

**Table 2
Intercept Orders Issued by Judges During Calendar Year 2008**

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*		Original Authorization	Extensions	Total Number of Days in Operation	Personal Residence	Business	Portable Device	Combination**	Other	Roaming	None Specified
TOTAL	1,891	71	54	28	1,809	1,266	29	29	73,509	31	6	1,793	38	10	11	2
FEDERAL	386	3	-	2	384	271	30	30	16,822	3	-	379	3	1	-	-
ARIZONA																
MARICOPA	17	7	-	-	17	19	28	29	819	-	-	16	1	-	-	-
YUMA	5	-	-	-	5	1	30	30	111	-	-	5	-	-	-	-
CALIFORNIA																
ALAMEDA	1	-	-	-	1	1	30	30	51	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
CONTRA COSTA	5	-	-	-	5	4	30	30	265	-	-	5	-	-	-	-
LOS ANGELES	181	-	4	2	175	51	30	30	5,898	-	-	172	8	-	1	-
NAPA	4	-	-	-	4	-	20	-	11	-	-	4	-	-	-	-
ORANGE	6	-	2	-	4	-	30	-	118	-	-	6	-	-	-	-
RIVERSIDE	1	-	-	-	1	4	30	30	138	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
SACRAMENTO	3	-	-	-	3	-	30	-	21	1	-	1	1	-	-	-
SAN BERNARDINO	84	-	-	3	81	17	30	28	2,510	-	-	83	1	-	-	-
SAN DIEGO	83	2	-	2	81	42	30	30	3,134	-	-	80	3	-	-	-
SAN FRANCISCO	2	-	-	-	2	1	30	19	73	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
SAN JOAQUIN	2	1	-	-	2	1	30	7	45	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
SAN LUIS OBISPO	4	-	-	-	4	3	30	30	112	-	-	4	-	-	-	-
SANTA CLARA	14	-	-	-	14	3	30	30	337	-	-	12	2	-	-	-
SONOMA	3	-	-	-	3	-	30	-	67	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
STANISLAUS	11	-	-	-	11	-	30	-	167	-	-	11	-	-	-	-
VENTURA	14	-	-	1	13	3	29	20	370	-	-	14	-	-	-	-
COLORADO																
1ST JUDICIAL DISTRICT (JEFFERSON)	23	-	-	-	23	6	30	30	682	-	-	23	-	-	-	-
4TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (EL PASO)	28	-	-	2	26	6	30	30	685	-	-	28	-	-	-	-
6TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (LA PLATA)	5	-	1	-	4	6	30	30	239	-	-	4	1	-	-	-
7TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (MONTROSE)	4	-	-	-	4	3	30	30	174	-	-	4	-	-	-	-
8TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (JACKSON/LARIMER)	7	-	-	-	7	1	30	30	151	-	-	7	-	-	-	-
9TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (GARFIELD, PITKIN, RIO BLANCO)	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	13	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
10TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (PUEBLO)	6	-	-	-	6	-	30	-	166	-	-	6	-	-	-	-
21ST JUDICIAL DISTRICT (MESA)	3	-	-	-	3	-	21	-	62	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
FLORIDA																
1ST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (ESCAMBRIA)	7	1	-	-	7	4	30	30	268	-	-	7	-	-	-	-
4TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (DUVAL)	14	1	1	-	13	9	30	30	617	-	-	14	-	-	-	-
5TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (LAKE/MARION)	7	2	-	-	7	6	30	30	362	-	-	7	-	-	-	-
7TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (VOLUSIA)	18	4	-	1	17	2	30	30	348	-	-	18	-	-	-	-

