

## **SUPPORTING STATEMENT**

### **2020 Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) Survey**

#### **Overview**

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) requests clearance to conduct the core 2020 Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) Survey. In each iteration of LEMAS, BJS draws a nationally-representative sample of state and local law enforcement agencies from its census of state and local law enforcement agencies, administers the LEMAS instrument, and produces national-level estimates about the organization and characteristics of law enforcement agencies. The proposed survey seeks to better meet the needs of the law enforcement community, while maintaining the ability to trend over time with the previous LEMAS waves. The 2020 LEMAS sample will consist of about 3,500 state, county and local general purpose law enforcement agencies (LEAs) in the United States, will be nationally-representative, and will preserve continuity between previous LEMAS waves on critical data elements about LEAs nationwide.

The LEMAS sampling frame consists of all state, county and local general purpose LEAs (i.e., any public agency with one or more sworn officers whose patrol and enforcement responsibilities are primarily delimited by the boundaries of a municipal, county, or state government); the current frame has a roster of about 14,993 such agencies. The LEMAS excludes special purpose agencies (e.g., campus law enforcement, transportation, natural resources). Since 1987, BJS has implemented 10 waves of LEMAS surveys. These surveys collected information about the changing aspects of law enforcement organization, resources, functions, personnel, salaries, training, collective bargaining, information systems, policies, and use of technology. Some topics have been covered in each wave; other topics have been dropped due to the changing priorities of law enforcement or difficulty in obtaining reliable answers. The LEMAS substantive domains currently include: the size, staffing, and specialization of agencies; personnel attributes including sex and race/ethnicity of sworn employees; hiring and training practices; measures of officer and agency activity such as the volume of calls for service; the extent to which agencies adhere to core principles of community policing; agency authorized and provided equipment; the adoption of technology; and agency policies and procedures.

The Census of State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies (CSLLEA; OMB 1121-0346) has been conducted approximately every four years since 1992 and broadly serves as the universe list for the LEMAS sample. The CSLLEA provides the basis for distinguishing among various types of agencies by asking about the functions performed by the agencies (e.g., law enforcement, investigative, court security, jail management, and process serving). The CSLLEA identifies general purpose agencies and a variety of special purpose agencies. The LEMAS sample is based on the universe of general purpose agencies. The 2018 CSLLEA will help to inform the frame for the 2020 LEMAS. However, the 2018 CSLLEA had a 90% response rate so we know there are agencies that would qualify for the LEMAS that did not respond. Similar to the 2016 LEMAS, the Law Enforcement Agency Roster (LEAR) will serve as the frame for the 2020 LEMAS. The LEAR will be updated for 2020 in order to incorporate updates from the 2016 LEMAS, 2018 CSLLEA and 2018 FBI Police Employee Data (OMB 1110-0004).

A review of BJS programs by the National Research Council (NRC) recognized the crucial role the LEMAS surveys play in the BJS statistical programs, but criticized the program for its limited focus on administrative and managerial characteristics of agencies (Groves and Cork, 2009). The NRC report recommended several changes to this program. First, the academy recommended that BJS law enforcement surveys should collect more information about behavior and performance of law enforcement staff and agencies. Second, the NRC urged BJS to enhance the use of agency identifiers to facilitate the linkage of agency-specific organizational characteristics with agency specific-crime statistics and with the demographic characteristics of the jurisdictions served by each agency. Third, noting the lengthy instrument and the irregular schedule of past LEMAS surveys, the NRC recommended that BJS adopt a “core and supplement” design for a regularly scheduled program of agency surveys. The NRC suggested the consistent use of a limited number of core items that would be integrated with thematic supplements that would vary from wave to wave.

The 2016 LEMAS was the first step to fully implementing the core and supplement model. The 2016 core LEMAS mirrored more closely to the 1997-2007 administrations of the LEMAS. The survey included key items with long-term historical trends in past LEMAS administrations. Additionally, a LEMAS supplement on body-worn cameras was conducted in 2016 and a second supplement on forensic science services was tested. The 2020 LEMAS will take the core and supplement model a step further by tailoring the instrument by agency type. BJS conducted a series of expert meetings in 2018 to discuss the 2016 LEMAS and how it could further benefit law enforcement practitioners. Two themes were noted from this meeting: 1) The LEMAS items had largely been unchanged for 30 years but law enforcement has significantly evolved over this time, and 2) The instrument was targeting multiple types of law enforcement agencies but these agencies have unique needs and some of the items were not applicable. As a result of the expert panel suggestions, the 2020 LEMAS will have two instruments: one of local and primary state police departments and one for sheriffs’ offices. Both instruments will contain a core set of items that can be used to measure trends over time and can be used to describe general purpose agencies. However, the instruments will also be supplemented with items specific to agency type. Going forward, this structure could allow for the LEMAS to be administered to special purpose agencies.

In addition to the expert panel meetings in 2018, BJS conducted cognitive interviews on the 2020 LEMAS core survey instruments (OMB 1121-0339). Cognitive interviewing was conducted October 2019-January 2020. A total of 20 agencies (11 local police and 9 sheriffs’ offices) were included in the cognitive testing. Based on reviewer feedback, questions and instructions were clarified and two items were dropped or consolidated to reduce confusion or burden. These changes are discussed further in Section 5.

BJS will use web-based data collection in the 2020 LEMAS to promote high response rates, rapid data collection, and simplified data verification and report preparation. The survey administration will use best practices in survey data collection technology to establish shorter cycles for future surveys of LEAs (e.g., LEMAS supplemental surveys, CSLLEA). BJS has selected the Research Triangle Institute (RTI) International to act as the data collection agent for this program. RTI will collect various paradata (e.g., respondent response mode, time required to answer each question, total time for survey completion, the time interval between respondent

access to the survey and completion of the survey, etc.) that will allow BJS to evaluate the impact of promoting online data collection. This information will also enable BJS to develop strategies to encourage greater online data collection for future LEMAS surveys.

## **A. Justification**

### **1. Necessity of Information Collection**

Under Title 34, United States Code, Section 10132 (Attachment 1), the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) is directed to collect and analyze statistical information concerning the operation of the criminal justice system at the federal, state, and local levels. State, county and local general purpose LEAs are the primary point of entry into the criminal justice system. LEAs play a crucial gate keeping function in receiving reports of offenses, investigating crimes and making arrests.

In the United States, local LEAs are numerous and diverse. In 2016, there were 15,322 local police agencies, sheriff's departments and primary state police agencies. Almost three-quarters of these organizations had fewer than 25 sworn personnel (71%) but the largest 374 (2.4%) agencies employed half of all sworn personnel. The functions, policies, and practices of local and county LEAs are determined and implemented by local governments with limited state-level coordination and oversight. State LEAs are few in number, large in size and typically emphasize a limited range of law enforcement functions, such as traffic enforcement. Because of the diversity and number of independent state, local and county governments, there is no organizational basis for systematically collecting and regularly reporting changes in the characteristics of LEAs or the personnel those agencies employ, except for BJS-sponsored surveys of LEAs.<sup>1</sup>

In 2016, approximately \$142 billion was spent by federal, state and local governments on police-related activities.<sup>2</sup> Sizeable investments by local governments have led to new debates about the appropriate size, function, and control over these activities in the current economic and social climate. Given this significant scope and expenditures, collecting data on issues related to law enforcement personnel and functions is of critical concern to BJS. Developing and maintaining an accurate picture of the nation's law enforcement workforce is paramount to understanding the current state of policing in the United States. As such, the LEMAS continues to serve as the most comprehensive survey on law enforcement agencies in the U.S. Data collected through LEMAS are imperative to understanding law enforcement organizations.

