2016 LEMAS OMB Attachments

Attachment 1: 2016 LEMAS Instrument

Attachment 2: Authorizing Legislation Title 42

Attachment 3: LEMAS Items and Domains

Attachment 4: LEMAS Publications

Attachment 5: 60-day notice

Attachment 6: 30-day notice

Attachment 7: Survey Invitation Letter

Attachment 8: LEMAS Flyer

Attachment 9: BJS Confidentiality Assurances

Attachment 10: PERF Letter of Support

Attachment 11: POC Update Form

Attachment 12: Respondent thank you

Attachment 13: First reminder - email

Attachment 14: Second reminder - letter

Attachment 15: Third reminder - email

Attachment 16: Telephone scripts

Attachment 17: Fifth reminder - email

Attachment 18: Final reminder - letter/End of study message

OMB No. 1121-0240: Approval Expires XX/XX/201X

RETURN TO

RTI INTERNATIONAL
RESEARCH OPERATONS CENTER
ATTN: DATA CAPTURE
5265 CAPITAL BOULEVARD
RALEIGH, NC 27616-2925
https://TBD
Telephone: TBD (toll-free)
Fax: TBD Email: TBD

2016 LAW ENFORCEMENT MANAGEMENT AND STATISTICS (LEMAS) SURVEY

Form CJ-44
2016 SURVEY OF STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES
U.S. Department of Justice
Bureau of Justice Statistics

In correspondence about this survey, please refer to the number at the top left of this box. (Please correct any error in name and mailing address in the box below. If the label is correct, please check the box in the bottom right hand corner.)

Agency ID:

Password:

Name:

Title:

Agency:

The label is correct ☐

INFORMATION SUPPLIED BY

NAME				**TITLE**		
TELEPHONE	Area Code	Number	Extension	**FAX**	Area Code	Number
EMAIL ADDRESS						

Completion and Return Instructions

- Unless otherwise noted, please answer all questions using June 30, 2016 as a reference.
- **Please do not leave any items blank.** If the answer to a question is unknown or not available, write "DK" in the space provided. If the answer is not applicable, write "NA" in the space provided. If the answer to a question is none or zero, write "0" in the space provided.
- There are four ways to submit this survey:
  - Online at **https://TBD** Please use the Agency ID and Password listed above to access the survey on the secure, encrypted website. This method allows for the ability to save partial data and return at a later time. If you or another staff member needs to access the survey multiple times, please only "submit" the survey once it is complete.
  - Mail the survey to RTI International (RTI) in the enclosed postage-paid envelope
  - Fax each page of the survey to XXX-XXX-XXXX (toll free)
  - Scan and email the survey to **TBD@rti.org**
- **Please submit your completed questionnaire by XX XX, 2016.**
- If you have questions about the survey, items on the questionnaire, or how to submit completed responses, please contact the Survey Team at RTI by email at **TBD@rti.org** or call the Help Line at XXX-XXX-XXXX (toll free). The Help Line is available from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. (EST). When communicating about the survey, please reference your Agency ID.
- If you have general comments or suggestions for improving the survey, please contact Shelley S. Hyland, LEMAS Program Manager, Bureau of Justice Statistics, by phone at 202-616-1706 or by email at Shelley.Hyland@usdoj.gov.
- Please retain a copy of your completed survey for one year. Questionnaires completed through the online option can be printed for your records.
- The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended (42 USC 3732), authorizes this information collection. Although this survey is voluntary, we need your participation to make the results comprehensive, accurate, and timely. We greatly appreciate your assistance.

Burden Statement

Federal agencies may not conduct or sponsor an information collection, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information, unless it displays a currently valid OMB Control Number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 3 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate, or any other aspects of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Director, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 810 Seventh Street NW, Washington, DC 20531.

AGENCY ID: _____

Section I: Descriptive Information

Unless otherwise noted, please answer all questions using June 30, 2016, as a reference.

1. Enter the number of AUTHORIZED full-time paid agency positions and ACTUAL full-time and part-time paid agency employees as of June 30, 2016. Full-time employees are those regularly scheduled for 35 or more hours per week. If none, enter '0.'

	AUTHORIZED full-time paid positions	ACTUAL paid agency employees	
		Full-time	Part-time
a. Sworn personnel with general arrest powers			
b. Officers/deputies with limited or no arrest powers (e.g., jail or court officers in some agencies)			
c. Non-sworn employees			
d. TOTAL (sum of lines 'a' through 'c')			

2. Of the total number of FULL-TIME SWORN personnel with general arrest powers (as entered in 1.a, column 2), enter the number of each of the following: (Personnel may be counted more than once. If none, enter '0.')

a. Uniformed officers with REGULARLY ASSIGNED DUTIES that include responding to citizen calls/requests for service	
b. Community Policing or Relations Officers, or other sworn personnel specifically designated to engage in community policing activities	
c. School Resource Officers, School Liaison Officers, or other general sworn personnel whose primary duties are related to school safety (exclude crossing guards)	

3. As of June 30, 2016, how many RESERVE or AUXILIARY OFFICERS did your agency have? Enter the full-time and part-time numbers below. If none, enter '0.'

	Full-time	Part-time
a. Sworn		
b. Limited/no arrest powers		
c. Non-sworn		

4. Enter the number of FULL-TIME personnel according to their PRIMARY job responsibility as of June 30, 2016. Count each full-time staff person only once. If a person performs more than one function, enter that person's count in the job category in which s/he spent most of her/his time. If none, enter '0'

	Sworn	Limited/no arrest powers	Non-sworn
a. **Administration** -- Chief of police or sheriff, assistants and other personnel who work in administrative capacity. *Include finance, personnel and internal affairs.*			
b. **Field operations** – Police officers, deputies, detectives, inspectors, supervisors, and other personnel providing direct law enforcement services. *Include traffic, patrol, investigations and special operations.*			
1. Patrol/field officers only			
2. Detectives/investigators only			
c. **Technical support** – Dispatchers, records clerks, data processors, and other personnel providing support services other than administrative. *Include communications, fleet management and training.*			
d. **Jail-related duties** – Correctional officers, guards, and other support personnel who primarily work in the jail.			
e. **Court related duties** – Bailiffs, security guards, process servers, etc.			
f. **Other** (e.g., crossing guards, parking enforcement, etc.)			

5. Enter your agency's total operating budget for the fiscal year that included June 30, 2016. If the budget is not available, provide an estimate and check the box below. Include jails administered by your agency. Do NOT include building construction costs or major equipment purchases.

$ ☐☐, ☐☐☐, ☐☐☐, ☐☐☐

Please mark here if this figure is an estimate ☐

Please indicate the date range of your agency's fiscal year that included June 30, 2016:

Start ☐☐ (mm dd) End ☐☐ (mm dd)

6. Enter the total estimated value of money, goods, and property received by your agency from an ASSET FORFEITURE program during the fiscal year that included June 30, 2016. If data are not available, provide an estimate and check the box below. Include federal, state and local funds. If no money, goods or property were received, enter '0'.

$ ☐☐, ☐☐☐, ☐☐☐, ☐☐☐

Please mark here if this figure is an estimate ☐

Section II: Personnel

Unless otherwise noted, please answer all questions using June 30, 2016, as a reference.

7a. Indicate your agency's minimum education requirement which new officer recruits must have at hiring or within two years of hiring. Mark only 1 response.

- ☐ Four-year college degree required
- ☐ Two-year college degree required
- ☐ Some college but no degree required
  (Total credit hours required: _____)
- ☐ High school diploma or equivalent required
- ☐ No formal education requirement (SKIP to Question 8)

7b. Does your agency consider MILITARY SERVICE as an exemption to this minimum education requirement?

☐ Yes ☐ No

8. Does your agency require a new officer recruit to be a U.S. citizen before hire?

☐ Yes ☐ No

9. How many total hours of ACADEMY training and FIELD training (e.g., with FTO) are required of your agency's new officer recruits? Include law enforcement training only. Include both state/POST requirements plus additional agency requirements. If no training of that type is required, enter '0'.

	Total Hours
a. Academy training	
b. Field training	

10. On average, how many hours of IN-SERVICE training are required annually for your agency's NON-PROBATIONARY field/patrol officers? Include law enforcement training only. Include both state/POST requirements plus additional agency requirements. If no in-service training is required, enter '0'.

Average annual hours per officer ☐

11. Which of the following screening techniques are used by your agency in selecting new officer recruits?

Background/record checks	**Yes**	**No**
a. Background investigation	☐	☐
b. Credit history check	☐	☐
c. Criminal history check	☐	☐
d. Driving record check	☐	☐
e. Social media check	☐	☐
Personal attributes	**Yes**	**No**
f. Personal interview	☐	☐
g. Personality/Psychological inventory	☐	☐
h. Polygraph exam	☐	☐
i. Psychological interview	☐	☐
j. Voice stress analyzer	☐	☐
k. Written aptitude test	☐	☐
l. Analytical/problem-solving ability assessment	☐	☐
Community relations skills	**Yes**	**No**
m. Assessment of understanding diverse cultural populations	☐	☐
n. Mediation/conflict management skills assessment	☐	☐
Physical attributes	**Yes**	**No**
o. Drug test	☐	☐
p. Medical exam	☐	☐
q. Vision test	☐	☐
r. Physical agility/fitness test	☐	☐

12. Enter the number of FULL-TIME agency personnel who were bi- or multilingual as of June 30, 2016. Full-time employees are those regularly scheduled for 35 or more hours per week. If none, enter '0'.

a. Sworn	
b. Limited/no arrest powers	
c. Non-sworn	

13. Enter the number of FULL-TIME SWORN personnel who were HIRED or SEPARATED during the fiscal year including June 30, 2016 by RACE, HISPANIC ORIGIN and SEX. The TOTAL rows should have the same values. If none, enter '0'.

	New Hires	Separations
a. White, non-Hispanic		
b. Black or African American, non-Hispanic		
c. Hispanic or Latino		
d. American Indian or Alaska Native, non-Hispanic		
e. Asian, non-Hispanic		
f. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic		
g. Two or more races		
h. Not known		
i. TOTAL (sum 'a' to 'h')		
j. Male		
k. Female		
l. TOTAL (sum 'j' and 'k')		

14. Enter the number of FULL-TIME SWORN personnel by RACE, HISPANIC ORIGIN and SEX for the pay period that included June 30, 2016. If none, enter '0'.

	Male	Female
a. White, non-Hispanic		
b. Black or African American, non-Hispanic		
c. Hispanic or Latino		
d. American Indian or Alaska Native, non-Hispanic		
e. Asian, non-Hispanic		
f. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic		
g. Two or more races		
h. Not known		
i. TOTAL (sum 'a' to 'h')		

15. Enter the SEX, RACE and HISPANIC ORIGIN of the chief executive (i.e., Chief of Police, Sheriff, Commissioner) for the pay period that included June 30, 2016.

a. ☐ Male ☐ Female

b. ☐ White, non-Hispanic
☐ Black or African American, non-Hispanic
☐ Hispanic or Latino
☐ American Indian or Alaskan Native, non-Hispanic
☐ Asian, non-Hispanic
☐ Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic
☐ Two or more races
☐ Not known

16. Enter the number of FULL-TIME SWORN personnel by RACE, HISPANIC ORIGIN and SEX who held the following supervisory positions for the pay period that included June 30, 2016. If a position does not exist in your agency, enter 'N/A'. If none, enter '0'.

	Intermediate supervisor (below chief executive and above sergeant or first-line supervisor)	**Sergeant or equivalent first-line supervisor**
a. White, non-Hispanic		
b. Black or African American, non-Hispanic		
c. Hispanic or Latino		
d. American Indian or Alaska Native, non-Hispanic		
e. Asian, non-Hispanic		
f. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic		
g. Two or more races		
h. Not known		
i. TOTAL (sum 'a' to 'h')		
j. Male		
k. Female		
l. TOTAL (sum 'j' and 'k')		

17. Is collective bargaining authorized for your agency's employees?

	All	Some	None
a. Sworn	☐	☐	☐
b. Limited/no arrest powers	☐	☐	☐
c. Non-sworn	☐	☐	☐

Section III: Operations

18. Enter the total number of calls for service (e.g., 911 calls, non-emergence calls, alarm or other source) received and dispatched by your agency during the fiscal year including June 30, 2016. If none, enter '0'. If data are not available, provide an estimate and check the corresponding box.

	Total Number	Estimate?
a. Calls/requests for service received		☐
b. Calls/requests for service resulting in dispatch of officer(s) or use of on-site unit		☐

19. During the fiscal year including June 30, 2016, did your agency use the following TYPES OF PATROL?

	Regularly	As Needed	No
a. Automobile	☐	☐	☐
b. Motorcycle	☐	☐	☐
c. Foot	☐	☐	☐
d. Horse	☐	☐	☐
e. Bicycle	☐	☐	☐
f. Human transporter (e.g., Segway)	☐	☐	☐
g. Manned aviation (e.g., airplane or helicopter)	☐	☐	☐
h. Marine (e.g., boat)	☐	☐	☐
i. Other (please specify): _____	☐	☐	☐

Section IV: Community Policing

20. As of June 30, 2016, did your agency's mission statement include a community policing component?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ N/A – agency does not have a mission statement

21. During the fiscal year including June 30, 2016, which of the following did your agency do?

	Yes	No
a. Maintain a written community policing plan	☐	☐
b. Use technology to support the analysis of community problems	☐	☐
c. Conduct a citizen police academy	☐	☐

22. During the fiscal year including June 30, 2016, what proportion of agency personnel received at least eight hours of community policing training (e.g., problem solving, SARA, or community partnerships)? Mark one choice per line. If your agency did not conduct training for a particular type of employee, please mark 'None.' If your agency did not have a particular type of employee for the specified time period, please mark 'N/A.'

	All	Some	None	N/A
a. New officer recruits	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. In-service sworn personnel	☐	☐	☐	

23. As of June 30, 2016, how many FULL-TIME SWORN personnel with primary responsibility for patrol/field duties (reported in 4.b.1, column 1) were encouraged to engage in SARA-type problem solving projects? If none, enter '0'.

Full-time patrol/field officers _____

24. As of June 30, 2016, how many FULL-TIME SWORN personnel with primary responsibility for patrol/field duties (reported in 4.b.1, column 1) were assigned to specific geographic areas/beats? If none, enter '0'.

Full-time patrol/field officers _____

25. During the fiscal year including June 30, 2016, did your agency have a problem-solving partnership or written agreement with any of the following?

	Yes	No
a. Advocacy groups	☐	☐
b. Business groups	☐	☐
c. Other local law enforcement agencies	☐	☐
d. Neighborhood associations	☐	☐
e. University or research group	☐	☐
f. Other (please specify): _____	☐	☐

26. During the fiscal year including June 30, 2016, did your agency conduct or sponsor a formal survey of local residents on crime experiences, fear of crime, or satisfaction with police?

☐ Yes ☐ No

27. During the fiscal year including June 30, 2016, did your agency use information from a survey of citizens for any of the following?

☐ Agency did not conduct or sponsor a citizen survey at any time (skip to 28)

	Yes	No
a. Prioritizing crime/disorder problems	☐	☐
b. Allocating resources to neighborhoods	☐	☐
c. Evaluating officer or agency performance	☐	☐
d. Training development	☐	☐
e. Informing agency policies and procedures	☐	☐

Section V: Equipment

28. Does your agency supply or give a cash allowance to its FULL-TIME SWORN personnel to purchase the following? Mark all that apply in each row.

	Agency supplies	Agency provides cash allowance	Neither (officer provides)	Equipment not authorized
a. Primary sidearm	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Backup sidearm	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Body armor	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Uniform	☐	☐	☐	☐

29. Which types of sidearms are authorized for use by your agency's FULL-TIME SWORN personnel? Mark all that apply in each row.

	On-duty primary sidearm	On-duty backup sidearm	Off-duty	Equipment not authorized
a. Semiautomatic	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Revolver	☐	☐	☐	☐

30. Which types of secondary firearms does your agency issue to FULL-TIME SWORN personnel or authorize for use? Mark all that apply.

☐ Fully automatic rifle (e.g., M-16)
☐ Semi-automatic rifle (e.g., AR-15)
☐ Manual rifle
☐ Shotgun (any type)
☐ Other (please specify):

_____

☐ N/A – no secondary firearms authorized

31. As of June 30, 2016, which of the following types of WEAPONS or ACTIONS were authorized for use by your agency's FULL-TIME SWORN personnel?

	Authorized for:		
	All sworn	Some sworn	Not authorized
a. Open hand techniques	☐	☐	☐
b. Closed hand techniques	☐	☐	☐
c. Takedown techniques (e.g., straight arm bar)	☐	☐	☐
d. Hold or neck restraint (e.g., carotid hold)	☐	☐	☐
e. Leg hobble or other restraints (not including handcuffs)	☐	☐	☐
f. OC spray/foam	☐	☐	☐
g. Chemical agent projectile (e.g., CS/tear gas, OC pellets)	☐	☐	☐
h. Baton	☐	☐	☐
i. Blunt force projectile (e.g., bean bag, rubber bullets)	☐	☐	☐
j. Conducted energy device (e.g., Taser, stun gun, Stinger)	☐	☐	☐
k. Explosives	☐	☐	☐
l. Other (please specify): _____	☐	☐	☐

32. As of June 30, 2016, does your agency require written documentation when the following types of WEAPONS or ACTIONS are used by your agency's FULL-TIME SWORN?

	Yes	No	N/A
a. Open hand techniques	☐	☐	☐
b. Closed hand techniques	☐	☐	☐
c. Takedown techniques (e.g., straight arm bar)	☐	☐	☐
d. Hold or neck restraint (e.g., carotid hold)	☐	☐	☐
e. Leg hobble or other restraints (not including handcuffs)	☐	☐	☐
f. OC spray/foam	☐	☐	☐
g. Chemical agent projectile (e.g., CS/tear gas, OC pellets)	☐	☐	☐
h. Baton	☐	☐	☐
i. Blunt force projectile (e.g., bean bag, rubber bullets)	☐	☐	☐
j. Display of conducted energy device (e.g., Taser flashing)	☐	☐	☐
k. Use of conducted energy device	☐	☐	☐
l. Explosives	☐	☐	☐
m. Display of firearm	☐	☐	☐
n. Discharge of a firearm	☐	☐	☐

33. Does your agency REQUIRE uniformed field/patrol officers to wear protective body armor while in the field?

- ☐ Yes - all the time
- ☐ Yes - in some circumstances
- ☐ No

34. Does your agency REQUIRE uniformed field/patrol officers to wear their seat belt while driving or riding in an agency vehicle?

