



Survey of Criminal History Information Systems, 1993

with Supplementary Information on Presale Firearm Checks, 1994

U.S. Department of Justice
Bureau of Justice Statistics

Jan Chaiken, Ph.D.
Director

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

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

Copyright © SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics 1994.

The U.S. Department of Justice authorizes any person to reproduce, publish, translate or otherwise use all or any part of the copyrighted material in this publication with the exception of those items indicating they are copyrighted or printed by any source other than SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics.

Contents

List of data tables iv

Foreword v

Glossary of terms vii

Introduction 1

Major findings 1

- Level of automation of master name indexes and criminal history files 1
- Level of disposition reporting 2
- Level of felony flagging 2
- Timeliness of trial court disposition data 2
- Participation in the Interstate Identification Index (III) 3
- Presale record checks on potential firearm purchasers 5

Additional findings 5

- Status of State criminal history files 5
- Completeness of data in State criminal history repository 7
- Disposition data 7
- Correctional data 8
- Timeliness of data in State criminal history repository 9
 - Arrests 9
 - Disposition data 9
 - Admission to correctional facilities 9
- Procedures to improve data quality 10
- Linking of arrests and dispositions 10
- Other data quality procedures 11
- Audits 11
- Presale criminal history record checks on potential firearms purchasers 12

Data tables 15

Methodology 74

List of data tables

1. Overview of State criminal history record systems, 1993 17
2. Number of subjects (individual offenders) in State criminal history file, 1989, 1992 and 1993 19
3. Number of final dispositions reported to State criminal history repository, 1989, 1992 and 1993 21
4. Automation of master name index and criminal history file, 1989, 1992 and 1993 23
5. Data required by State law to be submitted to State criminal history repository, 1993 25
6. Arrest records with fingerprints, 1989, 1992 and 1993 27
7. Notice to State criminal history repository of release of arrested persons without charging, 1989, 1992 and 1993 29
8. Completeness of prosecutor and court disposition reporting to State criminal history repository, 1989, 1992 and 1993 31
9. Polices/practices of State criminal history repository regarding modification of felony convictions, 1993 33
10. Fingerprinting of incarcerated offenders and linkage to records maintained by State criminal history repository, 1993 35
11. Probation and parole data in State criminal history repository, 1989, 1992 and 1993 37
12. Average number of days to process arrest data submitted to State criminal history repository and current status of backlog, 1993 39
13. Average number of days to process disposition data submitted to State criminal history repository and current status of backlog, 1993 41
14. Average number of days to process correctional admission data submitted to State criminal history repository and current status of backlog, 1993 43
15. Procedures employed by State criminal history repository to encourage complete arrest and disposition reporting, 1993 45
16. Methods used to link disposition information to arrest/charge information on criminal history record, 1993 47
17. Procedures followed when linkage cannot be made between court or correctional information and arrest information in the criminal history database, 1993 49
18. Strategies employed by State criminal history repository to ensure accuracy of data in criminal history database, 1993 51
19. Audit activities of State criminal history repository, 1989, 1992 and 1993 53
20. Data quality audits of State criminal history repository, 1993 55
- 21a. Procedures for presale criminal history record checks on potential firearm purchasers by States with “alternative” systems, 1993 57
- 21b. Data elements and databases used for presale criminal history record checks on potential firearm purchasers by States with “alternative” systems, 1993 59
22. Purchasers determined to be ineligible to purchase firearms in alternative States, 1993 61
23. Presale criminal history record checks by States subject to the Federal waiting period, February 28 - March 18, 1994 63
24. Cost of implementing and operating programs for presale criminal history record checks on potential firearm purchasers, 1993 65
25. Search methods used in conducting criminal history checks on potential firearm purchasers, 1993 67
26. U.S. Attorney General’s estimated goals/timetables for criminal history record sharing in a national instant background check system, 1994 69
27. Fingerprint cards and dispositions received by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1993 71
28. Criminal history records of Interstate Identification Index (III) participants maintained by the State criminal history repository and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1993 73

Electronic Editor's Note: An electronic version of this page is not available.

Glossary of terms

Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS): An automated system for searching fingerprint files and transmitting fingerprint images. AFIS computer equipment can scan fingerprint impressions (or utilize electronically transmitted fingerprint images) and automatically extract and digitize ridge details and other identifying characteristics in sufficient detail to enable the computer's searching and matching components to distinguish a single fingerprint from thousands or even millions of fingerprints previously scanned and stored in digital form in the computer's memory. The process eliminates the manual searching of fingerprint files and increases the speed and accuracy of ten-print processing (arrest fingerprint cards and noncriminal justice applicant fingerprint cards). AFIS equipment also can be used to identify individuals from "latent" (crime scene) fingerprints, even fragmentary prints of single fingers in some cases. Digital fingerprint images generated by AFIS equipment can be transmitted electronically to remote sites, eliminating the necessity of mailing fingerprint cards and providing remote access to AFIS fingerprint files.

Central Repository: The database (or the agency housing the database) which maintains criminal history records on all State offenders. Records include fingerprint files and files containing identification segments and notations of arrests and dispositions. The central repository is generally responsible for State-level identification of arrestees, and commonly serves as the central control terminal for contact with FBI record systems. Inquiries from local agencies for a national record check (for criminal justice or firearm check purposes) are routed to the FBI via the central repository. Although usually housed in the Department of Public Safety, the central repository may in some States be maintained by the State Police or some other State agency.

Criminal History Record Information (CHRI) or Criminal History Record Information System: A record (or the system maintaining such records) which includes individual identifiers and describes an individual's arrests and subsequent dispositions. Criminal history records do not include intelligence or investigative data or sociological data such as drug use history. CHRI systems usually include information on juveniles if they are tried as adults in criminal courts, but in most cases do not include data describing involvement of an individual in the juvenile justice system. All data in CHRI systems are usually backed by fingerprints of

the record subjects to provide positive identification. State legislation varies concerning disclosure of criminal history records for noncriminal justice purposes.

Data Quality: The extent to which criminal history records are complete, accurate and timely. The key concern in data quality is the completeness of records and the extent to which records include dispositions as well as arrest and charge information. Other concerns include the timeliness of data reporting to State and Federal repositories, the timeliness of data entry by the repositories and the readability of criminal history records.

Felony or Serious Misdemeanor: The category of offenses for which fingerprints and criminal history information are accepted by the FBI and entered in the Bureau's files, including the III system. Serious misdemeanor is defined to exclude certain minor offenses such as drunkenness or minor traffic offenses.

Interstate Identification Index (III): An "index-pointer" system for the interstate exchange of criminal history records. Under III, the FBI maintains an identification index to persons arrested for felonies or serious misdemeanors under State or Federal law. The index includes identification information (for example, name, date of birth, race, sex, etc.), FBI Numbers and State Identification Numbers (SIDs) from each State holding information about an individual. Search inquiries from criminal justice agencies nationwide are transmitted automatically via State telecommunications networks and the FBI's National Crime Information Center (NCIC) telecommunications lines. Searches are made on the basis of name and other identifiers. The process is entirely automated and takes approximately five seconds to complete. If a hit is made against the Index, record requests are made using SIDs or FBI Numbers and data are automatically retrieved from each repository holding records on the individual and forwarded to the requesting agency. At present, 25 States participate in III and the system operates for criminal justice inquiries only. Responses are provided from FBI files where the State originating the record is not a participant in III. Participation requires that the State maintain an automated criminal history record system capable of interfacing with the III system and capable of responding automatically to all interstate and Federal/State record requests. If extended to cover noncriminal justice inquiries, as planned, the III

system would eliminate the need for duplicate recordkeeping at the Federal and State level since it would no longer be necessary for the FBI to maintain records on State offenders. At present, III ensures higher quality criminal justice responses because, in most cases, reply data are supplied directly by the State from which the record originates.

Interstate Identification Index (III) Compact:

An interstate and Federal/State compact designed to facilitate the exchange of criminal history data among States for noncriminal justice purposes and to eliminate the need for the FBI to maintain duplicate data about State offenders. Under the compact, the operation of this system would be overseen by a policymaking council comprised of representatives of the Federal and State governments, as well as system users. The key concept underlying the compact is agreement among all States that all criminal history information (except sealed records) will be provided in response to noncriminal justice requests from another State — regardless of whether the information being requested would be permitted to be disseminated for a similar noncriminal justice purpose within the State holding the data. (That is, the law of the State which is *inquiring* about the data — rather than the law of the State which *originated* the data — governs its use.) In some cases, ratification of the compact will have the effect of amending existing State legislation governing interstate record dissemination, since most States do not currently authorize dissemination to all of the Federal agencies and out-of-state users authorized under the compact. At present, noncriminal justice inquiries are handled by the FBI from its files of voluntarily contributed State arrest and disposition records. This requires that the FBI maintain duplicates of State records and generally results in less complete records being provided, since FBI files of State records are not always complete due to reporting deficiencies. The FBI cannot abandon the duplicate records without a formal compact, however, since subsequent failure of a State to continue participation after cessation of the FBI's State offender files would jeopardize future noncriminal justice services to the Federal and State agencies that now rely on those files. The compact has been approved by the U.S. Attorney General and it is expected that it will be considered by the U.S. Congress in 1993 or 1994. After Congressional approval, the compact will be submitted for ratification by State legislatures.

Juvenile Justice Records: Official records of juvenile justice adjudications. Most adult criminal history record systems do not accept such records, which are frequently not supported by fingerprints and which usually are confidential under State law. Pursuant to an order dated July 15, 1992, the FBI

now accepts, and will disseminate, juvenile records on the same basis as adult records. States are not required to submit such records to the FBI, however.

Master Name Index (MNI): A subject identification index maintained by criminal record repositories that includes names and other identifiers for all persons about whom a record is held in the systems. As of 1992, almost all State MNIs were automated and included almost 100 percent of record subjects in the repositories. The automated name index is the key to rapidly identifying persons who have criminal records for such purposes as presale firearm checks, criminal investigations or bailsetting. MNIs may include “felony flags,” which indicate whether record subjects have arrests or convictions for felony offenses.

National Crime Information Center (NCIC): An automated database of criminal justice and justice-related records maintained by the FBI. The database includes the “hot files” of wanted and missing persons, stolen vehicles and identifiable stolen property, including firearms. Access to NCIC files is through central control terminal operators in each State that are connected to NCIC via dedicated telecommunications lines maintained by the FBI. Local agencies and officers on the beat can access the State control terminal via the State law enforcement network. Inquiries are based on name and other nonfingerprint identification. Most criminal history inquiries of the III system are made via the NCIC telecommunications system. NCIC data may be provided only for criminal justice and other specifically authorized purposes. For criminal history searches, this includes criminal justice employment, employment by Federally chartered or insured banking institutions or securities firms, and use by State and local governments for purposes of employment and licensing pursuant to a State statute approved by the U.S. Attorney General. Inquiries regarding presale firearm checks are included as criminal justice uses.

Positive Identification: Identification of an individual using biometric characteristics which are unique and not subject to alteration. Basically, in present usage, the term refers to identification by fingerprints but it may also include identification by retinal images, voiceprints or other techniques. Positive identification is to be distinguished from identification using name, sex, date of birth, etc., as shown on a document subject to alteration or counterfeit such as a birth certificate, social security card or drivers license. Because individuals can have identical or similar names, ages, etc., identifications based on such characteristics are not reliable.

Note to Readers: This is a report of the results of the Brady Act/Child Protection Act Survey of State Criminal History Information Systems. In some of the tables that follow, data from earlier data quality surveys is included. Caution should be used in drawing comparisons between the results of earlier surveys and the survey reported here. Since the last national data quality survey, the U.S. Justice Department has continued to implement assistance programs dedicated to improving criminal history records. As a result, States are continuing to focus new or additional resources on the condition of their records and in many cases, simply know more about their records today than in the past. A number of State repositories have also suffered fiscal cutbacks and have had to shift priorities away from certain criminal history information management tasks. For these and other reasons, comparisons between the data sets may not be as accurate a reflection of the Nation's criminal history records as the current data standing alone.

In addition, with the exception of Table 24, the survey responses are as of December 31, 1993. The effective date of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act was February 28, 1994; therefore, the responses reported here do not reflect changes in policies or practices that may have been implemented in 1994 pursuant to the Brady Act.

Introduction

This report is based upon the results from a survey conducted of the administrators of the State criminal history record repositories in March 1994. Fifty-six jurisdictions were surveyed, including the 50 States, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific (Republic of Palau) and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Responses were received from all 56 jurisdictions. Throughout this report, the 50 states will be referred to as "States"; American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific and the Virgin Islands will be referred to as "territories". "Nation" refers collectively to both the states and territories.

In addition, the Federal Bureau of Investigation provided information relating to the number of fingerprint cards and dispositions received by the FBI during 1993 and the number of criminal history records of the States participating in the Interstate Identification Index system that are maintained by the State criminal history repositories and the number of records maintained by the FBI for the States. Additional information was obtained from the Department of Justice relating to the timetables that were established by the Attorney General to comply with the mandates of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act. (See discussion in "Methodology" section, *infra*.)

Major Findings

Level of automation of master name indexes and criminal history files

Overview of State criminal history record systems, 1993 (Table 1):

- Forty-eight States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico have automated at least some records in either the criminal history record file or the master name index.
- Nineteen States (Alabama, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, Oregon, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Washington and Wyoming) and Puerto Rico have fully automated criminal history files and master name indexes.
- Forty-three States and Puerto Rico have fully automated master name indexes. The Trust Territory of the Pacific and the Virgin Islands do not maintain master name indexes. Guam does not currently maintain a central criminal records repository.
- Four states (Maine, New Mexico, Vermont and West Virginia) and four territories (American Samoa, Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific and the Virgin Islands) have no automated criminal history files.

- Four territories (American Samoa, Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific and the Virgin Islands) maintain totally manual criminal history information.

Automation of master name index and criminal history file, 1993 (Table 4):

- Of those States maintaining partially automated criminal history files, when an offender with a prior manual record is arrested, the prior manual record is subsequently automated in 22 States. In the District of Columbia, only the new information is automated. In Alabama and Kansas, the prior manual record is automated only if it complies with a cut-off date.

Level of disposition reporting

Overview of State criminal history record systems, 1993 (Table 1):

- Sixteen States (Alabama, Alaska, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont and Wyoming) representing approximately 19% of the Nation's population (based on 56 jurisdictions) and 20% of the Nation's criminal history records, report that 80% or more arrests within the past five years in the criminal history database have final dispositions recorded.
- A total of 21 States representing approximately 29% of the Nation's population and 32% of the Nation's criminal history records, report that 70% or more arrests within the past five years in the criminal history database have final dispositions recorded.

- A total of 26 States and Puerto Rico, representing approximately 41% of the Nation's population and 40% of the Nation's criminal history records, report that 60% or more arrests within the past five years in the criminal history database have final dispositions recorded.

- Overall, the figures are lower when arrests older than five years are considered. Ten States and Puerto Rico report that 80% or more arrests in the entire criminal history database have final dispositions recorded. Eighteen States and Puerto Rico report that 70% or more arrests in the entire criminal history database have final dispositions recorded. Twenty-two States and Puerto Rico report that 60% or more arrests in the entire criminal history database have final dispositions recorded.

Number of final dispositions reported to State criminal history repository, 1993 (Table 3):

Thirty-six states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico provided data on the number of final dispositions reported to their criminal history repositories indicating that over 4.85 million final dispositions were reported in 1993. The responding jurisdictions represent approximately 72% of the Nation's population.

Level of felony flagging

Overview of State criminal history record systems, 1993 (Table 1):

- Thirty-seven States and Puerto Rico currently flag some or all felony convictions in their criminal history databases.
- Twenty-four States collect sufficient data which would permit them to flag at least some previously unflagged felony convictions.

Timeliness of trial court disposition data

Average number of days to process disposition data submitted to State criminal history repository, 1993 (Table 13):

- The average number of days between the final court dispositions and receipt of that information by the State criminal history repositories is 39, ranging from less than one day in New York to 158 days in Indiana. The majority of jurisdictions receive the data between 20 and 60 days.
- The average number of days between receipt of final trial court dispositions and entry of disposition data into the criminal history databases is 41, ranging from 0 in States where dispositions are entered either directly by the courts or by tape to 540 in West Virginia. The majority of States enter the data in 10 days or less.
- Twenty-eight States and Puerto Rico indicate that they have backlogs in entering disposition data into the criminal history database.

Participation in the Interstate Identification Index (III)

State participation in the Interstate Identification Index (III), 1993 (Table 26):

- As of December 31, 1993, 29 States (Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois,

Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington and Wyoming) reported that they currently participate (contribute arrest information to be used in the Index) in the Interstate

Identification Index (III). The remaining 21 States, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific and the Virgin Islands did not participate. The 29 States include the 12 largest States in the Nation and as a whole account for 74% of the Nation's population.

Electronic Editor's Note: An electronic version of this page is not available.

Presale record checks on potential firearm purchasers

Procedures for presale criminal history record checks on potential firearm purchasers, 1993 (Table 21):

- Twenty-two jurisdictions (California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Tennessee, Utah, the Virgin Islands, Virginia and Wisconsin) conducted records checks of their State criminal history repository in connection with the sale of firearms prior to the effective date of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (Public Law 103-159, November 30, 1993; effective February 28, 1994). In addition, since Guam does not currently maintain a central criminal history records repository, checks conducted there consisted of fingerprints being submitted to the proper authority for a records check through the FBI. Colorado began an instant check system in 1994. All 24 of these jurisdictions have been approved by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, U.S. Treasury Department as having laws that qualify as alternatives to the five-day waiting period requirement of the Brady Act. (59 *Federal Register* 140, p. 37534, July 22, 1994).
- Ten States, Guam and the Virgin Islands required criminal history records checks on purchasers for all firearms. Eight States required checks for handgun purchases only; New York required checks for handguns and other specially designated categories, while Maryland required checks for other firearms.

- Thirteen States & Guam required waiting periods prior to the purchase of the firearm. The number of days required ranges from one day for long guns and three days for handguns in Illinois to an indefinite period in New Jersey, where potential purchasers are required to wait until both State and Federal fingerprint checks can be completed. In New York, a period of up to six months is permitted. In Guam, at least 30 days are required and up to 60 days are permitted.
- The number of presale checks for firearms conducted by jurisdictions in 1993 ranged from 160 in the Virgin Islands to 642,200 in California.
- Twenty States and the Virgin Islands checked their own State criminal history repository records. Other databases checked include the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) records (16 States and the Virgin Islands); the Interstate Identification Index (18 jurisdictions); FBI-Criminal Justice Information Services records (3 States and Guam); State mental health records (5 States); civil restraining order files (7 States); probation status and/or conditions of probation (10 States); parole status and/or conditions (9 States); pretrial release and/or conditions (7 States); and Immigration and Naturalization Service records (1 State). In addition, four States augment their criminal history records checks with checks of other databases: California checks specified juvenile offenses; Illinois procedures also require a determination that the potential purchaser is not a "clear and present danger" to himself or others and a determination that the individual is not wanted in the State of Illinois; Maryland also checks court disposition records; and Utah checks the statewide warrant database.

Search methods used in conducting record checks on potential firearms purchasers, 1993 (Table 21):

- Four States and Guam require fingerprint checks under some circumstances. Guam and New York use fingerprints for all checks. In New Jersey, all applicants must submit fingerprints; although, some denials are possible on the basis of the name check alone. Fingerprints are also used in Oregon if no identification is made on a name check. In Hawaii, fingerprint checks are not used to deny the initial purchase, but may be used to retrieve firearms sold to ineligible persons.

Additional findings

Status of State criminal history files

Overview of State criminal history record systems, 1993 (Table 1):

- Forty-six States and three Territories have master name indexes which contain names of all record subjects in the criminal history file. The Trust Territory of the Pacific and the Virgin Islands do not currently maintain a master name index.

Number of subjects (individual offenders) in State criminal history file, 1993 (Table 2):

- Over 47.8 million criminal history records were in the criminal history files of the State criminal history repositories on December 31, 1993 (individual offenders may have records in several states).

- Seventy-nine percent of the criminal history records maintained by the State criminal history repositories are automated. Approximately 9.4 million records, or 20% of the records are not automated. Approximately 1% of the records were not categorized by manual and automated.

- Seven States (Kansas, Maine, Mississippi, New Mexico, North Dakota, Vermont and West Virginia) and five territories (American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific and the Virgin Islands) have fewer than 30% automated criminal history files.

Automation of master name index and criminal history file, 1993 (Table 4):

- The 50 States and two territories have automated at least some records in either the criminal history record file or the master name index. In two of those jurisdictions, Maine and West Virginia, a portion of the master name index has been automated, but was currently not available for use.

- Four territories, American Samoa, Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific and the Virgin Islands have no automated criminal history information, either a master name index or criminal history files.

- Forty-three States and Puerto Rico have fully automated master name indexes. Twelve jurisdictions do not have fully automated master name indexes. Of those twelve jurisdictions, seven States and the District of Columbia have partially automated master name indexes. The Trust Territory of the Pacific and the Virgin Islands do not maintain master name indexes.

- Of those jurisdictions maintaining partially automated criminal history files, when an offender with a prior manual record is arrested, the prior manual record is subsequently automated in 22 States. In the District of Columbia, only the new information is automated. In Alabama and Kansas, the prior manual record is automated only if it complies with a cut-off date.

Data required by State law to be submitted to State criminal history repository, 1993 (Table 5):

- Thirty-one States and the District of Columbia require prosecutors to report to State criminal history repositories their decisions to decline prosecution in criminal cases. In Michigan, arrest fingerprints are submitted after the prosecutor's decision to charge a crime punishable by over 92 days.

- Forty-three States and the District of Columbia require felony trial courts to report the dispositions of felony cases to the State criminal history repository. In North Dakota, the reports are made by the prosecutors' offices in lieu of the courts.

- State prison admission on felony cases must be reported to the State criminal history repository in 38 States and three territories. State prison release information on felony cases must be reported to the State criminal history repository in 35 States and three territories.

- Admission data on felons housed in local correctional facilities must be reported to the State criminal history repository in 25 States. Release data on felons housed in local correctional facilities must be reported to the State criminal history repository in 17 States.

- The reporting of probation information is mandated in 30 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico while 33 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico require the reporting of parole information.

Arrest records with fingerprints, 1993 (Table 6):

- During 1993, over 6.4 million arrest fingerprint cards (or electronic substitutes) were submitted to the State criminal history repositories.

- Thirty-seven States and the District of Columbia, representing 81% of the nation's population, have records that are 100% fingerprint-supported. In 12 States and two territories, less than 100% of the arrests in the criminal history files are fingerprinted-supported. In Guam, Kentucky, the Trust Territory of the Pacific and the Virgin Islands, the inquiry regarding fingerprint-supported criminal history files was either not applicable or the percentage was unknown.

Completeness of data in State criminal history repository

Notice to State criminal history repository of release of arrested persons without charging, 1993 (Table 7):

- More than half of the jurisdictions (34 States and the District of Columbia) require law enforcement agencies to notify the State criminal history repository when an arrested person is released without formal charging but after the fingerprints have been submitted to the repository. In Michigan and North Carolina, police must release or charge a suspect *prior* to sending fingerprints to the State criminal history repository.
- Little information was reported on the percent of fingerprint submissions for which the repository is notified that the arrestee has not been charged. What information is available indicated a significant variance throughout the States ranging from as low as less than 1% in Alabama to as high as 100% in the District of Columbia.

