

NBSIR 73-215

# **LEAA Police Equipment Survey of 1972 Volume VI: Body Armor and Confiscated Weapons**

---

G. B. Hare, P. A. Klaus, E. D. Buntin

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

October 1973

Prepared for

**National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (NILECJ)  
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA)  
Department of Justice  
Washington, D.C. 20530**

REPORTS FROM THE LEAA POLICE EQUIPMENT SURVEY:

The present report is one in a series of reports produced from data gathered by the LEAA Police Equipment Survey of 1972. Listed below are the seven reports of that survey.

National Bureau of Standards Report 73-215 (The present report). LEAA POLICE EQUIPMENT SURVEY OF 1972, Volume VI: Body Armor and Confiscated Weapons.

National Bureau of Standards Report 73-210. LEAA POLICE EQUIPMENT SURVEY OF 1972, Volume I: The Need for Standards -- Priorities for Police Equipment.

National Bureau of Standards Report 73-211. LEAA POLICE EQUIPMENT SURVEY OF 1972, Volume II: Communications Equipment and Supplies.

National Bureau of Standards Report 73-212. LEAA POLICE EQUIPMENT SURVEY OF 1972, Volume III: Sirens and Emergency Warning Lights.

National Bureau of Standards Report 73-213. LEAA POLICE EQUIPMENT SURVEY OF 1972, Volume IV: Alarm Displays, Security Equipment, and Surveillance Equipment.

National Bureau of Standards Report 73-214. LEAA POLICE EQUIPMENT SURVEY OF 1972, Volume V: Handguns and Handgun Ammunition.

National Bureau of Standards Report 73-216. LEAA POLICE EQUIPMENT SURVEY OF 1972, Volume VII: Patrolcars.

NBSIR 73-215

**LEAA POLICE EQUIPMENT SURVEY OF 1972  
VOLUME VI: BODY ARMOR AND  
CONFISCATED WEAPONS**

---

G. B. Hare, P. A. Klaus, E. D. Buntin

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

October 1973

Prepared for  
National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (NILECJ)  
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA)  
Department of Justice  
Washington, D.C. 20530



---

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, Frederick B. Dent, Secretary  
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS, Richard W. Roberts, Director



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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 to the police departments whose officers and administrators helped the survey team during the developmental testing phases of the work. In addition, we thank Jacob J. Diamond, Chief of the Law Enforcement Standards Laboratory, for sharing his knowledge. The support and assistance of Lester Shubin, NILECJ, project monitor and consultant, is also gratefully acknowledged.

Although there are only three authors for this report, the work could not have been accomplished without the capable and conscientious efforts of the many members of the Technical Analysis Division who provided support for the whole survey effort:

William L. O'Neal for his help in computerizing the sample selection and for helping to design and program the interactive record-keeping system; Jenny L. Eldreth and P. Clare Peiser for maintaining the computerized record-keeping 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, a summer employee, for her help with questionnaire coding and record-keeping; Cassandra Streeter and Janice Davis, summer employees, for their help with record-keeping; 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.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
REPORTS FROM THE LEAA POLICE EQUIPMENT SURVEY	
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	iii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	v
EXECUTIVES' SUMMARY . . . . .	viii
 1.0 INTRODUCTION . . . . .	 1
1.1 Project Background . . . . .	1
1.2 Sample Design . . . . .	2
1.3 Questionnaire Administration. . . . .	6
1.4 Development and Design of the Body Armor & Confiscated Weapon DQ (Detailed Questionnaire) . . . . .	8
1.5 Characteristics of Subsample Groups . . . . .	10
 2.0 QUESTION BY QUESTION DISCUSSION . . . . .	 14
2.1 Advice to the Reader . . . . .	14
2.2 Discussion . . . . .	17
2.2.1 Characteristics of Respondents . . . . .	17
2.2.2 Use of Body Armor and Other Ballistic Protection Equipment. . . . .	19
2.2.3 Availability of Data to Researchers Developing Body Armor Standards . . . . .	29
2.2.4 Confiscated Weapons. . . . .	36
 APPENDIX A. Body Armor & Confiscated Weapons Questionnaire.	
 APPENDIX B. Data Tables	

## LIST OF TABLES

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

<u>Table Number</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.2-1            Stratification Categories . . . . .	3
1.2-2            Number of Police Departments by Region and Type . . .	4
1.2-3            Number of Departments Selected to Receive the Detailed Questionnaire: Body Armor & Confiscated Weapons . . . . .	7
1.3-1            Number of Sample of Departments Returning Acceptable Detailed Questionnaires: Body Armor & Confiscated Weapons . . . . .	9
1.5-1            Activities Handled by AT LEAST ONE-THIRD of Each Department Type, and Percent of Total Departments Having Each Activity. . . . .	11
1.5-2            Descriptive Data by Department Type (Means) . . . . .	13
1.5-3            Descriptive Data by LEAA Region (Means) . . . . .	13

### 2.0 QUESTION BY QUESTION DISCUSSION

<u>Table Number</u>	<u>Page</u>
i                Rank of Primary Respondent for Body Armor Questionnaire . . . . .	18
ii               Years of Experience in Law Enforcement of Primary Respondent . . . . .	19
1                Departments Maintaining Records of the Exact Locations of Wounds Sustained by Officers . . . . .	30
2                Of the Departments Maintaining Detailed Injury Data, the Percentages Including Specified Data in Those Records . . . . .	32



<u>Table Number</u>		<u>Page</u>
3	Of the Departments Maintaining Detailed Injury Data, Percentages Willing to Make These Records Available to Researchers . . . . .	33
4	Of the Departments Maintaining Detailed Injury Data, Percentages Keeping Summaries. . . . .	34
5	Of the Departments Maintaining Summarized Wound Data, Percentages Including Specified Data in Those Records. . . . .	35
6	Of the Departments Maintaining Summarized Data on Officers' Wounds, Percentage Willing to Provide Copies of These Data to Researchers . . .	36
7-1	Departments Preferring Visible, Hidden, or No Body Armor in a Potentially Explosive Situation. . . . .	20
7-2	Of the Departments Preferring Hidden Body Armor in Potentially Explosive Situations, Percentages Giving Specified Reason . . . . .	21
7-3	Of the Departments Preferring Visible Body Armor in Potentially Explosive Situation, Percentages Giving Specified Reason . . . . .	22
8	Departments Which <u>Would Routinely</u> Use Body Armor for Specified Activity. . . . .	24
9-1	Departments Using and Planning to Use Specified Ballistic Protective Item . . . . .	25
9-2	Departments Which were Using or Were Planning to Use Specified Ballistic Protection Item. . . . .	25
9-3	Departments Currently Using at Least One of the Ballistic Protection Items. . . . .	26



<u>Table Number</u>		<u>Page</u>
10-1	Departments Providing a Comment About Ballistic Protection Items or Body Armor . . . . .	27
10-2	Departments Which Commented That Their Departments Had No Body Armor . . . . .	27
10-3	Of the Departments Which Listed a Problem or Made a Comment, Percentages Citing Specified Comment. . . . .	29
11A/12A-1	Departments Which Supplied Numbers of Handguns and Shoulder Weapons Confiscated in 1970 and 1971. . . . .	38
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. . . . .	39
11A/12A-3	Numbers of Handguns and Shoulder Weapons Reported by the Departments Which Supplied Numbers of Weapons Confiscated in 1971 and 1970 . . . . .	40
11B/12B-1	Departments Which Reported Numbers of Weapons of Military Issue Confiscated in 1971 and 1970 . . . . .	41
11B/12B-2	Percentages of Handguns and Shoulder Weapons That Were Originally of Military Issue. . . . .	42
11C/12C-1	Departments Providing Data About Methods Used to Dispose of Confiscated Handguns in 1971 and 1970. . . . .	43
11C-2	Of the Departments Indicating Disposal Method(s), Percentages Using Specified Disposal Method in 1971 . . . . .	44
11C-3	Of the Total Numbers of Handguns Reported to Be Disposed in 1971, Percentages Disposed of by Specified Disposal Method . . . . .	46
12C-3	Of the Total Numbers of Handguns Reported to Be Disposed of in 1970, Percentages Disposed of by Specified Disposal Method. . . . .	47

## EXECUTIVES' SUMMARY:

### I. SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY

#### A. Background (pp. 1-2)

- Law Enforcement Standards Laboratory (LESL) was established in 1970 and became part of the NILECJ Equipment Systems Improvement Program (ESIP).
- 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 so that research to develop standards could begin.
- In addition, gathering information from the users would help to make police agencies aware of LESL and ESIP.
- 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 (pp. 8-10)

- Questionnaires were developed in conjunction with NILECJ, LESL, and cooperating police departments. Questionnaires were pretested at various times with approximately 40 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 Lights; Body Armor and Confiscated Weapons; and Patrolcars) 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 (pp. 2-6)

- The population sampled was made up of all police departments listed in a computerized file compiled and maintained by the LEAA Statistical Service.
- Courts, correctional institutions, forensic labs, special police agencies, etc., were excluded.
- The sample was stratified by LEAA Geographical 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 Fifty Largest Cities; the Fifty Largest U.S. Cities by population; and Township Departments).
- Overall, approximately 10% 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 (1386). Each Detailed Questionnaire was sent to all States, to all of the Fifty Largest Cities, and to a randomly selected subsample of the main sample (about 530 departments received each DQ).
- Thus, States and the Fifty Largest Cities were asked to fill in all seven questionnaires. Each of the remaining 1186 departments were asked to fill in the EPQ and two of the DQs.
- The sample for the Body Armor DQ consisted of 529 departments (see Table 1.2-3).

