


OJJDP

# Summary Report

## Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System 1978



U.S. Department of Justice  
BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS

SD-EE No. 15  
NCJ-66483

U.S. Department of Commerce  
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

State and Local Government  
Special Studies  
No. 94

## Bureau of Justice Statistics Reports

Single copies are available at no charge from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service, Box 6000, Rockville, Md. 20850. Multiple copies are for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

### National Crime Survey:

#### Criminal Victimization in the United States (annual):

Summary Findings of 1977-78 Changes in Crime and of Trends Since 1973, NCJ-61368

A Description of Trends from 1973 to 1977, NCJ-59898

1978 (final report), NCJ-66480

1977, NCJ-58725

1976, NCJ-49543

1975, NCJ-44593

1974, NCJ-39467

1973, NCJ-34732

#### The Cost of Negligence: Losses from Preventable Household Burglaries, NCJ-53527

#### Intimate Victims: A Study of Violence Among Friends and Relatives, NCJ-62319

#### Crime and Seasonality, NCJ-64818

#### Criminal Victimization of New York State Residents, 1974-77, NCJ-66481

#### Criminal Victimization Surveys in 13 American cities (summary report, 1 vol.), NCJ-18471

Boston, NCJ-34818

Buffalo, NCJ-34820

Cincinnati, NCJ-34819

Houston, NCJ-34821

Miami, NCJ-34822

Milwaukee, NCJ-34823

Minneapolis, NCJ-34824

New Orleans, NCJ-34825

Oakland, NCJ-34826

Pittsburgh, NCJ-34827

San Diego, NCJ-34828

San Francisco, NCJ-34829

Washington, D.C., NCJ-34830

#### Public Attitudes About Crime (13 vols.):

Boston, NCJ-46235

Buffalo, NCJ-46236

Cincinnati, NCJ-46237

Houston, NCJ-46238

Miami, NCJ-46239

Milwaukee, NCJ-46240

Minneapolis, NCJ-46241

New Orleans, NCJ-46242

Oakland, NCJ-46243

Pittsburgh, NCJ-46244

San Diego, NCJ-46245

San Francisco, NCJ-46246

Washington, D.C., NCJ-46247

#### Criminal Victimization Surveys in Chicago,

#### Detroit, Los Angeles, New York, and

#### Philadelphia: A Comparison of 1972 and

#### 1974 Findings, NCJ-36360

#### Criminal Victimization Surveys in the

#### Nation's Five Largest Cities: National

#### Crime Panel Surveys in Chicago, Detroit,

#### Los Angeles, New York, and Philadelphia,

1972, NCJ-16909

#### Criminal Victimization Surveys in Eight American Cities: A Comparison of 1971/72

#### and 1974/75 Findings—National Crime

#### Surveys in Atlanta, Baltimore, Cleveland,

#### Dallas, Denver, Newark, Portland, and St.

Louis, NCJ-36361

#### Crimes and Victims: A Report on the Dayton/San Jose Pilot Survey of Victimization,

NCJ-013314

#### Indicators of Crime and Criminal Justice: Quantitative Studies, NCJ-62349

### Applications of the National Crime Survey Victimization and Attitude Data:

#### Public Opinion About Crime: The Attitudes of Victims and Nonvictims in Selected Cities, NCJ-41336

#### Local Victim Surveys: A Review of the Issues, NCJ-39973

### The Police and Public Opinion: An Analysis of Victimization and Attitude Data from

#### 13 American Cities, NCJ-42018

#### An Introduction to the National Crime Survey, NCJ-43732

#### Compensating Victims of Violent Crime: Potential Costs and Coverage of a National Program, NCJ-43387

#### Crime Against Persons in Urban, Suburban, and Rural Areas: A Comparative Analysis of Victimization Rates, NCJ-53551

#### Rape Victimization in 26 American Cities, NCJ-55878

#### Criminal Victimization in Urban Schools, NCJ-56396

### National Prisoner Statistics:

#### Capital Punishment (annual):

1978, NCJ-59897

1979 advance report, NCJ-

#### Prisoners in State and Federal Institutions on December 31:

1978, NCJ-64671

1979 advance report, NCJ-66522

#### Census of State Correctional Facilities, 1974 advance report, NCJ-25642

#### Profile of State Prison Inmates: Socio-demographic Findings from the 1974 Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities, NCJ-58257

#### Census of Prisoners in State Correctional Facilities, 1973, NCJ-34729

#### Census of Jails and Survey of Jail Inmates, 1978, preliminary report, NCJ-55172

#### Profile of Inmates of Local Jails: Socio-demographic Findings from the 1978 Survey of Inmates of Local Jails, NCJ-65412

#### The Nation's Jails: A report on the census of jails from the 1972 Survey of Inmates of Local Jails, NCJ-19067

#### Survey of Inmates of Local Jails, 1972, advance report, NCJ-13313

### Uniform Parole Reports:

#### Parole in the United States (annual):

1978, NCJ-58722

1976 and 1977, NCJ-49702

#### Characteristics of the Parole Population, 1978, NCJ-66479

#### A National Survey of Parole-Related Legislation Enacted During the 1979 Legislative Session, NCJ-64218

### Children in Custody: Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facility Census

#### 1977 advance report

#### Census of Public Juvenile Facilities, NCJ-60967

#### Census of Private Juvenile Facilities, NCJ-60968

1975 (final report), NCJ-58139

1974, NCJ-57946

1973, NCJ-44777

1971, NCJ-13403

### Myths and Realities About Crime: A Nontechnical Presentation of Selected Information from the National Prisoner Statistics Program and the National Crime Survey, NCJ-46249

### State and Local Probation and Parole Systems, NCJ-41335

### State and Local Prosecution and Civil Attorney Systems, NCJ-41334

### National Survey of Court Organization:

#### 1977 Supplement to State Judicial Systems, NCJ-40022

#### 1975 Supplement to State Judicial Systems, NCJ-29433

1971 (full report), NCJ-11427

### State Court Model Statistical Dictionary, NCJ-62320

### State Court Caseload Statistics:

#### The State of the Art, NCJ-46934

Annual Report, 1975, NCJ-51885

Annual Report, 1976, NCJ-56599

### A Cross-City Comparison of Felony Case Processing, NCJ-55171

### Trends in Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System, 1971-77

(annual), NCJ-57463

### Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System (annual)

1978 Summary Report, NCJ-66483

1978 final report, NCJ-66482

1977 final report, NCJ-53206

### Dictionary of Criminal Justice Data Terminology:

Terms and Definitions Proposed for Interstate and National Data Collection and Exchange, NCJ-36747

### Criminal Justice Agencies in the U.S.:

Summary Report of the National Criminal Justice Agency List, NCJ-65560

### Criminal Justice Agencies in Region

1: Conn., Maine, Mass., N.H., R.I., Vt., NCJ-17930

2: N.J., N.Y., NCJ-17931

3: Del., D.C., Md., Pa., Va., W.Va., NCJ-17932

4: Ala., Ga., Ky., Miss., N.C., S.C., Tenn., NCJ-17933

5: Ill., Ind., Mich., Minn., Ohio, Wis., NCJ-17934

6: Ark., La., N.Mex., Okla., Tex., NCJ-17935

7: Iowa, Kans., Mo., Nebr., NCJ-17936

8: Colo., Mont., N.Dak., S.Dak., Utah, Wyo., NCJ-17937

9: Ariz., Calif., Hawaii, Nev., NCJ-15151

10: Alaska, Idaho, Oreg., Wash., NCJ-17938

### Utilization of Criminal Justice Statistics Project:

#### Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics

1979 (annual), NCJ-59679

#### Public Opinion Regarding Crime, Criminal Justice and Related Topics, NCJ-17419

#### New Directions in Processing of Juvenile Offenders: The Denver Model, NCJ-17420

#### Who Gets Detained? An Empirical Analysis of the Pre-Adjudicatory Detention of Juveniles in Denver, NCJ-17417

#### Juvenile Dispositions: Social and Legal Factors Related to the Processing of Denver Delinquency Cases, NCJ-17418

#### Offender-Based Transaction Statistics: New Directions in Data Collection and Reporting, NCJ-29645

#### Sentencing of California Felony Offenders, NCJ-29646

#### The Judicial Processing of Assault and Burglary Offenders in Selected California Counties, NCJ-29644

#### Pre-Adjudicatory Detention in Three Juvenile Courts, NCJ-34730

#### Delinquency Dispositions: An Empirical Analysis of Processing Decisions in Three Juvenile Courts, NCJ-34734

#### The Patterns and Distribution of Assault Incident Characteristics Among Social Areas, NCJ-40025

#### Patterns of Robbery Characteristics and Their Occurrence Among Social Areas, NCJ-40026

#### Crime-Specific Analysis:

#### The Characteristics of Burglary Incidents, NCJ-42093

#### An Empirical Examination of Burglary Offender Characteristics, NCJ-43131

#### An Empirical Examination of Burglary Offenders and Offense Characteristics, NCJ-42476

#### Sources of National Criminal Justice Statistics: An Annotated Bibliography, NCJ-45006

#### Federal Criminal Sentencing: Perspectives of Analysis and a Design for Research, NCJ-33683

#### Variations in Federal Criminal Sentences:

#### A Statistical Assessment at the National Level, NCJ-33684

#### Federal Sentencing Patterns: A Study of Geographical Variations, NCJ-33685

#### Predicting Sentences in Federal Courts: The Feasibility of a National Sentencing Policy, NCJ-33686

---

# **Summary Report**

## **Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System 1978**

---

**Issued September 1980**

---

**U.S. Department of Justice**  
Benjamin Civiletti,  
Attorney General

**BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS**  
Benjamin H. Renshaw, III,  
Acting Director  
SD-EE No. 15  
NCJ-66483

**U.S. Department of Commerce**  
Philip M. Klutznick, Secretary  
Courtenay M. Slater, Chief Economist

**BUREAU OF THE CENSUS**  
Vincent P. Barabba, Director  
  
**State and Local Government  
Special Studies No. 94**

**BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS**

**Benjamin H. Renshaw, III**  
Acting Director

**BUREAU OF THE CENSUS**

**Vincent P. Barabba**  
Director

**Daniel B. Levine**  
Deputy Director

**Shirley Kallek**  
Associate Director for  
Economic Fields

**Sherman Landau, Chief**  
**GOVERNMENTS DIVISION**

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The Bureau of the Census is indebted to the many Federal, State, and local government officials who provided the information and gave other assistance for the preparation of this report.

In the Bureau of Justice Statistics, general supervision was provided by Charles R. Kindermann, with project direction by Sue A. Lindgren and editorial supervision by Marilyn Marbrook, all of the Statistics Division. In the Bureau of the Census, Governments Division, general supervision was provided by Alan R. Jones and Diana M. Cull. Significant contributions were made by Bernice J. Brigham, Pamela H. Butler, Victoria E. Campbell, Ora E. Dorsey, Pauline E. Fain, Dennis E. Gosier, Martha S. Haselbush, Janie M. Hutchison, Purnell E. Johnson, Helen M. Kneeland, Mario F. Plascenia, Charlene M. Rhodes, Gloria A. Spicer, Joyce M. Stanford, and Joan B. Taylor. Preparation of publication copy was supervised by Corrine W. Davis. In the Field Division, general coordination was provided by W. Wilson Burdorff, and in the Data Preparation Division, by Janet Kitterman.

---

**SUGGESTED CITATION**

U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics and U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Summary Report—Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System: 1978*. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1980.

---

**IMPORTANT**

We have provided a User Evaluation Questionnaire at the end of this publication. It will assist us in improving future reports if you will complete and return it at your earliest convenience.

## CONTENTS

	Page
Selected Findings .....	v
Introduction.....	1
<b>Table</b>	
1. Distribution of expenditure for the criminal justice system, by level of government, fiscal year 1978.....	11
2. Distribution of employment and payrolls for the criminal justice system, by level of government, October 1978.....	12
3. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) by State and type of government, fiscal year 1978 .....	14
4. Criminal justice system employment and percent distribution of full-time equivalent employees by State and type of government, October 1978 .....	22
5. Percent distribution of criminal justice system payroll, by State and type of government, October 1978 .....	30
6. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) of 343 county governments, fiscal year 1978.....	38
7. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) of 406 large city governments, fiscal year 1978 .....	48
8. Total expenditure, and expenditure from general purpose revenue sources and own revenue sources, for criminal justice activities, by State and type of government, fiscal year 1978 .....	60
9. Total expenditure, and expenditure from general purpose revenue sources and own revenue sources, for criminal justice activities of 343 large county governments, fiscal year 1978.....	63
10. Total expenditure, and expenditure from general purpose revenue sources and own revenue sources, for criminal justice activities of 406 large city governments, fiscal year 1978.....	68
<b>Appendix 1: Definition of Terms.....</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Survey Forms .....</b>	<b>79</b>

## SELECTED FINDINGS

### General

Federal, State, and local governments expended \$24.1 billion in fiscal year 1978 for civil and criminal justice activities. Over half of this amount (\$13.1 billion) was spent for police protection and about one-fourth (\$5.5 billion) for corrections. The remainder was distributed for judicial activities (\$3.1 billion), legal services and prosecution (\$1.5 billion), public defense (\$0.5 billion), and other criminal justice activities (\$0.4 billion). Civil and criminal justice employment (1,157,436 employees on a full-time equivalent basis in 1978) was functionally distributed in nearly identical proportions.

Local governments spent more than Federal and State governments combined for justice activities, accounting for 59 percent of all direct expenditure and almost two-thirds of total full-time equivalent employment. However, the distribution of the six justice activities at each level of government varied substantially. Thus, municipalities accounted for nearly three-fifths of all police protection expenditure; State governments, about 60 percent of the total amount for corrections; and county governments, over 40 percent of the total amount in the judicial, legal services and prosecution, and "other criminal justice" sectors. The Federal Government spent the most for public defense; however, if Federal payments to the Legal Services Corporation for counseling of indigent persons in civil matters are excluded, county governments spent the most for public defense.

### Federal Government

Slightly more than one-half (\$2.0 billion) of the \$3.8 billion in total Federal justice expenditure and 71 percent (73,993) of the 103,678 Federal justice employees were in the police protection sector.

Reflecting Federal grant outlays, "other criminal justice" accounted for 20 percent of total Federal expenditure but only 2 percent of Federal justice employees.

### State Governments

State expenditure for corrections activities in 1978 totaled \$3.3 billion, or 44 percent of a total State justice expenditure of \$7.5 billion. Police protection activities accounted for \$2.0 billion, or 27 percent of States' justice spending.

### Local Governments: Counties and Municipalities

Municipal governments, spending \$7.5 billion or 85 percent of their justice expenditure on police protection, outspent county governments by better than 4 to 1 in this sector. However, county governments spent substantially more than municipalities in the other five justice sectors. For example, county expenditure of \$1.4 billion and \$1.6 billion for judicial activities and corrections, respectively, contrasts sharply with municipal outlays of \$433 million and \$491 million.

With the exception of public defense, average monthly pay for county employees was lowest in all justice sectors compared to Federal, State and municipal monthly pay rates. Despite the emphasis on police protection by municipalities, the average monthly pay of \$1,338 for municipal police was below the overall police average of \$1,367 for all governments.

The 343 counties with a population of 100,000 or more, accounting for 58 percent of total United States population in 1977, spent 77 percent (\$4.4 billion) of all county justice expenditure. The 406 municipal governments with a population of 50,000 or more, comprising 48 percent of total United States municipal population, spent 68 percent (\$6.1 billion) of all municipal justice expenditure.

### Expenditure Components

State governments spent 11.3 percent of their total justice expenditures as intergovernmental payments to local governments, in contrast to local governments, which spent negligible amounts on intergovernmental payments for justice activities.

Capital outlay of State and local governments in 1978 amounted to \$1.3 billion, or 6.2 percent of total State-local justice expenditure. These outlays, which include expenditures on construction, equipment and land, can vary sharply from year-to-year for individual governments and ranged between 1.5 percent of total justice expenditure for the State government in Ohio to 45.3 percent for the State of Wyoming.

As indicated from data on expenditure from dedicated revenue sources in table K, four percent of total justice expenditure of State and local governments was funded from Federal grant programs such as that of LEAA. Eight percent of State-local justice expenditure was funded from general purpose revenue sources such as Federal revenue sharing, antirecession

**SELECTED FINDINGS**

aid, and CETA funds. However, the percent ranged from 1.2 in Nebraska to 18 in Hawaii. These percentages are derived by subtracting the percent of expenditure from own revenue sources from the percent of expenditure from general purpose revenue sources in table K.

Federal and State intergovernmental revenue earmarked for justice purposes constituted 5.3 percent of large cities' justice spending in 1978. In contrast, large counties received 11.6 percent of their funds for justice purposes from dedicated revenue sources.

# INTRODUCTION

This publication reports data from the twelfth in a series of annual surveys of public expenditure and employment for criminal and civil justice activities in the United States. Included are seven of the main tables from the full annual report, presenting expenditure, employment and payroll data for designated "sectors" of justice activity of the Federal, State, and local governments; namely, police protection, judicial, legal services and prosecution, public defense, corrections, and "other criminal justice." Expenditure data are for the fiscal year 1978 and employment and payroll data are for the month of October 1978. Data totals are displayed for individual State governments; for the aggregate local level of government within each State by type (counties, municipalities); for 343 individual county governments with a population of 100,000 or more; and for 406 individual municipal governments (cities and townships) with a population of 50,000 or more.

In addition, the report includes three special tables presenting data on justice expenditure from "general purpose revenue sources" and from "own revenue sources" for individual State governments, the aggregate local level of government within each State, and for large individual county and municipal governments.

This is the first year that four reports will be issued from the survey—this summary report, an already published preliminary report, and subsequent Annual and Trends reports. The preliminary report, issued in January of this year, provides early release of initial expenditure and employment estimates for each of the six justice functions for Federal, State, and local governments.

The annual volume to be released in the fall of 1980, entitled *Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System*, presents expenditure and employment data in much greater detail by individual justice function for the 50 States, local governments within each State, the largest standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSA's with a population of 2 million or more), and the large individual county and municipal governments mentioned above. Lastly, a report entitled *Trends in Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System* summarizes and compares data from previous annual volumes. The next trends report, covering fiscal years 1971 through 1978, will be released in late 1980.

## Organization of this report

This introductory text briefly discusses the expenditure, employment and payroll data presented in the tables and

explains important financial and functional concepts. Also included is a description of the survey methodology covering the sources and limitations of the data.

The text is followed by 10 tables presenting summary data from the survey in the following order:

Tables 1 and 2 present summary data on expenditure, employment, and payroll, by justice function, for the three levels of government—Federal, State, local; tables 3, 4, and 5 provide total expenditure, employment, and payroll data, by justice function, for each of the 50 State governments, and the aggregate local level of government within each State by type (counties, municipalities); tables 6 and 7 provide total expenditure data by function for each of the 343 large county governments with a 1976 population of 100,000 or more and the 406 municipalities with a 1976 population of 50,000 or more; and tables 8, 9, and 10 report direct expenditure and capital outlay in addition to expenditure from general purpose revenue sources and expenditures from own revenue sources for State and local governments, large counties and municipalities.

Definitions for concepts, categories, and terms applied in the annual survey and used in this report are contained in Appendix 1. Several concepts that recur frequently throughout the text and tables, however, are worth noting here. Total expenditure is comprised of direct and intergovernmental expenditure of a government or level of government for justice activities. In tables 1 and 3 in this report, certain totals have been adjusted to exclude duplicative intergovernmental expenditure amounts. For example, money paid by a State government to a county government within that State is reported by the State government as an intergovernmental expenditure and by the county government as a direct expenditure when the money is spent. Therefore, in order to arrive at a combined State-local government total that does not duplicate these amounts, intergovernmental expenditure amounts are deducted from the State-local total, since those amounts are also reflected in the direct expenditures of the recipient governments. The same is true of intergovernmental payments between counties and municipalities within the same State and for payments between Federal, State, and local governments in table 1. Full-time equivalent employment is a statistical measure that represents the total number of employees (full-time and part-time), discounted by applying average full-time earning rates. It is calculated by dividing the total payroll (full-time plus part-time) by the full-time payroll and multiplying the resultant quotient by the number of full-time employees.

## INTRODUCTION

Two other expenditure categories presented in this report are expenditure from own revenue sources and expenditure from general purpose revenue sources. Used in calculating grant allocations under the provision of the Omnibus Crime Control & Safe Streets Act of 1968, expenditure from own revenue sources excludes all amounts expended from revenue received from other governments—including revenue received from the Federal Government for general support (i.e., General Revenue Sharing, Antirecession Fiscal Assistance, CETA grants, and general support payments from State and local governments). Expenditure from general purpose revenue sources, on the other hand, excludes only amounts expended from inter-governmental revenue specifically earmarked for criminal justice activities; e.g., LEAA grants. Under this concept, which will be used in calculating grants under the Omnibus Crime Control & Safe Streets Act as amended by the Justice System Improvement Act of 1979, expenditures from general support payments from the Federal Government are not deducted. These two expenditures are explained more fully later in the text and Appendix 1.

It is also important to note that in this report the judicial, legal services and prosecution, and public defense categories include expenditure and employment data for both criminal and civil justice activities because available source documents for many governments do not segregate these activities for courts or agencies that handle both. Nor are the State and local governmental officials who provide the survey data able to make this break reliably and consistently. Therefore, in the absence of a consistent and reliable basis for proration, both criminal and civil justice activities are included for these categories to preserve uniformity in the collection and presentation of data.

Appendix 2 exhibits the main questionnaire (Form CJ-6) used in the 1978 survey.

#### General, fiscal year 1978

Total expenditure for justice purposes in FY 1978 by all levels of government was \$24.1 billion, with over half, \$13.1 billion, going for police protection, and close to one-fourth, \$5.5 billion, for corrections. The balance was distributed as follows: \$3.1 billion or 12.7 percent for judicial activities, \$1.5 billion or 6.0 percent for legal services and prosecution, \$0.5 billion or 2.2 percent for public defense<sup>1</sup>, and \$0.4 billion or 1.8 percent for other criminal justice activities.

<sup>1</sup>Over one-third of this amount (\$185.4 million) consisted of payments by the Federal Government to the Legal Services Corporation for counseling indigent persons in civil matters.

Table A. Percent distribution of total direct expenditure for civil and criminal activities by level of government, fiscal year 1978

Level of government	Total	Police protection	Judicial	Legal services and prosecution	Public defense	Corrections	Other criminal justice
Total . . . . .	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Federal . . . . .	12.9	14.9	10.5	14.8	39.9	6.1	19.9
State . . . . .	27.7	14.4	33.0	26.4	18.7	57.5	28.0
Local, total . . . . .	59.4	70.7	56.5	58.8	41.4	36.4	52.1
Counties . . . . .	23.3	13.9	45.2	35.3	34.3	27.8	39.0
Municipalities . . . . .	36.1	56.8	11.3	23.5	7.1	8.6	13.1

As seen in table 2, there were 1,157,436 employees on a full-time equivalent basis in the justice system at all levels of government. Reflecting a functional distribution nearly identical to expenditure, 57 percent (656 thousand) of the full-time equivalent employment was in police protection, 23 percent (265 thousand) in corrections, 13 percent (149 thousand) in judicial activities, 6 percent (69 thousand) in legal services and prosecution, less than 1 percent (8 thousand) in public defense, and 1 percent (9 thousand) in other criminal justice activities.

Local governments spent more than the Federal and State governments combined for all justice activities. As seen in table A, local governments accounted for 59 percent of all direct expenditure; State governments contributed 28 percent, and the Federal Government 13 percent.

Table A also shows that five of the activities - police protection, judicial, legal services and prosecution, public defense, and "other criminal justice"- were supported mainly by local governments. State governments expended the largest amount for corrections. Municipalities accounted for nearly three-fifths of police protection expenditure by all levels of government. County governments, reflecting a more even distribution of expenditure than municipalities, outspent the other governments in the functional areas of judicial activities, legal services and prosecution, and "other criminal justice." The Federal Government expended the largest amount for public defense; however, if Federal assistance for counseling indigents on civil matters is excluded, then county governments' expenditure of \$180 million for public defense is the highest.

Relationships similar to those found for expenditure among the various levels of government also apply to employment in that almost two-thirds of the total full-time equivalent justice employment of all governments was at the local level. As seen in table B, the proportion of people employed by the three levels of government in each sector generally approximated the proportion of expenditures made in the sector. Exceptions to this pattern are seen in the public defense and "other criminal justice" sectors. The Federal Government accounted for 40 percent of the total expenditure for public defense but only 3 percent of the employees. This is because the Federal Government makes more extensive use of court-appointed counsel systems, whereby fees are paid to private counsel to defend indigent clients accused of crimes, than do State and

Table B. Percent distribution of full-time equivalent employment for civil and criminal justice activities by level of government, October 1978

Level of government	Total	Police protection	Judicial	Legal services and prosecution	Public defense	Corrections	Other criminal justice
Total . . . . .	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Federal . . . . .	9.0	11.3	5.5	10.9	3.2	4.5	18.3
State . . . . .	26.8	14.1	27.9	26.3	38.0	57.1	40.8
Local, total . . . . .	64.2	74.6	66.6	62.8	58.8	38.4	40.9
Counties . . . . .	25.6	15.2	52.8	42.2	54.7	30.5	28.4
Municipalities . . . . .	38.6	59.4	13.8	20.6	4.0	7.9	12.5

local governments, which more frequently have their own attorneys to provide public defense services. As previously noted, 89 percent of Federal public defense expenditure was in the form of payments to the Legal Services Corporation for counseling indigent persons in purely civil matters; because the Corporation is not an agency of the Federal Government, their employees are not included in the count of Federal employment. Other Federal public defense programs service clients in criminal matters. Local governments accounted for 52 percent of "other criminal justice" expenditure but only 41 percent of the employment, while State governments contributed 28 percent of the expenditure and 41 percent of the employment in this category. This is due in part to the effect of large capital expenditures in this category at the local government level for construction of multipurpose criminal justice buildings. Moreover, this residual category has smaller expenditure and employment totals and small changes have a greater proportionate impact.

## DISTRIBUTION OF EXPENDITURE AND EMPLOYMENT BY TYPE OF GOVERNMENT

### Federal Government

The largest share of Federal justice money was expended for police protection activities, including those agencies that

enforce Federal law and those that provide security and police services to Federal property and buildings. Of the \$3.8 billion in total Federal justice expenditure, slightly more than one-half (\$2.0 billion) was for activities in the police protection sector. Federal agencies accounting for most of Federal police protection activities are the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Bureau of Customs, the Drug Enforcement Administration, and the Postal Inspection Service. About one-fifth of all Federal justice expenditure (\$749 million) was reported for activities classified in the "other criminal justice" sector; most of this amount (\$662 million) consisted of grants to State and local governments. The other four sectors accounted for the remaining 29 percent of Federal justice expenditure.

Federal justice employees on a full-time equivalent basis numbered nearly 104,000 in October 1978, including 73,993 (71 percent) in the police protection sector; 11,918 (12 percent) in the corrections sector, 8,289 (8 percent) in the judicial sector; and 7,558 (7 percent) in the legal services and prosecution sector. Public defense and "other criminal justice" together accounted for only 1,920 Federal employees (2 percent), although these two sectors accounted for 25 percent of total Federal justice expenditure.

Federal justice employees drew an October 1978 payroll of \$184 million. Each sector's percentage of the total payroll

Table C. Percent distribution of total expenditure for the civil and criminal justice system by activity and type of government, fiscal year 1978

Type of government	Total	Police protection	Judicial	Legal services and prosecution	Public defense	Corrections	Other criminal justice
All governments . . . . .	100.0	54.4	12.7	6.0	2.2	22.9	1.8
Federal . . . . .	100.0	51.1	8.4	5.7	5.5	9.8	19.5
State . . . . .	100.0	26.7	15.2	5.3	1.5	44.3	7.0
Local . . . . .	100.0	64.2	12.6	6.0	1.5	14.0	1.7
Counties . . . . .	100.0	32.1	24.9	9.1	3.2	27.7	3.0
Municipalities . . . . .	100.0	84.6	4.9	3.8	0.4	5.5	0.8

Table D. Percent distribution of full-time equivalent employment for the civil and criminal justice system by activity and type of government, October 1978

Type of government	Total	Police protection	Judicial	Legal services and prosecution	Public defense	Corrections	Other criminal justice
All governments . . . . .	100.0	56.7	12.9	6.0	0.7	22.9	0.8
Federal . . . . .	100.0	71.4	8.0	7.3	0.2	11.5	1.6
State . . . . .	100.0	29.8	13.4	5.9	1.0	48.7	1.2
Local . . . . .	100.0	65.9	13.4	5.8	0.7	13.7	0.5
Counties . . . . .	100.0	33.7	26.6	9.9	1.5	27.4	0.9
Municipalities . . . . .	100.0	87.2	4.6	3.2	0.1	4.7	0.2

## INTRODUCTION

Table E. Average monthly salaries for all employees on a full-time equivalent basis in the civil and criminal justice system, by activity and type of government, October 1978

Type of government	Total	Police protection	Judicial	Legal services and prosecution	Public defense	Corrections	Other criminal justice
All governments.....	\$1,319	\$1,367	\$1,253	\$1,463	\$1,516	\$1,196	\$1,292
Federal.....	1,777	1,732	2,108	1,977	1,981	1,692	1,764
States.....	1,310	1,323	1,634	1,501	1,495	1,187	1,300
Counties.....	1,159	1,249	1,013	1,325	1,502	1,114	1,067
Municipalities.....	1,326	1,338	1,051	1,423	1,527	1,303	1,083

was generally proportionate to the percentage of full-time equivalent employment; however, there are slight disparities in some sectors because of a concentration of higher paid employees. As shown in table E, the Federal Government has the highest average monthly salaries in every justice sector. An average monthly salary of \$2,108 for judicial employees is followed by average salaries of \$1,981 and \$1,977 in the public defense and legal services/prosecution sectors, respectively.

#### State governments

Conforming to an established pattern, the corrections sector accounted for the largest portion (\$3.3 billion or 44 percent) of the total State justice expenditure of \$7.5 billion in fiscal year 1978. State governments' correction expenditure included the operation of State prisons systems and, in many States, the operation of the probation and parole systems as well. The remainder of State justice expenditure was distributed as follows: Police protection, \$2.0 billion or 27 percent; judicial, \$1.2 billion or 15 percent; legal services and prosecution, \$400 million or 5 percent; public defense, \$109 million, or 2 percent; and "other criminal justice," \$527 million, or 7 percent.

Full-time equivalent employment of State justice agencies in October 1978 totaled 310,554 employees who received \$407 million in salaries, wages, or other compensation during October. The distribution of State full-time equivalent employment and payrolls was roughly proportionate in four of the six sectors: police protection, legal services and prosecution, public defense and "other criminal justice." In the judicial sector, the payrolls accounted for 17 percent of the total State justice payroll but judicial employment was only 13 percent of the full-time equivalent employment, reflecting the higher average monthly salaries in this sector. In corrections, the situation was reversed, with 49 percent of the State justice employees receiving only 44 percent of the total payroll. Comparing the distribution of employment and total expenditure reveals that in the judicial and corrections sectors, the proportionate share of employment exceeds expenditure by 2 and 5 percentage points, respectively.

#### Local governments: Counties and municipalities

Close to two-thirds of total expenditure by local governments for justice activities occurred in the police protection sector (\$9.3 billion or 64 percent). The judicial and corrections sectors

accounted for 13 and 14 percent, respectively, while the remaining three sectors showed comparatively small outlays.

Local full-time equivalent employment was also distributed among the six sectors roughly in the same proportions as total expenditure. Two slight exceptions to this generalization are the public defense sector, where some payments are made to private court-appointed counsel who are not direct employees of the government; and the "other criminal justice" sector, where expenditures are frequently grants to private agencies associated with criminal justice activities or are used for construction of multipurpose criminal justice facilities. In both instances, large expenditures may be made without the governments involved directly employing the personnel.

Analyzing local justice expenditure in total, however, tends to obscure important differences between the county level of government and the municipal level. Municipal governments (cities, towns, and townships) outspent county governments on justice by about \$3.2 billion overall, but the difference can be attributed exclusively to the police sector, where the municipal governments outspent the county governments by more than 4 to 1. Municipal governments spent \$7.5 billion (or 85 percent of all their justice expenditure) on police protection, more than county governments spent on all six sectors altogether. However, county governments spent substantially more than municipal governments in the other five sectors. No one sector dominates county justice expenditure as police protection does municipal expenditure (See table 6).

County governments reflected more balance in justice activities than municipalities. Over one-third of the total county justice expenditure of \$5.7 billion was for judicial activities (24.9 percent), legal services and prosecution (9.1 percent), and public defense (3.2 percent). Counties had a substantially higher proportion of expenditure in these three sectors combined than did any other type of government. Police protection constituted another third (32 percent or \$1.8 billion) of county justice efforts—the largest single expenditure item among the six justice sectors. Corrections expenditure comprised 28 percent of county justice spending.

There were 295,970 county justice employees on a full-time equivalent basis in October 1978, drawing a monthly payroll of \$343 million. County payrolls and employment by justice

sector were distributed in nearly equal proportions. Concentrations of higher paid county employees were evident in police protection and legal services and prosecution where the percentage of total payroll exceeded the percentage of total employees. However, average monthly pay for county employees was the lowest in all sectors except public defense when compared to Federal, State, and municipal monthly pay averages.

Municipal justice employees on a full-time equivalent basis numbered 447,234 in October 1978 and received a monthly payroll of \$593 million. Municipal employment and payroll, comprising 39 and 37 percent, respectively, of total justice employees and payroll, are the highest by far of any type of government. Nearly 390,000 full-time equivalent employees, constituting 87 percent of all justice employment on the municipal level, are in the police protection sector. The distribution of employment and payroll on the municipal level are nearly identical in all sectors. Average monthly salaries of municipal employees are highest in the public defense and legal services/prosecution sectors, which employ highly paid, specialized personnel.

#### Individual large counties and municipalities

Separate data are presented in tables 6 and 7 for the 343 county governments with a 1976 population of 100,000 or more and for the 406 city governments with a population of 50,000 or more.<sup>2</sup> Large counties and cities combined accounted for close to three-fourths (\$10.5 billion or 72.7 percent) of total justice expenditure by local governments (table F). Over one-half (58 percent) of the total 1977 United States population lives in the 343 largest counties, but these counties accounted for more than 77 percent (or \$4.4 billion) of the total expenditure for justice activities at the county levels. In some functions, the large counties' share of all county justice spending exceeded 79 percent; viz., public defense (84.8 percent), corrections (82.6 percent) and other criminal justice (88.9 percent).

Accounting for 48 percent of total United States population, the 406 large city governments expended \$6.1 billion, or slightly more than two-thirds (68 percent) of total municipal justice

<sup>2</sup> A few municipal and county units continue to be shown individually even though their population has dropped below the established criteria. This is done to retain comparability in the presentation of individual unit data from year to year.

expenditure. The distribution of expenditure and employment throughout the various justice sectors in the 343 counties and the 406 cities reflects the distributions for counties and cities generally.

#### EXPENDITURE COMPONENTS

The tables in this report display expenditure data in several categories. Total expenditure is comprised of direct and intergovernmental expenditure. Direct expenditure, in turn, consists of expenditures for current operations (i.e., salaries, wages and other operating expenses), and for capital outlay (i.e., construction, equipment and land). Intergovernmental expenditure is payments from one government to another, including grants and reimbursements. Direct expenditure as a percent of total justice expenditure is on the average much higher at the local government level than at the State level. In 43 out of 51 jurisdictions (50 States and the District of Columbia), direct expenditure of local governments as a percent of total expenditure was between 99 and 100 percent. This is a reflection of the fact that local governments' intergovernmental expenditure for justice is confined to a few and infrequent types of payments such as reimbursement from one local government to another for boarding of prisoners or contractual payments from one local government to another for police protection.

State governments, on the other hand, expend a much larger proportion under intergovernmental payment programs to local governments. These payments include justice grants from the Federal Government that are passed through the States to local governments, such as LEAA block grants, as well as State government grants funded from their own revenue sources. Direct expenditure as a percent of total expenditure ranged between 78 and 96 percent for State governments, as illustrated by the following table:

Table G: Distribution of States based on direct expenditure as a percent of total expenditure for justice activities

Direct expenditure as a percent of total justice expenditure (percent class)	Number of States
95 to 100 . . . . .	12
90 to 95 . . . . .	20
85 to 90 . . . . .	10
80 to 85 . . . . .	6
75 to 80 . . . . .	2

Table F. Total civil and criminal justice expenditure of large counties and municipalities as a percent of the total for all counties and total municipalities by function, fiscal year 1978

Type of government	Total local	Police protection	Judicial	Legal services and prosecution	Public defense	Corrections	Other criminal justice
Total counties . . . . .	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
343 large counties* . . . . .	77.4	69.9	78.6	78.8	84.8	82.6	88.9
Total municipalities . . . . .	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
406 large municipalities* . . . . .	68.3	65.3	80.2	74.5	93.9	93.7	91.6

\*All county governments with a population of 100,000 or above; and all municipalities with a population of 50,000 or above are included in percent calculations.

## INTRODUCTION

Maryland at 78 percent and Virginia at 79 percent had the lowest proportions of direct expenditure for justice activities, and concomitantly the highest shares of intergovernmental expenditure. In Maryland, a State program of assistance to cities and counties for police protection primarily accounts for the high level of intergovernmental expenditure. In Virginia, substantial State assistance is given to cities and counties for police protection, detention homes, and jail construction in the form of reimbursement or in fixed ratio to local expenditure.

Direct expenditure ranged between 80 and 90 percent of total justice expenditure in seven of the nine most populous States: Pennsylvania (81 percent), Michigan (83 percent), Ohio (85 percent), Texas (86 percent), California (88 percent), New York (88 percent), and New Jersey (90 percent). Direct justice expenditure in Illinois was 91 percent of total expenditure, and Florida had the highest proportion at 96 percent.

For the 343 large county governments, direct expenditure for justice as a percent of total justice expenditure ranged between 67.7 percent to 100 percent. See Table H below. For the 406 large city governments, the range was 1.2 percent<sup>3</sup> to 100 percent. Direct expenditure constituted 95 percent or more of total justice expenditure in 301 of the 343 large counties and in 388 of the 406 large cities; and equaled 100 percent of total expenditure in 118 large counties (34 percent) and 216 large cities (53 percent).

Table H. Distribution of large counties and cities based on direct expenditure as a percent of total expenditure for justice activities

Direct expenditure as a percent of total justice expenditure (percent class)	343 large counties	406 large cities
95 to 100 . . . . .	301	388
90 to 95 . . . . .	20	9
85 to 90 . . . . .	12	-
80 to 85 . . . . .	7	2
75 to 80 . . . . .	-	-
below 75 . . . . .	3	7

- Represents zero.

State-local capital outlay for justice in 1978 amounted to \$1.3 billion, or 6.2 percent of total State-local justice expenditure. On the State level, capital outlay was \$483 million or 6.4 percent of State total justice expenditure; on the local level, it was \$816 million or 5.6 percent. The following table shows a distribution of the number of States based on capital outlay as a percent of State and local total justice expenditure.

Capital outlay as a percent of total justice expenditure ranged between 1.5 percent for the Ohio State government and 45.3 percent for the State of Wyoming. However, in 42 States,

State-local capital outlay did not exceed 10 percent of total justice expenditure. It should be noted that sharp variations can occur from year to year in capital expenditures, particularly for individual governments.

Table I. Distribution of capital outlay as a percent of State and local justice expenditure

Capital outlay as a percent of total justice expenditure (percent class)	State-local* total justice expenditure	State justice expenditure	Local* justice expenditure
0 to 5 . . . . .	14	20	16
5 to 10 . . . . .	29	19	28
10 to 15 . . . . .	6	6	5
15 to 20 . . . . .	1	1	2
20 and above . . . . .	1	4	-

\*Includes the District of Columbia.

- Represents zero.

As shown below in table J, capital outlay as a percent of total justice expenditure varied from 0.1 percent to 67.4 percent among large county governments. Of the 343 large counties, 34 had capital outlay expenditures comprising 20 percent or more of total expenditure; of these, 14 reported capital outlay exceeding 40 percent of total spending for justice. Capital outlay as a percent of total justice expenditure for the 406 large cities ranged from 0 percent to 48.7 percent. Capital expenditure accounted for five percent or less of total justice expenditure in 190 of the 343 large counties, and 292 of the 406 large cities.

Table J. Distribution of capital outlay of large counties and cities as a percent of total expenditure for justice activities

Capital outlay as a percent of total justice expenditure (percent class)	343 large counties	406 large cities
0 to 5 . . . . .	190	292
5 to 10 . . . . .	76	72
10 to 15 . . . . .	32	18
15 to 20 . . . . .	11	7
20 and above . . . . .	34	17

## EXPENDITURE FROM GENERAL PURPOSE REVENUE SOURCES AND FROM OWN REVENUE SOURCES (STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS)

Expenditure from general purpose revenue sources is defined as all expenditure financed from a government's own revenue sources (such as tax levies), from revenue received from the Federal Government for general support (e.g., General Revenue Sharing, Antirecession Fiscal Assistance, CETA grants), and from general support payments from State and local governments. In application, expenditure from general purpose revenue is calculated for an individual local government by subtracting from its total justice expenditure the following revenue items: 1) Federal and State revenues received specifically for justice purposes, and 2) all revenue from other local governments remitted for justice purposes. For State governments, expendi-

<sup>3</sup>Nearly all of the justice expenditure for the City of Norwalk, California consists of intergovernmental payments to the county government for police protection services. Similar situations are found in Bellflower, Carson, Lakewood, and Pico Rivera in California; and Las Vegas, Nevada.

ture from general purpose revenue is obtained by subtracting from the State government's total justice expenditure the following: 1) Federal revenue<sup>4</sup> received specifically for justice purposes, and 2) an estimate of local justice payments to the State government.<sup>5</sup>

Expenditure from own revenue sources is defined as all amounts expended by a government from its own tax levies, fees, charges and other such sources. Expenditure from inter-governmental revenue from whatever source (Federal, State, local) is excluded.<sup>5</sup>

Table K displays own source and general purpose justice expenditure as a percent of total justice expenditure for each State. Overall, local justice expenditure from general purpose revenue sources constituted 96 percent of total State-local justice spending. This indicates that 4 percent of State-local total expenditures for justice is supported from grant programs such as those of LEAA, the Highway Traffic Safety Administration, and HUD, which award funds earmarked for justice

<sup>4</sup>This measure of expenditure will be used in calculating State area and sub-State grant awards under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act as amended by the Justice System Improvement Act of 1979.

<sup>5</sup>This is the measure of expenditure that has been used in calculating the variable pass-through ratio to distribute block grants between State and local governments under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

activities. In all States, expenditure from general purpose revenue constituted 90 percent or more of total justice expenditure, with the mean being 95 percent (see table L). The distribution of expenditure from own revenue sources as a percent of total expenditure is more dispersed. In three-fourths of the States (37), expenditure from own sources made up less than 90 percent of total expenditure, with the mean being 87 percent.

Table L. Distribution of general purpose and own source expenditure as a percent of State-local total justice expenditure

Percent class	Number of States*	
	General purpose expenditure as percent of State-local total expenditure	Own source expenditure as percent of State-local total expenditure
97.5 to 100.0 . . . . .	2	-
95.0 to 97.5 . . . . .	21	1
92.5 to 95.0 . . . . .	24	6
90.0 to 92.5 . . . . .	4	7
87.5 to 90.0 . . . . .	-	10
85.0 to 87.5 . . . . .	-	14
82.5 to 85.0 . . . . .	-	6
80.0 to 82.5 . . . . .	-	4
77.5 to 80.0 . . . . .	-	2
75.0 to 77.5 . . . . .	-	1

\*Includes the District of Columbia.

- Represents zero.

Table K. Expenditure from own revenue sources, from general purpose revenue sources and from dedicated revenue sources as a percent of total State-local justice expenditure by State, fiscal year 1978

State	Own revenue sources	General purpose revenue sources <sup>1</sup>	Dedicated revenue sources	State	Own revenue sources	General purpose revenue sources <sup>1</sup>	Dedicated revenue sources
States-local, Total . . . . .	87.8	96.0	4.0	Missouri . . . . .	83.0	95.0	5.0
Alabama . . . . .	81.0	92.2	7.8	Montana . . . . .	85.8	94.8	5.2
Alaska . . . . .	93.5	96.5	3.5	Nebraska . . . . .	90.2	91.4	8.6
Arizona . . . . .	88.7	96.1	3.9	Nevada . . . . .	93.0	95.9	4.1
Arkansas . . . . .	80.1	93.1	6.9	New Hampshire . . . . .	87.0	90.8	9.2
California . . . . .	91.6	97.0	3.0	New Jersey . . . . .	86.2	97.2	2.8
Colorado . . . . .	92.7	97.2	2.8	New Mexico . . . . .	90.3	95.7	4.3
Connecticut . . . . .	89.0	94.4	5.6	New York . . . . .	85.2	97.4	2.6
Delaware . . . . .	84.0	94.8	5.2	North Carolina . . . . .	87.7	93.5	6.5
District of Columbia . . . . .	94.0	95.8	4.2	North Dakota . . . . .	87.3	95.0	5.0
Florida . . . . .	90.3	94.7	5.3	Ohio . . . . .	86.2	96.4	3.6
Georgia . . . . .	90.0	95.7	4.3	Oklahoma . . . . .	92.9	95.3	4.7
Hawaii . . . . .	75.4	93.4	6.6	Oregon . . . . .	84.8	96.2	3.8
Idaho . . . . .	84.4	94.6	5.4	Pennsylvania . . . . .	84.9	95.2	4.8
Illinois . . . . .	91.1	96.9	3.1	Rhode Island . . . . .	79.2	94.6	5.4
Indiana . . . . .	86.0	94.2	5.8	South Carolina . . . . .	82.2	95.4	4.6
Iowa . . . . .	89.8	94.0	6.0	South Dakota . . . . .	87.2	90.5	9.5
Kansas . . . . .	85.9	94.5	5.5	Tennessee . . . . .	93.4	97.6	2.4
Kentucky . . . . .	79.5	93.8	6.2	Texas . . . . .	88.2	94.6	5.4
Louisiana . . . . .	89.7	95.8	4.2	Utah . . . . .	90.1	94.1	5.9
Maine . . . . .	83.7	93.7	6.3	Vermont . . . . .	89.1	94.4	5.6
Maryland . . . . .	88.8	94.9	5.1	Virginia . . . . .	90.6	95.6	4.4
Massachusetts . . . . .	88.1	97.6	2.4	Washington . . . . .	82.5	94.8	5.2
Michigan . . . . .	85.7	96.9	3.1	West Virginia . . . . .	86.3	93.9	6.1
Minnesota . . . . .	85.2	94.2	5.8	Wisconsin . . . . .	86.3	97.0	3.0
Mississippi . . . . .	85.8	92.7	7.3	Wyoming . . . . .	95.8	97.1	2.9

<sup>1</sup>Includes own revenue sources and such general purpose Federal revenues as State and Local Fiscal Assistance (revenue sharing), antirecession aid, and CETA funds.

## INTRODUCTION

The difference between expenditure from general purpose revenue and expenditure from own revenue is the amount of Federal revenue sharing, antirecession aid, and CETA funds used for support of justice activities. These differences indicate that 8 percent<sup>6</sup> of total justice expenditure is supported from these general purpose revenue programs. However, the use of Federal general purpose revenue varied greatly from State to State, from 1 percent of total expenditure in Nebraska to 18 percent in Hawaii.

It should be noted that local governments made greater use of Federal general purpose revenue for justice purposes than did the State governments. This can be seen in table 8 by examining the much smaller differences between own source and general purpose expenditure at the State government level in most States.

Tables 9 and 10 display total expenditure, direct expenditure, capital outlay, own source expenditure, and general purpose expenditure for 343 large counties and 406 large municipalities. The frequency distribution in table M presenting own source and general purpose expenditure as a percent of total justice expenditure in individual large counties and large cities shows that 255 (63 percent) of the 406 large cities spent 95 percent of their justice expenditure from general purpose revenue sources. This contrasts sharply with the large counties where only 65 (19 percent) had general purpose expenditure above 95 percent of total justice expenditure. Overall, 94.2 percent of large city justice expenditure was from general purpose revenue sources, compared to 88.4 percent for large counties. Conversely then, 5.3 percent of large cities' justice spending in 1978 was supported by intergovernmental revenue earmarked for justice purposes, including not only revenue received directly from the Federal Government, but also Federal grants passed through the States (e.g., LEAA block grants), State-funded grants for justice, and reimbursements from the State or other local governments. For the large counties, the amount of justice spending supported by these intergovernmental revenues was 11.6 percent.

Large cities also financed a greater share of justice expenditure from their own revenue sources (i.e., excluding both earmarked and general purpose intergovernmental revenues) than did the large counties. Overall, 83.1 percent of large city justice expenditure was from their own revenue sources, compared to 75.2 percent for large counties. As shown in the frequency distribution in table M, 268 cities (or 68 percent of the total of 406) reported 80 percent or more of their justice expenditure from their own revenue sources, contrasted with 143 counties (or 42 percent of the total of 343). An average of 13.2 percent of large county justice funds came primarily from general grants such as revenue sharing, CETA, and anti-recession programs (88.4 percent minus 75.2 percent); compared with 11.1 percent for large cities (94.2 percent minus 83.1 percent).

<sup>6</sup>This percentage is derived by subtracting the percent that expenditure from own sources constituted of total expenditure from the percent that expenditure from general purpose revenue constituted of total expenditure. See table K.

Table M. Distribution of general purpose and own source expenditure of large counties and cities as a percent of total justice expenditure

Percent class	Expenditure from general purpose revenue sources		Expenditure from own revenue sources	
	343 large counties	406 large cities	343 large counties	406 large cities
95 to 100 . . . .	65	255	17	78
90 to 95 . . . .	91	93	32	85
85 to 90 . . . .	99	28	47	56
80 to 85 . . . .	50	14	47	49
75 to 80 . . . .	17	8	56	47
70 to 75 . . . .	11	3	45	23
65 to 70 . . . .	2	2	32	24
60 to 65 . . . .	4	1	19	15
55 to 60 . . . .	1	2	16	11
50 to 55 . . . .	1	-	11	8
Below 50 percent . . . .	2	-	23	10

- Represents zero.

## SURVEY METHODOLOGY - SOURCES AND LIMITATIONS OF THE DATA

Survey coverage and collection methods are described in detail below, and the definitions applied in the collection of data are presented in appendix 1.

### Survey coverage

The survey through which basic figures for this report were collected covered the Federal Government, all State governments, and a representative sample of local governments within each State. Data were collected for all county governments (regardless of size), for all municipalities (and townships in the New England and Middle Atlantic States) having a 1970 population of 10,000 or more, and for a sample of the remaining municipalities and townships with less than 10,000 population, selected according to the relative size of their annual expenditures as reported in the 1972 Census of Governments. The survey panel therefore included the Federal Government, the 50 State governments, and 9,044 local governments (the 3,042 county governments, 4,305 municipalities, and 1,697 townships).

### The survey period

Federal Government data are shown for fiscal year 1978 which began on October 1, 1977 and ended September 30, 1978. The State expenditure data cover the fiscal year ending June 30, 1978 for all States except four whose fiscal years ended as follows: New York, March 31, 1978; Texas, August 31, 1978; and Alabama and Michigan, September 30, 1978. However, there are some State agencies that operate on a different fiscal year basis from the rest of the State government. In such instances, figures shown are for the agency's fiscal year that ended within the State's regular fiscal year.

For local governments, the 1978 fiscal years reported are those that closed between July 1, 1977 and June 30, 1978. Most municipalities and counties ended their fiscal years on December 31, 1977 or June 30, 1978. The fiscal year reported for Washington, D.C. ended on September 30, 1978.

Employment data shown for Federal, State, and local governments are for October 1978.

## Data collection

The survey was accomplished using two methods of data collection: Field compilation and mail canvass. Trained field representatives compiled expenditure and employment data from the government's own records for the 50 States, the 343 largest counties, the 406 largest cities and selected smaller units. The compilation was done between October 1978 and May 1979 in accordance with the definitions presented in appendix 1. All other units in the sample were canvassed by mail for expenditure and employment data, over a 5-month period beginning in January 1979 and ending in May 1979. Response for field-compiled units was 100 percent. The response from mail canvass units was 93 percent. The primary mail canvass questionnaire, the CJ-6, is exhibited in appendix 2.

The field survey efforts and mail canvass were supplemented by reference to a variety of published government documents such as budgets, financial statements, and audit reports. In some cases, such sources were the basis for breakdowns of totals into more detailed employment and expenditure figures.

The expenditure and employment data for the Federal Government were collected through a special mail survey, with telephone followup of Federal Justice agencies, in accordance with definitions used for State and local governments (see appendix 1).

## Data limitations

The sample selected to develop local government figures is one of all possible samples of the same size that could have been chosen using the same sampling design. Estimates derived from these different samples would differ from each other and also from a complete census using the same data collection procedures. This variation among all possible estimates is sampling

error. Because all State and county governments were included in the survey, State and county figures are not subject to sampling error.

The local government sample was designed to produce an estimate for each State of the portion of total justice expenditure made by local governments with a relative sampling error of less than one-half of 1 percent. For the fiscal year 1978 data, the errors were less than one-half of 1 percent in all but 11 States; however, in all States, the errors were less than three-quarters of 1 percent, at the 95 percent confidence level.

The relative sampling error of the State-by-State estimates of local government justice expenditure has been calculated at the two-thirds confidence level and found to be within 3 percent of the estimated totals for all States and less than 2 percent for 32 States. The results of the computations of standard errors for local government totals on a relative standard error basis are summarized in table N.

Because State government figures are not subject to sampling variation, the State-local aggregates shown for individual States are relatively more reliable than the local government estimates they include.

The data are also subject to the inaccuracies in classification, response, and processing that would occur if a complete census had been conducted under the same conditions as the sample survey. Every effort was made to keep such errors to a minimum through care in examining, editing, and tabulating the data submitted by government officials. Followup procedures were used extensively to clarify inadequate and inconsistent survey returns.

Readers should be generally cautious in comparing governments, because differences in functional responsibilities from State to State and government to government can also affect the comparability of expenditure and employment data. For example, some State governments directly administer certain activities that elsewhere are undertaken by local governments, with or without fiscal aid, and the same variation in the division of responsibilities exists for counties and cities.

Because of rounding, the detail data in some tables may not add precisely to the totals shown.

**Table N. Relative standard errors of local government totals of civil and criminal justice expenditure**

0.5 or less	0.5 – 1.0		1.0 – 2.0		2.0 – 3.0
California	Alaska	Colorado	Maryland	Alabama	North Dakota
Hawaii	Arizona	Delaware	Massachusetts	Arkansas	Oklahoma
Michigan	Connecticut	Florida	Montana	Idaho	Pennsylvania
Nevada	Indiana	Georgia	Nebraska	Iowa	South Carolina
New Mexico	Rhode Island	Illinois	North Carolina	Minnesota	Tennessee
New York	Vermont	Kansas	Ohio	Mississippi	Utah
Texas		Kentucky	Oregon	Missouri	West Virginia
		Louisiana	South Dakota	New Hampshire	Wisconsin
		Maine	Virginia	New Jersey	Wyoming
			Washington		

## INTRODUCTION

### AVAILABILITY OF DATA

Copies of the annual summary and detailed reports, and the trends reports are available from National Criminal Justice Reference Service, Office of Justice Assistance, Research, and Statistics, Box 6000, Rockville, Md. 20850 and from U.S.

Department of Commerce District Offices.

In addition to the publications, data are also available on magnetic tape and computer printout. For details, contact the Bureau of Justice Statistics, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20531.

Table 1. Distribution of expenditure for the criminal justice system, by level of government,  
fiscal year 1978  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

Activity <sup>1</sup>	Amount				Percent distribution		
	All governments <sup>1</sup>	Federal Government <sup>2</sup>	State governments	Local governments <sup>1</sup>	Federal Government <sup>2</sup>	State governments	Local governments <sup>1</sup>
TOTAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM <sup>3</sup>	24 131 995	3 834 607	7 544 251	14 456 004	(X)	(X)	(X)
DIRECT EXPENDITURE	24 131 995	3 122 290	6 688 192	14 321 513	12.9	27.7	59.4
INTERGOVERNMENTAL EXPENDITURE	(3)	712 317	856 059	295 356	(X)	(X)	(X)
POLICE PROTECTION <sup>3</sup>	13 120 193	1 959 305	2 016 228	9 281 149	(X)	(X)	(X)
DIRECT EXPENDITURE	13 120 193	1 951 786	1 892 127	9 276 280	14.9	14.4	70.7
INTERGOVERNMENTAL EXPENDITURE	(3)	7 519	124 101	96 279	(X)	(X)	(X)
JUDICIAL <sup>3</sup>	3 067 221	321 373	1 150 265	1 823 223	(X)	(X)	(X)
DIRECT EXPENDITURE	3 067 221	321 373	1 012 899	1 732 949	10.5	33.0	56.5
INTERGOVERNMENTAL EXPENDITURE	(3)	-	137 366	118 381	(X)	(X)	(X)
LEGAL SERVICES AND PROSECUTION <sup>3</sup>	1 459 859	220 058	400 367	862 094	(X)	(X)	(X)
DIRECT EXPENDITURE	1 459 859	215 525	385 783	858 551	14.7	26.4	58.8
INTERGOVERNMENTAL EXPENDITURE	(3)	4 533	14 584	4 537	(X)	(X)	(X)
PUBLIC DEFENSE <sup>3</sup>	523 735	209 060	109 294	216 824	(X)	(X)	(X)
DIRECT EXPENDITURE	523 735	209 060	11 338	2 152	(X)	(X)	(X)
INTERGOVERNMENTAL EXPENDITURE	(3)	-	11 338	2 152	(X)	(X)	(X)
CORRECTIONS <sup>3</sup>	5 522 711	375 802	3 341 200	2 030 722	(X)	(X)	(X)
DIRECT EXPENDITURE	5 522 711	337 174	3 176 963	2 008 574	6.1	57.5	36.4
INTERGOVERNMENTAL EXPENDITURE	(3)	38 628	164 237	58 369	(X)	(X)	(X)
OTHER CRIMINAL JUSTICE <sup>3</sup>	438 276	749 009	526 897	241 992	(X)	(X)	(X)
DIRECT EXPENDITURE	438 276	87 372	122 464	228 440	19.9	28.0	52.1
INTERGOVERNMENTAL EXPENDITURE	(3)	661 637	404 433	15 638	(X)	(X)	(X)

- Represents zero or rounds to zero.

X Not applicable.

<sup>1</sup>Local governments data are estimates subject to sampling variations; see text for data limitations.

<sup>2</sup>Federal Government data are for the fiscal period beginning October 1, 1977 and ending September 30, 1978.

<sup>3</sup>The total line for each sector, and for the total Criminal Justice System, excludes duplicative intergovernmental expenditure amounts. This was done to avoid the artificial inflation which would result if an intergovernmental expenditure amount for one government is tabulated and then counted again when the recipient government(s) ultimately expend(s) that amount. The intergovernmental expenditure lines are not totaled for the same reason.