- ☐ Yes - all the time
- ☐ Yes - in some circumstances
- ☐ No

35. During the fiscal year including June 30, 2016, did your agency operate any of the following types of motorized vehicles or equipment?

	Yes	No
a. Marked cars	☐	☐
b. Other marked vehicles (e.g., SUV, truck, or van)	☐	☐
c. Unmarked cars	☐	☐
d. Other unmarked vehicles (e.g., SUV, truck, or van)	☐	☐
e. Armored military-type vehicles (e.g., MRAP, tank, BearCat or other SWAT carrier)	☐	☐
f. All-terrain vehicles (ATVs)	☐	☐
g. Motorcycles	☐	☐
h. Boats	☐	☐
i. Manned aviation (e.g., airplane or helicopter)	☐	☐
j. Unmanned aerial drones	☐	☐
k. Other (please specify): _____	☐	☐

36. During the fiscal year including June 30, 2016, how many of the following types of video cameras were operated by your agency on a REGULAR basis? If none, enter '0'.

	Total Number
a. Fixed-site surveillance in public areas	
b. Mobile surveillance	
c. In patrol cars	
d. On police officers (e.g. body-worn cameras)	
e. On weapons	
f. On aerial drones	

Section VI: Technology

37. As of June 30, 2016, did your agency maintain a website for any of the following?

- ☐ Agency did not maintain a website (skip to 38)

	Yes	No
a. Providing direct access to crime statistics/data	☐	☐
b. Providing direct access to stop (i.e., motor vehicle or street/field) statistics/data	☐	☐
c. Providing direct access to arrest statistics/data	☐	☐
d. Enabling citizens to report crimes or problems	☐	☐
e. Enabling citizens to ask questions and/or provide feedback	☐	☐
f. Enabling citizens to file complaints about police behavior or actions	☐	☐

38. As of June 30, 2016, did your agency use any of the following social media channels to communicate with the public?

	Yes	No
a. Twitter	☐	☐
b. Facebook, Google+, or similar service	☐	☐
c. Blogs	☐	☐
d. YouTube or other video sharing service	☐	☐
e. Mass communication/notification system (e.g. Nixle)	☐	☐

39. As of June 30, 2016, did your agency use computers for any of the following functions?

	Yes	No
a. Crime analysis (including crime mapping or hotspot identification)	☐	☐
b. Social network analysis	☐	☐
c. Intelligence gathering	☐	☐
d. Inter-agency information transmission	☐	☐
e. Automated booking	☐	☐

40. As of June 30, 2016, what was the PRIMARY method for transmitting criminal incident reports from the field to your agency's record management system? Mark only one response.

- ☐ Paper report
- ☐ Voice (cellphone, telephone, recording, radio)
- ☐ In-car fixed laptop/tablet
- ☐ Mobile laptop/tablet or phone
- ☐ Other (please specify):

_____

41. As of June 30, 2016, did your agency use any of the following technologies on a REGULAR basis?

	Yes	No
a. Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS)	☐	☐
b. Facial recognition	☐	☐
c. License plate readers (LPR)	☐	☐
d. Infrared (thermal) imagers	☐	☐
e. Electrical/engine disruption	☐	☐
f. Stolen vehicle tracking (e.g., LoJack)	☐	☐
g. Tire deflation devices	☐	☐
h. Gunshot detection (e.g., Shotspotter)	☐	☐
i. Firearm tracing (e.g., eTrace)	☐	☐
j. Ballistic imaging (e.g., NIBN, IBIS)	☐	☐
k. GPS	☐	☐

42. As of June 30, 2016, did your agency's field/patrol officers have direct access to the following types of information using in-field vehicle-mounted or mobile computers?

☐ Agency did not use in-field computers (skip to 43)

	Yes	No
a. Motor vehicle records	☐	☐
b. Driving records	☐	☐
c. Criminal history records	☐	☐
d. Warrants	☐	☐
e. Protection orders	☐	☐
f. Inter-agency information system	☐	☐
g. Address history (e.g., repeat calls for service)	☐	☐
h. Crime statistics/mapping	☐	☐

43. As of June 30, 2016, did your agency have an operational computer-based personnel performance monitoring/assessment system (e.g., Early Warning or Early Intervention System) for monitoring or responding to problematic officer behavior?

☐ Yes ☐ No

44. As of June 30, 2016, did your agency maintain its own computerized files with any of the following information?

	Yes	No
a. Arrests	☐	☐
b. Calls for service	☐	☐
c. Civilian complaints	☐	☐
d. Criminal incident reports	☐	☐
e. Firearms recovered, seized or found	☐	☐
f. Gangs	☐	☐
g. Informants	☐	☐
h. Intelligence related to terrorist activity	☐	☐
i. Motor vehicle stops	☐	☐
j. Motor vehicle accidents	☐	☐
k. Pawn shop data	☐	☐
l. Protective orders	☐	☐
m. Stolen property	☐	☐
n. Street/field stops	☐	☐
o. Use of force incidents	☐	☐
p. Video surveillance	☐	☐
q. Warrants	☐	☐

Section VII: Policies and Procedures

Unless otherwise noted, please answer all questions using June 30, 2016, as a reference.

45. Which of the following best describes your agency's written policy for pursuit driving? Mark only one response.

- ☐ Prohibition (prohibits all pursuits)
- ☐ Discouragement (discourages all pursuits but does not prohibit)
- ☐ Restrictive (restricts decisions of officers to specific criteria such as type of offense or speed)
- ☐ Judgmental (leaves decision to officer's discretion)
- ☐ N/A- Agency does not have a written policy pertaining to vehicle pursuits

46. Does your agency have written policy or procedural directives on the following?

Officer conduct	**Yes**	**No**
a. Use of deadly force/firearm discharge	☐	☐
b. Use of less-lethal force	☐	☐
c. Code of conduct and appearance	☐	☐
d. Maximum work hours allowed	☐	☐
e. Off-duty conduct	☐	☐
Dealing with special populations/situations	**Yes**	**No**
f. Mentally ill persons	☐	☐
g. Homeless persons	☐	☐
h. Domestic disputes	☐	☐
i. Juveniles	☐	☐
Procedural	**Yes**	**No**
j. In-custody deaths	☐	☐
k. Racial profiling/unbiased policing	☐	☐
l. Civilian complaints	☐	☐
m. Strip searches	☐	☐
n. Acts of terrorism	☐	☐
o. Active shooter	☐	☐
p. Stop and frisk	☐	☐
q. Foot pursuits	☐	☐
r. Motor vehicle stops	☐	☐
s. Investigation of employee misconduct	☐	☐
t. Prisoner transport	☐	☐
u. Mass demonstrations	☐	☐
v. Reporting use of force	☐	☐
w. Body-worn cameras	☐	☐
x. Social media	☐	☐
y. Cultural awareness training	☐	☐

47. As of June 30, 2016, does your agency require an external investigation in the following situations? Only include investigations conducted by another law enforcement or criminal investigative body. Do NOT include civilian reviews.

	Yes	**No**
a. Use of force resulting in a subject sustaining serious bodily injury	☐	☐
b. Use of force resulting in a subject's death	☐	☐
c. In-custody death not due to use of force (e.g., suicide, intoxication or accident)	☐	☐
d. Discharge of a firearm at or in the direction of a person	☐	☐

48. Is there a civilian complaint review board or agency in your jurisdiction that reviews complaints against officers in your agency?

☐ Yes ☐ No (skip to 51)

49. Does the civilian complaint review board or agency have independent investigative authority with subpoena powers?

☐ Yes- For all complaint cases

☐ Yes- Only for certain complaint types

☐ No

50. Does your agency have a written policy requiring that civilian complaints about USE OF FORCE receive separate investigation outside the chain of command where the accused officer is assigned?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Section VIII: Special Problems/Tasks

51. As of June 30, 2016, how did your agency address the following problems/tasks? Mark the most appropriate box for each problem/task listed below. Mark only one box per row.

Type of problem/task	(1) Agency HAS specialized unit with personnel assigned FULL-TIME to address this problem/task	Agency DOES NOT HAVE a specialized unit with full-time personnel			(5) Agency's jurisdiction does not have this problem (N/A)
		(2) Agency has designated personnel to address this problem/task	(3) Agency addresses this problem/task, but does not have designated personnel	(4) Agency does not formally address this problem/task	
a. Bias/hate crime	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Bomb/explosive disposal	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Child abuse / endangerment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Crime prevention	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Community policing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Crime analysis	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Cybercrime	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Domestic violence	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. Drug education in schools	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. Drug enforcement	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. Environmental crimes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
l. Financial crimes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
m. Firearms	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
n. Gangs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
o. Human trafficking	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
p. Impaired drivers (DUI/DWI)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
q. Internal affairs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
r. Juvenile crimes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
s. Missing children	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
t. Repeat offenders	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
u. Research and planning	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
v. School safety	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
w. Special operations (e.g. SWAT)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
x. Terrorism/homeland security	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
y. Victim assistance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Subsec. (c)(3). Pub. L. 98–473, § 604(b)(2)(B), substituted ''chapter'' for ''subchapter''.

Subsec. (c)(4) to (7). Pub. L. 98–473, § 604(b)(2)(C), (F), redesignated pars. (5) to (8) as (4) to (7), respectively, and struck out former par. (4) relating to evaluation of programs and projects under other subchapters of this chapter to determine their impact upon criminal and civil justice systems and achievement of purposes and policies of this chapter and for dissemination of information.

Subsec. (c)(8). Pub. L. 98–473, § 604(b)(2)(D)(i), (ii), (F), redesignated par. (10) as (8) and, in par. (8) as so designated, struck out ''nationality priority grants under subchapter V of this chapter and'' after ''for funding as'' and substituted ''subchapter V of this chapter'' for ''subchapter VI of this chapter''. Former par. (8) redesignated (7).

Subsec. (c)(9). Pub. L. 98–473, § 604(b)(2)(E), (F), redesignated par. (11) as (9), and struck out former par. (9) relating to a biennial report to President and Congress on state of justice research.

Subsec. (c)(10), (11). Pub. L. 98–473, § 604(b)(2)(F), redesignated pars. (10) and (11) as (8) and (9), respectively.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 2002 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 107–296 effective 60 days after Nov. 25, 2002, see section 4 of Pub. L. 107–296, set out as an Effective Date note under section 101 of Title 6, Domestic Security.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1984 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 98–473 effective Oct. 12, 1984, see section 609AA(a) of Pub. L. 98–473, set out as an Effective Date note under section 3711 of this title.

REPORT ON DRUG-TESTING TECHNOLOGIES

Pub. L. 107–273, div. B, title II, § 2201, Nov. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 1793, provided that:

''(a) REQUIREMENT.—The National Institute of Justice shall conduct a study of drug-testing technologies in order to identify and assess the efficacy, accuracy, and usefulness for purposes of the National effort to detect the use of illicit drugs of any drug-testing technologies (including the testing of hair) that may be used as alternatives or complements to urinalysis as a means of detecting the use of such drugs.

''(b) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act [Nov. 2, 2002], the Institute shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).''

ANTI-STALKING LEGISLATION EVALUATION, MODEL DEVELOPMENT, DISSEMINATION AND REPORT

Pub. L. 102–395, title I, § 109(b), Oct. 6, 1992, 106 Stat. 1842, directed Attorney General, acting through Director of National Institute of Justice, to evaluate existing and proposed anti-stalking legislation in the States, develop model anti-stalking legislation that is constitutional and enforceable, prepare and disseminate to State authorities the findings made as a result of such evaluation, and report to Congress the findings and the need or appropriateness of further action by the Federal Government by Sept. 30, 1993.

§ 3723. Authority for 100 per centum grants

A grant authorized under this subchapter may be up to 100 per centum of the total cost of each project for which such grant is made. The Institute shall require, whenever feasible, as a condition of approval of a grant under this subchapter, that the recipient contribute money, facilities, or services to carry out the purposes for which the grant is sought.

(Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 203, as added Pub. L. 96–157, § 2, Dec. 27, 1979, 93 Stat. 1174.)

PRIOR PROVISIONS

A prior section 3723, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 203, June 19, 1968, 82 Stat. 199; Pub. L. 91–644, title I, § 3(a)–(c), Jan. 2, 1971, 84 Stat. 1881; Pub. L. 93–83, § 2, Aug. 6, 1973, 87 Stat. 198; Pub. L. 93–415, title V, § 542, Sept. 7, 1974, 88 Stat. 1142; Pub. L. 94–503, title I, § 105, Oct. 15, 1976, 90 Stat. 2408; Pub. L. 95–115, § 9(b), Oct. 3, 1977, 91 Stat. 1061, provided for establishment of State planning agencies, prior to the general amendment of this chapter by Pub. L. 96–157.

§ 3724. Repealed. Pub. L. 98–473, title II, § 604(c), Oct. 12, 1984, 98 Stat. 2079

Section, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 204, as added Pub. L. 96–157, § 2, Dec. 27, 1979, 93 Stat. 1174, provided for a National Institute of Justice Advisory Board, including the establishment and composition of the Board, rules respecting organization and procedure, term of office, duties of the Board, and delegation of powers and duties to the Director.

Prior sections 3724 to 3726 were omitted in the general revision of this chapter by Pub. L. 96–157.

Section 3724, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 204, June 19, 1968, 82 Stat. 199; Pub. L. 91–644, title I, § 3(d), Jan. 2, 1971, 84 Stat. 1881; Pub. L. 93–83, § 2, Aug. 6, 1973, 87 Stat. 199; Pub. L. 94–503, title I, § 106, Oct. 15, 1976, 90 Stat. 2410, related to maximum percentage of Federal grant funds in expenses incurred by States.

Section 3725, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 205, June 19, 1968, 82 Stat. 199; Pub. L. 93–83, § 2, Aug. 6, 1973, 87 Stat. 199; Pub. L. 94–503, title I, § 107, Oct. 15, 1976, 90 Stat. 2410, related to allocation of funds and reallocation of unused funds.

Section 3726, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 206, as added Pub. L. 94–503, title I, § 108, Oct. 15, 1976, 90 Stat. 2411, related to advisory review of comprehensive statewide plans by States.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF REPEAL

Repeal effective Oct. 12, 1984, see section 609AA(a) of Pub. L. 98–473, set out as an Effective Date note under section 3711 of this title.

SUBCHAPTER III—BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS

§ 3731. Statement of purpose

It is the purpose of this subchapter to provide for and encourage the collection and analysis of statistical information concerning crime, juvenile delinquency, and the operation of the criminal justice system and related aspects of the civil justice system and to support the development of information and statistical systems at the Federal, State, and local levels to improve the efforts of these levels of government to measure and understand the levels of crime, juvenile delinquency, and the operation of the criminal justice system and related aspects of the civil justice system. The Bureau shall utilize to the maximum extent feasible State governmental organizations and facilities responsible for the collection and analysis of criminal justice data and statistics. In carrying out the provisions of this subchapter, the Bureau shall give primary emphasis to the problems of State and local justice systems.

(Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 301, as added Pub. L. 96–157, § 2, Dec. 27, 1979, 93 Stat. 1176; amended Pub. L. 98–473, title II, § 605(a), Oct. 12, 1984, 98 Stat. 2079.)

PRIOR PROVISIONS

A prior section 3731, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 301, June 19, 1968, 82 Stat. 199; Pub. L. 91–644, title I, § 4(1)–(4), Jan. 2, 1971, 84 Stat. 1882; Pub. L. 93–83, § 2, Aug. 6, 1973, 87 Stat. 199; Pub. L. 94–503, title I, §§ 109, 128(b), Oct. 15,

1976, 90 Stat. 2411, 2424, related to purposes and categories of grants for law enforcement and criminal justice purposes, prior to the general amendment of this chapter by Pub. L. 96–157.

AMENDMENTS

1984—Pub. L. 98–473 struck out ''(including white-collar crime and public corruption)'' after ''information concerning crime'' and ''(including crimes against the elderly, white-collar crime, and public corruption)'' after ''levels of crime''.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1984 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 98–473 effective Oct. 12, 1984, see section 609AA(a) of Pub. L. 98–473, set out as an Effective Date note under section 3711 of this title.

§ 3732. Bureau of Justice Statistics

(a) Establishment

There is established within the Department of Justice, under the general authority of the Attorney General, a Bureau of Justice Statistics (hereinafter referred to in this subchapter as ''Bureau'').

(b) Appointment of Director; experience; authority; restrictions

The Bureau shall be headed by a Director appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director shall have had experience in statistical programs. The Director shall have final authority for all grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts awarded by the Bureau. The Director shall be responsible for the integrity of data and statistics and shall protect against improper or illegal use or disclosure. The Director shall report to the Attorney General through the Assistant Attorney General. The Director shall not engage in any other employment than that of serving as Director; nor shall the Director hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any organization, agency, or institution with which the Bureau makes any contract or other arrangement under this Act.

