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SHERIFFS' MANAGEMENT SURVEY:
In the spring of 1986, the Statistical Analysis Center of the Division of Criminal Investigation surveyed all sheriffs' departments in South Dakota. The original questionnaire and cover letter were sent to all sheriffs in March. A follow-up questionnaire was sent approximately one month later in an attempt to increase the rate of response.

This was the second year the SAC has been involved in compiling statewide data pertaining to all sheriffs' departments. Last year, 64 of the 65 sheriffis in South Dakota participated in the project and many requested another study for 1986. Eight sheriffs reviewed the survey form and provided valuable input as to the contents of the survey. It is hoped the results of this survey will provide the sheriffs with a valid means of comparing policies and practices of other departments with those of their own. In addition, the results should provide the sheriffs with a more firm basis from which to justify managerial decisions.

This year fifty-eight of the sixty-five sheriffs in the state filled out and returned a useable questionnaire form, bringing the response rate to $89 \%$. The seven sheriffs who did not respond were from the following counties: Bennett, Grant, Hutchinson, Lawrence, McPherson, Meade, and Potter. The $89 \%$ who did participate are representative of county sheriffs' departments across the state.

The returned surveys were read and coded upon their arrival. In the case of erroneous or incomplete information, the SAC staff telephoned each agency to clarify the data. The completed questionnaires were entered into the computer and verified by data entry staff. The Statistical Analysis System (SAS) was used to analyze the data.

The agencies are arranged in descending order by county population, with the largest counties appearing first. This method of presentation allows the departments to make comparisoris with other counties of similar size. Population figures are 1984 estimates prepared by the State Data Center at the University of South Dakota. The counties are broken down by population as follows:

Population greater than $20,000 \quad N=5$
Population between 10,000 and $20,000 \quad N=9$
Population between 5,000 and 9,999 $N=21$
Population less than 5,000
$N=23$
Total $=58$

The survey began with budgetary questions. The sheriffs were asked to specify the sources of income for their departments' budgets in 1986. The total income available to the responding agencies ranged frori a low of $\$ 32,520$ per year to a high of $\$ 1,742,410$ per year. These county agencies had a combined budget income of $\$ 10,523,294$ for 1986 . The vast majority ( $91 \%$ ) of this total figure came from county funds. No sheriffs' departments reported receiving any income from state funds. Federal funds totalling $\$ 680,257$ were received by 12 agencies. Ten departments also indicated that they obtained funds from some "other" sources.

The sheriffs were also asked to provide a breakdown of their total departmental budgets by six specific categories. The results are found in the table below:


Total Budgets \$11,842,305
When personnel salaries and benefits are combined, they account for almost two-thirds (62.1\%) of the expenses incurred by sheriff's departments throughout the state. The costs of running the county jails required $17.6 \%$ of the combined sheriffs' departments budgets. Operating expenses, such as utilities, contractual services, supplies, travel, etc., took up $12.4 \%$ of the total budgets. Another $4.4 \%$ of the budgets went toward capital outlay, such as vehicles, land, equipment, construction, etc., while $3.5 \%$ of the expenses went to an "other" category (See Figure 1).


The fifty-eight reporting sheriffs' departments serve counties ranging in size from 1,503 to 118,145 people (according to 1984 estimates). The combined total population of these jurisdictions is 624,468 , a per capita cost of county law enforcement services of $\$ 19.65$ is obtained. This means the responding counties, as a whole, spent almost $\$ 20$ per person for law enforcement.

The budget breakdown and costs per capita can be further studied when the counties are separated into their appropriate population groupings:

DEPARTMENTAL BUDGET INFORMATION

| ! | : | Over 20,000 | ; | 10,000-20,000 | ! | 5,000-10,000 | : | Less than 5,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Salaries | ! | \$2,525,805 | ! | \$1,147, 954 | , | \$1,617,779 | ! | \$896,694 |
| Personnel Benefits | 1 | 527,195 | 1 | 192,840 | 1 | 272,639 | 1 | 173,093 |
| Operating Expenses | ; | 399,652 | ; | 259,649 | 1 | 522,054 | : | 283,463 |
| Capital Outlay | ! | 230,600 | 1 | 107,770 | 1 | 98,654 | : | 83,688 |
| IJail Operations | ! | 899,563 | ! | 486,126 | ! | 552,711 | 1 | 149,335 |
| Other | i | 154,992 | ; | 49,256 | ; | 176,458 | ! | 34,335 |
| i TOTAL | ! | \$5,073,454 | ; | \$2,243,595 | ! | \$3,283, 294 | ! | \$1,670, 112 |
| PPopulation | , | 276,742 | 1 | 130,828 | ; | 145,466 | ! | 71,432 |
| PPer Capita cost | 1 | \$18.33 | ! | \$17.15 | : | \$22.57 | ! | \$23.38 |

As can be seen from the above figures, the cost per capita of law enforcement protection generally increases as the population of the jurisdiction decreases. The one exception is the counties which range in size from 10,000 to 20,000 people. The per capita cost of law enforcement services in those counties is the lowest in the state.

The next section of the survey dealt with personnel issues. The 58 departments reported that they employ a total of 249 full-time, sworn personnel. The following pie ciart illustrates the size of the sheriffs' departments responding to the questionnaire.

Figure 2

## SIZE OF DEPARTMENT number of full-time sworn officers

$\stackrel{\square}{i}$
Over 10 officers (5.4\%)

3 to 5 officers (35.7\%)


Size of Department Number of Depts Percentage of Total One officer . . . . . . 9 . . . . . . . . 16.1\%
Two officers . . . . . 19 . . . . . . . $33.9 \%$
3 to 5 officers . . . . 20 . . . . . . . . 35.7\%
$\sigma$ to 10 officers . . . . 5 . . . . . . . . 8.9\%
Over 10 officers . . . . 3 . . . . . . . . 5.4\%

The most common (35.7\%) sheriff department employed 3 to 5 full-time sworn officers. Another third of the agencies (33.9\%) had 2 full-time sworn officers. Three sheriffs' departments (5.4\%) in the state employed more than 10 full-time sworn officers as of March l, 1986: Hughes County had 15; Pennington County had 34; and Minnehaha County had 39 full-time sworn officers.
it is interesting to examine the rate of personnel per ten thousand population. This rate is calculated with the following formula:

Number of Officers $X 10,000=$ Personnel Rate per 10,000 Population

The total full-time sworn personnel and population figures may be plugged into the formula:

$$
\underset{624,468}{249} \times 10,000=3.99
$$

This means there are almost four county law enforcement officers for every 10,000 people in all of the South Dakota counties surveyed.

The rate of personnei per 10,000 may also be looked at for the counties as they are broken down into their appropriate population categories:

Population Personnel Rate per 10,000
Counties greater than 20,000 . . . . . . . 3.39
Counties from 10,000 to 20,000 . . . . . . 3.36
Counties from 5,000 to 9,999 . . . . . . 4.74
Counties less than 5,000 . . . . . . . . . 5.88

As the above figures show, the personnel rate per 10,000 population increases as the counties get smaller. This is a trend that one would expect.


The departments were asked to report the number of their full-time, sworn personnel by rank. Over half (52.6\%) of the sworn personnel hold the rank of deputy sheriff. There were 131 deputies in the responding county departments throughout the state as of March l, 1986. Obviously each of the reporting agencies has a sheriff; these 58 sheriffs account for $23.3 \%$ of the total personnel figure. There were 37 chief deputies, 12 sergeants, 9 detectives, and 2 lieutenants in the responding sheriff's departments across the state.

Question 5 asked the sheriffs to indicate the number of full-time, sworn personnel in their department who were in the specified base pay annual salary ranges for the current fiscal year. The results are displayed in the bar graph:

Salary Range Number of Officers Percentage

1. Under \$12,000 ..... 1.2\%
2. \$12,000 to $\$ 14,999$ ..... 37 ..... $14.9 \%$
3. $\$ 15,000$ to $\$ 17,499$ ..... 66 ..... 26.6\%
4. \$17,500 to \$19,999 ..... 54 ..... 21.8\%
5. $\$ 20,000$ to $\$ 22,499$ ..... 64 ..... 25.8\%
6. $\$ 22,500$ to $\$ 24,999$ ..... 7.3\%
7. $\$ 25,000$ to $\$ 29,999$ ..... 1.6\%
8. $\$ 30,000$ and over ..... 8\%
As evidenced by the above figures, almost three-fourths ..... (74.2\%)of the full-time sworn personnel in sheriffs' departmentsthroughout the state have base salaries which range from $\$ 15,000$to $\$ 22,499$ per year. Information on annual salaries of theseofficers in each department was also collected per rank. Ofcourse, the sheriffs' salaries are set by law. Detailedinformation on the other officers salaries will be given infurther sections of the this report.

## SHERIFFS' SALARIES:

The sheriffs' salary schedule is set by SDCL 7-12-15. The statute states that the salary of the sheriff "shall be the same as specified in the following schedule based upon the most recent decennial federal census of population of counties." This current salary schedule is effective through December 31, 1986.