D. Questionnaire Administration (p. 6)

- 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 postcard 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 1300 calls were made. About 70% of the sample departments were called at least once.
- The responses from each questionnaire were edited and coded by by a specialized team to ensure consistency; the data were then keypunched and tabulated.
- Completed questionnaires were accepted for tabulation through January 7, 1973.

E. Rates of Return (pp. 8-9)

- 83% of the 529 departments returned usable Body Armor DQs, (83% of the 1386 departments returned usable EPQs).
- 81 - 85% of the other DQ subsamples returned usable questionnaires.
- Highest rates of return for the Body Armor DQ (over 90%) were from States, the Fifty Largest Cities, and Cities with 50 or more officers.
- Lowest rates of return for this DQ were from Counties and Townships (less than 75%).

F. Characteristics of Responding Departments (pp. 10-14)

- 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 Intra-departmental Communications (87%).
- All of the responding Fifty Largest Cities said they provided In-House Training and Criminal Investigations. This compared to 68% and 86%, respectively, of all responding departments.
- Only 13% of all respondents had Crime Laboratories. 73% of the Fifty Largest Cities and 55% 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% of the Cities with 50 or More Officers to 67% of the Counties.
- Overall, the reported Equipment Budgets represented somewhat over 10% 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 \$2.6 million for the Fifty Largest Cities.
- One of the Fifty Largest Cities reported an Equipment Budget of \$40 million.
- Overall, the Fifty Largest Cities reported a mean of 2491 Full-Time Sworn Officers; however, one of the Fifty Largest Cities had 27% of the total reported by that Department Type and another had about 12%.

G. Presentation of Data (pp. 16-17)

- Data in this report are presented in two forms: Text tables and full tables (Appendix B). Text tables do not always present a complete break out 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.

## II.. SUMMARY OF RESULTS

A. Characteristics of Respondents (pp. 17-19)

- 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% had been in law enforcement work for 6 or more years.

B. Use of Body Armor (pp. 19-24)

- 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) situation".

- Departments in the 50 Largest Cities were least clear cut in their opinions - 50% said body armor should be hidden in such a situation and 41% 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 (pp.24 -29)

- 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 Patrolcar Armor.
- Fewer than 20% 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 1/3 of the responding 50 Largest Cities and Cities (50+) were or would be using Hand-Held Ballistic Shields.
- About 1/4 of the responding States were or would be using Ballistic Helmets.
- Almost 1/3 of the responding 50 Largest Cities were using or planning to use Armored Cars.
- 61% of the 50 Largest Cities were using at least one of the four items of ballistic protective equipment at the time of the survey. Only 36% of the responding States and 28% of the Cities (50+) were using any of the items. 20% 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 (pp. 29-36)

- 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% 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 (pp. 36-48)

- Data supplied for 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 1/3 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 50 Largest City departments reported 2-3 times as many confiscated handguns per department as did responding State departments. Responding States reported 9-12 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.

## 1.0 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, in 1970, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) of the Department of Justice began a concentrated program toward the improvement of law enforcement equipment.

As the first step in its Equipment Systems Improvement Program (ESIP), 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 recommend performance standards which can be promulgated by LEAA as voluntary guidelines 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 ESIP 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 so that research to develop standards in these areas could begin.

This report fulfills part of the second general objective. The associated survey questionnaire (see Appendix A) will be referred to as the Body Armor and Confiscated Weapons Detailed Questionnaire (DQ). The remainder of the second objective is accomplished in the reports of the other five DQs: Alarms, Security and Surveillance Systems; Communications Equipment and Supplies; Handguns and Handgun Ammunition; Sirens and Emergency Warning Lights; and Patrolcars. The first general objective (above) is accomplished in the report on the Equipment Priorities Questionnaire (EPQ)\*. A complete listing of these seven reports may be found on the inside front cover of this report.

## 1.2 Sample Design

Although the objective of ESIP 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,

---

\* LEAA POLICE EQUIPMENT SURVEY OF 1972, Volume I: The Need for Standards -- Priorities for Police Equipment.

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 Appendix 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.

Table 1.2-1. Stratification Categories

DEPARTMENT TYPES:	LEAA GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS:
State Police	1 = Conn., Maine, Mass., N.H., R.I., Vt.
County Police & Sheriffs	2 = N.J., N.Y.
City with 1-9 Officers	3 = Del., Md., Penn., Va., W. Va., D.C.
City with 10-49 Officers	4 = Ala., Fla., Ga., Ky., Miss., N.C., S.C.,
City with 50 or more Officers*	Tenn.
The 50 Largest U.S. Cities**	5 = Ill., Ind., Mich., Ohio, Wis., Minn.
Township Departments	6 = Ark., La., N.M., Okla., Tex.
	7 = Iowa, Kan., Mo., Neb.
	8 = Colo., Mont., N.D., S.D., Utah, Wyo.
	9 = Ariz., Calif., Nev., Hawaii
	10 = Alas., Idaho, Ore., Wash.

\* Excluding the 50 largest U.S. Cities.

\*\* By population, U.S. 1970 census.

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% of the departments were city police, 43% having 1-9 full-time officers. County Departments

Table 1.2-2 Number of Police Departments by Region and Type

LEAA REGION

DEPARTMENT TYPE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	TOTAL
State	6	2	5	8	6	5	4	6	4	4	50*
County	66	84	257	764	536	506	413	288	103	120	3137
City (1-9 Officers)	27	348	713	979	1470	703	611	283	135	217	5486
City (10-49 Officers)	40	237	166	344	508	230	142	71	168	79	1985
City (50 or More 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	-	-	-	-	-	1574
TOTAL	829	1088	1544	2186	2883	1498	1196	668	505	439	12,836

\* Questionnaires were actually sent to 56 State Police departments since there were 6 State Departments which listed two police agencies without reference to a common central agency. However, only one set of questionnaires was accepted from each of these 6 agencies as described in Volume I, Appendix B, page B-2.



comprised about 24% of the population. By Region, the smallest (Region 10) contained only 3.4% of the police departments, while Region 5, the largest, had 22.5%. 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 1470.

The considerations discussed in the previous paragraph led to the sampling plan discussed briefly below. All of the State Departments and the Fifty Largest City Departments were included in the sample and were asked to complete all six DQs, i.e., they were sent the entire package of seven 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 large enough to allow a sufficient number of sample units (police departments) in small cells would yield an unmanageably large total sample; on the other hand, 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 thirty departments/cell was chosen to facilitate the equitable distribution of the six 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 the Fifty Largest Cities) receiving two 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.

### 1.3 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 terminal for each sample department. In general the following procedure was used:

- (a) 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.
- (b) About one week later, the questionnaire packages were mailed.
- (c) Departments not returning the questionnaires within a month were identified by the computer and were sent a self-return postcard requesting information as to the status of the questionnaires. Departments not receiving the questionnaire package were sent another; those not returning the postcard were placed on a list for telephone follow-up.
- (d) About a month and a half later, departments with which no contact had been made were called by telephone.
- (e) Returned questionnaires were reviewed for completeness and either coded for keypunching or filed for telephone call-back to supply missing data or to resolve ambiguities.



Table 1.2-3. Number of Departments Selected to Receive the Detailed Questionnaire:  
Body Armor & Confiscated Weapons, by Region and Department Type.

DEPARTMENT TYPE:	LEAA GEOGRAPHIC REGION:										TOTAL POPULATION
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
State	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
Townships**	10	10	10	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	40
Total	56	56	60	56	68	53	45	43	52	42	529*
PERCENT TOTAL POPULATION	7	5	4	3	2	4	4	7	11	10	4

\* Questionnaires were actually mailed to 56 State police departments since there were 6 states which listed two police agencies without references to a common central agency. However, only one set of questionnaires was accepted from each of these 6 states.

\*\* Township departments exist only in Regions 1, 2, 3, and 5.

Considerable effort was expended to ensure a high rate of response, and this effort was rewarded with an 83% response for the Body Armor DQ, and between 80% and 85% for each of the other questionnaires. In the course of the survey more than 70% of the sample departments were contacted at least once by telephone. More than 1300 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 larger Cities and States, (88 - 92%), while Counties and Townships had the poorest response rates (under 75%).

