Contents

Report of the Director 5
Reporting Requirements of the Statute 6
Regulations 6
Summary and Analysis of Reports by Judges 7
Authorized Lengths of Intercepts 7
Locations 8
Offenses 9
Summary and Analysis of Reports by Prosecuting Officials 9
Nature of Intercepts 9
Costs of Intercepts 11
Arrests and Convictions 12
Summary of Reports for Years Ending December 31, 1995 Through 2005 13
Supplementary Reports 13

Text Tables

Table 1
Jurisdictions With Statutes Authorizing the Interception of Wire, Oral, or Electronic Communications 14
Table 2
Intercept Orders Issued by Judges During Calendar Year 2005 15
Table 3
Major Offenses for Which Court-Authorized Intercepts Were Granted 18
Table 4
Summary of Interceptions of Wire, Oral, or Electronic Communications 21
Table 5
Average Cost per Order 24
Table 6
Types of Surveillance Used, Arrests, and Convictions for Intercepts Installed 27
Table 7
Authorized Intercepts Granted Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2519 30
Table 8
Summary of Supplementary Reports for Intercepts Terminated in Calendar Years 1996 Through 2004 31
Table 9
Arrests and Convictions Resulting From Intercepts Installed in Calendar Years 1995 Through 2005 35

Appendix Tables

Table A-1: United States District Courts
Report by Judges 36
Table A-2: United States District Courts
Supplementary Report by Prosecutors 90
Table B-1: State Courts
Report by Judges 112
Table B-2: State Courts
Supplementary Report by Prosecutors 226

Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts

on
Applications for Orders Authorizing or Approving the Interception of Wire, Oral, or Electronic Communications

The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 requires the Administrative Office of the United States Courts (AO) to report to Congress the number and nature of federal and state applications for orders authorizing or approving the interception of wire, oral, or electronic communications. The statute requires that specific information be provided to the AO, including the offense(s) under investigation, the location of the intercept, the cost of the surveillance, and the number of arrests, trials, and convictions that directly result from the surveillance. This report covers intercepts concluded between January 1, 2005, and December 31, 2005, and provides supplementary information on arrests and convictions resulting from intercepts concluded in prior years.

A total of 1,773 intercepts authorized by federal and state courts were completed in 2005, an increase of 4 percent compared to the number terminated in 2004. One application was denied. The number of applications for orders by federal authorities fell 14 percent to 625. The number of applications reported by state prosecuting officials grew 17 percent to 1,148, with three more state jurisdictions providing reports than in 2004. Wiretaps installed were in operation an average of 43 days per wiretap in 2005, the same as in 2004. The average number of persons whose communications were intercepted dropped from 126 per wiretap order in 2004 to 107 per order in 2005. The average percentage of intercepted communications that were incriminating was 22 percent in 2005, compared to 21 percent in 2004.

Public Law 106-197 amended 18 U.S.C. 2519(2)(b) to require that reporting should reflect the number of wiretap applications granted for which encryption was encountered and whether such encryption prevented law enforcement officials from obtaining the plain text of communications intercepted pursuant to the court orders. In 2005, no instances were reported of encryption's being encountered during a federal wiretap. State jurisdictions reported 13 instances in which encryption was encountered in wiretaps terminated in 2005; however, in none of these instances did the encryption prevent law enforcement officials from obtaining the plain text of communications intercepted.

The appendix tables of this report list all intercepts reported by judges and prosecuting officials for 2005. Appendix Table A-1 shows reports filed by federal judges and federal prosecuting officials. Appendix Table B-1 presents the same information for state judges and state prosecuting officials. Appendix Tables A-2 and B-2 contain information from the supplementary reports submitted by prosecuting officials about additional arrests and trials in 2005 arising from intercepts initially reported in prior years.

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2519(2), prosecutors must submit wiretap reports to the AO no later than January 31 of each year. This office, as is customary, sends a letter to the appropriate officials every year reminding them of the statutory mandate. Nevertheless, each year reports are received after the deadline has passed, and the filing of some reports may be delayed to avoid jeopardizing ongoing investigations. The percentage of missing state and local prosecutors' reports was 3 percent, the same as in 2004. Information received after the deadline will be included in next year's *Wiretap Report*. The AO is grateful for the cooperation and the prompt response we received from many officials around the nation.

Leonidas Ralph Mecham
Director

April 2006

Applications for Orders Authorizing or Approving the Interception of Wire, Oral, or Electronic Communications

Reporting Requirements of the Statute

Each federal and state judge is required to file a written report with the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts (AO) on each application for an order authorizing the interception of a wire, oral, or electronic communication (18 U.S.C. 2519(1)). This report is to be furnished within 30 days of the denial of the application or the expiration of the court order (after all extensions have expired). The report must include the name of the official who applied for the order, the offense under investigation, the type of interception device, the general location of the device, and the duration of the authorized intercept.

Prosecuting officials who applied for interception orders are required to submit reports to the AO each January on all orders that were terminated during the previous calendar year. These reports contain information related to the cost of each intercept, the number of days the intercept device was actually in operation, the total number of intercepts, and the number of incriminating intercepts recorded. Results such as arrests, trials, convictions, and the number of motions to suppress evidence related directly to the use of intercepts also are noted.

Neither the judges' reports nor the prosecuting officials' reports contain the names, addresses, or phone numbers of the parties investigated. The AO is **not** authorized to collect this information.

This report tabulates the number of applications for interceptions that were granted or denied, as reported by judges, as well as the number of authorizations for which interception devices were installed, as reported by prosecuting officials. No statistics are available on the number of devices installed for each authorized order. This report does not include interceptions regulated by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (FISA).

No report to the AO is required when an order is issued with the consent of one of the principal parties to the communication. Examples of such situations include the use of a wire interception to investigate obscene phone calls, the interception of a communication to which a police officer or police informant is a party, or the use of a body microphone. Also, no report to the AO is required for the use of a pen register (a device attached to a telephone line that records or decodes impulses identifying the numbers dialed from that line) unless the pen register is used in conjunction with any wiretap devices whose use must be reported. Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3126, the U.S. Department of Justice collects and reports data on pen registers and trap and trace devices.

Regulations

The Director of the AO is empowered to develop and revise the reporting regulations and reporting forms for collecting information on intercepts. Copies of the regulations, the reporting forms, and the federal wiretapping statute may be obtained by writing to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Statistics Division, Washington, D.C. 20544.

The Attorney General of the United States, the Deputy Attorney General, the Associate Attorney General, any Assistant Attorney General, any acting Assistant Attorney General, or any specially designated Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice may authorize an application to a federal judge for an order authorizing the interception of wire, oral, or electronic communications. On the state level, applications are made by a prosecuting attorney "if such attorney is authorized by a statute of that State to make application to a State court judge of competent jurisdiction."

Many wiretap orders are related to large-scale criminal investigations that cross county and state boundaries. Consequently, arrests, trials, and convictions resulting from these interceptions often do not occur within the same year as the installation of the intercept device. Under 18 U.S.C. 2519(2), prosecuting officials must file supplementary reports on additional court or police activity that occurs as a result of intercepts reported in prior years. Appendix Tables A-2 and B-2 describe the additional activity reported by prosecuting officials in their supplementary reports.

Table 1 shows that 47 jurisdictions (the federal government, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, and 44 states) currently have laws that authorize courts to issue orders permitting wire, oral, or electronic surveillance. During 2005, a total of 23 jurisdictions reported using at least one of these three types of surveillance as an investigative tool.

Summary and Analysis of Reports by Judges

Data on applications for wiretaps terminated during calendar year 2005 appear in Appendix Tables A-1 (federal) and B-1 (state). The reporting numbers used in the appendix tables are reference numbers assigned by the AO; these numbers do not correspond to the authorization or application numbers used by the reporting jurisdictions. The same reporting number is used for any supplemental information reported for a communications intercept in future volumes of the *Wiretap Report.*

The number of wiretaps reported increased 4 percent in 2005. A total of 1,773 applications were reported as authorized in 2005, including 625 submitted to federal judges and 1,148 to state judges. One application was denied. Compared to the number approved during 2004, the number of applications reported as approved by federal judges in 2005 fell 14 percent (see sidebar on page 8). The number of applications approved by state judges rose 17 percent. Wiretap applications in New York (391 applications), California (235 applications), New Jersey (218 applications), and Florida (72 applications) accounted for 80 percent of all applications approved by state judges. The number of states reporting wiretap activity was higher than the number for last year (22 states reported such activity in 2005, compared to 19 in 2004). Ninety-seven separate state jurisdictions submitted reports for 2005, which is 12 more than the total for 2004.

Authorized Lengths of Intercepts

Table 2 presents the number of intercept orders issued in each jurisdiction that provided reports, the number of amended intercept orders issued, the number of extensions granted, the average lengths of the original authorizations and their extensions, the total number of days the intercepts actually were in



operation, and the nature of the location where each interception of communications occurred. Most state laws limit the period of surveillance under an original order to 30 days. This period, however, can be lengthened by one or more extensions if the authorizing judge determines that additional time for surveillance is warranted.

During 2005, the average length of an original authorization was 28 days, the same as in 2004. A total of 1,360 extensions were requested and authorized in 2005, an increase of 1 percent. The average length of an extension was 28 days, the same as in 2004. The longest federal intercept occurred in the Southern District of New York, where an original 30-day order was extended nine times to complete a 287-day wiretap used in a racketeering investigation. Among state wiretaps terminating during 2005, the longest was used in a gambling investigation conducted in Queens County, New York; this wiretap, in use for 559 days, required a 30-day order to be extended 19 times. In contrast, 18 federal intercepts and 53 state intercepts each were in operation for less than a week.

Locations

The most common location specified in wiretap applications authorized in 2005 was "portable device, carried by/on individual," a category included for the first time in the *2000 Wiretap Report.* This category was added because wiretaps authorized for devices such as portable digital pagers and cellular telephones did not fit readily into the location categories provided prior to 2000. Since that time, the proportion of wiretaps involving fixed locations has declined as the use of mobile communications devices has become more prevalent. Table 2 shows that in 2005, a total of 91 percent (1,610 wiretaps) of all intercepts authorized involved portable devices such as these, which are not limited to fixed locations. This is an increase of 3 points over the percentage in 2004, when 88 percent of all intercepts involved portable devices.

The next most common specific location for the placement of wiretaps in 2005 was a "personal residence," a type of location that includes single-family houses, as well as row houses, apartments, and other multi-family dwellings. Table 2 shows that in 2005, a total of 3 percent (57 wiretaps) of all intercept devices were authorized for personal residences. One percent (21 wiretaps) were authorized for business establishments such as offices, restaurants, and hotels. Combinations of locations were cited in 49 federal and state applications (3 percent of the total) in 2005. Two percent (28 wiretaps) were authorized for "other" locations, which included such places as prisons, pay telephones in public areas, and motor vehicles.

Pursuant to the Electronic Communications Privacy Act of 1986, a specific location need not be cited if the application contains a statement explaining why such specification is not practical or shows "a purpose, on the part of that person (under investigation), to thwart interception by changing facilities" (see 18 U.S.C. 2518 (11)). In these cases, prosecutors use "roving" wiretaps to target a specific person rather than a specific telephone or location. The Intelligence Authorization Act of 1999, enacted on October 20, 1998, amended 18 U.S.C. 2518 (11)(b) to provide that a specific facility need not be cited "if there is probable cause to believe that actions by the person under investigation could have the effect of thwarting

Federal Wiretaps

The Department of Justice indicated that it examined the decrease in the reported use of wiretaps in federal investigations reflected in this year's report to Congress as opposed to last year's report and provided the following comments: "While it appears that the number of federal wiretap-assisted investigations conducted pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2518(1) declined last year, the numbers reported in the Administrative Office's report do not reflect a number of investigations not reported to the Department by the reporting deadline, as well as a large number of complex and/or sensitive investigations that continued into 2006 and thus could not be reported at this time. We believe that if these matters could have been included in the report, the report would reflect an increase in the use of federal wiretap-assisted investigations during Calendar Year 2005."

interception from a specified facility." The amendment also specifies that "the order authorizing or approving the interception is limited to interception only for such time as it is reasonable to presume that the person identified in the application is or was reasonably proximate to the instrument through which such communication will be or was transmitted."

For 2005, authorizations for eight wiretaps indicated approval with a relaxed specification order, meaning they were considered roving wiretaps. This is an increase from 2004, when one wiretap was reported as a roving wiretap; however, the 2005 total is similar to those reported for 2003 and 2002 (six and nine, respectively). One roving wiretap approved in 2005 was a federal wiretap used in a racketeering investigation. The other seven roving wiretaps were reported by state authorities: four were used in narcotics investigations, one in a murder investigation, one in a racketeering investigation, and one in a money laundering investigation.

Offenses

Violations of drug laws and racketeering laws were the two most prevalent types of offenses investigated through communications intercepts. Homicide/assault was the third most frequently recorded offense category, and gambling the fourth. Table 3 indicates that 81 percent of all applications for intercepts (1,433 wiretaps) authorized in 2005 cited a drug offense as the most serious offense under investigation. Many applications for court orders indicated that several criminal offenses were under investigation, but Table 3 includes only the most serious criminal offense named in an application. The use of federal intercepts to conduct drug investigations was most common in the Southern District of New York (37 applications), the Northern District of Illinois (31 applications), and the Central District of California (24 applications). On the state level, the largest number of drug-related intercepts was reported by the New York City Special Narcotics Bureau (148 applications), followed by Queens County of New York (100 applications) and Los Angeles County of California (85 applications). Nationwide, racketeering (94 orders) and homicide/assault (82 orders) were each specified in 5 percent of applications as the most serious offense under investigation. The categories of gambling (42 orders) and larceny/theft/robbery (16 orders) were specified in 2 percent and 1 percent of applications, respectively. Among the applications citing offenses counted under the category "other" in Table 3, the most frequently reported offenses were conspiracy (19 orders), fraud (17 orders), and corruption (11 orders).

Summary and Analysis of Reports by Prosecuting Officials

In accordance with 18 U.S.C. 2519(2), prosecuting officials must submit reports to the AO no later than January 31 of each year for intercepts terminated during the previous calendar year. Appendix Tables A-1 and B-1 contain information from all prosecutors' reports submitted for 2005. Judges submitted 57 reports for which the AO received no corresponding reports from prosecuting officials. For these authorizations, the entry "NP" (no prosecutor's report) appears in the appendix tables. Some of the prosecutors' reports may have been received too late to include in this report, and some prosecutors delayed filing reports to avoid jeopardizing ongoing investigations. Information received after the deadline will be included in next year's *Wiretap Report*.

Nature of Intercepts

Of the 1,773 communication interceptions authorized in 2005, reports submitted by prosecutors indicated that intercept devices were installed and results were reported in conjunction with a total of 1,694 orders. As shown in Table 2, orders for 22 wiretaps were approved for which no wiretaps actually were installed, and results from 57 wiretap orders were not available for reporting by the prosecutors. Table 4 presents information on the average number of intercepts per order, the number of persons whose communications were intercepted, the total number of communications intercepted, and the number of incriminating intercepts. Wiretaps varied extensively with respect to the above characteristics.

In 2005, installed wiretaps were in operation an average of 43 days, the same as the average number of days wiretaps were in operation in 2004. The most active federal wiretap occurred in the Southern District of New York, where a racketeering investigation involving the interception of cellular telephone



communications resulted in the interception of 51,712 messages over 287 days. The second most active federal intercept, also a cellular telephone wiretap, occurred in the Northern District of Texas as part of a racketeering investigation; this wiretap was active for 169 days and resulted in a total of 42,628 interceptions. The next most active federal wiretaps also involved cellular telephone intercepts: one wiretap lasting 109 days that was used in a prostitution investigation in the District of New Jersey produced an average of 335 interceptions per day, and one wiretap used in a smuggling investigation in the Central District of California for 135 days led to an average of 232 interceptions per day. For state authorizations, two jurisdictions reported wiretaps that produced an average of more than 600 intercepts per day: a wiretap used in a 30-day murder investigation in Los Angeles County, California, with an average of 666 intercepts per day, and a wiretap used in a 30-day narcotics investigation in San Diego County, California, with an average of 605 intercepts per day. Nationwide, in 2005 the average number of persons whose communications were intercepted per order in which intercepts were installed was 107, and the average number of communications intercepted was 2,835 per wiretap. An average of 629 intercepts per installed wiretap produced incriminating evidence. The average percentage of incriminating intercepts per order was 22 percent in 2005, compared to 21 percent in 2004.

The three major categories of surveillance are wire communications, oral communications, and electronic communications. In the early years of wiretap reporting, nearly all intercepts involved telephone (wire) surveillance, primarily communications made via conventional telephone lines; the remainder involved microphone (oral) surveillance or a combination of wire and oral interception. With the passage of the Electronic Communications Privacy Act of 1986, a third category was added for the reporting of electronic communications, which most commonly involve digital-display paging devices or fax machines, but also may include some computer transmissions.

Table 6 presents the type of surveillance method used for each intercept installed. The most common method of surveillance reported was "phone wire communication," which includes all telephones (land line, cellular, cordless, and mobile). Telephone wiretaps accounted for 95 percent (1,609 cases) of intercepts installed in 2005. Of those, 1,537 wiretaps involved cellular/mobile telephones, either as the only type of

device under surveillance (1,495 cases) or in combination with other types of telephones (42 cases).

The next most common method of surveillance reported was the electronic wiretap, which includes devices such as digital display pagers, voice pagers, fax machines, and transmissions via computer such as electronic mail. Electronic wiretaps accounted for 1 percent (23 cases) of intercepts installed in 2005; 15 of these involved electronic pagers, and 8 involved computers. Oral wiretaps including microphones were used in 1 percent of intercepts (18 cases). A combination of surveillance methods was used in 3 percent of intercepts (44 cases); of these combination intercepts, 93 percent (41 cases) included a mobile/cellular telephone as one of the devices monitored.