County Population
50,000 and over
30,000 to 49,999
17,000 to 29,999
10,000 to 16,999
8,000 to 9,999
Below 7,999

## Current Salary Sohedule

\$30,709
\$27,953
\$24,522
\$23,623
\$21,485
\$20,585

The 1986 amendment changed the population categories somewhat. Effective January 1, 1987, there will no longer be two categories below 10,000 population. The sheriffs' salary schedule, effective in 1987, will be:

County Population

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 50,000 \text { and over } \\
& 30,000 \text { to } 49,999 \\
& 17,000 \text { to } 29,999 \\
& 10,000 \text { to } 16,999 \\
& \text { Below } 9,999
\end{aligned}
$$

1987 Salary Schedule
\$31,937
\$29,071
\$25,503
\$24,568
\$22,344

The sheriffs were asked how the wages/salaries of the sworn officers (other than themselves) in their departments are determined. More than three-fourths of the departments responding (76.5\%) indicated the salaries were established at the discretion of county commissioners. Another $17.6 \%$ of the agencies have a salary schedule or policy in effect and $5.9 \%$ use some other method for salary determination.

## LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT:

## Question 6 asked for the length of employment of all full-time, sworn personnel for each department as of March $1,1986$.

Length of Employment Number of Officers Percentage
Less than one year . . . . . 26 . . . . . . . $10.6 \%$
1 to 2 years . . . . . . . 38 . . . . . . $15.5 \%$
3 to 4 years . . . . . . . 54 . . . . . . $22.0 \%$
5 to 9 years . . . . . . . 71 . . . . . . $29.0 \%$
10 to 14 years . . . . . . . 45 . . . . . . $18.4 \%$
15 to 19 years . . . . . . . 5 . . . . . . $2.0 \%$
20 to 24 years . . . . . . . 3 . . . . . . $1.2 \%$
25 years or more . . . . . . 3 . . . . . . $1.2 \%$

Less than one-iourth (22.8\%) of the full-time, sworn personnel in the responding agencies have been employed by the same sheriff's department for ten or more years.

AGE:
The sheriffs were also asked to specify the number of full-time, sworn personnel in their departments whose ages fell within certain ranges as of March l, 1986.

Age Category Number of Officers Percentage
21 to 24 years . . . . . 11 . . . . . . . $4.5 \%$
25 to 29 years . . . . . 48 . . . . . . . 19.8\%
30 to 34 years . . . . . 52 . . . . . . $21.4 \%$
35 to 39 years . . . . . 55 . . . . . . . 22.6\%
40 to 44 years . . . . . . 28 . . . . . . . 11.5\%
45 to 49 years . . . . . 19 . . . . . . $7.8 \%$
50 to 54 years . . . . . . 13 . . . . . . . 5.3\%
55 to 59 years . . . . . . 8 . . . . . . 3.3\%
60 to 64 years . . . . . 8 . . . . . . 3.3\%
65 years and over . . . . 1 . . . . . . . $4 \%$
Almost two-thirds (63.8\%) of the full-time, sworn county law enforcement officers in South Dakota are between the ages of 25 and 39 years.

Question 8 asked for the highest level of education currently completed by each full-time, sworn officer.

# HIGHEST. LEVEL OF ${ }^{\text {Figure }}$ EDUCATION ACHIEVED FULL-TIME SWORN OFFICERS OVERALL. 

Graduate work (3.3\%) No HS Diploma (1.2\%)
4.yrs. college (12.7\%)

2 yrs college (12.7\%)

Less 2 yrs college (15.2\%)


Highest Level of Education Attained:
3 officers ( $1.2 \%$ ) do not have a high school diploma
134 officers (54.9\%) have a high school diploma
37 officers ( $15.2 \%$ ) have completed less than 2 yrs. college
31 officers (12.7\%) have completed two years of college
31 officers ( $12.7 \%$ ) have completed four years of college
8 officers ( $3.7 \%$ ) have completed graduate work
The Law Enforcement Standards and Training Commission requires a high school diploma or the equivalent (GED) before any officer may be enrolled in the Six Week Basic Training Course, which is necessary for certification as a law enforcement officer. Specific departments may also have further minimum requirements for education levels if their officers expect to achieve certain ranks within the agency.

Question 9 dealt with the educational benefits provided to members of each sheriff's department. The most common form of educational benefit offered by these agencies is adjustment of the officers' work schedules to allow for class attendance, with almost half (48\%) of the reporting agencies providing this benefit. Over one-third (39\%) of the sheriffs' departments indicated they would permit time off with pay for their officers to attend classes. A smaller number of agencies (20\%) said their county would subsidize the books and tuition for advanced schooling.

None of the responding departments increase the pay of their officers based upon the number of accumulated college credits. Only two agencies use formal academic education as part of the basis for promotion of their officers.

The next question asked the sheriffs to estimate the average number of hours per week that their officers were scheduled to work, actually worked, and were paid for working. overall, the responding agencies said their officers were scheduled to work an average of 43.1 hours per week. They actually worked an average of 48 hours per week and were paid for working 42.6 hours weekly.

It is interesting to examine these data for each specific population category:
avbragr hours worked per population category

| ! | 1 | Over 20,000 | ! | 10,000-20,000 | I | 5,000-9,999 | ; | Less than 5,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scheduled to Work | 1 | 40 hours | 1 | 44 hours | 1 | 42 hours | ; | 46 hours |
| A Actually Worked | 1 | 40 hours | 1 | 49 hours | 1 | 49 hours | ! | 49 hours |
| : Paid for Working | ; | 40 hours | ; | 44 hours | ! | 42 hours | : | 44 hours |

As the above figures show, the officers in the smaller departments were generally scheduled to work and actually did work longer hours per week than did their colleagues in larger sheriffs' departments. The discrepancy between the average number of hours worked and the average number of hours paid for working also was greater among the smaller agencies. The officers from the smaller departments reported working for more hours without pay than did the officers from the larger sheriffs' departments.

South Dakota sheriff departments report a wide variety of insurance plans for their officers and their families. These various types of insurance are paid, in some cases, in full or in part by the agencies themselves, thereby reducing the financial burden of each officer.

Health insurance is the benefit offered most often to employees and their families, with 57 of the 58 departments offering health insurance for officers. Almost half of these $(N=28)$ pay the officer's health insurance in full, while 29 agencies pay for the partial cost of health insurance for their officers. Over half the county agencies (62\%) also offer health insurance for their employee's families, with 30 of these agencies paying the partial cost of health insurance coverage and another 4 departments paying the full cost of family health insurance.

Life insurance is offered by almost half (49\%) of the departments to their officers. The most common form of payment is partial; however, $43 \%$ of those departments do pay the full cost of life insurance for their officers. Slightly over one-fourth (26\%) of the agencies offer life insurance benefits of some type for their officers' families.

Dental insurance is available through only a few (9\%) of the sheriffs' departments. In fact, only four agencies offer some type of dental insurance plan for their officers and their families.

All but one county law enforcement agency buy false arrest and workmen's compensation insurance for their officers. Only in a few departments are the officers expected to partially contribute to the cost of these benefits.

INSURANCE BENBFITS PROVIDED BY COUNTIES

| 1 |  | FOR OFFICERS |  |  |  | ! | FOR FAMILIES |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| , | Full | 1 | Partial | ; | None | + | Full | ! | Partial | 1 | None |
| Life Insurance | 21.3\% | i | 27.6\% | 1 | 51.1\% | 1 | 6.5\% | 1 | 19.6\% | 1 | 73.9\% |
| CHealth Insurance | 48.3\% | : | 50.0\% | 1 | 1.7\% | , | 7.3\% | ! | 54.5\% | ' | 38.2\% |
| Dental Insurance | $4.5 \%$ | ! | 4.5\% | ; | 91.0\% | ; | 4.5\% | ! | 4.5\% | 1 | 91.0x |
| False Arrest | 94.4\% | 1 | 3.7\% | i | 1.9\% | i | -- | ! | -- | , | -- |
| 'Horkmen's Comp. | 87.0\% | 1 | 11.1\% | ! | 1.9\% | ; | -- | ; | -- | ; | -- |

Other benefits are provided by many sheriffs' departments in South Dakota. A list of several of these benefits and the percentage of responding departments who do and do not give them is included below.

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Extra pay for time in court $. ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~$ | $12.5 \%$ |

The most common benefit of this type provided was equipment such as handcuffs, holsters, other leathers, etc. These were given out by $84.5 \%$ of the responding agencies. Two-thirds (66.7\%) of the departments provided uniforms, or a cash allowance for such to their officers. Weapons were furnished by 61.4\% of the participating sheriffs' departments. The remainder of the benefits described above were all provided by less than one-fourth of the county law enforcement agencies, with some being provided by only a very few departments.

Tables presented in later sections of this report list the above and some further personnel benefits which are provided by each of the specific sheriff's departments.

The survey results have pointed out great variation among the departments in vacation allotments, sick leave, and the number of paid holidays offered officers. Most departments used a graduated scale when granting vacation/annual leave to their full-time officers. Those employees who had been with the agency for several years generally received more hours of paid vacation than did the recently-hired employees. The following table presents the average number of hours of paid vacation given after the specified number of years of service for all the responding departments.
Years of Service
After 1 year . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
Average Hours of Paid Vacation
After 2 years . . . . . . . . . . . . . 82 hours
After 5 years . . . . . . . . . . . . . 95 hours
After 7 years . . . . . . . . . . . . . 97 hours
After 10 years . . . . . . . . . . . . . 111 hours
After 15 hours . . . . . . . . . . . . . 121 hours
After 20 years . . . . . . . . . . . . . 126 hours

Forty-nine of the responding departments (86\%) have a formal sick leave plan. The remaining $14 \%$ do not have provisions for their officers who are ill. The average number of hours of sick leave earned by each officer in the department with a sick leave plan was 108 hours for the year 1986. Most of the agencies have a policy regarding the maximum number of sick leave hours which their officers may accumulate. This ranged from 48 to 1,000 hours, with the average being 392 hours.