(c) Duties and functions of Bureau

The Bureau is authorized to—

(1) make grants to, or enter into cooperative agreements or contracts with public agencies, institutions of higher education, private organizations, or private individuals for purposes related to this subchapter; grants shall be made subject to continuing compliance with standards for gathering justice statistics set forth in rules and regulations promulgated by the Director;

(2) collect and analyze information concerning criminal victimization, including crimes against the elderly, and civil disputes;

(3) collect and analyze data that will serve as a continuous and comparable national social indication of the prevalence, incidence, rates, extent, distribution, and attributes of crime, juvenile delinquency, civil disputes, and other statistical factors related to crime, civil disputes, and juvenile delinquency, in support of national, State, tribal, and local justice policy and decisionmaking;

(4) collect and analyze statistical information, concerning the operations of the criminal justice system at the Federal, State, tribal, and local levels;

(5) collect and analyze statistical information concerning the prevalence, incidence, rates, extent, distribution, and attributes of crime, and juvenile delinquency, at the Federal, State, tribal, and local levels;

(6) analyze the correlates of crime, civil disputes and juvenile delinquency, by the use of statistical information, about criminal and civil justice systems at the Federal, State, tribal, and local levels, and about the extent, distribution and attributes of crime, and juvenile delinquency, in the Nation and at the Federal, State, tribal, and local levels;

(7) compile, collate, analyze, publish, and disseminate uniform national statistics concerning all aspects of criminal justice and related aspects of civil justice, crime, including crimes against the elderly, juvenile delinquency, criminal offenders, juvenile delinquents, and civil disputes in the various States and in Indian country;

(8) recommend national standards for justice statistics and for insuring the reliability and validity of justice statistics supplied pursuant to this chapter;

(9) maintain liaison with the judicial branches of the Federal Government and State and tribal governments in matters relating to justice statistics, and cooperate with the judicial branch in assuring as much uniformity as feasible in statistical systems of the executive and judicial branches;

(10) provide information to the President, the Congress, the judiciary, State, tribal, and local governments, and the general public on justice statistics;

(11) establish or assist in the establishment of a system to provide State, tribal, and local governments with access to Federal informational resources useful in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of programs under this Act;

(12) conduct or support research relating to methods of gathering or analyzing justice statistics;

(13) provide for the development of justice information systems programs and assistance to the States, Indian tribes, and units of local government relating to collection, analysis, or dissemination of justice statistics;

(14) develop and maintain a data processing capability to support the collection, aggregation, analysis and dissemination of information on the incidence of crime and the operation of the criminal justice system;

(15) collect, analyze and disseminate comprehensive Federal justice transaction statistics (including statistics on issues of Federal justice interest such as public fraud and high technology crime) and to provide technical assistance to and work jointly with other Federal agencies to improve the availability and quality of Federal justice data;

(16) provide for the collection, compilation, analysis, publication and dissemination of information and statistics about the prevalence, incidence, rates, extent, distribution and attributes of drug offenses, drug related offenses and drug dependent offenders and further provide for the establishment of a national clearinghouse to maintain and update a compre-

hensive and timely data base on all criminal justice aspects of the drug crisis and to disseminate such information;

(17) provide for the collection, analysis, dissemination and publication of statistics on the condition and progress of drug control activities at the Federal, State, tribal, and local levels with particular attention to programs and intervention efforts demonstrated to be of value in the overall national anti-drug strategy and to provide for the establishment of a national clearinghouse for the gathering of data generated by Federal, State, tribal, and local criminal justice agencies on their drug enforcement activities;

(18) provide for the development and enhancement of State, tribal, and local criminal justice information systems, and the standardization of data reporting relating to the collection, analysis or dissemination of data and statistics about drug offenses, drug related offenses, or drug dependent offenders;

(19) provide for improvements in the accuracy, quality, timeliness, immediate accessibility, and integration of State and tribal criminal history and related records, support the development and enhancement of national systems of criminal history and related records including the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, the National Incident-Based Reporting System, and the records of the National Crime Information Center, facilitate State and tribal participation in national records and information systems, and support statistical research for critical analysis of the improvement and utilization of criminal history records;

(20) maintain liaison with State, tribal, and local governments and governments of other nations concerning justice statistics;

(21) cooperate in and participate with national and international organizations in the development of uniform justice statistics;

(22) ensure conformance with security and privacy requirement of section 3789g of this title and identify, analyze, and participate in the development and implementation of privacy, security and information policies which impact on Federal, tribal, and State criminal justice operations and related statistical activities; and

(23) exercise the powers and functions set out in subchapter VIII of this chapter.

(d) Justice statistical collection, analysis, and dissemination

(1) In general

To ensure that all justice statistical collection, analysis, and dissemination is carried out in a coordinated manner, the Director is authorized to—

(A) utilize, with their consent, the services, equipment, records, personnel, information, and facilities of other Federal, State, local, and private agencies and instrumentalities with or without reimbursement therefor, and to enter into agreements with such agencies and instrumentalities for purposes of data collection and analysis;

(B) confer and cooperate with State, municipal, and other local agencies;

(C) request such information, data, and reports from any Federal agency as may be required to carry out the purposes of this chapter;

(D) seek the cooperation of the judicial branch of the Federal Government in gathering data from criminal justice records;

(E) encourage replication, coordination and sharing among justice agencies regarding information systems, information policy, and data; and

(F) confer and cooperate with Federal statistical agencies as needed to carry out the purposes of this subchapter, including by entering into cooperative data sharing agreements in conformity with all laws and regulations applicable to the disclosure and use of data.

(2) Consultation with Indian tribes

The Director, acting jointly with the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs (acting through the Office of Justice Services) and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall work with Indian tribes and tribal law enforcement agencies to establish and implement such tribal data collection systems as the Director determines to be necessary to achieve the purposes of this section.

(e) Furnishing of information, data, or reports by Federal agencies

Federal agencies requested to furnish information, data, or reports pursuant to subsection (d)(1)(C) of this section shall provide such information to the Bureau as is required to carry out the purposes of this section.

(f) Consultation with representatives of State, tribal, and local government and judiciary

In recommending standards for gathering justice statistics under this section, the Director shall consult with representatives of State, tribal, and local government, including, where appropriate, representatives of the judiciary.

(g) Reports

Not later than 1 year after July 29, 2010, and annually thereafter, the Director shall submit to Congress a report describing the data collected and analyzed under this section relating to crimes in Indian country.

(Pub. L. 90–351, title I, §302, as added Pub. L. 96–157, §2, Dec. 27, 1979, 93 Stat. 1176; amended Pub. L. 98–473, title II, §605(b), Oct. 12, 1984, 98 Stat. 2079; Pub. L. 100–690, title VI, §6092(a), Nov. 18, 1988, 102 Stat. 4339; Pub. L. 103–322, title XXXIII, §330001(h)(2), Sept. 13, 1994, 108 Stat. 2139; Pub. L. 109–162, title XI, §1115(a), Jan. 5, 2006, 119 Stat. 3103; Pub. L. 111–211, title II, §251(b), July 29, 2010, 124 Stat. 2297.)

REFERENCES IN TEXT

This Act, referred to in subsecs. (b) and (c)(11), is Pub. L. 90–351, June 19, 1968, 82 Stat. 197, known as the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. For complete classification of this Act to the Code, see Short Title note set out under section 3711 of this title and Tables.

PRIOR PROVISIONS

A prior section 3732, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, §302, June 19, 1968, 82 Stat. 200; Pub. L. 93–83, §2, Aug. 6, 1973, 87

Stat. 201; Pub. L. 94–503, title I, §110, Oct. 15, 1976, 90 Stat. 2412, related to establishment of State planning agencies to develop comprehensive State plans for grants for law enforcement and criminal justice purposes, prior to the general amendment of this chapter by Pub. L. 96–157.

AMENDMENTS

2010—Subsec. (c)(3) to (6). Pub. L. 111–211, §251(b)(1)(A), inserted ''tribal,'' after ''State,'' wherever appearing.

Subsec. (c)(7). Pub. L. 111–211, §251(b)(1)(B), inserted ''and in Indian country'' after ''States''.

Subsec. (c)(9). Pub. L. 111–211, §251(b)(1)(C), substituted ''Federal Government and State and tribal governments'' for ''Federal and State Governments''.

Subsec. (c)(10), (11). Pub. L. 111–211, §251(b)(1)(D), inserted '', tribal,'' after ''State''.

Subsec. (c)(13). Pub. L. 111–211, §251(b)(1)(E), inserted '', Indian tribes,'' after ''States''.

Subsec. (c)(17). Pub. L. 111–211, §251(b)(1)(F), substituted ''activities at the Federal, State, tribal, and local'' for ''activities at the Federal, State and local'' and ''generated by Federal, State, tribal, and local'' for ''generated by Federal, State, and local''.

Subsec. (c)(18). Pub. L. 111–211, §251(b)(1)(G), substituted ''State, tribal, and local'' for ''State and local''.

Subsec. (c)(19). Pub. L. 111–211, §251(b)(1)(H), inserted ''and tribal'' after ''State'' in two places.

Subsec. (c)(20). Pub. L. 111–211, §251(b)(1)(I), inserted '', tribal,'' after ''State''.

Subsec. (c)(22). Pub. L. 111–211, §251(b)(1)(J), inserted '', tribal,'' after ''Federal''.

Subsec. (d). Pub. L. 111–211, §251(b)(2), designated existing provisions as par. (1), inserted par. (1) heading, substituted ''To ensure'' for ''To insure'', redesignated former pars. (1) to (6) as subpars. (A) to (F), respectively, of par. (1), realigned margins, and added par. (2).

Subsec. (e). Pub. L. 111–211, §251(b)(3), substituted ''subsection (d)(1)(C)'' for ''subsection (d)(3)''.

Subsec. (f). Pub. L. 111–211, §251(b)(4)(B), inserted '', tribal,'' after ''State''.

Pub. L. 111–211, §251(b)(4)(A), which directed insertion of '', tribal,'' after ''State'' in heading, was executed editorially but could not be executed in original because heading had been editorially supplied.

Subsec. (g). Pub. L. 111–211, §251(b)(5), added subsec. (g).

2006—Subsec. (b). Pub. L. 109–162, §1115(a)(1), inserted after third sentence ''The Director shall be responsible for the integrity of data and statistics and shall protect against improper or illegal use or disclosure.''

Subsec. (c)(19). Pub. L. 109–162, §1115(a)(2), amended par. (19) generally. Prior to amendment, par. (19) read as follows: ''provide for research and improvements in the accuracy, completeness, and inclusiveness of criminal history record information, information systems, arrest warrant, and stolen vehicle record information and information systems and support research concerning the accuracy, completeness, and inclusiveness of other criminal justice record information;''.

Subsec. (d)(6). Pub. L. 109–162, §1115(a)(3), added par. (6).

1994—Subsec. (c)(19). Pub. L. 103–322 substituted a semicolon for period at end.

1988—Subsec. (c)(16) to (23). Pub. L. 100–690 added pars. (16) to (19) and redesignated former pars. (16) to (19) as (20) to (23), respectively.

1984—Subsec. (b). Pub. L. 98–473, §605(b)(1), inserted provision requiring Director to report to Attorney General through Assistant Attorney General.

Subsec. (c)(13). Pub. L. 98–473, §605(b)(2)(A), (C), added par. (13) and struck out former par. (13) relating to provision of financial and technical assistance to States and units of local government relating to collection, analysis, or dissemination of justice statistics.

Subsec. (c)(14), (15). Pub. L. 98–473, §605(b)(2)(C), added pars. (14) and (15). Former pars. (14) and (15) redesignated (16) and (17), respectively.

Subsec. (c)(16). Pub. L. 98–473, §605(b)(2)(A), (B), redesignated par. (14) as (16) and struck out former par. (16) relating to insuring conformance with security and privacy regulations issued under section 3789g of this title.

Subsec. (c)(17). Pub. L. 98–473, §605(b)(2)(B), redesignated par. (15) as (17). Former par. (17) redesignated (19).

Subsec. (c)(18). Pub. L. 98–473, §605(b)(2)(D), added par. (18).

Subsec. (c)(19). Pub. L. 98–473, §605(b)(2)(B), redesignated former par. (17) as (19).

Subsec. (d)(1). Pub. L. 98–473, §605(b)(3)(A), inserted '', and to enter into agreements with such agencies and instrumentalities for purposes of data collection and analysis''.

Subsec. (d)(5). Pub. L. 98–473, §605(b)(3)(B)–(D), added par. (5).

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1984 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 98–473 effective Oct. 12, 1984, see section 609AA(a) of Pub. L. 98–473, set out as an Effective Date note under section 3711 of this title.

CONSTRUCTION OF 2010 AMENDMENT

Pub. L. 111–211, title II, §251(c), July 29, 2010, 124 Stat. 2298, provided that: ''Nothing in this section [amending this section and provisions set out as a note under section 534 of Title 28, Judiciary and Judicial Procedure] or any amendment made by this section—

''(1) allows the grant to be made to, or used by, an entity for law enforcement activities that the entity lacks jurisdiction to perform; or

''(2) has any effect other than to authorize, award, or deny a grant of funds to a federally recognized Indian tribe for the purposes described in the relevant grant program.''

[For definition of ''Indian tribe'' as used in section 251(c) of Pub. L. 111–211, set out above, see section 203(a) of Pub. L. 111–211, set out as a note under section 2801 of Title 25, Indians.]

STUDY OF CRIMES AGAINST SENIORS

Pub. L. 106–534, §5, Nov. 22, 2000, 114 Stat. 2557, provided that:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall conduct a study relating to crimes against seniors, in order to assist in developing new strategies to prevent and otherwise reduce the incidence of those crimes.

''(b) ISSUES ADDRESSED.—The study conducted under this section shall include an analysis of—

''(1) the nature and type of crimes perpetrated against seniors, with special focus on—

''(A) the most common types of crimes that affect seniors;

''(B) the nature and extent of telemarketing, sweepstakes, and repair fraud against seniors; and

''(C) the nature and extent of financial and material fraud targeted at seniors;

''(2) the risk factors associated with seniors who have been victimized;

''(3) the manner in which the Federal and State criminal justice systems respond to crimes against seniors;

''(4) the feasibility of States establishing and maintaining a centralized computer database on the incidence of crimes against seniors that will promote the uniform identification and reporting of such crimes;

''(5) the effectiveness of damage awards in court actions and other means by which seniors receive reimbursement and other damages after fraud has been established; and

''(6) other effective ways to prevent or reduce the occurrence of crimes against seniors.''

INCLUSION OF SENIORS IN NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMIZATION SURVEY

Pub. L. 106–534, §6, Nov. 22, 2000, 114 Stat. 2557, provided that: ''Beginning not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act [Nov. 22, 2000], as part of

each National Crime Victimization Survey, the Attorney General shall include statistics relating to—

''(1) crimes targeting or disproportionately affecting seniors;

''(2) crime risk factors for seniors, including the times and locations at which crimes victimizing seniors are most likely to occur; and

''(3) specific characteristics of the victims of crimes who are seniors, including age, gender, race or ethnicity, and socioeconomic status.''

CRIME VICTIMS WITH DISABILITIES AWARENESS

Pub. L. 105–301, Oct. 27, 1998, 112 Stat. 2838, as amended by Pub. L. 106–402, title IV, § 401(b)(10), Oct. 30, 2000, 114 Stat. 1739, provided that:

''SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

''This Act may be cited as the 'Crime Victims With Disabilities Awareness Act'.

''SEC. 2. FINDINGS; PURPOSES.

''(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

''(1) although research conducted abroad demonstrates that individuals with developmental disabilities are at a 4 to 10 times higher risk of becoming crime victims than those without disabilities, there have been no significant studies on this subject conducted in the United States;

''(2) in fact, the National Crime Victim's Survey, conducted annually by the Bureau of Justice Statistics of the Department of Justice, does not specifically collect data relating to crimes against individuals with developmental disabilities;

''(3) studies in Canada, Australia, and Great Britain consistently show that victims with developmental disabilities suffer repeated victimization because so few of the crimes against them are reported, and even when they are, there is sometimes a reluctance by police, prosecutors, and judges to rely on the testimony of a disabled individual, making individuals with developmental disabilities a target for criminal predators;

''(4) research in the United States needs to be done to—

''(A) understand the nature and extent of crimes against individuals with developmental disabilities;

''(B) describe the manner in which the justice system responds to crimes against individuals with developmental disabilities; and

''(C) identify programs, policies, or laws that hold promises for making the justice system more responsive to crimes against individuals with developmental disabilities; and

''(5) the National Academy of Science Committee on Law and Justice of the National Research Council is a premier research institution with unique experience in developing seminal, multidisciplinary studies to establish a strong research base from which to make public policy.

''(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

''(1) to increase public awareness of the plight of victims of crime who are individuals with developmental disabilities;

''(2) to collect data to measure the extent of the problem of crimes against individuals with developmental disabilities; and

''(3) to develop a basis to find new strategies to address the safety and justice needs of victims of crime who are individuals with developmental disabilities.

''SEC. 3. DEFINITION OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITY.

''In this Act, the term 'developmental disability' has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 [42 U.S.C. 15002].

''SEC. 4. STUDY.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall conduct a study to increase knowledge and information about crimes against individuals with developmental disabilities that will be useful in developing new strategies to reduce the incidence of crimes against those individuals.

''(b) ISSUES ADDRESSED.—The study conducted under this section shall address such issues as—

''(1) the nature and extent of crimes against individuals with developmental disabilities;

''(2) the risk factors associated with victimization of individuals with developmental disabilities;

''(3) the manner in which the justice system responds to crimes against individuals with developmental disabilities; and

''(4) the means by which States may establish and maintain a centralized computer database on the incidence of crimes against individuals with disabilities within a State.

''(c) NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES.—In carrying out this section, the Attorney General shall consider contracting with the Committee on Law and Justice of the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences to provide research for the study conducted under this section.

''(d) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act [Oct. 27, 1998], the Attorney General shall submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report describing the results of the study conducted under this section.

''SEC. 5. NATIONAL CRIME VICTIM'S SURVEY.

''Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, as part of each National Crime Victim's Survey, the Attorney General shall include statistics relating to—

''(1) the nature of crimes against individuals with developmental disabilities; and

''(2) the specific characteristics of the victims of those crimes.''

§ 3733. Authority for 100 per centum grants

A grant authorized under this subchapter may be up to 100 per centum of the total cost of each project for which such grant is made. The Bureau shall require, whenever feasible as a condition of approval of a grant under this subchapter, that the recipient contribute money, facilities, or services to carry out the purposes for which the grant is sought.

(Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 303, as added Pub. L. 96–157, § 2, Dec. 27, 1979, 93 Stat. 1178.)