Public Law 106-197 amended 18 U.S.C. 2519(2)(b) in 2001 to require that reporting should reflect the number of wiretap applications granted in which encryption was encountered and whether such encryption prevented law enforcement officials from obtaining the plain text of communications intercepted pursuant to the court orders. In 2005, no instances were reported of encryption encountered during any federal wiretap. State jurisdictions reported 13 instances of encryption encountered in wiretaps terminated in 2005; however, in none of these cases was encryption reported to have prevented law enforcement officials from obtaining the plain text of communications intercepted. In addition, state jurisdictions reported that encryption was encountered in 40 wiretaps that were terminated in calendar year 2004 or earlier, but were reported for the first time in 2005; in only one of these instances did the encryption prevent law enforcement officials from obtaining the plain text of communications intercepted.

Costs of Intercepts

Table 5 provides a summary of expenses related to intercept orders in 2005. The expenditures noted reflect the cost of installing intercept devices and monitoring communications for the 1,525 authorizations for which reports included cost data. The average cost of intercept devices installed in 2005 was $55,530, down 12 percent from the average cost in 2004. For federal wiretaps for which expenses were reported in 2005, the average cost was $70,480, a 7 percent de-



crease from the average cost in 2004. The average cost of a state wiretap fell 13 percent to $45,454 in 2005. For additional information, see Appendix Tables A-1 (federal) & B-1 (state).

Arrests and Convictions

Table 6 presents the numbers of persons arrested and convicted as a result of interceptions reported as terminated in 2005. As of December 31, 2005, a total of 4,674 persons had been arrested based on interceptions of wire, oral, or electronic communications, 4 percent more than in 2004. Wiretaps terminated in 2005 resulted in the conviction of 776 persons as of December 31, 2005, which was 17 percent of the number of persons arrested. Federal wiretaps were responsible for 50 percent of the arrests and 31 percent of the convictions arising from wiretaps during 2005. A state wiretap in Somerset County, New Jersey, that resulted in the most arrests of any intercept terminated in 2005 was the lead wiretap of six intercepts authorized for a narcotics investigation that led to the arrest of 62 persons. The Southern District of New York reported the most arrests of any federal wiretap; a wiretap used in a racketeering investigation there yielded the arrest of 51 persons. The leader among state intercepts in producing convictions was a wiretap that was the lead wiretap of ten intercepts authorized in Rockland County, New York, for a narcotics investigation, which led to the conviction of 39 of the 40 persons arrested. The next largest number of convictions reported to have resulted from a state wiretap occurred in Queens County, New York, where the lead wiretap of nine intercepts authorized in a gambling investigation yielded the conviction of 31 persons. The District of South Carolina reported the most convictions of any federal wiretap; there the lead wiretap of two intercepts authorized in a narcotics investigation produced convictions for 32 of the 49 persons arrested. A wiretap that was the lead wiretap of two used in a narcotics investigation in the Eastern District of Wisconsin resulted in the conviction of all of the 27 persons arrested.

Federal and state prosecutors often note the importance of electronic surveillance in obtaining arrests and convictions. The Northern District of Georgia reported that a federal wiretap involving cellular telephone surveillance during a narcotics conspiracy investigation led to 28 arrests; in addition, the reporting officials stated that this wiretap "resulted in the seizure of 10 vehicles, 10 weapons, 40 pounds of marijuana, 592 kilos of cocaine, and $8,000,000 in cash." Reporting officials in the Northern District of Illinois described a federal wiretap in use for 30 days in a narcotics investigation that resulted in 7 arrests, along with the seizure of 10 vehicles, 1 weapon, more than $500,000 in cash, 100 pounds of marijuana, and 20,000 pills of MDMA (commonly known by the street name "ecstasy"). Incriminating communications obtained from a wiretap in the District of Arizona produced 11 arrests and the seizure of 4 vehicles, 15 weapons, 1 ton of marijuana, 5 kilos of cocaine, and more than $100,000 in cash. Surveillance of cellular telephone communications reported by the Northern District of New York contributed to 15 arrests and the seizure of 13 vehicles, 80 kilos of marijuana, more than 4 kilos of MDMA, and more than $1,000,000 in cash.

On the state level, officials in the office of the Wisconsin state attorney general reported that a standard telephone wiretap was used in a murder investigation, stating that "the case involves a 25+ year old homicide; without an admission by the conspirators it is unlikely we would be able to file charges." Officials in Los Angeles County, California, noted that a cellular telephone wiretap in use for 7 days resulted in 500 incriminating communications, the arrest of 5 persons, and the seizure of 81 kilograms of cocaine and approximately $600,000 in U.S. currency. The district attorney in Davidson County, Tennessee, reported that interceptions obtained from a cellular telephone wiretap conducted over 201 days in a drug conspiracy investigation "allowed investigators to determine the identities of the out-of-state cocaine suppliers and allowed investigators to track drug loads being delivered in Nashville." In another investigation in Davidson County, Tennessee, the reporting official stated that "the interceptions were necessary to uncover a plot to have witnesses in a pending case murdered."

Because criminal cases involving the use of surveillance may still be under active investigation or prosecution, the final results of many of the wiretaps concluded in 2005 may not have been reported. Prosecutors will report additional costs, arrests, trials, motions to suppress evidence, and convictions related directly to these intercepts in future supplementary reports, which will be noted in Appendix Tables A-2 and B-2 of subsequent volumes of the *Wiretap Report*.

Summary of Reports for Years Ending December 31, 1995 Through 2005

Table 7 provides information on intercepts reported each year from 1995 to 2005. This table specifies the number of intercept applications requested, authorized, and installed; the number of extensions granted; the average length of original orders and extensions; the locations of intercepts; the major offenses investigated; average costs; and the average number of persons intercepted, communications intercepted, and incriminating intercepts. From 1995 to 2005, the number of intercept applications authorized increased 68 percent. The majority of wiretaps consistently have been used for drug crime investigations, which accounted for 81 percent of intercept applications in 2005. Between 1995 and 2005, the percentage of drug-related wiretaps has ranged from 69 percent to this year's high of 81 percent of all authorized applications.

Supplementary Reports

Under 18 U.S.C. 2519(2), prosecuting officials must file supplementary reports on additional court or police activity occurring as a result of intercepts reported in prior years. Because many wiretap orders are related to large-scale criminal investigations that cross county and state boundaries, supplementary reports are necessary to fulfill reporting requirements. Arrests, trials, and convictions resulting from these interceptions often do not occur within the same year in which the intercept was first reported. Appendix Tables A-2 and B-2 provide detailed data from all supplementary reports submitted.

During 2005, a total of 1,451 arrests, 1,638 convictions, and additional costs of $10,492,657 arose from and were reported for wiretaps completed in previous years. Table 8 summarizes additional prosecution activity by jurisdiction from supplemental reports on intercepts terminated in the years noted. Sixty-one percent of the supplemental reports of additional activity in 2005 involved wiretaps terminated in 2004. Of all supplemental arrests, convictions, and costs reported in 2005, intercepts concluded in 2004 led to 67 percent of arrests, 55 percent of convictions, and 84 percent of expenditures. Table 9 reflects the total number of arrests and convictions resulting from intercepts terminated in calendar years 1995 through 2005.

Table 1
Jurisdictions With Statutes Authorizing the Interception of Wire, Oral, or Electronic Communications Effective During the Period January 1 Through December 31, 2005*

Jurisdiction	Statutory Citation**	Reported Use of Wiretap in 2005	Number of Orders Authorized in 2005
Federal	18:2510 - 2520	Yes	625
Alaska	12.37	No	-
Arizona	ARS 13-3010 - 13-3018	Yes	12
California	Penal Code Sections 629.50-629.98	Yes	235
Colorado	16-15-102	Yes	12
Connecticut	54-41a - 54-41t	Yes	12
Delaware	11 Del.C.Chap.24	No	-
District of Columbia	23-541 - 23-556	No	-
Florida	934.01 - 934.10	Yes	72
Georgia	16-11-64	Yes	27
Hawaii	803-41 - 803-48	No	-
Idaho	18-6701 - 18-6710	No	-
Illinois	720 ILCS SEC.5/108B	Yes	3
Indiana	35-33.5-3-1	No	-
Iowa	808B.1 - 808B.9	No	-
Kansas	22-2514 - 22-2516	No	-
Louisiana	Act No. 121 3B No.233 15:1308(A)(2)	No	-
Maine	15 M.R.S.A. Sec 709 et seq.	No	-
Maryland	10-401 - 10-411	Yes	41
Massachusetts	272:99	Yes	11
Minnesota	626A.01 - 626A.21	Yes	2
Mississippi	41-29-501	Yes	8
Missouri	33-542.400 - 542.424	No	-
Nebraska	86-290 - 86-294	No	-
Nevada	179.410 - 179.515, NRS 200.620	Yes	3
New Hampshire	570-A:1 - A:11	No	-
New Jersey	2A-156A-1 - 156A-34	Yes	218
New Mexico	30-12-2 - 30-12-11	No	-
New York	CPL Article 700	Yes	391
North Carolina	N.C.G.S. 15A-286	Yes	8
North Dakota	29-29.2	No	-
Ohio	2933.51 - 2933.66	No	-
Oklahoma	13 O.S. 176.1 - 176.14	Yes	7
Oregon	ORS 133.721 - 133.739	Yes	6
Pennsylvania	18 Pa.C.S. Sec 5701-5728	Yes	47
Rhode Island	12-5.1-1 - 12-5.1-16	Yes	3
South Carolina	SC Code Section 17-30-10 et seq.	No	-
South Dakota	23A - 35A	No	-
Tennessee	40-6-301 - 40-6-311	Yes	21
Texas	Crim. Proc. Sec. 18.20	Yes	4
Utah	77-23a-1 - 77-23a-16	No	-
Virgin Islands	5 V.I.C. Sec 4101-4107	No	-
Virginia	19.2-61	No	-
Washington	9.73	No	-
West Virginia	62-1D-11	No	-
Wisconsin	968.27 - 968.33	Yes	5
Wyoming	7-3-701 - 7-3-712	No	-

* Pursuant to provisions of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, 18 U.S.C. 2519.
** Includes only those jurisdictions that enacted legislation during or before calendar year 2005.

Table 2
Intercept Orders Issued by Judges During Calendar Year 2005

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
TOTAL	**1,773**	**62**	**57**	**22**	**1,694**	**1,360**	**28**	**28**	**72,897**	**57**	**21**	**1,610**	**49**	**28**	**8**	**-**
FEDERAL	**625**	**3**	**-**	**1**	**624**	**461**	**30**	**30**	**28,277**	**15**	**6**	**584**	**14**	**5**	**1**	**-**
ARIZONA																
MARICOPA	4	1	-	-	4	3	30	30	178	-	-	3	1	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	8	2	-	-	8	8	30	30	391	-	-	5	3	-	-	-
CALIFORNIA																
ALAMEDA	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	26	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
FRESNO	3	-	-	-	3	1	30	30	82	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
LOS ANGELES	102	-	11	-	91	26	30	30	3,135	2	-	88	12	-	-	-
ORANGE	32	-	-	1	31	-	30	-	851	-	-	32	-	-	-	-
PLACER	2	-	-	-	2	-	30	-	46	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
RIVERSIDE	12	-	-	-	12	12	30	30	712	-	-	12	-	-	-	-
SAN BERNARDINO	18	-	-	-	18	2	30	30	570	-	-	17	1	-	-	-
SAN DIEGO	62	-	1	-	61	35	30	28	2,360	-	-	62	-	-	-	-
SANTA BARBARA	3	1	-	-	3	2	28	30	140	-	-	2	1	-	-	-
COLORADO																
2ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT (DENVER)	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	30	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
4TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (EL PASO)	11	-	3	-	8	2	27	30	251	-	-	10	1	-	-	-
CONNECTICUT																
NEW HAVEN	3	-	-	-	3	-	15	-	45	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
NEW LONDON	4	-	-	-	4	1	15	15	68	1	-	1	-	2	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	4	-	-	2	2	-	15	-	30	1	-	3	-	-	-	-
WATERBURY	1	-	-	-	1	1	15	15	28	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
FLORIDA																
4TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (DUVAL)	17	1	-	-	17	11	30	30	676	-	-	17	-	-	-	-
5TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (LAKE/MARION)	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	18	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
9TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (ORANGE/OSCEOLA)	2	1	-	-	2	1	30	30	75	-	-	1	1	-	-	-
13TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (HILLSBOROUGH)	9	1	-	-	9	2	30	20	275	-	-	9	-	-	-	-
17TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (BROWARD)	8	-	-	-	8	5	30	30	324	-	-	8	-	-	-	-
19TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (SAINT LUCIE)	3	1	2	-	1	-	30	-	14	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	32	2	2	-	30	14	30	30	1,143	-	-	31	1	-	-	-
GEORGIA																
AUGUSTA	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	20	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
BIBB	3	-	-	-	3	-	30	-	76	1	-	2	-	-	-	-
FULTON	2	-	-	1	1	-	30	-	11	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
GWINNETT	7	-	-	-	7	-	30	-	118	-	-	6	1	-	-	-
HOUSTON	14	-	-	1	13	-	29	-	151	-	-	14	-	-	-	-

Table 2
Intercept Orders Issued by Judges During Calendar Year 2005 (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
ILLINOIS																
CLARK	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	29	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
DUPAGE	1	-	-	-	1	1	30	30	43	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
POPE	1	-	-	-	1	1	30	2	32	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
MARYLAND																
BALTIMORE	5	-	-	-	5	2	30	30	130	-	-	4	-	1	-	-
BALTIMORE CITY	2	-	-	-	2	-	30	-	39	1	-	1	-	-	-	-
CECIL	10	-	-	-	10	2	30	30	256	-	-	10	-	-	-	-
HARFORD	5	-	-	-	5	-	30	-	98	-	-	5	-	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	19	-	-	-	19	3	28	30	481	1	-	18	-	-	-	-
MASSACHUSETTS																
HAMPSHIRE	1	-	-	-	1	-	15	-	15	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
MIDDLESEX	10	-	-	-	10	9	15	15	249	2	1	7	-	-	-	-
MINNESOTA																
HENNEPIN	2	-	-	-	2	1	30	30	58	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
MISSISSIPPI																
FORREST	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	17	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
HINDS	3	-	-	-	3	-	30	-	55	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
LAMAR	2	-	-	-	2	-	30	-	40	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
LEFLORE	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	17	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
WASHINGTON	1	-	-	-	1	1	30	30	36	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
NEVADA																
CLARK	2	-	-	-	2	-	16	-	20	-	-	1	1	-	-	-
ELKO	1	-	-	-	1	-	3	-	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
NEW JERSEY																
ATLANTIC	2	-	-	-	2	1	20	10	27	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
BURLINGTON	4	-	-	2	2	-	20	-	2	1	-	3	-	-	-	-
CAMDEN	4	-	-	1	3	1	30	30	87	-	-	3	-	1	-	-
CAPE MAY	2	-	-	-	2	-	30	-	28	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
ESSEX	5	-	3	-	2	-	26	-	31	-	-	2	-	3	-	-
GLOUCESTER	1	-	-	1	-	-	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
HUDSON	28	-	-	-	28	13	22	15	608	1	-	25	-	2	-	-
MIDDLESEX	5	-	-	1	4	-	20	-	63	-	-	3	-	2	-	-
MORRIS	29	-	1	-	28	19	20	11	692	1	-	28	-	-	-	-
PASSAIC	16	-	-	-	16	4	19	28	273	-	-	16	-	-	-	-
SALEM	1	-	-	-	1	1	20	10	30	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
SOMERSET	20	-	-	-	20	28	20	13	483	1	-	19	-	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	67	-	28	1	38	40	27	24	1,194	3	-	61	-	1	2	-
UNION	34	10	-	-	34	16	24	24	1,014	-	-	29	-	-	5	-
NEW YORK																
ALBANY	2	-	-	-	2	-	30	-	58	-	-	1	1	-	-	-
DUTCHESS	3	-	-	-	3	3	30	30	172	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
FRANKLIN	7	1	-	-	7	9	30	30	410	4	-	3	-	-	-	-
JEFFERSON	1	-	-	1	-	-	30	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
KINGS	3	-	-	-	3	10	29	29	374	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
MONTGOMERY	5	-	-	1	4	-	30	-	39	-	-	5	-	-	-	-
NASSAU	7	3	-	-	7	5	30	30	266	-	-	7	-	-	-	-

Table 2
Intercept Orders Issued by Judges During Calendar Year 2005 (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
NEW YORK (CONTINUED)																
NEW YORK	4	1	2	-	2	5	30	30	183	-	-	3	-	1	-	-
NY ORGANIZED CRIME TASK FORCE	9	3	-	-	9	36	30	30	1,109	-	-	4	5	-	-	-
NYC SPECIAL NARCOTICS BUREAU	148	7	-	5	143	89	30	30	5,461	6	-	138	-	4	-	-
ONEIDA	4	-	-	-	4	3	20	19	136	-	-	4	-	-	-	-
QUEENS	118	5	1	1	116	354	26	29	12,275	4	2	110	-	2	-	-
RICHMOND	4	-	-	-	4	1	30	30	58	-	-	4	-	-	-	-
ROCKLAND	10	-	-	-	10	6	30	30	380	-	-	10	-	-	-	-
SARATOGA	1	-	-	-	1	-	10	-	10	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
SCHENECTADY	1	-	-	-	1	1	30	21	41	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	1	1	1	-	-	9	30	23	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
SUFFOLK	41	11	-	-	41	29	30	30	1,551	1	10	30	-	-	-	-
WAYNE	2	-	-	-	2	1	27	30	71	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
WESTCHESTER	20	3	-	-	20	33	25	29	1,268	-	-	20	-	-	-	-
NORTH CAROLINA																
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	8	-	-	-	8	4	30	15	245	-	-	8	-	-	-	-
OKLAHOMA																
GARFIELD	2	-	-	-	2	1	30	30	53	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
OKLAHOMA	5	-	-	-	5	-	30	-	149	-	-	5	-	-	-	-
OREGON																
LANE	1	-	-	-	1	-	5	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
MARION	3	-	-	-	3	-	30	-	45	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
MULTNOMAH	2	-	-	1	1	-	16	-	5	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
PENNSYLVANIA																
MCKEAN	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	6	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
MONTGOMERY	5	-	-	-	5	-	30	-	61	-	-	5	-	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	41	-	1	-	40	8	30	30	983	5	-	36	-	-	-	-
RHODE ISLAND																
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	3	1	-	-	3	5	30	30	167	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
TENNESSEE																
DAVIDSON	20	-	-	1	19	18	30	30	914	-	-	19	-	1	-	-
SHELBY	1	1	-	-	1	-	30	-	15	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
TEXAS																
BURLESON	2	1	-	-	2	-	30	-	57	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
FORT BEND	1	1	-	-	1	-	30	-	23	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
STARR	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
WISCONSIN																
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	5	-	-	-	5	-	22	-	40	4	-	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.