Table 2. Distribution of employment and payrolls for the criminal justice system, by level of government,

October 1978

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

Activity	All governments <sup>1</sup>	Federal Government	State governments	Local governments <sup>1</sup>	Percent distribution		
					Federal Government	State governments	Local governments <sup>1</sup>
<b>TOTAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM:</b>							
TOTAL EMPLOYEES . . . . .	1 228 928	105 376	322 046	801 506	8.6	26.2	65.2
FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES . . . . .	1 125 974	102 722	303 950	719 302	9.1	27.0	63.9
FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT EMPLOYEES . . . . .	1 157 436	103 678	310 554	743 204	9.0	26.8	64.2
OCTOBER PAYROLL . . . . .	1 527 082	184 202	406 897	935 983	12.1	26.6	61.3
<b>POLICE PROTECTION:</b>							
TOTAL EMPLOYEES . . . . .	697 726	75 182	98 651	523 893	10.8	14.1	75.1
FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES . . . . .	642 306	73 559	89 977	478 770	11.5	14.0	74.5
FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT EMPLOYEES . . . . .	656 171	73 993	92 443	489 735	11.3	14.1	74.6
OCTOBER PAYROLL . . . . .	897 010	128 182	122 337	646 491	10.3	13.6	72.1
<b>JUDICIAL:</b>							
TOTAL EMPLOYEES . . . . .	163 264	8 321	43 625	111 318	5.1	26.7	68.2
FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES . . . . .	140 080	8 229	39 448	92 403	5.9	28.2	65.9
FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT EMPLOYEES . . . . .	149 290	8 289	41 642	99 359	5.6	27.9	66.5
OCTOBER PAYROLL . . . . .	186 990	17 474	68 050	101 466	9.3	36.4	54.3
<b>LEGAL SERVICES AND PROSECUTION:</b>							
TOTAL EMPLOYEES . . . . .	75 950	7 811	18 974	49 165	10.3	25.0	64.7
FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES . . . . .	65 475	7 325	17 596	40 554	11.2	26.9	61.9
FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT EMPLOYEES . . . . .	69 247	7 558	18 212	43 477	10.9	26.3	62.8
OCTOBER PAYROLL . . . . .	101 288	14 940	27 334	59 014	14.7	27.0	58.3
<b>PUBLIC DEFENSE:</b>							
TOTAL EMPLOYEES . . . . .	8 715	265	3 256	5 194	3.0	37.4	59.6
FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES . . . . .	7 981	265	3 121	4 595	3.3	39.1	57.6
FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT EMPLOYEES . . . . .	8 303	265	3 159	4 879	3.2	38.0	58.8
OCTOBER PAYROLL . . . . .	12 586	525	4 724	7 337	0.2	37.5	58.3
<b>CORRECTIONS:</b>							
TOTAL EMPLOYEES . . . . .	273 440	12 055	153 770	107 615	4.4	56.2	39.4
FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES . . . . .	261 347	11 800	150 148	99 399	4.5	57.5	38.0
FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT EMPLOYEES . . . . .	265 384	11 918	151 408	102 088	4.5	57.1	38.4
OCTOBER PAYROLL . . . . .	317 529	20 162	179 684	117 713	6.3	56.6	37.1
<b>OTHER CRIMINAL JUSTICE:</b>							
TOTAL EMPLOYEES . . . . .	9 833	1 742	3 770	4 321	17.7	38.3	44.0
FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES . . . . .	8 785	1 544	3 660	3 581	17.7	41.7	40.7
FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT EMPLOYEES . . . . .	9 041	1 655	3 690	3 696	18.3	40.8	40.9
OCTOBER PAYROLL . . . . .	11 679	2 919	4 797	3 983	25.0	41.1	33.9

<sup>1</sup>Local governments data are estimates subject to sampling variation; see text.

**This page left blank to preserve table sequence.**

Table 3. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental)  
by State and type of government, fiscal year 1978  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

State and type of government <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup> (in thousands)	Total general expenditure <sup>3</sup>	Total criminal justice system		Police protection		Judicial	
			Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total general expenditure	Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total criminal justice system
STATES-LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	216 332	219 998 000	21 009 705	9.5	11 168 407	53.2	2 745 848	13.1
STATES. . . . .	(X) 145 637 000	7 544 251	5.2	2 016 228	26.7	1 150 265	15.2	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X) 109 502 000	14 456 004	13.2	9 281 149	64.2	1 823 223	12.6	
COUNTIES. . . . .	(X) 43 274 000	5 699 974	13.2	1 832 616	32.2	1 418 524	24.9	
MUNICIPALITIES. . . . .	(X) 66 664 000	8 916 894	13.4	7 539 943	84.6	432 806	4.9	
ALABAMA . . . . .	3 690	2 972 000	232 063	7.8	121 944	52.5	43 719	18.8
STATE . . . . .	(X) 2 253 000	100 385	4.5	30 373	30.3	25 021	24.9	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X) 914 000	136 381	14.9	92 512	67.8	18 738	13.7	
COUNTIES. . . . .	(X) 296 000	54 088	18.3	17 179	31.8	16 698	30.9	
MUNICIPALITIES. . . . .	(X) 623 000	82 978	13.3	75 370	90.8	2 234	2.7	
ALASKA. . . . .	407	1 488 000	95 966	6.4	47 387	49.4	16 005	16.7
STATE . . . . .	(X) 1 158 000	70 839	6.1	24 518	34.6	15 976	22.6	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X) 596 000	26 402	4.4	22 875	86.6	53	0.2	
BOROUGHS. . . . .	(X) 141 000	1 652	1.2	1 196	72.4	-	-	
MUNICIPALITIES. . . . .	(X) 455 000	24 761	5.4	21 679	87.5	53	0.2	
ARIZONA . . . . .	2 296	2 168 000	278 994	12.9	157 284	56.4	30 169	10.8
STATE . . . . .	(X) 1 362 000	88 432	6.5	36 521	41.3	4 613	5.2	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X) 1 084 000	198 241	18.3	121 751	61.4	25 584	12.9	
COUNTIES. . . . .	(X) 465 000	90 118	19.4	25 119	27.9	20 266	22.5	
MUNICIPALITIES. . . . .	(X) 620 000	109 149	17.6	96 737	88.6	5 321	4.9	
ARKANSAS. . . . .	2 144	1 504 000	101 532	6.8	55 956	55.1	11 040	10.9
STATE . . . . .	(X) 1 228 000	49 219	4.0	17 006	34.6	3 572	7.3	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X) 441 000	57 909	13.1	39 032	67.4	7 529	13.0	
COUNTIES. . . . .	(X) 205 000	24 201	11.8	10 429	43.1	5 369	22.2	
MUNICIPALITIES. . . . .	(X) 236 000	34 328	14.5	28 695	83.6	2 343	6.8	
CALIFORNIA. . . . .	21 896	25 459 000	2 919 787	11.5	1 440 077	49.3	333 819	11.4
STATE . . . . .	(X) 16 284 000	778 622	4.8	253 335	32.5	45 185	5.8	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X) 14 440 000	2 238 658	15.5	1 200 575	53.6	296 050	13.2	
COUNTIES. . . . .	(X) 8 856 000	1 290 901	14.6	342 490	26.5	281 172	21.8	
MUNICIPALITIES. . . . .	(X) 5 608 000	988 134	17.6	895 597	90.6	15 170	1.5	
COLORADO. . . . .	2 619	2 528 000	271 597	10.7	139 570	51.4	39 924	14.7
STATE . . . . .	(X) 1 581 000	120 132	7.6	24 220	20.2	29 810	24.8	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X) 1 189 000	157 454	13.2	115 365	73.3	10 130	6.4	
COUNTIES. . . . .	(X) 462 000	40 926	8.9	19 070	46.6	2 650	6.5	
MUNICIPALITIES. . . . .	(X) 727 000	117 194	16.1	96 459	82.3	7 479	6.4	
CONNECTICUT . . . . .	3 108	3 911 000	248 025	6.3	146 958	59.3	29 312	11.8
STATE . . . . .	(X) 2 383 000	128 679	5.4	30 341	23.6	27 993	21.8	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X) 2 109 000	124 499	5.9	117 585	94.4	1 343	1.1	
MUNICIPALITIES. . . . .	(X) 2 108 000	124 942	5.9	117 890	94.4	1 389	1.1	
DELAWARE. . . . .	582	662 000	63 303	9.6	30 835	48.7	10 904	17.2
STATE . . . . .	(X) 516 000	44 195	8.6	13 060	29.6	9 924	22.5	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X) 190 000	20 988	11.0	18 004	85.8	1 997	9.5	
COUNTIES. . . . .	(X) 92 000	8 343	9.1	6 472	77.6	1 405	16.8	
MUNICIPALITIES. . . . .	(X) 98 000	12 749	13.0	11 635	91.3	592	4.6	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA. . . . .	690	1 623 000	206 665	12.7	98 895	47.9	23 689	11.5
STATE . . . . .	(X) -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X) 1 623 000	206 665	12.7	98 895	47.9	23 689	11.5	
MUNICIPALITIES. . . . .	(X) 1 623 000	206 665	12.7	98 895	47.9	23 689	11.5	
FLORIDA. . . . .	8 452	6 408 000	868 287	13.6	444 419	51.2	123 546	14.2
STATE . . . . .	(X) 3 570 000	330 228	9.3	65 907	20.0	36 631	11.1	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X) 3 334 000	553 054	16.6	379 230	68.6	87 364	15.8	
COUNTIES. . . . .	(X) 1 742 000	295 648	17.0	148 657	50.3	80 588	27.3	
MUNICIPALITIES. . . . .	(X) 1 613 000	261 215	16.2	233 539	89.4	7 329	2.8	
GEORGIA . . . . .	5 048	3 758 000	391 251	10.4	194 903	49.8	50 833	13.0
STATE . . . . .	(X) 2 716 000	169 977	6.3	48 401	28.5	9 695	5.7	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X) 1 320 000	235 723	17.9	146 784	62.3	41 223	17.5	
COUNTIES. . . . .	(X) 641 000	129 171	20.2	53 414	41.4	36 758	28.5	
MUNICIPALITIES. . . . .	(X) 684 000	107 217	15.7	93 520	87.2	4 471	4.2	
HAWAII. . . . .	895	1 687 000	106 461	6.3	56 401	53.0	15 467	14.5
STATE . . . . .	(X) 1 359 000	46 818	3.4	1 739	3.7	15 467	33.0	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X) 380 000	61 415	16.2	54 662	89.0	-	-	
COUNTIES. . . . .	(X) 98 000	16 079	16.4	12 241	76.1	-	-	
MUNICIPALITIES. . . . .	(X) 282 000	45 336	16.1	42 421	93.6	-	-	
IDAHO. . . . .	857	737 000	64 883	8.8	33 808	52.1	8 349	12.9
STATE . . . . .	(X) 590 000	28 102	4.8	9 183	32.7	4 130	14.7	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X) 215 000	38 083	17.7	24 799	65.1	4 240	11.1	
COUNTIES. . . . .	(X) 124 000	23 582	19.0	11 287	47.9	4 091	17.3	
MUNICIPALITIES. . . . .	(X) 91 000	17 439	19.2	16 242	93.1	246	1.4	

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table 3. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) by State and type of government, fiscal year 1978—Continued**  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

State and type of government <sup>1</sup>	Legal services and prosecution		Public defense		Corrections		Other criminal justice	
	Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total criminal justice system
STATES-LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	1 244 334	5.9	314 675	1.5	5 185 537	24.7	350 904	1.7
STATES . . . . .	400 367	5.3	109 294	1.4	3 341 200	44.3	526 897	7.0
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	862 094	6.0	216 824	1.5	2 930 722	14.0	241 992	1.7
COUNTIES . . . . .	519 871	9.1	180 215	3.2	1 576 185	27.7	172 563	3.0
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	343 217	3.8	38 655	0.4	490 758	5.5	71 515	0.8
ALABAMA . . . . .	10 780	4.6	1 816	0.8	52 470	22.6	1 333	0.6
STATE . . . . .	5 512	5.5	1 571	1.6	33 295	33.2	4 613	4.6
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	5 270	3.9	266	0.2	19 196	14.1	398	0.3
COUNTIES . . . . .	3 410	6.3	129	0.2	16 296	30.1	376	0.7
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	1 860	2.2	137	0.2	3 355	4.0	22	(Z)
ALASKA . . . . .	9 977	10.4	2 159	2.2	19 071	19.9	1 367	1.4
STATE . . . . .	7 226	10.2	2 159	3.0	19 170	27.1	1 790	2.5
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	2 770	10.5	-	-	704	2.7	-	-
BOROUGHS . . . . .	456	27.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	2 345	9.5	-	-	704	2.8	-	-
ARIZONA . . . . .	18 928	6.8	5 496	2.0	65 885	23.6	1 232	0.4
STATE . . . . .	3 883	4.4	-	-	36 173	40.9	7 242	8.2
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	15 045	7.6	5 496	2.8	29 874	15.1	491	0.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	10 153	11.3	5 403	6.0	29 112	32.3	66	0.1
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	4 892	4.5	426	0.4	1 347	1.2	425	0.4
ARKANSAS . . . . .	4 387	4.3	552	0.5	26 577	26.2	3 019	3.0
STATE . . . . .	1 055	2.1	15	(Z)	21 493	43.7	6 078	12.3
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	3 432	5.9	537	0.9	5 969	10.3	1 410	2.4
COUNTIES . . . . .	2 397	9.9	453	1.9	5 005	20.7	547	2.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	1 059	3.1	84	0.2	1 129	3.3	1 018	3.0
CALIFORNIA . . . . .	257 541	8.8	75 938	2.6	785 767	26.9	26 645	0.9
STATE . . . . .	55 058	7.1	6 469	0.8	359 823	46.2	58 752	7.5
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	202 510	9.0	71 222	3.2	448 589	20.0	19 710	0.9
COUNTIES . . . . .	155 689	12.1	67 907	5.3	428 629	33.2	15 014	1.2
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	46 921	4.7	3 315	0.3	22 043	2.2	5 087	0.5
COLORADO . . . . .	20 413	7.5	3 067	1.1	63 805	23.5	4 818	1.8
STATE . . . . .	4 510	3.8	3 045	2.5	50 512	42.0	8 035	6.7
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	15 903	10.1	22	(Z)	13 317	8.5	2 718	1.7
COUNTIES . . . . .	9 901	24.2	16	(Z)	8 222	20.1	1 066	2.6
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	6 261	5.3	22	(Z)	5 321	4.5	1 652	1.4
CONNECTICUT . . . . .	11 406	4.6	3 196	1.3	53 751	21.7	3 401	1.4
STATE . . . . .	7 198	5.6	3 183	2.5	53 660	41.7	6 304	4.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	4 208	3.4	13	(Z)	103	0.1	1 246	1.0
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	4 294	3.4	13	(Z)	103	0.1	1 252	1.0
DELAWARE . . . . .	2 932	4.6	908	1.4	16 446	26.0	1 279	2.0
STATE . . . . .	2 109	4.8	758	1.7	16 446	37.2	1 898	4.3
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	823	3.9	150	0.7	-	-	14	0.1
COUNTIES . . . . .	315	3.8	150	1.8	-	-	-	-
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	508	4.0	-	-	-	-	14	0.1
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA . . . . .	6 993	3.4	5 770	2.8	69 835	33.8	1 483	0.7
STATE . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	6 993	3.4	5 770	2.8	69 835	33.8	1 483	0.7
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	6 993	3.4	5 770	2.8	69 835	33.8	1 483	0.7
FLORIDA . . . . .	46 486	5.4	16 458	1.9	227 841	26.2	9 536	1.1
STATE . . . . .	32 416	9.8	13 827	4.2	166 369	50.4	15 078	4.6
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	14 071	2.5	2 631	0.5	61 472	11.1	8 285	1.5
COUNTIES . . . . .	6 200	2.1	2 535	0.9	50 761	17.2	6 907	2.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	7 872	3.0	98	(Z)	10 954	4.2	1 424	0.5
GEORGIA . . . . .	15 087	3.9	2 274	0.6	126 165	32.2	1 988	0.5
STATE . . . . .	5 502	3.2	349	0.2	94 637	55.7	11 393	6.7
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	9 585	4.1	2 074	0.9	34 880	14.8	1 186	0.5
COUNTIES . . . . .	7 484	5.8	1 927	1.5	29 030	22.5	559	0.4
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	2 103	2.0	148	0.1	6 335	5.9	640	0.6
HAWAII . . . . .	6 430	6.0	2 011	1.9	23 320	21.9	2 832	2.7
STATE . . . . .	2 190	4.7	2 011	4.3	22 147	47.3	3 264	7.0
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	4 240	6.9	-	-	1 173	1.9	1 340	2.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	1 392	8.7	-	-	1 173	7.3	1 273	7.9
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	2 848	6.3	-	-	-	-	67	0.1
IDAHO . . . . .	4 847	7.5	855	1.3	11 791	18.2	5 233	8.1
STATE . . . . .	1 833	6.5	-	-	9 645	34.3	3 311	11.8
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	3 014	7.9	855	2.2	2 170	5.7	3 006	7.9
COUNTIES . . . . .	2 198	9.3	855	3.6	2 145	9.1	3 006	12.7
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	816	4.7	-	-	136	0.8	-	-

Table 3. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental)  
by State and type of government, fiscal year 1978—Continued

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

State and type of government <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup> (in thousands)	Total general expenditure <sup>3</sup>	Total criminal justice system		Police protection		Judicial	
			Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total general expenditure	Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total criminal justice system
ILLINOIS . . . . .	11 245	9 582 000	1 159 866	12.1	685 259	59.1	124 408	10.7
STATE . . . . .	(X)	6 534 000	299 563	4.6	78 362	26.2	49 700	16.6
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	3 695 000	887 281	24.0	608 999	68.6	77 447	8.7
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	1 043 000	317 712	30.5	56 891	17.9	77 143	24.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	2 676 000	572 085	21.4	553 666	96.8	738	0.1
INDIANA . . . . .	5 330	3 622 000	319 136	8.8	177 869	55.7	40 900	12.8
STATE . . . . .	(X)	2 700 000	122 728	4.5	43 638	35.6	9 122	7.4
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	1 631 000	207 385	12.7	134 471	64.8	32 725	15.8
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	757 000	71 216	9.4	22 164	31.1	23 644	33.2
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	874 000	136 727	15.6	112 690	82.4	9 163	6.7
IOWA . . . . .	2 879	2 679 000	181 702	6.8	98 041	54.0	26 949	14.8
STATE . . . . .	(X)	1 836 000	79 868	4.4	28 398	35.6	8 703	10.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	1 197 000	114 830	9.6	71 110	61.9	18 262	15.9
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	607 000	58 785	9.7	16 876	28.7	18 697	31.8
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	590 000	58 914	10.0	55 888	94.9	31	0.1
KANSAS . . . . .	2 326	2 096 000	166 756	8.0	76 167	45.7	27 459	16.5
STATE . . . . .	(X)	1 252 000	76 253	6.1	13 225	17.3	14 318	18.8
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	941 000	98 005	10.4	62 945	64.2	14 959	15.3
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	315 000	44 252	14.0	13 982	31.6	13 230	29.9
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	626 000	55 948	8.9	50 767	90.7	1 780	3.2
KENTUCKY . . . . .	3 458	2 935 000	234 454	8.0	125 031	53.3	33 773	14.4
STATE . . . . .	(X)	2 332 000	143 733	6.2	50 373	35.0	28 561	19.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	712 000	118 453	16.6	81 848	69.1	9 017	7.6
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	322 000	53 258	16.5	24 301	45.6	6 609	12.4
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	429 000	66 106	15.4	57 866	87.5	2 426	3.7
LOUISIANA . . . . .	3 921	3 772 000	338 198	9.0	180 040	53.2	46 915	13.9
STATE . . . . .	(X)	2 721 000	134 083	4.9	45 625	34.0	12 509	9.3
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	1 344 000	214 737	16.0	135 006	62.9	34 611	16.1
PARISHES . . . . .	(X)	642 000	101 404	15.8	56 122	55.3	20 679	20.4
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	702 000	114 168	16.3	79 277	69.4	13 956	12.2
MAINE . . . . .	1 085	1 153 000	59 422	5.2	33 197	55.9	8 205	13.8
STATE . . . . .	(X)	939 000	32 705	3.5	10 346	31.6	6 336	19.4
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	486 000	29 071	6.0	22 856	78.6	2 323	8.0
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	19 000	8 528	44.9	2 748	32.2	2 292	26.9
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	467 000	21 389	4.6	20 505	95.9	139	0.6
MARYLAND . . . . .	4 139	6 164 000	468 226	7.6	240 154	51.3	47 004	10.0
STATE . . . . .	(X)	3 736 000	279 554	7.5	109 400	39.1	24 916	8.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	3 653 000	252 134	6.9	186 692	74.0	22 142	8.1
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	2 527 000	140 742	5.6	99 348	70.6	15 636	11.1
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	1 154 000	111 642	9.7	87 524	78.4	6 566	5.8
MASSACHUSETTS . . . . .	5 782	8 212 000	593 834	7.2	333 460	56.2	91 870	15.5
STATE . . . . .	(X)	4 953 000	175 941	3.6	46 666	26.5	23 120	13.1
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	4 661 000	437 352	9.4	290 461	66.4	78 702	18.0
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	147 000	100 858	68.6	1 508	1.5	57 278	56.8
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	4 514 000	339 614	7.5	289 056	85.1	24 103	7.1
MICHIGAN . . . . .	9 129	9 495 000	994 062	10.5	524 872	52.8	151 251	15.2
STATE . . . . .	(X)	6 539 000	333 988	5.1	91 880	27.5	51 076	15.3
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	4 220 000	719 211	17.0	439 708	61.1	114 700	15.9
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	1 497 000	301 222	20.1	64 286	21.3	88 672	29.4
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	2 734 000	437 921	16.0	381 187	87.0	28 501	6.5
MINNESOTA . . . . .	3 975	4 303 000	308 469	7.2	146 888	47.6	44 473	14.4
STATE . . . . .	(X)	3 073 000	99 426	3.2	34 671	34.9	11 065	11.1
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	2 066 000	228 104	11.0	121 936	53.5	33 528	14.7
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	1 086 000	129 682	11.9	29 822	23.0	33 719	26.0
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	987 000	102 109	10.3	94 093	92.1	158	0.2
MISSISSIPPI . . . . .	2 389	1 907 000	116 360	6.1	66 305	57.0	15 900	13.7
STATE . . . . .	(X)	1 384 000	52 162	3.8	23 886	45.8	3 679	7.1
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	721 000	67 367	9.3	42 946	63.7	12 240	18.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	437 000	32 247	7.4	11 012	34.1	11 045	34.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	284 000	35 472	12.5	31 987	90.2	1 196	3.4
MISSOURI . . . . .	4 801	3 177 000	361 372	11.4	219 588	60.8	46 378	12.8
STATE . . . . .	(X)	2 076 000	109 531	5.3	34 544	31.5	15 294	14.0
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	1 251 000	263 941	21.1	185 044	70.1	31 084	11.8
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	363 000	79 674	21.9	31 214	39.2	20 165	25.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	906 000	185 262	20.4	154 733	83.5	10 919	5.9
MONTANA . . . . .	761	793 000	55 876	7.0	27 934	50.0	7 747	13.9
STATE . . . . .	(X)	602 000	23 041	3.8	6 675	29.0	2 175	9.4
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	275 000	34 492	12.5	21 356	61.9	5 578	16.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	160 000	20 329	12.7	8 985	44.2	4 738	23.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	115 000	14 876	12.9	12 837	86.3	841	5.7

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table 3. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental)  
by State and type of government, fiscal year 1978—Continued**

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

State and type of government <sup>1</sup>	Legal services and prosecution		Public defense		Corrections		Other criminal justice	
	Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total criminal justice system
ILLINOIS . . . . .	52 595	4.5	14 149	1.2	220 072	19.0	63 382	5.5
STATE . . . . .	14 120	4.7	1 712	0.6	128 068	42.8	27 601	9.2
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	41 044	4.6	12 437	1.4	92 378	10.4	54 976	6.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	29 433	9.3	12 414	3.9	91 432	28.8	50 399	15.9
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	11 619	2.0	57	(2)	1 164	0.2	4 840	0.8
INDIANA . . . . .	16 663	5.2	3 113	1.0	76 643	24.0	3 948	1.2
STATE . . . . .	5 311	4.3	1 123	0.9	53 279	43.4	10 255	8.4
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	11 353	5.5	1 990	1.0	24 162	11.7	2 684	1.3
COUNTIES . . . . .	6 092	8.6	1 968	2.8	15 979	22.4	1 369	1.9
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	5 261	3.8	22	(2)	8 277	6.1	1 315	1.0
IOWA . . . . .	10 297	5.7	2 538	1.4	42 428	23.4	1 449	0.8
STATE . . . . .	2 838	3.6	—	—	38 255	42.9	5 674	7.1
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	7 459	6.5	2 538	2.2	14 750	12.8	710	0.6
COUNTIES . . . . .	5 184	8.8	2 529	4.3	14 803	25.2	696	1.2
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	2 277	3.9	9	(2)	675	1.1	33	0.1
KANSAS . . . . .	12 649	7.6	2 311	1.4	43 912	26.3	4 259	2.6
STATE . . . . .	5 273	6.9	2 243	2.9	34 534	45.3	6 660	8.7
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	7 376	7.5	208	0.2	9 378	9.6	3 139	3.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	5 132	11.6	118	0.3	8 916	20.1	2 874	6.5
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	2 250	4.0	94	0.2	772	1.4	285	0.5
KENTUCKY . . . . .	14 818	6.3	2 039	0.9	55 571	23.7	3 223	1.4
STATE . . . . .	10 914	7.6	2 706	1.9	48 988	34.1	2 191	1.5
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	6 510	5.5	615	0.5	18 613	15.7	1 851	1.6
COUNTIES . . . . .	3 836	7.2	644	1.2	16 017	30.1	1 851	3.5
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	2 674	4.0	166	0.3	2 892	4.4	82	0.1
LOUISIANA . . . . .	18 677	5.5	1 631	0.5	86 863	25.7	4 073	1.2
STATE . . . . .	6 892	5.1	230	0.2	58 243	43.4	10 584	7.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	11 785	5.5	1 401	0.7	29 682	13.8	2 252	1.0
PARISHES . . . . .	6 245	6.2	631	0.6	16 567	16.3	1 161	1.1
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	5 553	4.9	988	0.9	13 303	11.7	1 091	1.0
MAINE . . . . .	3 182	5.4	684	1.2	13 414	22.6	740	1.2
STATE . . . . .	2 049	6.3	684	2.1	10 694	32.7	2 596	7.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	1 136	3.9	—	—	2 728	9.4	28	0.1
COUNTIES . . . . .	540	6.3	—	—	2 917	34.2	31	0.4
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	600	2.8	—	—	144	0.7	2	(2)
MARYLAND . . . . .	18 213	3.9	7 074	1.5	152 225	32.5	3 555	0.8
STATE . . . . .	2 769	1.0	7 015	2.5	127 049	45.4	8 405	3.0
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	15 444	6.1	59	(2)	26 759	10.6	1 036	0.4
COUNTIES . . . . .	9 541	6.8	59	(2)	15 774	11.2	384	0.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	5 904	5.3	—	—	11 052	9.9	656	0.6
MASSACHUSETTS . . . . .	23 219	3.9	6 877	1.2	130 646	22.0	7 762	1.3
STATE . . . . .	10 469	6.0	3 564	2.0	83 426	47.4	8 696	4.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	12 750	2.9	3 313	0.8	47 229	10.8	4 896	1.1
COUNTIES . . . . .	3 679	3.6	2 393	2.4	35 788	35.5	212	0.2
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	9 226	2.7	920	0.3	11 624	3.4	4 684	1.4
MICHIGAN . . . . .	47 938	4.8	15 496	1.6	249 900	25.1	4 606	0.5
STATE . . . . .	11 353	3.4	1 169	0.4	161 939	48.5	16 571	5.0
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	37 393	5.2	14 327	2.0	110 771	15.4	2 312	0.3
COUNTIES . . . . .	24 749	8.2	13 767	4.6	108 309	36.0	1 439	0.5
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	12 678	2.9	559	0.1	14 076	3.2	918	0.2
MINNESOTA . . . . .	24 054	7.8	5 075	1.6	84 081	27.3	3 899	1.3
STATE . . . . .	5 359	5.4	573	0.6	37 378	37.6	10 380	10.4
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	18 995	8.3	4 510	2.0	47 246	20.7	1 889	0.8
COUNTIES . . . . .	13 272	10.2	4 698	3.6	47 428	36.6	743	0.6
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	5 728	5.6	39	(2)	945	0.9	1 146	1.1
MISSISSIPPI . . . . .	5 260	4.5	876	0.8	26 198	22.5	1 821	1.6
STATE . . . . .	2 741	5.3	—	—	18 514	35.5	3 342	6.4
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	2 519	3.7	876	1.3	8 556	12.7	230	0.3
COUNTIES . . . . .	1 489	4.6	839	2.6	7 665	23.8	198	0.6
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	1 033	2.9	37	0.1	1 186	3.3	32	0.1
MISSOURI . . . . .	16 466	4.6	2 846	0.8	73 544	20.4	2 550	0.7
STATE . . . . .	2 716	2.5	2 544	2.3	41 730	38.1	12 703	11.6
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	14 157	5.4	302	0.1	31 904	12.1	1 451	0.5
COUNTIES . . . . .	7 045	8.8	18	(2)	21 024	26.4	208	0.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	7 112	3.8	285	0.2	10 970	5.9	1 243	0.7
MONTANA . . . . .	4 149	7.4	905	1.6	13 656	24.4	1 483	2.7
STATE . . . . .	1 002	4.3	—	—	10 575	45.9	2 614	11.3
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	3 147	9.1	905	2.6	3 110	9.0	396	1.1
COUNTIES . . . . .	2 439	12.0	832	4.1	3 038	14.9	297	1.5
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	708	4.8	77	0.5	313	2.1	99	0.7

Table 3. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental)  
by State and type of government, fiscal year 1978—Continued

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

State and type of government <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup> (in thousands)	Total general expenditure <sup>3</sup>	Total criminal justice system		Police protection		Judicial	
			Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total general expenditure	Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total criminal justice system
NEBRASKA . . . . .	1 561	1 351 000	106 629	7.9	51 755	48.5	15 159	14.2
STATE . . . . .	(X)	977 000	49 805	5.1	12 416	24.9	7 184	14.4
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	611 000	60 806	10.0	39 340	64.7	7 975	13.1
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	305 000	26 197	8.6	9 045	34.5	6 013	23.0
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	308 000	35 179	11.4	30 747	87.4	1 968	5.6
NEVADA . . . . .	633	819 000	109 286	13.3	48 981	44.8	12 996	11.9
STATE . . . . .	(X)	462 000	39 881	8.6	6 842	17.2	2 218	5.6
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	411 000	72 788	17.7	42 149	57.9	10 789	14.8
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	277 000	53 624	19.4	27 513	51.3	8 790	16.4
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	146 000	31 756	21.8	27 098	85.3	1 999	6.3
NEW HAMPSHIRE . . . . .	849	794 000	57 176	7.2	34 408	60.2	7 494	13.1
STATE . . . . .	(X)	567 000	21 855	3.9	8 700	39.8	1 996	9.1
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	326 000	35 932	11.0	25 755	71.7	5 593	15.6
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	47 000	7 892	16.8	1 723	21.8	2 876	36.4
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	279 000	28 565	10.2	24 486	85.7	2 777	9.7
NEW JERSEY . . . . .	7 329	7 606 000	825 691	10.9	478 904	58.0	101 029	12.2
STATE . . . . .	(X)	5 752 000	223 554	3.9	73 311	32.8	28 264	12.6
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	4 057 000	625 963	15.4	413 613	66.1	74 443	11.9
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	1 685 000	204 657	12.1	24 270	11.9	57 396	28.0
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	2 393 000	423 237	17.7	391 229	92.4	17 047	4.0
NEW MEXICO . . . . .	1 190	1 114 000	103 937	9.3	52 961	51.0	11 875	11.4
STATE . . . . .	(X)	903 000	55 316	6.1	15 582	28.2	9 572	17.3
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	325 000	50 548	15.6	37 610	74.4	2 303	4.6
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	110 000	16 983	15.4	8 818	51.9	649	3.8
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	215 000	34 580	16.1	28 822	83.3	1 655	4.8
NEW YORK . . . . .	17 924	27 121 000	2 925 492	10.8	1 726 009	59.0	374 237	12.8
STATE . . . . .	(X)	15 248 000	922 759	6.1	116 887	12.7	339 651	36.8
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	20 215 000	2 216 955	11.0	1 610 550	72.6	151 916	6.9
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	4 641 000	463 092	10.0	229 488	49.6	65 470	14.1
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	15 626 000	1 758 401	11.3	1 382 753	78.6	89 210	5.1
NORTH CAROLINA . . . . .	5 525	5 831 000	394 323	6.8	181 074	45.9	46 626	11.8
STATE . . . . .	(X)	4 376 000	229 931	5.3	43 120	18.8	34 071	14.8
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	3 429 000	180 652	5.3	139 211	77.1	12 555	6.9
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	2 688 000	76 843	2.9	38 334	49.9	11 876	15.5
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	741 000	105 856	14.3	102 349	96.7	679	0.6
NORTH DAKOTA . . . . .	653	665 000	35 222	5.3	18 045	51.2	5 184	14.7
STATE . . . . .	(X)	526 000	13 749	2.6	3 189	23.2	1 735	12.6
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	203 000	22 291	11.0	14 865	66.7	3 451	15.5
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	84 000	10 489	12.5	3 896	37.1	3 061	29.2
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	119 000	12 175	10.2	11 278	92.6	395	3.2
OHIO . . . . .	10 701	8 746 000	882 568	10.1	408 584	46.3	162 373	18.4
STATE . . . . .	(X)	5 661 000	279 678	4.9	54 359	19.4	18 816	6.7
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	4 209 000	645 078	15.3	355 055	55.0	144 754	22.4
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	1 859 000	276 461	14.9	55 435	20.1	112 602	40.7
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	2 422 000	391 231	16.2	300 497	76.8	47 087	12.0
OKLAHOMA . . . . .	2 811	2 309 000	202 202	8.8	100 186	49.5	23 035	11.4
STATE . . . . .	(X)	1 627 000	111 813	6.9	32 065	28.7	9 413	8.4
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	830 000	98 223	11.8	68 252	69.5	14 564	14.8
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	218 000	29 986	13.8	7 406	24.7	12 546	41.8
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	615 000	68 843	11.2	60 932	88.5	2 418	3.5
OREGON . . . . .	2 376	2 558 000	248 684	9.7	120 853	48.6	30 513	12.3
STATE . . . . .	(X)	1 830 000	107 903	5.9	36 097	33.5	10 141	9.4
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	940 000	150 612	16.0	86 936	57.7	22 756	15.1
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	455 000	89 432	19.7	30 706	34.3	21 264	23.8
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	485 000	62 295	12.8	57 061	91.6	1 583	2.5
PENNSYLVANIA . . . . .	11 785	10 236 000	993 980	9.7	530 519	53.4	153 382	15.4
STATE . . . . .	(X)	7 317 000	378 084	5.2	123 268	32.6	64 499	17.1
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	3 673 000	695 845	18.9	408 116	58.7	112 888	16.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	1 072 000	183 876	17.2	17 955	9.8	64 762	35.2
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	2 603 000	515 913	19.8	393 409	76.3	48 274	9.4
RHODE ISLAND . . . . .	935	1 288 000	88 016	6.8	47 040	53.4	11 334	12.9
STATE . . . . .	(X)	894 000	52 399	5.9	11 575	22.1	11 054	21.1
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	556 000	38 220	6.9	36 974	96.7	280	0.7
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	555 000	38 220	6.9	36 974	96.7	280	0.7
SOUTH CAROLINA . . . . .	2 876	2 153 000	182 463	8.5	97 558	53.5	22 819	12.5
STATE . . . . .	(X)	1 747 000	89 290	5.1	30 968	34.7	6 054	6.8
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	614 000	98 749	16.1	67 741	68.6	16 842	17.1
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	422 000	56 017	13.3	27 221	48.6	15 820	28.2
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	191 000	43 639	22.8	40 562	92.9	1 022	2.3

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table 3. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) by State and type of government, fiscal year 1978—Continued**  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

State and type of government <sup>1</sup>	Legal services and prosecution		Public defense		Corrections		Other criminal justice	
	Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total criminal justice system
NEBRASKA . . . . .	6 508	6.1	1 279	1.2	30 840	28.9	1 089	1.0
STATE . . . . .	925	1.9	-	-	24 455	49.1	4 825	9.7
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	5 583	9.2	1 279	2.1	6 500	10.7	130	0.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	3 824	14.6	1 279	4.9	6 016	23.0	20	0.1
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	1 759	5.0	-	-	595	1.7	110	0.3
NEVADA . . . . .	8 215	7.5	1 944	1.8	36 117	33.0	1 032	0.9
STATE . . . . .	1 814	4.5	266	0.7	26 015	65.2	2 726	6.8
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	6 401	8.8	1 725	2.4	11 178	15.4	547	0.8
COUNTIES . . . . .	4 971	9.3	1 680	3.1	10 123	18.9	547	1.0
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	1 430	4.5	156	0.5	1 073	3.4	-	-
NEW HAMPSHIRE . . . . .	2 290	4.0	320	0.6	11 834	20.7	830	1.5
STATE . . . . .	1 019	4.7	319	1.5	8 615	39.4	1 206	5.5
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	1 271	3.5	1	(2)	3 219	9.0	92	0.3
COUNTIES . . . . .	495	6.3	1	(2)	2 797	35.4	-	-
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	776	2.7	-	-	435	1.5	92	0.3
NEW JERSEY . . . . .	58 944	7.1	14 289	1.7	167 145	20.2	5 379	0.7
STATE . . . . .	11 512	5.1	14 076	6.3	81 009	36.2	15 382	6.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	47 432	7.6	443	0.1	86 144	13.8	3 887	0.6
COUNTIES . . . . .	34 951	17.1	190	0.1	85 836	41.9	2 014	1.0
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	12 482	2.9	269	0.1	337	0.1	1 873	0.4
NEW MEXICO . . . . .	8 327	8.0	3 111	3.0	24 307	23.4	3 355	3.2
STATE . . . . .	6 517	11.8	3 056	5.5	16 367	29.6	4 222	7.6
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	1 814	3.6	55	0.1	7 940	15.7	825	1.6
COUNTIES . . . . .	484	2.9	-	-	6 324	37.2	708	4.2
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	1 330	3.8	55	0.2	2 600	7.5	117	0.3
NEW YORK . . . . .	163 435	5.6	38 794	1.3	592 621	20.3	30 396	1.0
STATE . . . . .	39 575	4.3	9 063	1.0	352 133	38.2	65 450	7.1
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	124 211	5.6	29 731	1.3	279 517	12.6	21 030	0.9
COUNTIES . . . . .	35 071	7.6	12 538	2.7	117 325	25.3	3 201	0.7
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	89 143	5.1	17 193	1.0	162 273	9.2	17 829	1.0
NORTH CAROLINA . . . . .	21 553	5.5	5 101	1.3	129 699	32.9	10 270	2.6
STATE . . . . .	17 397	7.6	5 010	2.2	112 161	48.8	18 172	7.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	4 156	2.3	91	0.1	19 307	10.7	5 333	3.0
COUNTIES . . . . .	1 723	2.2	100	0.1	19 574	25.5	5 235	6.8
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	2 433	2.3	60	0.1	232	0.2	102	0.1
NORTH DAKOTA . . . . .	2 982	8.5	217	0.6	7 028	20.0	1 766	5.0
STATE . . . . .	1 118	8.1	-	-	5 166	37.6	2 541	18.5
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	1 864	8.4	217	1.0	1 862	8.4	32	0.1
COUNTIES . . . . .	1 501	14.3	212	2.0	1 787	17.0	32	0.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	365	3.0	5	(2)	133	1.1	-	-
OHIO . . . . .	43 791	5.0	12 525	1.4	229 155	26.0	26 140	3.0
STATE . . . . .	13 087	4.7	7 804	2.8	160 607	57.4	25 005	8.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	30 706	4.8	11 856	1.8	79 272	12.3	23 435	3.6
COUNTIES . . . . .	16 887	6.1	11 139	4.0	64 554	23.4	15 844	5.7
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	13 847	3.5	1 245	0.3	20 919	5.3	7 635	2.0
OKLAHOMA . . . . .	10 467	5.2	1 255	0.6	65 410	32.3	1 849	0.9
STATE . . . . .	7 003	6.3	-	-	58 296	52.1	5 036	4.5
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	6 293	6.4	1 255	1.3	7 285	7.4	574	0.6
COUNTIES . . . . .	3 762	12.5	1 028	3.4	5 244	17.5	-	-
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	2 577	3.7	227	0.3	2 115	3.1	574	0.8
OREGON . . . . .	23 880	9.6	4 713	1.9	66 013	26.5	2 713	1.1
STATE . . . . .	12 106	11.2	385	0.4	43 289	40.1	5 885	5.5
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	11 999	8.0	4 357	2.9	23 291	15.5	1 274	0.8
COUNTIES . . . . .	9 621	10.8	4 283	4.8	22 936	25.6	622	0.7
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	2 378	3.8	85	0.1	538	0.9	651	1.0
PENNSYLVANIA . . . . .	43 364	4.4	10 963	1.1	249 325	25.1	6 426	0.6
STATE . . . . .	8 284	2.2	-	-	152 247	40.3	29 786	7.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	35 831	5.1	10 963	1.6	126 081	18.1	1 966	0.3
COUNTIES . . . . .	17 646	9.6	6 546	3.6	76 451	41.6	517	0.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	18 185	3.5	4 417	0.9	50 179	9.7	1 449	0.3
RHODE ISLAND . . . . .	3 445	3.9	666	0.8	24 541	27.9	990	1.1
STATE . . . . .	2 482	4.7	666	1.3	24 540	46.8	2 082	4.0
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	963	2.5	-	-	1	(2)	2	(Z)
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	963	2.5	-	-	1	(2)	2	(Z)
SOUTH CAROLINA . . . . .	7 423	4.1	1 483	0.8	50 767	27.8	2 414	1.3
STATE . . . . .	4 467	5.0	665	0.7	41 802	46.8	5 334	6.0
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	3 541	3.6	856	0.9	9 039	9.2	730	0.7
COUNTIES . . . . .	2 630	4.7	1 002	1.8	8 653	15.4	692	1.2
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	920	2.1	-	(2)	808	1.9	327	0.7

Table 3. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental)

by State and type of government, fiscal year 1978—Continued

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

State and type of government <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup> (in thousands)	Total general expenditure <sup>3</sup>	Total criminal justice system		Police protection		Judicial	
			Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total general expenditure	Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total criminal justice system
SOUTH DAKOTA . . . . .	689	657 000	41 430	6.3	22 199	53.6	6 288	15.2
STATE . . . . .	(X)	496 000	21 104	4.3	6 409	30.4	5 129	24.3
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	188 000	23 060	12.3	15 816	68.6	2 319	10.1
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	76 000	11 515	15.2	4 958	43.1	2 276	19.8
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	111 000	12 023	10.8	11 269	93.7	43	0.4
TENNESSEE . . . . .	4 299	4 641 000	323 469	7.0	158 935	49.1	39 265	12.1
STATE . . . . .	(X)	2 836 000	121 233	4.3	27 189	22.4	10 304	8.5
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	2 600 000	215 942	8.3	131 788	61.0	28 967	13.4
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	1 267 000	89 292	7.0	24 344	27.3	22 086	24.7
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	1 413 000	128 305	9.1	108 029	84.2	6 909	5.4
TEXAS . . . . .	12 830	8 825 000	885 420	10.0	486 194	54.9	118 198	13.3
STATE . . . . .	(X)	5 424 000	279 569	5.2	89 858	32.1	19 473	7.0
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	3 494 000	646 675	18.5	398 927	61.7	101 422	15.7
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	1 145 000	274 292	24.0	61 663	22.5	87 917	32.1
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	2 354 000	375 486	16.0	338 568	90.2	13 811	3.7
UTAH . . . . .	1 268	1 160 000	109 208	9.4	59 521	54.5	10 624	9.7
STATE . . . . .	(X)	885 000	52 542	5.9	19 032	36.2	3 879	7.4
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	349 000	61 827	17.7	41 209	66.7	6 905	11.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	173 000	27 706	16.0	11 928	43.1	4 294	15.5
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	178 000	34 646	19.5	29 665	85.6	2 611	7.5
VERMONT . . . . .	483	506 000	33 308	6.6	16 469	49.4	4 647	14.0
STATE . . . . .	(X)	440 000	25 180	5.7	8 648	34.3	4 180	16.6
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	99 000	8 684	8.8	7 821	90.1	470	5.4
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	1 000	700	70.0	186	28.5	440	62.9
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	98 000	8 114	8.3	7 749	95.5	45	0.6
VIRGINIA . . . . .	5 148	5 981 000	423 807	7.1	190 652	45.0	44 751	10.6
STATE . . . . .	(X)	3 931 000	234 656	6.0	44 367	18.9	43 826	18.7
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	3 099 000	241 489	7.8	146 290	60.6	28 391	11.8
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	1 641 000	107 124	6.5	61 956	57.8	14 744	13.8
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	1 458 000	137 226	9.4	85 021	62.0	14 363	10.5
WASHINGTON . . . . .	3 658	3 622 000	325 154	9.0	163 231	50.2	35 681	11.0
STATE . . . . .	(X)	2 716 000	122 356	4.5	35 062	28.7	6 852	5.6
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	1 216 000	211 547	17.4	128 769	60.9	28 882	13.7
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	540 000	109 560	20.3	40 043	36.5	23 613	21.6
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	679 000	109 260	16.1	92 328	84.5	5 748	5.3
WEST VIRGINIA . . . . .	1 859	1 606 000	93 423	5.8	49 165	52.6	16 890	18.1
STATE . . . . .	(X)	1 312 000	49 927	3.8	18 243	36.5	11 088	22.2
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	329 000	45 264	13.8	30 933	68.3	5 843	12.9
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	118 000	22 296	18.9	9 101	40.8	5 435	24.4
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	211 000	23 166	11.0	21 858	94.4	408	1.8
WISCONSIN . . . . .	4 651	5 105 000	365 940	7.2	201 371	55.0	37 233	10.2
STATE . . . . .	(X)	3 655 000	117 449	3.2	21 086	18.0	10 584	9.0
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	2 836 000	260 019	9.2	181 082	69.6	31 140	12.0
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	1 292 000	116 580	9.0	44 279	38.0	29 931	25.7
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	1 548 000	144 061	9.3	137 074	95.2	1 300	0.9
WYOMING . . . . .	406	509 000	46 338	9.1	20 553	44.4	4 207	9.1
STATE . . . . .	(X)	378 000	26 014	6.9	5 662	21.8	1 691	6.5
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	205 000	20 989	10.2	14 898	71.0	2 516	12.0
COUNTIES . . . . .	(X)	115 000	10 746	9.3	5 535	51.5	2 117	19.7
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	(X)	90 000	10 356	11.5	9 430	91.1	398	3.8

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table 3. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) by State and type of government, fiscal year 1978—Continued**

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

State and type of government <sup>1</sup>	Legal services and prosecution		Public defense		Corrections		Other criminal justice	
	Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount <sup>4</sup>	Percent of total criminal justice system
SOUTH DAKOTA . . . . .	3 676	8.9	627	1.5	8 315	20.1	325	0.8
STATE . . . . .	1 752	8.3	-	-	6 261	29.7	1 553	7.4
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	2 244	9.7	627	2.7	2 054	8.9	-	-
COUNTIES . . . . .	1 838	16.0	617	5.4	1 825	15.8	-	-
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	406	3.4	10	0.1	295	2.5	-	-
TENNESSEE . . . . .	13 391	4.1	3 183	1.0	82 154	25.4	26 541	8.2
STATE . . . . .	8 789	7.2	1 761	1.5	65 869	54.3	7 321	6.0
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	4 602	2.1	1 422	0.7	23 423	10.8	25 740	11.9
COUNTIES . . . . .	1 672	1.9	921	1.0	15 790	17.7	24 479	27.4
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	2 931	2.3	501	0.4	8 318	6.5	1 617	1.3
TEXAS . . . . .	52 730	6.0	7 361	0.8	191 925	21.7	29 012	3.3
STATE . . . . .	12 258	4.4	-	-	118 249	42.3	39 731	14.2
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	40 605	6.3	7 361	1.1	76 959	11.9	21 401	3.3
COUNTIES . . . . .	30 551	11.1	7 332	2.7	70 774	25.8	16 055	5.9
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	10 154	2.7	29	(Z)	7 545	2.0	5 379	1.4
UTAH . . . . .	6 994	6.4	807	0.7	29 071	26.6	2 191	2.0
STATE . . . . .	2 284	4.3	-	-	23 336	44.4	4 011	7.6
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	5 039	8.1	807	1.3	6 218	10.1	1 650	2.7
COUNTIES . . . . .	3 264	11.8	780	2.8	6 227	22.5	1 212	4.4
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	1 774	5.1	27	0.1	108	0.3	462	1.3
VERMONT . . . . .	2 057	6.2	1 180	3.5	8 325	25.0	627	1.9
STATE . . . . .	1 710	6.8	1 180	4.7	8 278	32.9	1 184	4.7
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	347	4.0	-	-	47	0.5	-	-
COUNTIES . . . . .	29	4.2	-	-	45	6.4	-	-
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	318	3.9	-	-	2	(Z)	-	-
VIRGINIA . . . . .	16 757	4.0	5 669	1.3	153 767	36.3	12 209	2.9
STATE . . . . .	7 286	3.1	5 292	2.3	122 374	52.2	11 511	4.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	12 356	5.1	377	0.2	46 182	19.1	7 892	3.3
COUNTIES . . . . .	5 477	5.1	154	0.1	19 109	17.8	5 684	5.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	6 911	5.0	224	0.2	28 470	20.7	2 238	1.6
WASHINGTON . . . . .	21 242	6.5	6 609	2.0	94 872	29.2	3 519	1.1
STATE . . . . .	7 018	5.7	398	0.3	67 334	55.0	5 692	4.7
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	14 747	7.0	6 211	2.9	30 770	14.5	2 167	1.0
COUNTIES . . . . .	10 135	9.3	5 462	5.0	29 289	26.7	1 019	0.9
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	4 613	4.2	881	0.8	4 300	3.9	1 390	1.3
WEST VIRGINIA . . . . .	5 940	6.4	1 057	1.1	18 527	19.8	1 843	2.0
STATE . . . . .	2 726	5.5	1 011	2.0	13 604	27.2	3 255	6.5
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	3 218	7.1	46	0.1	5 036	11.1	187	0.4
COUNTIES . . . . .	2 613	11.7	46	0.2	5 027	22.5	73	0.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	606	2.6	-	-	179	0.8	114	0.5
WISCONSIN . . . . .	30 171	8.2	5 027	1.4	83 587	22.8	8 551	2.3
STATE . . . . .	16 233	13.8	1 392	1.2	60 372	51.4	7 782	6.6
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	16 282	6.3	4 246	1.6	23 309	9.0	3 961	1.5
COUNTIES . . . . .	11 174	9.6	4 245	3.6	23 015	19.7	3 936	3.4
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	5 147	3.6	1	(Z)	494	0.3	44	(2)
WYOMING . . . . .	2 361	5.1	379	0.8	18 315	39.5	522	1.1
STATE . . . . .	707	2.7	-	-	16 779	64.5	1 175	4.5
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	1 654	7.9	379	1.8	1 541	7.3	-	-
COUNTIES . . . . .	1 281	11.9	379	3.5	1 433	13.3	-	-
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	374	3.6	-	(Z)	154	1.5	-	-

- Represents zero or rounds to zero.

X Not applicable.

Z Less than half the unit of measurement shown.

<sup>1</sup>Data for municipalities, and the local governments totals which include municipal data, are estimates subject to sampling variation; data for counties (boroughs, parishes) are based on a canvass of all county governments and therefore are not subject to sampling variation; see text for data limitations.

<sup>2</sup>Estimated population of States as of July 1, 1977 is derived from Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 790, December 1978.

<sup>3</sup>The relation of criminal justice total expenditure to total general expenditure is based on data for general purpose governments only and does not include data for State-operated liquor stores, independent school districts, or special districts.

<sup>4</sup>For each State, and the United States summary, the expenditure figures shown on the "Local, total" line and the combined State-local total line (the data shown opposite the names of the individual States) exclude duplicative intergovernmental amount(s). This was done to avoid the artificial inflation which would result if an intergovernmental expenditure amount for one government is tabulated and then counted again when the recipient government(s) ultimately expend(s) that amount.

Table 4. Criminal justice system employment and percent distribution of

Line number	State and type of government <sup>1</sup>	Total full-time equivalent employees <sup>2</sup>	Total criminal justice system			Police protection			Judicial					
			Number of employees		Percent of total full-time equivalent employees	Number of employees		Percent of total full-time equivalent employees	Number of employees		Percent of total full-time equivalent employees			
			Total	Full-time only		Total	Full-time only		Total	Full-time only				
1	STATES-LOCAL, TOTAL.	6 750 180	1 123 552	1 023 252	1 053 758	15.6	622 544	568 747	582 178	55.2	154 943	131 851	141 001	13.4
2	STATES . . . . .	2 949 933	322 046	303 950	310 554	10.5	98 651	89 977	92 443	29.8	43 625	39 448	41 642	13.4
3	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . .	3 800 247	801 506	719 302	743 204	19.6	523 893	478 770	489 735	65.9	111 318	92 403	99 359	13.4
4	COUNTIES . . . . .	1 595 773	322 538	285 372	295 970	18.5	110 502	98 344	99 889	33.7	85 725	74 002	78 748	26.6
5	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	2 204 474	478 968	433 930	447 234	20.3	413 391	380 426	389 846	87.2	25 593	18 401	20 611	4.6
6	ALABAMA . . . . .	109 134	15 653	13 684	14 543	13.3	8 993	8 324	8 469	58.2	2 522	1 925	2 181	15.0
7	STATE . . . . .	60 985	5 299	4 860	5 052	8.3	1 581	1 516	1 526	30.2	1 422	1 261	1 326	26.2
8	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . .	48 149	10 354	9 024	9 491	19.7	7 412	6 808	6 943	73.2	1 100	654	855	9.0
9	COUNTIES . . . . .	19 302	3 686	3 099	3 398	17.6	1 355	1 270	1 295	38.1	832	542	696	20.5
10	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	28 847	6 668	5 925	6 093	21.1	6 057	5 538	5 648	92.7	268	122	159	2.6
11	ALASKA . . . . .	28 578	2 921	2 779	2 806	9.8	1 437	1 402	1 408	50.2	606	526	539	19.2
12	STATE . . . . .	15 678	2 075	1 962	1 984	12.7	682	672	674	34.0	605	525	538	27.1
13	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . .	12 900	846	817	822	6.4	755	730	734	89.3	1	1	1	0.1
14	BOROUGHS . . . . .	3 304	11	10	10	0.3	4	4	4	40.0	-	-	-	-
15	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	9 596	835	807	812	8.5	751	726	730	89.9	1	1	1	0.1
16	ARIZONA . . . . .	71 438	13 505	13 229	13 351	18.7	7 398	7 325	7 337	55.0	1 748	1 600	1 693	12.7
17	STATE . . . . .	36 310	3 721	3 644	3 708	10.2	1 609	1 609	1 609	43.4	191	114	178	4.8
18	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . .	35 128	9 784	9 585	9 643	27.5	5 789	5 716	5 728	59.4	1 557	1 486	1 515	15.7
19	COUNTIES . . . . .	15 531	4 811	4 723	4 753	30.6	1 324	1 310	1 315	27.7	1 280	1 251	1 261	26.5
20	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	19 597	4 973	4 862	4 890	25.0	4 465	4 406	4 413	90.2	277	235	254	5.2
21	ARKANSAS . . . . .	55 831	7 500	6 287	6 682	12.0	4 406	3 975	4 101	61.4	1 173	593	773	11.6
22	STATE . . . . .	33 000	1 954	1 909	1 923	5.8	886	841	855	44.5	103	103	103	5.4
23	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . .	22 831	5 546	4 378	4 759	20.8	3 520	3 134	3 246	68.2	1 070	490	670	14.1
24	COUNTIES . . . . .	12 026	2 428	1 801	2 002	16.6	946	820	861	43.0	722	365	470	23.5
25	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	10 805	3 118	2 577	2 757	25.5	2 574	2 314	2 385	86.5	348	125	200	7.3
26	CALIFORNIA . . . . .	605 858	124 033	117 084	119 720	19.8	62 096	59 495	60 069	50.2	14 842	13 117	14 286	11.9
27	STATE . . . . .	242 823	26 157	24 613	25 358	10.4	9 763	9 264	9 421	37.2	976	521	976	3.8
28	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . .	363 035	97 876	92 471	94 362	26.0	52 333	50 231	50 648	53.7	13 666	12 596	13 310	14.1
29	COUNTIES . . . . .	212 948	56 706	52 983	54 549	25.6	14 469	13 922	14 078	25.8	13 254	12 011	12 710	23.3
30	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	150 087	41 170	39 488	39 813	28.5	37 864	36 309	36 570	91.9	612	585	600	1.5
31	COLORADO . . . . .	85 614	13 772	12 805	13 067	15.3	7 569	7 147	7 231	55.3	1 870	1 598	1 691	12.9
32	STATE . . . . .	44 813	4 654	4 351	4 445	9.9	1 084	989	967	22.2	1 181	1 068	1 113	25.0
33	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . .	40 801	9 118	8 454	8 622	21.1	6 485	6 180	6 242	72.4	689	530	578	6.7
34	COUNTIES . . . . .	16 734	2 718	2 470	2 535	15.1	1 260	1 165	1 186	46.8	144	144	144	5.7
35	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	24 067	6 400	5 984	6 087	25.3	5 225	5 015	5 056	83.1	545	386	434	7.1
36	CONNECTICUT . . . . .	129 536	13 745	12 593	12 845	9.9	8 551	7 670	7 825	60.9	1 693	1 521	1 568	12.2
37	STATE . . . . .	45 341	6 414	6 154	6 232	13.7	1 498	1 433	1 444	23.2	1 607	1 480	1 516	24.3
38	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . .	84 195	7 331	6 439	6 613	7.9	7 053	6 237	6 381	96.5	86	41	52	0.8
39	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	84 195	7 331	6 439	6 613	7.9	7 053	6 237	6 381	96.5	86	41	52	0.8
40	DELAWARE . . . . .	19 162	3 632	3 503	3 527	18.4	1 696	1 606	1 619	45.9	753	733	741	21.0
41	STATE . . . . .	14 572	2 506	2 440	2 450	16.8	767	723	729	29.8	598	592	594	24.2
42	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . .	4 590	1 126	1 063	1 077	23.5	929	883	890	82.6	155	141	147	13.6
43	COUNTIES . . . . .	2 297	377	377	377	16.4	258	258	258	68.4	107	107	107	28.4
44	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	2 293	749	686	700	30.5	671	625	632	90.3	48	34	40	5.7
45	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA . . . . .	43 896	8 728	8 688	8 705	20.5	4 637	4 624	4 637	51.5	814	808	810	9.0
46	STATE . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
47	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . .	43 896	8 728	8 688	8 705	20.5	4 637	4 624	4 637	51.5	814	808	810	9.0
48	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	43 896	8 728	8 688	8 705	20.5	4 637	4 624	4 637	51.5	814	808	810	9.0
49	FLORIDA . . . . .	237 097	49 756	48 707	48 948	20.6	25 923	25 285	25 371	51.8	6 372	6 122	6 225	12.7
50	STATE . . . . .	101 846	17 832	17 726	17 739	17.4	3 453	3 414	3 415	19.3	1 329	1 327	1 327	7.5
51	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . .	135 251	31 924	30 931	31 209	23.1	22 470	21 871	21 956	70.4	5 043	4 795	4 898	15.7
52	COUNTIES . . . . .	68 753	17 072	16 603	16 736	24.3	8 945	8 726	8 767	52.4	4 605	4 437	4 498	26.9
53	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	66 498	14 852	14 373	14 473	21.8	13 525	13 145	13 189	91.1	438	356	400	2.8
54	GEORGIA . . . . .	134 559	24 557	22 597	23 134	17.2	13 053	12 358	12 512	54.1	3 558	2 765	3 003	13.0
55	STATE . . . . .	76 540	7 718	7 382	7 485	9.8	2 347	2 209	2 245	30.0	534	383	432	5.8
56	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . .	58 019	16 839	15 215	15 649	27.0	10 706	10 149	10 267	65.6	3 024	2 382	2 571	16.4
57	COUNTIES . . . . .	26 704	9 004	7 934	8 253	30.9	3 777	3 610	3 648	44.2	2 665	2 128	2 293	27.8
58	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	31 315	7 835	7 281	7 396	23.6	6 929	6 539	6 619	89.5	359	254	278	3.8
59	HAWAII . . . . .	45 742	4 390	4 369	4 372	9.6	2 651	2 640	2 641	60.4	686	679	680	15.6
60	STATE . . . . .	34 317	1 613	1 604	1 606	4.7	102	102	102	6.4	686	679	680	42.3
61	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . .	11 425	2 777	2 765	2 766	24.2	2 549	2 538	2 539	91.8	-	-	-	-
62	COUNTIES . . . . .	3 098	727	715	716	23.1	619	608	609	85.1	-	-	-	-
63	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	8 327	2 050	2 050	2 050	24.6	1 930	1 930	1 941	-	-	-	-	-
64	IDAHO . . . . .	24 917	4 557	3 734	3 899	15.6	2 424	2 204	2 245	57.6	579	547	557	14.3
65	STATE . . . . .	14 850	1 713	1 209	1 303	8.8	490	486	487	37.4	179	170	173	13.3
66	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . .	10 067	2 844	2 525	2 596	25.8	1 934	1 718	1 758	67.7	400	377	384	14.8
67	COUNTIES . . . . .	5 813	1 655	1 494	1 535	26.4	622	735	750	48.9	378	360	366	23.8
68	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	4 254	1 189	1 031	1 061	24.9	1 112	983	1 008	95.0	22	17	18	1.7

See footnotes at end of table.