Disposition data

Completeness of prosecutor and court disposition reporting to State criminal history repository, 1993 (Table 8):

- Seventeen States (Alabama, Alaska, Connecticut, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont and Virginia) report that final felony trial court dispositions in 80% or more of the cases in their States are received by the State criminal history repositories. Five of those States (Connecticut, Massachusetts, Oregon, Rhode Island and South Carolina) estimate that they receive notice in 100% of the cases.
- A total of 23 States, or six additional States (Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska and Washington) report that final felony trial court dispositions in 70% or more of the cases in their States are received by the State criminal history repositories.
- A total of 27 States, or four additional States (Colorado, Kentucky, Oklahoma and Pennsylvania), report that final felony trial court dispositions in 60% or more of the cases in their States are received by the State criminal history repositories.
- A total of 31 States, or four additional States (Arkansas, New York, Texas and Wisconsin), report that final felony trial court dispositions in 50% or more of the cases in their States are received by the State criminal history repositories. Florida receives 30-50% of the cases.

- Of the respondents indicating that there is either a legal requirement for prosecutors to notify the State criminal history record repository of declinations to prosecute or where the information is reported voluntarily, 3 States (Massachusetts, New Jersey and Vermont) estimate that they receive notice in 80% or more of such cases. Only Massachusetts estimates that notice is received in 100% of the cases.
- Only eight States were able to estimate the number of prosecutor declinations received. The numbers ranged from 2,800 in Minnesota to 10,600 in Illinois.

Policies/practices of State criminal history repository regarding modification of felony convictions, 1993 (Table 9):

- Expungements: Twenty States and three territories have statutes that provide for the expungement of felony convictions. In six States and Puerto Rico, the record is destroyed by the State criminal history repository. In Maryland, the record is retained for two years, then destroyed. In Washington, the record is either destroyed or returned to the submitting agency. In 10 States and the Virgin Islands, the record is retained with the action noted on the record. Vermont returns the record to the court; Utah seals the record; Ohio returns the record to the submitting agency; the District of Columbia removes the information from the criminal history record and forwards all supporting documentation to the U.S. Attorney's Office; Rhode Island maintains the records in a separate area and considers them inaccessible except under limited circumstances; and Tennessee forwards the information to the FBI. In Massachusetts, the record is retained with the action noted and sealed.

- **Setting aside of convictions:** Forty States and two territories have statutes which provide for setting aside felony convictions. In two States, the record is destroyed. In 30 States and Puerto Rico, the record is retained with the action noted only. Vermont returns the record to the court; in Oregon, the record is sealed; in Minnesota, the record is retained with the action noted and also sealed; the District of Columbia removes the information from the criminal history record and forwards all supporting documentation to the U.S. Attorney's Office; Rhode Island maintains the records in a separate area and considers them inaccessible except under limited circumstances; and in New York, the fingerprints are destroyed, but the text is retained.

- **Pardons:** Almost all of the jurisdictions (50 States and five territories) have statutes that provide for the granting of a pardon. In 38 States and three territories, the criminal history record is retained with the action noted. In three States (Arizona, Connecticut and South Dakota), the record is destroyed. In Maryland, the record is retained for two years, then destroyed. In Utah, the record is sealed. Vermont returns the record to the Governor's Office. In Colorado, the information is removed from the file; the District of Columbia removes the information from the criminal history record and forwards all supporting documentation to the U.S. Attorney's Office; Rhode Island maintains the records in a separate area and considers them inaccessible except under limited circumstances. In Tennessee, although the State law provides for pardons, none have been received by the repository.

- **Restoration of civil rights:** Forty-four States and four territories have legal provisions for the restoration of a convicted felon's civil rights. In the majority of those jurisdictions (34 States and two territories), the record is retained with the action noted. In two States (Arizona and South Dakota), the record is destroyed. In Maryland, the record is retained for two years, then destroyed. In Utah, the record is sealed; the District of Columbia removes the information from the criminal history record and forwards all supporting documentation to the U.S. Attorney's Office; Rhode Island maintains the records in a separate area and considers them inaccessible except under limited circumstances. In Tennessee, although the State law provides for restoration of civil rights, none have been received by the repository.

Correctional data

Fingerprinting of incarcerated offenders and linkage to records maintained by State criminal history repository, 1993 (Table 10):

- In 35 States and the District of Columbia, there is a legal requirement (State statute or State administrative regulation having the force of law) that the State prison system must fingerprint admitted prisoners and send the fingerprints to the State criminal history repository.

- About half of the jurisdictions, a total of 24 States and the District of Columbia, have the same legal requirement for reporting by local jails.

- In the 41 jurisdictions where State correctional facilities are legally required to report information or the information is reported voluntarily, the majority of jurisdictions (35 States) estimate that in at least 90% of the cases, admission information is reported to the State repository. Twenty-eight of those States estimate that 100% of the admissions are reported to the repository. Six States estimate a reporting rate of less than 90%, ranging from 86% in Indiana to less than 5% in New York where correctional information is updated on-line and fingerprints are requested only when an on-line match cannot be made.

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

- In 42 States and the District of Columbia, fingerprints received from State and local correctional facilities are processed by the State criminal history record repository to establish positive identification of incarcerated offenders and to ensure that correctional information is linked to the proper records.

Probation and parole data in State criminal history repository, 1993 (Table 11):

- Of the 35 States where reporting of probation data is legally required or voluntarily reported, six estimate that 100% of the cases in which probation is ordered are reported to the State

criminal history repository. An additional five States report that in at least 50% of the cases, the State criminal history repository receives probation information. Seven States and two territories report that information is received in less than 50% of the cases.

- Eleven States where reporting of parole data is legally required or voluntarily reported, estimate that parole information is reported in 100% of the cases. In additional four States, parole information is reported in 80% or more of the cases. Five States and Puerto Rico report receiving parole information in less than 20% of the cases.

Timeliness of data in State criminal history repository

—Arrests

Average number of days to process arrest information submitted to State criminal history repository, 1993 (Table 12):

- The average number of days between arrest and receipt of arrest data and fingerprints by the State criminal history repositories is 15, ranging from less than one day in the District of Columbia (where the Metropolitan Police Department is both the repository and the arresting agency) up to between 14 to 90 days in Oregon. The majority receive the data in 15 days or less.
- The average number of days between receipt of fingerprints by the State criminal history repository and entry into the master name index by the State criminal history repositories is 22, ranging from 0 to one day in North Dakota to 180 days in Mississippi. The majority of jurisdictions enter the data in 10 days or less.

- The average number of days between receipt of fingerprints and entry of arrest data into the criminal history databases is 26, ranging from less than one day in Delaware, the District of Columbia and North Dakota to 180 days in Mississippi. The majority of jurisdictions enter the data in 10 days or less.

- Thirty States and three territories indicate that they have backlogs in entering arrest data into the criminal history database. The number of person-days to clear the backlogs range from two days in Alaska to clear an estimated 400 unprocessed or partially processed fingerprint cards to 10,858 person-days to clear an estimated 262,000 unprocessed or partially processed fingerprint cards in California.

—Disposition data

Average number of days to process disposition data submitted to State criminal history repository and current status of backlog, 1993 (Table 13):

- The average number of days between the occurrence of a final felony court disposition and receipt of the disposition data by the State criminal history repositories is 39, ranging from less than one day in Delaware and the large, urban courts in New York up to between 120 to 190 days in Kentucky. The majority receive the data in 30 days or less.

- The average number of days between receipt of disposition date by the State criminal history repository and entry into the criminal history database by the State criminal history repositories is 41, ranging from 0 in Maryland and Massachusetts to 540 days in West Virginia. The majority of jurisdictions enter the data in 30 days or less.

- Twenty-eight States and Puerto Rico indicate that they have backlogs in entering disposition data into the criminal history database. The number of person-days to clear the backlogs range from seven days in Iowa and Kentucky to 3,125 person-days to clear an estimated 777,000 unprocessed or partially processed disposition forms in California.

—Admission to correctional facilities

Average number of days to process correctional admission data submitted to State criminal history repository, 1993 (Table 14):

- The average number of days between the admission of offenders to State correctional facilities and receipt of the information by the State criminal history repository is 22, ranging from less than one day in Delaware to between 90-100 days in Louisiana. Most States receive the information in 30 days or less.
- The average number of days between the admission of offenders to local jails and receipt of the information by the State criminal history repository is 17, ranging from five days in Michigan, North Carolina and South Carolina to between 42-56 days in Virginia. All jurisdictions, except Virginia, receive the information in 30 days or less.

- The average number of days between receipt of correctional admissions information by the State criminal history repository and entry into the criminal history databases is 21, ranging from less than one day in Delaware to approximately 200 days in California. All but three jurisdictions enter the information in 30 days or less.
- Twenty-one States indicate that they have backlogs in entering the correctional information into the criminal history databases. The number of person-days to clear the backlogs range from two in Pennsylvania to clear an estimated 700 unprocessed or partially processed custody-supervision forms to 7,863 person-days to clear an estimated 188,000 unprocessed or partially processed custody-supervision forms in California.

Procedures to improve data quality

Procedures employed by State criminal history repository to encourage complete arrest and disposition reporting, 1993 (Table 15):

- Nineteen States and two territories generate lists of arrests with missing dispositions as a means of monitoring disposition reporting.
- Thirty-two States and two territories report using field visits to encourage complete arrest and disposition reporting.
- Thirty-two States and American Samoa generate form letters as a method of encouraging complete arrest and disposition reporting.

- The method most used to encourage complete arrest and disposition reporting is telephone calls conducted by 39 States and four territories.

- Other jurisdictions report using training, audits, special projects, electronic contact, pursuing legislative and administrative changes, and returning the information to the submitting agency as methods to encourage complete arrest and disposition reporting.

Linking of arrests and dispositions

Methods used to link disposition information to arrest/charge information on criminal history record, 1993 (Table 16):

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

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

- Thirty-three States and three territories employ a unique tracking number for the individual subject.

- Thirty-six States and three territories use a unique arrest event identifier to link disposition and arrest/charge information on State criminal history records.

- Twenty-three States and three territories utilize a unique charge identifier in linking disposition and arrest/charge information.

- Thirty-eight States and two territories use the arrest date, while 39 States and four territories use the subject's name as a method to link disposition information with arrest/charge information.

- Thirty States and four territories report using the subject's name and the reporting agency's case number as the mechanism to link disposition information and arrest/charge information.

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

Procedures followed when linkage cannot be made between court or correctional information and arrest information in the criminal history database, 1993 (Table 17):

- Forty-six States and four territories report that they sometimes receive final court dispositions that cannot be linked to arrest information in the criminal history record database. The jurisdictions vary considerably in the percentage of court dispositions that cannot be linked to arrest cycles in the criminal history database, ranging from less than 1% in Nevada to 99% in Colorado. Three States (Massachusetts, Ohio and Wyoming) and the District of Columbia report that all final court dispositions can be linked to the arrest cycle in the criminal history database.
- Thirty-eight States and two territories report that they sometimes receive correctional information that cannot be linked to arrest information in the criminal history record database. The percentage of correctional dispositions that cannot be linked to arrest cycles in the criminal history database range from 1% in Colorado and South Dakota to 100% in California. Ten States and two territories report that all correctional dispositions can be linked to the arrest cycle in the criminal history database.

- The jurisdictions use a variety of procedures when a linkage cannot be established. Eleven States create “dummy” arrest segments from court disposition records; six States create “dummy” court segments from custody records; nine States and Puerto Rico enter court information into the database without any linkage to a prior arrest; 16 States and Puerto Rico enter custody information into the database without any linkage to a prior court disposition; 23 States and the Virgin Islands do not enter the unlinked court information; seven jurisdictions do not enter unlinked custody information; and 14 States and American Samoa utilize other procedures, such as contacting or returning the information to the originating or contributing agency or using temporary or pending files until a match can be established.

Other data quality procedures

Strategies employed by State criminal history repository to ensure accuracy of data in criminal history database, 1993 (Table 18):

- In order to prevent the entry and storage of inaccurate data and to detect and correct inaccurate entries in the criminal history database, a large majority of the jurisdictions, a total of 47 States and three territories complete a manual review of incoming source documents or reports.
- Other methods used most frequently include computer edit and verification programs employed by 43 States and two territories; and manual review of transcripts before dissemination performed in 25 States and American Samoa.

- Manual double-checking before data entry is completed in 22 States and American Samoa.
- Nineteen States the District of Columbia perform random sample comparisons of the State criminal history repository files with stored documents.
- Eleven States and the District of Columbia generate error lists which are returned to the reporting agencies.
- Fifteen jurisdictions use various methods, such as periodic audits of reporting agencies or of the repository and comparison of data in the criminal history database to fingerprint information.

Audits

Audit activities of State criminal history repository, 1993 (Table 19):

- Forty-five States and two territories maintain transaction logs to provide an audit trail of all inquiries, responses and record updates or modifications.
- Less than half of the repositories, a total of 22 States and the District of Columbia, report that the State criminal history repository or some other agency performed random sample audits of user agencies to ensure accuracy and completeness of repository records and to ensure that the agencies comply with applicable laws and regulations.

Data quality audits of State criminal history repository, 1993 (Table 20):

- During the past five years, an audit of the State criminal history repository's database (other than ongoing systematic sampling) has been conducted in 33 States and two territories to determine the level of accuracy and completeness of the criminal history file.
- Of the jurisdictions where audits have been performed, in 27 States and the District of Columbia, another agency conducted the audit; in five States and Puerto Rico the repository conducted its own audit; and in one jurisdiction the audit was conducted with a combination of an outside agency and the repository.
- In 30 of the jurisdictions (29 States and the District of Columbia) where audits were conducted, changes were made as a result of the audit to improve data quality of the records. In three jurisdictions, changes were underway prior to the audit or are currently in the planning stage.
- Twenty-seven States and three territories have data quality audits planned or scheduled for the next three years.
- Forty-five States and five territories have initiatives underway at the repository or contributing agencies to improve data quality. Initiatives include audit activities (28); automation changes (38); disposition or arrest reporting enhancements (37); felony flagging (23); fingerprint enhancements (32); agency interfaces (34); legislation (19); plan development (27); establishment of task forces/advisory groups (24); implementation or improvement of tracking numbers (23); and training (38).

Presale criminal history record checks on potential firearms purchasers

Purchasers determined to be ineligible to purchase firearms in alternative States, 1993 (Table 22):

- Of the jurisdictions reporting the total number of purchasers determined to be ineligible, the denials ranged from 7,540 in Florida to 11 in the Virgin Islands.
- The factor resulting in denial most frequently was a disqualifying conviction. This accounted for 7,200 of the denials in Florida. Other reasons for denials were: under indictment for a disqualifying crime; fugitive from justice; unlawful user of or addicted to controlled substances; adjudicated mental defective or committed to a mental institution; illegal alien; under age; invalid permit; non-resident; firearms that were being purchased were stolen; dishonorable discharge from the armed services; and exceeded the lawful handgun limits.
- About one-third of the jurisdictions took some form of action against the individual at the State level. Other jurisdictions may have taken action at the local level. Types of action included seeking issuance of a warrant; providing information to State or local prosecutors or law enforcement authorities; providing information to Federal prosecutors or law enforcement authorities; and providing the information to other requesting criminal justice agencies.

Costs of implementing and operating programs for presale criminal history record checks on potential firearm purchasers, 1993 (Table 24):

- Of the jurisdictions conducting presale records checks in 1993 that were able to specifically quantify start-up costs of their programs, the costs ranged from \$200 expended in South Dakota for training to \$7,500,000 in California.
- Programs that are not fee-supported or that the fees do not totally support the program are generally supplemented by the operating budgets or general funds of the jurisdiction.

Search methods used in conducting criminal history checks on potential firearm purchasers, 1993 (Table 25):

- Almost all jurisdictions have minimum data elements which must be submitted to conduct the records search. Nineteen States and Guam conduct records checks on firearms purchasers based on name and date of birth or name only. Eight States conduct searches based on name, sex and date of birth. Eleven jurisdictions augment name, sex and date of birth information with race. Eight additional jurisdictions (seven States and the District of Columbia) require some combination of name and date of birth with race, sex, Social Security Number, driver's license number, originating agency number, or password. Two jurisdictions, New York and Puerto Rico also require fingerprints.

- All but five of the jurisdictions (two States and three territories) use a computer-based soundex searching capability. This enables the computer to identify likely candidates based on the phonetic sound of the name, rather than only the spelling.

- The statutes in 13 States and two territories authorized the release of information to individual firearms dealers, although in three jurisdictions, the information was released to in-state firearms dealers only.

- The statutes in 28 States permitted giving “sale approval” or “no sale” information directly to firearms dealers; although nine States restricted this information to in-state firearms dealers only, while one State authorized the release only to out-of-state firearms dealers.

U.S. Attorney General’s estimated goals/timetables for criminal history record sharing in a national instant background check system, 1994 (Table 26):

- Up to 25% of all current and shareable records (records available through the Interstate Identification Index(III)) will be available in 51 jurisdictions (47 States and four territories) no later than December 1998; the records in the remaining five jurisdictions will be available no later than December 2000. A total of 25 States currently share at least 25% of their records through III.

- Up to 50% of all current and shareable records will be available in 45 States and four territories no later than December 1998; the records in the remaining seven jurisdictions will be available no later than December 2000. A total of 17 States currently share at least 50% of their records through III.

- Up to 75% of all current and shareable records will be available in 35 States and four territories no later than December 1998; the records in the remaining 17 jurisdictions will be available no later than December 2000. A total of nine States currently share at least 75% of their records through III.

- Up to 80% of all current and shareable records will be available in 31 States and three territories no later than December 1998; the records in the remaining 22 jurisdictions will be available no later than December 2000. A total of seven States currently share at least 80% of their records through III.

- One hundred percent of all current and shareable records will be available in nine States no later than December 1998; 100% of the records in the remaining 47 jurisdictions will be available no later than December 2000. One State (Virginia) currently shares 100% of its records through III.

Fingerprint cards and dispositions received by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1993 (Table 27):

- Over 4.6 million fingerprints were received by the FBI in 1993. Of that number, almost 4.2 million were for criminal justice purposes, and approximately 414,000 were for noncriminal justice purposes. New York submitted the highest number of both criminal justice (503,500) and noncriminal justice (54,200) fingerprints. Florida was a participant in the National Fingerprint File in 1993, and therefore submitted only the first fingerprint card of an individual to the FBI.

- Almost 2.7 million final dispositions were received by the FBI in 1993, with Georgia submitting the highest number (825,000). Twelve States (Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Georgia, Missouri, Montana, New York, Ohio, South Dakota, Virginia and Wyoming) submit most dispositions by tape with Nebraska also scheduled to begin tape submissions in 1994.

Criminal history records of Interstate Identification Index (III) participants maintained by the State criminal history repository and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1993 (Table 28):

- Approximately 12.4 million III records are indexed with the State’s identification (SID) pointers. Over 3.8 million records are maintained by the FBI for the States. Only 18% of the total records available through III in 1993 were maintained by the States.

Data Tables

Explanatory Notes for Table 1

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

Note: Percentages and numbers reported are results of estimates. Numbers have been rounded to the nearest 100. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number. The numbers in the column "Number of subjects (individual offenders) in State criminal history file" apply only to the criminal history file, including partially automated files, and do *not* include the master name index. Final dispositions include release by police without charging, declination to proceed by prosecutor, or final trial court disposition.

* State is fully manual.

. . . Not available.

NA Not applicable.

† Flag is set when arrest information is entered.

†† Flag is set when conviction information is entered.

** Flag is set both at arrest and conviction.

^aFigure includes adults and subjects under 18 years of age.

^bFigure represents subjects as of March 25, 1994.

^cFor an arrest to be counted as having a final disposition, each count associated with that arrest must have a final disposition.

^dManual records totaling 1.5 million will require review to determine if there is arrest and conviction data present and if it is at the felony level.

^ePersons charged with certain misdemeanors are not included in the master name index (MNI).

^fGuam is not currently automated and has no central criminal records repository.

^gThe delinquent disposition rate is based only on those cases actually entered into the offender-based transaction/computerized criminal history system (OBTS/CCH). It does not include arrest cases never entered, nor does it include penal summons type court cases. Although the law provides for the fingerprinting of offenders convicted via penal summons, many cases are never ordered down for processing. The Hawaii Criminal Justice Data Center is aware that this situation may represent a major gap in conviction information carried on OBTS/CCH. Efforts to address these, however, especially in the area of Family Court cases (which include child abuse offenses) await the availability of resources and the restructure of OBTS/CCH.

^hAll subjects with dates of birth of 1920 or later are automated.

ⁱFigure represents subjects as of March 28, 1994.

^jFinal dispositions that are received on court abstracts are not supported by fingerprints and are filed alphabetically in a holding file. They are their own index and are not currently in the MNI.

^kFingerprint-supported subjects are in an automated MNI that is not complete or accurate at this time.

^lThe flag is generated on an ad hoc basis when an inquiry is made against the file.

^mFigure is for the five-year period of 1988-92.

ⁿFigure is as of February 4, 1994.

^oFlags are set only on automated records.

^pThe severity of the original *charge* is set when arrest information is entered.

^qThe MNI does not include manual records.

^rSubjects with dates of birth prior to 1940 are in manual records unless a trigger event causes conversion.

^sResponse applies to felonies only.

^tAlthough flagging has not yet begun, a data field is available at the arrest, prosecutor and court levels to identify felony offenses.

^uAn MNI is not currently maintained.

^vTotal figure includes applicants and corrections-based records.

^wApproximately 50% is automated, with complete automation estimated for December 1994.

