



A11106 048519 al

Publication
480-6

NBS
Publi-
cations

ef

LEAA Police Equipment Survey of 1972, Volume VI

Body Armor and Confiscated Weapons



Law Enforcement
Equipment
Technology

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
COMMERCE
National Bureau of
Standards



QC
100
J57
No. 480-6
1977

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to the 440 police departments throughout the United States who contributed their time and knowledge to make this report possible. Special thanks go to the police departments whose officers and administrators helped the survey team during the developmental and testing phases of the work. In addition, we thank Jacob J. Diamond, Chief of the NBS Law Enforcement Standards Laboratory, for sharing his knowledge. The support and assistance of Lester Shubin, NILECJ project monitor and consultant, is also gratefully acknowledged.

We thank the many members of the NBS Technical Analysis Division who provided support: William L. O'Neal for his help in computerizing the sample selection and for helping to design and program the interactive recordkeeping system; Jenny L. Eldreth and P. Clare Peiser for maintaining the computerized recordkeeping system; Sandra J. Mumford for supervising the coding/editing of the questionnaires; June R. Cornog for her advice, support, and help with initial interviews; Diane R. Beall for the many typings of the various versions of the questionnaires; Suellen Halpin, Mary L. Friend, Susan E. Bergsman, and Dwight F. Doxey for making follow-up telephone calls; Lorraine S. Freeman for her administrative support; Karen Jackson for her help with questionnaire coding and recordkeeping; Cassandra Streeter and Janice Davis for their help with recordkeeping; and Jo A. E. Copeland for typing the report. Michael R. Vogt receives special thanks for his help in carrying out the computerized edit and tabulation of the data. We also gratefully acknowledge the help of Robert J. Cunitz in editing and reviewing the report.

t
**NBS Special
Publication
480-6**

LEAA Police Equipment Survey of 1972, Volume VI

Body Armor and Confiscated Weapons

by

G. B. Hare, P. A. Klaus, E. D. Bunten
Institute for Applied Technology
National Bureau of Standards
Washington, D. C. 20234

prepared by

Law Enforcement Standards Laboratory
Center for Consumer Product Technology
National Bureau of Standards
Washington, D.C. 20234

prepared for

National Institute of Law
Enforcement and Criminal Justice
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, D. C. 20531



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, Juanita M. Kreps, *Secretary*
Dr. Sidney Harman, *Under Secretary*
Jordan J. Baruch, *Assistant Secretary for Science and Technology*
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS, Ernest Ambler, *Acting Director*

**Issued
June 1977**

OF STANDARDS
LIBRARY
JUL 21 1977
rol AC
QC
100
657
H420
1377

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Law Enforcement Standards Laboratory.

LEAA police equipment survey of 1972.

(NBS special publication ; 480-1—480-7)

"CODEN: XNBSAV."

CONTENTS: v. 1. Ku, R., Bunten, E., Klaus, P. The need for standards, priorities for police equipment.—v. 2. Mumford, S. et al. Communications equipment and supplies.—v. 3. Klaus, P. and Bunten, E. Sirens and emergency warning lights. [etc.]

I. Police—Equipment and supplies—Collected works. I. National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. II. Title. III. Series: United States. National Bureau of Standards. Special publication ; 480-1—480-7.

QC100.U57 no. 480-1—480-7 [HV7936.E7] 602'.1s [363.2'028]

74-28442

National Bureau of Standards

Special Publication 480-6

Nat. Bur. Stand. (U.S.), Spec. Publ. 480-6, 77 pages

CODEN:XNBSAV

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON:

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents,

U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402

(Order by SD Catalog No. C 13.10:480-6). Stock No. 003-003-01748-5 price \$2.20

(Add 25 percent additional for other than U.S. mailing).

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| List of Tables | IV |
| Foreword | VII |
| Executive Summary | IX |
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1. Project Background | 1 |
| 1.2. Sample Design | 2 |
| 1.3. Questionnaire Administration | 4 |
| 1.4. Development and Design of the Body Armor and Confiscated Weapons DQ (Detailed Questionnaire) | 5 |
| 1.5. Characteristics of Subsample Groups | 5 |
| 2. Question by Question Discussion | 7 |
| 2.1. Advice to the Reader | 7 |
| 2.2. Discussion | 8 |
| 2.2.1. Characteristics of Respondents | 8 |
| 2.2.2. Use of Body Armor and Other Ballistic Protection Equipment | 10 |
| 2.2.3. Availability of Data to Researchers Developing Body Armor Standards | 16 |
| 2.2.4. Confiscated Weapons | 21 |
| Appendix A. Body Armor and Confiscated Weapons Questionnaire | |
| Appendix B. Data Tables | |

LIST OF TABLES

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Table 1.2-1. Stratification categories | 3 |
| Table 1.2-2. Number of police departments by region and type | 3 |
| Table 1.2-3. Number of departments selected to receive the Detailed Questionnaire: Body armor and confiscated weapons | 3 |
| Table 1.3-1. Number of departments returning acceptable Detailed Questionnaires: Body armor and confiscated weapons | 4 |
| Table 1.5-1. Activities handled by at least one-third of each department by department type, and percent of total departments having each activity | 6 |
| Table 1.5-2. Descriptive data by department type (means) | 6 |
| Table 1.5-3. Descriptive data by LEAA region (means) | 7 |
| Table i. Rank of primary respondent for body armor questionnaire, by department type | 9 |
| Table ii. Years of experience in law enforcement of primary respondent | 9 |
| Table 7-1. Percentages of departments in each department type preferring visible, hidden, or no body armor in a potentially explosive situation | 10 |
| Table 7-2. Of the 246 departments preferring hidden body armor in potentially explosive situations, percentages giving specified reason | 11 |
| Table 7-3. Of the 150 departments preferring visible body armor in potentially explosive situations, percentages giving specified reason | 11 |
| Table 8. Percentages of departments in each department type which would routinely use body armor for specified activity | 12 |
| Table 9-1. Percentages of responding departments using and planning to use specified ballistic protective item | 13 |
| Table 9-2. Percentages of departments in each department type which were using or were planning to use specified ballistic protective item | 14 |
| Table 9-3. Percentages of departments in each department type currently using at least one of the ballistic protective items | 14 |
| Table 10-1. Percentages of departments in each department type providing a comment about ballistic protective items or body armor | 15 |
| Table 10-2. Percentages of departments in each department type which commented (Question 10) that their departments had no body armor | 15 |
| Table 10-3. Of the 183 departments which listed a problem or made a comment (other than "no problem"), percentages citing specified comment | 16 |

| | | |
|----------------------|--|----|
| Table 1. | Percentages of departments in each department type maintaining records of the exact locations of wounds sustained by officers | 17 |
| Table 2. | Of the departments in each department type maintaining detailed injury data ("yes" to Question 1), the percentages including specified data in those records | 18 |
| Table 3. | Of the departments in each department type maintaining detailed injury data, the percentages willing to make these records available to researchers | 18 |
| Table 4. | Of the departments in each department type maintaining detailed injury data, percentages keeping summaries of those records | 19 |
| Table 5. | Of the departments in each department type maintaining summarized wound data, percentages including specified data in those records | 20 |
| Table 6. | Of the 147 departments maintaining summarized data on officers' wounds, percentages willing to provide copies of these data to researchers | 20 |
| Table 11A/ 12A-1. | Percentages of responding departments in each department type which supplied numbers (including zero) of handguns and shoulder weapons confiscated in 1971 (Question 11A) and 1970 (Question 12A) | 22 |
| Table 11A/ 12A-2. | Of the total numbers of confiscated weapons reported by the responding departments in 1971 and 1970, percentages that were handguns and shoulder weapons | 22 |
| Table 11A/ 12A-3. | Numbers of handguns and shoulder weapons reported by the departments which supplied numbers (including zero) of weapons confiscated in 1971 (Question 11A) and 1970 (Question 12A) | 23 |
| Table 11B/ 12B-1. | Percentages of departments in each department type which reported numbers (including zero) of weapons of military issue confiscated in 1971 (Question 11B) and 1970 (Question 12B) | 24 |
| Table 11B/ 12B-2. | Using mean number of weapons confiscated per department in each department type and mean number of weapons of military issue per department in each department type, percentages of handguns and shoulder weapons that were originally of military issue | 24 |
| Table 11C/ 12C-1. | Percentages of departments in each department type providing data about methods used to dispose of confiscated handguns in 1971 and 1970 | 25 |
| Table 11C-2. | Of the departments indicating disposal methods, percentage in each department type using specified disposal method in 1971 | 26 |
| Table 11C-3. | Of the total numbers of handguns reported to be disposed of by each department type in 1971, percentages disposed of by specified disposal method | 26 |
| Table 12C-3. | Of the total numbers of handguns reported to be disposed of by each department type in 1970, percentages disposed of by specified disposal method | 27 |

FOREWORD

The Law Enforcement Standards Laboratory (LESL) of the National Bureau of Standards (NBS) furnishes technical support to the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (NILECJ) program to strengthen law enforcement and criminal justice in the United States. LESL's function is to conduct research that will assist law enforcement and criminal justice agencies in the selection and procurement of quality equipment.

LESL is: (1) Subjecting existing equipment to laboratory testing and evaluation and (2) conducting research leading to the development of several series of documents, including national voluntary equipment standards, user guidelines, state-of-the-art surveys and other reports.

This document is a law enforcement equipment report developed by LESL under the sponsorship of NILECJ. Additional reports as well as other documents are being issued under the LESL program in the areas of protective equipment, communications equipment, security systems, weapons, emergency equipment, investigative aids, vehicles and clothing.

Technical comments and suggestions concerning the subject matter of this report are invited from all interested parties. Comments should be addressed to the Law Enforcement Standards Laboratory, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D.C. 20234.

Jacob J. Diamond, *Chief*
Law Enforcement Standards
Laboratory

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY

A. Background

° Law Enforcement Standards Laboratory (LESL) was established in 1971 under the sponsorship of the NILECJ Advanced Technology Division (ATD).

° NILECJ asked the Behavioral Sciences Group of the National Bureau of Standards to develop and carry out a procedure to get information from the users of law enforcement equipment.

° "User" information would aid NILECJ in setting priorities for LESL programs and would provide some detailed information in support of the research to develop standards and guidelines.

° In addition, gathering information from the users would help to make police agencies aware of LESL and ATD.

° A nationwide mail sample survey was selected as the best procedure to collect user information.

° An Equipment Priorities Questionnaire (EPQ) and six Detailed Questionnaires (DQs) were developed and administered. A separate report was prepared for each of these seven questionnaires.

B. Design of Questionnaires

° Questionnaires were developed in conjunction with NILECJ, LESL, and cooperating police departments. Questionnaires were pretested at various times with approximately 45 police departments.

° The EPQ was designed to provide information about priority needs for standards for various types of equipment.

° In addition, the EPQ asked for data about numbers of full- and part-time officers, activities performed in the department, budget, size of jurisdiction, etc.

° The six DQs (Alarms, Security and Surveillance Equipment; Communications Equipment and Supplies; Handguns and Handgun Ammunition; Sirens and Emergency Warning Lights; Body Armor and Confiscated Weapons; and Patrol Cars) were each developed separately.

° The DQs asked about kinds and quantities of equipment in use, problems with existing equipment, suggestions for improving equipment, needs for standards related to the equipment, etc. Although entitled Detailed Questionnaires, these questionnaires were designed to give an overview of the use of specific items of equipment.

C. Sample

° The population sampled was made up of all police departments listed in a computerized file and maintained by the LEAA Statistical Service.

° Courts, correctional institutions, forensic labs, special police agencies, etc., were excluded.

° The sample was stratified by LEAA geographic region (10 regions) and by department type (7 department types: state police; county police and sheriffs; city departments with 1-9 officers; city departments with 10-49 officers; city departments with 50 or more officers, excluding the 50 largest cities; the 50 largest U.S. cities by population; and township departments).

- ° Overall, approximately 10 percent of the 12,836 departments in the population were selected as respondents (see table 1.2-2).

- ° The Equipment Priorities Questionnaire was sent to every sample department (1,386). Each Detailed Questionnaire was sent to all states, to all of the 50 largest cities, and to a randomly selected subsample of the main sample (about 530 departments received each DQ).

- ° Thus, states and the 50 largest cities were asked to fill in all 7 questionnaires. Each of the remaining 1,286 departments was asked to fill in the EPQ and 2 of the DQs.

- ° The sample for the Body Armor DQ consisted of 529 departments $\frac{1}{8}$ see table 1.2-3 $\frac{1}{4}$.

D. Questionnaire Administration

- ° Stringent control of administration was required.

- ° Introductory letters were sent to heads of departments asking cooperation.

- ° On June 1, 1972, questionnaire packages were mailed.

- ° In July 1972, follow-up by self-return post card was begun.

- ° In August 1972, follow-up by telephone was begun. Departments which had not returned questionnaires were called. Also, calls were made to clear up ambiguities in the returned questionnaires. About 1,300 calls were made. About 70 percent of the sample departments were called at least once.

- ° Each questionnaire was edited and coded by a specialized team to ensure consistency; it was then keypunched and tabulated.

- ° Completed questionnaires were accepted for tabulation through January 7, 1973.

E. Rates of Return

- ° Eighty-three percent of the 1,386 departments returned usable EPQs.

- ° Eighty-three percent of the 529 departments returned usable Body Armor DQs.

- ° Between 81 and 85 percent of the other DQ subsamples returned usable questionnaires.

- ° Highest rates of return (over 88%) were from states, the 50 largest cities, cities with 50 or more officers, and cities with 10-49 officers.

- ° Lowest rates of return were from counties and townships (less than 75%).

F. Characteristics of Responding Departments

- ° The activities most commonly carried out by the respondents (to the EPQ) were serving traffic and criminal warrants (88%), traffic safety and traffic control (87%), and intradepartmental communications (87%).

- ° All of the responding 50 largest cities said they provided inhouse training and criminal investigations. This compared to 68 percent and 86 percent, respectively, of all responding departments.

- ° Only 13 percent of all respondents had crime laboratories. Seventy-three percent of the 50 largest cities and 55 percent of the states had crime laboratories.

- ° About three-fifths of the departments in all department types were providing emergency aid and rescue, ranging from 60 percent of the cities with 50 or more officers to 67 percent of the counties.

- ° Overall, the reported equipment budgets represented somewhat over 10 percent of the total budgets reported.

- ° Among department types, there was a wide range of total equipment expenditures, from a mean of about \$10,000 for cities with 1-9 officers to a mean of almost \$2.7 million for the 50 largest cities.

- ° One of the 50 largest cities reported an equipment budget of \$40 million.

- ° Overall, the 50 largest cities reported a mean of 2,491 full-time sworn officers.

However, 1 of the 50 largest cities had 27 percent of all the full-time officers reported by that department type and another had about 12 percent.

G. Presentation of Data

- ° Data in this report are presented in two forms: text tables and full tables (app. B). Text tables do not always present a complete breakdown of the data.

- ° All tables (text and full) present the data in unweighted form, i.e., numbers and percentages of the responding departments from the sample for this questionnaire, not figures that have been weighted to expand the data to the total population of police departments in the U.S.

- ° The sample selected for this questionnaire was not proportional to the total population of police departments. If decisions are to be made which require estimates of population figures, the appropriate extrapolation must be performed (see app. B).

II. SUMMARY OF RESULTS

A. Characteristics of Respondents

- ° The body armor questionnaire was generally filled in by high ranking officers—the chiefs or sheriffs of smaller departments and sergeants, lieutenants, or captains in larger departments.

- ° Most of the responding officers had been in law enforcement work for several years; more than 80 percent had been in law enforcement work for 6 or more years.

B. Use of Body Armor

- ° Within every department type, half or more of the responding departments said that body armor should be hidden when worn in “potentially explosive (crowd control) situations.”

- ° Departments in the 50 largest cities were least clear cut in their opinions—50 percent said body armor should be hidden in such a situation and 41 percent said it should be visible.

- ° The most common reasons for body armor to be hidden when worn in “potentially explosive situations” were: Snipers are less likely to aim for vulnerable areas and body armor tends to incite crowds.

- ° Reasons for body armor to be visible in such situations were: Shows that officer is prepared, has a deterrent effect on crowd, and has psychological effect on officer and/or crowd.

- ° The majority of responding departments said they would routinely use body armor for sniper situations and “man with a gun” calls if an appropriate body armor were available.

C. Use of Other Ballistic Protective Equipment

- ° Small percentages of the 440 responding departments were using or were planning to use ballistic protective equipment other than body armor.

- ° Those responding departments which were using or planning to use other ballistic protective items were more likely to be using ballistic shields or ballistic helmets than armored cars or patrol car armor.

- ° Fewer than 20 percent of the responding counties, townships, cities (1-9), and cities (10-49) were using or planning to use each of those four ballistic protective items.

- ° About one-third of the responding 50 largest cities and cities (50+) were or would be using hand-held ballistic shields.

- ° About one-fourth of the responding states were or would be using ballistic helmets.

- ° Almost one-third of the responding 50 largest cities were using or planning to use armored cars.

- ° Sixty-one percent of the 50 largest cities were using at least 1 of the 4 items of ballistic protective equipment at the time of the survey. Only 36 percent of the responding states and 28 percent of the cities (50+) were using any of the items. Twenty percent or less of the responding departments in the other four department types were using any of those items.

- ° The 50 largest city and city (50+) departments were the department types most likely to make comments about or describe problems with body armor or ballistic protective equipment.

D. Availability of Data on Officers' Wounds

- ° The seven department types differed greatly in the percentages of departments which kept detailed records on officer wounds and injuries by knife or gun.

- ° More than half of the responding states, 50 largest cities, cities (50+), and cities (10-49) said they kept such detailed records. High percentages of the departments in small department types said they had never had an officer killed or injured by knife or gun.

- ° Most of the responding departments which kept detailed records said those records were detailed enough to determine the caliber and type of gun, the type of bullet used, and the distance from which the shot was fired.

- ° Only 7 percent of the responding departments which kept such detailed records said they would not be willing to make these records available to researchers.

- ° Most of the 50 largest cities with records kept summaries of those detailed records on officer injuries, and more than half of the departments in the other department types kept summaries.

- ° These summaries tended to be as detailed as the records themselves.

E. Confiscated Weapons

- ° Data supplied in answer to questions about confiscated weapons were accepted as they were, and there were ambiguities which made these data unusable for estimating total numbers of handguns confiscated in the U.S. by police departments.

- ° A majority of the responding departments in five of the six department types did report numbers of weapons confiscated. However, only about one-third of the responding states supplied those data.

- ° Responding counties said they confiscated nearly as many shoulder weapons as handguns in 1971 and 1970. City department types, however, reported about twice as many handguns as shoulder weapons confiscated.

- ° The 51 largest city departments reported 2 to 3 times as many confiscated handguns per department as did responding state departments. Responding states reported 9 to 12 times as many confiscated handguns per department as did city (50+) departments.

- ° Responding states and 50 largest cities tended to actually destroy greater proportions of their confiscated handguns, whereas smaller department types tended to report much higher proportions of confiscated handguns returned to owner or agent of owner.

LEAA POLICE EQUIPMENT SURVEY OF 1972

Volume VI: Body Armor and Confiscated Weapons

G. Hare, E. Bunten, and P. Klaus

Institute for Applied Technology, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D. C. 20234

The report outlines the methodology of and summarizes a portion of the data from the LEAA Police Equipment Survey of 1972. One of a series of 7 reports resulting from this nationwide mail survey of a stratified random sample of police departments, the present report summarizes the answers of 440 police departments concerning body armor and confiscated weapons; preference for hidden or visible body armor; use of other ballistic protective equipment; routine operations where body armor would be most useful; current problems and failures with present equipment; needs for standards for the testing and assessment of penetration resistance of body armor; and disposition of confiscated weapons. The data are presented by all responding departments and by seven department types.

Key words: Ballistic protective equipment; body armor; confiscated weapons; police; police equipment; standards.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Project Background

During the past several years, law enforcement agencies in the United States have become more aware of the importance of equipment in the performance of their duties. Much of their equipment was originally designed for other uses and must be modified before it can be used for police work. Other equipment items are used as given. No standards have existed against which equipment performance could be measured nor were any standard test methods or procedures available. It has been difficult for agencies to compare the performance of equipment items. Recognizing this problem, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) of the Department of Justice began a concentrated program in 1971, toward the improvement of law enforcement equipment.