#### 1.4 Development and Design of the Body Armor & Confiscated Weapons 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 as respondents for pre-tests 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 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

Table 1.3-1. Number of Sample of Departments Returning Acceptable Detailed Questionnaires:  
Body Armor & Confiscated Weapons.

DEPARTMENT TYPE:

LEAA GEOGRAPHIC REGION:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total	% TOTAL SAMPLE
State*	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**	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%	

\* Questionnaires were actually mailed to 56 State police departments since there were 6 states which listed two police agencies without references to a common central agency. However, only one set of questionnaires was accepted from each of these 6 states.

\*\* Township departments exist only in Regions 1, 2, 3, and 5.

Note: The conventions used in displaying and reporting on the results of the questionnaires are presented on page 16, section "g".

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 scope of the activities handled by the department.

Table 1.5-1 presents a partial tabulation, by department type, of the responses to a check list 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 Section 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% (Cities with 50+ Officers) to 67% (Counties).

Higher percentages of State and Fifty Largest City departments than of other Department Types were handling certain of the 30 activities. For example, all of the Fifty Largest City departments responding and 98% of the responding State departments said that their departments provided Police

---

\* LEAA POLICE EQUIPMENT SURVEY OF 1972, Volume I. Op. Cit.



Table 1.5-1. Activities Handled by AT LEAST ONE-THIRD of That Department Type by Department Type, and Percent of Total Departments Having Each Activity

DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITY:

DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITY:	State			City			City			City			Largest			Township			Total		
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Serve Traffic and Criminal Warrants	70	89	84	89	89	84	89	89	94	87	93										88
Traffic Safety and Traffic Control	92	56	94	96	96	94	96	96	96	98	94										87
Communications for Own Department	94	86	76	95	95	76	95	95	94	96	70										87
Criminal Investigation	66	86	71	95	95	71	95	95	97	100	79										86
Police Training for Own Department	98	55	48	77	77	48	77	77	87	100	42										68
Custody/Detention-Less than 1 Day	-	79	51	73	73	51	73	73	72	80	43										65
Breath-Alcohol Test	89	46	47	72	72	47	72	72	83	91	49										64
Emergency Aid and Rescue	62	67	62	63	63	62	63	63	60	67	62										63
Public Building Protection	-	40	63	60	60	63	60	60	58	44	68										54
Service Function	-	-	48	55	55	48	55	55	60	60	42										48
Animal Control (Dog Catcher)	-	-	58	63	63	58	63	63	42	-	37										44
Highway Patrol	96	38	48	36	36	48	36	36	-	-	88										43
Maintenance of Police Buildings	51	36	34	41	41	34	41	41	48	47											40
Custody/Detention-1 Week or Less	-	73		36	36		36	36	46	49											38
Communications for Other Agency	66	56		40	40		40	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
Tests for Drivers License	34																				3
Custody/Detention-More than 1 Year																					3

Training for Own Department. These compare to 68% for all responding departments. All of the responding Fifty Largest Cities said that they handled Criminal Investigation in their own departments. This compares to 86% of the total sample of departments. Although only 13% of the departments overall had Crime Laboratories, 73% of the Fifty Largest Cities and 55% 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 these departments had Custody/Detention--Up to 1 Year, as compared with 22% of the total sample.

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 thousand dollars for responding Cities (1-9) to almost 2.5 million dollars for the Fifty Largest Cities. Overall, equipment budgets represented somewhat over 10% of the Annual Total Budget.

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 Fifty Largest Cities, only six had part-time officers, including one city which had nearly 6000. Thus, the mean value of 1115 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.

Table 1.5-2. Descriptive Data by Department Type (Means)

Department Type	Area (Sq. Miles)	Population	Number of		Annual Total Budget	Annual Equipment Budget	Annual Personnel Budget
			Full-Time Officers	Part-Time Officers			
50 Largest	187	851342	2491	1115	\$43,268,865	\$2,669,920	\$34,712,818
State	62580	3936410	889	18	\$16,377,358	\$2,304,339	\$12,020,572
County	1518	130254	60	25	\$1,089,919	\$58,539	\$859,984
City (50+)	31	83344	132	26	\$1,733,340	\$173,099	\$1,407,177
City (10-49)	12	15849	22	9	\$257,927	\$24,362	\$206,187
Township	28	13228	14	8	\$175,654	\$20,854	\$141,675
City (1-9)	9	5038	8	5	\$82,381	\$9,764	\$60,061

Table 1.5-3. Descriptive Data by LEAA Region (Means)

LEAA Region	Area (Sq. Miles)	Population	Number of		Annual Total Budget	Annual Equipment Budget	Annual Personnel Budget
			Full-Time Officers	Part-Time Officers			
1	750	158112	96	18	\$1,360,155	\$135,130	\$979,911
2	648	240781	365	97	\$7,148,315	\$148,172	\$5,265,546
3	1096	245733	216	7	\$3,412,567	\$435,153	\$2,879,293
4	3691	340996	151	11	\$2,318,382	\$248,600	\$1,767,292
5	2652	448174	283	8	\$4,916,607	\$431,478	\$3,879,374
6	5738	271386	160	17	\$2,193,823	\$160,363	\$1,709,910
7	2379	112094	84	9	\$1,220,385	\$121,001	\$983,696
8	6346	83023	54	9	\$728,549	\$77,081	\$568,463
9	4218	372094	281	46	\$5,743,553	\$728,801	\$4,528,692
10	3580	104877	69	9	\$1,253,894	\$82,198	\$1,011,604



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 one of the Fifty Largest Cities.

## 2.0 QUESTION BY QUESTION DISCUSSION

### 2.1 Advice to the Reader

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

- (a) 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.
- (b) The report reflects only what police departments were 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.
- (c) Each discussion begins with the presentation of the question that appeared in the questionnaire, and in most cases the choices supplied, if any, that were set off in a box. However, the reader is cautioned to become familiar with the questionnaire sent to departments in the sample (See Appendix A) and to evaluate the data in terms of the exact questions asked.

- (d) The text tables that appear in Section 2 are almost never the complete tables that were tabulated for that question. Data categories for the 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 after 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.
- (e) 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% when percentages are based on the total respondents, or to percentage differences of less than 10% 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.
- (f) 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 would 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.

- (g) The subsample groups (Department Types and Regions) are capitalized when they are discussed in the text. In addition, the four Department Types which are composed of city departments are at times discussed as a group. In those cases, the word "city" is also capitalized. 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 = City (10-49)

City with 50 or More Officers = City (50+)

The Fifty Largest Cities = Fifty Largest

In table headings this same convention has been used except that the parentheses have been removed, and the Fifty Largest Cities are designated "50 Largest".

- (h) 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.

- (i) 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 List of Tables in the Table of Contents.

## 2.2 Discussion

### 2.2.1 Characteristics of Respondents

---

#### 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% of the City (1-9) departments the questionnaire was completed by the Chief; in Township departments, 64% were filled in by the Chief; and in City (10-49) departments, 52% 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.

Table i. Rank of Primary Respondent for Body Armor Questionnaire,  
by Department Type.\*

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
"Non Rank" Title	6	1	10	17	7

\* Excluding County and State Departments.

In County and State departments too, relatively high ranking officers filled in the Body Armor Questionnaire: In 46% of the State departments the questionnaire was completed by either a Captain or a Lieutenant; in 57% of the County departments the form was answered by the Sheriff or Under Sheriff.

In sixteen percent of the State and 17% of the Fifty 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.

#### NUMBER OF YEARS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT EXPERIENCE OF RESPONDENTS

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 of experience. Only 3% of all respondents had less than 2 years of such experience.



More than eighty percent of the respondents from States and the three largest City Department Types had more than 10 years of experience in law enforcement.

Table ii. Years of Experience in Law Enforcement of Primary Respondent.

NUMBER OF YEARS OF

LAW ENFORCEMENT EXPERIENCE:

DEPARTMENT TYPE:

	% State	% County	% City 1-9	% City 10-49	% City 50+	% 50 Largest	% Town- ship
	***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

7B. 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 Fifty Largest Cities were least clear cut in their opinions -- 50% of these largest city departments said Should Be Hidden and 41% said Should Be Visible.

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 <u>Hidden</u>	% Should Be <u>Visible</u>	% Should Not <u>Be Worn</u>	% Don't Know/No <u>Answer</u>
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
Fifty Largest	50	41	7	2
All Respondents	56	34	3	7

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 two 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 agressor rather than as a "peace officer". In addition, some commented that visible body armor conceals the uniform, and thus the identity, of the officer.

Table 7-2. Of the 246 Departments Preferring Hidden Body Armor in Potentially Explosive Situations, Percentages\* Giving Specified Reason.

---

REASON:	% Respondents* <u>Saying "Hidden"</u> (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

---

\* Percentages add to slightly more than 100% since multiple answers were allowed.

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 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%).