**full-time equivalent employees by State and type of government, October 1978**

Legal services and prosecution			Public defense			Corrections			Other criminal justice			Line number				
Number of employees		Percent of total criminal justice system employees	Number of employees		Percent of total criminal justice system employees	Number of employees		Percent of total criminal justice system employees	Number of employees		Percent of total criminal justice system employees					
Total	Full-time only	Full-time equivalent	Total	Full-time only	Full-time equivalent	Total	Full-time only	Full-time equivalent	Total	Full-time only	Full-time equivalent					
68 139	58 150	61 680	5.9	8 450	7 716	8 038	0.8	261 385	249 547	253 466	24.1	8 091	7 241	7 386	0.7	1
18 974	17 596	18 212	5.9	3 256	3 121	3 159	1.0	153 770	150 148	151 408	48.8	3 770	3 660	3 690	1.2	2
49 165	40 554	43 477	5.8	5 194	4 595	4 879	0.7	107 615	99 399	102 058	15.7	4 321	3 581	3 696	0.5	3
32 499	27 743	29 208	9.9	4 817	4 278	4 543	1.5	86 327	78 485	81 015	27.4	2 668	2 520	2 567	0.9	4
16 666	12 811	14 269	3.2	577	517	536	0.1	21 288	20 914	21 043	4.7	1 653	1 061	1 129	0.3	5
773	337	571	3.9	11	5	6	(Z)	3 314	3 253	3 276	22.5	40	40	40	0.3	6
373	160	277	5.5	2	2	2	(Z)	1 883	1 883	1 883	37.3	38	38	38	0.8	7
400	177	294	3.1	9	3	4	(Z)	1 431	1 370	1 393	14.7	2	2	2	(Z)	8
290	136	236	6.9	5	2	2	0.1	1 202	1 147	1 167	34.3	2	2	2	0.1	9
110	41	58	1.0	4	1	2	(Z)	229	223	226	5.7	-	-	-	-	10
274	265	266	9.5	54	50	51	1.8	529	516	522	18.6	21	20	20	0.7	11
210	205	205	10.3	54	50	51	2.6	503	490	496	25.0	21	20	20	1.0	12
64	60	61	7.4	-	-	-	-	26	26	26	3.2	-	-	-	-	13
7	6	6	60.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14
57	54	55	6.8	-	-	-	-	26	26	26	3.2	-	-	-	-	15
970	941	951	7.1	165	160	161	1.2	3 193	3 172	3 178	23.8	31	31	31	0.2	16
203	203	203	5.5	-	-	-	-	1 694	1 694	1 694	45.7	24	24	24	0.6	17
767	738	748	7.8	165	160	161	1.7	1 499	1 478	1 484	15.4	7	7	7	0.1	18
573	552	560	11.8	154	159	160	3.4	1 465	1 446	1 452	30.5	5	5	5	0.1	19
194	186	188	3.8	1	1	1	(Z)	34	32	32	0.7	2	2	2	(Z)	20
391	273	331	5.0	34	29	30	0.4	1 444	1 367	1 396	20.9	52	50	51	0.8	21
42	42	42	2.2	-	-	-	-	879	879	879	45.7	44	44	44	2.3	22
349	231	289	6.1	34	29	30	0.6	565	488	517	10.9	8	6	7	0.1	23
253	188	214	10.7	28	23	24	1.2	474	400	428	21.4	5	5	5	0.2	24
96	43	75	2.7	6	6	6	0.2	91	88	89	3.2	3	1	2	0.1	25
11 226	10 962	11 074	9.2	1 936	1 897	1 908	1.6	33 564	31 263	32 024	26.7	369	350	359	0.3	26
2 221	2 199	2 205	8.7	1 444	1 411	1 411	0.6	12 927	12 365	12 490	49.3	126	123	125	0.5	27
9 005	8 763	8 869	9.4	1 792	1 756	1 767	1.9	20 637	18 898	19 534	20.7	243	227	234	0.2	28
7 377	7 216	7 282	13.3	1 718	1 683	1 694	3.1	19 727	17 999	18 629	34.2	161	152	156	0.3	29
1 628	1 547	1 587	4.0	74	73	73	0.2	910	899	905	2.3	82	75	78	0.2	30
1 099	962	1 000	7.7	153	146	149	1.1	2 994	2 868	2 911	22.3	87	84	85	0.7	31
158	155	155	3.5	153	146	149	3.4	2 040	1 978	2 001	45.0	38	38	38	0.5	32
941	808	845	9.8	-	-	-	-	954	890	910	10.6	49	46	47	0.5	33
639	546	571	22.5	-	-	-	-	633	573	592	23.4	42	42	42	1.7	34
302	262	274	4.5	-	-	-	-	321	317	318	5.2	7	4	5	0.1	35
580	527	557	4.3	135	128	132	1.0	2 688	2 655	2 669	20.8	98	92	94	0.7	36
440	412	425	6.8	135	128	132	2.1	2 682	2 650	2 664	42.7	52	51	51	0.8	37
140	115	132	2.0	-	-	-	-	6	5	5	0.1	46	41	43	0.7	38
140	115	132	2.0	-	-	-	-	6	5	5	0.1	46	41	43	0.7	39
145	142	143	4.1	41	41	41	1.2	958	942	944	26.8	39	39	39	1.1	40
104	104	104	4.2	41	41	41	1.7	958	942	944	38.5	38	38	38	1.6	41
41	38	39	3.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	0.1	42
12	12	12	3.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	43
29	26	27	3.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	0.1	44
207	207	207	5.6	106	106	106	1.2	2 941	2 920	2 922	32.5	23	23	23	0.3	45
207	207	207	5.6	106	106	106	1.2	2 941	2 920	2 922	32.5	23	23	23	0.3	46
207	207	207	5.6	106	106	106	1.2	2 941	2 920	2 922	32.5	23	23	23	0.3	47
2 331	2 303	2 320	4.7	848	840	843	1.7	13 806	13 687	13 716	28.0	476	470	473	1.0	49
1 849	1 845	1 846	10.4	786	786	786	4.4	10 360	10 299	10 310	58.1	55	55	55	0.3	50
482	458	474	1.5	62	54	57	0.2	3 446	3 388	3 406	10.9	421	415	418	1.3	51
229	223	225	1.3	60	52	55	0.3	2 861	2 804	2 822	16.9	372	366	369	2.2	52
253	235	249	1.7	2	2	2	(Z)	585	584	584	4.0	49	49	49	0.3	53
973	724	801	3.5	96	58	64	0.3	6 818	6 639	6 697	28.9	59	53	57	0.2	54
271	241	258	3.4	30	13	14	0.2	4 505	4 505	4 505	60.2	31	31	31	0.4	55
702	483	543	3.5	66	45	50	0.3	2 313	2 134	2 192	14.0	28	22	26	0.2	56
570	398	452	5.5	56	38	42	0.5	1 920	1 747	1 802	21.8	16	13	16	0.2	57
132	85	91	1.2	10	7	8	0.1	393	367	390	5.3	12	9	10	0.1	58
289	289	289	6.6	53	53	53	1.2	629	627	628	14.4	82	81	81	1.9	59
108	108	108	6.7	53	53	53	3.3	584	582	583	36.3	80	80	80	5.0	60
181	181	181	6.5	-	-	-	-	45	45	45	1.6	2	1	1	(Z)	61
61	61	61	8.5	-	-	-	-	45	45	45	6.3	2	1	1	0.1	62
120	120	120	5.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	63
335	284	298	7.6	37	36	36	0.9	1 144	625	725	18.6	38	38	38	1.0	64
78	75	76	5.8	-	-	-	-	928	440	529	40.6	38	38	38	2.9	65
257	209	222	8.6	37	36	36	1.4	216	185	196	7.6	-	-	-	-	66
204	180	189	12.3	37	36	36	2.3	214	183	194	12.6	-	-	-	-	67
53	29	33	3.1	-	-	-	-	2	2	2	0.2	-	-	-	-	68

Table 4. Criminal justice system employment and percent distribution of full-time

Line number	State and type of government <sup>1</sup>	Total full-time equivalent employees <sup>2</sup>	Total criminal justice system			Police protection			Judicial					
			Number of employees		Percent of total full-time equivalent employees	Number of employees		Percent of total full-time equivalent employees	Number of employees		Percent of total full-time equivalent employees			
			Total	Full-time only		Total	Full-time only		Total	Full-time only				
1	ILLINOIS . . . . .	248 464	60 496	55 696	57 263	23.0	37 339	34 354	35 313	61.7	7 909	6 888	7 215	12.6
2	STATES . . . . .	113 131	12 780	12 499	12 584	11.1	3 716	3 654	3 665	29.1	1 619	1 601	1 605	12.8
3	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	135 333	47 716	43 197	44 679	33.0	33 623	30 700	31 648	70.8	6 290	5 287	5 610	12.6
4	COUNTIES . . . . .	41 671	16 983	15 316	15 832	38.0	3 519	3 277	3 326	21.0	6 260	5 263	5 584	35.3
5	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	93 662	30 733	27 881	28 847	30.8	30 104	27 423	28 322	98.2	30	24	26	0.1
6	INDIANA . . . . .	135 497	20 518	17 963	19 296	14.2	11 383	10 529	10 712	55.5	3 157	2 499	2 974	15.4
7	STATE . . . . .	62 059	5 475	4 981	5 354	8.6	2 194	2 083	2 106	39.3	410	141	410	7.7
8	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	73 438	15 043	12 982	13 942	19.0	9 189	8 446	8 606	61.7	2 747	2 358	2 564	18.4
9	COUNTIES . . . . .	36 969	5 666	4 587	5 134	13.9	1 556	1 366	1 413	27.5	1 968	1 714	1 850	36.0
10	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	36 469	9 377	8 395	8 808	24.2	7 623	7 080	7 193	81.7	779	644	714	8.1
11	IOWA . . . . .	79 874	11 313	9 707	10 080	12.6	6 343	5 505	5 629	55.8	1 648	1 229	1 359	13.5
12	STATE . . . . .	42 458	3 364	3 055	3 157	7.4	1 237	1 196	1 204	36.7	367	171	241	7.6
13	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	37 416	7 949	6 652	6 923	18.5	5 106	4 309	4 425	63.9	1 281	1 058	1 118	16.1
14	COUNTIES . . . . .	20 622	3 835	3 208	3 380	16.4	1 111	955	986	29.2	1 281	1 058	1 118	33.1
15	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	16 794	4 114	3 444	3 543	21.1	3 995	3 354	3 439	97.1	-	-	-	-
16	KANSAS . . . . .	69 499	11 291	9 792	10 112	14.5	5 836	5 065	5 196	51.4	2 045	1 657	1 734	17.1
17	STATE . . . . .	38 001	3 217	3 059	3 081	8.1	931	800	821	26.6	348	322	323	10.5
18	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	31 498	8 074	6 733	7 031	22.3	4 905	4 265	4 375	62.2	1 697	1 335	1 411	20.1
19	COUNTIES . . . . .	15 010	3 765	3 201	3 365	22.4	1 254	988	1 038	30.8	1 347	1 216	1 249	37.1
20	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	16 488	4 309	3 532	3 666	22.2	3 651	3 277	3 337	91.0	350	119	162	4.4
21	KENTUCKY . . . . .	91 008	14 556	12 853	13 253	14.6	7 518	6 864	7 001	52.8	2 343	2 079	2 135	16.1
22	STATE . . . . .	59 542	6 347	5 894	6 062	10.2	1 993	1 863	1 893	31.2	1 871	1 789	1 804	29.8
23	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	31 466	8 209	6 959	7 191	22.9	5 525	5 001	5 108	71.0	472	290	331	4.6
24	COUNTIES . . . . .	13 128	3 595	3 153	3 267	24.9	1 632	1 455	1 490	45.6	314	250	271	8.3
25	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	18 338	4 614	3 806	3 924	21.4	3 893	3 516	3 618	92.2	158	40	60	1.5
26	LOUISIANA . . . . .	120 482	27 773	18 723	22 890	19.0	16 722	9 467	12 917	56.4	4 013	2 971	3 265	14.3
27	STATE . . . . .	68 134	10 761	5 609	7 552	11.1	6 290	1 591	3 292	43.6	358	245	265	3.5
28	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	52 348	17 012	13 114	15 338	29.3	10 432	7 876	9 625	62.8	3 655	2 726	3 000	19.6
29	PARISHES . . . . .	21 963	7 685	5 886	6 368	29.0	3 918	3 204	3 347	52.6	2 326	1 576	1 761	27.7
30	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	30 385	9 327	7 228	8 970	29.5	6 514	4 672	6 278	70.0	1 329	1 150	1 239	13.8
31	MAINE . . . . .	38 304	4 496	3 613	3 783	9.9	2 842	2 170	2 270	60.0	504	408	438	11.6
32	STATE . . . . .	17 070	1 732	1 694	1 706	10.0	540	533	535	31.4	361	341	346	20.3
33	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	21 234	2 764	1 919	2 077	9.8	2 302	1 637	1 735	83.5	143	67	92	4.4
34	COUNTIES . . . . .	926	860	468	564	60.9	418	201	240	42.6	142	66	91	16.1
35	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	20 308	1 904	1 451	1 513	7.5	1 884	1 436	1 495	98.8	1	1	1	0.1
36	MARYLAND . . . . .	220 251	22 696	22 109	22 281	10.1	12 435	12 264	12 294	55.2	2 345	2 209	2 250	10.1
37	STATE . . . . .	74 161	9 896	9 564	9 671	13.0	2 841	2 815	2 819	29.1	1 219	1 136	1 164	12.0
38	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	146 090	12 800	12 545	12 610	8.6	9 594	9 449	9 475	75.1	1 126	1 073	1 086	8.6
39	COUNTIES . . . . .	100 332	6 505	6 372	6 409	6.4	4 558	4 524	4 531	70.7	719	666	679	10.6
40	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	45 758	6 295	6 173	6 201	13.6	5 036	4 925	4 944	79.7	407	407	407	6.6
41	MASSACHUSETTS . . . . .	252 483	31 102	28 369	29 006	11.5	18 762	16 622	17 017	58.7	4 355	4 101	4 197	14.5
42	STATE . . . . .	72 291	7 566	7 462	7 500	10.4	2 386	2 304	2 339	31.2	780	771	772	10.3
43	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	180 192	23 536	20 907	21 506	11.9	16 374	14 318	14 678	68.3	3 575	3 330	3 425	49.2
44	COUNTIES . . . . .	6 792	4 898	4 409	4 602	67.8	57	44	46	1.0	2 406	2 174	2 263	49.2
45	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	173 400	18 638	16 498	16 904	9.7	16 317	14 274	14 632	86.6	1 169	1 156	1 162	6.9
46	MICHIGAN . . . . .	234 036	45 376	41 685	42 952	18.4	25 444	23 655	23 876	55.6	7 050	5 947	6 771	15.8
47	STATE . . . . .	118 736	11 434	10 557	10 987	9.3	4 210	3 909	3 934	35.8	732	375	732	6.7
48	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	115 300	33 942	31 128	31 965	27.7	21 234	19 746	19 942	62.4	6 318	5 572	6 039	18.9
49	COUNTIES . . . . .	46 377	13 998	12 755	13 304	28.7	3 464	3 259	3 308	24.9	4 990	4 398	4 759	35.8
50	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	68 923	19 944	18 373	18 661	27.1	17 770	16 487	16 634	89.1	1 328	1 174	1 280	6.9
51	MINNESOTA . . . . .	111 371	15 666	13 866	14 188	12.7	8 321	7 198	7 344	51.8	2 109	1 934	1 973	13.9
52	STATE . . . . .	53 351	3 409	3 315	3 331	6.1	930	878	887	26.6	338	332	332	10.0
53	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	58 017	12 257	10 551	10 857	18.7	7 391	6 320	6 457	59.5	1 771	1 602	1 641	15.1
54	COUNTIES . . . . .	30 016	6 271	5 659	5 822	19.4	1 747	1 596	1 624	27.9	1 771	1 602	1 641	28.2
55	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	28 001	5 986	4 892	5 035	18.0	5 644	4 724	4 833	96.0	-	-	-	-
56	MISSISSIPPI . . . . .	72 169	8 481	7 236	7 643	10.6	5 216	4 687	4 808	62.9	1 033	671	800	10.5
57	STATE . . . . .	36 676	2 817	2 727	2 749	7.5	1 216	1 203	1 205	43.8	136	126	127	4.6
58	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	35 493	5 664	4 509	4 894	13.8	4 000	3 454	3 603	73.6	897	545	673	13.8
59	COUNTIES . . . . .	20 162	2 369	1 688	1 920	9.5	1 040	857	894	46.6	723	448	535	27.9
60	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	15 331	3 295	2 821	2 974	19.4	2 960	2 617	2 709	91.1	174	97	138	4.6
61	MISSOURI . . . . .	120 348	24 496	21 867	22 418	18.6	14 535	13 266	13 482	60.1	3 890	3 192	3 352	15.0
62	STATE . . . . .	63 695	5 436	5 282	5 328	8.4	1 803	1 739	1 749	32.8	855	852	853	16.0
63	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	56 653	19 060	16 585	17 090	30.2	12 732	11 527	11 733	68.7	3 035	2 340	2 499	14.6
64	COUNTIES . . . . .	19 279	5 952	5 149	5 370	27.9	2 074	1 900	1 933	36.0	1 865	1 603	1 689	31.5
65	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	37 374	13 108	11 436	11 720	31.4	10 658	9 627	9 800	83.6	1 170	737	810	6.9
66	MONTANA . . . . .	24 991	4 050	3 375	3 552	14.2	2 000	1 779	1 826	51.4	592	394	445	12.5
67	STATE . . . . .	14 598	1 247	1 183	1 206	8.3	325	334	334	27.7	68	64	64	5.3
68	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	10 393	2 803	2 192	2 346	22.6	1 665	1 446	1 492	63.6	524	336	381	16.2
69	COUNTIES . . . . .	5 860	1 724	1 296	1 408	24.0	789	642	672	47.7	416	290	327	23.2
70	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	4 533	1 079	896	938	20.7	876	804	820	87.4	106	40	54	5.8

See footnotes at end of table.

**equivalent employees by State and type of government, October 1978—Continued**

Legal services and prosecution			Public defense			Corrections			Other criminal justice			Line number
Number of employees		Percent of total criminal justice system employees	Number of employees		Percent of total criminal justice system employees	Number of employees		Percent of total criminal justice system employees	Number of employees		Percent of total criminal justice system employees	Line number
Total	Full-time only		Total	Full-time only		Total	Full-time only		Total	Full-time only		
3 071	2 610	2 773	4.8	798	705	746	1.3	10 987	10 749	10 825	18.9	392
810	614	683	5.4	102	98	99	0.8	6 248	6 247	6 247	49.6	285
2 261	1 996	2 090	4.7	696	607	647	1.4	4 739	4 502	4 578	10.2	107
1 735	1 635	1 664	10.5	696	607	647	4.1	4 730	4 493	4 569	28.9	43
526	361	426	1.5	-	-	-	-	9	9	9	(Z)	64
1 413	672	1 197	6.2	169	86	147	0.8	4 248	4 049	4 132	21.4	148
333	243	308	5.8	39	37	38	0.7	2 443	2 421	2 436	45.5	56
1 080	429	889	6.4	130	49	109	0.8	1 805	1 628	1 696	12.2	92
709	334	574	11.2	128	49	108	2.1	1 266	1 098	1 162	22.6	29
371	95	315	3.6	2	-	1	(Z)	539	530	534	6.1	63
626	507	557	5.5	56	44	46	0.5	2 587	2 371	2 438	24.2	53
141	118	121	3.8	-	-	-	-	1 600	1 551	1 572	49.8	19
485	389	436	6.3	56	44	46	0.7	987	820	866	12.5	34
401	331	365	10.8	56	44	46	1.4	952	788	833	24.6	34
84	58	71	2.0	-	-	-	-	35	32	33	-	-
815	599	671	6.6	22	20	20	0.2	2 462	2 348	2 386	23.6	111
165	165	165	5.4	17	17	17	0.6	1 731	1 730	1 730	56.2	25
650	434	506	7.2	5	3	3	(Z)	731	618	656	9.3	86
404	356	399	11.9	2	-	-	-	681	570	607	18.0	77
246	78	107	2.9	3	3	3	0.1	50	48	49	1.3	9
676	535	578	4.4	76	74	75	0.6	3 328	2 960	3 121	23.5	615
264	249	251	4.1	75	73	74	1.2	1 948	1 732	1 850	30.5	196
412	286	327	4.5	1	1	1	(Z)	1 380	1 228	1 271	17.7	419
296	228	250	7.7	1	1	1	(Z)	1 215	1 082	1 118	34.2	137
116	58	77	2.0	-	-	-	-	165	146	153	3.9	282
1 421	829	1 179	5.2	84	74	78	0.3	5 402	5 256	5 321	23.2	131
438	150	350	4.6	8	6	7	0.1	3 609	3 559	3 580	47.4	58
983	679	829	5.4	76	68	71	0.5	1 793	1 697	1 741	11.4	73
539	280	405	6.4	24	20	22	0.3	870	798	825	13.0	8
444	399	424	4.7	52	48	49	0.5	923	899	916	10.2	65
193	177	184	4.9	-	-	-	-	936	837	870	23.0	21
126	126	126	7.4	-	-	-	-	684	673	678	39.7	21
67	51	58	2.8	-	-	-	-	252	164	192	9.2	-
48	37	41	7.3	-	-	-	-	252	164	192	34.0	-
19	14	17	1.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1 005	947	970	4.4	330	268	283	1.3	6 409	6 249	6 312	28.3	172
155	127	136	1.4	330	268	283	2.9	5 205	5 072	5 123	53.0	146
850	820	834	6.6	-	-	-	-	1 204	1 177	1 189	9.4	26
538	519	524	8.2	-	-	-	-	682	655	667	10.4	8
312	301	310	5.0	-	-	-	-	522	522	522	8.4	18
1 137	1 021	1 075	3.7	162	156	158	0.5	6 469	6 262	6 349	21.9	217
486	480	481	6.4	135	135	135	1.8	3 688	3 687	3 687	49.2	89
651	541	594	2.8	27	21	23	0.1	2 781	2 575	2 662	12.4	128
215	182	195	4.2	27	21	23	0.5	2 180	1 975	2 062	44.8	13
436	359	399	2.4	-	-	-	-	601	600	600	3.5	115
1 961	1 843	1 876	4.4	100	92	94	0.2	10 726	10 055	10 242	23.8	95
411	378	384	3.5	40	40	40	0.4	5 992	5 806	5 848	53.2	49
1 550	1 465	1 492	4.7	60	52	54	0.2	4 734	4 249	4 394	13.7	46
1 232	1 180	1 194	9.0	59	51	53	0.4	4 218	3 834	3 957	29.7	35
318	285	298	1.6	1	1	1	(Z)	516	415	437	2.3	11
1 330	1 055	1 130	8.0	208	162	186	1.3	3 613	3 437	3 474	24.5	85
216	213	64	22	22	22	22	0.7	1 843	1 813	1 819	54.6	57
1 114	842	917	8.4	186	140	164	1.5	1 770	1 624	1 655	15.2	25
793	693	735	12.6	186	140	164	2.8	1 754	1 610	1 640	28.2	20
321	149	182	3.6	-	-	-	-	16	14	15	0.3	5
334	184	252	3.3	28	12	16	0.2	1 810	1 652	1 707	22.3	60
126	101	113	4.1	-	-	-	-	1 294	1 252	1 259	45.8	45
208	83	139	2.8	28	12	16	0.3	516	400	448	9.2	15
137	60	100	5.2	24	11	13	0.7	451	318	364	19.0	14
71	23	39	1.3	4	1	3	0.1	85	82	84	2.8	1
1 239	972	1 031	4.6	121	119	119	0.5	4 637	4 244	4 360	19.4	74
134	119	124	2.3	119	119	119	2.2	2 501	2 429	2 459	46.2	24
1 105	853	907	5.3	2	-	-	-	2 136	1 815	1 901	11.1	50
608	562	578	10.8	1	-	-	-	1 384	1 064	1 150	21.4	20
497	291	329	2.8	1	-	-	-	752	751	751	6.4	30
372	231	281	7.9	11	9	10	0.3	1 018	913	939	26.4	57
89	39	58	4.8	-	-	-	-	709	708	709	58.8	46
283	192	223	9.5	11	9	10	0.4	309	205	230	9.8	11
212	163	182	12.9	11	9	10	0.7	290	187	212	15.1	6
71	29	41	4.4	-	-	-	-	19	18	18	1.9	5

Table 4. Criminal justice system employment and percent distribution of full-time

Line number	State and type of government <sup>1</sup>	Total full-time equivalent employees <sup>2</sup>	Total criminal justice system				Police protection				Judicial			
			Number of employees			Percent of total full-time equivalent employees	Number of employees			Percent of total full-time equivalent employees	Number of employees			Percent of total full-time equivalent employees
			Total	Full-time only	Full-time equivalent		Total	Full-time only	Full-time equivalent		Total	Full-time only	Full-time equivalent	
1	NEBRASKA.	51 485	6 600	5 913	6 066	11.8	3 358	3 194	3 260	53.7	965	890	907	15.0
2	STATES.	28 116	2 243	2 209	2 219	7.9	665	641	648	29.2	481	473	475	21.4
3	LOCAL, TOTAL.	23 369	4 357	3 704	3 847	16.5	2 893	2 553	2 612	67.9	484	417	432	11.2
4	COUNTIES.	12 647	1 885	1 529	1 623	12.8	705	620	639	39.4	366	304	318	19.6
5	MUNICIPALITIES.	10 722	2 472	2 175	2 224	20.7	2 188	1 933	1 973	88.7	118	113	114	5.1
6	NEVADA.	26 189	5 104	4 951	4 993	19.1	2 396	2 345	2 354	47.1	729	669	688	13.8
7	STATE.	12 119	1 299	1 257	1 269	10.5	315	303	306	24.1	83	72	74	5.8
8	LOCAL, TOTAL.	14 070	3 805	3 694	3 724	26.5	2 081	2 042	2 048	55.0	646	597	614	16.5
9	COUNTIES.	9 511	2 732	2 669	2 687	28.3	1 296	1 285	1 287	47.9	502	467	478	17.8
10	MUNICIPALITIES.	4 559	1 073	1 025	1 037	22.7	785	757	761	73.4	144	130	136	13.1
11	NEW HAMPSHIRE.	26 989	4 317	3 008	3 251	12.0	2 975	1 867	2 022	62.2	391	283	336	10.3
12	STATE.	12 865	1 153	1 096	1 119	8.7	417	404	408	36.5	93	86	89	8.0
13	LOCAL, TOTAL.	14 124	3 164	1 912	2 132	15.1	2 558	1 463	1 614	75.7	298	197	247	11.6
14	COUNTIES.	2 383	497	408	438	18.4	129	105	109	24.9	151	110	127	29.0
15	MUNICIPALITIES.	11 741	2 667	1 504	1 694	14.4	2 429	1 358	1 505	88.8	147	87	120	7.1
16	NEW JERSEY.	241 962	49 461	46 114	46 928	19.4	28 215	25 963	26 299	56.0	6 683	6 109	6 379	13.6
17	STATE.	79 128	10 144	10 005	10 021	12.7	3 704	3 567	3 582	35.7	985	985	985	9.8
18	LOCAL, TOTAL.	162 834	39 317	36 109	36 907	22.7	24 511	22 396	22 717	61.6	5 698	5 124	5 394	14.6
19	COUNTIES.	60 688	13 993	13 672	13 782	22.7	1 647	1 631	1 639	11.9	3 956	3 859	3 883	28.2
20	MUNICIPALITIES.	102 146	25 324	22 437	23 125	22.6	22 864	20 765	21 078	91.1	1 742	1 265	1 511	6.5
21	NEW MEXICO.	41 516	6 347	6 029	6 114	14.7	3 694	3 489	3 533	57.8	903	842	867	14.2
22	STATE.	27 962	2 858	2 814	2 820	10.1	923	882	886	31.4	670	670	670	23.8
23	LOCAL, TOTAL.	13 554	3 489	3 215	3 294	24.3	2 771	2 607	2 647	80.4	233	172	197	6.0
24	COUNTIES.	4 132	872	811	827	20.0	605	581	587	71.0	39	36	37	4.5
25	MUNICIPALITIES.	9 422	2 404	2 467	2 62	2 166	2 026	2 060	83.5	194	136	160	6.5	
26	NEW YORK.	665 422	124 917	117 345	119 061	17.9	73 133	70 158	70 594	59.3	14 654	12 162	12 724	10.7
27	STATE.	190 912	35 961	34 711	35 048	18.4	6 584	6 387	6 417	18.3	11 080	10 752	10 822	30.9
28	LOCAL, TOTAL.	474 710	88 956	82 634	84 013	17.7	66 549	63 771	64 177	76.4	3 574	1 410	1 902	2.3
29	COUNTIES.	101 240	19 847	18 339	18 802	18.6	10 537	10 113	10 198	54.2	853	589	660	3.5
30	MUNICIPALITIES.	373 470	69 109	64 295	65 211	17.5	56 012	53 658	53 979	82.8	2 721	821	1 242	1.9
31	NORTH CAROLINA.	265 386	24 505	23 623	23 820	9.0	12 249	11 585	11 714	49.2	2 851	2 796	2 815	11.8
32	STATE.	83 992	12 754	12 666	12 676	15.1	2 276	2 193	2 201	17.4	2 395	2 390	2 392	18.9
33	LOCAL, TOTAL.	181 394	11 751	10 957	11 144	6.1	9 973	9 392	9 513	85.4	456	406	423	3.8
34	COUNTIES.	152 202	4 461	4 071	4 170	2.7	2 771	2 581	2 617	62.8	456	406	423	10.1
35	MUNICIPALITIES.	29 192	7 290	6 886	6 974	23.9	7 202	6 811	6 896	98.9	-	-	-	-
36	NORTH DAKOTA.	17 707	2 712	1 946	2 084	11.8	1 395	1 131	1 169	56.1	617	278	338	16.2
37	STATE.	11 642	656	607	614	5.3	221	187	192	31.3	77	75	75	12.2
38	LOCAL, TOTAL.	6 065	2 056	1 339	1 470	24.2	1 174	944	977	66.5	540	203	263	17.9
39	COUNTIES.	3 169	1 026	627	717	22.6	324	262	270	37.7	402	188	235	32.8
40	MUNICIPALITIES.	2 896	1 030	712	753	26.0	850	682	707	93.9	138	15	28	3.7
41	OHIO.	262 145	49 123	43 348	48 257	18.4	24 480	21 985	25 142	52.1	8 743	6 926	8 178	16.9
42	STATE.	109 815	10 896	10 452	10 816	9.8	2 716	2 623	2 636	24.4	526	175	526	4.9
43	LOCAL, TOTAL.	152 330	38 227	32 896	37 441	24.6	21 764	19 362	22 506	60.1	8 217	6 751	7 652	20.4
44	COUNTIES.	72 220	15 709	13 554	14 540	20.1	3 496	3 178	3 248	22.3	5 902	4 920	5 553	38.2
45	MUNICIPALITIES.	80 110	22 518	19 342	22 901	28.6	18 266	16 184	19 258	84.1	2 315	1 831	2 099	9.2
46	OKLAHOMA.	88 916	12 311	11 156	11 515	13.0	6 990	6 481	6 627	57.6	1 712	1 318	1 427	12.4
47	STATE.	50 787	4 949	4 710	4 806	9.5	1 745	1 628	1 661	34.6	446	430	431	9.0
48	LOCAL, TOTAL.	38 129	7 362	6 446	6 709	17.6	5 245	4 853	4 966	74.0	1 266	888	996	14.8
49	COUNTIES.	13 488	1 979	1 717	1 812	13.4	602	552	569	31.4	820	693	748	41.3
50	MUNICIPALITIES.	24 641	5 383	4 729	4 897	19.9	4 643	4 301	4 397	89.8	446	195	248	5.1
51	OREGON.	68 983	12 610	11 589	11 867	17.2	6 157	5 847	5 891	49.6	1 792	1 444	1 556	13.1
52	STATE.	41 750	4 139	3 962	4 016	9.6	1 338	1 292	1 298	32.3	276	232	240	6.0
53	LOCAL, TOTAL.	27 233	8 471	7 627	7 851	28.8	4 819	4 555	4 593	58.5	1 516	1 212	1 316	16.8
54	COUNTIES.	14 978	4 955	4 486	4 610	30.8	1 679	1 568	1 580	34.3	1 273	1 144	1 191	25.8
55	MUNICIPALITIES.	12 255	3 516	3 141	3 241	26.4	3 140	2 987	3 013	93.0	243	68	125	3.9
56	PENNSYLVANIA.	256 521	59 299	49 824	50 736	19.8	35 924	27 757	28 207	55.6	8 952	8 391	8 600	17.0
57	STATE.	126 917	12 655	12 433	12 461	9.8	5 762	5 608	5 621	45.1	1 119	1 119	1 119	9.0
58	LOCAL, TOTAL.	129 604	46 644	37 391	38 275	29.5	30 162	22 149	22 586	59.0	7 833	7 272	7 481	19.5
59	COUNTIES.	50 046	17 769	11 447	11 911	23.8	6 463	1 263	1 309	11.0	5 286	4 725	4 934	41.4
60	MUNICIPALITIES.	79 558	28 875	25 944	26 364	33.1	23 699	20 886	21 277	80.7	2 547	2 547	2 547	9.7
61	RHODE ISLAND.	42 692	4 502	4 280	4 326	10.1	2 750	2 580	2 600	60.1	652	631	638	14.7
62	STATE.	18 815	2 012	1 997	1 999	10.6	360	346	348	17.4	610	609	609	30.5
63	LOCAL, TOTAL.	23 877	2 490	2 283	2 327	9.7	2 390	2 234	2 252	96.8	42	22	29	1.2
64	MUNICIPALITIES.	23 877	2 490	2 283	2 327	9.7	2 390	2 234	2 252	96.8	42	22	29	1.2
65	SOUTH CAROLINA.	91 924	13 305	12 172	12 519	13.6	7 232	6 783	6 883	55.0	1 776	1 305	1 472	11.8
66	STATE.	58 875	5 537	5 377	5 407	9.2	1 950	1 841	1 856	34.3	294	287	288	5.3
67	LOCAL, TOTAL.	33 049	7 768	6 795	7 112	21.5	5 282	4 942	5 027	70.7	1 482	1 018	1 184	16.6
68	COUNTIES.	21 097	4 150	3 563	3 769	17.9	1 926	1 844	1 865	49.5	1 318	951	1 083	20.7
69	MUNICIPALITIES.	11 952	3 618	3 232	3 343	28.0	3 356	3 098	3 162	94.6	164	67	101	3.0

See footnotes at end of table.

**equivalent employees by State and type of government, October 1978—Continued**

Legal services and prosecution			Public defense			Corrections			Other criminal justice			Line number
Number of employees		Percent of total criminal justice system employees	Number of employees		Percent of total criminal justice system employees	Number of employees		Percent of total criminal justice system employees	Number of employees		Percent of total criminal justice system employees	
Total	Full-time only	Full-time equivalent	Total	Full-time only	Full-time equivalent	Total	Full-time only	Full-time equivalent	Total	Full-time only	Full-time equivalent	
479	381	412	6.8	62	53	56	0.9	1 508	1 367	1 403	23.1	28
56	56	56	2.5	-	-	-	-	1 017	1 015	1 016	45.8	24
423	325	356	9.3	62	53	56	1.5	491	352	387	10.1	17
319	257	280	17.3	62	53	56	3.5	433	295	330	20.3	-
104	68	76	3.4	-	-	-	-	58	57	57	2.5	4
430	417	421	8.4	77	77	77	1.5	1 431	1 402	1 412	28.3	41
72	71	71	5.6	10	10	10	0.8	802	784	791	62.3	17
358	346	350	9.4	67	67	67	1.8	629	618	621	16.7	24
279	273	275	10.2	67	67	67	2.5	564	553	556	20.7	24
79	73	75	7.2	-	-	-	-	65	65	65	6.3	-
123	95	104	3.2	-	-	-	-	789	729	752	23.1	39
56	56	56	5.0	-	-	-	-	553	520	534	47.7	34
67	39	48	2.3	-	-	-	-	236	209	218	10.2	5
25	22	25	5.7	-	-	-	-	192	171	177	40.4	-
42	17	23	1.4	-	-	-	-	44	38	41	2.4	5
3 480	3 193	3 320	7.1	546	518	526	1.1	10 296	10 091	10 164	21.7	241
708	708	708	7.1	513	513	513	5.1	4 176	4 174	4 175	41.7	58
2 772	2 485	2 612	7.1	33	5	13	(Z)	6 120	5 917	5 989	16.2	183
2 174	2 160	2 167	15.7	2	2	2	(Z)	6 095	5 901	5 972	43.3	119
598	325	445	1.9	31	3	11	(Z)	25	16	17	0.1	64
435	426	428	7.0	77	73	76	1.2	1 150	1 135	1 142	18.7	88
363	363	363	12.9	72	69	71	2.5	810	810	810	28.7	20
72	63	65	2.0	5	4	5	0.2	340	325	332	10.1	68
4	4	4	0.5	-	-	-	-	161	151	156	18.9	63
68	59	61	2.5	5	4	5	0.2	179	174	176	7.1	5
8 446	7 613	7 915	6.6	250	175	216	0.2	27 277	26 150	26 512	22.3	1 157
2 001	1 965	1 974	5.6	5	5	5	(Z)	15 406	14 768	14 989	42.8	885
6 445	5 648	5 941	7.1	245	170	211	0.3	11 871	11 382	11 523	13.7	253
1 925	1 681	1 801	9.6	245	170	211	1.1	6 117	5 631	5 772	30.7	170
4 520	3 967	4 140	6.3	-	-	-	-	5 754	5 751	5 751	8.8	102
1 107	1 070	1 080	4.5	64	64	64	0.3	8 045	7 931	7 966	33.4	189
945	945	945	7.5	60	60	60	0.5	6 992	6 992	6 992	55.2	86
162	125	135	1.2	4	4	4	(Z)	1 053	939	974	8.7	103
83	59	66	1.6	4	4	4	0.1	1 048	934	969	23.2	99
79	66	69	1.0	-	-	-	-	5	5	5	0.1	4
220	147	164	7.9	-	-	-	-	464	375	398	19.1	16
47	45	45	7.3	-	-	-	-	295	285	287	46.7	15
173	102	119	8.1	-	-	-	-	169	90	111	7.6	-
138	94	108	15.1	-	-	-	-	162	83	104	14.5	-
35	8	11	1.5	-	-	-	-	7	7	7	0.9	-
2 883	2 377	2 614	5.4	277	237	253	0.5	11 885	11 230	11 433	23.7	855
680	680	680	6.3	46	46	46	0.4	6 804	6 804	6 804	62.9	124
2 203	1 697	1 934	5.2	231	191	207	0.6	5 081	4 426	4 426	12.4	731
1 298	1 153	1 212	8.3	207	170	185	1.3	4 427	3 790	3 987	27.4	379
905	544	722	3.2	24	21	22	0.1	654	636	642	2.8	352
742	642	673	5.8	31	30	30	0.3	2 796	2 645	2 718	23.6	40
518	489	498	10.4	-	-	-	-	2 203	2 126	2 179	45.3	37
224	153	175	2.6	31	30	30	0.4	593	519	539	8.0	3
44	34	37	2.0	29	28	28	1.5	484	410	430	23.7	-
180	119	138	2.8	2	2	2	(Z)	109	109	109	2.2	3
1 228	1 069	1 117	9.4	193	177	191	1.6	3 192	3 005	3 065	25.8	48
531	473	488	12.2	18	15	16	0.4	1 944	1 919	1 943	48.4	32
697	596	629	8.0	175	162	175	2.2	1 248	1 086	1 122	14.3	16
579	525	541	11.7	175	162	175	3.8	1 239	1 077	1 113	24.1	10
118	71	88	2.7	-	-	-	-	9	9	9	0.3	6
2 489	2 124	2 230	4.4	531	496	521	1.0	11 140	10 793	10 915	21.5	263
294	294	294	2.4	-	-	-	-	5 243	5 175	5 190	41.6	237
2 195	1 830	1 936	5.1	531	496	521	1.4	5 897	5 618	5 725	15.0	26
1 404	1 157	1 234	10.4	531	496	521	4.4	4 065	3 786	3 893	32.7	20
791	673	702	2.7	-	-	-	-	1 832	1 832	1 832	6.9	6
192	163	182	4.2	39	39	39	0.9	843	842	842	19.5	26
136	136	136	6.8	39	39	39	2.0	842	842	842	42.1	25
56	27	46	2.0	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-
56	27	46	2.0	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-
462	384	413	3.3	36	24	33	0.3	3 745	3 626	3 667	29.3	54
208	202	205	3.8	-	-	-	-	3 045	3 008	3 019	55.8	40
254	182	208	2.9	36	24	33	0.5	700	618	648	9.1	14
211	162	177	4.7	36	24	33	0.9	650	573	602	16.0	9
43	20	31	0.9	-	-	-	-	50	45	46	1.4	5

Table 4. Criminal justice system employment and percent distribution of full-time

Line number	State and type of government <sup>1</sup>	Total full-time equivalent employees <sup>2</sup>	Total criminal justice system				Police protection			Judicial			
			Number of employees			Percent of total full-time equivalent employees	Number of employees		Percent of total full-time equivalent employees	Number of employees		Percent of total full-time equivalent employees	
			Total	Full-time only	Full-time equivalent		Total	Full-time only		Total	Full-time only	Full-time equivalent	
1	SOUTH DAKOTA . . . . .	19 994	2 791	2 244	2 367	11.8	1 566	1 287	1 340	56.6	396	291	303 12.8
2	STATES . . . . .	12 565	1 207	1 040	1 076	8.6	318	291	295	27.4	393	288	300 27.9
3	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	7 429	1 584	1 204	1 291	17.4	1 248	986	1 045	80.9	3	3	3 0.2
4	COUNTIES . . . . .	3 515	649	464	513	14.6	356	275	292	56.9	3	3	3 0.6
5	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	3 913	935	740	778	19.9	892	721	753	96.8	-	-	- 0.4
6	TENNESSEE . . . . .	199 792	19 501	18 159	18 475	9.2	10 498	9 917	10 061	54.5	2 922	2 478	2 570 13.9
7	STATE . . . . .	63 487	5 791	5 735	5 751	9.1	1 443	1 305	1 412	24.5	412	412	412 7.2
8	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	136 305	13 710	12 424	12 722	9.3	9 055	8 522	8 649	68.0	2 510	2 066	2 158 17.0
9	COUNTIES . . . . .	71 040	5 051	4 359	4 526	6.4	1 783	1 635	1 674	37.0	1 873	1 573	1 637 36.2
10	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	65 265	8 659	8 065	8 196	12.6	7 272	6 887	6 975	85.1	637	493	521 6.4
11	TEXAS . . . . .	323 751	54 990	51 497	52 471	16.2	30 991	29 810	30 026	57.2	9 357	8 019	8 523 16.2
12	STATE . . . . .	165 587	11 529	11 134	11 230	6.8	5 071	4 862	4 899	43.6	572	571	571 5.1
13	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	158 164	43 461	40 363	41 241	26.1	25 920	24 948	25 127	60.9	8 785	7 448	7 952 19.3
14	COUNTIES . . . . .	58 526	19 670	17 743	18 365	31.4	4 715	4 318	4 399	24.0	7 212	6 333	6 714 36.6
15	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	99 638	23 791	22 620	22 876	23.0	21 205	20 630	20 728	90.6	1 573	1 115	1 238 5.4
16	UTAH . . . . .	39 855	6 824	5 130	5 282	13.3	3 382	3 121	3 170	60.0	701	562	611 11.6
17	STATE . . . . .	26 930	1 973	1 855	1 886	7.0	769	705	717	38.0	214	204	207 11.0
18	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	12 925	4 851	3 275	3 396	26.3	2 613	2 416	2 453	72.2	487	358	404 11.9
19	COUNTIES . . . . .	6 813	2 720	1 405	1 464	21.5	804	776	783	53.5	265	207	227 15.5
20	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	6 112	2 131	1 870	1 932	31.6	1 809	1 640	1 670	86.4	222	151	177 9.2
21	VERMONT . . . . .	13 547	2 253	1 836	1 903	14.0	1 301	955	1 005	52.8	240	207	215 11.3
22	STATE . . . . .	10 514	1 381	1 272	1 286	12.2	488	420	426	33.1	193	184	186 14.5
23	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	3 033	872	564	617	20.3	813	535	579	93.8	47	23	29 4.7
24	COUNTIES . . . . .	24	121	39	49	204.2	67	14	16	32.7	47	23	29 59.2
25	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	3 009	751	525	568	18.9	746	521	563	99.1	-	-	-
26	VIRGINIA . . . . .	269 745	25 712	23 598	24 126	9.0	12 015	11 423	11 551	47.8	3 323	2 477	2 603 10.8
27	STATE . . . . .	93 083	11 386	10 040	10 415	11.2	2 563	2 343	2 396	23.0	2 292	1 555	1 649 15.8
28	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	176 662	14 326	13 558	13 771	7.8	9 452	9 080	9 155	66.5	1 031	922	954 6.9
29	COUNTIES . . . . .	102 740	6 032	5 600	5 711	5.6	3 733	3 536	3 573	62.6	573	497	517 9.1
30	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	73 922	8 294	7 958	8 060	10.9	5 719	5 544	5 582	69.3	458	425	437 5.4
31	WASHINGTON . . . . .	106 810	17 580	15 981	16 522	15.5	8 693	8 204	8 280	50.1	2 484	1 807	2 135 12.9
32	STATE . . . . .	67 232	5 490	5 307	5 436	8.1	1 780	1 715	1 726	31.8	343	225	343 6.3
33	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	39 578	12 090	10 674	11 086	28.0	6 913	6 489	6 554	59.1	2 141	1 582	1 792 16.2
34	COUNTIES . . . . .	18 711	6 385	5 709	5 963	31.9	2 173	2 071	2 088	35.0	1 631	1 318	1 487 24.9
35	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	20 867	5 705	4 965	5 123	24.6	4 740	4 418	4 466	87.2	510	264	305 6.0
36	WEST VIRGINIA . . . . .	54 555	6 395	5 877	6 010	11.0	3 581	3 284	3 349	55.7	1 182	1 054	1 089 18.1
37	STATE . . . . .	37 900	2 748	2 727	2 728	7.2	1 064	1 043	1 044	38.3	632	632	632 23.2
38	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	16 655	3 647	3 150	3 282	19.7	2 517	2 241	2 305	70.2	550	422	457 13.9
39	COUNTIES . . . . .	7 210	1 708	1 565	1 619	22.5	728	690	703	43.4	434	403	416 25.7
40	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	9 445	1 939	1 585	1 663	17.6	1 789	1 551	1 602	96.3	116	19	41 2.5
41	WISCONSIN . . . . .	148 960	20 989	18 435	18 967	12.7	12 458	10 859	11 105	58.5	2 373	1 951	2 088 11.0
42	STATE . . . . .	55 540	5 468	5 144	5 229	9.4	1 058	9 930	9 955	18.3	501	468	488 9.3
43	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	93 420	15 521	13 291	13 738	14.7	11 400	9 929	10 150	73.9	1 872	1 483	1 600 11.6
44	COUNTIES . . . . .	39 714	6 203	5 544	5 726	14.4	2 626	2 411	2 452	42.8	1 645	1 431	1 511 26.4
45	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	53 706	9 318	7 747	8 012	14.9	8 774	7 518	7 698	96.1	227	52	89 1.1
46	WYOMING . . . . .	15 200	2 345	2 084	2 172	14.3	1 381	1 272	1 296	59.7	336	248	284 13.1
47	STATE . . . . .	8 624	680	665	671	7.8	235	234	234	34.9	65	65	65 9.7
48	LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	6 576	1 665	1 419	1 501	22.8	1 146	1 038	1 062	70.8	271	183	219 14.6
49	COUNTIES . . . . .	4 061	823	690	737	18.1	411	359	373	50.6	203	153	175 23.7
50	MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	2 515	842	729	764	30.4	735	679	689	90.2	66	30	44 5.8

- Represents zero or rounds to zero.

Z Less than half the unit of measurement shown.

Data for municipalities, and the local governments totals which include municipal data, are estimates subject to sampling variation; data for counties (boroughs, parishes) are based on a canvass of all county governments and therefore are not subject to sampling variation; see text for data limitations.

<sup>1</sup>The relation of criminal justice full-time equivalent employees to total full-time equivalent employees is based on data for general purpose governments only and does not include data for State-operated liquor stores, locally-operated utility systems, or for independent school districts and special districts.

**equivalent employees by State and type of government, October 1978—Continued**

Legal services and prosecution			Public defense			Corrections			Other criminal justice			Line number
Number of employees		Percent of total criminal justice system employees	Number of employees		Percent of total criminal justice system employees	Number of employees		Percent of total criminal justice system employees	Number of employees		Percent of total criminal justice system employees	
Total	Full-time only	Full-time equivalent	Total	Full-time only	Full-time equivalent	Total	Full-time only	Full-time equivalent	Total	Full-time only	Full-time equivalent	
285	211	235	9.9	9	7	8	0.3	522	435	468	13	1
97	93	94	8.7	-	-	-	-	386	355	374	13	2
188	118	141	10.9	9	7	8	0.6	136	80	94	-	3
148	102	119	23.2	9	7	8	1.6	133	77	91	17.7	-
40	16	22	2.8	-	-	-	-	3	3	0.4	-	4
752	554	599	3.2	138	123	126	0.7	5 128	5 024	5 056	27.4	5
424	424	424	7.4	53	45	46	0.8	3 423	3 423	3 423	59.5	36
328	130	175	1.4	85	78	80	0.6	1 705	1 601	1 633	12.8	27
167	28	60	1.3	50	46	47	1.0	1 164	1 063	1 094	24.2	14
161	102	115	1.4	35	32	33	0.4	541	538	539	6.6	13
3 449	3 005	3 080	5.9	17	12	13	(Z)	10 675	10 164	10 329	19.7	501
571	517	527	4.7	-	-	-	-	5 188	5 057	5 106	45.5	127
2 878	2 488	2 553	6.2	17	12	13	(Z)	5 487	5 107	5 223	12.7	374
2 298	2 028	2 068	11.3	17	12	13	0.1	5 107	4 738	4 851	26.4	321
580	460	485	2.1	-	-	-	-	380	369	372	1.6	53
1 549	333	361	6.8	8	2	3	0.1	1 166	1 094	1 119	21.2	18
100	78	83	4.4	-	-	-	-	874	852	863	45.8	16
1 449	255	278	8.2	8	2	3	0.1	292	242	256	7.5	2
1 353	179	196	13.4	7	2	3	0.2	289	239	253	17.3	2
96	76	82	4.2	1	-	-	-	3	3	0.2	-	-
118	101	106	5.6	56	56	56	2.9	512	492	496	26.1	26
110	98	100	7.8	56	56	56	4.4	508	489	493	38.3	26
8	3	6	1.0	-	-	-	-	4	3	3	0.5	-
4	-	2	4.1	-	-	-	-	3	2	2	4.1	-
4	3	4	0.7	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	0.2	-
816	726	761	3.1	24	18	22	0.1	9 071	8 527	8 810	36.4	463
105	96	98	0.9	21	15	19	0.2	6 318	5 960	6 174	59.3	87
711	630	663	4.8	3	3	3	(Z)	2 753	2 567	2 636	19.1	376
350	305	326	5.7	-	-	-	-	1 077	975	1 006	17.6	299
361	325	337	4.2	3	3	3	(Z)	1 676	1 592	1 630	20.2	77
1 272	1 068	1 148	6.9	76	69	71	0.4	4 936	4 743	4 793	29.0	119
329	329	329	6.1	-	-	-	-	3 011	3 011	3 011	55.4	27
943	739	819	7.4	76	69	71	0.6	1 925	1 732	1 782	16.1	92
641	576	593	9.9	72	69	70	1.2	1 836	1 647	1 696	28.4	32
302	163	226	4.4	4	-	1	(Z)	89	85	86	1.7	60
410	381	389	6.5	-	-	-	-	1 194	1 130	1 155	19.2	28
166	166	166	6.1	-	-	-	-	858	858	858	31.5	28
244	215	223	6.8	-	-	-	-	336	272	297	9.0	-
211	201	204	12.6	-	-	-	-	335	271	296	18.3	-
33	14	19	1.1	-	-	-	-	1	1	0.1	-	-
1 413	1 140	1 223	6.4	100	92	95	0.5	4 527	4 284	4 342	22.9	118
477	413	426	8.1	78	73	75	1.4	3 294	3 208	3 228	61.7	60
936	727	797	5.8	22	19	20	0.1	1 233	1 076	1 114	8.1	58
648	573	598	10.4	16	16	16	0.3	1 210	1 056	1 092	19.1	57
288	154	199	2.5	6	3	4	(Z)	23	20	22	0.3	-
173	132	152	7.0	5	4	4	0.2	439	417	425	19.6	11
29	29	29	4.3	-	-	-	-	340	326	332	49.5	11
144	103	123	8.2	5	4	4	0.3	99	91	93	6.2	-
114	92	101	13.7	5	4	4	0.5	90	82	84	11.4	-
30	11	22	2.9	-	-	-	-	9	9	9	1.2	-

Table 5. Percent distribution of criminal justice system payroll, by State and type of government,  
October 1978

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

State and type of government <sup>1</sup>	Total October payroll <sup>2</sup>	Total criminal justice system		Police protection		Judicial	
		October payroll	Percent of total October payroll	October payroll	Percent of total October payroll	October payroll	Percent of total October payroll
STATES-LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	7 200 275	1 342 880	18.7	768 828	57.2	169 516	12.6
STATES . . . . .	3 080 050	406 897	13.2	122 337	30.0	68 050	16.7
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	4 120 225	935 983	22.7	646 491	69.1	101 466	10.8
COUNTIES . . . . .	1 322 254	343 125	26.0	124 757	36.4	79 803	23.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	2 797 971	592 859	21.2	521 735	88.0	21 663	3.7
ALABAMA . . . . .	111 821	15 484	13.8	8 976	58.0	2 302	14.9
STATE . . . . .	70 663	5 968	8.4	1 877	31.4	1 494	25.0
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	41 158	9 516	23.1	7 099	74.6	808	8.5
COUNTIES . . . . .	12 392	3 246	26.2	1 331	41.0	618	19.0
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	28 767	6 269	21.8	5 769	92.0	191	3.0
ALASKA . . . . .	50 589	5 807	11.5	3 089	53.2	1 006	17.3
STATE . . . . .	26 059	4 037	15.5	1 488	36.9	1 004	24.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	24 500	1 769	7.2	1 601	90.5	3	0.2
BOROUGHS . . . . .	4 823	1 26	0.5	6	22.4	-	-
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	19 676	1 743	8.9	1 596	91.5	3	0.2
ARIZONA . . . . .	74 661	17 872	23.9	10 685	59.8	1 869	10.5
STATE . . . . .	34 345	4 665	13.6	2 180	46.7	301	6.5
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	40 316	13 207	32.8	8 505	64.4	1 567	11.9
COUNTIES . . . . .	14 930	5 810	38.9	1 733	29.8	1 285	22.1
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	25 386	7 397	29.1	6 772	91.5	282	3.8
ARKANSAS . . . . .	46 904	5 785	12.3	3 507	60.6	684	11.8
STATE . . . . .	31 241	1 998	6.4	856	42.9	223	11.2
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	15 662	3 787	24.2	2 651	70.0	561	12.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	6 133	1 467	23.9	621	42.3	324	22.1
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	9 530	2 320	24.3	2 030	87.5	137	5.9
CALIFORNIA . . . . .	758 795	185 565	24.5	96 321	51.9	20 370	11.0
STATE . . . . .	282 809	41 472	14.7	14 660	35.3	2 999	7.2
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	475 986	144 093	30.3	81 661	56.7	17 371	12.1
COUNTIES . . . . .	233 476	80 445	34.5	23 127	28.7	16 523	20.5
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	242 510	63 648	26.2	58 534	92.0	848	1.3
COLORADO . . . . .	96 558	17 018	17.6	9 354	55.0	2 185	12.8
STATE . . . . .	53 638	6 227	11.6	1 337	21.5	1 539	24.7
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	42 919	10 791	25.1	8 017	74.3	646	6.0
COUNTIES . . . . .	10 322	2 750	26.6	1 265	46.0	150	5.5
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	32 597	8 040	24.7	6 752	84.0	496	6.2
CONNECTICUT . . . . .	147 502	16 549	11.2	10 491	63.4	1 771	10.7
STATE . . . . .	48 818	7 819	16.0	2 028	25.9	1 715	21.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	98 683	8 730	8.8	8 463	96.9	56	0.6
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	99 369	8 730	8.8	8 463	96.9	56	0.6
DELAWARE . . . . .	19 784	4 185	21.2	2 078	49.7	807	19.3
STATE . . . . .	15 255	2 849	18.7	946	33.2	658	23.1
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	4 529	1 336	29.5	1 133	84.8	150	11.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	1 736	491	28.3	372	75.8	103	20.9
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	2 792	845	30.3	761	90.0	47	5.6
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA . . . . .	68 812	15 492	22.5	8 053	52.0	1 332	8.6
STATE . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	68 812	15 492	22.5	8 053	52.0	1 332	8.6
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	68 812	15 492	22.5	8 053	52.0	1 332	8.6
FLORIDA . . . . .	235 669	58 685	24.9	32 100	54.7	7 325	12.5
STATE . . . . .	96 397	21 479	22.3	4 011	18.7	2 921	13.6
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	139 272	37 206	26.7	28 089	75.5	4 404	11.8
COUNTIES . . . . .	62 570	19 348	30.9	11 658	60.3	4 015	20.8
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	76 703	17 858	23.3	16 431	92.0	389	2.2
GEORGIA . . . . .	120 417	24 124	20.0	12 757	52.9	3 229	13.4
STATE . . . . .	70 695	8 982	12.7	2 740	30.5	767	8.5
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	49 723	15 141	30.5	10 017	66.2	2 463	16.3
COUNTIES . . . . .	19 910	8 034	40.4	3 671	45.7	2 191	27.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	29 812	7 107	23.8	6 345	89.3	272	3.8
HAWAII . . . . .	56 683	6 120	10.8	3 690	60.3	912	14.9
STATE . . . . .	42 677	2 190	5.1	132	6.0	912	41.6
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	14 006	3 930	28.1	3 558	90.5	-	-
COUNTIES . . . . .	2 980	1 015	34.0	848	83.6	-	-
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	11 026	2 915	26.4	2 710	93.0	-	-
IDAHO . . . . .	25 295	4 110	16.2	2 335	56.8	620	15.1
STATE . . . . .	16 528	1 633	9.9	571	35.0	340	20.8
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	8 768	2 477	28.2	1 764	71.2	280	11.3
COUNTIES . . . . .	4 325	1 319	30.5	663	50.3	264	20.0
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	4 443	1 158	26.1	1 101	95.1	16	1.4

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 5. Percent distribution of criminal justice system payroll, by State and type of government,  
October 1978—Continued