Most of the departments grant offirial paid holidays to their employees in addition to offeriny vacation or annual leave. Nine paid holidays was the average granted per year for the responding agencies.

Question 18 dealt with the type of compensation provided to officers working overtime. Two-thirds of the departments do not offer compensatory time to any of their employees. However, thirteen agencies offer comp time to their line officers only; one agency gives comp time only to its supervisory officers; and five departments give comp time to both line and supervisory officers.

Paid overtime is provided to at least some officers by less than one-fourth (22.4\%) of the agencies. Ni.ne departments pay cash for overtime hours worked to the line officers only; one agency pays overtime to just the supervisory officers; and 3 departments provide overtime pay to both their line and supervisory officers.

The majority (68.8\%) of those departments which do pay cash for overtime worked pay at the rate of time-and-one-half. Another $18.8 \%$ use a regular pay schedule and $6.2 \%$ of the agencies use some other rate of compensation for paid overtime. Only 6.2\% of the responding sheriffs' departments pay double time for regular hours worked; however, several departments indicated that they do pay double time to those officers who must work on holidays.

More than three-fourths (82.4\%) of the responding departments permit their officers to work a second job. The remainder do not allow their officers to moonlight. The types of restrictions placed on secondary employment vary greatly. Some ( $37.9 \%$ ) restrict the type of employment, while $15.5 \%$ limit the number of hours their officers may moonlight. The departments are most likely to insist upon granting approval preceding secondary employment. Almost half (44.8\%) insist upon prior approval, while $36.2 \%$ only require their officers to notify them about holding second jobs.

## VEHICLES:

A total of 236 vehicles are used by the 58 sheriffs' departments who responded from throughout the state. The majority (62.7\%) of the vehicles are marked cars owned by the departments, while another $17.4 \%$ are unmarked cars owned by the departments. The various types of vehicles and the number used by the collective departments are presented below:
Type of Vehicle Number of Vehicles
Marked cars owned by department ..... 148
Unmarked cars owned by department ..... 41
Any leased vehicles ..... 4
Privately-owned cars ..... 16
Jeeps, trucks, and vans ..... 19
Motorcycles ..... 4
Other ..... 4
Total Vehicles Available ..... 236

Less than half of the departments (44.6\%) have a schedule or policy for replacing vehicles. The majority who do not have a replacement policy said vehicles are replaced at the whim of their county commissions. The mileage accumulated is the determining factor for 48\% of the departments who do have a replacement schedule; another $36 \%$ base replacement on the age of the vehicle; and $16 \%$ use a policy other than age or mileage for replacement of vehicles.

The table below shows the specialized equipment owned by the sheriff's departments as a whole. It is not surprising that the equipment owned by most agencies is the type used in everyday activities, while the type of equilment used only rarely is generally owned by a few of the larger departments.
Specialized Equipment Owned by Departments Yes ..... No
Sidearm ..... 17
Tranquilizer Rifle ..... 50
Other rifle ..... 27 ..... 26
Shotgun ..... 51 ..... 7
Police car radio (two-way) ..... 58 ..... 0
Hand-held police radio ..... 42 ..... 16
Radar unit ..... 48 ..... 9
Fingerprint kit ..... 55 ..... 2
Polygraph equipment ..... 51
D.W.I. Breath Analysis Equipment ..... 21
Gas mask ..... 29
Bulletproof vest ..... 22
Mace canister ..... 15
Bomb technical equipment ..... 51
VCR equipment ..... 14 ..... 40

Pages 20 through 23 present tables of the specialized equipment owned by specific departments throughout the state. This information is provided to assist agencies in identifying others with equipment which they themselves might occasionally need but do not own.

SPECIALIZED EQUIPMENT OWNED BY SHERIFF DEPARTMENTS

| Population Greate: <br> Than 20,000 <br> Department | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 톤 } \\ & \frac{\pi}{\mathbb{D}} \\ & \stackrel{\pi}{n} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{a}{c} \\ & \frac{4}{c} \\ & \underset{\omega}{\Phi} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ᄃ } \\ & \text { + } \\ & \text { 号 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brookings | Y | N | Y | $Y$ | $y$ | Y | $Y$ | $Y$ | N | $Y$ | N | $Y$ | Y | N | N |
| Brown | $Y$ | N | Y | Y | $Y$ | $Y$ | $\gamma$ | $Y$ | N | $y$ | $Y$ | $Y$ | Y | N | $Y$ |
| Codington | Y | N | $N$ | Y | Y | Y | $Y$ | Y | N | $Y$ | $N$ | $Y$ | N | N | Y |
| Minnehaha | Y | Y | Y | Y | $Y$ | $Y$ | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y |
| Pennington | Y | N | $Y$ | Y | Y | Y | $\gamma$ | Y | Y | Y | Y | $Y$ | Y | $Y$ | Y |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

SPECIALIZED EQUIPMENT OWNED BY SHERIFF DEPARTMENTS

Population
10,000-20,000
Department

| Department | $\frac{\stackrel{y}{n}}{n}$ | $\stackrel{5}{5}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ² }}{+}$ | $\frac{\stackrel{0}{n}}{i}$ | $0$ | 오 | O | $\underset{\sim}{\text { E }}$ | $\stackrel{7}{2}$ | 穴 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \text { n } \end{aligned}$ | $\bar{\infty}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\mathrm{O}} \\ & \mathbf{2} \end{aligned}$ | E | $\stackrel{\square}{5}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beadle | $N$ | N | $N$ | N | Y | $N$ | N | $Y$ | N | $\gamma$ | Y | $Y$ | Y | N | $N$ |
| Clay | $Y$ | N | $Y$ | $Y$ | Y | Y | Y | $Y$ | $N$ | N | $Y$ | $Y$ | Y | N | N |
| Davison | $Y$ | N | $Y$ | Y | $Y$ | $Y$ | Y | $Y$ | $N$ | $Y$ | Y | $Y$ | $Y$ | N | Y |
| Hughes | $Y$ | N | $Y$ | $Y$ | Y | $Y$ | N | $Y$ | N | $Y$ | $Y$ | Y | $Y$ | $N$ | $Y$ |
| Lake | $Y$ | N | Y | $Y$ | Y | Y | Y | $Y$ | $N$ | $N$ | $N$ | N | $N$ | $N$ | $N$ |
| Lincoln | N | $N$ | $Y$ | $Y$ | $Y$ | $Y$ | $N$ | $Y$ | $N$ | $N$ | $N^{*}$ | Y | Y | N | N |
| Roberts | $Y$ | N | $N$ | Y | $Y$ | $Y$ | $Y$ | $Y$ | $N$ | N | N | $Y$ | N | N | N |
| Union | $Y$ | $N$ | Y | $Y$ | $Y$ | $N$ | $Y$ | $Y$ | $N$ | $Y$ | $N$ | $Y$ | N | N | $Y$ |
| Yankton | $Y$ | N | $Y$ | Y | $Y$ | $Y$ | $Y$ | $Y$ | $N$ | $N$ | $Y$ | $Y$ | $Y$ | N | $N$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . |  |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\because$ | i |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

SPECIALIZED EQUIPMENT OWNED BY SHERIFF DEPARTMENTS

Population
5,000-9,999

Department

Bon Homme
Brule

Butte
Charles Mix
Corson
Custer
Day
Deuel
Dewey
Fall River
Gregory
Haml in
Kingsbury
McCook
Marshall

## Moody

spink
Todd
Tripp
Turner
Walworth

Population Less
Than 5,000
Department

Question 27 asked the sheriffs how they felt the workload of their departments had changed in recent years. The vast majority ( $89.6 \%$ ) of the sheriffs said their workload had increased, with $57.7 \%$ of these saying their workload had increased dramatically in recent years. A few (6.8\%) of the sheriffs indicated they had had no change in their workload, and only $3.4 \%$ reported a decrease in the department's workload.

Those sheriffs reporting an increase in their workload ( $N=52$ ) were asked how important several factors were in contributing to that workload. They were to rate them as "4" for extremely important; "3" for somewhat important; "2" for of minor importance; or "l" for no effect. A mean or average score was computed from the combined scores given by each of the responding sheriffs. Civil complaints and the resultant serving of papers was cited by the sheriffs as being the most important factor in contributing to an increased workload. Following close behind in the order of importance was the administration/paper work factor. The fourteen factors and their corresponding scores are presented below in rank order of importance.
Workload Contributing Factors Mean Score

1. Civil Complaints and Serving of Papers ..... 3.62
2. Administration/Paper Work ..... 3.49
3. Crime Scene Investigation and Follow-Up ..... 3.25
4. Criminal Warrants ..... 3.18
5. Court Appearances ..... 2.86
6. Support to county, state, and federal law enforcement agencies ..... 2.86
7. Business/Residential "Trouble Calls" ..... 2.73
8. Transport of prisoners to other
jurisdictions ..... 2.65
9. Traffic-Related Work ..... 2.63
10. Radio Traffic ..... 2.56
11. Permits to Purchase Guns ..... 2.42
12. Routine Patrol ..... 2.41
13. Jail Administration ..... 2.39
14. Internal Investigation ..... 1.60

Question 29 listed three different solutions and asked the sheriffs to indicate which should first be implemented to better meet the current demands placed upon their departments. The most popular response, chosen by $53.8 \%$ of the sheriffs, was to hire additional personnel, leaving the existing training/salary requirements intact. The responding sheriffs indicated needs which ranged from one to six additional sworn officers. The majority of these sheriffs (58\%) reported that one more sworn officer would effectively meet the current demands placed on their departments.

