus Dept. of Criminology and Criminal Justice University of Maryland College Park, MD 20740	

9. Paying Respondents

Neither BJS nor RTI will provide any payment or gift of any type to respondents. Respondents will participate on a voluntary basis.

10. Assurance of Confidentiality

According to 42 U.S.C. 3735 Section 304, the information gathered in this data collection shall be used only for statistical or research purposes, and shall be gathered in a manner that precludes their use for law enforcement or any purpose relating to a particular individual other than statistical or research purposes. The data collected through the LEMAS represent institutional characteristics of publicly-administered LEAs. Information about these organizations is largely available in the public domain. The fact that participation in this survey is voluntary and that information about individual agency responses will be available to the public is included on the first page of the survey instrument. However, BJS will not release the names, phone numbers or email of the actual persons responsible for completing the 2016 LEMAS.

11. Justification for Sensitive Questions

There are no questions of a sensitive nature in the proposed 2016 LEMAS Survey.

12. Estimate of Respondent Burden

BJS has estimated the respondent burden for the proposed 2016 LEMAS at 10,497 hours (Table 4). This estimate is based on the burden estimate from the 2007 LEMAS and not the most recent version fielded in 2013. The 2007 burden estimate assumed a 3 hour burden for the completion of the 10-page long-form survey. The form collected data on 324 variables; 76 required the respondents to report an amount (e.g., number of personnel, hours, dollars, etc.) and 227 required the respondent to check a single item. The 2016 LEMAS questionnaire includes 327 variables; 117 require reporting of amounts and 210 require checking a single item.

Table 4: Estimated Burden Hours for 2016 LEMAS.

	Sample Size	Estimated Burden (in hours)	Total Burden Hours
All Agencies	3,499	3.0	10,497

13. Estimate of Respondent's Cost Burden

BJS anticipates that one or more persons per surveyed agency will spend time reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Whether the response is provided by one or by more than one person, the weighted average for the total burden for each agency is estimated to be 3 hours. Assuming a pay rate approximately equivalent to the GS-12 / 01 level (\$77,490 per year), the estimated agency cost of employee time would be approximately \$34.45 per hour.

Approximately 3,499 agencies will be randomly sampled to participate in the 2016 LEMAS. Based on the estimated time burden per response and employee pay rate, the total respondent employee time cost burden is estimated at \$361,622.

There are no anticipated costs to respondents beyond the employee time expended during completion of the survey instrument and addressed in above.

14. Costs to Federal Government

The 2016 LEMAS is being developed and conducted under a multi-year cooperative agreement under the LECS program. Table 5 reflects the cost to administer the 2016 LEMAS core.

Table 5. Estimated costs for the 2016 LEMAS core

Category	Cost
<u>BJS costs</u>	
Staff salaries	
GS-12 Statistician (25%)	\$19,000
GS-15 Supervisory Statistician (3%)	\$7,000
GS-13 Editor (10%)	\$10,000
Other Editorial Staff	\$5,000
Front-Office Staff (GS-15 & Directors)	\$2,000
Subtotal salaries	\$43,000
Fringe benefits (28% of salaries)	\$12,040
<i>Subtotal: Salary & fringe</i>	<i>\$55,040</i>
Other administrative costs of salary & fringe (15%)	\$8,256
Subtotal: BJS costs	\$63,296
<u>Data Collection Agent (RTI)</u>	
Personnel (including fringe)	\$194,912
Travel	\$74,067
Supplies	\$1,454
Consultant/Contracts	\$139,002
Other	\$30,145
Total Indirect	\$230,175
Subtotal Data Collection Agent Costs	\$669,755
TOTAL COSTS	\$733,051

15. Reason for Change in Burden

The total burden estimate for the 2016 LEMAS has been reduced by 247 hours compared to the 2013 LEMAS. Topical questions that were of interest during the 2013 LEMAS have been omitted in order to focus on core questions that have been in past waves. The 2016 LEMAS will not have long- and short-form versions; all participants will receive the same survey. The 2016 LEMAS more closely matches the 2007 LEMAS long form in the total number of data elements. The number of questions requiring reporting of amounts (e.g. number of personnel) has increased compared to the 2007 LEMAS administration. These questions typically take longer to

answer and, as a result, overall burden has increased from the 2007 LEMAS administration. Table 6 summarizes the changes in estimated burden between the previous LEMAS administrations.