---

<sup>1</sup> The FBI collects some data on police personnel in its Uniform Crime Reporting Program, but these data differ from those collected by the LEMAS surveys in a number of ways that will be discussed later in this statement.

<sup>2</sup> Justice Expenditure and Employment Extracts 2016 - Preliminary, NCJ 254126.

The 2020 LEMAS focuses on a core set of questions about the characteristics of LEAs.<sup>3</sup> As mentioned previously, the LEMAS covers a number of law enforcement organizational topics such as personnel, policies, procedures, equipment, technology, and operations. The majority of these items have been asked on past LEMAS surveys and will allow for trend comparisons. Attachment 2 provides a list of each survey item by category domain and whether the specific item has been included in prior BJS LEA surveys.

Some questions in the 2016 LEMAS did not make it into the 2020 LEMAS instrument due to poor past performance and recommendations from the expert panel and cognitive testing because some content was determined to be out of date, some questions led to inconsistent reporting in 2016, some items needed to be dropped in order to decrease the overall burden. Based on recommendations from the expert panel meetings, a number of questions in the technology, equipment and community policing sections were modified or dropped.

Refining these items has allowed for the introduction of new items pertaining to current issues impacting law enforcement. Over the past couple of years, the issue of hiring and retention has consistently been highlighted as a concern in law enforcement. This was a primary topic suggested by the expert panel meetings. In 2008, the CSLLEA included a supplement on hiring and retention that was administered to a sample of 3,500 agencies. Many of these items overlapped with suggested items by the expert panel and have been included on the 2020 LEMAS. Additionally, a couple of new items suggested by the expert panel were included (e.g., total weeks to hire, K-9s, and for sheriffs population served and service area).

The 2020 LEMAS instruments were modified based on recommendations from the expert panel and BJS priorities. As mentioned previously, the most substantive change to the 2020 LEMAS structure is the development of two instruments: one for local and primary state police departments and one for sheriffs' offices. Both instruments contain the same set of core items which include sections IV-VIII on the local police/primary state police survey (LP) and sections V-IX on the sheriffs' offices survey (SO). Sections I-III (LP) and I-IV (SO) are unique to the agency types. The first page of the 2020 LEMAS instruments captures basic descriptive information about the name, address and agency ORI code needed to link these responses to past and future law enforcement organizational surveys. Information about the person completing the survey is also captured.

### ***Core Items***

#### **Selection and Training (5 items): Section IV (LP) and Section V (SO)**

Section IV (LP) and Section V (SO) represents the first section of the core items and are related to selection of new officer recruits and training. All of these items have been included on the

---

<sup>3</sup> The past LEMAS surveys have not, and the proposed 2020 LEMAS will not, collect information about the nature of criminal behavior or injuries to sworn personnel. These two information needs are addressed by the FBI. In its Uniform Crime Reporting Program and Supplemental Homicide Reporting Program (SHR), the FBI collects detailed information about the nature of crimes reported to state and local LEAs. In its Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted (LEOKA) and Supplemental Homicide Reporting (SHR) Programs, the FBI collects detailed information about the number of law enforcement officers killed or assaulted. The 2020 LEMAS will include FBI ORI codes that can be used to link LEMAS data on agency characteristics with FBI data on known offenses, arrest, as well as officers killed or assaulted.

LEMAS surveys since 2000. Expert panel members felt that selection and training were important items to retain on the core. BJS asks many questions about training for new recruits in its Census of Law Enforcement Training Academies (OMB No. 1121-0255), so BJS was careful to only include items captured previously on training rather than expanding this section. For officer selection, the LEMAS asks agencies about their minimum education requirement (Q14a LP; Q16a SO) and if there is a military service exemption to this item (Q14b LP; Q16b SO) and pre-employment screening practices (Q15 LP; Q17 SO). For training, the LEMAS asks about the total number of academy (Q16 LP; Q18 SO), field training (Q16 LP; Q18 SO) and annual in-service training hours (Q17 LP; Q19 SO).

#### Hiring and Retention (10 items): Section V (LP) and Section VI (SO)

The vast majority of expert panel members stated that questions on hiring and retention practices were needed on the LEMAS. Over the past few years, law enforcement agencies have struggled to maintain staffing levels and panel members wanted to know what is being done by agencies to address this issue. To address this need, BJS included items asked on past LEMAS surveys and from a 2008 Census of State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies (CSLLEA) supplement on hiring and retention. Items from earlier waves of LEMAS include the number of hires (Q18 LP; Q20 SO), number of separations by reason of separation (Q22 LP; Q24 SO), base annual salary by sworn position (Q24 LP; Q26 SO), authorized special pay (Q25 LP; Q27 SO), and standard shift length for patrol officers (Q27 LP; Q29 SO). Items from the 2008 CSLLEA include types of applicants targeted for hiring (Q20 LP; Q22 SO), hiring incentives (Q21 LP; Q23 SO), exit interview policy for those who leave (Q23 LP; Q25 SO), and methods to increase retention rate (Q26 LP; Q28 SO). One new item added at the request of the expert panel members was the average number of weeks to hire (Q19 LP; Q21 SO). Departments that take too long to hire often have more difficulty retaining new recruits and this item will allow BJS to examine what is happening on average nationally and by population served or agency size.

#### Equipment and Operations (4 items): Section VI (LP) and Section VII (SO)

This section has been a staple of LEMAS since it was first developed. During the expert panel discussions, the local agencies found less utility for these items than the sheriffs. However, all panel members agreed that the items pertaining to weapons and actions (Q31 and Q32 on the 2016 LEMAS) were important. It was suggested that Q29, Q30, Q31 and Q32 on the 2016 LEMAS could be combined into one item. Q28 (LP) and Q30 (SO) on the 2020 LEMAS reflect this combined item and ask about the authorization and on/off-duty use for different types of firearms and less-lethal weapons and techniques. This section also contains an item asking about the number of video cameras (Q29 LP; Q31 SO) which has been used on previous LEMAS surveys. The other two items in this section are about K-9s (Q30a and Q30b LP; Q32a and Q32b SO). Expert panel members from all three agency types expressed a desire to know more about the functions of K-9s, which has not been asked about on previous LEMAS or CSLLEA instruments. Past LEMAS surveys have asked about the number of dogs but no items pertaining to what K-9s engage in. The 2020 LEMAS is also asking about the number of handlers for the dogs and the activities that the K-9s engage in.

#### Technology (4 items): Section VII (LP) and Section VII (SO)

Past LEMAS waves have also had a number of items pertaining to technology but many of these would be considered out of date. For example, questions asking about what types of data are

maintained as computerized files (Q44 on 2016 LEMAS) are not particularly meaningful as the majority of departments have moved to electronic systems in the past few years. Expert panel members felt the detail of some of the items was not necessary, preferring yes/no to whether the agency has a website (Q31 LP; Q33 SO) or uses social media (Q32 LP; Q34 SO) to asking what is specifically used or provided through these mediums. The historic LEMAS item relating to technologies used on a regular basis (Q33 LP; Q35 SO) was retained and updated to be more relevant to agencies. The other item in the section updated Q39 from the 2016 LEMAS, which asked about the tasks for which computers are used. Expert panel members stated they were more interested in how data was being used rather than if computers were being used. Q34 (LP) and Q36 (SO) on the 2020 LEMAS ask agencies if they use data for a number of activities such as budget allocation, hot spot analysis, and patrol allocation.