Over one-third (36.5\%) of the sheriffs felt that improving the current salary structure for their present personnel would be the best method to meet the demands placed upon their departments. Another $9.6 \%$ stated that improved training for existing personnel would best meet the current demands placed on their departments (see Figure 5).

Figure 5
BEST METHOD TO MEET DEMAND responses of sheriffs overall


## CALLS FOR SERVICE:

The survey defined a call for service as:

1) A call by a citizen to a law enforcement agency or officer initiating a police action/service other than information.

OR
2) An incident observed by an officer resulting in police action or service even though no citizen reported it.

Given this definition, the sheriffs were asked how many calls for service their departments made during calendar year 1985. The results will be looked at per population categories for counties of similar size.
A. County Population Greater Than 20,000:

Four of the five departments in this category ( $80 \%$ ) answered this question. The number of calls for service made by each department ranged from 250 to 23,450 for 1985. A total of 29,031 calls for service were made by the four responding agencies. They all use the same policy in counting the calls for service; that is, only the number of incidents are counted.
B. County Population 10,000 to 20,000:

Five of the nine departments in this category (56\%) answered this question. The number of calls for service made by each department ranged from 174 to 1,468 , with a total of 2,844 calls made by the five responding departments. All of the departments use the same policy in counting the number of calls for service; that is, only the number of incidents are counted.
C. County Population 5,000 to 9,999:

14 of the 21 departments in this category ( $67 \%$ ) answered this question. The number of calls for service ranged from 1 to 4,500 , with a total of 21,961 calls made by the 14 responding agencies in 1986. It is somewhat difficult to compare the number of calls for service in this category because the agencies do not all use the same policy in counting the calls. The vast majority (93\%) count the number of incidents, while the remaining $7 \%$ count the number of officers or units sent to the scene.
D. County Population Less Than 5,000:

14 of the 23 departments in this category (61\%) answered this question. The number of calls for service made by each department ranged from 64 to 1,500 , with a total of 6,487 calls made by the 14 responding departments. It is somewhat difficult to compare the number of calls for service in this category because the departments do not all use the same policy in counting the calls. Most ( $86 \%$ ) count the number of incidents; $7 \%$ count the number of officers or units sent to the scene; and $7 \%$ use some other policy.

## CRIME PREVENTION:

Less than half (46.4\%) of the responding sheriffs' departments currently have an active crime prevention program. of those departments which work with crime prevention, the most popular program was providing speakers on crime prevention topics. Twenty agencies noted that they used this type of speaker. Seven departments are active in firearms safety presentations; six agencies participate in the McGruff--Take a Bite Out of Crime Program; and 3 departments have established neighborhood watch programs in their counties. It should be noted that a sheriffs' department could be involved in one or several of the above activities.

More than one-third (37\%) of the sheriffs' departments without current crime prevention programs indicated they are planning to establish some program of this type in the near future. The rest ( $N=17$ ) do not have a current crime prevention program, nor are they planning to start one.

Over half (56.1\%) of the responding sheriffs' departments presently contribute statistics to the Uniform Crime Reporting (U.C.R.) Program. The length of time they have participated in the U.C.R. Program ranged from a few months to over 15 years.

More than two-thirds (68.8\%) of the sheriffs whose agencies currently participate in U.C.R. find it helpful to them from a management standpoint. In fact, $12.5 \%$ stated that U.C.R. information was very helpful to them as law enforcement administrators. Another $31.2 \%$ indicated that U.C.R. statistics have not been helpful to them as managers.

Slightly over half (55.2\%) of the departments who were not currently reporting to the U.C.R Program reported that they have an alternate system to tally major offenses which occur in their jurisdictions. The remainder do not keep any statistics of this type.

Question 50 discussed the Division of Criminal Investigation's desire to become the state clearinghouse for all U.C.R. data in South Dakota. This would mean that local law enforcement agencies would submit their monthly reports directly to pierre instead of to the F.B.I. in Washington, D.C. The departments were asked to indicate their level of interest in participating in the U.C.R. Program if this were to happen. Two-thirds (66.7\%) expressed a definite desire to participate; another $28.1 \%$ said they might be interested in such a program; and only 5.3\% stated they were not interested.

## CONTRACT LAW ENFORCEMENT:

The next section of the survey dealt with the provision of law enforcement services by the sheriff's departments to municipalities in their jurisdictions without such protection. Over one-fourth (28.1\%) of the responding departments have a contract to provide law enforcement services to at least one of the municipalities in their county. Four sheriffs indicated that their departments provide contract law enforcement services for all of the incorporated areas within their jurisdictions.

Many sheriffs without actual contracts with municipalities in their county which do not have a police force stated that they are still responsible for protecting the citizens of these area towns. Generally, if they are paid a certain amount by the municipality for protection, their officers are required to spend a specific amount of time per month patrolling there. The departments without contractual arrangements usually respond to calls as they are needed. Several sheriffs noted that their county commission would not allow routine patrol of the county.

The nineteen sheriffs' departments who provide contract law enforcement services to area municipalities spend a total of 4,233 hours per month providing these services. The time spent per department ranged from 8 to 720 hours monthly.

Some county sheriffs' departments also contract with federal agencies to provide law enforcement services. Twelve of the responding departments ( $21 \%$ ) have such a contract with a federal agency. Generally, the sheriffs' departments are paid to patrol federally-owned property and also occasionally for boarding federal prisoners. The twelve agencies spend a total of 3,129 hours per month providing these law enforcement services to federal agencies.

Twenty six of the counties described the type of law enforcement services they provide for area municipalities and/or federal agencies.
AURORA - has county-wide law enforcement, that is, a contract with all municipalities. The contract is made on a per capita basis and they spend approximately 240 hours per month providing these services.
BROOKINGS - spends approximately 320 hours per monthproviding law enforcement services to Aurora,Volga, and White. Paid on an hourly rate.
BROWN - Frederick and Hecla split the cost of a law enforcement officer with Brown County. Half the cost of this full-time officer is paid by Frederick and Hecla, the other half by Brown County.
BUFFALO - spends 320 hours per month patrolling federal property on a seasonal basis.
CHARLES MIX - spends approximately 300 hours per month patrolling federal property.
CORSON - spends about 128 hours monthly on a seasonal basis patrolling federal property.
CUSTER - spends 600 hours per month providing services to Custer city. An agreement between county commissioners, city council, and the sheriff.
DAVISON - spends 50 hours per month patrolling Ethan and Mt. Vernon, at a cost of $\$ 500$ per city per month.
DEUEL - county-wide contract law enforcement. The cities of Clear Lake, Gary and Toronta pay an annual fee for approximately 364 hours of protection per month.
DOUGLAS - Corsica pays an annual fee for a minimum of 130 hours per month.
EDMUNDS - has a contract with Bowdle and Roscoe for approximately 160 hours monthly. Pay at an hourly rate.
FALL RIVER - patrol federal property for 10 hours per month.
FAULK - contracts with Cresbard, Faulkton, Onaka, and Orient for 360 hours of service per month. Payment based on a combination of the per capita rate and the tax base.
GREGORY - spends 200 hours a month patrolling federal property.
HAAKON - informal agreement with City of Midland for 20 hours of services per month for a monthly fee.
HUGHES - spends 704 hours per year patrolling federal property.
MARSHALL - provide law enforcement services for all county municipalities. Paid at a per-capita rate to provide 720 hours a month (or "around the clock") protection.
MINNEHAHA - paid quarterly for providing approximately 80 hours of service per month to Baltic, Colton, Humboldt, and Valley Springs. Also spend 3,240 hours annually patrolling Air National Guard property.
MOODY - joint cooperative agreement with Flandreau, Egan, Trent, and Ward. Give 365 hours monthly based on a per capita rate. Moody County also has a contract with Flandreau Santee Sioux effective 4-1-86, for which no specific details were available at time of survey.
PENNINGTON - annual contract with Hill City for approximately 320 hours per month. Also spend about 100 hours per month patrolling federal property and they board federal prisoners.
SPINK - paid annually for spending about 120 hours per month in Doland.
STANLEY - patrol on Corps' of Engineers project land at the Oahe Dam area for approximately 72 hours per month.
SULLY - patrol about 21 hours per month seasonally on Corps' of Engineers property.
UNION - provide 60 hours per month of services to area municipalities.
WALWORTH - paid an hourly rate for approximately 8 hours per month of service to Akaska and Java. Also spend 72 working days per year to patrol federal property.
YANKTON - spend 275 hours per month patrolling federal property.

CIVIL PROCESS:
Civil process procedures appear to be a major concern to the majority of sheriffs in South Dakota. As discussed on page 24, dealing with civil complairits and the serving of papers was the one factor cited by the most sheriffs as being extremely important in contributing to their increased workload. It is also an area which could involve serious liability ramifications for the counties.