Table 3
Major Offenses for Which Court-Authorized Intercepts Were Granted Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2519
January 1 Through December 31, 2005

Reporting Jurisdiction	Total	Bribery	Gambling	Homicide and Assault	Kidnapping	Larceny, Theft, and Robbery	Loansharking, Usury, and Extortion	Narcotics	Racketeering	Other
TOTAL	**1,773**	**4**	**42**	**82**	**6**	**16**	**8**	**1,433**	**94**	**88**
FEDERAL	**625**	**4**	**1**	**3**	**-**	**3**	**6**	**521**	**42**	**45**
ARIZONA										
MARICOPA	4	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	8	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	3	3
CALIFORNIA										
ALAMEDA	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
FRESNO	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-
LOS ANGELES	102	-	-	17	-	-	-	85	-	-
ORANGE	32	-	-	1	-	-	-	30	-	1
PLACER	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
RIVERSIDE	12	-	-	1	-	-	-	11	-	-
SAN BERNARDINO	18	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	-	-
SAN DIEGO	62	-	-	-	-	-	-	61	-	1
SANTA BARBARA	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-
COLORADO										
2ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT (DENVER)	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
4TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (EL PASO)	11	-	-	1	1	-	-	9	-	-
CONNECTICUT										
NEW HAVEN	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-
NEW LONDON	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-
WATERBURY	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
FLORIDA										
4TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (DUVAL)	17	-	-	-	-	-	-	17	-	-
5TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (LAKE/MARION)	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
9TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (ORANGE/OSCEOLA)	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
13TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (HILLSBOROUGH)	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	2	-
17TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (BROWARD)	8	-	4	-	-	2	-	2	-	-
19TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (SAINT LUCIE)	3	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	32	-	-	1	-	-	-	31	-	-
GEORGIA										
AUGUSTA	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
BIBB	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-
FULTON	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
GWINNETT	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-
HOUSTON	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	-	-
ILLINOIS										
CLARK	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
DUPAGE	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
POPE	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-

Table 3
Major Offenses for Which Court-Authorized Intercepts Were Granted Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2519
January 1 Through December 31, 2005 (Continued)

Reporting Jurisdiction	Total	Bribery	Gambling	Homicide and Assault	Kidnapping	Larceny, Theft, and Robbery	Loansharking, Usury, and Extortion	Narcotics	Racketeering	Other
MARYLAND										
BALTIMORE	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
BALTIMORE CITY	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
CECIL	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	-
HARFORD	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	19	-	-	3	-	-	-	14	-	2
MASSACHUSETTS										
HAMPSHIRE	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
MIDDLESEX	10	-	5	-	-	-	-	5	-	-
MINNESOTA										
HENNEPIN	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
MISSISSIPPI										
FORREST	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
HINDS	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-
LAMAR	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
LEFLORE	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
WASHINGTON	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
NEVADA										
CLARK	2	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
ELKO	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
NEW JERSEY										
ATLANTIC	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
BURLINGTON	4	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-
CAMDEN	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	1
CAPE MAY	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
ESSEX	5	-	-	1	-	1	1	2	-	-
GLOUCESTER	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HUDSON	28	-	-	5	2	-	-	10	-	11
MIDDLESEX	5	-	-	2	-	-	-	3	-	-
MORRIS	29	-	2	-	-	-	-	27	-	-
PASSAIC	16	-	-	3	-	-	-	11	-	2
SALEM	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
SOMERSET	20	-	1	-	-	-	-	19	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	67	-	-	7	-	-	-	27	33	-
UNION	34	-	-	-	-	-	-	33	1	-
NEW YORK										
ALBANY	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
DUTCHESS	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-
FRANKLIN	7	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	6	-
JEFFERSON	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
KINGS	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	-
MONTGOMERY	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-
NASSAU	7	-	-	1	-	-	-	6	-	-
NEW YORK	4	-	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
NY ORGANIZED CRIME TASK FORCE	9	-	1	-	-	1	-	6	-	1
NYC SPECIAL NARCOTICS BUREAU	148	-	-	-	-	-	-	148	-	-
ONEIDA	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-
QUEENS	118	-	3	2	-	6	-	100	-	7

Table 3
Major Offenses for Which Court-Authorized Intercepts Were Granted Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2519
January 1 Through December 31, 2005 (Continued)

Reporting Jurisdiction	Total	Bribery	Gambling	Homicide and Assault	Kidnapping	Larceny, Theft, and Robbery	Loansharking, Usury, and Extortion	Narcotics	Racketeering	Other
NEW YORK (CONTINUED)										
RICHMOND	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-
ROCKLAND	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	-
SARATOGA	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
SCHENECTADY	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
SUFFOLK	41	-	13	-	-	-	-	28	-	-
WAYNE	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
WESTCHESTER	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	-	-
NORTH CAROLINA										
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-
OKLAHOMA										
GARFIELD	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
OKLAHOMA	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-
OREGON										
LANE	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
MARION	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-
MULTNOMAH	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
PENNSYLVANIA										
MCKEAN	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
MONTGOMERY	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	4	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	41	-	5	2	-	-	-	29	-	5
RHODE ISLAND										
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	3	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
TENNESSEE										
DAVIDSON	20	-	-	1	-	-	-	19	-	-
SHELBY	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
TEXAS										
BURLESON	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
FORT BEND	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
STARR	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
WISCONSIN										
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	5	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note: This table shows the most serious offense for each court-authorized interception.

Table 4
Summary of Interceptions of Wire, Oral, or Electronic Communications
January 1 Through December 31, 2005*

Reporting Jurisdiction	Number Authorized	Orders for Which Intercepts Installed	Average Number per Order When Installed**		
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incrimi-nating Intercepts
TOTAL	**1,773**	**1,694**	**107**	**2,835**	**629**
FEDERAL	**625**	**624**	**114**	**3,555**	**554**
ARIZONA					
MARICOPA	4	4	48	2,347	864
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	8	8	1,040	4,516	1,423
CALIFORNIA					
ALAMEDA	1	1	NR	5,479	NR
FRESNO	3	3	1,240	1,240	145
LOS ANGELES	102	91	228	2,074	330
ORANGE	32	31	92	832	112
PLACER	2	2	22	475	53
RIVERSIDE	12	12	124	3,170	473
SAN BERNARDINO	18	18	84	990	147
SAN DIEGO	62	61	93	2,824	615
SANTA BARBARA	3	3	962	1,926	404
COLORADO					
2ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT (DENVER)	1	1	55	4,662	142
4TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (EL PASO)	11	8	101	1,401	254
CONNECTICUT					
NEW HAVEN	3	3	27	137	49
NEW LONDON	4	4	11	181	171
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	4	2	NR	208	1
WATERBURY	1	1	214	1,212	158
FLORIDA					
4TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (DUVAL)	17	17	170	4,658	855
5TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (LAKE/MARION)	1	1	331	5,559	401
9TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (ORANGE/OSCEOLA)	2	2	944	3,390	270
13TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (HILLSBOROUGH)	9	9	21	2,741	127
17TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (BROWARD)	8	8	247	2,790	510
19TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (SAINT LUCIE)	3	1	120	2,044	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	32	30	190	3,731	449
GEORGIA					
AUGUSTA	1	1	67	3,129	176
BIBB	3	3	32	2,426	383
FULTON	2	1	134	1,294	-
GWINNETT	7	7	87	857	83
HOUSTON	14	13	16	720	155
ILLINOIS					
CLARK	1	1	-	-	-
DUPAGE	1	1	18	467	56
POPE	1	1	1	4	4

Table 4
Summary of Interceptions of Wire, Oral, or Electronic Communications
January 1 Through December 31, 2005 (Continued)*

Reporting Jurisdiction	Number Authorized	Orders for Which Intercepts Installed	Average Number per Order When Installed**		
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incrimi-nating Intercepts
MARYLAND					
BALTIMORE	5	5	191	1,917	436
BALTIMORE CITY	2	2	399	3,560	128
CECIL	10	10	58	2,327	760
HARFORD	5	5	31	400	101
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	19	19	65	1,114	115
MASSACHUSETTS					
HAMPSHIRE	1	1	25	260	234
MIDDLESEX	10	10	31	1,523	377
MINNESOTA					
HENNEPIN	2	2	299	3,261	864
MISSISSIPPI					
FORREST	1	1	50	2,434	34
HINDS	3	3	40	1,201	105
LAMAR	2	2	26	691	30
LEFLORE	1	1	20	1,143	131
WASHINGTON	1	1	60	2,171	466
NEVADA					
CLARK	2	2	21	534	17
ELKO	1	1	1	2	NR
NEW JERSEY					
ATLANTIC	2	2	41	2,890	215
BURLINGTON	4	2	9	27	-
CAMDEN	4	3	79	5,160	137
CAPE MAY	2	2	34	1,574	371
ESSEX	5	2	2	20	19
GLOUCESTER	1	NP	NP	NP	NP
HUDSON	28	28	44	1,550	147
MIDDLESEX	5	4	182	1,876	1,272
MORRIS	29	28	54	1,278	227
PASSAIC	16	16	9	1,254	321
SALEM	1	1	49	3,720	360
SOMERSET	20	20	134	1,932	1,583
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	67	38	47	2,697	204
UNION	34	34	26	1,643	228
NEW YORK					
ALBANY	2	2	-	1,573	119
DUTCHESS	3	3	27	2,115	372
FRANKLIN	7	7	69	7,668	84
JEFFERSON	1	NP	NP	NP	NP
KINGS	3	3	233	11,394	6,705
MONTGOMERY	5	4	16	607	85
NASSAU	7	7	147	3,567	641
NEW YORK	4	2	33	9,110	280
NY ORGANIZED CRIME TASK FORCE	9	9	156	15,552	5,680
NYC SPECIAL NARCOTICS BUREAU	148	143	25	1,283	156
ONEIDA	4	4	23	385	214
QUEENS	118	116	56	3,966	2,229
RICHMOND	4	4	60	2,959	846
ROCKLAND	10	10	33	4,827	601
SARATOGA	1	1	8	8	NR

Table 4
Summary of Interceptions of Wire, Oral, or Electronic Communications
January 1 Through December 31, 2005 (Continued)*

Reporting Jurisdiction	Number Authorized	Orders for Which Intercepts Installed	Average Number per Order When Installed**		
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incrimi-nating Intercepts
NEW YORK (CONTINUED)					
SCHENECTADY	1	1	110	3,962	1,400
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	1	NP	NP	NP	NP
SUFFOLK	41	41	219	1,550	812
WAYNE	2	2	25	1,536	295
WESTCHESTER	20	20	102	4,356	2,213
NORTH CAROLINA					
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	8	8	10	2,535	241
OKLAHOMA					
GARFIELD	2	2	125	1,484	465
OKLAHOMA	5	5	169	3,054	611
OREGON					
LANE	1	1	-	-	-
MARION	3	3	112	978	517
MULTNOMAH	2	1	90	258	8
PENNSYLVANIA					
MCKEAN	1	1	-	-	-
MONTGOMERY	5	5	26	391	111
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	41	40	61	2,314	474
RHODE ISLAND					
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	3	3	69	1,807	722
TENNESSEE					
DAVIDSON	20	19	88	3,002	419
SHELBY	1	1	53	3,315	7
TEXAS					
BURLESON	2	2	17	2,067	139
FORT BEND	1	1	85	1,870	97
STARR	1	NP	NP	NP	NP
WISCONSIN					
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	5	5	52	81	-

* NR = Not reported or could not be determined. NP = No prosecutor's report.

** Excludes those reports in which the number of persons intercepted, the number of intercepts, or the number of incriminating intercepts was not reported or could not be determined.

Table 5
Average Cost per Order
January 1 Through December 31, 2005*

Reporting Jurisdiction	Authorized Orders for Which Intercepts Installed	Intercept Orders for Which Cost Reported**	Average Cost per Order in $
TOTAL	**1,694**	**1,525**	**55,530**
FEDERAL	**624**	**614**	**70,480**
ARIZONA			
MARICOPA	4	4	50,904
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	8	8	181,945
CALIFORNIA			
ALAMEDA	1	1	143,834
FRESNO	3	3	21,592
LOS ANGELES	91	70	51,019
ORANGE	31	28	40,564
PLACER	2	2	7,114
RIVERSIDE	12	12	69,493
SAN BERNARDINO	18	17	22,919
SAN DIEGO	61	60	34,064
SANTA BARBARA	3	3	85,909
COLORADO			
2ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT (DENVER)	1	1	9,700
4TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (EL PASO)	8	8	40,193
CONNECTICUT			
NEW HAVEN	3	3	9,465
NEW LONDON	4	4	15,005
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	2	2	13,900
WATERBURY	1	1	96,519
FLORIDA			
4TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (DUVAL)	17	17	5,330
5TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (LAKE/MARION)	1	1	43,000
9TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (ORANGE/OSCEOLA)	2	2	69,859
13TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (HILLSBOROUGH)	9	9	52,586
17TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (BROWARD)	8	8	66,521
19TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (SAINT LUCIE)	1	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	30	30	38,247
GEORGIA			
AUGUSTA	1	1	21,100
BIBB	3	3	14,667
FULTON	1	-	-
GWINNETT	7	7	34,143
HOUSTON	13	8	14,505
ILLINOIS			
CLARK	1	1	300
DUPAGE	1	1	8,000
POPE	1	1	1,167

Table 5
Average Cost per Order
January 1 Through December 31, 2005 (Continued)*

Reporting Jurisdiction	Authorized Orders for Which Intercepts Installed	Intercept Orders for Which Cost Reported**	Average Cost per Order in $
MARYLAND			
BALTIMORE	5	-	-
BALTIMORE CITY	2	2	17,000
CECIL	10	10	10,600
HARFORD	5	5	58,747
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	19	19	45,238
MASSACHUSETTS			
HAMPSHIRE	1	1	45,600
MIDDLESEX	10	10	13,961
MINNESOTA			
HENNEPIN	2	2	22,400
MISSISSIPPI			
FORREST	1	1	9,140
HINDS	3	3	9,140
LAMAR	2	2	18,970
LEFLORE	1	1	9,140
WASHINGTON	1	1	34,560
NEVADA			
CLARK	2	2	20,764
ELKO	1	-	-
NEW JERSEY			
ATLANTIC	2	2	50,000
BURLINGTON	2	-	-
CAMDEN	3	3	89,440
CAPE MAY	2	2	32,935
ESSEX	2	-	-
GLOUCESTER	NP	NP	NP
HUDSON	28	28	14,869
MIDDLESEX	4	4	15,371
MORRIS	28	28	21,136
PASSAIC	16	15	27,900
SALEM	1	1	9,200
SOMERSET	20	20	14,100
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	38	38	92,200
UNION	34	29	116,888
NEW YORK			
ALBANY	2	-	-
DUTCHESS	3	3	122,333
FRANKLIN	7	7	49,761
JEFFERSON	NP	NP	NP
KINGS	3	3	163,800
MONTGOMERY	4	4	8,750
NASSAU	7	7	128,637
NEW YORK	2	2	173,200
NY ORGANIZED CRIME TASK FORCE	9	9	314,607
NYC SPECIAL NARCOTICS BUREAU	143	49	25,580
ONEIDA	4	4	12,537
QUEENS	116	115	21,340
RICHMOND	4	4	95,250

Table 5
Average Cost per Order
January 1 Through December 31, 2005 (Continued)*

Reporting Jurisdiction	Authorized Orders for Which Intercepts Installed	Intercept Orders for Which Cost Reported**	Average Cost per Order in $
NEW YORK (CONTINUED)			
ROCKLAND	10	10	44,023
SARATOGA	1	-	-
SCHENECTADY	1	1	45,000
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	NP	NP	NP
SUFFOLK	41	41	40,955
WAYNE	2	2	123,664
WESTCHESTER	20	20	43,021
NORTH CAROLINA			
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	8	8	61,147
OKLAHOMA			
GARFIELD	2	2	40,532
OKLAHOMA	5	4	72,725
OREGON			
LANE	1	1	2,400
MARION	3	3	42,800
MULTNOMAH	1	1	46,800
PENNSYLVANIA			
MCKEAN	1	-	-
MONTGOMERY	5	5	16,785
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	40	36	63,844
RHODE ISLAND			
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	3	3	16,667
TENNESSEE			
DAVIDSON	19	15	43,183
SHELBY	1	1	10,000
TEXAS			
BURLESON	2	2	59,389
FORT BEND	1	1	112,299
STARR	NP	NP	NP
WISCONSIN			
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	5	3	4,763

* NP = No prosecutor's report.
** Includes costs for orders for which intercepts were installed but not used.