Table 2
Intercept Orders Issued by Judges During Calendar Year 2008 (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*	Number of Extensions	Original Authorization	Extensions	Total Number of Days in Operation	Personal Residence	Business	Portable Device	Combination**	Other	Roving	None Specified
FLORIDA (CONTINUED)																
8TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (ALACHUA)	3	-	3	-	-	-	30	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
9TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (ORANGE/OSCEOLA)	17	-	-	-	17	10	30	30	721	-	-	17	-	-	-	-
10TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (POLK)	2	1	-	-	2	3	30	30	142	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (DADE)	3	-	-	-	3	-	30	-	88	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
13TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (HILLSBOROUGH)	18	-	-	-	18	3	30	30	493	-	-	18	-	-	-	-
17TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (BROWARD)	4	-	-	-	4	2	30	30	176	1	-	3	-	-	-	-
18TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (BREVARD/SEMINOLE)	7	-	1	-	6	2	39	30	190	-	-	7	-	-	-	-
19TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (SAINT LUCIE)	2	-	2	-	-	6	30	25	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
GEORGIA																
BIBB	2	1	-	-	2	1	30	30	64	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
COBB	6	-	-	-	6	4	30	30	219	-	-	6	-	-	-	-
COWETA	2	-	-	-	2	-	30	-	60	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
EASTERN	4	1	-	-	4	4	28	23	200	-	-	4	-	-	-	-
GWINNETT	30	2	-	-	30	16	30	30	1,127	-	-	30	-	-	-	-
HAWAII																
MAUI	1	-	-	-	1	1	30	30	52	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
ILLINOIS																
CHRISTIAN	5	-	-	-	5	-	30	-	30	-	-	1	4	-	-	-
COOK	5	-	-	-	5	1	30	30	178	-	-	5	-	-	-	-
DUPAGE	7	-	-	-	7	1	30	30	174	-	-	7	-	-	-	-
HENDERSON	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
INDIANA																
MORGAN	2	-	-	-	2	2	30	30	100	1	-	1	-	-	-	-
KANSAS																
SALINE	3	-	-	-	3	-	30	-	39	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
MARYLAND																
BALTIMORE	31	-	-	-	31	12	29	29	919	-	-	31	-	-	-	-
BALTIMORE CITY	20	-	-	-	20	10	30	30	739	-	-	20	-	-	-	-
CECIL	6	-	-	-	6	-	30	-	164	-	-	6	-	-	-	-
FREDERICK	3	-	-	-	3	-	30	-	84	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
HARFORD	17	-	-	-	17	13	30	28	536	-	-	17	-	-	-	-
MASSACHUSETTS																
BRISTOL	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	15	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
MIDDLESEX	1	-	-	-	1	11	15	15	180	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
NORFOLK	2	-	-	-	2	-	15	-	12	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
PLYMOUTH	1	1	-	-	1	-	30	-	27	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
NEVADA																
CLARK	45	2	-	5	40	14	30	30	1,235	-	-	41	4	-	-	-
DOUGLASS	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	13	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
WASHOE	2	1	-	-	2	1	30	30	59	-	-	2	-	-	-	-