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

State and type of government <sup>1</sup>	Legal services and prosecution		Public defense		Corrections		Other criminal justice	
	October payroll	Percent of total criminal justice system	October payroll	Percent of total criminal justice system	October payroll	Percent of total criminal justice system	October payroll	Percent of total criminal justice system
STATES-LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	86 348	6.4	12 062	0.9	297 367	22.1	8 759	0.7
STATES . . . . .	27 334	6.7	4 724	1.2	179 654	44.2	4 797	1.2
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	59 014	6.3	7 337	0.8	117 713	12.6	3 963	0.4
COUNTIES . . . . .	38 713	11.3	6 824	2.0	90 290	26.3	2 739	0.8
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	20 301	3.4	513	0.1	27 423	4.6	1 223	0.2
ALABAMA . . . . .	772	5.0	8	0.1	3 362	21.7	63	0.4
STATE . . . . .	438	7.3	4	0.1	2 097	35.1	59	1.0
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	334	3.5	4	(7)	1 266	13.3	4	(Z)
COUNTIES . . . . .	242	7.5	2	0.1	1 050	32.4	4	0.1
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	92	1.5	2	(2)	216	3.4	-	-
ALASKA . . . . .	629	10.8	107	1.8	933	16.1	42	0.7
STATE . . . . .	495	12.3	107	2.6	902	22.3	42	1.0
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	134	7.6	-	-	31	1.8	-	-
BOROUGHS . . . . .	20	77.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	114	6.5	-	-	31	1.8	-	-
ARIZONA . . . . .	1 410	7.9	291	1.6	3 573	20.0	45	0.2
STATE . . . . .	290	6.2	-	-	1 859	39.8	36	0.8
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	1 121	8.5	291	2.2	1 714	13.0	9	0.1
COUNTIES . . . . .	822	14.1	289	5.0	1 676	28.8	6	0.1
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	299	4.0	2	(2)	38	0.5	3	(Z)
ARKANSAS . . . . .	326	5.6	35	0.6	1 172	20.3	61	1.1
STATE . . . . .	58	2.9	-	-	803	40.2	56	2.8
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	268	7.1	35	0.9	369	9.7	5	0.1
COUNTIES . . . . .	194	13.2	28	1.9	297	20.2	3	0.2
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	74	3.2	7	0.3	72	3.1	1	0.1
CALIFORNIA . . . . .	17 179	9.3	3 759	2.0	47 419	25.6	516	0.3
STATE . . . . .	3 234	7.8	286	0.7	20 090	48.4	202	0.5
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	13 945	9.7	3 473	2.4	27 329	19.0	314	0.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	11 107	13.8	3 331	4.1	26 143	32.5	213	0.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	2 837	4.5	142	0.2	1 186	1.9	101	0.2
COLORADO . . . . .	1 412	8.3	242	1.4	3 721	21.9	104	0.6
STATE . . . . .	274	4.4	242	3.9	2 781	44.7	53	0.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	1 138	10.5	-	-	980	8.7	50	0.5
COUNTIES . . . . .	780	26.9	-	-	551	20.0	45	1.6
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	398	4.9	-	-	389	4.8	5	0.1
CONNECTICUT . . . . .	786	4.7	210	1.3	3 191	19.3	101	0.6
STATE . . . . .	618	7.9	210	2.7	3 185	40.7	64	0.8
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	168	1.9	-	-	6	0.1	38	0.4
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	168	1.9	-	-	6	0.1	38	0.4
DELAWARE . . . . .	189	4.5	56	1.3	1 004	24.0	50	1.2
STATE . . . . .	137	4.8	56	2.0	1 004	35.3	48	1.7
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	52	3.9	-	-	-	-	1	0.1
COUNTIES . . . . .	16	3.3	-	-	-	-	1	0.2
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	36	4.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA . . . . .	451	2.9	185	1.2	5 437	35.1	35	0.2
STATE . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	451	2.9	185	1.2	5 437	35.1	35	0.2
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	451	2.9	185	1.2	5 437	35.1	35	0.2
FLORIDA . . . . .	3 339	5.7	1 206	2.1	14 209	24.2	505	0.9
STATE . . . . .	2 591	12.1	1 142	5.3	10 742	50.0	72	0.3
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	748	2.0	64	0.2	3 467	9.3	433	1.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	353	1.8	60	0.3	2 875	14.9	386	2.0
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	395	2.2	4	(2)	591	3.3	48	0.3
GEORGIA . . . . .	1 075	4.5	77	0.3	6 917	28.7	68	0.3
STATE . . . . .	444	4.9	17	0.2	4 976	55.4	39	0.4
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	631	4.2	60	0.4	1 941	12.8	30	0.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	508	6.3	47	0.6	1 598	19.9	19	0.2
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	124	1.7	12	0.2	343	4.8	11	0.2
HAWAII . . . . .	479	7.8	74	1.2	845	13.8	119	1.9
STATE . . . . .	170	7.8	74	3.4	784	35.8	118	5.4
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	309	7.9	-	-	61	1.6	1	(Z)
COUNTIES . . . . .	104	10.3	-	-	61	6.0	1	0.1
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	205	7.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
IDAHO . . . . .	341	8.3	36	0.9	726	17.7	50	1.2
STATE . . . . .	121	7.4	-	-	551	33.7	50	3.1
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	221	8.9	36	1.4	176	7.1	-	-
COUNTIES . . . . .	182	13.8	36	2.7	174	15.2	-	-
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	39	3.4	-	-	2	0.1	-	-

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 5. Percent distribution of criminal justice system payroll, by State and type of government,  
October 1978—Continued  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

State and type of government <sup>1</sup>	Total October payroll <sup>2</sup>	Total criminal justice system		Police protection		Judicial	
		October payroll	Percent of total October payroll	October payroll	Percent of total October payroll	October payroll	Percent of total October payroll
ILLINOIS . . . . .	270 071	77 323	28.6	50 880	65.8	8 731	11.3
STATE . . . . .	112 383	18 111	16.1	5 836	32.2	3 406	18.8
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	157 688	59 213	37.6	45 044	76.1	5 325	9.0
COUNTIES . . . . .	31 022	17 365	56.0	3 894	22.4	5 302	30.5
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	126 666	41 848	33.0	41 149	98.3	23	0.1
INDIANA . . . . .	131 798	19 829	15.0	11 486	57.9	2 596	13.1
STATE . . . . .	71 854	6 689	9.3	2 578	38.5	676	10.1
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	59 944	13 140	21.9	8 908	67.8	1 920	14.6
COUNTIES . . . . .	23 430	4 182	17.8	1 309	31.3	1 379	33.0
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	36 514	8 958	24.5	7 599	84.8	541	6.0
IOWA . . . . .	84 187	11 725	13.9	6 441	54.9	1 755	15.0
STATE . . . . .	50 106	4 312	8.6	1 639	38.0	655	15.2
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	34 081	7 413	21.8	4 802	64.8	1 100	14.8
COUNTIES . . . . .	14 707	3 473	23.6	1 012	29.1	1 100	31.7
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	19 374	3 940	20.3	3 790	96.2	-	-
KANSAS . . . . .	64 902	9 762	15.0	5 242	53.7	1 568	16.1
STATE . . . . .	39 247	3 326	8.5	5 932	28.0	545	16.4
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	25 654	6 436	25.1	4 310	67.0	1 023	15.9
COUNTIES . . . . .	8 686	2 675	30.8	874	32.7	891	33.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	16 969	3 761	22.2	3 436	91.4	132	3.5
KENTUCKY . . . . .	81 147	13 820	17.0	7 879	57.0	2 152	15.6
STATE . . . . .	55 852	6 470	11.6	2 312	35.7	1 893	29.3
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	25 294	7 350	29.1	5 568	75.8	260	3.5
COUNTIES . . . . .	7 371	3 151	42.7	1 675	53.2	200	6.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	17 923	4 199	23.4	3 893	92.7	60	1.4
LOUISIANA . . . . .	102 732	22 037	21.5	11 820	53.6	3 612	16.4
STATE . . . . .	62 026	8 721	14.1	3 350	38.4	1 140	13.1
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	40 706	13 316	32.7	8 470	63.6	2 472	18.6
PARISHES . . . . .	14 283	5 567	39.0	3 085	55.4	1 462	26.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	26 423	7 749	29.3	5 386	69.5	1 009	13.0
MAINE . . . . .	35 026	3 956	11.3	2 384	60.3	479	12.1
STATE . . . . .	16 507	1 927	11.7	617	32.0	418	21.7
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	18 519	2 029	11.0	1 766	87.0	61	3.0
COUNTIES . . . . .	599	441	73.6	202	45.9	60	13.6
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	17 920	1 588	8.9	1 564	98.5	1	0.1
MARYLAND . . . . .	259 789	29 281	11.3	16 655	56.9	2 730	9.3
STATE . . . . .	83 348	12 536	15.0	3 801	30.3	1 486	11.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	176 441	16 746	9.5	12 853	76.8	1 244	7.4
COUNTIES . . . . .	131 874	9 236	7.0	6 843	74.1	821	8.9
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	44 567	7 510	16.9	6 010	80.0	423	5.6
MASSACHUSETTS . . . . .	274 248	37 633	13.7	23 394	62.2	5 057	13.4
STATE . . . . .	62 381	9 298	14.9	2 891	31.1	1 182	12.7
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	211 867	28 335	13.4	20 503	72.4	3 875	13.7
COUNTIES . . . . .	4 735	5 259	111.1	50	1.0	2 540	48.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	207 132	23 076	11.1	20 452	88.6	1 335	5.8
MICHIGAN . . . . .	297 184	64 588	21.7	38 167	59.1	8 832	13.7
STATE . . . . .	152 243	17 471	11.5	6 525	37.4	1 571	9.0
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	144 941	47 117	32.5	31 642	67.2	7 261	15.4
COUNTIES . . . . .	39 478	17 087	43.3	4 450	26.0	5 623	32.9
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	105 463	30 031	28.5	27 192	90.5	1 638	5.5
MINNESOTA . . . . .	130 901	19 928	15.2	10 471	52.5	2 845	14.3
STATE . . . . .	65 718	5 356	8.1	1 512	28.2	958	17.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	65 184	14 572	22.4	8 959	61.5	1 887	12.9
COUNTIES . . . . .	27 800	7 259	26.1	1 983	27.3	1 887	26.0
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	37 384	7 314	19.6	6 976	95.4	-	-
MISSISSIPPI . . . . .	55 319	6 903	12.5	4 320	62.6	888	12.9
STATE . . . . .	30 736	2 814	9.2	1 255	44.6	334	11.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	24 583	4 089	16.6	3 065	75.0	554	13.5
COUNTIES . . . . .	11 880	1 524	12.8	710	46.6	455	29.9
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	12 703	2 566	20.2	2 355	91.8	98	3.8
MISSOURI . . . . .	112 569	24 349	21.6	15 294	62.8	3 543	14.6
STATE . . . . .	60 519	6 116	10.1	2 062	33.7	1 393	22.8
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	52 049	18 232	35.0	13 232	72.6	2 150	11.8
COUNTIES . . . . .	10 703	4 964	46.4	1 889	38.1	1 436	28.9
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	41 347	13 269	32.1	11 343	85.5	714	5.4
MONTANA . . . . .	26 326	3 686	14.0	1 863	50.5	445	12.1
STATE . . . . .	17 029	1 471	8.6	382	26.0	136	9.3
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	9 297	2 215	23.8	1 481	66.9	309	13.9
COUNTIES . . . . .	4 432	1 240	26.0	618	49.9	257	20.7
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	4 865	975	20.0	863	88.4	52	5.3

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 5. Percent distribution of criminal justice system payroll, by State and type of government,  
October 1978—Continued  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

State and type of government <sup>1</sup>	Legal services and prosecution		Public defense		Corrections		Other criminal justice	
	October payroll	Percent of total criminal justice system	October payroll	Percent of total criminal justice system	October payroll	Percent of total criminal justice system	October payroll	Percent of total criminal justice system
ILLINOIS . . . . .	3 780	4.9	1 108	1.4	12 303	15.9	521	0.7
STATE . . . . .	846	4.7	134	0.7	7 485	41.3	405	2.2
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	2 934	5.0	975	1.6	4 818	8.1	117	0.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	2 345	13.5	975	5.6	4 807	27.7	41	0.2
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	589	1.4	-	-	11	(Z)	76	0.2
INDIANA . . . . .	1 212	6.1	164	0.6	4 230	21.3	140	0.7
STATE . . . . .	457	6.8	51	0.8	2 855	42.7	72	1.1
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	755	5.7	113	0.9	1 375	10.5	68	0.5
COUNTIES . . . . .	455	16.9	112	2.7	900	21.5	27	0.6
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	301	3.4	-	(Z)	475	5.3	42	0.5
IOWA . . . . .	729	6.2	60	0.5	2 677	22.8	63	0.5
STATE . . . . .	195	4.5	-	-	1 795	41.6	28	0.6
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	534	7.2	60	0.8	881	11.9	35	0.5
COUNTIES . . . . .	427	12.3	60	1.7	840	24.2	35	1.0
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	107	2.7	-	-	42	1.1	-	-
KANSAS . . . . .	689	7.1	23	0.2	2 135	21.9	105	1.1
STATE . . . . .	200	6.0	21	0.6	1 602	48.2	27	0.8
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	490	7.6	3	(Z)	533	8.3	78	1.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	344	12.9	-	(Z)	496	18.5	70	2.6
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	145	3.9	2	0.1	36	1.0	9	0.2
KENTUCKY . . . . .	639	4.6	83	0.6	2 709	19.6	357	2.6
STATE . . . . .	325	5.0	81	1.3	1 629	25.2	230	3.6
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	314	4.3	1	(Z)	1 080	14.7	127	1.7
COUNTIES . . . . .	221	7.0	1	(Z)	941	29.9	112	3.5
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	92	2.2	-	-	139	3.3	16	0.4
LOUISIANA . . . . .	1 204	5.5	88	0.4	5 182	23.8	131	0.6
STATE . . . . .	518	5.9	14	0.2	3 636	41.7	63	0.7
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	687	5.2	73	0.6	1 546	11.6	67	0.5
PARISHES . . . . .	324	5.8	22	0.4	663	11.9	11	0.2
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	363	4.7	52	0.7	883	11.4	57	0.7
MAINE . . . . .	220	5.6	-	-	849	21.5	23	0.6
STATE . . . . .	169	8.8	-	-	699	36.3	23	1.2
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	52	2.6	-	-	150	7.4	-	-
COUNTIES . . . . .	29	6.5	-	-	150	34.1	-	-
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	23	1.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
MARYLAND . . . . .	1 425	4.9	426	1.5	7 800	26.6	245	0.8
STATE . . . . .	220	1.8	426	3.4	6 392	51.0	216	1.7
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	1 205	7.2	-	-	1 408	8.4	35	0.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	760	8.2	-	-	797	8.6	15	0.2
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	445	5.9	-	-	611	8.1	21	0.3
MASSACHUSETTS . . . . .	1 364	3.6	212	0.6	7 366	19.6	240	0.6
STATE . . . . .	712	7.7	182	2.0	4 220	45.4	116	1.2
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	652	2.3	30	0.1	3 146	11.1	136	0.5
COUNTIES . . . . .	197	3.8	30	0.6	2 428	46.2	13	0.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	454	2.0	-	-	718	3.1	117	0.5
HIGHIGHIAN . . . . .	3 249	5.0	139	0.2	14 054	21.8	147	0.2
STATE . . . . .	782	4.5	69	0.4	8 435	48.3	89	0.5
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	2 467	5.2	70	0.1	5 619	11.9	58	0.1
COUNTIES . . . . .	1 926	11.3	69	0.4	4 979	29.1	39	0.2
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	540	1.8	1	(Z)	640	2.1	19	0.1
MINNESOTA . . . . .	1 708	8.6	299	1.5	4 492	22.5	113	0.6
STATE . . . . .	375	7.0	32	0.6	2 397	44.7	83	1.5
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	1 333	9.1	267	1.8	2 096	14.4	31	0.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	1 019	14.0	267	3.7	2 079	28.6	23	0.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	314	4.3	-	-	16	0.2	7	0.1
MISSISSIPPI . . . . .	318	4.6	15	0.2	1 301	18.8	61	0.9
STATE . . . . .	196	7.0	-	-	982	34.9	46	1.7
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	122	3.0	15	0.4	318	7.8	14	0.3
COUNTIES . . . . .	79	5.2	14	0.9	252	16.5	13	0.9
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	43	1.7	2	0.1	66	2.6	1	(Z)
MISSOURI . . . . .	1 175	4.8	127	0.5	4 126	16.9	83	0.3
STATE . . . . .	163	2.7	127	2.1	2 339	38.2	32	0.5
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	1 013	5.6	-	(Z)	1 787	9.8	51	0.3
COUNTIES . . . . .	585	11.8	-	(Z)	1 036	20.9	17	0.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	427	3.2	-	(Z)	751	5.7	34	0.3
MONTANA . . . . .	277	7.5	10	0.3	1 017	27.6	74	2.0
STATE . . . . .	79	5.4	-	-	813	55.3	60	4.1
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	197	8.9	10	0.4	204	9.2	14	0.6
COUNTIES . . . . .	158	12.7	10	0.8	188	15.2	9	0.7
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	39	4.0	-	-	16	1.6	6	0.6

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 5. Percent distribution of criminal justice system payroll, by State and type of government,  
October 1978—Continued  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

State and type of government <sup>1</sup>	Total October payroll <sup>2</sup>	Total criminal justice system		Police protection		Judicial	
		October payroll	Percent of total October payroll	October payroll	Percent of total October payroll	October payroll	Percent of total October payroll
NEBRASKA . . . . .	38 289	6 575	17.2	3 741	56.6	986	15.0
STATE . . . . .	18 238	2 377	13.9	2 785	33.0	583	24.5
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	20 021	4 199	21.0	2 957	70.4	404	9.6
COUNTIES . . . . .	7 032	1 576	22.4	431	40.6	288	18.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	12 990	2 622	20.2	2 326	88.7	115	4.4
NEVADA . . . . .	31 982	6 665	20.8	3 135	50.0	780	11.7
STATE . . . . .	15 015	1 684	11.2	413	24.5	140	8.3
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	16 966	4 981	29.4	2 922	58.7	640	12.8
COUNTIES . . . . .	11 136	3 525	31.7	1 822	51.7	486	13.8
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	5 831	1 457	25.0	1 100	75.5	154	10.5
NEW HAMPSHIRE . . . . .	27 387	3 568	13.0	2 207	61.9	373	10.4
STATE . . . . .	14 561	1 339	9.2	478	35.7	147	11.0
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	12 826	2 229	17.4	1 729	77.6	226	10.1
COUNTIES . . . . .	1 285	424	33.0	105	24.7	121	28.5
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	11 541	1 806	15.6	1 625	90.0	105	5.8
NEW JERSEY . . . . .	269 314	59 373	22.0	35 072	59.1	7 323	12.3
STATE . . . . .	94 854	13 376	14.1	4 710	35.2	1 574	11.8
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	174 460	45 997	26.4	30 362	66.0	5 749	12.5
COUNTIES . . . . .	57 189	15 582	27.2	1 838	11.8	4 457	28.6
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	117 272	30 414	25.9	28 524	93.8	1 292	4.2
NEW MEXICO . . . . .	81 494	6 217	15.0	3 471	55.8	887	14.3
STATE . . . . .	29 113	3 109	10.7	968	31.1	707	22.8
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	12 382	3 108	25.1	2 503	80.5	180	5.8
COUNTIES . . . . .	2 674	709	26.5	521	73.6	34	4.8
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	9 707	2 400	24.7	1 982	82.6	146	6.1
NEW YORK . . . . .	767 172	176 328	23.0	108 447	61.5	19 781	11.2
STATE . . . . .	167 785	51 066	30.4	8 956	17.5	17 714	34.7
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	599 387	125 262	20.9	99 491	79.4	2 067	1.6
COUNTIES . . . . .	33 551	27 090	80.7	16 432	60.7	743	2.7
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	565 837	98 171	17.3	83 059	94.6	1 323	1.3
NORTH CAROLINA . . . . .	256 259	24 702	9.6	12 046	48.8	2 911	11.8
STATE . . . . .	88 187	13 772	15.6	2 577	18.7	2 497	18.1
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	168 072	10 930	6.5	9 469	88.6	415	3.8
COUNTIES . . . . .	137 641	3 745	2.7	2 405	64.2	415	11.1
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	30 432	7 186	23.6	7 064	98.3	-	-
NORTH DAKOTA . . . . .	19 100	2 262	11.8	1 279	56.5	381	16.8
STATE . . . . .	13 219	751	5.7	237	31.6	130	17.3
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	5 882	1 510	25.7	1 041	69.0	251	16.6
COUNTIES . . . . .	2 380	665	27.9	254	38.3	218	32.8
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	3 501	845	24.1	787	93.1	33	3.9
OHIO . . . . .	264 250	55 172	20.9	28 822	52.2	8 583	15.6
STATE . . . . .	113 915	15 035	13.2	3 751	24.9	1 338	8.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	150 334	40 136	26.7	25 072	62.5	7 245	16.1
COUNTIES . . . . .	50 682	14 389	28.4	3 453	24.0	5 083	35.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	99 652	25 748	25.8	21 619	84.0	2 162	8.4
OKLAHOMA . . . . .	77 014	11 589	15.0	6 766	58.4	1 528	13.2
STATE . . . . .	47 139	5 090	10.8	1 813	35.6	738	14.5
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	29 875	6 499	21.8	4 954	76.2	790	12.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	6 044	1 459	24.1	426	29.2	571	39.2
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	23 831	5 040	21.1	4 528	89.8	218	4.3
OREGON . . . . .	80 566	15 419	19.1	8 110	52.6	1 924	12.5
STATE . . . . .	48 348	5 595	11.6	1 880	33.6	611	10.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	32 218	9 824	30.5	6 231	63.4	1 313	13.4
COUNTIES . . . . .	15 366	5 436	35.4	2 108	38.8	1 199	22.0
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	16 853	4 388	26.0	4 123	94.0	114	2.6
PENNSYLVANIA . . . . .	270 573	65 684	24.3	39 569	60.2	9 686	14.7
STATE . . . . .	137 454	17 822	13.0	8 264	46.4	2 389	13.4
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	133 119	47 862	36.0	31 305	65.4	7 298	15.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	35 305	10 928	31.0	1 258	11.5	4 182	38.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	97 814	36 934	37.8	30 047	81.4	3 116	8.4
RHODE ISLAND . . . . .	49 984	5 635	11.3	3 356	59.6	767	13.6
STATE . . . . .	20 885	2 803	13.4	601	21.4	745	26.6
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	29 099	2 832	9.7	2 755	97.3	23	0.8
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	29 447	2 832	9.6	2 755	97.3	23	0.8
SOUTH CAROLINA . . . . .	80 636	11 774	14.6	6 450	54.8	1 474	12.5
STATE . . . . .	55 058	5 478	9.9	1 892	34.5	493	9.0
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	25 578	6 297	24.6	4 558	72.4	980	15.6
COUNTIES . . . . .	15 189	3 272	21.5	1 699	51.9	892	27.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	10 390	3 024	29.1	2 859	94.5	89	2.9

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 5. Percent distribution of criminal justice system payroll, by State and type of government,  
October 1978—Continued  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

State and type of government <sup>1</sup>	Legal services and prosecution		Public defense		Corrections		Other criminal justice	
	October payroll	Percent of total criminal justice system	October payroll	Percent of total criminal justice system	October payroll	Percent of total criminal justice system	October payroll	Percent of total criminal justice system
NEBRASKA . . . . .	495	7.5	76	1.2	1 245	18.9	32	0.5
STATE . . . . .	76	3.2	-	-	906	38.1	26	1.1
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	419	10.0	76	1.8	338	8.1	6	0.1
COUNTIES . . . . .	294	18.7	76	4.8	287	18.2	-	-
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	124	4.7	-	-	52	2.0	6	0.2
NEVADA . . . . .	627	9.4	129	1.9	1 743	26.2	51	0.8
STATE . . . . .	130	7.7	16	1.0	967	37.5	18	1.1
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	498	10.0	113	2.5	776	15.6	33	0.7
COUNTIES . . . . .	380	10.8	113	3.2	690	19.6	33	0.9
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	118	8.1	-	-	85	5.9	-	-
NEW HAMPSHIRE . . . . .	147	4.1	-	-	795	22.3	46	1.3
STATE . . . . .	82	6.1	-	-	592	44.3	40	3.0
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	65	2.9	-	-	203	9.1	6	0.3
COUNTIES . . . . .	35	8.2	-	-	164	38.6	-	-
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	30	1.7	-	-	39	2.2	6	0.3
NEW JERSEY . . . . .	4 491	7.6	869	1.5	11 357	19.1	260	0.4
STATE . . . . .	1 112	8.3	854	6.4	5 046	37.7	80	0.6
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	3 380	7.3	15	(Z)	6 311	13.7	180	0.4
COUNTIES . . . . .	2 873	18.4	2	(Z)	6 297	40.4	116	0.7
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	507	1.7	13	(Z)	14	(Z)	65	0.2
NEW MEXICO . . . . .	582	9.4	92	1.5	1 114	17.9	70	1.1
STATE . . . . .	493	15.9	88	2.8	827	26.6	25	0.8
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	89	2.9	4	0.1	287	9.2	45	1.5
COUNTIES . . . . .	6	0.9	-	-	109	15.3	39	5.4
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	83	3.5	4	0.2	178	7.4	6	0.3
NEW YORK . . . . .	11 502	6.5	264	0.1	38 101	19.9	1 232	0.7
STATE . . . . .	3 234	6.3	13	(Z)	20 196	39.5	952	1.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	8 268	6.5	250	0.2	14 906	11.9	280	0.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	2 728	10.1	250	0.9	6 779	25.0	158	0.6
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	5 540	5.6	-	-	8 127	8.3	122	0.1
NORTH CAROLINA . . . . .	1 519	6.2	91	0.4	7 938	32.1	196	0.8
STATE . . . . .	1 327	9.6	87	0.6	7 173	52.1	111	0.8
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	192	1.8	4	(Z)	765	7.0	85	0.8
COUNTIES . . . . .	78	2.1	4	0.1	762	20.4	81	2.2
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	114	1.6	-	-	3	(Z)	5	0.1
NORTH DAKOTA . . . . .	190	8.4	-	-	394	17.4	19	0.8
STATE . . . . .	65	8.6	-	-	301	40.1	19	2.5
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	125	8.3	-	-	93	6.1	-	-
COUNTIES . . . . .	108	16.3	-	-	84	12.7	-	-
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	17	2.0	-	-	8	1.0	-	-
OHIO . . . . .	3 291	6.0	299	0.5	13 440	24.4	736	1.3
STATE . . . . .	941	6.3	61	0.4	8 763	58.3	182	1.2
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	2 349	5.9	238	0.6	4 677	11.7	554	1.4
COUNTIES . . . . .	1 390	9.7	203	1.4	3 892	27.0	368	2.6
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	959	3.7	35	0.1	785	3.1	186	0.7
OKLAHOMA . . . . .	853	7.4	44	0.4	2 353	20.3	46	0.4
STATE . . . . .	643	12.6	-	-	1 853	36.4	43	0.8
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	210	3.2	44	0.7	500	7.7	3	(Z)
COUNTIES . . . . .	35	2.4	41	2.8	386	26.5	-	-
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	175	3.5	3	0.1	114	2.3	3	0.1
OREGON . . . . .	1 522	9.9	65	0.4	3 728	24.2	71	0.5
STATE . . . . .	678	12.1	23	0.4	2 356	42.1	48	0.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	844	8.6	42	0.4	1 372	14.0	23	0.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	711	13.1	42	0.8	1 362	25.1	15	0.3
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	133	3.0	-	-	10	0.2	8	0.2
PENNSYLVANIA . . . . .	2 837	4.3	498	0.8	12 757	19.4	337	0.5
STATE . . . . .	424	2.4	-	-	6 434	36.1	311	1.7
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	2 413	5.0	498	1.0	6 323	13.2	26	0.1
COUNTIES . . . . .	1 359	12.4	498	4.6	3 611	33.0	19	0.2
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	1 053	2.9	-	-	2 712	7.3	7	(Z)
RHODE ISLAND . . . . .	222	3.9	61	1.1	1 194	21.2	34	0.6
STATE . . . . .	168	6.0	61	2.2	1 194	42.6	34	1.2
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	54	1.9	-	-	-	(Z)	-	(Z)
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	54	1.9	-	-	-	(Z)	-	(Z)
SOUTH CAROLINA . . . . .	547	4.6	35	0.3	3 209	27.3	59	0.5
STATE . . . . .	304	5.6	-	-	2 740	50.0	48	0.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	243	3.9	35	0.6	470	7.5	11	0.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	211	6.4	35	1.1	429	13.1	7	0.2
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	32	1.1	-	-	41	1.4	3	0.1

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table 5. Percent distribution of criminal justice system payroll, by State and type of government,  
October 1978—Continued**

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

State and type of government <sup>1</sup>	Total October payroll <sup>2</sup>	Total criminal justice system		Police protection		Judicial	
		October payroll	Percent of total October payroll	October payroll	Percent of total criminal justice system	October payroll	Percent of total criminal justice system
SOUTH DAKOTA . . . . .	18 762	2 474	13.2	1 331	53.8	398	16.1
STATE . . . . .	12 822	1 278	10.0	349	27.3	396	31.0
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	5 940	1 195	20.1	982	82.1	2	0.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	1 955	428	21.9	241	56.4	2	0.5
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	3 985	768	19.3	740	94.4	-	-
TENNESSEE . . . . .	173 146	18 619	10.8	10 212	54.8	2 852	15.3
STATE . . . . .	48 323	6 083	12.6	1 569	25.8	771	12.7
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	124 822	12 537	10.0	8 643	68.9	2 082	16.6
COUNTIES . . . . .	46 876	4 177	8.9	1 536	36.8	1 545	37.0
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	77 946	8 360	10.7	7 107	85.0	537	6.4
TEXAS . . . . .	310 023	58 867	19.0	35 472	60.3	8 692	14.8
STATE . . . . .	161 659	12 713	7.9	5 208	41.0	1 383	10.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	148 364	46 154	31.1	30 264	65.6	7 309	15.8
COUNTIES . . . . .	30 284	17 541	57.9	3 981	22.7	6 217	35.4
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	118 080	28 613	24.2	26 283	91.9	1 092	3.8
UTAH . . . . .	41 857	6 551	15.7	3 999	61.0	728	11.1
STATE . . . . .	28 389	2 512	8.8	957	38.1	358	14.3
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	13 468	4 040	30.0	3 042	75.3	370	9.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	6 182	1 618	26.2	861	53.2	225	13.9
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	7 286	2 422	33.2	2 182	90.1	145	6.0
VERMONT . . . . .	14 090	2 097	14.9	1 118	53.3	264	12.6
STATE . . . . .	10 976	1 487	13.5	537	36.1	242	16.3
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	3 114	610	19.6	581	95.2	22	3.6
COUNTIES . . . . .	37	35	94.6	11	30.0	22	62.2
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	3 077	575	18.7	570	99.2	-	-
VIRGINIA . . . . .	270 047	26 496	9.8	13 060	49.3	2 970	11.2
STATE . . . . .	97 375	11 496	11.8	2 721	23.7	2 026	17.6
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	172 671	15 001	8.7	10 339	68.9	944	6.3
COUNTIES . . . . .	100 138	6 731	6.7	4 429	65.8	536	8.0
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	72 533	8 270	11.4	5 910	71.5	408	4.9
WASHINGTON . . . . .	124 093	22 173	17.9	11 888	53.6	2 528	11.4
STATE . . . . .	74 729	7 236	9.7	2 491	34.4	529	7.3
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	49 363	14 937	30.3	9 397	62.9	1 999	13.4
COUNTIES . . . . .	15 262	7 551	49.5	2 884	38.2	1 665	22.0
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	34 102	7 387	21.7	6 513	88.2	335	4.5
WEST VIRGINIA . . . . .	48 738	5 837	12.0	3 293	56.4	1 028	17.6
STATE . . . . .	36 084	2 800	7.6	1 120	40.0	702	25.1
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	12 654	3 037	24.0	2 172	71.5	326	10.7
COUNTIES . . . . .	4 378	1 411	32.2	607	43.1	293	20.8
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	8 276	1 626	19.6	1 565	96.2	33	2.0
WISCONSIN . . . . .	170 902	24 851	14.5	14 636	58.9	2 747	11.1
STATE . . . . .	67 007	7 197	10.7	1 218	16.9	1 049	14.6
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	103 895	17 654	17.0	13 418	76.0	1 698	9.6
COUNTIES . . . . .	35 823	6 804	19.0	3 018	44.3	1 604	23.6
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	68 072	10 849	15.9	10 400	95.9	94	0.9
WYOMING . . . . .	15 772	2 336	14.8	1 414	60.5	277	11.8
STATE . . . . .	9 840	864	8.8	324	37.5	125	14.5
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	5 932	1 473	24.8	1 091	74.1	151	10.3
COUNTIES . . . . .	3 086	658	21.3	346	52.6	118	17.9
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	2 846	815	28.6	745	91.4	34	4.1

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 5. Percent distribution of criminal justice system payroll, by State and type of government,  
October 1978—Continued  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

State and type of government <sup>1</sup>	Legal services and prosecution		Public defense		Corrections		Other criminal justice	
	October payroll	Percent of total criminal justice system	October payroll	Percent of total criminal justice system	October payroll	Percent of total criminal justice system	October payroll	Percent of total criminal justice system
SOUTH DAKOTA . . . . .	254	10.3	9	0.4	467	18.9	15	0.6
STATE . . . . .	124	9.7	-	-	395	30.9	15	1.1
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	130	10.9	9	0.7	73	6.1	-	-
COUNTIES . . . . .	106	24.7	9	2.1	70	16.3	-	-
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	24	3.1	-	-	3	0.4	-	-
TENNESSEE . . . . .	959	5.2	147	0.8	4 386	23.6	64	0.3
STATE . . . . .	735	12.1	48	0.8	2 925	48.1	36	0.6
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	224	1.8	99	0.8	1 461	11.7	28	0.2
COUNTIES . . . . .	85	2.0	61	1.5	935	22.4	16	0.4
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	140	1.7	38	0.5	526	6.3	12	0.1
TEXAS . . . . .	4 031	6.8	18	(2)	10 140	17.2	514	0.9
STATE . . . . .	851	6.7	-	-	5 088	40.0	183	1.4
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	3 180	6.9	18	(2)	5 052	10.9	331	0.7
COUNTIES . . . . .	2 429	13.8	18	0.1	4 591	26.2	304	1.7
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	751	2.6	-	-	461	1.6	26	0.1
UTAH . . . . .	527	8.0	4	0.1	1 270	19.4	23	0.3
STATE . . . . .	155	6.2	-	-	1 021	40.7	20	0.8
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	372	9.2	4	0.1	249	6.2	2	0.1
COUNTIES . . . . .	280	17.3	4	0.2	246	15.2	2	0.1
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	92	3.8	-	(2)	3	0.1	-	-
VERMONT . . . . .	139	6.6	62	3.0	485	23.1	29	1.4
STATE . . . . .	133	9.0	62	4.2	483	32.5	29	1.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	6	1.0	-	-	2	0.3	-	-
COUNTIES . . . . .	1	3.2	-	-	2	4.7	-	-
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	5	0.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
VIRGINIA . . . . .	1 036	3.9	28	0.1	8 853	33.4	550	2.1
STATE . . . . .	149	1.3	27	0.2	6 473	56.3	101	0.9
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	887	5.9	2	(2)	2 380	18.9	449	3.0
COUNTIES . . . . .	408	6.1	-	-	975	14.5	383	5.7
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	480	5.8	2	(2)	1 405	17.0	66	0.8
WASHINGTON . . . . .	1 705	7.7	93	0.4	5 828	26.3	131	0.6
STATE . . . . .	515	7.1	-	-	3 660	50.6	41	0.6
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	1 190	8.0	93	0.6	2 168	14.5	90	0.6
COUNTIES . . . . .	819	10.8	92	1.2	2 058	27.3	33	0.4
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	372	5.0	1	(2)	110	1.5	57	0.8
WEST VIRGINIA . . . . .	521	8.9	-	-	965	16.5	30	0.5
STATE . . . . .	206	7.3	-	-	742	26.5	30	1.1
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	315	10.4	-	-	223	7.4	-	-
COUNTIES . . . . .	288	20.4	-	-	223	15.8	-	-
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	28	1.7	-	-	1	(2)	-	-
WISCONSIN . . . . .	1 789	7.2	132	0.5	5 409	21.8	139	0.6
STATE . . . . .	645	9.0	109	1.5	4 102	57.0	74	1.0
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	1 144	6.5	23	0.1	1 306	7.4	65	0.4
COUNTIES . . . . .	814	12.0	17	0.3	1 286	18.9	65	1.0
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	330	3.0	6	0.1	20	0.2	-	-
WYOMING . . . . .	182	7.8	6	0.3	443	19.0	14	0.6
STATE . . . . .	39	4.5	-	-	362	42.0	14	1.6
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	144	9.8	6	0.4	81	5.5	-	-
COUNTIES . . . . .	117	17.9	6	0.9	71	10.8	-	-
MUNICIPALITIES . . . . .	26	3.2	-	-	10	1.2	-	-

-Represents zero or rounds to zero.

<sup>1</sup>Z Less than half the unit of measurement shown.

<sup>1</sup>Data for municipalities, and the local governments totals which include municipal data, are estimates subject to sampling variation; data for counties (boroughs, parishes) are based on a canvass of all county governments and therefore are not subject to sampling variation; see text for data limitations.

<sup>2</sup>The relation of criminal justice October payroll to total October payroll is based on data for general governments only and does not include data for state-operated liquor stores, locally operated utility systems, or for independent school districts and special districts.

**Table 6. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) of 343 large county governments fiscal year 1978**

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

County <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup>	Total general expenditure	Total criminal justice system		Police protection		Judicial	
			Amount	Percent of total general expenditure	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system
TOTAL . . . . .	125 793 274	27 950 624	4 412 226	15.8	1 280 324	29.0	1 114 587	25.3
ALABAMA:								
CALHOUN . . . . .	112 409	5 124	950	18.5	161	16.9	512	53.9
JEFFERSON . . . . .	652 222	98 850	13 991	14.2	3 923	28.0	4 885	34.9
HADISON . . . . .	186 532	10 820	2 823	26.1	549	19.4	1 029	36.5
MOBILE . . . . .	352 970	29 748	9 322	28.0	2 138	25.7	2 341	28.1
MONTGOMERY . . . . .	184 473	13 646	3 355	24.6	628	18.7	1 338	39.9
TUSCALOOSA . . . . .	123 895	17 827	3 029	17.0	599	19.8	1 018	33.6
ARIZONA:								
MARICOPA . . . . .	1 288 754	185 724	38 579	20.8	8 886	23.0	9 516	24.7
PIMA . . . . .	454 627	106 846	27 521	25.8	7 388	26.8	5 146	18.7
ARKANSAS:								
PULASKI . . . . .	325 159	13 543	4 795	35.4	1 290	26.9	1 447	30.2
SEBASTIAN . . . . .	88 707	4 934	1 873	38.0	331	17.7	549	29.3
CALIFORNIA:								
ALAMEDA . . . . .	1 099 186	377 523	82 312	21.8	10 072	12.2	21 762	26.4
BUTTE . . . . .	127 841	50 940	6 260	12.3	2 008	32.1	1 509	24.1
CONTRA COSTA . . . . .	612 866	242 076	44 591	18.4	8 655	19.4	6 651	14.9
FRESNO . . . . .	472 492	209 384	32 143	15.4	9 143	28.4	5 734	17.8
HUMBOLDT . . . . .	106 793	50 364	7 841	15.6	3 073	39.2	1 672	21.3
KERN . . . . .	363 305	184 419	29 869	16.2	8 373	28.0	4 504	15.1
LOS ANGELES . . . . .	7 028 518	2 759 317	428 880	15.5	131 705	30.7	95 657	22.3
MARIN . . . . .	223 548	78 379	12 458	15.9	2 447	19.6	2 951	23.7
MERCED . . . . .	124 330	64 742	5 908	9.1	1 733	29.3	1 348	22.8
MONTEREY . . . . .	275 304	90 387	17 654	19.5	5 572	31.6	3 401	19.3
ORANGE . . . . .	1 799 032	407 768	79 495	19.5	12 992	16.3	22 287	28.0
RIVERSIDE . . . . .	575 095	225 646	33 405	14.8	10 760	32.2	7 446	22.3
SACRAMENTO . . . . .	721 311	441 890	54 931	12.4	16 845	30.7	9 343	17.0
SAN BERNARDINO . . . . .	736 540	302 165	47 956	15.9	15 726	32.8	11 913	24.8
SAN DIEGO . . . . .	1 675 714	472 542	72 997	15.4	13 713	18.8	19 422	26.6
SAN JOAQUIN . . . . .	311 612	149 557	22 280	14.9	5 994	26.9	4 943	22.2
SAN LUIS OBISPO . . . . .	134 498	56 275	8 438	15.0	2 822	33.4	1 718	20.4
SAN MATEO . . . . .	587 724	186 667	37 129	19.9	6 522	17.6	7 443	20.0
SANTA BARBARA . . . . .	287 433	115 284	21 168	18.4	6 025	28.5	4 613	21.8
SANTA CLARA . . . . .	1 216 365	413 425	61 500	14.9	10 781	17.5	14 582	23.7
SANTA CRUZ . . . . .	169 188	67 358	12 340	18.3	2 937	23.8	2 652	21.5
SOLANO . . . . .	201 430	69 719	13 027	18.7	2 144	16.5	2 825	21.7
SONOMA . . . . .	263 243	102 829	14 469	14.1	5 085	35.1	2 577	17.8
STANISLAUS . . . . .	235 997	109 660	15 509	14.1	3 325	21.4	3 026	19.5
TULARE . . . . .	216 927	118 673	15 535	13.1	4 261	27.4	2 810	18.1
VENTURA . . . . .	467 480	194 226	30 011	15.5	9 219	30.7	5 636	18.8
YOLO . . . . .	106 425	41 827	7 084	16.9	2 339	33.0	1 325	18.7
COLORADO:								
ADAMS . . . . .	224 133	41 777	3 692	8.8	2 101	56.9	37	1.0
ARAPAHOE . . . . .	239 179	24 403	4 586	18.8	1 789	39.0	595	13.0
BOULDER . . . . .	171 436	25 708	3 431	13.3	1 550	45.2	53	1.5
EL PASO . . . . .	285 987	32 356	4 881	15.1	743	15.2	1 435	29.4
JEFFERSON . . . . .	335 842	45 539	5 461	12.5	2 825	51.7	124	2.3
LARIMER . . . . .	124 401	22 413	2 158	9.6	1 235	57.2	-	-
PUEBLO . . . . .	123 408	29 917	1 948	6.5	612	31.4	188	9.7
WELD . . . . .	109 980	25 212	3 491	13.8	1 649	47.2	-	-
DELAWARE:								
NEW CASTLE . . . . .	398 488	59 527	7 896	13.3	6 322	80.1	1 247	15.8
FLORIDA:								
ALACHUA . . . . .	126 363	18 637	7 899	42.4	2 550	32.3	3 827	48.4
BREVARD . . . . .	233 955	42 813	6 050	14.1	3 013	49.8	2 013	33.3
BROWARD . . . . .	867 861	95 240	22 562	23.7	10 043	44.5	6 273	27.8
DADE . . . . .	1 439 854	521 218	78 682	15.1	43 130	54.8	18 535	23.6
ESCAMBIA . . . . .	225 793	33 928	13 119	38.7	2 602	19.8	8 075	61.6
HILLSBOROUGH . . . . .	583 383	131 554	21 326	16.2	8 951	42.0	5 494	25.8
LEE . . . . .	165 965	37 565	5 381	14.3	2 998	55.7	1 307	24.3
LEON . . . . .	129 406	17 317	3 946	22.8	1 972	50.0	1 213	30.7
MANATEE . . . . .	125 300	30 427	3 235	10.6	1 720	53.2	852	26.3
OKALOOSA . . . . .	104 247	13 399	1 748	13.0	755	43.2	794	45.4
ORANGE . . . . .	414 378	86 497	16 292	18.8	8 155	50.1	3 931	24.1
PALM BEACH . . . . .	477 250	82 511	17 825	21.6	9 458	53.1	4 114	23.1
PASCO . . . . .	142 033	20 189	4 165	20.6	2 468	59.3	1 110	26.7
PINELLAS . . . . .	654 294	90 583	17 614	19.4	6 381	36.2	7 219	41.0
POLK . . . . .	277 175	40 748	8 265	20.3	3 994	48.3	2 642	32.0
SARASOTA . . . . .	167 570	22 106	4 880	22.1	3 042	62.3	899	18.4
SEMINOLE . . . . .	142 943	17 827	3 784	21.2	2 321	61.3	836	22.1
VOLUSIA . . . . .	213 741	34 103	10 669	31.3	3 059	28.7	1 666	15.6
GEORGIA:								
BIBBS . . . . .	143 730	19 570	4 063	20.8	1 339	33.0	1 112	27.4
CHATHAM . . . . .	191 613	39 316	5 767	14.7	2 241	38.9	2 001	34.7
CLAYTON . . . . .	136 108	25 342	5 602	22.1	3 040	54.3	1 293	23.1

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 6. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) of 343 large county governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

County <sup>1</sup>	Legal services and prosecution		Public defense		Corrections		Other criminal justice	
	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system
TOTAL . . . . .	409 583	9.3	152 822	3.5	1 301 505	29.5	153 405	3.5
ALABAMA:								
CALHOUN . . . . .	47	4.9	-	-	230	24.2	-	-
JEFFERSON . . . . .	996	7.1	51	0.4	3 854	27.5	282	2.0
MADISON . . . . .	374	13.2	-	-	859	30.4	12	0.4
MOBILE . . . . .	370	4.4	16	0.2	3 457	41.5	-	-
MONTGOMERY . . . . .	366	10.9	-	-	971	28.9	52	1.5
TUSCALOOSA . . . . .	144	4.8	10	0.3	1 258	41.5	-	-
ARIZONA:								
MARICOPA . . . . .	4 852	12.6	2 889	7.5	12 376	32.1	60	0.2
PIMA . . . . .	3 015	11.0	1 424	5.2	10 548	38.3	-	-
ARKANSAS:								
PULASKI . . . . .	812	16.9	149	3.1	922	19.2	175	3.6
SEBASTIAN . . . . .	190	10.1	57	3.0	434	23.2	312	16.7
CALIFORNIA:								
ALAMEDA . . . . .	9 922	12.1	6 715	8.2	32 872	39.9	969	1.2
BUTTE . . . . .	980	15.7	218	3.5	1 541	24.6	4	0.1
CONTRA COSTA . . . . .	5 300	11.9	2 576	5.8	20 678	46.4	731	1.6
FRESNO . . . . .	4 237	13.2	1 575	4.9	9 892	30.8	1 562	4.9
HUMBOLDT . . . . .	1 005	12.8	334	4.3	1 667	21.3	90	1.1
KERN . . . . .	3 351	11.2	883	3.0	11 810	39.5	948	3.2
LOS ANGELES . . . . .	50 035	11.7	24 940	5.8	126 543	29.5	-	-
MARIN . . . . .	1 470	11.8	901	7.2	4 241	34.0	448	3.6
MERCED . . . . .	689	11.7	185	3.1	1 773	30.0	180	3.0
MONTEREY . . . . .	2 328	13.2	849	4.8	5 229	29.6	275	1.6
ORANGE . . . . .	10 657	13.4	3 856	4.9	28 051	35.3	1 652	2.1
RIVERSIDE . . . . .	4 262	12.8	878	2.6	10 059	30.1	-	-
SACRAMENTO . . . . .	8 567	15.6	3 149	5.7	15 476	28.2	1 551	2.8
SAN BERNARDINO . . . . .	4 245	8.9	1 767	3.7	14 305	29.8	-	-
SAN DIEGO . . . . .	9 289	12.7	4 391	6.0	25 894	35.5	288	0.4
SAN JOAQUIN . . . . .	2 720	12.2	1 495	6.7	7 105	31.9	23	0.1
SAN LUIS OBISPO . . . . .	1 292	15.3	262	3.1	2 296	27.2	48	0.6
SAN MATEO . . . . .	3 257	8.8	1 548	4.2	16 419	44.2	1 940	5.2
SANTA BARBARA . . . . .	2 438	11.5	998	4.7	7 094	33.5	-	-
SANTA CLARA . . . . .	7 607	12.4	3 205	5.2	24 744	40.2	581	0.9
SANTA CRUZ . . . . .	1 598	12.9	619	5.0	4 275	34.6	259	2.1
SOLANO . . . . .	1 480	11.4	734	5.6	5 844	44.9	-	-
SONOMA . . . . .	1 673	11.6	561	3.9	4 492	31.0	81	0.6
STANISLAUS . . . . .	2 089	13.5	448	2.9	6 215	40.1	406	2.6
TULARE . . . . .	2 057	13.2	902	5.8	4 936	31.8	569	3.7
VENTURA . . . . .	3 960	13.2	1 144	3.8	9 546	31.8	506	1.7
YOLO . . . . .	969	13.7	434	6.1	2 004	28.3	13	0.2
COLORADO:								
ADAMS . . . . .	1 068	28.9	-	-	486	13.2	-	-
ARAPAHOE . . . . .	1 303	28.4	-	-	859	18.7	41	0.9
BOULDER . . . . .	620	18.1	-	-	953	27.8	255	7.4
EL PASO . . . . .	1 328	27.2	-	-	1 375	28.2	-	-
JEFFERSON . . . . .	1 542	28.2	-	-	409	7.5	561	10.3
LARIMER . . . . .	412	19.1	-	-	461	21.4	50	2.3
PUEBLO . . . . .	648	33.3	15	0.8	426	21.9	59	3.0
WELD . . . . .	570	16.3	-	-	1 235	35.4	37	1.1
DELAWARE:								
NEW CASTLE . . . . .	256	3.2	71	0.9	-	-	-	-
FLORIDA:								
ALACHUA . . . . .	182	2.3	44	0.6	933	11.8	363	4.6
BREVARD . . . . .	374	6.2	31	0.5	511	8.4	108	1.8
BROWARD . . . . .	569	2.5	132	0.6	3 338	14.8	2 207	9.8
DADE . . . . .	1 363	1.7	539	0.7	13 436	17.1	1 679	2.1
ESCAMBIA . . . . .	292	2.2	66	0.5	2 038	15.5	46	0.4
HILLSBOROUGH . . . . .	388	1.8	412	1.9	5 295	24.8	786	3.7
LEE . . . . .	190	3.5	67	1.2	732	13.6	87	1.6
LEON . . . . .	116	2.9	25	0.6	511	12.9	109	2.8
MANATEE . . . . .	125	3.9	25	0.8	433	13.4	80	2.5
OKALOOSA . . . . .	44	2.5	15	0.9	140	8.0	-	-
ORANGE . . . . .	306	1.9	60	0.4	3 572	21.9	268	1.6
PALM BEACH . . . . .	294	1.6	424	2.4	3 198	17.9	337	1.9
PASCO . . . . .	152	3.6	12	0.3	422	10.1	1	(2)
PINELLAS . . . . .	516	2.9	130	0.7	2 992	17.0	376	2.1
POLK . . . . .	235	2.8	93	1.1	1 134	13.7	167	2.0
SARASOTA . . . . .	119	2.4	101	2.1	676	13.9	43	0.9
SEMINOLE . . . . .	136	3.6	17	0.4	453	12.0	21	0.6
VOLUSIA . . . . .	138	1.3	4	(2)	5 764	54.0	38	0.4
GEORGIA:								
BIBB . . . . .	377	9.3	64	1.6	1 171	28.8	-	-
CHATTHAM . . . . .	371	6.4	209	3.6	945	16.4	-	-
CLAYTON . . . . .	443	7.9	72	1.3	739	13.2	15	0.3

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 6. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) of 343 large county governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

County <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup>	Total general expenditure	Total criminal justice system		Police protection		Judicial	
			Amount	Percent of total general expenditure	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system
GEORGIA--CONTINUED								
COBB.	251 635	48 200	9 764	20.3	4 334	44.4	3 776	38.7
DE KALB	457 698	122 963	18 431	15.0	10 239	55.6	3 647	19.8
FULTON.	566 963	130 792	19 138	14.6	2 782	14.5	7 852	41.0
GWINNETT.	128 206	29 165	4 623	15.9	2 147	46.4	1 524	33.0
RICHMOND.	154 829	24 839	5 921	23.8	2 051	34.6	1 184	20.0
IDAHO:								
ADA	144 665	16 194	6 298	38.9	1 490	23.7	826	13.1
ILLINOIS:								
CHAMPAIGN	168 156	11 730	2 523	21.5	799	31.7	466	18.5
COOK	5 309 763	352 629	196 787	55.8	16 550	8.4	51 950	26.4
DU PAGE	580 262	57 940	10 382	17.9	2 777	26.7	2 817	27.1
KANE.	271 399	15 305	5 134	33.5	1 365	26.6	1 336	26.0
LAKE.	416 208	42 952	8 357	19.5	2 904	34.7	1 255	15.0
LA SALLE.	108 849	10 868	1 879	17.3	483	25.7	306	16.3
MCHENRY	133 788	7 476	2 918	39.0	1 408	48.3	436	14.9
MCLEAN.	118 389	8 524	3 428	40.2	769	22.4	501	14.6
MACON	127 227	8 258	2 195	26.6	926	42.2	489	22.3
MADISON	216 366	15 420	4 333	28.1	1 378	31.8	1 273	29.4
PEORIA	201 223	15 623	4 369	28.0	1 379	31.6	821	18.8
ROCK ISLAND	163 778	11 578	2 796	24.1	1 198	42.8	464	16.6
ST. CLAIR	280 531	14 953	4 736	31.7	1 219	25.7	1 025	21.6
SANGAMON.	173 727	11 837	3 463	29.3	1 243	35.9	602	17.4
TAZEWELL.	127 907	6 086	1 762	29.0	626	35.5	428	24.3
WILL.	306 491	25 452	4 928	19.4	2 388	48.5	1 182	24.0
WINNEBAGO	141 715	23 862	5 831	24.4	1 902	32.6	1 238	21.2
INDIANA:								
ALLEN	283 527	35 142	6 027	17.2	1 868	31.0	1 789	29.7
DELWARE	128 900	11 369	1 676	14.7	475	28.3	575	34.3
ELKHART	134 031	17 370	2 836	16.3	930	32.8	707	24.9
LAKE.	543 056	87 536	12 651	14.5	3 443	27.2	3 938	31.1
LA PORTE.	106 820	10 664	2 283	21.4	665	29.1	857	37.5
MADISON	138 205	15 473	2 152	13.9	389	18.1	797	37.0
ST. JOSEPH.	239 228	27 400	4 602	16.8	1 161	25.2	1 599	34.7
TIPPECANOE.	115 417	9 961	1 763	17.7	636	36.1	385	21.8
VANDERBURGH	162 099	17 990	3 415	19.0	1 146	33.6	1 202	35.2
VIGO.	111 521	11 213	1 902	17.0	347	18.2	810	42.6
IOWA:								
BLACK HAWK.	136 993	13 939	3 212	23.0	589	18.3	1 306	40.7
LINN.	157 491	19 990	4 198	21.0	872	20.8	1 352	32.2
POLK.	301 030	41 071	10 614	25.8	1 010	9.5	3 418	32.2
SCOTT.	154 336	12 024	2 479	20.6	750	30.3	769	31.0
WOODBURY.	103 535	15 239	2 531	16.6	354	14.0	1 050	41.5
KANSAS:								
JOHNSON	251 401	36 666	4 812	13.1	1 647	34.2	1 465	30.4
SEDWICK.	352 595	39 497	9 553	24.2	1 520	15.9	2 666	27.9
SHAWNEE.	156 334	17 738	4 614	26.0	841	18.2	1 158	25.1
WYANDOTTE	176 668	14 678	3 692	25.2	591	16.0	1 519	41.1
KENTUCKY:								
JEFFERSON	683 495	117 719	27 323	23.2	11 918	43.6	4 042	14.8
KENTON.	130 431	21 237	1 565	7.4	715	45.7	275	17.6
LOUISIANA:								
CADDO.	242 518	18 758	5 080	27.1	2 195	43.2	876	17.2
CALCASIEU.	156 540	30 996	5 875	19.0	3 668	62.4	822	14.0
JEFFERSON	422 801	111 361	24 013	21.6	11 947	49.8	4 278	17.8
LAFAYETTE.	132 318	18 483	3 764	20.4	2 273	60.4	632	16.8
OUACHITA.	130 226	14 095	3 192	22.6	1 495	46.8	407	12.8
RAPIDES.	124 836	20 509	2 976	14.5	1 612	54.2	398	13.4
MAINE:								
CUMBERLAND.	204 783	2 729	1 609	59.0	572	35.6	208	12.9
KENNEBEC.	103 256	1 461	523	35.8	144	27.5	116	22.2
PENOBCOT.	136 467	1 536	862	56.1	201	23.3	256	29.7
YORK.	125 867	1 361	1 035	76.0	208	20.1	286	27.6
MARYLAND:								
ANNE ARUNDEL.	356 374	248 880	13 116	5.3	9 927	75.7	1 235	9.4
BALTIMORE.	641 976	485 627	29 983	6.2	24 447	81.5	1 954	6.5
HARFORD.	143 664	92 251	3 230	3.5	1 304	40.4	640	19.8
MONTGOMERY.	571 868	585 823	38 917	6.6	26 266	67.5	5 795	14.9
PRINCE GEORGES.	671 984	516 393	36 526	7.1	26 976	73.9	4 026	11.0
WASHINGTON.	108 716	61 900	1 195	1.9	508	42.5	204	17.1
MASSACHUSETTS:								
BARNSTABLE.	136 919	5 380	3 473	64.6	496	14.3	1 286	37.0
BERKSHIRE.	143 840	3 263	2 252	69.0	43	1.9	967	42.9
BRISTOL.	468 893	8 443	6 012	71.2	66	1.1	3 152	52.4
ESSEX.	624 862	14 537	11 683	80.4	75	0.6	6 052	51.8
HAMPDEN.	456 868	10 381	11 742	113.1	89	0.8	5 711	48.6
HAMPSHIRE.	131 858	3 778	2 562	67.8	23	0.9	917	35.8

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 6. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) of 343 large county governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

County <sup>1</sup>	Legal services and prosecution		Public defense		Corrections		Other criminal justice	
	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system
GEORGIA--CONTINUED								
COBB . . . . .	551	5.6	38	0.4	936	9.6	129	1.3
DE KALB . . . . .	915	5.0	206	1.1	3 284	17.8	149	0.8
FULTON . . . . .	1 914	10.0	368	1.9	5 994	31.3	228	1.2
GWINNETT . . . . .	202	4.4	8	0.2	742	16.1	-	-
RICHMOND . . . . .	400	6.8	78	1.3	2 208	37.3	-	-
IDAHO:								
ADA . . . . .	404	6.4	171	2.7	591	9.4	2 816	44.7
ILLINOIS:								
CHAMPAIGN . . . . .	344	13.6	176	7.0	738	29.3	-	-
COOK . . . . .	15 190	7.7	7 988	4.1	60 698	30.8	44 411	22.6
DU PAGE . . . . .	1 660	16.0	512	4.9	2 580	24.9	36	0.3
KANE . . . . .	468	9.1	154	3.0	1 785	34.8	26	0.5
LAKE . . . . .	933	11.2	150	1.8	3 054	36.5	61	0.7
LA SALLE . . . . .	235	12.5	55	2.9	364	19.4	436	23.2
MCHENRY . . . . .	296	10.1	98	3.4	680	23.3	-	-
MCLEAN . . . . .	214	6.2	81	2.4	444	13.0	1 419	41.4
MACON . . . . .	249	11.3	94	4.3	437	19.9	-	-
MADISON . . . . .	397	9.2	172	4.0	1 108	25.6	5	0.1
PEORIA . . . . .	440	10.1	119	2.7	1 610	36.9	-	-
ROCK ISLAND . . . . .	352	12.6	43	1.5	561	20.1	178	6.4
ST. CLAIR . . . . .	504	10.6	184	3.9	1 799	38.0	5	0.1
SANGAMON . . . . .	414	12.0	117	3.4	1 066	30.8	21	0.6
TAZEWELL . . . . .	256	14.5	63	3.6	354	20.1	35	2.0
WILL . . . . .	524	10.6	210	4.3	604	12.3	20	0.4
WINNEBAGO . . . . .	572	9.8	249	4.3	1 628	27.9	242	4.2
INDIANA:								
ALLEN . . . . .	395	6.6	170	2.8	1 805	29.9	-	-
DELWARE . . . . .	153	9.1	44	2.6	365	21.8	64	3.8
ELKHART . . . . .	149	5.3	71	2.5	799	28.2	180	6.3
LAKE . . . . .	1 226	9.7	300	2.4	3 631	28.7	113	0.9
LA PORTE . . . . .	182	8.0	1	(Z)	382	16.7	196	8.6
MADISON . . . . .	158	7.3	89	4.1	580	27.0	139	6.5
ST. JOSEPH . . . . .	400	8.7	145	3.2	1 004	21.8	293	6.4
TIPPECANOE . . . . .	281	15.9	43	2.4	418	23.7	-	-
VANDERBURGH . . . . .	312	9.1	204	6.0	417	12.2	134	3.9
VIGO . . . . .	220	11.6	68	3.6	393	20.7	64	3.4
IOWA:								
BLACK HAWK . . . . .	217	6.8	220	6.8	873	27.2	7	0.2
LINN . . . . .	335	8.0	282	6.7	1 342	32.0	15	0.4
POLK . . . . .	747	7.0	541	5.1	4 358	41.1	540	5.1
SCOTT . . . . .	244	9.8	113	4.6	598	24.1	5	0.2
WOODBURY . . . . .	256	10.1	212	8.4	652	25.8	7	0.3
KANSAS:								
JOHNSON . . . . .	643	13.4	39	0.8	1 018	21.2	-	-
SEDWICK . . . . .	1 168	12.2	-	-	2 275	23.8	1 924	20.1
SHAWNEE . . . . .	469	10.2	-	-	1 547	33.5	599	13.0
WYANDOTTE . . . . .	429	11.6	37	1.0	1 014	27.5	102	2.8
KENTUCKY:								
JEFFERSON . . . . .	1 719	6.3	326	1.2	7 885	28.9	1 433	5.2
KENTON . . . . .	78	5.0	57	3.6	280	17.9	160	10.2
LOUISIANA:								
CADDO . . . . .	262	5.2	176	3.5	1 571	30.9	-	-
CALCASIEU . . . . .	475	8.1	25	0.4	885	15.1	-	-
JEFFERSON . . . . .	1 944	8.1	22	0.1	5 368	22.4	454	1.9
LAFAYETTE . . . . .	93	2.5	10	0.3	586	15.6	170	4.5
OUACHITA . . . . .	417	13.1	96	3.0	469	14.7	308	9.6
RAPIDES . . . . .	273	9.2	68	2.3	623	20.9	2	0.1
MAINE:								
CUMBERLAND . . . . .	116	7.2	-	-	713	44.3	-	-
KENNEBEC . . . . .	80	15.3	-	-	183	35.0	-	-
PENOBSCT . . . . .	129	15.0	-	-	255	29.6	21	2.4
YORK . . . . .	76	7.3	-	-	460	44.4	5	0.5
MARYLAND:								
ANNE ARUNDEL . . . . .	1 023	7.8	-	-	911	6.9	20	0.2
BALTIMORE . . . . .	1 747	5.8	-	-	1 835	6.1	-	-
HARFORD . . . . .	484	15.0	20	0.6	782	24.2	-	-
MONTGOMERY . . . . .	1 696	4.4	-	-	4 996	12.8	164	0.4
PRINCE GEORGES . . . . .	2 419	6.6	39	0.1	2 869	7.9	197	0.5
WASHINGTON . . . . .	114	9.5	-	-	369	30.9	-	-
MASSACHUSETTS:								
BARNSTABLE . . . . .	215	6.2	78	2.2	1 398	40.3	-	-
BERKSHIRE . . . . .	85	3.8	30	1.3	1 127	50.0	-	-
BRISTOL . . . . .	172	2.9	356	5.9	2 266	37.7	-	-
ESSEX . . . . .	235	2.0	201	1.7	5 120	43.8	-	-
HAMPDEN . . . . .	294	2.5	318	2.7	5 302	45.2	28	0.2
HAMPSHIRE . . . . .	135	5.3	59	2.3	1 417	55.3	11	0.4