#### Policies and Procedures (9 items): Section VIII (LP) and Section IX (SO)

The last section of the core items pertains to policies and procedures, which also contains a number of previously asked LEMAS items. Expert panel members consistently rated this section as one of the most useful components of LEMAS. Items retained from previous iterations of LEMAS include asking about written policy or procedural directives on a number of topics (Q35 LP; Q37 SO), use of an Early Intervention System (Q39 LP; Q41 SO), the number of civilian complaints by disposition status (Q40 LP; Q42 SO), the presence of a civilian complaint review board (Q41 LP; Q43 SO), and external investigation of use of force incidents (Q42 LP; Q44 SO). A new set of items pertaining to immigration policies and practices is also included in the 2020 LEMAS core. These items were added to respond to the President and Attorney General's emphasis on immigration practices. Items ask agencies under what circumstances they check immigration status (Q36 LP; Q38 SO), if agencies verify immigration status with the Department of Homeland Security (Q37 LP; Q39 SO) and reasons for not checking immigration status (Q38 LP; Q40 SO).

#### ***Agency Specific Sections***

Among the sections included to be agency specific, a number of items still overlap substantially between the two forms. Therefore, both instruments will be discussed within these sections. Only Section III (SO) differs substantially between the two versions.

#### Personnel (8 items): Section I (LP and SO)

The first section of both surveys is on personnel. This section contains what are likely the most essential items of LEMAS. LEMAS is the only national survey to provide race and Hispanic origin of sworn officers. This section is modified to better reflect the types of personnel employed by local police and state police departments compared to those in sheriffs' offices. Seven items in this section have been asked on previous LEMAS waves. Q1 is the primary staffing count variable. On the 2016 LEMAS there were three types of personnel: sworn with general arrest powers, officers/deputies with limited arrest powers (e.g., jail or court officers in some agencies) and non-sworn employees. The category pertaining to officers/deputies with limited arrest powers was added solely for sheriffs' offices and has created confusion for respondents in local departments and primary state police agencies. Therefore, this type of personnel is dropped on LP on the 2020 LEMAS but retained on SO. Another modification to Q1 on the 2016 LEMAS was removing "authorized" positions. During data collection and expert review, this item caused confusion and agencies had difficulty distinguishing the difference

between “authorized” and “actual” full-time sworn. For the 2020 LEMAS, BJS has created a new item (Q2) asking about the number of full-time sworn officer vacancies. This value can be added to the number of full-time sworn officers in order to obtain the authorized count.

The item requesting the number of personnel by primary job responsibility (Q3) differs the most between the two forms. On LP, there are 4 primary duty areas: administration, operations, support and other. On SO, there are 7 primary duty areas: administration, operations, jail-related, court-related, civil process, support, and other. On both forms, agencies are asked to report the number of patrol/field officers, detectives/investigators and dispatchers. Personnel counts are requested for sworn officers with general arrest powers and non-sworn on LP and for these personnel types as well as officers with limited or no arrest powers on SO.

Race, Hispanic origin and sex of full-time sworn officers is captured through Q4. Q6 captures race, Hispanic origin and sex based on supervisory status and does not differ between the two forms, but are included in the personnel section for continuity. Similarly, Q5 does not differ between the two forms other than adjusting the question stems slightly; chief executive is used in the stem on LP and sheriff is used on SO.

This section also includes an item asking for the number of full-time agency personnel who are bi- or multilingual by type of personnel (Q7). This item only differs between the two forms because SO also includes counts for officers/deputies with limited or no arrest powers.

The last item (Q8) in the section asks about the types of personnel assigned to various problems or tasks. There is no difference in this item across the two forms. Since it deals with personnel, its placement within this section was most fitting.

#### Budget (4 items): Section II (LP and SO)

Operating budget has been on every wave of LEMAS, and asset forfeiture funds (Q10) has been on every LEMAS since 1997 (in 2013 total amount was replaced with yes/no option). The primary difference in this section across the two forms is asking for the jail administration budget (Q9b and Q9c SO) separately from the total operating budget (Q9a) for sheriffs’ offices. Past administrations of LEMAS have shown that some sheriffs include the jail budget in the total operating costs and others do not. By allowing them to report separately, this will allow BJS to better understand the budget allocations in sheriffs’ offices. The fiscal year is asked on both forms (Q9b LP; Q9d SO).

#### Community Policing (3 items): Section III (LP) and Section IV (SO)

Both surveys include three items on community policing. However, primary state police agencies will not be asked these questions. Based on expert panel feedback and results from previous LEMAS waves, primary state police agencies rarely engaged in these activities. LEMAS has included community policing items since 2000. The three items retained for 2020 have been revised with feedback from the expert panel members, which included the DOJ Community-Oriented Policing Service (COPS) office, to be more relevant. Items in this section ask the types of groups/organizations that the agency had a problem-solving partnership with (Q11 LP; Q13 SO), the types of activities on which the agency solicited community feedback (Q12 LP; Q14 SO) and types of community policing activities the agency engaged in (Q13 LP; Q15 SO).

### Service Area (2 items): Section III (SO)

On SO, section III consists of two items pertaining to their service area. Specifically, sheriffs' offices are asked to enter the total square mileage of their service area (Q11) and the total resident population for which they have primary responsibility for providing law enforcement services (Q12). The sheriffs that participated in the expert panel discussions requested these two items. Additionally, BJS has had difficulty accurately capturing the population for which sheriffs primarily provide law enforcement to and as such typically do not report out by population served. Q12 would allow BJS to report on sheriffs' offices by population served.

The LEMAS will be administered from September 2020 through March 2020. During this 7-month period, the instrument will be administered to all law enforcement agencies selected in the sample.

## **2. Needs and Uses**

BJS employs various methods to capture data to better understand the criminal justice system. For example, we capture data on crime from resident surveys, inmate surveys and the collection of administrative data. Data collections on agency characteristics are primarily conducted through establishment surveys, and this is the primary data collection vehicle for the law enforcement core collections. The LEMAS is the only systematic establishment survey that produces national estimates of personnel, resources, policies, and practices of the most common types of LEAs.

### BJS Needs and Uses

Without LEMAS, BJS will be unable to describe the number and types of officers in state, county and local LEAs and to report to the nation the activities and functions LEAs perform. In addition, this survey provides BJS with systematic knowledge about the resources, policies practices, and organizational responses used to meet the challenges faced by contemporary LEAs. Comparisons of the 2020 LEMAS data with those from prior LEMAS surveys will also provide important information on how LEAs have changed over time including the adoption of new technology, instituting policies to address issues of contemporary importance (e.g., militarization of police and dealing with mentally ill persons), adopting community policing practices and changing diversity in law enforcement.

