SCIBRS & CCHR:
A Status Report on the Feasibility of Linking Two Important South Carolina Law Enforcement Databases

Charles Bradberry
South Carolina Office of Research and Statistics

Rob McManus
South Carolina Statistical Analysis Center

December 31, 2010

SCIBRS and CCHR: A Status Report On the Feasibility Of Linking Two Important South Carolina Law Enforcement Databases

The South Carolina Department of Public Safety and the South Carolina Office of Research and Statistics worked together over the course of several months to determine the feasibility of linking files from the state's Computerized Criminal History Records (CCHR) database to files from the South Carolina Incident Based Reporting System (SCIBRS). Linking these files is important, because if successful, it would then be possible to determine whether those incidents that are described as Criminal Domestic Violence (CDV) in the SCIBRS files actually resulted in an arrest for CDV or for some other offense. The project looked at two time periods, CY 2005 and CY2006-08, to determine if there was improvement over this time.

Comment [NM1]: I'm not sure if this is correct, but some explanation is needed here to tell the reader who did what, why they did it, and when.

This proposition is both more complicated and important than it might initially appear to be. Much of the complication stems from the nature and contents of each database. While each database contains important and worthwhile information about crime, sole reliance upon either can result in conclusions that may not be completely accurate. This effort provides an important example of how linking these datasets could yield important policy-relevant information—in this case, determining if domestic violence incidents are being handled appropriately.

The State Law Enforcement Division's (SLED) CCHR contains information on individuals who are arrested or have judicial dispositions. The CCHR database is composed of six files: 1) *Identification* – provides the physical descriptive information regarding the arrestee; 2) *Arrest* – provides a description of the offense(s) for which the individual was arrested; 3) *Count* – lists the number of counts for each arrest charge; 4) *Custody* – provides information as to whether or not the offender is in a state adult correctional facility or what his/her supervision status is; 5) *Judicial* – provides information on the disposition of each arrest; and 6) *Aliases* – provides information on various names the offender may have used. These files record when an arrest has occurred but they provide absolutely no details as to the circumstances that led to the arrest. SCIBRS, on the other hand, provides not only a narrative description of the incident, but also such details as the relationship between the victim(s) and the offender(s), whether or not alcohol or other drugs were involved in the incident, the date, time, and location of the incident, and other important information. The SCIBRS data, however, lack identifying information on the arrestee (as well as the victim and the complainant).That information is withheld when law enforcement agencies forward, usually electronically, the Incident Report information to SLED.

SCIBRS data are organized into several segments related to the incident: the administrative file, the offense segment, the property segment, the victim segment the offender segment and the arrest segment. For this analysis, the victim and arrest segments were linked and used to provide two extract files. The following variables were included in these files: age at time of arrest, arrest date, arrestee ethnicity, incident date, incident hour, incident year, juvenile status, ORI number, ORI/CASE number combination, arrest offenses (1 through 5), arrestee race, arrestee sex, residence (jurisdictional), victim type, multi-clearance and victim to offender relationships (1 through 10).

SCIBRS data do contain a number of "identifiers" on the incident report that are transmitted to SLED, which could be used to link to the CCHR. The Case Number is not a statewide unique number, but within a law enforcement agency it should uniquely identify a particular incident. A combination of the Agency ID Number, or ORI (originating agency identifier) number as it is sometimes called, and the Case Number should be unique statewide. The Arrest segment of the CCHR also contains both the Case Number and the ORI number for each arrest record. The accuracy and completeness of these two variables in the CCHR will be discussed later.