As the first step in its program, LEAA in cooperation with the Department of Commerce established a Law Enforcement Standards Laboratory (LESL) at the National Bureau of Standards (NBS). The broad goal of LESL is to develop performance standards which can be promulgated by LEAA as voluntary aids for the selection of equipment by law enforcement agencies. Additionally, LESL is developing standard test methods and procedures, so that the relative performance of similar items may be evaluated by departments themselves.

In order to provide equipment user information for the program, in 1971 the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (NILECJ) of LEAA asked the Behavioral Sciences Group of the Technical Analysis Division at NBS to gather information from the users of law enforcement equipment about their specialized equipment needs and problems. Although face-to-face interviews with a large sample of representatives from law enforcement agencies would have been desirable, time and manpower constraints led to the development of a nationwide mail sample survey having two general objectives: (1) To assist NILECJ in the establishment of priorities for LESL's standards development activities; and (2) to obtain detailed information about certain broad equipment categories in support of the research to develop standards and guidelines in these areas.

This report fulfills part of the second general objective and the associated survey questionnaire (see app. A) will be referred to as the Body Armor Detailed Questionnaire (DQ). The remainder of the second objective is accomplished in the reports of the other five DQs: Alarms, Security, and Surveillance Systems; Handguns and Handgun Ammunition; Sirens and Emergency Warning Lights; Communications Equipment and Supplies; and Patrol Cars. The first general objective (above) is accomplished in the report on the Equipment Priorities Questionnaire (EPQ).¹

1.2. Sample Design

Although the objective of ATD is to serve all types of law enforcement agencies, this particular study was purposefully limited to police departments as the largest single group of law enforcement agencies with identifiable equipment needs. No attempt was made to survey correctional institutions, courts, forensic laboratories, or special police agencies such as park police, harbor patrols, or university police. The computerized directory of approximately 14,000 police agencies, compiled and maintained by LEAA's Statistics Division, provided the population from which the sample was drawn. Care was taken to exclude the double listings that existed for some agencies. (Details of the selection process are given in app. B of the Equipment Priorities Questionnaire.)

The final list of 12,842 departments was cross-stratified by LEAA geographic region and department type by the mutual agreement of NBS and NILECJ. The assignment of states to regions and the seven department types chosen for study are shown in table 1.2-1.

The breakdown of the population of police departments by cross-strata is exhibited in table 1.2-2. As can be seen from the table, there were no townships in regions 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10. Almost 63 percent of the departments were city police, 43 percent having 1-9 full-time officers. County departments comprised about 24 percent of the population. By region, the smallest (region 10) contained only 3.4 percent of the police departments, while region 5, the largest, had 22.5 percent. The variation in the number of departments in a cell (region/department type combination) was even greater than that across the strata, i.e., the number of departments in each cell ranged from 0 to 1,470.

The considerations discussed in the previous paragraph led to the sampling plan discussed briefly below. All of the state departments and the 50 largest city departments were included in the sample and were asked to complete all 6 DQs, i.e., they were sent the entire package of 7 questionnaires. For the remaining cells the variation in cell size presented a problem: If the same fraction of the entire population was to be selected from the members of each cell, a constant sampling fraction small enough to make the total sample manageable would yield too few sample units in small cells. To solve this problem, a fixed sample of 30 police departments/cell was chosen, wherever possible, resulting in a different sampling fraction for each cell. A fixed sample size of 30 departments/cell was chosen to facilitate the equitable distribution of the 6 DQs. This plan resulted in sending the Body Armor DQ to 529 departments.

The departments were selected randomly within each cell, from the total cell population, each department (other than the states and 50 largest cities) receiving 2 DQs. Thus, in cells having 30 sample units, the Body Armor DQ was mailed to 10 departments; cells having fewer sample units were allocated proportionally fewer Body Armor DQs. Table 1.2.3 presents the total sample for the Body Armor DQ by region and department type.

Once the sample was selected, each sample unit was assigned a unique seven-digit identification number, coding region, type, and questionnaire assignment.

¹ LEAA Police Equipment Survey of 1972, Vol. I: The Need for Standards—Priorities for Police Equipment.

TABLE 1.2-1. *Stratification categories*

| Department types | LEAA geographic region |
|--|--|
| State police | 1 = Conn., Maine, Mass., N.H., R.I., Vt. |
| County police and sheriffs | 2 = N.J., N.Y. |
| City with 1-9 officers | 3 = Del., Md., Pa., Va., W. Va., D.C. |
| City with 10-49 officers | 4 = Ala., Fla., Ga., Ky., Miss., N.C., S.C., Tenn. |
| City with 50 or more officers ¹ | 5 = Ill., Ind., Mich., Ohio, Wis., Minn. |
| The 50 largest U.S. cities ² | 6 = Ark., La., N. Mex., Okla., Tex. |
| Township departments | 7 = Iowa, Kans., Mo., Nebr. |
| | 8 = Colo., Mont., N. Dak., S. Dak., Utah, Wyo. |
| | 9 = Ariz., Calif., Nev., Hawaii |
| | 10 = Alaska, Idaho, Oreg., Wash. |

¹ Does not include the 50 largest cities.² By population, U.S. 1970 census.TABLE 1.2-2. *Number of police departments by region and type*

| Department type | LEAA region | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-----------------------|-------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | |
| State | 6 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 50 ¹ |
| County | 66 | 84 | 257 | 764 | 536 | 506 | 413 | 288 | 103 | 120 | 3,137 |
| City (1-9 officers) | 27 | 348 | 713 | 979 | 1,470 | 703 | 611 | 283 | 135 | 217 | 5,486 |
| City (10-49 officers) | 40 | 237 | 166 | 344 | 508 | 230 | 142 | 71 | 168 | 79 | 1,985 |
| City (50+ officers) | 60 | 64 | 36 | 83 | 119 | 46 | 23 | 19 | 87 | 17 | 554 |
| 50 largest cities | 1 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 50 |
| Township | 629 | 349 | 362 | - | 234 | - | - | - | - | - | 1,574 |
| Total | 829 | 1,088 | 1,544 | 2,186 | 2,883 | 1,498 | 1,196 | 668 | 505 | 439 | 12,836 |

¹ Questionnaires were actually sent to 56 state police departments since there were 6 state departments which listed 2 police agencies without reference to a common central agency. However, only one set of questionnaires was accepted from each of these six states as described in vol. 1, app. B, p. B-2.

TABLE 1.2-3. *Number of departments selected to receive the Detailed Questionnaire: Body armor and confiscated weapons*

| Department type | LEAA geographic region | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-----------------------|------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | |
| State ¹ | 6 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 50 |
| County | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 100 |
| City (1-9 officers) | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 99 |
| City (10-49 officers) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 100 |
| City (50+ officers) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 6 | 90 |
| 50 largest cities | 1 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 50 |
| Township ² | 10 | 10 | 10 | - | 10 | - | - | - | - | - | 40 |
| Total | 56 | 56 | 60 | 56 | 66 | 53 | 45 | 43 | 52 | 42 | 529 |

¹ Questionnaires were actually sent to 56 state police departments since there were 6 state departments which listed 2 police agencies without reference to a common central agency. However, only one set of questionnaires was accepted from each of these six states.

² Township departments exist only in regions 1, 2, 3, and 5.

1.3. Questionnaire Administration

From the beginning of the project, it was evident that stringent control would be required in administering the questionnaires to ensure a high rate of response. Computer-stored daily status records were input via a teletypewriter for each sample department. In general, the following procedure was used:

(1) Each department in the sample was mailed a letter, signed by the director of NILECJ, addressed to the head of the department. This letter introduced the survey and requested cooperation.

(2) About 1 week later, the questionnaire packages were mailed.

(3) Departments not returning the questionnaires within a month were identified by the computer and were sent a self-return post card requesting information as to the status of the questionnaires. Departments not receiving the questionnaire package were sent another; those not returning the post card were placed on a list for telephone follow-up.

(4) About a month and a half later, departments with which no contact had been made were called by telephone.

(5) Returned questionnaires were reviewed for completeness and either coded for keypunching or filed for telephone callback to supply missing data or to resolve ambiguities.

Considerable effort was expended to ensure a high rate of response, and this effort was rewarded with an 83 percent response for the Body Armor DQ, and between 80 percent and 85 percent for each of the other questionnaires. In the course of the survey more than 70 percent of the sample departments were contacted at least once by telephone. More than 1,300 phone calls were made by the survey team.

The distribution of respondents (departments which returned usable Body Armor DQs) is exhibited in table 1.3-1. The highest percentages of response were from the states and larger cities (88-92%), while counties and townships had the poorest response rates (under 75%).

TABLE 1.3-1. *Number of departments returning acceptable Detailed Questionnaires: Body armor and confiscated weapons*

| Department type | LEAA geographic region | | | | | | | | | | Total | Percent total sample |
|------------------------|------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|----------------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | | |
| State ¹ | 4 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 44 | 88 |
| County | 5 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 74 | 74 |
| City (1-9 officers) | 6 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 78 | 79 |
| City (10-49 officers) | 10 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 89 | 89 |
| City (50+ officers) | 10 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 5 | 81 | 90 |
| 50 largest cities | 1 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 46 | 92 |
| Townships ² | 8 | 7 | 7 | - | 6 | - | - | - | - | - | 28 | 70 |
| Total | 44 | 48 | 48 | 47 | 51 | 43 | 37 | 41 | 46 | 35 | 440 | 83 |
| Percent total sample | 78 | 86 | 80 | 84 | 75 | 81 | 82 | 95 | 88 | 83 | 83 | |

¹ Questionnaires were actually mailed to 56 state police departments since there were 6 states which listed 2 police agencies without reference to a common central agency. However, only one set of questionnaires was accepted from each of these six states.

² Township departments exist only in regions 1, 2, 3, and 5.

1.4. Development and Design of the Body Armor DQ

The survey plan and questionnaire design (of all seven questionnaires) evolved over a 12-month period. During this time, the survey team consulted at length with NILECJ equipment experts, LESL program managers, and equipment manufacturers. In addition, the officers and administrators of about 40 police departments served as consultants and/or respondents for pretests of various versions of the questionnaires.

The Body Armor DQ, in its final form, is reproduced in appendix A. This DQ asked respondents to describe situations which would require the use of body armor, kinds of data maintained when officers were killed or wounded, and about other kinds of ballistic protective devices used in their departments. A section asking about numbers of weapons confiscated and methods of disposing of those weapons was added to this questionnaire at the request of the U.S. Department of the Treasury. The questionnaire was limited to general topics because: (1) it was not possible, considering the scope of the present survey, to explore in a detailed manner specific information about all types of body armor or other protective equipment in use, and (2) it was felt that the general data gathered in the present effort would provide important direction for research in the development of standards, the main objective of the survey.

1.5. Characteristics of Subsample Groups

The EPQ of the LEAA Police Equipment Survey requested data from each department about population served, physical size of jurisdiction served, type of jurisdiction, number of full- and part-time officers, approximate total, equipment, and personnel budgets during 1971, and activities handled by the department.

Table 1.5-1 presents a partial tabulation, by department type, of the responses to a checklist of 30 typical police activities by the respondents to the EPQ. (The EPQ respondents include, but are not limited to, the respondents to the Body Armor DQ. See sec. 1.2.) The activities most frequently checked by all departments were: (1) Serve traffic and criminal warrants (88%), (2) traffic safety and traffic control (87%), and (3) communications for own department (87%). The activity with the most consistent level across all department types was that of emergency aid and rescue, ranging from 60 percent (cities with 50+ officers) to 67 percent (counties).

Higher percentages of state and 50 largest city departments than of other department types were handling certain of the 30 activities. For example, all of the 50 largest city departments responding, and 98 percent of the responding state departments said that their departments provided police training for their own department. These compare to 68 percent for all responding departments. All of the responding 50 largest cities said that they handled criminal investigation in their own departments. This compares to 86 percent of the total sample of departments. Although only 13 percent of the departments overall had crime laboratories, 73 percent of the 50 largest cities and 55 percent of the states had them.

Counties appeared to be the only department type with significant responsibilities for custody and detention for more than 1 week. Seventy-eight percent of those departments had custody/detention up to 1 year, as compared with 22 percent of all responding departments.

Tables 1.5-2 and 1.5-3 present summaries of descriptive data by department type and LEAA region, respectively. As can be seen from the column for "Annual equipment budget" (table 1.5-2), there was a wide range of expenditures among different department types: from a mean of about \$10,000 for cities (1-9) to almost \$2.7 million for the 50 largest cities. Overall, equipment budgets represented somewhat over 10 percent of the annual total budgets.

The mean number of part-time officers was based on those respondents having part-time officers in their departments. Of the 45 responding from the 50 largest cities,

TABLE 1.5-1. *Activities handled by at least one-third of each department by department type, and percent of total departments having each activity*

| Description of activity | State | County | City (1-9) | City (10-49) | City (50+) (in %) | 50 largest | Town- ship | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------|--------|---------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------|
| Serve traffic and criminal warrants | 70 | 89 | 84 | 89 | 94 | 87 | 93 | 88 |
| Traffic safety and traffic control | 92 | 56 | 94 | 96 | 96 | 98 | 94 | 87 |
| Communications for own department | 94 | 86 | 76 | 95 | 94 | 96 | 70 | 87 |
| Criminal investigation | 66 | 86 | 71 | 95 | 97 | 100 | 79 | 86 |
| Police training for own department | 98 | 55 | 48 | 77 | 87 | 100 | 42 | 68 |
| Custody/detention—less than 1 day | - | 79 | 51 | 73 | 72 | 80 | 43 | 65 |
| Breath-alcohol test | 89 | 46 | 47 | 72 | 83 | 91 | 49 | 64 |
| Emergency aid and rescue | 62 | 67 | 62 | 63 | 60 | 67 | 62 | 63 |
| Public building protection | - | 40 | 63 | 60 | 58 | 44 | 68 | 54 |
| Service function | - | - | 48 | 55 | 60 | 60 | 42 | 48 |
| Animal control (dogcatcher) | - | - | 58 | 63 | 42 | - | 37 | 44 |
| Highway patrol | 96 | 38 | 48 | 36 | - | - | 88 | 43 |
| Maintenance of police buildings | 51 | 36 | 34 | 41 | 48 | 47 | | 40 |
| Custody/detention—1 week or less | - | 73 | | 36 | 46 | 49 | | 38 |
| Communications for other agency | 66 | 56 | | 40 | - | - | | 36 |
| Serve civil process | - | 88 | | | - | - | | 32 |
| Police training for other agency | 77 | - | | | 42 | 84 | | 24 |
| Custody/detention—up to 1 year | - | 78 | | | - | - | | 22 |
| Underwater recovery | 34 | 42 | | | - | 42 | | 19 |
| Bomb disposal | 45 | | | | - | 82 | | 17 |
| Polygraph | 62 | | | | 36 | 90 | | 17 |
| Vehicle inspection | 55 | | | | | - | | 17 |
| Crime laboratory | 55 | | | | | 73 | | 13 |
| Narcotics laboratory analysis | 43 | | | | | 62 | | 11 |
| Harbor patrol | - | | | | | - | | 7 |
| Lab analysis for blood alcohol | 34 | | | | | 53 | | 7 |
| Other | - | | | | | | | 6 |
| Coroner | - | | | | | | | 5 |
| Test for driver's license | 34 | | | | | | | 3 |
| Custody/detention—more than 1 year | | | | | | | | 3 |

TABLE 1.5-2. *Descriptive data by department type (means)*

| Department type | Area (mi ²) | Population | Number of full-time officers | Number of part-time officers | Annual total budget | Annual equipment budget | Annual personnel budget |
|-----------------|----------------------------|------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 50 largest | 187 | 851,342 | 2,491 | 1,115 | \$43,268,865 | \$2,669,920 | \$34,712,818 |
| State | 62,580 | 3,936,410 | 889 | 18 | 16,377,358 | 2,304,339 | 12,020,572 |
| County | 1,518 | 130,254 | 60 | 25 | 1,089,919 | 58,539 | 859,984 |
| City (50+) | 31 | 83,334 | 132 | 26 | 1,733,340 | 173,099 | 1,407,177 |
| City (10-49) | 12 | 15,849 | 22 | 9 | 257,927 | 24,362 | 206,187 |
| Township | 28 | 13,228 | 14 | 8 | 175,654 | 20,854 | 141,675 |
| City (1-9) | 9 | 5,038 | 8 | 5 | 82,381 | 9,764 | 60,061 |

TABLE 1.5-3. *Descriptive data by LEAA region (means)*

| LEAA region | Area (mi ²) | Population | Number of full-time officers | Number of part-time officers | Annual total budget | Annual equipment budget | Annual personnel budget |
|-------------|----------------------------|------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | 750 | 158,112 | 96 | 18 | \$1,360,155 | \$135,130 | \$ 979,911 |
| 2 | 648 | 240,781 | 365 | 97 | 7,148,315 | 148,172 | 5,265,546 |
| 3 | 1,096 | 245,733 | 216 | 7 | 3,412,567 | 435,153 | 2,879,293 |
| 4 | 3,691 | 340,996 | 151 | 11 | 2,318,382 | 248,600 | 1,767,292 |
| 5 | 2,652 | 448,174 | 283 | 8 | 4,916,607 | 431,478 | 3,879,374 |
| 6 | 5,738 | 271,386 | 160 | 17 | 2,193,823 | 160,363 | 1,709,910 |
| 7 | 2,379 | 112,094 | 84 | 9 | 1,220,385 | 121,001 | 983,696 |
| 8 | 6,346 | 83,023 | 54 | 9 | 728,549 | 77,081 | 568,463 |
| 9 | 4,218 | 372,094 | 281 | 46 | 5,743,553 | 728,801 | 4,528,692 |
| 10 | 3,580 | 104,877 | 69 | 9 | 1,253,894 | 82,198 | 1,011,604 |

only 6 had part-time officers, including 1 city which had nearly 6,000. Thus, the mean value of 1,115 for this department type is somewhat misleading. It should be noted that the category part-time officers included officers described as auxiliary, volunteer, reserve, school-crossing guard, dispatcher, summer, special agent, traffic supervisor, posse, and cadet. All of these classifications were counted in the part-time officer category since it has different meanings for different departments.

Variations in these descriptive averages by LEAA region (table 1.5-3) were considerably smaller than variations by department type. Regions 1 and 8 had smaller budgets than the others, primarily because each had only 1 of the 50 largest cities.

2. QUESTION BY QUESTION DISCUSSION

2.1. Advice to the Reader

In reading section 2, certain points should be kept in mind:

(1) This report is not an evaluation of any of the equipment described or discussed within it. It is a presentation of information and opinions of a stratified random sample of police departments given in response to a specific set of questions. It does not, in any way, reflect objective testing of any equipment by the National Bureau of Standards.

(2) The report reflects only what police departments are willing and able to say in response to a specific set of questions. In most cases, no attempt was made to verify the accuracy of the information given or the level of sophistication of the respondent.

(3) Each discussion begins with the presentation of the question that appeared in the questionnaire, and in most cases the choices supplied, if any, set off in bold face type. However, the reader is cautioned to become familiar with the questionnaire sent to sample departments (see app. A) and to evaluate the data in terms of the exact questions asked.

(3) The text tables that appear in section 2 are almost never the complete tables that were tabulated for that question. Data categories for text tables may have been collapsed from the full table, or certain categories of interest may have been singled out for fuller discussion. Appendix B contains the complete tables from which the text tables were extracted. Text tables have been numbered after the question number (e.g., the text tables for Question 6A would be numbered 6A-1, 6A-2, etc.). The tables in appendix B are also numbered the same as the question number, in the same manner. In some cases, tables that appear in appendix B will not have been discussed at all in the text.

(5) Data in the text of this report are usually presented by nearest whole percent of the group under consideration. In appendix B, the data are usually presented by number of respondents and percent. Because of statistical limitations imposed by the sample sizes used in this study, the reader is cautioned to be wary of assigning importance to percentage differences of less than 5 percent when percentages are based on the total number of respondents, and to percentage differences of less than 10 percent when percentages are based on one of the subsample groups (e.g., a particular department type or region). No statistical tests of significance are reported.