Table 1: Overview of State criminal history record systems, 1993

| State | Percent of record subjects in master name index | Fully automated master name index | Number of subjects (individual offenders) in State criminal history file | | Percent of arrests in database which have final dispositions recorded | | System flags subjects with felony convictions | System has information to identify unflagged felony convictions |
|--------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|---|
| | | | Total | Automated | All arrests | Arrests within past 5 years | | |
| Total | | | 47,833,600 | 37,723,900 | | | | |
| Alabama | 100% | Yes | 1,800,000 | 1,800,000 | 60% | 80% | All** | |
| Alaska | 100 | Yes | 184,300 | 134,300 | 84 | 86 | All†† | |
| American Samoa | 100 | No* | 10,800 ^a | 0 | ... | ... | | |
| Arizona | 100 | Yes | 612,900 ^b | 370,900 ^b | 49 ^c | 53 ^c | All** | |
| Arkansas | 100 | No | 448,000 | 183,000 | 15 | 50 | Some†† | Some |
| California | 100% | Yes | 5,316,900 | 3,816,900 | ... | 47% | Some†† ^d | |
| Colorado | 100 | Yes | 612,700 | 612,700 | 13% | 13 | Some** | All |
| Connecticut | 100 | Yes | 681,000 | ... | ... | ... | | |
| Delaware | 100 | Yes | 245,900 | 179,900 | 55 | 67 | | Some |
| District of Columbia | 80 ^e | No | 497,900 | 142,900 | 30 | 10 | | |
| Florida | 100% | Yes | 2,729,000 | 2,729,000 | 48% | 33% | Some** | Some |
| Georgia | 100 | Yes | 1,532,100 | 1,532,100 | 62 | 62 | All†† | |
| Guam ^f | 100 | No* | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Hawaii | 100 | Yes | 318,300 | 318,300 | 87 ^g | 76 | All†† | |
| Idaho | 100 | Yes | 138,700 | 91,200 | 27 | 40 | All†† | |
| Illinois | 92% | Yes ^h | 2,558,000 ⁱ | 2,358,000 ⁱ | 52% | 51% | All** | |
| Indiana | 100 | Yes | 1,241,800 | 1,241,800 | 12 | 12 | | Some |
| Iowa | 100 | Yes | 367,100 | 242,700 | 95 | 100 | All†† | |
| Kansas | 100 | Yes | 627,400 | 171,900 | 20 | 30 | Some | Some |
| Kentucky | 100 | No | ... | ... | 39 | 65 | | |
| Louisiana | 100% | Yes | 1,338,800 | 667,700 | 30% | 25% | Some†† | All |
| Maine | 60 ^j | No ^k | 300,000 | 0 | 90 | 97 | | Some |
| Maryland | 100 | Yes | 834,100 | 834,100 | ... | ... | All ^l | |
| Massachusetts | 100 | Yes | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 95 | 100 | | Some |
| Michigan | 100 | Yes | 970,400 | 970,400 | 72 | 84 ^m | | Some |
| Minnesota | 100% | Yes | 258,300 ⁿ | 193,200 ⁿ | ... | ... | Some†† | All |
| Mississippi | 100 | No | 368,000 | 26,000 | ... | ... | Some†† | Some |
| Missouri | 100 | Yes | 673,900 | 502,500 | 61% | 57% | All†† ^o | |
| Montana | 100 | Yes | 108,900 | 108,900 | 85 | 80 | All† | |
| Nebraska | 100 | Yes | 138,000 | 138,000 | 70 | 74 | All†† | |
| Nevada | 100% | Yes | 130,300 | 130,300 | 41% | 42% | ^p | All |
| New Hampshire | 100 | Yes | 180,600 | 180,600 | 75 | 75 | Some** | All |
| New Jersey | 80 ^q | Yes | 1,508,800 | 1,208,800 | 90 | 85 | All†† | |
| New Mexico | 100 | Yes | 230,000 | 0 | 25 | 27 | All†† | |
| New York | 87 ^q | Yes | 4,314,200 | 3,767,100 | 83 | 75 | | All |
| North Carolina | 100% | Yes | 560,400 | 514,900 | 87% | 90% | | Some |
| North Dakota | 100 | No ^r | 216,000 ⁱ | 58,000 ⁱ | 92+ | 86 | Some†† | |
| Ohio | 100 | No | 1,700,000 | 808,000 | 38-50 | 35-50 | Some** | Some |
| Oklahoma | 100 | Yes | 582,200 | 315,200 | 20-25 | 20-25 | Some†† | Some |
| Oregon | 100 | Yes | 699,900 | 699,900 | ... | 71 | Some†† | |
| Pennsylvania | 100% | Yes | 1,462,700 | 803,600 | 73% | 64% | Some†† ^o | |
| Puerto Rico | 100 | Yes | 78,500 | 78,500 | 86 | 69 | All† | |
| Rhode Island | 100 | Yes | 199,000 | 199,000 | 56 | 92 ^s | Some†† | |
| South Carolina | 100 | Yes | 737,200 | 672,400 | 70 | 80 | Some†† | Some |
| South Dakota | 100 | Yes | 128,600 | 71,100 | 60 | 80 | | Some |
| Tennessee | 100% | Yes | 600,000 | 193,000 | ... | ... | All** | |
| Texas | 100 | Yes | 4,504,100 | 4,504,100 | 43% | ... | Some ^t | Some |
| Trust Territory of the Pacific | NA ^u | NA* ^u | 6,500 | 0 | 50 | 50% | | |
| Utah | 100 | Yes | 276,300 | 276,300 | 52 | 80 | All† | |
| Vermont | 100 | Yes | 135,000 | 0 | 70 | 96 | | Some |
| Virgin Islands | NA ^u | NA* ^u | 13,700 | 0 | ... | ... | | |
| Virginia | 100% | Yes | 921,100 | 694,700 | ... | ... | All ^l | |
| Washington | 100 | Yes | 677,000 ^v | 677,000 | 75% | 68% | All ^l | |
| West Virginia | 100 | No ^w | 375,000 | 0 | ... | ... | | |
| Wisconsin | 100 | Yes | 611,100 | 434,600 | ... | 58 | Some†† | Some |
| Wyoming | 100 | Yes | 72,200 | 72,200 | 79 | 82 | Some †† | Some |

Explanatory Notes for Table 2

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

Note: In 1989, data were not reported from American Samoa, Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific and the Virgin Islands. In 1992, data were not reported from American Samoa, Guam and the Trust Territory of the Pacific. Except for Arkansas, Idaho, Massachusetts, Missouri, Puerto Rico and Utah, for which corrected data were submitted, the data in the columns for 1989 were taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems* (March 1991), Table 2. Except for Indiana, Pennsylvania, Utah, Washington and West Virginia, for which corrected data were submitted, the data in the columns for 1992 were taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems, 1992* (November 1993), Table 2.

^aFigure includes adults and subjects under 18 years of age.

^bFigure represents subjects as of March 25, 1994.

^cThe total number of files decreased due to elimination of records of deceased subjects and purged records.

^dThe total number of criminal history files decreased due to purging of old and duplicate records, as well as civil files that erroneously were given criminal identification numbers.

^eThe decrease from 1992 is a result of two factors: (1) the California Department of Justice purged and continues to purge records meeting specified criteria; and (2) the estimate of manual criminal records fluctuates as more knowledge is gained about the system; there is no way to determine an exact count of the manual records.

^fThe decrease in total files was the result of excluding traffic files that were assumed included in the 1989 figure.

^gFigure represents subjects as of March 28, 1994.

^hThe number of subjects in the criminal history file decreased in 1993 for two reasons: (1) State law requires removal of all arrests without dispositions after four years, and (2) a "presumed dead" file was purged using age 70 (rather than age 80).

ⁱMore accurate information is now available. Previous responses were based on estimates.

^jThe estimated number of records remained the same for 1992 and 1993 for two reasons: (1) there was a 8.9% decrease in the number of persons arrested from 1992 to 1993; and (2) in the course of implementing automation, records of subjects over age 80 were purged.

^kThe number of subjects in the criminal history file shows a decrease for 1993 because the 1992 response included noncriminal identification subjects in addition to the criminal record subjects.

^lFigure is as of February 4, 1994.

^mThe number of subjects in the State criminal history file has decreased since 1992 because the 1992 number reflected all automated records, jackets and index cards containing criminal offenses. Since that time, the State criminal history repository has been aggressively converting its manual records held in jackets and index cards. Many of the index cards do not meet the criteria of a criminal offense. Since the actual number of criminal offenses appearing on index cards is unknown, the repository elected to report the actual number of automated records only for 1993. Record conversion is expected to be complete in 1995.

ⁿThe decrease in the number of subjects in the criminal history file from 1992 to 1993 is the result of removing records of non-Ohio offenses, misdemeanors and subjects presumed dead from the database.

^oTotal figure includes applicants and corrections-based records.

^pMore accurate information is now available.

Table 2: Number of subjects (individual offenders) in State criminal history file, 1989, 1992 and 1993

| State | Number of subjects in manual and automated files | | Number of subjects in manual and automated files, 1993 | | | Percent of automated files | | | Percent change in total files | |
|--------------------------------|--|----------------------|--|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|------|------------------|-------------------------------|---------|
| | 1989 | 1992 | Total | Manual file | Automated file | 1989 | 1992 | 1993 | 1989-92 | 1992-93 |
| Total | 42,476,400 | 47,307,900 | 47,833,600 | 9,426,900 | 37,723,900 | | 77% | 79% | 11% | 1% |
| Alabama | 1,000,000 | 1,300,000 | 1,800,000 | 0 | 1,800,000 | 50% | 100% | 100% | 30% | 38 |
| Alaska | 143,000 | 180,500 | 184,300 | 50,000 | 134,300 | 86 | 72 | 73 | 27 | 2 |
| American Samoa | ... | ... | 10,800 ^a | 10,800 ^a | 0 | ... | ... | 0 | NA | NA |
| Arizona | 742,100 | 631,000 | 612,900 ^b | 242,000 ^b | 370,900 ^b | 39 | 54 | 60 | -15 ^c | -3 |
| Arkansas | 480,000 | 417,600 | 448,000 | 265,000 | 183,000 | 0 | 32 | 41 | -15 ^d | 7 |
| California | 4,500,000 | 4,675,400 | 5,316,900 | 1,500,000 | 3,816,900 | 67% | 79% | 72% ^e | 4% | 14% |
| Colorado | 489,000 | 575,700 | 612,700 | 0 | 612,700 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 18 | 6 |
| Connecticut | 401,400 | 648,700 | 681,000 | ... | ... | 58 | 58 | ... | 62 | 5 |
| Delaware | 600,000 | 237,300 | 245,900 | 66,000 | 179,900 | 83 | 67 | 73 | -60 ^f | ... |
| District of Columbia | 427,000 | 456,100 | 497,900 | 355,000 | 142,900 | 0 | 22 | 29 | 7 | 9 |
| Florida | 2,427,900 | 2,671,700 | 2,729,000 | 0 | 2,729,000 | 95% | 100% | 100% | 10% | 2% |
| Georgia | 1,055,000 | 1,445,000 | 1,532,100 | 0 | 1,532,100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 37 | 6 |
| Guam | ... | ... | NA | NA | NA | ... | ... | 0 | NA | NA |
| Hawaii | 270,500 | 309,600 | 318,300 | 0 | 318,300 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 14 | 3 |
| Idaho | 105,000 | 132,300 | 138,700 | 47,500 | 91,200 | 30 | 57 | 66 | 26 | 5 |
| Illinois | 2,152,300 | 2,493,200 | 2,558,000 ^g | 200,000 ^g | 2,358,000 ^g | 86% | 88% | 92% | 16% | 3% |
| Indiana | 670,000 | ... | 1,241,800 | 0 | 1,241,800 | 10 | 91 | 100 | 10 | ... |
| Iowa | 300,000 | 377,000 | 367,100 ^h | 124,400 | 242,700 | 43 | 60 | 66 | 26 | -3 |
| Kansas | 520,000 | 599,600 | 627,400 | 455,500 | 171,900 | 3 | 23 | 27 | 15 | 5 |
| Kentucky | 535,100 | 530,500 | ... | ... | ... | 72 | 79 | ... | -1 | ... |
| Louisiana | 1,449,000 | 1,591,500 | 1,338,800 ⁱ | 671,100 | 667,700 | 33% | 36% | 50% | 10% | -16% |
| Maine | 270,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 ^j | 300,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Maryland | 649,300 | 1,050,900 | 834,100 ^k | 0 | 834,100 | 69 | 54 | 100 | 62 | -21 |
| Massachusetts | 2,260,000 | 2,500,000 | 2,000,000 | 0 | 2,000,000 | 21 | 100 | 100 | 11 | -20 |
| Michigan | 771,800 | 939,900 | 970,400 | 0 | 970,400 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 22 | 3 |
| Minnesota | 190,600 | 232,500 | 258,300 ^l | 65,100 ^l | 193,200 ^l | 61% | 68% | 75% | 22% | 11% |
| Mississippi | 350,000 | 350,000 ⁺ | 368,000 | 342,000 | 26,000 | 0 | 7 | 7 | ... | 5 |
| Missouri | 593,000 | 647,700 | 673,900 | 171,400 | 502,500 | 81 | 73 | 75 | 32 | 4 |
| Montana | 86,000 | 107,100 | 108,900 | 0 | 108,900 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 25 | 2 |
| Nebraska | 300,000 | 124,000 | 138,000 | 0 | 138,000 | 40 | 94 | 100 | -59 | 11 |
| Nevada | 31,300 | 102,800 | 130,300 | 0 | 130,300 | 100% | 100% | 100% | 228% | 27% |
| New Hampshire | 155,000 | 253,900 | 180,600 ^m | 0 | 180,600 | 93 | 68 | 100 | 39 | -29 |
| New Jersey | 1,090,200 | 1,187,400 | 1,508,800 | 300,000 | 1,208,800 | 77 | 83 | 80 | 9 | 27 |
| New Mexico | 207,000 | 201,000 | 230,000 | 230,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -3 | 14 |
| New York | 3,812,100 | 4,123,400 | 4,314,200 | 547,100 | 3,767,100 | 82 | 88 | 87 | 8 | 5 |
| North Carolina | 432,800 | 529,800 | 560,400 | 45,500 | 514,900 | 83% | 87% | 92% | 22% | 6% |
| North Dakota | 202,000 | 212,900 | 216,000 ^g | 158,000 ^g | 58,000 ^g | 21 | 25 | 27 | 5 | 1 |
| Ohio | 2,315,700 | 2,444,400 | 1,700,000 ⁿ | 892,000 | 808,000 | 25 | 34 | 48 | 6 | -30 |
| Oklahoma | 500,000 | 600,000 | 582,200 ⁱ | 267,000 | 315,200 | 33 | 60 | 54 | 20 | -3 |
| Oregon | 548,500 | 661,800 | 699,900 | 0 | 699,900 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 21 | 6 |
| Pennsylvania | 1,265,800 | 1,414,500 | 1,462,700 | 659,100 | 803,600 | 39% | 51% | 55% | 12% | 3% |
| Puerto Rico | 45,400 | 64,100 | 78,500 | 0 | 78,500 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 45 | 22 |
| Rhode Island | 156,900 | 186,700 | 199,000 | 0 | 199,000 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 19 | 7 |
| South Carolina | 572,900 | 695,900 | 737,200 | 64,800 | 672,400 | 87 | 90 | 91 | 21 | 6 |
| South Dakota | 144,000 | 125,000 | 128,600 | 57,500 | 71,100 | 0 | 56 | 55 | -13 | 3 |
| Tennessee | 500,000 | 590,000 | 600,000 | 407,000 | 193,000 | 0% | 28% | 32% | 18% | 2% |
| Texas | 3,789,500 | 4,277,700 | 4,504,100 | 0 | 4,504,100 | 99 | 100 | 100 | 13 | 5 |
| Trust Territory of the Pacific | ... | ... | 6,500 | 6,500 | 0 | ... | ... | 0 | NA | NA |
| Utah | 210,300 | 258,600 | 276,300 | 0 | 276,300 | 77 | 100 | 100 | 23 | 7 |
| Vermont | 118,000 | 130,000 | 135,000 | 135,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4 |
| Virgin Islands | ... | 11,300 | 13,700 | 13,700 | 0 | ... | 0% | 0% | NA | 21% |
| Virginia | 744,000 | 874,500 | 921,100 | 226,400 | 694,700 | 56% | 70 | 75 | 18% | 5 |
| Washington | 474,100 | 623,300 | 677,000 ^o | 0 | 677,000 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 31 | 9 |
| West Virginia | 650,000 | ... | 375,000 ^p | 375,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ... | ... |
| Wisconsin | 491,000 | 474,800 | 611,100 | 176,500 | 434,600 | 55 | 68 | 71 | 17 | 29 |
| Wyoming | 62,000 | 67,100 | 72,200 | 0 | 72,200 | 84 | 100 | 100 | 8 | 8 |

Explanatory Notes for Table 3

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

Note: Final dispositions include release by police without charging, declination to proceed by prosecutor, or final trial court disposition. Percentages and numbers reported are results of estimates. Numbers have been rounded to the nearest 100. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number. Except for Oklahoma, Puerto Rico, South Carolina and Utah, for which corrected data were submitted, the data for 1989 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems* (March 1991), Table 3. Except for Delaware, Iowa, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Utah and Washington, for which corrected data were submitted, the data for 1992 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems, 1992* (November 1993), Table 3.

. . . Not available.

NA Not applicable.

^aThe number of reported dispositions decreased from 1992 due to personnel shortages.

^bThis figure includes 155 [200] releases by police without charging and 15,000 prosecutor declinations; final trial court dispositions currently are not reported to the repository.

^cFigure represents the number received as of April 11, 1994.

^dGuam currently does not have a central criminal records repository.

^eThe number of final dispositions reported in 1993 declined from the number reported in 1992 because special projects were undertaken in 1992 to address the large backlog of delinquent dispositions. Since then, the efforts have resulted in a leveling off of the number of reported dispositions, and thus, a decline in 1993.

^fDuring 1993, the State repository concentrated on State's Attorneys' filing charges. In 1994, the focus was changed to court dispositions. Since January 1, 1994, a total of 489,013 court dispositions have been posted to the database.

^gFrom 1989-1992, courts noted a decrease in caseload, although Uniform Crime Reports indicated an increase in crime.

^hThe figure for 1992 is atypical due to a records improvement project which resulted in a higher number of dispositions during the period.

ⁱPolice release and prosecutor declinations are reported on the arrest card.

^jMore accurate information is now available; the 1992 figure includes a backlog.

^kThe decrease in reported dispositions is due to implementation of procedures that restrict the classes of misdemeanors accepted by the State repository.

^lThe 1992 figure represents the collection and clearing of a backlog of dispositions of lesser offenses from the town and village courts; therefore, the 1993 figure shows a decline from 1992.

^mThe decrease in dispositions is believed to be attributable to design problems in a new automated judicial reporting system; disposition reporting was halted for a period of time between 1992-93 to correct the problems.

ⁿArrest and prosecution dispositions currently are not indexed by disposition type.

^oThe number of reported dispositions decreased during this period due to personnel shortages.

^pA significant backlog developed in 1993 due to delays in providing and receiving reporting forms from contributors.

Table 3: Number of final dispositions reported to State criminal history repository, 1989, 1992 and 1993

| State | Number of dispositions reported | | | Percent change | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|---------|
| | 1989 | 1992 | 1993 | 1989-92 | 1992-93 |
| Alabama | 35,000 | 192,000 | ... | 449% | ... |
| Alaska | 40,800 | 26,400 | 31,300 | -35 | 19% |
| American Samoa | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Arizona | 112,500 | 112,200 | 117,500 | <-1 | 5 |
| Arkansas | 7,000 | 18,000 | ... | 157 | ... |
| California | 850,000 | 1,011,300 | 1,100,000 | 19% | 9% |
| Colorado | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Connecticut | 142,900 | 139,800 | 135,300 ^a | -2 | -3 |
| Delaware | 57,000 | 70,000 | 80,000 | 24 | 154 |
| District of Columbia | ... | 13,600 | 15,200 ^b | ... | 12 |
| Florida | 110,000 | 173,400 | 162,000 ^c | 58% | ... |
| Georgia | 260,000 | ... | 545,000 | ... | ... |
| Guam | ... | ... | NA ^d | ... | NA |
| Hawaii | 54,800 | 56,000 | 51,700 ^e | 2 | -8 |
| Idaho | ... | 20,000 | 19,300 | ... | -4 |
| Illinois | 135,000 | 149,000 | 95,600 ^f | 11% | -36% |
| Indiana | 20,000 | 44,600 | ... | 123 | ... |
| Iowa | 23,000 | 35,000 | 54,200 | 52 | 54 |
| Kansas | 28,900 | 41,300 | 34,300 | 43 | 17 |
| Kentucky | 6,000 | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Louisiana | 30,000 | 21,100 | 21,400 | -30% | 1% |
| Maine | 30,000 | 27,800 ^g | 29,000 | -7 | 4 |
| Maryland | 436,600 | 500,100 | ... | 14 | ... |
| Massachusetts | ... | 270,000 | 300,000 | ... | 11 |
| Michigan | 78,800 | 307,400 ^h | 178,100 ⁱ | ... | ... |
| Minnesota | 45,000 | 103,000 | 60,000 ^j | 129% | ... |
| Mississippi | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Missouri | ... | ... | 65,100 | ... | ... |
| Montana | 9,600 | ... | 26,200 | ... | ... |
| Nebraska | 12,400 | 25,900 | 23,000 ^k | 109 | -11 |
| Nevada | 20,000 | 29,700 | ... | 48% | ... |
| New Hampshire | ... | ... | 31,000 | ... | ... |
| New Jersey | 200,000 | 250,000 | 260,000 | 25 | 4% |
| New Mexico | 2,600 | 9,800 | 11,100 | 277 | 13 |
| New York | 443,000 | 500,000 | 383,500 ^l | 13 | 23 |
| North Carolina | 60,000 | 65,000 | ... | 8% | ... |
| North Dakota | 4,000 | 6,200 | 6,500 | 55 | 5% |
| Ohio | 65,000 | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Oklahoma | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | ... | ... |
| Oregon | ... | ... | 36,900 | ... | ... |
| Pennsylvania | 74,200 | 219,000 | 203,700 ^m | 195% | -7% |
| Puerto Rico | 20,100 | 24,800 | 24,300 | 23 | -2 |
| Rhode Island | ... | ... | 10,000 | ... | ... |
| South Carolina | 103,700 | 183,100 | 212,600 | 77 | 16 |
| South Dakota | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Tennessee | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Texas | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Trust Territory of the Pacific | ... | ... | 0 | ... | ... |
| Utah | 17,100 | 18,900 | 17,800 | 11% | -6% |
| Vermont | 18,700 | ... | 20,000 | ... | ... |
| Virgin Islands | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Virginia | 141,600 | 228,100 | 211,500 | 61% | -7% |
| Washington | ... | 172,500 | 157,800 | ... | -9 |
| West Virginia | 38,000 | 6,000 | ... | -84 ^o | ... |
| Wisconsin | 58,800 | 90,000 | 99,000 | 54 | 10 |
| Wyoming | 6,000 | 9,000 | 6,600 ^p | 50 | -27 |

Explanatory Notes for Table 4

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

Note: Except for Puerto Rico, for which additional information has been submitted, the data in the columns for 1989 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems* (March 1991), Table 4. Except for Alabama, Mississippi and Pennsylvania, for which corrected data were submitted, the data for 1992 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems, 1992* (November 1993), Table 4.

* State is fully manual.

. . . Not available.

NA Not applicable.

^aPrior manual record is automated if the new arrest has occurred since 1985.

^bAll automated records and approximately 50% of the manual records are contained in an automated master name index (MNI).

^cOnly the new arrest information is automated.

^dThe new information is added to the manual file.

^eTraffic and misdemeanor cases are not included in the MNI.

^fA backlog of arrest cards for second/subsequent arrests were awaiting entry into the automated criminal history file.

^gAll subjects with dates of birth of 1920 or later are automated.

^hOnly new arrest information since July 1, 1993 is automated at this time due to lack of personnel.

ⁱThe manual file is not in the automated MNI.

^jApproximately 20,000 names, name derivatives and aliases have been entered into a temporary, abbreviated automated MNI; however, the MNI is not usable at this time for a name search.

^kFingerprint-supported subjects are in an automated MNI that is not complete or accurate at this time.

^lThere are 760,000 records that are automated; however, a backlog consisting of 80,000 records is not yet on the MNI.

^mRecords automated since 1989 are in the automated MNI; prior records are completely manual.

ⁿAdding all records onto the automated MNI is in process.

^oAlthough the criminal history database that is utilized in Nebraska is fully automated, there are approximately 6,000 partially automated records that are in the process of being deleted.

^pOnly those with a date of birth of 1940 and later are included in the automated MNI.

^qThe automated MNI contains all arrest subjects since 1972.

^rThe record is automated only upon a request for the record.

^sAutomated file was initiated in 1987. It contains only felonies and related misdemeanors.

^tRespondent is undertaking an ongoing data entry program to fully automate the MNI.

^uIf an offender's prior fingerprint records was of poor quality, it was not automated; upon receipt of AFIS (Automated Fingerprint Identification System) quality fingerprints, the record will be automated.

^vAn MNI is not maintained currently.

^wApproximately 50% is automated with complete automation estimated for December 1994.