The list below details the type of information that will be available through the 2020 LEMAS data:

- Number of full-time and part-time sworn officers and non-sworn employees
- Number of full-time sworn vacancies
- Number of sworn and non-sworn personnel by task scope (e.g., administration, operations, and support)
- Sex, race and Hispanic origin of full-time sworn personnel, the chief executive, intermediate and first line supervisors
- Average number of sworn and non-sworn staff who are bilingual
- Prevalence of specialized units designed to address specific problems
- Average total operating budget

- Average total forfeiture assets
- Rates/percentages of agencies that engage in key community policing activities
- Prevalence of educational requirements for new officers
- Percentage of agencies that employ specific pre-employment screening techniques
- Average academy, field, and in-service training hours
- Number of new hires by type of hire
- Average number of weeks until hire
- Prevalence of special hiring recruitment efforts
- Percent of agencies using hiring incentives
- Number of officers who separated by type of separation
- Average base salary by position type
- Percent of agencies using special pay
- Percent of agencies using methods to increase retention
- Average shift length
- Rates/percentages of agencies that authorize the use of specific kinds of weapons or force actions
- Average number of video cameras utilized regularly
- Percent of agencies who are using body worn cameras
- Average number of K-9 employed by agencies
- Percent of agencies using a website or social media
- Percent of agencies employing various types of technology
- Prevalence of written policies and procedures
- Percent of agencies who verify immigration status
- Prevalence of civilian review board
- Prevalence of civilian complaints by disposition status
- Percent of agencies who use external investigation for use of force incidents

These characteristics can be disaggregated to produce estimates by agency size and type based on the stratification procedure.

Since 1987, BJS has published 35 reports on data obtained from previous LEMAS surveys to describe characteristics of different types of LEAs (e.g., local police departments and sheriff's offices). These reports are often cited in textbooks, research articles and public discussions as the authoritative source on the characteristics of state and local LEAs. BJS staff have also used LEMAS data to produce reports on thematic issues such as use of force complaints (Hickman and Piquero, 2009), women in law enforcement (Langton, 2010), the comparison of campus and city police operations (Bromley and Reaves, 1998), and use of technology (Reaves, 2015).

#### Uses of the LEMAS Data by Others

The information generated from LEMAS surveys has been widely used by policy makers, law enforcement professionals, and researcher. A systematic review of the literature identified 114 peer-reviewed studies using LEMAS data published between 1987 and 2013 (Matusiak, Campbell, and King, 2014). Private publications authored by independent researchers tend to use the LEMAS data in conjunction with other sources of information to address specific topics such as police arrest decisions, police use-of-control and professionalism (Shjarback & White, 2015; Schuck & Rabe-Hemp, 2014), predictors of officer turnover (Smith, Wareham, & Lambert, 2014), law enforcement uses of geographic information systems, and law enforcement responses

to specific issues such as hate crimes, gangs, intimate partner violence, human trafficking (Farrell, 2014; Jurek & King 2020) and terrorism (Randol, 2013).<sup>4</sup> Some have used LEMAS data to examine racial and/or gender representation within departments (Aiello, 2019; Hur, 2013; Bies et al., 2015; Barrick, Hickman & Strom, 2014; Gustafson, 2013; Sharp, 2014), in addition to organizational trends such as early intervention (EI) systems (Shjarback, 2014), structure (Schuck & Rabe-Hemp, 2014; Willits, 2014), and unionization (DeCarlo & Jenkins, 2015; Schuck, 2014) and the coinciding impacts on clearance rates (Walfield, 2015; Roberts & Roberts, 2015), departmental practices, and the police-community relationship (Perez & Bromley, 2015; Cave, Telep & Grieco, 2015). LEMAS data have also provided important contributions to emerging issues in law enforcement such as the use of asset forfeitures (Mughan et al, 2020) and the militarization of law enforcement agencies (Carter & Fox, 2019).

Others simply refer to the LEMAS data to obtain accurate counts of sworn officers (Chalfin & McCrary, 2013). The LEMAS data are also used by Justice Department officials (U.S. Department of Justice, 2011) and in widely read publications by professional law enforcement organizations (Melekian, 2012) as authoritative statistics on law enforcement trends. Attachment 3 provides a complete listing of known publications derived from LEMAS data.

State, county, and local LEA staff frequently use the information obtained from the LEMAS surveys; these are often individuals from the same agencies that complete the LEMAS surveys. While some users are interested in summary statistics or national averages provided by BJS published reports, BJS frequently answers inquiries from law enforcement personnel about aspects of a select number of agencies that are interested in comparisons to similar jurisdictions. For instance, the Phoenix Police Department may want to compare itself with the Dallas Police Department or a sheriff's office in Florida may want to know how many other similarly sized sheriff's offices in the state have a gang unit or a use of force policy. The existence of specialized units or the adoption of new technology are two aspects of the LEMAS surveys, which have been of regular interest to law enforcement personnel, many of whom are considering creating new units or purchasing similar equipment for their agencies.

Two other frequent users of the LEMAS data are the media and the public. The BJS Law Enforcement Statistics Unit answers many calls every year from the public or from reporters. These calls often concern details that can be answered only with information from BJS surveys of general purpose LEAs.

The revised design of the 2020 LEMAS will enhance the use of these data by law enforcement professionals and researchers. First, by archiving data files with consistent agency identification numbers for each agency, analysts outside of BJS can more easily examine changes in particular agencies or groups of agencies over time. Second, the 2020 LEMAS results can be linked, through ORI and FIPS codes, with data from the FBI's UCR and LEOKA and the Census Bureau.

### Anticipated Products

---

<sup>4</sup> Beginning with the first LEMAS survey, BJS has provided free access to public-use data files at National Archive of Criminal Justice Data at the University of Michigan (<https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/NACJD/series/92/studies>).

BJs anticipates producing multiple reports from the 2020 LEMAS. Detailed information on the reports to be produced is discussed under 15. Project Schedule.

At the time of the initial publication from the 2020 LEMAS, BJS will release fully-documented data files for public use through the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data at the University of Michigan.

### **3. Use of Information Technology**

The 2020 LEMAS instrument has been designed for online data collection that will export survey data and paradata in various data formats specified by BJS. This software will allow RTI to send an email to respondents explaining the LEMAS program and containing a hyperlink to the questionnaire. Additionally, the software allows for real-time online tracking of respondents thereby allowing BJS to track the completion of each agency's responses.

Agencies may have a number of reasons why they do not respond via the internet, for example some might not have reliable internet access and others might find it difficult to complete online because of the complexity of the requested data or the need to involve multiple people in preparing the response. Agencies that require paper access will have multiple methods of receiving paper versions of the instrument. Hard copies will be sent via mail during routine non-response follow-up. Hard copies will also be sent via fax if agencies request. Finally, agencies will be able to download a PDF version of the survey from the survey site that can be printed or e-mailed to agency staff. Respondents can then complete the survey in hard copy and transcribe it to the online survey instrument, scan and return the completed form via mail, e-mail, or secure fax.

The dataset and supporting documentation will be made available without charge at the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data at the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) and at Data.gov. Access to these data permits analysts to identify the specific responses of individual agencies and to conduct statistical analyses about general purpose law agencies. These data will have agency- and jurisdiction-specific identifiers that will permit public use in combination with other data files with similar identifiers.

The BJS-produced findings from the 2020 LEMAS will be provided to the public in electronic format. These reports will be available on the BJS website as PDF files. BJS may also produce a web-based, data analysis tool for the 2020 LEMAS to increase the ease with which the public can access information about specific agencies or types of agencies.

### **4. Efforts to Identify Duplication**

Based on our knowledge of the federal statistical system, in general, and law enforcement surveys in particular, BJS has determined that the 2020 LEMAS includes measures of the number of law enforcement personnel that are also included in five ongoing surveys by other Federal agencies.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> BJS' Census of State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies, from which the LEMAS sample is drawn, also includes measures of the number of law enforcement personnel.