(6) Data were always tabulated by each of the choices supplied, if any, in the questionnaire. Any "other" choices written in by the respondents were also tabulated and/or recorded verbatim. In most cases, the numbers of respondents giving a specific "other" response do not reflect the numbers of respondents who might have marked that choice if it had been one of those provided. Therefore, in most cases, this report lists or gives examples of "other" responses, but does not present numbers or percents of departments giving that response. For those questions for which choices were not provided in the questionnaire, coding categories were developed after approximately one-fourth of the questionnaires had been returned.

(7) The following convention has been adopted in the report to designate the four city department types:

City with 1-9 officers=city (1-9)

City with 10-49 officers=(10-49)

City with 50 or more officers=city (50+)²

The 50 largest cities=50 largest³

In table headings this same convention has been used.

(8) Questions which asked departments to identify manufacturers of their equipment were asked in this manner only to make the question clearer; not to evaluate a manufacturer's product.

(9) In an attempt to make this report more readable, the main topics of the questionnaire have been reordered in the report; the discussion of the findings does not follow the order of the questions. To find the discussion of a particular question quickly, consult the Contents or the List of Tables.

(10) When the subsample groups are discussed (e.g., "counties said..." or "cities (1-9) said...") the reference is to the responding departments from one of the sample strata. It is particularly important to note that when the text or tables refer to "all departments" or "all responding departments," the reference is to all responding departments from the sample described in section 1.2. This sample was not proportional to the total population of police departments, and although it is possible to do so, the data in this report have not been weighted to allow direct extrapolation to the total population. (See app. B, p. B-1.)

2.2. Discussion

2.2.1. Characteristics of Respondents

a. Rank/Title of Respondents

All of the questionnaires in the LEAA Police Equipment Survey were mailed to the chief (or highest official) of the department with a request that the questionnaires be directed to the person or persons within the department who were felt to be best qualified to answer the questions.

In general, the body armor questionnaire was filled in by officers with high rank. In 68 percent of the city (1-9) departments the questionnaire was completed by the

²Excluding the 50 largest U.S. cities.

³By population, 1970 U.S. Census.

chief; in township departments, 64 percent were filled in by the chief; and in city (10-49) departments, 52 percent of the body armor questionnaires were filled in by the chief. As the size of the city department increased, the percentage of chiefs completing this questionnaire decreased. In the larger cities, greater percentages of respondents were sergeants, captains, and lieutenants. (See table i.)

In county and state departments too, relatively high ranking officers filled in the body armor questionnaire. In 46 percent of the state departments the questionnaire was completed by either a captain or a lieutenant; in 57 percent of the county departments the form was answered by the sheriff or undersheriff.

In 16 percent of the state and 17 percent of the 50 largest city departments the questionnaire was completed by a person with some title that was not a police rank. Usually these respondents were administrative personnel.

b. Number of Years of Law Enforcement Experience of Respondent

In general, the respondents to the body armor questionnaire had been in law enforcement work for several years when they answered the questionnaire. Forty-eight percent of the 440 respondents said they had more than 15 years of experience in law enforcement. Eighty-four percent of them had 6 or more years of experience. Only 3 percent of all respondents less than 2 years of such experience.

More than 80 percent of the respondents from states and the 3 largest city department types had more than 10 years of experience in law enforcement. (See table ii.)

TABLE i. *Rank of primary respondent for body armor questionnaire, by department type*¹

| Title/rank | Department type | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|----------|
| | City (1-9) | City (10-49) | City (50+) | 50 largest | Township |
| Chief | 68 | 52 | 22 | 7 | 64 |
| Captain | 4 | 13 | 16 | 15 | 4 |
| Lieutenant | 1 | 12 | 20 | 17 | 7 |
| Sergeant | 9 | 9 | 11 | 24 | 14 |
| "Nonrank" title | 6 | 1 | 10 | 17 | 7 |

¹Excluding county and state departments.

TABLE ii. *Years of experience in law enforcement of primary respondent*

| Number of years of law enforcement experience | Department type | | | | | | Township |
|---|-----------------|--------|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|----------|
| | State | County | City (1-9) | City (10-49) | City (50+) | 50 largest | |
| | | | (Cumulative percentages) | | | | |
| More than 10 years | 83 | 38 | 45 | 82 | 86 | 85 | 39 |
| More than 20 years | 46 | 19 | 22 | 33 | 42 | 41 | 4 |
| More than 25 years | 30 | 12 | 8 | 15 | 22 | 15 | 4 |

2.2.2. Use of Body Armor and Other Ballistic Protection Equipment

7. In your department's opinion, if body armor is worn in a potentially explosive situation (a potential riot, for example, or in controlling an "unfriendly" crowd), would it be better for the body armor to be visible or to be hidden under the uniform?

Should be visible

Should be hidden

Should not be worn at all

7.b Why is that?

More than half (56%) of the responding departments said that when body armor is worn in a potentially explosive situation it should be hidden. About one-third felt it should be visible. Very few departments (3%) felt it should not be worn at all.

The seven department types tended to be similar in their assessment of this use of body armor: Within every department type half or more of the responding departments said body armor should be hidden in this sort of situation. Departments in the 50 largest cities were least clear cut in their opinions—50 percent of these largest city departments said it should be hidden and 41 percent said it should be visible. (See table 7-1.)

Departments were asked to give a reason for their answers to Question 7. Using these narrative responses, coding categories were developed and the responses were tabulated in these categories.

The 2 most common reasons given by the 246 responding departments which said body armor should be hidden were: Snipers are less likely to aim for vulnerable areas (31%), and the sight of body armor tends to incite crowds (28%). About one-fourth of the departments that favored hidden body armor gave no reason for that answer. Several of the departments which preferred hidden armor wrote comments about the effects of body armor on public opinion. Body armor, they said, presents the officer as the aggressor rather than as a peace officer. In addition, some commented that visible body armor conceals the uniform, and thus the identity, of the officer. (See table 7-2.)

The 150 responding departments which said body armor should be visible in a potentially explosive situation generally referred to the positive effects of visible body armor on the crowd: Shows that officers are prepared (25%), has a deterrent effect on a crowd (21%), has a psychological effect (13%), and show of force (9%). A smaller percentage of the departments favoring visible body armor gave reasons which expressed a belief that visible body armor would be more practical or comfortable: Easier to put on and take off (9%), and more comfortable/maneuverable (5%). (See table 7-3.)

TABLE 7-1. Percentages of departments in each department type preferring visible, hidden, or no body armor in a potentially explosive situation

| Department type | Should be hidden | Should be visible | Should not be worn | Don't know/no answer |
|-----------------|------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Township | 64 | 32 | 0 | 4 |
| State | 59 | 32 | 2 | 7 |
| City (10-49) | 58 | 34 | 2 | 5 |
| County | 57 | 28 | 5 | 10 |
| City (1-9) | 54 | 35 | 1 | 10 |
| City (50+) | 53 | 37 | 2 | 7 |
| 50 largest | 50 | 41 | 7 | 2 |
| All respondents | 56 | 34 | 3 | 7 |

TABLE 7-2. *Of the 246 departments preferring hidden body armor in potentially explosive situations, percentages¹ giving specified reason*

| Reason | Percent of respondents ¹ preferring hidden [n=246] |
|---|---|
| Snipers are less likely to aim for vulnerable areas | 31 |
| Sight of armor tends to incite crowds | 28 |
| Don't want others to know it's worn; element of surprise | 9 |
| Visibility of uniform is more important than visibility of armor; identify officer by uniform | 2 |
| So that unprotected officers will not become targets | 2 |
| Miscellaneous others | 9 |
| No answer | 26 |

¹ Percentages add to slightly more than 100 percent since multiple answers were allowed.

TABLE 7-3. *Of the 150 departments preferring visible body armor in potentially explosive situations, percentages¹ giving specified reason*

| Reason | Percent of respondents ¹ preferring visible [n=246] |
|--|--|
| Well equipped officer should show training, protection, and preparedness for crowd | 25 |
| Deterrent effect on crowd | 21 |
| Psychological effect | 13 |
| Ease of putting on and taking off equipment | 9 |
| Show of force | 9 |
| Comfort, less restrictions, maneuverability | 5 |
| Miscellaneous | 14 |
| No answer | 20 |

¹ Percentages add to slightly more than 100 percent since multiple answers were allowed.

8. If body armor designed for the following activities were available to you, for which of those listed below do you think such body armor would be used *routinely* in your department? (Mark X By Each Item That Applies.)

- ° Foot Patrol (concealed armor)
- ° Automobile Patrol (concealed armor)
- ° Detectives (concealed armor)
- ° Foot and/or Auto Patrol in High Crime Areas (concealed armor)
- ° Sniper Situations
- ° "Man with a Gun" Calls
- ° Burglary Calls
- ° Robbery Calls
- ° Family Disturbance Calls
- ° Approaching a Suspicious Vehicle
- ° Other (Specify)

This question was designed to allow departments to speculate about the activities for which body armor would most likely be used if appropriate body armor for that activity were available. The body armors available to police departments at the time of this survey were clearly too heavy, too difficult to put on and take off, and in some cases, required too much care in handling to allow them to be used in situations other than those in which there was known danger of exposure to gunfire, such as sniper situations. There have, however, been recent technological developments leading to relatively lightweight, flexible, and comfortable body armor or bullet protective clothing which might be usable in some of the situations described in Question 8.

The two activities for which most responding departments said they would routinely use an appropriate body armor were: sniper situations (80%) and "man with a gun" calls (70%). More than one-third of the responding departments also said they

TABLE 8. Percentages¹ of departments in each department type which would routinely use body armor for specified activity

| Activity | Department type | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|------------|-------|--------------|------------|--------|----------|
| | 50 largest | City (50+) | State | City (10-49) | City (1-9) | County | Township |
| Snipers | 98 | 93 | 84 | 83 | 69 | 68 | 57 |
| "Man with gun" | 48 | 79 | 59 | 76 | 72 | 69 | 79 |
| Robbery | 22 | 42 | 9 | 29 | 42 | 47 | 54 |
| Burglary | 11 | 15 | 5 | 22 | 33 | 26 | 54 |
| Patrol in high crime (concealed) | 26 | 16 | 2 | 19 | 26 | 16 | 14 |
| Family disturbances | 9 | 12 | 0 | 18 | 15 | 27 | 39 |
| Suspicious vehicle | 9 | 11 | 18 | 13 | 19 | 24 | 36 |
| Auto patrol (concealed) | 7 | 4 | 14 | 15 | 15 | 9 | 29 |
| Detectives (concealed) | 11 | 14 | 14 | 11 | 9 | 8 | 4 |
| Foot patrol (concealed) | 4 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 3 | 7 |
| Other | 41 | 22 | 23 | 8 | 5 | 15 | 4 |
| No answer | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 7 |

¹ Percentages add to more than 100 percent since multiple answers were allowed.

would use body armor routinely for robbery calls (36%), if an appropriate armor were available. Four other activities were each cited for routine body armor use by about one-fifth of the departments: burglary calls (22%), patrol in high crime areas/concealed armor (18%), family disturbance calls (17%), and approaching a suspicious vehicle (17%).

There were some department type differences. Fewer states cited robbery, burglary, family disturbance, and foot patrol; these were more often mentioned by the other department types. A smaller proportion of the 50 largest cities cited "man with a gun" calls than did counties, townships, and the other city department types. The 50 largest cities also more often listed some "other" activity.

Other activities mentioned included riots and/or civil disturbances, apprehension of dangerous persons or barricaded criminals, and guarding VIPs. (See table 8.)

9. Which of the following types of ballistic protective items, if any, does your department now use or expect to use? (Mark X by Each Item That Applies.)

Now Use Will be Using

Hand-held Ballistic Shields
Patrol Car Armor
Ballistic Helmets
Special Armored Cars

Taken as a group, only small percentages of the 440 responding departments were using or were planning to use any of the listed ballistic protective items. (In this case, no answer was assumed to mean the department neither used nor planned to use the item.) Departments were more likely to be using or planning to use ballistic shields or ballistic helmets than armored cars or patrol car armor. (See table 9-1.)

Among the seven department types, however, some department types had relatively high percentages of departments using ballistic protective devices. Fewer than 20 percent of counties, townships, cities (1-9), and cities (10-49) were using or were planning to use each of the ballistic items listed. But, about one-third of the 50 largest city and city (50+) departments were or would be using hand-held ballistic shields. About one-fourth of the states were using or were planning to use ballistic helmets, and almost one-third of the 50 largest cities were using or planning to use armored cars. (See table 9-2.)

The 50 largest city departments were much more likely to have been currently using at least one of the listed ballistic protective items than the other department types. It appears that use of these ballistic protective items was related to the size of the department. (See table 9-3.)

TABLE 9-1. Percentages¹ of responding departments using and planning to use specified ballistic protective item

| Ballistic protective item | Now using | Plan to use | No answer/ none |
|----------------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|
| Ballistic helmet | 12 | 6 | 82 |
| Hand-held ballistic shield | 10 | 7 | 83 |
| Special armored car | 4 | 2 | 94 |
| Patrol car armor | 2 | 1 | 97 |

¹ Percentages add to more than 100 percent since multiple answers were allowed.

TABLE 9-2. Percentages¹ of departments in each department type which were using or were planning to use specified ballistic protective item

| Department type | Ballistic protective item | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------------|-------------------|--------------|------------------|
| | Ballistic helmets | Hand-held shields | Armored cars | Patrol car armor |
| 50 largest | 19 | 35 | 30 | 9 |
| State | 26 | 14 | 16 | 2 |
| City (50+) | 20 | 29 | 4 | 5 |
| City (10-49) | 19 | 19 | 0 | 3 |
| Township | 15 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| County | 17 | 8 | 1 | 4 |
| All respondents | 18 | 17 | 6 | 3 |

¹ Percentages add to more than 100 percent since multiple answers were allowed.

TABLE 9-3. Percentages of departments in each department type currently using at least one of the ballistic protective items

| Department type | Departments using at least one item |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| 50 largest | 61 |
| State | 36 |
| City (50+) | 28 |
| City (10-49) | 20 |
| Township | 11 |
| County | 11 |
| City (1-9) | 10 |
| All respondents | 24 |

10. Do you have any comments about the use of, or problems with, the use of body armor or ballistic protective items?

No choices were supplied for this question, and as is often the case with open-ended questions, many departments (46%) gave no answer. For an additional 12 percent, the only comment supplied was that they had no problems with ballistic protective equipment or body armor. The remaining 42 percent wrote a comment other than "No Problems" or described a problem with such equipment. The two largest city department types (50 largest and 50+ officers) were more likely to mention a problem than the other department types. (See table 10-1.)

The body armor questionnaire did not ask whether the department was currently using body armor, and many departments used Question 10 to volunteer that they were not using body armor. Table 10-2 is presented only to show the flavor of those responses, the data in this table cannot be used to estimate numbers of departments using body armor. It shows approximately the same trend as table 10-1 and table 9-3, that the larger departments are more likely to have ballistic protective devices.

Of the 183 responding departments which made a comment (other than "no problem") or described a problem, the most common problem mentioned was that body

TABLE 10-1. *Percentages of departments in each department type providing a comment about ballistic protective items or body armor*

| Department type | Problem or comment | No problem | No answer |
|-----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|
| 50 largest | 57 | 4 | 39 |
| City (50+) | 52 | 9 | 38 |
| City (10-49) | 39 | 12 | 48 |
| Township | 36 | 11 | 54 |
| State | 39 | 11 | 50 |
| County | 36 | 14 | 50 |
| City (1-9) | 32 | 21 | 47 |
| All respondents | 42 | 12 | 46 |

TABLE 10-2. *Percentages of departments in each department type which commented (Question 10) that their departments had no body armor¹*

| Department type | Respondents saying no body armor |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Township | 28 |
| County | 20 |
| City (1-9) | 17 |
| City (10-49) | 16 |
| State | 7 |
| City (50+) | 7 |
| 50 largest | 0 |
| All respondents [n=440] | 13 |

¹ Data based on narrative response; see discussion immediately preceding table 10-2.

armor was too heavy and bulky making it: Impractical for routine use (12%), restricting maneuverability (10%), uncomfortable (5%), or causing fatigue (5%). About 8 percent of those making comments specifically suggested redesign to make body armor lighter or more flexible. These comments on the weight and bulk of body armor included discussions of the difficulties of putting on and taking off the armor, the amount of time required to "suit up," the problems of getting in and out of vehicles while wearing armor, and the general problems of fatigue and buildup of body heat while wearing armor. (See table 10-3.)

A few of the responding departments which made comments referred to the cost of body armor. The most common comment was that body armor was too expensive for the department to provide it for all officers.

About 10 percent of the responding departments which made comments said that body armor provided inadequate protection and/or provided a false sense of security.

TABLE 10-3. *Of the 183 departments which listed a problem or made a comment (other than "no problem"), percentage¹ citing specified comment*

| Comment | Percent of respondents citing problems/comments [n=183] |
|---|---|
| Don't have body armor | 32 |
| Too heavy and bulky | |
| Impractical for routine use | 12 |
| Restricts maneuverability | 10 |
| Uncomfortable | 5 |
| Causes fatigue/too hot | 5 |
| Inadequate protection/false security | 10 |
| Redesign to make lighter/comfortable/flexible | 8 |
| Too expensive to provide for all officers | 5 |
| Comment about ceramic body armor | 2 |

¹ Percentages add to slightly more than 100 percent since multiple answers were allowed.

About one-fourth of the state and 50 largest city departments which made comments mentioned this problem. The comments centered on the belief that body armor did not protect against the fire power it was subjected to and on requests that body armor be subjected to test procedures using rifles and various calibers of handguns. Further, these departments said that officers seemed to believe that body armor protects better than it actually has been shown to do and, therefore, took risks which sometimes resulted in deaths or injuries.

2.2.3. Availability of Data for Researchers Developing Body Armor Standards

The departments were asked a series of questions to find out the kinds of data which might be available to researchers developing standards for body armor. The first question in the series was used to identify the departments which kept detailed death and injury statistics. Questions 2 through 6 were then to be answered only by the departments which kept detailed records.

1. When one of your officers is injured or killed (by knife or gun), does your department keep records which are detailed enough to determine the exact (within an inch or two) location on the body at which the wound occurred?

Yes

No

Sometimes

There were large differences among the seven department types in their answers to this question. These differences, however, appeared to be more related to the incidence of officer injury by knife or gun than to departmental recordkeeping policies.

About one-third or more of the responding departments in the four smallest department types volunteered that they had never had an officer killed. None of the 50 largest city departments made that statement. (See table 1.)

A large majority (87%) of the 50 largest city departments said they kept detailed records concerning officer's wounds as did more than half of the responding departments in states, cities (50+), and cities (10-49).

TABLE 1. Percentages of departments in each department type maintaining records of the exact locations of wounds sustained by officers (ordered by size of department based on average number of officers¹)

| Department type | Keep exact records? | | | No officer killed |
|-----------------|---------------------|----|-----------|-------------------|
| | Yes | No | Sometimes | |
| 50 largest | 87 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| State | 61 | 18 | 9 | 11 |
| City (50+) | 60 | 12 | 7 | 20 |
| County | 47 | 15 | 3 | 35 |
| City (10-49) | 53 | 11 | 2 | 31 |
| Township | 29 | 25 | 0 | 46 |
| City (1-9) | 37 | 19 | 1 | 40 |
| All respondents | 53 | 15 | 4 | 27 |

¹For department type statistics, see table 1.5-2.

2. How about the weapons used? Are your records detailed enough to determine:

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----|----|-----------|
| Caliber and type of gun? | Yes | No | Sometimes |
| Type of bullet used? | Yes | No | Sometimes |
| Distance from which shot was fired | Yes | No | Sometimes |

Most of the 235 departments which said they maintained records concerning officers' wounds ("Yes" to Question 1) said these records included information about the caliber and type of gun which was used (92%) and the type of bullet used (86%). A slightly smaller percentage (70%) said their records identified the distance from which the shot was fired.

Department type differences were not as great with respect to the kind of records kept as they were with respect to whether records were kept or not. Of the responding departments in each department type keeping detailed records, three-fourths or more in each department type⁴ said the records identified caliber and type of gun and the type of bullet used. Slightly higher percentages of the larger departments recorded these two items than did counties and cities (1-9).