PRIOR PROVISIONS

A prior section 3733, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 303, June 19, 1968, 82 Stat. 201; Pub. L. 91–644, title I, § 4(5), (6), Jan. 2, 1971, 84 Stat. 1883; Pub. L. 93–83, § 2, Aug. 6, 1973, 87 Stat. 201; Pub. L. 93–415, title V, § 543, Sept. 7, 1974, 88 Stat. 1142; Pub. L. 94–503, title I, § 111, Oct. 15, 1976, 90 Stat. 2413; Pub. L. 96–181, § 15(b), Jan. 2, 1980, 93 Stat. 1316, set out requirements of State plans in order to qualify for grants for law enforcement and criminal justice purposes, prior to the general amendment of this chapter by Pub. L. 96–157.

§ 3734. Repealed. Pub. L. 98–473, title II, § 605(c), Oct. 12, 1984, 98 Stat. 2080

Section, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 304, as added Pub. L. 96–157, § 2, Dec. 27, 1979, 93 Stat. 1178, provided for a Bureau of Justice Statistics Advisory Board, including establishment and composition of Board, rules respecting organization and procedure, term of office, duties and functions of Board, and delegation of powers and duties to Director.

A prior section 3734, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 304, June 19, 1968, 82 Stat. 202; Pub. L. 93–83, § 2, Aug. 6, 1973, 87 Stat. 203; Pub. L. 94–503, title I, § 112, Oct. 15, 1976, 90 Stat. 2414, related to plans or applications for financial assistance from local government units, prior to the general revision of this chapter by Pub. L. 96–157.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF REPEAL

Repeal effective Oct. 12, 1984, see section 609AA(a) of Pub. L. 98–473, set out as an Effective Date note under section 3711 of this title.

§ 3735. Use of data

Data collected by the Bureau 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 private person or public agency other than statistical or research purposes.

(Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 304, formerly § 305, as added Pub. L. 96–157, § 2, Dec. 27, 1979, 93 Stat. 1179; renumbered § 304, Pub. L. 98–473, title II, § 605(d), Oct. 12, 1984, 98 Stat. 2080; amended Pub. L. 109–162, title XI, § 1115(b), Jan. 5, 2006, 119 Stat. 3104.)

PRIOR PROVISIONS

A prior section 304 of Pub. L. 90–351, as added by Pub. L. 96–157, was classified to section 3734 of this title prior to repeal by Pub. L. 98–473, title II, § 605(c), Oct. 12, 1984, 98 Stat. 2080.

Prior sections 3735 to 3739 were omitted in the general amendment of this chapter by Pub. L. 96–157.

Section 3735, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 305, June 19, 1968, 82 Stat. 202; Pub. L. 91–644, title I, § 4(7), Jan. 2, 1971, 84 Stat. 1883; Pub. L. 93–83, § 2, Aug. 6, 1973, 87 Stat. 203, related to reallocation of funds.

Section 3736, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 306, June 19, 1968, 82 Stat. 202; Pub. L. 91–644, title I, § 4(8), Jan. 2, 1971, 84 Stat. 1883; Pub. L. 93–83, § 2, Aug. 6, 1973, 87 Stat. 203; Pub. L. 94–503, title I, § 113, Oct. 15, 1976, 90 Stat. 2415, related to allocation of funds.

Section 3737, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 307, June 19, 1968, 82 Stat. 202; Pub. L. 93–83, § 2, Aug. 6, 1973, 87 Stat. 204; Pub. L. 94–503, title I, § 114, Oct. 15, 1976, 90 Stat. 2415, related to priority programs and projects.

Section 3738, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 308, as added Pub. L. 93–83, § 2, Aug. 6, 1973, 87 Stat. 204; amended Pub. L. 94–503, title I, § 115, Oct. 15, 1976, 90 Stat. 2415, related to Administration action upon State plans within prescribed time after date of submission.

Section 3739, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 309, as added Pub. L. 94–503, title I, § 116, Oct. 15, 1976, 90 Stat. 2415, related to assistance and grants to aid State antitrust enforcement.

AMENDMENTS

2006—Pub. L. 109–162 substituted ''private person or public agency'' for ''particular individual''.

SUBCHAPTER IV—ESTABLISHMENT OF BUREAU OF JUSTICE ASSISTANCE

PRIOR PROVISIONS

A prior subchapter IV, consisting of sections 3741 to 3748, related to block grants by Bureau of Justice Assistance, prior to repeal by Pub. L. 100–690, title VI, § 6091(a), Nov. 18, 1988, 102 Stat. 4328. For similar provisions, see part A (§ 3750 et seq.) of subchapter V of this chapter.

Section 3741, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 401, as added Pub. L. 98–473, title II, § 606, Oct. 12, 1984, 98 Stat. 2080; amended Pub. L. 99–570, title I, § 1552(b)(1), Oct. 27, 1986, 100 Stat. 3207–46, related to establishment of Bureau of Justice Assistance, appointment of Director, and authority and restrictions with regard to Director.

Section 3742, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 402, as added Pub. L. 98–473, title II, § 606, Oct. 12, 1984, 98 Stat. 2080, related to duties and functions of Director.

Section 3743, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 403, as added Pub. L. 98–473, title II, § 606, Oct. 12, 1984, 98 Stat. 2081, described grant program.

Section 3744, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 404, as added Pub. L. 98–473, title II, § 606, Oct. 12, 1984, 98 Stat. 2082, authorized Bureau to make financial assistance under this subchapter available to States.

Section 3745, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 405, as added Pub. L. 98–473, title II, § 606, Oct. 12, 1984, 98 Stat. 2082, related to applications for assistance and contents of applications.

Section 3746, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 406, as added Pub. L. 98–473, title II, § 606, Oct. 12, 1984, 98 Stat. 2084, related to review of applications.

Section 3747, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 407, as added Pub. L. 98–473, title II, § 606, Oct. 12, 1984, 98 Stat. 2084, related to allocation and distribution of funds.

Section 3748, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 408, as added Pub. L. 98–473, title II, § 606, Oct. 12, 1984, 98 Stat. 2085, related to designation of a State office to prepare applications and administer funds.

Another prior subchapter IV, consisting of sections 3741 to 3745, related to formula grant program, prior to the general amendment of this subchapter by Pub. L. 98–473.

Section 3741, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 401, as added Pub. L. 96–157, § 2, Dec. 27, 1979, 93 Stat. 1179, described formula grant program.

Section 3742, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 402, as added Pub. L. 96–157, § 2, Dec. 27, 1979, 93 Stat. 1181, related to eligibility provisions for formula grants.

Section 3743, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 403, as added Pub. L. 96–157, § 2, Dec. 27, 1979, 93 Stat. 1187, concerned application requirements for formula grants.

Section 3744, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 404, as added Pub. L. 96–157, § 2, Dec. 27, 1979, 93 Stat. 1188, provided for review of applications for formula grants.

Section 3745, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 405, as added Pub. L. 96–157, § 2, Dec. 27, 1979, 93 Stat. 1189, provided for allocation and distribution of funds for formula grants.

Another prior subchapter IV, consisting of sections 3741 to 3748 and 3750 to 3750d, related to training, education, research, demonstration, and special grants prior to the general amendment of this chapter by Pub. L. 96–157.

Section 3741, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 401, June 19, 1968, 82 Stat. 203; Pub. L. 93–83, § 2, Aug. 6, 1973, 87 Stat. 205, set out the Congressional statement of purposes in making provision for training, education, research, demonstration, and special grants.

Section 3742, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 402, June 19, 1968, 82 Stat. 203; Pub. L. 93–83, § 2, Aug. 6, 1973, 87 Stat. 205; Pub. L. 94–503, title I, § 117, Oct. 15, 1976, 90 Stat. 2416, provided for creation of a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.

Section 3743, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 403, June 19, 1968, 82 Stat. 203; Pub. L. 93–83, § 2, Aug. 6, 1973, 87 Stat. 206, related to limitations on size of grants and contributions requirements for grants.

Section 3744, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 404, June 19, 1968, 82 Stat. 204; Pub. L. 93–83, § 2, Aug. 6, 1973, 87 Stat. 207, provided for Federal Bureau of Investigation law enforcement training programs.

Section 3745, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 405, June 19, 1968, 82 Stat. 204; Pub. L. 93–83, § 2, Aug. 6, 1973, 87 Stat. 207, repealed Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965 and provided for funds to continue projects started thereunder.

Section 3746, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 406, June 19, 1968, 82 Stat. 204; Pub. L. 91–644, title I, § 5(1), Jan. 2, 1971, 84 Stat. 1884; Pub. L. 93–83, § 2, Aug. 6, 1973, 87 Stat. 207, provided for academic educational assistance.

Section 3747, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 407, formerly § 408, as added Pub. L. 91–644, title I, § 5(2), Jan. 2, 1971, 84 Stat. 1885; renumbered § 407, Pub. L. 93–83, § 2, Aug. 6, 1973, 87 Stat. 209, related to administration of training programs for prosecuting attorneys.

Another prior section 3747, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 407, as added Pub. L. 91–644, title I, § 5(2), Jan. 2, 1971, 84 Stat. 1885, related to Administration law enforcement training program for enforcement personnel, prior to the general amendment of this chapter by section 2 of Pub. L. 93–83.

Section 3748, Pub. L. 90–351, title I, § 408, as added Pub. L. 91–644, title I, § 5(2), Jan. 2, 1971, 84 Stat. 1885,

2016 LEMAS Survey Items and Trends

Item	Section I: Descriptive Information	Trend*	Justification for New Item/Expanded Options
1	Enter the number of AUTHORIZED full-time paid agency positions and ACTUAL full-time and part-time paid agency employees as of June 30, 2016.	Y	
2	Of the total number of FULL-TIME SWORN personnel with general arrest powers (as entered in 1.a, column 2), enter the number of each of the following:	Y	
3	As of June 30, 2016, how many RESERVE or AUXILIARY OFFICERS did your agency have?	Y	
4	Enter the number of your FULL-TIME SWORN and NON-SWORN personnel according to their PRIMARY job responsibility.	Y	
5	Enter your agency's total operating budget for the fiscal year that included June 30, 2016.	Y	
6	Enter the total estimated value of money, goods, and property received by your agency from an ASSET FORFEITURE program during the fiscal year that included June 30, 2016.	Y	
Item	**Section II: Personnel**	**Trend**	**Justification for New Item/Expanded Options**
7a	Indicate your agency's minimum education requirement which new officer recruits must have at hiring or within two years of hiring.	Y	
7b	Does your agency consider MILITARY SERVICE as an exemption to this minimum education requirement?	Y	
8	Does your agency require a new officer recruit to be a U.S. citizen before hire?	**N**	Added to address Task Force recommendation 2.5.1
9	How many total hours of ACADEMY training and FIELD training (e.g., with FTO) are required of your agency's new officer recruits?	Y	
10	On average, how many hours of IN-SERVICE training are required annually for your agency's NON-PROBATIONARY field/patrol officers?	Y	
11	Which of the following screening techniques are used by your agency in selecting new officer recruits?	Y	
12	Enter the number of FULL-TIME agency personnel who were bilingual as of June 30,2016.	Y	
13	Enter the number of FULL-TIME SWORN personnel who were HIRED or SEPARATED during the fiscal year including June 30,2016 by RACE and SEX.	**N**	Added to address Task Force recommendation 2.5.1
14	Enter the number of FULL-TIME SWORN personnel by RACE and SEX for the pay period that included June 30,2016.	Y	
15	Enter the SEX and RACE of the chief executive (i.e. Chief of Police, Sheriff, Commissioner) for your agency as of June 30, 2016.	**P**	Sex can be trended with 2012 LEMAS; Race added to address Task Force recommendation 2.5.1
16	Enter the number of FULL-TIME SWORN personnel by RACE and SEX who held the following SUPERVISORY for the pay period that included June 30, 2016.	**N**	Added to address Task Force recommendation 2.5.1
17	Is collective bargaining authorized for your agency's employees?	Y	

Trend: Y-Yes, N-No, P-Partial

2016 LEMAS Survey Items and Trends

Item	Section III: Operations	Trend	Justification for New Item/Expanded Options
18	Enter the total number of calls for service (i.e., 911 calls, non-emergence calls, alarm or other source) received and dispatched by your agency during the fiscal year including June 30, 2016.	Y	
19	During the fiscal year including June 30, 2016, did your agency use the following types of patrol?	Y	
Item	**Section IV: Community Policing**	**Trend**	**Justification for New Item/Expanded Options**
20	As of June 30, 2016, did your agency's mission statement include a community policing component?	Y	
21	During the fiscal period including June 30, 2016, which of the following did your agency do?	Y	
22	During the 12-month period ending July 31, 2016, what proportion of agency personnel received at least eight hours of community policing training (problem solving, SARA, community partnerships, etc.)?	Y	
23	As of June 30, 2016, how many FULL-TIME SWORN personnel with primary responsibility for patrol duties (reported in 4.b.1, column 1) were encouraged to engage in SARA-type problem solving projects?	Y	
24	As of June 30, 2016, how many FULL-TIME SWORN personnel with primary responsibility for patrol duties (reported in 4.b.1, column 1) were assigned to specific geographic areas/beats?	Y	
25	During the fiscal year including June 30, 2016, did your agency have a problem-solving partnership or written agreement with any of the following?	Y	
26	During the fiscal year including June 30, 2016, did your agency conduct or sponsor a formal survey of local residents on crime experiences, fear or crime, OR satisfaction with police?	Y	
27	During the fiscal year including June 30, 2016, did your agency use information from a survey of citizens for any of the following?	Y	
Item	**Section V: Equipment**	**Trend**	**Justification for New Item/Expanded Options**
28	Does your agency supply or give a cash allowance to its FULL-TIME SWORN personnel to purchase the following?	Y	
29	Which types of sidearms are authorized for use by your agency's FULL-TIME SWORN personnel?	Y	
30	Which types of secondary firearms does your agency issue to FULL-TIME SWORN personnel or authorize for use?	Y	
31	As of June 30, 2016, which of the following types of WEAPONS or ACTIONS were authorized for use by your agency's FULL-TIME SWORN personnel?	Y	
32	As of June 30, 2016, does your agency require written documentation when the following types of WEAPONS or ACTIONS are used?	Y	
33	Does your agency REQUIRE uniformed field/patrol officers to wear protective body armor while in the field?	Y	
34	Does your agency REQUIRE uniformed field/patrol officers to wear their seat belt while driving or riding in an agency vehicle?	**N**	Added to assess Task Force recommendation 6.6
35	Enter the total number of motorized vehicles operated by your agency as of June 30, 2016.	Y	
36	During the fiscal period including June 30, 2016, how many of the following types of video cameras were operated by your agency on a REGULAR basis?	Y	

Trend: Y-Yes, N-No, P-Partial

2016 LEMAS Survey Items and Trends

Item	Section VI: Technology	Trend	Justification for New Item/Expanded Options
37	During the fiscal year including June 30, 2016, did your agency maintain a website for any of the following?	**P**	Includes new categories (stops and arrests) in order to assess Task Force recommendation 1.3.1
38	During the fiscal year including June 30, 2016, did your agency use any of following social media to communicate with the public?	Y	
39	As of June 30, 2016, did your agency use computers for any of the following functions?	Y	
40	As of June 30, 2016, what was the PRIMARY method for transmitting criminal incident reports from the field to your agency's record management system?	Y	
41	During the fiscal year including June 30, 2016, did your agency use any of the following technologies on a REGULAR basis?	Y	
42	As of June 30, 2016, did your agency's field/patrol officers have direct access to the following types of information using in-field vehicle-mounted or mobile computers?	Y	
43	As of June 30, 2016, did your agency have an operational computer-based personnel performance monitoring/assessment system (e.g., Early Warning or Early Intervention System) for monitoring or responding to problematic officer behavior?	Y	
44	As of June 30, 2016, did your agency maintain its own computerized files with any of the following information?	Y	

Item	Section VII: Policies and Procedures	Trend	Justification for New Item/Expanded Options
45	Which of the following best describes your agency's written policy for pursuit driving?	Y	
46	Does your agency have a written policy or procedural directives on the following?	**P**	Additional policies added to assess Task Force recommendation 2.7.1 and 2.13
47	As of June 30, 2016, does your agency require an external investigation in the following situations?	**N**	Added to addess Task Force recommendation 2.2.2
48	Is there a civilian complaint review board/agency in your jurisdiction that reviews complaints against officers in your agency?	Y	
49	Does the civilian review board/agency have independent investigative authority with subpoena powers?	Y	
50	Does your agency have a written policy requiring that civilian complaints about USE OF FORCE receive separate investigation outside the chain of command where the accused officer is assigned?	Y	

Item	Section VIII: Special Problems/Tasks	Trend	Justification for New Item/Expanded Options
51	As of June 30, 2016, how did your agency address the following problems/tasks?	Y	