Table 4: Automation of master name index and criminal history file, 1989, 1992 and 1993

| State | Master name index is automated | | | Criminal history file is automated | | | Prior manual record is automated if offender is re-arrested | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------|---|------------------|------------------|
| | 1989 | 1992 | 1993 | 1989 | 1992 | 1993 | 1989 | 1992 | 1993 |
| Alabama | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes ^a |
| Alaska | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| American Samoa | ... | ... | No* | ... | ... | No* | ... | ... | ... |
| Arizona | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Arkansas | Partial | Partial ^b | Partial ^b | No | Partial | Partial | | Yes | Yes |
| California | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Partial | No | No | No |
| Colorado | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | |
| Connecticut | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Delaware | Partial | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Partial | No ^c | No ^c | No ^d |
| District of Columbia | Partial | Partial ^e | Partial ^e | No | Partial | Partial | | No ^c | No ^c |
| Florida | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes | | |
| Georgia | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | |
| Guam | ... | ... | No* | ... | ... | NA | | | |
| Hawaii | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | |
| Idaho | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial ^f | Partial | | Yes | Yes |
| Illinois | Partial | Yes | Yes ^g | Partial | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Indiana | Yes | Partial ^e | Yes | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| Iowa | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Kansas | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Partial | No | Yes | No ^h |
| Kentucky | Partial | Partial ⁱ | Partial ⁱ | Partial | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Louisiana | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Maine | No | Partial ^j | Partial ^k | No | No | No | | | |
| Maryland | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Yes | ... | No ^s | |
| Massachusetts | Yes | Yes ^l | Yes | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| Michigan | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | |
| Minnesota | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Partial | No | No ^s | Yes |
| Mississippi | No | Partial | Partial ^m | No | Partial | Partial | ... | ... | No |
| Missouri | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Montana | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | |
| Nebraska | Partial | Partial ⁿ | Yes | Partial | Partial | Yes ^o | Yes | Yes | |
| Nevada | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | |
| New Hampshire | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| New Jersey | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| New Mexico | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | | | |
| New York | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| North Carolina | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| North Dakota | Partial | Partial ^p | Partial ^p | Partial | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Ohio | Partial | Partial ^q | Partial ^q | Partial | Partial | Partial | No | No | No |
| Oklahoma | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Oregon | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | |
| Pennsylvania | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Partial | Yes | | No ^r |
| Puerto Rico | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes ^s | Yes ^s | Yes | | | |
| Rhode Island | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | |
| South Carolina | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| South Dakota | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Tennessee | Partial | Partial ^t | Yes | No | Partial | Partial | | Yes | No |
| Texas | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes ^u | Yes ^u |
| Trust Territory of the Pacific | ... | ... | NA ^v | ... | ... | No | ... | ... | ... |
| Utah | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes | | |
| Vermont | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | | | |
| Virgin Islands | NA ^t | NA ^t | NA ^t | ... | No | No* | | | |
| Virginia | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Washington | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | |
| West Virginia | No | No | Partial ^w | No | No | No | | | |
| Wisconsin | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial | Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Wyoming | Yes | Yes | Yes | Partial | Yes | Yes | Yes | | |

Explanatory Notes for Table 5

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

^aAdmission information only.

^bThe District of Columbia law directs the Metropolitan Police Department (the criminal history repository) to show this information and to keep a record of cases that the prosecutor declines to prosecute.

^cUnder the District of Columbia law, the repository is required to keep a record of final dispositions.

^dUnder the District of Columbia law, the repository is required to keep a record of the admission and release of sentenced felons.

^eNo central criminal history record repository is maintained currently.

^fThe charging agency has the obligation to notify the repository of the disposition of every arrest, including no complaint by the prosecutor.

^gBy statute, arrest fingerprints are submitted after the prosecutor's decision to charge a crime punishable by over 92 days. The prosecutor's decision is provided on the arrest fingerprint card; declinations are not.

^hThe fingerprint requirement was repealed in 1993. Release and admission information is now reported via a computer to computer interface.

ⁱAll action, including prosecutor action, is reported as a final disposition by the Administrative Office of the Courts.

^jProsecutors report final court dispositions in lieu of the courts.

^kPursuant to statutory amendment, effective September 1, 1994.

^lNone of the actions is required by law to be reported; however, the courts do voluntarily report felony dispositions.

^mRelease information only.

Table 5: Data required by State law to be submitted to State criminal history repository, 1993

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

Explanatory Notes for Table 6

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

Note: Percentages and numbers reported are results of estimates. Numbers have been rounded to the nearest 100. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number. The total number of arrest fingerprint cards submitted to State criminal history repositories in 1989 and in 1992 was calculated using the mid-point of the range where a range appears in the underlying data. Except as noted in the "Explanatory Notes", arrest information is reported to all State criminal history repositories by fingerprint cards only. Except for Louisiana, Maryland, Montana, Utah and Wisconsin, for which corrected data were submitted, the data in the columns for 1989 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems* (March 1991), Table 6. Except for Louisiana, Puerto Rico and Utah, for which corrected data were submitted, the data in the columns for 1992 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems, 1992* (November 1993), Table 6.

... Not available.

NA Not applicable.

^aA change in procedure now allows the use of a court disposition as an arrest document when no arrest fingerprint card is received.

^bArrest information is reported by fingerprint cards, terminal and court judgments.

^cState law and/or policy does not require arrest information to be supported by fingerprints; arrest information is entered from final dispositions and from criminal summonses which are not supported by fingerprints.

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

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

^fArrest information is reported on fingerprint cards and on uniform arrest reports which may not include fingerprints.

^gArrest information is reported by fingerprint cards and criminal summonses.

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

ⁱThe Metropolitan Police Department also serves as the central repository for criminal records for the District of Columbia; fingerprinting, therefore, is performed by the Police Department.

^jFigure is for fiscal year 1989 rather than calendar year 1989.

^kArrest information is reported by a hard copy of the arrest report.

^lRepository no longer receives fingerprint cards for nonserious charges.

^mNo central criminal history record repository is maintained currently.

ⁿArrest information is reported by terminal.

^oThe small percentage of arrests that are not supported by fingerprints are assigned State identification numbers with a "U" (unknown) prefix. This allows for easy identification of these exceptions. Unsupported arrests sometimes occur when an offender is hospitalized, or refuses, or for some other reason, is unable to be printed.

^pArrest information is reported by fingerprint cards, terminal, final dispositions, FBI abstracts and other documents.

^qArrest information is entered from final dispositions and criminal summonses which are not supported by fingerprints; cases handled in other ways, such as diversion agreements, are also unsupported.

^rApproximately 70% of all persons charged with a criminal offense are summoned to appear in court rather than being arrested. In 1987, the fingerprint law was changed to provide that persons being summoned in addition to those arrested are to be fingerprinted. Prior to the change, the law mandated that a person had to be "in custody charged with the commission of a crime" to be fingerprinted. Training is ongoing to bring the submission rate into compliance.

^sArrest information is entered from criminal summonses which are not supported by fingerprints.

^tAlthough arrests are fingerprint-supported, the arrests are not linked to the case cycle; therefore, the criminal history file is not fingerprint-supported.

^uPre-1968 arrests are supported by FBI fingerprints.

^vArrest information is reported by fingerprint cards and court abstracts.

^wThe decrease in fingerprint cards submitted was due to a decrease in criminal arrests.

^xNew York law requires that the fingerprints associated with sealed records must be purged.

^yArrests for "not sufficient funds" checks are entered with only an index fingerprint.

^zFigure is lower than reported in 1989 and 1992 because the 1993 figure does not include applicant cards, as did the 1989 and 1992 figures.

^{aa}A 30-35% non-compliance rate for mandated fingerprint card submissions is under review.

^{bb}No fingerprint system is maintained currently.

^{cc}Arrest information is reported on an arrest/custody form which need not be accompanied by fingerprints.

^{dd}Response is based on the results of an audit.

^{ee}Arrest information is entered from final dispositions and citations which are not supported by fingerprints. The State regulations requiring fingerprints also are not enforced.

^{ff}Arrest information is entered from arrest forms submitted to the Records Bureau by the Police Department. Fingerprints are taken and retained in the Forensic Bureau.

Table 6: Arrest records with fingerprints, 1989, 1992 and 1993

| State | Number of arrest fingerprint cards submitted to State criminal history repository | | | Percent change 1989-92 | Percent change 1992-93 | Percent of arrest events in criminal history files that are fingerprint-supported | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------|
| | 1989 | 1992 | 1993 | | | 1989 | 1992 | 1993 |
| Total | 6,012,400 | 6,255,800 | 6,466,000 | 4% | 3% | | | |
| Alabama | 292,900 | 197,200 | 192,300 | -33% | -2% | 100% | 99% ^a | 99% |
| Alaska | 15,900 | 12,000 | 14,000 | -25 | 17 | 75 ^b | 39 | 39 |
| American Samoa | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | <100 ^c |
| Arizona | 101,900 | 110,000 | 114,800 | 8 | 4 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Arkansas | 23,000 | 32,400 | 36,000 | 41 | 11 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| California | 1,000,000 | 1,100,000 | 1,100,000 | 10% | 0% | 100% | 100% ^d | 100% |
| Colorado | 137,000 | 130,700 | 129,000 | -5 ^e | -1 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Connecticut | 97,100 | 114,000 | 115,000 | 17 | 1 | 75 ^f | 100 | 100 |
| Delaware | 40,000 | 50,000 | 44,700 | 25 | -11 | 95 ^g | 90 ^h | 90 |
| District of Columbia ⁱ | 10,000 ^j | 42,700 | 41,800 | 327 | -2 | 95 ^k | 100 | 100 |
| Florida | 585,400 | 507,000 ^l | 500,600 | -13% | -1% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Georgia | 330,000 | 346,500 | 350,000 | 5 | 1 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Guam ^m | ... | ... | NA | ... | NA | ... | ... | NA |
| Hawaii | 52,700 | 52,600 | 53,200 | <-1 | 1 | 98 ⁿ | 100 | <100 ^o |
| Idaho | 27,300 | 28,200 | 34,300 | 3 | 22 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Illinois | 200,300 | 404,800 | 336,700 | 102% | -17% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Indiana | 46,400 | 52,300 | 50,400 | 13 | -4 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Iowa | 30,000 | 47,300 | 53,100 | 58 | 12 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Kansas | 46,800 | 62,100 | 64,500 | 33 | 4 | 70-75 ^p | 0-65 | 80 ^q |
| Kentucky | 22,500 | 41,300 | | 84 | | 98 | 100 | |
| Louisiana | 135,900 | 134,400 | 154,700 | ... | ... | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Maine | 6,500 | 7,300 | 5,500 | 12% | -25% | 30 ^r | 30 ^r | 30 ^r |
| Maryland | 103,000 | 105,300 | 162,400 | -31 | 54 | 100 | 100 | 75 ^s |
| Massachusetts | 50,000-55,000 | 60,000 | 65,000 | 9-20 | 8 | 0 ^t | 0 ^t | 0 ^t |
| Michigan | 116,800 | 124,100 | 114,800 | 6 | -7 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Minnesota | 26,500 | 35,600 | 40,000 | 34% | 10% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Mississippi | 9,000 | 8,400 | 9,000 | -7 | 7 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Missouri | 92,000 | 91,900 | 89,500 | <-1% | -3 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Montana | 13,300 | 26,000 | ... | 95 | ... | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Nebraska | 13,700 | 18,500 | 16,500 | 35 | -11 | 100 | 100 | 98 ^u |
| Nevada | 36,300 | 53,700 | 49,600 | 48% | -8% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| New Hampshire | 9,300 | ... | 20,100 | ... | ... | 25-35 ^v | 50 | 100 |
| New Jersey | 145,700 | 123,300 | 110,900 | -15 ^w | -10 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| New Mexico | 26,200 | 33,600 | 34,800 | 28 | 4 | 98 | 100 | 100 |
| New York | 520,100 | 496,500 | 492,900 | -5 | -1 | 90 | 99 | 70 ^x |
| North Carolina | 63,200 | 75,000 | 76,300 | 19% | 2% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| North Dakota | 5,000 | 7,000 | 7,200 | 40 | 3 | 100 | 100 | 94 ^y |
| Ohio | 114,500 | 140,900 | 149,200 | 23 | 6 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Oklahoma | 60,000 | 59,500 | 46,000 ^z | <-1 | -23 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Oregon | 92,100 | 106,000 | 91,400 | 15 | -14 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Pennsylvania | 166,700 | 168,100 | 143,700 | 1% | -15% ^{aa} | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Puerto Rico | ... | ... | 15,800 | ... | ... | ... | 7 | 17 |
| Rhode Island | 30,000 | ... | 25,000 | ... | ... | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| South Carolina | 154,400 | 161,900 | 167,300 | 5 | 3% | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| South Dakota | 17,600 | 20,000 | 19,000-20,000 | 14 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Tennessee | 75,000 | 90,000 | 83,200 | 20% | -8% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Texas | 398,400 | 450,000 | 581,400 | 13 | 29 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Trust Territory of the Pacific | ... | ... | NA ^{bb} | ... | NA | ... | ... | NA |
| Utah | 35,200 | 42,500 | 44,400 | 21 | 4 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Vermont | 9,000 | 7,000 | 5,000 | -22 | -29 | 35-40 ^{cc} | 20 ^{dd} | 25 ^{ee} |
| Virgin Islands | ... | 300 | NA ^{ff} | ... | NA | ... | 100% | NA |
| Virginia | 110,000 | 134,100 | 136,400 | 22% | 2% | 100% | 100 | 100% |
| Washington | 131,600 | 160,600 | 168,300 | 22 | 5 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| West Virginia | 37,200 | ... | ... | ... | ... | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Wisconsin | 78,600 | 96,500 | 100,000 | 23 | 4 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Wyoming | 11,100 | 10,100 | 9,800 | -9 | -3 | 100 | | |

Explanatory Notes for Table 7

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

Note: Percentages reported are results of estimates. Except for Delaware, Florida, Louisiana, Puerto Rico, Utah, Vermont and Washington, for which corrected data were submitted, the data in the columns for 1989 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems* (March 1991), Table 7. Except for Delaware, Florida, Louisiana, Utah and Vermont, for which corrected data were submitted, the data in the columns for 1992 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems, 1992* (November 1993), Table 7.

. . . Not available.

NA Not applicable.

^aThe figure reflects an estimate of the number *received* by the State repository.

^bBoth the fingerprinting and the filing of charges are performed at the same unit.

^cNo central criminal history repository is maintained currently.

^dThe number of such cases reflect only those actually reported and entered in the repository. It is unknown how many of those cases were not reported or erroneously reported; therefore a percentage is unavailable.

^eThe law requires total expungement of records that result from an acquittal or dismissal. "No charges filed" is considered a dismissal; thus, no statistics exist.

^fPolice must release or charge an individual *before* sending fingerprints to the repository.

^gNotification is accomplished by disposition forms.

^hPolice departments do report dispositions.

ⁱNo fingerprint system is maintained currently.

^jArrest information is entered from arrest forms submitted to the Records Bureau by the Police Department. Fingerprints are taken and retained in the Forensic Bureau.

Table 7: Notice to State criminal history repository of release of arrested persons without charging, 1989, 1992 and 1993

| State | If an arrestee is not charged after submission of fingerprints, State law requires notification of repository | | | Number of cases 1993 | Percent of fingerprint submissions for which repository is notified that arrestee has not been charged 1993 |
|-----------------------------------|---|------|------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | 1989 | 1992 | 1993 | | |
| Alabama | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | <1% |
| Alaska | No | No | No | ... | ... |
| American Samoa | ... | ... | No | ... | ... |
| Arizona | No | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| Arkansas | No | No | Yes | ... | <1 |
| California | Yes | Yes | Yes | 125,000 ^a | ... |
| Colorado | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | <5% |
| Connecticut | No | No | No | ... | ... |
| Delaware | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| District of Columbia ^b | | | Yes | 155 | 100% |
| Florida | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| Georgia | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| Guam ^c | ... | ... | NA | NA | NA ^d |
| Hawaii | Yes | Yes | Yes | 13,100 ^d | ... |
| Idaho | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| Illinois | Yes | Yes | Yes | 1,300 | ... |
| Indiana | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| Iowa | Yes | Yes | Yes ^e | ... | ... |
| Kansas | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| Kentucky | No | Yes | | ... | ... |
| Louisiana | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| Maine | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | ^b |
| Maryland | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| Massachusetts | No | No | No | ... | ... |
| Michigan ^f | | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| Minnesota | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| Mississippi | No | No | No | ... | ... |
| Missouri | No | No | Yes | ... | ... |
| Montana | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| Nebraska | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| Nevada | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| New Hampshire | No | No | No | ... | ... |
| New Jersey | No | No | No | ... | ... |
| New Mexico | No | No | No | ... | ... |
| New York | No | Yes | No | ... | ... |
| North Carolina ^f | No | No | Yes | ... | ... |
| North Dakota | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| Ohio | No | No | Yes ^g | ... | ... |
| Oklahoma | No | No | No | ... | ... |
| Oregon | No | No | Yes | ... | ... |
| Pennsylvania | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| Puerto Rico | No | No | No | ... | ... |
| Rhode Island | No | No | No ^h | ... | ... |
| South Carolina | No | No | No | ... | ... |
| South Dakota | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | 5% |
| Tennessee | No | No | No | ... | ... |
| Texas | No | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| Trust Territory of the Pacific | ... | ... | NA ⁱ | NA | NA |
| Utah | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| Vermont | No | No | No | ... | ... |
| Virgin Islands | ... | No | NA ^j | NA | NA |
| Virginia | No | No | No | ... | ... |
| Washington | No | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| West Virginia | Yes | Yes | No | ... | ... |
| Wisconsin | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| Wyoming | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |

Explanatory Notes for Table 8

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

Note: Percentages and numbers reported are results of estimates. Numbers have been rounded to the nearest 100. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number. Except for Delaware, Puerto Rico and Utah, for which corrected data were submitted, the data in the columns for 1989 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems* (March 1991), Table 8. Except for Arkansas, Delaware, Iowa, Puerto Rico, South Carolina and Utah, for which corrected data were submitted, the data in the columns for 1992 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems, 1992* (November 1993), Table 8.

. . . Not available.

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

^aBased on the information retained by the repository, this number cannot be determined.

^bPending legislation will require reporting of prosecutor declinations.

^cPending legislation will require reporting of felony trial court dispositions.

^dThe figure reflects an estimate of the number *received* by the repository.

^eDispositions are not received on 30-40% if *all* arrests. It is unknown at what level the final disposition occurred.

^fProsecutors' position is that a declination is not a disposition; therefore, declinations are not reported.

^gIn 1989, the repository was receiving 100% of all dispositions that had occurred in the automated District Court systems; these dispositions were placed in the automated disposition "Pending Posting" file, but they lacked sufficient elements to match them with arrest records. The estimate for 1992 reflects the number of dispositions reported that do match arrests.

^hPercentage estimate is as of April 1994.

ⁱThe response is based on more accurate information available to the repository.

^jApproximately 47% of all felony arrests *without* dispositions are over one year old.

^kNo central criminal history records repository is maintained currently.

^lFigure represents *all* cases, not just felonies.

^mFigure was determined by a data quality baseline audit.

ⁿMore accurate information was available. The State repository is working with the courts to improve reporting of dispositions.

^oThe response for 1992 was an estimate; the 1993 response is based on the results of a baseline audit.

^pThe law requires total expungement of records that result from an acquittal or dismissal. "No charges filed" is considered a dismissal; therefore, no statistics exist.

^qThe charging agency has the responsibility to notify the repository of the disposition of every arrest, including those where no complaint is filed by the prosecutor.

^rFifty-one percent of the 1993 arrests have final dispositions.

^sMore accurate information was available.

^tBy administrative regulation, failure of the prosecutor to notify the repository of action on the case within 30 days after the arrest results in the case being closed and considered not filed.

^uThe decrease in dispositions in 1993 from 1992 resulted when a major contributor, St. Louis Police Department, stopped reporting dispositions for the courts. The courts did not pick up the reporting when the Police Department stopped. The State criminal history repository is currently in the process of obtaining the dispositions from the courts.

^vThrough an interpretation of the existing statute, it has been determined that the statute does not require that final court dispositions be submitted to the repository.

^wPercentage represents final dispositions for 1993 felony arrests received as of February 15, 1994.

^xAll action, including prosecutor action, is reported as final dispositions by the Administrative Office of the Courts.

^yDue to manpower requirements, the project for obtaining missing dispositions was suspended for a few years. The repository currently is working on ways to obtain the missing dispositions.

^zThe decline is due to large contributors who are no longer reporting and some who are working toward electronic reporting.

^{aa}Decline in dispositions received is due to a personnel shortage.

^{bb}Figure reflects the percent of dispositions reported in 1987; more current figures were unavailable.

^{cc}Information is provided by County Clerks of Court.

^{dd}In 1992, this requirement was relatively new.

^{ee}The total number is not available; 346 cases were reported to April 1994.