Table 6
Types of Surveillance Used, Arrests, and Convictions for Intercepts Installed
January 1 Through December 31, 2005*

Reporting Jurisdiction	Orders for Which Intercepts Installed	Wire (Incl. Any Type Telephone: Standard, Cell, Mobile)	Oral (Incl. Microphone, Eavesdrop)	Electronic (Incl. Digital Pager, Fax, Computer)	Combination**	Number of Persons	
						Arrested	Convicted***
TOTAL	**1,694**	**1,609**	**18**	**23**	**44**	**4,674**	**776**
FEDERAL	**624**	**602**	**7**	**2**	**13**	**2,354**	**240**
ARIZONA							
MARICOPA	4	4	-	-	-	13	5
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	8	8	-	-	-	55	6
CALIFORNIA							
ALAMEDA	1	1	-	-	-	13	-
FRESNO	3	3	-	-	-	-	-
LOS ANGELES	91	89	-	2	-	208	14
ORANGE	31	9	-	-	22	5	1
PLACER	2	2	-	-	-	-	-
RIVERSIDE	12	12	-	-	-	30	1
SAN BERNARDINO	18	18	-	-	-	16	3
SAN DIEGO	61	61	-	-	-	156	112
SANTA BARBARA	3	3	-	-	-	15	7
COLORADO							
2ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT (DENVER)	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
4TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (EL PASO)	8	8	-	-	-	12	-
CONNECTICUT							
NEW HAVEN	3	3	-	-	-	3	-
NEW LONDON	4	4	-	-	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	2	2	-	-	-	-	-
WATERBURY	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
FLORIDA							
4TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (DUVAL)	17	17	-	-	-	52	-
5TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (LAKE/MARION)	1	1	-	-	-	12	-
9TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (ORANGE/OSCEOLA)	2	1	-	-	1	35	1
13TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (HILLSBOROUGH)	9	9	-	-	-	40	-
17TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (BROWARD)	8	8	-	-	-	29	1
19TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (SAINT LUCIE)	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	30	30	-	-	-	53	10
GEORGIA							
AUGUSTA	1	1	-	-	-	8	-
BIBB	3	3	-	-	-	47	-
FULTON	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
GWINNETT	7	7	-	-	-	27	1
HOUSTON	13	13	-	-	-	31	8
ILLINOIS							
CLARK	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
DUPAGE	1	1	-	-	-	1	-
POPE	1	1	-	-	-	2	1

Table 6
Types of Surveillance Used, Arrests, and Convictions for Intercepts Installed
January 1 Through December 31, 2005 (Continued)*

Reporting Jurisdiction	Orders for Which Intercepts Installed	Wire (Incl. Any Type Telephone: Standard, Cell, Mobile)	Oral (Incl. Microphone, Eavesdrop)	Electronic (Incl. Digital Pager, Fax, Computer)	Combination**	Number of Persons	
						Arrested	Convicted***
MARYLAND							
BALTIMORE	5	4	1	-	-	-	-
BALTIMORE CITY	2	2	-	-	-	32	13
CECIL	10	10	-	-	-	-	-
HARFORD	5	5	-	-	-	20	13
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	19	19	-	-	-	-	-
MASSACHUSETTS							
HAMPSHIRE	1	1	-	-	-	16	-
MIDDLESEX	10	10	-	-	-	1	-
MINNESOTA							
HENNEPIN	2	2	-	-	-	10	2
MISSISSIPPI							
FORREST	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
HINDS	3	3	-	-	-	-	-
LAMAR	2	2	-	-	-	-	-
LEFLORE	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
WASHINGTON	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
NEVADA							
CLARK	2	2	-	-	-	3	1
ELKO	1	1	-	-	-	1	1
NEW JERSEY							
ATLANTIC	2	2	-	-	-	20	-
BURLINGTON	2	2	-	-	-	-	-
CAMDEN	3	2	1	-	-	24	1
CAPE MAY	2	2	-	-	-	20	3
ESSEX	2	2	-	-	-	2	-
GLOUCESTER	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
HUDSON	28	25	1	2	-	55	-
MIDDLESEX	4	4	-	-	-	60	17
MORRIS	28	28	-	-	-	169	-
PASSAIC	16	16	-	-	-	29	-
SALEM	1	1	-	-	-	27	-
SOMERSET	20	19	-	1	-	160	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	38	37	-	1	-	-	-
UNION	34	34	-	-	-	60	-
NEW YORK							
ALBANY	2	2	-	-	-	-	-
DUTCHESS	3	3	-	-	-	8	-
FRANKLIN	7	7	-	-	-	22	-
JEFFERSON	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
KINGS	3	3	-	-	-	15	-
MONTGOMERY	4	4	-	-	-	2	2
NASSAU	7	6	-	-	1	20	5
NEW YORK	2	1	-	-	1	3	-
NY ORGANIZED CRIME TASK FORCE	9	8	-	-	1	20	20
NYC SPECIAL NARCOTICS BUREAU	143	132	4	7	-	54	36
ONEIDA	4	4	-	-	-	12	12

Table 6
Types of Surveillance Used, Arrests, and Convictions for Intercepts Installed
January 1 Through December 31, 2005 (Continued)*

Reporting Jurisdiction	Orders for Which Intercepts Installed	Wire (Incl. Any Type Telephone: Standard, Cell, Mobile)	Oral (Incl. Microphone, Eavesdrop)	Electronic (Incl. Digital Pager, Fax, Computer)	Combination**	Number of Persons	
						Arrested	Convicted***
NEW YORK (CONTINUED)							
QUEENS	116	106	2	5	3	125	77
RICHMOND	4	4	-	-	-	15	5
ROCKLAND	10	10	-	-	-	40	39
SARATOGA	1	1	-	-	-	1	-
SCHENECTADY	1	1	-	-	-	3	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
SUFFOLK	41	37	-	2	2	92	47
WAYNE	2	2	-	-	-	7	-
WESTCHESTER	20	19	-	1	-	59	23
NORTH CAROLINA							
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	8	8	-	-	-	35	27
OKLAHOMA							
GARFIELD	2	2	-	-	-	-	-
OKLAHOMA	5	5	-	-	-	17	-
OREGON							
LANE	1	-	1	-	-	-	-
MARION	3	3	-	-	-	37	-
MULTNOMAH	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
PENNSYLVANIA							
MCKEAN	1	-	1	-	-	-	-
MONTGOMERY	5	5	-	-	-	18	3
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	40	40	-	-	-	107	16
RHODE ISLAND							
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	3	3	-	-	-	15	2
TENNESSEE							
DAVIDSON	19	19	-	-	-	16	-
SHELBY	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
TEXAS							
BURLESON	2	2	-	-	-	-	-
FORT BEND	1	1	-	-	-	3	-
STARR	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-
WISCONSIN							
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	5	5	-	-	-	2	-

* NP = No prosecutor's report.
** Combination refers to the number of installed intercepts for which more than one type of surveillance was used.
*** Convictions resulting from interceptions often do not occur within the same year in which an intercept was first reported. See Tables 8 and 9.

Table 7
Authorized Intercepts Granted Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2519 as Reported in Wiretap Reports for Calendar Years 1995 - 2005

Wiretap Report Date	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Intercept applications requested	**1,058**	**1,150**	**1,186**	**1,331**	**1,350**	**1,190**	**1,491**	**1,359**	**1,442**	**1,710**	**1,774**
Intercept applications authorized	**1,058**	**1,149**	**1,186**	**1,329**	**1,350**	**1,190**	**1,491**	**1,358**	**1,442**	**1,710**	**1,773**
Federal	532	581	569	566	601	479	486	497	578	730	625
State	526	568	617	763	749	711	1,005	861	864	980	1148
Avg. days of original authorization	29	28	28	28	27	28	27	29	29	28	28
Number of extensions	834	887	1,028	1,164	1,367	926	1,008	889	1,145	1,341	1,360
Average length of extensions (in days)	29	28	28	27	29	28	29	29	29	28	28
Location of authorized intercepts:											
Personal residence	428	434	382	436	341	244	206	154	118	83	57
Business	101	101	78	87	59	56	60	37	35	30	21
Portable device	-	-	-	-	-	719	1,007	1,046	1,165	1,507	1,610
Multiple locations	115	149	197	222	287	109	117	85	95	65	49
Not indicated or other*	414	465	529	584	663	62	101	36	29	25	36
Major offense specified:											
Arson, explosives, and weapons	4	-	3	3	8	5	5	-	5	12	3
Bribery	4	10	13	9	42	21	1	3	9	16	4
Extortion (includes usury and loan-sharking)	18	9	24	12	11	10	28	18	6	5	8
Gambling	95	114	98	93	60	49	82	82	49	90	42
Homicide and assault	30	41	31	55	62	72	52	58	80	48	82
Larceny and theft	12	7	22	19	9	15	47	8	48	30	11
Narcotics	732	821	870	955	978	894	1,167	1,052	1,104	1,308	1,433
Robbery and burglary	5	4	5	4	4	4	8	3	3	9	7
Racketeering	98	105	93	153	139	76	70	72	96	138	94
Other or unspecified	60	38	27	28	37	44	31	62	42	54	89
Intercept applications installed**	**1,024**	**1,035**	**1,094**	**1,245**	**1,277**	**1,139**	**1,405**	**1,273**	**1,367**	**1,633**	**1,694**
Federal	527	574	563	562	595	472	481	490	576	723	624
State	497	461	531	683	682	667	924	783	791	910	1070
For intercepts installed:											
Total days in operation	43,179	43,635	48,871	53,411	63,243	47,729	53,574	50,025	60,198	69,980	72,897
Avg. number of persons intercepted ***	140	192	197	190	195	196	86	92	116	126	107
Average number of intercepted communications***	2,028	1,969	2,081	1,858	1,921	1,769	1,565	1,708	3,004	3,017	2,835
Average number of incriminating intercepted communications***	459	422	418	350	390	402	333	403	993	619	629
Authorizations where costs reported	983	1,007	1,029	1,184	1,232	1,080	1,327	1,193	1,236	1,559	1,525
Average cost of intercepts for which costs reported	56,454	61,436	61,176	57,669	57,511	54,829	48,198	54,586	62,164	63,011	55,530
Intercept applications authorized but reported after publication****	82	48	90	118	196	196	202	181	341	178	-
Total authorized by year (reported through December 2005)	1,140	1,197	1,276	1,447	1,546	1,386	1,693	1,539	1,783	1,888	1,773

* Starting in 2000, location categories were revised to improve reporting and reduce the number of instances in which "other" location was reported.
** Installed intercepts include only those intercepts for which reports were received from prosecuting officials.
*** As of 1998, the average excludes those reports in which the number of persons intercepted, the number of intercepts, or the number of incriminating intercepts was not reported or could not be determined.
**** Some wiretaps terminated in a given year are not reported until a subsequent year because they are part of ongoing investigations.

Table 8
Summary of Supplementary Reports for Intercepts Terminated in Calendar Years 1996 Through 2004
(Report as of December 31, 2005)

Report Year and Jurisdiction	Total Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
	Number of Reports	Costs in $	Number of Persons Arrested	Number of Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts*			Number of Persons Convicted
					G	D	P	
TOTAL ALL YEARS	**635**	**10,492,656**	**1,452**	**88**	**1**	**106**	**29**	**1,638**
TOTAL 1996	**1**	**-**	**10**	**1**	**-**	**10**	**-**	**6**
FEDERAL	**1**	**-**	**10**	**1**	**-**	**10**	**-**	**6**
TOTAL 1997	**2**	**-**	**2**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**2**
FEDERAL	**1**	**-**	**1**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**1**
ARIZONA								
MARICOPA	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
TOTAL 1998	**6**	**-**	**9**	**2**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**10**
FEDERAL	**3**	**-**	**5**	**1**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**7**
ARIZONA								
MARICOPA	2	-	3	-	-	-	-	2
FLORIDA								
9TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (ORANGE/OSCEOLA)	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	1
TOTAL 1999	**7**	**-**	**6**	**1**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**1**
FEDERAL	**4**	**-**	**4**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**1**
TEXAS								
TOM GREEN	3	-	2	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL 2000	**14**	**-**	**5**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**56**
FEDERAL	**13**	**-**	**4**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**55**
ARIZONA								
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
TOTAL 2001	**32**	**-**	**90**	**18**	**-**	**4**	**-**	**105**
FEDERAL	**24**	**-**	**67**	**18**	**-**	**2**	**-**	**54**
ARIZONA								
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	1	-	4	-	-	-	-	34
FLORIDA								
19TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (SAINT LUCIE)	7	-	19	-	-	2	-	17

Table 8
Summary of Supplementary Reports for Intercepts Terminated in Calendar Years 1996 Through 2004 (Report as of December 31, 2005) (Continued)

Report Year and Jurisdiction	Total Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
	Number of Reports	Costs in $	Number of Persons Arrested	Number of Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts*			Number of Persons Convicted
					G	D	P	
TOTAL 2002	**50**	**911,257**	**105**	**7**	**-**	**13**	**-**	**164**
FEDERAL	**29**	**276,507**	**66**	**1**	**-**	**3**	**-**	**112**
ARIZONA								
MARICOPA	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	2
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	3
CALIFORNIA								
SAN BERNARDINO	1	-	4	-	-	-	-	4
MARYLAND								
BALTIMORE CITY	6	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
NEW JERSEY								
CAMDEN	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
MORRIS	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	4	77,750	-	-	-	-	-	5
NEW YORK								
NEW YORK	1	557,000	9	-	-	9	-	1
PENNSYLVANIA								
BERKS	3	-	-	2	-	-	-	2
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	1	-	23	4	-	-	-	23
TOTAL 2003	**136**	**760,541**	**258**	**19**	**-**	**16**	**9**	**399**
FEDERAL	**63**	**182,814**	**190**	**14**	**-**	**7**	**1**	**203**
ARIZONA								
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	6	-	14	1	-	-	-	44
CALIFORNIA								
LOS ANGELES	1	9,012	3	-	-	-	2	-
SAN DIEGO	4	-	22	-	-	-	-	16
CONNECTICUT								
NEW HAVEN	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
FLORIDA								
6TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (PINELLAS)	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	3
11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (DADE)	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	2
19TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (SAINT LUCIE)	5	-	16	1	-	-	-	28
MARYLAND								
BALTIMORE CITY	2	-	-	-	-	9	-	9
MISSISSIPPI								
HINDS	2	-	4	-	-	-	-	2
NEW JERSEY								
BURLINGTON	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
CAMDEN	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	24

Table 8
Summary of Supplementary Reports for Intercepts Terminated in Calendar Years 1996 Through 2004
(Report as of December 31, 2005 (Continued)

Report Year and Jurisdiction	Total Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
	Number of Reports	Costs in $	Number of Persons Arrested	Number of Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts*			Number of Persons Convicted
					G	D	P	
TOTAL 2003 (CONTINUED)								
NEW JERSEY (CONTINUED)								
MORRIS	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	11	387,115	-	-	-	-	-	-
NEW YORK								
NASSAU	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
QUEENS	11	181,600	-	-	-	-	-	42
PENNSYLVANIA								
BERKS	3	-	-	-	-	-	6	1
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	12	-	7	-	-	-	-	6
TEXAS								
HARRIS	1	-	1	2	-	-	-	1
TOTAL 2004	**387**	**8,820,858**	**967**	**40**	**1**	**63**	**20**	**895**
FEDERAL	**177**	**5,052,877**	**594**	**12**	**-**	**39**	**3**	**400**
ARIZONA								
PIMA	1	-	2	-	-	1	1	13
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	7	-	14	1	-	-	-	49
CALIFORNIA								
FRESNO	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	25
LOS ANGELES	4	153,832	2	-	-	-	-	-
MONTEREY	1	5,963	-	-	-	-	-	-
ORANGE	8	220,068	3	-	-	-	-	-
SACRAMENTO	6	292,571	13	-	-	-	-	13
SAN BERNARDINO	5	-	6	-	-	-	-	4
SAN DIEGO	2	-	10	-	-	-	-	2
SANTA BARBARA	2	155,080	20	-	-	-	-	14
STANISLAUS	6	113,676	18	-	-	-	-	-
VENTURA	7	122,064	6	-	-	-	-	-
FLORIDA								
4TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (DUVAL)	4	-	5	-	-	-	-	7
9TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (ORANGE/OSCEOLA)	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
17TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (BROWARD)	2	-	35	-	-	-	-	6
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	4	55,000	-	2	-	2	1	43
GEORGIA								
AUGUSTA	2	-	7	1	-	-	6	1
BIBB	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
CHATHAM	1	-	29	-	-	-	1	15
HOUSTON	4	-	36	-	-	-	-	-
MARYLAND								
BALTIMORE	6	207,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
CECIL	2	-	18	17	-	1	1	17

Table 8
Summary of Supplementary Reports for Intercepts Terminated in Calendar Years 1996 Through 2004 (Report as of December 31, 2005) (Continued)

Report Year and Jurisdiction	Total Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
	Number of Reports	Costs in $	Number of Persons Arrested	Number of Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts*			Number of Persons Convicted
					G	D	P	
TOTAL 2004 (CONTINUED)								
NEVADA								
CLARK	5	212,451	16	-	-	-	-	14
NEW JERSEY								
CAMDEN	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
GLOUCESTER	3	34,347	-	-	-	-	-	-
HUDSON	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	20
MIDDLESEX	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	14
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	23	887,538	-	-	-	-	-	16
NEW YORK								
ALBANY	1	52,500	3	-	-	-	-	-
FRANKLIN	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
NASSAU	3	-	6	-	1	1	-	21
NEW YORK	1	-	8	-	-	-	2	3
NY ORGANIZED CRIME TASK FORCE	7	-	47	-	-	8	3	61
QUEENS	65	1,125,600	29	-	-	-	-	41
SUFFOLK	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
WESTCHESTER	2	29,989	-	-	-	-	-	-
OKLAHOMA								
LINCOLN	1	-	-	3	-	9	-	15
OKLAHOMA	4	-	13	-	-	-	-	15
PENNSYLVANIA								
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	5	-	14	-	-	-	1	26
UTAH								
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	1	99,802	11	-	-	-	-	-
WISCONSIN								
MILWAUKEE	2	-	-	3	-	1	-	26

* Motions: G = granted, D = denied, P = pending.