A section on civil process was included in the 1986 survey instrument at the request of several sheriffs. The responding sheriffs' departments served a combined total of 31,994 civil papers in l985. They collected $\$ 288,559$ in civil fees which were turned over to their county treasurers. The combined departments also collected $\$ 51,175$ for mileage fees which were related to the civil process.

Thirty-nine departments returned 4,178 executions in 1985, at a total dollar value of $\$ 3,572,829$. It should be noted that four counties (Clay, Minnehaha, Pennington, and Union) have constables to aid in the civil process. The sheriffs' departments in these counties generally would not have statistics to reflect the activities of these constables. Also, some counties do not keep track of their civil process activities. Therefore, the statistics presented here should not be viewed as statewide totals for civil process procedures. These totals are lower than the actual statewide totals would be.

Most of the sheriffs' departments keep track of the degree of satisfaction for executions served based on the amount of fees returned to the county treasurer. The majority (65\%) of executions were returned not satisfied; $9 \%$ were returned partially satisfied; and $25 \%$ were returned fully satisfied. The degree of satisfaction should not be seen as a reflection on the quality of work done by the specific sheriffs' departments. Many factors are involved in whether an execution is satisfied or not, and these factors will vary among jurisdictions.

The responding departments collected a total of $\$ 180,947$ in delinquent taxes. This included property taxes collected for their local county in addition to sales and unemployment taxes collected for the state government.

The sheriffs were asked to estimate the percentage of time spent annually by themselves and/or a deputy(ies) working on all elements of the civil process. Their answer was to be stated in terms of an FTE (Full-Time Employee). Forty departments reported that 40 FTE's are required to spend $100 \%$ of their time with civil process. Some smaller departments stated that civil process procedures required about $20 \%$ of one officer's time annually, while in a larger county several officers are needed to work civil process on a full-time basis.

Pages 34 through 39 present tables of the civil process statistics kept by each specific department. The departments are arranged alphabetically within their appropriate population categories.

CIVIL PROCESS - 1985 STATISTICS
COLnTY POPILATION GREATER THAN 23,000

_ * Minnehaha County - has 5 constables to aid in civil process. The sheriff's departents statistics do not include collections made by the constables.
** Pennington County - has priyately enployed constables who report to county condission.

CIVIL PROCESS - 1985 STATISTICS
COUNTY POPULATION 10,000 to 20,000


* Clay County has a constable to aid in the civil process; who is responsible to the sheriff.
** Union County has a constable who is responsible to the county supervisors. The sheriff's departeent does not keep statistics on the activities of the constables.

CIVIL PROCESS - 1985 STATISTICS
COUNTY POPULATION 5,000 to 10,000


Continued-

CIVIL PROCESS - 1985 STATISTICS
COUNTY POPulation 5,000 to 10,000
(continued)


Gregory and Moody Counties did not fill out the section on civil process.

CIVIL PROCESS - 1985 STATISTICS
COONTY POPULATION LESS THAN 5,000


Continued --

CIVIL PROCESS - 1985 STATISTICS
COUnty POPulation less than 5,000
(continued)


2iebach County did not respond to the civil process section.

## COUNTY JAIL FACILITIES:

County jail facilities have been a "hot" topic among South Dakota sheriffs and many others for several years and promise to continue to be cause for concern in the future. At one time, virtually every county in South Dakota maintained a jail to house their own prisoners. Over the years, the facilities in many counties became obsolete and were not replaced. The counties realized that jails are very expensive to maintain and have a potentially high liability risk.

Currently, slightly less than half (49\%) of the counties responding to the survey operate a jail facility. Fourteen of the facilities are classified as Regional Jail Centers; that is, they house prisoners from other jurisdictions as well as from their own. Another 8 counties have Full Jail Facilities and are able to house their own prisoners for extended periods of time (longer than 72 hours). Seven counties have Limited Holding Facilities and are limited to housing prisoners for less than 72 hours. If a prisoner must be detained for longer than 72 hours, the counties with limited facilities must take their prisoners to a regional jail center. Thirty of the counties who responded to thesurvey do not operate a jail facility of any type. Any prisoners from these counties must be transported to a regional jail center in a neighboring jurisdiction.

The 1986 survey contained a fairly large section on county jail facilities. The jail section began with budget information. Twenty-seven departments reported a combined jail budget total of $\$ 3,115,324$. The jail budgets are further analyzed for each county on the following pages.

The responding counties report a total of 184 employees involved in the operation of their jail facilities. Over three-fourths of these ( $77 \%$ ) are full-time employees, with the remainder working part-time. The jail personnel are involved in direct custody functions, clerical/maintenance activities, and/or the administration of the facilities. More than half (62\%) of the employees are involved in direct custody functions, with titles such as correctional officers, guards, jailers, etc. The majority (61\%) of these correctional officers are male, while $39 \%$ are female.

It should be noted that the meaning of the term "jail personnel" will vary among departments. Only four of the counties with large jail facilities have employees who are assigned full-time to jajiduties. In most of the counties, the jail personnel have varied responsibilities within their departments; such as deputies, dispatchers, and secretaries in combination with their duties as correctional officers.

These split responsibilities should be kept in mind when examining the statistics which follow for the specific departments.

Twenty percent of the responding sheriffs' departments with jails require all of their corrections officers to be law enforcement certified. Another $32 \%$ of the departments indicated that some of their correctional officers were certified, while 48\% of the departments do not have any sworn corrections officers.

The vast majority of departments (84\%) do provide some type of training for their corrections officers. The training utilized may be one or a combination of the following: in-service training; National Sheriffs' Association Jail Training Correspondence; or the DCI Training Academy. Over three-fourths of the departments ( $82 \%$ ) were interested in participating in a correctional officer certification program.

The authorized annual salaries available to correctional officers in the responding departments ranged from $\$ 7,280$ to $\$ 16,160$ per year.

The responding counties with jails can hold a combined total of 563 males, 118 females, and 89 juveniles. A few counties did not categorize their holding capacity by type of prisoner. The total capacity for the participating agencies was 825 prisoners.

The remaining information collected for the jails is presented in the tables on pages 43 through 5l. The counties are arranged alphabetically within the following categories: l) regional jail centers, 2) full jail facilities, 3) limited jail facilities, and 4) no jail facilities. Several definitions are provided for increased understanding of the jail-related tables which follow.

+ Regional Jail Center - jail facility which houses prisoners from at least one other jurisdiction in addition to the county's own prisoners.
+ Full Jail Facility - able to house their own prisoners for extended periods of time (longer than 72 hours).
+ Limited Holding Facility - limited to holding prisoners for less than 72 hours. Any prisoner who must be incarcerated for more than 72 hours must be transported from a limited to a regional facility.
+ No Jail Facility - the county does not operate a jail facility.
+ Total Jail Personnel - includes both full and part-time employees involved in jail operations. May include personnel with other responsibilities in the department.
+ Receive Prisoners From - the counties which send their prisoners to regional jail centers.
+ Total Prisoner Days - the sum total of days that each prisoner spent in jail. For example, 5 prisoners for 5 days equals 25 prisoner days.
+ Out-of-County Prisoner Days - number of prisoner days when inmates were held for other jurisdictions, such as neighboring counties and federal agencies.
+ Daily Fee Charged - price charged per day to other jurisdictions for boarding their prisoners.
$+\frac{\text { Prisoners }}{\text { Received }}$ - number of prisoners received by the facility in 1985.
+ Prisoners Taken To - jurisdiction where counties with limited or no jail facilities take their prisoners.
+ Total Prisoners Transported - number of prisoners the county had to transport to another jail facility in 1985.
+ Mileage Transporting Prisoners - number of miles travelled by the department transporting prisoners to another facility in 1985.
+ Daily Fee Paid - price paid per day to another jurisdiction for boarding of prisoners.
+ Total Jail Fees Paid - dollar amount spent by the department in $19 \overline{85}$ in jail fees to other jurisdictions.
+ Total Jail Fees Received - dollar amount received by regional facilities from other counties for boarding their prisoners.
+ Work Release Monies Received - dollar amount of county work release monies collected by the department in 1985.

When examining the information on jail budgets, it is important to realize that some departments have completely distinct budgets for their jails and for their departments overall. Other counties can not separate all the jail costs from their total budget. In these counties, it is difficult to distinguish the expenses incurred for jail personnel from the departmental personnel costs overall, and the jail operations expenses from the department expenses as a whole, etc. Budget comparisons among these counties will be difficult.

## regional daills budget information



REGIONAL JAIL FACILITIES
1985 COUNTY STATISITICS


* Charles Mix County can also hold 2 in trustee cells; 2 in detention; and 4 in drunk tank: total of 66.
** Codington County can hold an additional prisoner in solitary confinement: total of 53.
Davison County is unique in that it is classified as both a regional and limited jail facility. iney do board prisoners from other jurisdictions, but only for less than 72 hours.