Fewer of the departments which kept injury data said that they were always able to determine distance from which the shot was fired (70%), as compared to caliber of gun (92%) and type of bullet used (86%) information. However, relatively higher percentages of departments stated that they sometimes were able to determine this information (23%) than in the other two categories (67% and 9%, respectively). (See table 2.)

⁴Excluding townships for which no statement can be made. Fewer than 10 of the township departments said they kept records of officers' wounds.

TABLE 2. *Of the departments in each department type maintaining detailed injury data ("Yes" to Question 1), the percentages including specified data in those records*

| Department type | Caliber and type of gun | | Type of bullet used | | Distance shot fired from | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|--------------------------|-----------|
| | Yes | Sometimes | Yes | Sometimes | Yes | Sometimes |
| State [n=27] | 96 | 4 | 85 | 15 | 78 | 22 |
| City (50+) [n=49] | 96 | 4 | 90 | 8 | 67 | 24 |
| City (10-49) [n=47] | 96 | 2 | 94 | 2 | 85 | 9 |
| 50 largest [n=40] | 95 | 5 | 90 | 10 | 60 | 40 |
| County [n=35] | 83 | 6 | 77 | 9 | 60 | 26 |
| City (1-9) [n=29] | 79 | 17 | 79 | 10 | 72 | 14 |
| Township* [n=8] | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| All respondents [n=235] | 92 | 6 | 86 | 9 | 70 | 23 |

*Excluding township departments. Fewer than eight of the responding townships maintained such records.

3. Would your department be willing to allow a researcher to visit and study these records for research purposes?

Yes

No

Don't Know

Only 7 percent of the 235 responding departments which maintained records officers' wounds said that they would not be willing to make these records available to researchers. A higher percentage, however, said that they didn't know whether the records could be made available or not. These "don't know" responses probably represented two distinct factors. Some of the respondents said that permission would have to be obtained from a particular official, that the respondent himself could not give permission; and some respondents indicated that the records could only be made available under certain conditions. (See table 3.)

Respondents from state and 50 largest city departments were more likely to say they don't know. This tendency was probably the result of the fact that fewer chiefs or department heads filled in the body armor questionnaire in these department types.

TABLE 3. *Of the departments in each department type maintaining detailed injury data ("Yes" to Question 1), the percentages willing to make these records available to researchers*

| Department type | Willing to make available? | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|------------|----|-----------|
| | Yes | Don't know | No | No answer |
| City (10-49) | 85 | 11 | 4 | 0 |
| County | 80 | 6 | 11 | 3 |
| City (50+) | 76 | 16 | 6 | 2 |
| City (1-9) | 72 | 24 | 3 | 0 |
| 50 largest | 60 | 32 | 7 | 0 |
| State | 48 | 41 | 11 | 0 |
| Township* | * | * | * | * |
| All respondents [n=235] | 72 | 20 | 7 | 1 |

*Excluding townships. Fewer than eight of the responding townships maintained such records.

4. Are any summaries of these statistics on death and injury to your officers kept by your department?

Yes

No (If "No" to Question 4, Go to Question 7)

Sometimes

More than 80 percent of the 50 largest cities which maintained statistics on officers' injuries and deaths said that they kept summaries of those records. Between about half and three-fifths of the departments in the other department types kept such summaries.

A total of 147 departments, 33 percent of the 440 responding departments, said that they kept summary statistics on death or injury to their officers ("Yes" to Question 1 and "Yes" or "Sometimes" to Question 4). (See table 4.)

TABLE 4. *Of the departments in each department type maintaining detailed injury data ("Yes" to Question 1), percentages keeping summaries of those records*

| Department type | Maintain summaries? | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------|----|-----------|
| | Yes | No | Sometimes |
| 50 largest | 82 | 15 | 2 |
| State | 63 | 37 | 0 |
| County | 60 | 34 | 6 |
| City (50+) | 55 | 39 | 2 |
| City (10-49) | 53 | 47 | 0 |
| City (1-9) | 48 | 48 | 3 |
| Townships* | * | * | * |
| All respondents [n=235] | 60 | 37 | 2 |

*Excluding townships. Fewer than eight of the responding townships maintained such records.

5. (If "Yes" or "Sometimes" to Question 4) Do these summaries contain information about:

| | | | |
|--|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Exact (within an inch) location | Yes | No | Sometimes |
| Caliber and type of gun? | Yes | No | Sometimes |
| Type of bullet used? | Yes | No | Sometimes |
| Distance from which shot was fired? | Yes | No | Sometimes |

Most of the 147 responding departments which maintained summary statistics on death and injury to officers said those summaries contained information about caliber and type of gun (90%), type of bullet used (82%), and the exact location of the wound (78%). About two-thirds of those respondents also said their summaries listed the distance from which the shot was fired. It appears that virtually all of the departments that compile such summaries list those four pieces of information when they are available—the addition of "Yes" and "Sometimes" answers equals 100 percent in most cases except for the distance from which the shot was fired category. (See table 5.)

TABLE 5. *Of the departments in each department type maintaining summarized wound data ("Yes" to Question 1 and "Yes" or "Sometimes" to Question 4), percentages including specified data in those records*

| Department type | Exact location of wound | | Caliber and type of gun | | Type of bullet used | | Distance shot fired | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|
| | Yes | Sometimes | Yes | Sometimes | Yes | Sometimes | Yes | Sometimes |
| City (10-49) [n=25] | 92 | 4 | 100 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 96 | 4 |
| State [n=17] | 82 | 18 | 94 | 6 | 82 | 18 | 76 | 24 |
| 50 largest [n=34] | 79 | 12 | 85 | 12 | 76 | 18 | 47 | 44 |
| City (50+) [n=28] | 75 | 14 | 89 | 4 | 82 | 11 | 61 | 25 |
| County [n=23] | 74 | 26 | 83 | 13 | 70 | 22 | 61 | 35 |
| City (1-9) [n=15] | 67 | 27 | 93 | 7 | 93 | 0 | 80 | 13 |
| Townships* [n=5] | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| All respondents [n=147] | 78 | 16 | 90 | 7 | 82 | 12 | 67 | 27 |

*Excluding townships. Fewer than eight of the responding townships maintained summary records.

6. (If "Yes" or "Sometimes" to Question 4) Would your department be willing to send copies of these summaries to the research team that is writing standards for body armor?

Yes

No

Don't Know (If "Don't Know") Whom should we contact to obtain such permission?

Name

Address

Only about one-tenth of the 147 departments that maintained summary statistics on officer's wounds said they would not be willing to send copies of these data to researchers. Sixty-one percent said they would be willing to provide copies, and 28 percent said some other person in the department would have to be contacted in order to get permission to obtain those statistics. Nearly all of those who said "don't know" provided the name of a person or agency to contact for obtaining permission. (See table 6.)

TABLE 6. *Of the 147 departments maintaining summarized data on officers' wounds ("Yes" to Question 1 and "Yes" or "Sometimes" to Question 4), percentage willing to provide copies of these data to researchers*

| Provide data? | Percent of respondents with summarized data [n=147] |
|---------------|---|
| Yes | 61 |
| Don't know | 28 |
| No | 11 |
| No answer | 1 |

2.2.4. Confiscated Weapons

Section II: Confiscated weapons was added to the body armor questionnaire at the request of the U.S. Treasury Department. The Treasury Department was interested in the kinds and numbers of weapons confiscated by police departments; how police disposed of confiscated weapons; and problems encountered, if any, in disposing of confiscated weapons. Although answers to questions such as these are of correlative interest to current equipment research, they were not considered of primary importance to the NILECJ standards development program. Therefore, although questions concerning confiscated weapons were developed and included in this questionnaire, these questions were developed too late to allow the same pretests that were carried out for other questions in the survey. In addition, it was agreed by NILECJ and NBS that NBS would analyze data from this section "as returned," i.e., if Question 11A-C and 12A-C contained ambiguous data, or lacked data, telephone calls would not be made to complete the data, as was the usual practice for other parts of the survey.

The confiscated weapons section asked a series of three questions about weapons confiscated in 2 separate years, 1970 and 1971:

(1) 11A/12A. About how many (a) handguns, and (b) shoulder weapons did your department confiscate in 1971/1970?

(2) 11B/12B. Of the total number of (a) handguns, and (b) shoulder weapons you confiscated in 1971/1970, about how many had originally been *military issue*?

(3) 11C/12C. About how many of all *handguns* confiscated in 1971/1970 were disposed of in each of the following ways? (Followed by choices.)

There are several points the reader should keep in mind when reading and interpreting the responses to Questions 11A-C and 12A-C. Although the questions were designed so that it would be possible to directly relate the answers from one question to those of another question, it was not always possible to do so. For example, although it was expected that numbers of handguns confiscated (Questions 11A and 12A) would approximate the numbers of handguns disposed of (Questions 11C and 12C), this was not always the case. Some departments provided numbers in answer to one of the questions, but either checkmarked or left other questions blank. Other departments indicated numbers of handguns confiscated in a given year, and then described all handguns disposed of in that year—a number that included the handguns confiscated over a period of several years. In addition, a large proportion of the responding departments did not answer one or more of the questions. Therefore, estimates of total numbers of weapons confiscated in 1970 or 1971 based on these data might be subject to considerable error.

11A/12A. About how many (a) handguns, and (b) shoulder weapons did your department confiscate in 1971/1970?

Weapon Type

Number Confiscated in 1971/1970

a. Handguns

b. Shoulder Weapons

Although a majority of the 440 responding departments supplied numbers (including 0) of weapons confiscated in 1971 and 1970, there was 1 major department type difference. Only about one-third of the state departments provided data for 1971 and even fewer (25%) reported numbers confiscated in 1970. More than 69 percent of the departments in every other department type reported numbers of handguns and shoulder weapons confiscated in 1971, and more than 50 percent of those department types supplied 1970 data. Nonresponding state departments often said "don't know," data not available, no records kept, or don't confiscate weapons.

In every department type, higher percentages of departments supplied data for 1971 (Question 11) than for 1970 (Question 12). There are two possible explanations for

this finding: The 1971 data may have been more readily available since it was the more recent, or some departments (particularly those which said zero) which answered Question 11 (1971 data) may have felt it unnecessary to repeat their answers for Question 12. (See table 11A/12A-1.)

About three-fourths of the confiscated weapons reported by respondents were handguns in both 1971 and 1970. However, this proportion was heavily influenced by the numbers of weapons reported by 50 largest city departments; more than 80 percent of the confiscated weapons reported by the responding departments were reported by departments in the 50 largest cities. Responding county departments, in contrast, reported that in 1970, 54 percent of their confiscated weapons were handguns and 46 percent were shoulder weapons. (See table 11A/12A-2.)

Based on those departments which supplied data, it appears that number of weapons confiscated per department was directly related to the size of the department type. The responding 50 largest cities reported 2 to 3 times as many confiscated handguns per department as state departments. Responding states reported 9 to 12 times as many confiscated handguns per department as city (50+) departments. (See table 11A/12A-3.)

TABLE 11A/12A-1. *Percentages of responding departments in each department type which supplied numbers (including zero) of handguns and shoulder weapons confiscated in 1971 (Question 11A) and 1970 (Question 12A)*

| Department type | Supplying 1971 numbers | | Supplying 1970 numbers | |
|---------------------|------------------------|--------------|------------------------|--------------|
| | for handguns | for shoulder | for handguns | for shoulder |
| City (1-9) [n=78] | 97 | 85 | 83 | 76 |
| City (10-49) [n=89] | 94 | 83 | 85 | 76 |
| Township [n=28] | 89 | 79 | 68 | 68 |
| County [n=74] | 85 | 69 | 66 | 54 |
| City (50+) [n=81] | 79 | 79 | 72 | 70 |
| 50 largest [n=46] | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 |
| States [n=44] | 34 | 34 | 25 | 25 |

TABLE 11A/12A-2. *Of the total numbers of confiscated weapons reported by the responding departments in each department type¹ in 1971 and 1970, percentages that were handguns and shoulder weapons*

| Department type | 1971 figures | | 1970 figures | |
|-----------------|--------------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | Handguns | Shoulder | Handguns | Shoulder |
| State | 89 | 11 | 93 | 7 |
| 50 largest | 76 | 24 | 76 | 24 |
| City (1-9) | 69 | 31 | 75 | 25 |
| City (50+) | 68 | 32 | 68 | 32 |
| City (10-49) | 64 | 36 | 66 | 34 |
| Township | 61 | 39 | 50 | 50 |
| County | 58 | 42 | 54 | 46 |

¹ Table based on those departments reporting numbers.

TABLE 11A/12A-3. *Numbers of handguns and shoulder weapons reported by the departments which supplied numbers (including zero) of weapons confiscated in 1971 (Question 11A) and 1970 (Question 12A)*

| Department type | Handguns | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| | 1971 figures | | | 1970 figures | | |
| | Total no. reported | No. depts. reporting | Mean no. per department | Total no. reported | No. depts. reporting | Mean no. per department |
| 50 largest | 47,819 | 33 | 1,449 | 42,298 | 33 | 1,282 |
| State | 6,990 | 15 | 466 | 7,436 | 11 | 676 |
| City (50+) | 3,454 | 64 | 54 | 3,138 | 58 | 54 |
| City (10-49) | 644 | 84 | 8 | 464 | 76 | 6 |
| County | 473 | 63 | 7.5 | 286 | 49 | 6 |
| City (1-9) | 198 | 76 | 3 | 116 | 65 | 2 |
| Township | 38 | 25 | 1.5 | 23 | 19 | 1 |

| Shoulder weapons | | | | | | |
|------------------|--------|----|-----|--------|----|-----|
| 50 largest | 14,892 | 33 | 451 | 13,422 | 33 | 407 |
| State | 862 | 14 | 62 | 7,436 | 11 | 53 |
| City (50+) | 1,629 | 64 | 25 | 3,138 | 57 | 26 |
| City (10-49) | 355 | 74 | 5 | 464 | 68 | 3 |
| County | 339 | 51 | 7 | 286 | 40 | 6 |
| City (1-9) | 91 | 66 | 1 | 116 | 59 | 1 |
| Township | 24 | 22 | 1 | 23 | 19 | 1 |

11B/12B. Of the total number of (a) handguns, and (b) shoulder weapons you confiscated in 1971/1970, about how many had been Military Issue:

Weapon Type Issue in 1971

Number Military

a. Handguns

b. Shoulder Weapons

Slightly smaller percentages of the responding departments supplied information about confiscated weapons of military issue than reported numbers of weapons confiscated. (A department was counted as having answered if it gave a number or stated "zero." Blanks could not be considered "zero" answers.) This higher nonresponse rate might be attributed to the fact that some departments did not include military origin in their records on confiscated weapons. (See table 11B/12B-1.)

As stated in the introduction to section 2.2.4, it is difficult to compare data obtained from more than one question in this section of the questionnaire, since different sets of responding departments answered each question. Therefore, to compare total numbers of confiscated handguns and shoulder weapons with numbers of handguns and shoulder weapons originally of military issue, average numbers per department within each department type must be used to account for differences in numbers of respondents.

Based on these figures, it appears that only small proportions of the weapons confiscated by the responding departments in 1970 and 1971 had originally been of military issue. There did not appear to be any striking differences between the proportions of handguns and shoulder weapons that had been of military origin. (See table 11B/12B-2.)

TABLE 11B/12B-1. *Percentages of departments in each department type which reported numbers (including zero) of weapons of military issue confiscated in 1971 (Question 11B) and 1970 (Question 12B)*

| Department type | Supplying 1971 numbers | | Supplying 1970 numbers | |
|-----------------|------------------------|----------|------------------------|----------|
| | Handguns | Shoulder | Handguns | Shoulder |
| City (10-49) | 84 | 78 | 73 | 70 |
| City (1-9) | 79 | 74 | 64 | 63 |
| City (50+) | 65 | 65 | 59 | 60 |
| County | 64 | 53 | 50 | 46 |
| Township | 57 | 54 | 50 | 54 |
| 50 largest | 39 | 37 | 37 | 33 |
| State | 23 | 25 | 14 | 14 |

TABLE 11B/12B-2. *Using mean number of weapons confiscated per department in each department type and mean number of weapons of military issue per department in each department type, percentages of handguns and shoulder weapons that were originally of military issue*

| Department type | Handguns | | Shoulder weapons | |
|-----------------|----------|------|------------------|------|
| | 1971 | 1970 | 1971 | 1970 |
| City (10-49) | 9 | 3 | 8 | 3 |
| City (1-9) | 8 | 11 | 14 | 6 |
| Township | 7 | 8 | 9 | 25 |
| County | 4 | 10 | 1.5 | 8 |
| City (50+) | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5 |
| 50 largest | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| State | 1.5 | 1 | 6 | 11 |

11C/12C. About how many of all handguns confiscated in 1971/1970 were disposed of in each of the following ways?

| Number | Disposal of Handguns in 1971 |
|--------|---|
| | Turned Over to Another Agency for Disposal (Specify) |
| | Melted in a Furnace |
| | Dumped in Deep Water |
| | Crushed |
| | Cut with Torches or Hacksaws |
| | Given to Arms Museums or Other Authorized Sample Collection |
| | Issued to Sworn Officers for Use on Duty or Target Range |
| | Returned to Owner or Agent of Owner |
| | Resold (Specify to Whom) |
| | Other (Specify) |

There were again large differences among the seven department types in the percentages of responding departments indicating methods used to dispose of confiscated handguns. High percentages of the responding departments in the three largest city departments did show disposal methods for both 1971 and 1970: 87 percent

and 83 percent of the 50 largest cities, 88 percent and 76 percent of cities (50+), and 80 percent and 74 percent of the cities (10-49). Only about one-third of the responding townships provided 1971 disposal information, and 36-39 percent of townships, cities (1-9), states, and counties provided 1970 disposal information. Note that a higher percentage of the responding state departments provided 1971 disposal information (55%) than provided information about total numbers of handguns confiscated in 1971 (34%), the only department type to do so. (See table 11C/12C-1.)

Responses to Questions 11C and 12C were tabulated in two ways: A frequency count of departments whichever used the specified method to dispose of confiscated handguns in the given year (indicated by a number of weapons disposed of in a specified way or by a checkoff of a disposal method), and a tabulation of the actual numbers of handguns disposed of in a given way (based on those departments supplying numbers).

In terms of percentages of responding departments using a specified method of disposal, the methods used by the highest percentages of departments were those which did not entail destruction of the handgun: return to owner or agent of owner, turn over to other agency, issue to officer for use, arms museum/sample collection, resold, and "other." (Other responses to this question referred almost exclusively to handguns being held in the department pending trial or other disposition.) As will be discussed further below, however, the numbers of handguns disposed of in these ways (with the exception of return to owner) were relatively small. Table 11C-2, below, presents the frequency count of departments for 1971 only. See appendix B for 1970 figures.

Departments which reported that they at least sometimes turned confiscated handguns over to another agency were usually referring to courts, sheriff departments, or the Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (ATF) Bureau of the Treasury Department.

The responding departments which gave actual numbers of handguns disposed of in each category reported a total of 66,307 handguns disposed of in 1971 and a total of 38,763 handguns disposed of in 1970. The vast majority (over 80%) of both these totals were reported by departments in the 50 largest cities. (The reader is again cautioned that these numbers should not be used to estimate total numbers of handguns disposed of in these years because of high nonresponse rates. Tables 11C-3 and 12C-3 are presented in order to show trends in the relative use of disposal methods by different department types.