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table 6. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) of 343 large county governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued**  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

County <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup>	Total general expenditure	Total criminal justice system		Police protection		Judicial	
			Amount	Percent of total general expenditure	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system
<b>MASSACHUSETTS--CONTINUED</b>								
MIDDLESEX . . . . .	1 386 584	29 774	34 580	116.1	178	0.5	24 625	71.2
NORFOLK . . . . .	619 504	13 256	8 418	63.5	67	0.8	4 191	49.8
PLYMOUTH . . . . .	387 947	8 231	8 253	100.3	335	4.1	4 289	52.0
WORCESTER . . . . .	641 242	14 154	10 409	73.5	58	0.6	5 420	52.1
<b>MICHIGAN:</b>								
BAY . . . . .	120 957	29 406	6 743	22.9	1 444	21.4	1 090	16.2
BERRIEN . . . . .	170 302	21 885	6 509	29.7	1 298	19.9	1 863	28.6
CALHOUN . . . . .	140 265	21 459	6 155	28.7	1 129	18.3	2 372	38.5
GENESEE . . . . .	447 396	73 223	15 840	21.6	2 570	16.2	5 378	34.0
INGHAM . . . . .	271 467	32 211	8 658	26.9	2 084	24.1	2 566	29.6
JACKSON . . . . .	148 805	21 808	4 756	21.8	1 089	22.9	1 548	32.5
KALAMAZOO . . . . .	206 426	21 957	9 478	43.2	1 739	18.3	3 944	41.6
KENT . . . . .	430 705	61 456	10 872	17.7	2 582	23.7	2 060	18.9
MACOMB . . . . .	687 316	79 894	14 034	17.6	3 099	22.1	4 357	31.0
MONROE . . . . .	129 419	28 125	4 814	17.1	1 916	39.8	1 110	23.1
MUSKEGON . . . . .	158 677	32 603	5 007	15.4	1 433	28.6	1 489	29.7
OAKLAND . . . . .	989 807	177 590	24 953	14.1	5 943	23.8	6 281	25.2
OTTAWA . . . . .	145 770	14 603	3 038	20.8	1 131	37.2	814	26.8
SAGINAW . . . . .	227 397	38 815	8 301	21.4	2 495	30.1	1 992	24.0
ST. CLAIR . . . . .	132 209	40 769	4 121	10.1	985	23.9	1 256	30.5
WASHTENAW . . . . .	250 788	38 342	9 993	26.1	2 726	27.3	2 790	27.9
WAYNE . . . . .	2 451 273	430 671	88 497	20.5	8 239	9.3	26 079	29.5
<b>MINNESOTA:</b>								
ANOKA . . . . .	194 573	31 332	5 387	17.2	1 758	32.6	1 116	20.7
DAKOTA . . . . .	184 102	25 153	3 093	12.3	846	27.4	1 083	35.0
HENNEPIN . . . . .	909 619	245 069	37 155	15.2	3 824	10.3	9 384	25.3
RAMSEY . . . . .	454 078	145 469	25 725	17.7	2 067	8.0	5 213	20.3
ST. LOUIS . . . . .	224 381	68 885	9 604	13.9	1 658	17.3	2 374	24.7
STEARN . . . . .	106 816	11 947	1 522	12.7	500	32.9	652	42.8
WASHINGTON . . . . .	111 833	17 414	2 899	16.6	1 215	41.9	788	27.2
<b>MISSISSIPPI:</b>								
HARRISON . . . . .	146 672	15 919	3 838	24.1	843	22.0	2 271	59.2
HINDS . . . . .	235 448	14 791	3 834	25.9	731	19.1	937	24.4
JACKSON . . . . .	113 096	21 691	2 060	9.5	718	34.9	814	39.5
<b>MISSOURI:</b>								
CLAY . . . . .	135 054	6 457	2 194	34.0	543	24.7	572	26.1
GREENE . . . . .	172 437	5 978	1 806	30.2	538	29.8	738	40.9
JACKSON . . . . .	625 749	69 868	17 578	25.2	1 398	8.0	5 118	29.1
JEFFERSON . . . . .	125 932	8 998	1 640	18.2	673	41.0	547	33.4
ST. CHARLES . . . . .	122 997	5 652	2 017	35.7	1 058	52.5	497	24.6
ST. LOUIS . . . . .	977 954	121 254	29 934	24.7	17 329	57.9	6 529	21.8
<b>NEBRASKA:</b>								
DOUGLAS . . . . .	407 976	59 341	7 729	13.0	1 975	25.6	1 879	24.3
LANCASTER . . . . .	183 267	29 482	3 211	10.9	544	16.9	1 394	43.4
<b>NEVADA:</b>								
CLARK . . . . .	361 095	143 568	38 481	26.8	20 686	53.8	6 071	15.8
WASHOE . . . . .	156 785	43 052	8 065	18.7	2 833	35.1	1 618	20.1
<b>NEW HAMPSHIRE:</b>								
HILLSBOROUGH . . . . .	256 355	10 238	2 132	20.8	208	9.8	963	45.2
ROCKINGHAM . . . . .	175 316	6 511	1 604	24.6	291	18.1	766	47.8
<b>NEW JERSEY:</b>								
ATLANTIC . . . . .	190 579	57 085	5 458	9.6	66	1.2	1 929	35.3
BERGEN . . . . .	874 329	125 941	17 334	13.8	3 838	22.1	4 972	28.7
BURLINGTON . . . . .	361 243	62 301	7 228	11.6	419	5.8	2 141	29.6
CAMDEN . . . . .	471 553	124 762	17 042	13.7	775	4.5	4 263	25.0
CUMBERLAND . . . . .	131 175	30 834	3 663	11.9	179	4.9	776	21.2
ESSEX . . . . .	852 345	288 497	41 930	14.5	4 884	11.6	12 854	30.7
GLoucester . . . . .	196 370	28 809	3 538	13.2	402	11.4	722	20.4
HUDSON . . . . .	564 189	139 371	15 570	11.2	4 044	26.0	4 152	26.7
MERCER . . . . .	316 501	73 801	14 086	19.1	502	3.6	2 662	18.9
MIDDLESEX . . . . .	593 823	129 030	14 865	11.5	1 748	11.8	4 788	32.2
MONMOUTH . . . . .	491 683	85 770	8 103	9.4	796	9.8	2 295	28.3
MORRIS . . . . .	396 513	65 743	7 215	11.0	1 834	25.4	1 583	21.9
OCEAN . . . . .	319 566	54 072	6 567	12.1	885	13.5	1 914	29.1
PASSAIC . . . . .	460 288	89 825	13 758	15.3	780	5.7	4 586	33.3
SOMERSET . . . . .	203 650	33 084	4 998	15.1	780	15.6	1 114	22.3
UNION . . . . .	512 273	80 931	15 507	19.2	1 486	9.6	4 792	30.9
<b>NEW MEXICO:</b>								
BERNALILLO . . . . .	377 345	28 340	9 065	32.0	2 991	33.0	186	2.1
<b>NEW YORK:</b>								
ALBANY . . . . .	286 883	143 920	8 458	5.9	966	11.4	1 759	20.8
BROOME . . . . .	219 281	64 408	4 902	7.6	1 329	27.1	965	19.7
CHAUTAUQUA . . . . .	146 878	65 285	3 904	6.0	1 042	26.7	549	14.1
CHEMUNG . . . . .	99 103	36 888	3 138	8.5	659	21.0	425	13.5
DUTCHESS . . . . .	232 235	74 757	5 355	7.2	1 499	28.0	1 034	19.3

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 6. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) of 343 large county governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

County <sup>1</sup>	Legal services and prosecution		Public defense		Corrections		Other criminal justice	
	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system
<b>MASSACHUSETTS--CONTINUED</b>								
MIDDLESEX	660	1.9	730	2.1	8 386	24.3	1	(Z)
NORFOLK	1 097	13.0	113	1.3	2 876	34.2	74	0.9
PLYMOUTH	461	5.6	290	3.5	2 864	34.7	14	0.2
WORCESTER	248	2.4	204	2.0	4 395	42.2	84	0.8
<b>MICHIGAN:</b>								
BAY	350	5.2	226	3.4	3 633	53.9	-	-
BERRIEN	609	9.4	243	3.7	2 496	38.3	-	-
CALHOUN	518	8.4	213	3.5	1 923	31.2	-	-
GENESEE	2 298	14.5	431	2.7	5 088	32.1	75	0.5
INGHAM	1 164	13.4	637	7.4	2 207	25.5	-	-
JACKSON	354	7.4	227	4.8	1 538	32.3	-	-
KALAMAZOO	858	9.1	400	4.2	2 537	26.8	-	-
KENT	845	7.8	508	4.7	4 683	43.1	194	1.8
MACOMB	1 671	11.9	-	-	4 907	35.0	-	-
MONROE	270	5.6	171	3.6	1 347	28.0	-	-
MUSKEGON	347	6.9	95	1.9	1 621	32.4	22	0.4
OAKLAND	2 190	8.8	1 031	4.1	9 416	37.7	92	0.4
OTTAWA	162	5.3	109	3.6	822	27.1	-	-
SAGINAW	578	7.0	466	5.6	2 658	32.0	112	1.3
ST. CLAIR	357	8.7	170	4.1	1 353	32.8	-	-
WASHTENAW	683	6.8	485	4.9	3 309	33.1	-	-
WAYNE	5 576	6.3	5 706	6.4	42 412	47.9	485	0.5
<b>MINNESOTA:</b>								
ANOKA	667	12.4	203	3.8	1 643	30.5	-	-
DAKOTA	407	13.2	187	6.0	570	18.4	-	-
HENNEPIN	5 007	13.5	1 962	5.3	16 665	44.9	313	0.8
RAMSEY	2 250	8.7	508	2.0	15 549	60.4	138	0.5
ST. LOUIS	842	8.8	489	5.1	4 241	44.2	-	-
STEARN	153	10.1	41	2.7	176	11.6	-	-
WASHINGTON	238	8.2	86	3.0	572	19.7	-	-
<b>MISSISSIPPI:</b>								
HARRISON	175	4.6	15	0.4	534	13.9	-	-
HINDS	87	2.3	159	4.1	1 804	47.1	116	3.0
JACKSON	98	4.8	37	1.8	361	17.5	32	1.6
<b>MISSOURI:</b>								
CLAY	293	13.4	-	-	786	35.8	-	-
GREENE	160	8.9	-	-	370	20.5	-	-
JACKSON	1 660	9.4	-	-	9 387	53.4	15	0.1
JEFFERSON	160	9.8	-	-	152	9.3	108	6.6
ST. CHARLES	209	10.4	-	-	253	12.5	-	-
ST. LOUIS	1 494	5.0	-	-	4 523	15.1	59	0.2
<b>NEBRASKA:</b>								
DOUGLAS	848	11.0	368	4.8	2 644	34.2	15	0.2
LANCASTER	534	16.6	219	6.8	520	16.2	-	-
<b>NEVADA:</b>								
CLARK	2 979	7.7	1 049	2.7	7 278	18.9	418	1.1
WASHOE	1 188	14.7	485	6.0	1 827	22.7	114	1.4
<b>NEW HAMPSHIRE:</b>								
HILLSBOROUGH	142	6.7	-	-	819	38.4	-	-
ROCKINGHAM	85	5.3	-	-	462	28.8	-	-
<b>NEW JERSEY:</b>								
ATLANTIC	1 248	22.9	-	-	2 050	37.6	165	3.0
BERGEN	3 021	17.4	22	0.1	5 317	30.7	164	0.9
BURLINGTON	1 328	18.4	-	-	3 244	44.9	96	1.3
CAMDEN	3 007	17.6	-	-	8 841	51.9	156	0.9
CUMBERLAND	346	9.4	-	-	2 325	63.5	37	1.0
ESSEX	5 373	12.8	102	0.2	18 576	44.3	141	0.3
GLoucester	780	22.0	-	-	1 598	45.2	36	1.0
HUDSON	2 941	18.9	-	-	4 380	28.1	53	0.3
MERCER	1 497	10.6	-	-	9 347	66.4	78	0.6
MIDDLESEX	2 760	18.6	35	0.2	5 447	36.6	87	0.6
MONMOUTH	1 426	17.6	3	(Z)	3 528	43.5	55	0.7
MORRIS	1 394	19.3	-	-	2 349	32.6	55	0.8
OCEAN	1 320	20.1	-	-	2 406	36.6	42	0.6
PASSAIC	2 815	20.5	4	(Z)	5 527	40.2	46	0.3
SOMERSET	999	20.0	6	0.1	2 034	40.7	65	1.3
UNION	3 247	20.9	-	-	5 313	34.3	669	4.3
<b>NEW MEXICO:</b>								
BERNALILLO	214	2.4	-	-	5 001	55.2	673	7.4
<b>NEW YORK:</b>								
ALBANY	815	9.6	304	3.6	4 552	53.8	62	0.7
BROOME	508	10.4	205	4.2	1 860	37.9	35	0.7
CHAUTAUQUA	407	10.4	166	4.3	1 740	44.6	-	-
CHEMUNG	274	8.7	85	2.7	1 695	54.0	-	-
DUTCHESS	591	11.0	294	5.5	1 935	36.1	2	(Z)

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table 6. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) of 343 large county governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued**

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

County <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup>	Total general expenditure	Total criminal justice system		Police protection		Judicial	
			Amount	Percent of total general expenditure	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system
<b>NEW YORK--CONTINUED</b>								
ERIE.	1 077 086	\$24 009	30 544	5.8	6 463	21.2	6 129	20.1
MONROE.	707 160	350 526	23 637	6.7	5 999	25.4	6 323	26.8
NASSAU.	1 399 725	765 713	151 868	19.8	107 056	70.5	10 505	6.9
NIAGARA.	237 772	87 395	5 416	6.2	1 546	28.5	1 494	27.6
ONEIDA.	262 521	75 911	4 566	6.0	789	17.3	1 496	32.8
ONDONDAGA.	474 133	285 485	18 038	6.3	4 213	23.4	3 011	16.7
ORANGE.	246 939	92 407	5 059	5.5	81	1.6	1 528	30.2
OSWEGO.	111 239	42 687	2 717	6.4	768	28.3	784	28.9
RENSSELAER.	151 471	54 926	2 996	5.5	501	16.7	570	19.0
ROCKLAND.	257 543	112 512	6 626	5.9	1 132	17.1	1 283	19.4
ST. LAWRENCE.	117 101	37 890	1 993	5.3	428	21.5	552	27.7
SARATOGA.	148 212	37 297	2 000	5.4	537	26.8	616	30.8
SCHENECTADY.	155 930	48 294	3 244	6.7	349	10.8	794	24.5
STEUBEN.	100 738	30 645	1 930	6.3	314	16.3	507	26.3
SUFFOLK.	1 295 268	622 499	108 730	17.5	76 141	70.0	11 229	10.3
ULSTER.	154 597	50 598	3 309	6.5	512	15.5	982	29.7
WESTCHESTER.	874 068	444 576	29 129	6.6	5 682	19.5	4 657	16.0
<b>NORTH CAROLINA:</b>								
BUNCOMBE.	151 738	73 024	2 866	3.9	1 547	54.0	525	18.3
CUMBERLAND.	230 917	112 931	6 042	5.4	2 707	44.8	2 138	35.4
DURHAM.	143 144	74 455	3 554	4.8	492	13.8	407	11.5
FORSYTH.	228 433	121 248	3 722	3.1	1 177	31.6	1 327	35.7
GASTON.	155 186	72 063	2 137	3.0	1 271	59.5	273	12.8
GUILFORD.	304 288	152 800	4 650	3.0	1 724	37.1	716	15.4
MECKLENBURG.	377 150	219 006	8 293	3.8	3 128	37.7	2 238	27.0
ONslow.	115 168	36 316	1 908	5.3	470	24.6	1 075	56.3
WAKE.	273 011	130 499	2 931	2.2	890	30.4	891	30.4
<b>OHIO:</b>								
ALLEN.	107 072	20 760	2 551	12.3	581	22.8	678	26.6
ASHTABULA.	99 722	13 392	3 544	26.5	601	17.0	601	17.0
BUTLER.	250 479	30 298	3 318	11.0	792	23.9	1 143	34.4
CLARK.	150 059	22 410	2 866	12.9	602	20.9	795	27.5
CLERMONT.	114 195	19 021	1 691	8.9	340	20.1	685	38.7
COLUMBIANA.	112 620	10 003	1 643	16.4	228	13.9	649	39.5
CUYAHOGA.	1 559 471	229 458	52 944	23.1	7 828	14.8	20 069	37.9
FRANKLIN.	869 996	128 315	49 966	38.9	4 275	8.6	36 415	72.9
GREENE.	128 774	22 051	2 711	12.3	661	24.4	765	28.2
HAMILTON.	883 339	125 866	24 198	19.2	6 578	27.2	7 975	33.0
LAKE.	210 670	33 548	4 486	13.4	787	17.5	1 470	32.8
LICKING.	114 947	14 354	2 128	14.8	434	20.4	695	32.7
LORAIN.	263 929	32 988	4 020	12.2	848	21.1	1 238	30.8
LUCAS.	469 030	60 415	13 130	21.7	827	6.3	4 042	30.8
MAHONING.	299 845	42 986	4 670	10.9	794	17.0	2 061	44.1
MONTGOMERY.	580 609	153 493	17 559	11.4	3 429	19.5	4 660	26.5
PORTAGE.	132 212	29 824	2 975	10.0	846	28.4	1 032	34.7
RICHLAND.	130 057	12 694	2 633	20.7	685	26.0	680	25.8
STARK.	376 258	45 379	7 645	16.8	2 607	26.3	1 720	22.5
SUMMIT.	529 253	80 059	10 404	13.0	2 404	23.1	2 940	28.3
TRUMBULL.	240 190	30 416	3 934	12.9	1 295	32.9	1 512	38.4
WOOD.	102 697	17 275	1 815	10.5	538	29.6	714	39.3
<b>OKLAHOMA:</b>								
CLEVELAND.	103 489	3 498	634	18.1	232	36.6	114	18.0
COMANCHE.	117 471	4 728	1 563	32.1	354	22.6	575	36.8
OKLAHOMA.	547 141	32 378	4 652	14.4	226	4.9	1 891	40.6
TULSA.	431 918	30 793	8 299	27.0	983	11.8	4 763	57.4
<b>OREGON:</b>								
CLACKAMAS.	213 154	34 507	6 450	18.7	2 635	40.9	1 031	16.0
JACKSON.	117 919	23 853	7 672	32.2	1 867	24.3	3 484	45.4
LANE.	249 268	68 507	14 354	21.0	3 567	24.9	3 401	23.7
MARION.	177 363	18 520	5 054	27.3	1 566	31.0	1 231	24.4
MULTNOMAH.	545 198	90 479	24 613	27.2	8 646	35.1	5 894	23.9
WASHINGTON.	203 196	29 942	5 951	19.9	2 424	40.7	1 046	17.6
<b>PENNSYLVANIA:</b>								
ALLEGHENY.	1 493 272	213 374	29 173	13.7	6 782	23.2	8 916	30.6
BEAVER.	208 705	23 456	3 876	16.5	447	11.5	1 787	40.1
BERKS.	304 064	32 531	7 217	22.2	161	2.2	2 054	28.5
BLAIR.	133 729	10 713	1 776	16.6	35	2.0	873	49.2
BUCKS.	469 738	45 163	9 578	21.2	731	7.6	3 826	39.9
BUTLER.	141 527	18 331	1 859	10.1	211	11.4	721	38.8
CAMBRIA.	188 432	21 126	2 753	13.0	160	5.8	1 255	45.6
CENTRE.	109 323	8 752	1 090	12.5	16	1.5	499	45.8
CHESTER.	303 512	28 721	7 816	27.2	769	9.8	2 170	27.8
CUMBERLAND.	171 575	13 127	2 339	17.8	277	11.8	822	35.1
DAUPHIN.	223 669	29 900	7 026	23.5	193	2.7	2 254	32.1
DELAWARE.	582 060	88 396	16 023	18.1	1 025	6.4	5 705	35.6
ERIE.	273 833	22 219	6 277	28.3	210	3.3	1 910	30.4
FAYETTE.	155 901	6 209	2 106	33.9	318	15.1	934	44.3
FRANKLIN.	107 256	7 138	1 482	20.8	39	2.6	449	30.3
LACKAWANNA.	231 387	17 107	2 839	16.6	54	1.9	1 248	44.0
LANCASTER.	347 914	29 265	5 952	20.3	313	5.3	2 318	38.9
LAWRENCE.	105 983	7 252	1 271	17.5	23	1.8	600	47.2

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table 6. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) of 343 large county governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued**

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

County <sup>1</sup>	Legal services and prosecution		Public defense		Corrections		Other criminal justice	
	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system
<b>NEW YORK--CONTINUED</b>								
ERIE	3 285	10.8	1 261	4.1	13 276	43.5	130	0.4
MONROE	2 137	9.0	837	3.5	8 054	34.1	287	1.2
NASSAU	7 978	5.3	2 312	1.5	23 507	15.5	510	0.3
NIAGARA	438	8.1	172	3.2	1 744	32.2	22	0.4
ONEIDA	525	11.5	159	3.5	1 597	35.0	-	-
ONONDAGA	1 438	8.0	743	4.1	8 092	44.9	541	3.0
ORANGE	654	12.9	296	5.9	2 500	49.4	-	-
OSWEGO	239	8.8	39	1.4	887	32.6	-	-
RENSSELAER	350	11.7	136	4.5	1 439	48.0	-	-
ROCKLAND	1 063	16.0	351	5.3	2 797	42.2	-	-
ST. LAWRENCE	155	7.8	87	4.4	771	38.7	-	-
SARATOGA	227	11.3	56	2.8	564	28.2	-	-
SCHENECTADY	420	12.9	71	2.2	1 603	49.4	7	0.2
STEUBEN	213	11.0	94	4.9	802	41.6	-	-
SUFFOLK	5 084	4.7	1 715	1.6	13 423	12.3	1 138	1.0
ULSTER	325	9.8	107	3.2	1 319	39.9	64	1.9
WESTCHESTER	4 665	16.1	1 730	5.9	12 102	41.5	273	0.9
<b>NORTH CAROLINA:</b>								
BUNCOMBE	72	2.5	-	-	680	23.7	42	1.5
CUMBERLAND	100	1.7	27	0.4	1 066	17.6	4	0.1
DURHAM	67	1.9	-	-	339	9.5	2 249	63.3
FORSYTH	122	3.3	-	-	995	24.7	101	2.7
GASTON	58	2.7	23	1.1	475	22.2	37	1.7
GUILFORD	256	5.5	-	-	1 467	31.5	487	10.5
MECKLENBURG	148	1.8	37	0.4	1 665	20.1	1 077	13.0
ONslow	35	1.8	-	-	298	15.6	30	1.6
WAKE	132	4.5	-	-	688	23.5	330	11.3
<b>OHIO:</b>								
ALLEN	246	9.6	41	1.6	1 005	39.4	-	-
ASHTABULA	125	3.5	28	0.8	420	11.9	1 769	49.9
BUTLER	218	6.6	57	1.7	981	29.6	127	3.8
CLARK	236	8.2	131	4.5	996	34.5	126	4.4
CLERMONT	119	7.0	65	3.8	371	21.9	141	8.3
COLUMBIANA	199	12.1	88	5.4	428	26.0	51	3.1
CUYAHOGA	2 016	3.8	2 493	4.7	13 383	25.3	7 155	13.5
FRANKLIN	1 708	3.4	1 390	2.8	4 774	9.6	1 404	2.8
GREENE	208	7.7	131	4.8	874	32.2	72	2.7
HAMILTON	927	3.8	1 091	4.5	7 514	31.1	113	0.5
LAKE	476	10.6	157	3.5	1 513	33.7	83	1.9
LICKING	280	13.2	146	6.9	565	26.6	8	0.4
LORAIN	409	10.2	72	1.8	1 453	36.1	-	-
LUCAS	651	5.0	849	6.5	6 761	51.5	-	-
MAHONING	369	7.9	270	5.8	984	21.1	192	4.1
MONTGOMERY	1 003	5.7	1 213	6.9	4 485	25.5	2 769	15.8
PORTAGE	243	8.2	120	4.0	733	24.6	1	(Z)
RICHLAND	396	15.0	87	3.3	715	27.2	70	2.7
STARK	400	5.2	256	3.3	3 242	42.4	20	0.3
SUMMIT	950	9.1	627	6.0	3 084	29.6	399	3.8
TRUMBULL	289	7.3	63	1.6	772	19.6	3	0.1
WOOD	138	7.6	85	4.7	340	18.7	-	-
<b>OKLAHOMA:</b>								
CLEVELAND	201	31.7	-	-	87	13.7	-	-
COMANCHE	194	12.4	41	2.6	399	25.5	-	-
OKLAHOMA	731	15.7	440	9.5	1 364	29.3	-	-
TULSA	717	8.6	191	2.3	1 645	19.8	-	-
<b>OREGON:</b>								
CLACKAMAS	685	10.6	276	4.3	1 607	24.9	216	3.3
JACKSON	360	4.7	-	-	1 961	25.6	-	-
LANE	1 584	11.0	692	4.8	5 110	35.6	-	-
MARION	761	15.1	175	3.5	1 321	26.1	-	-
MULTNOMAH	2 980	12.1	1 668	6.8	5 208	21.2	217	0.9
WASHINGTON	642	10.8	304	5.1	1 535	25.8	-	-
<b>PENNSYLVANIA:</b>								
ALLEGHENY	3 396	11.6	1 029	3.5	9 001	30.9	49	0.2
BEAVER	364	9.4	123	3.2	1 101	28.4	54	1.4
BERKS	345	4.8	120	1.7	4 537	62.9	-	-
BLAIR	125	7.0	82	4.6	661	37.2	-	-
BUCKS	1 094	11.4	306	3.2	3 621	37.8	-	-
BUTLER	132	7.1	66	3.6	729	39.2	-	-
CAMBRIA	308	11.2	108	3.9	922	33.5	-	-
CENTRE	77	7.1	52	4.8	441	40.5	5	0.5
CHESTER	1 091	14.0	388	5.0	3 398	45.5	-	-
CUMBERLAND	151	6.5	64	2.7	972	41.6	53	2.3
DAUPHIN	532	7.6	237	3.4	3 588	51.1	222	3.2
DELAWARE	2 288	14.3	597	3.7	6 334	39.5	74	0.5
ERIE	429	6.8	304	4.8	3 409	54.3	15	0.2
FAYETTE	139	6.6	55	2.6	660	31.3	-	-
FRANKLIN	91	6.1	56	3.8	847	57.2	-	-
LACKAWANNA	277	9.8	129	4.5	1 131	39.8	-	-
LANCASTER	347	5.8	212	3.6	2 762	46.4	-	-
LAWRENCE	152	12.0	44	3.5	452	35.6	-	-

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table 6. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) of 343 large county governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued**

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

County <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup>	Total general expenditure	Total criminal justice system		Police protection		Judicial	
			Amount	Percent of total general expenditure	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system
PENNSYLVANIA--CONTINUED								
LEBANON . . . . .	106 329	8 860	1 509	17.0	167	11.1	549	36.4
LEHIGH . . . . .	265 035	32 213	5 280	16.4	155	2.9	1 717	32.5
LUZERNE . . . . .	341 074	21 325	4 708	22.1	235	5.0	2 089	44.4
LYCOMING . . . . .	115 123	16 750	2 717	16.2	24	0.9	891	32.8
MERCER . . . . .	127 077	8 673	1 877	21.6	23	1.2	804	42.8
MONTGOMERY . . . . .	629 191	57 291	16 109	28.1	1 961	12.2	5 332	33.1
NORTHAMPTON . . . . .	225 573	23 047	4 470	19.4	52	1.2	1 446	32.3
NORTHUMBERLAND . . . . .	99 001	11 102	1 633	14.7	84	5.1	600	36.7
SCHUYLKILL . . . . .	158 336	15 107	2 697	17.9	48	1.8	941	34.9
WASHINGTON . . . . .	214 031	16 005	3 058	19.1	383	12.5	1 364	44.6
WESTMORELAND . . . . .	382 714	42 061	4 750	11.3	170	3.6	2 220	46.7
YORK . . . . .	289 703	21 185	5 133	24.2	771	15.0	1 825	35.6
SOUTH CAROLINA:								
ANDERSON . . . . .	117 213	6 418	1 966	30.6	833	42.4	548	27.9
CHARLESTON . . . . .	260 537	26 032	5 948	22.8	3 325	55.9	1 449	24.4
GREENVILLE . . . . .	269 136	47 646	6 661	14.0	3 162	47.5	1 592	23.9
LEXINGTON . . . . .	126 573	13 429	2 872	21.4	1 502	52.3	783	27.3
RICHLAND . . . . .	248 176	21 364	8 247	38.6	2 877	34.9	3 631	44.0
SPARTANBURG . . . . .	195 083	20 762	4 120	19.8	2 443	59.3	1 001	24.3
TENNESSEE:								
HAMILTON . . . . .	271 750	83 902	5 959	7.1	1 788	30.0	1 942	32.6
KNOX . . . . .	299 708	80 344	5 582	6.9	2 276	40.8	1 922	34.4
SHELBY . . . . .	748 733	192 737	40 190	20.9	5 000	12.4	6 660	16.6
SULLIVAN . . . . .	137 320	50 861	1 994	3.9	849	42.6	705	35.4
TEXAS:								
BELL . . . . .	159 888	5 220	2 162	41.4	339	15.7	538	24.9
BEXAR . . . . .	947 207	36 612	16 009	43.7	2 140	13.4	4 353	27.2
BRAZORIA . . . . .	136 120	12 242	3 178	26.0	1 135	35.7	1 082	34.0
CAMERON . . . . .	177 114	9 351	5 103	54.6	219	4.3	1 039	20.4
DALLAS . . . . .	1 458 358	74 669	33 889	45.4	8 876	26.2	10 847	32.0
EL PASO . . . . .	436 640	15 593	7 100	45.5	1 284	18.1	2 270	32.0
GALVESTON . . . . .	194 035	18 658	4 365	23.4	1 119	25.6	1 488	34.1
HARRIS . . . . .	2 123 161	184 348	55 704	30.2	7 188	12.9	19 380	34.8
HIDALGO . . . . .	235 033	8 972	4 433	49.4	424	9.6	1 235	27.9
JEFFERSON . . . . .	245 483	14 020	5 493	39.2	1 160	21.1	1 593	29.0
LUBBOCK . . . . .	200 332	17 643	3 029	17.2	575	19.0	1 050	34.7
MCLENNAN . . . . .	160 762	10 243	2 950	28.8	486	16.5	702	23.8
NUCES . . . . .	249 375	18 448	7 667	41.6	627	8.2	2 450	32.0
SMITH . . . . .	111 557	4 386	2 019	46.0	512	25.4	901	44.6
TARRANT . . . . .	773 414	31 618	14 317	45.3	3 111	21.7	4 207	29.4
TAYLOR . . . . .	104 296	2 820	1 495	53.0	218	14.6	693	46.4
TRAVIS . . . . .	388 187	19 181	9 494	49.5	1 556	16.4	2 484	26.2
WICHITA . . . . .	122 519	3 968	1 520	38.3	358	23.6	533	35.1
UTAH:								
DAVIS . . . . .	122 692	5 873	1 362	23.2	626	46.0	176	12.9
SALT LAKE . . . . .	540 533	93 697	15 099	16.1	7 297	48.3	2 473	16.4
UTAH . . . . .	177 106	9 013	3 064	34.0	375	12.2	478	15.6
WEBER . . . . .	135 974	11 722	2 148	18.3	591	27.7	295	13.7
VERMONT:								
CHITTENDEN . . . . .	111 734	179	143	79.9	7	4.9	134	93.7
VIRGINIA:								
ARLINGTON . . . . .	152 269	119 789	11 402	9.5	7 678	67.3	1 200	10.5
CHESTERFIELD . . . . .	121 741	72 084	4 211	5.8	2 707	64.3	579	13.7
FAIRFAX . . . . .	533 954	436 701	31 666	7.3	17 910	56.6	3 854	12.2
HENRICO . . . . .	171 535	113 335	12 577	11.1	6 150	48.9	2 969	23.6
PRINCE WILLIAM . . . . .	131 363	86 855	5 357	6.2	3 363	62.8	846	15.8
WASHINGTON:								
CLARK . . . . .	164 481	25 949	5 361	20.7	1 960	36.6	1 153	21.8
KING . . . . .	1 160 211	217 072	35 086	16.2	11 602	33.1	7 912	22.6
KITSAP . . . . .	122 063	18 136	3 666	20.2	1 357	37.0	778	21.2
PIERCE . . . . .	426 067	53 939	11 491	21.3	4 539	39.5	2 175	18.9
SNOHOMISH . . . . .	275 357	38 336	7 776	20.3	3 344	43.0	1 797	23.1
SPOKANE . . . . .	312 467	33 570	8 424	25.1	2 866	34.0	1 743	20.7
YAKIMA . . . . .	158 527	19 469	4 207	21.6	1 113	26.5	1 134	27.0
WEST VIRGINIA:								
CABELL . . . . .	105 534	7 250	1 105	15.2	317	28.7	174	15.7
KANAWHA . . . . .	227 341	13 135	2 325	17.7	582	25.0	521	22.4
WISCONSIN:								
BROWN . . . . .	174 930	30 758	3 480	11.3	2 001	57.5	688	19.8
DANE . . . . .	311 740	57 281	9 295	16.2	3 236	34.8	2 657	28.6
KENOSHA . . . . .	124 453	21 684	3 482	16.1	1 724	49.5	876	25.2
MARATHON . . . . .	106 468	19 032	2 222	11.7	1 130	50.9	402	18.1
MILWAUKEE . . . . .	1 003 569	313 586	29 646	9.5	5 253	17.7	10 233	34.5
OUTAGAMIE . . . . .	127 175	21 580	2 553	11.8	991	38.8	832	32.6
RACINE . . . . .	176 793	39 511	6 574	16.6	2 096	31.9	1 282	19.5
ROCK . . . . .	134 730	32 090	3 650	11.4	1 176	32.2	916	25.1
WAUKESHA . . . . .	270 691	39 034	5 343	13.7	2 637	49.4	1 452	27.2
WINNEBAGO . . . . .	132 629	24 048	2 670	11.1	1 016	38.1	662	24.8

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table 6. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) of 343 large county governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued**

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

County <sup>1</sup>	Legal services and prosecution		Public defense		Corrections		Other criminal justice	
	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system
PENNSYLVANIA--CONTINUED								
LEBANON . . . . .	86	5.7	32	2.1	675	44.7	-	-
LEHIGH . . . . .	499	9.5	146	2.8	2 763	52.3	-	-
LUZERNE . . . . .	414	8.8	199	4.2	1 771	37.6	-	-
LYCOMING . . . . .	196	7.2	64	2.4	1 526	56.2	-	0.6
MERCER . . . . .	233	12.4	130	6.9	665	35.4	16	1.2
MONTGOMERY . . . . .	1 533	9.5	545	3.4	6 730	41.8	22	-
NORTHAMPTON . . . . .	288	6.4	170	3.8	2 514	56.2	-	-
NORTHUMBERLAND . . . . .	152	9.3	91	5.6	706	43.2	-	-
SCHUYLKILL . . . . .	148	5.5	108	4.0	1 452	53.8	-	-
WASHINGTON . . . . .	237	7.8	75	2.5	999	32.7	-	-
WESTMORELAND . . . . .	567	11.9	170	3.6	1 623	34.2	-	-
YORK . . . . .	235	4.6	90	1.8	2 212	43.1	-	-
SOUTH CAROLINA								
ANDERSON . . . . .	87	4.4	36	1.8	462	23.5	-	-
CHARLESTON . . . . .	235	4.0	139	2.3	770	12.9	30	0.5
GREENVILLE . . . . .	364	5.5	155	2.3	1 012	15.2	376	5.6
LEXINGTON . . . . .	102	3.6	34	1.2	367	12.8	84	2.9
RICHLAND . . . . .	718	8.7	245	3.0	763	9.3	13	0.2
SPARTANBURG . . . . .	194	4.7	73	1.8	253	6.1	156	3.8
TENNESSEE								
HAMILTON . . . . .	178	3.0	-	-	1 843	30.9	208	3.5
KNOX . . . . .	147	2.6	-	-	1 165	20.9	72	1.3
SHELBY . . . . .	666	1.7	774	1.9	6 727	16.7	20 363	50.7
SULLIVAN . . . . .	61	3.1	4	0.2	375	18.8	-	-
TEXAS								
BELL . . . . .	493	22.8	138	6.4	597	27.6	57	2.6
BEXAR . . . . .	2 028	12.7	456	2.8	5 264	32.9	1 768	11.0
BRAZORIA . . . . .	271	8.5	57	1.8	604	19.0	29	0.9
CAMERON . . . . .	273	5.3	84	1.6	1 026	20.1	2 462	48.2
DALLAS . . . . .	3 722	11.0	1 325	3.9	8 853	26.1	266	0.8
EL PASO . . . . .	1 093	15.4	244	3.4	2 179	30.7	30	0.4
GALVESTON . . . . .	561	12.9	124	2.8	779	17.8	294	6.7
HARRIS . . . . .	6 255	11.2	2 111	3.8	15 399	27.6	5 371	9.6
HIDALGO . . . . .	337	7.6	98	2.2	2 339	52.8	-	-
JEFFERSON . . . . .	764	13.9	201	3.7	1 118	20.4	657	12.0
LUBBOCK . . . . .	388	12.8	64	2.1	898	29.6	54	1.8
MCLENNAN . . . . .	303	10.3	43	1.5	1 247	42.3	169	5.7
NUCES . . . . .	591	7.7	142	1.9	2 166	28.3	1 691	22.1
SMITH . . . . .	169	8.4	45	2.1	341	16.9	53	2.6
TARRANT . . . . .	2 705	18.9	281	2.0	2 825	19.7	1 188	8.3
TAYLOR . . . . .	139	9.3	96	6.4	319	21.3	30	2.0
TRAVIS . . . . .	865	9.1	184	1.9	4 231	44.6	174	1.8
WICHITA . . . . .	174	11.4	37	2.4	395	26.0	23	1.5
UTAH								
DAVIS . . . . .	196	14.4	68	5.0	146	10.7	150	11.0
SALT LAKE . . . . .	1 849	12.2	460	3.0	2 247	14.9	773	5.1
UTAH . . . . .	222	7.2	73	2.4	1 770	57.8	146	4.8
WEBER . . . . .	331	15.4	75	3.5	747	34.8	105	4.9
VERMONT								
CHITTENDEN . . . . .	2	1.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
VIRGINIA								
ARLINGTON . . . . .	445	3.9	-	-	1 596	14.0	483	4.2
CHESTERFIELD . . . . .	181	4.3	-	-	718	17.1	26	0.6
FAIRFAX . . . . .	1 011	3.2	129	0.4	4 268	13.5	4 494	14.2
HENRICO . . . . .	482	3.8	-	-	2 976	23.7	-	-
PRINCE WILLIAM . . . . .	336	6.3	-	-	788	14.7	24	0.4
WASHINGTON:								
CLARK . . . . .	537	10.0	211	3.9	1 489	27.8	11	0.2
KING . . . . .	3 046	8.7	2 272	6.5	10 147	28.9	107	0.3
KITSAP . . . . .	357	9.7	243	6.5	892	24.3	39	1.1
PIERCE . . . . .	992	8.6	546	4.8	3 184	27.7	55	0.5
SNOHOMISH . . . . .	684	8.8	245	3.2	1 640	21.1	66	0.8
SPOKANE . . . . .	635	7.5	567	6.7	2 170	25.8	443	5.3
YAKIMA . . . . .	379	9.0	195	4.6	1 344	31.9	42	1.0
WEST VIRGINIA								
CABELL . . . . .	148	13.4	-	-	466	42.2	-	-
KANAWHA . . . . .	333	14.3	-	-	889	38.2	-	-
WISCONSIN								
BROWN . . . . .	189	5.4	101	2.9	501	14.4	-	-
DANE . . . . .	1 634	17.6	310	3.3	1 458	15.7	-	-
KENOSHA . . . . .	328	9.4	138	4.0	416	11.9	-	-
MARATHON . . . . .	166	7.5	43	1.9	470	21.2	11	0.5
MILWAUKEE . . . . .	2 931	9.9	1 659	5.6	8 422	28.4	1 148	3.9
OUTAGAMIE . . . . .	198	7.8	60	2.4	304	11.9	168	6.6
RACINE . . . . .	434	6.6	468	7.1	772	11.7	1 522	23.2
ROCK . . . . .	360	9.9	181	5.0	940	25.8	77	2.1
WAUKESHA . . . . .	412	7.7	139	2.6	637	11.9	66	1.2
WINNEBAGO . . . . .	187	7.0	85	3.2	176	6.6	544	20.4

\* Represents zero or rounds to zero.

<sup>1</sup>Data are based on a field compilation from records of each county government shown; see text for data limitations.

<sup>2</sup>Population as of July 1, 1977 from Bureau of the Census estimates.

Table 7. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) of 406 large city governments, fiscal year 1978  
(Dollar amounts in thousands),

City <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup>	Total general expenditure	Total criminal justice system		Police protection		Judicial	
			Amount	Percent of total general expenditure	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system
TOTAL.	66 046 129	44 169 098	6 090 329	13.8	4 925 675	80.9	346 948	5.7
ALABAMA:								
BIRMINGHAM	282 358	126 961	18 210	14.3	15 723	86.3	532	2.9
GADSDEN	49 013	14 149	1 432	10.0	1 283	90.9	23	1.6
HUNTSVILLE	143 906	41 260	4 524	11.0	4 051	89.5	136	3.0
MOBILE	205 174	66 458	7 993	12.0	6 758	84.5	443	5.5
MONTGOMERY	156 333	45 680	5 541	12.1	4 990	90.1	130	2.3
TUSCALOOSA	69 482	18 465	2 797	15.1	2 569	91.8	132	4.7
ALASKA:								
ANCHORAGE	181 754	266 128	11 704	4.2	9 790	86.6	-	-
ARIZONA:								
GLENDALE	73 730	14 822	2 691	18.2	2 364	87.8	74	2.7
MESA	110 079	25 808	4 226	16.4	3 914	92.6	149	3.5
PHOENIX	684 516	284 971	58 856	20.7	52 257	88.8	3 073	5.2
SCOTTSDALE	81 458	29 717	3 683	12.4	3 182	86.4	131	3.1
TEMPE	98 146	22 525	4 898	21.7	4 447	90.9	155	3.2
TUCSON	301 152	119 436	15 397	12.9	14 139	91.8	515	3.3
ARKANSAS:								
FORT SMITH	68 180	11 800	1 757	14.9	1 419	80.8	65	3.7
LITTLE ROCK	153 494	44 514	5 928	13.3	4 575	77.2	414	7.0
NORTH LITTLE ROCK	62 875	11 888	2 314	19.5	1 924	83.1	148	6.4
PINE BLUFF	55 817	8 356	1 687	20.2	1 288	76.3	141	8.4
CALIFORNIA:								
ALAMEDA	72 612	13 013	2 800	21.5	2 697	96.3	-	-
ALHAMBRA	60 242	15 786	2 499	15.8	2 412	96.5	-	-
ANAHEIM	202 477	79 734	12 763	16.0	12 232	95.8	-	-
BAKERSFIELD	83 035	32 219	5 892	18.3	5 696	96.7	-	-
BELLFLOWER	50 306	6 313	3 342	52.9	3 299	98.7	-	-
BERKELEY	109 387	52 900	6 135	11.6	5 925	96.6	-	-
BUENA PARK	62 396	12 943	3 211	24.8	2 960	92.2	-	-
BURBANK	84 811	31 991	5 039	15.8	4 529	89.9	-	-
CARSON	80 339	31 653	3 168	10.0	2 788	88.0	-	-
CHULA VISTA	78 749	15 177	3 017	19.9	2 917	96.7	-	-
COMPTON	73 845	30 119	5 216	17.3	4 897	93.9	61	1.2
CONCORD	98 718	23 850	4 383	18.4	4 272	97.5	-	-
COSTA MESA	77 656	18 195	4 726	26.0	4 506	95.3	-	-
DALY CITY	73 968	14 022	3 008	21.5	2 932	97.5	-	-
DOWNEY	85 090	18 454	3 731	20.2	3 482	93.3	-	-
EL CAJON	66 158	11 895	2 660	22.4	2 605	97.9	-	-
EL MONTE	66 684	14 042	3 883	27.7	3 767	97.0	72	1.9
FAIRFIELD	53 651	15 776	2 056	13.0	1 995	97.0	-	-
FOUNTAIN VALLEY	54 602	9 467	1 914	20.2	1 782	93.1	-	-
FREMONT	120 223	23 843	4 780	20.0	4 647	97.2	-	-
FRESNO	187 895	60 333	11 977	19.9	11 535	96.3	-	-
FULLERTON	96 980	27 641	4 101	14.8	3 994	97.4	6	0.1
GARDEN GROVE	117 737	29 019	4 279	14.7	3 782	88.4	-	-
GLENDALE	133 864	40 193	5 246	13.1	4 890	93.2	15	0.3
HANTHORNE	53 591	12 548	2 599	20.7	2 435	93.7	-	-
HAYWARD	97 374	28 328	4 354	15.4	4 215	96.8	-	-
HUNTINGTON BEACH	161 860	36 040	8 093	22.5	6 959	86.0	-	-
INGLEWOOD	86 976	37 058	8 601	23.2	8 359	97.2	4	(2)
LAKEWOOD	79 604	12 385	1 969	15.9	1 886	95.8	-	-
LONG BEACH	336 697	193 078	24 647	12.8	20 697	84.0	-	-
LOS ANGELES	2 761 222	1 008 467	256 578	25.4	240 647	93.8	13	(2)
MODESTO	92 035	23 130	3 745	16.2	3 598	96.1	-	-
MOUNTAIN VIEW	55 221	17 348	2 541	14.6	2 424	95.4	-	-
NEWPORT BEACH	65 195	22 665	4 806	21.2	4 676	97.3	-	-
NORWALK	83 843	9 599	3 093	32.2	2 827	91.4	-	-
OAKLAND	332 385	167 684	26 044	15.5	25 469	97.8	14	0.1
OCEANSIDE	64 615	20 383	3 091	15.2	2 981	96.4	-	-
ONTARIO	68 403	17 279	3 418	19.8	3 375	98.7	-	-
ORANGE	84 934	19 486	4 171	21.4	4 005	96.0	-	-
OXNARD	93 379	22 789	5 006	22.0	4 845	96.8	-	-
PALO ALTO	54 277	27 711	3 899	14.1	3 596	92.2	-	-
PASADENA	106 535	58 967	9 277	15.7	8 847	95.4	-	-
PICO RIVERA	50 690	9 996	1 607	16.1	1 526	95.0	-	-
POMONA	85 497	21 972	6 494	29.6	4 494	69.2	57	0.9
REDONDO BEACH	62 134	13 946	4 181	30.0	3 876	92.7	-	-
REDWOOD CITY	54 990	15 381	2 211	14.4	2 067	93.5	-	-
RICHMOND	70 381	44 892	6 540	14.6	6 347	97.0	-	-
RIVERSIDE	155 029	43 106	7 294	16.9	6 915	94.8	-	-
SACRAMENTO	264 511	105 710	15 974	15.1	15 726	98.4	-	-
SALINAS	75 316	20 389	3 648	17.9	3 330	91.3	-	-
SAN BERNARDINO	102 270	42 409	7 485	17.6	7 315	97.7	-	-
SAN BUENAVENTURA	67 246	23 104	2 868	12.4	2 724	95.0	-	-
SAN DIEGO	799 725	236 046	32 304	13.7	29 263	90.6	-	-
SAN FRANCISCO	655 072	710 898	93 942	13.2	50 555	53.8	14 653	15.
SAN JOSE	583 402	170 002	28 467	16.7	27 474	96.5	-	-
SAN LEANDRO	68 717	21 285	2 951	13.9	2 774	94.0	-	-
SAN MATEO	79 303	27 034	3 057	11.3	2 951	96.5	-	-
SANTA ANA	183 138	62 895	11 312	18.0	10 676	94.4	-	-
SANTA BARBARA	72 753	25 085	4 029	16.1	3 839	95.3	-	-

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 7. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) of 406 large city governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

City <sup>1</sup>	Legal services and prosecution		Public defense		Corrections		Other criminal justice	
	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system
TOTAL . . . . .	255 844	4.2	36 288	0.6	460 055	7.6	65 519	1.1
ALABAMA:								
BIRMINGHAM . . . . .	506	2.8	75	0.4	1 353	7.4	21	0.1
GADSDEN . . . . .	34	2.4	-	-	72	5.1	-	-
HUNTSVILLE . . . . .	114	2.5	-	-	223	4.9	-	-
MOBILE . . . . .	286	3.6	5	0.1	501	6.3	-	-
MONTGOMERY . . . . .	105	1.9	18	0.3	298	5.4	-	-
TUSCALOOSA . . . . .	58	2.1	5	0.2	33	1.2	-	-
ALASKA:								
ANCHORAGE . . . . .	1 281	11.3	-	-	233	2.1	-	-
ARIZONA:								
GLENDALE . . . . .	33	1.2	23	0.9	112	4.2	65	3.2
MESA . . . . .	77	1.8	11	0.3	75	1.8	-	-
PHOENIX . . . . .	2 568	4.4	308	0.5	557	0.9	93	0.2
SCOTTSDALE . . . . .	266	7.2	11	0.3	-	-	111	3.0
TEMPE . . . . .	173	3.5	9	0.2	22	0.4	92	1.9
TUCSON . . . . .	713	4.6	-	-	30	0.2	-	-
ARKANSAS:								
FORT SMITH . . . . .	63	3.6	8	0.5	137	7.8	65	3.7
LITTLE ROCK . . . . .	130	2.2	31	0.5	276	4.7	502	8.5
NORTH LITTLE ROCK . . . . .	70	3.0	20	0.9	152	6.6	-	-
PINE BLUFF . . . . .	67	4.0	-	-	100	5.9	91	5.4
CALIFORNIA:								
ALAMEDA . . . . .	103	3.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
ALHAMBRA . . . . .	87	3.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
ANAEIM . . . . .	531	4.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
BAKERSFIELD . . . . .	196	3.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
BELLFLOWER . . . . .	43	1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
BERKELEY . . . . .	210	3.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
BUENA PARK . . . . .	251	7.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
BURBANK . . . . .	372	7.4	-	-	136	2.7	2	(Z)
CARSON . . . . .	380	12.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
CHULA VISTA . . . . .	100	3.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
COMPTON . . . . .	218	4.2	-	-	-	-	40	0.8
CONCORD . . . . .	111	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
COSTA MESA . . . . .	147	1.1	-	-	-	-	65	1.4
DALY CITY . . . . .	76	2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
DOWNEY . . . . .	36	1.0	-	-	10	0.3	203	5.4
EL CAJON . . . . .	55	2.1	-	-	-	-	44	1.1
EL MONTE . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FAIRFIELD . . . . .	61	3.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
FOUNTAIN VALLEY . . . . .	65	3.4	-	-	-	-	67	3.5
FREMONT . . . . .	133	2.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
FRESNO . . . . .	442	3.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
FULLERTON . . . . .	101	2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
GARDEN GROVE . . . . .	65	1.5	-	-	-	-	432	10.1
GLENDALE . . . . .	214	4.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
HAWTHORNE . . . . .	164	6.3	-	-	127	2.4	-	-
HAYWARD . . . . .	126	2.9	-	-	13	0.3	-	-
HUNTINGTON BEACH . . . . .	293	3.6	-	-	383	4.7	458	5.7
INGLEWOOD . . . . .	258	2.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
LAKEWOOD . . . . .	46	2.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
LONG BEACH . . . . .	2 198	8.9	-	-	1 752	7.1	-	-
LOS ANGELES . . . . .	15 229	5.9	-	-	465	0.2	224	0.1
MODESTO . . . . .	147	3.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
MOUNTAIN VIEW . . . . .	117	4.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
NEWPORT BEACH . . . . .	130	2.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
NORWALK . . . . .	39	1.3	-	-	-	-	227	7.3
OAKLAND . . . . .	561	2.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
OCEANSIDE . . . . .	110	3.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
ONTARIO . . . . .	43	1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
ORANGE . . . . .	166	4.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
OXNARD . . . . .	161	3.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
PALO ALTO . . . . .	303	7.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
PASADENA . . . . .	421	4.5	-	-	-	-	9	0.1
PICO RIVERA . . . . .	80	5.0	-	-	1	0.1	-	-
POMONA . . . . .	136	2.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
REDONDO BEACH . . . . .	102	2.4	-	-	200	3.1	1 607	24.7
REDWOOD CITY . . . . .	144	6.5	-	-	203	4.0	-	-
RICHMOND . . . . .	176	2.7	17	0.3	-	-	-	-
RIVERSIDE . . . . .	379	5.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
SACRAMENTO . . . . .	248	1.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
SALINAS . . . . .	95	2.6	-	-	-	-	223	6.1
SAN BERNARDINO . . . . .	170	2.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAN BUENAVENTURA . . . . .	144	5.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAN DIEGO . . . . .	2 244	6.9	376	1.2	292	0.9	129	0.4
SAN FRANCISCO . . . . .	8 131	8.7	2 884	3.1	17 496	18.6	223	0.2
SAN JOSE . . . . .	993	3.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAN LEANDRO . . . . .	177	6.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAN MATEO . . . . .	106	3.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
SANTA ANA . . . . .	488	4.3	-	-	1	(Z)	147	1.3
SANTA BARBARA . . . . .	190	4.7	-	-	-	-	-	-

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table 7. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) of 406 large city governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued**  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

City <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup>	Total general expenditure	Total criminal justice system		Police protection		Judicial	
			Amount	Percent of total general expenditure	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system
<b>CALIFORNIA--CONTINUED</b>								
SANTA CLARA.	84 065	34 288	4 338	12.7	4 147	95.6	-	-
SANTA MONICA	89 319	27 850	5 617	20.2	5 085	90.5	-	-
SANTA ROSA	71 335	28 171	3 232	11.5	3 126	96.7	-	-
SIMI VALLEY	73 262	8 586	2 238	26.1	2 070	92.5	-	-
SOUTH GATE	59 776	12 551	2 763	22.0	2 541	92.0	-	-
STOCKTON	124 037	67 620	7 647	11.3	7 241	94.7	-	-
SUNNYVALE	105 065	31 083	3 826	12.3	3 655	95.5	-	-
THOUSAND OAKS	63 171	18 589	1 888	10.2	1 783	94.4	-	-
TORRANCE	129 067	39 686	7 228	18.2	6 440	89.1	84	1.2
VALLEJO	70 264	20 748	3 250	15.7	3 131	96.3	-	-
WEST COVINA	72 770	14 220	3 304	23.2	3 191	96.6	-	-
WESTMINSTER	69 155	9 831	2 716	27.6	2 686	98.9	-	-
WHITTIER	69 528	15 031	3 096	20.6	3 054	98.6	-	-
<b>COLORADO<sup>1</sup></b>								
ARVADA	79 958	10 807	2 448	22.7	2 275	92.9	75	3.1
AURORA	127 121	31 149	5 304	17.0	4 641	87.5	202	3.8
BOULDER	76 795	22 340	3 090	13.8	2 688	87.0	183	5.9
COLORADO SPRINGS	183 534	49 127	7 678	15.6	7 093	92.4	321	4.2
DENVER	475 098	346 785	54 677	15.8	40 192	73.5	4 707	8.6
FORT COLLINS	58 107	18 448	1 537	8.3	1 400	91.1	55	3.6
LAKEMOOR	124 350	22 252	6 601	29.7	5 802	87.9	275	4.2
PUEBLO	102 547	22 888	4 716	20.6	4 407	93.4	96	2.0
<b>CONNECTICUT:</b>								
BRIDGEPORT	137 116	115 587	8 150	7.1	7 898	96.9	-	-
BRISTOL	57 597	41 502	2 843	6.9	2 270	79.8	425	14.9
DANBURY	56 382	35 988	2 292	6.4	2 221	96.9	6	0.3
HARTFORD	130 015	175 208	11 812	6.7	11 166	94.5	21	0.2
MERIDEN	57 135	35 881	2 014	5.6	1 798	89.3	26	1.3
MILFORD	50 240	37 903	2 882	7.6	2 747	95.3	32	1.1
NEW BRITAIN	75 986	35 253	3 157	9.0	2 872	91.0	6	0.2
NEW HAVEN	122 085	114 698	8 127	7.1	7 843	96.5	1	(Z)
NORWALK	77 159	54 071	2 980	5.5	2 671	89.6	10	0.3
STAMFORD	105 136	89 993	5 940	6.6	5 530	93.1	8	0.1
WATERBURY	104 890	69 714	7 763	11.1	7 476	96.3	22	0.3
WEST HAVEN	52 190	27 577	2 144	7.8	1 930	90.0	2	0.1
<b>DELAWARE:</b>								
WILMINGTON	72 943	79 449	7 711	9.7	6 916	89.7	389	5.0
<b>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:</b>								
WASHINGTON	684 891	1 551 294	206 665	12.7	98 895	47.9	23 689	11.5
<b>FLORIDA:</b>								
CLEARWATER	75 492	27 229	4 001	14.7	3 786	94.6	-	-
FORT LAUDERDALE	151 502	60 789	12 264	20.2	11 552	94.2	229	1.9
GAINESVILLE	70 108	26 518	3 689	13.9	3 511	95.2	-	-
HIALEAH	122 793	35 072	5 694	16.2	5 656	99.3	-	-
HOLLYWOOD	116 820	34 803	7 510	21.6	7 126	94.9	58	0.8
JACKSONVILLE	527 777	193 717	34 673	17.9	20 066	57.9	5 770	16.6
MIAMI	346 716	115 301	22 411	19.4	21 723	96.9	-	-
MIAMI BEACH	87 904	49 565	6 921	14.0	6 567	94.9	120	1.7
ORLANDO	116 115	58 277	10 263	17.6	8 784	85.6	144	1.4
PENSACOLA	65 915	49 262	3 088	6.3	2 823	91.4	17	0.6
ST. PETERSBURG	237 134	71 626	16 951	23.7	15 741	92.9	-	-
TALLAHASSEE	85 856	36 126	3 234	9.0	3 050	94.3	-	-
TAMPA	264 884	127 356	15 897	12.5	15 285	96.2	-	-
WEST PALM BEACH	60 139	22 779	3 920	17.2	3 556	90.7	46	1.2
<b>GEORGIA:</b>								
ALBANY	76 619	16 753	2 890	17.3	2 713	93.9	16	0.6
ATLANTA	416 715	260 147	31 160	12.0	24 892	79.9	1 389	4.5
AUGUSTA	52 861	16 891	2 587	15.3	2 372	91.7	66	2.6
COLUMBUS	165 511	51 389	9 279	18.1	5 740	61.9	2 016	21.7
MACON	121 282	23 363	4 266	18.3	3 750	87.9	157	3.7
SAVANNAH	113 020	36 970	4 458	12.1	4 097	91.9	154	3.5
<b>HAWAII:</b>								
HONOLULU	717 852	275 056	45 336	16.5	42 421	93.6	-	-
<b>IDAHO:</b>								
BOISE CITY	107 687	26 303	3 754	14.3	3 279	87.3	153	4.1
<b>ILLINOIS:</b>								
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS	71 977	14 368	2 570	17.9	2 473	96.2	-	-
AURORA	78 753	20 195	5 117	25.3	4 979	97.3	4	0.1
BERwyn	47 799	6 057	1 320	21.8	1 281	97.0	-	-
CHAMPAIGN	59 519	14 073	2 249	16.0	2 187	97.2	-	-
CHICAGO	3 062 881	1 213 942	336 055	27.7	325 976	97.0	516	0.2
CICERO	60 483	10 415	2 177	20.9	2 050	94.2	-	-
DECATUR	89 690	15 332	2 397	15.6	2 317	96.7	-	-
DES PLAINES	57 422	11 311	2 290	20.2	2 215	96.7	1	(Z)
EAST ST. LOUIS	53 902	19 530	2 720	13.9	2 612	96.0	-	-
ELGIN	61 690	13 055	2 243	17.2	2 168	96.7	13	0.6

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 7. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) of 406 large city governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

City <sup>1</sup>	Legal services and prosecution		Public defense		Corrections		Other criminal justice	
	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system
<b>CALIFORNIA--CONTINUED</b>								
SANTA CLARA . . . . .	111	2.6	-	-	-	-	80	1.8
SANTA MONICA . . . . .	460	8.2	-	-	-	-	72	1.3
SANTA ROSA . . . . .	106	3.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
SIMI VALLEY . . . . .	168	7.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOUTH GATE . . . . .	85	3.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
STOCKTON . . . . .	363	4.7	-	-	-	-	137	5.0
SUNNYVALE . . . . .	171	4.5	-	-	-	-	43	0.6
THOUSAND OAKS . . . . .	105	5.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
TORRANCE . . . . .	382	5.3	-	-	322	4.5	-	-
VALLEJO . . . . .	119	3.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
WEST COVINA . . . . .	43	1.3	-	-	-	-	70	2.1
WESTMINSTER . . . . .	30	1.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
WHITTIER . . . . .	42	1.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>COLORADO:</b>								
ARVADA . . . . .	91	3.7	-	-	7	0.3	-	-
AURORA . . . . .	299	5.6	-	-	-	-	162	3.1
BOULDER . . . . .	160	5.2	-	-	-	-	59	1.9
COLORADO SPRINGS . . . . .	250	3.3	-	-	14	0.2	-	-
DENVER . . . . .	3 527	6.5	-	-	4 931	9.0	1 320	2.4
FORT COLLINS . . . . .	69	4.5	-	-	13	0.8	-	-
LAKWOOD . . . . .	380	5.8	5	0.1	139	2.1	-	-
PUEBLO . . . . .	140	3.0	16	0.3	-	-	57	1.2
<b>CONNECTICUT:</b>								
BRIDGEPORT . . . . .	179	2.2	-	-	33	0.4	40	0.5
BRISTOL . . . . .	61	2.1	-	-	-	-	87	3.1
DANBURY . . . . .	57	2.5	-	-	-	-	8	0.3
HARTFORD . . . . .	625	5.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
MERIDEN . . . . .	68	3.4	-	-	-	-	122	6.1
MILFORD . . . . .	92	3.2	-	-	11	0.4	-	-
NEW BRITAIN . . . . .	172	5.4	-	-	-	-	107	3.4
NEW HAVEN . . . . .	282	3.5	-	-	-	-	1	(Z)
NORWALK . . . . .	176	5.9	-	-	-	-	123	4.1
STAMFORD . . . . .	260	4.4	12	0.2	-	-	130	2.2
WATERBURY . . . . .	185	2.4	-	-	14	0.2	66	0.9
WEST HAVEN . . . . .	109	5.1	-	-	-	-	103	4.8
<b>DELAWARE:</b>								
WILMINGTON . . . . .	393	5.1	-	-	-	-	13	0.2
<b>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:</b>								
WASHINGTON . . . . .	6 993	3.4	5 770	2.8	69 835	33.8	1 483	0.7
<b>FLORIDA:</b>								
CLEARWATER . . . . .	144	3.6	-	-	71	1.8	-	-
FORT LAUDERDALE . . . . .	231	1.9	8	0.1	244	2.0	-	-
GAINESVILLE . . . . .	178	4.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
HIALEAH . . . . .	38	0.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
HOLLYWOOD . . . . .	220	2.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
JACKSONVILLE . . . . .	1 042	3.0	21	0.1	7 373	21.3	401	1.2
MIAMI . . . . .	670	3.0	-	-	-	-	18	0.1
MIAMI BEACH . . . . .	218	3.1	-	-	-	-	16	0.2
ORLANDO . . . . .	203	2.0	3	(Z)	869	8.5	260	2.5
PENSACOLA . . . . .	111	3.6	-	-	137	4.4	-	-
ST. PETERSBURG . . . . .	401	2.4	-	-	435	2.6	374	2.2
TALLAHASSEE . . . . .	184	5.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
TAMPA . . . . .	436	2.7	-	-	-	-	176	1.1
WEST PALM BEACH . . . . .	101	2.6	-	-	217	5.5	-	-
<b>GEORGIA:</b>								
ALBANY . . . . .	51	1.8	-	-	110	3.8	-	-
ATLANTA . . . . .	924	3.0	63	0.2	3 319	10.7	573	1.8
AUGUSTA . . . . .	20	0.8	-	-	129	5.0	-	-
COLUMBUS . . . . .	344	3.7	78	0.8	1 101	11.9	-	-
MACON . . . . .	119	2.8	-	-	240	5.6	-	-
SAVANNAH . . . . .	68	1.5	-	-	139	3.1	-	-
<b>HAWAII:</b>								
HONOLULU . . . . .	2 848	6.3	-	-	-	-	67	0.1
<b>IDAHO:</b>								
BOISE CITY . . . . .	254	6.8	-	-	68	1.8	-	-
<b>ILLINOIS:</b>								
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS . . . . .	97	3.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
AURORA . . . . .	134	2.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
BERWYN . . . . .	39	3.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
CHAMPAIGN . . . . .	62	2.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
CHICAGO . . . . .	4 539	1.4	-	-	810	0.2	4 214	1.3
CICERO . . . . .	127	5.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
DECATUR . . . . .	80	3.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
DES PLAINES . . . . .	74	3.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
EAST ST. LOUIS . . . . .	108	4.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
ELGIN . . . . .	62	2.8	-	-	-	-	-	-

<sup>1</sup> See footnotes at end of table.