Table 8: Completeness of prosecutor and court disposition reporting to State criminal history repository, 1989, 1992 and 1993

| State | Number of prosecutor declinations 1993 | Percent of cases in which State criminal history repository is notified of: | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|---|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| | | Prosecutor declinations | | | Final felony trial court dispositions | | |
| | | 1989 | 1992 | 1993 | 1989 | 1992 | 1993 |
| Alabama | ... | <1% | <1% | ... | 30% | 20% | 90% |
| Alaska | ... | NA | ... ^a | ... ^a | 85 | 90 | 90 |
| American Samoa | ... | ... | ... | NA | ... | ... | NA |
| Arizona | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Arkansas | ... | 15 | NA ^b | <1% | 35 | 62 ^c | 58 |
| California | 84,000 ^d | ... | ... | ... | 85% | ... ^e | 47% |
| Colorado | 0 ^f | <15% | 0% ^f | 0% ^f | 100 | 0-1% ^g | 60 |
| Connecticut | ... | NA | NA | NA | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Delaware | ... | ... | ... | ... | 60 | 72 | 72 |
| District of Columbia | 15,000 | 0 | ... | 50 | 5 | ... | ... |
| Florida | ... | 60% | 80% | ... | 50% | 80% | 30-50% ^h |
| Georgia | ... | 100 | 90+ ⁱ | ... | 85 | 90+ | ... ^j |
| Guam ^k | ... | ... | ... | NA | ... | ... | NA |
| Hawaii | 5,900 ^d | ... | ... | ... | ... | 80 ^l | 74 |
| Idaho | ... | 100 | ... | NA | 80 | 71 ^m | 70 |
| Illinois | 10,600 ^d | 50% | 68% | ... | 50% | 52% | ... |
| Indiana | ... | 50 | 55 | NA | 75 | 30-40 ⁿ | 12% ^o |
| Iowa | ... ^p | NA | NA | ... | ... | 98 | 98 |
| Kansas | ... | 35-40 | ... | ... | 80 | ... | ... |
| Kentucky | ... | NA | 100 | NA | 75-80 | 90 | 60 |
| Louisiana | ... | 50% | 30% | ... | 50% | 50% | ... |
| Maine | ... | <1 | ... ^q | 1% | 100 | 99 | 99% |
| Maryland | ... | ... | 100 | ... | 82 | 100 | ... |
| Massachusetts | NA | NA | 100 | 100 | 100 | 98 | 100 |
| Michigan | ... | NA | ... | ... | 64 | 70 | ... ^r |
| Minnesota | 2,800 | 70% | 40% ^s | ... | 99% | 99% | 98% |
| Mississippi | ... | 30 | NA | NA | 25 | NA | NA |
| Missouri | 9,400 | 80 | 5-10 ^t | 10% | 60 | 68 | 35 ^u |
| Montana | ... | ... | ... | ... | 80 | 70 | 73 |
| Nebraska | ... | 100 | ... | NA | 50 | 75 | 75 |
| Nevada | ... | 90% | 75% | ... | 65% | 50% | ... |
| New Hampshire | ... | NA | NA | NA | 80 | 80 | 80% |
| New Jersey | 3,000 | 90 | 90 | 95% | 95 | 95 | 90 |
| New Mexico | ... | NA | 5 | 2 | 5 | 15 ^v | 10 |
| New York | 9,200 ^d | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 59 ^w |
| North Carolina | ... | NA | 85% | ... ^x | 93% | 85% ^y | 90% |
| North Dakota | ... | 80% | ... | ... | 80 | 90 | ... |
| Ohio | ... | NA | NA | NA | 55 | 35 ^z | 35 |
| Oklahoma | ... | NA | NA | NA | 80 | 60 ^{aa} | 60 |
| Oregon | ... | NA | NA | NA | 60 ^{bb} | 100 | 100 |
| Pennsylvania | ... | 80% | 65% | ... | ... | 65% | 65% |
| Puerto Rico | NA | NA | NA | NA | 14% | 18 | 17 |
| Rhode Island | NA | 1 | ... | NA | ... | ... | 100 |
| South Carolina | ... | 80 | 100 ^{cc} | NA | 100 | 98 | 100 |
| South Dakota | ... | 1 | ... | 5% | 75 | 60-75 | 81 |
| Tennessee | ... | NA | NA | NA | 5% | 35-40% | NA |
| Texas | ... | 0% | 0% ^{dd} | ... ^{dd} | 40 | 40 ^{dd} | 50 |
| Trust Territory of the Pacific | ... | ... | ... | NA | ... | ... | 30% |
| Utah | ... | 0 | 45 | 64% | 55% | 60% | 91% |
| Vermont | ... | 100 | 94 | 95 | 100 | 94 | 95 |
| Virgin Islands | ... | ... | ... | NA | ... | 35% | NA |
| Virginia | ... | NA | NA | NA | 95% | 96 | 96 |
| Washington | ... | 40% | ... | ... | 7 | 75-80 | 78% |
| West Virginia | ... | 85 | 75% | NA | 85 | 75 | ... |
| Wisconsin | ... | ... | ... | NA | ... | ... | 58 |
| Wyoming | ... ^{ee} | 60 | 80 | ... | 60 | 80 | ... |

Explanatory Notes for Table 9

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

- † 1 Record is destroyed by State criminal history repository.
- 2 Record is retained with action noted on the record.
- 3 Record is returned to the court.
- 4 Record is sealed.
- 5 No action is taken.
- 6 Record is returned to submitting agency.
- 7 Record is returned to the Governor's Office.
- 8 Other

. . . Not available.

NA Not applicable.

^aInformation is removed from the file.

^bJuveniles only.

^cUpon expungement or a pardon only.

^dPursuant to District of Columbia law, expungements and set asides are granted only for cases that fall under the Youth Rehabilitation Act and Drug (Misdemeanor Possession) Title. The restoration of an individual's civil rights would follow such rulings. Pending legislation would give the Mayor of the District of Columbia broader authority for granting expungements and setting aside of convictions.

^eThe repository removes the information from the criminal history record, gathers all supporting documentation and forwards all to the U.S. Attorney's Office for final disposition.

^fThe Mayor of the District of Columbia has limited authority to grant pardons.

^gNo central criminal history repository is maintained currently.

^hState law does not provide for expungements, but courts have inherent authority to order a record expunged; in such cases, the record is destroyed.

ⁱThe record is retained for two years, then destroyed.

^jThe offender's fingerprints are destroyed, but the text data is retained.

^kThe information is destroyed only if the offender is also pardoned.

^lRecords are maintained in a separate area and are inaccessible under and to all except in very limited circumstances.

^mIf received, the information is forwarded to the FBI.

ⁿNone have been received.

Table 9: Policies/practices of State criminal history repository regarding modification of felony convictions, 1993

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

Explanatory Notes for Table 10

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

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

... Not available.

NA Not applicable.

^aIf fingerprint cards are received from corrections, they are processed; there is no link, however, between corrections and the criminal history database.

^bThere are no local jails in Delaware.

^cThe State repository and the Department of Corrections are working on a project to electronically enter the corrections data into the repository database.

^dApproximately 43,000 custodial fingerprints were received in 1993.

^eNo central criminal history repository is maintained currently.

^fThere is no legal requirement to submit fingerprints; the Department of Corrections has a policy to do so.

^gFingerprints are required for felons only.

^hOnly when on-line data could not be matched were fingerprints requested by the State repository.

ⁱFingerprints are submitted if they have not been taken previously by an arresting agency.

^jNo fingerprint system is maintained currently.

^kThe Virginia Department of Corrections has eliminated local jail classification of inmates.

Table 10: Fingerprinting of incarcerated offenders and linkage to records maintained by State criminal history repository, 1993

| State | Law requires fingerprinting of admitted prisoners and sending fingerprints to repository | | Percent of admitted prisoners for whom repository receives fingerprints | | Repository uses fingerprints to make positive identification and to link correctional data with proper records |
|---|--|------------------|---|------------------|--|
| | State prisons | Local jails | State prisons | Local jails | |
| Alabama | Yes | | 100% | | Yes |
| Alaska ^a | | | | | |
| American Samoa | | | | | |
| Arizona | Yes | Yes | ... | ... | |
| Arkansas | Yes | Yes | 100 | 60% | Yes |
| California | Yes | Yes | 99% | ... | Yes |
| Colorado | Yes | Yes | 70 | 99% | Yes |
| Connecticut | | | | | |
| Delaware | Yes | NA ^b | 100 | | Yes |
| District of Columbia | Yes | Yes | ... | ... | Yes |
| Florida | Yes | | ... | ... | |
| Georgia | Yes | | ... | ... | |
| Guam ^c | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Hawaii | | | | | |
| Idaho | Yes | | 100% | | Yes |
| Illinois | Yes | Yes | 100% | ... | Yes |
| Indiana | Yes | Yes | 86 | 58% | Yes |
| Iowa | Yes | Yes | 99 | ... | Yes |
| Kansas | | | 100 | 100 | Yes |
| Kentucky | Yes | Yes | 85 | 60 | Yes |
| Louisiana | | | 100% | | Yes |
| Maine | | | 99 ^f | 5% | Yes |
| Maryland | Yes | | 100 | | Yes |
| Massachusetts | Yes | Yes | 100 | 50 | Yes |
| Michigan | Yes | | 100 | | Yes |
| Minnesota | Yes | Yes | 100% | 0% | Yes |
| Mississippi | Yes | | 100 | | |
| Missouri | Yes | | 100 | | Yes |
| Montana | | Yes ^g | 100 | ... | Yes |
| Nebraska | Yes | Yes | 95 | ... | Yes |
| Nevada | | | 100% | | |
| New Hampshire | | | 100 | | Yes |
| New Jersey | Yes | Yes | 100 | 80% | Yes |
| New Mexico | Yes | Yes | ... | ... | Yes |
| New York | | Yes | ... | ... | Yes |
| North Carolina | Yes | Yes | 100% | 100% | Yes |
| North Dakota | Yes | Yes | 100 | 25 | Yes |
| Ohio | Yes | | 100 | | Yes |
| Oklahoma | | | 100 | | Yes |
| Oregon | | | 100 | | Yes |
| Pennsylvania | | | 95% | | Yes |
| Puerto Rico | | | | | |
| Rhode Island | | | | | |
| South Carolina | Yes | | 99 | 98% | Yes |
| South Dakota | Yes | Yes | 100 | 95 | Yes |
| Tennessee | Yes | Yes ⁱ | 100% | ... | Yes |
| Texas | Yes | | 100 | | Yes |
| Trust Territory of the Pacific ^j | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Utah | Yes | | 100 | | Yes |
| Vermont | Yes | Yes | 100 | ... | Yes |
| Virgin Islands | | | | | |
| Virginia | Yes | Yes | 85% | 15% ^k | Yes |
| Washington | Yes | Yes | 90 | ... | Yes |
| West Virginia | | | | | Yes |
| Wisconsin | Yes | Yes | 68 | ... | Yes |
| Wyoming | Yes | Yes | 100 | ... | Yes |

Explanatory Notes for Table 11

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

Note: The figures reported in this table are from States in which there is a legal requirement that probation/parole information must be reported to the State criminal history repository or States where the information is voluntarily reported. The absence of a response indicates that the State neither statutorily mandates that the information is reported nor is the information voluntarily reported. See Table 5 for States which have a legal requirement that probation/parole information must be reported to the repository. Percentages reported are the results of estimates. Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number. Except for Mississippi and Puerto Rico, for which corrected data were submitted, the data in the columns for 1989 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems* (March 1991), Table 11. Except for Arkansas, Missouri and Puerto Rico, for which corrected data were submitted, the data in the columns for 1992 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems, 1992* (November 1993), Table 11.

^aThe first figure represents information relating to admission to supervision; the second figure represents information relating to release.

^bNo central criminal history repository is maintained currently.

^cThe response for 1992 was an estimate; the 1993 response is based on the results of a baseline audit.

^dResponse is based on the results of a baseline audit.

^eThe State repository receives information on admissions to but not releases from probation.

^fThe percentage is estimated due to inability to determine all probation orders assigned in 1993.

... Not available.

NA Not applicable.

Table 11: Probation and parole data in State criminal history repository, 1989, 1992 and 1993

| State | Percent of cases where admission to and release from supervision is reported to repository | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------|------------------|--------|--------------------|------------------|
| | Probation | | | Parole | | |
| | 1989 | 1992 | 1993 | 1989 | 1992 | 1993 |
| Alabama | | 100% | | | 100% | |
| Alaska | | | | | | |
| American Samoa | | | | | | |
| Arizona | | 0 | 0% | | 0 | ... |
| Arkansas | 10% | 30 | 30 | 100% | 98 | 90% |
| California | 85% | ... | | 100% | ... | ... |
| Colorado | 0 | <1% | <10% | 100 | 100% | 100% |
| Connecticut | | | | | | |
| Delaware | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| District of Columbia | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| Florida | 85% | | | 85% | | ... |
| Georgia | 100 | 90/10% ^a | ... | 100 | 90/2% ^a | ... |
| Guam ^b | ... | ... | NA | ... | ... | NA |
| Hawaii | ... | | ... | ... | | 0% |
| Idaho | 0 | 0 | 0% | | 0 | 0 |
| Illinois | 50% | ... | 0% | 50% | ... | ... |
| Indiana | 75 | 60% | ... | 1 | 60% | 16% ^c |
| Iowa | ... | 0 | ... | ... | 0 | ... |
| Kansas | 98 | 100 | 100 | 90 | ... | 100 |
| Kentucky | 100 | 100 | 80 | 100 | 100 | 80 |
| Louisiana | 98% | 100% | 100% | 95% | 100% | 100% |
| Maine | | | | | | |
| Maryland | 40 | 100 | ... | 40 | 100 | ... |
| Massachusetts | | 100 | 100 | | 100 | 100 |
| Michigan | | | | | | |
| Minnesota | 99% | 85% ^d | 75% | 99% | 85% ^d | ... |
| Mississippi | ... | 0-10 | ... | ... | 0-10 | ... |
| Missouri | 100 | 50 | 50% ^e | 100 | 99 | 100% |
| Montana | | | | | | |
| Nebraska | 50 | 45-50 | | 100 | 98 | ... |
| Nevada | ... | ... | | | | |
| New Hampshire | | | | | | |
| New Jersey | 40% | 80% | 90% | 90% | 80% | 80% |
| New Mexico | | | | | | |
| New York | 100 | ... | | 100 | ... | |
| North Carolina | 100% | | | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| North Dakota | 100 | 100% | 100% | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Ohio | 50 | 50 | ... | 95 | 95 | ... |
| Oklahoma | | | 10 | | | 10 |
| Oregon | 25 | | | 25 | | |
| Pennsylvania | 90% | ... | ... | 90% | ... | ... |
| Puerto Rico | 16 | 48% | 1% | 2 | 5% | 2% |
| Rhode Island | ... | | | ... | | |
| South Carolina | 100 | 100% | 98% | | | |
| South Dakota | 80 | 80 | 80 | 98 | 95% | 95 |
| Tennessee | ... | ... | | ... | ... | |
| Texas | 50% | 50% | 50% ^f | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Trust Territory of the Pacific | ... | ... | | ... | ... | |
| Utah | 75 | ... | ... | 100 | ... | ... |
| Vermont | 10 | 15 | ... | 50 | 60 | ... |
| Virgin Islands | ... | | | ... | | |
| Virginia | | | ... | | | ... |
| Washington | | 100% | 100% | | 100% | 100% |
| West Virginia | 85% | 90 | ... | 90% | 90 | ... |
| Wisconsin | ... | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Wyoming | 10 | 10 | 10 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Explanatory Notes for Table 12

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

Note: Numbers and percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number. Numbers of unprocessed or partially processed fingerprint cards have been rounded to the nearest 100.

. . . Not available.

NA Not applicable.

^aThere is no legal requirement for reporting arrest and fingerprint information to the repository.

^bData is for 1991.

^cProcessing time is due to a large backlog resulting from budget cuts; normal processing time is 30 days.

^dFigure represents the number as of October 1, 1994. It is estimated that this is a four-month backlog; 72 hours is the goal.

^eThis figure would include processing all archival arrests; for current workload, 80 days is needed to process the backlog.

^fIn most cases, arrests are entered into the system by the courts at the time of the arrest.

^gBecause the courts enter the arrest information at the time of the arrest, an arrest is started in the system before a fingerprint card is received; therefore, there is a backlog of entering fingerprint cards but not arrest text data.

^hThere is no backlog in the processing of manual arrest fingerprint cards. There is a backlog in entering corrections to arrest information into the automated system that supports the fingerprint cards.

ⁱWithin 2-3 days, arrest data is entered into a *temporary* file and is available on-line. Within 14-20 days, it is moved to permanent status.

^jNo central criminal history repository is maintained currently.

^kArrest fingerprint cards and arrest data are received and processed differently. In addition, there is a substantial difference in time and in the percent of total submittals between Honolulu and the other counties. The average time in 1993 between the occurrence of an arrest and receipt of the fingerprints for Honolulu was 7-10 days. This accounts for 71% of the State's fingerprint and arrest information. The average time in 1993 between the occurrence of an arrest and receipt of the fingerprints for others counties in the State was 24 days. The other counties account for 29% of the State's fingerprint and arrest information. The average time in 1993 between the occurrence of an arrest and receipt of the arrest information for Honolulu was 3-4 days. The average time in 1993 between the occurrence of an arrest and receipt of arrest information for others counties in the State was 7-14 days.

^lCurrently the State repository processes fingerprint cards to the FBI for only one small agency. Since this represents a very small percentage (3%) of all arrests in the State, the repository is able to process these within one day. This does not reflect the projected turnaround time for fingerprint card processing when the repository becomes a single source contributor.

^mThe August 1992 data quality baseline audit showed that nearly 1% of actual arrests are not entered into the State criminal history repository. In addition, there are approximately 1,100 "Neighbor Island" arrests that are missing arrest fingerprint cards and have not yet been processed for identification purposes. The backlog of arrests, therefore, is at least 1,100 records. The effort to research these missing arrests is extremely labor intensive; the person-days reported to clear the backlog is an estimate.

ⁿFigure reflects number of unprocessed fingerprint cards as of April 1, 1994.

^oThe amount of days to eliminate the backlog is unknown, but it is expected to be eliminated by summer 1994.

^pArrest data received in the form of arrest fingerprint cards are entered into the automated, temporary criminal history record file within two days of receipt. The names and aliases are placed in the master name index at that time. The fingerprint cards are then placed in a backlog for fingerprint search/identification processing. As of December 31, 1993, approximately 43,000 fingerprint cards were awaiting processing.

^qNo fingerprint system is maintained currently.

^rThis figure does not include person-days needed for processing the new receipts. The backlog is the result of automated fingerprint identification system (AFIS) conversion.

Table 12: Average number of days to process arrest data submitted to State criminal history repository and current status of backlog, 1993

| State | Average number of days between arrest and receipt of arrest data and fingerprints | Average number of days between receipt of fingerprints and entry of data into: | | Number of arresting agencies reporting arrest data by automated means | Percent of daily arrests in State represented by arresting agencies reporting by automated means | Backlog of entering data into criminal history database exists | Number of unprocessed or partially processed fingerprint cards | Number of person-days needed to eliminate backlog |
|---|---|--|---------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| | | Master name index | Criminal history database | | | | | |
| Alabama | 10 | 5 | 5 | | | No | | |
| Alaska | 15 | 3-25 | 2 | | | Yes | 400 | 2 |
| American Samoa ^a | NA | NA | NA | | | Yes | ... | ... |
| Arizona | 14 | 11 ^b | 11 ^b | | | Yes | 11,400 | 49 |
| Arkansas | 7 | 110 | 110 | | | Yes | 9,000 | 180 |
| California | 7-30 | 150 ^c | 150 ^c | | | Yes | 262,000 | 10,858 |
| Colorado | 8 | 2 | 15 | | | Yes | 40,000 ^d | 3,460 ^e |
| Connecticut | 7-10 | 120 | 120 | | | Yes | 28,000 | 120 |
| Delaware | 5 | 45 | 0-1 ^f | 61 | 100% | ... | ... | 60 |
| District of Columbia | <1 | 1 | <1 | 23 | 100 | Yes ^h | | 30 |
| Florida | 3-10 | 2-3 ⁱ | 2-3 ⁱ | | | No | | |
| Georgia | 4 | 3 | 3 | | | No | | |
| Guam ^j | NA | NA | NA | | | | | |
| Hawaii ^k | | 1 ^l | ... | 1 | 71% | Yes ^m | 1,100 | 150 |
| Idaho | 30 | 5 | 5 | | | Yes | 6,000 | 500 |
| Illinois | ... | ... | ... | 2 | 49% | Yes | 49,400 ⁿ | ... |
| Indiana | 7 | 14 | 14 | | | Yes | 11,000 | 870 |
| Iowa | 10 | 1 | 5 | | | Yes | 500 | 7 |
| Kansas | 10-30 | 90+ | 90-180 | | | Yes | 50,000 | 400 |
| Kentucky | 21 | 30 | 30 | | | Yes | 3,000 | 10 |
| Louisiana | 30 | 1 | 1 | | | Yes | 50,000 | ... |
| Maine | 14 | 1 | 3 | | | Yes | 300 | 14 |
| Maryland | 14 | 15 | 15 | | | No | | |
| Massachusetts | 14 | 14 | ... | | | Yes | 80,000 | ... |
| Michigan | ... | 10 | 10 | | | Yes | 4,500 | 10 |
| Minnesota | 20 | 1 | 2 | | | No | | |
| Mississippi | ... | 180 | 180 | | | Yes | ... | ... |
| Missouri | 23 | 2-3 | 2-3 | | | No | | |
| Montana | 18 | 1 | 3 | | | No | | |
| Nebraska | 14 | 16 | 16 | | | No | | |
| Nevada | 10 | 2 | 2 | | | No | 43,000 ^p | 350 |
| New Hampshire | 10 | 1 | 1 | | | No | | |
| New Jersey | 14-21 | 1 | 1 | | | No | | |
| New Mexico | 12 | 4 | 4 | | | No | | |
| New York | <7 | <7 | <7 | 18 | 58% | Yes | 12,100 | 30 |
| North Carolina | ... | 5 | 5 | | | No | | |
| North Dakota | 7-10 | 0-1 | 0-1 | | | No | | |
| Ohio | 12 | 6 | 6 | | | Yes | 2,500 | 4 |
| Oklahoma | 14 | <60 | <60 | | | Yes | 12,500 | 30-45 |
| Oregon | 14-90 | 14 | 14 | | | Yes | 9,000 | 140 |
| Pennsylvania | ... | 42 | 42 | | | Yes | 18,500 | 451 |
| Puerto Rico | ... | ... | ... | | | Yes | ... | ... |
| Rhode Island | 30 | 15 | 15 | | | No | | |
| South Carolina | 5 | 20 | 20 | | | No | | |
| South Dakota | 5-10 | 1 | 1 | | | No | | |
| Tennessee | ... | ... | ... | | | Yes | 7,500 | 792 |
| Texas | 10 | 10 | 10 | | | No | | |
| Trust Territory of the Pacific ^q | NA | NA | NA | | | | | |
| Utah | 10 | 5 | 5 | | | Yes | 2,000 | 14 |
| Vermont | ... | ... | ... | | | Yes | 1,200 | 18 |
| Virgin Islands ^a | NA | NA | NA | | | | | |
| Virginia | 15 | 2-4 | 5-7 | | | No | | |
| Washington | 18 | 14 | 29 | | | Yes | 11,700 | 80 |
| West Virginia | ... | 10 | 10 | | | Yes | 3,000 | 60 |
| Wisconsin | 29 | 3 | 86 | | | Yes | 33,000 | 958 ^r |
| Wyoming | 10 | 7-10 | 7-10 | | | Yes | 530 | 10 |

Explanatory Notes for Table 13

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

Note: Numbers and percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number. Numbers of unprocessed or partially processed disposition forms have been rounded to the nearest 100.

... Not available.

NA Not applicable.

^aFigure represents 61 counties.

^bNo legal requirement exists mandating the reporting of felony court dispositions to the repository.

^cFigure represents the average number of days for 1992.

^dAll felony disposition data is reported by automated means by the State Administrative Office of the Courts.

^eAll disposition reporting is to be done via on-line reporting to the State criminal history repository. Posting to the criminal history record is done monthly.

^fAn automated update occurs every 24 hours.

^gData is entered promptly upon receipt from the courts.

^hNo central criminal history repository is maintained currently.

ⁱThe court disposition backlog reflects the number of delinquent court charges that the State repository identifies through ongoing delinquent monitoring programs; the repository does not receive court forms, per se, for the purpose of data entry.

^jThe information is placed into a holding file on the same day it is received; it is added to the record when the record is inquired upon or returned to the file if no fingerprint-supported file exists.

^kCourt data is reported by tape and inserted into the database.

^lAll courts (13) report by diskette to the State Court Administrator's Office; the State repository then receives the information by automated means from the State Court Administrator's Office.

^mGenerally information is received within 24 hours from the urban/large automated courts which account for most of the felony trial courts.

ⁿInformation is entered immediately.

^oBacklog consists of manual dispositions.

^pAll courts report through one system.

^qResponse applies to felonies only.

^rProcessing for daily mail is 10 days; a pre-existing backlog is being reduced through a special project.

^sThe State repository has agreements with counties representing 72% of the dispositions to report electronically; the implementation is in process and is expected to be completed in December 1994.

^tAlthough no legal requirement exists for reporting felony court dispositions, those that are voluntarily reported are received in 15 days and account for about 30% of the felony court dispositions entered.

^uFigure represents the percentage of the total dispositions received.

^vThe reporting by automated means is a test project.

^wThe backlog also includes misdemeanor cases.

^xThis figure does not include person-days needed for processing the new receipts.