REGIONAL JAIL FACILItIES
1985 COUNTY STATISTICS

full jail facilities budget information


FULL JAIL FACILITIES
1985 County Statistics

| I |  |  | HODING | CAPACITY |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| , | TOTAL |  | HOLDING | Capacity |  | TOTAL | TOTAL |  |
| I | JAIL |  |  |  | \| | \| PRISONERS | \| PRISONER | OF |
| 1 COUNTY | PERSONNEL | MALES | \| FEMALES | JUVENILES | TOTAL | RECEIVED | 1 DAYS | FACILITY |
| \| 1. Bon Homme | 11 | 6 | 16 | 0 | 12 | 66 | 309 | 152 yrs. 1 |
| \| 2. Clay | 6 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 18 | 190 | 2,502 | 170 yrs. 1 |
| 1 3. Day | 6 | 8 | 13 | 2 | 13 | 1,200 | 1,595 | \| 22 yrs. |
| \| 4. Faulk | 2 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 16 | 43 | 223 | 50 yrs. 1 |
| \| 5. Marshall | 12 | 5 | 11 | 1 | 7 | 107 | 214 | \| 79 yrs. 1 |
| \| 6. Pennington | 33 | 103 | 9 | 0 | 112* | 4,354 | 33,311 | 164 yrs. 1 |
| 17. Union | 7 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 185 | 770 | $8 \mathrm{yrs}$. |
| \| 8. Walworth | -- | 6 | 13 | 0 | 9 | 138 | 1,989 | $1-1$ |
| TOTALS | 77 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} 160 \\ \text { males } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ \text { females } \end{gathered}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} 9 \\ \text { juveniles } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} 199 \\ \text { total } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} 6,283 \\ \text { received } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 40,913 } \\ \text { days } \end{gathered}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{r} 52 \text { yrs. } \\ \mid \text { median age } \end{array}\right.$ |

** Pennington County can hold 70 prisoners in the main jail facility and 42 more in the work release annex.

## limited Jail facilities budget information

| $:$ COUNTY | PERSONNEL SALARIES \& WAGES | ! | PERSONNEL BENEFITS | ! | OPERATING EXPENSES | : | CAPITAL OUTLAY | ! | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL } \\ & \text { JAIL } \\ & \text { BUDGET } \end{aligned}$ | ! | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { JAIL FEES } \\ \text { PAID } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 1. Davison | \$75,820 | : | \$15,858 | ; | \$59,470 | ; | - | : | . $\$ 151,148$ | : | \$39,440 |
| : 2. Edmunds | - | i | - | ; | 8,000 | ; | - | : | 8,000 | ; | 10,800 |
| i 3. Hand | - | ; | - | : | 15,000 | 1 | - | ; | 15,000 | : | ----- |
| : 4. Lincoln | - | : | - | ; | - | ; | - | ; | 12,000 | ; | - |
| : 5. Mellette | 2,385 | : | - | : | 11,200 | ; | - | ; | 13,585 | : | 6,200 |
| : 6. Perkins | - | ; | - | 1 | - | ; | - | ; | 14,500 | ; | 7,819 |
| : 7. Turner | - | ; | - | : | - | ; | - | ; | ---- | : | - |
| : totals |  | ! |  | $!$ |  | ; |  | : | \$214,233 | ; | \$64,259 |

LImIted Jail facilities
1985 COUNTY STATISTICS

|   <br> COUNTY TOTAL <br> JERSOLL  <br> PEREL  |  | holding capacity |  |  |  | NLMBEROFPRISONERSRECEIVED | TOTAL PRISONER DAYS |  |  | TOTAL PRISONERS TRANSFORTED | MILEAGE TRANSPORT PRISONERS | $\left\|\begin{array}{c}\text { DAILY } \\ \text { JAIL } \\ \text { FEE } \\ \text { PAID }\end{array}\right\|$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | MALE | FEMALE | JUVENILE | I total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 1. Davison* | 8 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 118 | 530 | 1,312 | 50 yrs . | Minnehaha | 128 | 16,653 | \$25 |
| 1 2. Edmunds | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 72 | 241 | 17 yrs. | Brown | 23 | 1,150 | \$25 |
| 1 3. Hand | -- | -- | -- | 1 -- | 1 -- | -- | -- | 1 -- \| | Beadle | 38 | 1,380 | \$30 |
| 14. Lincoln | -- | -- | - | -- | 1 -- | -- | -- | 1 -- | Minnehaha | -- | -- | - |
| 15. Mellette | -- | 7 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 150 | - -- | 1 -- | Hughes | 50 | 8,000 | \$32 |
| 16. Perkins | 6 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 61 | 61 | \| $50 \mathrm{yrs}$. | Corson or Lawrence | 43 | 2,000 | 1 \$25 |
| 17. Turner | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 1 - | 68 | 130 yrs . | -- | 1 -- | 1 -- | -- |
| 1 TOTALS | 22 | 36 | 5 | 0 | 141 | 813 | 1,682 | $\left\|\begin{array}{c}\text { \| } \\ \text { a } \\ \text { median age }\end{array}\right\|$ |  | \$312 | 29,183 | 1 |

* Davison County is unique in that it is classified as both a regional and limited jail facility. They do board prisoners from neighboring jurisdictions, but only for less than 72 hours.


## COUNTIES WITHOUT JAIL FACILITIES

| County | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered}\text { Prisoners } \\ \text { Pransported } \\ \text { To }\end{gathered}\right.$ | Number of Prisoners Transported |  | Daily Fee Paid | Total Spent Jail Fees |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \| 1. Aurora | Brule, <br> Davison or <br> I <br> Minnehaha | 36 | 9,000 | $\$ 26$ $\$ 25$ $\$ 25$ | \$ 6,570 |
| 1 2. Buffalo | \| Brule | 2 | 250 | \$26 | \$ 184 |
| 13. Butte | \| Lawrence | -- | 1 -- | \| \$25 | 1 -- |
| \| 4. Campbell | \| Walworth | 2 | 120 | - \$20 | \$ 400 |
| \| 5. Clark | \| Codington | -- | 1 -- | \| \$25 | \$10,000 |
| 16. Custer | \| Fall River | 108 | 7,000 | \| \$25 | \$12,474 |
| 17. Deuel | 1 Codington | -- | 15,000 | - \$25 | \$23,000 |
| \| 8. Douglas | \| Charles Mix | -- | 1 -- | \$24 | 1 -- |
| 19. Gregory | \| Charles Mix | | -- | 1 -- | \$24 | 1 -- |
| 110. Haakon | 1 Hughes | 16 | 1,305 | \$32 | \$4,200 |
| 11. Hamlin | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { Brookings or } \\ & \text { Codington }\end{aligned}\right.$ | 41 | \| -- | \| $\begin{array}{r}\$ 30 \\ \$ 25\end{array}$ | \$4,065 |
| 12. Hanson | 1Davison or <br> Minnehaha | 20 | 1,100 | \$25 $\$ 25$ | \$ 3,690 |
| 113. Harding | \| Lawrence | -- | 1 -- | \$25 | 1 -- |
| 114. Hyde | 1 Hughes | 27 | 5,110 | \$32 | \$ 5,151 |
| 115. Jackson | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bennett or } \\ & \text { Hughes } \end{aligned}$ | 5 | 800 | \$32 | \$ 343 |
| 116. Jerauld | $\|$Beadle, <br> Davison, or <br> D <br> Minnehaha | 27 | 4,000 | $\$ 30$ $\$ 25$ $\$ 25$ | \$ 7,945 |
| 117. Jones | 1 Hughes | 9 | 1,035 | \$32 | 1 \$2,211 |

## COUNTIES WITHOUT JAIL FACILITIES (continued)

| County | $\left\|\begin{array}{c}\text { Prisoners } \\ \text { Transported } \\ \text { To }\end{array}\right\|$ | Number of Prisoners Transported | Miles Travelled Transporting Prisoners | Daily Fee Paid | Total <br> Spent <br> Jail <br> Fees |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \|18. Kingsbury | \| Lake | -- | -- | \$20 | -- |
| 119. Lyman | \| Brule | -- | -- | \$26 | \$25,000 |
| 120. McCook | \| Minnehaha | -- | -- | \$25 | -- |
| 121. Miner | \| Lake | 48 | 1,920 | \$20 | \$ 5,620 |
| 122. Moody | \| Lake or <br> \| Minnehaha | -- | -- | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 20 \\ & \$ 25 \end{aligned}$ | \$11,000 |
| 123. Sanborn | Beadle or <br> Davison | 6 | 450 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 30 \\ & \$ 25 \end{aligned}$ | \$ 430 |
| 124. Spink ** | \| Brown | -- | -- | \$25 | -- |
| 125. Stanley | 1 Hughes | 229 | 2,529 | \$32 | \$19,200 |
| 126. Sully | \| Hughes | 12 | -- | \$32 | \$ 3,000 |
| 127. Todd | \| Winner City | | 6 | 600 | \$25 | -- |
| 128. Tripp | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { Winner City } \\ & \left\|\begin{array}{l} \text { or Hughes } \end{array}\right\| \end{aligned}\right.$ | 30 | 7,104 | $\$ 25$ $\$ 30$ | \$5,175 |
| 129. Yankton | \| Yankton City | -- | 0 | -- | -- |
| 130. Ziebach | \| Dewey | 2 | 2,000 | \$20 | \$ 300 |
| TOTALS | \| | 626 Prisoners | 59,323 Miles |  | \$149,958 Total |

[^0]
## TURNOVER:

Question 85 asked the sheriffs to specify the number of personnel separations in their department during 1985. They were instructed to include only full-time, sworn personnel in their count. Information was collected on the reason for leaving the department; the number of years the officer had worked for the department; and if possible, the total number of years the officer had warked in the law enforcement field. They were asked to round-off months of service to the nearest year.