Table 9
Arrests and Convictions Resulting From Intercepts Installed in Calendar Years 1995 Through 2005

	Year Reported											Total All Years	
Year of Intercepts	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Number	Percent
1995													
Arrests	2,577	1,246	448	425	40	19	14	28	3	-	-	4,800	100.0
Convictions	494	1,112	740	502	33	29	26	23	4	-	-	2,963	61.7
1996													
Arrests	-	2,464	1,069	402	194	25	37	11	1	-	10	4,213	100.0
Convictions	-	502	1,110	423	205	62	59	9	2	-	6	2,378	56.4
1997													
Arrests	-	-	3,086	1,406	493	176	110	33	19	-	2	5,325	100.0
Convictions	-	-	542	1,220	464	169	87	62	25	5	2	2,576	48.4
1998													
Arrests	-	-	-	3,450	1,266	441	337	114	30	7	9	5,654	100.0
Convictions	-	-	-	911	1,214	596	271	139	23	14	10	3,178	56.2
1999													
Arrests	-	-	-	-	4,372	1,600	428	216	38	7	6	6,667	100.0
Convictions	-	-	-	-	654	1,323	515	235	77	35	1	2,840	42.6
2000													
Arrests	-	-	-	-	-	3,411	1,741	681	142	17	5	5,997	100.0
Convictions	-	-	-	-	-	736	1,148	793	280	30	56	3,043	50.7
2001													
Arrests	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,683	1,325	316	109	90	5,523	100.0
Convictions	-	-	-	-	-	-	732	1,316	572	121	105	2,846	51.5
2002													
Arrests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,060	1,067	362	105	4,594	100.0
Convictions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	493	1,082	489	164	2,228	48.5
2003													
Arrests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,674	1,651	257	5,582	100.0
Convictions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	844	989	399	2,232	40.0
2004													
Arrests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,506	967	5,473	100.0
Convictions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	634	895	1,529	27.9
2005													
Arrests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,674	4,674	100.0
Convictions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	776	776	16.6

TABLE A-1
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
ARIZONA									
1	MARTONE	NAHMIAS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/01/2004	30	1	60
2	TEILBORG	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/04/2005	30	-	30
3	TEILBORG	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/09/2005	30	-	30
4	MCNAMEE	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/11/2005	30	-	30
5	ZAPATA	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/23/2005	30	2	90
6	BROWNING	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/01/2005	30	1	60
7	CAMPBELL	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/14/2005	30	-	30
8	ZAPATA	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/18/2005	30	1	60
9	CARROLL	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/23/2005	30	-	30
10	CARROLL	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/31/2005	30	1	60
11	TEILBORG	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/21/2005	30	1	60
12	WAKE	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WS	H	04/22/2005	30	1	60
13	BROWNING	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/25/2005	30	-	30
14	MCNAMEE	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/29/2005	30	-	30
15	MCNAMEE	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/25/2005	30	1	60
16	BROWNING	KEENEY	$LAUNDERING	WC	D	06/06/2005	30	-	30
17	BROWNING	KEENEY	$LAUNDERING	WC	D	06/06/2005	30	-	30
18	CARROLL	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/06/2005	30	2	90
19	TEILBORG	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/07/2005	30	1	60
20	CAMPBELL	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/20/2005	30	-	30
21	CARROLL	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/28/2005	30	-	30
22	CARROLL	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/17/2005	30	-	30
23	TEILBORG	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/19/2005	30	1	60
24	WAKE	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/22/2005	30	-	30
25	CAMPBELL	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/22/2005	30	1	60
26	COLLINS	KEENEY	$LAUNDERING	WS	H	10/27/2005	30	-	30
27	COLLINS	KEENEY	$LAUNDERING	WC	D	10/27/2005	30	-	30
28	COLLINS	KEENEY	$LAUNDERING	WC	D	10/27/2005	30	-	30
18*	BOLTON	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/01/2004	30	-	30
19*	ZAPATA	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/15/2004	30	-	30

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE A-1
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			Persons Convicted
										G	D	P	
ARIZONA													
1	60	33	114	2,006	122	76,995	2,350	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	30	57	34	1,697	500	33,295	3,500	3	-	-	-	-	-
3	20	123	40	2,463	536	23,364	3,500	RELATED TO NO. 2					
4	29	28	12	812	20	31,458	2,200	3	-	-	-	-	-
5	56	7	96	392	287	73,447	5,287	11	-	-	-	-	-
6	30	15	37	463	101	43,000	22,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	30	2	2	59	-	14,950	3,950	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	34	31	74	1,038	308	RELATED TO NO. 5		RELATED TO NO. 5					
9	10	18	36	183	48	15,120	2,200	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	41	99	47	4,079	450	77,515	7,000	RELATED TO NO. 2					
11	59	95	27	5,591	1,413	62,097	3,500	RELATED TO NO. 2					
12	59	68	149	4,019	453	84,175	1,000	2	-	-	-	-	-
13	16	34	6	544	107	18,520	2,200	10	-	-	-	-	-
14	5	132	3	660	6	14,328	2,200	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	38	42	6	1,589	165	75,328	3,500	2	-	-	-	-	-
16	30	134	288	4,007	472	75,857	4,035	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	22	21	90	472	66	. RELATED TO NO.16		-	-	-	-	-	-
18	80	55	150	4,371	1,513	155,560	11,400	11	-	-	-	-	-
19	47	107	74	5,044	671	50,179	3,500	RELATED TO NO. 2					
20	12	10	4	125	51	52,864	3,500	2	-	-	-	-	-
21	10	20	23	197	76	15,120	2,200	-	-	-	-	-	-
22	30	155	160	4,642	941	121,500	9,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
23	59	80	98	4,735	685	62,097	3,500	RELATED TO NO. 2					
24	20	48	43	964	170	RELATED TO NO. 22		-	-	-	-	-	-
25	59	66	203	3,895	672	RELATED TO NO. 22		-	-	-	-	-	-
26	30	39	178	1,169	36	115,662	3,200	-	-	-	-	-	-
27	30	4	32	135	21	RELATED TO NO. 26		-	-	-	-	-	-
28	30	18	72	551	36	RELATED TO NO. 26		-	-	-	-	-	-
18*	30	9	15	273	2	44,214	2,525	-	-	-	-	-	-
19*	26	35	129	915	172	45,373	11,645	1	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE A-1
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
ARKANSAS, EASTERN									
1	HOLMES	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/19/2005	30	1	60
2	HOWARD	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/19/2005	30	-	30
3	HOLMES	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/10/2005	30	-	30
4	HOLMES	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/10/2005	30	-	30
CALIFORNIA, CENTRAL									
1	CARNEY	NAHMIAS	RACKETEERING	WC	D	08/18/2004	30	4	150
2	FEESS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WS	H	10/26/2004	30	2	90
3	FEESS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/06/2004	30	1	60
4	ANDERSON	SWARTZ	RACKETEERING	WC	D	12/09/2004	30	3	120
5	CARNEY	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/10/2005	30	1	60
6	FEESS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/01/2005	30	1	60
7	KLAUSNER	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/07/2005	30	1	60
8	MANELLA	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/16/2005	30	-	30
9	MANELLA	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/16/2005	30	-	30
10	SELNA	KEENEY	SMUGGLING	WC	D	02/24/2005	30	4	150
11	SELNA	KEENEY	SMUGGLING	WC	D	02/24/2005	30	4	150
12	SCHIAVELLI	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/09/2005	30	-	30
13	FEESS	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/10/2005	30	-	30
14	KLAUSNER	BIANCO	CONSPIRACY	WS	H	03/17/2005	30	-	30
15	SELNA	KEENEY	SMUGGLING	WC	D	03/17/2005	30	3	120
16	WALTER	WARREN	BRIBERY	WC	D	03/18/2005	30	1	60
17	SELNA	KEENEY	SMUGGLING	WC	D	04/16/2005	30	2	90
18	FEESS	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/03/2005	30	-	30
19	CARNEY	PARSKY	SMUGGLING	WC	D	05/19/2005	30	5	180
20	COLLINS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/01/2005	30	-	30
21	OTERO	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/06/2005	30	1	60
22	SCHIAVELLI	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/09/2005	30	2	90
23	OTERO	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/17/2005	30	2	90
24	LEW	WARREN	$LAUNDERING	WC	D	06/21/2005	30	-	30
25	LEW	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	06/21/2005	30	-	30

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE A-1
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
										Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			
A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	G	D	P	Persons Convicted
ARKANSAS, EASTERN													
1	60	122	191	7,348	29	93,187	5,700	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	30	132	200	3,970	847	92,385	17,160	8	-	-	-	-	-
3	30	5	26	157	10	88,160	4,100	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	30	20	68	614	78	RELATED TO NO. 3		-	-	-	-	-	-
CALIFORNIA, CENTRAL													
1	150	74	298	11,092	2,624	253,574	26,500	31	1	1	-	-	10
2	75	15	28	1,095	222	RELATED TO NO. 3		RELATED TO NO. 3					
3	45	16	14	710	209	87,000	12,000	13	-	-	2	-	11
4	105	56	296	5,853	1,064	175,612	7,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	60	15	37	928	271	105,928	4,000	19	-	-	-	-	-
6	58	139	70	8,073	2,043	36,382	3,550	4	-	-	-	-	-
7	60	383	1,578	22,957	87	116,500	6,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	30	134	225	4,015	401	127,850	3,250	37	-	-	-	-	-
9	13	1	10	16	-	53,205	1,825	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	135	217	1,725	29,273	218	546,365	20,900	20	-	-	-	-	-
11	135	232	9,144	31,359	1,866	RELATED TO NO. 10		RELATED TO NO. 10					
12	16	12	10	200	8	66,360	3,000	3	-	-	-	-	-
13	29	157	65	4,555	914	19,416	3,000	RELATED TO NO. 6					
14	9	3	10	31	2	16,584	70	4	-	-	-	-	2
15	120	15	304	1,763	161	RELATED TO NO. 10		RELATED TO NO. 10					
16	44	23	111	1,019	568	85,656	9,683	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	90	90	1,439	8,096	1,336	RELATED TO NO. 10		RELATED TO NO. 10					
18	29	50	65	1,450	144	20,315	3,000	RELATED TO NO. 6					
19	148	96	14	14,217	3,248	169,168	15,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
20	30	18	212	549	131	183,001	16,796	-	-	-	-	-	-
21	60	26	349	1,537	175	142,700	10,600	9	-	-	-	-	-
22	90	83	84	7,457	1,724	137,400	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
23	90	122	678	10,956	448	104,055	10,983	-	-	-	-	-	-
24	30	1	-	30	-	26,550	1,775	-	-	-	-	-	-
25	15	3	7	39	10	9,208	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
CALIFORNIA, CENTRAL (CONTINUED)									
26	COLLINS	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WS	H	07/14/2005	30	2	90
27	SCHIAVELLI	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/15/2005	30	1	60
28	MORROW	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/20/2005	30	-	30
29	MATZ	BIANCO	CONSPIRACY	OM	O	07/21/2005	30	-	30
30	LEW	WARREN	$LAUNDERING	WC	D	07/21/2005	30	-	30
31	CARNEY	WARREN	SMUGGLING	WC	D	07/25/2005	30	3	120
32	OTERO	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/26/2005	30	-	30
33	LEW	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/19/2005	30	1	60
34	OTERO	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/14/2005	30	-	30
35	PREGERSON	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/22/2005	30	-	30
36	COLLINS	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/12/2005	30	-	30
37	COLLINS	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/12/2005	30	1	60
45*	CARNEY	NAHMIAS	RACKETEERING	WC	D	01/20/2004	30	4	150
46*	CARNEY	SWARTZ	RACKETEERING	WC	D	03/12/2004	30	5	180
47*	COLLINS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/03/2004	30	-	30
48*	PREGERSON	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/08/2004	30	-	30
49*	COLLINS	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/19/2004	30	-	30
48**	WALTER	MALCOLM	CIVIL RIGHTS	OM	B	04/17/2003	30	-	30
49**	COLLINS	WARREN	CONSPIRACY	WC	D	06/12/2003	30	-	30
50**	COLLINS	KEENEY	MURDER	WC	D	11/05/2003	30	-	30
CALIFORNIA, EASTERN									
1	ISHII	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/03/2004	30	1	60
2	WANGER	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/04/2005	30	1	60
3	COYLE	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/30/2005	30	3	120
4	KARLTON	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/17/2005	30	-	30
5	COYLE	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/24/2005	30	-	30
6	KARLTON	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/04/2005	30	-	30
7	KARLTON	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/07/2005	30	-	30
8	WANGER	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/16/2005	30	-	30
9	SHUBB	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WS	H	04/07/2005	30	-	30

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
CALIFORNIA, CENTRAL (CONTINUED)													
26	86	15	230	1,273	78	RELATED TO NO. 20		-	-	-	-	-	-
27	60	284	34	17,016	2,884	140,400	6,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
28	1	2	1	2	-	1,547	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
29	30	35	2	1,056	283	79,229	1,800	-	-	-	-	-	-
30	30	1	-	26	-	26,550	1,775	-	-	-	-	-	-
31	112	30	13	3,372	485	RELATED TO NO. 19		-	-	-	-	-	-
32	14	-	2	1	-	RELATED TO NO. 6		-	-	-	-	-	-
33	60	20	107	1,170	796	36,308	2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
34	30	12	16	373	20	RELATED TO NO. 23		-	-	-	-	-	-
35	30	1	9	17	17	19,276	2,860	2	-	-	-	-	-
36	4	-	-	-	-	4,500	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
37	37	9	309	327	56	RELATED TO NO. 20		-	-	-	-	-	-
45*	150	19	115	2,842	827	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
46*	180	47	339	8,535	1,158	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
47*	24	8	80	182	101	16,740	3,300	-	-	-	-	-	-
48*	30	25	90	760	177	19,800	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
49*	10	-	3	3	3	13,700	8,100	4	-	-	-	-	-
48**	29	4	4	125	30	9,672	200	-	-	-	-	-	-
49**	21	2	14	33	33	10,869	600	-	-	-	-	-	-
50**	12	11	2	137	-	4,864	600	-	-	-	-	-	-
CALIFORNIA, EASTERN													
1	60	12	61	721	421	185,940	4,500	15	-	-	-	-	-
2	50	76	170	3,807	481	123,646	23,000	2	-	-	-	-	1
3	102	99	25	10,062	852	7,771	-	9	-	-	-	-	-
4	21	17	69	364	84	97,420	-	8	-	-	-	-	-
5	20	4	9	78	14	7,528	-	RELATED TO NO. 3					
6	6	23	37	139	45	9,824	-	RELATED TO NO. 4					
7	23	40	48	930	108	44,889	2,200	6	-	-	-	-	-
8	30	29	84	880	100	51,812	12,000	RELATED TO NO. 2					
9	30	14	106	409	43	67,494	19,615	2	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
CALIFORNIA, EASTERN (CONTINUED)									
10	KARLTON	BIANCO	MURDER	WC	D	04/14/2005	30	-	30
11	ISHII	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/28/2005	30	-	30
12	SHUBB	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/13/2005	30	-	30
13	ISHII	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/27/2005	30	-	30
14	SHUBB	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/11/2005	30	-	30
15	LEVI	PARSKY	$LAUNDERING	WC	D	07/07/2005	30	-	30
16	WANGER	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/09/2005	30	-	30
18*	ISHII	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/09/2004	30	-	30
CALIFORNIA, NORTHERN									
1	CHESNEY	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/19/2005	30	-	30
2	WHITE	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/09/2005	30	-	30
3	WARE	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/30/2005	30	-	30
4	PATEL	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/08/2005	30	2	90
5	PATEL	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/25/2005	30	1	60
6	PATEL	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/31/2005	30	-	30
7	WARE	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/31/2005	30	-	30
8	JENKINS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/15/2005	30	1	60
9	ARMSTRONG	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/12/2005	30	-	30
10	FOGEL	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/19/2005	30	-	30
11	ALSUP	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/23/2005	30	-	30
12	HAMILTON	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/27/2005	30	-	30
9*	WALKER	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/21/2004	30	-	30
10*	JENKINS	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/21/2004	30	-	30
CALIFORNIA, SOUTHERN									
1	JONES	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/19/2005	30	4	150
2	GONZALEZ	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/01/2005	30	2	90
3	HOUSTON	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/18/2005	30	3	120
4	HOUSTON	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/18/2005	30	3	120
5	JONES	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/18/2005	30	2	90
6	JONES	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/18/2005	30	2	90

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
										Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			
A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	G	D	P	Persons Convicted
CALIFORNIA, EASTERN (CONTINUED)													
10	30	61	144	1,829	250	31,022	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	20	-	1	1	NR	25,000	10,000	13	-	-	-	-	-
12	30	31	53	931	198	60,561	19,365	6	-	-	-	-	-
13	10	3	8	31	9	127,000	7,000	RELATED TO NO. 11					
14	25	30	139	742	169	77,624	21,966	2	-	-	-	-	-
15	30	59	126	1,771	181	61,660	8,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	30	20	57	613	117	146,000	21,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
18*	30	18	17	549	67	63,160	3,550	-	-	-	-	-	-
CALIFORNIA, NORTHERN													
1	30	36	20	1,086	326	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	30	47	128	1,408	195	67,406	32,180	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	30	14	8	431	198	38,377	1,175	11	-	-	-	-	-
4	67	343	421	23,012	4,392	139,286	4,500	15	-	-	-	-	-
5	60	53	27	3,187	918	282,600	3,550	21	-	-	-	-	-
6	30	191	142	5,742	1,192	39,085	1,980	RELATED TO NO. 4					
7	30	36	8	1,066	158	50,976	1,600	RELATED TO NO. 3					
8	60	138	75	8,290	2,206	152,476	2,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	3	3	5	9	1	1,128	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	30	25	115	738	46	33,580	3,500	2	-	-	-	-	-
11	30	25	46	763	318	24,320	6,000	1	-	-	-	-	-
12	25	43	30	1,070	117	78,601	16,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
9*	30	183	250	5,500	500	58,000	8,000	7	-	-	-	-	-
10*	30	70	180	2,100	178	RELATED TO NO. 9*		RELATED TO NO. 9*					
CALIFORNIA, SOUTHERN													
1	140	28	27	3,972	956	402,888	76,632	2	2	-	-	-	2
2	90	116	24	10,469	798	96,586	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	110	21	29	2,293	355	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
4	110	18	14	2,032	636	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
5	70	48	28	3,386	1,476	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
6	70	18	15	1,277	286	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
CALIFORNIA, SOUTHERN (CONTINUED)									
7	JONES	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/18/2005	30	-	30
8	JONES	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/24/2005	30	-	30
9	JONES	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/15/2005	30	1	60
10	JONES	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/25/2005	30	-	30
11	JONES	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/16/2005	30	-	30
12	JONES	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/16/2005	30	-	30
13	JONES	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/26/2005	30	3	120
14	BENITEZ	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/27/2005	30	1	60
15	GONZALEZ	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/15/2005	30	-	30
16	GONZALEZ	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/22/2005	30	-	30
17	BENITEZ	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/11/2005	30	-	30
18	MILLER	WARREN	CONSPIRACY	WC,OO	D	07/19/2005	30	1	60
19	LORENZ	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/19/2005	30	-	30
20	WHELAN	KEENEY	BRIBERY	WC	D	08/02/2005	30	1	60
COLORADO									
1	WEINSHIENK	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/07/2004	30	-	30
2	BABCOCK	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/25/2005	30	1	60
3	BABCOCK	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/04/2005	30	-	30
4	WEINSHIENK	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/24/2005	30	-	30
5	WEINSHIENK	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/30/2005	30	-	30
6	WEINSHIENK	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/18/2005	30	-	30
7	WEINSHIENK	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/20/2005	30	2	90
8	KANE	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/09/2005	30	1	60
9	KANE	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/09/2005	30	-	30
10	WEINSHIENK	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/12/2005	30	1	60
11	WEINSHIENK	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/14/2005	30	2	90
12	WEINSHIENK	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/22/2005	30	-	30
13	BABCOCK	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/14/2005	30	-	30
14	WEINSHIENK	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/18/2005	30	2	90
15	WEINSHIENK	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/27/2005	30	-	30