Table 13: Average number of days to process disposition data submitted to State criminal history repository and current status of backlog, 1993

| State | Average number of days between occurrence of final felony court disposition and receipt of data | Average number of days between receipt of final felony court disposition and entry of data into criminal history database | Number of courts currently reporting by automated means | Percent of cases disposed of in State represented by courts reporting by automated means | Backlog of entering court data into criminal history database | Number of unprocessed or partially processed court disposition forms | Number of person-days needed to eliminate backlog |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| Alabama | ... | 5 | 61 ^a | 85% | No | | |
| Alaska | 50 | 21 | | | Yes | 2,500 | 10-15 |
| American Samoa ^b | NA | NA | | | | | |
| Arizona | 24 ^c | 24 ^c | | | Yes | 24,300 | 77 |
| Arkansas | 45 | 4 | 1 ^d | 100 | No | | |
| California | 30-90 | <90 | 3 | 2% | Yes | 777,000 | 3,125 |
| Colorado ^e | >90 | 15 | 8 | 60 | | | |
| Connecticut | 14-28 | 485 | | | Yes | 147,000 | 294 |
| Delaware | 1 ^f | 1 ^f | 51 | 100 | No | | |
| District of Columbia | ... | ... | | | No | | |
| Florida | ... | 1 ^g | 60 | 100% | No | | |
| Georgia | 45 | 10 | 35 | 5 | Yes | 12,500 | 30 |
| Guam ^h | NA | NA | | | | | |
| Hawaii | 14 | 1-14 | 11 | 77 | Yes | 118,900 ⁱ | 2,258 |
| Idaho | 148 ^c | ... | 1 | 5 | Yes | 13,000 | 630 |
| Illinois | ... | ... | 5 | 67% | Yes | 14,500 | 189 |
| Indiana | 158 | 30 | | | Yes | 5,000 | 30 |
| Iowa | 20 | 7 | | | Yes | ... | 7 |
| Kansas | ... | ... | | | Yes | 50,000 | 400 |
| Kentucky | 120-190 | 10 | | | Yes | 4,000 | 7 |
| Louisiana | ... | ... | | | Yes | 100,000 | ... |
| Maine | 10 | 1 ^j | | | No | | |
| Maryland | 14 | 0 ^k | 51 | 98% | No | | |
| Massachusetts | 1 | 0 | 80 | 100 | No | | |
| Michigan | ... | 5 | 41 | 37 | Yes | 3,200 | 11 |
| Minnesota | 31 | 14 | 87 | 100% | No | | |
| Mississippi ^b | NA | NA | | | | | |
| Missouri | 51 | 5-7 | 1 ^l | 100 | No | | |
| Montana | ... | ... | | | No | | |
| Nebraska | 90 | 160 | | | Yes | 1,200 | 40 |
| Nevada | 30 | ... | | | Yes | 25,000 | 200 |
| New Hampshire | 7 | 1 | | | No | | |
| New Jersey | 30 | 30 | 60 | 90% | Yes | 65,000 | 365 |
| New Mexico | 30 | 30 | | | No | | |
| New York | <1 ^m | <1 ⁿ | ... | 75 | Yes | 20,000 | 145 |
| North Carolina | <5 | 1 | 99 | 92% | No | | |
| North Dakota | 30 | 1-5 | | | No | | |
| Ohio | 21 | 4 | ... | ... | Yes | 3,500 | 10 |
| Oklahoma | 30 | 30 | 2 | 16 | No | | |
| Oregon | 7 | 7 | ... | 100 | Yes | 21,000 ^o | 730 |
| Pennsylvania | ... | 3 | 560 | 65% | Yes | 52,800 | 199 |
| Puerto Rico | 1-5 | 5-10 | | | Yes | 54,600 | 11 |
| Rhode Island | 30 | 30 | 1 ^p | 100 ^q | | | |
| South Carolina | 30 | 15 | 37 | 75 | Yes | ... | 14 |
| South Dakota | 30 | 14 | | | No | | |
| Tennessee ^b | NA | NA | | | | | |
| Texas | 30 | 10 ^r | 26 | 80% ^s | Yes | 48,000 | 415 |
| Trust Territory of the Pacific ^b | 15 ^t | NA | | | | | |
| Utah | 30-60 | <1 ⁿ | 27 | 51 | No | | |
| Vermont | 10 | 7 | | | Yes | 2,500 | 20 |
| Virgin Islands | 25 | <1 | | | ... | | |
| Virginia | 90-120 | 3-4 | 2 | <1% ^u | No | | |
| Washington | 10 | 18 | 1 | ... ^v | Yes ^w | 49,000 | 230 |
| West Virginia | ... | 540 | | | Yes | 50,000 | 400 |
| Wisconsin | 56 | 126 | | | Yes | 114,000 | 831 ^x |
| Wyoming | 30-60 | 3-5 | | | Yes | 350 | 10 |

Explanatory Notes for Table 14

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

Note: Numbers and percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number. Numbers of unprocessed or partially processed custody-supervision reports have been rounded to the nearest 100.

* No legal requirement mandates the reporting of the information to the State criminal history repository.

. . . Not available.

NA Not applicable.

^aEffective February 1994, correctional data is received from the Department of Corrections (DOC) every two weeks; it is unknown how often the DOC database is updated.

^bThe entry delay is caused by a large backlog resulting from budget cuts.

^cThe delay is in submission of fingerprints; automated reports are current daily.

^dFigure refers to state-level releases.

^eThere are no local jails in Delaware.

^fThe correctional facilities enter their data into the database immediately; so the State repository has on-line access to the information. Fingerprint cards are received at the repository after the information is entered into the system.

^gThe State repository and the Department of Corrections are working on a project to enter the corrections data into the repository electronically.

^hThe figure refers to the State Department of Corrections.

ⁱFigure reflects average days for 1992.

^jThe information is placed into the file jacket on the date received. The record is not updated until it is inquired upon.

^kThe figure refers to State facilities only.

^lThe number totals several hundred thousand.

^mThe information is received immediately when entered on-line. If fingerprints are requested when an on-line data match cannot be made, the time increases to approximately 21 days.

ⁿFigure represents one state-level agency; local jails do not report on-line.

^oAlthough there is no legal requirement to submit the information, when it is submitted, the average time to enter the information into the criminal history database is 30 days.

^pThe number of person-days to eliminate the entire criminal history record information backlog of information and fingerprints from all agencies is 792; the number of person-days to eliminate the corrections backlog alone is unknown.

^qThe first figure represents the number of days to process fingerprint information; the second figure represents the number of days to process disposition data.

Table 14: Average number of days to process correctional admission data submitted to State criminal history repository and current status of backlog, 1993

| State | Average number of days between admission of offender and receipt of data from: | | Average number of days between receipt of correctional data and entry into criminal history database | Number of correctional agencies currently reporting by automated means | Percent of admission/status change/release activity occurring in State represented by agencies reporting by automated means | Backlog of entering correctional data into criminal history database | Number of unprocessed or partially processed custody - supervision reports | Number of person-days needed to eliminate backlog |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| | State prisons | Local jails | | | | | | |
| Alabama | 5 | NA* | 5 | 1 | 100% | No | | |
| Alaska* | NA | NA | | | | | | |
| American Samoa* | | | | | | | | |
| Arizona | ... ^a | ... ^a | ... | 1 | ... | No | | |
| Arkansas | 14 | 14 | 30 | | | Yes | ... | ... |
| California | 30 | 30 | >200 ^b | | | Yes | 188,000 | 7,863 |
| Colorado | >90 ^c | 10 | 30 | 1 | 100% ^d | Yes | 450 | 5 |
| Connecticut* | | | | | | | | |
| Delaware | <1 ^f | NA ^e | <1 ^f | 19 | 100 | No | | |
| District of Columbia | ... | NA* | ... | 1 | ... | No | | |
| Florida | ... | ... | ... ^g | | | ... | | |
| Georgia | 10 | NA* | 3 | 1 ^h | 100% | No | | |
| Guam* | | | | | | | | |
| Hawaii | ... | ... | ... | | | Yes | 8,500 | 161 |
| Idaho | 33 ⁱ | NA* | ... | | | Yes | ... | ... |
| Illinois | ... | ... | ... | | | No | | |
| Indiana | 32 | 7 | ... | | | Yes | ... | ... |
| Iowa | ... | ... | 3 | | | No | | |
| Kansas | 3-5 | ... | 90+ | | | Yes | 1,000 | 100 |
| Kentucky | 30 | 30 | 10 | | | Yes | 1,000 | 4 |
| Louisiana | 90-100 | NA* | ... | | | Yes | 2,000 | ... |
| Maine | 10 | NA* | 1 ^j | | | No | | |
| Maryland | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | No | | |
| Massachusetts | 20 | 20 | 2 | 9 | 72% | No | | |
| Michigan | 10 | 5 | 10 | | | Yes | ... | ... |
| Minnesota | 23 | 23 | 2 | 10 ^k | 100% | Yes | ... ^l | 600 |
| Mississippi | ... | ... | ... | | | Yes | ... | ... |
| Missouri | ... | ... | 3-5 | | | No | | |
| Montana* | NA | NA | | | | | | |
| Nebraska | 20 | 15 | 4 | 12 | 90 | No | | |
| Nevada | 10 | NA* | 10 | | | No | | |
| New Hampshire* | | | | | | | | |
| New Jersey | 14 | 14 | 30 | ... | 60% | Yes | 100 | 3 |
| New Mexico | ... | ... | 4 | | | No | | |
| New York | NA* | ... | 0-21 ^m | 1 ⁿ | 100 | Yes | ... | ... |
| North Carolina | 15 | 5 | 5 | | | No | | |
| North Dakota | 7 | 30 | 1-5 | | | No | | |
| Ohio | 20 | 15 | 30 | | | Yes | ... | ... |
| Oklahoma | 5 | NA* | 2 | | | No | | |
| Oregon* | NA | NA | 30 ^o | | | Yes | 800 | 5 |
| Pennsylvania* | NA | NA | NA | | | Yes | 700 | 2 |
| Puerto Rico | NA | NA | NA | | | | | |
| Rhode Island | NA | NA | NA | | | | | |
| South Carolina | 5 | 5 | 20 | | | No | | |
| South Dakota | 30 | 5-10 | 2-5 | | | No | | |
| Tennessee | ... | ... | ... | | | Yes | 2,000 | ... ^p |
| Texas | 3 | NA* | 2 | | | No | | |
| Trust Territory of the Pacific | 5 | NA* | 1 | | | No | | |
| Utah | ... | NA* | 30 | | | No | | |
| Vermont* | NA | NA | | | | | | |
| Virgin Islands* | NA | NA | | | | | | |
| Virginia | 42-56 | 42-56 | 5 | 1 | 100% | No | | |
| Washington | 30 | ... | 1 | 1 | ... | No | | |
| West Virginia | 14 | 14 | 28 | | | Yes | 250 | 5 |
| Wisconsin | 29 | ... | 86/126 ^q | | | Yes | ... | ... |
| Wyoming | 7-10 | ... | 10 | | | Yes | ... | ... |

Explanatory Notes for Table 15

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

- a Legislation/administrative changes
- b Training
- c Special project to obtain dispositions
- d Return to submitting agency
- e Auditing
- f Contact courts electronically

^jAll of the above procedures have been employed previously or are under consideration but cannot be maintained with current personnel.

^kNo central criminal history repository is maintained currently.

^lDelinquent disposition report monitoring began January 1, 1994.

^gDisposition monitoring is conducted only for felonies.

^mNew electronic programs are being developed to implement procedures to encourage complete arrest and disposition reporting.

^hDispositions are provided to the repository after a request (usually in written form) is initiated by private citizens seeking criminal record checks.

ⁿDelinquent disposition report monitoring is not currently done, but such procedures are a part of the computerized criminal history enhancements that are still to be implemented.

ⁱThe State criminal history repository is in the process of doing a "follow-up" program by county.

^oState repository is currently developing the capability to generate computer lists of missing dispositions.

Table 15: Procedures employed by State criminal history repository to encourage complete arrest and disposition reporting, 1993

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

Explanatory Notes for Table 16

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

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

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

^aName and court case number.

^bCourt case number.

^cArresting agency and booking number.

^dThe State repository uses a number constructed of the unique arrest event identifier, the arrest date and the originating agency identifier (ORI).

^eCriminal Justice Information System (CJIS) case number.

^fThe State repository uses a number that is a combination of the unique individual tracking number and the date of arrest.

^gNo central criminal history repository is maintained currently.

^hDate of birth.

ⁱORI number.

^jState identification (SID) number and agency case number and SID and arrest number.

^kThe State repository compares all data reported on the disposition form against all data received on the fingerprint card.

^lCase number is optional.

^mNo linking capability currently exists.

Table 16: Methods used to link disposition information to arrest/charge information on criminal history record, 1993

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

Explanatory Notes for Table 17

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

Note: Numbers and percentages reported are results of estimates. Numbers have been rounded to the nearest 100. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

. . . Not available.

* All data received can be linked.

^aDispositions are cross-matched through criminal case and police numbers.

^bInformation is entered temporarily into a separate database (Nonfingerprint-based Arrest and Disposition [NFAD] File).

^cThe information remains suppressed until linkage can be made.

^dThis figure is the result of a backlog; the normal percentage would be 10%.

^eInformation is placed into a "temporary" automated disposition file to match with late arriving arrest reports.

^fA manual file is maintained. Information is kept in the subject's jacket. When information is matched, it is added to the automated file.

^gNo central criminal history repository is maintained currently.

^hInformation is placed into a pending file.

ⁱThe submitting agency is contacted.

^jInformation is returned to the submitting agency.

^kCustody information is entered onto the rap sheet, and the court name and docket number are included.

^lThe unlinked court data are computerized for linking to arrest data when processed; the unlinked court records are not accessible to the field.

^mDummy segments may be created only if fingerprints are on file.

ⁿCorrectional information is not linked to arrest information.

^oTwo attempts are made to link the disposition; if no arrest fingerprints are found, the correctional fingerprints are used.

^pThis procedure is used if the court submission includes fingerprints that can be linked to an existing criminal history.

^qNo linking capability currently exists.

^rCourt and correctional data must have fingerprints.

Table 17: Procedures followed when linkage cannot be made between court or correctional information and arrest information in the criminal history database, 1993

| State | Create a 'dummy' segment | | Enter information without linkage to arrest/charge data | | Enter no information without linkage | | Other | Estimated dispositions received which <u>cannot</u> be linked to arrest/charge information | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Arrest assumed from court disposition | Court disposition assumed from correctional data | From courts | From correctional agencies | From courts | From correctional agencies | | Number of final court dispositions | Percent of final court dispositions | Number of correctional dispositions | Percent of correctional dispositions |
| Alabama | X | X | | | | | | ... | ... | ... | <10% |
| Alaska | X | | | | | | | ... | ... | * | * |
| American Samoa | | | | | | | X ^a | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Arizona | | | | | X | | X ^b | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Arkansas | | | X ^c | X ^c | | | | 2,000 | 42% | 400 | 10 |
| California | X | | | X | | | | 327,000 | 50% ^d | 108,000 | 100% |
| Colorado | | | | | | | X ^e | ... | 99 | ... | 1 |
| Connecticut | | | | | X | | X ^f | ... | 5 | ... | 7 |
| Delaware | | | X | | | | | ... | 5 | ... | ... |
| District of Columbia | | | | | | | | * | * | * | * |
| Florida | | | | | X | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Georgia | | | | | | | | ... | ... | 11,100 | 28% |
| Guam ^g | | | | | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Hawaii | | | | | X | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Idaho | | | | X | X | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Illinois | | | | | | | X ^h | ... | ... | * | * |
| Indiana | | | | | | | X ⁱ | ... | 30% | ... | 98% |
| Iowa | | | | | X | X | X ^j | ... | 5 | * | * |
| Kansas | X | X | X | X | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Kentucky | | | | X | X | | | ... | 15 | ... | 5 |
| Louisiana | | | | X | | | X ^j | ... | 10% | * | * |
| Maine | | | X | | | | X ^k | ... | 70 | ... | ... |
| Maryland | | | X | X | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Massachusetts | | | | X | | | | * | * | 5,600 | 18% |
| Michigan | | X | X | | | | X ^l | 28,900 | 16 | ... | ... |
| Minnesota | | | | | X | X | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Mississippi | | | | | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Missouri | | | | | X | | | ... | 4% | * | * |
| Montana | | | | X | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Nebraska | | X | | X | X | | | 4,000 | 22 | 2,300 | 18% |
| Nevada | | | | | X | | X ^j | ... | <1% | * | * |
| New Hampshire | X | | X | | | | | 15,500 | 60 | * | * |
| New Jersey | X ^m | X ^m | | | X ^c | X ^c | | 20,000 | 10 | 1,000 | 5% |
| New Mexico | | | | | X | X | X ^j | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| New York | | | X | X | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| North Carolina | | | | | X | | | 2,400 | 3% | n | n |
| North Dakota | | | | | | | | ... | 10 | ... | 10% |
| Ohio | | | | | | | | * | * | ... | ... |
| Oklahoma | X | | | | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Oregon | | | | | X | | | ... | 8-12 | * | * |
| Pennsylvania | | | | | X | | X ^o | 58,800 | 29% | ... | ... |
| Puerto Rico | | | X | X | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Rhode Island | | | | | X | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| South Carolina | | X | | X | X | | | ... | 7 | * | * |
| South Dakota | | | | X | X | | | ... | 5 | ... | 1% |
| Tennessee | | | | X | X | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Texas | X ^p | | | | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Trust Territory of the Pacific ^q | | | | | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Utah | | | | | X | | | ... | 38% | ... | ... |
| Vermont | X | | | | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Virgin Islands | | | | | X | | | ... | 1% | * | * |
| Virginia | X | | | X | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Washington | X | | X | X | | | X ^r | 1,900 | 2 | ... | ... |
| West Virginia | | | | | X | X | X ^j | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Wisconsin | | | | | X | X | | 5,600 | 6 | 290 | 6% |
| Wyoming | | | | | | | | * | * | * | * |

Explanatory Notes for Table 18

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| ^a Operator identification numbers are embedded in every record to identify and track errors. | ^h A complete quality control function exists on all criminal history entries. |
| ^b Audit procedures are employed. | ⁱ Computer reconciliation of computerized criminal history data is performed with contributing agencies' databases. |
| ^c Audit procedures are being tested. | ^j Computer comparison is made with the FBI computerized criminal history records. |
| ^d No central criminal history repository is maintained currently. | ^k All data is dual entered. |
| ^e Key verification. | ^l Two verifications are made of the fingerprint identification. |
| ^f Ensure compatible tracking numbers. | ^m Data purge lists are returned to data entry operators for correction. |
| ^g Missing information is obtained from courts and arresting agencies via telephone to ensure complete and accurate records. | |

Table 18: Strategies employed by State criminal history repository to ensure accuracy of data in criminal history database, 1993

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

Explanatory Notes for Table 19

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

Note: Except for Wisconsin for which corrected data was submitted, the data in the columns for 1989 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems* (March 1991), Table 18. The data in the columns for 1992 are taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems, 1992* (November 1993), Table 19.

. . . Not available.

^aLog is maintained for inquiries only.

^bAll inquiries are logged; updates are limited to the last transaction.

^cRandom sample audits were scheduled to begin in February 1994, resources permitting.

^dResources to conduct audits has been limited.

^eThe expungement process, however, was audited for 1990-92.

^fSince June 30, 1992, the Georgia Crime Information Center (GCIC) auditors have had to reduce the scope of their audits to satisfy National Crime Information Center (NCIC) audit frequency requirements.

^gNo central criminal history repository is maintained currently.

^hAudits were completed in conjunction with the baseline audit completed in August 1992.

ⁱRecord transaction log only.

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

^kA formal audit was not conducted; an agency was provided assistance on improving its procedures.

^lIn-house audits only.

^mRandom sampling is conducted daily on incoming fingerprint card submissions; specific agencies are not isolated.

ⁿVery limited.

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

^pExcept for modifications.

^qLogs are maintained for inquiries and responses only.

^rField staff works with agencies on data quality.

^sUser agencies are on a four-year auditing cycle. Data quality is one component of the audit.

^tThe first date represents the last audit of disposition reporting; the second date represents the last audit of arrest reporting.

^uThe first date represents the time period for the audit of disposition reporting; the second date represents the time period for the audit of arrest reporting.

Table 19: Audit activities of State criminal history repository, 1989, 1992 and 1993

| State | Transaction logs maintained to provide audit trail of inquiries, responses, record updates, modifications | | | Random sample audits of user agencies conducted to ensure data quality and compliance with laws | | | Date of last audit | Period of time covered by audit |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------|------------------|---|------------------|------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | 1989 | 1992 | 1993 | 1989 | 1992 | 1993 | | |
| Alabama | Yes | Yes ^a | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | | |
| Alaska | Yes | Yes | Yes ^b | No | No | No | | |
| American Samoa | ... | ... | No | ... | ... | No | | |
| Arizona | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | | |
| Arkansas | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | | |
| California | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Feb 1994 | 1 year |
| Colorado | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes ^c | | |
| Connecticut | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | |
| Delaware | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No ^d | Oct 1993 | Jan-June 1993 |
| District of Columbia | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | | |
| Florida | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No ^e | | |
| Georgia | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No ^f | | |
| Guam ^g | ... | ... | | ... | ... | | | |
| Hawaii | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes ^h | Yes | Aug 1992 | Jul 1991-Jan 1992 |
| Idaho | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | | |
| Illinois | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | ... | ... |
| Indiana | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | 1993 | 1992 |
| Iowa | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | 1994 | last 3 years |
| Kansas | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | | |
| Kentucky | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | | |
| Louisiana | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | 1993 | 1990-92 |
| Maine | Yes ⁱ | Yes ⁱ | Yes ⁱ | No ^j | No ^j | No ^j | | |
| Maryland | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | 1992 | 1991 |
| Massachusetts | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | | |
| Michigan | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | | |
| Minnesota | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes ^k | Jan 1994 | 2 years |
| Mississippi | No | No | No | No | No | No | | |
| Missouri | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes ^l | No | No | | |
| Montana | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 1993 | ... |
| Nebraska | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | | |
| Nevada | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | | |
| New Hampshire | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | | |
| New Jersey | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | ongoing | 1989 |
| New Mexico | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | | |
| New York | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Aug 1990 | Jan 1970-Sep 1988 |
| North Carolina | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | ongoing | |
| North Dakota | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 1990 | 1988-90 |
| Ohio | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes ^l | Yes | ... | last 5 years |
| Oklahoma | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | | |
| Oregon | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Mar 1994 | 1989-93 |
| Pennsylvania | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes ^m | Yes | | |
| Puerto Rico | ... | Yes | Yes | ... | No | No | | |
| Rhode Island | No | No | No | No | No | No | | |
| South Carolina | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes ⁿ | ... | ... |
| South Dakota | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | May 1993 | 1988-92 |
| Tennessee | Yes | Yes ^o | No | No | Yes | Yes | | |
| Texas | Yes | Yes ^p | Yes ^q | No | No ^r | No ^r | | |
| Trust Territory of the Pacific | ... | ... | No | ... | ... | No | | |
| Utah | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | |
| Vermont | Yes | Yes | Yes ^q | No | No | Yes | Jul 1993 | 1990 |
| Virgin Islands | ... | No | No | ... | No | No | | |
| Virginia | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes ^s | ongoing | last 4 years |
| Washington | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Dec 1993 | Jan 1991-Dec 1993 |
| West Virginia | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | | |
| Wisconsin | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | | |
| Wyoming | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Dec 93/Nov 1992 ^t | 1993/Sep 1993 ^u |

Explanatory Notes for Table 20

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

... Not available.

§The State repository is in the process of strategy development.