In order to test the linking ability of the variable created by combining the Case Number and ORI Number, the Department of Public Safety (DPS) provided the Office of Research and Statistics (ORS) with two extracts of the SCIBRS data. One extract consisted of CY2005 arrests and the other consisted of CY2006 through CY2008 arrests. Both of these cohorts contained only arrests for Simple Assault, Aggravated Assault, and Intimidation where the victim to offender relationship was that of spouse, common-law spouse, or ex-spouse. This, as closely as possible, follows the statutory definition of criminal domestic violence, which would also include violence between cohabitating or formerly cohabitating couples and couples who have children in common (SCIBRS victim to offender relationship codes do not capture those relationships). The CY2005 file consisted of 10,869 records and the CY2006-08 file consisted of 23,599 records. Both files contained the same 29 variables. These variables are shown below in Table 1.

TABLE 1
SCIBRS Extract Variables

Age At Time of Arrest
Arrest Date
Ethnicity
Incident Date
Incident Hour
Incident Year
Juvenile
ORI Number
ORI/CASE Number Combination
Offense 1 - Offense 5
Race
Sex
Residence
Victmtype
Multiclearance
Offender Relationship 1 - 10

An initial review of these two files was conducted in order to determine if the variable that was to be used to link the SCIBRS files to the SLED CCHR files, i.e., the ORICaseNumber, was unique within the SCIBRS files. This was necessary in order to avoid complications, or unintended consequences, of a "many-to-many" matching process. The ORICaseNumber variable was used to "de-duplicate" (remove duplicate files from) the CY2005 and CY2006-08 SCIBRS cohort files. When this was done, 3,053 and 3,165 duplicate records, respectively, were deleted, resulting in de-duplicated SCIBRS CY2005 and CY2006-08 cohort files consisting of 7,816 and 20,434 records, respectively. The records removed were of two types: 1) the entire record was a duplicate of another record, i.e., every value of the 29 variables of a record matched every value of the 29 variables in one or more other records, or 2) the same ORICaseNumber involved more than one individual, and each individual had a separate record, e.g., two records may have the same ORICaseNumber if both parties (husband and wife, for example) are arrested. It is even possible that there were three or more records with the same ORICaseNumber if, for example, the husband, the wife, and the wife's father were all arrested. They would each receive the same ORICaseNumber and each would have a separate record.

Another consideration is that the SCIBRS cohorts were created using parameters that indicated an arrest was made and that arrest should reasonably result in an charge of CDV for every individual in each of the records in the cohorts. Therefore, if, for example, there were three records with the same ORICaseNumber involving, say, the husband, the wife, and the wife's father, then each of those individuals should have an arrest charge of CDV, but if not CDV, then some other charge or charges. To further complicate the issue, and to continue with the example of these three individuals, when these records are linked to SLED's CCHR, it is entirely conceivable that one of the following scenarios would be observed:

- All three individuals are arrested for CDV;
- None of these individuals are arrested for CDV, but are arrested for some other charge;
- One or more of these individuals are arrested for CDV and one or more are arrested for some other charge; and,
- Any of the three scenarios described above, plus additional arrest charges added to one, two, or all three of these individuals, e.g., trespassing, resisting arrest, assault on an officer, drug possession, public drunkenness, kidnapping, child endangerment, etc.

As these scenarios illustrate, the issue becomes more complicated as more and more individuals are involved in the incident.

The purpose of this project, however, was not to determine which of the above scenarios were actually observed in the linking process, but to see how well the ORICaseNumber can be used to link SCIBRS records to SLED's CCHR. In order to determine this, it was necessary to create an ORICaseNumber on the CCHR.

A process similar to that used on the SCIBRS files was used for creating an ORICaseNumber variable on the Arrest segment of the CCHR. The two files were then merged using the ORICaseNumber unique identifier. Of the 7,816 records in the 2005 SCIBRS cohort and the 20,434 records in the 2006-08 SCIBRS cohort, a total of 1,337 (17.1%) and 4,297 (21.0%), respectively, were matched to the CCHR Arrest records. These matching results were unexpectedly low. Discussions with SLED personnel led us to conclude that the files may contain some incorrect case numbers, as many local law enforcement agencies do not require accurate reporting of the case number when an arrest is made.