Table 7-3. Of the 150 Departments Preferring Visible Body Armor in Potentially Explosive Situations, Percentages\* Giving Specified Reason.

REASON:	% Respondents Saying "Visible"*
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

\* Percentages add to slightly more than 100% 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)                                    | . Burglary calls                      |
| . Automobile Patrol (concealed armor)                              | . Robbery calls                       |
| . Detectives (concealed armor)                                     | . Family Disturbance calls            |
| . Foot and/or Auto Patrol in High<br>Crime Areas (concealed armor) | . Approaching a Suspicious<br>Vehicle |
| . Sniper situations  | . Other (specify)                     |
| . "Man with a Gun" calls   |                                       |

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 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 Fifty Largest Cities cited "Man With a Gun" Calls than did Counties, Townships, and the other City Department Types. The Fifty Largest Cities also more often listed some "Other" activity.

"Other" activities mentioned were such things as riots and/or civil disturbances, apprehension of dangerous persons or barricaded criminals, and guarding VIPs.

Table 8. Percentages\* 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

\* Percentages add to more than 100% since multiple answers were allowed.

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>
Hand-held Ballistic Shields	_____	_____
Patrolcar 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 Patrolcar Armor.

Table 9-1. Percentages\* of Responding Departments Using and Planning to Use Specified Ballistic Protective Item.

BALLISTIC PROTECTIVE ITEM:	% Now <u>Using</u>	% Plan <u>To Use</u>	% No Answer/ <u>None</u>
Ballistic Helmet	12	6	82
Hand-held Ballistic Shield	10	7	83
Special Armored Cars	4	2	94
Patrolcar Armor	2	1	97

Among the seven Department Types, however, some Department Types had relatively high percentages of departments using ballistic protective devices. Fewer than 20% 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 Fifty 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 Fifty Largest Cities were using or planning to use Armored Cars.

Table 9-2. Percentages\* of Departments in Each Department Type Which Were Using Or Were Planning to Use Specified Ballistic Protective Item.

DEPARTMENT TYPE:	BALLISTIC PROTECTIVE ITEM:			
	% Ballis. <u>Helmets</u>	% Hand-held <u>Shields</u>	% Armored <u>Cars</u>	% Patrolcar <u>Armor</u>
Fifty 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	14	10	0	1
City (1-9)	17	8	1	4
All Respondents	18	17	6	3

\* Percentages add to more than 100% since multiple answers were allowed.



The Fifty 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.

Table 9-3. Percentages of Departments in Each Department Type Currently Using At Least One of the Ballistic Protective Items.

DEPARTMENT TYPE:	% Depts. Using <u>At Least One Item</u>
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%, the only comment supplied was that they had "No Problems" with ballistic protective equipment or body armor. The remaining 42% wrote a comment other than "No Problems" or described a problem with such equipment. The two largest City Department Types (Fifty Largest and 50+ Officers) were more likely to mention a problem than the other Department Types.

Table 10-1. Percentages of Departments in Each Department Type Providing a Comment About Ballistic Protective Items or Body Armor.

DEPARTMENT TYPE:	<u>% Problem or Comment</u>	<u>% No Problem</u>	<u>% No Answer</u>
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

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. (below) 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 does show approximately the same trend as Table 10-1 and Table 9-3; that the larger departments are more likely to have ballistic protective devices.

Table 10-2. Percentages of Departments in Each Department Type Which Commented (Q. 10) That Their Departments Had No Body Armor.\*

DEPARTMENT TYPE:	<u>% Respondents Saying No Body Armor</u>
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

\* Data based on narrative response; see discussion immediately preceding Table 10-2.

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 armor was too heavy and bulky making it Impractical for Routine Use (12%), Restricting Maneuverability (10%), Uncomfortable (5%), or Causing Fatigue (5%). About 8% of those making comments specifically suggested re-design 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 build up of body heat while wearing armor.

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 one in ten of the responding departments which made comments said that body armor provided Inadequate Protection and/or provided a False Sense of Security. About one-fourth of the State and Fifty 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.

Table 10-3. Of the 183 Departments Which Listed a Problem Or Made a Comment  
(Other Than "No Problem"), Percentage\* Citing Specified Comment.

COMMENT:	<u>% Respondents Citing Problems/Comments</u> (n = 183)
<u>Don't Have Body Armor</u> -----	32
Too Heavy & Bulky	
Impractical for Routine Use	12
Restricts Maneuverability	10
Uncomfortable	5
<u>Causes Fatigue/Too Hot</u> -----	5
<u>Inadequate Protection/False Security</u> -----	10
Redesign to Make Lighter/Comfortable/Flexible	8
Too Expensive to Provide for All Officers	5
Comment About Ceramic Body Armor	2

\* Percentages add to slightly more than 100% since multiple answers were allowed.

### 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 of 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 record-keeping 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 Fifty Largest City Departments made that statement.

A large majority (87%) of the Fifty Largest City departments said they kept detailed records concerning officers' 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 Officers.\*)

DEPARTMENT TYPE:	KEEP EXACT RECORDS?:			
	<u>% Yes</u>	<u>% No</u>	<u>% Sometimes</u>	<u>% No Officer Killed</u>
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

\* For Department Type statistics, see Table 1.5-2, page 13.



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 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 Type\* 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 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).

\*Excluding 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 Q. 1), the Percentages Including Specified Data in Those Records.

DEPARTMENT TYPE:	CALIBER & TYPE OF GUN:		TYPE OF BULLET USED:		DISTANCE SHOT FIRED FROM:	
	<u>% Yes</u>	<u>% Sometimes</u>	<u>% Yes</u>	<u>% Sometimes</u>	<u>% Yes</u>	<u>% Sometimes</u>
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 8 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% of the 235 responding departments which maintained records on 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.

Respondents from State and Fifty Largest City departments were more likely to say 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 Q. 1), the Percentages Willing to Make These Records Available to Researchers.

DEPARTMENT TYPE:	WILLING TO MAKE AVAILABLE?:			
	<u>% Yes</u>	<u>% Don't Know</u>	<u>% No</u>	<u>% No Answer</u>
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 8 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% of the Fifty 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% 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).

Table 4. Of the Departments in Each Department Type Maintaining Detailed Injury Data ("Yes" to Q. 1), Percentages Keeping Summaries of Those Records.

DEPARTMENT TYPE:	MAINTAIN SUMMARIES?:		
	<u>% Yes</u>	<u>% No</u>	<u>% Sometimes</u>
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=325]	60	37	2

\* Excluding Townships. Fewer than 8 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 & 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 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% in most cases except for the Distance From Which Shot Was Fired Category.

Table 5. Of the Departments in Each Department Type Maintaining Summarized Wound Data ("Yes" to Q. 1 and "Yes" or "Sometimes" to Q. 4), Percentages Including Specified Data in Those Records.

DEPARTMENT TYPE:		EXACT LOCATION OF WOUND:		CALIBER & TYPE OF GUN:		TYPE OF BULLET USED:		DISTANCE SHOT FIRED:	
		% Yes	% Some- times	% Yes	% Some- times	% Yes	% Some- times	% Yes	% Some- times
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 8 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 officers' 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% 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.

Table 6. Of the 147 Departments Maintaining Summarized Data On Officers' Wounds ("Yes" to Q. 1 and "Yes" or "Sometimes" to Q. 4), Percentage Willing to Provide Copies of These Data to Researchers.

PROVIDE DATA?:	<u>% Respondents With Summarized Data</u> (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 correlary 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 two 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: (1) 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 (Qs. 11A and 12A) would approximate the numbers of handguns disposed of (Qs. 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. (2) 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 zero) of weapons confiscated in 1971 and 1970, there was one 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% of the departments in every other Department Type reported numbers of handguns and shoulder weapons confiscated in 1971, and more than 50% of those Department Types supplied 1970 data. Non-responding 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 (Q. 11) than for 1970 (Q. 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.

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 (Q. 11A) and 1970 (Q. 12A)

DEPARTMENT TYPE:	SUPPLYING 1971 NUMBERS:		SUPPLYING 1970 NUMBERS:	
	% for <u>HANDGUNS</u>	% for <u>SHOULDER</u>	% for <u>HANDGUNS</u>	% for <u>SHOULDER</u>
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

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 Fifty Largest City departments: More than 80% of the confiscated weapons reported by the responding departments were reported by departments in the Fifty Largest Cities. Responding County departments, in contrast, reported that in 1970, 54% of their confiscated weapons were handguns and 46% were shoulder weapons.

Table 11A/12A-2. Of the Total Numbers of Confiscated Weapons Reported by the Responding Departments in Each Department Type\* in 1971 and 1970, Percentages That Were Handguns and Shoulder Weapons.

DEPARTMENT TYPE:	1971 FIGURES:		1970 FIGURES:	
	% <u>HANDGUNS</u>	% <u>SHOULDER</u>	% <u>HANDGUNS</u>	% <u>SHOULDER</u>
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

\*Table based on those departments reporting numbers.