**Table 7. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) of 406 large city governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued**  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

City <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup>	Total general expenditure	Total criminal justice system		Police protection		Judicial	
			Amount	Percent of total general expenditure	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system
<b>ILLINOIS--CONTINUED</b>								
EVANSTON	72 019	25 512	3 894	15.3	3 728	95.7	-	-
JOLIET	72 102	25 572	4 003	15.7	3 852	96.2	-	-
OAK LAWN	62 198	15 228	2 263	14.9	2 159	95.4	-	-
OAK PARK	56 691	16 617	3 661	22.0	3 572	97.6	-	-
PEORIA	125 724	32 540	7 294	22.4	6 877	94.3	-	-
ROCKFORD	140 667	31 608	5 387	17.0	5 130	95.2	-	-
ROCK ISLAND	47 299	12 169	1 914	15.7	1 831	95.7	24	1.3
SKOKIE	65 885	13 881	2 856	20.6	2 717	95.1	10	0.4
SPRINGFIELD	87 520	29 916	3 658	12.2	3 389	92.6	-	-
WAUKESHA	63 398	15 759	2 919	18.5	2 835	97.1	-	-
<b>INDIANA:</b>								
ANDERSON	68 584	13 586	2 308	17.0	2 162	93.7	57	2.5
EVANSVILLE	133 975	33 977	4 844	14.3	4 666	96.3	-	-
FORT WAYNE	182 213	53 338	5 903	11.1	5 550	94.0	-	-
GARY	159 412	28 982	7 112	24.3	5 788	81.4	483	6.8
HAMMOND	102 027	15 999	3 664	22.9	3 237	86.3	297	8.1
INDIANAPOLIS	704 556	279 616	51 894	18.6	35 152	67.7	6 255	12.1
MUNCIE	82 152	16 577	1 990	12.0	1 859	93.4	66	3.3
KOKOMO	52 006	16 024	2 055	12.8	1 912	93.0	43	2.1
SOUTH BEND	114 011	21 200	4 544	21.4	4 338	95.5	-	-
TERRE HAUTE	63 443	13 855	1 793	12.9	1 636	91.2	83	4.6
<b>IOWA:</b>								
CEDAR RAPIDS	107 996	70 441	3 500	5.0	3 309	94.5	-	-
COUNCIL BLUFFS	58 668	16 229	2 588	15.9	2 467	95.3	-	-
DAVENPORT	101 410	33 467	2 582	7.7	2 471	95.7	-	-
DES MOINES	193 772	66 625	7 959	11.9	7 051	88.6	-	-
DUBUQUE	62 349	18 622	1 708	9.2	1 569	91.9	1	0.1
SIOUX CITY	85 113	42 447	2 851	6.7	2 546	89.3	-	-
WATERLOO	78 915	26 033	2 719	10.4	2 653	97.6	-	-
<b>KANSAS:</b>								
KANSAS CITY	167 064	57 843	7 012	12.1	6 118	87.3	164	2.3
LAWRENCE	51 459	24 389	1 441	5.9	1 328	92.2	27	1.9
OVERLAND PARK	82 372	11 869	3 228	27.2	2 768	85.7	159	4.9
TOPEKA	122 065	40 686	5 406	13.3	4 799	88.8	111	2.1
WICHITA	268 012	205 823	9 471	4.6	8 470	89.4	359	3.8
<b>KENTUCKY:</b>								
COVINGTON	46 925	13 813	2 528	18.3	2 279	90.2	40	1.6
LEXINGTON	190 142	52 433	12 271	23.4	8 721	71.1	848	6.9
LOUISVILLE	322 870	172 147	20 586	12.0	19 055	92.6	549	2.7
OWENSBORO	50 490	14 775	1 730	11.7	1 618	93.5	32	1.8
<b>LOUISIANA:</b>								
BATON ROUGE	308 178	150 791	21 808	14.5	12 776	58.6	4 730	21.7
LAFAYETTE	79 732	23 106	2 431	10.5	1 930	79.4	288	11.8
LAKE CHARLES	78 464	16 306	2 080	12.8	1 604	77.1	295	14.2
MONROE	63 633	17 790	1 826	10.3	1 523	83.4	95	5.2
NEW ORLEANS	561 266	259 721	50 276	19.4	29 402	58.5	6 963	13.8
SHREVEPORT	188 652	46 444	7 237	15.6	6 288	86.9	421	5.8
<b>MAINE:</b>								
PORLTAND	62 127	44 640	3 048	6.8	2 891	94.8	-	-
<b>MARYLAND:</b>								
BALTIMORE	804 304	983 740	91 978	9.3	68 434	74.4	6 506	7.1
<b>MASSACHUSETTS:</b>								
BOSTON	618 493	717 635	98 047	13.7	60 830	62.0	19 458	19.8
BROCKTON	94 175	82 994	5 591	6.7	5 423	97.0	2	(2)
CAMBRIDGE	99 296	94 719	8 211	8.7	7 637	93.0	-	-
CHICOPEE	56 572	32 249	2 499	7.7	2 433	97.4	-	-
FALL RIVER	98 898	64 646	5 615	8.7	5 164	92.0	-	-
HOLYOKE	44 267	39 016	2 182	5.6	2 073	95.0	-	-
LAWRENCE	63 845	38 273	3 155	8.2	2 975	94.3	-	-
LOWELL	88 449	68 411	3 994	5.8	3 681	92.2	-	-
LYNN	77 089	69 287	5 039	7.3	4 716	93.6	-	-
MALDEN	54 987	56 354	2 419	4.3	2 369	97.9	-	-
MEDFORD	60 519	38 106	3 317	8.7	3 220	97.1	-	-
NEW BEDFORD	98 845	87 116	6 364	7.3	6 160	98.8	-	-
NEWTON	87 183	82 976	6 271	7.6	6 039	96.3	-	-
PITTSFIELD	52 313	35 933	2 089	5.8	2 018	96.6	-	-
QUINCY	90 571	92 892	6 628	7.1	6 456	97.4	-	-
SOMERVILLE	76 771	41 758	3 435	8.2	2 962	86.2	-	-
SPRINGFIELD	164 895	122 711	7 985	6.5	7 435	93.1	67	0.8
WALTHAM	55 632	44 910	3 471	7.7	3 330	95.9	-	-
WORCESTER	165 229	145 697	9 913	6.8	9 040	91.2	7	0.1
<b>MICHIGAN:</b>								
ANN ARBOR	105 602	38 063	5 134	13.5	4 359	84.9	453	8.8
DEARBORN	93 871	50 788	5 912	11.6	5 140	86.9	291	4.9
DEARBORN HEIGHTS	73 108	15 371	3 479	22.6	2 937	84.4	238	6.8
DETROIT	1 289 910	840 362	170 717	20.3	147 734	86.5	12 438	7.3
EAST LANSING	50 789	10 782	1 706	15.8	1 269	74.4	273	16.0

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 7. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental)  
of 406 large city governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

City <sup>1</sup>	Legal services and prosecution		Public defense		Corrections		Other criminal justice	
	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system
ILLINOIS--CONTINUED								
EVANSTON	136	3.5	21	0.5	9	0.2	-	-
JOLIET	132	3.3	-	-	-	-	19	0.5
OAK LAWN	104	4.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
OAK PARK	89	2.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
PEORIA	252	3.5	-	-	85	1.2	80	1.1
ROCKFORD	173	3.2	-	-	-	-	84	1.6
ROCK ISLAND	31	1.6	28	1.5	-	-	-	-
SKOKIE	129	4.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
SPRINGFIELD	221	6.0	-	-	48	1.3	-	-
WAUKEGAN	84	2.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
INDIANA:								
ANDERSON	67	2.9	4	0.2	18	0.8	-	-
EVANSVILLE	176	3.6	-	-	-	-	2	(Z)
FORT WAYNE	200	3.4	-	-	-	-	153	2.6
GARY	179	2.5	-	-	186	2.6	476	6.7
HAMMOND	93	2.5	2	0.1	35	1.0	-	-
INDIANAPOLIS	2 901	5.6	-	-	7 194	13.9	392	0.8
MUNCIE	53	2.7	-	-	12	0.6	-	-
KOKOMO	89	4.3	-	-	11	0.5	-	-
SOUTH BEND	186	4.1	-	-	-	-	20	0.4
TERRE HAUTE	74	4.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
IOWA:								
CEDAR RAPIDS	182	5.2	-	-	9	0.3	-	-
COUNCIL BLUFFS	95	3.7	-	-	18	0.7	8	0.3
DAVENPORT	109	4.2	-	-	-	-	2	0.1
DES MOINES	447	5.6	-	-	461	5.8	-	-
DUBUQUE	61	3.6	-	-	58	3.4	19	1.1
SIOUX CITY	196	6.9	-	-	105	3.7	4	0.1
WATERLOO	66	2.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
KANSAS:								
KANSAS CITY	377	5.4	6	0.1	290	4.1	57	0.8
LAWRENCE	57	4.0	-	-	10	0.7	19	1.3
OVERLAND PARK	205	6.4	12	0.4	3	0.1	81	2.5
TOPEKA	302	5.6	55	1.0	39	0.7	100	1.8
WICHITA	381	4.0	-	-	261	2.8	-	-
KENTUCKY:								
COVINGTON	177	7.0	-	-	32	1.3	-	-
LEXINGTON	444	3.6	108	0.9	2 079	16.9	71	0.6
LOUISVILLE	982	4.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
OWENSBORO	51	2.9	-	-	29	1.7	-	-
LOUISIANA:								
BATON ROUGE	1 673	7.7	355	1.6	2 071	9.5	203	0.9
LAFAYETTE	152	6.3	-	-	61	2.5	-	-
LAKE CHARLES	114	5.5	-	-	67	3.2	-	-
MONROE	95	5.2	-	-	113	6.2	-	-
NEW ORLEANS	2 527	5.0	397	0.8	10 111	20.1	876	1.7
SHREVEPORT	164	2.3	-	-	364	5.0	-	-
MAINE:								
PORTLAND	157	5.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
MARYLAND:								
BALTIMORE	5 362	5.8	-	-	11 052	12.0	624	0.7
MASSACHUSETTS:								
BOSTON	3 426	3.5	878	0.9	10 839	11.1	2 616	2.7
BROCKTON	123	2.2	-	-	43	0.8	-	-
CAMBRIDGE	258	3.1	-	-	-	-	316	3.8
CHICOPEE	66	2.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
FALL RIVER	217	3.9	-	-	149	2.7	85	1.5
HOLYOKE	109	5.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
LAWRENCE	59	1.9	-	-	1	(Z)	120	3.8
LOWELL	178	4.5	-	-	33	0.8	102	2.6
LYNN	109	2.2	-	-	-	-	214	4.2
MALDEN	50	2.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
MEDFORD	97	2.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
NEW BEDFORD	141	2.2	-	-	59	0.9	4	0.1
NEWTON	232	3.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
PITTSFIELD	71	3.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
QUINCY	126	1.9	-	-	46	0.7	-	-
SOMERVILLE	87	2.5	-	-	-	-	386	11.2
SPRINGFIELD	313	3.9	-	-	62	0.8	108	1.4
WALTHAM	141	4.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
WORCESTER	281	2.8	-	-	-	-	585	5.9
MICHIGAN:								
ANN ARBOR	156	3.0	51	1.0	115	2.2	-	-
DEARBORN	238	4.0	4	0.1	239	4.0	-	-
DEARBORN HEIGHTS	59	1.7	6	0.2	239	6.9	-	-
DETROIT	2 984	1.7	169	0.1	7 263	4.3	129	0.1
EAST LANSING	127	7.4	6	0.4	31	1.8	-	-

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table 7. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) of 406 large city governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued**  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

City <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup>	Total general expenditure	Total criminal justice system		Police protection		Judicial	
			Amount	Percent of total general expenditure	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system
MICHIGAN--CONTINUED								
FARMINGTON HILLS . . . . .	57 538	11 882	2 236	18.8	1 963	87.6	162	7.2
FLINT . . . . .	163 594	83 885	12 483	14.9	10 876	87.1	748	6.0
GRAND RAPIDS . . . . .	184 954	88 981	10 066	11.3	7 978	79.3	1 013	10.1
KALAMAZOO . . . . .	79 077	25 939	4 544	17.5	3 702	81.5	442	9.7
LANSING . . . . .	127 128	64 990	8 573	13.2	6 857	80.0	745	8.7
LINCOLN PARK . . . . .	47 502	10 772	2 077	19.3	1 831	88.2	187	9.0
LIVONIA . . . . .	108 337	29 809	4 264	14.3	3 576	83.9	335	7.9
PONTIAC . . . . .	79 189	63 157	8 150	12.9	6 708	82.3	782	9.6
ROSEVILLE . . . . .	56 978	12 531	2 774	22.1	2 392	86.2	261	9.4
ROYAL OAK . . . . .	76 208	16 401	3 141	19.2	2 749	87.5	228	7.3
SAGINAW . . . . .	82 162	31 749	7 341	23.1	7 116	96.9	-	-
SOUTHFIELD . . . . .	75 541	29 009	10 052	34.7	6 122	60.9	1 385	13.8
ST. CLAIR SHORES . . . . .	5 020	17 378	3 607	20.8	3 413	94.6	132	3.7
STERLING HEIGHTS . . . . .	96 676	23 931	4 806	20.1	4 386	90.6	299	6.2
TAYLOR . . . . .	79 223	18 960	3 407	18.0	3 107	91.2	224	6.6
TROY . . . . .	62 390	19 162	4 297	22.4	3 515	81.8	635	14.8
WARREN . . . . .	170 084	49 056	7 837	16.0	6 739	86.0	778	9.9
WESTLAND . . . . .	88 631	21 376	3 516	16.4	2 868	81.6	424	12.1
WYOMING . . . . .	58 335	13 105	2 902	22.1	2 524	87.0	214	7.4
MINNESOTA:								
BLOOMINGTON . . . . .	78 052	23 174	2 552	11.0	2 320	90.9	65	2.5
DULUTH . . . . .	95 248	47 773	3 607	7.6	3 257	90.3	35	1.0
MINNEAPOLIS . . . . .	360 269	183 778	23 485	12.8	20 849	88.8	-	-
ROCHESTER . . . . .	56 865	17 627	1 822	10.3	1 721	94.5	-	-
ST. PAUL . . . . .	265 971	153 858	16 864	11.0	15 406	91.4	-	-
MISSISSIPPI:								
BILOXI . . . . .	44 439	7 310	1 172	16.0	1 102	94.0	21	1.8
JACKSON . . . . .	190 542	54 426	6 982	12.8	5 728	82.0	251	3.6
MISSOURI:								
COLUMBIA . . . . .	64 612	14 939	2 121	14.2	1 920	90.5	86	4.1
FLORISSANT . . . . .	70 639	5 160	1 430	27.7	1 387	97.0	25	1.7
INDEPENDENCE . . . . .	111 575	19 527	3 607	18.5	3 289	81.2	149	4.1
KANSAS CITY . . . . .	458 573	246 162	37 456	15.2	31 797	84.9	1 690	4.5
ST. JOSEPH . . . . .	77 804	30 580	2 233	7.3	2 092	93.7	47	2.1
ST. LOUIS . . . . .	517 671	248 901	63 780	25.6	45 152	70.8	6 605	10.4
SPRINGFIELD . . . . .	134 974	33 071	3 700	11.2	3 442	93.0	115	3.1
MONTANA:								
BILLINGS . . . . .	72 303	25 118	2 379	9.5	2 146	90.2	106	4.5
GREAT FALLS . . . . .	60 334	17 028	1 780	10.5	1 632	91.7	37	2.1
NEBRASKA:								
LINCOLN . . . . .	163 937	53 355	6 508	12.2	4 999	76.8	681	10.5
OMAHA . . . . .	365 711	126 717	14 302	11.3	12 075	84.4	1 244	8.7
NEVADA:								
LAS VEGAS . . . . .	161 086	45 575	13 838	30.4	12 486	90.2	697	5.0
RENO . . . . .	82 541	44 154	7 503	17.0	6 415	85.5	400	5.3
NEW HAMPSHIRE:								
MANCHESTER . . . . .	85 119	60 425	4 011	6.6	3 526	87.9	183	4.6
NASHUA . . . . .	64 273	34 974	4 998	14.3	3 661	73.2	1 165	23.3
NEW JERSEY:								
BAYONNE . . . . .	70 222	21 480	3 560	16.6	3 249	91.3	149	4.2
BLOOMFIELD . . . . .	50 957	11 696	2 675	22.9	2 460	92.0	92	3.4
CAMDEN . . . . .	88 785	33 409	10 517	31.5	9 784	93.0	379	3.6
CLIFTON . . . . .	76 838	29 779	3 631	12.2	3 396	93.5	143	3.9
EAST ORANGE . . . . .	71 863	49 077	5 142	10.5	4 334	84.3	455	8.8
ELIZABETH . . . . .	103 497	67 880	7 067	10.4	6 603	93.4	161	2.3
IRVINGTON . . . . .	56 036	14 024	3 038	21.7	2 659	87.5	206	6.8
JERSEY CITY . . . . .	232 137	156 638	26 576	17.0	25 079	94.4	815	3.1
NEWARK . . . . .	324 138	342 422	31 243	9.1	29 191	93.4	851	2.7
PASSAIC . . . . .	50 258	14 163	3 398	24.0	3 106	91.4	102	3.0
PATERSON . . . . .	152 414	96 859	8 916	9.2	8 452	94.8	241	2.7
TRENTON . . . . .	96 951	35 998	8 652	24.0	8 063	93.2	335	3.9
UNION CITY . . . . .	52 305	15 304	3 309	21.6	2 884	87.2	244	7.4
VINELAND . . . . .	52 984	31 649	2 237	7.1	2 038	91.1	107	4.8
NEW MEXICO:								
ALBUQUERQUE . . . . .	291 187	115 522	16 371	14.2	12 693	77.5	997	6.1
NEW YORK:								
ALBANY . . . . .	107 798	56 606	6 899	12.2	6 347	92.0	315	4.6
BINGHAMTON . . . . .	60 130	24 261	2 847	11.7	2 586	90.8	162	5.7
BUFFALO . . . . .	390 065	361 598	27 413	7.6	24 662	90.0	1 156	4.2
MOUNT VERNON . . . . .	73 572	27 484	4 309	15.7	3 818	88.6	252	5.8
NEW ROCHELLE . . . . .	70 450	37 085	4 741	12.8	4 353	91.8	237	5.0
NEW YORK CITY . . . . .	7 297 787	11 541 904	1 452 975	12.6	1 122 016	77.2	69 667	4.8

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 7. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) of 406 large city governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued  
 (Dollar amounts in thousands)

City <sup>1</sup>	Legal services and prosecution		Public defense		Corrections		Other criminal justice	
	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system
MICHIGAN--CONTINUED								
FARMINGTON HILLS	106	4.7			5	0.2		
FLINT	320	2.6	38	0.3	501	4.0		
GRAND RAPIDS	344	3.4	13	0.1	332	3.3	386	3.8
KALAMAZOO	271	6.0			129	2.8		
LANSING	174	2.0	26	0.3	771	9.0		
LINCOLN PARK	40	1.9	1	(2)	18	0.9		
LIVONIA	165	3.9	15	0.4	173	4.1		
PONTIAC	398	4.9	33	0.4	229	2.8		
ROSEVILLE	92	3.3	29	1.0		-		
ROYAL OAK	85	2.7	7	0.2	72	2.3		
SAGINAW	225	3.1				-		
SOUTHFIELD	224	2.2	14	0.1	2 307	23.0		
ST. CLAIR SHORES	62	1.7				-		
STERLING HEIGHTS	123	2.6	9	0.2	19	0.4		
TAYLOR	60	1.8			16	0.5		
TROY	121	2.8	3	0.1	23	0.5		
WARREN	301	3.8	19	0.2		-		
WESTLAND	72	2.0	12	0.3	140	4.0		
WYOMING	125	4.3	4	0.1	35	1.2		
MINNESOTA:								
BLOOMINGTON	144	5.6			23	0.9		
DULUTH	284	7.9	20	0.6	11	0.3		
MINNEAPOLIS	1 481	6.3			515	2.2	640	2.7
ROCHESTER	101	5.5				-		
ST. PAUL	866	5.1	19	0.1	79	0.5	494	2.9
MISSISSIPPI:								
BILOXI	31	2.6			18	1.5		
JACKSON	374	5.4			598	8.6	31	0.4
MISSOURI:								
COLUMBIA	115	5.4				-		
FLORISSANT	18	1.3				-		
INDEPENDENCE	138	3.8	1	(2)		-		
KANSAS CITY	1 229	3.3	258	0.7	1 526	4.1	956	2.6
ST. JOSEPH	91	4.1	1	(2)	2	0.1		
ST. LOUIS	3 179	5.0			8 642	13.5	202	0.3
SPRINGFIELD	128	3.5			6	0.2	9	0.2
MONTANA:								
BILLINGS	97	4.1	7	0.3	23	1.0		
GREAT FALLS	37	2.1			74	4.2		
NEBRASKA:								
LINCOLN	402	6.2			426	6.5		
OMAHA	782	5.5			93	0.7	108	0.8
NEVADA:								
LAS VEGAS	544	3.9	111	0.8		-		
RENO	298	4.0	9	0.1	381	5.1		
NEW HAMPSHIRE:								
MANCHESTER	124	3.1			96	2.4	82	2.0
NASHUA	76	1.5			96	1.9		
NEW JERSEY:								
BAYONNE	151	4.2	11	0.3		-		
BLOOMFIELD	87	3.3				-	36	1.3
CAMDEN	244	2.5				-	90	0.9
CLIFTON	92	2.5				-		
EAST ORANGE	248	4.8				-	105	2.0
ELIZABETH	187	2.6				-	116	1.6
IRVINGTON	173	5.7				-		
JERSEY CITY	327	1.2	39	0.1		-	316	1.2
NEWARK	724	2.3				-	477	1.5
PASSAIC	82	2.4				-	108	3.2
PATERSON	223	2.5				-		
TRENTON	133	1.5	12	0.1		-	109	1.3
UNION CITY	68	2.1				-	113	3.4
VINELAND	92	4.1				-		
NEW MEXICO:								
ALBUQUERQUE	678	4.1	17	0.1	1 938	11.8	48	0.3
NEW YORK:								
ALBANY	201	2.9	7	0.1		-	29	0.4
BINGHAMTON	99	3.5				-		
BUFFALO	1 026	3.7	63	0.2		-	506	1.8
MOUNT VERNON	202	4.7			27	0.6	10	0.2
NEW ROCHELLE	151	3.2				-		
NEW YORK CITY	72 728	5.0	16 563	1.1	156 387	10.8	15 614	1.1

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table 7. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) of 406 large city governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued**  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

City <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup>	Total general expenditure	Total criminal justice system		Police protection		Judicial	
			Amount	Percent of total general expenditure	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system
<b>NEW YORK--CONTINUED</b>								
NIAGARA FALLS . . . . .	79 060	74 417	3 683	4.9	3 299	89.6	216	5.9
ROCHESTER . . . . .	256 285	278 501	17 362	6.2	15 840	91.2	786	4.5
ROME . . . . .	47 377	33 606	1 357	4.0	1 024	75.5	78	5.7
SCHENECTADY . . . . .	73 263	18 157	3 743	20.6	3 534	94.4	115	3.1
SYRACUSE . . . . .	177 564	134 584	10 904	8.1	9 698	88.9	588	5.4
TROY . . . . .	58 739	40 382	2 551	6.3	2 311	90.6	111	4.4
UTICA . . . . .	80 103	25 576	3 206	12.5	2 817	87.9	192	6.0
WHITE PLAINS . . . . .	46 895	107 815	5 173	4.8	4 506	87.1	273	5.3
YONKERS . . . . .	189 139	140 250	12 819	9.1	10 878	84.9	627	4.9
<b>NORTH CAROLINA:</b>								
ASHEVILLE . . . . .	58 642	17 291	2 463	14.2	2 265	92.0	-	-
CHARLOTTE . . . . .	295 685	114 786	12 481	10.9	12 155	97.4	-	-
DURHAM . . . . .	103 686	31 842	6 348	19.9	6 170	97.2	-	-
FAYETTEVILLE . . . . .	67 072	15 324	2 782	18.2	2 677	96.2	-	-
GREENSBORO . . . . .	160 562	56 225	8 133	14.5	7 891	97.0	-	-
HIGH POINT . . . . .	68 343	26 317	2 568	9.8	2 493	97.1	-	-
RALEIGH . . . . .	138 005	46 481	7 051	15.2	6 793	96.3	-	-
WILMINGTON . . . . .	54 353	14 678	2 156	14.7	2 060	95.5	-	-
WINSTON-SALEM . . . . .	139 688	52 771	8 542	16.2	8 230	96.3	-	-
<b>NORTH DAKOTA:</b>								
FARGO . . . . .	57 394	21 196	2 013	9.5	1 865	92.6	58	2.9
<b>OHIO:</b>								
AKRON . . . . .	244 265	81 011	10 823	13.4	7 661	70.8	1 311	12.1
CANTON . . . . .	98 044	36 269	5 437	15.0	4 299	79.1	679	12.5
CINCINNATI . . . . .	403 363	247 578	34 499	13.9	23 968	69.5	4 075	11.8
CLEVELAND . . . . .	609 187	339 734	79 559	23.4	51 954	65.3	18 114	22.8
CLEVELAND HEIGHTS . . . . .	54 944	11 596	2 237	19.3	1 924	86.0	-	7.6
COLUMBUS . . . . .	532 339	191 699	38 606	20.1	29 505	76.4	4 321	11.2
DAYTON . . . . .	197 744	96 897	17 140	17.7	12 428	72.5	1 373	8.0
ELYRIA . . . . .	51 260	11 421	1 811	15.9	1 201	66.3	368	20.3
EUCLID . . . . .	61 080	20 249	2 795	13.8	2 465	88.2	172	6.2
HAMILTON . . . . .	66 712	18 750	3 721	19.8	2 055	55.2	153	4.1
KETTERING . . . . .	68 569	9 933	2 306	23.2	1 668	72.3	265	11.5
LAKewood . . . . .	63 584	12 092	1 860	15.4	1 567	84.2	170	9.1
LIMA . . . . .	50 263	19 958	2 333	11.7	1 758	75.4	313	13.4
LORAIN . . . . .	81 197	19 035	2 402	12.6	1 784	74.3	300	12.5
MANSFIELD . . . . .	56 470	12 487	3 856	30.9	1 811	47.0	441	11.4
PARMA . . . . .	97 427	13 674	2 575	18.8	1 995	77.5	421	16.3
SPRINGFIELD . . . . .	74 018	19 232	3 587	18.7	2 699	75.2	474	13.2
TOLEDO . . . . .	358 677	134 033	20 520	15.3	15 932	77.6	2 009	9.8
WARREN . . . . .	59 262	11 151	2 688	24.1	1 796	66.8	543	20.2
YOUNGSTOWN . . . . .	129 875	38 120	6 849	18.0	5 098	74.4	673	9.8
<b>OKLAHOMA:</b>								
LAWTON . . . . .	83 785	22 249	2 980	13.4	2 438	81.8	184	6.2
MIDWEST . . . . .	50 341	7 656	1 685	22.0	1 567	93.0	41	2.4
NORMAN . . . . .	62 521	10 441	2 212	21.2	2 012	91.0	104	4.7
OKLAHOMA CITY . . . . .	371 802	139 536	17 039	12.2	14 506	85.1	540	3.2
TULSA . . . . .	334 365	126 578	13 930	11.0	12 039	86.4	424	3.0
<b>OREGON:</b>								
EUGENE . . . . .	99 220	34 324	4 478	13.0	3 834	85.6	265	5.9
PORTLAND . . . . .	383 904	184 573	23 026	12.5	21 710	94.3	-	-
SALEM . . . . .	83 738	41 040	3 878	9.4	3 524	90.9	100	2.6
<b>PENNSYLVANIA:</b>								
ALLENTOWN . . . . .	103 204	35 563	3 496	9.8	3 406	97.4	-	-
ALTOONA . . . . .	58 630	10 123	1 610	15.9	1 572	97.6	-	-
BETHLEHEM . . . . .	72 887	19 065	2 562	13.4	2 504	97.7	-	-
CHESTER . . . . .	45 775	14 385	2 796	19.4	2 688	96.1	-	-
ERIE . . . . .	124 469	31 014	4 072	13.1	3 751	92.1	106	2.6
HARRISBURG . . . . .	56 105	22 124	2 910	13.2	2 819	96.9	-	-
LANCASTER . . . . .	56 954	16 590	2 043	12.3	1 994	97.6	-	-
PHILADELPHIA . . . . .	1 778 345	1 335 582	295 448	22.1	182 564	61.8	46 839	15.9
PITTSBURGH . . . . .	442 139	166 837	25 331	15.2	23 835	94.1	404	1.6
READING . . . . .	78 457	19 385	3 239	16.7	3 142	97.0	-	-
SCRANTON . . . . .	91 503	25 656	3 057	11.9	2 971	97.2	-	-
WILKES-BARRE . . . . .	54 867	18 143	1 829	10.1	1 777	97.2	-	-
YORK . . . . .	46 595	10 645	2 318	21.8	2 260	97.5	-	-
<b>RHODE ISLAND:</b>								
CRANSTON . . . . .	73 523	42 112	2 867	6.8	2 809	98.0	8	0.3
PAWTUCKET . . . . .	69 911	44 395	2 838	6.4	2 726	96.1	31	1.1
PROVIDENCE . . . . .	160 982	101 182	9 728	9.6	9 282	95.4	190	2.0
WARRICK . . . . .	87 450	54 998	4 416	8.0	4 333	98.1	5	0.1
<b>SOUTH CAROLINA:</b>								
CHARLESTON . . . . .	59 911	16 810	3 665	21.8	3 515	95.9	47	1.3
COLUMBIA . . . . .	110 851	29 945	4 568	15.3	3 697	80.9	314	6.9
GREENVILLE . . . . .	57 406	16 902	2 834	16.8	2 392	84.4	133	4.7
NORTH CHARLESTON . . . . .	58 658	4 431	1 576	35.6	1 511	95.9	29	1.8

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 7. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) of 406 large city governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

City <sup>1</sup>	Legal services and prosecution		Public defense		Corrections		Other criminal justice	
	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system
NEW YORK--CONTINUED								
NIAGARA FALLS	168	4.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
ROCHESTER	685	3.9	-	-	-	-	51	0.3
ROME	255	18.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
SCHENECTADY	94	2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
SYRACUSE	273	2.5	-	-	-	-	345	3.2
TROY	129	5.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
UTICA	187	5.8	-	-	10	0.3	-	-
WHITE PLAINS	394	7.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
YONKERS	505	3.9	-	-	491	3.8	318	2.5
NORTH CAROLINA:								
ASHEVILLE	111	4.5	-	-	-	-	87	3.5
CHARLOTTE	310	2.5	-	-	16	0.1	-	-
DURHAM	167	2.6	-	-	-	-	11	0.2
FAYETTEVILLE	105	3.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
GREENSBORO	185	2.3	-	-	57	0.7	-	-
HIGH POINT	75	2.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
RALEIGH	215	3.0	32	0.5	11	0.2	-	-
WILMINGTON	96	4.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
WINSTON-SALEM	206	2.4	26	0.3	80	0.9	-	-
NORTH DAKOTA:								
FARGO	90	4.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
OHIO:								
AKRON	491	4.5	-	-	1 280	11.8	80	0.7
CANTON	285	5.2	-	-	174	3.2	-	-
CINCINNATI	1 217	3.5	286	0.8	4 720	13.7	233	0.7
CLEVELAND	1 438	1.8	153	0.2	4 596	5.8	3 304	4.2
CLEVELAND HEIGHTS	100	4.5	-	-	40	1.8	4	0.2
COLUMBUS	1 469	3.8	352	0.9	2 350	6.1	609	1.6
DAYTON	475	2.8	180	1.1	2 684	15.7	-	-
ELYRIA	137	7.6	24	1.3	81	4.5	-	-
EUCLID	157	5.6	-	-	1	(Z)	-	-
HAMILTON	60	1.6	10	0.3	152	4.1	1 291	34.7
KETTERING	156	6.8	20	0.9	197	8.5	-	-
LAKEWOOD	101	5.4	-	-	22	1.2	-	-
LIMA	81	3.5	21	0.9	160	6.9	-	-
LORAIN	182	7.6	5	0.2	131	5.5	-	-
MANSFIELD	85	2.2	-	-	113	2.9	1 406	36.5
PARMA	159	6.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
SPRINGFIELD	167	4.7	-	-	74	2.1	173	4.8
TOLEDO	475	2.3	42	0.2	2 051	10.0	11	0.1
WARREN	170	6.3	-	-	94	3.5	85	3.2
YOUNGSTOWN	383	5.6	-	-	464	6.8	231	3.4
OKLAHOMA:								
LAWTON	116	3.9	27	0.9	86	2.9	129	4.3
MIDWEST	28	1.7	-	-	49	2.9	-	-
NORMAN	90	4.1	-	-	6	0.3	-	-
OKLAHOMA CITY	839	4.9	-	-	772	4.5	382	2.2
TULSA	517	3.7	162	1.2	788	5.7	-	-
OREGON:								
EUGENE	308	6.9	23	0.5	48	1.1	-	-
PORTLAND	685	3.0	-	-	-	-	631	2.7
SALEM	183	4.7	8	0.2	63	1.6	-	-
PENNSYLVANIA:								
ALLENTOWN	90	2.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
ALTOONA	38	2.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
BETHLEHEM	58	2.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
CHESTER	108	3.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
ERIE	122	3.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
HARRISBURG	68	2.3	-	-	-	-	93	2.3
LANCASTER	49	2.4	-	-	-	-	23	0.8
PHILADELPHIA	11 600	3.9	4 327	1.5	49 372	16.7	746	0.3
PITTSBURGH	665	2.6	-	-	-	-	427	1.7
READING	97	3.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
SCRANTON	86	2.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
WILKES-BARRE	52	2.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
YORK	39	1.7	-	-	-	-	19	0.8
RHODE ISLAND:								
CRANSTON	50	1.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
PAWTUCKET	81	2.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
PROVIDENCE	256	2.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
WARWICK	76	1.7	-	-	-	-	2	(Z)
SOUTH CAROLINA:								
CHARLESTON	102	2.8	-	-	-	-	1	(Z)
COLUMBIA	119	2.6	-	-	-	-	33	0.7
GREENVILLE	80	2.8	-	-	-	-	229	8.1
NORTH CHARLESTON	36	2.3	-	-	-	-	-	-

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table 7. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) of 406 large city governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued**

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

City <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup>	Total general expenditure	Total criminal justice system		Police protection		Judicial	
			Amount	Percent of total general expenditure	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system
SOUTH DAKOTA: SIOUX FALLS . . . . .	74 927	27 139	2 564	9.4	2 493	97.2	-	-
TENNESSEE: CHATTANOOGA . . . . .	165 280	107 529	8 631	8.0	8 115	94.0	226	2.6
CLARKSVILLE . . . . .	57 299	8 391	1 232	14.7	1 216	98.7	6	0.5
KNOXVILLE . . . . .	184 942	116 342	7 478	6.4	6 685	89.4	72	1.0
MEMPHIS . . . . .	668 443	379 282	37 932	10.0	32 252	85.0	1 371	3.6
NASHVILLE-DAVIDSON . . . . .	428 957	335 765	32 260	9.6	21 613	67.0	4 237	13.1
TEXAS: ABILENE . . . . .	95 392	15 043	2 279	15.1	2 045	89.7	127	5.6
AMARILLO . . . . .	143 434	35 411	4 710	13.3	4 354	92.4	202	4.3
ARLINGTON . . . . .	124 646	27 522	3 695	13.4	3 377	91.4	145	3.9
AUSTIN . . . . .	323 250	101 444	13 714	13.5	11 853	86.4	599	4.4
BEAUMONT . . . . .	117 144	25 542	4 348	17.0	3 913	90.0	148	3.4
BROWNSVILLE . . . . .	71 092	15 290	1 927	12.6	1 730	89.8	48	2.5
CORPUS CHRISTI . . . . .	215 224	45 278	9 630	21.3	8 801	91.4	406	4.2
DALLAS . . . . .	844 528	255 046	56 924	22.3	52 009	91.4	1 948	3.4
EL PASO . . . . .	395 419	74 262	13 892	18.3	12 262	90.2	517	3.8
FORT WORTH . . . . .	367 993	119 085	19 383	16.3	17 764	91.6	561	2.9
GALVESTON . . . . .	60 149	26 353	2 803	10.6	2 525	90.1	141	5.0
GARLAND . . . . .	124 298	31 047	3 400	11.0	3 137	92.3	63	1.9
GRAND PRAIRIE . . . . .	61 017	14 703	1 620	11.0	1 359	83.9	94	5.8
HOUSTON . . . . .	1 554 960	411 684	76 728	18.6	68 173	88.9	2 536	3.3
IRVING . . . . .	105 070	17 363	2 767	15.9	2 515	90.9	115	4.2
LAREDO . . . . .	80 570	19 179	1 359	7.1	1 151	84.7	117	8.6
LONGVIEW . . . . .	54 173	12 539	1 525	12.2	1 379	90.4	104	6.8
LUBBOCK . . . . .	166 127	44 939	5 855	13.0	5 441	92.9	216	3.7
MESQUITE . . . . .	62 878	9 629	2 004	20.8	1 881	93.9	44	2.2
MIDLAND . . . . .	65 829	14 540	2 365	16.3	1 980	83.7	122	5.2
ODESSA . . . . .	87 624	12 450	2 317	18.6	2 010	86.8	147	6.3
PASADENA . . . . .	103 856	19 860	3 554	17.9	3 238	91.1	161	4.5
PORT ARTHUR . . . . .	61 286	14 816	2 036	13.7	1 019	89.3	72	3.5
RICHARDSON . . . . .	64 870	13 718	1 652	12.0	1 566	94.8	77	4.7
SAN ANGELO . . . . .	67 710	12 645	2 026	16.0	1 796	88.6	89	4.4
SAN ANTONIO . . . . .	793 374	188 371	33 368	17.7	28 806	86.3	731	2.2
TYLER . . . . .	64 097	14 261	1 674	11.7	1 511	90.3	84	5.0
WACO . . . . .	104 329	32 928	3 532	10.7	3 128	88.6	85	2.4
WICHITA FALLS . . . . .	96 884	18 096	2 530	14.0	2 150	85.0	141	5.6
UTAH: OGDEN . . . . .	68 512	18 487	4 100	22.2	3 395	82.8	432	10.5
PROVO . . . . .	55 577	18 469	1 725	9.3	1 203	69.7	134	7.8
SALT LAKE CITY . . . . .	167 404	64 454	13 614	21.1	12 286	90.2	868	6.4
VIRGINIA: ALEXANDRIA . . . . .	104 056	98 860	8 796	8.9	5 480	62.3	1 643	18.7
CHESAPEAKE . . . . .	111 136	65 754	6 271	9.5	3 555	56.7	700	11.2
HAMPTON . . . . .	126 761	84 220	10 032	11.9	6 612	65.9	610	6.1
LYNCHBURG . . . . .	63 221	43 001	4 020	9.3	2 747	68.3	224	5.6
NEWPORT NEWS . . . . .	142 262	84 211	8 881	10.5	4 045	45.5	1 221	13.7
NORFOLK . . . . .	281 962	156 496	18 389	11.8	10 969	59.6	1 919	10.4
PORTSMOUTH . . . . .	108 147	86 580	6 867	7.9	4 021	58.6	920	13.4
RICHMOND . . . . .	223 212	216 130	18 283	8.5	10 628	58.1	2 769	15.1
ROANOKE . . . . .	96 606	80 689	9 146	11.3	2 901	31.7	1 042	11.4
VIRGINIA BEACH . . . . .	235 840	138 692	12 000	8.7	7 412	61.8	549	4.6
WASHINGTON: BELLEVUE . . . . .	68 679	23 574	2 841	12.1	2 398	84.4	80	2.8
EVERETT . . . . .	50 505	14 790	2 601	17.6	2 377	91.4	-	-
SEATTLE . . . . .	488 928	229 639	37 174	16.2	29 806	80.2	2 746	7.4
SPOKANE . . . . .	175 327	51 989	7 209	13.9	6 234	86.5	358	5.0
TACOMA . . . . .	154 340	62 482	8 811	14.1	6 805	77.2	582	6.6
WEST VIRGINIA: CHARLESTON . . . . .	66 965	25 757	3 088	12.0	2 827	91.5	67	2.2
HUNTINGTON . . . . .	69 592	18 185	2 676	14.7	2 494	93.2	26	1.0
WISCONSIN: APPLETON . . . . .	60 311	40 440	1 708	4.2	1 663	97.4	45	2.6
GREEN BAY . . . . .	90 368	73 072	3 049	4.2	2 849	93.4	72	2.4
KENOSHA . . . . .	80 385	16 632	3 002	18.0	2 857	95.2	55	1.8
LA CROSSE . . . . .	47 844	30 853	1 477	4.8	1 405	95.1	18	1.2
MADISON . . . . .	168 932	131 285	8 177	6.2	7 795	95.3	-	-
MILWAUKEE . . . . .	653 417	238 228	47 329	19.9	45 492	96.1	452	1.0
OSHKOSH . . . . .	50 460	36 279	1 575	4.3	1 506	95.6	-	-
RACINE . . . . .	93 497	32 917	4 674	14.2	4 514	96.6	30	0.6
WAUWATOSA . . . . .	56 613	36 015	2 131	5.9	2 056	96.5	22	1.0
WEST ALLIS . . . . .	69 346	44 356	3 199	7.2	3 081	96.3	23	0.7

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table 7. Percent distribution of criminal justice system total expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) of 406 large city governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued**  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

City <sup>1</sup>	Legal services and prosecution		Public defense		Corrections		Other criminal justice	
	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system	Amount	Percent of total criminal justice system
SOUTH DAKOTA:								
SIOUX FALLS . . . . .	71	2.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
TENNESSEE:								
CHATTANOOGA . . . . .	290	3.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
CLARKSVILLE . . . . .	7	0.6	-	-	3	0.2	-	-
KNOXVILLE . . . . .	293	3.9	-	-	428	5.7	-	-
MEMPHIS . . . . .	640	1.7	69	0.2	2 439	6.4	1 161	3.1
NASHVILLE-DAVIDSON . . . . .	976	3.0	395	1.2	4 674	14.5	365	1.1
TEXAS:								
ABILENE . . . . .	98	4.3	-	-	-	-	9	0.4
AHARILLO . . . . .	154	3.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
ARLINGTON . . . . .	173	4.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
AUSTIN . . . . .	867	6.3	29	0.2	98	0.7	268	2.0
BEAUMONT . . . . .	148	3.4	-	-	124	2.9	15	0.3
BROWNSVILLE . . . . .	58	3.0	-	-	63	3.3	28	1.5
CORPUS CHRISTI . . . . .	301	3.1	-	-	122	1.3	-	-
DALLAS . . . . .	1 315	2.3	-	-	1 646	2.9	6	(2)
EL PASO . . . . .	522	3.8	-	-	209	1.5	82	0.6
FORT WORTH . . . . .	399	2.1	-	-	547	2.8	112	0.6
GALVESTON . . . . .	78	2.8	-	-	-	-	59	2.1
GARLAND . . . . .	144	4.2	-	-	-	-	56	1.6
GRAND PRAIRIE . . . . .	167	10.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
HOUSTON . . . . .	1 060	1.4	-	-	3 145	4.1	1 814	2.4
IRVING . . . . .	137	5.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
LAREDO . . . . .	75	5.5	-	-	2	0.1	14	1.0
LONGVIEW . . . . .	24	1.6	-	-	18	1.2	-	-
LUBBOCK . . . . .	198	3.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
MESQUITE . . . . .	79	3.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
MIDLAND . . . . .	71	3.0	-	-	192	8.1	-	-
ODESSA . . . . .	84	3.6	-	-	76	3.3	-	-
PASADENA . . . . .	155	4.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
PORT ARTHUR . . . . .	134	6.6	-	-	-	-	11	0.5
RICHARDSON . . . . .	9	0.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAN ANGELO . . . . .	69	3.4	-	-	41	2.0	31	1.5
SAN ANTONIO . . . . .	597	1.8	-	-	489	1.5	2 745	8.2
TYLER . . . . .	71	4.2	-	-	5	0.3	3	0.2
WACO . . . . .	138	3.9	-	-	151	4.3	30	0.8
WICHITA FALLS . . . . .	97	3.8	-	-	142	5.6	-	-
UTAH:								
OGDEN . . . . .	132	3.2	12	0.3	-	-	129	3.1
PROVO . . . . .	61	3.5	2	0.1	4	0.2	321	18.6
SALT LAKE CITY . . . . .	408	3.0	-	-	52	0.4	-	-
VIRGINIA:								
ALEXANDRIA . . . . .	510	5.8	59	0.7	1 056	12.0	48	0.5
CHESAPEAKE . . . . .	384	5.5	-	-	1 639	26.1	33	0.5
HAMPTON . . . . .	422	4.2	17	0.2	2 274	22.7	97	1.0
LYNCHBURG . . . . .	203	5.0	29	0.7	782	19.5	35	0.9
NEWPORT NEWS . . . . .	393	4.4	20	0.2	2 884	32.5	318	3.6
NORFOLK . . . . .	1 130	6.1	-	-	4 340	23.6	31	0.2
PORTSMOUTH . . . . .	528	7.7	20	0.3	978	14.2	400	5.8
RICHMOND . . . . .	981	5.4	31	0.2	3 322	18.2	552	3.0
ROANOKE . . . . .	380	4.2	-	-	4 646	50.8	177	1.9
VIRGINIA BEACH . . . . .	647	5.4	-	-	3 072	25.6	320	2.7
WASHINGTON:								
BELLEVUE . . . . .	248	8.7	18	0.6	97	3.4	-	-
EVERETT . . . . .	121	4.7	-	-	77	3.0	26	1.0
SEATTLE . . . . .	1 316	3.5	582	1.6	1 890	5.1	834	2.2
SPOKANE . . . . .	352	4.9	25	0.3	240	3.3	-	-
TACOMA . . . . .	456	5.2	42	0.5	710	8.1	216	2.5
WEST VIRGINIA:								
CHARLESTON . . . . .	121	3.9	-	-	22	0.7	51	1.7
HUNTINGTON . . . . .	91	3.4	-	-	16	0.6	49	1.8
WISCONSIN:								
APPLETON . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
GREEN BAY . . . . .	122	4.0	-	-	6	0.2	-	-
KENOSHA . . . . .	85	2.8	-	-	5	0.2	-	-
LA CROSSE . . . . .	48	3.2	-	-	6	0.4	-	-
MADISON . . . . .	377	4.6	-	-	5	0.1	-	-
MILWAUKEE . . . . .	1 366	2.9	-	-	19	(Z)	-	-
OSHKOSH . . . . .	67	4.3	-	-	2	0.1	-	-
RACINE . . . . .	130	2.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
WAUWATOSA . . . . .	53	2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
WEST ALLIS . . . . .	95	3.0	-	-	-	-	-	-

- Represents zero or rounds to zero.

Z Less than half the unit of measurement shown.

<sup>1</sup>Data are based on a field compilation from records of each city government shown; see text for data limitations.

<sup>2</sup>Population as of July 1, 1977 from Bureau of the Census estimates.