Trend: Y-Yes, N-No, P-Partial

LEMAS Publications, 1987-2015

Authors	Year	Title	Publication Title	Publisher	Volume	Issue no.	Start page	End page
Ansari, Sami	2013	Estimating Crime Rates from Police Reports and Victim Surveys: Progressive and Convergence in Time Series Analyses		LFB Scholarly Publishing				
Anzia, Sarah F.; Moe, Terry M.	2014	Public sector unions and the costs of government	Journal of Politics					
Arslan, Metin	2010	The Effects of Community Policing on Crime and Crime Clearance Rates in Texas		The University of Texas at Dallas				
Baldwin, Neal C.	2014	Environmental Determinism and the Existence of Citizen Oversight of the Police		University of Tennessee at Chattanooga				
Baltaci, Halil	2010	Crime Analysis: An Empirical Analysis of Its Effectiveness as a Crime Fighting Tool		The University of Texas at Dallas				
Barrick, Kelle; Hickman, Matthew J.; Strom, Kevin J.	2014	Representative policing and violence towards the police	Policing					
Beckman, Karen A.	2006	Community Policing and Changing Crime Rates: Does What Police Do Matter?		University of Maryland, College Park				
Bennett, Laura	2015	Race and Gender in Policing: Are More Representative Departments More Effective?		Duke University				
Bies, Katherine J.; Deporto, Isaiah M.; Long, Darryl G.; McKoy, Megan S.; Mukamal, Debbie A.; Sklansky, David A.	2015	Stuck in the '70s: The Demographics of California Prosecutors		Stanford Law School, Stanford Criminal Justice Center				
Bishopp, Stephen A.; Worrall, John L.	2009	Do state asset forfeiture laws explain the upward trend in drug arrests?	Journal of Crime and Justice		32	2	117	138
Bond, Brenda J.; Gabriele, Kathryn R.	2016	Research and planning units: An innovation instrument in the 21st-century police organization	Criminal Justice Policy Review					
Briggs, Steven J.; Zhao, Jihong; Wilson, Steve; Ren, Ling	2008	The effect of collective bargaining on large police agency supplemental compensation policies: 1990-2000	Police Practice and Research		9	3	227	238
Bromley, Max L.; Reaves, Brian A.	1998	Comparing campus and city police operational practices	Journal of Security Administration		21	2	41	54
Bromley, Max L.; Reaves, Brian A.	1998	Comparing campus and municipal police: The human resource dimension	Policing		21	3	534	546
Brunet, James R.	2005	Drug Testing in Law Enforcement Agencies: Social Control in the Public Sector		LFB Scholarly Publishing				
Burch, Andrea M.	2012	Sheriffs' Offices, 2007	Statistical Tables	Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 238558		
Burruss, George W.; Giblin, Matthew J.	2014	Modeling isomorphism on policing innovation: The role of institutional pressures in adopting community-oriented policing	Crime and Delinquency		60	3	331	355
Catalano, Shannan M.	2004	An Examination of the Convergence between Police Recording and Victim Reporting of Serious Violent Crime, 1973-2002		University of Missouri St. Louis				
Cave, Breanne; Telep, Cody W.; Grieco, Julie	2014	Rigorous evaluation research among US police departments: special cases or a representative sample?	Police Practice and Research					
Chalfin, Aaron; McCrary, Justin	2013	The Effect of Police on Crime: New Evidence from U.S. Cities, 1960-2010		National Bureau of Economic Research		18815		
Chalfin, Aaron; McCrary, Justin	2013	Are U.S. cities underpoliced?: Theory and evidence						
Chamlin, Mitchell B.; Sanders, Beth A.	2010	Macro social determinants of black police force size: Political mobilization and crime control	Policing		33	4	607	620
Chappell, Allison T.; MacDonald, John M.; Manz, Patrick W.	2006	The Organizational Determinants of Police Arrest Decisions	Crime and Delinquency		52	2	287	306
Choi, KyuBeom	2005	The Effects of Actual Punishment Levels on Perceptions of Punishment: A Multi-Level Approach		Florida State University				
Dalehite, Esteban G.	2008	Determinants of performance measurement: An investigation into the decision to conduct citizen surveys	Public Administration Review		68	5	891	907
D'Alessio, Steward J.; Eitle, David; Stolzenberg, Lisa	2005	Impact of serious crime, racial threat and economic inequality on private police size	Social Science Research		34	2	267	282
D'Alessio, Stewart J.; Stolzenberg, Lisa; Flexon, Jamie L.	2015	Are Drug Asset Forfeiture Laws Corrupting the Police?		Weston Publishing				
D'Alessio, Stewart, J.; Eitle, David; Stolzenberg, Lisa	2005	Police Organizational Factors, the Racial Composition of the Police, and the Probability of Arrest	Justice Quarterly		22	1	30	57
Dalton, Teresa A.	2010	The Expanding Definition of Crime and Its Effect on the Individual: A Multilevel Modeling Analysis		University of Denver				
Davies, Heather J.	2003	Understanding Variations in Murder Clearance Rates: The Influence of the Political Environment		American University				
DeCarlo, John; Jenkins, Michael J.	2015	Labor Unions, Management Innovation and Organizational Change in Police Departments	Springer Briefs in Criminology	Springer International Publishing				
del Carmen, Alejandro; Guevara, Lori	2003	Police officers on two-officer units: A study of attitudinal responses toward a patrol experiment	Policing		26	1	144	161
DeLone, Gregory J.	2007	Law enforcement mission statements post-September 11	Police Quarterly		10	2	218	235

LEMAS Publications, 1987-2015

Authors	Year	Title	Publication Title	Publisher	Volume	Issue no.	Start page	End page
Demir, Serhat	2009	Diffusion of Police Technology Across Time and Space and the Impact of Technology Use on Police Effectiveness and its Contribution to Decision-Making		Kent State University				
Dichter, Melissa E.; Marcus, Steven C.; Morabito, Melissa S.; Rhodes, Karin V.	2011	Explaining the IPV arrest decision: Incident, agency, and community factors	Criminal Justice Review		36	1	22	39
Dorsey, Tina L.; Zawitz, Marianne W.; Middleton, Priscilla	2004	Drugs and Crime Facts		Bureau of Justice Statistics				
Edson, Timothy C.	2014	Arrest Warrant Apprehension: Examining Characteristics of Expediency Using a Multilevel Approach		University of Massachusetts Lowell				
Eitle, David	2005	The influence of mandatory arrest policies, police organizational characteristics, and situational variables on the probability of arrest in domestic violence cases	Crime and Delinquency		51	4	573	597
Eitle, David; D'Alessio, Stewart J.; Stolzenberg, Lisa	2014	The effect of organizational and environmental factors on police misconduct	Police Quarterly		17	2	103	126
Eitle, David; Monahan, Susanne	2009	Revisiting the racial threat thesis: The role of police organizational characteristics in predicting race-specific drug arrest rates	Justice Quarterly		26	3	528	561
Elliott, Everett	2002	An Analysis of the Relationship Between Hate Crimes Reporting and Administrative Policies as They Relate to Community Policing		West Virginia University				
Engbeck, John R.	2010	Dynamics of Police Organizational Change, Learning-Based Interactions, and Agency Innovation and Cooperation within Community Policing		Capella University				
Fan, Amy Z.; Prescott, Marta R.; Zhao, Guixiang; Gotway, Carol A.; Galea, Sandro	2015	Individual and community-level determinants of mental and physical health after the Deepwater Horizon oil spill: Findings from the Gulf States Population Survey	Journal of Behavioral Health Services and Research		42	1	23	41
Farrell, Amy	2014	Environmental and institutional influences on police agency responses to human trafficking	Police Quarterly		17	1	3	29
Forst, Brian	2008	Improving Police Effectiveness and Transparency: National Information Needs on Law Enforcement		United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 234182		
Fox, James P., Jr.	2012	Legitimacy and Law Enforcement: The Counterinsurgency Against Gang Crime in the United States		Georgetown University				
Garicano, Luis; Heaton, Paul	2010	Information technology, organization, and productivity in the public sector: Evidence from police departments	Journal of Labor Economics		28	1	167	201
Gau, Jacinta M.; Terrill, William; Paoline, Eugene A., III	2013	Looking up: Explaining police promotional aspirations	Criminal Justice and Behavior		40	3	247	269
Giblin, Matthew J.	2014	Understanding Influence Across Justice Agencies: The Spread of 'Community Reforms' from Law Enforcement to Prosecutor Organizations		Southern Illinois University		NCJ 245945		
Goldberg, Andrew L.; Reaves, Brian A.	1999	Sheriffs' Departments 1997: Executive Summary		United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 179011		
Goldberg, Andrew L.; Reaves, Brian A.	2000	Sheriffs' Departments, 1997		United States Deparment of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 173428		
Graco, Warwick; Koesmarno, Warwick	2013	Configurations and couplings: An exploratory study	Advances in Data Mining: Applications and Theoretical Aspects	Springer	7987		266	279
Greene, Helen Taylor; del Carmen, Alejandro	2002	Female police officers in Texas: Perceptions of colleagues and stress	Policing		25	2	385	398
Greenfeld, Lawrence A.; Smith, Steven K.	1999	American Indians and Crime		United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 173386		
Gul, Zakir	2009	A Partial Test of the Intelligence-Led Policing Model		Kent State University				
Gul, Zakir; Kule, Ahmet	2013	Intelligence-led policing: How the use of crime intelligence analysis translates in to the decision-making	International Journal of Security and Terrorism		4	1	21	40
Gustafson, Joseph	2013	Diversity in municipal police agencies: A national examination of minority hiring and promotion	Policing		36	4		
Gustafson, Joseph L.	2010	Diversity in Municipal Police Agencies: A National Examination of its Determinants and Effects		Northeastern University				
Gutierrez, Ricky S.	2003	Social Equity and the Funding of Community Policing		LFB Scholarly Publishing				
Gutierrez, Ricky Steven	2002	Building Bridges: Is the Architecture of Community Policing Flawed? A Policy Impact Analysis in 202 American Cities		Washington State University				
Harmon, Rachel	2012	Why do we (still) lack data on policing?	Marquette Law Review		96	4	1119	1146
Hassell, Kimberly D.; Zhao, Jihong Solomon; Maguire, Edward R.	2003	Structural arrangements in large municipal police organizations: Revisiting Wilson's theory of local political culture	Policing		26	2	231	250

LEMAS Publications, 1987-2015

Authors	Year	Title	Publication Title	Publisher	Volume	Issue no.	Start page	End page
Helms, Ronald	2008	Locally elected sheriffs and money compensation: A quantitative analysis of organizational and environmental contingency explanations	Criminal Justice Review		33	1	5	28
Helms, Ronald; Gutierrez, Ricky S.	2007	Federal subsidies and evidence of progressive change: A quantitative assessment of the effects of targeted grants on manpower and innovation in large U. S. police agencies	Police Quarterly		10	1	87	107
Hickman, Matthew J.	2006	Citizen complaints about police use of force		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 210296		
Hickman, Matthew J.	2014	Police administrative records as social science data	The Oxford Handbook of Police and Policing	Oxford University Press			433	448
Hickman, Matthew J.	2006	Impact of the military reserve activation on police staffing	Police Chief		73	10		
Hickman, Matthew J.; Piquero, Alex R.	2009	Organizational, administrative, and environmental correlates of complaints about police use of force: Does minority representation matter?	Crime and Delinquency		15	1	3	27
Hickman, Matthew J.; Reaves, Brian A.	2001	Community Policing in Local Police Departments, 1997 and 1999, Special Report		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 184794		
Hickman, Matthew J.; Reaves, Brian A.	2001	Local Police Departments 1999		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 186478		
Hickman, Matthew J.; Reaves, Brian A.	2003	Local Police Departments 2000		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 196002		
Hickman, Matthew J.; Reaves, Brian A.	2002	Sheriffs' Offices 2000		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 196534		
Hickman, Matthew J.; Reaves, Brian A.	2006	Sheriffs' Offices, 2003		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 211361		
Hickman, Matthew J.; Reaves, Brian A.	2006	Local Police Departments, 2003		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 210118		
Hickman, Matthew J; Reaves, Brian A.	2002	Local police and homeland security: Some baseline data	Police Chief		10		83	85, 88
Holcomb, Jefferson E.; Kovandzic, Tomislav V.; Williams, Marian R.	2011	Civil asset forfeiture, equitable sharing, and policing for profit in the United States	Journal of Criminal Justice		39	3	273	285
Holian, Matt	2007	Compstat, community policing and the science of success: A market-based approach to police management	Economic Affairs		27	4	23	29
Holmes, Malcolm D.; Smith, Brad W.; Freng, Adrienne B.; Munoz, Ed A.	2008	Minority threat, crime control and police resource allocation in the southwestern United States	Crime and Delinquency		54	1	128	152
Hur, Yongbeom	2014	Turnover, voluntary turnover, and organizational performance: Evidence from municipal police departments	Policing		37	1		
Hur, Yongbeom	2013	Racial diversity, is it a blessing to an organization? Examining its organizational consequences in municipal police departments	International Review of Administrative Sciences		79	1	149	164
James, Nathan; Council, Logan R.	2008	How Crime in the United States is Measured		Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service				
Jenness, Valerie; Grattet, Ryken	2005	The law-in-between: The effects of organizational perviousness on the policing of hate crime	Social Problems		52	3	337	359
Johnson, Brian D.; Ulmer, Jeffery T.; Kramer, John H.	2008	The social context of guidelines circumvention: The case of Federal District courts	Criminology		46	3	737	783
Johnson, Richard R.	2013	An examination of police department uniform color and police-citizen aggression	Criminal Justice and Behavior		40	2	228	244
Jones, Matthew A.	2008	Police Organizations: An Empirical Examination of American Sheriff's Offices and Municipal Police Agencies		Portland State University				
Jones-Webb, Rhonda; Wall, Melanie	2008	Neighborhood Racial/Ethnic Concentration, Social Disadvantage and Homicide Risk: An Ecological Analysis of 10 U.S. Cities	Journal of Urban Health		85	5	662	676
Kaminski, Robert J.; Stucky, Thomas D.	2009	Reassessing political explanations for murders of police	Homicide Studies		13	1	3	20
Kaminski, Robert John	2002	An Opportunity Model of Police Homicide Victimization		State University of New York - Albany				
Katz, Charles M.; Maguire, Edward R.; Roncek, Dennis W.	2002	The creation of specialized police gang units: A macro-level analysis of contingency, social threat and resource dependency explanations	Policing		25	3	472	506
Keith, Louis E.	2015	Significant Predictors of Forming Police-Citizen Collaborative Partnerships: A Secondary Data Analysis		Capella University				
Kennedy, William G.	2009	The Impact of Police Agency Size on Crime Clearance Rates		University of North Carolina at Charlotte				

LEMAS Publications, 1987-2015

Authors	Year	Title	Publication Title	Publisher	Volume	Issue no.	Start page	End page
Kim, Hannah; Choo, Jaegul; Park, Haesun; Endert, Alex	2015	Interaxis: Steering scatterplot axes via observation-level interaction	IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics					
Kim, Pan Suk; Mengistu, Berhanu	1994	Women and minorities in the work force of law-enforcement agencies	American Review of Public Administration		24	2	161 -	
King, Ryan D.	2007	The context of minority group threat: Race, institutions and complying with Hate Crime law	Law and Society Review		41	1	189	224
King, William R.	2000	Measuring police innovation: Issues and measurement	Policing		23	3	303	317
King, William R.	1999	Time, constancy, and change in American municipal police organizations	Police Quarterly		2	3	338	364
King, William R.	2009	Toward a life-course perspective of police organizations	Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency		46	2	213	244
King, William R.; Lab, Steven P.	2000	Crime prevention, community policing, and training: Old wine in new bottles	Police Practice and Research		1	2	241	252
Kunihama, Tsuyoshi	2015	Nonparametric Bayes Analysis of Social Science Data	Duke University					
Langton, Lynn	2009	Aviation Units in Large Law Enforcement Agencies, 2007		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 226672		
Langton, Lynn	2010	Women in Law Enforcement, 1987-2008		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 230521		
Langton, Lynn	2010	Gang Units in Large Local Law Enforcement Agencies, 2007		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 230071		
Langworthy, Robert H.	2002	LEMAS: A comparative organizational research platform	Justice Research and Policy		4	1/2	21	38
Lee, Hoon; Jang, Hyunseok; Yun, Ilhong; Lim, Hyeyoung; Tushaus, David W.	2010	An examination of police use of force utilizing police training and neighborhood contextual factors: A multilevel analysis	Policing		33	4	681	702
Lemmer, Thomas J.	2005	Police Department Reorganization and Effectiveness in Addressing Gang Violence in Chicago		Loyola University Chicago				
Lilley, David; Hinduja, Sameer	2006	Organizational values and police officer evaluation: A content comparison between traditional and community policing agencies	Police Quarterly		9	4	486	513
Lilley, David; Hinduja, Sameer	2007	Police officer performance appraisal and overall satisfaction	Journal of Criminal Justice		35	2	137	150
Lindsay, William	2009	Law Enforcement Performance Standards and Wages: A Test of the Efficiency Wage Hypothesis		Washington State University				
Lombardo, Robert M.; Olson, David E.	2009	Organizational approaches to drug law enforcement by local police departments in the United States: Specialized drug units and participation in multi-agency drug task forces	Justice Research and Policy		11		45	75
Lord, Vivian B.; Kuhns, Joseph B.; Friday, Paul C.	2009	Small city community policing and citizen satisfaction	Policing		32	4	574	594
Lott, John R., Jr.	2000	Does a helping hand put others at risk? Affirmative action, police departments, and crime	Economic Inquiry		38	2	239	277
Louden, Robert Joseph	1999	The Structure and Procedures of Hostage/crisis Negotiation Units in United States Police Organizations		City University of New York				
Lynch, James P.	2002	Trends in Juvenile Violent Offending: An Analysis of Victim Survey Data	OJJDP Juvenile Justice Bulletin	United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention		NCJ 191052		
MacDonald, John M.	2002	The effectiveness of community policing in reducing urban violence	Crime and Delinquency		48	4	592	618
Maguire, Edward R.	1997	Structural change in large municipal police organizations during the community policing era	Justice Quarterly		14	3	547	576
Maguire, Edward R.	2003	Organizational Structure in American Police Agencies: Context, Complexity, and Control		State University of New York Press				
Maguire, Edward R.	2009	Police organizational structure and child sexual abuse case attrition	Policing		32	1	157	179
Maguire, Edward R.	2002	Multiwave establishment surveys of police organizations	Justice Research and Policy		4		39	60
Maguire, Edward R.; Shin, Yeunhee; Zhao, Jihong 'Solomon'; Hassell, Kimberly D.	2003	Structural change in large police agencies during the 1990s	Policing		26	2	251	265
Markovic, John; Bueermann, James; Smith, Kurt	2006	Coming to Terms with Geographical Information Systems	Police Chief		73	6		
Marschall, Melissa J.; Ruhil, Anirudh V.S.	2007	Substantive symbols: The attitudinal dimension of black political incorporation in local government	American Journal of Political Science		51	1	17	33
Marschall, Melissa; Shah, Paru R.	2007	The attitudinal effects of minority incorporation: Examining the racial dimensions of trust in urban America	Urban Affairs Review		42	5	629	658