- † 1 Audit/audit functions/procedures
- 2 Automation conversion/redesign/enhancements
- 3 Disposition/arrest reorting procedures/enhancements
- 4 Felony flagging
- 5 Fingerprint card/system conversion/enhancements
- 6 Inter-agency/local agency interface
- 7 Legislation
- 8 Plan/strategy development
- 9 Task force/advisory group establishment
- 10 Tracking number implementation/improvements
- 11 Training seminars/policy and procedures manuals
- 12 Other

hMajor redesign of the computerized criminal history system in New Jersey was undertaken prior to the audit.

i The audit is currently under review for appropriate action.

jIn addition to this audit that determined the rate of missing felony dispositions for the past five years and the follow-up measures in which 95% of the dispositions were located and added to the State computerized criminal history system, many ongoing procedures help to ensure the quality of data maintained by the State repository. All new records (40%) are sent to contributors via telecommunications requesting verification of the accuracy of the rap sheet. The unified judicial system reports dispositions directly to the State repository; repository staff then contact arresting agencies if there are no fingerprints. No outside agency has conducted an audit because all funds were dedicated to becoming a full participant in the Interstate Identification Index and interfacing electronically with the court system, both of which have synchronization procedures guaranteeing high data quality standards.

^aElectronic capture of criminal justice information at the local level

^bInstallation of improved imaging (photo) system

^cInternal controls

kRegional hearings are being conducted on current system enhancements.

^dNo central criminal history repository is currently maintained.

lThe entire recordkeeping system is being organized, and a fingerprint procedure of all arrests is being implemented.

^eThe first time period is for the period covered for repository records; the second time period is for the period covered for reporting rates.

m Other changes as dictated by the Virginia Task Force workplan.

^fIdentifying "child abuse" information pursuant to the National Child Protection Act of 1993

Table 20: Data quality audits of State criminal history repository, 1993

| State | State criminal history repository database audited for completeness within last 5 years | Date of last audit | Period of time covered by audit | Agency that performed audit | Changes to improve data quality were made as a result of audit† | Data quality audits are planned or scheduled for next 3 years | Initiatives are underway to improve data quality‡ |
|--------------------------------|---|--------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|---|
| Alabama | | | | | | | ... |
| Alaska | X | 1993 | 1991-93 | Other agency | 4,8,9,10 | X | 3,5,6,7,8,10 |
| American Samoa | | | | | | X | 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11 |
| Arizona | X | Jul 1992 | 1987-91 | Other agency | 8,9,11 | X | 2,3,5,6,11 |
| Arkansas | | | | | | X | 1,2,4,5,6,8,10,11 |
| California | | | | | | | 2,3,4,6,8,9,10,11,12 ^a |
| Colorado | X | 1993 | prior 12 months | Other agency | 1,2,3,8 | X | 1,2,3,5,6,10,11 |
| Connecticut | | | | | | | 2,3,4,5,6,10 |
| Delaware | X | Oct 1992 | 1986-92 | Other agency | 2,3,5 | X | 2,4,5,11 |
| District of Columbia | X | 1993 | 1989-93 | Other agency | 1,2,3,5,6,8,9,10,12 ^b | X | 1,2,3,5,6,8,9 |
| Florida | | | | | | X | 1,2,3,4,6,7,10,11 |
| Georgia | X | Mar 1992 | 1980-91 | Other agency | 1,8,11,12 ^c | | 1,2,3,5,8,11 |
| Guam ^d | | | | | | | |
| Hawaii | X | Aug 1992 | Jul 1991-Jan 1992 | Other agency | 1,2,3,8 | X | 1,2,6 |
| Idaho | X | Mar 93 | 1988-92/1991-92 ^e | Other agency | 8,9 | | 2,3,6,7,10,11 |
| Illinois | X | Dec 1992 | 1992 | Other agency | 3,6,7,8,9,11 | X | 1,2,3,5,6,7,8,9,11 |
| Indiana | X | 1993 | 1992 | Other agency | 1,3,6,8,9,11 | X | 1,3,6,8,9,11 |
| Iowa | X | 1991 | 1986-91 | Other agency | 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,10,11 | | 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,10,11,12 ^f |
| Kansas | | | | | | X | 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11 |
| Kentucky | X | Jan 1994 | 1976-94 | Repository | g | X | 2,3,4,5,8,9,10 |
| Louisiana | X | 1993 | 1990-92 | Other agency | 2,3,4,5,6,8,9,10,11 | | 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,10,11 |
| Maine | | | | | | | 9,11 |
| Maryland | X | Aug-Sep 1992 | 1991 | Other agency | 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11 | X | 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11 |
| Massachusetts | X | Jun 1994 | 1993 | Other agency | 5,6,8,9,10 | X | 2,5,6,8,9,10,11 |
| Michigan | X | 1993 | 1991 | Other agency | 8,9 | X | 1,2,4,5,6,8,9 |
| Minnesota | X | Apr 1992 | 1990 | Other agency | 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,11 | X | 1,3,5,6,7,8,9,10,11 |
| Mississippi | X | ... | ... | Other agency | 8,9 | | |
| Missouri | X | 1993 | 1970-93 | Repository | 1,3,10,11 | | 1,2,3,6,10,11 |
| Montana | X | 1993 | cross-section | Other agency | 1,3,10 | X | 1,2,3,8,11 |
| Nebraska | X | Apr 1992 | 1986-91 | Other agency | 1,2,3,7,8,9,11 | X | 1,3,4,5,6,7,8,11 |
| Nevada | X | Jul-Dec 1993 | 1987-93 | Other agency | 8 | | 1,2,3,4,6,7,11 |
| New Hampshire | | | | | | X | 1,3,9 |
| New Jersey | X | Jan 1994 | 1993 | Repository, other agency | h | X | 1,2,3,6,11 |
| New Mexico | | | | | | | 2,4,8,9,11 |
| New York | X | Aug 1990 | 1985-87 | Other agency | 2,6 | X | 1,2,5,6,9,11 |
| North Carolina | | | | | | | 3,4,5,6,8,9 |
| North Dakota | | | | | | X | 1,2,3,5,11 |
| Ohio | X | ... | last 5 years | Repository | 2,4 | X | 2,3,5,10,11 |
| Oklahoma | | | | | | X | 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11 |
| Oregon | X | Mar 1994 | 1989-93 | Other agency | i | | 1 |
| Pennsylvania | X | Sep 1993 | prior 12 months | Other agency | 3,11 | X | 3,4,5,6,7,8,9,11 |
| Puerto Rico | X | Sep 1993 | 1987-93 | Repository | | X | 1,2,5,6,7,8,9,11,12 |
| Rhode Island | | | | | | | 3 |
| South Carolina | | | | | | | 2,3,9,10,11 |
| South Dakota | X ^j | May 1993 | 1988-92 | Repository | 1,2,3,6,7,10,11 | | |
| Tennessee | X | Dec 1992 | Jul 1991-Jun 1992 | Other agency | | | 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,10,11,12 ^k |
| Texas | | | | | | | 2,9,11,12 ^l |
| Trust Territory of the Pacific | | | | | | | |
| Utah | X | Dec 1993 | Jan 1992-Nov 1993 | Other agency | 3,5,6,8,10,11 | | 2,3,5,11 |
| Vermont | X | Jul 1993 | 1990 | Other agency | 5,8,9 | | 2,3,4,5,6,8,9,10,11 |
| Virgin Islands | | | | | | | 2,3,5,6,7,8,9,10 |
| Virginia | X | 1992 | 1991 | Other agency | 1,2,3,6,7,8,12 ^m | X | 12 ^m |
| Washington | X | ongoing | annually | Repository | 1,2,3,4,6,8,9,10,11 | X | 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11 |
| West Virginia | | | | | | X | 1,2,4,9 |
| Wisconsin | X | Jun 1993 | 1992 | Other agency | 4,8,9 | | 1,2,3,5,6,7,8,9,10,11 |
| Wyoming | | | | | | | 3,4,11 |

Explanatory Notes for Table 21A

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

* Note: States appearing in this table have been designated by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, U.S. Treasury Department, as States that currently have laws that qualify as alternatives to the five-day waiting period requirements of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (Public Law 103-159, November 30, 1993). 59 *Federal Register* 140, p. 37534 (July 22, 1994). Numbers for firearms checks have been rounded to the nearest 10.

- **
- 1 Prior to the sale of the handgun, a criminal records check of the potential purchaser is conducted using an *instant name check* system.
 - 2 Prior to the sale of the handgun, a name check of the potential purchaser is conducted that is *not* an instant name check.
 - 3 Prior to the sale of the handgun, the potential purchaser must submit an application and fingerprints to the appropriate authority.
 - 4 Prior to the sale of the handgun, the potential purchaser must obtain a permit (Firearm Owners Identification Card) that is fingerprint verified.
 - 5 Prior to the sale of the handgun, the potential purchaser must obtain a permit that is based upon a name search only.

- †
- A All firearms
 - H Handguns only
 - O Other firearms

^aUp to 24 hours is permitted if the instant check does not respond.

^bInstant check system did not begin until 1994.

^cExcept shotguns and antiques.

^dThe waiting period applies to handguns only.

^eAt least 30 days are required, but not more than 60 days.

^fThe Honolulu Police Department does not utilize information derived from an FBI fingerprint check to deny a permit. This is due in part to the length of time to process the fingerprints. The check, however, is utilized as a basis for retrieval of firearms from those individuals prohibited from ownership.

^gThe purchaser is required to wait three days when purchasing a handgun and one day when purchasing a long gun.

^hAll checks are conducted through the county sheriffs' offices, so totals are not available at the State repository level. The State repository can determine the number of times that purpose code "F" (for firearms checks) was used. For 1993, the total was 9,579; however, a number of factors could skew the number, including the use of another purpose code for a firearms check, duplicate inquiries on the same person, and inability of the system to distinguish inquiries for "permits to carry" from inquiries for "permits to purchase".

ⁱChecks are conducted for assault weapons and for some handguns approved by the Handgun Review Board.

^jPrior to issuing a license to purchase a handgun, a criminal history record check is conducted by the local police or sheriff's department, depending upon the purchaser's residency. The purchaser is then required to return to the local agency and have the handgun "inspected"/registered. All data on the sale and registration is forwarded to and indexed in the State criminal records repository.

^kGuns 30 inches or less in length are considered handguns in Michigan.

^lFigures represent the actual purchases made or attempted to be made; more may have been approved but never purchased.

^mChecks are made by the local sheriffs' departments, and the outcome of the checks is not reported to the State repository.

ⁿFigures represent the checks conducted by the State repository; since the handgun permit checks are performed by local law enforcement, there is no way to measure all of the criminal history checks conducted for purchase of handguns.

^oPotential purchasers are required to wait until both a State and a Federal fingerprint check can be completed.

^pFigure represents name checks conducted for the purpose renewals only.

^qUp to six months are permitted for the initial permit investigation.

^rCriminal history record checks are also conducted for the purchase of long guns in New York City.

^sThe figure represents the total number of fingerprint checks conducted for the purchase of firearms; breakdowns for approvals and denials are not available.

^tAt least two days are required, but not more than five days.

Table 21A: Procedures for presale criminal history record checks on potential firearm purchasers by States with “alternative”* systems, 1993

| State | Eligibility practices** | Waiting period | Types of firearms regulated† | Number of firearm checks, 1993 | | | |
|----------------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| | | | | Fingerprint checks | | Name checks | |
| | | | | Approved | Denied | Approved | Denied |
| California | 2-Non-instant name check | 15 | A | | | 635,690 | 6,509 |
| Colorado | 1-Instant name check | ^a | H | | | | ^b |
| Connecticut | 2-Non-instant name check | 14 | A | | | 44,770 | 297 |
| Delaware | 1-Instant name check | 0 | A ^c | | | 14,170 | 500 |
| Florida | 1-Instant name check | ^{3d} | A | | | 311,380 | 7,538/ 180 pending |
| Guam | 3-Fingerprint check | 30-60 ^e | A | 3,650 | 40 | | |
| Hawaii | 4-Permit | 14 | A | 5,000 | 0 ^f | 7,730 | 197 |
| Idaho | 1-Instant name check | | | | | | |
| Illinois | 1-Instant name check and 5-Permit (name-based) | 1-3 ^g | A | | | 202,780 | 1,160 |
| Indiana | 2-Non-instant name check | 7 | H | | | 123,150 | 45 |
| Iowa | 1-Instant name check and 5-Permit (name-based) | 3 | H | | | | ^h |
| Maryland | 2-Non-instant name check | 7 | ⁱ | | | 35,000 | 377 |
| Massachusetts | 5-Permit (name-based) | | A | | | | |
| Michigan | 5-Permit (name-based) ^j | | H ^k | | | 108,020 | 3,200 ^l |
| Missouri | 2-Non-instant name check ^m | | | | | | |
| Nebraska | 5-Permit (name-based) | | H | | | 3,090 | 185/ 510 pending ⁿ |
| New Jersey | 3-Fingerprint check and 5-Permit (name-based) | indefinite ^o | A | 24,730 | 900 | 28,120 ^p | 49 |
| New York | 4-Permit | 180 ^q | H,O ^r | | 29,670 ^s | | |
| Oregon | 3-Fingerprint check | 15 | H | 50,850 | 264 | | |
| Tennessee | 5-Permit (name-based) | 15 | A | | | | |
| Utah | 1-Instant name check | 0 | H | | | | |
| Virgin Islands | 2 and 3 - Other approvals and 4-Permit | | A | | | 150 | 11 |
| Virginia | 1- Instant check | | A | | | 211,140 | 1,739 |
| Wisconsin | 1-Instant name check | 2-5 ^t | H | | | 41,150 | 308 |

Explanatory Notes for Table 21B

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

* Note: States appearing in this table have been designated by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, U.S. Treasury Department, as States that currently have laws that qualify as alternatives to the five-day waiting period requirements of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (Public Law 103-159, November 30, 1993). *59 Federal Register* 140, p. 37534 (July 22, 1994). Numbers for firearms checks have been rounded to the nearest 10.

** N = Name check
F = Fingerprint check

^aProcedures require that private commitments, as well as commitments to State mental facilities, be included in the check.

^bSpecified juvenile offenses are also included in the check.

^cProcedures also require a determination that the potential purchaser is not a "clear and present danger" to himself or others and that the potential purchaser is not "wanted" in the State of Illinois.

^dCourts are also checked for disposition information.

^eThe statewide warrant database is also checked.

Table 21B: Data elements and databases used for presale record checks on potential firearm purchasers by States with “alternative” systems, 1993

| State | Data elements used in search of criminal history database | DATABASES CHECKED | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----|--|
| | | State repository records | National Crime Information Center | Interstate Identification Index | FBI-CJIS files | State mental health records | Civil restraining order files | INS | Probation/parole/pretrial release status |
| California | Name, DOB | N | N | N | | N ^d | N | | N ^b |
| Colorado | | N | N | N | | | N | N | |
| Connecticut | Name, DOB | N | | N | | | | | |
| Delaware | Name, DOB, SSN, Dr. Lic. | N | N | N | | | | | |
| Florida | Name, DOB, race, sex, SSN | N | N | N | | | N | | |
| Guam | Name, fingerprints | | | | F, N | | | | |
| Hawaii | Fingerprints if no name identification | F, N | N | | F | N | | | |
| Idaho | Name, DOB | N | N | N | | | N | | |
| Illinois | Name, DOB | N | N | N | | N ^d | | | N ^c |
| Indiana | Name, DOB | N | | | | | | | |
| Iowa | Name, DOB | N | N | N | | | | | |
| Maryland | Name, DOB, SSN, Dr. Lic. | N | N | N | N | | | N | N ^d |
| Massachusetts | Name, DOB | N | N | N | | | N | N | |
| Michigan | Name, DOB | N | N | N | | | | N | |
| Missouri | | | | | | | | | |
| Nebraska | Name, DOB | N | N | N | | | | | |
| New Jersey | Name, DOB, fingerprints | F, N | N | N | F | | | F | |
| New York | Fingerprints | F | | | F | N | | F | |
| Oregon | Fingerprints if no name identification | F | N | N | | N ^d | N | N | |
| Tennessee | Name, DOB | | | N | | | | | |
| Utah | Name, DOB | N | N | N | | | | N | N ^e |
| Virgin Islands | Name, DOB | N | N | | | | | | |
| Virginia | Name, DOB | N | N | N | | N | N | | |
| Wisconsin | Name, DOB | N | | N | | | | N | |

Explanatory Notes for Table 22

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

* Note: States appearing in this table have been designated by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, U.S. Treasury Department, as States that currently have laws that qualify as alternatives to the five-day waiting period requirements of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (Public Law 103-159, November 30, 1993). *59 Federal Register* 140, p. 37534 (July 22, 1994).

** Information was received from State-level repository. Additional information available from local "Chief Law Enforcement Officers" (CLEO's) may not be included on this table.

... Not available.

† F = Federal
S = State/Local

^aFigure represents potential purchasers who were ineligible because they were under age.

^bColorado's alternative system was not implemented until 1994. Under both the pre-Brady system and the alternative system, sale approvals have been granted in 92% of the cases and denials have occurred in 8% of the cases.

^cUpon request, list of "nonapprovals" is provided to other criminal justice agencies.

^dThe alternative system was approved by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms in July 1994.

^eInformation is provided only if there is an outstanding warrant.

^fFigure represents potential purchasers who were ineligible because their permits were invalid—e.g., expired, revoked, etc., including revocations due to felony convictions.

^gFigure includes potential purchasers who were ineligible because they were non-residents (3), under 21 (3), or because the firearms were stolen (144).

^hThe alternative system was not implemented until 1994.

ⁱFigure includes potential purchasers who were ineligible because they were dishonorably discharged from the armed services (1), or because they attempted to exceed the lawful handgun limits (264).

Table 22: Purchasers determined to be ineligible to purchase firearms in "alternative"* States, 1993

| State | Potential purchasers determined to be ineligible | | | | | | Action taken by State repository regarding purchasers determined to be ineligible** | | | |
|-------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|-----------|---|---|----------------|---|------------------------------|--|-------|
| | Total | Disqualifying convictions/ indictment | Fugitives | Unlawful users or addicted to controlled substances | Adjudicated mental defective or committed to mental institution | Illegal aliens | Other | Sought issuance of a warrant | Provided information to Federal/ State/local prosecution or law enforcement authorities† | Other |
| California ^a | 6,509 | 5,861 | | | 429 | | 219 ^a | S, F | | |
| Colorado ^b | | | | | | | | | | |
| Connecticut | 297 | | | | | | | | | X |
| Delaware | 468 | | 32 | | | | | S | | |
| Florida | 7,538 | 7,200 | 321 | | 17 | | | | X ^c | |
| Guam | 40 | 39 | | | 1 | | | | | X |
| Hawaii | 197 | | | | | | | | | X |
| Idaho ^d | ... | | | | | | | S ^e | | |
| Illinois | 1,160 | 63 | | | | | 1,097 ^f | | | |
| Indiana | 45 | 45 | | | | | | | | |
| Iowa | ... | | | | | | | | | |
| Maryland | 377 | | | | | | | | | |
| Massachusetts | ... | | | | | | | | | |
| Michigan | 3,200 | | | | | | | | | |
| Missouri | ... | | | | | | | | | |
| Nebraska | 185 | 185 | | | | | | S, F | | |
| New Jersey | 949 | 949 | | | | | | X | | |
| New York | ... | | | | | | | | | |
| Oregon | 264 | 104/5 | 5 | | | | 150 ^g | | | |
| Tennessee ^h | ... | | | | | | | | | X |
| Utah ^h | ... | | | | | | | | | X |
| Virgin Islands | 11 | 6 | | 4 | 1 | | | | | X |
| Virginia | 1,739 | 1,148/270 | 47 | | 5 | 4 | 265 ⁱ | | | |
| Wisconsin | 308 | 308 | | | | | | | | X |

Explanatory Notes for Table 23

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

* Note: States appearing in this table have been designated by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, U.S. Treasury Department, as States that are subject to the Federal five-day waiting period requirements of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (Public Law 103-159, November 30, 1993). *59 Federal Register* 140, pp. 37533-34 (July 22, 1994).

** Information was received from State-level repository. Additional information available from local "Chief Law Enforcement Officers" (CLEO's) may not be included on this table.

† F = Federal
S = State/Local

. . . Not available.

* Local law enforcement agencies conduct the checks; therefore, the information is not available at the State repository level.

^a "Brady checks" are processed by individual county and local law enforcement agencies. Legislation was passed that transferred the responsibility to a Handgun Clearance Center to be established within the Arizona Department of Public Safety; implementation details were not available at the time the survey response was completed.

^b Additional potential purchasers may have been found ineligible as a result of checking databases other than the State repository database.

^c Although Rhode Island does operate in compliance with the Brady Act, the State has for some time applied a mandatory seven-day waiting period on the purchase of all firearms. During that time, local law enforcement conducts checks of criminal history records. During 1993, a total of 10,325 checks were conducted of which 201 potential purchases were denied.

^d Local authorities also are notified if the potential purchaser has a State or National Crime Information Center (NCIC) warrant outstanding.

^e Background checks are not done currently.

Table 23: Presale criminal history record checks by States subject to the Federal waiting period*, February 28 - March 18, 1994

| State | Number of criminal record background checks conducted for purchase of handguns | Number of criminal record background checks resulting in denials to purchase handguns | Number of criminal record background checks resulting in approvals to proceed with purchase of handguns | Number of applications pending processing | Action taken by State repository regarding purchasers determined to be ineligible** | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| | | | | | Provided information to Federal/State/local prosecution or law enforcement authorities† | No action taken by State repository |
| Alabama* | | | | | | X* |
| Alaska | 1,448 | 51 | 1,394 | 3 | | X* |
| American Samoa | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | X |
| Arizona* ^a | | | | | | X* |
| Arkansas | 950 | 9 | 631 | 310 | | X |
| District of Columbia | 30 | ... | ... | ... | | X |
| Georgia | 9,213 | ... | ... | ... | | X |
| Kansas | 1,628 | 71 | 1,557 | 0 | S, F | |
| Kentucky | 3,823 | 138 | 3,685 | 0 | S, F | |
| Louisiana* | | | | | | X* |
| Maine | 1,554 | 10 ^b | 0 | 0 | | X |
| Minnesota* | | | | | | X* |
| Mississippi | ... | | | | | X |
| Montana* | | | | | | X* |
| Nevada | 2,416 | 29 | 2,387 | 0 | S, F | |
| New Hampshire | ... | | | | | X |
| New Mexico | 1,272 | 26 | 1,246 | 0 | S | |
| North Carolina | 12,000 | ... | ... | ... | | X* |
| North Dakota | 428 | 13 | 413 | 2 | F | |
| Ohio | 3,604 | 38 | 3,566 | 0 | S | |
| Oklahoma* | ... | | | | | X |
| Pennsylvania | ... | | | | | X |
| Puerto Rico | ... | | | | | |
| Rhode Island | ... ^c | | | | F | |
| South Carolina | 4,305 | 190 | 4,102 | 13 | S ^d | |
| South Dakota* | | | | | | X* |
| Texas | 53,395 | ... | ... | ... | | X* |
| Trust Territory of the Pacific ^e | | | | | | |
| Vermont | 600 | ... | ... | ... | F | |
| Washington* | | | | | | X* |
| West Virginia | ... | 16 | | | S | |
| Wyoming | 1,050 | 33 | 1,013 | 4 | | X* |

Explanatory Notes for Table 24

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

Note: Since data reported is as of 1993, costs of implementing the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (citation) which became effective February 28, 1994, are not included. Start-up costs have been rounded to the nearest \$100.