Using the reported numbers, it appears that the responding states and 50 largest cities tended actually to destroy a greater proportion of their confiscated handguns than the other department types. The methods most commonly used by states and 50 largest

TABLE 11C/12C-1. *Percentages of departments in each department type providing data about methods used to dispose of confiscated handguns in 1971 and 1970*

| Department type | Reporting numbers or checking disposal method | |
|-----------------|---|------|
| | 1971 | 1970 |
| City (50+) | 88 | 76 |
| 50 largest | 87 | 83 |
| City (10-49) | 80 | 74 |
| County | 70 | 39 |
| City (1-9) | 60 | 38 |
| State | 55 | 39 |
| Township | 36 | 36 |

TABLE 11C-2. *Of the departments indicating disposal methods, percentage¹ in each department type² using specified disposal method in 1971*

| Disposal method | Department type | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| | County [n=52] | City (10-49) [n=71] | City (50+) [n=71] | 50 largest [n=40] | City (1-9) [n=47] | State [n=24] |
| Return to owner/owner's agent | 67 | 56 | 52 | 50 | 45 | 8 |
| Turn over to other agency | 15 | 22 | 41 | 45 | 23 | 67 |
| Issue to officers | 21 | 25 | 25 | 37 | 19 | 12 |
| "Other" | 21 | 29 | 32 | 7 | 26 | 8 |
| Arms museum/sample collection | 8 | 25 | 13 | 20 | 11 | 12 |
| Dump in deep water | 4 | 11 | 14 | 20 | 4 | 4 |
| Cut with torch/hacksaw | 8 | 7 | 18 | 7 | 6 | 4 |
| Melt in furnace | 0 | 0 | 3 | 50 | 0 | 17 |
| Crush | 10 | 7 | 8 | 12 | 4 | 0 |
| Resold | 4 | 3 | 7 | 17 | 6 | 8 |

¹Percentages add to more than 100 percent since multiple answers were allowed.

²Excluding townships in which only 10 respondents answered.

TABLE 11C-3. *Of the total numbers of handguns reported to be disposed of by each department type¹ in 1971, percentages disposed of by specified disposal method*

| Disposal method | Department type | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|
| | 50 largest [n=54,335] | State [n=7,483] | City (50+) [n=2,998] | City (10-49) [n=732] | City (1-9) [n=184] | County [n=554] |
| Melted in furnace | 47 | 84 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dumped in water | 18 | 0 | 7 | 10 | * | * |
| Crushed | 6 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 8 | 6 |
| Cut: torch/hacksaw | 1 | 0 | 15 | 2 | * | 5 |
| Return to owner | 13 | 1 | 35 | 47 | 40 | 50 |
| Turn over to agency | 6 | 11 | 18 | 7 | 14 | 25 |
| Issue to officer | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 14 | 4 |
| Resold | 4 | 0 | 2 | * | 7 | 0 |
| Arms museum | 1 | 3 | 1 | 12 | 5 | 1 |
| Other | 2 | 0 | 11 | 12 | 11 | 9 |

¹Excluding township.

*Less than 1 percent.

cities were melting in a furnace and dumping in deep water. The smaller department types showed much higher proportions of their confiscated handguns as returned to owner.

Relatively small percentages of confiscated handguns were said to be resold. In some cases, this choice was accompanied by a comment indicating that confiscated handguns were used as partial payment for the department's service revolvers.

TABLE 12C-3. *Of the total numbers of handguns reported to be disposed of by each department type¹ in 1970, percentages disposed of by specified disposal method*

| Disposal method | Department type | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| | 50 largest [n=28,850] | State [n=7,236] | City (50+) [n=1,777] | City (10-49) [n=437] | City (1-9) [n=84] | County [n=359] |
| Melted in furnace | 31 | 90 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dumped in water | 16 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 0 | 1 |
| Crushed | 10 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 3 |
| Cut: torch/hacksaw | 2 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 6 |
| Return to owner | 20 | 2 | 39 | 47 | 44 | 56 |
| Turn over to agency | 9 | 6 | 17 | 9 | 1 | 27 |
| Issue to officer | 2 | * | 4 | 5 | 11 | 1 |
| Resold | 20 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 2 |
| Arms museum | * | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 0 |
| Other | 2 | 0 | 14 | 16 | 18 | 4 |

¹ Excluding township.

*Less than 1 percent.

13. What problems, if any, have you had in disposing of confiscated weapons?

14. Other comments:

Only 14 percent of the responding departments had a comment in response to Question 13. These comments were very rarely problem statements, most of them described the department's disposal procedure. The only problems mentioned had to do with the legal questions concerning disposal of weapons, obtaining court orders, etc.

Twenty-one percent of the responding departments made a comment for Question 14. These comments usually also described departmental policies, procedures, or recordkeeping, or discussed legal questions concerning disposal of weapons.

Some examples are shown below:

Our records do not reflect the information required in this section.

None—Sold on a bid basis to the highest bidder to be shipped out of the U.S.

F.S.A. 790/08 Guidelines are well defined.

No major problems in the past; however, we now have a new state law which...requires us to turn all confiscated weapons over to the sheriff.

System of using those weapons which are serviceable saves the taxpayer and allows us to have guns on hand to issue in event a gun is brought in for repair.

Tighter control regarding the accessibility of cheap domestic and foreign handguns.

A stricter court policy regarding cases involving handguns and a less liberal return of weapons once confiscated.

APPENDIX A

NBS-888
May 1972

OMB 41-F72030
Approval Expires June 30, 1973

U.S. Department of Commerce
National Bureau of Standards

DETAILED QUESTIONNAIRE: BODY ARMOR

POLICE EQUIPMENT SURVEY

Sponsored By:

National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
U. S. Department of Justice

Directed and Conducted By:

Behavioral Sciences Group
National Bureau of Standards
Washington, D. C. 20234
Phone: 301-921-3558

NOTE: This questionnaire is included in this document as a supplement to the discussion in the text. It has no other intended use.

INTRODUCTION: Many police departments have said that the body armor they are now able to buy is not suited to police work. They have described it as awkward, too heavy, and not protective enough for their work. In order to write voluntary performance standards for body armor, the Law Enforcement Standards Laboratory is trying to find out what police departments need.

PURPOSE OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE: This "detailed" questionnaire asks you to tell us in what situations your officers might use body armor, and under what circumstances you have had officers wounded or killed where body armor might have prevented injury or death. YOUR answers will be used to determine where further research and development is needed.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Fill in the questionnaire completely. Even if you do not have all the information you need "at your fingertips", please make your best effort to supply every answer AS ACCURATELY AS POSSIBLE.
2. Answer all questions for YOUR OWN DEPARTMENT. Do not attempt to supply information that might exist in some other department.
3. The results of this questionnaire will be compiled by computer. It is very important that you follow directions and answer every question legibly and in the boxes and spaces provided.
4. No individual department will be identified in the report of this survey; the results will be published in tabulated form.
5. Additional instructions for filling in your answers appear after some questions. Follow the directions given.
6. Please PRINT all comments or answers CLEARLY.
7. When this questionnaire has been completely filled in; place it, with the other questionnaires sent to your department, in the stamped, addressed envelope supplied. Return all of them to:
Technology Building, All0
National Bureau of Standards
Washington, D.C. 20234
8. If you have any questions, write to the above address or call collect:
E. Bunten or P. Klaus
Phone: 301-921-3558
9. Remember that it is only by getting YOUR answers to these questions that the Laboratory will know what police body armor should be designed to withstand.

SECTION I: USE OF BODY ARMOR

1. When one of your officers is injured or killed (by knife or gun), does your department keep records which are detailed enough to determine the exact (within an inch or two) location on the body at which the wound occurred?

(10) *** Yes
 No
 Sometimes

2. How about the weapons used? Are your records detailed enough to determine?

(11) Caliber and type of gun? Yes No Sometimes
(12) Type of bullet used? Yes No Sometimes
(13) Distance from which shot Yes No Sometimes
 was fired?

3. Would your department be willing to allow a researcher to visit and study these records for research purposes?

(14) Yes
 No
 Don't Know

4. Are any SUMMARIES of these statistics on death and injury to your officers kept by your department?

(15) Yes
 No (IF "NO" TO QUESTION 4, GO TO QUESTION 7)
 Sometimes

***Numbers in parentheses are for computer use only.

5. (IF "YES" OR "SOMETIMES" TO QUESTION 4) Do these SUMMARIES contain information about:

- (16) Exact (within an inch) location Yes _____ No _____ Sometimes _____
- (17) Caliber and type of gun? Yes _____ No _____ Sometimes _____
- (18) Type of bullet used? Yes _____ No _____ Sometimes _____
- (19) Distance from which shot was fired? Yes _____ No _____ Sometimes _____

6. (IF "YES" OR "SOMETIMES" TO QUESTION 4) Would your department be willing to send copies of these SUMMARIES to the research team that is writing standards for body armor?

- (20) _____ Yes
- _____ No
- _____ Don't Know

(IF "DON'T KNOW") Whom should we contact to obtain such permission?

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

7. In your department's opinion, if body armor is worn in a potentially explosive situation (a potential riot, for example, or in controlling an "unfriendly" crowd), would it be better for the body armor to be visible or to be hidden under the uniform?

- (21) _____ Should be visible
- _____ Should be hidden
- _____ Should not be worn at all

(22-23) 7.B. Why is that? _____

8. If body armor designed for any of the following activities were available to you, for which of those listed below do you think such body armor would be used routinely in your department?
(MARK X BY EACH ITEM THAT APPLIES)

(24-34) ☐ Foot Patrol (concealed armor)
☐ Automobile Patrol (concealed armor)
☐ Detectives (concealed armor)
☐ Foot and/or Auto Patrol in High Crime Areas (concealed armor)
☐ Sniper situations
☐ "Man with a Gun" Calls
☐ Burglary Calls
☐ Robbery Calls
☐ Family Disturbance Calls
☐ Approaching a Suspicious Vehicle
☐ Other (Specify) _____
☐ Other (Specify) _____

9. Which of the following types of ballistic protective items, if any, does your department now use or expect to use? (MARK X BY EACH ITEM THAT APPLIES)

| | | <u>NOW USE</u> | <u>WILL BE USING</u> |
|---------|-----------------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| (35-36) | Hand-held Ballistic Shields | _____ | _____ |
| (37-38) | Patrolcar Armor | _____ | _____ |
| (39-40) | Ballistic Helmets | _____ | _____ |
| (41-42) | Special Armored Cars | _____ | _____ |

10. Do you have any comments about the use of, or problems with the use of body armor or ballistic protective items?

(43-44)

This image shows a single page of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

SECTION II: CONFISCATED WEAPONS

These questions were added to the Police Equipment Survey at the request of the U. S. Department of the Treasury. The Treasury Department would like to find out what sorts of problems police departments face in confiscating and disposing of weapons, what kinds of weapons they are now confiscating, and how they dispose of these weapons.

Remember that your department will NOT be identified to any agency or in any report of this survey. YOUR ANSWERS WILL BE GROUPED with the answers of other departments of the same type or the same geographic area. The data collected in this survey will NOT be turned over to the Treasury Department until identifying information has been removed from it.

11.A. About how many (a) handguns, and (b) shoulder weapons did your department confiscate in 1971?

| | <u>WEAPON TYPE</u> | <u>NUMBER CONFISCATED IN 1971</u> |
|---------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|
| (45-49) | a. Handguns | _____ |
| (50-54) | b. Shoulder Weapons | _____ |

11.B. Of the total number of (a) handguns, and (b) shoulder weapons you confiscated in 1971, about how many had originally been MILITARY ISSUE?

| | <u>WEAPON TYPE</u> | <u>NUMBER MILITARY ISSUED IN 1971</u> |
|---------|---------------------|---|
| (55-59) | a. Handguns | _____ |
| (60-64) | b. Shoulder Weapons | _____ |

11.C. About how many of all HANDGUNS confiscated in 1971 were disposed of in each of the following ways?

| | <u>NUMBER</u> | <u>DISPOSAL OF HANDGUNS IN 1971</u> |
|---------|---------------|---|
| (65-69) | _____ | Turned over to another agency for disposal |
| (70) | | (Specify) _____ |
| (71-75) | _____ | Melted in a Furnace |
| (76-80) | _____ | Dumped in Deep Water |
| (10-14) | _____ | Crushed |
| (15-19) | _____ | Cut with Torches or Hacksaws |
| (20-24) | _____ | Given to Arms Museum or Other Authorized Sample Collection |
| (25-29) | _____ | Issued to Sworn Officers for Use on Duty or Target Range |
| (30-34) | _____ | Returned to Owner or Agent of Owner |
| (35-39) | _____ | Resold (Specify to Whom) _____ |
| (40) | | _____ |
| (41-45) | _____ | Other (Specify) _____ |

12.A. About how many (a) handguns, and (b) shoulder weapons did your department confiscate in 1970?

| | <u>WEAPON TYPE</u> | <u>NUMBER CONFISCATED IN 1970</u> |
|---------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|
| (46-50) | a. Handguns | _____ |
| (51-55) | b. Shoulder Weapons | _____ |

12.B. Of the total numbers of (a) handguns, and (b) shoulder weapons you confiscated in 1970, about how many had originally been military issue?

| | <u>WEAPON TYPE</u> | <u>NUMBER MILITARY ISSUE IN 1970</u> |
|---------|---------------------|--|
| (56-60) | a. Handguns | _____ |
| (61-65) | b. Shoulder Weapons | _____ |

12.C. About how many of all HANDGUNS confiscated in 1970 were disposed of in each of the following ways?

| <u>NUMBER</u> | <u>DISPOSAL OF HANDGUNS IN 1970</u> |
|---------------|--|
| (66-70) | _____ Turned over to another agency for disposal (Specify) |
| (71) | _____ |
| (72-76) | _____ Melted in a Furnace |
| (10-14) | _____ Dumped in Deep Water |
| (15-19) | _____ Crushed |
| (20-24) | _____ Cut with Torches or Hacksaws |
| (25-29) | _____ Given to Arms Museum or Other Authorized Sample Collection |
| (30-34) | _____ Issued to Sworn Officers for Use on Duty or Target Range |
| (35-39) | _____ Returned to Owner or Agent of Owner |
| (40-44) | _____ Resold (Specify to Whom) _____ |
| (45) | _____ |
| (46-50) | _____ Other (Specify) _____ |

13. What problems, if any, have you had in disposing of confiscated weapons?

(51-52)

14. OTHER comments:

(53-54)

IDENTIFYING INFORMATION: (All identifying information will be kept confidential)

Name of Department: _____

Address: _____

Name of person who answered this questionnaire:

Name

Title: _____ Rank: _____

No. of years experience in law enforcement: _____

Telephone Number: _____

Others who helped: 1. _____
Name

Title: _____ Rank: _____

No. of years experience in law enforcement: _____

Telephone Number: _____

2. _____
Name

Title: _____ Rank: _____

No. of years experience in law enforcement: _____

Telephone Number: _____

APPENDIX B

Data Tables

B.1. Advice to the Reader

(a) The data presented in the following tables resulted from the responses of a stratified random sample (see sec. 1.2) of police departments in response to a specific set of questions (see app. A). These data do not, in any way, reflect objective testing of any of the equipment by the National Bureau of Standards. The reader is cautioned to become familiar with the questionnaire and to evaluate the data in terms of the exact questions asked.

(b) Tables have been numbered after the question number (e.g., the tables for Question 6A would be numbered 6A-1, 6A-2, etc.). The data are usually presented by number of respondents and nearest whole percentage. Because of the statistical limitations imposed by the sample sizes used in this study, the reader is cautioned to be wary of assigning importance to percentage differences of less than 5 percent when percentages are based on all respondents, and to percentage differences of less than 10 percent when percentages are based on one of the subsample groups (e.g., a particular department type or region). No statistical tests of significance are reported.

(c) These tables are based on the responding departments from the specific sample selected for this questionnaire. This sample was not proportional to the total population of police departments, and although it is possible to do so, the data in these tables have not been weighted to allow direct extrapolation to the total population.

(d) In order to extrapolate to the total population from the respondent data presented in this report, use the following procedure: For each department type, multiply the percentage of respondents of a particular department type giving the answer of interest (see B.2 Data Tables, app. B) by the total number of departments of that department type in the population (see table 1.2-2, sec. 1.2); add those seven subtotals; and divide the total by the total number of police departments in the population (table 1.2-2). The quotient of this division will be an estimate of the percentage of all U.S. police departments that would choose the answer of interest.

B.2. Data Tables

Table i-1

RANK OF PERSON WHO FILLED IN QUESTIONNAIRE:

RESPONSE

| RESPONSE | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | | | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | | | TOWNSHIP | | | | |
|-----------------|----------------------|-----|----|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|-----------------------|----|----------------------------|----|----------------------|----|-----|
| | STATE | | | COUNTY | | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | |
| | NO. | % | | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | |
| CHIEF | 141 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 53 | 68 | 46 | 52 | 18 | 22 | 3 | 7 |
| CAPTAIN | 50 | 11 | 14 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 16 | 7 | 15 |
| COMMISSIONER | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| COLONEL | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ACTING CHIEF | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ASSISTANT CHIEF | 12 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| MAJOR | 8 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| LIEUTENANT | 49 | 11 | 6 | 14 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 8 | 17 |
| CORPORAL | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| PRIVATE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DEPUTY | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| INSPECTOR | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| SHERIFF | 35 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 46 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CONSTABLE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SERGEANT | 51 | 12 | 8 | 18 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 11 | 11 | 24 |
| PATROLMAN | 16 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 13 |
| OTHER TITLE | 45 | 10 | 7 | 16 | 14 | 19 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 17 |
| UNDERSHERIFF | 12 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| NO ANSWER | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTALS | 440 | 100 | 44 | 100 | 74 | 100 | 78 | 100 | 89 | 100 | 81 | 100 | 46 | 100 |

B-2

Table i-2

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF PERSON WHO FILLED IN QUESTIONNAIRE:

RESPONSE

| RESPONSE | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | STATE | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | TOWNSHIP | | | |
|-------------|----------------------------|-------|-----------------|-----|---------------------------|-----|-----------------------------|-----|----------------------------------|----------------------------|----------|-----|----|-----|
| | | | COUNTY | | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | | | | | | | |
| | | | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | | | | NO. | % | |
| 2 OR LESS | 13 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 14 |
| 3-5 YEARS | 32 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 12 | 13 | 17 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 11 |
| 6-10 YEARS | 81 | 18 | 5 | 11 | 26 | 35 | 19 | 24 | 11 | 12 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 32 |
| 11-15 YEARS | 79 | 18 | 3 | 7 | 11 | 15 | 10 | 13 | 19 | 21 | 20 | 25 | 6 | 21 |
| 16-20 YEARS | 78 | 18 | 13 | 30 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 10 | 25 | 28 | 15 | 19 | 10 | 22 |
| 21-25 YEARS | 67 | 15 | 7 | 16 | 5 | 7 | 11 | 14 | 16 | 18 | 16 | 20 | 12 | 26 |
| 26-30 YEARS | 35 | 8 | 7 | 16 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 5 | 11 |
| 31 OR MORE | 32 | 7 | 6 | 14 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| NO ANSWER | 23 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 8 | 11 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| TOTALS | 440 | 100 | 44 | 100 | 74 | 100 | 78 | 100 | 89 | 100 | 81 | 100 | 46 | 100 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | 28 | 100 |

Table 1-1

Q.1: WHEN ONE OF YOUR OFFICERS IS INJURED OR KILLED (BY KNIFE OR GUN), DOES YOUR DEPARTMENT KEEP RECORDS WHICH ARE DETAILED ENOUGH TO DETERMINE THE EXACT (WITHIN AN INCH OR TWO) LOCATION ON THE BODY AT WHICH THE WOUND OCCURRED?

| RESPONSE | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------|-----|-------|-----|--------|-----|---------------------|-----|-----------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|----------|-----|
| | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | | STATE | | COUNTY | | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | |
| | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| YES | 235 | 53 | 27 | 61 | 35 | 47 | 29 | 37 | 47 | 53 | 49 | 60 | 40 | 87 | 8 | 29 |
| NO | 64 | 15 | 8 | 18 | 11 | 15 | 15 | 19 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 12 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 25 |
| SOMETIMES | 18 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| NO OFFICER KILLED: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NO OR BLANK | 53 | 12 | 4 | 9 | 12 | 16 | 10 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 25 |
| YES | 66 | 15 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 19 | 21 | 27 | 16 | 18 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 21 |
| NO ANSWER | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTALS | 440 | 100 | 44 | 100 | 74 | 100 | 78 | 100 | 89 | 100 | 81 | 100 | 46 | 100 | 28 | 100 |

Table 2 A-1

Q.2(A): (IF YES TO Q.1):
HOW ABOUT THE WEAPONS USED? ARE YOUR RECORDS DETAILED ENOUGH TO DETERMINE?