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 Fifty Largest Cities reported 2-3 times as many confiscated handguns per department as State departments. Responding States reported 9-12 times as many confiscated handguns per department as City (50+) departments.



Table 11A/12A-3. Numbers of Handguns and Shoulder Weapons Reported by the Departments Which Supplied Numbers (Including Zero) of Weapons Confiscated in 1971 (Q. 11A) and 1970 (Q. 12A).

DEPARTMENT TYPE:	<u>HANDGUNS</u>					
	1971 FIGURES:			1970 FIGURES:		
	<u>Total No. Reported</u>	<u>No. Depts. Reporting</u>	<u>Mean No. Per Dept.</u>	<u>Total No. Reported</u>	<u>No. Depts. Reporting</u>	<u>Mean No. Per Dept.</u>
50 Largest	47,819	33	1449	42,298	33	1282
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

	<u>SHOULDER WEAPONS</u>					
	1971 FIGURES:			1970 FIGURES:		
	<u>Total No. Reported</u>	<u>No. Depts. Reporting</u>	<u>Mean No. Per Dept.</u>	<u>Total No. Reported</u>	<u>No. Depts. Reporting</u>	<u>Mean No. Per Dept.</u>
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:

<u>WEAPON TYPE</u>	<u>NUMBER MILITARY ISSUED IN 1971</u>
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 non-response rate might be attributed to the fact that some departments did not include "military origin" in their records on confiscated weapons.



Table 11B/12B-1. Percentages of Departments in Each Department Type Which Reported Numbers (Including Zero) Of Weapons of Military Issue Confiscated in 1971 (Q. 11B) and 1970 (Q. 12B)

DEPARTMENT TYPE:	SUPPLYING 1971 NUMBERS:		SUPPLYING 1970 NUMBERS:	
	% Depts. Reporting Military Issue <u>Handguns</u>	% Depts. Reporting Military Issue <u>Shoulder</u>	% Depts. Reporting Military Issue <u>Handguns</u>	% Depts. Reporting Military Issue <u>Shoulder</u>
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

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.

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:	
	% Military Issue <u>1971</u>	% Military Issue <u>1970</u>	% Military Issue <u>1971</u>	% Military Issue <u>1970</u>
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 Museum 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% and 83% of the Fifty Largest Cities, 88% and 76% of Cities (50+), and 80% and 74% of the Cities (10-49). Only about one-third of the responding Townships provided 1971 disposal information, and 36-39%

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.

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:	
	%	%
	<u>1971</u>	<u>1970</u>
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

Responses to Questions 11C and 12C were tabulated in two ways: A frequency count of departments which ever 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 check-off 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.

Table 11C-2. Of the Departments Indicating Disposal Method(s), Percentage\* In Each Department Type\*\* 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 Collec- tion	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

\* Percentages add to more than 100% since multiple answers were allowed.

\*\* Excluding Townships in which only 10 respondents answered.

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 Fifty 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 non-response 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 Fifty 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 Fifty Largest 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 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.

DISPOSAL METHOD:	DEPARTMENT TYPE:					
	% 50 Largest Handguns (n=54,335)	% State Handguns (n=7,483)	% City 50+ Handguns (n=2,998)	% City 10-49 Handguns (n=732)	% City 1-9 Handguns (n=184)	% County Handguns (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/Hack- saw	1	0	15	2	**	5
<hr/>						
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

\* Excluding Township.

\*\* Less than 1%

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.

DISPOSAL METHOD:	DEPARTMENT TYPE:					
	% 50 Largest Handguns (n=28,850)	% State Handguns (n=7,236)	% City 50 + Handguns (n=1,777)	% City 10-49 Handguns (n=437)	% City 1-9 Handguns (n=84)	% County Handguns (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/Hack- saw	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

\* Excluding Townships.

\*\* Less than 1%.

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

14. Other comments:

Only 14% 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 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 record keeping, 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 & foreign handguns."

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

APPENDIX A  
QUESTIONNAIRE

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

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 ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, 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: \_\_\_\_\_

## NOTES



## 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 Section 1.2) of police departments in response to a specific set of questions (see Appendix 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% when percentages are based on all respondents, and to percentage differences of less than 10% when percentages are based on one of the sub-sample 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, Appendix B) by the total number of departments of that Department Type in the population (See Table 1.2-2, Section 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			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.	%	
CHIEF	141	32		0	0		3	4		53	68		46	52		18	22		3	7		18	64	
CAPTAIN	50	11		14	32		0	0		3	4		12	13		13	16		7	15		1	4	
COMMISSIONER	2	0		1	2		0	0		1	1		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0	
COLONEL	2	0		2	5		0	0		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		1	4	
ASSISTANT CHIEF	12	3		1	2		0	0		1	1		7	8		3	4		0	0		0	0	
MAJOR	8	2		3	7		1	1		0	0		1	1		2	2		1	2		0	0	
LIEUTENANT	49	11		6	14		5	7		1	1		11	12		16	20		8	17		2	7	
CORPORAL	3	1		1	2		0	0		0	0		0	0		1	1		1	2		0	0	
PRIVATE	0	0		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		0	0	
INSPECTOR	6	1		1	2		0	0		0	0		1	1		3	4		1	2		0	0	
SHERIFF	35	8		0	0		34	46		1	1		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0	
CONSTABLE	0	0		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		4	14	
PATROLMAN	16	4		0	0		0	0		3	4		1	1		6	7		6	13		0	0	
OTHER TITLE	45	10		7	16		14	19		5	6		1	1		8	10		8	17		2	7	
UNDERSHERIFF	12	3		0	0		8	11		2	3		0	0		2	2		0	0		0	0	
NO ANSWER	0	0		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		28	100	

Table i-2

## YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF PERSON WHO FILLED IN QUESTIONNAIRE:

## 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.	%		NO.	%		NO.	%		NO.	%		NO.	%		NO.	%	
2 OR LESS	13	3		0	0		3	4		5	6		0	0		0	0		1	2		4	14	
3-5 YEARS	32	7		0	0		9	12		13	17		4	4		2	2		1	2		3	11	
6-10 YEARS	81	18		5	11		26	35		19	24		11	12		7	9		4	9		9	32	
11-15 YEARS	79	18		3	7		11	15		10	13		19	21		20	25		10	22		6	21	
16-20 YEARS	78	18		13	30		3	4		8	10		25	28		15	19		10	22		4	14	
21-25 YEARS	67	15		7	16		5	7		11	14		16	18		16	20		12	26		0	0	
26-30 YEARS	35	8		7	16		5	7		3	4		6	7		9	11		5	11		0	0	
31 OR MORE	32	7		6	14		4	5		3	4		7	8		9	11		2	4		1	4	
NO ANSWER	23	5		3	7		8	11		0	8		1	1		3	4		1	2		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	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.	%
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.	%
CALIBER AND TYPE OF GUN	YES	216	92	26	96	29	83	45	96	47	96	38	95	8	100
	NO	4	2	0	0	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SOMETIMES	13	6	1	4	2	6	1	2	2	4	2	5	0	0
	NO RECORDS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NA	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	BLANK	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	TOTALS	235	100	27	100	35	100	47	100	49	100	40	100	8	100
TYPE OF BULLET USED	YES	203	86	23	85	27	77	44	94	44	90	36	90	6	75
	NO	9	4	0	0	5	14	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	12
	SOMETIMES	20	9	4	15	3	9	1	2	4	8	4	10	1	12
	NO RECORDS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NA	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	BLANK	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0
	TOTALS	235	100	27	100	35	100	47	100	49	100	40	100	8	100
DISTANCE FROM WHICH SHOT WAS FIRED	YES	165	70	21	78	21	60	40	85	33	67	24	60	5	62
	NO	13	6	0	0	5	14	2	4	2	4	0	0	0	0
	SOMETIMES	54	23	6	22	9	26	4	9	12	24	16	40	3	37
	NO RECORDS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NA	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	BLANK	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0
	TOTALS	235	100	27	100	35	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

## 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.	%
CALIBER AND TYPE OF GUN	279	87	30	94	43	84	36	71	59	91
	5	2	0	0	4	8	0	0	0	0
	20	6	2	6	4	8	6	12	2	3
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	3
NA	11	3	0	0	0	0	8	16	2	3
BLANK										
TOTALS	319	100	32	100	51	100	51	100	65	100
TYPE OF BULLET USED	261	82	25	78	41	80	36	71	57	88
	13	4	1	3	5	10	2	4	2	3
	29	9	6	19	5	10	4	8	2	3
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	3
NA	12	4	0	0	0	0	8	16	2	3
BLANK										
TOTALS	319	100	32	100	51	100	51	100	65	100
DISTANCE FROM WHICH SHOT WAS FIRED	217	68	22	69	34	67	32	63	52	80
	16	5	0	0	6	12	4	8	3	5
	70	22	10	31	11	22	7	14	6	9
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	3
NA	12	4	0	0	0	0	7	14	2	3
BLANK										
TOTALS	319	100	32	100	51	100	51	100	65	100
	26	8	41	65	36	84	55	87	36	84
	1	0	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
	6	2	5	8	6	14	5	8	6	14
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	1	2	1	2	1	2	0	0
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BLANK	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	43	100	63	100	43	100	63	100	43	100
	26	60	41	65	26	60	41	65	26	60
	0	0	3	5	0	0	3	5	0	0
	17	40	16	25	17	40	16	25	17	40
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	2	0	0
NA	0	0	2	3	0	0	2	3	0	0
BLANK	1	2	2	3	2	3	2	3	1	2
TOTALS	43	100	63	100	43	100	63	100	43	100



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.	%	NO.	%	CITY (1-9 OFFICERS)		CITY (10-49 OFFICERS)		CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS)		NO.	%	NO.	%
							NO.	%	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

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

Table 4 A-1

Q.4(A): (IF YES TO Q.1):  
ARE ANY SUMMARIES OF THESE STATISTICS ON DEATH AND INJURY TO YOUR OFFICERS KEPT BY YOUR DEPARTMENT?