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
CALIFORNIA, SOUTHERN (CONTINUED)													
7	30	22	8	646	190	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
8	27	20	12	534	51	200,000	50,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	40	9	14	351	68	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
10	30	40	29	1,210	106	RELATED TO NO. 8		-	-	-	-	-	-
11	20	2	6	41	9	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
12	20	6	7	116	38	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
13	109	63	25	6,866	455	RELATED TO NO. 8		-	-	-	-	-	-
14	60	17	98	993	123	68,571	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	29	19	41	539	4	30,118	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	30	19	37	580	66	39,175	3,100	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	24	2	273	37	78	22,857	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	59	152	39	8,990	730	110,812	3,500	6	-	-	-	-	-
19	28	9	25	262	55	29,080	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20	55	53	104	2,934	84	89,464	5,800	-	-	-	-	-	-
COLORADO													
1	28	79	47	2,203	85	52,648	1,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	60	111	147	6,633	1,900	53,264	3,000	1	-	-	-	-	-
3	27	111	148	3,002	135	58,218	33,184	12	-	-	-	-	-
4	30	21	26	626	136	57,820	3,100	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	30	127	98	3,799	1,220	26,882	1,750	26	-	-	-	-	-
6	30	56	71	1,680	363	RELATED TO NO. 5		RELATED TO NO. 5					
7	90	24	150	2,175	855	55,312	7,550	12	-	-	-	-	1
8	49	54	187	2,657	193	83,126	45,614	RELATED TO NO. 3					
9	21	41	65	866	41	32,127	18,060	RELATED TO NO. 3					
10	60	8	45	457	43	RELATED TO NO. 7		RELATED TO NO. 7					
11	76	243	133	18,474	3,719	400,614	13,500	49	-	-	-	-	-
12	30	11	54	332	35	40,326	4,500	1	-	-	-	-	-
13	9	144	61	1,296	273	RELATED TO NO. 11		RELATED TO NO. 11					
14	90	9	67	767	180	71,835	3,072	11	-	-	-	-	11
15	29	184	69	5,346	1,521	RELATED TO NO. 11		RELATED TO NO. 11					

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
COLORADO (CONTINUED)									
25*	KANE	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/22/2004	30	1	60
26*	DOWNES	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/08/2004	30	-	30
27*	WEINSHIENK	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/09/2004	30	1	60
28*	WEINSHIENK	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/23/2004	30	2	90
29*	WEINSHIENK	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/08/2004	30	1	60
30*	WEINSHIENK	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/20/2004	30	1	60
31*	WEINSHIENK	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/27/2004	30	1	60
32*	WEINSHIENK	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/04/2004	30	1	60
33*	WEINSHIENK	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/03/2004	30	-	30
CONNECTICUT									
1	ARTERTON	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WS,WC	H,D	10/29/2004	30	2	90
2	HALL	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/28/2004	30	1	60
3	HALL	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/28/2005	30	-	30
4	DRONEY	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/01/2005	30	1	60
5	DRONEY	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/21/2005	30	-	30
6	DRONEY	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/27/2005	30	1	60
7	NEVAS	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/03/2005	30	2	90
8	NEVAS	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/06/2005	30	-	30
9	NEVAS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/21/2005	30	-	30
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA									
1	LEON	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/04/2004	30	2	90
2	FRIEDMAN	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/02/2005	30	1	60
3	KOLLAR-KOTELLY	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/27/2005	30	-	30
8**	KESSLER	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/15/2002	30	-	30
9**	KESSLER	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/31/2002	30	1	48
10**	KESSLER	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/30/2003	30	1	35
11**	SULLIVAN	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/01/2003	30	1	60
FLORIDA, MIDDLE									
1	CONWAY	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/26/2004	30	2	90
2	CONWAY	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/23/2005	30	-	30

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
COLORADO (CONTINUED)													
25*	48	30	53	1,442	450	88,904	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
26*	30	34	81	1,023	100	58,949	53,873	-	-	-	-	-	-
27*	60	52	93	3,134	1,040	179,160	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
28*	85	19	53	1,603	206	364,800	28,000	22	-	-	-	-	-
29*	35	66	75	2,300	534	85,627	3,167	-	-	-	-	-	-
30*	58	159	79	9,219	1,900	RELATED TO NO. 28*		RELATED TO NO. 28*					
31*	51	95	42	4,845	391	RELATED TO NO. 28*		RELATED TO NO. 28*					
32*	37	69	22	2,543	335	RELATED TO NO. 28*		RELATED TO NO. 28*					
33*	10	53	14	529	24	RELATED TO NO. 28*		RELATED TO NO. 28*					
CONNECTICUT													
1	90	69	153	6,247	2,003	50,259	2,987	29	-	-	-	-	-
2	59	115	37	6,800	1,097	60,473	10,800	30	-	-	-	-	20
3	28	59	37	1,646	505	14,887	3,100	RELATED TO NO. 2					
4	56	78	59	4,396	951	134,489	9,551	27	-	-	-	-	10
5	30	96	34	2,871	363	RELATED TO NO. 4		RELATED TO NO. 4					
6	54	8	33	446	372	RELATED TO NO. 4		RELATED TO NO. 4					
7	90	87	53	7,813	4,053	155,736	8,400	41	-	-	-	-	-
8	11	-	2	3	-	17,957	1,750	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	29	106	5	3,080	1,424	51,728	4,000	RELATED TO NO. 7					
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA													
1	90	64	118	5,794	312	20,350	4,750	7	-	-	-	-	-
2	53	127	211	6,754	1,029	25,080	4,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	30	259	105	7,784	564	138,041	2,700	-	-	-	-	-	-
8**	29	100	39	2,892	147	10,971	3,500	6	-	-	-	-	6
9**	48	51	34	2,440	482	11,986	1,700	RELATED TO NO. 8**					
10**	35	44	47	1,546	478	9,603	1,700	RELATED TO NO. 8**					
11**	60	115	301	6,917	4,479	16,939	8,900	38	-	-	-	-	16
FLORIDA, MIDDLE													
1	90	55	62	4,941	749	332,724	13,641	12	-	1	-	-	5
2	30	70	32	2,096	302	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
FLORIDA, MIDDLE (CONTINUED)									
3	STEELE	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/24/2005	30	1	60
4	SCHLESINGER	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/30/2005	30	-	30
5	SCHLESINGER	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/25/2005	30	-	30
6	MERRYDAY	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/02/2005	30	1	60
7	FAWSETT	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/09/2005	30	-	30
8	COVINGTON	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/14/2005	30	-	30
9	MERRYDAY	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/02/2005	30	-	30
10	WHITTEMORE	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/15/2005	30	-	30
11	CORRIGAN	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/19/2005	30	3	120
12	WHITTEMORE	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/15/2005	30	-	30
13	MERRYDAY	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC,EO	D	08/17/2005	30	1	60
14	MERRYDAY	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/07/2005	30	-	30
15	MERRYDAY	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/15/2005	30	1	60
3*	STEELE	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/25/2004	30	-	30
FLORIDA, NORTHERN									
1	RODGERS	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/22/2005	30	-	30
2	RODGERS	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/10/2005	30	1	60
3	RODGERS	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/27/2005	30	3	120
4	RODGERS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/23/2005	30	-	30
5	VINSON	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/25/2005	30	1	60
6	RODGERS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/23/2005	30	-	30
FLORIDA, SOUTHERN									
1	RYSKAMP	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/03/2004	30	2	90
2	MARTINEZ	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/21/2004	30	1	60
3	MARTINEZ	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/10/2005	30	-	30
4	MIDDLEBROOKS	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/11/2005	30	-	30
5	MORENO	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/28/2005	30	-	30
6	HUCK	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/01/2005	30	-	30
7	PAINE	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/10/2005	30	1	60

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
FLORIDA, MIDDLE (CONTINUED)													
3	52	201	70	10,464	519	274,100	8,700	28	-	-	-	-	-
4	5	-	-	-	-	21,919	4,480	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	12	169	20	2,024	236	117,556	33,851	15	-	-	-	-	-
6	60	195	198	11,715	260	204,384	63,117	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	30	19	30	573	170	40,686	40,686	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	30	40	25	1,189	309	101,581	4,125	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	30	146	141	4,380	86	RELATED TO NO. 6		-	-	-	-	-	-
10	30	9	2	263	35	43,000	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	120	55	407	6,605	784	269,429	78,843	18	-	-	-	-	-
12	30	9	1	259	11	43,000	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	60	36	56	2,139	173	406,770	18,000	29	-	-	-	-	-
14	30	216	326	6,478	250	RELATED TO NO. 6		-	-	-	-	-	-
15	51	37	22	1,872	103	251,080	7,000	RELATED TO NO. 13					
3*	26	100	142	2,611	155	76,821	23,376	6	-	-	-	-	2
FLORIDA, NORTHERN													
1	29	49	167	1,429	367	67,249	3,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	60	98	42	5,900	371	591,354	168,938	40	-	-	-	-	14
3	111	128	42	14,246	778	RELATED TO NO. 2		RELATED TO NO. 2					
4	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	51	12	42	616	190	RELATED TO NO. 2		RELATED TO NO. 2					
6	22	162	42	3,554	212	RELATED TO NO. 2		RELATED TO NO. 2					
FLORIDA, SOUTHERN													
1	90	8	15	728	500	82,053	3,900	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	31	6	3	175	71	27,124	-	5	-	-	-	-	-
3	12	18	6	216	132	5,950	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	18	8	2	143	25	56,044	1,850	9	-	-	-	-	6
5	30	200	65	5,997	327	89,992	1,600	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	30	51	23	1,526	-	31,018	6,600	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	60	81	150	4,857	1,800	128,945	3,900	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
FLORIDA, SOUTHERN (CONTINUED)									
8	GRAHAM	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/25/2005	30	-	30
9	GRAHAM	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/10/2005	30	-	30
10	DIMITROULEAS	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/22/2005	30	2	90
11	SEITZ	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/18/2005	30	1	60
12	SEITZ	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/29/2005	30	-	30
13	HURLEY	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/24/2005	30	-	30
14	GOLD	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/06/2005	30	1	60
15	UNGARO-BENAGES	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/07/2005	30	-	30
16	DIMITROULEAS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/21/2005	30	1	60
17	JORDAN	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/03/2005	30	-	30
18	DIMITROULEAS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/23/2005	30	-	30
19	HUCK	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/23/2005	30	1	60
20	DIMITROULEAS	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/28/2005	30	-	30
14*	HUCK	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/17/2004	30	1	60
15*	HUCK	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/17/2004	30	-	30
16*	MARTINEZ	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/22/2004	30	-	30
GEORGIA, MIDDLE									
1*	SANDS	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/02/2004	30	-	30
GEORGIA, NORTHERN									
1	PANNELL	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/19/2004	30	1	60
2	DUFFEY	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/15/2005	30	2	90
3	CAMP	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/25/2005	30	1	60
4	CARNES	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/18/2005	30	-	30
5	CARNES	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/28/2005	30	-	30
6	COOPER	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/27/2005	30	1	60
7	HUNT	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/10/2005	30	-	30
8	HUNT	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/12/2005	30	-	30
9	HUNT	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/08/2005	30	1	60
10	HUNT	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/26/2005	30	-	30
11	PANNELL	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/04/2005	30	2	90

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
FLORIDA, SOUTHERN (CONTINUED)													
8	23	20	27	454	21	21,647	3,000	6	-	-	1	-	2
9	10	83	50	832	125	9,622	1,500	6	-	-	-	-	-
10	90	65	10	5,889	1,043	112,717	6,500	2	-	-	-	-	2
11	26	240	100	6,243	344	93,368	2,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	30	68	4	2,046	220	12,000	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
13	30	17	15	506	25	75,007	3,900	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	57	133	104	7,597	2,348	1,535,144	3,190	12	-	-	-	-	7
15	22	40	48	869	193	35,193	1,925	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	60	103	30	6,189	2,301	269,400	-	32	-	-	-	-	-
17	30	368	200	11,034	886	96,534	2,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	30	99	45	2,982	564	RELATED TO NO. 16		RELATED TO NO. 16					
19	50	48	13	2,423	418	69,163	-	5	-	-	-	-	-
20	30	134	65	4,026	843	RELATED TO NO. 16		RELATED TO NO. 16					
14*	60	56	44	3,376	333	91,001	1,200	13	-	-	-	-	12
15*	23	54	33	1,236	158	36,541	1,750	-	-	-	-	-	-
16*	30	101	31	3,023	812	103,598	4,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
GEORGIA, MIDDLE													
1*	12	117	6	1,400	385	43,296	3,900	5	-	-	-	-	-
GEORGIA, NORTHERN													
1	50	38	50	1,909	469	69,392	6,300	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	90	17	40	1,500	1,000	62,700	44,700	2	-	-	-	-	-
3	60	123	73	7,394	1,357	287,760	3,600	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	2	30	10	60	45	28,080	17,880	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	30	36	53	1,094	159	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	44	59	126	2,608	344	211,984	3,600	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	16	114	41	1,830	299	79,376	3,600	28	-	-	-	-	-
8	30	135	40	4,048	815	59,400	41,400	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	60	237	209	14,207	3,533	294,960	10,800	RELATED TO NO. 7					
10	30	14	42	420	54	RELATED TO NO. 7		RELATED TO NO. 7					
11	60	81	143	4,846	597	80,704	14,400	RELATED TO NO. 7					

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
GEORGIA, NORTHERN (CONTINUED)									
12	PANNELL	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/30/2005	30	-	30
13	PANNELL	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/02/2005	30	-	30
14	CARNES	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/19/2005	30	2	90
15	MARTIN	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/30/2005	30	1	60
16	MARTIN	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/30/2005	30	1	60
17	MARTIN	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/30/2005	30	1	60
18*	PANNELL	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/17/2004	30	-	30
HAWAII									
1	EZRA	NAHMIAS	EXTORTION	WC	D	08/18/2004	30	3	120
2	GILLMOR	KEENEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	09/21/2004	30	5	180
3	MOLLWAY	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WS	B	11/15/2004	30	4	150
4	MOLLWAY	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WS	B	11/15/2004	30	4	150
5	EZRA	KEENEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	12/06/2004	30	3	120
6	EZRA	KEENEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	01/24/2005	30	2	90
7	GILLMOR	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/24/2005	30	-	30
8	GILLMOR	SWARTZ	OTHER	EE	H	07/08/2005	30	3	120
7*	GILLMOR	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/21/2004	30	3	120
8*	EZRA	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/28/2004	30	4	150
9*	EZRA	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/28/2004	30	4	150
ILLINOIS, CENTRAL									
1	SCOTT	KEENEY	FRAUD	WS,WC	H,D	07/28/2005	30	-	30
2	SCOTT	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/14/2005	30	1	60
ILLINOIS, NORTHERN									
1	KOCORAS	NAHMIAS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/22/2004	30	1	60
2	KOCORAS	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/02/2004	30	-	30
3	KOCORAS	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/13/2004	30	1	60
4	KOCORAS	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/20/2005	30	-	30
5	KOCORAS	KEENEY	EXTORTION	WC	D	02/04/2005	30	-	30
6	KOCORAS	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/16/2005	30	-	30