RESPONSE

| | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | | STATE | | COUNTY | | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|-----|-------|-----|--------|-----|---------------------|-----|-----------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|----------|-----|
| | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| CALIBER AND TYPE OF GUN | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| YES | 216 | 92 | 26 | 96 | 29 | 83 | 23 | 79 | 45 | 96 | 47 | 96 | 38 | 95 | 8 | 100 |
| NO | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SOMETIMES | 13 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 17 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| NO RECORDS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NA | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BLANK | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTALS | 235 | 100 | 27 | 100 | 35 | 100 | 29 | 100 | 47 | 100 | 49 | 100 | 40 | 100 | 8 | 100 |
| TYPE OF BULLET USED | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| YES | 203 | 86 | 23 | 85 | 27 | 77 | 23 | 79 | 44 | 94 | 44 | 90 | 36 | 90 | 6 | 75 |
| NO | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 |
| SOMETIMES | 20 | 9 | 4 | 15 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 10 | 1 | 12 |
| NO RECORDS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NA | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BLANK | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTALS | 235 | 100 | 27 | 100 | 35 | 100 | 29 | 100 | 47 | 100 | 49 | 100 | 40 | 100 | 8 | 100 |
| DISTANCE FROM WHICH SHOT WAS FIRED | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| YES | 165 | 70 | 21 | 78 | 21 | 60 | 21 | 72 | 40 | 85 | 33 | 67 | 24 | 60 | 5 | 62 |
| NO | 13 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 4 | 14 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SOMETIMES | 54 | 23 | 6 | 22 | 9 | 26 | 4 | 14 | 4 | 9 | 12 | 24 | 16 | 40 | 3 | 37 |
| NO RECORDS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NA | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BLANK | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTALS | 235 | 100 | 27 | 100 | 35 | 100 | 29 | 100 | 47 | 100 | 49 | 100 | 40 | 100 | 8 | 100 |

Table 2-1

Q.2: (IF YES, SOMETIMES, OR YES, HAVE HAD NO OFFICERS KILLED TO Q.1):
HOW ABOUT THE WEAPONS USED? ARE YOUR RECORDS DETAILED ENOUGH TO DETERMINE?

RESPONSE

| | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | STATE | | COUNTY | | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------|-----|--------|-----|---------------------------|-----|----|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------|-----|
| | | NO. | % | NO. | % | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | NO. | % | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| CALIBER AND TYPE OF GUN | YES | 279 | 87 | 30 | 94 | 43 | 84 | 36 | 71 | 59 | 91 | 40 | 93 | 13 | 93 |
| | NO | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | SOMETIMES | 20 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 12 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| | NO RECORDS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | NA | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTALS | BLANK | 11 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 16 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 |
| | | 319 | 100 | 32 | 100 | 51 | 100 | 51 | 100 | 65 | 100 | 43 | 100 | 14 | 100 |
| TYPE OF BULLET USED | YES | 261 | 82 | 25 | 78 | 41 | 80 | 36 | 71 | 57 | 88 | 36 | 84 | 11 | 79 |
| | NO | 13 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 7 |
| | SOMETIMES | 29 | 9 | 6 | 19 | 5 | 10 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 14 | 1 | 7 |
| | NO RECORDS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | NA | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTALS | BLANK | 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 16 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 |
| | | 319 | 100 | 32 | 100 | 51 | 100 | 51 | 100 | 65 | 100 | 43 | 100 | 14 | 100 |
| DISTANCE FROM WHICH SHOT WAS FIRED | YES | 217 | 68 | 22 | 69 | 34 | 67 | 32 | 63 | 52 | 80 | 26 | 60 | 10 | 71 |
| | NO | 16 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | SOMETIMES | 70 | 22 | 10 | 31 | 11 | 22 | 7 | 14 | 6 | 9 | 17 | 40 | 3 | 21 |
| | NO RECORDS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | NA | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTALS | BLANK | 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 |
| | | 319 | 100 | 32 | 100 | 51 | 100 | 51 | 100 | 65 | 100 | 43 | 100 | 14 | 100 |

Table 3-1

Q.3: (IF YES, SOMETIMES, OR YES, HAVE HAD NO OFFICER KILLED TO Q.1):
WOULD YOUR DEPARTMENT BE WILLING TO ALLOW A RESEARCHER TO VISIT AND STUDY THESE
RECORDS FOR RESEARCH PURPOSES?

| RESPONSE | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | STATE | | COUNTY | | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | | | |
|-----------|----------------------------|-------|---|--------|-----|---------------------------|-----|----|-----------------------------|-----|-----|----------------------------------|-----|----------|-----|----|-----|
| | | NO. | % | NO. | % | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | NO. | % | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | NO. | % | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | NO. | % | NO. | % | |
| YES | 221 | 69 | | 16 | 50 | 39 | 76 | 34 | 67 | 50 | 77 | 46 | 73 | 24 | 56 | 12 | 86 |
| NO | 20 | 6 | | 3 | 9 | 6 | 12 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| DONT KNOW | 61 | 19 | | 13 | 41 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 18 | 8 | 12 | 12 | 19 | 15 | 35 | 1 | 7 |
| NA | 3 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BLANK | 14 | 4 | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 14 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 |
| TOTALS | 319 | 100 | | 32 | 100 | 51 | 100 | 51 | 100 | 65 | 100 | 63 | 100 | 43 | 100 | 14 | 100 |

Table 3 A-1

Q.3(A): (IF YES TO Q.1):
WOULD YOUR DEPARTMENT BE WILLING TO ALLOW A RESEARCHER TO VISIT AND STUDY THESE
RECORDS FOR RESEARCH PURPOSES?

| RESPONSE | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | STATE | | COUNTY | | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | | |
|-----------|----------------------------|-------|----|--------|----|---------------------------|----|-----------------------------|----|----------------------------------|----|----------------------------------|----|----------------------------|---|----------|---|--|
| | | NO. % | | NO. % | | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | | |
| | | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | |
| YES | 170 | 72 | 13 | 48 | 28 | 80 | 21 | 72 | 40 | 85 | 37 | 76 | 24 | 60 | 7 | 87 | | |
| NO | 16 | 7 | 3 | 11 | 4 | 11 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | | |
| DONT KNOW | 47 | 20 | 11 | 41 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 24 | 5 | 11 | 8 | 16 | 13 | 32 | 1 | 12 | | |
| NA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| BLANK | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| TOTALS | 235 | 100 | 27 | 100 | 35 | 100 | 29 | 100 | 47 | 100 | 49 | 100 | 40 | 100 | 8 | 100 | | |

Table 4-1

Q.4: (IF YES, SOMETIMES, OR YES, HAVE HAD NO OFFICER WILLED TO Q.1):
ARE ANY SUMMARIES OF THESE STATISTICS ON DEATH AND INJURY TO YOUR OFFICERS KEPT BY YOUR DEPARTMENT?

RESPONSE

| RESPONSE | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | STATE | | | | COUNTY | | | | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | | | | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | | | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | | | TOWNSHIP | | | |
|-----------|----------------------------|-------|---|-----|-----|--------|-----|-----|-----|---------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|----------------------------------|---|-----|---|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|----------|---|-----|---|
| | | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| YES | 184 | 58 | | 20 | 62 | 30 | 59 | 22 | 43 | 34 | 52 | 35 | 56 | 34 | 79 | 9 | 64 | | | | | 34 | 79 | 9 | 64 | | | | |
| NO | 104 | 33 | | 11 | 34 | 15 | 29 | 17 | 33 | 26 | 40 | 24 | 38 | 2 | 16 | 4 | 29 | | | | | 7 | 16 | 4 | 29 | | | | |
| SOMETIMES | 9 | 3 | | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | | | | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| NA | 3 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| BLANK | 19 | 6 | | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 20 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | | | | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | | | | |
| TOTALS | 319 | 100 | | 32 | 100 | 51 | 100 | 51 | 100 | 65 | 100 | 63 | 100 | 43 | 100 | 14 | 100 | | | | | 43 | 100 | 14 | 100 | | | | |

Table 4 A-1

Q.41A): (IF YES TO Q.1):
ARE ANY SUMMARIES OF THESE STATISTICS ON DEATH AND INJURY TO YOUR OFFICERS KEPT BY YOUR DEPARTMENT?

RESPONSE

| RESPONSE | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | STATE | | | | COUNTY | | | | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | | | | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | | | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | | | TOWNSHIP | | | |
|-----------|----------------------------|-------|---|-----|-----|--------|-----|-----|-----|---------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|----------------------------------|---|-----|---|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|----------|---|-----|---|
| | | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| YES | 142 | 60 | | 17 | 63 | 21 | 60 | 14 | 48 | 25 | 53 | 27 | 55 | 33 | 82 | 5 | 62 | | | | | 33 | 82 | 5 | 62 | | | | |
| NO | 86 | 37 | | 10 | 37 | 12 | 34 | 14 | 48 | 22 | 47 | 19 | 39 | 6 | 15 | 3 | 37 | | | | | 6 | 15 | 3 | 37 | | | | |
| SOMETIMES | 5 | 2 | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | | | | | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| NA | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| BLANK | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| TOTALS | 235 | 100 | | 27 | 100 | 35 | 100 | 29 | 100 | 47 | 100 | 49 | 100 | 40 | 100 | 8 | 100 | | | | | 40 | 100 | 8 | 100 | | | | |

Table 5 A-1

Q.5(A): (IF YES OR SOMETIMES TO Q.4 AND YES TO Q.1):
DO THESE SUMMARIES CONTAIN INFORMATION ABOUT:

RESPONSE

| | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | STATE | | COUNTY | | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------|-----|--------|-----|---------------------------|-----|----|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------|-----|
| | | NO. | % | NO. | % | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | NO. | % | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| EXACT LOCATION (WITHIN 1 INCH) | YES | 115 | 78 | 14 | 82 | 17 | 74 | 10 | 67 | 23 | 92 | 21 | 75 | 27 | 79 |
| | NO | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 11 | 3 | 9 |
| | SOMETIMES | 23 | 16 | 3 | 18 | 6 | 26 | 4 | 27 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 14 | 4 | 12 |
| | NA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | BLANK | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTALS | | 147 | 100 | 17 | 100 | 23 | 100 | 15 | 100 | 25 | 100 | 28 | 100 | 34 | 100 |
| CALIBER AND GUN TYPE | YES | 132 | 90 | 16 | 94 | 19 | 83 | 14 | 93 | 25 | 100 | 25 | 89 | 29 | 85 |
| | NO | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 3 |
| | SOMETIMES | 11 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 13 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 12 |
| | NA | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | BLANK | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTALS | | 147 | 100 | 17 | 100 | 23 | 100 | 15 | 100 | 25 | 100 | 28 | 100 | 34 | 100 |
| TYPE OF BULLET USED | YES | 121 | 82 | 14 | 82 | 16 | 70 | 14 | 93 | 25 | 100 | 23 | 82 | 26 | 76 |
| | NO | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 6 |
| | SOMETIMES | 18 | 12 | 3 | 18 | 5 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 6 | 18 |
| | NA | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | BLANK | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTALS | | 147 | 100 | 17 | 100 | 23 | 100 | 15 | 100 | 25 | 100 | 28 | 100 | 34 | 100 |
| DISTANCE FROM WHICH SHOT WAS FIRED | YES | 99 | 67 | 13 | 76 | 14 | 61 | 12 | 80 | 24 | 96 | 17 | 61 | 16 | 47 |
| | NO | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 3 | 9 |
| | SOMETIMES | 39 | 27 | 4 | 24 | 8 | 35 | 2 | 13 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 25 | 15 | 44 |
| | NA | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | BLANK | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTALS | | 147 | 100 | 17 | 100 | 23 | 100 | 15 | 100 | 25 | 100 | 28 | 100 | 34 | 100 |

Table 6 A-1

Q.6(A): (IF YES OR SOMETIMES TO Q.4 AND YES TO Q.1):
WOULD YOUR DEPARTMENT BE WILLING TO SEND COPIES OF THESE SUMMARIES TO THE RESEARCH TEAM
THAT IS WRITING STANDARDS FOR BODY ARMOR?

| RESPONSE | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|----------------------|-----|-------|-----|--------|-----|---------------------|-----|-----------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|----------|-----|
| | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | | STATE | | COUNTY | | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | |
| | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| YES | 89 | 61 | 5 | 29 | 18 | 78 | 12 | 80 | 19 | 76 | 18 | 64 | 14 | 41 | 3 | 60 |
| NO | 16 | 11 | 4 | 24 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 3 | 11 | 4 | 12 | 0 | 0 |
| DONT KNOW | 41 | 28 | 8 | 47 | 3 | 13 | 3 | 20 | 3 | 12 | 6 | 21 | 16 | 47 | 2 | 40 |
| NA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BLANK | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTALS | 147 | 100 | 17 | 100 | 23 | 100 | 15 | 100 | 25 | 100 | 28 | 100 | 34 | 100 | 5 | 100 |

Table 7

Q.7: IN YOUR DEPARTMENTS OPINION, IF BODY ARMOR IS WORN IN A POTENTIALLY EXPLOSIVE SITUATION
(A POTENTIAL RIOT, FOR EXAMPLE, OR IN CONTROLLING AN UNFRIENDLY CROWD), WOULD
IT BE BETTER FOR THE BODY ARMOR TO BE VISIBLE OR TO BE HIDDEN UNDER THE UNIFORM?

| RESPONSE | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|-----|-------|-----|--------|-----|---------------------|-----|-----------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|----------|-----|
| | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | | STATE | | COUNTY | | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | |
| | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| SHOULD BE VISIBLE SHOULD BE HIDDEN SHOULD NOT BE WORN AT ALL DONT KNOW DOES NOT MATTER | 150 | 34 | 14 | 32 | 21 | 28 | 27 | 35 | 30 | 34 | 30 | 37 | 19 | 41 | 9 | 32 |
| | 246 | 56 | 26 | 59 | 42 | 57 | 42 | 54 | 52 | 58 | 43 | 53 | 23 | 50 | 18 | 64 |
| | 13 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NA | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BLANK | 17 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| TOTALS | 440 | 100 | 44 | 100 | 74 | 100 | 78 | 100 | 89 | 100 | 81 | 100 | 46 | 100 | 28 | 100 |

Table 7 B-1

Q.7.8. (IF SHOULD BE VISIBLE TO Q.7): WHY IS THAT?

RESPONSE

| RESPONSE | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | STATE | | COUNTY | | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | |
|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------|---|----------|---|
| | | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| WELL EQPT OFFICER SHOULD SHOW TRAINING, PROTECTION & PREPAREDNESS FOR CROWD EASE OF PUT ON & TAKE OFF MORE EFFECTIVE ON OUTSIDE COMFORT, LESS RESTRICTION, MANEUVERABILITY | 38 25 14 9 2 1 7 5 | 2 14 1 7 0 0 0 0 | 7 33 1 5 0 0 1 5 | 7 26 1 4 1 4 2 7 | 6 20 4 13 0 0 2 7 | 8 27 3 10 0 0 1 3 | 5 26 4 21 1 5 1 5 | 3 33 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | | | | | | |
| SHOW OF FORCE | 13 9 | 2 14 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 1 3 | 3 10 | 3 16 | 1 11 | | | | | | | |
| PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFECT | 19 13 | 2 14 | 1 5 | 1 4 | 5 17 | 5 17 | 5 26 | 0 0 | | | | | | | |
| DETERRENT EFFECT ON CROWD | 31 21 | 3 21 | 4 19 | 5 19 | 8 27 | 5 17 | 2 11 | 4 44 | | | | | | | |
| OTHER | 20 13 | 4 29 | 4 19 | 1 4 | 3 10 | 7 23 | 1 5 | 0 0 | | | | | | | |
| BLANK | 30 20 | 0 0 | 4 19 | 10 37 | 6 20 | 5 17 | 3 16 | 2 22 | | | | | | | |
| TOTALS | 174 116 | 14 99 | 22 105 | 31 116 | 35 117 | 37 124 | 25 131 | 10 110 | | | | | | | |

Table 7 B-2

Q.7.8.: (IF SHOULD BE HIDDEN TO Q.7): WHY IS THAT?

RESPONSE

| RESPONSE | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | STATE | | COUNTY | | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------|---|----------|---|
| | | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| OBVIOUS UNPROTECTED OFFICER WILL NOT BECOME TARGET SIGHT OF BODY ARMOR TENDS TO MAKE SITUATION WORSE SNIPERS LESS LIKELY TO CHANGE AIMING POINT ELEMENT OF SURPRISE VIS. UNIFORM MORE IMPORTANT THAN VISIBLE ARMOR OTHER BLANK | 5 2 69 28 77 31 21 9 5 2 23 9 63 26 | 1 4 6 23 6 23 0 0 2 8 5 19 6 23 | 0 0 8 19 12 29 3 7 2 5 4 10 13 31 | 0 0 15 36 12 29 6 14 0 0 4 10 10 24 | 2 4 15 29 17 33 6 12 0 0 4 8 12 23 | 1 2 17 40 12 28 1 2 1 2 2 5 12 28 | 1 4 4 17 13 57 1 4 0 0 2 9 5 22 | 0 0 4 22 5 28 4 22 0 0 2 11 5 28 | | | | | | | |
| TOTALS | 263 107 | 26 100 | 42 101 | 47 113 | 56 109 | 46 107 | 26 113 | 20 111 | | | | | | | |

Table 7 B-3

Q.7.B.: (IF SHOULD NOT BE WORN AT ALL TO Q.7): WHY IS THAT?

RESPONSE

| RESPONSE | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | STATE | COUNTY | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | TOWNSHIP |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|----------|
| | | | | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | | |
| | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| DEPT HAS NO BODY ARMOR | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HAMPERS MANEUVERABILITY: | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOO HEAVY: BURDENSOME | 4 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 33 |
| USE ONLY SPECIAL SITUATION | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ONLY SELECT PEOPLE WEAR | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PSYCHOLOGICAL REASONS | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| OTHER EGMT BETR FOR SITUATN | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| WORN ONLY IF KNOWN SHOOTING | | | | | | | | | | |
| & SNIPING EXIST | 1 | 8 | 1 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 33 |
| OTHER | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BLANK | 3 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 33 |
| TOTALS | 13 | 102 | 1 | 100 | 4 | 100 | 1 | 100 | 3 | 99 |

Table 8

Q.8: IF BODY ARMOR DESIGNED FOR ANY OF THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES WERE AVAILABLE TO YOU, FOR WHICH OF THOSE LISTED BELOW DO YOU THINK SUCH BODY ARMOR WOULD BE USED ROUTINELY IN YOUR DEPARTMENT?

RESPONSE

| RESPONSE | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | STATE | COUNTY | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | TOWNSHIP |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|----------|
| | | | | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | | |
| | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| FOOT PATROL: CONCEALED ARMOR | 23 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 4 |
| AUTO PATROL: CONCEALED ARMOR | 52 | 12 | 6 | 14 | 7 | 9 | 12 | 15 | 3 | 7 |
| DETECTIVES: CONCEALED ARMOR | 46 | 10 | 6 | 14 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 14 |
| FOOT &/OR AUTO PATROL IN | | | | | | | | | | |
| HIGH CRIME AREA | 79 | 18 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 26 | 13 | 16 |
| SNIPER SITUATIONS | 351 | 80 | 37 | 84 | 50 | 68 | 54 | 69 | 74 | 83 |
| MAN WITH A GUN CALLS | 309 | 70 | 26 | 59 | 51 | 69 | 56 | 72 | 64 | 79 |
| BURGLARY CALLS | 99 | 22 | 2 | 5 | 19 | 26 | 26 | 33 | 20 | 22 |
| ROBBERY CALLS | 157 | 36 | 4 | 9 | 35 | 47 | 33 | 42 | 26 | 29 |
| FAMILY DISTURBANCE CALLS | 73 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 27 | 12 | 15 | 10 | 12 |
| APPROACH A SUSP. VEHICLE | 76 | 17 | 8 | 18 | 18 | 24 | 15 | 19 | 12 | 13 |
| OTHER | 70 | 16 | 10 | 23 | 11 | 15 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 8 |
| QUESTION BLANK | 15 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| TOTALS | 1350 | 306 | 101 | 230 | 237 | 320 | 250 | 319 | 273 | 305 |
| | | | | | | | | | 251 | 310 |
| | | | | | | | | | 131 | 286 |
| | | | | | | | | | 107 | 384 |

Table 9

Q.9: WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING TYPES OF BALLISTIC PROTECTIVE ITEMS, IF ANY, DOES YOUR DEPARTMENT NOW USE OR EXPECT TO USE?

