

Table 6
Types of Surveillance Used, Arrests, and Convictions for Intercepts Installed
January 1 Through December 31, 2014

Reporting Jurisdiction	Orders for Which Intercepts Installed ¹	Wire (Incl. Any Type Telephone: Standard, Cell, Mobile)	Oral (Incl. Microphone, Eavesdrop)	Electronic (Incl. Digital Pager, Fax, Computer)	Combination ²	Number of Persons	
						Arrested	Convicted ³
TOTAL	2,433	2,270	3	32	109	3,544	553
FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS							
FEDERAL TOTAL	313	273	-	8	14	1,014	150
ALABAMA, MIDDLE	3	3	-	-	-	18	-
ALABAMA, NORTHERN	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
ALABAMA, SOUTHERN	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
ALASKA	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
ARIZONA	17	14	-	2	-	49	1
ARKANSAS, EASTERN	6	6	-	-	-	57	-
ARKANSAS, WESTERN	2	2	-	-	-	1	-
CALIFORNIA, CENTRAL	5	1	-	-	-	-	-
CALIFORNIA, EASTERN	10	10	-	-	-	64	-
CALIFORNIA, NORTHERN	2	2	-	-	-	16	11
CALIFORNIA, SOUTHERN	9	5	-	2	-	3	-
COLORADO	18	16	-	-	-	2	-
CONNECTICUT	3	3	-	-	-	1	-
DELAWARE	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
FLORIDA, MIDDLE	7	5	-	2	-	26	10
FLORIDA, SOUTHERN	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
GEORGIA, MIDDLE	2	2	-	-	-	-	-
GEORGIA, NORTHERN	19	18	-	-	-	10	-
GEORGIA, SOUTHERN	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
HAWAII	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
IDAHO	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
ILLINOIS, NORTHERN	9	7	-	-	-	35	-
ILLINOIS, SOUTHERN	4	2	-	-	1	-	-
INDIANA, NORTHERN	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
INDIANA, SOUTHERN	8	4	-	-	4	66	3
IOWA, SOUTHERN	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
KANSAS	4	4	-	-	-	-	-
KENTUCKY, EASTERN	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
KENTUCKY, WESTERN	8	6	-	2	-	-	-
LOUISIANA, EASTERN	2	2	-	-	-	-	-
LOUISIANA, MIDDLE	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
LOUISIANA, WESTERN	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
MAINE	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
MARYLAND	7	7	-	-	-	22	7
MASSACHUSETTS	5	4	-	-	1	10	-
MICHIGAN, EASTERN	1	1	-	-	-	5	-
MICHIGAN, WESTERN	2	2	-	-	-	-	-

Table 6
Types of Surveillance Used, Arrests, and Convictions for Intercepts Installed
January 1 Through December 31, 2014 (Continued)