**Table 8. Total expenditure, and expenditure from general purpose revenue sources and own revenue sources for criminal justice activities, by State and type of government, fiscal year 1978**  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

State and type of government <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup> (in thou- ands)	Expenditure from all revenue sources				Expenditure from general purpose revenue sources	Expenditure from own revenue sources	
		Total criminal justice expenditure <sup>3</sup>	Direct expenditure		Capital outlay expenditure			
			Amount	Percent of total expenditure	Amount	Percent of total expenditure		
ALABAMA . . . . .	3 690	232 062	232 062	100.0	10 412	4.5	213 910	
STATE. . . . .	(x)	100 385	95 770	95.4	1 701	1.7	82 294	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	136 380	136 292	99.9	8 711	6.4	131 616	
ALASKA. . . . .	407	95 965	95 965	100.0	2 974	3.1	92 651	
STATE. . . . .	(x)	70 839	69 843	98.6	2 041	2.9	67 386	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	26 402	26 122	98.9	933	3.5	25 265	
ARIZONA . . . . .	2 296	278 994	278 994	100.0	20 603	7.4	267 986	
STATE. . . . .	(x)	88 432	80 943	91.5	12 166	13.8	78 449	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	198 241	198 051	99.9	8 437	4.5	189 536	
ARKANSAS. . . . .	2 144	101 531	101 531	100.0	8 460	8.3	94 495	
STATE. . . . .	(x)	49 219	43 895	89.2	4 965	10.1	42 647	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	57 908	57 636	99.5	3 495	6.0	51 848	
CALIFORNIA. . . . .	21 896	2 919 786	2 919 786	100.0	112 445	3.9	2 832 304	
STATE. . . . .	(x)	778 622	683 115	87.7	29 572	3.8	705 553	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	2 238 657	2 236 671	99.9	82 873	3.7	2 126 751	
COLORADO. . . . .	2 619	271 597	271 597	100.0	15 057	5.5	264 007	
STATE. . . . .	(x)	120 132	114 158	95.0	4 584	3.8	112 640	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	157 454	157 439	100.0	10 473	6.7	151 367	
CONNECTICUT . . . . .	3 108	248 025	248 025	100.0	14 000	5.6	234 085	
STATE. . . . .	(x)	128 679	124 513	96.8	5 661	4.4	115 450	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	124 498	123 512	99.2	8 339	6.7	118 635	
DELAWARE. . . . .	582	63 302	63 302	100.0	4 275	6.8	60 006	
STATE. . . . .	(x)	44 195	42 410	96.0	2 993	6.8	40 827	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	20 987	20 692	99.5	1 282	6.1	19 178	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA. . . . .	690	206 665	206 665	100.0	3 457	1.7	197 960	
STATE. . . . .	(x)	206 665	-	100.0	3 457	1.7	197 960	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	-	-	-	-	-	-	
FLORIDA . . . . .	8 452	868 286	868 286	100.0	77 130	8.9	822 384	
STATE. . . . .	(x)	330 228	315 720	95.6	34 149	10.3	286 401	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	553 054	552 566	99.9	42 981	7.8	535 982	
GEORGIA . . . . .	5 048	391 250	391 250	100.0	34 929	8.9	374 456	
STATE. . . . .	(x)	169 977	155 640	91.6	21 720	12.8	153 433	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	235 733	235 610	99.9	13 209	5.6	221 023	
HAWAII. . . . .	895	106 460	106 460	100.0	10 876	10.2	99 444	
STATE. . . . .	(x)	46 818	45 046	96.2	10 170	21.7	39 802	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	61 414	61 414	100.0	706	1.2	59 642	
IDAHO . . . . .	857	64 882	64 882	100.0	8 113	12.5	61 358	
STATE. . . . .	(x)	28 102	26 911	95.8	1 241	4.4	24 635	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	38 083	37 971	99.7	6 872	18.0	36 723	
ILLINOIS. . . . .	11 245	1 159 866	1 159 866	100.0	110 117	9.5	1 123 928	
STATE. . . . .	(x)	299 563	273 014	91.1	17 676	5.9	263 349	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	887 280	886 852	100.0	92 441	10.4	860 579	
INDIANA . . . . .	5 330	319 135	319 135	100.0	26 788	8.4	300 563	
STATE. . . . .	(x)	122 728	113 260	92.3	15 941	13.0	102 843	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	207 384	205 875	99.3	10 847	5.2	197 719	
IOWA. . . . .	2 879	181 701	181 701	100.0	8 404	4.6	170 867	
STATE. . . . .	(x)	79 868	67 356	84.3	3 092	3.9	69 399	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	114 829	114 345	99.6	5 312	4.6	101 467	
KANSAS. . . . .	2 326	166 755	166 755	100.0	15 176	9.1	157 660	
STATE. . . . .	(x)	76 253	68 848	90.3	9 354	12.3	68 050	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	98 005	97 907	99.9	5 822	5.9	89 609	
KENTUCKY. . . . .	3 458	234 453	234 453	100.0	16 666	7.1	219 845	
STATE. . . . .	(x)	143 733	116 020	80.7	9 734	6.8	130 151	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	118 452	118 433	100.0	6 932	5.9	89 693	
LOUISIANA . . . . .	3 921	338 198	338 198	100.0	17 269	5.1	323 998	
STATE. . . . .	(x)	134 083	124 031	92.5	3 326	2.5	120 607	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	214 737	214 167	99.7	13 943	6.5	203 391	
MAINE . . . . .	1 085	59 422	59 422	100.0	3 600	6.1	55 693	
STATE. . . . .	(x)	32 705	30 823	94.2	1 804	5.5	28 583	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	29 070	28 599	98.4	1 796	6.2	27 109	
MARYLAND. . . . .	4 139	468 226	468 226	100.0	33 423	7.1	444 386	
STATE. . . . .	(x)	279 554	217 002	77.6	16 608	5.9	255 486	
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	252 133	251 224	99.6	16 815	6.7	188 900	

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 8. Total expenditure, and expenditure from general purpose revenue sources and own revenue sources for criminal justice activities, by State and type of government, fiscal year 1978—Continued  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

State and type of government <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup> (in thou- sands)	Expenditure from all revenue sources				Expenditure from general purpose revenue sources	Expenditure from own revenue sources	
		Total criminal justice expenditures	Direct expenditure		Capital outlay expenditure			
			Amount	Percent of total expenditure	Amount	Percent of total expenditure		
MASSACHUSETTS . . . . .	5 782	593 833	593 833	100.0	30 226	5.1	579 339	523 016
STATE: . . . . .	(X)	175 941	157 301	89.4	2 933	1.7	162 316	161 406
LOCAL; TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	437 351	436 532	99.8	27 293	6.2	417 023	361 610
MICHIGAN . . . . .	9 129	994 062	994 062	100.0	71 227	7.2	963 382	852 033
STATE: . . . . .	(X)	333 988	277 636	83.1	30 085	9.0	303 018	301 987
LOCAL; TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	719 210	716 426	99.6	41 142	5.7	600 364	500 047
MINNESOTA . . . . .	3 975	308 469	308 469	100.0	20 661	6.7	290 450	262 951
STATE: . . . . .	(X)	99 426	81 056	81.5	2 806	2.8	83 709	83 532
LOCAL; TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	228 104	227 413	99.7	17 855	7.8	206 740	179 418
MISSISSIPPI . . . . .	2 389	116 359	116 359	100.0	10 465	9.0	107 850	99 850
STATE: . . . . .	(X)	52 162	49 029	94.0	3 245	6.2	44 275	43 345
LOCAL; TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	67 367	67 330	99.9	7 220	10.7	63 574	56 505
MISSOURI . . . . .	4 801	361 371	361 371	100.0	23 223	6.4	343 349	299 782
STATE: . . . . .	(X)	109 531	97 543	89.1	7 279	6.6	92 501	91 159
LOCAL; TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	263 941	263 828	100.0	15 944	6.0	250 848	208 622
MONTANA . . . . .	761	55 875	55 875	100.0	2 924	5.2	52 985	47 934
STATE: . . . . .	(X)	23 041	21 408	92.9	778	3.4	20 171	18 865
LOCAL; TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	34 492	34 467	99.9	2 146	6.2	32 814	29 069
NEBRASKA . . . . .	1 561	106 628	106 628	100.0	8 818	8.3	97 472	96 176
STATE: . . . . .	(X)	49 805	45 826	92.0	6 755	13.6	43 464	43 398
LOCAL; TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	60 805	60 802	100.0	2 063	3.4	54 007	52 777
NEVADA . . . . .	633	109 285	109 285	100.0	13 617	12.5	104 777	101 650
STATE: . . . . .	(X)	39 881	36 564	91.7	10 400	26.1	35 623	35 614
LOCAL; TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	72 788	72 721	99.9	3 217	4.4	69 154	66 035
NEW HAMPSHIRE . . . . .	849	57 175	57 175	100.0	6 164	10.8	51 917	49 763
STATE: . . . . .	(X)	21 855	21 387	97.9	1 907	8.7	18 828	18 808
LOCAL; TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	35 931	35 788	99.6	4 257	11.8	33 088	30 955
NEW JERSEY . . . . .	7 329	825 690	825 690	100.0	30 897	3.7	802 964	712 551
STATE: . . . . .	(X)	223 554	199 977	89.5	8 137	3.6	200 811	193 754
LOCAL; TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	625 962	625 713	100.0	22 760	3.6	602 153	518 797
NEW MEXICO . . . . .	1 190	103 937	103 937	100.0	12 129	11.7	99 423	93 807
STATE: . . . . .	(X)	55 316	53 394	96.5	5 576	10.1	51 114	50 751
LOCAL; TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	50 548	50 543	100.0	6 553	13.0	48 308	43 055
NEW YORK . . . . .	17 924	2 925 492	2 925 492	100.0	80 112	2.7	2 848 733	2 492 720
STATE: . . . . .	(X)	922 759	808 646	87.6	51 123	5.5	752 457	748 885
LOCAL; TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	2 216 954	2 116 846	95.5	28 989	1.3	2 056 275	1 743 834
NORTH CAROLINA . . . . .	5 525	394 322	394 322	100.0	30 257	7.7	368 599	345 670
STATE: . . . . .	(X)	229 931	213 688	92.9	8 307	3.6	206 088	202 334
LOCAL; TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	180 651	180 634	100.0	21 950	12.2	162 511	143 336
NORTH DAKOTA . . . . .	653	35 222	35 222	100.0	2 180	6.2	33 471	30 766
STATE: . . . . .	(X)	13 749	12 942	94.1	532	3.9	12 052	11 716
LOCAL; TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	22 291	22 280	99.9	1 648	7.4	21 419	19 049
OHIO . . . . .	10 701	882 567	882 567	100.0	85 993	9.7	851 091	760 353
STATE: . . . . .	(X)	279 678	237 886	85.1	4 261	1.5	252 315	250 840
LOCAL; TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	645 078	644 681	99.9	81 732	12.7	598 776	509 513
OKLAHOMA . . . . .	2 811	202 201	202 201	100.0	31 723	15.7	192 686	187 778
STATE: . . . . .	(X)	111 813	107 816	96.4	24 894	22.3	98 967	98 952
LOCAL; TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	98 223	94 385	96.1	6 829	7.0	93 718	88 825
OREGON . . . . .	2 376	248 684	248 684	100.0	19 131	7.7	239 245	210 917
STATE: . . . . .	(X)	107 903	98 334	91.1	6 445	6.0	98 940	86 460
LOCAL; TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	150 612	150 350	99.8	12 686	8.4	140 305	124 456
PENNSYLVANIA . . . . .	11 785	993 979	993 979	100.0	32 601	3.3	946 595	843 922
STATE: . . . . .	(X)	378 084	304 224	80.5	10 652	2.8	330 755	306 927
LOCAL; TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	695 845	689 755	99.1	21 949	3.2	615 839	537 894
RHODE ISLAND . . . . .	935	88 015	88 015	100.0	9 470	10.8	83 232	69 936
STATE: . . . . .	(X)	52 399	49 796	95.0	8 705	16.6	47 688	45 881
LOCAL; TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	38 219	38 219	100.0	765	2.0	35 544	24 055
SOUTH CAROLINA . . . . .	2 876	182 463	182 463	100.0	13 864	7.6	174 090	149 976
STATE: . . . . .	(X)	89 290	84 155	94.2	7 236	8.1	81 147	80 717
LOCAL; TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	98 748	98 308	99.6	6 628	6.7	92 942	69 258
SOUTH DAKOTA . . . . .	689	41 430	41 430	100.0	3 232	7.8	37 489	36 127
STATE: . . . . .	(X)	21 104	19 876	94.2	4 882	4.2	15 761	15 722
LOCAL; TOTAL . . . . .	(X)	23 059	21 554	93.5	2 350	10.2	21 728	20 405

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table 8. Total expenditure, and expenditure from general purpose revenue sources and own revenue sources for criminal justice activities, by State and type of government, fiscal year 1978 —Continued**

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

State and type of government <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup> (in thou- ands)	Expenditure from all revenue sources				Expenditure from general purpose revenue sources	Expenditure from own revenue sources	
		Total criminal justice expenditure <sup>3</sup>	Direct expenditure		Capital outlay expenditure			
			Amount	Percent of total expenditure	Amount	Percent of total expenditure		
TENNESSEE . . . . .	4 299	323 469	323 469	100.0	47 847	14.8	315 568	302 029
STATE. . . . .	(x)	121 233	107 580	88.7	12 689	10.5	113 708	112 736
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	215 942	215 889	100.0	35 158	16.3	201 860	189 292
TEXAS . . . . .	12 830	985 419	985 419	100.0	61 136	6.2	837 294	781 294
STATE. . . . .	(x)	279 569	240 667	86.1	16 476	5.9	235 579	235 576
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	646 675	644 652	99.7	44 710	6.9	601 705	545 718
UTAH. . . . .	1 268	109 207	109 207	100.0	8 674	7.9	102 750	98 440
STATE. . . . .	(x)	52 542	47 384	90.2	3 453	6.6	46 452	46 178
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	61 826	61 823	100.0	5 221	8.4	56 298	52 261
VERMONT . . . . .	483	33 304	33 304	100.0	1 313	3.9	31 452	29 667
STATE. . . . .	(x)	25 180	24 623	97.8	1 074	4.3	23 325	23 097
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	8 684	8 681	100.0	239	2.8	8 127	6 569
VIRGINIA. . . . .	5 135	423 806	423 806	100.0	35 653	8.4	405 063	384 056
STATE. . . . .	(x)	234 656	186 272	79.4	10 812	4.6	213 408	212 177
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	241 488	237 534	98.4	24 841	10.3	191 655	171 879
WASHINGTON. . . . .	3 658	325 153	325 153	100.0	14 940	4.6	308 131	268 207
STATE. . . . .	(x)	122 356	113 922	93.1	8 874	7.3	107 038	106 240
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	211 546	211 231	99.9	6 066	2.9	201 093	161 967
WEST VIRGINIA . . . . .	1 859	93 422	93 422	100.0	7 232	7.7	87 744	80 660
STATE. . . . .	(x)	49 927	48 328	96.8	3 929	7.9	44 272	43 952
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	45 264	45 094	99.6	3 303	7.3	43 471	36 707
WISCONSIN . . . . .	4 651	365 939	365 939	100.0	15 192	4.2	354 862	315 926
STATE. . . . .	(x)	117 449	107 253	91.3	2 169	1.8	105 115	104 503
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	260 019	258 686	99.5	13 023	5.0	249 746	211 423
WYOMING . . . . .	406	46 337	46 337	100.0	13 270	28.6	45 008	44 400
STATE. . . . .	(x)	26 014	25 361	97.5	11 779	45.3	24 718	24 714
LOCAL, TOTAL . . . . .	(x)	20 988	20 976	99.9	1 491	7.1	20 289	19 685

- Represents zero or rounds to zero.

X Not applicable.

<sup>1</sup>Data for municipalities, and the local governments totals which include municipal data, are estimates subject to sampling variation; data for counties (boroughs, parishes) are based on a canvass of all county governments and therefore are not subject to sampling variation; see text for data limitations.

<sup>2</sup>Population as of July 1, 1977 from Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports*, Series R25, No. 790, December 1978.

<sup>3</sup>For each State, the expenditure figures shown on the "Local, total" line and the combined State-local total line (the data shown opposite the names of the individual States) exclude duplicative intergovernmental expenditure amounts. This was done to avoid the artificial inflation which would result if an intergovernmental expenditure amount for one government is tabulated and then counted again when the recipient government(s) ultimately expend(s) the amount.

**Table 9. Total expenditure, and expenditure from general purpose revenue sources and own revenue sources, for criminal justice activities of 343 large county governments, fiscal year 1978**  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

County <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup>	Expenditure from all revenue sources				Expenditure from general purpose revenue sources	Expenditure from own revenue sources	
		Total criminal justice expenditure	Direct expenditure		Capital outlay expenditure			
			Amount	Percent of total expenditure	Amount	Percent of total expenditure		
ALABAMA:								
CALHOUN	112 409	950	930	97.9	39	4.1	822	
JEFFERSON	652 222	13 991	13 962	99.8	962	6.9	12 556	
HADISON	186 532	2 823	2 823	100.0	85	3.0	2 340	
MOBILE	352 970	8 322	8 322	100.0	348	4.2	7 356	
MONTGOMERY	184 473	3 355	3 326	99.1	156	4.6	3 040	
TUSCALOOSA	123 895	3 029	3 028	100.0	50	1.7	2 709	
ARIZONA:								
MARICOPA	1 288 754	38 579	38 579	100.0	1 242	3.2	35 503	
PIMA	454 627	27 521	27 370	99.5	422	1.5	24 265	
ARKANSAS:								
PULASKI	325 159	4 795	4 713	98.3	209	4.4	4 318	
SEBASTIAN	88 707	1 873	1 818	97.1	77	4.1	1 438	
CALIFORNIA:								
ALAMEDA	1 099 186	82 312	81 512	99.0	3 206	3.9	78 182	
BUTTE	127 841	6 260	6 213	99.2	361	5.8	5 821	
CONTRA COSTA	612 866	44 591	44 496	99.8	6 285	14.1	41 168	
FRESNO	472 492	32 143	32 074	99.8	2 093	6.5	30 175	
HUMBOLDT	106 793	7 841	7 827	99.8	245	3.1	7 256	
KERN	363 305	29 869	29 842	99.9	4 424	14.8	28 053	
LOS ANGELES	7 028 518	428 880	427 852	99.8	1 807	0.4	375 001	
MARIN	223 548	12 458	12 354	99.2	199	1.6	11 274	
MERCED	124 330	5 908	5 836	98.8	244	4.1	5 180	
MONTEREY	275 304	17 654	17 648	100.0	1 096	6.2	16 438	
ORANGE	1 799 032	79 495	79 307	99.8	1 106	1.4	69 004	
RIVERSIDE	575 095	33 405	33 405	100.0	384	1.1	26 567	
SACRAMENTO	721 311	54 931	54 928	100.0	545	1.0	49 035	
SAN BERNARDINO	736 540	47 956	47 956	100.0	1 408	2.9	46 276	
SAN DIEGO	1 675 714	72 997	72 997	100.0	4 025	5.5	62 242	
SAN JOAQUIN	311 612	22 280	22 254	99.9	1 067	4.8	19 597	
SAN LUIS OBISPO	134 498	8 438	8 309	98.5	267	3.2	7 484	
SAN MATEO	587 724	37 129	37 129	100.0	2 007	5.4	32 795	
SANTA BARBARA	287 433	21 168	21 068	99.5	531	2.5	20 641	
SANTA CLARA	216 365	61 500	61 449	99.9	2 006	3.3	55 927	
SANTA CRUZ	169 188	12 340	12 333	99.9	657	5.3	11 600	
SOLANO	201 430	13 027	12 963	99.5	1 444	11.1	11 695	
SONOMA	263 243	14 469	14 439	99.8	493	3.4	13 549	
STANISLAUS	235 997	15 509	15 267	98.4	1 934	12.5	14 586	
TULARE	216 927	15 535	15 452	99.5	174	1.1	14 440	
VENTURA	467 480	30 011	29 921	99.7	2 271	7.6	25 218	
YOLO	106 425	7 084	7 030	99.2	259	3.7	6 241	
COLORADO:								
ADAMS	224 133	3 692	3 692	100.0	76	2.1	3 635	
ARAPAHOE	238 179	4 586	4 398	95.9	39	0.9	4 314	
BOULDER	171 436	3 431	3 431	100.0	93	2.7	3 304	
EL PASO	285 987	4 881	4 881	100.0	69	1.4	4 784	
JEFFERSON	335 842	5 461	5 461	100.0	253	4.6	5 280	
LARIMER	124 401	2 158	2 158	100.0	190	8.8	1 816	
PUEBLO	123 408	1 948	1 948	100.0	81	4.2	1 792	
WELD	109 980	3 491	3 491	100.0	1 750	50.1	3 366	
DELAWARE:								
NEW CASTLE	398 488	7 896	7 896	100.0	922	11.7	6 789	
FLORIDA:								
ALACHUA	126 363	7 899	7 874	99.7	3 414	43.2	7 149	
BREVARD	233 955	6 050	5 985	98.9	795	13.1	5 257	
BROWARD	867 861	22 562	20 700	91.7	945	4.2	21 370	
DADE	1 439 854	78 682	78 682	100.0	5 311	6.7	73 813	
ESCAMBIA	225 793	13 119	13 119	100.0	5 192	39.6	12 875	
HILLSBOROUGH	583 383	21 326	21 183	99.3	1 732	8.1	19 964	
LEE	165 965	5 381	5 381	100.0	534	9.9	5 141	
LEON	129 406	3 946	3 946	100.0	301	7.6	3 831	
MANATEE	125 300	3 235	3 227	99.8	135	4.2	3 132	
OKALOOSA	104 247	1 748	1 748	100.0	85	4.9	1 682	
ORANGE	414 378	16 292	16 203	99.5	1 366	8.4	15 574	
PALM BEACH	477 250	17 825	17 764	99.7	1 808	10.1	16 958	
PASCO	142 033	4 165	4 146	99.6	380	9.1	4 091	
PINELLAS	654 294	17 614	17 614	100.0	2 080	11.8	16 725	
POLK	277 175	8 265	8 230	99.6	685	8.3	8 071	
SARASOTA	167 570	4 880	4 880	100.0	378	7.7	4 880	
SEMINOLE	142 943	3 784	3 738	98.8	380	10.0	3 609	
VOLUSIA	213 741	10 669	10 592	99.3	4 054	38.0	10 472	
GEORGIA:								
BIBB	143 730	4 063	4 063	100.0	678	16.7	3 901	
CHATTHAM	191 613	5 767	5 691	98.7	265	4.6	5 521	
CLAYTON	136 108	5 602	5 602	100.0	284	5.1	4 415	

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table 9. Total expenditure, and expenditure from general purpose revenue sources and own revenue sources, for criminal justice activities of 343 large county governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued**  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

County <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup>	Expenditure from all revenue sources				Expenditure from general purpose revenue sources	Expenditure from own revenue sources	
		Total criminal justice expenditure	Direct expenditure		Capital outlay expenditure			
			Amount	Percent of total expenditure	Amount	Percent of total expenditure		
GEORGIA--CONTINUED								
COBB.	251 635	9 764	9 751	99.9	919	9.4	9 174	8 257
DE KALB	457 698	18 431	18 431	100.0	123	0.7	17 005	15 708
FULTON.	566 963	19 138	19 138	100.0	487	2.5	18 275	13 907
GWINNETT.	128 206	4 623	4 623	100.0	309	6.7	4 343	4 201
RICHMOND.	154 829	5 921	5 920	100.0	968	16.3	5 498	4 396
IDAHO:								
ADA	144 665	6 298	6 206	98.5	2 976	47.3	5 967	5 732
ILLINOIS:								
CHAMPAIGN	168 156	2 523	2 520	99.9	189	7.5	2 105	2 009
COOK.	5 309 763	196 787	196 418	99.8	70 339	35.7	190 611	170 182
DU PAGE	580 262	10 382	10 357	99.8	396	3.8	9 863	7 866
KANE.	271 399	5 134	5 050	98.4	95	1.9	4 677	3 649
LAKE.	416 208	8 357	8 339	99.8	1 132	13.5	7 646	6 136
LA SALLE.	108 849	1 879	1 875	99.8	479	25.5	1 826	1 353
MCHENRY.	133 788	2 918	2 907	99.6	151	5.2	2 688	2 169
MCLEAN.	118 389	3 428	3 427	100.0	181	5.3	3 348	2 696
MACON.	127 227	2 195	2 195	100.0	-	-	2 058	1 664
MADISON.	246 366	4 333	4 322	99.7	164	3.8	4 017	3 205
PEORIA.	201 223	4 369	4 369	100.0	77	1.8	3 762	3 118
ROCK ISLAND.	163 778	2 796	2 686	96.1	38	1.4	2 214	1 777
ST. CLAIR.	280 531	4 736	4 720	99.7	73	1.5	4 530	2 472
SANGAMON.	173 727	3 463	3 455	99.8	122	3.5	3 307	2 827
TAZEWELL.	127 907	1 762	1 751	99.4	41	2.3	1 685	1 393
WILL.	306 491	4 928	4 873	98.9	87	1.8	4 250	3 862
WINNEBAGO.	241 715	5 831	5 582	95.7	69	1.2	5 510	3 855
INDIANA:								
ALLEN.	288 527	6 027	5 992	99.4	333	5.5	5 516	4 304
DELWARE.	128 900	1 676	1 636	97.7	101	6.0	1 471	1 382
ELKHART.	134 031	2 836	2 729	96.2	207	7.3	2 672	2 515
LAKE.	543 056	12 651	12 093	95.6	218	1.7	12 141	11 641
LA PORTE.	106 820	2 283	2 279	99.8	161	7.1	1 994	1 063
MADISON.	138 205	2 152	2 028	94.2	38	1.8	1 817	1 591
ST. JOSEPH.	239 228	4 402	4 527	98.4	103	2.2	4 217	4 146
TIPPECANOE.	115 417	1 763	1 736	98.5	135	7.7	1 498	1 457
VANDERBURGH.	162 099	3 415	3 369	98.7	122	3.6	3 035	1 734
VIGO.	111 521	1 902	1 880	98.8	36	1.9	1 883	1 827
IOWA:								
BLACK HAWK.	136 993	3 212	3 129	97.4	166	5.2	2 650	2 560
LINN.	167 491	4 198	4 122	98.2	537	12.8	3 656	3 121
POLK.	301 030	10 614	10 269	96.7	110	1.0	7 578	7 359
SCOTT.	154 336	2 479	2 479	100.0	157	6.3	2 324	2 267
WOODBURY.	103 535	2 531	2 474	97.7	141	5.6	2 121	2 107
KANSAS:								
JOHNSON.	251 401	4 812	4 812	100.0	194	4.0	4 540	4 167
SEDWICK.	352 595	9 553	9 553	100.0	933	9.8	8 362	6 484
SHAWNEE.	156 334	4 614	4 614	100.0	493	10.7	3 390	3 152
WYANDOTTE.	176 668	3 692	3 692	100.0	448	12.1	3 178	2 656
KENTUCKY:								
JEFFERSON.	683 495	27 323	27 140	99.3	1 510	5.5	23 085	14 373
KENTON.	130 431	1 565	1 497	95.7	85	5.4	1 157	950
LOUISIANA:								
CADDO.	242 518	5 080	5 080	100.0	292	5.7	3 983	3 618
CALCASIEU.	156 540	5 875	5 746	97.8	254	4.3	4 971	4 504
JEFFERSON.	422 801	24 013	24 013	100.0	4 013	16.7	19 848	18 424
LAFAYETTE.	132 318	3 764	3 752	99.7	213	5.7	2 781	2 534
OUACHITA.	130 226	3 192	3 192	100.0	288	9.0	1 743	1 702
RAPIDES.	124 836	2 976	2 950	99.1	121	4.1	1 368	1 192
MAINE:								
CUMBERLAND.	204 783	1 609	1 608	99.9	74	4.6	1 481	1 252
KENNEBEC.	103 256	523	523	100.0	21	4.0	488	403
PENOBCOT.	136 467	862	846	98.1	38	4.4	774	563
YORK.	125 867	1 035	701	67.7	81	7.8	997	872
MARYLAND:								
ANNE ARUNDEL.	356 374	13 116	13 116	100.0	838	6.4	11 037	8 359
BALTIMORE.	641 976	29 983	29 983	100.0	187	0.6	24 908	16 513
HARFORD.	143 664	3 230	3 230	100.0	170	5.3	2 629	2 612
MONTGOMERY.	571 868	38 917	38 848	99.8	8 582	22.1	33 081	24 862
PRINCE GEORGES.	671 984	36 526	36 526	100.0	1 473	4.0	29 512	29 271
WASHINGTON.	108 716	1 195	1 148	96.1	100	8.4	965	763
MASSACHUSETTS:								
BARNSTABLE.	136 919	3 473	3 473	100.0	52	1.5	3 422	3 422
BERKSHIRE.	143 840	2 252	2 252	100.0	79	3.5	2 150	1 971
BRISTOL.	468 693	6 012	5 985	99.6	65	1.1	5 762	5 027
ESSEX.	624 862	11 683	11 627	99.5	2 338	20.0	10 682	10 571
HAMPDEN.	456 868	11 742	11 741	100.0	1 716	14.6	11 138	10 795
HAMPSHIRE.	131 858	2 562	2 554	99.7	150	5.9	2 424	2 192

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table 9. Total expenditure, and expenditure from general purpose revenue sources and own revenue sources, for criminal justice activities of 343 large county governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued**  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

County <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup>	Expenditure from all revenue sources				Expenditure from general purpose revenue sources	Expenditure from own revenue sources	
		Total criminal justice expenditure	Direct expenditure		Capital outlay expenditure			
			Amount	Percent of total expenditure	Amount	Percent of total expenditure		
MASSACHUSETTS--CONTINUED								
MIDDLESEX	1 386 584	34 580	34 565	100.0	12 114	35.0	31 907	
NORFOLK	619 504	8 418	8 418	100.0	381	4.5	7 587	
PLYMOUTH	387 947	8 253	8 252	100.0	1 000	12.1	7 231	
WORCESTER	641 242	10 409	10 409	100.0	593	5.7	10 046	
MICHIGAN:								
BAY	120 957	6 743	6 544	97.0	2 949	43.7	5 834	
BERRIEN	170 302	6 509	6 280	96.5	151	2.3	5 627	
CALHOUN	140 265	6 155	5 805	94.3	164	2.7	5 135	
GENESEE	447 396	15 840	15 277	96.4	314	2.0	13 195	
INGHAM	271 467	8 658	8 592	99.2	127	1.5	9 417	
JACKSON	148 805	4 756	4 547	95.6	113	2.4	3 973	
KALAMAZOO	206 426	9 478	9 318	98.3	1 831	19.3	8 704	
KENT	430 705	10 872	10 813	99.5	641	5.9	9 611	
MACOMB	687 316	14 034	14 014	99.9	671	4.8	12 211	
MONROE	129 419	4 814	4 720	98.0	397	8.2	4 113	
MUSKEGON	158 677	5 007	4 826	96.4	34	0.7	3 835	
OAKLAND	989 807	24 953	24 489	98.1	458	1.8	18 115	
OTTAWA	145 770	3 038	2 920	96.1	53	1.7	2 580	
SAGINAW	227 397	8 301	7 884	95.0	758	9.1	6 212	
ST. CLAIR	132 209	4 121	3 976	96.5	64	1.6	3 110	
WASHTENAW	250 788	9 993	9 777	97.8	328	3.3	8 663	
WAYNE	2 451 273	88 497	78 856	89.1	8 218	9.3	73 398	
MINNESOTA:								
ANOKA	194 573	5 387	5 208	96.7	190	3.5	4 247	
DAKOTA	184 102	3 093	3 005	97.2	116	3.8	2 592	
HENNEPIN	909 619	37 155	37 023	99.6	3 829	10.3	33 380	
RAMSEY	454 078	25 725	25 689	99.9	6 336	24.6	21 423	
ST. LOUIS	224 381	9 604	9 467	98.6	226	2.4	6 934	
STEARNS	106 816	1 522	1 478	97.1	78	5.1	1 358	
WASHINGTON	111 833	2 899	2 853	98.4	107	3.7	2 332	
MISSISSIPPI:								
HARRISON	146 672	3 838	3 738	97.4	1 405	36.6	3 567	
HINDS	235 448	3 834	3 823	99.7	894	23.3	3 710	
JACKSON	113 096	2 060	2 059	100.0	140	6.8	1 960	
MISSOURI:								
CLAY	135 054	2 194	2 189	99.8	106	4.8	2 021	
GREENE	172 487	1 806	1 806	100.0	64	3.5	1 612	
JACKSON	625 749	17 578	17 563	99.9	4 642	26.4	15 302	
JEFFERSON	125 932	1 640	1 634	99.6	200	12.2	1 579	
ST. CHARLES	122 897	2 017	2 017	100.0	142	7.0	1 891	
ST. LOUIS	977 954	29 934	29 934	100.0	1 637	5.5	28 304	
NEBRASKA:								
DOUGLAS	407 976	7 729	7 729	100.0	25	0.3	5 327	
LANCASTER	183 267	3 211	3 211	100.0	20	0.6	2 796	
NEVADA:								
CLARK	361 095	38 481	38 481	100.0	1 637	4.3	22 952	
WASHOE	156 785	8 065	8 065	100.0	220	2.7	7 682	
NEW HAMPSHIRE:								
HILLSBOROUGH	256 355	2 132	2 132	100.0	22	1.0	2 079	
ROCKINGHAM	175 316	1 604	1 604	100.0	121	7.5	1 514	
NEW JERSEY:								
ATLANTIC	190 579	5 458	5 458	100.0	163	3.0	4 761	
BERGEN	874 329	17 334	17 334	100.0	216	1.2	16 450	
BURLINGTON	361 243	7 228	7 228	100.0	908	12.6	6 461	
CAMDEN	471 553	17 042	17 042	100.0	2 716	15.9	15 863	
CUMBERLAND	131 175	3 663	3 663	100.0	242	6.6	3 220	
ESSEX	852 345	41 930	41 930	100.0	287	0.7	41 447	
GLoucester	196 370	3 538	3 538	100.0	13	0.4	3 343	
HUDSON	564 189	15 570	15 570	100.0	24	0.2	15 304	
MERCER	316 501	14 086	14 086	100.0	5 094	36.2	13 351	
MIDDLESEX	593 823	14 865	14 865	100.0	466	3.1	13 969	
MONMOUTH	491 683	8 103	8 101	100.0	5	0.1	7 601	
MORRIS	396 513	7 215	7 215	100.0	69	1.0	6 901	
OCEAN	319 566	6 567	6 567	100.0	231	3.5	6 090	
PASSAIC	460 288	13 758	13 758	100.0	69	0.5	13 201	
SOMERSET	203 650	4 998	4 998	100.0	189	3.8	4 672	
UNION	512 273	15 507	15 507	100.0	527	3.4	14 599	
NEW MEXICO:								
BERNALILLO	377 345	9 065	8 357	92.2	3 775	41.6	7 948	
NEW YORK:								
ALBANY	286 883	8 458	7 733	91.4	102	1.2	5 399	
BROOME	219 281	4 902	4 126	84.2	162	3.3	4 439	
CHAUTAUQUA	146 878	3 904	3 573	91.5	102	2.6	3 428	
CHEMUNG	99 103	3 138	2 178	69.4	72	2.3	2 881	
DUTCHESS	232 236	5 355	4 788	89.4	70	1.3	4 976	

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table 9. Total expenditure, and expenditure from general purpose revenue sources and own revenue sources, for criminal justice activities of 343 large county governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued**  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

County <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup>	Expenditure from all revenue sources				Expenditure from general purpose revenue sources	Expenditure from own revenue sources
		Total criminal justice expenditure	Direct expenditure		Capital outlay expenditure		
			Amount	Percent of total expenditure	Amount	Percent of total expenditure	
<b>NEW YORK--CONTINUED</b>							
ERIE.	1 077 086	30 544	27 239	89.2	599	2.0	25 001
MONROE.	707 160	23 637	21 486	90.9	299	1.3	19 231
NASSAU.	1 399 725	151 868	151 868	100.0	3 313	2.2	125 010
NIAGARA.	237 772	5 416	4 764	88.0	153	2.8	4 693
ONEIDA.	262 521	4 566	3 712	81.3	277	6.1	4 036
ONONDAGA.	474 133	18 038	16 699	92.6	502	2.8	14 494
ORANGE.	246 939	5 059	4 506	89.1	357	7.1	4 337
OSWEGO.	111 239	2 717	2 388	87.9	364	13.4	2 325
RENSSELAER.	151 471	2 996	2 531	84.5	47	1.6	2 223
ROCKLAND.	257 543	6 626	6 009	90.7	157	2.4	5 347
ST. LAWRENCE.	117 101	1 993	1 734	87.0	58	2.9	1 650
SARATOGA.	148 212	2 000	1 725	86.2	100	5.0	1 803
SCHEMECTADY.	155 930	3 244	2 755	84.9	256	7.9	2 559
STEUBEN.	100 738	1 930	1 625	84.2	59	3.1	1 565
SUFFOLK.	1 295 268	108 730	105 036	96.6	2 295	2.1	102 168
ULSTER.	154 597	3 309	2 924	88.4	443	13.4	2 813
WESTCHESTER.	874 068	29 129	26 424	90.7	1 041	3.6	24 644
<b>NORTH CAROLINA:</b>							
BUNCOMBE.	151 788	2 866	2 866	100.0	433	15.1	2 503
CUMBERLAND.	230 917	3 042	5 922	98.0	2 433	40.3	5 224
DURHAM.	143 144	3 554	3 554	100.0	2 280	64.2	2 639
FORSYTH.	228 433	3 722	3 476	93.4	392	10.5	3 105
GASTON.	155 186	2 137	2 098	98.2	282	13.2	1 962
GUILFORD.	304 288	4 650	4 556	98.0	295	6.3	3 593
MECKLENBURG.	377 150	8 293	7 900	95.3	1 231	14.8	3 569
ONSLOW.	115 168	1 908	1 908	100.0	836	43.8	1 820
WAKE.	273 011	2 931	2 930	100.0	267	9.1	2 327
<b>OHIO:</b>							
ALLEN.	107 072	2 551	2 551	100.0	61	2.4	1 992
ASHTABULA.	99 722	3 544	3 544	100.0	1 802	50.8	1 755
BUTLER.	250 479	3 318	3 318	100.0	190	5.7	3 065
CLARK.	150 059	2 886	2 870	99.4	268	9.3	2 595
CLERMONT.	114 195	1 691	1 654	97.8	185	10.9	1 527
COLUMBIANA.	112 620	1 643	1 493	90.9	18	1.1	1 602
CUYAHOGA.	1 559 471	52 944	51 474	97.2	9 021	17.0	35 309
FRANKLIN.	869 996	49 966	49 557	99.2	33 685	67.4	47 145
GREENE.	128 774	2 711	2 711	100.0	68	2.5	2 282
HAMILTON.	883 339	24 198	22 449	92.8	705	2.9	22 754
LAKE.	210 670	4 486	4 486	100.0	1 008	22.5	4 286
LICKING.	114 947	2 128	2 128	100.0	47	2.2	1 776
LORAIN.	263 929	4 020	4 020	100.0	99	2.5	3 576
LUCAS.	469 030	13 130	12 981	98.9	1 825	13.9	11 813
MAHONING.	299 845	4 670	4 404	94.3	172	3.7	4 189
MONTGOMERY.	580 609	17 559	17 088	97.3	83	0.5	13 827
PORTAGE.	132 212	2 975	2 975	100.0	55	1.8	2 616
RICHLAND.	130 067	2 633	2 633	100.0	123	4.7	2 438
STARK.	376 258	7 645	7 644	100.0	189	2.5	6 845
SUMMIT.	529 253	10 404	10 330	99.3	182	1.7	8 598
TRUMBULL.	240 190	3 934	3 934	100.0	62	1.6	3 524
WOOD.	102 697	1 815	1 746	96.2	185	10.2	1 655
<b>OKLAHOMA:</b>							
CLEVELAND.	105 489	634	456	71.9	23	3.6	626
COMANCHE.	117 471	1 563	1 273	81.4	32	2.0	1 229
OKLAHOMA.	547 141	4 652	3 930	84.5	15	0.3	4 597
TULSA.	431 918	8 299	7 373	88.8	2 686	32.4	8 194
<b>OREGON:</b>							
CLACKAMAS.	213 154	6 450	6 450	100.0	584	9.1	5 651
JACKSON.	117 919	7 672	7 672	100.0	3 621	47.2	7 217
LANE.	249 268	14 354	14 328	99.8	3 724	25.9	12 745
MARION.	177 363	5 054	5 053	100.0	225	4.5	4 439
MULTNOMAH.	545 198	24 613	24 247	98.5	797	3.2	21 881
WASHINGTON.	203 196	5 951	5 951	100.0	141	2.4	4 775
<b>PENNSYLVANIA:</b>							
ALLEGHENY.	1 493 272	29 173	29 173	100.0	373	1.3	21 797
BEAVER.	208 705	3 876	3 828	98.8	39	1.0	3 197
BERKS.	304 064	7 217	7 158	99.2	129	1.8	6 024
BLAIR.	133 729	1 776	1 758	99.0	26	1.5	1 479
BUCKS.	469 738	9 578	9 573	99.9	135	1.4	8 474
BUTLER.	141 527	1 859	1 858	99.9	13	0.7	1 520
CAMBRIA.	188 432	2 753	2 721	98.8	34	1.2	2 243
CENTRE.	109 323	1 090	1 090	100.0	22	2.0	960
CHESTER.	303 512	7 816	7 575	96.9	203	2.6	6 780
CUMBERLAND.	171 575	2 339	2 324	99.4	44	1.9	1 826
DAUPHIN.	223 669	7 026	6 807	96.9	547	7.8	5 151
DELAWARE.	582 060	16 023	15 937	99.5	403	2.5	13 221
ERIE.	273 833	6 277	6 191	98.6	64	1.0	5 430
FAYETTE.	155 901	2 106	1 986	94.3	47	2.2	1 910
FRANKLIN.	107 256	1 482	1 447	97.6	7	0.5	1 250
LACKAWANNA.	231 387	2 839	2 710	95.5	5	0.2	2 444
LANCASTER.	347 914	5 952	5 147	86.5	947	15.9	5 578
LAWRENCE.	105 983	1 270	1 231	96.9	20	1.6	1 032

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 9. Total expenditure, and expenditure from general purpose revenue sources and own revenue sources, for criminal justice activities of 343 large county governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

County <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup>	Expenditure from all revenue sources				Expenditure from general purpose revenue sources	Expenditure from own revenue sources	
		Total criminal justice expenditure	Direct expenditure		Capital outlay expenditure			
			Amount	Percent of total expenditure	Amount	Percent of total expenditure		
PENNSYLVANIA--CONTINUED								
LEBANON . . . . .	106 329	1 509	1 454	96.4	46	3.0	1 329	
LEHIGH . . . . .	265 035	5 280	5 002	94.7	114	2.2	4 604	
LUZERNE . . . . .	341 074	4 708	4 427	94.0	24	0.5	4 176	
LYCOMING . . . . .	115 123	2 717	2 700	99.4	349	12.8	2 468	
MERCER . . . . .	127 077	1 877	1 875	99.9	72	3.8	1 492	
MONTGOMERY . . . . .	629 191	16 109	15 880	98.6	4 341	26.9	14 159	
NORTHAMPTON . . . . .	225 573	4 470	3 970	88.8	161	3.6	3 266	
NORTHUMBERLAND . . . . .	99 001	1 633	1 590	97.4	9	0.6	1 409	
SCHUYLKILL . . . . .	158 336	2 697	2 675	99.2	-	-	2 185	
WASHINGTON . . . . .	214 031	3 058	2 849	93.2	23	0.8	2 731	
WESTMORELAND . . . . .	382 714	4 750	4 750	100.0	50	1.1	3 829	
YORK . . . . .	289 703	5 133	4 917	95.8	532	10.4	4 491	
SOUTH CAROLINA:								
ANDERSON . . . . .	117 213	1 966	1 928	98.1	112	5.7	1 943	
CHARLESTON . . . . .	260 537	5 948	5 756	96.8	446	7.5	5 821	
GREENVILLE . . . . .	269 136	6 661	6 661	100.0	316	4.7	6 351	
LEXINGTON . . . . .	126 573	2 872	2 839	98.9	472	16.4	2 456	
RICHLAND . . . . .	248 176	8 247	8 151	98.8	1 581	19.2	7 992	
SPARTANBURG . . . . .	195 083	4 120	4 061	98.6	208	5.0	3 601	
TENNESSEE:								
HAMILTON . . . . .	271 750	5 959	5 958	100.0	463	7.8	5 322	
KNOX . . . . .	299 708	5 582	5 560	99.5	405	7.3	4 953	
SHELBY . . . . .	748 733	40 190	39 802	99.0	21 132	52.6	37 235	
SULLIVAN . . . . .	137 320	1 994	1 994	100.0	76	3.8	1 855	
TEXAS:								
BELL . . . . .	159 888	2 162	2 161	100.0	68	3.1	1 981	
BEXAR . . . . .	947 207	16 009	15 960	99.7	680	4.2	13 846	
BRAZORIA . . . . .	136 120	3 178	3 145	99.0	435	13.7	3 101	
CAMERON . . . . .	177 114	5 103	4 943	96.9	2 504	49.1	4 519	
DALLAS . . . . .	1 458 358	33 889	33 889	100.0	1 017	3.0	31 371	
EL PASO . . . . .	436 640	7 100	7 100	100.0	80	1.1	4 566	
GALVESTON . . . . .	194 035	4 365	4 316	98.9	115	2.6	4 021	
HARRIS . . . . .	2 123 161	55 704	55 704	100.0	4 966	8.9	51 107	
HIDALGO . . . . .	235 033	4 433	4 433	100.0	1 278	28.8	3 877	
JEFFERSON . . . . .	245 483	5 493	5 456	99.3	151	2.7	5 231	
LUBBOCK . . . . .	200 332	3 029	2 978	98.3	394	13.0	2 964	
MCLENNAN . . . . .	160 762	2 950	2 934	99.5	116	3.9	2 560	
NUCES . . . . .	249 375	7 667	7 657	99.9	2 135	27.8	6 895	
SMITH . . . . .	111 557	2 019	1 966	97.4	327	16.2	1 954	
TARRANT . . . . .	773 414	14 317	13 912	97.2	1 488	10.4	12 741	
TAYLOR . . . . .	104 296	1 495	1 465	98.0	112	7.5	1 486	
TRAVIS . . . . .	388 187	9 494	9 372	98.7	641	6.8	8 525	
WICHITA . . . . .	122 519	1 520	1 501	98.7	47	3.1	1 434	
UTAH:								
DAVIS . . . . .	122 692	1 362	1 330	97.7	157	11.5	1 187	
SALT LAKE . . . . .	540 533	15 099	15 099	100.0	354	2.3	12 943	
UTAH . . . . .	177 106	3 064	3 062	99.9	1 583	51.7	3 023	
WEBER . . . . .	135 974	2 148	2 148	100.0	28	1.3	1 753	
VERMONT:								
CHITTENDEN . . . . .	111 734	143	143	100.0	-	-	88	
VIRGINIA:								
ARLINGTON . . . . .	152 269	11 402	11 001	96.5	47	0.4	9 771	
CHESTERFIELD . . . . .	121 741	4 211	4 151	98.5	360	8.5	3 418	
FAIRFAX . . . . .	533 954	31 666	30 632	96.7	1 492	4.7	28 580	
HENRICO . . . . .	171 535	12 577	12 305	97.8	4 762	37.9	11 463	
PRINCE WILLIAM . . . . .	131 363	5 357	5 244	97.9	497	9.3	4 777	
WASHINGTON:								
CLARK . . . . .	164 481	5 361	5 347	99.7	129	2.4	3 465	
KING . . . . .	1 160 211	35 086	34 708	98.9	748	2.1	26 840	
KITSAP . . . . .	122 063	3 666	3 666	100.0	177	4.8	3 119	
PIERCE . . . . .	426 067	11 491	11 445	99.6	60	0.5	9 946	
SNOHOMISH . . . . .	275 357	7 776	7 326	94.2	412	5.3	7 093	
SPOKANE . . . . .	312 467	8 424	8 424	100.0	187	2.2	7 029	
YAKIMA . . . . .	158 527	4 207	4 207	100.0	101	2.4	3 828	
WEST VIRGINIA:								
CABELL . . . . .	105 534	1 105	1 104	99.9	14	1.3	1 017	
KANAWHA . . . . .	227 341	2 325	2 298	98.8	129	5.5	2 155	
WISCONSIN:								
BROWN . . . . .	174 930	3 480	3 412	98.0	138	4.0	2 743	
DANE . . . . .	311 740	9 295	9 109	98.0	275	3.0	8 655	
KENOSHA . . . . .	124 453	3 482	3 393	97.4	166	4.8	2 956	
MARATHON . . . . .	106 468	2 222	2 169	97.6	138	6.2	2 029	
MILWAUKEE . . . . .	1 003 569	29 646	29 641	100.0	724	2.4	25 223	
OUTAGAMIE . . . . .	127 175	2 553	2 478	97.1	228	8.9	2 249	
RACINE . . . . .	176 793	6 574	6 414	97.6	1 585	24.1	5 767	
ROCK . . . . .	134 730	3 650	3 589	98.3	94	2.6	3 340	
WAUKESHA . . . . .	270 691	5 343	5 185	97.0	291	5.4	4 767	
WINNEBAGO . . . . .	132 629	2 670	2 636	98.7	625	23.4	2 388	

<sup>1</sup> Represents zero or rounds to zero. <sup>2</sup> Data are based on a field compilation from records of each county government shown; see text for data limitations. <sup>3</sup> Population as of July 1, 1977 from Bureau of the Census estimates.

Table 10. Total expenditure, and expenditure from general purpose revenue sources and own revenue sources, for criminal justice activities of 406 large city governments, fiscal year 1978  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

City <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup>	Expenditure from all revenue sources				Expenditure from general purpose revenue sources	Expenditure from own revenue sources	
		Total criminal justice expenditure	Direct expenditure		Capital outlay expenditure			
			Amount	Percent of total expenditure	Amount	Percent of total expenditure		
ALABAMA:								
BIRMINGHAM	282 358	18 210	18 210	100.0	1 599	8.8	17 741	
GADSDEN	49 013	1 412	1 412	100.0	35	2.5	1 407	
HUNTSVILLE	143 906	4 524	4 437	98.1	299	6.6	4 476	
MOBILE	205 174	7 993	7 610	95.2	400	5.0	7 866	
MONTGOMERY	156 333	5 541	5 501	99.3	201	3.6	5 479	
TUSCALOOSA	69 482	2 797	2 760	98.7	193	6.9	2 768	
ALASKA:								
ANCHORAGE	181 754	11 304	11 054	97.8	71	0.6	7 564	
ARIZONA:								
GLENDALE	73 730	2 691	2 691	100.0	117	4.3	2 557	
MESA	110 079	4 226	4 226	100.0	400	9.5	4 130	
PHOENIX	684 516	58 856	58 274	99.0	2 255	3.8	57 407	
SCOTTSDALE	81 458	3 683	3 683	100.0	53	1.4	3 652	
TEMPE	98 146	4 898	4 876	99.6	291	5.9	4 830	
TUSCON	301 152	15 397	15 367	99.8	685	4.4	15 230	
ARKANSAS:								
FORT SMITH	68 180	1 757	1 630	92.8	75	4.3	1 729	
LITTLE ROCK	153 494	5 928	5 928	100.0	379	6.4	5 832	
NORTH LITTLE ROCK	62 875	2 314	2 257	97.5	14	0.6	2 155	
PINE BLUFF	55 817	1 687	1 548	91.8	111	6.6	1 481	
CALIFORNIA:								
ALAMEDA	72 612	2 800	2 800	100.0	118	4.2	2 756	
ALHAMBRA	60 242	2 499	2 490	99.6	69	2.8	2 410	
ANAHEIM	202 477	12 763	12 758	100.0	252	2.0	12 638	
BAKERSFIELD	83 055	5 892	5 892	100.0	143	2.4	5 853	
BELLFLOWER	50 306	3 342	1 615	48.3	1 573	47.1	3 342	
BERKELEY	109 387	6 135	6 135	100.0	16	0.3	5 823	
BUENA PARK	62 396	3 211	3 207	99.9	418	13.0	3 026	
BURBANK	84 811	5 039	5 023	99.7	75	1.5	5 002	
CARSON	80 339	3 168	629	19.9	-	-	2 747	
CHULA VISTA	78 749	3 017	3 017	100.0	241	8.0	2 926	
COMPTON	73 845	5 216	5 208	99.8	139	2.7	4 937	
CONCORD	98 718	4 383	4 383	100.0	147	3.4	4 295	
COSTA MESA	77 656	4 726	4 710	99.7	94	2.0	4 455	
DALY CITY	73 968	3 008	3 008	100.0	64	2.1	2 726	
DOWNEY	85 090	3 731	3 504	93.9	355	9.5	3 046	
EL CAJON	66 158	2 660	2 660	100.0	83	3.1	2 647	
EL MONTE	66 684	3 883	3 729	96.0	580	14.9	2 880	
FAIRFIELD	53 651	2 056	2 056	100.0	17	0.8	1 845	
FOUNTAIN VALLEY	54 602	1 914	1 907	99.6	44	2.3	1 829	
FREMONT	120 223	4 780	4 780	100.0	209	4.4	4 577	
FRESNO	187 895	11 977	11 971	99.9	1 051	9.8	11 382	
FULLERTON	96 980	4 101	4 095	99.9	167	4.1	4 086	
GARDEN GROVE	117 737	4 279	4 262	99.6	296	6.9	3 663	
GLENDALE	133 864	5 246	5 234	99.8	150	2.9	5 147	
HAWTHORNE	53 591	2 599	2 591	99.7	105	4.0	2 522	
HAYWARD	97 374	4 354	4 354	100.0	53	1.2	4 231	
HUNTINGTON BEACH	161 860	8 093	8 069	99.7	356	4.4	7 379	
INGLEWOOD	86 976	8 601	8 463	98.4	41	0.5	7 893	
LAKWOOD	79 604	1 969	378	19.2	94	4.8	1 626	
LONG BEACH	336 697	24 647	24 497	99.4	580	2.4	23 758	
LOS ANGELES	2 761 222	256 578	256 001	99.8	5 909	2.3	252 453	
MODESTO	92 035	3 745	3 745	100.0	49	1.3	3 614	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	55 221	2 541	2 541	100.0	315	12.4	2 395	
NEWPORT BEACH	65 195	4 806	4 795	99.8	219	4.6	4 774	
NORWALK	83 843	3 093	38	1.2	-	-	2 856	
OAKLAND	332 385	26 044	26 044	100.0	271	1.0	25 599	
OCEANSIDE	64 615	3 091	3 091	100.0	127	4.1	2 989	
ONTARIO	68 403	3 418	3 375	98.7	29	0.8	2 842	
ORANGE	84 934	4 171	4 155	99.6	46	1.1	4 105	
OXNARD	93 379	5 006	5 001	99.9	597	11.9	4 450	
PALO ALTO	54 277	3 899	3 899	100.0	86	2.2	3 878	
PASADENA	106 535	9 277	9 090	98.0	312	3.4	8 826	
PICO RIVERA	50 690	1 607	79	4.9	-	-	1 552	
POMONA	85 497	6 494	6 494	100.0	338	5.2	5 412	
REDONDO BEACH	62 134	4 181	3 480	83.2	48	1.1	3 260	
REDWOOD CITY	54 990	2 211	2 211	100.0	47	2.1	2 078	
RICHMOND	70 381	6 540	6 540	100.0	186	2.8	6 312	
RIVERSIDE	155 029	7 294	7 294	100.0	268	3.7	6 963	
SACRAMENTO	264 511	15 974	15 974	100.0	46	0.3	15 839	
SALINAS	75 316	3 648	3 548	97.3	101	2.8	3 394	
SAN BERNARDINO	102 270	7 485	7 381	98.6	1 670	22.3	7 270	
SAN BUENAVVENTURA	67 246	2 868	2 855	99.5	105	3.7	2 868	
SAN DIEGO	799 725	32 304	32 188	99.6	609	1.9	30 971	
SAN FRANCISCO	655 072	93 942	93 942	100.0	1 472	1.6	90 090	
SAN JOSE	583 402	28 467	28 467	100.0	90	0.3	27 820	
SAN LEANDRO	68 717	2 951	2 951	100.0	30	1.0	2 939	
SAN MATEO	79 303	3 057	3 057	100.0	80	2.6	2 869	
SANTA ANA	183 138*	11 312	11 245	99.4	251	2.2	10 920	
SANTA BARBARA	72 753	4 029	3 982	98.8	88	2.2	3 626	

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 10. Total expenditure, and expenditure from general purpose revenue sources and own revenue sources, for criminal justice activities of 406 large city governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

City <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup>	Expenditure from all revenue sources				Expenditure from general purpose revenue sources	Expenditure from own revenue sources	
		Total criminal justice expenditure	Direct expenditure		Capital outlay expenditure			
			Amount	Percent of total expenditure	Amount	Percent of total expenditure		
<b>CALIFORNIA--CONTINUED</b>								
SANTA CLARA . . . . .	84 065	4 338	4 338	100.0	153	3.5	4 213	
SANTA MONICA . . . . .	89 319	5 617	5 588	99.5	89	1.6	5 398	
SANTA ROSA . . . . .	71 335	3 232	3 232	100.0	618	19.1	3 056	
SIMI VALLEY . . . . .	73 262	2 238	2 238	100.0	87	3.9	2 020	
SOUTH GATE . . . . .	59 776	2 763	2 762	100.0	65	2.4	2 620	
STOCKTON . . . . .	124 037	7 647	7 647	100.0	62	0.8	7 151	
SUNNYVALE . . . . .	105 065	3 826	3 826	100.0	29	0.8	3 754	
THOUSAND OAKS . . . . .	63 171	1 888	179	9.5	4	0.2	1 791	
TORRANCE . . . . .	129 067	7 228	7 206	99.7	707	9.8	7 119	
VALLEJO . . . . .	70 264	3 250	3 250	100.0	152	4.7	3 143	
WEST COVINA . . . . .	72 770	3 304	3 290	99.6	235	7.1	2 611	
WESTMINSTER . . . . .	69 155	2 716	2 682	98.7	34	1.3	2 706	
WHITTIER . . . . .	69 528	3 096	3 084	99.6	91	2.9	3 073	
<b>COLORADO:</b>								
ARVADA . . . . .	79 958	2 448	2 448	100.0	185	7.6	2 425	
AURORA . . . . .	127 121	5 304	5 304	100.0	244	4.6	5 245	
BOULDER . . . . .	76 795	3 090	3 090	100.0	111	3.6	3 040	
COLORADO SPRINGS . . . . .	183 534	7 678	7 664	99.8	386	5.0	7 250	
DENVER . . . . .	475 098	54 677	54 677	100.0	4 988	9.1	52 611	
FORT COLLINS . . . . .	58 107	1 537	1 537	100.0	35	2.3	1 537	
LAKewood . . . . .	124 350	6 601	6 601	100.0	52	0.8	6 369	
PUEBLO . . . . .	102 547	4 716	4 700	99.7	323	6.8	4 326	
<b>CONNECTICUT:</b>								
BRIDGEPORT . . . . .	137 116	8 150	8 150	100.0	38	0.5	7 969	
BRISTOL . . . . .	57 597	2 843	2 843	100.0	842	29.6	2 769	
DANBURY . . . . .	56 382	2 292	2 283	99.6	81	3.5	2 261	
HARTFORD . . . . .	130 015	11 812	11 792	99.8	1 642	13.9	9 617	
MERIDEN . . . . .	57 135	2 014	2 014	100.0	37	1.8	1 953	
MILFORD . . . . .	50 240	2 882	2 882	100.0	577	20.0	2 840	
NEW BRITAIN . . . . .	75 986	3 157	3 157	100.0	97	3.1	3 124	
NEW HAVEN . . . . .	122 085	8 127	8 127	100.0	98	1.2	7 870	
NORWALK . . . . .	77 159	2 980	2 980	100.0	97	3.3	2 950	
STAMFORD . . . . .	105 136	5 940	5 920	99.7	269	4.5	5 778	
WATERBURY . . . . .	104 890	7 763	7 757	99.9	2 328	30.0	5 409	
WEST HAVEN . . . . .	52 190	2 144	2 144	100.0	30	1.4	1 922	
<b>DELAWARE:</b>								
WILMINGTON . . . . .	72 943	7 711	7 711	100.0	72	0.9	7 259	
<b>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:</b>								
WASHINGTON . . . . .	684 891	206 665	206 665	100.0	3 457	1.7	197 960	
<b>FLORIDA:</b>								
CLEARWATER . . . . .	75 492	4 001	4 001	100.0	56	1.4	3 698	
FORT LAUDERDALE . . . . .	151 502	12 264	12 200	99.5	132	1.1	11 758	
GAINESVILLE . . . . .	70 108	3 689	3 685	99.9	123	3.3	3 622	
HIALEAH . . . . .	122 793	5 694	5 694	100.0	93	1.6	5 376	
HOLLYWOOD . . . . .	116 820	7 510	7 510	100.0	66	0.9	6 774	
JACKSONVILLE . . . . .	527 777	34 673	34 578	99.7	255	0.7	33 245	
MIAMI . . . . .	346 716	22 411	22 411	100.0	154	0.7	22 096	
MIAMI BEACH . . . . .	87 904	6 921	6 921	100.0	13	0.2	6 898	
ORLANDO . . . . .	116 115	10 263	10 263	100.0	167	1.6	9 482	
PENSACOLA . . . . .	65 915	3 088	3 088	100.0	204	6.6	2 949	
ST. PETERSBURG . . . . .	237 134	16 951	16 951	100.0	3 408	20.1	13 102	
TALLAHASSEE . . . . .	85 856	3 234	3 234	100.0	124	3.8	3 175	
TAMPA . . . . .	264 884	15 897	15 897	100.0	718	4.5	15 342	
WEST PALM BEACH . . . . .	60 139	3 920	3 915	99.9	152	3.9	3 827	
<b>GEORGIA:</b>								
ALBANY . . . . .	76 619	2 890	2 810	97.2	149	5.2	2 818	
ATLANTA . . . . .	416 715	31 160	31 055	99.7	1 553	5.0	28 870	
AUGUSTA . . . . .	52 861	2 587	2 582	99.8	174	6.7	2 273	
COLUMBUS . . . . .	165 511	9 279	9 279	100.0	579	6.2	8 923	
MACON . . . . .	121 282	4 266	4 249	99.6	468	11.0	3 943	
SAVANNAH . . . . .	113 020	4 458	4 444	99.7	31	0.7	4 307	
<b>HAWAII:</b>								
HONOLULU . . . . .	717 852	45 336	45 336	100.0	318	0.7	40 785	
<b>IDAHO:</b>								
BOISE CITY . . . . .	107 687	3 754	3 686	98.2	319	8.5	3 227	
<b>ILLINOIS:</b>								
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS . . . . .	71 977	2 570	2 565	99.8	207	8.1	2 516	
AURORA . . . . .	78 753	5 117	5 095	99.6	1 389	27.1	5 050	
BERWYN . . . . .	47 799	1 320	1 320	100.0	-	-	1 320	
CHAMPAIGN . . . . .	59 519	2 249	2 225	98.9	113	5.0	1 921	
CHICAGO . . . . .	3 062 881	336 055	336 053	100.0	3 358	1.0	329 740	
CICERO . . . . .	60 483	2 177	2 177	100.0	109	5.0	2 166	
DECATUR . . . . .	89 690	2 397	2 382	99.4	79	3.3	2 389	
DES PLAINES . . . . .	57 422	2 290	2 290	100.0	81	3.5	2 289	
EAST ST. LOUIS . . . . .	53 902	2 720	2 719	100.0	69	2.5	2 650	
ELGIN . . . . .	61 690	2 243	2 237	99.7	116	5.2	2 213	

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table 10. Total expenditure, and expenditure from general purpose revenue sources and own revenue sources, for criminal justice activities of 406 large city governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued**  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