1. The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) annually collects information from LEAs about the number and sex of sworn and nonsworn personnel as part of the “Number of Full-Time Law Enforcement Employees” (OMB No. 1110-0004).
2. The Bureau of Labor Statistics’ (BLS) “Occupational Employment Survey” (OMB No. 1220-0042) samples employers yearly about the number, race and Hispanic origin of employees in three Protective Service Occupation subcategories: 1) police and sheriff’s patrol officers, 2) detectives and criminal investigators, and 3) first line supervisors of police and detectives.
3. The Census Bureau tabulates and publishes Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) information on the sex, race and ethnicity of persons who work in a protective service. This information is available for geographies that represent worksite and residence. This information has been based on the decennial census and more recently on the American Community Survey (OMB No. 0607-0810 & 0607-0936). This tabulation is sponsored by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), the Employment Litigation Section of the Civil Rights Division at the Department of Justice (DOJ), the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP) at the Department of Labor (DOL), and the Office of Personnel Management (OPM).
4. The Census Bureau also collects data on number of employees (and total payroll) of police protection agencies as part of its Annual Survey of Public Employment & Payroll (ASPEP; OMB No. 0607-0452).
5. The EEOC biennially collects information from state and local governments on the number of employees who work in a protective service by salary, race/ethnicity, and sex (EEO-4; OMB No. 3046-0008).

BJS has identified four variables—the number of male sworn, male nonsworn, female sworn, and female nonsworn personnel—that are collected and reported by the FBI survey and by BJS in the CSLLEA and LEMAS surveys.

BJS and FBI data collections differ on several key measures. First, the definition of law enforcement officer varies depending upon how the officer is funded at the agency. The FBI survey is limited to personnel paid “with law enforcement funds” while the BJS surveys include all personnel regardless of what public funds pay their salaries. Second, the scope of agencies considered for inclusion in data collection efforts differs. BJS surveys capture all agencies that employ the equivalent (i.e., two part-time staff) of at least one full-time sworn personnel; while the FBI requires at least one full-time sworn staff member. Third, the data collection goals differ. The items about personnel in the FBI survey are collected in conjunction with annual data collections of hundreds of items about reported offenses and about assaults on law enforcement officers. The FBI uses these data to report on offense, arrest, and assault rates per sworn personnel. Finally, BJS includes additional demographic variables (race and ethnicity) for sworn personnel.

These design elements lead to differences in the estimated number of total sworn officers, which persist over time across various waves of data collection. In the six years (1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008 and 2018) for which both the FBI survey and the BJS CSLLEA were conducted, the FBI collected data from 3,600 to 5,200 fewer agencies (24.9%) and reported about 100,000

fewer total personnel (10.0%). These differences are due in part to the different criteria for inclusion of agencies and personnel in these two surveys. Lastly, the FBI survey is limited to agencies that report to the FBI's UCR program during a particular year (see Reaves, 2011).

The number of duplicate data collection items in the BJS and FBI data collection is small, and the information collected is necessary to meet the goals of each survey. Further, personnel items included in the LEMAS surveys are used to produce national estimates of personnel and to provide the basis for computing the percentages of sworn personnel by race and ethnicity, by law enforcement function, and by current and newly hired personnel. LEMAS also collects information about part-time employees of LEAs.

Turning to the Occupational Employment Survey, both the BJS and BLS surveys report information about the number of law enforcement employees. The BLS survey emphasizes comparisons of the number of positions and their compensation among many occupations types across different geographical areas of the country. The samples and employee definitions used in these two surveys vary due to the differing purposes of the surveys. In law enforcement surveys the distinction between sworn and nonsworn is crucial, but this distinction is not made in the BLS occupational sub-codes. Moreover, many law enforcement employees, such as forensic scientists or crime analysts, are unlikely to fit into any BLS occupational codes for protection service occupations.

As with the FBI survey, the number of duplicate items in the BJS and BLS surveys is small, and the items are needed for the internal purposes of the survey. The BJS annual data are collected and reported at the agency level and at the national level separately for sheriff's departments and local and county police departments. The BLS data are collected at the employer level and three-year averages are reported at the SMSA level and the national level with no distinction among federal, state or local LEAs.

The EEO tabulations based upon the decennial census, and more recently the American Community Survey, provide national estimates on the number persons working in protective services. The dataset contains breakdowns by sex, race, and Hispanic origin. The EEO tabulations suffer from the same limitations as the Occupational Employment Survey, namely it is impossible to fully understand the law enforcement related job codes that may be subsumed under the "protective service" heading. This dataset also provides geographic rather than agency staffing estimates. Estimates are provided for location of employment or residence rather than the law enforcement agency. LEMAS data reflect place of work rather than location of work or place of residence.

The EEOC's own data collection is insufficient to disaggregate the number of sworn versus nonsworn officers and are also insufficient to disaggregate those working in local law enforcement versus Sheriff's offices. Similarly, while the EEOC data includes job function with protective service, a clear distinction does not exist between sworn and nonsworn officers. Data collected by the EEOC are reported only at the national level; individual responses are confidential and used for investigative purposes by the EEOC and the Department of Justice.

Finally, the ASPEP data collection provides full-time and part-time employment and payroll estimates for persons with power of arrest within the police protection category but the rest of the police protection category provides insufficient detail as to the work of sworn personnel and little to no detail on the job functions of nonsworn personnel.

BJS has identified five federally-sponsored surveys with varying samples and measures of employees that can be used to estimate the number of law enforcement personnel in the United States. However, only BJS has a primary goal of creating national estimates of the number of LEAs and number of sworn and nonsworn personnel. Furthermore, the LEMAS is the only data source that provides demographic characteristics of full-time sworn by supervisory position based on the employing agency rather than residents. This allows for national estimates at all jurisdiction levels: local, county, and state. BJS released a report comparing these differences, titled *National Sources of Law Enforcement Employee Data* (NCJ 249681).

## 5. Efforts to Minimize Burden

Efforts to minimize burden are focused on two areas: instrument design and support services. First, in July and November 2018, BJS obtained extensive feedback on the 2016 LEMAS to reduce burden and increase relevance to law enforcement agencies. This panel was comprised of 18 individuals with expertise in law enforcement and included both law enforcement practitioners as well as policing scholars that were known for using LEMAS data in the past. The outcome of this expert panel resulted in some significant changes for the 2020 LEMAS. The biggest change was to administer separate surveys for local police and sheriffs’ offices. Doing so increases the relevance of the survey items for these agencies and will help to boost response rates. Burden was also reduced by clarifying question wording to better reflect the current state of policing, minimizing response categories, streamlining the reporting reference period to the agency’s fiscal year, and dropping some items that no longer have utility. Other items were dropped because they were out-of-date and some items were revised in order to be more clear and current. Additionally, there were a handful of items on the 2016 LEMAS that required count data which were dropped for the 2020 LEMAS because they did not perform well or because they overlapped with other items on the survey.

Under an OMB generic clearance (OMB Control Number 1121-0339), the 2020 LEMAS instruments underwent expanded cognitive testing. A total of 20 local police departments and sheriffs’ offices participated in the testing (Table 1). The instrument was sent to respondents with instructions to complete the survey just as they would if they received the survey as part of the regular sample of agencies. Testers were asked to take note of any aspects of the instrument that were unclear, any questions or topics that were omitted, or any answer choices or response categories that were missing, and to mark these comments directly on the survey instrument. Testers were also asked to time how long it took them to complete the questionnaire. Respondents were then asked to return the survey and participate in a 1-hour post survey interview.

