

**Table 2**  
**Intercept Orders Issued by Judges During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	Number of Intercept Orders					Number of Extensions	Avg. Length (in Days)			Location Authorized in Original Application						
	Authorized	Amended	No Prosecutor's Report	Never Installed	Installed <sup>1</sup>		Original Authorization	Extensions	Total Number of Days in Operation	Personal Residence	Business	Portable Device	Combination <sup>2</sup>	Other	Roving	None Specified
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,732</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>490</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>2,189</b>	<b>1,777</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>91,240</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2,674</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>FEDERAL</b>	<b>792</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>423</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>367</b>	<b>403</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>15,400</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>784</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>ARIZONA</b>																
MARICOPA	21	4	-	-	21	50	29	30	1,623	-	-	21	-	-	-	-
PIMA	40	-	-	1	39	17	30	30	1,372	-	-	40	-	-	-	-
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>																
BUTTE	4	-	-	-	4	1	30	30	146	-	-	4	-	-	-	-
CONTRA COSTA	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
IMPERIAL	39	2	-	-	39	15	30	30	1,593	-	-	39	-	-	-	-
KERN	8	-	-	-	8	2	30	30	188	-	-	8	-	-	-	-
LOS ANGELES	180	-	-	10	170	55	30	30	6,049	1	1	173	5	-	-	-
MERCED	16	5	-	-	16	1	25	30	353	-	-	16	-	-	-	-
ORANGE	26	-	-	2	24	-	30	-	688	-	-	26	-	-	-	-
PLACER	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	25	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
RIVERSIDE	154	-	1	6	147	56	30	30	5,139	-	-	154	-	-	-	-
SACRAMENTO	9	-	-	-	9	-	30	-	87	-	-	9	-	-	-	-
SAN BERNARDINO	76	-	1	-	75	38	30	30	2,980	-	-	75	1	-	-	-
SAN DIEGO	43	4	1	2	40	28	30	30	1,576	-	-	43	-	-	-	-
SAN JOAQUIN	8	-	-	-	8	4	30	30	249	-	-	7	1	-	-	-
SAN LUIS OBISPO	2	-	-	-	2	-	30	-	46	1	-	-	1	-	-	-
SAN MATEO	3	-	-	-	3	-	30	-	57	-	-	2	1	-	-	-
SANTA BARBARA	11	-	1	-	10	5	30	30	283	-	-	11	-	-	-	-
SANTA CLARA	19	-	-	-	19	17	29	30	1,028	-	-	19	-	-	-	-
SONOMA	4	-	1	-	3	-	30	-	90	-	-	4	-	-	-	-
STANISLAUS	4	-	-	-	4	-	30	-	57	-	-	4	-	-	-	-
VENTURA	22	3	1	-	21	-	30	-	486	-	-	21	1	-	-	-
<b>COLORADO</b>																
1ST JUDICIAL DISTRICT (JEFFERSON)	4	-	-	-	4	-	26	-	57	-	-	3	1	-	-	-
4TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (EL PASO)	35	-	3	2	30	5	30	30	766	-	-	35	-	-	-	-
10TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (PUEBLO)	15	-	-	-	15	1	30	30	429	-	-	15	-	-	-	-
17TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (ADAMS)	2	-	-	-	2	-	30	-	60	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
18TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (ARAPAHOE)	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
20TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (BOULDER)	2	-	2	-	-	-	30	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
21ST JUDICIAL DISTRICT (MESA)	3	-	-	-	3	-	24	-	73	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	12	1	-	-	12	4	29	30	348	-	-	12	-	-	-	-
<b>FLORIDA</b>																
2ND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (LEON)	4	-	-	-	4	1	30	30	134	-	-	4	-	-	-	-
4TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (DUVAL)	49	-	-	-	49	15	30	30	1,461	-	-	49	-	-	-	-
5TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (LAKE/MARION)	10	1	-	-	10	3	30	30	282	-	-	10	-	-	-	-
7TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (VOLUSIA)	13	-	-	-	13	-	30	-	206	-	-	13	-	-	-	-
8TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (ALACHUA)	4	-	-	-	4	4	30	30	189	-	-	4	-	-	-	-
9TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (ORANGE/OSCEOLA)	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	23	-	-	-	1	-	-	-