In order to increase the percentage of matched records, a new variable was created using the following variables that are common to both the SCIBRS cohort files and the CCHR Arrest file:

ORI Number
Arrest Date
Offense Date
Race
Sex
Age at Time of Arrest

For the purposes of this discussion, we will refer to this new variable as UNIQUE2. This variable was used to link the records in the two SCIBRS cohort files that were not linked using the ORICaseNumber variable. That is, the previously unmatched SCIBRS records in the 2005 and 2006-08 cohorts, i.e., 6,479 and 16,137, respectively, were linked to the CCHR Arrest file. This second matching process yielded a total of 2,716 (41.9%) and 6,433 (39.9%) match records from the previously unmatched 2005 and 2006-08 cohort files, respectively. The combined match rate for the 2005 SCIBRS cohort file was determined to be 51.8 percent (1,337 + 2,716 = 4,053/7,816 x 100 = 51.8%). The combined match rate for the 2006-08 SCIBRS cohort file was determined to be 52.5 percent (4,297 + 6,433 = 10,730/20,434 x 100 = 52.5%). The results of this matching process are summarized in Table 2.

TABLE 2
Records Matched by Unique2 Variable

Year	Unduplicated Number of SCIBRS Records	ORI/Case # Matches		Unique2 Matches	Total # of Matched Records	Total % of Matched Records
		# Matched	% Matched	# Matched		
2005	7,816	1,337	17.1	2,716	4,053	51.8
2006	7,145	1,495	20.9	2,291	3,786	53.0
2007	6,925	1,502	21.7	2,085	3,587	51.8
2008	6,364	1,300	20.4	2,057	3,357	52.7
Total 2006-08	20,434	4,297	21.0	6,433	10,730	52.5

A listing of all arrest offenses from the CCHR that resulted from matching the 2005 SCIBRS and the 2006-08 SCIBRS cohorts to the CCHR are shown in Tables 3 and 4, respectively.

TABLE 3
Arrest Offenses from Matching 2005 CCHR and SCIBRS Cohorts

2005 ARREST OFFENSES (CCHR)	#	%
CRIMINAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	3,646	83.2
ASSAULT	173	3.9
PUBLIC DISORDERLY CONDUCT	62	1.4
DRUG OFFENSES	59	1.3
FRAUDULENT CHECK	41	0.9
DRIVING UNDER SUSPENSION	29	0.7
FAILURE TO APPEAR	27	0.6
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	24	0.5
SHOPLIFTING	19	0.4
BREACH OF PEACE	15	0.3
BURGLARY	13	0.3
POSSESSION OF DRUG PARAPHERNALIA	13	0.3
OPEN CONTAINER OF BEER/WINE	12	0.3
DRINKING ALCOHOL IN PUBLIC CONVEYANCE UNLAWFUL	10	0.2
POINTING AND PRESENTING FIREARMS AT A PERSON	10	0.2
RESISTING ARREST	10	0.2
ALL OTHER OFFENSES	221	5.0
TOTAL	4,384	100.0