Reporting Jurisdiction	Orders for Which Intercepts Installed ¹	Wire (Incl. Any Type Telephone: Standard, Cell, Mobile)	Oral (Incl. Microphone, Eavesdrop)	Electronic (Incl. Digital Pager, Fax, Computer)	Combination ²	Number of Persons	
						Arrested	Convicted ³
FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS (Continued)							
MINNESOTA	1	1	-	-	-	21	-
MISSISSIPPI, NORTHERN	1	1	-	-	-	6	-
MISSISSIPPI, SOUTHERN	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
MISSOURI, EASTERN	7	6	-	-	-	1	-
MISSOURI, WESTERN	14	10	-	-	4	59	2
MONTANA	3	3	-	-	-	15	7
NEBRASKA	2	1	-	-	1	4	1
NEVADA	3	3	-	-	-	4	-
NEW HAMPSHIRE	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
NEW JERSEY	8	8	-	-	-	20	-
NEW MEXICO	9	8	-	-	-	14	-
NEW YORK, EASTERN	1	1	-	-	-	1	-
NEW YORK, NORTHERN	1	1	-	-	-	14	9
NEW YORK, SOUTHERN	8	8	-	-	-	39	-
NEW YORK, WESTERN	2	-	-	-	2	2	-
NORTH CAROLINA, EASTERN	2	2	-	-	-	1	-
NORTH CAROLINA, WESTERN	3	3	-	-	-	7	3
OHIO, NORTHERN	8	8	-	-	-	16	-
OHIO, SOUTHERN	6	6	-	-	-	75	68
OKLAHOMA, EASTERN	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
OKLAHOMA, NORTHERN	7	7	-	-	-	66	-
OKLAHOMA, WESTERN	8	8	-	-	-	79	7
OREGON	4	4	-	-	-	27	-
PENNSYLVANIA, EASTERN	5	5	-	-	-	32	-
PENNSYLVANIA, MIDDLE	1	1	-	-	-	9	8
PENNSYLVANIA, WESTERN	5	5	-	-	-	20	-
PUERTO RICO	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
RHODE ISLAND	2	2	-	-	-	1	-
SOUTH CAROLINA	4	4	-	-	-	19	-
TENNESSEE, EASTERN	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
TENNESSEE, MIDDLE	3	3	-	-	-	22	-
TENNESSEE, WESTERN	6	6	-	-	-	1	-
TEXAS, NORTHERN	8	8	-	-	-	4	-
TEXAS, SOUTHERN	5	5	-	-	-	-	-
TEXAS, WESTERN	13	13	-	-	-	25	13
UTAH	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
VIRGINIA, EASTERN	4	2	-	-	-	4	-
WASHINGTON, EASTERN	2	-	-	-	1	-	-
WASHINGTON, WESTERN	2	2	-	-	-	21	-
WISCONSIN, EASTERN	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 6
Types of Surveillance Used, Arrests, and Convictions for Intercepts Installed
January 1 Through December 31, 2014 (Continued)

Reporting Jurisdiction	Orders for Which Intercepts Installed ¹	Wire (Incl. Any Type Telephone: Standard, Cell, Mobile)	Oral (Incl. Microphone, Eavesdrop)	Electronic (Incl. Digital Pager, Fax, Computer)	Combination ²	Number of Persons	
						Arrested	Convicted ³
ARIZONA							
MARICOPA	14	10	-	-	4	116	38
PIMA	9	2	-	-	7	3	-
CALIFORNIA							
ALAMEDA	10	10	-	-	-	14	-
CONTRA COSTA	6	6	-	-	-	1	1
EL DORADO	2	-	-	-	2	-	-
FRESNO	24	24	-	-	-	23	-
KERN	19	19	-	-	-	13	3
KINGS	2	2	-	-	-	4	-
LOS ANGELES	129	117	-	-	12	35	2
MADERA	8	8	-	-	-	-	-
MERCED	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
NAPA	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
ORANGE	3	3	-	-	-	3	-
PLACER	2	2	-	-	-	4	-
RIVERSIDE	624	624	-	-	-	176	-
SACRAMENTO	6	6	-	-	-	13	-
SAN BERNARDINO	30	30	-	-	-	51	2
SAN DIEGO	14	14	-	-	-	34	18
SAN JOAQUIN	18	18	-	-	-	29	-
SANTA BARBARA	4	4	-	-	-	10	5
SANTA CLARA	13	13	-	-	-	35	3
SONOMA	2	2	-	-	-	2	-
STANISLAUS	14	14	-	-	-	12	1
TULARE	11	11	-	-	-	3	-
VENTURA	28	28	-	-	-	16	7
COLORADO							
4TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (EL PASO)	14	7	-	-	7	16	5
6TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (LA PLATA)	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
8TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (JACKSON/LARIMER)	5	5	-	-	-	50	-
9TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (GARFIELD, PITKIN, RIO BLANCO)	9	9	-	-	-	11	-
10TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (PUEBLO)	8	8	-	-	-	6	4
17TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (ADAMS)	15	15	-	-	-	24	-
18TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (ARAPAHOE)	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
19TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (WELD)	1	1	-	-	-	13	9

Table 6
Types of Surveillance Used, Arrests, and Convictions for Intercepts Installed
January 1 Through December 31, 2014 (Continued)