There were a total of 26 full-time swarn personnel separations in calendar year 1985 for the participating sheriffs' agencies. Over half $(N=15)$ of these separations were caused by resignation. The 15 resigning officers had spent an average of 7.5 years working for their departments.

Ten officers (38\%) were dismissed from their departments in 1985. The discharged officers had spent an average of 4.5 years of service with the department, and had averaged 5.3 years of total law enforcement service..

Only one officer retired from his department in 1985. None of the sheriffs reported that any of their sworn officers had died while employed by the county during the last year.

The rate of turnover can be calculated by dividing the total number of separations (26) by the total number of full-time sworn personnel (249). The overall turnover rate for the fifty-eight departments was 10.4\% for the year 1985. This rate of turnover varies when the agencies are categorized by county population. Generally, the turnover rate increases as the population of the county decreases (see Figure 6 ).

| County | Number of | Total | Turnover |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population | Turnovers | Personnel | Rate |

Greater than 20,000 . . . 6 . . . . . . 94 . . . . $6.4 \%$
10,000 to 20,000 . . . . 2 . . . . . 44 . . . 4.5\%
5,000 to 9,999 . . . . 11 . . . . . 69 . . 15.9\%
Less than 5,000 . . . . . 7 . . . . . 42 . . . $16.7 \%$
Overall Turnover Rate $=10.4 \%$

Figure 6
SWORN OFFICER TURNOVER RATE

$1=$ Population greater than 20,000
$2=$ Population 10,000 to 20,000
$3=$ Population 5,000 to 10,000
4.a Population less than 5,000

## LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING COURSES:

The sheriffs were presented a list of 44 courses and were asked how important each should be in the development of the Law Enforcement Training Academy's curriculum. Each course could be rated as "3" for extremely important; "2" for somewhat important; or "l" for not immediately important. The course names and their combined scores from all the responding sheriffs are given below in order of their scored importance.

Overall

## Course Name

Mean Score

1. Arrest, Search, and Seizure . . . . . . . . . 2.80
2. Civil Process . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 2.76
3. Interviewing and Interrogation . . . . . . . . 2.74
4. Crime Scene Investigation . . . . . . . . . . . 2.70
5. Liability of Law Enforcement Authority to Arrest 2.62
6. Child Abuse and Domestic Violence . . . . . . . 2.56
7. Evidence Collection Techniques . . . . . . . . 2.56
8. Case Preparation and Courtroom Testimony . . . 2.50
9. Search Warrant Preparation and Execution . . . 2.48
10. Report Writing . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 2.46
11. Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs . . . . . . . . 2.44
12. Liability of Police Administrators/Supervisors 2.43
13. Rape and Other Sex Offenses . . . . . . . . . . 2.41
14. Police Survival . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 2.38
15. Juvenile Justice Law \& Rights of Children . . . 2.33
16. Stress Management . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 2.32
17. Basic Training Update . . . . . . . . . . . . 2.31
18. Criminal Code and Case Law . . . . . . . . . . 2.30
19. Juvenile Problems . . . . . . . . . . . . . 2.30
20. Prisoner Custody and Transportation . . . . . . 2.30

The Sheriffs were also asked to rank the five courses (out of 44 listed) which were most important to the training needs of their own department, that they would like the Law Enforcement Training Academy to offer. The most frequently named courses and the number of sheriffs who listed those topics are listed in rank order below.
Number Percentage of TotalCourse Name Of Sheriffs

1. Interviewing \& Interrogation ..... 52\%
2. Civil Process ..... 45\%
3. Arrest, Search, and Seizure ..... 29\%
4. Crime Scene Investigation ..... 29\%
5. Child Abuse \& Domestic Violence ..... 11 ..... 19\%
6. Liability of Law Enforcement. Authority to Arrest ..... $17 \%$
7. Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs ..... 17\%
8. Stress Management ..... $16 \%$
9. Accident Investigation ..... $12 \%$
10. Police Survival ..... 12\%
11. Basic Training Update ..... $10 \%$
12. Evidence Collection Techniques ..... $10 \%$
13. Jailer Training/Jail Management 4 ..... 7\%
14. Prisoner Custody \& Transportation 4 ..... 7\%
15. Search Warrant Preparation \& Execution ..... 4 ..... $7 \%$

## County Population Greater Than 20,000

budget expenses of countibs grbater than 20,000 population

| : | ; | POPULATION | : | SALARIES | ; | BENBFITS | : | OPERATING | : | CAPITAI. | ; | JAIL | ! | OTHER | 1 | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brookings | : | 25,013 | : | \$187, 241 | ! | \$39,773 | i | \$36,584 | ; | \$2,500 | : | -0- | ; | \$5,554 | : | \$271, 652 |
| : Brown | ; | 36,784 | ; | 364, 020 | ; | 84,267 | : | 37,500 | ; | 96,900 | : | 60,300 | , | -0- | ; | 642,987 |
| : Codingtor | * | 22,084 | : | 100,000 | ; | 19,296 | ; | 23,500 |  | 2,800 | : | 190,647 | : | -0- | ; | 335,647 |
| Minnehaha | ; | 118,145 | ; | 1,173,922 | ; | 230,108 | ; | 125,330 | ; | 58,200 | ! | 147,350 | : | 7,500 | ; | 1,742,410 |
| Pennington | 只: | 74.716 | ; | 800,622 | : | 173,047 | : | 200,238 | : | 73,000 | : | 691,913 | ; | 141,938 | : | 2,080,758 |
| : TOTAL | ; | 276,742 | 1 | \$2,625,805 | ; | \$546,491 | ! | \$423,152 | ; | \$233,400 | 1 | 1,219,735 | ; | \$154, 992 | ' | \$5,202,979 |

: Codington County's jail expense includes salaries and benefits of jail personnel, jail operating expenses, and capital outlay for the jail.
*: Pennington County's jail expense includes salaries and benefits of jail personnel.

## ANNUAL SALARTES OF FULL-TIME SWORN PERSONNEL

POPULATION GREATER THAN 20,000


Using current salaries as of March 1, 1986.

* 25 th Percentile $=75 \%$ of the salaries are above this
** Median $=$ half the salaries are above and half are below
*** 75 th Percentile $=25 \%$ of the salaries are above this
Population Greater Than 20,000

| Population Greater <br> Than 20,000 <br> Department |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \lambda \\ & \omega \\ & 0 \\ & \infty \\ & \vdots \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \lambda \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \dot{2} \\ & \dot{E} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & \vdots \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \lambda \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \lambda \\ & \cdots \\ & \cdots \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & c \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{cc}  & 0 \\ n & 0 \\ 5 & \frac{c}{n} \\ 0 & \frac{2}{0} \\ 0 & \frac{2}{3} \\ 0 & 4 \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{array}{cc} 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{0} & \frac{1}{n} \\ \frac{2}{2} & \frac{5}{5} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{3} \\ 0 & 4 \\ \hline 1 & 4 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brookings | 7 | $P$ | $F$ | $N$ | $F$ | F | N | $Y$ | $Y$ | N | $Y$ | N | N | $Y$ | $Y$ | Y | $Y$ | L | $L$ | 8 | Y | N |
| Brown | 10 | P | $P$ | P | $F$ | $F$ | Y | $N$ | N | N | $Y$ | $N$ | $N$ | $Y$ | $Y$ | Y | $Y$ | $N$ | $L$ | 9 | Y | Y |
| Codington | 4 | N | $F$ | N | F | $F$ | $N$ | $Y$ | N | $N$ | $Y$ | N | $N$ | Y | $Y$ | $Y$ | $Y$ | $B$ | - | 5 | N | N |
| Minnehaha | 39 | P | $P$ | P | $F$ | F | $Y$ | N | Y | N | $Y$ | N | Y | $Y$ | $Y$ | $Y$ | $Y$ | B | B | 22 | Y | Y |
| Pennington | 34 | P | $P$ | P | $p$ | P | $Y$ | $N$ | $N$ | N | $Y$ | N | $Y$ | $Y$ | $Y$ | Y | $Y$ | S | L | 27 | $Y$ | $Y$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^1]
## County Population $\mathbf{1 0 , 0 0 0}$ to $\mathbf{2 0 , 0 0 0}$

budget expenses of counties $\mathbf{1 0 , 0 0 0}$ to $\mathbf{2 0 , 0 0 0}$ POPULATION

| : | ! | POPULATION | : | SALARIES | : | BENEFITS | ; | OPERATING | : | CAPITAL | : | JAIL | ; | OTHER | ; | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| i Beadle | ; | 18,367 | ! | \$85, 155 | ; | \$18,490 | ; | \$26.500 | : | \$11,000 | : | \$191, 788 | ! | - 0 | : | \$332,933 |
| CClay | ; | 13,663 | ; | 70,550 | : | 16,165 | ; | 23,050 | : | 2,800 | : | 43,516 | ; | -0- | : | 156,081 |
| : Davison | : | 17,814 | ; | 172,448 | : | 34,247 | ; | 34,553 | ; | 12,000 | : | 17,470 | ; | \$42,000 | : | 312,718 |
| : Hughes | ; | 14,715 | ; | 275,739 | ; | 49,196 | ; | 25,000 | ; | 41,610 | : | 58,000 | ; | -0- | 1 | 449,545 |
| : Lake | : | 10,995 | i | 118,600 | : | 22,680 | : | 43,000 | : | 15,300 | : | 49,167 | ! | -0- | ! | 248,747 |
| ilincoln | ; | 14,307 | : | 81,000 | ; | 12,160 | : | 20,000 | ; | -0- | ! | 12,000 | ; | -0- | ; | 125,160 |
| : Roberts | ; | 11,053 | ; | 125,260 | : | 22,239 | : | 31,995 | ! | 12,500 | : | 48,185 | ! | 4,256 | : | 244,435 |
| iUnion | ! | 10,816 | ; | 108,320 | : | 7,745 | , | 21,500 | ; | -0- | ! | 10,000 | ; | 3,000 | ; | 150,565 |
| ; Yankton | ; | 19,098 | ; | 110,882 | : | 9,918 | ; | 34,051 | ; | 12,560 | ; | 56,000 | ; | -0- | ; | 223,411 |
| : TOTAL | ; | 130,828 | ; | \$1,147,954 | : | \$192,840 | : | \$259,649 | , | \$107,770 | ; | \$486, 126 | : | \$49,256 | : | \$2,243,595 |



Using current salaries of March 1, 1986.