TABLE 4
Arrest Offenses from Matching 2006-08 CCHR and SCIBRS Cohorts

2006-08 ARREST OFFENSES (CCHR)	#	%
CRIMINAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	9,801	85.0
ASSAULT	249	2.2
DRUG OFFENSES	163	1.4
PUBLIC DISORDERLY CONDUCT	147	1.3
ASSAULT	143	1.2
DRIVING UNDER SUSPENSION	92	0.8
FRAUDULENT CHECK	87	0.8
FAILURE TO APPEAR	70	0.6
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	54	0.5
BURGLARY	52	0.5
MALICIOUS INJURY TO PERSONAL PROPERTY	50	0.4
LARCENY	41	0.4
RESISTING ARREST	39	0.3
UNLAWFUL USE OF TELEPHONE	36	0.3
TRESPASSING	35	0.3
BREACH OF PEACE	33	0.3
VIOLATION OF COURT ORDER OF PROTECTION	25	0.2
KIDNAPPING	24	0.2
DRINKING ALCOHOL IN PUBLIC CONVEYANCE UNLAWFUL	20	0.2
SHOPLIFTING	19	0.2
POINTING AND PRESENTING FIREARMS AT A PERSON	14	0.1
VIOLATION OF CITY ORDINANCE	14	0.1
UNLAWFUL NEGLECT OF CHILD/HELPLESS PERSON	13	0.1
OPEN CONTAINER OF BEER/WINE	12	0.1
PUBLIC DRUNK	11	0.1
STALKING	11	0.1
UNLAWFUL CARRYING OF WEAPON	11	0.1
ALL OTHER OFFENSES	264	2.3
TOTAL	11,530	100.0

The number of arrest offenses, i.e., 4,384 for the 2005 cohort and 11,530 for the 2006-08 cohort, is greater than the number of matched records, 4,053 and 10,730, respectively, due to the fact that offenders may be arrested for other offenses in addition to or, in some cases instead of, CDV. The number of CDV arrests totaled 3,646 and 9,801 from the 2005 and 2006-08 SCIBRS cohorts, respectively. In order to determine what percentage of the SCIBRS records contained a CDV arrest, it was necessary to remove all of the *exact* duplicate records, as opposed to records that contained just duplicate ORICaseNumber values, from the two SCIBRS matched cohort files. This process results in files that may contain multiple records for the same event, but those records represent different individuals involved in the incident. For example, if three individuals are involved in the incident and those three individuals are in the SCIBRS cohort file, then these individuals had circumstances that one could reasonably assume would result in an arrest charge of CDV. Exact duplicate records, if not removed, would skew the results. This process of

removing the exact duplicate records yielded 4,268 unduplicated records in the 2005 SCIBRS matched cohort file and 11,153 unduplicated records in the 2006-08 SCIBRS matched cohort file. We can now make the statement that of the 4,268 unduplicated 2005 SCIBRS records that matched to the SLED CCHR files, 85.4 percent of them resulted in a CDV arrest charge. Similarly, of the 11,153 unduplicated 2006-08 SCIBRS records that matched to the SLED CCHR files, 87.9 percent of them resulted in a CDV arrest charge. Based on the circumstances described in the SCIBRS records, one would expect all, i.e., 100 percent, of the unduplicated matched records from the two cohort files to result in a CDV arrest charge. The Appendix contains descriptive information about the 2005 and 2006-08 SCIBRS cohort files that linked to the CCHR. Please note that the number of records indicated in these tables, i.e., 4,742 and 12,666, respectively, are the total number of records in the SCIBRS that matched to the CCHR.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this project was to determine how well the ORICaseNumber variable on the SCIBRS files could be used to "link" to SLED CCHR files. This is important because it would then be possible to determine if those incidents that are described as CDV incidents in the SCIBRS files actually resulted in an arrest for CDV or for some other offense. The project looked at two time periods, CY 2005 and CY2006-08, to determine if there was improvement during these two time periods. This study found that the ORICaseNumber was not a particularly good "linker" to the CCHR. Only 17 percent of the 2005 SCIBRS records could be matched to the CCHR and only 21 percent of the 2006-08 SCIBRS records could be matched.

In an attempt to improve the match, another linker was created. This linker, called Unique2, did improve the percentage of records matched to the CCHR. The use of these two linkers resulted in a nearly 52 percent match rate for both the 2005 and the 2006-08 SCIBRS cohort files.

This study also determined that 85 percent of the 2005 SCIBRS records that matched to the SLED CCHR resulted in an arrest for CDV. For the 2006-08 SCIBRS matched records, 88 percent resulted in an arrest for CDV.