Table 2
Intercept Orders Issued by Judges During Calendar Year 2008 (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*		Original Authorization	Extensions	Total Number of Days in Operation	Personal Residence	Business	Portable Device	Combination**	Other	Roving	None Specified
NEW JERSEY																
ATLANTIC	8	-	-	-	8	2	24	1	122	-	-	8	-	-	-	-
BURLINGTON	6	-	-	-	6	2	20	10	74	-	-	6	-	-	-	-
CAMDEN	15	-	2	-	13	6	32	30	474	1	1	13	-	-	-	-
CAPE MAY	1	1	-	-	1	-	30	-	26	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
GLOUCESTER	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
HUDSON	10	-	2	1	7	1	24	30	138	-	-	10	-	-	-	-
MERCER	3	-	-	-	3	1	23	10	68	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
MIDDLESEX	1	-	-	-	1	-	20	-	19	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
MONMOUTH	21	-	-	-	21	5	29	30	649	-	-	14	-	-	7	-
MORRIS	9	-	5	-	4	3	27	23	113	-	-	9	-	-	-	-
PASSAIC	22	2	-	1	21	2	21	10	310	-	-	19	-	-	3	-
SOMERSET	10	1	-	1	9	4	20	10	180	-	-	10	-	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	39	-	10	2	27	15	22	18	683	2	-	35	-	2	-	-
UNION	29	-	20	-	9	16	28	29	142	-	-	29	-	-	-	-
NEW YORK																
BRONX	24	5	-	-	24	30	30	30	1,376	1	-	23	-	-	-	-
FULTON	1	1	-	-	1	1	30	30	52	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
GREENE	9	-	-	-	9	1	30	30	242	-	-	9	-	-	-	-
KINGS	5	2	-	-	5	4	30	30	267	-	-	5	-	-	-	-
MONROE	17	-	-	-	17	6	30	30	419	1	-	16	-	-	-	-
MONTGOMERY	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	9	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
NASSAU	5	2	-	-	5	3	30	30	162	-	-	3	2	-	-	-
NIAGARA	2	-	-	-	2	1	30	30	89	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
NY ORGANIZED CRIME TASK FORCE	15	6	-	-	15	66	30	30	2,098	-	-	10	5	-	-	-
NYC SPECIAL NARCOTICS BUREAU	101	2	1	2	98	44	30	31	3,330	1	-	97	-	3	-	-
ONONDAGA	3	3	-	-	3	9	30	30	351	-	-	2	1	-	-	-
QUEENS	195	-	-	-	195	363	28	29	14,200	7	3	182	1	-	-	2
SCHENECTADY	3	-	-	-	3	3	30	30	101	1	-	2	-	-	-	-
SUFFOLK	40	9	-	-	40	36	30	30	1,547	6	-	32	-	2	-	-
SULLIVAN	1	-	-	-	1	4	15	15	75	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
WESTCHESTER	11	3	-	-	11	10	27	27	405	-	-	11	-	-	-	-
OHIO																
LORAIN	6	-	-	-	6	3	30	30	212	1	-	5	-	-	-	-
OKLAHOMA																
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	3	-	-	-	3	-	30	-	87	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
OREGON																
LANE	2	-	-	-	2	1	30	30	60	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
MULTNOMAH	2	-	-	1	1	-	30	-	9	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
PENNSYLVANIA																
DELAWARE	2	2	-	-	2	1	30	30	68	1	-	1	-	-	-	-
JEFFERSON	2	-	-	-	2	-	30	-	28	1	-	1	-	-	-	-
MONTGOMERY	7	-	-	1	6	-	30	-	107	-	-	5	-	2	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	10	-	-	-	10	2	30	30	300	1	-	9	-	-	-	-

Table 2
Intercept Orders Issued by Judges During Calendar Year 2008 (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*	Number of Extensions	Original Authorization	Extensions	Total Number of Days in Operation	Personal Residence	Business	Portable Device	Combination**	Other	Roving	None Specified
TENNESSEE																
4TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (SEVIER)	3	-	-	-	3	5	30	30	205	1	-	2	-	-	-	-
11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (HAMILTON)	9	-	-	-	9	8	30	30	475	-	-	9	-	-	-	-
13TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (PUTNAM)	3	-	-	-	3	2	30	30	94	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
20TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (DAVIDSON)	18	1	-	-	18	21	30	30	882	-	-	18	-	-	-	-
30TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (SHELBY)	1	-	-	-	1	1	30	30	41	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
TEXAS																
TARRANT	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	30	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
TRAVIS	1	1	-	-	1	-	30	-	12	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
WISCONSIN																
MILWAUKEE	7	-	-	-	7	3	30	30	241	-	-	7	-	-	-	-
SHEBOYGAN	2	-	-	-	2	-	30	-	53	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
WYOMING																
LARAMIE	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	11	-	-	1	-	-	-	-

* Based on the number of orders for which intercept devices were installed as reported by the prosecuting official.

** Combination refers to the number of authorized interceptions for which more than one location was reported.