Table 6: Estimated Burden Hours for the 2007 LEMAS, 2013 LEMAS, and 2016 LEMAS

	Sample Size	Estimated Burden (in hours)	Total Burden Hours
2007 LEMAS			
Long Form	1,000	3.00	3,000
Short Form	2,200	2.00	4,400
Total Sample	3,200	2.3	7,400
2013 LEMAS			
Large Agencies	1,000	4.37	4,369
Small Agencies	2,500	2.55	6,375
Weighted Sample	3,500	3.07	10,744
2016 LEMAS			
All Agencies	3,499	3.0	10,497

Another consideration is that the methodology for estimating the 2016 instrument’s burden was different than the methodology used to estimate the burden for the 2013 LEMAS instrument. The 2013 estimate was derived from a more concrete process that involved pilot testing the instrument with eight agencies. This was necessary because of the major changes involved with the 2013 LEMAS that made comparison to previous versions less reliable. The 2016 burden estimate is based on a more generalized experience of fielding a similar survey over previous waves, but was not directly linked to a test of the 2016 instrument.

16. Project Schedule and Publication Plan

The data collection for 2016 LEMAS is scheduled to begin in early August 2016. The data collection period is 9 months. BJS has determined that the shortened schedule for data collection is feasible because of paradata from the 2007 and 2013 LEMAS data collections show a 45% response rate in the first month of data collection and an 80% response rate within 6 months.

The design of the 2016 LEMAS calls for the initiation of data analyses including the assessment of nonresponse biases when the response rate hits 50%. While this program anticipates a final response rate in excess of 90%, BJS is prepared to conduct and report national estimates based on response rates greater than 80%, if that is necessary to meet the deadline for the release of published findings by Winter 2016-2017. Table 7 contains the project schedule.

Table 7. Project Schedule

Stage	Type of contact	Date	Attachment Number
LEMAS informational website	All	-60 days	--
Survey invitation letter (with URL and login instructions) and LEMAS informational flyer	All	Day 1	1, 7-11
Email invitation with URL and login instructions	All	Day 7	7
Completion thank you	All	Variable	12
First reminder email	All	Day 30	13
Second reminder letter	Non-respondents	Day 51	14
Third reminder email	Non-respondents	Day 72	15
Telephone non-response contact	Non-respondents	Day 72	16
Fifth reminder email	Non-respondents	Day 88	17
Final mailing (end of study letter)	Non-respondents	Day 153	18
Analysis	N/A	Months 6-8	--
Reports	N/A	Months 9-12	--

BJS will be responsible for the statistical analysis and publication of the data from the 2016 LEMAS. Contingent on the processing and delivery of the final data file, BJS anticipates releasing several reports by May 2018.

The first report titled, *Local Police Departments, 2016: Personnel, Policies, and Practices*, will discuss the general trends in the composition of local law enforcement officers by sex, race and Hispanic origin. This report will provide demographic information on supervisory positions, personnel counts by task scope, salary requirements and administrative budget. Additionally, this report will examine trends in functional differentiation, formalization, hiring requirements and pre-employment screening over time. Lastly, this report will include work load estimates for the first time since 1997.

A second report, titled, *Sheriff Departments, 2016: Personnel, Policies and Practices*, will cover the same topics above for sheriff departments. Anticipated release date for both: February 2018

The third report, title *Local Police Departments, 2016: Equipment and Technology*, will present data equipment and technology. Topics to be covered include nonlethal weapons, use of video equipment and use of other specialized technologies. The report will also include trends in the use of body armor and the types of motorized vehicles utilized by departments. Information technology trends will also be discussed and what types of records are held in computerized format and accessible by patrol officers while in the field. Lastly, trends in the use of an early intervention system will be discussed.

A fourth report, titled *Sheriff Departments, 2016: Equipment and Technology*, will cover the same topics for sheriff departments. Anticipated release date for both: April 2018

A fifth report, tentative titled, *Community Policing, 2000-2016*, will examine the trends in community policing over time for LEMAS waves 2000, 2003, 2007, 2013 and 2016. The report

will provide information on the percent of local police departments and sheriffs' offices that maintain a mission statement with a community policing component and the percent of sworn personnel employed by these agencies. The brief will examine how law enforcement agencies are practicing the community policing philosophy and identify changes in practices since 2000. Information on the percent of agencies that encouraged patrol officers to engaged in SARA (Scanning, Analysis, Response and Assessment) problem-solving projects and the number of officers that engaged in SARA projects and how agencies will be provided. In addition, the brief will include information about the percent of agencies with geographic assignments for patrol officers and the number of patrol officers that have primary responsibility for areas or beats. Anticipated release date: May 2018

17. Display of Expiration Date

The expiration date will be shown on the survey form.

18. Exception to the Certificate Statement

BJS is not requesting an exception to the certification of this information collection.

19. Contacts for Statistical Aspects and Data Collection

a. BJS contacts include:

Shelley Hyland, PhD
202-616-1706
Shelley.Hyland@usdoj.gov

b. Persons consulted on statistical methodology:

Stephanie Zimmer, PhD
RTI International

c. Persons consulted on data collection and analysis:

Tim Smith
RTI International

Travis Taniguchi, PhD
RTI International

Sean Goodison, PhD
Police Executive Research Forum