The problem, however, with these matching processes is that it is not possible to verify that the records were, in fact, correctly matched without further identifying information, such as the arrestee's name and date of birth and, possibly, a review of the narrative portion of the Incident Report. But there is a possible solution to this problem. SLED's Fusion Center collects these missing data elements from the Incident Reports. In other words, using the SCIBRS files and matching them to the Fusion Center files, using the ORICaseNumber, will provide us with identifiers that will then allow for the creation of the entire Incident Report, with identifiers and the narrative. Using the Office of Research and Statistics' (ORS) Unique Identifier Process, a unique identifier (UIDNUM) then can be placed on these records. ORS routinely places the UIDNUM on the CCHR extracts that it receives from SLED; therefore, it will be possible to link the Incident Report to the CCHR. This will result in two significant improvements to the process previously discussed in this report: 1) the process will provide assurance of a correct match, and 2) the match rate should improve significantly.

The Department of Public Safety (DPS) and ORS are jointly exploring this possibility with SLED's Fusion Center. Initial meetings have produced very positive results. Officials at the Fusion Center have agreed to provide ORS and/or the DPS with an extract of its files and ORS is in the process of developing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) among the three agencies for the purpose of data sharing.

APPENDIX

DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION ABOUT 2005 AND 2006-08 SCIBRS COHORT FILES LINKED TO CCHR

TABLE A1
Age

	SCIBRS Cohort Matched To CCHR			
	2005		2006 - 2008	
Age Category	#	%		
19 and Under	92	1.9	271	2.1
20 - 25	721	15.2	1,969	15.5
26 - 30	853	18.0	2,166	17.1
31 - 35	803	16.9	1,932	15.3
36 - 40	770	16.2	1,916	15.1
41 - 45	662	14.0	1,795	14.2
46 - 50	425	9.0	1,302	10.3
51 - 55	211	4.4	666	5.3
56 - 60	106	2.2	338	2.7
Over 60	96	2.0	290	2.3
UNK	3	0.1	21	0.2
Total	4,742	100.0	12,666	100.0

TABLE A2
Gender

	SCIBRS Cohort Matched To CCHR			
	2005		2006 - 2008	
Gender	#	%	#	%
Male	2,756	58.1	9,762	77.1
Female	1,967	41.5	2,904	22.9
Total	4,742	100.0	12,666	100.0

TABLE A3
Race

Race	SCIBRS Cohort Matched To CCHR			
	2005		2006 - 2008	
	#	%	#	%
White	2,756	58.1	7,563	59.7
Black	1,967	41.5	5,052	39.9
Asian	13	0.3	30	0.2
Other	6	0.1	21	0.2
Total	4,742	100.0	12,666	100.0

TABLE A4
Victim/Offender Relationship

Victim Relationship To Offender	SCIBRS Cohort Matched To CCHR			
	2005		2006 - 2008	
	#	%	#	%
Victim was Spouse	2,876	60.6	7,870	62.1
Victim was Common-Law Spouse	1,418	29.9	3,472	27.4
Victim was Offender	405	8.5	1,137	9.0
Victim was Acquaintance	16	0.3	50	0.4
Relationship Unknown	13	0.3	15	0.1
Victim was Otherwise Unknown	9	0.2	47	0.4
Victim was Sibling	2	0.0	7	0.1
Victim was Parent	2	0.0	9	0.1
Victim was Other Family Member	1	0.0	17	0.1
Victim was Inlaw	0	0.0	14	0.1
Victim was Friend	0	0.0	8	0.1
Victim was Stepparent	0	0.0	6	0.0
Other	0	0.0	14	0.1
Total	4,742	100.0	12,666	100.0