LEMAS Publications, 1987-2015

Authors	Year	Title	Publication Title	Publisher	Volume	Issue no.	Start page	End page
Martin, Susan E.	1995	A Cross-burning is Not Just an Arson: Police Social Construction of Hate Crimes in Baltimore County	Criminology		33	3	303	326
Matusiak, Matthew C.; Campbell, Bradley A.; King, William R.	2014	The legacy of LEMAS: Effects on police scholarship of a federally administered, multi-wave establishment survey	Policing		37	3	630	648
McCabe, Kimberly A.; Fajardo, Robin G.	2001	Law enforcement accreditation: A national comparison of accredited vs. nonaccredited agencies	Journal of Criminal Justice		29	2	127	131
McCormack, Philip	2015	Minority-group threat and social control: Race/ethnicity and the issues of heterogeneity		University of Massachusetts, Lowell				
Meesing, Robert T.	2004	An Exploratory Study Regarding the Effects of Community Policing on Index Crime Clearance Rates in Local Agencies with Investigators		Michigan State University				
Miller, Kirk	2007	Racial profiling and postmodern society: Police responsiveness, image maintenance, and the left flank of police legitimacy	Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice		23	3	248	262
Miller, Kirk	2013	The institutionalization of racial profiling policy: An examination of antiprofiling policy adoption among large law enforcement agencies	Crime and Delinquency		59	1	32	58
Miller, Kirk	2008	Race, police, and policy: Do racial profiling policies reduce disparities in police traffic stops?		American Society of Criminology Annual Meeting				
Morabito, Melissa S.	2008	The adoption of police innovation: The role of the political environment	Policing		31	3	466	484
Morabito, Melissa Schaefer	2010	Understanding community policing as an innovation: Patterns of adoption	Crime and Delinquency		56	4	564	587
Morash, Merry; Kwak, Dae-Hoon; Haarr, Robin	2006	Gender differences in the predictors of police stress	Policing		29	3	541	563
Murphy, David W.; Worrall, John H.	1999	Residency requirements and public perceptions of the police in large municipalities	Policing		22	3	327	342
National Research Council	2009	Ensuring the Quality, Credibility, and Relevance of U.S. Justice Statistics		National Academies Press				
Nicholson-Crotty, Sean; O'Toole, Laurence J., Jr.	2004	Public management and organizational performance: The case of law enforcement agencies	Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory		14	1	1	18
Nowotny, Jordan J.; Jordan, Emma K.; Schuck, Amie M.; Rabe-Hemp, Cara E.	2010	The Impact of Women on Police Organizations		American Society of Criminology Annual Meeting				
Nunn, Samuel	2001	Police information technology: Assessing the effects of computerization on urban police functions	Public Administration Review		61	2	221	234
Pascarella, Jospeh E.	1999	Municipal police salaries as a function of community home values, household incomes, and physical housing characteristics	Justice Research and Policy		1	2	89	110
Perez, Nicholas M.; Bromley, Max	2015	Comparing campus and city police human resource and select community outreach policies and practices: An update	Policing		38	4	664	674
Perry, Steven W.	2004	American Indians and Crime: A BJS Statistical Profile, 1992-2002		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 203097		
Planty, Michael	2006	The national crime victimization survey: 34 years of measuring crime in the United States	Statistical Journal of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe		23	4	289	301
Prelog, Andrew J.	2012	Longitudinal and Geographic Analysis of the Relationship Between Natural Disasters and Crime in the United States		Colorado State University				
Presley, Daniel C.	2013	An Assessment of Officer Safety: Does Departmental Authorization of Tasers Reduce Officer Assault Rates?		Southern Illinois University, Carbondale				
Pyrooz, David C.	2012	Structural covariates of gang homicide in large U.S. cities	Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency		49	4	489	518
Pyrooz, David C.; Fox, Andrew M.; Decker, Scott H.	2010	Racial and ethnic heterogeneity, economic disadvantage, and gangs: A macro-level study of gang membership in urban America	Justice Quarterly		27	6	867	892
Randol, Blake M.	2012	The organizational correlates of terrorism response preparedness in local police departments	Criminal Justice Policy Review		23	3	304	326
Randol, Blake M.	2013	Modeling a Decade of Organizational Change in Municipal Police Departments: A Longitudinal Analysis of Technical, Administrative, and Programmatic Innovations		Washington State University				
Randol, Blake M.	2013	An exploratory analysis of terrorism prevention and response preparedness efforts in municipal police departments in the United States: Which agencies participate in terrorism prevention and why?	Police Journal		86	2	158	181
Reaves, Brian	1989	Profile of State And Local Law Enforcement Agencies, 1987		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 113949		
Reaves, Brian A.	1989	Profile of State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies, 1987		Bureau of Justice Statistics				

LEMAS Publications, 1987-2015

Authors	Year	Title	Publication Title	Publisher	Volume	Issue no.	Start page	End page
Reaves, Brian A.	1996	Local Police Departments, 1993		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 148822		
Reaves, Brian A.	1989	Police Departments in Large Cities, 1987, Special Report		Bureau of Justice Statistics				
Reaves, Brian A.	1992	Drug Enforcement by Police and Sheriffs' Departments, 1990		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 134505		
Reaves, Brian A.	1992	State and Local Police Departments, 1990		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 133284		
Reaves, Brian A.	1992	Sheriffs' Departments 1990: A LEMAS Report		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 133283		
Reaves, Brian A.	1996	A LEMAS Report: Local Police Departments, 1993, Executive Summary		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 160802		
Reaves, Brian A.	2010	Local Police Departments, 2007		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 231174		
Reaves, Brian A.	2015	Local Police Departments, 2013: Equipment and Technology		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 248767		
Reaves, Brian A.; Goldberg, Andrew	1999	Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics, 1997: Data for Individual State and Local Agencies with 100 or More Officers		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 171681		
Reaves, Brian A.; Goldberg, Andrew	1999	Local Police Departments, 1997		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 178934; NCJ 1734		
Reaves, Brian A.; Goldberg, Andrew	1999	Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics, 1997: Data for Individual State and Local Agencies with 100 or More Officers		Bureau of Justice Statistics				
Reaves, Brian A.; Hart, Timothy	2000	Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics, 1999: Data for Individual State and Local Agencies with 100 or More Officers		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 184481		
Reaves, Brian A.; Hickman, Matthew J.	2001	Sheriffs' Offices 1999		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 186479		
Reaves, Brian A.; Hickman, Matthew J.	2002	Police Departments in Large Cities, 1990-2000		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 175703		
Reaves, Brian A.; Smith, Pheny Z.	1996	Sheriffs' Departments 1993		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 148823		
Reaves, Brian A.; Smith, Pheny Z.	1995	Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics, 1993: Data for Individual State and Local Agencies with 100 or More Officers		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 148825		
Reaves, Brian J.; Hickman, Matthew J.	2004	Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics, 2000: Data for Individual State and Local Agencies with 100 or More Officers		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 203350		
Redmond, Michael	2011	Communities and Crime Unnormalized Data Set		University of California, Irvine, Center for Machine Learning and Intelligent Systems				
Redmond, Michael; Baveja, Alok	2002	A data-driven software tool for enabling cooperative information sharing among police departments	European Journal of Operational Research		141	3	660	678
Riggs, Courtney	2012	Exploring the Impact of Department Policy on TASER-Proximate Arrest Related Deaths		Arizona State University				
Roberts, Aki	2008	The influences of incident and contextual characteristics on crime clearance of nonlethal violence: A multilevel event history analysis	Journal of Criminal Justice		36	1	61	71
Roberts, Aki; Block, Steven	2013	Explaining temporary and permanent motor vehicle theft rates in the United States: A crime-specific approach	Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency		50	3	445	471
Roberts, Aki; Roberts, John M., Jr.	2007	The structure of informal communication between police agencies	Policing		30	1	93	107
Roberts, Aki; Roberts, John M., Jr.	2009	Impact of network ties on change in police agency practices	Policing		32	1	38	55
Roberts, Aki; Roberts, John M., Jr.	2006	Police Innovations and the Structure of Informal Communication Between Police Agencies: Network and LEMAS Data		United States Department of Justice		NCJ 216150		
Roberts, Aki; Roberts, John M., Jr.	2015	Crime clearance and temporal variation in police investigative workload: Evidence from National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) data	Journal of Quantitative Criminology					
Roberts, Aki; Roberts, John M., Jr.; Liedka, Raymond V.	2012	Elements of terrorism preparedness in local police agencies, 2003-2007: Impact of vulnerability, organizational characteristics, and contagion in the post-9/11 era	Crime and Delinquency		58	5	720	747
Rosenbaum, Dennis P.; Graziano, Lisa M.; Stephens, Cody D.; Schuck, Amie M.	2011	Understanding community policing and legitimacy-seeking behavior in virtual reality: A national study of municipal police websites	Police Quarterly		14	1	25	47
Sass, Tim R.; Troyer, Jennifer L.	1999	Affirmative action, political representation, unions, and female police employment	Journal of Labor Research		20	4	571	587
Schnebly, Stephen M.	2008	The influence of community-oriented policing on crime-reporting behavior	Justice Quarterly		25	2	223	250

LEMAS Publications, 1987-2015

Authors	Year	Title	Publication Title	Publisher	Volume	Issue no.	Start page	End page
Schnebly, Stephen M.	2005	Community Variation in the Nature of Crime Reporting		University of Missouri-St. Louis				
Schroedel, Jean Reith; Frisch, Scott; Hallamore, Nancy; Peterson, Julie; Vanderhorst, Nicole	1996	The joint impact of race and gender on police department employment practices	Women and Criminal Justice		8	2	59	77
Schuck, Amie M.	2014	Female representation in law enforcement: The influence of screening, unions, incentives, community policing, CALEA, and size	Police Quarterly		17	1	54	78
Schuck, Amie M.	2015	Prevalence and predictors of surveillance cameras in law enforcement: The importance of stakeholders and community factors	Criminal Justice Policy Review					
Schuck, Amie M.; Rabe-Hemp, Cara	2014	Citizen complaints and gender diversity in police organisations	Policing and Society					
Scott, Michael L.	2015	Law Enforcement's Adoption of Technology: A Quantitative Study Exploring the Adoption of Technology by Law Enforcement Agencies		Capella University				
Sever, Brion	2001	The relationship between minority populations and police force strength: Expanding our knowledge	Police Quarterly		4	1	28	68
Sever, Brion; McSkimming, Michael J.	2004	The impact of racial composition and other county characteristics on the size of sheriff's departments: A new analysis of police force growth	Criminal Justice Policy Review		15	4	486	512
Sharp, Elaine B.	2006	Policing urban America: A new look at the politics of agency size	Social Science Quarterly		87	2	291	307
Sharp, Elaine B.	2014	Minority representation and order maintenance policing: Toward a contingent view	Social Science Quarterly		95	4	1155	1171
Sharp, Elaine B.; Johnson, Paul E.	2009	Accounting for variation in distrust of local police	Justice Quarterly		26	1	157	182
Shjarback, John A.	2015	Emerging early intervention systems: An agency-specific pre-post comparison of formal citizen complaints of use of force	Policing					
Shjarback, John A.; White, Michael D.	2015	Departmental professionalism and its impact on indicators of violence in police-citizen encounters	Police Quarterly					
Skogan, Wesley G.	2014	Using community surveys to study policing	The Oxford Handbook of Policing	Oxford University Press			449	470
Smith, Brad W.	2003	The impact of police officer diversity on police-caused homicides	Policy Studies Journal		31	2	147	162
Smith, Brad W.	2004	Structural and organizational predictors of homicide by police	Policing		27	4	539	557
Smith, Brad W. Holmes, Malcolm D.	2014	Police use of excessive force in minority communities: A test of the minority threat, place, and community accountability hypotheses	Social Problems		61	1	83	104
Smith, Brad W.; Holmes, Malcolm D.	2003	Community accountability, minority threat and policy brutality: An examination of civil rights criminal complaints	Criminology		41	4	1035 -	
Smith, Brad W.; Wareham, Jennifer; Lambert, Eric G.	2014	Community and organizational influences on voluntary turnover in law enforcement	Journal of Criminal Justice		37	3	377	398
Sozer, M. A.	2009	Crime and Community Policing		LFB Scholarly Publishing				
Sozer, Mehmet A.	2008	Assessing the Performance of Community Policing: The Effect of Community Policing Practices on Crime Rates		Indiana University of Pennsylvania				
Sozer, Mehmet Alper; Merlo, Alida V.	2013	The impact of community policing on crime rates: Does the effect of community policing differ in large and small law enforcement agencies?	Police Practice and Research		14	6	506	521
Stucky, Thomas D.	2001	An Institutional Resources Perspective on Crime and Crime Control in U.S. Cities		University of Iowa				
Stults, Brian J.	2003	Social Threat and Benign Neglect: A Conflict Perspective on Racial Differences in Arrest		University at Albany, State University of New York				
Telep, Cody W.	2013	Moving Forward with Evidence-Based Policing: What Should Police Be Doing and Can We Get Them to Do It?		George Mason University				
Timrots, Anita; Renshaw III, Benjamin H.; Lindgren, Sue A.	1994	Drug and Crime Facts, 1994		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 154043		
Tucker, Jane M.	2012	What Shapes Police Officer Willingness to Use Stress Intervention Services? An Empirical Study of Current Factors in Pennsylvania		Temple University				
Ulkemen, Sinan	2009	The Impact of Surveillance Technology on the Behaviors of Municipal Police Departments		University of North Texas				
Urbina, Martin Guevara; Alvarez, Sofia Espinoza	2015	Latino Police Officers in the United States: An Examination of Emerging Trends and Issues		Charles C Thomas Publisher				
Walfield, Scott M.	2015	When a cleared rape is not cleared: A multilevel study of arrest and exceptional clearance	Journal of Interpersonal Violence					
Walker, Samuel; Katz, Charles M.	1995	Less than meets the eye: Police department bias-crime units	American Journal of Police		14	10	29	48
Wareham, Jennifer; Smith, Brad W.; Lambert, Eric G.	2015	Rates and patterns of law enforcement turnover: A research note	Criminal Justice Policy Review		26	4	345	370

LEMAS Publications, 1987-2015

Authors	Year	Title	Publication Title	Publisher	Volume	Issue no.	Start page	End page
Watkins, Charles E., Jr.	2005	The Information Technology Productivity Paradox in Law Enforcement: An Exploratory Study		George Washington University				
Weisburd, David; Lum, Cynthia	2005	The diffusion of computerized crime mapping in policing: Linking research and practice	Police Practice and Research		6	5	419	434
Weitzer, Ronald	2000	Racialized policing: Residents' perceptions in three neighborhoods	Law and Society Review		34	1	129	155
Weitzer, Ronald	1999	Citizens' perceptions of police misconduct: Race and neighborhood context	Justice Quarterly		16	4	819	846
Welker, David	2010	Police Programs, Canines, and Contingency Theory: An Explanation of Canine Numbers Among Large Police Departments		Southern Illinois University Carbondale				
Williams, Keith L.	2015	Beyond the Rhetoric: Factors Influencing the Implementation of Strategic Plans by American Police Agencies		American University				
Willits, Dale W.	2014	The organisational structure of police departments and assaults on police officers	International Journal of Police Science and Management		16	2	140	154
Willits, Dale W.; Nowacki, Jeffrey S.	2014	Police organisation and deadly force: An examination of variation across large and small cities	Policing and Society		24	1	63	80
Wilson, Jeremy M.	2003	Measurement and association in the structure of municipal police organizations	Policing		26	2	276	297
Wilson, Jeremy M.	2005	Determinants of Community Policing: An Open Systems Model of Implementation	Working Paper	United States Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice		NCJ 211975		
Wilson, Jeremy M.	2004	A measurement model approach to estimating community policing implementation	Justice Research and Policy		6	2	1	24
Wilson, Jeremy M.	2002	Implementation of Community Policing in Large Municipal Police Organizations		Ohio State University				
Wilson, Jeremy M.; Heinonen, Justin A.	2011	Advancing a police science: Implications from a national survey of police staffing	Police Quarterly		14	3	277	297
Wilson, Steve	2005	Determining the Correlates of Police Victimization: An Analysis of Social Disorganization and Organizational Level Factors on Injurious Assaults		University of Nebraska				
Wilson, Steve; Buckler, Kevin	2010	The debate over police reform: Examining minority support for citizen oversight and resistance by police unions	American Journal of Criminal Justice		35	4	184	197
Wilson, Steve; Zhao, Jihong	2008	Determining the correlates of police victimization: An analysis of organizational level factors on injurious assaults	Journal of Criminal Justice		36	5	461	468
Worrall, John L.	1998	Administrative determinants of civil liability lawsuits against municipal police departments: An exploratory analysis	Crime and Delinquency		44	2	295	313
Worrall, John L.	2001	Addicted to the drug war: The role of civil asset forfeiture as a budgetary necessity in contemporary law enforcement	Journal of Criminal Justice		29		171	187
Worrall, John L.; Kovandzic, Tomislav V.	2008	Is policing for profit? Answers from asset forfeiture	Criminology and Public Policy		7	2	219	244
Xie, Min; Lauritsen, Janet L.	2012	Racial context and crime reporting: A test of Black's stratification hypothesis	Journal of Quantitative Criminology		28	2	265	293
Zawitz, Marianne W.; Klaus, Patsy A.; Bachman, Ronet; Langan, Patrick; Harlow, Carol W.	1994	Violence Between Intimates		Bureau of Justice Statistics		NCJ 149259		
Zhao, Jihong; Lovrich, Nicholas	1997	Collective bargaining and the police: The consequences for supplemental compensation policies in large agencies	Policing		20	3	508	518
Zhao, Jihong; Ren, Ling; Lovrich, Nicholas P.	2012	Political culture versus socioeconomic approaches to predicting police strength in U.S. police agencies: Results of a longitudinal study, 1993 to 2003	Crime and Delinquency		58	2	167	195

Proposed respondents, other interested parties, and members of the public are invited to file comments, not to exceed five (5) pages in length, inclusive of attachments, on any public interest issues raised by the complaint or section 210.8(b) filing. Comments should address whether issuance of the relief specifically requested by the complainant in this investigation would affect the public health and welfare in the United States, competitive conditions in the United States economy, the production of like or directly competitive articles in the United States, or United States consumers.