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

† Revenues generated from fees covers the costs of operating the program.

. . . Not available.

^a Programming costs.

^b No start-up costs were included because the program has been in place since before 1970, and no figures are available.

^c Dealers pay \$100 annually as an access fee to criminal history record information.

^d Figure represents the fee charged by the Puerto Rico Police Department for a license application.

^e Figure represents expenditure for training and education of chief law enforcement officers regarding implementation of "Brady" background checks.

^f No system currently exists for conducting background checks.

Table 24: Cost of implementing and operating programs for presale criminal history record checks on potential firearm purchasers, 1993

| State | Start-up costs* | Fees charged by repository to conduct search | | Gun check considered criminal justice (CJ) or noncriminal justice activity (NCJ) | Funding sources for programs not supported by firearm search fees |
|---|-----------------------|--|-------------------|--|---|
| | | Name | Fingerprint | | |
| Alabama | ... | | | | |
| Alaska | ... | | | | |
| American Samoa | ... | | | CJ,NCJ | |
| Arizona | \$10,000 ^a | | | CJ | |
| Arkansas | 9,400 | \$15 | \$15 | NCJ | State General Fund |
| California | \$7,500,000 | \$14 [†] | | CJ | |
| Colorado | 105,700 | 12 [†] | | Neither | |
| Connecticut | ... | | | CJ | |
| Delaware | 120,000 | | | CJ | State General Fund |
| District of Columbia | ... | 5 | 2.50 | CJ | Operating budget |
| Florida | \$638,600 | \$8 [†] | | CJ | |
| Georgia | ... | | | | |
| Guam | 6 | | | | |
| Hawaii | ... | | | CJ | City, county revenues |
| Idaho | 153,800 | c | | NCJ | |
| Illinois | \$249,499 | \$2 [†] | | CJ | |
| Indiana | ... | | | CJ | |
| Iowa | ... | | | CJ | |
| Kansas | ... | | | CJ | |
| Kentucky | 103,000 | | | | |
| Louisiana | ... | | | | |
| Maine | \$2,500 | | | NCJ | |
| Maryland | ... | | | CJ | State Police budget |
| Massachusetts | ... | | | CJ | |
| Michigan | ... | | | CJ | Other system user fees |
| Minnesota | ... | | | CJ | |
| Mississippi | ... | | | | |
| Missouri | ... | | | CJ | |
| Montana | ... | | | | |
| Nebraska | ... | \$3 [†] | | CJ | |
| Nevada | \$123,000 | \$15 [†] | | NCJ | |
| New Hampshire | ... | | | CJ | |
| New Jersey | ... | 8 [†] | \$12 [†] | NCJ | |
| New Mexico | ... | | | CJ | |
| New York | ... | | 50 | NCJ | |
| North Carolina | ... | | | CJ | |
| North Dakota | ... | | | | |
| Ohio | ... | \$15 [†] | | NCJ | |
| Oklahoma | ... | | | | |
| Oregon | \$1,500,000 | | | CJ | |
| Pennsylvania | ... | | | CJ | |
| Puerto Rico | ... | \$50 ^d | | | |
| Rhode Island | ... | | | | |
| South Carolina | \$383,300 | 5 [†] | | CJ | |
| South Dakota | 200 ^e | | | NCJ | |
| Tennessee | ... | | \$24 | NCJ | |
| Texas | ... | | | CJ | |
| Trust Territory of the Pacific ^f | ... | | | | |
| Utah | \$34,000 | \$5 [†] | | CJ | |
| Vermont | ... | | | NCJ | General Fund |
| Virgin Islands | ... | \$9 | | CJ | General Fund |
| Virginia | \$343,700 | 2 | | CJ | General Fund |
| Washington | ... | | | CJ | |
| West Virginia | 100,000+ | | | CJ | |
| Wisconsin | 270,900 | 8 [†] | | CJ | |
| Wyoming | ... | | | | |

Explanatory Notes for Table 25

The notes below expand on the data in Table 25. The explanatory information was provided by the respondent.

. . . Not available.

^c Originating agency identification number.

^a In-state firearm dealers only.

^d Out-of-state firearm dealers only.

^b Currently the local police departments process firearms permits. The existing State law on firearms does not explicitly allow such notification information to be given directly to a firearms dealer. In Hawaii, however, conviction information is considered a public record; therefore, dealers appear to be able to receive notification based on a felony conviction. Communication of other bases for disqualification would require legal clarification.

^e Soundex is not used for "Brady" checks.

^f No master name index is maintained currently.

Table 25: Search methods used in conducting criminal history checks on potential firearm purchasers, 1993

| State | Minimum data elements required to search master name index | Soundex can be used in name search | State law permits giving felony conviction information to firearm dealer | State law permits giving "sale approval"/"no sale" information to firearm dealer |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Alabama | Name, sex, race, DOB, SSN | Yes | No | Yes ^a |
| Alaska | Name | Yes | No | No |
| American Samoa | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Arizona | Name, DOB | Yes | No | Yes |
| Arkansas | Name, sex, DOB | Yes | No | Yes |
| California | Name, sex, DOB | Yes | No | Yes |
| Colorado | Name, sex, race, DOB | Yes | No | Yes ^a |
| Connecticut | Name, DOB | Yes | Yes ^a | Yes ^a |
| Delaware | Name, sex, race, DOB, dr. lic., SSN | Yes | No | Yes |
| District of Columbia | Name, sex, race, DOB, SSN | Yes | Yes | No |
| Florida | Name, sex, race, DOB | Yes | No | Yes ^a |
| Georgia | Name, sex, race, DOB | Yes | No | No |
| Guam | Name, DOB | No | ... | ... |
| Hawaii | Name, sex, DOB, SSN | Yes | No | No ^b |
| Idaho | Name, DOB | Yes | No | Yes ^a |
| Illinois | Name, DOB | Yes | ... | Yes ^a |
| Indiana | Name, DOB | Yes | Yes ^a | Yes ^a |
| Iowa | Name, DOB | Yes | No | No |
| Kansas | Name, sex, DOB | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Kentucky | Name, sex, race, DOB, SSN | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Louisiana | Name, sex, race, DOB | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Maine | Name, DOB | Yes | Yes | No |
| Maryland | Name, sex, race, DOB | Yes | No | Yes ^a |
| Massachusetts | Name, DOB | Yes | No | No |
| Michigan | Name, sex, race, DOB | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Minnesota | Name, sex, DOB, password, ORI ^c , purpose code | Yes | No | No |
| Mississippi | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Missouri | Name, DOB | Yes | No | No |
| Montana | ... | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Nebraska | Name, sex, race, DOB, SSN | Yes | No | Yes |
| Nevada | Name, sex, DOB | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| New Hampshire | Name, DOB | Yes | No | No |
| New Jersey | Name, DOB, SSN | Yes | No | No |
| New Mexico | Name, DOB | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| New York | Name, sex, DOB, fingerprints | Yes | No | No |
| North Carolina | Name, sex, race, DOB | Yes | No | Yes ^d |
| North Dakota | Name, DOB | Yes | No | No |
| Ohio | Name, DOB, SSN | No ^e | No | No |
| Oklahoma | Name, sex, DOB | Yes | ... | ... |
| Oregon | Name, DOB | Yes | No | No |
| Pennsylvania | Name, DOB | No | Yes | Yes |
| Puerto Rico | Name, DOB, sex, race, SSN, fingerprints | Yes | No | No |
| Rhode Island | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| South Carolina | Name, DOB | Yes | No | Yes ^a |
| South Dakota | Name, sex, DOB | Yes | No | No |
| Tennessee | Name, sex, race, DOB | Yes | No | No |
| Texas | Name, sex, race, DOB | Yes | No | No |
| Trust Territory of the Pacific | NA ^f | NA ^f | No | No |
| Utah | Name, sex, DOB | Yes | No | Yes |
| Vermont | Name, DOB | Yes | No | Yes |
| Virgin Islands | NA ^f | No | Yes ^a | No |
| Virginia | Name, sex, race, DOB | Yes | No | Yes |
| Washington | Name, DOB | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| West Virginia | Name, DOB | No | No | No |
| Wisconsin | Name, sex, race, DOB | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Wyoming | Name, sex, DOB | Yes | No | No |

Explanatory Notes for Table 26

The notes below expand on the data in Table 26. The explanatory information was provided by the respondent.

Note: Records are considered to be current and shareable if the jurisdiction is a member of the FBI Interstate Identification Index (III) and the records of arrest within the preceding five years contain dispositions of those arrests. Guam and the Trust Territory of the Pacific did not provide estimates of the date of entry into the III system. Listed dates are based on the goal of December 2000. American Samoa provided only an estimated date of entry into III. Intermediate goals are based on this date and the goal December 2000.

X = Goal has been achieved.

Table 26: U.S. Attorney General's estimated goals/timetables for criminal history record sharing in a national instant background check system, 1994

| State | Month and year State will become III participant | Month and year in which the percent of all current and shareable records is to be at least: | | | | | Full participant |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|------------------|
| | | Up to 25% | 50% | 75% | 80% | | |
| Alabama | Dec 95 | Dec 95 | Dec 95 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | |
| Alaska | X | X | X | X | X | Dec 00 | |
| American Samoa | Jan 95 | Mar 96 | Mar 97 | Mar 98 | Mar 99 | Dec 00 | |
| Arizona | Mar 96 | Dec 96 | Dec 96 | Dec 96 | Dec 96 | Dec 00 | |
| Arkansas | Feb 95 | Jan 96 | Apr 97 | Dec 98 | Jun 99 | Dec 00 | |
| California | X | X | X | Dec 98 | Dec 98 | Dec 00 | |
| Colorado | X | Jan 97 | Jan 98 | Jul 98 | Sep 98 | Jan 99 | |
| Connecticut | X | X | X | Jun 95 | Jun 95 | Jun 99 | |
| Delaware | X | X | X | Dec 96 | Dec 97 | Dec 99 | |
| District of Columbia | Dec 95 | Dec 95 | Dec 96 | Dec 97 | Dec 98 | Dec 99 | |
| Florida | X | X | Dec 95 | Dec 98 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | |
| Georgia | X | X | X | Dec 98 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | |
| Guam | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | |
| Hawaii | Dec 99 | Dec 99 | Dec 99 | Dec 99 | Dec 99 | Dec 00 | |
| Idaho | X | X | Jan 96 | Jan 97 | Jan 98 | Dec 00 | |
| Illinois | X | Jan 97 | Jan 97 | Jan 97 | Aug 97 | Aug 98 | |
| Indiana | Jun 95 | Jun 95 | Jun 95 | Jun 95 | Jun 95 | Dec 95 | |
| Iowa | Jul 95 | Jul 95 | Jul 95 | Jul 95 | Jul 95 | Jul 99 | |
| Kansas | Jan 98 | Jan 98 | Jan 98 | Jan 98 | Jan 98 | Jan 98 | |
| Kentucky | Jan 96 | Jan 96 | Jan 96 | Jan 97 | Jan 98 | Jan 00 | |
| Louisiana | Dec 96 | Dec 96 | Dec 96 | Dec 96 | Dec 96 | Dec 96 | |
| Maine | Jan 96 | Oct 98 | Oct 99 | Oct 00 | Oct 00 | Dec 00 | |
| Maryland | Dec 97 | Dec 97 | Dec 97 | Dec 97 | Dec 97 | Dec 00 | |
| Massachusetts | Dec 98 | Jun 99 | Jun 00 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | |
| Michigan | X | X | X | X | X | Dec 00 | |
| Minnesota | X | X | X | Dec 95 | Dec 96 | Dec 99 | |
| Mississippi | Dec 98 | Dec 98 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | |
| Missouri | X | X | Dec 95 | Dec 99 | Dec 99 | Dec 00 | |
| Montana | X | X | X | X | Dec 96 | Dec 00 | |
| Nebraska | Jun 96 | Jun 96 | Dec 96 | Dec 97 | Dec 98 | Dec 00 | |
| Nevada | X | X | Dec 94 | Dec 95 | Jul 97 | Dec 00 | |
| New Hampshire | Dec 94 | Dec 94 | Dec 94 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | |
| New Jersey | X | X | X | X | X | Dec 99 | |
| New Mexico | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | |
| New York | X | X | X | X | Jun 95 | Dec 00 | |
| North Carolina | X | X | X | X | X | Dec 00 | |
| North Dakota | X | Dec 95 | Dec 97 | Dec 99 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | |
| Ohio | X | X | Dec 95 | Dec 96 | Dec 97 | Dec 98 | |
| Oklahoma | X | Dec 96 | Dec 97 | Dec 98 | Dec 99 | Dec 99 | |
| Oregon | X | X | Dec 98 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | |
| Pennsylvania | X | X | X | Dec 96 | Dec 97 | Dec 99 | |
| Puerto Rico | Jan 96 | Jan 96 | Jan 96 | Jan 96 | Jan 96 | Dec 00 | |
| Rhode Island | Dec 98 | Dec 98 | Dec 98 | Dec 98 | Dec 98 | Dec 98 | |
| South Carolina | X | X | X | X | X | Jan 98 | |
| South Dakota | X | X | Jun 98 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | |
| Tennessee | Oct 97 | Oct 97 | Dec 98 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | |
| Texas | X | X | X | Jun 98 | Jun 98 | Dec 00 | |
| Trust Territory of the Pacific | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | |
| Utah | X | X | X | Dec 96 | Dec 97 | Dec 00 | |
| Vermont | Jun 96 | Dec 98 | Dec 98 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | |
| Virgin Islands | Dec 98 | Dec 98 | Dec 98 | Dec 98 | Dec 98 | Dec 00 | |
| Virginia | X | X | X | X | X | X | |
| Washington | X | Jun 95 | Jun 95 | Jan 96 | Dec 96 | Dec 99 | |
| West Virginia | Dec 96 | Dec 96 | Jan 98 | Jan 99 | Jan 00 | Jan 00 | |
| Wisconsin | Jun 96 | Jun 96 | Jun 00 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | Dec 00 | |
| Wyoming | X | X | X | X | X | Dec 97 | |

Explanatory Notes for Table 27

The notes below expand on the data in Table 27. The explanatory information was provided by the respondent.

Note: The information in this table was provided by the Criminal Justice Information Services Division, FBI. Numbers have been rounded to the nearest 100.

* Most dispositions are received by tape submissions.

^a Florida is a participant in the National Fingerprint File and submits only the first fingerprint card of an individual to the FBI. The number of fingerprint cards submitted to the FBI, therefore, is substantially less than the number received by the State criminal history repository for processing.

^b As of 1994, Nebraska became a machine readable State reporting dispositions by tape.

Table 27: Fingerprint cards and dispositions received by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1993

| State | Number of fingerprints received by the FBI, 1993 | | Number of final dispositions received by the FBI, 1993 |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--|
| | Criminal justice purposes | Noncriminal justice purposes | |
| Total | 4,192,500 | 413,800 | 2,770,200 |
| Alabama | 61,300 | 2,600 | 62,800* |
| Alaska | 10,600 | 1,400 | 1,700 |
| American Samoa | | | |
| Arizona | 72,700 | 9,500 | 59,600* |
| Arkansas | 21,700 | 2,500 | 70,400* |
| California | 426,800 | 40,400 | 412,900 |
| Colorado | 110,400 | 5,300 | 100 |
| Connecticut | 31,600 | 10,500 | 8,600 |
| Delaware | 12,000 | 2,100 | 15,400* |
| District of Columbia | 30,600 | 21,500 | 9,400 |
| Florida | 206,900 ^a | 22,200 | 1,200 |
| Georgia | 335,600 | 10,700 | 825,000* |
| Guam | 1,200 | 2,800 | |
| Hawaii | 14,600 | 6,000 | 3,100 |
| Idaho | 21,000 | 5,200 | 100 |
| Illinois | 303,100 | 9,300 | 13,400 |
| Indiana | 32,300 | 4,000 | 11,400 |
| Iowa | 34,500 | 1,100 | 46,500 |
| Kansas | 41,600 | 1,800 | 23,100 |
| Kentucky | 30,900 | 1,000 | 10,100 |
| Louisiana | 73,700 | 4,400 | 8,000 |
| Maine | 3,800 | 200 | 1,100 |
| Maryland | 136,000 | 9,200 | 4,300 |
| Massachusetts | 16,300 | 2,200 | 700 |
| Michigan | 87,200 | 16,400 | 300 |
| Minnesota | 49,400 | 1,300 | 700 |
| Mississippi | 20,200 | 4,500 | 4,800 |
| Missouri | 67,200 | 5,300 | 96,300* |
| Montana | 13,600 | 400 | 168,300* |
| Nebraska | 11,000 | 900 | 1,000 ^b |
| Nevada | 37,900 | 2,400 | 1,100 |
| New Hampshire | 9,200 | 600 | 5,700 |
| New Jersey | 112,900 | 32,000 | 400 |
| New Mexico | 33,400 | 1,900 | 8,000 |
| New York | 503,500 | 54,200 | 232,900* |
| North Carolina | 70,100 | 8,000 | 100 |
| North Dakota | 3,600 | 0 | 2,400 |
| Ohio | 126,800 | 3,800 | 82,600* |
| Oklahoma | 29,100 | 2,600 | 9,000 |
| Oregon | 56,000 | 14,400 | 83,300 |
| Pennsylvania | 156,100 | 6,400 | 69,300 |
| Puerto Rico | 4,500 | 0 | |
| Rhode Island | 7,800 | 300 | 3,400 |
| South Carolina | 132,100 | 6,600 | 2,700 |
| South Dakota | 15,000 | 300 | 116,100* |
| Tennessee | 60,800 | 5,900 | 19,700 |
| Texas | 276,100 | 27,700 | 61,500 |
| Trust Territory of the Pacific | | | |
| Utah | 17,600 | 1,100 | 1,200 |
| Vermont | 3,900 | 200 | 1,700 |
| Virgin Islands | 1,100 | 0 | |
| Virginia | 108,900 | 8,200 | 64,100 |
| Washington | 98,400 | 28,400 | 118,700* |
| West Virginia | 11,000 | 400 | 7,000 |
| Wisconsin | 32,100 | 3,200 | 13,100 |
| Wyoming | 7,100 | 500 | 5,900* |

Explanatory Notes for Table 28

The notes below expand on the data in Table 28. The explanatory information was provided by the respondent.

Note: The information in this table was provided by the Criminal Justice Information Services Division, FBI. The numbers have been rounded to the nearest 100. The information is not applicable to States that are not currently participating in III, and therefore, the cells for no-participant States are blank.

* State was not a III participant by December 31, 1993, but has since become one.

Table 28: Criminal history records of Interstate Identification Index (III) participants maintained by the State criminal history repository and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1993

| State | III records indexed with the State's identification (SID) pointers | III records maintained by the FBI for the State | Percent of total records available through III maintained by the State |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Total | 12,449,700 | 3,891,700 | |
| Alabama | | | |
| Alaska | 11,800 | 55,600 | 18% |
| American Samoa | | | |
| Arizona | | | |
| Arkansas | | | |
| California | 2,124,300 | 607,800 | 78% |
| Colorado | 246,600 | 92,300 | 73 |
| Connecticut | 91,100 | 97,400 | 48 |
| Delaware | 41,000 | 47,700 | 46 |
| District of Columbia | | | |
| Florida | 1,555,500 | 231,700 | 87% |
| Georgia | 1,117,800 | 68,700 | 94 |
| Guam | | | |
| Hawaii | | | |
| Idaho | 64,800 | 20,800 | 76 |
| Illinois | 18,300 | 959,800 | 2% |
| Indiana | | | |
| Iowa | | | |
| Kansas | | | |
| Kentucky | | | |
| Louisiana | | | |
| Maine | | | |
| Maryland | | | |
| Massachusetts | | | |
| Michigan | 503,600 | 42,300 | 92% |
| Minnesota | 156,400 | 19,600 | 89% |
| Mississippi | | | |
| Missouri | 182,200 | 133,600 | 58 |
| Montana | 20,500 | 41,100 | 33 |
| Nebraska | | | |
| Nevada | 3,500 | 181,500 | 2% |
| New Hampshire | | | |
| New Jersey | 706,300 | 49,000 | 94 |
| New Mexico | | | |
| New York | 1,672,700 | 64,800 | 96 |
| North Carolina | 424,800 | 21,700 | 95% |
| North Dakota* | | | |
| Ohio | 504,200 | 76,000 | 87 |
| Oklahoma* | | | |
| Oregon | 268,100 | 13,200 | 95 |
| Pennsylvania | 467,200 | 243,900 | 66% |
| Puerto Rico | | | |
| Rhode Island | | | |
| South Carolina | 495,800 | 29,800 | 94 |
| South Dakota* | | | |
| Tennessee | | | |
| Texas | 1,359,000 | 109,500 | 93% |
| Trust Territory of the Pacific | | | |
| Utah | 14,200 | 123,100 | 10 |
| Vermont | | | |
| Virgin Islands | | | |
| Virginia | 337,000 | 190,500 | 64% |
| Washington | 31,800 | 357,800 | 8 |
| West Virginia | | | |
| Wisconsin | | | |
| Wyoming | 31,200 | 12,500 | 71 |

Methodology

This report is based upon the results from a survey conducted of the administrators of the State criminal history record repositories in March 1994. A total of 56 jurisdictions were surveyed, including the 50 States, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific (Republic of Palau) and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Responses were received from all 56 jurisdictions.

The three-part survey instrument consisted of 98 questions, many of which were multi-part. The survey was designed to collect comprehensive data in 14 topical areas, as follows:

- current quality and quantity of records in the criminal history databases;
- hardware and software capabilities and needs;
 - State repository search methods and policies regarding current procedures for performing criminal history checks for firearms purchases;
- ability of State repositories to participate in a system in which convicted felons are uniquely and easily identified by some form of a targeted database;
- level of fingerprint-supported arrest reporting to the State repositories and the processing and timeliness of the information that is entered into criminal history record databases;
- level of prosecutor-reported information in criminal history databases;
- level and timeliness of disposition reporting by the courts to the State criminal history repositories;

- types and timeliness of information reported to the State criminal history repositories by State and local correctional facilities;
- level of probation/parole-related information in State criminal history databases;
- extent to which the records in State criminal history databases contain final disposition information;
- ability of the State repositories to link reported disposition data to arrest data in State criminal history record databases;
- level of audit activity in the States and the strategies employed the State repositories to ensure accuracy of the data in the criminal history record databases;
- arrest and disposition reporting rates relating to child abuse crimes; and
- participation of the States in the Interstate Identification Index and the National Fingerprint File.

In addition, the Federal Bureau of Investigation provided information relating to the number of fingerprint cards and dispositions received by the FBI during 1993 and the number of criminal history records of the States participating in the Interstate Identification Index system that are maintained by the State criminal history repositories and the number of records maintained by the FBI for the States. Additional information was obtained from the Department of Justice relating to the timetables that were established by the Attorney General in compliance with the mandates of the Brady

Handgun Violence Prevention Act.

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

Numbers and percentages shown in the tables were rounded. In most cases, numbers were rounded to the nearest 100. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number.

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

Data reported for 1983 and 1984 were taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Technical Report: State Criminal Records Repositories* (October 1985). As shown in the tables in this report, the numbers were rounded to the nearest 100. Data reported for 1989 was taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Survey of Criminal History Information Systems* (March 1991). Data reported for 1992 was taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Survey of Criminal History Information Systems, 1992* (November 1993).