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.	%
YES	142	60	17	63	21	60	14	48	25	53	27	55	33	82	5	62
NO	86	37	10	37	12	34	14	48	22	47	19	39	6	15	3	37
SOMETIMES	5	2	0	0	2	6	1	3	0	0	1	2	1	2	0	0
NA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BLANK	1	0	0	0	0	0	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 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

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)							
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
EXACT LOCATION (WITHIN 1 INCH)	115	78	14	82	17	74	10	67	23	92	21	75	27	79	3	60
	8	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	1	4	3	11	3	9	0	0
	23	16	3	18	6	26	4	27	1	4	4	14	4	12	1	20
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	20
TOTALS	147	100	17	100	23	100	15	100	25	100	28	100	34	100	5	100
CALIBER AND GUN TYPE	132	90	16	94	19	83	14	93	25	100	25	89	29	85	4	80
	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	1	3	0	0
	11	7	1	6	3	13	1	7	0	0	1	4	4	12	1	20
	1	1	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	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	5	100
TYPE OF BULLET USED	121	82	14	82	16	70	14	93	25	100	23	82	26	76	3	60
	6	4	0	0	1	4	1	7	0	0	2	7	2	6	0	0
	18	12	3	18	5	22	0	0	0	0	3	11	6	18	1	20
	1	1	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	20
TOTALS	147	100	17	100	23	100	15	100	25	100	28	100	34	100	5	100
DISTANCE FROM WHICH SHOT WAS FIRED	99	67	13	76	14	61	12	80	24	96	17	61	16	47	3	60
	7	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	3	11	3	9	0	0
	39	27	4	24	8	35	2	13	1	4	7	25	15	44	2	40
	1	1	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	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 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

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.	%
YES	89	61	5	29	18	78	12	80		19	76		14	41	3	60
NO	16	11	4	24	2	9	0	0		3	12		4	12	0	0
DONT KNOW	41	28	8	47	3	13	3	20		3	12		16	47	2	40
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		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

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.	%
SHOULD BE VISIBLE	150	34	14	32	21	28	27	35		30	34		19	41	9	32
SHOULD BE HIDDEN	246	56	26	59	42	57	42	54		52	58		23	50	18	64
SHOULD NOT BE WORN AT ALL	13	3	1	2	4	5	1	1		2	2		3	7	0	0
DONT KNOW	4	1	0	0	2	3	1	1		1	1		0	0	0	0
DOES NOT MATTER	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0
NA	9	2	0	0	2	3	3	4		2	2		0	0	0	0
BLANK	17	4	3	7	3	4	4	5		2	2		1	2	1	4
TOTALS	440	100	44	100	74	100	78	100		89	100		46	100	28	100

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

## RESPONSE

ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES	NO.	%	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.	%	NO.
WELL EQPT OFFICER SHOULD SHOW TRAINING, PROTECTION & PREPAREDNESS FOR CROWD	38	25	2	14	7	33	7	26	8	27	3
EASE OF PUT ON & TAKE OFF	14	9	1	7	1	5	1	4	3	10	0
MORE EFFECTIVE ON OUTSIDE	2	1	0	0	1	4	1	4	0	0	0
COMFORT, LESS RESTRICTION, MANEUVERABILITY	7	5	0	0	2	7	2	7	1	3	0
SHOW OF FORCE	13	9	2	14	3	11	1	3	3	10	1
PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFECT	19	13	2	14	1	4	5	17	5	17	1
DETERRENT EFFECT ON CROWD	31	21	3	21	5	19	8	27	5	17	0
OTHER	20	13	4	29	1	4	3	10	7	23	4
BLANK	30	20	0	0	10	37	6	20	5	17	0
TOTALS	174	116	14	99	31	116	35	117	37	124	10

Table 7 B-2

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

## RESPONSE

ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES	NO.	%	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.	%	NO.
OBVIOUS UNPROTECTED OFFICER WILL NOT BECOME TARGET	5	2	1	4	0	0	1	2	1	4	0
SIGHT OF BODY ARMOR TENDS TO MAKE SITUATION WORSE	69	28	6	23	15	36	15	29	17	40	4
SNIPERS LESS LIKELY TO CHANGE AIMING POINT	77	31	6	23	12	29	12	28	13	57	5
ELEMENT OF SURPRISE	21	9	0	0	6	14	6	12	1	4	4
VIS. UNIFORM MORE IMPORTANT THAN VISIBLE ARMOR	5	2	2	8	0	0	1	2	0	0	0
OTHER	23	9	5	19	4	10	2	5	2	9	2
BLANK	63	26	6	23	10	24	12	23	5	22	5
TOTALS	263	107	26	100	47	113	56	109	46	107	20



Table 7 B-3

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

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. %	NO. %	NO. %
DEPT HAS NO BODY ARMOR	1 8	0 0	1 25	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
HAMPERS MANEUVERABILITY:											
TOO HEAVY: BURDENSOME	4 31	0 0	1 25	1 100	0 0	1 50	1 33	0 0	1 33	0 0	0 0
USE ONLY SPECIAL SITUATION	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
ONLY SELECT PEOPLE WEAR	1 8	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 50	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
PSYCHOLOGICAL REASONS	1 8	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 50	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
OTHER EQPT BETR FOR SITUATN	1 8	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 33	0 0	1 33	0 0	0 0
WORN ONLY IF KNOWN SHOOTING											
& SNIPING EXIST	1 8	1 100	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
OTHER	1 8	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 50	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
BLANK	3 23	0 0	2 50	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 33	0 0	1 33	0 0	0 0
TOTALS	13 102	1 100	4 100	1 100	2 100	2 100	3 99	0 0	3 99	0 0	0 0

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	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. %	NO. %	NO. %
FOOT PATROL: CONCEALD ARMOR	23 5	1 2	2 3	6 8	8 9	2 2	2 4	2 7	2 4	2 7	2 7
AUTO PATROL: CONCEALD ARMOR	52 12	6 14	7 9	12 15	13 15	3 4	3 7	8 29	3 7	8 29	8 29
DETECTIVES: CONCEALD ARMOR	46 10	6 14	6 8	7 9	10 11	11 14	5 11	1 4	5 11	1 4	1 4
FOOT &/OR AUTO PATROL IN											
HIGH CRIME AREA	79 18	1 2	12 16	20 26	17 19	13 16	12 26	4 14	12 26	4 14	4 14
SNIPER SITUATIONS	351 80	37 84	50 68	54 69	74 83	75 93	45 98	16 57	45 98	16 57	16 57
MAN WITH A GUN CALLS	309 70	26 59	51 69	56 72	68 76	64 79	22 48	22 79	22 48	22 79	22 79
BURGLARY CALLS	99 22	2 5	19 26	26 33	20 22	12 15	5 11	15 54	5 11	15 54	15 54
ROBBERY CALLS	157 36	4 9	35 47	33 42	26 29	34 42	10 22	15 54	10 22	15 54	15 54
FAMILY DISTURBANCE CALLS	73 17	0 0	20 27	12 15	16 18	10 12	4 9	11 39	4 9	11 39	11 39
APPROACH A SUSP. VEHICLE	76 17	8 18	18 24	15 19	12 13	9 11	4 9	10 36	4 9	10 36	10 36
OTHER	70 16	10 23	11 15	4 5	7 8	18 22	19 41	1 4	19 41	1 4	1 4
QUESTION BLANK	15 3	0 0	6 8	5 6	2 2	0 0	0 0	2 7	0 0	2 7	2 7
TOTALS	1350 306	101 230	237 320	250 319	273 305	251 310	131 286	107 384	131 286	107 384	107 384

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

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.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	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	1	7	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	1	7	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 A