**Table 1. 2020 LEMAS Cognitive Interview Participants.**

| Agency Name | Type | Size |
|-------------|------|------|
|-------------|------|------|

|   |          |                    |
|---|----------|--------------------|
| San Diego (CA) Police Department              | Local PD | Large (100+ FTS)   |
| Sandy Springs (GA) Police Department          | Local PD | Large (100+ FTS)   |
| Shreveport (LA) Police Department             | Local PD | Large (100+ FTS)   |
| Tallahassee (FL) Police Department            | Local PD | Large (100+ FTS)   |
| Waterbury (CT) Police Department              | Local PD | Large (100+ FTS)   |
| Alexandria (VA) Police Department             | Local PD | Large (100+ FTS)   |
| Prince George's County (MD) Police Department | Local PD | Large (100+ FTS)   |
| Brookfield (CT) Police Department             | Local PD | Medium (11-99 FTS) |
| Lemont (IL) Police Department                 | Local PD | Medium (11-99 FTS) |
| Darien (CT) Police Department                 | Local PD | Medium (11-99 FTS) |
| Moorcroft (WY) Police Department              | Local PD | Small (<= 10 FTS)  |
| Pima County (AZ) Sheriff's Department         | Sheriffs | Large (100+ FTS)   |
| St. Mary's County (MD) Sheriff's Office       | Sheriffs | Large (100+ FTS)   |
| Pinellas County (FL) Sheriff's Office         | Sheriffs | Large (100+ FTS)   |
| Colusa County (CA) Sheriff's Office           | Sheriffs | Medium (11-99 FTS) |
| Dinwiddie County (VA) Sheriff's Office        | Sheriffs | Medium (11-99 FTS) |
| Kershaw County (SC) Sheriff's Office          | Sheriffs | Medium (11-99 FTS) |
| Logan County (OH) Sheriff's Office            | Sheriffs | Medium (11-99 FTS) |
| Sierra County (CA) Sheriff's Office           | Sheriffs | Medium (11-99 FTS) |
| Campbell County (SD) Sheriff's Office         | Sheriffs | Small (<= 10 FTS)  |

As a result of the cognitive testing, minimal items on the survey were modified. Q3 on both LP and SO asks the agency to provide the number of full-time personnel according to their primary job responsibility. Within two of the primary job responsibility categories, there were subcategories for select responsibilities. These subcategories were meant to capture only a subset of the personnel already captured in the category above, but many participants thought that all personnel within the category needed to be reported within one of the subcategories. To alleviate this confusion, the total for the category was removed and an 'all other' subcategory was added so that the subcategories can be summed in order to get the total for the category.

In the cognitively tested version of SO, sheriffs were asked about their total operating budget with an instruction not to include jail administration costs. Three items later, they were asked if their agency oversees a jail and were then asked for the jail administration budget. Testing revealed that several respondents overlooked the instruction in the initial question and included jail administration costs in the total operating budget. To address this issue and consolidate the items to improve understanding, the instructions were revised to direct respondents to include jail administration costs in the total operating budget (Q9a), since this was the default approach observed during testing. Next is a follow-up question asking if the agency operates a jail (Q9b) and, if yes, how much of the total operating budget was for jail administration (Q9c).

A new question was proposed for the 2020 LEMAS, asking if the agency's total operating budget included a line item for community policing activities. Based on the feedback received from interviews, this question was removed. Respondents questioned the purpose of this item

and interpretation of the term ‘community policing activities’ varied widely between respondents. Full results of the cognitive testing are included in Attachment 4.

We expect that many respondents will make use of the online survey software to complete the survey. A number of web-based system functions will be in place to ease the burden of survey completion. RTI will utilize an intelligent log-in program for data collection, which will store agency information and responses, allowing for multi-session, non-sequential completion of the survey instrument. Since many agencies, particularly the larger ones, will need to seek out multiple information sources within their organizations to answer different sections, this will reduce the burden on them by facilitating data entry from different sources. It will also reduce the burden by allowing them to stop response entry pending confirmation of information from others in the agency. Help icons located next to each survey question will link respondents to item-specific information, additional guidance, and helpdesk contact information to facilitate requests for assistance.

The online system will also provide a glossary of terms for respondent reference. In addition, a help desk will be staffed during normal business hours (Eastern time) and will be available to respondents through a toll-free number. Respondents will also receive a hard copy questionnaire, along with directions, by mail. Additionally, respondents will be able to access a PDF version of the survey online, which can be printed. Once complete, this paper version of the survey can be used to enter data through the web-based survey instrument or can be returned via e-mail, fax, or mail.

In addition, project staff from RTI will be available to assist respondents throughout the data collection period. A data collection manager will oversee the help desk. When not available, calls to the help desk will be routed automatically to another survey team member for immediate response. Voice-mail will be available outside of regular business hours and a dedicated LEMAS help e-mail address will be provided with the introductory letter and survey packet. The office and cell-phone numbers, as well as the e-mail address for the survey principal investigator, will also be provided to respondents to insure timely communications.

## **6. Consequences of Less Frequent Collection**

Based in part on recommendations from the NRC (Groves and Cork, 2011) and the Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing (Melekian, 2012), BJS has determined that it is necessary to improve the frequency of its law enforcement data collections and to establish a more regular schedule of future surveys of LEAs. To this end, a significant portion of BJS’s law enforcement data collection efforts been planned to minimize overlap and reduce burden on large agencies that are invited to participate in these collections. These data collection efforts will now share a common alternating schedule that will serve to reduce burden and increase the timeliness of data collection. Table 2 shows the data collection schedule for these core projects.

**Table 2. Data collection schedule for the key law enforcement collections, 2020-2026**

| Collection                                     | Start of Data Collection |
|--|--------------------------|
| 2020 LEMAS core                                | September 2020           |
| 2021 Survey of Campus Law Enforcement Agencies | September 2021           |

|   |                |
|---|----------------|
| 2022 CSLLEA                                       | September 2022 |
| 2023 Census of Law Enforcement Training Academies | January 2024   |
| 2024 LEMAS core                                   | September 2024 |
| 2025 LEMAS Supplement                             | September 2025 |
| 2026 CSLLEA                                       | September 2026 |

Conducting multiple surveys in a single year may lead to lower response rates and result in less precise and biased estimates for key survey items. Under this model only one of the core collections (i.e., LEMAS core, LEMAS supplement, or CSLLEA) will be administered per year in order to reduce burden on agencies that will be selected with certainty for each collection. Furthermore, the proposed data collection schedule will allow for reliable indicators of officer staffing, and changes in staffing, every two years.

The LEMAS data collection efforts, and the required consultation with experts in the field of both practice and research, will be used to identify the topical areas for the LEMAS supplemental surveys. The supplements are designed to provide more timely and actionable information to agencies on topics that are of contemporary concern and are designed to be conducted every 2-years. Less frequent collection of LEMAS supplemental data will hinder our ability to address relevant issues in law enforcement and to assist other agencies such as BJA, NIJ and COPS with their grant programs.

## 7. Special Circumstances

No special circumstances have been identified for this project.