In particular, the Commission is interested in comments that:

(i) Explain how the articles potentially subject to the requested remedial orders are used in the United States;

(ii) identify any public health, safety, or welfare concerns in the United States relating to the requested remedial orders;

(iii) identify like or directly competitive articles that complainant, its licensees, or third parties make in the United States which could replace the subject articles if they were to be excluded;

(iv) indicate whether complainant, complainant's licensees, and/or third party suppliers have the capacity to replace the volume of articles potentially subject to the requested exclusion order and/or a cease and desist order within a commercially reasonable time; and

(v) explain how the requested remedial orders would impact United States consumers.

Written submissions must be filed no later than by close of business, eight calendar days after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register.** There will be further opportunities for comment on the public interest after the issuance of any final initial determination in this investigation.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document electronically on or before the deadlines stated above and submit 8 true paper copies to the Office of the Secretary by noon the next day pursuant to section 210.4(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.4(f)). Submissions should refer to the docket number (''Docket No. 3117'') in a prominent place on the cover page and/or the first page. (*See* Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures, Electronic Filing Procedures [4]). Persons with questions regarding filing should contact the Secretary (202–205–2000).

Any person desiring to submit a document to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary to the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. *See* 19 CFR 201.6. Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is properly sought will be treated accordingly. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary and on EDIS [5].

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and of sections 201.10 and 210.8(c) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 201.10, 210.8(c)).

By order of the Commission.

Dated: February 2, 2016.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2016–02296 Filed 2–5–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1121–0240]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed eCollection eComments Requested; Reinstatement, With Change, of a Previously Approved Collection for Which Approval Has Expired: 2016 Law Enforcement Administrative and Management Statistics (LEMAS) Survey

AGENCY: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Department of Justice.

ACTION: 60-Day notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics, will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for 60 days until April 8, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have additional comments especially on the estimated public burden or associated response time, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact Shelley S. Hyland, Statistician, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 810 Seventh Street NW., Washington, DC 20531 (email: *Shelley.Hyland@usdoj.gov;* telephone: 202–616–1706).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

—Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, including whether the information will have practical utility;

—Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

—Evaluate whether and if so how the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected can be enhanced; and

—Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.,* permitting electronic submission of responses.

Overview of this information collection:

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Reinstatement of the Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) Survey, with changes, a previously approved collection for which approval has expired.

(2) *The Title of the Form/Collection:* 2016 Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics Survey.

(3) *The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:* The form number for the questionnaire is CJ–44. The applicable component within the Department of Justice is the Bureau of Justice Statistics, in the Office of Justice Programs.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Respondents will be general purpose state, county and local law enforcement agencies (LEAs), including local and county police departments,

[4] Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures: *http://www.usitc.gov/secretary/fed_reg_notices/rules/handbook_on_electronic_filing.pdf.*

[5] Electronic Document Information System (EDIS): *http://edis.usitc.gov.*

sheriff's offices, and primary state law enforcement agencies. Since 1987, BJS has collected information about the personnel, policies, and practices of law enforcement agencies via the Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) survey. This core survey, which has been administered every 4 to 6 years, has been used to produce nationally representative estimates on the demographic characteristics of sworn personnel, hiring practices, operations, equipment, technology, and agency policies and procedures. BJS plans to publish this information in reports and reference it when responding to queries from the U.S. Congress, Executive Office of the President, the U.S. Supreme Court, state officials, international organizations, researchers, students, the media, and others interested in criminal justices statistics.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* An agency-level survey will be sent to approximately 3,497 LEA respondents. The expected burden placed on these respondents is about 2.65 hours per respondent. The burden estimate is based on data from prior administrations of the LEMAS.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* There is an estimated 9,269 total burden hours associated with this collection.

If additional information is required contact: Jerri Murray, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, Policy and Planning Staff, Two Constitution Square, 145 N Street NE., 3E.405B, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: February 3, 2016.

Jerri Murray,

Department Clearance Officer for PRA, U.S. Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 2016–02378 Filed 2–5–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–18–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1110–0026]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed eCollection eComments Requested; Extension With Change, of a Previously Approved Collection Federal Firearms Licensee (FFL) Enrollment/National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) E-Check Enrollment Form, Federal Firearms Licensee (FFL) Officer/Employee Acknowledgement of Responsibilities Under the NICS Form

AGENCY: Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

ACTION: 60-day notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics, will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for 60 days until April 8, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have additional comments especially on the estimated public burden or associated response time, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact Brandon S. Seifert, Management and Program Analyst, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Division, NICS section, Module A–3, 1000 Custer Hollow Road, Clarksburg, West Virginia 26306, or facsimile at (304) 625–7540.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

—Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, including whether the information will have practical utility;

—Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

—Evaluate whether and if so how the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected can be enhanced; and

—Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.,* permitting electronic submission of responses.

Overview of this information collection:

1. *Type of Information Collection:* Extension with change of a currently approved collection.

2. *The Title of the Form/Collection:* Federal Firearms Licensee (FFL) Enrollment/National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) E-Check Enrollment Form, Federal Firearms Licensee (FFL) Officer/Employee Acknowledgment of Responsibilities under the NICS form.

3. *The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:* The form is unnumbered

4. *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:*

Primary: Any Federal Firearms Licensee (FFL) or State Point of Contact (POC) requesting access to conduct National Instant Criminal Background Check Systems (NICS) checks telephonically or by the Internet through the NICS E-Check.

Abstract: The Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act of 1993 required the United States Attorney General to establish a national instant criminal background check system that any FFL may contact, by telephone or by other electronic means, for information to be supplied immediately, on whether receipt of a firearm to a prospective purchaser would violate state or federal law. Information pertaining to licensees who may contact the NICS is being collected to manage and control access to the NICS and to the NICS E-Check, to ensure appropriate resources are available to support the NICS and also to ensure the privacy and security of NICS information.

5. *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* The completion of the Federal Firearms Licensee (FFL) Enrollment/National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) E-Check Enrollment Form is estimated that there are 406 respondents each month, 4,872 (406×12) annual responses, and that each response takes approximately two minutes, time to complete the form is estimated to be three minutes; and the time to assemble, mail, or fax the form

Geographical evidence, burial context and practices, and museum records support affiliation with and the Southern Ute Indian Tribe of the Southern Ute Indian Reservation and Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation, Colorado, New Mexico and Utah.

Determinations Made by History Colorado

Officials of the History Colorado have determined that:

• Pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001(3)(B), the two cultural items described above are reasonably believed to have been placed with or near individual human remains at the time of death or later as part of the death rite or ceremony and are believed, by a preponderance of the evidence, to have been removed from a specific burial site of a Native American individual.

• Pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001(2), there is a relationship of shared group identity that can be reasonably traced between the unassociated funerary objects and the Southern Ute Indian Tribe of the Southern Ute Indian Reservation and the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation, Colorado, New Mexico and Utah.

Additional Requestors and Disposition

Lineal descendants or representatives of any Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization not identified in this notice that wish to claim these cultural items should submit a written request with information in support of the claim to Sheila Goff, 1200 Broadway, Denver, CO 80203, telephone (303) 866–4531, email *sheila.goff@state.co.us,* by May 13, 2016. After that date, if no additional claimants have come forward, transfer of control of the unassociated funerary objects to the Southern Ute Indian Tribe of the Southern Ute Indian Reservation and the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation, Colorado, New Mexico and Utah may proceed.

History Colorado is responsible for notifying the Southern Ute Indian Tribe of the Southern Ute Indian Reservation, Colorado; the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah & Ouray Reservation, Utah and the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation, Colorado, New Mexico and Utah that this notice has been published.

Dated: March 21, 2016.

Melanie O'Brien,

Manager, National NAGPRA Program.

[FR Doc. 2016–08452 Filed 4–12–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1121–0240]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed eCollection eComments Requested; Reinstatement, With Change, of a Previously Approved Collection for Which Approval Has Expired: 2016 Law Enforcement Administrative and Management Statistics (LEMAS) Survey

AGENCY: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Department of Justice.

ACTION: 30-Day notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics, will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. This proposed information collection was previously published in the **Federal Register** at Volume 81 *FR* 6539, February 8, 2016, allowing for a 60 day comment period.

DATES: Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for an additional 30 days until May 13, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have additional comments especially on the estimated public burden or associated response time, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact Shelley S. Hyland, Statistician, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 810 Seventh Street NW., Washington, DC 20531 (email: *Shelley.Hyland@usdoj.gov;* telephone: 202–616–1706). Written comments and/or suggestions can also be directed to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention Department of Justice Desk Officer, Washington, DC 20503 or sent to *OIRA_submissions@omb.eop.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

—Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, including whether the information will have practical utility;

—Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

—Evaluate whether and if so how the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected can be enhanced; and

—Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.,* permitting electronic submission of responses.

Overview of This Information Collection

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Reinstatement, with change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired: 2016 Law Enforcement Administrative and Management Statistics (LEMAS) survey.

(2) *The Title of the Form/Collection:* 2016 Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics Survey.

(3) *The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:* The form number for the questionnaire is CJ–44. The applicable component within the Department of Justice is the Bureau of Justice Statistics, in the Office of Justice Programs.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Respondents will be general purpose state, county and local law enforcement agencies (LEAs), including local and county police departments, sheriff's offices, and primary state law enforcement agencies. Since 1987, BJS has collected information about the personnel, policies, and practices of law enforcement agencies via the Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) survey. This core survey, which has been administered every 4 to 6 years, has been used to produce nationally representative estimates on the demographic characteristics of sworn personnel, hiring practices, operations, equipment, technology, and agency policies and procedures. BJS plans to publish this information in reports and reference it when responding to queries from the U.S. Congress, Executive Office of the President, the U.S. Supreme Court, state officials, international organizations, researchers, students, the media, and others interested in criminal justices statistics.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* An agency-level survey will be

sent to approximately 3,499 LEA respondents. The expected burden placed on these respondents is about 3 hours per respondent. The burden estimate is based on data from prior administrations of the LEMAS.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* There is an estimated 10,497 total burden hours associated with this collection.

If additional information is required contact: Jerri Murray, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, Policy and Planning Staff, Two Constitution Square, 145 N Street NE., 3E.405B, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: April 8, 2016.

Jerri Murray,

Department Clearance Officer for PRA, U.S. Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 2016–08448 Filed 4–12–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–18–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mine Safety and Health Administration

Petitions for Modification of Application of Existing Mandatory Safety Standards

AGENCY: Mine Safety and Health Administration, Labor.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Section 101(c) of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 and Title 30 of the Code of Federal Regulations Part 44 govern the application, processing, and disposition of petitions for modification. This notice is a summary of petitions for modification submitted to the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) by the parties listed below.

DATES: All comments on the petitions must be received by the MSHA's Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances on or before May 13, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may submit your comments, identified by ''docket number'' on the subject line, by any of the following methods:

1. *Electronic Mail: zzMSHA-comments@dol.gov.* Include the docket number of the petition in the subject line of the message.

2. *Facsimile:* 202–693–9441.

3. *Regular Mail or Hand Delivery:* MSHA, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances, 201 12th Street South, Suite 4E401, Arlington, Virginia 22202–5452, Attention: Sheila McConnell, Director, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances. Persons delivering documents are required to check in at the receptionist's desk in Suite 4E401. Individuals may inspect copies of the petitions and comments during normal business hours at the address listed above.

MSHA will consider only comments postmarked by the U.S. Postal Service or proof of delivery from another delivery service such as UPS or Federal Express on or before the deadline for comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Barbara Barron, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances at 202–693–9447 (Voice), *barron.barbara@dol.gov* (Email), or 202–693–9441 (Facsimile). [These are not toll-free numbers.]

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

Section 101(c) of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 (Mine Act) allows the mine operator or representative of miners to file a petition to modify the application of any mandatory safety standard to a coal or other mine if the Secretary of Labor determines that:

1. An alternative method of achieving the result of such standard exists which will at all times guarantee no less than the same measure of protection afforded the miners of such mine by such standard; or

2. That the application of such standard to such mine will result in a diminution of safety to the miners in such mine.

In addition, the regulations at 30 CFR 44.10 and 44.11 establish the requirements and procedures for filing petitions for modification.

II. Petitions for Modification

Docket Number: M–2016–008–C.

Petitioner: Rosebud Mining Company, 301 Market Street, Kittanning, Pennsylvania 16201.

Mine: Barrett Mine, MSHA I.D. No. 36–09342, located in Indiana County, Pennsylvania.

Regulation Affected: 30 CFR 75.503 (Permissible electric face equipment; maintenance) and 18.35(a)(5)(i) (Portable (trailing) cables and cords).

Modification Request: The petitioner requests a modification of the existing standard to permit the use of 480-volt trailing cables with a maximum length of 950 feet when No. 4 American Wire Gauge (AWG) cable is used on roof bolters. The petitioner states that:

(1) The trailing cables for the 480-volt bolters will not be smaller than No. 4 AWG cable.

(2) All circuit breakers used to protect the No. 4 AWG trailing cable exceeding 700 feet in length will have instantaneous trip units calibrated to trip at 500 amperes. The trip setting of these circuit breakers will be sealed to ensure that the settings on these breakers cannot be changed, and these circuit breakers will have permanent, legible labels. Each label will identify the circuit breaker as being suitable for protecting the cables as listed above.

(3) Replacement circuit breakers and/or instantaneous trip units used to protect the No. 4 AWG trailing cable will be calibrated to trip at 500 amperes and they will be sealed.

(4) All components that provide short-circuit protection will have a sufficient interruption rating in accordance with the maximum calculated fault currents available.

(5) During each production day, the trailing cables and the circuit breakers will be examined in accordance with all 30 CFR provisions.

(6) Permanent warning labels will be installed and maintained on the load center identifying the location of each short-circuit protection device. These labels will warn miners not to change or alter the settings of these devices.

(7) If the affected trailing cables are damaged in any way during the shift, the cable will be de-energized and repairs made.

(8) The alternative method will not be implemented until all miners who have been designated to operate the bolters, or any other person designated to examine the trailing cables or trip settings on the circuit breakers, have received the proper training as to the performance of their duties.

(9) Within 60 days after the proposed decision and order becomes final, the petitioner will submit proposed revisions for their approved 30 CFR part 48 training plans to the District Manager. These revisions will specify task training for miners designated to examine the trailing cables for safe operating condition and verify that the short-circuit settings of the circuit-interrupting devices that protect the affected trailing cables do not exceed the settings specified previously in this petition. The training will include the following elements:

(a) The hazards of setting short-circuit interrupting device(s) too high to adequately protect the trailing cables.

(b) How to verify that the circuit interrupting device(s) protecting the trailing cable(s) are properly set and maintained.

(c) Mining methods and operating procedures that will protect the trailing cables against damage.

(d) Proper procedures for examining the trailing cables to ensure that the

U. S. Department of Justice

Office of Justice Programs

Bureau of Justice Statistics

Washington, D.C. 20531

«Date»

«Salutation» «ContactFirstName» «ContactLastName»
«Agency Name»
«ContactAddress1» «ContactAddress2»
«ContactCity», «ContactState» «ContactZip»

Dear «Salutation» «ContactLastName»:

On behalf of the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), Research Triangle Institute (RTI) International is conducting the Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) survey. This letter is to inform you that your agency is invited to participate in this survey. Since 1987, BJS has successfully implemented nine waves of LEMAS surveys. The 2016 LEMAS survey captures information about resources, functions, personnel, salaries, training, information systems, policies, and use of technology. It will include items that are relevant to all law enforcement agencies – regardless of agency size. The reliability of the study's results directly depends on the participation rate among the selected agencies; your agency cannot be replaced.

BJS will use the data collected in this survey only for research and statistical purposes, as described in Title 42, USC §3735 and 3789g (enclosed). The data will assist Federal, State, and local officials in their efforts to assess the impact of past funding programs, as well as help them assess the current and future needs of law enforcement agencies. Findings from the survey will be available on the BJS website at http://www.bjs.gov/.

I understand that you receive a number of data requests throughout the year; however, I would greatly appreciate it if you would please take the time to complete our survey. Your responses will allow us to examine trends in law enforcement agencies over time.

You may access the survey at <<URL>>, using your survey access code: <<access code>>. You may also download a copy of the survey from the website. Downloading the survey will also facilitate sharing it electronically with others at your agency who might be asked to provide some of the requested information. **Please complete this survey by [DATE].**

If you have any general comments about this data collection, please contact Shelley Hyland, BJS Program Manager, at <<phone>> or <<e-mail>>. If you have questions about the LEMAS survey, need to change the point of contact at your agency, or need to update your contact information (including e-mail address), please contact Michael Keating, the RTI data collection task leader, via phone or e-mail at (800) ###-#### or xxxxxx@rti.org.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to our continued work together.

Sincerely,

Jeri M. Mulrow
Acting Director
Bureau of Justice Statistics

Enclosures: Confidentiality Assurances, LEMAS flyer, PERF letter of support, POC update form, 2016 LEMAS instrument

Front Side

Title Page

The 2016 Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) Core Survey

Conducted by
Bureau of Justice Statistics, US Department of Justice
RTI International

How can I learn more about the LEMAS Survey?

Any questions about the LEMAS Survey can be directed to:

Travis Taniguchi, PhD
Research Criminologist
RTI International
3040 E Cornwallis Blvd, RTP, NC 27709
taniguchi@rti.org
919-248-8501

For information about BJS's Law Enforcement Core Statistics Program, contact:

Shelley Hyland, PhD
Statistician
Bureau of Justice Statistics
810 7th Street NW, Washington, DC 20531
Shelley.Hyland@usdoj.gov
202-616-1706

The 2016 LEMAS Core Survey Schedule

Fall 2016

- BJS will send out a letter inviting Law Enforcement Agency heads to participate in the LEMAS core survey
- Heads of agencies invited to participate in the LEMAS core survey will be asked to designate a point of contact who will complete the survey
- RTI will provide the point of contact with a website to access the survey and login instructions or a paper survey if requested

Winter-Spring 2016-2017

- Survey data will be collected and verified

Summer-Fall 2017

- Results will be processed and analyzed
- BJS and RTI will draft a report on survey findings

Winter 2017-2018

- BJS will publish preliminary survey findings

Backside

What is LEMAS?