TABLE A5
Cohort Files Matched, by Agency

Agency	SCIBRS Cohort Matched To CCHR			
	2005		2006 - 2008	
	#	%	#	%
ABBEVILLE	11	0.2	49	0.4
AIKEN	216	4.6	689	5.4
ALLENDALE	1	0.0	5	0.0
ANDERSON	165	3.5	419	3.3
ANDREWS	3	0.1	4	0.0
BAMBERG	8	0.2	19	0.2
BARNWELL	34	0.7	120	0.9
BATESBURG-LEESVILLE	9	0.2	32	0.3
BEAUFORT	108	2.3	234	1.8
BELTON	2	0.0	2	0.0
BENNETTSVILLE	12	0.3	35	0.3
BERKELEY	101	2.1	291	2.3
BISHOPVILLE	1	0.0	2	0.0
BLACKSBURG	3	0.1	4	0.0
BLACKVILLE	0	0.0	2	0.0
BLUFFTON	4	0.1	25	0.2
CALHOUN	2	0.0	2	0.0
CALHOUN FALLS	1	0.0	0	0.0
CAMDEN	25	0.5	41	0.3
CAYCE	12	0.3	39	0.3
CENTRAL	7	0.1	5	0.0
CHAPIN	0	0.0	1	0.0
CHARLESTON	188	4.0	593	4.7
CHARLESTON CNTY AVIA AUT	1	0.0	0	0.0
CHERAW	4	0.1	6	0.0
CHEROKEE	62	1.3	122	1.0
CHESNEE	0	0.0	4	0.0
CHESTER	21	0.4	127	1.0
CHESTERFIELD	5	0.1	19	0.2
CLARENDON	12	0.3	69	0.5
CLEMSON	4	0.1	13	0.1
CLINTON	22	0.5	44	0.3
CLIO	2	0.0	0	0.0
CLOVER	6	0.1	19	0.2
COLLETON	36	0.8	122	1.0
COLUMBIA	76	1.6	127	1.0
CONWAY	46	1.0	48	0.4
COWPENS	2	0.0	1	0.0
DARLINGTON	83	1.8	219	1.7
DENMARK	0	0.0	1	0.0
DILLON	13	0.3	27	0.2
DORCHESTER	93	2.0	213	1.7

DUE WEST	0	0.0	2	0.0
DUNCAN	6	0.1	18	0.1
EASLEY	5	0.1	39	0.3
EDGEFIELD	12	0.3	28	0.2
EDISTO BEACH	1	0.0	0	0.0
ELGIN	1	0.0	7	0.1
ESTILL	0	0.0	2	0.0
FAIRFIELD	15	0.3	54	0.4
FLORENCE	86	1.8	210	1.7
FOLLY BEACH	3	0.1	14	0.1
FOREST ACRES	7	0.1	7	0.1
FORT LAWN	0	0.0	4	0.0
FORT MILL	18	0.4	45	0.4
FOUNTAIN INN	18	0.4	57	0.5
FRANCIS MARION UNIVERSIT	1	0.0	0	0.0
GAFFNEY	10	0.2	18	0.1
GASTON	0	0.0	2	0.0
GEORGETOWN	55	1.2	365	2.9
GOOSE CREEK	22	0.5	63	0.5
GREAT FALLS	0	0.0	2	0.0
GREENVILLE	403	8.5	733	5.8
GREENWOOD	222	4.7	438	3.5
GREER	22	0.5	57	0.5
HAMPTON	6	0.1	9	0.1
HANAHAN	30	0.6	92	0.7
HARDEEVILLE	1	0.0	8	0.1
HARLEYVILLE	0	0.0	2	0.0
HARTSVILLE	12	0.3	29	0.2
HOLLY HILL	1	0.0	0	0.0
HONEA PATH	3	0.1	14	0.1
HORRY COUNTY POLICE DEPT	209	4.4	599	4.7
INMAN	0	0.0	4	0.0
IRMO	3	0.1	22	0.2
ISLE OF PALMS	2	0.0	5	0.0
JASPER	8	0.2	65	0.5
JOHNSONVILLE	1	0.0	0	0.0
JOHNSTON	3	0.1	2	0.0
KERSHAW	12	0.3	41	0.3
KINGSTREE	1	0.0	7	0.1
LAKE CITY	17	0.4	47	0.4
LAMAR	0	0.0	3	0.0
LANCASTER	82	1.7	270	2.1
LANDRUM	1	0.0	8	0.1
LATTA	0	0.0	2	0.0
LAURENS	88	1.9	168	1.3
LEE	1	0.0	24	0.2
LEXINGTON	109	2.3	41	0.3
LIBERTY	1	0.0	4	0.0