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

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		TOWNSHIP	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
TOTAL WHICH NOW USE:																
HAND-HELD BALLISTIC SHIELD	46	10	6	14	4	5	2	3	7	8	15	19	12	26	0	0
PATROLCAR ARMOR	11	2	1	2	0	0	3	4	2	2	1	1	4	9	0	0
BALLISTIC HELMETS	52	12	10	23	4	5	6	8	9	10	12	15	8	17	3	11
SPECIAL ARMORED CARS	19	4	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	26	0	0
TOTAL: ANY OF THE ABOVE	104	24	16	36	8	11	8	10	18	20	23	28	28	61	3	11

Table 9 B

Q.9(B): (WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING TYPES OF BALLISTIC PROTECTIVE ITEMS, IF ANY, DOES YOUR DEPARTMENT NOW USE OR EXPECT TO USE?) TOTAL NUMBER OF DEPARTMENTS WHICH WILL USE EQUIPMENT:

RESPONSE	DEPARTMENT TYPE												TOWNSHIP			
	ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES		STATE		COUNTY		CITY (11-9 OFFICERS)		CITY (10-49 OFFICERS)		CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS)		FIFTY LARGEST CITIES			
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
TOTAL WHICH WILL USE:																
HAND-HELD BALLISTIC SHIELD	32	7	0	0	4	5	4	5	10	11	8	10	4	9	2	7
PATROLCAR ARMOR	5	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	3	4	0	0	0	0
BALLISTIC HELMETS	28	6	2	5	7	9	7	9	6	7	4	5	1	2	1	4
SPECIAL ARMORED CARS	7	2	2	5	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	2	2	4	0	0
TOTAL: ANY OF THE ABOVE	59	13	4	9	10	14	10	13	15	17	12	15	5	11	3	11

Table 9 C

9.9(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

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

Table 10-1

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

## RESPONSE

	ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES		STATE		COUNTY		DEPARTMENT TYPE				TOWNSHIP					
							CITY (1-9 OFFICERS)		CITY (10-49 OFFICERS)		CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS)		FIFTY LARGEST CITIES			
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%		
YES (SOME PROB MENTIONED)	162	37	14	32	23	31	23	29	34	38	37	46	22	48	9	32
NO, NONE, NO PROBLEMS	54	12	5	11	10	14	16	21	11	12	7	9	2	4	3	11
NO PROBLEM BUT COMMENT	21	5	3	7	4	5	2	3	1	1	6	7	4	9	1	4
BLANK	203	46	22	50	37	50	37	47	43	48	31	38	18	39	15	54
TOTALS	440	100	44	100	74	100	78	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	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								TOWNSHIP	
							NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%							NO.	%
HEAVY&BULKY: UNCOMFORTABLE	10	5	1	6	0	0	2	8	2	6	5	12	0	0	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	0	0				
HEAVY&BULKY: RESTRICTS MANEUVERABILITY	19	10	4	24	0	0	1	4	5	14	4	9	5	19	0	0	0	0				
HEAVY&BULKY: IMPRACTICAL FOR ROUTINE USE	22	12	2	12	0	0	2	8	0	0	9	21	6	23	3	30	0	0				
TOO EXPENSIVE TO PROVIDE FOR ALL OFFICERS	10	5	1	6	0	0	2	8	1	3	4	9	2	8	0	0	0	0				
INADEQUATE PROTECTION, FALSE SECURITY	19	10	4	24	4	15	0	0	2	6	3	7	6	23	0	0	0	0				
REDESIGN LIGHTER, MORE COMFORTABLE & FLEXIBLE	14	8	1	6	2	7	2	8	3	9	1	2	4	15	1	10	0	0				
CERAMIC BODY ARMOR COMMENTS	3	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0				
HAVE NONE, DONT USE, NEED NOT APPARENT	59	32	3	18	15	56	13	52	14	40	6	14	0	0	0	8	80	0				
OTHER	55	30	5	29	10	37	6	24	11	31	13	30	9	35	1	10	1	10				
TOTALS	220	119	23	137	32	119	28	112	40	115	47	109	37	143	13	130	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 &amp; 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	
	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	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. %
HANDGUNS	59616 77	6990 89	473 58	198 69	644 64	3454 68	47819 76	38 61		
SHOULDER WEAPONS	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	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		
SHOULDER WEAPONS	56.15	61.57	6.65	1.38	4.80	25.45	451.27	1.09		

Table 11 B-1

Q.11.8: (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

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.	%
<b>HANDGUNS</b>														
GAVE NO. OR STATED ZERO	281	64	10	23	47	64	52	79	75	84	53	65	18	39
NA	9	2	3	7	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	3	7
DO NOT KNOW	27	6	6	14	3	4	0	0	1	1	6	7	11	24
DONT CONFISCATE WEAPONS	11	2	6	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4
DATA NOT AVAILABLE	23	5	7	16	1	1	0	0	1	1	4	5	10	22
NO RECORDS	6	1	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2
BLANK	83	19	8	18	21	28	15	19	12	13	14	17	1	2
TOTALS	440	100	44	100	74	100	78	100	89	100	81	100	46	100
<b>SHOULDER WEAPONS</b>														
GAVE NO. OR STATED ZERO	262	60	11	25	39	53	58	74	69	78	53	65	17	37
NA	7	2	2	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	2	4
DO NOT KNOW	15	3	3	7	2	3	0	0	1	1	4	5	5	11
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	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BLANK	151	34	26	59	32	43	19	24	18	20	24	30	19	41
TOTALS	440	100	44	100	74	100	78	100	89	100	81	100	46	100
													15	54
													0	0
													0	0
													0	0
													0	0
													0	0
													13	46
													28	100



TABLE 111: FREQUENCY OF CODES USED IN QUESTION 11.C.

## RESPONSE

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.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.
GAVE NUMBER OR CHECKED STATED ZERO	317	72	24	55	52	70	47	60	71	80	71	88	40
NA	32	7	0	0	6	8	14	18	8	8	1	1	1
DO NOT KNOW	4	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
DONT CONFISCATE WEAPONS	4	1	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DATA NOT AVAILABLE	10	2	6	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	1
NO RECORDS	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
BLANK	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	70	16	7	16	14	19	17	22	9	10	5	6	4
TOTALS	440	100	44	100	74	100	78	100	89	100	81	100	46
													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 DISPOSED OF IN EACH OF THE FOLLOWING WAYS?)

## FREQUENCY OF DISPOSAL METHODS BY DEPARTMENT TYPE: 1971

## RESPONSE

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.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.
TURNED OVER TO OTHER AGENCY	101	32	16	67	8	15	11	23	16	22	29	41	18
MELTED IN A FURNACE	26	8	4	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	20
DUMPED IN DEEP WATER	32	10	1	4	2	4	2	4	8	11	10	14	8
CRUSHED	23	7	0	0	5	10	2	4	5	7	6	8	5
CUT WITH TORCHES/HACKSAWS	29	9	1	4	4	8	3	6	5	7	13	18	3
ARMS MUSEUM OR AUTHORIZED SAMPLE COLLECTION	49	15	3	12	4	8	5	11	18	25	9	13	8
ISSUED TO OFFICERS	75	24	3	12	11	21	9	19	18	25	18	25	15
RETURNED TO OWNER	157	50	2	8	35	67	21	45	40	56	37	52	20
RESOLD	21	7	2	8	2	4	3	6	2	3	5	7	7
OTHER	76	24	2	8	11	21	12	26	21	29	23	32	3
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 (50 OR MORE OFFICERS)		FIFTY LARGEST CITIES		TOWNSHIP	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	CITY (11-9 OFFICERS)	NO.	%	CITY (10-49 OFFICERS)	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
TURNED OVER TO OTHER AGENCY	4823	7	829	11	136	25	26	14	53	7	542	18	3229	6	8	26
MELTED IN A FURNACE	31749	48	6286	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	1	25438	47	0	0
DUMPED IN DEEP WATER	10156	15	0	0	2	0	1	0	74	10	213	7	9865	18	1	3
CRUSHED	3404	5	0	0	34	6	15	8	24	3	226	7	3105	6	0	0
CUT WITH TORCHES/HACKSAWS	1058	2	0	0	28	5	1	0	13	2	445	15	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
ISSUED TO OFFICERS	1061	2	46	1	16	3	26	14	46	6	81	3	835	1	11	35
RETURNED TO OWNER	8930	13	110	1	272	50	73	40	344	47	1053	35	7075	13	3	10
RESOLD	2227	3	0	0	0	0	13	7	1	0	60	2	2153	4	0	0
OTHER	1742	3	0	0	48	9	20	11	91	12	320	11	1255	2	8	26
TOTALS	66307	100	7483	100	544	100	184	100	732	100	2998	100	54335	100	31	100