**Table 2**  
**Intercept Orders Issued by Judges During Calendar Year 2011 (Continued)**

Reporting Jurisdiction	Number of Intercept Orders					Number of Extensions	Avg. Length (in Days)			Location Authorized in Original Application						
	Authorized	Amended	No Prosecutor's Report	Never Installed	Installed <sup>1</sup>		Original Authorization	Extensions	Total Number of Days in Operation	Personal Residence	Business	Portable Device	Combination <sup>2</sup>	Other	Roving	None Specified
<b>FLORIDA (CONTINUED)</b>																
11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (DADE)	1	1	-	-	1	-	30	-	26	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
18TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (BREVARD/SEMINOLE)	46	1	-	1	45	-	30	-	906	-	-	46	-	-	-	-
19TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (SAINT LUCIE)	1	-	-	-	1	3	30	30	102	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
<b>GEORGIA</b>																
AUGUSTA	2	-	1	-	1	2	30	30	39	-	-	1	1	-	-	-
BIBB	3	-	-	-	3	1	30	30	84	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
DECATUR	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	30	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
DOUGLAS	28	-	-	-	28	6	30	30	787	-	-	28	-	-	-	-
FLINT	1	-	-	-	1	1	30	30	33	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
GWINNETT	5	2	-	-	5	4	30	30	208	-	-	5	-	-	-	-
HOUSTON	5	-	-	1	4	2	30	30	146	-	-	5	-	-	-	-
MACON	4	-	-	-	4	1	30	30	82	-	-	4	-	-	-	-
<b>ILLINOIS</b>																
COOK	39	-	-	3	36	1	30	30	926	-	-	39	-	-	-	-
LAKE	2	-	-	-	2	2	30	18	91	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
WINNEBAGO	15	-	1	1	13	1	30	30	304	-	-	15	-	-	-	-
<b>KANSAS</b>																
SALINE	3	-	2	-	1	-	30	-	4	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
<b>MARYLAND</b>																
BALTIMORE	22	-	-	-	22	6	30	20	472	-	1	21	-	-	-	-
BALTIMORE CITY	12	-	-	-	12	5	30	30	385	-	-	12	-	-	-	-
FREDERICK	7	-	-	-	7	-	28	-	150	-	-	7	-	-	-	-
HARFORD	25	-	1	-	24	8	30	30	608	-	1	23	1	-	-	-
HOWARD	5	-	-	-	5	1	30	30	150	-	-	5	-	-	-	-
ST. MARY'S	3	-	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	1	-	-
WASHINGTON	2	-	-	-	2	3	30	30	31	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
WICOMICO	2	-	-	-	2	1	30	30	44	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
<b>MASSACHUSETTS</b>																
BRISTOL	1	-	-	-	1	-	15	-	15	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	5	-	-	-	5	9	15	15	150	-	-	5	-	-	-	-
<b>MINNESOTA</b>																
DAKOTA	2	-	-	-	2	-	30	-	60	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
<b>MISSISSIPPI</b>																
GRENADA	1	-	-	-	1	1	30	30	31	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
HINDS	2	-	-	-	2	1	30	30	86	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
MARSHALL	6	-	-	1	5	-	30	-	84	-	-	6	-	-	-	-
NEWTON	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	10	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
RANKIN	5	-	-	-	5	1	30	30	163	-	-	5	-	-	-	-
SCOTT	3	-	-	-	3	4	30	30	173	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
<b>MISSOURI</b>																
ST. LOUIS	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	22	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
<b>NEVADA</b>																
CLARK	91	1	2	4	85	19	30	30	2,523	-	-	91	-	-	-	-
<b>NEW JERSEY</b>																
ATLANTIC	1	-	-	-	1	-	10	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
BERGEN	11	-	-	-	11	-	20	-	115	-	-	11	-	-	-	-