Reporting Jurisdiction	Orders for Which Intercepts Installed ¹	Wire (Incl. Any Type Telephone: Standard, Cell, Mobile)	Oral (Incl. Microphone, Eavesdrop)	Electronic (Incl. Digital Pager, Fax, Computer)	Combination ²	Number of Persons	
						Arrested	Convicted ³
COLORADO (Continued)							
20TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (BOULDER)	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
21ST JUDICIAL DISTRICT (MESA)	5	5	-	-	-	14	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	65	65	-	-	-	26	-
DELAWARE							
NEW CASTLE	1	1	-	-	-	1	-
FLORIDA							
4TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (DUVAL)	31	31	-	-	-	4	1
5TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (LAKE/MARION)	7	7	-	-	-	73	-
6TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (PINELLAS)	4	4	-	-	-	14	2
8TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (ALACHUA)	3	3	-	-	-	5	-
13TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (HILLSBOROUGH)	10	10	-	-	-	28	-
14TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (BAY)	2	2	-	-	-	36	-
18TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (BREVARD/SEMINOLE)	16	16	-	-	-	16	-
19TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (SAINT LUCIE)	4	4	-	-	-	42	12
20TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (LEE)	5	5	-	-	-	16	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	71	49	-	-	22	261	67
GEORGIA							
CHATHAM	16	-	-	-	16	23	-
CHEROKEE	6	6	-	-	-	-	-
DOUGLAS	1	1	-	-	-	29	-
EVANS	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
JEFF DAVIS	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
LOOKOUT MOUNTAIN	1	1	-	-	-	8	2
ILLINOIS							
COOK	27	27	-	-	-	21	-
DUPAGE	13	13	-	-	-	-	-
LAKE	6	6	-	-	-	-	-
LEE	2	2	-	-	-	-	-
MCHENRY	2	2	-	-	-	-	-
WHITE	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
INDIANA							
DAVISS	3	3	-	-	-	9	-

Table 6
Types of Surveillance Used, Arrests, and Convictions for Intercepts Installed
January 1 Through December 31, 2014 (Continued)

Reporting Jurisdiction	Orders for Which Intercepts Installed ¹	Wire (Incl. Any Type Telephone: Standard, Cell, Mobile)	Oral (Incl. Microphone, Eavesdrop)	Electronic (Incl. Digital Pager, Fax, Computer)	Combination ²	Number of Persons	
						Arrested	Convicted ³
INDIANA (Continued)							
LAPORTE	1	1	-	-	-	2	-
MARION	1	1	-	-	-	55	42
VANDERBURGH	12	12	-	-	-	58	1
KANSAS							
FINNEY	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
SALINE	2	-	-	-	2	6	-
LOUISIANA							
19TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (EAST BATON ROUGE)	3	3	-	-	-	20	-
24TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (JEFFERSON)	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
32ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT (TERREBONNE)	1	1	-	-	-	4	-
MARYLAND							
BALTIMORE	10	10	-	-	-	-	-
BALTIMORE CITY	12	12	-	-	-	6	-
CECIL	3	3	-	-	-	2	-
HARFORD	21	21	-	-	-	-	-
HOWARD	2	2	-	-	-	-	-
MONTGOMERY	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
PRINCE GEORGE'S	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
MASSACHUSETTS							
MIDDLESEX	1	1	-	-	-	9	1
MISSISSIPPI							
MARSHALL	3	3	-	-	-	19	-
NEWTON	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
OKTIBBEHA	2	2	-	-	-	10	7
WARREN	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
NEVADA							
CLARK	163	160	-	-	2	69	11
NEW JERSEY							
ATLANTIC	10	10	-	-	-	-	-
BURLINGTON	3	3	-	-	-	7	-
CAMDEN	16	11	-	-	5	39	-
CAPE MAY	1	-	-	-	1	-	-
CUMBERLAND	5	5	-	-	-	1	-
ESSEX	11	11	-	-	-	66	-
GLOUCESTER	2	1	-	1	-	-	-
MERCER	3	3	-	-	-	-	-