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
GEORGIA, NORTHERN (CONTINUED)													
12	30	2	2	65	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	30	176	107	5,273	1,262	145,680	3,600	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	89	37	148	3,290	956	80,707	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	45	39	83	1,747	197	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	45	35	65	1,582	126	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	45	273	346	12,291	1,476	227,520	14,400	RELATED TO NO. 7					
18*	15	80	62	1,199	163	56,040	3,600	4	-	-	-	-	-
HAWAII													
1	117	11	78	1,302	258	140,527	5,009	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	159	157	219	24,914	1,294	220,639	21,516	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	146	89	63	13,065	557	75,000	70,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	146	22	63	3,145	71	15,000	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	99	271	105	26,835	611	137,928	14,344	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	69	62	21	4,306	283	99,424	10,758	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	30	20	28	607	113	98,134	3,500	4	-	-	-	-	-
8	97	13	1	1,269	320	28,584	300	1	-	-	-	-	-
7*	118	47	65	5,495	186	158,563	14,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
8*	146	34	53	4,924	715	98,225	6,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
9*	146	37	72	5,397	997	6,500	6,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
ILLINOIS, CENTRAL													
1	28	81	62	2,258	276	47,553	6,497	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	47	122	173	5,744	475	51,057	1,425	-	-	-	-	-	-
ILLINOIS, NORTHERN													
1	60	113	70	6,785	1,490	45,509	800	12	-	-	-	-	2
2	30	104	53	3,110	518	39,300	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	59	339	72	19,987	1,442	44,663	6,000	23	-	-	-	-	-
4	30	100	6	3,000	450	40,000	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	13	13	17	172	42	14,908	1,800	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	30	67	75	2,015	687	32,448	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
ILLINOIS, NORTHERN (CONTINUED)									
7	KOCORAS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/04/2005	30	2	90
8	KOCORAS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/22/2005	30	2	90
9	KOCORAS	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/24/2005	30	-	30
10	KOCORAS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/01/2005	30	-	30
11	KOCORAS	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/05/2005	30	-	30
12	KOCORAS	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/20/2005	30	1	60
13	KOCORAS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/20/2005	30	3	120
14	HOLDERMAN	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/04/2005	30	-	30
15	KOCORAS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/12/2005	30	-	30
16	KOCORAS	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/13/2005	30	-	30
17	KOCORAS	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/18/2005	30	-	30
18	KOCORAS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/23/2005	30	2	90
19	KOCORAS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/01/2005	30	-	30
20	KOCORAS	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/05/2005	30	-	30
21	KOCORAS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WS	H	07/07/2005	30	1	60
22	ZAGEL	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/22/2005	30	1	60
23	ZAGEL	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/22/2005	30	1	60
24	NORGLE	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/29/2005	30	-	30
25	REINHART	KEENEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	08/09/2005	30	1	60
26	KOCORAS	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/23/2005	30	1	60
27	KOCORAS	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/24/2005	30	2	90
28	ZAGEL	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/16/2005	30	-	30
29	KOCORAS	PARSKY	OTHER	WS,WC	B,D	09/20/2005	30	-	30
30	KOCORAS	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/21/2005	30	-	30
31	KOCORAS	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/26/2005	30	-	30
32	KOCORAS	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/28/2005	30	1	60
33	KOCORAS	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/14/2005	30	-	30
34	KOCORAS	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/21/2005	30	-	30
60*	REINHART	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/18/2004	30	5	180

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
ILLINOIS, NORTHERN (CONTINUED)													
7	83	100	100	8,300	2,500	23,470	7,500	11	-	-	-	-	5
8	90	28	14	2,500	300	44,910	5,300	3	-	-	-	-	-
9	30	5	21	139	45	48,269	14,112	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	15	59	20	880	80	13,542	2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	30	86	50	2,576	358	43,095	500	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	50	60	107	2,991	679	92,360	2,500	9	-	-	-	-	-
13	102	31	67	3,203	422	104,000	4,000	5	-	-	-	-	-
14	30	52	20	1,561	162	44,656	35	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	18	59	15	1,060	99	14,936	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	24	66	84	1,593	135	46,771	3,400	9	-	-	-	-	-
17	30	56	20	1,669	25	35,000	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	87	40	133	3,478	199	38,388	4,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
19	30	22	50	661	300	34,000	4,000	14	-	-	-	-	-
20	30	52	32	1,549	154	32,932	90	-	-	-	-	-	-
21	28	37	36	1,026	54	31,142	750	4	-	-	-	-	-
22	60	196	364	11,739	3,789	140,654	200	-	-	-	-	-	-
23	34	95	25	3,246	300	23,245	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
24	20	38	53	759	131	14,160	2,000	RELATED TO NO. 21					
25	43	70	30	3,000	2,000	199,260	20,982	13	-	-	-	-	-
26	58	62	15	3,619	396	49,147	4,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
27	90	12	48	1,065	208	9,928	1,300	-	-	-	-	-	-
28	30	158	20	4,749	350	17,997	2,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
29	30	71	379	2,118	105	67,571	750	-	-	-	-	-	-
30	30	-	2	1	1	6,558	6,558	-	-	-	-	-	-
31	30	10	11	291	131	38,980	2,500	7	-	-	-	-	-
32	60	9	13	545	139	89,224	1,800	-	-	-	-	-	-
33	29	70	121	2,030	246	51,986	100	-	-	-	-	-	-
34	29	206	98	5,975	1,132	36,736	280	-	-	-	-	-	-
60*	154	88	1,407	13,559	1,473	486,775	96,600	15	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
ILLINOIS, NORTHERN (CONTINUED)									
61*	HIBBLER	WARREN	NARCOTICS	EF	H	07/01/2004	30	-	30
62*	KOCORAS	KEENEY	RACKETEERING	WS,WC	H,D	07/07/2004	30	1	60
63*	KOCORAS	WRAY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/09/2004	30	-	30
ILLINOIS, SOUTHERN									
1	GILBERT	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/16/2005	30	-	30
INDIANA, NORTHERN									
1	MOODY	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/25/2005	30	1	60
2	MOODY	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/26/2005	30	-	30
3	MOODY	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/21/2005	30	-	30
INDIANA, SOUTHERN									
1	HAMILTON	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/07/2005	30	-	30
2	MCKINNEY	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/14/2005	30	-	30
3	TINDER	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/18/2005	30	-	30
4	MCKINNEY	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/11/2005	30	-	30
5	HAMILTON	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/07/2005	30	1	60
IOWA, NORTHERN									
1	BENNETT	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/27/2005	30	-	30
2	BENNETT	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/23/2005	30	-	30
IOWA, SOUTHERN									
1	LONGSTAFF	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/24/2005	30	-	30
KANSAS									
1	BROWN	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/08/2005	30	2	90
2	BROWN	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/17/2005	30	-	30
3	BROWN	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/29/2005	30	-	30
4	BROWN	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/08/2005	30	-	30
5	BROWN	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/15/2005	30	-	30
6	VANBEBBER	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/25/2005	30	-	30
7	VANBEBBER	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/26/2005	30	2	90
8	BROWN	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/05/2005	30	-	30

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			Persons Convicted
										G	D	P	
ILLINOIS, NORTHERN (CONTINUED)													
61*	30	50	20	1,500	600	21,891	2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
62*	57	214	382	12,180	1,925	12,749	856	-	-	-	-	-	-
63*	30	34	38	1,030	338	20,654	4,200	16	-	-	-	-	1
ILLINOIS, SOUTHERN													
1	30	60	12	1,800	500	98,620	57,738	7	-	-	-	-	-
INDIANA, NORTHERN													
1	43	157	76	6,754	120	43,733	1,500	2	-	-	-	-	-
2	24	154	53	3,688	59	24,452	1,000	1	-	-	-	-	-
3	4	52	11	208	9	11,988	120	2	-	-	-	-	-
INDIANA, SOUTHERN													
1	30	20	15	590	47	26,540	3,500	13	-	-	-	-	-
2	30	112	56	3,371	1,012	127,272	69,000	10	-	-	-	-	-
3	30	241	137	7,241	1,513	200,494	2,283	10	-	-	-	-	1
4	30	58	72	1,727	285	RELATED TO NO. 3		RELATED TO NO. 3					
5	57	121	93	6,910	1,770	RELATED TO NO. 3		RELATED TO NO. 3					
IOWA, NORTHERN													
1	10	3	10	34	1	9,867	2,930	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	30	33	110	984	19	23,742	2,930	-	-	-	-	-	-
IOWA, SOUTHERN													
1	27	97	6	2,608	843	19,659	4,850	6	-	-	-	-	-
KANSAS													
1	90	112	50	10,061	2,201	96,463	26,463	35	-	-	-	-	-
2	12	50	40	603	102	20,458	10,458	RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	22	19	15	424	82	20,211	10,211	RELATED TO NO. 1					
4	30	60	40	1,803	891	35,430	19,430	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	30	42	15	1,251	403	44,429	19,429	RELATED TO NO. 1					
6	30	150	173	4,515	256	49,750	1,750	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	82	22	39	1,802	426	122,217	1,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	30	96	20	2,895	524	42,643	12,643	RELATED TO NO. 1					

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
KANSAS (CONTINUED)									
9	MURGUIA	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC,EO	D	06/10/2005	30	-	30
10	LUNGSTRUM	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/28/2005	30	-	30
11	ROGERS	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/27/2005	30	1	60
6*	VANBEBBER	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/09/2004	30	-	30
KENTUCKY, EASTERN									
1	REEVES	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WS	B	03/07/2005	30	1	60
2	FORESTER	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/17/2005	30	1	60
3	FORESTER	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/26/2005	30	-	30
4	FORESTER	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/06/2005	20	-	20
5	BUNNING	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/25/2005	30	1	60
KENTUCKY, WESTERN									
1	HEYBURN	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/24/2005	30	2	90
2	HEYBURN	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC,EO	D	07/12/2005	30	-	30
3	SIMPSON	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/12/2005	30	1	60
LOUISIANA, EASTERN									
1	FELDMAN	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/13/2005	30	-	30
2	FELDMAN	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/01/2005	30	-	30
3	BERRIGAN	PARSKY	COUNTERFEITING	WS,WC	H,D	03/31/2005	30	-	30
4	VANCE	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/22/2005	30	1	60
5	LEMMON	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/24/2005	30	-	30
6	VANCE	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/25/2005	30	-	30
7	VANCE	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/15/2005	30	-	30
8	AFRICK	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/10/2005	30	-	30
LOUISIANA, WESTERN									
1	HICKS	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/29/2005	30	-	30
2	MINALDI	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/17/2005	30	-	30
3	MELANCON	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	OM	H	04/13/2005	30	-	30
4	HICKS	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/14/2005	30	-	30
5	HICKS	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/23/2005	30	-	30
6	HAIK	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/03/2005	30	-	30

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
										Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			
A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	G	D	P	Persons Convicted
KANSAS (CONTINUED)													
9	30	9	7	272	30	RELATED TO NO. 7		-	-	-	-	-	-
10	30	99	22	2,960	44	48,950	950	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	43	51	58	2,213	274	37,900	3,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
6*	30	58	51	1,741	224	97,770	25,770	-	-	-	-	-	-
KENTUCKY, EASTERN													
1	49	61	183	3,012	389	75,556	3,248	25	1	-	2	-	5
2	60	151	22	9,086	855	55,840	1,400	3	-	-	-	-	-
3	30	71	5	2,133	38	55,840	1,400	RELATED TO NO. 2					
4	20	7	80	147	17	25,273	800	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	60	221	183	13,238	1,106	69,048	1,950	-	-	-	-	-	-
KENTUCKY, WESTERN													
1	80	4	9	284	122	115,165	8,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	30	10	37	307	11	52,102	5,600	1	-	-	-	-	-
3	36	45	151	1,615	84	62,303	6,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
LOUISIANA, EASTERN													
1	21	241	47	5,060	561	67,604	2,000	10	-	-	-	-	-
2	6	58	40	350	25	20,514	1,200	2	-	-	-	-	-
3	21	172	30	3,608	-	50,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	60	187	280	11,236	583	174,409	34,902	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	30	12	26	362	60	32,965	500	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	30	272	326	8,174	344	87,205	17,451	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	30	123	263	3,684	380	87,205	17,451	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	17	90	46	1,523	251	51,652	18,850	-	-	-	-	-	-
LOUISIANA, WESTERN													
1	30	45	37	1,358	61	35,539	1,210	9	-	-	-	-	-
2	15	12	12	187	39	15,828	1,100	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	10	39	9	386	19	141,381	3,300	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	2	220	30	439	48	2,866	1,210	RELATED TO NO. 1					
5	30	67	49	2,005	144	82,097	1,300	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	26	52	46	1,344	459	141,181	3,100	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
LOUISIANA, WESTERN (CONTINUED)									
7	HAIK	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/03/2005	30	-	30
8	STAGG	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/10/2005	30	-	30
4*	HICKS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/05/2004	30	-	30
MAINE									
1*	HORNBY	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/26/2004	30	1	60
MARYLAND									
1	WILLIAMS	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WS,WC	H,D	02/01/2005	30	2	90
2	GARBIS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/17/2005	30	2	90
3	BLAKE	KEENEY	EXTORTION	WC	D	04/01/2005	30	-	30
4	GARBIS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	OM,EO	O	04/05/2005	30	-	30
5	MOTZ	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/21/2005	30	1	60
6	DAVIS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/23/2005	30	-	30
7	MOTZ	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/20/2005	30	-	30
8	MOTZ	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/28/2005	30	-	30
MASSACHUSETTS									
1	STEARNS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/28/2005	30	1	60
14*	TAURO	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/29/2004	30	1	60
15*	TAURO	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/04/2004	30	-	30
MICHIGAN, EASTERN									
1	CLELAND	SWARTZ	FRAUD	WC	D	12/13/2004	30	-	30
2	ROBERTS	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/27/2005	30	-	30
3	O' MEARA	BIANCO	CORRUPTION	WC	D	02/24/2005	30	1	60
4	HOOD	SWARTZ	RACKETEERING	WC	D	03/02/2005	30	-	30
5	STEEH	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/25/2005	30	1	60
6	TARNOW	SWARTZ	RACKETEERING	WC	D	06/27/2005	30	1	60
7	FRIEDMAN	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/15/2005	30	-	30
8	FRIEDMAN	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/08/2005	30	1	60
9	FRIEDMAN	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/28/2005	30	1	60
10	STEEH	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/13/2005	30	-	30
11	BATTANI	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/04/2005	30	-	30

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
LOUISIANA, WESTERN (CONTINUED)													
7	26	10	9	269	55	RELATED TO NO. 6		-	-	-	-	-	-
8	30	36	40	1,069	150	84,332	1,300	-	-	-	-	-	-
4*	20	1	8	19	-	8,570	1,210	-	-	-	-	-	-
MAINE													
1*	60	86	47	5,170	325	191,800	115,000	10	-	-	3	-	-
MARYLAND													
1	87	161	225	14,000	4,000	35,000	18,000	19	-	-	-	-	4
2	84	134	126	11,262	861	273,430	10,750	3	-	-	-	-	-
3	30	27	74	815	232	135,272	1,775	1	-	-	-	-	-
4	30	18	17	538	58	RELATED TO NO. 2		RELATED TO NO. 2					
5	60	59	500	3,530	376	34,000	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
6	18	16	25	295	50	50,000	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
7	30	21	110	623	34	34,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	30	66	133	1,983	257	34,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MASSACHUSETTS													
1	37	533	459	19,721	1,384	137,973	5,000	20	-	-	-	-	-
14*	50	18	103	878	651	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15*	21	5	19	115	87	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MICHIGAN, EASTERN													
1	30	109	76	3,280	442	37,254	874	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	10	14	31	136	52	12,021	847	16	-	-	-	-	-
3	56	98	222	5,463	85	92,664	1,048	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	30	17	52	509	85	162,858	30,250	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	59	31	73	1,842	667	92,040	1,694	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	58	136	319	7,870	1,182	96,293	1,150	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	30	41	174	1,218	238	33,622	874	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	60	53	98	3,174	243	66,586	994	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	60	65	56	3,900	796	66,586	994	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	30	219	13	6,571	168	33,860	874	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	30	60	41	1,800	174	33,783	847	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
MINNESOTA									
1	DAVIS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/16/2005	30	-	30
2	DAVIS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/17/2005	30	-	30
3	ROSENBAUM	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/29/2005	30	-	30
4	DOTY	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/13/2005	30	1	60
5	ROSENBAUM	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/24/2005	30	-	30
6	DOTY	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/14/2005	30	-	30
7	DOTY	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/14/2005	30	-	30
MISSISSIPPI, NORTHERN									
1	DAVIS	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/29/2005	30	-	30
MISSISSIPPI, SOUTHERN									
1	GUIROLA	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/19/2005	30	1	60
MISSOURI, EASTERN									
1	LIMBAUGH	KEENEY	ROBBERY	WS,WC	H,D	12/20/2004	30	1	60
2	LIMBAUGH	KEENEY	ROBBERY	WC	D	12/23/2004	30	1	60
3	LIMBAUGH	KEENEY	ROBBERY	WC	D	01/06/2005	30	-	30
4	PERRY	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/01/2005	30	1	60
5	PERRY	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WS	H	03/07/2005	30	-	30
6	LIMBAUGH	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/27/2005	30	-	30
7	WEBBER	PARSKY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	03/30/2005	30	-	30
8	SIPPEL	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/20/2005	30	1	60
9	LIMBAUGH	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/24/2005	30	2	90
10	LIMBAUGH	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/08/2005	30	-	30
11	LIMBAUGH	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/19/2005	30	1	60
12	JACKSON	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/19/2005	30	-	30
MISSOURI, WESTERN									
1	DORR	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/10/2005	30	-	30
2	LAUGHREY	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WS,WC	H,D	05/25/2005	30	1	60
NEBRASKA									
1	KOPF	NAHMIAS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/23/2004	30	4	150
2	KOPF	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WS	B	10/14/2004	30	5	180

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE A-1
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
										Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			
A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	G	D	P	Persons Convicted
MINNESOTA													
1	30	38	35	1,130	173	182,272	400	9	-	-	1	-	7
2	30	9	9	269	34	RELATED TO NO.1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	30	16	21	494	189	32,708	8,300	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	60	1	25	64	20	57,116	8,300	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	30	25	61	747	109	32,708	8,300	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	30	10	45	307	157	19,154	8,300	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	30	11	53	335	99	RELATED TO NO. 6		-	-	-	-	-	-
MISSISSIPPI, NORTHERN													
1	18	147	100	2,641	1,950	18,710	11,604	37	-	-	-	-	-
MISSISSIPPI, SOUTHERN													
1	41	20	6	800	210	46,959	8,012	-	-	-	-	-	-
MISSOURI, EASTERN													
1	51	138	600	7,021	526	112,985	300	7	-	-	-	-	-
2	47	42	130	1,977	229	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	11	21	34	230	4	RELATED TO NO. 11		RELATED TO NO. 1					
4	59	40	205	2,361	348	70,776	53,652	7	-	-	3	-	-
5	30	82	65	2,466	780	7,850	5,550	11	-	-	-	-	-
6	24	42	23	1,015	62	70,778	53,653	RELATED TO NO. 4					
7	30	95	230	2,842	220	38,373	180	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	60	217	150	13,022	1,008	8,750	5,550	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	90	140	100	12,560	850	36,600	15,000	3	-	-	-	-	-
10	30	95	50	2,858	80	12,200	5,000	2	-	-	-	-	-
11	60	159	101	9,556	1,132	115,337	320	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	10	42	7	423	74	RELATED TO NO. 11		-	-	-	-	-	-
MISSOURI, WESTERN													
1	28	105	134	2,943	521	36,500	2,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	60	60	361	3,579	141	120,352	11,500	4	-	-	-	-	-
NEBRASKA													
1	128	53	189	6,761	529	112,314	5,000	3	-	-	-	-	3
2	166	53	279	8,845	393	198,470	5,672	RELATED TO NO. 1					