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

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

RESPONSE	ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES	STATE		COUNTY		DEPARTMENT TYPE				CITY		CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS)		FIFTY LARGEST CITIES		TOWNSHIP	
		NO.	%	NO.	%	CITY (1-9 OFFICERS)	CITY (10-49 OFFICERS)	CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS)	FIFTY LARGEST CITIES	TOWNSHIP	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	4	0	0	0	0
	DO NOT KNOW	23	5	5	11	9	12	4	5	2	2	3	2	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	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.	%	
HANDGUNS SHOULDER WEAPONS	53761	77	7436	93	286	54	116	75	464	66	3138	68	42298	76	23	50
	16035	23	583	7	248	46	38	25	234	34	1487	32	13422	24	23	50
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	ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES	STATE	COUNTY	DEPARTMENT TYPE				FIFTY LARGEST CITIES	TOWNSHIP
				CITY (1-9 OFFICERS)	CITY (10-49 OFFICERS)	CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS)	AVERAGE NUMBER		
HANDGUNS	AVERAGE NUMBER	AVERAGE NUMBER	AVERAGE NUMBER	AVERAGE NUMBER	AVERAGE NUMBER	AVERAGE NUMBER	AVERAGE NUMBER	AVERAGE NUMBER	AVERAGE NUMBER
SHOULDER WEAPONS	172.86	676.00	5.84	1.78	6.11	54.10	1281.76	1.21	1.21
	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	ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES	STATE	COUNTY	DEPARTMENT TYPE				FIFTY LARGEST CITIES	TOWNSHIP
				CITY (1-9 OFFICERS)	CITY (10-49 OFFICERS)	CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS)	AVERAGE NUMBER		
HANDGUNS	NO. %	NO. %	NO. %	NO. %	NO. %	NO. %	NO. %	NO. %	NO. %
GAVE NO. OR STATED ZERO	237 54	6 14	37 50	50 64	65 73	48 59	17 37	14 50	
NA	12 3	2 5	3 4	1 1	1 1	2 2	3 7	0 0	
DO NOT KNOW	30 7	4 9	5 7	2 3	1 1	8 10	10 22	0 0	
DONT CONFISCATE WEAPONS	11 2	6 14	1 1	0 0	0 0	2 2	2 4	0 0	
DATA NOT AVAILABLE	25 6	7 16	1 1	0 0	2 2	5 6	10 22	0 0	
NO RECORDS	14 3	6 14	1 1	2 3	1 1	2 2	2 4	0 0	
BLANK	111 25	13 30	26 35	23 29	19 21	14 17	2 4	14 50	
TOTALS	440 100	44 100	74 100	78 100	89 100	81 100	46 100	28 100	
SHOULDER WEAPONS	NO. %	NO. %	NO. %	NO. %	NO. %	NO. %	NO. %	NO. %	NO. %
GAVE NO. OR STATED ZERO	230 52	6 14	34 46	49 63	62 70	49 60	15 33	15 54	
NA	6 1	2 5	0 0	1 1	1 1	0 0	2 4	0 0	
DO NOT KNOW	9 2	1 2	0 0	0 0	1 1	4 5	3 7	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	0 0	0 0	3 7	0 0	
NO RECORDS	0 0	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	13 46	
TOTALS	440 100	44 100	74 100	78 100	89 100	81 100	46 100	28 100	

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

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

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

Table 12 C-1

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				CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS)		FIFTY LARGEST CITIES		TOWNSHIP	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	CITY (1-9 OFFICERS)	NO.	%	CITY (10-49 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				CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS)		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	295	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	0	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.A1A): 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

	ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES		STATE		COUNTY		DEPARTMENT TYPE				CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS)		FIFTY LARGEST CITIES		TOWNSHIP	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	CITY (11-9 OFFICERS)	NO.	%	CITY (10-49 OFFICERS)	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
TURNED OVER TO OTHER AGENCY	3374	9	426	6	96	27	1	1		41	9		2496	9	3	15
MELTED IN A FURNACE	15444	40	6480	90	0	0	0	0		0	0		8949	31	0	0
DUMPED IN DEEP WATER	4702	12	0	0	5	1	0	0		45	10		4573	16	0	0
CRUSHED	3035	8	0	0	11	3	9	11		11	3		2950	10	0	0
CUT WITH TORCHES/HACKSAWS	726	2	0	0	20	6	5	6		15	3		561	2	0	0
ARMS MUSEUM OR AUTHORIZED SAMPLE COLLECTION	268	1	178	2	0	0	3	4		26	6		19	0	0	0
ISSUED TO OFFICERS	802	2	26	0	4	1	9	11		21	5		669	2	1	5
RETURNED TO OWNER	6909	18	126	2	202	56	37	44		206	47		5627	20	10	50
RESOLD	2628	7	0	0	8	2	5	6		0	0		2488	9	0	0
OTHER	875	2	0	0	13	4	15	18		72	16		518	2	6	30
TOTALS	38763	100	7236	100	359	100	64	100		437	100		28850	100	20	100

Table 13-1

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

RESPONSE

	ALL DEPARTMENT TYPES		STATE		COUNTY		DEPARTMENT TYPE				CITY (50 OR MORE OFFICERS)		FIFTY LARGEST CITIES		TOWNSHIP	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	CITY (11-9 OFFICERS)	NO.	%	CITY (10-49 OFFICERS)	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
NO PROBLEMS	212	48	13	30	37	50	43	55		47	53		23	50	12	43
DESCRIBE PROCEDURES &/OR ROUTINE PROBLEMS	33	7	1	2	1	1	4	5		7	8		6	13	1	4
DISPOSED OF BY COURT ORDER	7	2	1	2	1	1	0	0		2	2		0	0	0	0
HAVENT CONFISCATED &/OR DONT DISPOSE OF WEAPONS	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	3		0	0		0	0	0	0
NO LEGAL PROVISIONS FOR DISPOSAL OF WEAPONS	5	1	2	5	2	3	0	0		0	0		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
OTHER	7	2	3	7	1	1	0	0		2	2		1	2	0	0
BLANK	167	38	25	57	28	38	28	36		29	33		16	35	15	54
TOTALS	440	100	45	103	74	99	77	99		89	100		46	100	28	101

Table 14-1

## Q.14: OTHER COMMENTS:

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 PROBLEMS, NONE	20	5	1	2	3	4	8	10	4	4	4	5	9	0
DO NOT DISPOSE OF WEAPONS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
STATS ON GUNS CONFISCATED	11	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	3	4	5	0
&/OR DISPOSED ARENT KEPT	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	2	0
CONFISCATED WEAPONS ARE:	7	2	0	0	1	1	2	3	0	0	1	1	3	7
DISPLAYD REISSUED OR SOLD	33	7	6	14	3	4	1	1	3	3	10	12	8	17
CRITICISM OF GUN LAWS OR	9	2	3	7	0	0	2	3	0	0	2	2	0	0
LEG PROVIS FOR DISPOSAL	17	4	2	5	2	3	4	5	2	2	2	2	2	4
DISPOSAL METHODS &/OR	349	70	34	77	64	86	61	78	79	89	57	70	30	65
POLICIES MENTIONED	452	102	47	107	74	99	76	100	90	100	82	100	50	100
COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC														
QUESTIONS IN SURVEY														
OTHER														
BLANK														
TOTALS														



U.S. DEPT. OF COMM. BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET		1. PUBLICATION OR REPORT NO.  NBSIR 73-215	2. Gov't Accession No.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE  LEAA POLICE EQUIPMENT SURVEY OF 1972 Volume VI: Body Armor and Confiscated Weapons			5. Publication Date	
			6. Performing Organization Code	
7. AUTHOR(S) G. Hare, E. Buntin, P. Klaus			8. Performing Organ. Report No.	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS  NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE WASHINGTON, D.C. 20234			10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.  4314517	
			11. Contract/Grant No.  LEAA-J-IAA-009-2	
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Complete Address (Street, City, State, ZIP)  National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Department of Justice, Washington, D. C. 20530			13. Type of Report & Period Covered  Final: 8/71-10/73	
			14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
16. ABSTRACT (A 200-word or less factual summary of most significant information. If document includes a significant bibliography or literature survey, mention it here.)  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 seven 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 capabilities of body armor; Disposition of confiscated weapons. The data are presented by all responding departments and by seven department types.				
17. KEY WORDS (six to twelve entries; alphabetical order; capitalize only the first letter of the first key word unless a proper name; separated by semicolons)  Ballistic protective equipment; Body Armor; Confiscated weapons; Police; Standards.				
18. AVAILABILITY  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unlimited  <input type="checkbox"/> For Official Distribution. Do Not Release to NTIS  <input type="checkbox"/> Order From Sup. of Doc., U.S. Government Printing Office Washington, D.C. 20402, SD Cat. No. C13  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Order From National Technical Information Service (NTIS) Springfield, Virginia 22151		19. SECURITY CLASS (THIS REPORT)  UNCLASSIFIED  20. SECURITY CLASS (THIS PAGE)  UNCLASSIFIED		21. NO. OF PAGES  100 102  22. Price

