Table 6
Types of Surveillance Used, Arrests, and Convictions for Intercepts Installed
January 1 Through December 31, 2014 (Continued)

Reporting Jurisdiction	Orders for Which Intercepts Installed ¹	Wire (Incl. Any Type Telephone: Standard, Cell, Mobile)	Oral (Incl. Microphone, Eavesdrop)	Electronic (Incl. Digital Pager, Fax, Computer)	Combination ²	Number of Persons	
						Arrested	Convicted ³
NEW JERSEY (Continued)							
MONMOUTH	6	6	-	-	-	57	10
MORRIS	3	3	-	-	-	23	12
OCEAN	4	4	-	-	-	11	-
SALEM	1	-	-	-	1	-	-
SOMERSET	7	7	-	-	-	17	10
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	8	-	-	-	8	-	-
UNION	1	-	-	-	1	-	-
NEW MEXICO							
2ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT (BERNALILLO)	7	7	-	-	-	2	-
NEW YORK							
KINGS	61	61	-	-	-	43	-
NASSAU	3	3	-	-	-	22	3
NY ORGANIZED CRIME TASK FORCE	7	6	-	-	1	77	24
NYC SPECIAL NARCOTICS BUREAU	149	126	-	23	-	70	31
ONEIDA	2	2	-	-	-	-	-
PUTNAM	2	2	-	-	-	4	2
QUEENS	14	13	-	-	1	6	6
ROCKLAND	4	4	-	-	-	-	-
SENECA	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	1	1	-	-	-	37	8
WESTCHESTER	22	22	-	-	-	29	8
NORTH CAROLINA							
CUMBERLAND	2	2	-	-	-	-	-
FORSYTH	1	-	1	-	-	1	-
GUILFORD	3	3	-	-	-	52	-
LEE	5	5	-	-	-	16	-
MECKLENBURG	3	3	-	-	-	6	6
PITT	1	-	1	-	-	-	-
WAKE	13	13	-	-	-	5	-
OHIO							
FRANKLIN	3	3	-	-	-	-	-
HAMILTON	2	1	-	-	1	3	-
PICKAWAY	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
STARK	1	1	-	-	-	16	14
WASHINGTON	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
OKLAHOMA							
OKLAHOMA	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 6
Types of Surveillance Used, Arrests, and Convictions for Intercepts Installed
January 1 Through December 31, 2014 (Continued)

Reporting Jurisdiction	Orders for Which Intercepts Installed ¹	Wire (Incl. Any Type Telephone: Standard, Cell, Mobile)	Oral (Incl. Microphone, Eavesdrop)	Electronic (Incl. Digital Pager, Fax, Computer)	Combination ²	Number of Persons	
						Arrested	Convicted ³
PENNSYLVANIA							
ALLEGHENY	3	3	-	-	-	-	-
BERKS	11	11	-	-	-	38	-
BUCKS	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
CHESTER	3	3	-	-	-	49	-
FRANKLIN	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
MONTGOMERY	10	10	-	-	-	29	-
PHILADELPHIA	20	19	-	-	1	54	-
PIKE	4	4	-	-	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	19	18	-	-	1	22	-
TENNESSEE							
11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (HAMILTON)	2	2	-	-	-	1	-
13TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (PUTNAM)	4	4	-	-	-	19	-
16TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (RUTHERFORD)	8	8	-	-	-	-	-
20TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (DAVIDSON)	47	47	-	-	-	34	-
30TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (SHELBY)	1	1	-	-	-	23	-
TEXAS							
DALLAS	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
LUBBOCK	3	3	-	-	-	-	-
WISCONSIN							
BROWN	1	-	1	-	-	30	10
WYOMING							
FREMONT	2	2	-	-	-	-	-
LARAMIE	1	1	-	-	-	9	9
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	1	1	-	-	-	9	6

¹NP = No prosecutor's report. NI = Never installed.

²Combination refers to installed intercepts for which more than one type of surveillance was used.

³Convictions resulting from an intercept often do not occur within the same year in which the intercept was first reported. See Tables 8 and 9.