LYMAN	3	0.1	9	0.1
MANNING	2	0.0	4	0.0
MARION	21	0.4	70	0.6
MARLBORO	17	0.4	15	0.1
MAULDIN	12	0.3	41	0.3
MCCOLL	1	0.0	3	0.0
MCCORMICK	9	0.2	14	0.1
MEDICAL U OF S CAROLINA	3	0.1	2	0.0
MONCKS CORNER	14	0.3	24	0.2
MOUNT PLEASANT	16	0.3	75	0.6
MULLINS	3	0.1	9	0.1
MYRTLE BEACH	95	2.0	554	4.4
NEW ELLENTON	0	0.0	5	0.0
NEWBERRY	114	2.4	195	1.5
NINETY SIX	0	0.0	1	0.0
NORTH AUGUSTA	31	0.7	85	0.7
NORTH CHARLESTON	194	4.1	620	4.9
NORTH MYRTLE BEACH	29	0.6	72	0.6
OCONEE	62	1.3	135	1.1
ORANGEBURG	27	0.6	147	1.2
PACOLET	2	0.0	6	0.0
PAGELAND	11	0.2	6	0.0
PAMPLICO	0	0.0	1	0.0
PELION	0	0.0	1	0.0
PICKENS	34	0.7	105	0.8
PORT ROYAL	16	0.3	17	0.1
PROSPERITY	3	0.1	7	0.1
RICHLAND	125	2.6	468	3.7
RIDGELAND	1	0.0	4	0.0
ROCK HILL	55	1.2	397	3.1
SALUDA	14	0.3	12	0.1
SANTEE	0	0.0	1	0.0
SENECA	0	0.0	21	0.2
SIMPSONVILLE	30	0.6	79	0.6
SOCIETY HILL	0	0.0	1	0.0
SOUTH CONGAREE	0	0.0	15	0.1
SPARTANBURG	392	8.3	846	6.7
SPRINGDALE	1	0.0	8	0.1
ST. GEORGE	4	0.1	1	0.0
ST. STEPHEN	0	0.0	1	0.0
SULLIVANS ISLAND	0	0.0	1	0.0
SUMMERTON	0	0.0	3	0.0
SUMMERVILLE	44	0.9	134	1.1
SUMTER	94	2.0	181	1.4
SURFSIDE BEACH	10	0.2	23	0.2
SWANSEA	2	0.0	9	0.1
TEGA CAY	2	0.0	20	0.2
TIMMONSVILLE	1	0.0	4	0.0

TRAVELERS REST	3	0.1	8	0.1
TURBEVILLE	0	0.0	4	0.0
UNION	73	1.5	118	0.9
UNIV OF SC: COLUMBIA	0	0.0	2	0.0
WAGENER	0	0.0	1	0.0
WALHALLA	7	0.1	10	0.1
WALTERBORO	33	0.7	61	0.5
WARE SHOALS	1	0.0	4	0.0
WELLFORD	0	0.0	7	0.1
WEST COLUMBIA	16	0.3	31	0.2
WESTMINSTER	8	0.2	8	0.1
WHITMIRE	5	0.1	15	0.1
WILLIAMSBURG	14	0.3	15	0.1
WILLIAMSTON	2	0.0	17	0.1
WILLISTON	2	0.0	3	0.0
WINNSBORO	7	0.1	15	0.1
WOODRUFF	4	0.1	9	0.1
YORK	174	3.7	461	3.6
TOTAL	4,742	100.0	12,666	100.0