RESPONSE

| RESPONSE | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | | STATE | | COUNTY | | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----|-------|-----|--------|-----|---------------------------|-----|-----------------------------|-----|----------------------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------|-----|
| | | | | | | | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | | | | |
| HAND-HELD BALLISTIC SHIELD | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NOW USE | 46 | 10 | 6 | 14 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 8 | 15 | 19 | 12 | 26 | 0 | 0 |
| WILL BE USING | 32 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 11 | 8 | 10 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 7 |
| NONE OR ZERO | 51 | 12 | 5 | 11 | 11 | 15 | 15 | 19 | 10 | 11 | 7 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 |
| UNKNOWN | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NA | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BLANK | 284 | 64 | 29 | 66 | 49 | 65 | 52 | 67 | 55 | 62 | 50 | 62 | 27 | 59 | 22 | 79 |
| OTHER | 22 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 7 |
| TOTALS | 441 | 100 | 44 | 100 | 75 | 100 | 78 | 100 | 89 | 100 | 81 | 100 | 46 | 100 | 28 | 100 |
| PATROLCAR ARMOR | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NOW USE | 11 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| WILL BE USING | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NONE OR ZERO | 51 | 12 | 5 | 11 | 11 | 15 | 15 | 19 | 10 | 11 | 7 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 |
| UNKNOWN | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NA | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BLANK | 347 | 79 | 34 | 77 | 56 | 76 | 56 | 72 | 69 | 78 | 69 | 85 | 39 | 85 | 24 | 86 |
| OTHER | 20 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 7 |
| TOTALS | 440 | 100 | 44 | 100 | 74 | 100 | 78 | 100 | 89 | 100 | 81 | 100 | 46 | 100 | 28 | 100 |
| BALLISTIC HELMETS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NOW USE | 52 | 12 | 10 | 22 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 12 | 15 | 8 | 17 | 3 | 11 |
| WILL BE USING | 28 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| NONE OR ZERO | 51 | 12 | 5 | 11 | 11 | 15 | 15 | 19 | 10 | 11 | 7 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 |
| UNKNOWN | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NA | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BLANK | 286 | 65 | 24 | 53 | 48 | 64 | 46 | 59 | 57 | 64 | 57 | 70 | 34 | 74 | 20 | 71 |
| OTHER | 19 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 7 |
| TOTALS | 442 | 100 | 45 | 100 | 75 | 100 | 78 | 100 | 89 | 100 | 81 | 100 | 46 | 100 | 28 | 100 |
| SPECIAL ARMORED CARS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NOW USE | 19 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 26 | 0 | 0 |
| WILL BE USING | 7 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| NONE OR ZERO | 51 | 12 | 5 | 11 | 11 | 15 | 15 | 19 | 10 | 11 | 7 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 |
| UNKNOWN | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NA | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BLANK | 336 | 76 | 28 | 64 | 57 | 77 | 57 | 73 | 72 | 81 | 69 | 85 | 29 | 63 | 24 | 86 |
| OTHER | 21 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 7 |
| TOTALS | 440 | 100 | 44 | 100 | 74 | 100 | 78 | 100 | 89 | 100 | 81 | 100 | 46 | 100 | 28 | 100 |

Table 9 C

Q.9(C): (WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING TYPES OF BALLISTIC PROTECTIVE ITEMS, IF ANY, DOES YOUR DEPARTMENT NOW USE OR EXPECT TO USE?)

SUMMARY TABLE FOR QUESTION 9

| RESPONSE | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------------|-----|-------|-----|--------|-----|---------------------|----|-----------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|----------|-----|
| | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | | STATE | | COUNTY | | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | |
| | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| SUMMARY FIGURES: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| USE ANY NOW | 104 | 24 | 16 | 36 | 8 | 11 | 8 | 10 | 18 | 20 | 23 | 28 | 28 | 61 | 3 | 11 |
| WILL BE USING ANY | 59 | 13 | 4 | 9 | 10 | 14 | 10 | 13 | 15 | 17 | 12 | 15 | 5 | 11 | 3 | 11 |
| NONE OR ZERO | 51 | 12 | 5 | 11 | 11 | 15 | 15 | 19 | 10 | 11 | 7 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 |
| UNKNOWN | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NA | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BLANK | 210 | 48 | 17 | 39 | 41 | 55 | 40 | 51 | 41 | 46 | 40 | 49 | 12 | 26 | 19 | 68 |
| OTHER | 21 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 7 |
| TOTALS | 451 | 103 | 46 | 104 | 76 | 103 | 78 | 99 | 91 | 102 | 83 | 102 | 48 | 104 | 29 | 104 |

B-14

Table 10-1

Q.10: DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS ABOUT THE USE OF, OR PROBLEMS WITH THE USE OF BODY ARMOR OR BALLISTIC PROTECTIVE ITEMS?

RESPONSE

| RESPONSE | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----|-------|-----|--------|-----|---------------------------|-----|-----------------------------|-----|----------------------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------|---|
| | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | | STATE | | COUNTY | | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | |
| | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| YES (SOME PROB MENTIONED) | 162 | 37 | 14 | 32 | 23 | 31 | 34 | 38 | 37 | 46 | 22 | 48 | 9 | 32 | | |
| NO, NONE, NO PROBLEMS | 54 | 12 | 5 | 11 | 10 | 14 | 11 | 12 | 7 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 11 | | |
| NO PROBLEM BUT COMMENT | 21 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 9 | 1 | 4 | | |
| BLANK | 203 | 46 | 22 | 50 | 37 | 50 | 43 | 48 | 31 | 38 | 18 | 39 | 15 | 54 | | |
| TOTALS | 440 | 100 | 44 | 100 | 74 | 100 | 89 | 100 | 81 | 100 | 46 | 100 | 28 | 100 | | |

Table 10-2

Q.10: DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS ABOUT THE USE OF, OR PROBLEMS WITH THE USE OF BODY ARMOR OR BALLISTIC PROTECTIVE ITEMS?
RESPONSES OF THOSE STATING COMMENTS OR PROBLEMS

RESPONSE

DEPARTMENT TYPE

| | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | | STATE | | COUNTY | | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-----|-------|-----|--------|-----|---------------------------|-----|-----------------------------|-----|----------------------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------|-----|
| | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| HEAVY&BULKY: UNCOMFORTABLE | 10 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HEAVY&BULKY: FATIGUE AND | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HEAT(PERSPIRATION) | 9 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 12 | 0 | 0 |
| HEAVY&BULKY: RESTRICTS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MANEUVERABILITY | 19 | 10 | 4 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 14 | 4 | 9 | 5 | 19 | 0 | 0 |
| HEAVY&BULKY: IMPRACTICAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FOR ROUTINE USE | 22 | 12 | 2 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 21 | 6 | 23 | 3 | 30 |
| TOO EXPENSIVE TO PROVIDE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FOR ALL OFFICERS | 10 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| INADEQUATE PROTECTION, | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FALSE SECURITY | 19 | 10 | 4 | 24 | 4 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 23 | 0 | 0 |
| REDESIGN LIGHTER, MORE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| COMFORTABLE & FLEXIBLE | 14 | 8 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 15 | 1 | 10 |
| CERAMIC BODY ARMOR COMMENTS | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| HAVE NONE, DONT USE, | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NEED NOT APPARENT | 59 | 32 | 3 | 18 | 15 | 56 | 13 | 52 | 14 | 40 | 6 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 80 |
| OTHER | 55 | 30 | 5 | 29 | 10 | 37 | 6 | 24 | 11 | 31 | 13 | 30 | 9 | 35 | 1 | 10 |
| TOTALS | 220 | 119 | 23 | 137 | 32 | 119 | 28 | 112 | 40 | 115 | 47 | 109 | 37 | 143 | 13 | 130 |

Table 11 A-1

Q.11.A: (ABOUT HOW MANY (A) HANDGUNS, AND (B) SHOULDER WEAPONS DID YOUR DEPARTMENT CONFISCATE IN 1971?)

FREQUENCY OF ANSWER GIVEN ABOUT HANDGUNS & SHOULDER WEAPONS CONFISCATED IN 1971

| RESPONSE | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | | STATE | | COUNTY | | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|-----|-------|-----|--------|-----|---------------------------|-----|-----------------------------|-----|----------------------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------|-----|
| | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| HANDGUNS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| GAVE NO. OR STATED ZERO | 360 | 82 | 15 | 34 | 63 | 85 | 76 | 97 | 84 | 94 | 64 | 79 | 33 | 72 | 25 | 89 |
| NA | 4 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DO NOT KNOW | 8 | 2 | 6 | 14 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DONT CONFISCATE WEAPONS | 11 | 2 | 6 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| DATA NOT AVAILABLE | 23 | 5 | 7 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 17 | 0 | 0 |
| NO RECORDS | 6 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| BLANK | 28 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 11 |
| TOTALS | 440 | 100 | 44 | 100 | 74 | 100 | 78 | 100 | 89 | 100 | 81 | 100 | 46 | 100 | 28 | 100 |
| SHOULDER WEAPONS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| GAVE NO. OR STATED ZERO | 324 | 74 | 14 | 32 | 51 | 69 | 66 | 85 | 74 | 83 | 64 | 79 | 33 | 72 | 22 | 79 |
| NA | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DO NOT KNOW | 4 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DONT CONFISCATE WEAPONS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DATA NOT AVAILABLE | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| NO RECORDS | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BLANK | 105 | 24 | 23 | 52 | 22 | 30 | 12 | 15 | 14 | 16 | 17 | 21 | 11 | 24 | 6 | 21 |
| TOTALS | 440 | 100 | 44 | 100 | 74 | 100 | 78 | 100 | 89 | 100 | 81 | 100 | 46 | 100 | 28 | 100 |

Table 11 A-2

Q.11.A: (OF THOSE WHO GAVE A NUMBER TO ABOUT HOW MANY (A) HANDGUNS, AND (B) SHOULDER WEAPONS
DID YOU CONFISCATE IN 1971?): ACTUAL NUMBER OF HANDGUNS AND SHOULDER WEAPONS CONFISCATED IN 1971

| RESPONSE | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|----------------------|-----|--------|-----|-------|-----|---------------------|-----|-----------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|----------|-----|
| | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | | COUNTY | | STATE | | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | |
| | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| HANDGUNS | 59616 | 77 | 6990 | 89 | 473 | 58 | 198 | 69 | 644 | 64 | 3454 | 68 | 47819 | 76 | 38 | 61 |
| | 18192 | 23 | 862 | 11 | 339 | 42 | 91 | 31 | 355 | 36 | 1629 | 32 | 14892 | 24 | 24 | 39 |
| TOTALS | 77808 | 100 | 7852 | 100 | 812 | 100 | 289 | 100 | 999 | 100 | 5083 | 100 | 62711 | 100 | 62 | 100 |

Table 11 A-3

Q.11.A: (OF THOSE WHO GAVE A NUMBER TO ABOUT HOW MANY (A) HANDGUNS, AND (B) SHOULDER WEAPONS
DID YOU CONFISCATE IN 1971?): AVERAGE NUMBER OF HANDGUNS AND SHOULDER WEAPONS CONFISCATED IN 1971

| RESPONSE | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|----------------------------|--------|--------|---------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|----------|
| | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | STATE | COUNTY | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | TOWNSHIP |
| | | | | AVERAGE NUMBER | AVERAGE NUMBER | AVERAGE NUMBER | AVERAGE NUMBER | AVERAGE NUMBER | AVERAGE NUMBER | | |
| HANDGUNS | 165.60 | 466.00 | 7.51 | 2.61 | 7.67 | 53.97 | 1449.06 | 1.52 | | | |
| | 56.15 | 61.57 | 6.65 | 1.38 | 4.80 | 25.45 | 451.27 | 1.09 | | | |

Table 11 B-1

Q.11.B: (OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF (A) HANDGUNS, AND (B) SHOULDER WEAPONS YOU CONFISCATED IN 1971,
ABOUT HOW MANY HAD ORIGINALLY BEEN MILITARY ISSUE?)

FREQUENCY OF ANSWER GIVEN ABOUT MILITARY ISSUED HANDGUNS & SHOULDER WEAPONS CONFISCATED IN 1971

| RESPONSE | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | | STATE | | COUNTY | | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | | | |
|------------------|----------------------|-----|-------|-----|--------|-----|---------------------|-----|----|-----------------------|----------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|----|-----|
| | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | NO. | % | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | NO. | % | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | NO. | % | |
| HANDGUNS | 281 | 64 | 10 | 23 | 47 | 64 | 62 | 79 | 75 | 84 | 53 | 65 | 18 | 39 | 16 | 57 |
| | 9 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| | 27 | 6 | 6 | 14 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 11 | 24 | 0 | 0 |
| | 11 | 2 | 6 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| | 23 | 5 | 7 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 22 | 0 | 0 |
| | 6 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| | 83 | 19 | 8 | 18 | 21 | 28 | 15 | 19 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 17 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 43 |
| TOTALS | 440 | 100 | 44 | 100 | 74 | 100 | 78 | 100 | 89 | 100 | 81 | 100 | 46 | 100 | 28 | 100 |
| SHOULDER WEAPONS | 262 | 60 | 11 | 25 | 39 | 53 | 58 | 74 | 69 | 78 | 53 | 65 | 17 | 37 | 15 | 54 |
| | 7 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| | 15 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 151 | 34 | 26 | 59 | 32 | 43 | 19 | 24 | 18 | 20 | 24 | 30 | 19 | 41 | 13 | 46 |
| TOTALS | 440 | 100 | 44 | 100 | 74 | 100 | 78 | 100 | 89 | 100 | 81 | 100 | 46 | 100 | 28 | 100 |

Table 11 B-2

Q.11.B: (OF THOSE WHO GAVE A NUMBER TO: OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF (A) HANDGUNS, AND (B) SHOULDER WEAPONS
YOU CONFISCATED IN 1971, ABOUT HOW MANY HAD ORIGINALLY BEEN MILITARY ISSUE):
ACTUAL NUMBER OF MILITARY ISSUED HANDGUNS & SHOULDER WEAPONS CONFISCATED IN 1971

| RESPONSE | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | | STATE | | COUNTY | | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | | | |
|----------|----------------------|-----|-------|-----|--------|-----|---------------------|-----|----|-----------------------|----------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|---|-----|
| | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | NO. | % | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | NO. | % | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | NO. | % | |
| HANDGUNS | 693 | 62 | 71 | 65 | 32 | 67 | 17 | 71 | 14 | 52 | 59 | 46 | 499 | 64 | 1 | 33 |
| | 431 | 38 | 39 | 35 | 16 | 33 | 7 | 29 | 13 | 48 | 70 | 54 | 284 | 36 | 2 | 67 |
| TOTALS | 1124 | 100 | 110 | 100 | 48 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 27 | 100 | 129 | 100 | 783 | 100 | 3 | 100 |

Table 11 B-3

Q.11.B: (OF THOSE WHO GAVE A NUMBER TO: OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF (A) HANDGUNS, AND (B) SHOULDER WEAPONS
YOU CONFISCATED IN 1971, ABOUT HOW MANY HAD ORIGINALLY BEEN MILITARY ISSUE):
AVERAGE NUMBER OF MILITARY ISSUED HANDGUNS & SHOULDER WEAPONS CONFISCATED IN 1971

| RESPONSE | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|----------|
| | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | STATE | COUNTY | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | TOWNSHIP |
| | | AVERAGE NUMBER | AVERAGE NUMBER | AVERAGE NUMBER | AVERAGE NUMBER | AVERAGE NUMBER | AVERAGE NUMBER | AVERAGE NUMBER | AVERAGE NUMBER | AVERAGE NUMBER | |
| HANDGUNS SHOULDER WEAPONS | 2.47 | 7.10 | .68 | .27 | .19 | .19 | 1.11 | 27.72 | .06 | | |
| | 1.65 | 3.55 | .41 | .12 | .19 | .19 | 1.32 | 16.71 | .13 | | |

Table 11 C-2

TABLE III: FREQUENCY OF CODES USED IN QUESTION 11.C.

| RESPONSE | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|-----|-------|-----|--------|-----|---------------------------|-----|-----------------------------|-----|----------------------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------|-----|
| | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | | STATE | | COUNTY | | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | |
| | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| GAVE NUMBER OR CHECKED | 317 | 72 | 24 | 55 | 52 | 70 | 47 | 60 | 71 | 80 | 71 | 88 | 40 | 87 | 10 | 36 |
| STATED ZERO | 32 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 14 | 18 | 8 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 14 |
| NA | 4 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DO NOT KNOW | 4 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DONT CONFISCATE WEAPONS | 10 | 2 | 6 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| DATA NOT AVAILABLE | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NO RECORDS | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BLANK | 70 | 16 | 7 | 16 | 14 | 19 | 17 | 22 | 9 | 10 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 14 | 50 |
| TOTALS | 440 | 100 | 44 | 100 | 74 | 100 | 78 | 100 | 89 | 100 | 81 | 100 | 46 | 100 | 28 | 100 |

Table 11 C-1

Q.11.C: (OF THOSE DEPARTMENTS WHO INDICATED A DISPOSAL METHOD: ABOUT HOW MANY OF ALL HANDGUNS
CONFISCATED IN 1971 WERE DISPOSSED OF IN EACH OF THE FOLLOWING WAYS?)

FREQUENCY OF DISPOSAL METHODS BY DEPARTMENT TYPE: 1971

| RESPONSE | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | | STATE | | COUNTY | | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | |
|--|----------------------|-----|-------|-----|--------|-----|---------------------|-----|-----------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|----------|-----|
| | | | | | | | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | | | | |
| | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| TURNED OVER TO OTHER AGENCY MELTED IN A FURNACE DUMPED IN DEEP WATER CRUSHED CUT WITH TORCHES/HACKSAWS ARMS MUSEUM OR AUTHORIZED SAMPLE COLLECTION ISSUED TO OFFICERS RETURNED TO OWNER RESOLD OTHER | 101 | 32 | 16 | 67 | 8 | 15 | 11 | 23 | 16 | 22 | 29 | 41 | 18 | 45 | 3 | 30 |
| | 26 | 8 | 4 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 20 | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| | 32 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 11 | 10 | 14 | 8 | 20 | 1 | 10 |
| | 23 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 0 |
| | 29 | 9 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 13 | 18 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| | 49 | 15 | 3 | 12 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 11 | 18 | 25 | 9 | 13 | 8 | 20 | 2 | 20 |
| | 75 | 24 | 3 | 12 | 11 | 21 | 9 | 19 | 18 | 25 | 18 | 25 | 15 | 37 | 2 | 20 |
| | 157 | 50 | 2 | 8 | 35 | 67 | 21 | 45 | 40 | 56 | 37 | 52 | 20 | 50 | 2 | 20 |
| | 21 | 7 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 17 | 0 | 0 |
| | 76 | 24 | 2 | 8 | 11 | 21 | 12 | 26 | 21 | 29 | 23 | 32 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 30 |
| TOTALS | 589 | 186 | 34 | 140 | 82 | 158 | 68 | 144 | 133 | 186 | 152 | 213 | 107 | 265 | 13 | 130 |

Table 11 C-3

Q.11.C: (OF THOSE WHO GAVE ACTUAL NUMBERS TO Q.11.A(A)): ABOUT HOW MANY OF ALL HANDGUNS CONFISCATED IN 1971 WERE DISPOSED OF IN EACH OF THE FOLLOWING WAYS?): ACTUAL NUMBER OF WEAPONS DISPOSED OF PER METHOD: 1971

| RESPONSE | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | STATE | | | | COUNTY | | | | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | CITY | | | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | | | TOWNSHIP | | | |
|--|----------------------------|-------|---|------|-----|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----------------|-----|------|-----|-------|-----|-----|----|----------------------------------|---|-----|---|----------------------------|-----|-----|----|----------|---|-----|---|
| | | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| TURNED OVER TO OTHER AGENCY | 4823 | 7 | | 829 | 11 | 136 | 25 | 26 | 14 | 53 | 7 | 542 | 18 | 3229 | 6 | 8 | 26 | | | | | 3229 | 6 | 8 | 26 | | | | |
| MELTED IN A FURNACE | 31749 | 48 | | 6286 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 1 | 25438 | 47 | 0 | 0 | | | | | 25438 | 47 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| DUMPED IN DEEP WATER | 10156 | 15 | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 74 | 10 | 213 | 7 | 9865 | 18 | 1 | 3 | | | | | 9865 | 18 | 1 | 3 | | | | |
| CRUSHED | 3404 | 5 | | 0 | 0 | 34 | 6 | 15 | 8 | 24 | 3 | 226 | 7 | 3105 | 6 | 0 | 0 | | | | | 3105 | 6 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| CUT WITH TORCHES/HACKSAWS | 1058 | 2 | | 0 | 0 | 28 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 2 | 445 | 15 | 571 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | | | | 571 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| ARMS MUSEUM OR AUTHORIZED SAMPLE COLLECTION | 1057 | 2 | | 212 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 9 | 5 | 86 | 12 | 33 | 1 | 809 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | | | | 809 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| ISSUED TO OFFICERS | 1061 | 2 | | 46 | 1 | 16 | 3 | 26 | 14 | 46 | 6 | 81 | 3 | 835 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | | | | 835 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| RETURNED TO OWNER | 8930 | 13 | | 110 | 1 | 272 | 50 | 73 | 40 | 344 | 47 | 1053 | 35 | 7075 | 13 | 0 | 0 | | | | | 7075 | 13 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| RESOLD | 2227 | 3 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 60 | 2 | 2153 | 4 | 0 | 0 | | | | | 2153 | 4 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| OTHER | 1742 | 3 | | 0 | 0 | 48 | 9 | 20 | 11 | 91 | 12 | 320 | 11 | 1255 | 2 | 0 | 0 | | | | | 1255 | 2 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| TOTALS | 66307 | 100 | | 7483 | 100 | 544 | 100 | 184 | 100 | 732 | 100 | 2998 | 100 | 54335 | 100 | | | | | | | 54335 | 100 | | | | | | |

Table 12 A-1

Q.12.A: (ABOUT HOW MANY (A) HANDGUNS, AND (B) SHOULDER WEAPONS DID YOUR DEPARTMENT CONFISCATE IN 1970?)