## 8. Federal Register Publication and Outside Consultations

The research under this clearance is consistent with the guidelines in 5 CFR 1320.6. The 60-day notice for public commentary was published in the Federal Register, Volume 85, Number 50, page 14705 on Friday, March 13, 2020 (Attachment 5). The 30-day notice for public commentary was published in the Federal Register, Volume 85, Number 102, page 31809, on Wednesday, May 27, 2020 (Attachment 6). In response to the 60-day notice, BJS received one comment seeking additional questions about asset forfeiture funds received by agencies (Attachment 7). BJS determined that the burden imposed by such additional detail outweighs the likely quality of the responses.

In July and November 2018, BJS shared a copy of a draft 2016 LEMAS survey instrument with law enforcement practitioners and research scholars with 1) a known interest in law enforcement and 2) a history of publishing research that had used LEMAS data in the past. The 18 expert reviewers (Table 3) were given an electronic draft of the survey instrument and asked to comment on question wording, and make recommendations on the most important items and the least important.

**Table 3. Expert Reviewers for the 2020 LEMAS Instrument**

---

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Matthew Matusiak, Ph.D., Assistant Professor<br>Dept. of Criminal Justice<br>University of Central Florida<br>Orlando, FL 32816                        | Patrick Oliver, Ph.D., Director<br>Criminal Justice Program<br>Cedarville University<br>Cedarville, OH 45314                   |
| Brian Williams, Ph.D., Associate Professor<br>Frank Batten School of Leadership & Public Policy<br>University of Virginia<br>Charlottesville, VA 22904 | Tanya Meisenholder, Ph.D., Assistant Commissioner<br>Strategic Initiatives<br>New York Police Department<br>New York, NY 10007 |
| William King, Ph.D., Associate Professor<br>College of Criminal Justice<br>Sam Houston State University<br>Huntsville, TX 77341                        | Patrick Brinkley, Major<br>Director of Bureau of Research and Development<br>Pennsylvania State Police<br>Harrisburg, PA 17110 |
| Henry Stawinski, III, Chief of Police<br>Prince George’s County Police Department<br>Landover, MD 20785  | Gina Hawkins, Chief of Police<br>Fayetteville Police Department<br>Fayetteville, NC 28301                                      |
| Rachel Tolber, Lieutenant<br>Redlands Police Department<br>Redlands, CA 92373  | Jeremiah Johnson, Ph.D., Sergeant<br>Darien Police Department<br>Darien, CT 06820  |
| Pete Kassetas, Chief of Police<br>New Mexico State Police<br>Santa Fe, NM 87507  | Michael Brown, Chief of Police<br>Alexandria Police Department<br>Alexandria, VA 22304   |
| Deanna Carey, Lieutenant<br>Pinellas County Sheriff’s Office<br>Largo, FL 33778  | Haans Vitek, Captain<br>Hennepin County Sheriff’s Office<br>Minneapolis, MN 55415  |
| Scott Parks, Sheriff<br>Marathon County Sheriff’s Office<br>Wausau, WI 54403   | Marvin Butler, Chief of Staff<br>St. Mary’s County Sheriff’s Office<br>Leonardtown, MD 20650                                   |
| Jim Burch, President<br>National Police Foundation<br>Arlington, VA 22202  | Jessica Scullin, Supervisory Social Science Analyst<br>COPS Office<br>Washington, DC 20530                                     |

---

After development of the draft instruments, 40 agencies were invited to participate in cognitive interviewing under the OMB generic clearance (OMB control number 1121-0339). For cognitive interviewing, participants were invited to complete the survey via paper form and then participate in an hour long interview to assess survey content. Of the 40 agencies invited, 20 participated. The results of the cognitive interviews are included in Attachment 4.

## **9. Paying Respondents**

Neither BJS nor RTI will provide any payment or gift of any type to respondents. Respondents will participate on a voluntary basis.

## **10. Assurance of Confidentiality**

According to 34 U.S. Code § 10134, the information gathered in this data collection shall be used only for statistical or research purposes, and shall be gathered in a manner that precludes their use for law enforcement or any purpose relating to a particular individual other than statistical or research purposes. The data collected through the LEMAS represent institutional characteristics of publicly-administered LEAs. Information about these organizations is largely available in the public domain. The fact that participation in this survey is voluntary and that information about individual agency responses will be available to the public is included on the first page of the survey instrument. However, BJS will not release the names, phone numbers or email of the actual persons responsible for completing the 2020 LEMAS.

## **11. Justification for Sensitive Questions**

While BJS has asked LEAs questions about their policies, including policies on the use of lethal and less-lethal weapons and techniques (Question 28 for local and state police; Question 30 for sheriffs) since 1987, LEAs may conclude that, in an era of increased scrutiny of law enforcement use of force, such information may be particularly sensitive. However, there has been a history of law enforcement criticism on use of force techniques, such as the 1991 assault on Rodney King, and 2014 deaths of Eric Garner and Michael Brown. Even in these heightened times, the LEMAS has maintained these questions and not received pushback from agencies in completing these items. Law enforcement agencies have been supportive in reporting their policies on this topic as it leads to increased transparency. Including these items will allow BJS to assess changes in policies since 1997 and as recently as 2016. Therefore, BJS believes asking questions about the use of lethal and less-lethal weapons and techniques is essential.

Questions on circumstances under which officers/deputies check immigration status (Questions 36-38 for local and state police; Questions 38-40 for sheriffs) may also be considered sensitive given public debate on the role of state and local law enforcement in aiding in enforcement of federal immigration law. As with policies on lethal and less-lethal weapons and techniques, the policy debate raises the importance of systematic collection of the data. Knowing the sensitivity of the topic area, these items were specifically crafted to examine existing agency policies and practices. Careful consideration was taken to ensure agencies did not feel they were being questioned about their position on this matter. During cognitive interviewing, we did not receive feedback that these items made the respondents feel uncomfortable and respondents were willing to complete these items.

The contact materials, including the survey invitation letter (Attachment 9), stress BJS's data use policies, including the statement that "BJS uses the data collected in LEMAS only for research and statistical purposes, as described in Title 34, USC §10134" and pointing respondents to our Data Protection Guidelines. BJS will stress these protections for the data in its communication with respondents.

## 12. Estimate of Respondent Burden

BJS has estimated the respondent burden for the proposed 2020 LEMAS at 8,750 hours (Table 4). This estimate is based the results of the cognitive interviewing. Respondents were asked to time themselves when taking the survey. The burden estimate is the average of these estimates. The 2016 LEMAS had a 3-hour burden and included 327 variables; 117 required reporting of amounts and 210 required checking a single item. The 2020 LEMAS local and state police version is estimated to have a 2.5-hour burden with 330 variables (123 requiring reporting of counts and 207 requiring checking a single item). The 2020 LEMAS sheriff version is estimated to have a 2.5 hour burden with 346 variables; 138 requiring reporting of counts and 208 requiring checking a single item.

**Table 4: Estimated Burden Hours for 2020 LEMAS.**

|                      | <b>Sample Size</b> | <b>Estimated Burden (in hours)</b> | <b>Total Burden Hours</b> |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Local police         | 2,591              | 2.5                                | 6,477.5                   |
| Primary state police | 49                 | 2.5                                | 122.5                     |
| Sheriffs             | 860                | 2.5                                | 2,150.0                   |
| Total                | 3,500              |                                    | 8,750.0                   |

## 13. Estimate of Respondent's Cost Burden

BJS anticipates that one or more persons per surveyed agency will spend time reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Whether the response is provided by one or by more than one person, the weighted average for the total burden for each agency is estimated to be 2.5 hours. Assuming a pay rate approximately equivalent to the GS-12 / 01 level (\$74,596 per year), the estimated agency cost of employee time would be approximately \$35.39 per hour.