City <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup>	Expenditure from all revenue sources				Expenditure from general purpose revenue sources	Expenditure from own revenue sources	
		Total criminal justice expenditure	Direct expenditure		Capital outlay expenditure			
			Amount	Percent of total expenditure	Amount	Percent of total expenditure		
<b>ILLINOIS--CONTINUED</b>								
EVANSTON . . . . .	72 019	3 894	3 894	100.0	55	1.4	3 706	
JOLIET . . . . .	72 102	4 003	4 003	100.0	113	2.8	3 866	
OAK LAWN . . . . .	62 198	2 263	2 254	99.6	73	3.2	2 243	
OAK PARK . . . . .	56 691	3 661	3 661	100.0	186	5.1	3 536	
PEORIA . . . . .	125 724	7 294	7 241	99.3	141	1.9	6 748	
ROCKFORD . . . . .	140 667	5 387	5 387	100.0	119	2.2	5 212	
ROCK ISLAND . . . . .	47 299	1 914	1 914	100.0	8	0.4	1 797	
SKOKIE . . . . .	65 885	2 856	2 856	100.0	61	2.1	2 836	
SPRINGFIELD . . . . .	87 520	3 658	3 658	100.0	157	4.3	3 487	
WAUKEGAN . . . . .	63 398	2 919	2 911	99.7	65	2.2	2 909	
<b>INDIANA:</b>								
ANDERSON . . . . .	68 584	2 308	2 308	100.0	41	1.8	2 263	
EVANSVILLE . . . . .	133 975	4 844	4 844	100.0	37	0.8	4 660	
FORT WAYNE . . . . .	182 213	5 903	5 903	100.0	159	2.7	5 773	
GARY . . . . .	159 412	7 112	7 112	100.0	313	4.4	6 794	
HAMMOND . . . . .	102 027	3 664	3 664	100.0	90	2.5	3 547	
INDIANAPOLIS . . . . .	704 556	51 894	51 635	99.5	4 564	8.8	49 871	
MUNCIE . . . . .	82 152	1 990	1 990	100.0	125	6.3	1 966	
KOKOMO . . . . .	52 006	2 055	2 055	100.0	92	4.5	1 827	
SOUTH BEND . . . . .	114 011	4 544	4 544	100.0	200	4.4	4 450	
TERRE HAUTE . . . . .	63 443	1 793	1 793	100.0	80	4.5	1 615	
<b>IOWA:</b>								
CEDAR RAPIDS . . . . .	107 996	3 500	3 488	99.7	377	10.8	3 429	
COUNCIL BLUFFS . . . . .	58 668	2 588	2 437	94.2	263	10.2	2 563	
DAVENPORT . . . . .	101 410	2 582	2 582	100.0	130	5.0	2 520	
DES MOINES . . . . .	193 772	7 959	7 939	99.7	68	0.9	7 534	
DUBUQUE . . . . .	62 349	1 708	1 685	98.7	80	4.7	1 336	
SIOUX CITY . . . . .	85 115	2 851	2 851	100.0	92	3.2	2 709	
WATERLOO . . . . .	78 915	2 719	2 719	100.0	62	2.3	2 575	
<b>KANSAS:</b>								
KANSAS CITY . . . . .	167 064	7 012	7 012	100.0	397	5.7	6 730	
LAWRENCE . . . . .	51 459	1 441	1 412	98.0	65	4.5	1 390	
OVERLAND PARK . . . . .	82 372	3 228	3 228	100.0	259	8.0	3 204	
TOPEKA . . . . .	122 065	5 406	5 399	99.9	179	3.3	5 195	
WICHITA . . . . .	268 012	9 471	9 312	98.3	158	1.7	9 219	
<b>KENTUCKY:</b>								
COVINGTON . . . . .	46 925	2 528	2 528	100.0	146	5.8	2 265	
LEXINGTON . . . . .	190 142	12 271	12 082	98.5	826	6.7	10 296	
LOUISVILLE . . . . .	322 870	20 586	20 586	100.0	1 138	5.5	18 275	
OWENSBORO . . . . .	50 490	1 730	1 701	98.3	78	4.5	1 598	
<b>LOUISIANA:</b>								
BATON ROUGE . . . . .	308 178	21 808	21 808	100.0	1 165	5.3	20 047	
LAFAYETTE . . . . .	79 732	2 431	2 369	97.4	271	11.1	2 298	
LAKE CHARLES . . . . .	78 464	2 080	2 011	96.7	125	6.0	2 016	
MONROE . . . . .	63 633	1 826	1 826	100.0	35	1.9	1 788	
NEW ORLEANS . . . . .	561 266	50 276	49 560	98.6	2 977	5.9	46 310	
SHREVEPORT . . . . .	188 652	7 237	7 237	100.0	480	6.6	7 064	
<b>MAINE:</b>								
PORLTAND . . . . .	62 127	3 048	3 048	100.0	121	4.0	3 029	
<b>MARYLAND:</b>								
BALTIMORE . . . . .	804 304	91 978	91 978	100.0	667	0.7	55 558	
<b>MASSACHUSETTS:</b>								
BOSTON . . . . .	618 493	98 047	98 047	100.0	1 955	2.0	92 342	
BROCKTON . . . . .	94 175	5 591	5 589	100.0	-	-	5 583	
CAMBRIDGE . . . . .	99 296	8 211	8 211	100.0	103	1.3	8 153	
CHICOPEE . . . . .	56 572	2 499	2 499	100.0	76	3.0	2 435	
FALL RIVER . . . . .	98 898	5 615	5 615	100.0	100	1.8	5 139	
HOLYOKE . . . . .	44 267	2 182	2 182	100.0	78	3.6	2 142	
LAWRENCE . . . . .	63 845	3 155	3 155	100.0	51	1.6	3 034	
LOWELL . . . . .	88 449	3 994	3 991	99.9	47	1.2	3 892	
LYNN . . . . .	77 089	5 039	5 039	100.0	70	1.4	4 818	
MALDEN . . . . .	54 987	2 419	2 419	100.0	36	1.5	2 395	
MEDFORD . . . . .	60 519	3 317	3 299	99.5	48	1.4	3 317	
NEW BEDFORD . . . . .	98 845	6 364	6 364	100.0	80	1.3	6 250	
NEWTON . . . . .	87 183	6 271	6 271	100.0	885	14.1	5 413	
PITTSFIELD . . . . .	52 313	2 089	2 089	100.0	79	3.8	2 046	
QUINCY . . . . .	90 571	6 628	6 628	100.0	151	2.3	6 536	
SOMERVILLE . . . . .	76 771	3 435	3 435	100.0	56	1.6	3 335	
SPRINGFIELD . . . . .	164 895	7 985	7 985	100.0	98	1.2	7 656	
WALTHAM . . . . .	55 632	3 471	3 471	100.0	47	1.4	3 402	
WORCESTER . . . . .	165 229	9 913	9 913	100.0	277	2.8	9 613	
<b>MICHIGAN:</b>								
ANN ARBOR . . . . .	105 602	5 134	5 134	100.0	30	0.6	5 044	
DEARBORN . . . . .	93 871	5 912	5 806	98.2	11	0.2	5 845	
DEARBORN HEIGHTS . . . . .	73 108	3 479	3 469	99.7	152	4.4	3 297	
DETROIT . . . . .	1 289 910	170 717	169 779	99.5	4 789	2.8	141 563	
EAST LANSING . . . . .	50 789	1 706	1 706	100.0	67	3.9	1 695	

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 10. Total expenditure, and expenditure from general purpose revenue sources and own revenue sources, for criminal justice activities of 406 large city governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

City <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup>	Expenditure from all revenue sources				Expenditure from general purpose revenue sources	Expenditure from own revenue sources	
		Total criminal justice expenditure	Direct expenditure		Capital outlay expenditure			
			Amount	Percent of total expenditure	Amount	Percent of total expenditure		
MICHIGAN--CONTINUED								
FARMINGTON HILLS	57 538	2 236	2 062	92.2	132	5.9	2 113	1 962
FLINT	163 594	12 483	12 464	99.8	146	1.2	11 953	8 064
GRAND RAPIDS	184 954	10 066	10 012	99.5	151	1.5	9 880	7 978
KALAMAZOO	79 077	4 544	4 500	99.0	168	3.7	4 277	3 652
LANSING	127 128	8 573	8 570	100.0	604	7.0	8 214	6 890
LINCOLN PARK	47 502	2 077	2 077	100.0	65	3.1	2 057	1 943
LIVONIA	108 337	4 264	4 172	97.8	35	0.8	4 233	4 019
PONTIAC	79 189	8 150	8 041	98.7	75	0.9	7 542	6 034
ROSEVILLE	56 978	2 774	2 774	100.0	67	2.4	2 753	2 443
ROYAL OAK	76 208	3 141	3 141	100.0	16	0.5	3 141	2 661
SAGINAW	82 162	7 341	7 338	100.0	1 953	26.6	7 050	6 979
SOUTHFIELD	75 541	10 052	10 002	99.5	4 893	48.7	9 881	9 788
ST. CLAIR SHORES	85 420	3 607	3 598	99.8	159	4.4	3 431	3 204
STERLING HEIGHTS	96 676	4 806	4 794	99.8	219	4.6	4 541	3 216
TAYLOR	79 223	3 407	3 404	99.9	119	3.5	3 193	3 013
TROY	62 390	4 297	4 288	99.8	1 330	31.0	4 252	3 013
WARREN	170 084	7 837	7 827	99.9	218	2.8	7 779	6 330
WESTLAND	88 631	3 516	3 516	100.0	23	0.7	3 432	2 836
WYOMING	58 335	2 902	2 902	100.0	100	3.4	2 801	1 882
MINNESOTA:								
BLOOMINGTON	78 052	2 552	2 529	99.1	8	0.3	2 504	2 120
DULUTH	95 248	3 607	3 561	98.7	132	3.7	3 380	2 654
MINNEAPOLIS	360 269	23 485	23 185	98.7	56	0.2	22 222	19 787
ROCHESTER	56 865	1 822	1 801	98.8	52	2.9	1 811	1 811
ST. PAUL	265 971	16 864	16 845	99.9	2 087	12.4	15 311	12 560
MISSISSIPPI:								
BILOXI	44 439	1 172	1 154	98.5	103	8.8	1 160	967
JACKSON	190 542	6 982	6 982	100.0	137	2.0	6 685	6 634
MISSOURI:								
COLUMBIA	64 612	2 121	2 121	100.0	110	5.2	2 104	2 064
FLORISSANT	70 639	1 430	1 430	100.0	9	0.6	1 430	1 398
INDEPENDENCE	111 575	3 607	3 577	99.2	185	5.1	3 574	3 289
KANSAS CITY	458 573	37 456	37 456	100.0	1 096	2.9	35 024	34 505
ST. JOSEPH	77 804	2 233	2 230	99.9	87	3.9	2 227	2 070
ST. LOUIS	517 671	63 780	63 780	100.0	1 296	2.0	60 695	43 121
SPRINGFIELD	134 974	3 700	3 700	100.0	126	3.4	3 417	3 332
MONTANA:								
BILLINGS	72 303	2 379	2 356	99.0	20	0.8	2 010	1 900
GREAT FALLS	60 334	1 780	1 757	98.7	153	8.6	1 678	1 489
NEBRASKA:								
LINCOLN	163 937	6 508	6 508	100.0	50	0.8	5 489	5 473
OMAHA	365 711	14 302	14 255	99.7	829	5.8	13 883	13 883
NEVADA:								
LAS VEGAS	161 086	13 838	1 672	12.1	52	0.4	13 758	13 701
RENO	82 541	7 503	7 469	99.5	459	6.1	7 373	7 096
NEW HAMPSHIRE:								
MANCHESTER	85 119	4 011	4 011	100.0	645	16.1	3 858	3 799
NASHUA	64 273	4 998	4 998	100.0	2 297	46.0	2 846	2 602
NEW JERSEY:								
BAYONNE	70 222	3 560	3 560	100.0	46	1.3	3 433	2 811
BLOOMFIELD	50 957	2 675	2 675	100.0	38	1.4	2 675	2 525
CAMDEN	88 785	10 517	10 517	100.0	1 633	15.5	9 353	7 064
CLIFTON	76 838	3 631	3 631	100.0	-	-	3 631	3 063
EAST ORANGE	71 863	5 142	5 142	100.0	71	1.4	4 472	4 075
ELIZABETH	103 497	7 067	7 067	100.0	35	0.5	6 390	4 981
IRVINGTON	56 036	3 038	3 038	100.0	98	3.2	2 707	2 130
JERSEY CITY	232 137	26 576	26 576	100.0	322	1.2	19 688	19 688
NEWARK	324 138	31 243	31 243	100.0	420	1.3	29 077	18 628
PASSAIC	50 258	3 398	3 398	100.0	108	3.2	3 095	2 452
PATERSON	152 414	8 916	8 916	100.0	153	1.7	7 923	7 744
TRENTON	96 951	8 652	8 652	100.0	142	1.6	7 848	7 653
UNION CITY	52 305	3 309	3 309	100.0	-	-	2 882	2 212
VINELAND	52 984	2 237	2 237	100.0	121	5.4	2 141	1 412
NEW MEXICO:								
ALBUQUERQUE	291 187	16 371	16 371	100.0	1 272	7.8	15 357	13 526
NEW YORK:								
ALBANY	107 798	6 899	6 785	98.3	212	3.1	6 691	6 667
BINGHAMTON	60 130	2 847	2 847	100.0	71	2.5	2 767	2 759
BUFFALO	390 065	27 413	26 595	97.0	144	0.5	24 926	24 021
MOUNT VERNON	73 572	4 309	4 309	100.0	31	0.7	4 227	4 100
NEW ROCHELLE	70 450	4 741	4 596	96.9	67	1.4	4 480	4 453
NEW YORK CITY	7 297 787	1 452 974	1 380 432	95.0	10 312	0.7	1 419 874	1 127 478

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 10. Total expenditure, and expenditure from general purpose revenue sources and own revenue sources, for criminal justice activities of 406 large city governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued  
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

City <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup>	Expenditure from all revenue sources				Expenditure from general purpose revenue sources	Expenditure from own revenue sources	
		Total criminal justice expenditure	Direct expenditure		Capital outlay expenditure			
			Amount	Percent of total expenditure	Amount	Percent of total expenditure		
NEW YORK--CONTINUED								
NIAGARA FALLS . . . . .	79 060	3 683	3 573	97.0	5	0.1	3 681 3 482	
ROCHESTER . . . . .	256 285	17 362	16 783	96.7	523	3.0	16 078 13 572	
ROME . . . . .	47 377	1 357	1 357	100.0	232	17.1	1 349 930	
SCHENECTADY . . . . .	73 263	3 743	3 660	97.8	48	1.3	3 733 3 733	
SYRACUSE . . . . .	177 564	10 904	10 746	98.6	304	2.8	10 089 9 978	
TROY . . . . .	58 739	2 551	2 476	97.1	126	4.9	2 517 2 083	
UTICA . . . . .	80 103	3 206	3 089	96.4	89	2.8	2 990 2 400	
WHITE PLAINS . . . . .	46 895	5 173	5 173	100.0	109	2.1	5 093 4 593	
YONKERS . . . . .	189 139	12 819	12 819	100.0	163	1.3	11 992 11 236	
NORTH CAROLINA:								
ASHEVILLE . . . . .	58 642	2 463	2 448	99.4	234	9.5	2 405 2 205	
CHARLOTTE . . . . .	295 685	12 481	12 481	100.0	497	4.0	11 922 11 432	
DURHAM . . . . .	103 686	6 348	6 348	100.0	352	5.5	5 980 5 716	
FAYETTEVILLE . . . . .	67 072	2 782	2 762	99.3	202	7.3	2 566 2 487	
GREENSBORO . . . . .	160 562	8 133	8 125	99.9	589	7.2	7 959 6 804	
HIGH POINT . . . . .	68 343	2 568	2 565	99.9	213	8.3	2 495 2 483	
RALEIGH . . . . .	138 005	7 051	6 817	96.7	263	3.7	6 596 6 281	
WILMINGTON . . . . .	54 353	2 156	2 156	100.0	90	4.2	2 067 1 668	
WINSTON-SALEM . . . . .	139 688	8 542	8 542	100.0	340	4.0	8 477 7 590	
NORTH DAKOTA:								
FARGO . . . . .	57 394	2 013	2 013	100.0	64	3.2	1 988 1 932	
OHIO:								
AKRON . . . . .	244 265	10 823	10 565	97.6	652	6.0	10 494 10 204	
CANTON . . . . .	98 044	5 437	5 302	97.5	8	0.1	5 301 3 498	
CINCINNATI . . . . .	403 363	34 499	34 185	99.1	419	1.2	31 696 25 165	
CLEVELAND . . . . .	609 187	79 559	65 558	82.4	13 590	17.1	72 744 60 870	
CLEVELAND HEIGHTS . . . . .	54 944	2 237	2 237	100.0	45	2.0	2 088 1 918	
COLUMBUS . . . . .	532 339	38 606	38 269	99.1	1 188	3.1	37 795 34 893	
DAYTON . . . . .	197 744	17 140	17 140	100.0	531	3.1	15 362 13 508	
ELYRIA . . . . .	51 260	1 811	1 749	96.6	2	0.1	1 811 1 443	
EUCLID . . . . .	61 080	2 795	2 794	100.0	181	6.5	2 779 2 651	
HAMILTON . . . . .	66 712	3 721	3 721	100.0	1 421	38.2	3 546 3 281	
KETTERING . . . . .	68 569	2 306	2 217	96.1	61	2.6	2 222 2 222	
LAKEWOOD . . . . .	63 584	1 860	1 860	100.0	39	2.1	1 860 1 739	
LIMA . . . . .	50 263	2 333	2 297	98.5	13	0.6	2 226 1 529	
LORAIN . . . . .	81 197	2 402	2 351	97.9	44	1.8	2 319 1 348	
MANSFIELD . . . . .	56 470	3 856	3 841	99.6	841	21.8	3 081 2 548	
PARMA . . . . .	97 427	2 575	2 571	99.8	124	4.8	2 575 2 450	
SPRINGFIELD . . . . .	74 018	3 587	3 570	99.5	161	4.5	3 280 2 365	
TOLEDO . . . . .	358 677	20 520	20 003	97.5	885	4.3	19 440 18 011	
WARREN . . . . .	59 262	2 688	2 659	98.9	23	0.9	2 497 2 139	
YOUNGSTOWN . . . . .	129 875	6 849	6 847	100.0	282	4.1	6 337 5 296	
OKLAHOMA:								
LAWTON . . . . .	83 785	2 980	2 980	100.0	135	4.5	2 533 2 516	
MIDWEST . . . . .	50 341	1 685	1 685	100.0	61	3.6	1 685 1 418	
NORMAN . . . . .	62 521	2 212	2 206	99.7	388	17.5	1 613 1 473	
OKLAHOMA CITY . . . . .	371 802	17 039	17 039	100.0	919	5.4	15 635 14 344	
TULSA . . . . .	334 365	13 930	13 684	99.7	501	3.6	13 270 13 107	
OREGON:								
EUGENE . . . . .	99 220	4 478	4 430	98.9	175	3.9	4 207 3 968	
PORTLAND . . . . .	383 904	23 026	23 026	100.0	86	0.4	22 116 20 432	
SALEM . . . . .	83 738	3 878	3 811	98.3	48	1.2	3 719 1 775	
PENNSYLVANIA:								
ALLENTOWN . . . . .	103 204	3 496	3 496	100.0	125	3.6	3 357 3 357	
ALTOONA . . . . .	58 650	1 610	1 610	100.0	-	-	1 548 927	
BETHLEHEM . . . . .	72 887	2 562	2 562	100.0	100	3.9	2 530 2 530	
CHESTER . . . . .	45 775	2 796	2 796	100.0	15	0.5	2 621 1 866	
ERIE . . . . .	124 469	4 072	4 072	100.0	76	1.9	3 963 3 936	
HARRISBURG . . . . .	56 105	2 910	2 910	100.0	100	3.4	2 526 1 644	
LANCASTER . . . . .	56 954	2 043	2 043	100.0	54	2.6	1 906 1 906	
PHILADELPHIA . . . . .	1 778 345	295 448	293 144	99.2	6 474	2.2	251 582 232 439	
PITTSBURGH . . . . .	442 139	25 331	25 331	100.0	41	0.2	24 357 14 173	
READING . . . . .	78 457	3 239	3 239	100.0	273	8.4	2 788 2 144	
SCRANTON . . . . .	91 503	3 057	3 057	100.0	197	6.4	5 034 2 284	
WILKES-BARRE . . . . .	54 867	1 829	1 829	100.0	97	5.3	1 815 975	
YORK . . . . .	46 595	2 318	2 318	100.0	15	0.6	2 104 1 356	
RHODE ISLAND:								
CRANSTON . . . . .	73 523	2 867	2 867	100.0	91	3.2	2 738 1 907	
PAWTUCKET . . . . .	69 911	2 838	2 838	100.0	63	2.2	2 838 1 275	
PROVIDENCE . . . . .	160 982	9 728	9 728	100.0	32	0.3	9 531 5 907	
WARWICK . . . . .	87 450	4 416	4 416	100.0	131	3.0	4 368 3 377	
SOUTH CAROLINA:								
CHARLESTON . . . . .	59 911	3 665	3 644	99.4	298	8.1	3 612 2 844	
COLUMBIA . . . . .	110 851	4 568	4 540	99.4	14	0.3	4 507 4 440	
GREENVILLE . . . . .	57 406	2 834	2 605	91.9	159	5.6	2 717 2 479	
NORTH CHARLESTON . . . . .	58 658	1 576	1 563	99.2	150	9.5	1 574 992	

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 10. Total expenditure, and expenditure from general purpose revenue sources and own revenue sources, for criminal justice activities of 406 large city governments, fiscal year 1978—Continued

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

City <sup>1</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup>	Expenditure from all revenue sources				Expenditure from general purpose revenue sources	Expenditure from own revenue sources
		Total criminal justice expenditure	Direct expenditure		Capital outlay expenditure		
			Amount	Percent of total expenditure	Amount	Percent of total expenditure	
SOUTH DAKOTA: SIOUX FALLS . . . . .	74 927	2 564	2 564	100.0	81	3.2	2 523
TENNESSEE: CHATTANOOGA . . . . .	165 280	8 631	8 631	100.0	573	6.6	7 939
CLARKSVILLE . . . . .	57 299	1 232	1 229	99.8	60	4.9	1 221
KNOXVILLE . . . . .	184 942	7 478	7 478	100.0	88	1.2	7 088
MEMPHIS . . . . .	668 443	37 932	37 471	98.8	3 204	8.4	35 784
NASHVILLE-DAVIDSON . . . . .	428 957	32 260	32 260	100.0	1 847	5.7	29 040
TEXAS: ABILENE . . . . .	95 392	2 279	2 278	100.0	101	4.4	2 273
AMARILLO . . . . .	143 434	4 710	4 710	100.0	62	1.3	4 399
ARLINGTON . . . . .	124 646	3 695	3 695	100.0	147	4.0	3 650
AUSTIN . . . . .	323 250	13 714	13 418	97.8	368	2.7	13 087
BEAUMONT . . . . .	117 144	4 348	4 348	100.0	508	11.7	4 170
BROWNSVILLE . . . . .	71 092	1 927	1 864	96.7	293	15.2	1 836
CORPUS CHRISTI . . . . .	215 224	9 630	9 608	99.8	250	2.6	9 360
DALLAS . . . . .	844 528	56 924	56 924	100.0	482	0.8	55 278
EL PASO . . . . .	395 419	13 592	13 383	98.5	761	5.6	13 026
FORT WORTH . . . . .	367 993	19 383	19 383	100.0	145	0.7	17 162
GALVESTON . . . . .	60 149	2 803	2 803	100.0	220	7.8	2 642
GARLAND . . . . .	124 298	3 400	3 400	100.0	142	4.2	3 098
GRAND PRAIRIE . . . . .	61 017	1 620	1 620	100.0	69	4.3	1 584
HOUSTON . . . . .	1 534 960	76 728	76 728	100.0	8 507	11.1	74 778
IRVING . . . . .	105 070	3 220	3 220	100.0	409	12.7	3 087
LAREDO . . . . .	80 570	1 359	1 339	98.5	109	8.0	1 299
LONGVIEW . . . . .	54 173	1 525	1 524	99.9	313	20.5	1 455
LUBBOCK . . . . .	166 127	5 855	5 855	100.0	1 295	22.1	5 787
MESQUITE . . . . .	62 878	2 004	2 004	100.0	202	10.1	1 763
MIDLAND . . . . .	65 829	2 365	2 365	100.0	19	0.8	2 294
ODESSA . . . . .	87 624	2 317	2 317	100.0	66	2.8	2 301
PASADENA . . . . .	103 856	3 554	3 554	100.0	106	3.0	3 479
PORT ARTHUR . . . . .	61 286	2 036	2 025	99.5	166	8.2	1 907
RICHARDSON . . . . .	64 870	1 652	1 652	100.0	95	5.8	1 566
SAN ANGELO . . . . .	67 710	2 026	1 995	98.5	176	8.7	1 953
SAN ANTONIO . . . . .	793 374	33 368	32 502	97.4	1 386	4.2	31 127
TYLER . . . . .	64 097	1 674	1 666	99.5	17	1.0	1 673
WACO . . . . .	104 329	3 532	3 532	100.0	56	1.6	3 324
WICHITA FALLS . . . . .	96 884	2 530	2 530	100.0	264	10.4	2 501
UTAH: OGDEN . . . . .	68 512	4 100	4 100	100.0	361	8.8	3 858
PROVO . . . . .	55 577	1 725	1 721	99.8	134	7.8	1 645
SALT LAKE CITY . . . . .	167 404	13 614	13 562	99.6	368	2.7	13 057
VIRGINIA: ALEXANDRIA . . . . .	104 056	8 796	8 472	96.3	1 031	11.7	7 923
CHESAPEAKE . . . . .	111 136	6 271	6 081	97.0	506	8.1	4 982
HAMPTON . . . . .	126 761	10 032	9 911	98.8	4 168	41.5	8 991
LYNCHBURG . . . . .	63 221	4 020	3 913	97.3	60	1.5	3 189
NEWPORT NEWS . . . . .	142 262	8 881	8 754	98.6	366	4.1	7 346
NORFOLK . . . . .	281 962	18 389	17 755	98.6	438	2.4	15 521
PORTSMOUTH . . . . .	108 147	6 867	6 556	95.5	113	1.6	5 219
RICHMOND . . . . .	223 212	18 283	18 283	100.0	95	0.5	14 726
ROANOKE . . . . .	96 606	9 146	8 814	96.4	3 278	35.8	7 523
VIRGINIA BEACH . . . . .	235 840	12 000	12 000	100.0	1 683	14.0	10 779
WASHINGTON: BELLEVUE . . . . .	68 679	2 841	2 837	99.9	111	3.9	2 732
EVERETT . . . . .	50 505	2 601	2 392	92.0	85	3.3	2 405
SEATTLE . . . . .	488 928	37 174	35 921	96.6	333	0.9	34 736
SPokane . . . . .	175 327	7 209	6 606	91.6	93	1.3	6 198
TACOMA . . . . .	154 340	8 811	8 342	94.7	39	0.4	7 484
WEST VIRGINIA: CHARLESTON . . . . .	66 965	3 088	3 066	99.3	19	0.6	2 984
HUNTINGTON . . . . .	69 592	2 676	2 660	99.4	21	0.8	2 609
WISCONSIN: APPLETON . . . . .	60 311	1 708	1 708	100.0	44	2.6	1 624
GREEN BAY . . . . .	90 368	3 049	3 043	99.8	14	0.5	3 047
KENOSHA . . . . .	80 385	3 002	2 997	99.8	121	4.0	2 957
LA CROSSE . . . . .	47 844	1 477	1 471	99.6	52	3.5	1 475
MADISON . . . . .	168 932	8 177	8 172	99.9	244	3.0	8 121
MILWAUKEE . . . . .	653 417	47 329	47 310	100.0	733	1.5	46 476
OSHKOSH . . . . .	50 460	1 575	1 573	99.9	39	2.5	1 557
RACINE . . . . .	93 497	4 674	4 674	100.0	111	2.4	4 605
WAUWATOSA . . . . .	56 613	2 131	2 131	100.0	12	0.6	1 179
WEST ALLIS . . . . .	69 346	3 199	3 199	100.0	102	3.2	3 191

<sup>1</sup> Represents zero or rounds to zero.

<sup>2</sup> Data are based on a field compilation from records of each city government shown; see text for data limitations.

<sup>3</sup> Population as of July 1, 1977 from Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 790, December 1978.

## APPENDIX 1: DEFINITION OF TERMS

Following is a glossary of terms, concepts, and categories used in this report and comments concerning their limitations.

The definitions are those applied in the field compilation of data for the 50 States, 343 largest counties, and 406 largest cities. These definitions were necessarily summarized for inclusion in the survey questionnaire (see appendix 2) sent to governments in the mail portion of the survey.

### Government expenditure

Expenditure is all amounts of money paid out (net of any correcting transactions) other than for retirement of debt (including interest), investment in securities, extensions of loans, or agency transactions. It includes only external cash payments and excludes any intragovernmental transfers and noncash transactions, such as the provision of meals or housing of employees. It also includes any payments financed from borrowing, fund balances, intergovernmental revenue, and other current revenue. In several instances, two or more governments share the expense of maintaining a court or criminal justice agency. In these cases, the allocable direct expenditure amount is reported for each government in the appropriate category. When a government pays pensions directed to retired employees from appropriated funds, such payments are included as expenditure of the government concerned. However, State and local government contributions to retirement systems and various other employee benefits are not included in expenditure data, since the majority of governments make lump-sum contributions to plans covering all government employees and cannot report for criminal justice employees separately. Neither in government's basic accounting records (from which criminal justice expenditure figures are drawn) nor in the records of their general-coverage employee benefit systems is there usually any breakdown of amounts contributed in terms of the various agencies or functions involved. Nor has an adequate procedure for calculating the proportion of such contributions allocable to criminal justice employees been developed because of the wide variation in the coverage of various plans, employee status requirements, benefit rates, etc.

For those governments whose records reflect contributions of criminal justice employees separately, separate data were obtained. However, these data are subject to the same variation referred to above, and neither the amount nor the quality of the data reported would permit any attempt to estimate total

contributions for all similar governments in a given State. Given the problems involved, no estimation procedure seems feasible. Such data as were reported separately were therefore excluded from total criminal justice expenditures to provide a consistent data base for administering the "variable pass-through" requirement.

Expenditure is divided into two major categories by character:

1. Direct expenditure is all expenditure except that classed as intergovernmental and is further divided into two principal object categories:

a. Direct current, which includes salaries, wages, fees, and commission, purchase of supplies, materials, and contractual services.

b. Capital outlay, which includes expenditures for the three subcategories below:

**Construction:** Production of fixed works and structures, and additions, replacements and major alterations thereto undertaken either on a contract basis by private contractors or through force account construction by the employees of the government. Included are the planning and designing of specific projects, the grading, landscaping, and other site improvement, and provision of equipment and facilities that are integral parts of the structure.

**Equipment:** Purchase and installation of apparatus, furnishings, office equipment, motor vehicles and the like having an expected life of more than 5 years. This includes both additional equipment and replacements. Rentals for equipment, including rental payments that may be credited on the purchase price if purchase options are exercised, are classified as direct current expenditure. Equipment and facilities that are integral parts of constructed or purchased structures are classified respectively under construction or purchase of land and existing structures.

**Purchase of land and existing structures:** Purchase of these assets as such, purchase of rights-of-way, and title search and similar activities associated with purchase transactions.

The other object categories—interest on general debt, assistance and subsidies, and insurance benefits—are not applied to specific functions because they are not ordinarily available on a functional basis from government financial reports. In the few instances where bonded or mortgaged general indebtedness is identified for specific purposes, the interest payments are aggregated with other interest expenditures which make it virtually impossible to arrive at reliable and consistent breakouts of such data over a long period of time.

**2. Intergovernmental expenditure** is payments from one general purpose government to another, including grants-in-aid, shared revenues, payments in lieu of taxes, and amounts for services performed by one government for another on a reimbursable or cost-sharing basis (for example, payments by one government to another for boarding prisoners).

**Total expenditure** is direct and intergovernmental expenditure of a government or level of government for criminal justice activities.

**Total general expenditure** is all expenditure of a government or level of government for all government functions, including criminal justice activities, but excluding utility system expenditure, liquor store expenditure, and insurance trust expenditure. Total general expenditure shown for the local level of government includes expenditure only of general purpose governments, and excludes expenditure of special districts and school districts.

**Expenditure from general purpose revenue sources** is all expenditure financed from a government's own revenue sources (such as tax levies), from revenue received from the Federal government for general support (e.g., General Revenue Sharing, Anti-Recession Fiscal Assistance, CETA grants), and from general support payments from State and local governments. In application, expenditure from general purpose revenue is calculated for an individual local government by subtracting from its total criminal justice expenditure the following revenue items: 1) Federal and State revenues received specifically for criminal justice purposes, and 2) all revenue from other local governments remitted for criminal justice purposes. For State governments, expenditure from general purpose revenue is obtained by subtracting from the State government's total criminal justice expenditure the following: 1) Federal revenue received specifically for criminal justice purposes, and 2) an estimate of local criminal justice payments to the State government.

**Expenditure from own revenue sources** is all amounts expended by a government from its own tax levies, fees, charges, etc. Expenditure from intergovernmental revenue from whatever source is excluded.

#### Government employment

**Employees** includes all persons paid for personal services performed, including all paid officials and persons in paid leave

status, and excludes unpaid officials, persons on unpaid leave, pensioners and contractors. Under this definition are two classes:

1. **Full-time employees**, who are all persons employed during the pay period including October 15, 1978, on a full-time basis, including all full-time temporary or seasonal workers employed during this pay period, as well as persons having permanent status.

2. **Part-time employees**, who are persons employed during the pay period including October 15, 1978, on a basis other than full-time, and persons paid by more than one government.

Derived from these two classes is:

**Full-time equivalent employees**, which means the total number of employees discounted by applying average full-time earning rates. This is calculated by dividing the total payroll (full-time plus part-time) by the full-time payroll and multiplying the results by the number of full-time employees, where both full-time and part-time employees and payroll are reported. Where only part-time employees and payroll are reported, full-time equivalent employees are calculated by dividing the total part-time payroll by the average full-time salary for the particular criminal justice sector and type of government. Average full-time salary is calculated by dividing the full-time payroll by the number of full-time employees for the particular criminal justice sector and type of government.

**Payroll** is the gross payroll before deductions and includes salaries, wages, fees and commissions paid to employees as defined above for the month of October 1978.

#### Governmental functions

**Police protection** is the function of enforcing the law, preserving order, and apprehending those who violate the law, whether these activities are performed by a police department, a sheriff's department, or a special police force maintained by an agency whose prime responsibility is outside the criminal justice system, but which has a police force to perform these activities in its specialized area (geographic or functional).

Included in this activity are regular police services, the maintenance of buildings used for police purposes, and such specialized police forces (including public and private contract forces) as airport police, free and toll highway police, free and toll bridge and tunnel police, housing police, maritime police, park police, transit and other utility system police, college and university campus police, and alcoholic beverage control agents. Coroners and medical examiners are also included. Excluded are vehicular inspection and licensing, traffic safety and engineering, fish and game wardens, fire marshals, and the like.

The special police forces included in the data are only those which are part of general purpose governments. Security forces, building guards, school crossing guards, and meter maids with-

out general arrest power were excluded. Those special police forces that are part of independent school districts or special districts are not included in the data, inasmuch as these districts are not general purpose governments. However, data for selected larger special police forces of these districts are displayed in appendix 1, tables A and B of the Annual Report. In addition, data for State and local government dependent colleges and universities are displayed in tables C and D of the Annual Report.

In most States, sheriffs' departments are multifunctional agencies providing police protection, judicial, and/or correctional services. In order to allocate expenditure and employment data to the proper activity, the data for sheriffs' departments are prorated using factors developed from a special survey of sheriffs' departments conducted in 1973, or more current estimates of manpower distribution if available.

Short-term custody and detention are considered part of the police protection function. Data for institutions with authority to hold prisoners 48 hours or more are included in the "corrections" sector. Data for lockups or "tanks" holding prisoners less than 48 hours are included in the "police protection" sector.

Judicial activities encompass all civil and criminal courts and activities associated with courts such as law libraries, grand juries, petit juries, and the like. Since the names of courts with similar functions and legal jurisdiction vary from State to State and even within States, data have been categorized by types of court rather than by court name.

1. Appellate courts include courts of last resort and intermediate appellate courts. These are courts having jurisdiction of appeal and review, with original jurisdiction conferred only in special cases.

2. Courts of general jurisdiction are trial courts having unlimited original jurisdiction in civil and/or criminal cases, the names of which vary considerably. In many States, statutes either require or permit local governments to supplement the salary of State-paid judges of general jurisdiction courts. These judges were counted as part-time employees at both the State and local levels when actually receiving a check from both governments.

3. Courts of limited jurisdiction are courts whose legal jurisdiction covers only a particular class of cases or cases where the amount in controversy is below a prescribed sum or is subject to specific exceptions. Included under this category are probate courts, juvenile courts and other courts of limited jurisdiction.

4. Miscellaneous judicial includes data on judicial activities that could not be reported under any of the above court categories, such as judicial councils and conferences, court administration offices (where identifiable), law libraries, jury commissions, and grand juries.


Legal services and prosecution includes the civil and criminal justice activities of the attorneys general, district attorneys, State's attorneys, and their variously named equivalents; corporation counsels, solicitors, and legal departments with various names. It includes providing legal advice to the chief executives and subordinate departmental officers, representation of the government in lawsuits, and the prosecution of accused violators of criminal law. These activities are included whether performed by one office or several, because in some jurisdictions a single officer provides all legal services, whereas in others a prosecutor's office handles only criminal matters, and a separate attorney's office performs all civil legal services. The operations of various investigative agencies having full arrest powers and attached to offices of attorneys general, district attorneys, or their variously named equivalents are also included.

Public defense includes legal counsel and representation in either criminal or civil proceedings as provided by public defenders, and other government programs that pay the fees of court-appointed counsel. These include court-paid fees to individually retained counsel, fees paid by the court to court-appointed counsel, government contributions to private legal aid societies and bar association-sponsored programs, and the activities of an established public defender office or program. Employment data are included only for public defenders' offices, because fee-paid counselors are not considered government employees, nor are counselors working for bar associations or legal aid societies.

Corrections is that function of government involving the confinement and rehabilitation of adults and juveniles convicted of offenses against the law and the confinement of persons suspected of a crime and awaiting adjudication. Data for institutions with authority to hold prisoners 48 hours or more are included in this sector. Data for lockups or "tanks" holding prisoners less than 48 hours are included in "Police Protection." Correction includes the operation of prisons, reformatories, jails, houses of correction, and other institutions. It also includes institutions, facilities and programs exclusively for the confinement of the criminally insane or for the examination, evaluation, classification, and assignment of inmates and institutions and programs for the confinement, treatment, and rehabilitation of drug addicts and alcoholics if the institution or program is administered by a correction agency of the criminal justice system. Pardon boards and parole and probation agencies, including resettlement or halfway houses for those not in need of institutionalization, are included in the correction sector as a separate subcategory.

Other criminal justice activities, shown in some tables, includes expenditure or employment data that are not elsewhere classified, that cut across more than one category, or that are not allocable to separate categories; e.g., expenditure on a general curriculum in educational institutions, the operation of State criminal justice agencies, crime commissions, etc. Such data are included in the totals, where they are not shown separately.

## APPENDIX 2: SURVEY FORMS

<p><b>IMPORTANT - PLEASE READ</b></p> <p>Please read the definitions on page 3 and the enclosed supplemental instructions before completing the questionnaire.</p> <p>If you would like to receive a free copy of the current report, Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System 1977, or wish to other LEAA reports, complete and return the enclosed mailer, which requires no postage.</p>	<p>FORM CJ-6 (111-7-79)</p> <p><b>SURVEY OF EXPENDITURE AND EMPLOYMENT FOR CIVIL AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACTIVITIES OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS</b></p> <p>In correspondence pertaining to this report, please refer to the identification number above your address</p>
<p>RETURN TO</p> 	<p>Bureau of the Census 1201 East Tenth Street Jeffersonville, Indiana 47132</p> <p>(Please correct any error in name and address including ZIP code)</p>

FROM THE DIRECTOR,  
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS


On behalf of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, the Bureau of the Census annually collects public expenditure and employment data for six criminal justice functions: police protection, judicial, legal services and prosecution, public defense, corrections, and other criminal justice. Your cooperation in completing this year's questionnaire will be appreciated.

The data collected in this survey are used by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in implementing and administering the formula grant programs of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 as amended. The data are published annually in a report entitled **Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System**.

If there are any items on this questionnaire for which the answer cannot be obtained from available records, reasonable estimates are requested. Please indicate such estimates with an asterisk (\*). The duplicate copy of this questionnaire is for your files. The addressed copy should be returned, preferably within 3 weeks, in the enclosed preaddressed envelope. If you have any problems in completing this questionnaire, please call collect for assistance on (301) 763-7825 or (301) 763-2843.

This report is authorized by the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended (42 USC 3701). While you are not legally required to respond, your participation is needed to make the results of this survey comprehensive, accurate, and timely.

Sincerely,



VINCENT P. BARABBA

Enclosures

**CIVIL  
AND  
CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
ACTIVITIES**

*(Please review activities below  
and refer to supplemental instructions  
prior to completing this questionnaire)*

**Part I – EMPLOYMENT AND PAYROLL**

Enter employment and payroll data for your government's one pay period which included October 15, 1979.

Do NOT report ANNUAL payroll data.

Count each employee only once – in the activity where that person works the largest part of the time.

**PAY PERIOD INTERVAL**

Mark one box to indicate the pay period interval for which all or most of the employees are paid. Report for both full- and part-time employees.

**FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES      PART-TIME EMPLOYEES**

- 1  Monthly  
 2  Twice a month  
 3  Every 2 weeks  
 4  Weekly  
 5  Other – Specify ↗

- 1  Monthly  
 2  Twice a month  
 3  Every 2 weeks  
 4  Weekly  
 5  Other – Specify ↗

**Part II – EXPENDITURE**

Mark (X) appropriate box to indicate your government's fiscal year (12-month accounting period) and report data for this period only, even though a more recent one may be available.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> July 1978–June 1979   | <input type="checkbox"/> Jan. 1978–Dec. 1978  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> June 1978–May 1979    | <input type="checkbox"/> Dec. 1977–Nov. 1978  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> May 1978–April 1979   | <input type="checkbox"/> Nov. 1977–Oct. 1978  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> April 1978–March 1979 | <input type="checkbox"/> Oct. 1977–Sept. 1978 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> March 1978–Feb. 1979  | <input type="checkbox"/> Sept. 1977–Aug. 1978 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Feb. 1978–Jan. 1979   | <input type="checkbox"/> Aug. 1977–July 1978  |

	Number of employees (1)	Gross payroll amount (for the one pay period which included October 15, 1979) (Omit cents) \$	Number of employees (3)	Gross payroll amount (for the one pay period which included October 15, 1979) (Omit cents) \$	Annual salaries and all current operating expenses. Exclude employer contributions for employee benefits and enter in column (9). (5)	Annual expenditures for construction, equipment, and land (6)	Annual payments to cities, counties, and towns (7)	Annual payments to the State government (8)	GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS FOR EMPLOYEE BENEFITS FICA, PERS, insurance, workmen's comp., etc. Exclude employee contributions. (9)
<b>1. POLICE PROTECTION – All police activities, including special police force units. Include also coroners and medical examiners. Exclude jails holding adults or juveniles beyond arraignment (usually more than 48 hours) and report under "Corrections." Exclude also school crossing guards.</b>									
a. Total personnel (lines b plus c)		\$		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
b. Sworn police personnel only (i.e., having general power to arrest)		\$		\$					
c. Non-sworn police personnel only (i.e., support personnel who do not have general arrest power)		\$		\$					
<b>2. JUDICIAL – All civil and criminal courts and court-related activities. Include:</b>									
Judges and staff (law clerks, court reporters, etc.)		\$		\$					
Clerk of Court and staff		\$		\$					
Other current operating expenditure (e.g., jury fees, law library, etc.)		\$		\$					
Exclude probation and parole and report under "Corrections."									

<b>3. LEGAL SERVICES AND PROSECUTION</b> Prosecuting attorneys' offices, legal departments, and all attorneys providing legal services for your government. Includes: Prosecutor and staff Legal Advisor and staff Attorneys on retainer or fees All other legal expenses Include annual retainers and/or fees paid to private attorneys/law firms in column (5) only. Do not include as employees.	\$		\$										
<b>4. PUBLIC DEFENSE</b> — Public defenders' offices. Include fees paid to court-appointed counsel and contributions to private legal aid societies in column (5) only. Do not include court-appointed private attorneys as employees.	\$		\$										
<b>5. CORRECTIONS</b>	\$		\$										
a. Total (lines b, c, and d)	\$		\$										
b. Jails, prisons, reformatories, detention homes, halfway houses, and the like, holding adults or juveniles beyond arraignment (usually for more than 48 hours). Exclude institutions solely for dependent or neglected children.	\$		\$										
c. Probation and parole agencies and programs. Include probation and parole programs administered by the courts.	\$		\$										
d. Other corrections including nonresidential treatment programs for adults and juveniles. Include alcohol and narcotic addiction programs only if administered by the correctional authority.	\$		\$										
<b>6. OTHER CRIMINAL JUSTICE</b> — Other criminal justice activities (e.g., crime councils, criminal justice planning agencies) not reported above. Please list each activity separately in the spaces provided below.	\$		\$										

<b>Part III – INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUE – Enter all revenue received from other governments for criminal justice activities during the fiscal year marked above.</b>		
<b>Item A – Direct revenue received from the Federal Government for the above activities</b>	<b>Item B – Revenue received from the State government for the above activities</b>	<b>Item C – Revenue received from other local governments for the above activities</b>
<p>Enter only revenue received directly from the Federal Government. Do not enter amounts from the Federal Government received through the State or any of its departments or agencies.</p> <p><b>1. General revenue used for criminal justice purposes</b></p> <p>a. General revenue sharing/Anti-recession aid (only that portion used for criminal justice purposes) \$</p> <p>b. CETA funds used for criminal justice purposes ..... \$</p> <p>c. <b>TOTAL (add lines a and b)</b> ..... \$</p> <p><b>2. Amounts received specifically for criminal justice purposes (i.e., "dedicated" revenues)</b></p> <p>a. LEAA discretionary grants ..... \$</p> <p>b. Reimbursements received from the Federal Government for criminal justice services rendered by your government, e.g., boarding of Federal prisoners ..... \$</p> <p>c. Other "dedicated" revenues used for criminal justice purposes (e.g., Alcohol Safety Act Program (ASAP) — <i>Specify</i>) ..... \$</p> <p><b>d. TOTAL (add lines a, b, and c)</b> ..... \$</p>		
<p>Enter amounts from the Federal Government received through the State or any of its departments or agencies and amounts received from State-funded programs; also include reimbursements by the State for criminal justice services or activities provided by your government to the State by law or under contract.</p> <p>1. LEAA block action and planning grants passed through the State government ..... \$</p> <p>2. Other Federal criminal justice revenue passed through the State government ..... \$</p> <p>3. State-funded criminal justice program grants ..... \$</p> <p>4. Reimbursements received from the State government for criminal justice services rendered by your government ..... \$</p> <p>5. Other criminal justice grants — <i>Specify</i> _____ \$</p> <p>_____ \$</p> <p>_____ \$</p> <p><b>6. TOTAL</b> → \$</p>		
<p>Enter amounts from the Federal or State governments received through other local governments; and amounts received from other local governments as reimbursement for criminal justice services or activities provided by your government to other local governments by law or under contract. Do not report CETA funds here but only under item A, 1b.</p> <p>EXAMPLE: Payments received from another county, city, or town for police services rendered (such as patrol).</p> <p>1. Reimbursements received from other local governments for criminal justice services rendered by your government ..... \$</p> <p>2. Other — <i>Specify</i> _____ \$</p> <p>_____ \$</p> <p>_____ \$</p> <p><b>3. TOTAL</b> → \$</p>		

OTHER CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACTIVITIES — List activities included on line 6 above.		
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
Name  Data supplied by	Position	
Official address (Number and street, city, State, ZIP code)	Telephone	
	Area code	Number
		Extension
CERTIFICATION — This report is substantially accurate and has been prepared in accordance with instructions.		
Signature of financial officer	Title and organization	Date

FORM CJ-6 (11-7-79)

## APPENDIX 2—Continued

**DEFINITIONS FOR COMPLETING PARTS I AND II, COLUMNS (1) THROUGH (9)****► Part I — EMPLOYMENT AND PAYROLL**

**EMPLOYEES** — All persons paid by your government for services performed, including all paid officials, salaried workers, other persons in paid leave status and persons employed by your government under emergency or supplemental programs, e.g., Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA), anti-recession aid, etc. Exclude unpaid officials, persons on unpaid leave, pensioners, contractors and their employees, and persons paid entirely by another government for services performed for your government.

**Full-time employees, column (1)** — Persons employed on a full-time basis during the one pay period which included October 15, 1979. Include all full-time temporary or seasonal workers employed during this pay period.

**Part-time employees, column (3)** — Persons employed on a part-time basis during the one pay period which included October 15, 1979. Include here all persons working for your government who received part of their pay from another government (e.g., with supplemental check).

**PAYROLL, columns (2) and (4)** — Gross payroll before deductions, including salaries, wages, fees, or commissions earned during the one pay period which included October 15, 1979, by employees as defined above. If some employees are paid on a basis different from the predominant pay period, please include amounts for them on an adjusted basis.

**► Part II — EXPENDITURE**

**CURRENT OPERATIONS, column (5)** — Annual expenditure for salaries and wages of your government's officers and employees, including overtime, termination, and retroactive pay; and for the purchase of supplies, materials, and contractual services from individuals and firms in the private sector, e.g., attorney retainers or fees to court-appointed counsel, and any other current operating expenditure.

**Exclude capital outlay and report in column (6)** — Also exclude expenditures for debt retirement, securities investment, loan extensions, and within-government transactions. Exclude employer contributions for employee benefits and report in column (9).

**CAPITAL OUTLAY, column (6)** — Direct expenditure for contract or force account construction of buildings and other fixed improvements, and for the purchase of equipment, land, and existing structures.

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL EXPENDITURE** — All money paid to other governments as fiscal aid or payment for services rendered, or for contracts or compacts with another government (e.g., purchase of police services or care and boarding of prisoners in another government's jail). Exclude money paid to another government for the purchase of commodities, property or utility services, any taxes imposed and paid as such, and contributions for social insurance.

**Payments to cities, counties, and towns, column (7)** — Exclude payments to special purpose governments such as special districts or independent school districts.

**Payments to the State government, column (8)** — Payments of your government to the State government or any of its departments or agencies.

**GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS FOR EMPLOYEE BENEFITS, column (9)** — Any employer contributions, readily separable by activity, to the Federal Social Security program. State and local retirement systems, commercial or mutual life insurance plans, workmen's compensation funds; and premiums paid by your government for health, hospital, disability, and other insurance programs. Exclude payments made directly to individuals and contributions made by employees to any of the above programs.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS

**USER EVALUATION**

**Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System, 1978. Summary Report**

Dear Reader:

We have provided an evaluation form below for whatever opinions you wish to express about this report. Please cut out both pages, staple them together on one corner, and fold so that the address appears on the outside. After folding, use tape to seal closed.

Thank you for your help.

1. For what purpose did you use this report?

2. For that purpose, the report -

Met some of my needs       Met all of my needs       Met none of my needs

3. What particular types of data in the report did you use?

4. If the report did not meet your needs, what changes would increase its usefulness to you?

CUT ALONG THIS LINE

**5. What additional types of data, if any, would you like to see collected for agencies within the justice system?**

**6. Which parts of this report, if any, were difficult to understand or use? How could they be improved?**

**7. Would a different format have been more useful to you?  
If yes, please suggest a more useful organization of the material.**

**8. Can you point out specific parts of the test or table notes that are not clear or additional terms that need to be defined?**

**9. In What capacity did you use this report?**

- Researcher
- Educator
- Student
- Criminal justice agency employee
- Government employee other than criminal justice – *Specify* \_\_\_\_\_
- Other – *Specify* \_\_\_\_\_

**CONTINUED**

**1 OF 2**

10. If you used this report as a government employee, please indicate the level of government.

- Federal
- State
- County

City

Other - *Specify*

11. If you used this report as a justice agency employee, please indicate the sector in which you work.

- Law enforcement (police)
- Legal services and prosecution
- Public or private defense services
- Courts or court administration
- Probation

Corrections

Parole

Criminal justice planning agency

Other criminal justice agency - *Specify type*

12. If you used this report as a justice employee, please indicate the type of position you hold.

*Mark all that apply*

- Agency or institution administrator
- General program planner/evaluator/analyst
- Operations or management planner/evaluator/analyst
- Budget planner/evaluator/analyst

Program or project manager

Statistician

Other - *Specify*

13. Additional comments

CUT ALONG THIS LINE

**OPTIONAL**

Name	Telephone	
	(      )	
Number and street		
City	State	ZIP Code

(Fold here)

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**  
**Bureau of Justice Statistics**  
**Washington, D.C. 20531**

PLACE  
STAMP  
HERE

**BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS**  
**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**  
**WASHINGTON, D.C. 20531**

(Fold here)

**NCJRS REGISTRATION**

The National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) abstracts documents published in the criminal justice field. Persons who are registered with the Reference Service receive announcements of documents in their stated fields of interest and order forms for free copies of Bureau of Justice Statistics publications. If you are not registered with the Reference Service, and wish to be, please provide your name and mailing address below and check the appropriate box.

Name	Telephone (      )		
Number and street			
City	State	ZIP Code	
<input type="checkbox"/> Please send me a NCJRS registration form. <input type="checkbox"/> Please send me the reports listed below.			

— — — (Fold here) — — —

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**  
Bureau of Justice Statistics  
Washington, D.C. 20531

PLACE  
STAMP  
HERE

**User Services Department: 2**  
**National Criminal Justice Reference Service**  
**Bureau of Justice Statistics**  
**U.S. Department of Justice**  
**Box 6000**  
**Rockville, Maryland 20850**

— — — (Fold here) — — —

If you wish to receive copies of any of the Bureau of Justice Statistics Reports listed on the reverse side, please list them below.

---

---

---

---

---

## Bureau of Justice Statistics Reports

Single copies are available at no charge from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service, Box 6000, Rockville, Md. 20850. Multiple copies are for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

### National Crime Survey:

Criminal Victimization in the United States (annual):

Summary Findings of 1977-78 Changes in Crime and of Trends Since 1973, NCJ-61368  
A Description of Trends from 1973 to 1977, NCJ-59898  
1978 (final report), NCJ-66480  
1977, NCJ-58725  
1976, NCJ-49543  
1975, NCJ-44593  
1974, NCJ-39467  
1973, NCJ-34732

The Cost of Negligence: Losses from Preventable Household Burglaries, NCJ-53527

Intimate Victims: A Study of Violence Among Friends and Relatives, NCJ-62319

Crime and Seasonality, No. -64818

Criminal Victimization of New York State Residents, 1974-77, NCJ-66481

Criminal Victimization Surveys in 13 American cities (summary report, 1 vol.), NCJ-18471

Boston, NCJ-34818

Buffalo, NCJ-34820

Cincinnati, NCJ-34819

Houston, NCJ-34821

Miami, NCJ-34822

Milwaukee, NCJ-34823

Minneapolis, NCJ-34824

New Orleans, NCJ-34825

Oakland, NCJ-34826

Pittsburgh, NCJ-34827

San Diego, NCJ-34828

San Francisco, NCJ-34829

Washington, D.C., NCJ-34830

Public Attitudes About Crime (13 vols.):

Boston, NCJ-46235

Buffalo, NCJ-46236

Cincinnati, NCJ-46237

Houston, NCJ-46238

Miami, NCJ-46239

Milwaukee, NCJ-46240

Minneapolis, NCJ-46241

New Orleans, NCJ-46242

Oakland, NCJ-46243

Pittsburgh, NCJ-46244

San Diego, NCJ-46245

San Francisco, NCJ-46246

Washington, D.C., NCJ-46247

Criminal Victimization Surveys in Chicago, Detroit, Los Angeles, New York, and Philadelphia: A Comparison of 1972 and 1974 Findings, NCJ-36360

Criminal Victimization Surveys in the Nation's Five Largest Cities: National Crime Panel Surveys in Chicago, Detroit, Los Angeles, New York, and Philadelphia, 1972, NCJ-16909

Criminal Victimization Surveys in Eight American Cities: A Comparison of 1971/72 and 1974/75 Findings—National Crime Surveys in Atlanta, Baltimore, Cleveland, Dallas, Denver, Newark, Portland, and St. Louis, NCJ-36361

Crimes and Victims: A Report on the Dayton/San Jose Pilot Survey of Victimization, NCJ-013314

Indicators of Crime and Criminal Justice: Quantitative Studies, NCJ-62349

### Applications of the National Crime Survey Victimization and Attitude Data:

Public Opinion About Crime: The Attitudes of Victims and Nonvictims in Selected Cities, NCJ-41336

Local Victim Surveys: A Review of the Issues, NCJ-39973

The Police and Public Opinion: An Analysis of Victimization and Attitude Data from 13 American Cities, NCJ-42018

An Introduction to the National Crime Survey, NCJ-43732

Compensating Victims of Violent Crime: Potential Costs and Coverage of a National Program, NCJ-43387

Crime Against Persons in Urban, Suburban, and Rural Areas: A Comparative Analysis of Victimization Rates, NCJ-53551

Rape Victimization in 26 American Cities, NCJ-55878

Criminal Victimization in Urban Schools, NCJ-56396

### National Prisoner Statistics:

Capital Punishment (annual):

1978, NCJ-59897

1979 advance report, NCJ-17930

Prisoners in State and Federal Institutions on December 31:

1978, NCJ-64671

1979 advance report, NCJ-66522

Census of State Correctional Facilities, 1974 advance report, NCJ-25642

Profile of State Prison Inmates: Socio-demographic Findings from the 1974 Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities, NCJ-58257

Census of Prisoners in State Correctional Facilities, 1973, NCJ-34729

Census of Jails and Survey of Jail Inmates, 1978, preliminary report, NCJ-55172

Profile of Inmates of Local Jails: Socio-demographic Findings from the 1978 Survey of Inmates of Local Jails, NCJ-65412

The Nation's Jails: A report on the census of jails from the 1972 Survey of Inmates of Local Jails, NCJ-19067

Survey of Inmates of Local Jails, 1972, advance report, NCJ-13313

### Uniform Parole Reports:

Parole in the United States (annual):

1978, NCJ-58722

1976 and 1977, NCJ-49702

Characteristics of the Parole Population, 1978, NCJ-66479

A National Survey of Parole-Related Legislation Enacted During the 1979 Legislative Session, NCJ-64218

### Children in Custody: Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facility Census

1977 advance report:

Census of Public Juvenile Facilities, NCJ-60967

Census of Private Juvenile Facilities, NCJ-60968

1975 (final report), NCJ-58139

1974, NCJ-57946

1973, NCJ-44777

1971, NCJ-13403

### Myths and Realities About Crime: A Nontechnical Presentation of Selected Information from the National Prisoner Statistics Program and the National Crime Survey, NCJ-46249

### State and Local Probation and Parole Systems, NCJ-41335

### State and Local Prosecution and Civil Attorney Systems, NCJ-41334

### National Survey of Court Organization:

1977 Supplement to State Judicial Systems, NCJ-40022

1975 Supplement to State Judicial Systems, NCJ-29433

1971 (full report), NCJ-11427

### State Court Model Statistical Dictionary, NCJ-62320

### State Court Caseload Statistics:

The State of the Art, NCJ-46934

Annual Report, 1975, NCJ-51885

Annual Report, 1976, NCJ-56599

### A Cross-City Comparison of Felony Case Processing, NCJ-55171

### Trends in Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System, 1971-77

(annual), NCJ-57463

### Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System (annual)

1978 Summary Report, NCJ-65483

1978 final report, NCJ-66482

1977 final report, NCJ-53206

### Dictionary of Criminal Justice Data Terminology:

Terms and Definitions Proposed for Interstate and National Data Collection and Exchange, NCJ-36747

### Criminal Justice Agencies in the U.S.:

Summary Report of the National Criminal Justice Agency List, NCJ-65560

### Criminal Justice Agencies in Region

1: Conn., Maine, Mass., N.H., R.I., Vt., NCJ-17930

2: N.J., N.Y., NCJ-17931

3: Del., D.C., Md., Pa., Va., W.Va., NCJ-17932

4: Ala., Ga., Fla., Ky., Miss., N.C., S.C., Tenn., NCJ-17933

5: Ill., Ind., Mich., Minn., Ohio, Wis., NCJ-17934

6: Ark., La., N.Mex., Okla., Tex., NCJ-17935

7: Iowa, Kans., Mo., Nebr., NCJ-17936

8: Colo., Mont., N.Dak., S.Dak., Utah, Wyo., NCJ-17937

9: Ariz., Calif., Hawaii, Nev., NCJ-15151

10: Alaska, Idaho, Oreg., Wash., NCJ-17938

### Utilization of Criminal Justice Statistics Project:

Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics

1979 (annual), NCJ-59679

Public Opinion Regarding Crime, Criminal Justice, and Related Topics, NCJ-17419

New Directions in Processing of Juvenile Offenders: The Denver Model, NCJ-17420

Who Gets Detained? An Empirical Analysis of the Pre-Adjudicatory Detention of Juveniles in Denver, NCJ-17417

Juvenile Dispositions: Social and Legal Factors Related to the Processing of Denver Delinquency Cases, NCJ-17418

Offender-Based Transaction Statistics: New Directions in Data Collection and Reporting, NCJ-22645

Sentencing of California Felony Offenders, NCJ-29646

The Judicial Processing of Assault and Burglary Offenders in Selected California Counties, NCJ-29644

Pre-Adjudicatory Detention in Three Juvenile Courts, NCJ-34730

Delinquency Dispositions: An Empirical Analysis of Processing Decisions in Three Juvenile Courts, NCJ-34734

The Patterns and Distribution of Assault Incident Characteristics Among Social Areas, NCJ-40025

Patterns of Robbery Characteristics and Their Occurrence Among Social Areas, NCJ-40026

### Crime-Specific Analysis:

The Characteristics of Burglary Incidents, NCJ-42093

An Empirical Examination of Burglary Offender Characteristics, NCJ-43131

An Empirical Examination of Burglary Offenders and Offense Characteristics, NCJ-42476

Sources of National Criminal Justice Statistics: An Annotated Bibliography, NCJ-45006

Federal Criminal Sentencing: Perspectives of Analysis and a Design for Research, NCJ-33683

### Variations in Federal Criminal Sentences:

A Statistical Assessment at the National Level, NCJ-33684

Federal Sentencing Patterns: A Study of Geographical Variations, NCJ-33685

Predicting Sentences in Federal Courts: The Feasibility of a National Sentencing Policy, NCJ-33686

**END**