The LEMAS is a survey conducted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics approximately every four years. It is presently the most systematic and comprehensive source of national data on law enforcement. Approximately 3,500 agencies are randomly selected to participate in this survey.

What information do the LEMAS surveys collect?

The LEMAS core collects important information on personnel, expenditures and pay, operations, equipment, computers and information systems, and policies and procedures. This information is used to create national estimates for all law enforcement agencies in the U.S. The LEMAS supplements will collect in-depth information on a specific topical area. The first supplement focuses on body-worn camera usage.

Why is LEMAS important?

LEMAS is the only survey of law enforcement agencies that gathers nationally representative information about agencies on key factors like personnel, policies, and agency activities and trends over time. LEMAS data are widely used by researchers, policy makers and law enforcement agencies to understand law enforcement at local, county, state and national levels.

Why have I received multiple LEMAS surveys recently?

The LEMAS is moving to a new core + topical supplement model. Topical supplements will cover emerging issues in law enforcement and will change over time. You have just completed the first LEMAS topical supplement which covered body-worn camera usage. You may also be invited to participate in the 2016 LEMAS core this fall. In 2017, you may be invited to participate in the 2017 Body-Worn Camera Supplement as we will be using this survey to assess changes in attitudes towards and usage of BWCs over time.

Do I need to complete the LEMAS if I recently completed a different LEMAS survey?

Yes! The LEMAS core and supplements are critically important to understanding characteristics, policies and procedures of law enforcement agencies across the country. Each agency that was selected to participate is crucial – each agency's responses are important. We need responses from all selected agencies for each survey sent to ensure that the results are representative of law enforcement agencies across the U.S.

What will I be asked to do?

The chief executive will be asked to designate a staff member to complete the survey (i.e., point of contact). The agency point of contact will be provided information on how to access the online survey (or request a paper survey if desired). The website will be secure and will allow respondents to save and close the survey at any time. The survey can be reopened later to enter or edit responses until the final responses are submitted. Agencies will also be provided a paper copy of the survey if they prefer to submit the survey by mail, email or fax.

Bureau of Justice Statistics (Bureau) – Confidentiality Assurances

42 USC § 3735 - Use of Data

Data collected by the Bureau 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 private person or public agency other than statistical or research purposes.

42 USC § 3789g - Confidentiality of information

(a) Research or statistical information; immunity from process; prohibition against admission as evidence or use in any proceedings

No officer or employee of the Federal Government and no recipient of assistance under the provisions of this chapter shall use or reveal any research or statistical information furnished under this chapter by any person and identifiable to any specific private person for any purpose other than the purpose for which it was obtained in accordance with this chapter. Such information and copies thereof shall be immune from legal process, and shall not, without the consent of the person furnishing such information, be admitted as evidence or used for any purpose in any action, suit, or other judicial, legislative, or administrative proceedings.

(b) Criminal history information; disposition and arrest data; procedures for collection, storage, dissemination, and current status; security and privacy; availability for law enforcement, criminal justice, and other lawful purposes; automated systems: review, challenge, and correction of information

All criminal history information collected, stored, or disseminated through support under this chapter shall contain, to the maximum extent feasible, disposition as well as arrest data where arrest data is included therein.
The collection, storage, and dissemination of such information shall take place under procedures reasonably designed to insure that all such information is kept current therein; the Office of Justice Programs shall assure that the security and privacy of all information is adequately provided for and that information shall only be used for law enforcement and criminal justice and other lawful purposes. In addition, an individual who believes that criminal history information concerning him contained in an automated system is inaccurate, incomplete, or maintained in violation of this chapter, shall, upon satisfactory verification of his identity, be entitled to review such information and to obtain a copy of it for the purpose of challenge or correction.

(c) Criminal intelligence systems and information; prohibition against violation of privacy and constitutional rights of individuals

All criminal intelligence systems operating through support under this chapter shall collect, maintain, and disseminate criminal intelligence information in conformance with policy standards which are prescribed by the Office of Justice Programs and which are written to assure that the funding and operation of these systems furthers the purpose of this chapter and to assure that such systems are not utilized in violation of the privacy and constitutional rights of individuals.

(d) Violations; fine as additional penalty

Any person violating the provisions of this section, or of any rule, regulation, or order issued there under, shall be fined not to exceed $10,000, in addition to any other penalty imposed by law.

POLICE EXECUTIVE RESEARCH FORUM

(DATE)

(NAME)
(AGENCY NAME)
(ADDRESS)
(CITY, STATE, ZIP)

Dear (NAME):

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), working with RTI International and the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF), is fielding the next iteration of the Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) survey in 2016. Conducted periodically since 1987, LEMAS collects data from more than 3,000 general-purpose state and local law enforcement agencies.

You probably are familiar with LEMAS. This survey draws on a nationally representative sample to collect data on agency responsibilities, budgets, staffing levels, policies, equipment, and other information. The results are used to identify trends in police training, hiring standards (such as educational requirements and salary levels for new officers), involvement in various types of task forces and community policing activities, use of technologies (such as body-worn cameras, various less-lethal weapons, and computer equipment), policies on use of force and other matters, and many other measures.

LEMAS is the only nationally representative source of this kind of information. With the LEMAS results, your agency will be able to learn how agencies of similar size and characteristics to your own conduct business, and where your agency stands in a national framework. In addition to providing valuable information to law enforcement agencies, LEMAS findings are of interest to researchers and the general public.

I write to strongly encourage you to complete the survey when it arrives. Your agency has been specifically chosen as part of a national sample to obtain a representative picture of law enforcement in the U.S. All information that you share will remain confidential; study reports will only present findings at a national level and no information will be publicly linked to your agency by name. The receipt of information from each agency will greatly improve the quality of data and analysis of results. We appreciate your agency taking the time and effort required to complete the LEMAS. Any questions about the LEMAS can be directed to (BJS/RTI contacts TBD).

This is a critical survey to help understand trends in policing, and PERF is pleased to have the opportunity to work with BJS and RTI on this important project.

Sincerely,

Chuck Wexler

1120 Connecticut Avenue, NW Suite 930 Washington, DC 20036
Tel: 202.466.7820 Fax: 202.466.7826 TTY: 202.466.2670 www.PoliceForum.org perf@policeforum.org

[CASE ID]

LEMAS Point of Contact Form

Please confirm and update point of contact information for your agency. If you have any questions, please contact RTI International by emailing us at [email] or calling [toll free number].

Law Enforcement Agency: [LEA Name]

Agency head: [LEA Agency Head]

LEMAS Point of Contact name: [LEMAS POC Name]

Contact Information for LEMAS Point of Contact:

Address: [POC address]
City: [POC city]
State: [POC state]
Zip: [POC zip code]
Telephone: [POC phone]
Email: [POC email]

Is this LEMAS point of contact correct?

- o Yes – THANK YOU! THIS FORM IS COMPLETE.
- o No – PLEASE UPDATE YOUR LEMAS POINT OF CONTACT INFORMATION BELOW.

New LEMAS Point of Contact name: _____

Updated Contact Information for LEMAS Point of Contact:

Address: _____
City: _____
State: _____
Zip: _____
Telephone: _____
Email: _____

Would the new Point of Contact prefer to complete the LEMAS survey on the web or via a paper questionnaire?

- o Web
- o Paper

U. S. Department of Justice

Office of Justice Programs

Bureau of Justice Statistics

Washington, D.C. 20531

«Date»
«Salutation» «ContactFirstName» «ContactLastName»
«Agency Name»
«ContactAddress1» «ContactAddress2»
«ContactCity», «ContactState» «ContactZip»

<<Email subject line: Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics Survey Thank You!>>

Dear «Salutation» «ContactLastName»:

On behalf of the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) and Research Triangle Institute (RTI) International, I would like to thank you for your participation in the 2016 Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) survey. I truly appreciate your support in completing this survey. Your participation is vital to the success of the national collection.

This <<letter/email>> confirms that we have received your survey and are currently processing the data. RTI will contact you if we have any questions about the answers your agency has submitted. We anticipate that data collection will be completed by <<date>>. Once the data have been processed, BJS and RTI will send participating agencies a brief report with key findings based on the jurisdiction size (i.e., number of full-time sworn personnel or population size) that your agency serves.

Your agency may be selected to take part in a different LEMAS survey in the future, and I hope that your agency will continue to participate. In the meantime, if you have any general comments or questions, please contact Shelley Hyland, BJS Program Manager, at <<phone>> or <<e-mail>>. If you have questions about the LEMAS survey, need to change the point of contact at your agency, or need to update your contact information (including e-mail address), please contact Michael Keating, the RTI data collection task leader, via phone or e-mail at (800) ###-#### or xxxxxx@rti.org.

Sincerely,

Shelley S. Hyland, Ph.D.
Program Manager
Bureau of Justice Statistics

SUBJECT: Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics Survey

Dear «Salutation» «ContactLastName»:

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) recently e-mailed you a link to a web survey seeking information about your law enforcement agency (LEA) for the Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) Survey. If you have already completed the survey, please accept our sincere thanks.

If you have not completed your survey we ask you to **complete the survey by [DATE]**. Your responses are very important. They allow other law enforcement agencies, and state and local policy makers understand administrative aspects of your agency and other agencies like yours. 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.

Please complete the survey by using the following link: «URL» and entering your survey access code «PIN».

If you would prefer to complete the survey on paper, you may download and print a paper version upon entering your survey access code on the LEMAS survey website. You may also request a paper survey by emailing RTI International at <<email address>> or calling <<project phone number>>. Upon receipt of your agency's request, you will receive a paper version and a postage paid return envelope within two business days.

If you have any general comments about this data collection, please contact Shelley Hyland, BJS Program Manager, at <<phone>> or <<e-mail>>. If you have questions about the LEMAS survey, have difficulty accessing the website, or would like a paper copy of the survey, please contact me via phone or e-mail at **(###) ###-####** or xxxxxx@rti.org.

On behalf of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, we are grateful for your participation. Thank you for your time and attention.

Michael Keating
RTI International
Data Collection Task Leader

U. S. Department of Justice

Office of Justice Programs

Bureau of Justice Statistics

Washington, D.C. 20531

«Date»
«Salutation» «ContactFirstName» «ContactLastName»
«Agency Name»
«ContactAddress1» «ContactAddress2»
«ContactCity», «ContactState» «ContactZip»

Dear «Salutation» «ContactLastName»:

Your law enforcement agency (LEA) was selected to participate in the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) survey. About a month ago, a reminder to complete the survey was e-mailed to you at «email» by <<date>>. Your LEA is among a randomly selected group of agencies chosen to participate in this data collection; your LEA cannot be replace with another.

I recognize that you may not have received the previous email message or that you may not have responded because of time constraints. I appreciate that your time is limited; however, the reliability of the study directly depends on the participation of surveyed agencies. The survey includes items that are relevant to all agencies and your responses are essential for the federal government and state and local policy makers to understand the current state of policing.

You may access the survey by using the following link: «URL» and entering your survey access code «PIN».

Alternatively, if you prefer to submit your data by mail, enclosed in this packet you will find a paper version of the survey and a business reply envelope to facilitate the return of your completed form.

Please submit your questionnaire by «date». If you have any general comments about this data collection, please contact Shelley Hyland, BJS Program Manager, at <<phone>> or <<e-mail>>. If you have questions about the LEMAS survey or have difficulty accessing the website, please contact Michael Keating, the data collection task leader at RTI International, our data collection agent for this study. Mr. Keating can be reached via phone or e-mail at (800) ###-#### or xxxxxx@rti.org.

Sincerely,

Jeri M. Mulrow
Acting Director
Bureau of Justice Statistics

Enclosures: 2016 LEMAS Core Survey; Business reply envelope

SUBJECT: Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics Survey|

Dear «Salutation» «ContactLastName»:

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) recently sent a survey packet and e-mailed a link to the Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) survey to your law enforcement agency (LEA). Your LEA is among a select group of agencies asked to participate in this data collection.

I appreciate that your time is limited, but your participation is critical. The survey includes items that are relevant to all types of LEAs, regardless of size, and will help other law enforcement agencies, and state and local policy makers understand the current state of policing in the United States.

Please complete the survey by using the following link: «URL» and entering your survey access code «PIN».

If you have any general comments about this data collection, please contact Shelley Hyland, BJS Program Manager, at <<phone>> or <<e-mail>>. If you would like another paper version of the survey, have questions about the operation of the web survey, or have difficulty accessing the website, please contact me via phone or e-mail at <<phone>> or <<e-mail>>. I will be happy to assist you with any questions you might have.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Michael Keating
RTI International
Data Collection Task Leader

Sample Call Script for Nonresponse Telephone Calls

[IF CALL RINGS TO A GATEKEEPER]

Hello, this is <<INSERT NAME>> calling on behalf of the Bureau of Justice Statistics in the U.S. Department of Justice regarding the 2016 Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics survey. I am following up on a survey invitation that we sent addressed to <<POC NAME>>. May I speak with <<POC NAME>>?

[IF CALL RINGS TO POC]

Hello, this is <<INSERT NAME>> calling on behalf of the Bureau of Justice Statistics in the U.S. Department of Justice regarding the 2016 Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics survey. A few months ago, we sent you a letter and an email message inviting your agency to participate in the survey. We did not hear back from your agency and I wanted to follow up with you to confirm that you received the messages that we sent.

Have you received our communications?

[IF YES]

[IF QUESTIONS ABOUT THE SURVEY]

- The LEMAS survey is the central part of the Law Enforcement Core Statistics (LECS) Program.
- The survey captures information about the changing aspects of law enforcement organization, resources, functions, personnel, salaries, training, collective bargaining, information systems, policies, and use of technology.
- BJS will use the data collected through this survey only for research and statistical purposes.
- The survey will take approximately XX minutes to complete.

[OFFER ASSISTANCE TO COMPLETE]

Is there anything I can do to assist you in completing the survey? A paper version is available if you would prefer to submit the information by mail. Alternatively, I can complete the survey with you over the phone.

[IF PROMPTING AGENCY TO COMPLETE ONLY CRITICAL ITEMS]

BJS considers the following questions to be most critical: <<INSERT ITEMS>>. Would you be able to provide responses to just those questions?

[IF AGENCY SAYS THEY DO NOT INTEND TO RESPOND]

Thank you for letting us know. Would you be willing to share with us why you have chosen not to participate?

[IF NO]

Let me review the information we have on file for your agency. [REVIEW E-MAIL ADDRESS AND MAILING ADDRESS.]

Ask for the POC's preferred method of contact and offer to re-send the information.

SUBJECT: Reminder: Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics Program Survey

Dear «Salutation» «ContactLastName»:

On behalf of the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), the Research Triangle Institute (RTI) International is conducting the Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) survey. This letter is to remind you that your agency has been invited to participate in this survey. The 2016 LEMAS survey captures information about the functions, personnel, training, equipment, policies, and use of technology in your agency. It includes items that are relevant to all law enforcement agencies (LEAs) – regardless of agency size. *The reliability of the study depends on your participation; your agency cannot be replaced.*

Please complete the LEMAS survey by [Date]. I understand that you receive a number survey requests and I genuinely appreciate your attention to this survey.

You may access the survey online at <<URL>> and entering your survey access code: <<access code>>.

BJS will use the data collected in this survey only for research and statistical purposes, as described in Title 42, USC §3735 and 3789g (enclosed). There are no risks or benefits to your agency based on your decision to participate in this survey. However, your response is very important in order to help the federal government and state and local policy makers understand administrative aspects of your agency and others like yours.

If you prefer to submit your survey via paper, you may download a paper version of the survey from the website above. You may also request a paper survey by emailing RTI at <<email address>> or calling <<project phone number>>. Upon receipt of your agency's request you will receive a paper version of the survey within 2 business days. A postage-paid envelope will be provided to return your completed survey.

If you have any general comments about this data collection, please contact me at <<phone>> or <<e-mail>>. If you have questions about the LEMAS survey, need to change the point of contact at your agency, or need to update your contact information (including e-mail address), please contact Michael Keating, the RTI data collection task leader, via phone or e-mail at (800) ###-#### or xxxxxx@rti.org.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to our continued work together.

Sincerely,

Shelley Hyland, Ph.D.
Program Manager
Bureau of Justice Statistics

U. S. Department of Justice

Office of Justice Programs

Bureau of Justice Statistics

Washington, D.C. 20531

«Date»
«Salutation» «ContactFirstName» «ContactLastName»
«Agency Name»
«ContactAddress1» «ContactAddress2»
«ContactCity», «ContactState» «ContactZip»

Dear «Salutation» «ContactLastName»:

We have made several attempts to contact you over the past few months regarding your participation in the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) survey. Your law enforcement agency is among a select group of agencies asked to participate in this data collection.

We are writing today to notify you that there are only a few weeks remaining to complete the survey. We must receive your response by **[DATE]** or the data from your agency will be excluded from the study results. As a reminder, your participation is vital to the success of the survey. The 2016 LEMAS survey captures information about the changing aspects of law enforcement organization, resources, functions, personnel, salaries, training, collective bargaining, information systems, policies, and use of technology. It will include items that are relevant to all law enforcement agencies (LEAs) – regardless of agency size. The reliability of the study's results directly depends on the participation of the selected LEAs; **your LEA cannot be replaced**.

The online survey will remain open until «Date». **Please complete the questionnaire by using the following link: «URL» and entering your survey access code «PIN».**

Alternatively, if you prefer to submit your data by mail, enclosed in this packet you will find a paper version of the survey and a business reply envelope to facilitate the return of your completed form.

If you have any general comments about this data collection, please contact Shelley Hyland, BJS Program Manager, at <<phone>> or <<e-mail>>. If you have questions about the operation of the web survey, have difficulty accessing the website, or need instruction in completing the paper survey, please contact Michael Keating, the RTI data collection task leader, via phone or e-mail at (800) ###-#### or xxxxxx@rti.org. We will be happy to assist you with any questions you might have.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Jeri M. Mulrow
Acting Director
Bureau of Justice Statistics

Enclosures: 2016 LEMAS Survey; Business reply envelope