Approximately 3,500 agencies will be randomly sampled to participate in the 2020 LEMAS. Based on the estimated time burden per response and employee pay rate, the total respondent employee time cost burden is estimated at \$309,663.

There are no anticipated costs to respondents beyond the employee time expended during completion of the survey instrument and addressed in above.

#### 14. Costs to Federal Government

The 2020 LEMAS is being developed and conducted under a multi-year cooperative agreement under the LECS program. Table 5 reflects the cost to administer the 2020 LEMAS core.

**Table 5. Estimated costs for the 2020 LEMAS core**

| Category  | Cost             |
|---|------------------|
| <u>BJS costs</u>                                    |                  |
| Staff salaries                                      |                  |
| GS-14 Statistician (25%)                            | \$30,300         |
| GS-15 Supervisory Statistician (3%)                 | \$4,300          |
| GS-13 Editor (10%)                                  | \$10,000         |
| Other Editorial Staff                               | \$5,000          |
| Front-Office Staff (GS-15 & Directors)              | \$2,000          |
| Subtotal salaries                                   | \$51,600         |
| Fringe benefits (28% of salaries)                   | \$14,450         |
| <i>Subtotal: Salary &amp; fringe</i>                | <i>\$66,050</i>  |
| Other administrative costs of salary & fringe (15%) | \$9,900          |
| <b>Subtotal: BJS costs</b>                          | <b>\$75,950</b>  |
| <u>Data Collection Agent (RTI)</u>                  |                  |
| Personnel (including fringe)                        | \$336,937        |
| Travel  | \$500            |
| Supplies  | \$0              |
| Consultant/Contracts                                | \$66,486         |
| Other   | \$32,798         |
| Total Indirect                                      | \$283,397        |
| <b>Subtotal Data Collection Agent Costs</b>         | <b>\$720,558</b> |
| <b>TOTAL COSTS</b>                                  | <b>\$796,508</b> |

#### 14. Reason for Change in Burden

The total burden estimate for the 2020 LEMAS has been reduced by 1,747 hours compared to the 2016 LEMAS. Topical questions that were of interest during the 2016 LEMAS have been omitted in order to focus on core questions that have been in past waves. The 2016 LEMAS more closely matches the 2007 LEMAS long form in the total number of data elements. The 2020 LEMAS burden is based on the average time reported for survey completion during cognitive interviews by agency type. Table 6 summarizes the changes in estimated burden between the previous LEMAS administrations.

**Table 6: Estimated Burden Hours for the 2007 LEMAS, 2013 LEMAS, and 2016 LEMAS**

|                      | Sample Size | Estimated Burden<br>(in hours) | Total Burden<br>Hours |
|----------------------|-------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| <b>2013 LEMAS</b>    |             |                                |                       |
| Large Agencies       | 1,000       | 4.37                           | 4,369                 |
| Small Agencies       | 2,500       | 2.55                           | 6,375                 |
| Weighted Sample      | 3,500       | 3.07                           | 10,744                |
| <b>2016 LEMAS</b>    |             |                                |                       |
| All Agencies         | 3,499       | 3.0                            | 10,497                |
| <b>2020 LEMAS</b>    |             |                                |                       |
| Local Police         | 2,591       | 2.5                            | 6,477.5               |
| Primary State Police | 49          | 2.5                            | 2,150.0               |
| Sheriff's Office     | 860         | 2.5                            | 122.5                 |
| Total                | 3,500       |                                | 8,750.0               |

Another consideration is that the methodology for estimating the 2020 instrument's burden was different than the methodology used to estimate the burden for the 2016 LEMAS instrument. The 2020 estimate was derived from a more concrete process that involved cognitively testing the instrument with 20 agencies. The 2016 burden estimate was based on a more generalized experience of fielding a similar survey over previous waves, but was not directly linked to a test of the 2016 instrument.

## 15. Project Schedule

The data collection for 2020 LEMAS is scheduled to begin in early September 2020. The data collection period is 7 months. BJS has determined that the shortened schedule for data collection is feasible because of paradata from the 2016 LEMAS data collection show a 45% response rate in the first two months of data collection and an 80% response rate within 7 months.

The design of the 2020 LEMAS calls for the initiation of data analyses including the assessment of nonresponse biases when the response rate hits 50%. While this program anticipates a final response rate in excess of 80%, if the response rate should not achieve 80%, BJS will conduct nonresponse bias assessment. Table 7 contains the project schedule.

**Table 7. Project Schedule**

| Stage   | Type of contact | Date         | Attachment Number |
|---|-----------------|--------------|-------------------|
| LEMAS informational website   | All             | -60 days     | --                |
| Survey prenotification letter   | All             | -17 days     | 8                 |
| Survey invitation letter (with URL and login instructions) with letter of support, LEMAS study flyer, agency point of contact update form, and LEMAS 2020 survey content sheet) | All             | Day 1        | 9-14              |
| Email invitation with URL and login instructions  | All             | Day 7        | 15                |
| Completion thank you  | All             | Variable     | 16                |
| First reminder letter (with paper survey and return envelope)   | Non-respondents | Day 21       | 17 and 18 or 19   |
| Second reminder email (with URL and login instructions)   | Non-respondents | Day 28       | 20                |
| Third reminder self-mailer (postcard, with URL and login instructions)  | Non-respondents | Day 42       | 21                |
| Fourth reminder email (with URL and login instructions)   | Non-respondents | Day 56       | 22                |
| Fifth reminder letter (with URL and login instructions, paper survey, and return envelope)  | Non-respondents | Day 70       | 23 (and 18 or 19) |
| Telephone non-response contact  | Non-respondents | Day 77       | 24                |
| Sixth reminder letter (via UPS; email if no valid street address)   | Non-respondents | Day 104      | 25                |
| Seventh reminder email  | Non-respondents | Day 134      | 26                |
| Final mailing (end of study letter)   | Non-respondents | Day 187      | 27                |
| Final messaging (end of study email)  | Non-respondents | Day 188      | 28                |
| File cleaning and preparation   | N/A             | Months 6-12  |                   |
| Analysis  | N/A             | Months 12-18 | --                |
| Reports   | N/A             | Months 18-24 | --                |

BJS will be responsible for the statistical analysis and publication of the data from the 2020 LEMAS. Contingent on the processing and delivery of the final data file, BJS anticipates releasing two primary reports and the data by August 2022.

The first report titled, *Local Police Departments, 2020: Personnel & Hiring*, will discuss the general trends in the composition of local law enforcement officers by sex, race and Hispanic origin. This report will provide demographic information on supervisory positions, personnel counts by task scope, salary requirements and administrative budget. This report will also include hiring and retention practices. A second report, titled, *Sheriff Departments, 2020: Personnel & Hiring*, will cover the same topics above for sheriff departments. Anticipated release date for both: August 2022

## 16. Display of Expiration Date

The expiration date will be shown on the survey form.

### **17. Exception to the Certificate Statement**

BJS is not requesting an exception to the certification of this information collection.

### **18. Contacts for Statistical Aspects and Data Collection**

a. BJS contacts include:

Shelley Hyland, PhD  
202-616-1706  
Shelley.Hyland@usdoj.gov

b. Persons consulted on statistical methodology:

Stephanie Zimmer, PhD  
RTI International

c. Persons consulted on data collection and analysis:

Tim Smith  
RTI International

Travis Taniguchi, PhD  
RTI International