FREQUENCY OF ANSWER GIVEN ABOUT HANDGUNS & SHOULDER WEAPONS CONFISCATED IN 1970

| RESPONSE | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | | | | | | | TOWNSHIP | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----|---|-----|----------|---|-----|
| | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | STATE | COUNTY | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | NO. | % | NO. | NO. | % | NO. |
| HANDGUNS | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| GAVE NO. OR STATED ZERO | 311 71 | 11 25 | 49 66 | 65 83 | 76 85 | 58 72 | 33 72 | | | | 19 68 | | |
| NA | 6 1 | 3 7 | 1 1 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 2 2 | 0 0 | | | | 0 0 | | |
| DO NOT KNOW | 23 5 | 5 11 | 9 12 | 4 5 | 2 2 | 3 4 | 0 0 | | | | 0 0 | | |
| DONT CONFISCATE WEAPONS | 11 2 | 6 14 | 1 1 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 2 2 | 2 4 | | | | 0 0 | | |
| DATA NOT AVAILABLE | 26 6 | 7 16 | 2 3 | 0 0 | 3 3 | 6 7 | 8 17 | | | | 0 0 | | |
| NO RECORDS | 14 3 | 6 14 | 1 1 | 2 3 | 1 1 | 2 2 | 2 4 | | | | 0 0 | | |
| BLANK | 49 11 | 6 14 | 11 15 | 7 9 | 7 8 | 8 10 | 1 2 | | | | 9 32 | | |
| TOTALS | 440 100 | 44 100 | 74 100 | 78 100 | 89 100 | 81 100 | 46 100 | | | | 28 100 | | |
| SHOULDER WEAPONS | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| GAVE NO. OR STATED ZERO | 287 65 | 11 25 | 40 54 | 59 76 | 68 76 | 57 70 | 33 72 | | | | 19 68 | | |
| NA | 3 1 | 2 5 | 1 1 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | | | | 0 0 | | |
| DO NOT KNOW | 6 1 | 2 5 | 2 3 | 0 0 | 2 2 | 0 0 | 0 0 | | | | 0 0 | | |
| DONT CONFISCATE WEAPONS | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | | | | 0 0 | | |
| DATA NOT AVAILABLE | 4 1 | 1 2 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 1 1 | 0 0 | 2 4 | | | | 0 0 | | |
| NO RECORDS | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | | | | 0 0 | | |
| BLANK | 140 32 | 28 64 | 31 42 | 19 24 | 18 20 | 24 30 | 11 24 | | | | 9 32 | | |
| TOTALS | 440 100 | 44 100 | 74 100 | 78 100 | 89 100 | 81 100 | 46 100 | | | | 28 100 | | |

Table 12 A-2

Q.12.A: (OF THOSE WHO GAVE A NUMBER TO ABOUT HOW MANY (A) HANDGUNS, AND (B) SHOULDER WEAPONS DID YOU CONFISCATE IN 1970?): ACTUAL NUMBER OF HANDGUNS AND SHOULDER WEAPONS CONFISCATED IN 1970

| RESPONSE | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | | | | | | | TOWNSHIP | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|----------|---------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----|---|-----|----------|---|-----|
| | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | STATE | COUNTY | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | NO. | % | NO. | NO. | % | NO. |
| HANDGUNS | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| GAVE NO. OR STATED ZERO | 53761 77 | 7436 93 | 286 54 | 116 75 | 464 66 | 3138 68 | 42298 76 | | | | 23 50 | | |
| NA | 16035 23 | 583 7 | 248 46 | 38 25 | 234 34 | 1487 32 | 13422 24 | | | | 23 50 | | |
| DO NOT KNOW | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DONT CONFISCATE WEAPONS | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DATA NOT AVAILABLE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NO RECORDS | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLANK | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTALS | 69796 100 | 8019 100 | 534 100 | 154 100 | 698 100 | 4625 100 | 55720 100 | | | | 46 100 | | |

Table 12 A-3

Q.12.A: (OF THOSE WHO GAVE A NUMBER TO ABOUT HOW MANY (A) HANDGUNS, AND (B) SHOULDER WEAPONS
DID YOU CONFISCATE IN 1970?): AVERAGE NUMBER OF HANDGUNS AND SHOULDER WEAPONS CONFISCATED IN 1970

RESPONSE

| RESPONSE | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | STATE | COUNTY | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | TOWNSHIP |
|------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|----------|
| | | | | AVERAGE NUMBER | AVERAGE NUMBER | | | | | |
| HANDGUNS | 172.86 | 676.00 | 5.84 | 1.78 | 6.11 | 54.10 | 1281.76 | 1.21 | | |
| SHOULDER WEAPONS | 55.87 | 53.00 | 6.20 | .64 | 3.44 | 26.09 | 406.73 | 1.21 | | |

Table 12 B-1

Q.12.B: (OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF (A) HANDGUNS, AND (B) SHOULDER WEAPONS YOU CONFISCATED IN 1970,
ABOUT HOW MANY HAD ORIGINALLY BEEN MILITARY ISSUE?)

FREQUENCY OF ANSWER GIVEN ABOUT MILITARY ISSUED HANDGUNS & SHOULDER WEAPONS CONFISCATED IN 1970

RESPONSE

DEPARTMENT TYPE

| RESPONSE | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | STATE | COUNTY | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | TOWNSHIP |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|-----------------|-----|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|----------|
| | | | | NO. | % | | | | | |
| HANDGUNS | 237 54 | 6 14 | 37 50 | 50 | 64 | 65 | 73 | 48 | 59 | 17 37 |
| NA | 12 3 | 2 5 | 3 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 7 |
| DO NOT KNOW | 30 7 | 4 9 | 5 7 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 10 | 10 22 |
| DONT CONFISCATE WEAPONS | 11 2 | 6 14 | 1 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 4 |
| DATA NOT AVAILABLE | 25 6 | 7 16 | 1 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 10 22 |
| NO RECORDS | 14 3 | 6 14 | 1 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 4 |
| BLANK | 111 25 | 13 30 | 26 35 | 23 | 29 | 19 | 21 | 14 | 17 | 2 4 |
| TOTALS | 440 100 | 44 100 | 74 100 | 78 | 100 | 89 | 100 | 81 | 100 | 46 100 |
| SHOULDER WEAPONS | 230 52 | 6 14 | 34 46 | 49 | 63 | 62 | 70 | 49 | 60 | 15 33 |
| NA | 6 1 | 2 5 | 0 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 4 |
| DO NOT KNOW | 9 2 | 1 2 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 3 7 |
| DONT CONFISCATE WEAPONS | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 |
| DATA NOT AVAILABLE | 4 1 | 1 2 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 7 |
| NO RECORDS | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 |
| BLANK | 191 43 | 34 77 | 40 54 | 28 | 36 | 25 | 28 | 28 | 35 | 23 50 |
| TOTALS | 440 100 | 44 100 | 74 100 | 78 | 100 | 89 | 100 | 81 | 100 | 46 100 |

Table 12 B-2

Q.12.B: (OF THOSE WHO GAVE A NUMBER TO: OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF (A) HANDGUNS, AND (B) SHOULDER WEAPONS YOU CONFISCATED IN 1970, ABOUT HOW MANY HAD ORIGINALLY BEEN MILITARY ISSUE):
 ACTUAL NUMBER OF MILITARY ISSUED HANDGUNS & SHOULDER WEAPONS CONFISCATED IN 1970

| RESPONSE | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|----------|-------|---|
| | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | STATE | COUNTY | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | TOWNSHIP | | |
| | NO. % | NO. % | NO. % | NO. % | NO. % | NO. % | NO. % | NO. % | NO. % | % |
| HANDGUNS | 612 61 | 48 59 | 22 56 | 12 86 | 13 62 | 72 55 | 443 62 | 2 29 | | |
| SHOULDER WEAPONS | 391 39 | 34 41 | 17 44 | 2 14 | 8 38 | 58 45 | 267 38 | 5 71 | | |
| TOTALS | 1003 100 | 82 100 | 39 100 | 14 100 | 21 100 | 130 100 | 710 100 | 7 100 | | |

Table 12 B-3

Q.12.B: (OF THOSE WHO GAVE A NUMBER TO: OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF (A) HANDGUNS, AND (B) SHOULDER WEAPONS YOU CONFISCATED IN 1970, ABOUT HOW MANY HAD ORIGINALLY BEEN MILITARY ISSUE):
 AVERAGE NUMBER OF MILITARY ISSUED HANDGUNS & SHOULDER WEAPONS CONFISCATED IN 1970

| RESPONSE | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | STATE | COUNTY | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | TOWNSHIP | | |
| | AVERAGE NUMBER | AVERAGE NUMBER | AVERAGE NUMBER | AVERAGE NUMBER | AVERAGE NUMBER | AVERAGE NUMBER | AVERAGE NUMBER | AVERAGE NUMBER | AVERAGE NUMBER | AVERAGE NUMBER |
| HANDGUNS | 2.58 | 8.00 | .59 | .24 | .20 | 1.50 | 26.06 | .14 | | |
| SHOULDER WEAPONS | 1.70 | 5.67 | .50 | .04 | .13 | 1.18 | 17.80 | .33 | | |

Q.12.c: (OF THOSE DEPARTMENTS WHO INDICATED A DISPOSAL METHOD: ABOUT HOW MANY OF ALL HANDGUNS CONFISCATED IN 1970 WERE DISPOSED OF IN EACH OF THE FOLLOWING WAYS?)

FREQUENCY OF DISPOSAL METHODS BY DEPARTMENT TYPE: 1970

| RESPONSE | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | | STATE | | COUNTY | | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | |
|--|----------------------------|------------------|-------|-----------------|--------|-----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------------|----------|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | | | | |
| TURNED OVER TO OTHER AGENCY MELTED IN A FURNACE DUMPED IN DEEP WATER CRUSHED CUT WITH TORCHES/HACKSAWS ARMS MUSEUM OR AUTHORIZED SAMPLE COLLECTION ISSUED TO OFFICERS RETURNED TO OWNER RESOLD OTHER | 73 | 30 | 10 | 59 | 6 | 21 | 5 | 17 | 14 | 24 | 22 | 36 | 15 | 39 | 1 | 10 |
| | 23 | 9 | 4 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 17 | 45 | 0 | 0 |
| | 27 | 11 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 12 | 8 | 13 | 9 | 24 | 0 | 0 |
| | 18 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 |
| | 25 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| | 32 | 13 | 3 | 18 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 10 | 9 | 15 | 7 | 11 | 5 | 13 | 3 | 30 |
| | 46 | 19 | 3 | 18 | 3 | 10 | 3 | 10 | 10 | 17 | 12 | 20 | 14 | 37 | 1 | 10 |
| | 124 | 51 | 3 | 18 | 16 | 55 | 13 | 43 | 37 | 63 | 32 | 52 | 19 | 50 | 4 | 40 |
| | 13 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 |
| | 54 | 22 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 21 | 4 | 13 | 18 | 30 | 19 | 31 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 30 |
| TOTALS | 435 | 178 (n = 244) | 26 | 155 (n = 17) | 41 | 139 (n = 29) | 35 | 117 (n = 30) | 105 | 178 (n = 59) | 122 | 196 (n = 62) | 94 | 249 (n = 38) | 12 | 120 (n = 10) |

Table 12 C-2

TABLE IV: FREQUENCY OF CODES USED IN QUESTION 12.C.

| RESPONSE | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | | STATE | | COUNTY | | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | |
|--|----------------------------|-----|-------|-----|--------|-----|---------------------------|-----|-----------------------------|-----|----------------------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------|-----|
| | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | |
| | | | | | | | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| GAVE NUMBER, STATED ZERO OR CHECKED | 285 | 65 | 18 | 41 | 41 | 55 | 44 | 56 | 66 | 74 | 63 | 78 | 39 | 85 | 14 | 50 |
| NA | 7 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DO NOT KNOW | 6 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DONT CONFISCATE WEAPONS | 10 | 2 | 6 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| DATA NOT AVAILABLE | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NO RECORDS | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BLANK | 123 | 28 | 13 | 30 | 27 | 36 | 31 | 40 | 22 | 25 | 10 | 12 | 6 | 13 | 14 | 50 |
| TOTALS | 440 | 100 | 44 | 100 | 74 | 100 | 78 | 100 | 89 | 100 | 81 | 100 | 46 | 100 | 28 | 100 |

Q.12.c: (OF THOSE WHO GAVE ACTUAL NUMBERS TO Q.12.a(1)): ABOUT HOW MANY OF ALL HANDGUNS CONFISCATED IN 1970 WERE DISPOSED OF IN EACH OF THE FOLLOWING WAYS?): ACTUAL NUMBER OF WEAPONS DISPOSED OF PER METHOD: 1970

RESPONSE

| RESPONSE | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | | | STATE | | COUNTY | | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | | |
|--|----------------------|-----|------|-------|-----|--------|----|---------------------|-----|-----|-----------------------|-----|-------|----------------------------|-----|----------|-----|---|
| | NO. | % | | NO. | % | NO. | % | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | NO. | % | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | NO. | % | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| TURNED OVER TO OTHER AGENCY MELTED IN A FURNACE DUMPED IN DEEP WATER CRUSHED CUT WITH TORCHES/HACKSAWS ARMS MUSEUM OR AUTHORIZED SAMPLE COLLECTION ISSUED TO OFFICERS RETURNED TO OWNER RESOLD OTHER | 3374 | 9 | 426 | 6 | 96 | 27 | 1 | 1 | 41 | 9 | 311 | 17 | 2496 | 9 | 3 | 15 | | |
| | 15444 | 40 | 6480 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 8949 | 31 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | 4702 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 10 | 79 | 4 | 4573 | 16 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | 3035 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 3 | 9 | 11 | 11 | 3 | 54 | 3 | 2950 | 10 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | 726 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 15 | 3 | 125 | 7 | 561 | 2 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | 268 | 1 | 178 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 26 | 6 | 42 | 2 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | 802 | 2 | 26 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 11 | 21 | 5 | 72 | 4 | 669 | 2 | 1 | 5 | | |
| | 6909 | 18 | 126 | 2 | 202 | 56 | 37 | 44 | 206 | 47 | 701 | 39 | 5627 | 20 | 10 | 50 | | |
| | 2628 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 127 | 7 | 2488 | 9 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | 875 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 4 | 15 | 18 | 72 | 16 | 251 | 14 | 518 | 2 | 6 | 30 | | |
| TOTALS | 38763 | 100 | 7236 | 100 | 359 | 100 | 84 | 100 | 437 | 100 | 1777 | 100 | 28850 | 100 | 20 | 100 | | |

Table 13-1

Q.13: WHAT PROBLEMS, IF ANY, HAVE YOU HAD IN DISPOSING OF CONFISCATED WEAPONS?

RESPONSE

| RESPONSE | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | | STATE | | COUNTY | | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | |
|--|----------------------------|-----|-------|-----|--------|----|---------------------------|-----|----|-----------------------------|-----|-----|----------------------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------|---|
| | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | NO. | % | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| NO PROBLEMS | 212 | 48 | 13 | 30 | 37 | 50 | 43 | 55 | 47 | 53 | 37 | 46 | 23 | 50 | 12 | 43 | | |
| DESCRIBE PROCEDURES &/OR ROUTINE PROBLEMS | 33 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 13 | 16 | 6 | 13 | 1 | 4 | | |
| DISPOSED OF BY COURT ORDER | 7 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| HAVENT CONFISCATED &/OR DONT DISPOSE OF WEAPONS | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| NO LEGAL PROVISIONS FOR DISPOSAL OF WEAPONS | 5 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| PROB. WITH COURT ORDER &/OR DEFIN. OF DISPOSITION | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| OTHER | 7 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | | |
| BLANK | 167 | 38 | 25 | 57 | 28 | 38 | 28 | 36 | 29 | 33 | 26 | 32 | 16 | 35 | 15 | 54 | | |
| TOTALS | 440 | 100 | 45 | 103 | 74 | 99 | 77 | 99 | 89 | 100 | 81 | 100 | 46 | 100 | 28 | 101 | | |

Table 14-1

Q.14: OTHER COMMENTS:

RESPONSE

| | ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES | | STATE | | COUNTY | | DEPARTMENT TYPE | | | | CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS) | | FIFTY LARGEST CITIES | | TOWNSHIP | |
|---------------------------|----------------------|-----|-------|-----|--------|----|---------------------|-----|----|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|----------|-----|
| | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % | CITY (1-9 OFFICERS) | NO. | % | CITY (10-49 OFFICERS) | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| NO PROBLEMS, NONE | 20 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DO NOT DISPOSE OF WEAPONS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| STATS ON GUNS CONFISCATED | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| &/OR DISPOSED ARENT KEPT | 11 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 0 |
| CONFISCATED WEAPONS ARE: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DISPLAYD REISSUED OR SOLD | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| CRITICISM OF GUN LAWS OR | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LEG PROVIS FOR DISPOSAL | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| DISPOSAL METHODS &/OR | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| POLICIES MENTIONED | 33 | 7 | 6 | 14 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 12 | 8 | 17 | 2 | 7 |
| COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| QUESTIONS IN SURVEY | 9 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| OTHER | 17 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 11 |
| BLANK | 349 | 79 | 34 | 77 | 64 | 86 | 61 | 78 | 79 | 89 | 57 | 70 | 30 | 65 | 24 | 86 |
| TOTALS | 452 | 102 | 47 | 107 | 74 | 99 | 78 | 100 | 90 | 100 | 82 | 100 | 50 | 108 | 31 | 111 |

ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW PUBLICATIONS ON NATIONAL CRIME AND RELATED SUBJECTS

Superintendent of Documents,
Government Printing Office,
Washington, D.C. 20402

Dear Sir:

Please add my name to the announcement list of new publications to be issued on the above subjects (including this NBS series):

Name _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____

(Notification key N-351)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Bureau of Standards
Washington, D.C. 20234

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

Penalty for Private Use, \$300

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
COM-215



SPECIAL FOURTH-CLASS RATE
BOOK