**Table 2**  
**Intercept Orders Issued by Judges During Calendar Year 2011 (Continued)**

Reporting Jurisdiction	Number of Intercept Orders					Number of Extensions	Avg. Length (in Days)			Location Authorized in Original Application						
	Authorized	Amended	No Prosecutor's Report	Never Installed	Installed <sup>1</sup>		Original Authorization	Extensions	Total Number of Days in Operation	Personal Residence	Business	Portable Device	Combination <sup>2</sup>	Other	Roving	None Specified
<b>NEW JERSEY (CONTINUED)</b>																
BURLINGTON	1	-	-	-	1	1	10	5	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	
CAMDEN	5	-	4	-	1	3	20	30	1	1	-	4	-	-	-	
CAPE MAY	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	
CUMBERLAND	9	1	-	-	9	2	23	25	207	-	-	9	-	-	-	
ESSEX	6	-	-	-	6	8	12	28	242	-	-	6	-	-	-	
GLOUCESTER	14	5	-	-	14	10	24	20	528	-	-	14	-	-	-	
HUDSON	7	1	-	-	7	6	26	30	305	-	-	7	-	-	-	
MERCER	2	-	2	-	-	1	20	10	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	
MIDDLESEX	4	-	4	-	-	2	21	10	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	
MONMOUTH	7	-	-	1	6	1	22	30	168	-	-	5	-	-	2	
MORRIS	13	1	2	7	4	1	20	10	96	-	-	6	-	1	6	
OCEAN	12	-	-	-	12	5	20	18	248	-	-	12	-	-	-	
SOMERSET	4	-	-	-	4	-	20	-	76	-	-	4	-	-	-	
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	23	4	7	-	16	13	27	26	441	-	-	21	1	1	-	
UNION	19	-	19	-	-	1	30	30	-	-	-	19	-	-	-	
WARREN	1	-	1	-	-	-	20	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	
<b>NEW YORK</b>																
BRONX	30	3	-	-	30	45	26	30	1,999	4	-	26	-	-	-	
CLINTON	1	-	-	-	1	30	-	1	30	-	-	1	-	-	-	
KINGS	5	-	-	-	5	4	30	30	211	-	-	5	-	-	-	
MONROE	2	-	-	-	2	-	30	-	4	-	-	-	-	2	-	
NASSAU	1	-	-	-	1	1	30	30	58	-	-	1	-	-	-	
NY ORGANIZED CRIME TASK FORCE	13	8	3	-	10	84	30	30	1,738	-	-	12	1	-	-	
NYC SPECIAL NARCOTICS BUREAU	76	5	-	8	68	21	30	30	2,169	1	-	73	-	2	-	
ONEIDA	14	-	-	-	14	4	30	30	347	-	-	14	-	-	-	
QUEENS	235	-	1	1	233	601	29	29	21,907	1	-	234	-	-	-	
RICHMOND	21	-	-	-	21	12	30	30	895	-	2	19	-	-	-	
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	2	-	-	-	2	1	30	30	64	-	-	2	-	-	-	
SUFFOLK	21	-	-	-	21	9	21	21	562	-	-	21	-	-	-	
TOMPKINS	2	1	-	-	2	2	30	30	93	-	-	2	-	-	-	
WESTCHESTER	18	-	-	-	18	28	30	30	1,199	-	-	18	-	-	-	
<b>NORTH CAROLINA</b>																
HARNETT	1	-	-	-	1	7	30	26	213	-	-	1	-	-	-	
WAKE	1	-	-	-	1	1	30	30	27	-	-	1	-	-	-	
WAYNE	1	-	-	-	1	1	30	30	46	-	-	1	-	-	-	
<b>OHIO</b>																
CUYAHOGA	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	28	-	-	1	-	-	-	
HAMILTON	9	-	2	-	7	1	30	3	94	-	-	9	-	-	-	
JEFFERSON	3	-	-	-	3	-	30	-	74	-	-	3	-	-	-	
SENECA	1	-	-	-	1	3	30	30	120	-	-	1	-	-	-	
<b>OKLAHOMA</b>																
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	8	-	-	-	8	-	30	-	185	-	-	8	-	-	-	
<b>OREGON</b>																
BENTON	10	-	-	-	10	4	30	30	179	-	-	10	-	-	-	
CLACKAMAS	1	-	-	-	1	-	14	-	10	-	-	1	-	-	-	

**Table 2**  
**Intercept Orders Issued by Judges During Calendar Year 2011 (Continued)**

Reporting Jurisdiction	Number of Intercept Orders					Avg. Length (in Days)			Location Authorized in Original Application							
	Authorized	Amended	No Prosecutor's Report	Never Installed	Installed <sup>1</sup>	Number of Extensions	Original Authorization	Extensions	Total Number of Days in Operation	Personal Residence	Business	Portable Device	Combination <sup>2</sup>	Other	Roving	None Specified
<b>PENNSYLVANIA</b>																
BERKS	6	-	-	-	6	-	30	-	127	-	-	6	-	-	-	-
CHESTER	8	-	-	-	8	3	30	30	229	-	-	8	-	-	-	-
LEHIGH	2	-	-	-	2	1	30	30	34	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
MONTGOMERY	9	-	-	-	9	4	30	30	226	-	-	9	-	-	-	-
PHILADELPHIA	13	3	-	-	13	13	30	30	664	-	1	12	-	-	-	-
SCHUYLKILL	5	-	-	-	5	-	30	-	99	1	-	4	-	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	29	-	1	-	28	7	30	30	834	1	-	27	-	1	-	-
<b>TENNESSEE</b>																
20TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (DAVIDSON)	23	-	-	-	23	18	30	30	920	-	-	23	-	-	-	-
30TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (SHELBY)	14	-	-	-	14	6	30	30	453	-	-	14	-	-	-	-
<b>TEXAS</b>																
TRAVIS	2	1	-	-	2	1	30	30	84	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
<b>UTAH</b>																
UTAH	1	1	-	-	1	-	30	-	18	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
<b>VIRGINIA</b>																
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	1	-	-	-	1	1	30	30	37	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
<b>WYOMING</b>																
FREMONT	4	-	-	-	4	-	30	-	120	-	-	3	1	-	-	-
LARAMIE	3	-	-	-	3	1	30	30	95	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
SWEETWATER	5	-	-	-	5	1	30	30	144	-	-	5	-	-	-	-

<sup>1</sup> Based on the number of orders for which intercept devices were installed as reported by the prosecuting official.

<sup>2</sup> Combination refers to the number of authorized interceptions for which more than one location was reported.