* 25th Percentile $=75 \%$ of the salaries are above this
* Median $=$ half the salaries are above and half are below
*** 75th Percentile $=25 \%$ of the salaries are above this

PERSONNEL BENEFITS
Population $10,000=20,000$


County Population $\mathbf{5 , 0 0 0}$ to 9,999
budget expenses of counties 5,000 to 10,000 POPULATION

| ; | : | POPULATION | : | SALARIES | : | BENEEITS | 1 | OPMRATING | : | CAPITAL | ; | JAIL | 1 | OTHER | : | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| : Bon Homme | ; | 7,870 | ; | \$56,750 | : | *8,750 | : | \$23,000 | : | \$8,000 | ; | \$46,480 | ; | -0- | ; | \$142,980 |
| ; Brule | : | 5,385 | : | 50,165 | ; | 11,880 | ; | 34,904 | ; | -0- | ; | 107,803 | ; | -0- | ; | 204,752 |
| : Butte | : | 8,253 | ; | -0- | ; | -0- | ; | -0- | ! | -0- | ; | 50,000 | ; | -0- | ; | 93,000 |
| Charles Mix | : | 9,719 | ; | 134,000 | : | 31,684 | ; | 55,200 | ; | 10,360 | ; | 24,602 | ; | \$50,385 | ; | 306,231 |
| iCorson | ; | 5,245 | ; | 45,500 | : | 5,510 | ; | B,700 | ; | 10:500 | ; | 17,500 | 1 | -0- | ! | 87:710 |
| : Custer | ; | 6,643 | ; | 216,042 | ; | 31,969 | ; | 69,489 | ; | -0- | : | -0- | : | 48,000 | : | 365,500 |
| : Day | ; | 7,956 | : | 86,129 | ' | 4,400 | \% | 13,500 | : | 12,000 | : | 31,280 | ; | -0- | : | 147,309 |
| : Deuel | ; | 5,229 | ; | 108,900 | ; | 19,900 | ; | 28,577 | ; | 12,000 | ; | -0- | : | 24,000 | ; | 193,377 |
| ! Dewey | ; | 5,467 | ; | 39,000 | ! | 4,776 | ! | 10,235 | : | 2,659 | : | 4,500 | : | -0- | ; | 61,170 |
| :Fall River | ; | 7,954 | ; | 86,853 | ; | 17,843 | ; | 39,200 | : | -0- | ; | 141,746 | ; | -0- | : | 285,642 |
| : Gregory | ; | 5,930 | ; | 37,585 | ! | 7,280 | : | 14,150 | ; | 1,200 | : | 21,200 | ; | 28,971 | : | 110,386 |
| :Hawlin | ; | 5,261 | ; | 38,885 | : | 4,380 | : | 15,960 | : | 615 | ! | -0- | i | -0- | ! | 59,840 |
| iKingsbury | : | 6,537 | ; | 35,560 | ; | 4,865 | ; | 13,700 | : | -0- | : | 41,600 | ; | 5,000 | ; | 100,725 |
| i McCook | : | 6,282 | ; | 50,000 | ; | 7,250 | : | 22,750 | : | -0- | ; | 10,000 | ; | -0- | : | 90,000 |
| M Marshall | ; | 5,263 | : | 131,019 | ; | 28,637 | ; | 46,500 | ; | -0- | : | 10,000 | ; | -0- | ; | 216,156 |
| : Moody | : | 6,921 | ; | 184,347 | : | 23,530 | ; | 69,000 | : | 12,000 | ; | 17,000 | ; | -0- | ; | 306,477 |
| : Spink | : | 9,126 | ; | 175,000 | : | 41,799 | ; | 20,781 | ; | 22,000 | : | 17,000 | ! | 15,400 | ; | 291,980 |
| : Todd | i | 7,299 | ; | -- | ; | -- | ; | -- | ; | -- | : | -- | ; | -- | : | 32,520 |
| : Tripp | ; | 7,255 | ; | 53,214 | : | 2,708 | : | -0- | : | -0- | ; | -0- | : | 3,751 | ; | 59,146 |
| : Turner | ; | 9, 162 | ; | 35,830 | ; | 5,858 | ! | 17,458 | : | -0- | : | -0- | : | -0- | i | 59,673 |
| ; Walworth | - | 6,709 | i | 40,000 | ; | 8,420 | ; | 12,600 | ; | -0- | : | 12,000 | ; | -0- | ! | 73,020 |
| : TOTAL | : | 145,466 | ! | \$1,604,779 |  | \$271,439 | ! | \$516, 304 | : | \$91,334 | : | \$551,761 | ; | \$176,457 | ; \$3 | , 287,067 |

## ANNUAL SALARIES OF FULI-TIME SWORN PERSONNEE

POPULATION 5,000 TO 10,000


Using current salaries of March $1,1986$.

* 25 th Percentile $=75 \%$ of the salaries are above this
** Median = half the salariea are above and half are below
*** 75 th Percentile $=25 \%$ of the salaries are above tais

PERSONNEL BENEFITS
Population 5,000-9,999


PERSONNEL BENEFITS
Population $5,000=9,999$


## County Population Less Than 5,000

budget expenses of counties less than 5,000 population

| : | : | POPUEATION | i | SALARIES | : | BENEFITS | : | OPERATING | ! | CAPITAL | ! | JAIL | ! | OTHER | : | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| : Aurora | : | 3,483 | ; | \$61, 135 | i | \$17,837 | : | \$16,550 | : | \$2,800 | 1 | \$15,000 | ; | -0- | ; | \$113,322 |
| © Buffalo | : | 1,711 | ; | 31,925 | ! | 4,310 | : | 2,400 | : | 1,000 | ; | -0- | ! | \$2,000 | ! | 41,635 |
| : Campbell | ; | 2,273 | : | 23,000 | ; | 5,950 | ; | 10,050 | ; | -0- | : | 2,000 | ; | -0- | : | 41,000 |
| ! Clark | ; | 4,953 | : | 37,865 | ! | 10,300 | ; | 13,130 | : | -0- | ; | 15,000 | : | 2,000 | 1 | 78,295 |
| : Douglas | ; | 3,957 | ; | 49,235 | ! | 13,200 | ; | 21,600 | ; | 8,200 | : | 5,000 | : | -0- | ; | 97,235 |
| : Edmunds | ; | 4,992 | , | 77,800 | ; | 15,803 | ; | 12,800 | : | 3,000 | ; | 8,000 | : | 10,035 | : | 127,438 |
| : Faulk | : | 3,183 | ; | 115,875 | ; | 28,590 | : | 19,680 | : | 5,000 | ; | -0- | i | -0- | : | 169,145 |
| : Haskon | ; | 2,935 | : | 33,785 | : | 2,416 | ; | 7,081 | ; | 8,500 | ; | 5,000 | ; | -0- | ! | 56,782 |
| ; Hand | ; | 4,768 | ; | 58,000 | ; | -0- | ! | 11,570 | : | 6,340 | : | 15,000 | ; | -0- | : | 89,910 |
| : Hanson | ; | 3,322 | ; | 23,685 | : | 5,645 | ; | 12,650 | ; | -0- | : | 8,000 | ; | -0- | : | 49,880 |
| : Harding | : | 1,855 | : |  | ! |  | ; |  | ; |  | : |  | i |  | ! | 49,505 |
| : Hyde | ! | 1,947 | ; | 23,000 | ; | 2,645 | ; | 8,450 | ; | 250 | ; | 3,000 | ! | -0- | ; | 37,345 |

Continued - -
bUdGET EXPBNSES OF COUNTIES LESS THAN 5,000 POPULATION - continued


ANNUAL SALARIES OF FULL-TIME SWORN PERSONNEG POPULATION LESS THAN 5,000


Using current selaries as of March 1, 1986.

* 25th Percentile $=75 \%$ of the salaries are above this
** Median $=$ half the salaries are above and half are below
*** 75th Percentile $=25 \%$ of the salaries are above this


PERSONNEL BENEFITS
Population Less Than 5,000



[^0]:    ** Spink County closed their jail as of March 21, 1986 and must currently transport their prisoners to the regional facility in Brown County.

[^1]:    Overtime: $L=$ Overtime for line officers only
    supervisory officers only $B=$ Overtime for both line and supervisory