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
NEBRASKA (CONTINUED)									
3	KOPF	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	OM	B	12/16/2004	30	1	60
4	KOPF	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/03/2005	30	1	60
NEVADA									
1	PRO	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/08/2004	30	1	60
2	JONES	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/07/2005	30	-	30
3	PRO	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/04/2005	30	1	60
4	DAWSON	KEENEY	CORRUPTION	WS,WC	B,D	07/29/2005	30	3	120
5	HICKS	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/29/2005	30	-	30
6	MCKIBBEN	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/15/2005	30	-	30
7	HUNT	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/01/2005	30	-	30
NEW HAMPSHIRE									
1	DICLERICO	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/08/2005	30	-	30
2	DICLERICO	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/10/2005	30	1	60
3	MCAULIFFE	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/17/2005	30	1	60
4	MCAULIFFE	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/25/2005	30	-	30
NEW JERSEY									
1	WOLFSON	NAHMIAS	RACKETEERING	WC	D	10/15/2004	30	6	210
2	KUGLER	KEENEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	02/16/2005	30	2	90
3	DEBEVOISE	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/18/2005	30	-	30
4	HOCHBERG	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/18/2005	30	-	30
5	GREENAWAY	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/07/2005	30	-	30
6	GREENAWAY	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/25/2005	30	-	30
7	MARTINI	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/06/2005	30	-	30
8	GREENAWAY	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/08/2005	30	-	30
9	PISANO	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/13/2005	30	-	30
10	PISANO	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/28/2005	30	1	60
11	PISANO	SWARTZ	FRAUD	WC	D	04/28/2005	30	1	60
12	WOLFSON	KEENEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	05/13/2005	30	1	60
13	HAYDEN	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/20/2005	30	1	60
14	BASSLER	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	05/20/2005	30	-	30

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
										Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			
A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	G	D	P	Persons Convicted
NEBRASKA (CONTINUED)													
3	51	15	1	779	5	71,130	19,050	RELATED TO NO. 1					
4	59	76	240	4,513	313	9,500	9,500	RELATED TO NO. 1					
NEVADA													
1	23	69	172	1,588	282	36,755	30,505	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	30	119	13	3,565	675	47,003	65	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	58	79	380	4,607	756	16,671	10,421	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	119	41	311	4,932	387	260,132	31,742	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	19	80	245	1,527	258	71,618	2,375	8	-	-	-	-	-
6	30	40	314	1,203	124	118,061	31,810	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	15	5	28	72	65	18,441	50	-	-	-	-	-	-
NEW HAMPSHIRE													
1	28	43	25	1,216	229	90,000	10,000	24	-	-	-	-	-
2	40	141	25	5,635	806	125,000	10,000	RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	46	239	73	10,979	1,134	198,615	38,609	24	-	-	-	-	-
4	15	49	42	732	99	RELATED TO NO. 3		RELATED TO NO. 3					
NEW JERSEY													
1	200	44	67	8,757	2,883	327,888	28,200	47	-	-	-	-	-
2	90	NR	NR	NR	NR	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
3	30	8	4	225	28	40,612	23,110	3	-	-	-	-	-
4	17	18	12	303	14	RELATED TO NO. 3		RELATED TO NO. 3					
5	30	44	5	1,328	50	27,000	2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	24	29	27	700	405	38,980	2,500	35	-	-	-	-	-
7	8	70	25	561	16	7,212	3,500	5	-	-	-	-	-
8	20	20	3	400	80	38,980	2,500	RELATED TO NO. 6					
9	28	-	4	12	-	32,068	8,100	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	60	18	253	1,077	811	151,258	9,950	10	-	-	-	-	-
11	60	17	225	1,015	384	RELATED TO NO. 10		RELATED TO NO. 10					
12	59	23	4	1,360	236	39,032	5,300	1	-	-	-	-	-
13	50	2	2	75	17	31,300	2,500	RELATED TO NO. 6					
14	28	28	24	786	66	29,231	2,750	9	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
NEW JERSEY (CONTINUED)									
15	HAYDEN	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/03/2005	30	1	60
16	SWARTZ	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/07/2005	30	1	60
17	HAYDEN	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/13/2005	30	-	30
18	CAVANAUGH	BIANCO	FRAUD	WC	D	06/14/2005	30	1	60
19	CAVANAUGH	PARSKY	CIVIL RIGHTS	WS	D	06/17/2005	30	1	60
20	CAVANAUGH	WARREN	FRAUD	WC	D	06/29/2005	30	2	90
21	GREENAWAY	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/30/2005	30	-	30
22	HAYDEN	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/05/2005	30	-	30
23	GREENAWAY	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/05/2005	30	-	30
24	CAVANAUGH	SWARTZ	CIVIL RIGHTS	WS	D	07/18/2005	30	-	30
25	MARTINI	WARREN	FRAUD	WC	D	07/29/2005	30	-	30
26	PISANO	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/03/2005	30	1	60
27	KUGLER	KEENEY	OTHER	WC	D	08/05/2005	30	3	120
28	CAVANAUGH	WARREN	$LAUNDERING	WC	D	08/16/2005	30	1	60
29	ACKERMAN	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/24/2005	30	-	30
30	LIFLAND	SWARTZ	CIVIL RIGHTS	WC	D	08/25/2005	30	-	30
31	LIFLAND	SWARTZ	CIVIL RIGHTS	WC	D	08/26/2005	30	1	60
32	HAYDEN	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/09/2005	30	-	30
33	PISANO	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/27/2005	30	-	30
34	PISANO	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/27/2005	30	-	30
35	CAVANAUGH	WARREN	CIVIL RIGHTS	WS	D	10/08/2005	30	-	30
27*	HAYDEN	SWARTZ	$LAUNDERING	WC	D	09/22/2004	30	-	30
28*	PISANO	NAHMIAS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/01/2004	30	1	60
29*	MARTINI	KEENEY	$LAUNDERING	WC	D	11/05/2004	30	-	30
NEW MEXICO									
1	BLACK	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/22/2004	30	2	90
2	BROWNING	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/03/2005	30	-	30
3	CONWAY	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/13/2005	30	-	30
4	BROWNING	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/30/2005	30	-	30

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
										Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			
A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	G	D	P	Persons Convicted
NEW JERSEY (CONTINUED)													
15	60	6	12	355	96	31,300	2,500	RELATED TO NO. 6					
16	42	235	16	9,885	1,147	29,231	2,750	RELATED TO NO. 14					
17	30	7	2	205	65	31,300	2,500	RELATED TO NO. 6					
18	56	9	73	531	149	72,053	7,785	-	-	-	-	-	-
19	60	26	332	1,580	263	77,646	7,895	-	-	-	-	-	-
20	87	133	726	11,586	1,989	163,959	20,250	8	-	-	-	-	-
21	20	2	2	50	25	31,300	2,500	RELATED TO NO. 6					
22	21	75	10	1,577	309	29,231	2,750	6	-	-	-	-	-
23	30	9	3	275	98	31,300	2,500	RELATED TO NO. 6					
24	23	19	107	433	46	26,073	6,746	-	-	-	-	-	-
25	30	20	51	591	158	13,250	3,250	1	-	-	-	-	-
26	59	16	132	955	256	99,993	6,074	-	-	-	-	-	-
27	109	335	71	36,465	4,224	92,255	11,150	-	-	-	-	-	-
28	60	24	334	1,434	111	72,461	4,019	-	-	-	-	-	-
29	30	39	10	1,167	57	29,231	2,750	-	-	-	-	-	-
30	30	33	71	995	304	41,027	1,625	-	-	-	-	-	-
31	59	57	245	3,341	1,316	136,890	4,625	1	-	-	-	-	-
32	6	86	15	517	81	19,440	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
33	30	11	24	335	1	RELATED TO NO. 26		-	-	-	-	-	-
34	30	-	7	13	9	RELATED TO NO. 26		-	-	-	-	-	-
35	30	70	247	2,097	884	37,507	2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
27*	29	21	79	603	172	23,880	3,600	-	-	-	-	-	-
28*	59	48	42	2,851	569	106,078	4,800	-	-	-	-	-	-
29*	26	22	57	573	195	24,817	3,600	-	-	-	-	-	-
NEW MEXICO													
1	90	123	257	11,101	1,793	22,868	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	30	194	89	5,805	788	9,085	500	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	30	20	197	587	96	21,546	2,200	16	-	-	-	-	-
4	22	588	611	12,937	10,072	112,764	2,200	RELATED TO NO. 3					

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE A-1
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
NEW YORK, EASTERN									
1	SEYBERT	KEENEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	07/26/2004	30	4	150
2	BLOCK	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/09/2004	30	-	30
3	FEUERSTEIN	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/22/2004	30	-	30
4	FEUERSTEIN	BIANCO	RACKETEERING	WC	D	12/28/2004	30	-	30
5	BLOCK	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/12/2005	30	2	90
6	DEARIE	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/20/2005	30	1	60
7	BLOCK	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/08/2005	30	1	60
8	TOWNES	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/10/2005	30	1	60
9	JOHNSON	WARREN	RACKETEERING	WC	D	03/04/2005	30	-	30
10	GERSHON	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/08/2005	30	-	30
11	TRAGER	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/14/2005	30	3	120
12	BLOCK	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/24/2005	30	-	30
13	JOHNSON	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/14/2005	30	-	30
14	SIFTON	KEENEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	04/19/2005	30	1	60
15	GARAUFIS	BIANCO	RACKETEERING	WC	D	04/20/2005	30	1	60
16	JOHNSON	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/29/2005	30	-	30
17	GLEESON	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/20/2005	30	2	90
18	WEINSTEIN	BIANCO	$LAUNDERING	WC	D	05/26/2005	30	2	90
19	TRAGER	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/03/2005	30	-	30
20	GLEESON	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC,EO	D	06/07/2005	30	1	60
21	TRAGER	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/08/2005	30	-	30
22	JOHNSON	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/20/2005	30	-	30
23	SEYBERT	WARREN	RACKETEERING	WC	D	07/19/2005	30	-	30
24	REDACTED								
25	GLEESON	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/25/2005	30	-	30
26	GARAUFIS	BIANCO	MURDER	WC	D	08/15/2005	30	1	60
27	GARAUFIS	KEENEY	$LAUNDERING	WC	D	08/18/2005	30	1	60
28	GARAUFIS	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/19/2005	30	-	30
29	AMON	KEENEY	MURDER	WC	D	10/07/2005	30	1	60
30	GLASSER	WARREN	RACKETEERING	WC	D	10/24/2005	30	1	60

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
NEW YORK, EASTERN													
1	150	128	151	19,251	1,799	123,116	5,750	7	-	-	-	-	-
2	30	89	270	2,657	139	14,629	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	22	24	25	528	152	5,232	-	11	-	-	-	-	-
4	30	4	10	109	2	32,866	500	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	83	58	75	4,848	3,720	312,917	32,931	24	-	-	-	-	-
6	59	81	89	4,763	756	54,311	1,750	12	-	-	-	-	-
7	56	48	105	2,664	1,223	RELATED TO NO. 5		RELATED TO NO. 5					
8	60	170	48	10,180	1,581	56,952	3,500	RELATED TO NO. 6					
9	30	4	11	116	44	33,171	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	30	13	2	390	322	41,105	2,600	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	120	17	50	2,000	272	62,466	3,250	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	12	32	14	380	75	RELATED TO NO. 5		RELATED TO NO. 5					
13	30	26	25	780	255	19,796	1,750	2	-	-	-	-	-
14	59	27	26	1,571	366	68,307	800	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	59	42	30	2,468	264	67,373	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	14	13	25	187	25	10,171	1,750	RELATED TO NO. 13					
17	64	99	10	6,322	134	121,464	7,638	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	90	17	1	1,509	411	157,642	13,450	-	-	-	-	-	-
19	30	23	20	679	177	15,491	2,600	-	-	-	-	-	-
20	39	161	73	6,267	1,121	19,013	4,000	18	-	-	-	-	-
21	2	80	15	161	25	5,968	4,399	4	-	-	-	-	1
22	30	32	5	947	32	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
23	30	38	57	1,133	46	35,509	500	14	-	-	-	-	-
24	REDACTED												
25	29	169	138	4,896	836	13,779	3,000	RELATED TO NO. 20					
26	54	87	73	4,715	775	64,906	6,100	5	-	-	-	-	-
27	60	106	1	6,352	409	102,026	8,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
28	8	55	10	437	22	5,830	2,750	RELATED TO NO. 20					
29	52	127	84	6,598	727	65,020	6,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
30	34	148	1	5,047	94	324,040	45,500	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
NEW YORK, EASTERN (CONTINUED)									
29*	SPATT	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/30/2004	30	2	90
30*	DEARIE	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/03/2004	30	-	30
31*	DEARIE	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/17/2004	30	-	30
32*	ROSS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/14/2004	30	-	30
33*	GARAUFIS	WARREN	RACKETEERING	WC	D	11/02/2004	30	1	60
34*	GERSHON	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/04/2004	30	1	60
35*	ROSS	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/10/2004	30	-	30
NEW YORK, NORTHERN									
1	SCULLIN	NAHMIAS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/05/2004	30	2	90
2	MUNSON	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/12/2005	30	-	30
3	KAHN	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/20/2005	30	-	30
4	KAHN	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/08/2005	30	1	60
5	SHARPE	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/26/2005	30	-	30
6	SHARPE	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/31/2005	30	1	60
7	HURD	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/10/2005	30	1	60
8	MCAVOY	SWARTZ	COERCION	WC	D	07/28/2005	30	1	60
9	SHARPE	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/22/2005	30	-	30
NEW YORK, SOUTHERN									
1	KEENAN	KEENEY	RACKETEERING	OM	R	02/05/2004	30	13	420
2	OWEN	KEENEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	03/22/2004	30	9	300
3	OWEN	SWARTZ	RACKETEERING	WC	D	09/22/2004	30	3	120
4	WOOD	NAHMIAS	FIREARMS	WC	D	10/20/2004	30	4	150
5	SWEET	WARREN	RACKETEERING	WC,OM	D,B	10/28/2004	30	6	210
6	CASTEL	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/07/2005	30	-	30
7	PRESKA	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/11/2005	30	-	30
8	PRESKA	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/14/2005	30	-	30
9	OWEN	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/09/2005	30	1	60
10	OWEN	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/11/2005	30	-	30
11	OWEN	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/14/2005	30	-	30
12	PATTERSON	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/24/2005	30	-	30

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
										Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			
A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	G	D	P	Persons Convicted
NEW YORK, EASTERN (CONTINUED)													
29*	84	370	239	31,083	3,551	119,012	3,500	25	-	-	-	-	-
30*	18	32	5	581	67	6,929	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
31*	30	3	60	92	15	6,226	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
32*	15	21	32	320	101	9,001	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
33*	57	189	192	10,764	409	63,292	1,750	3	-	-	-	-	3
34*	42	14	480	600	50	6,023	500	-	-	-	-	-	-
35*	8	1	1	5	-	5,851	1,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
NEW YORK, NORTHERN													
1	90	212	230	19,090	5,557	33,918	6,000	11	-	-	-	-	-
2	22	52	35	1,150	328	11,306	2,000	RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	30	10	19	298	49	46,277	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	34	40	28	1,370	182	50,516	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	30	40	30	1,200	560	18,664	-	10	-	-	-	-	-
6	36	10	15	360	85	22,397	-	RELATED TO NO. 5					
7	60	85	72	5,114	902	93,934	9,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	44	88	339	3,863	10	78,569	5,593	1	-	-	-	-	-
9	22	250	100	5,500	4,400	59,671	10,951	15	-	-	-	-	-
NEW YORK, SOUTHERN													
1	222	8	65	1,874	1,311	129,269	21,500	34	-	-	-	-	-
2	287	180	1,190	51,712	6,151	440,038	12,500	51	-	-	1	-	7
3	120	67	365	8,086	1,042	288,331	14,000	27	-	-	-	-	-
4	148	35	20	5,195	800	211,700	11,828	20	-	-	-	-	2
5	210	36	35	7,500	500	348,452	8,000	20	-	-	-	-	-
6	NI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	30	65	30	1,955	44	26,607	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	28	8	6	213	19	15,004	2,600	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	52	32	30	1,664	625	23,555	1,750	5	-	-	-	-	-
10	30	30	38	915	492	31,654	1,750	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	19	3	5	66	6	17,279	2,600	2	-	-	-	-	-
12	13	49	34	637	19	25,167	1,775	2	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
NEW YORK, SOUTHERN (CONTINUED)									
13	PATTERSON	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/28/2005	30	1	60
14	CHIN	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/18/2005	30	3	120
15	LYNCH	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/25/2005	30	1	60
16	LYNCH	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/28/2005	30	2	90
17	OWEN	WARREN	EXTORTION	WC	D	04/07/2005	30	3	120
18	OWEN	WARREN	RACKETEERING	WC	D	04/07/2005	30	3	120
19	OWEN	WARREN	RACKETEERING	WC	D	04/07/2005	30	2	90
20	HELLERSTEIN	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/11/2005	30	-	30
21	CHIN	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/21/2005	30	-	30
22	CHIN	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/28/2005	30	-	30
23	GRIESE	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/11/2005	30	-	30
24	GRIESE	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/11/2005	30	2	90
25	BAER	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/26/2005	30	-	30
26	BAER	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/27/2005	30	-	30
27	COTE	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/31/2005	30	2	90
28	COTE	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/03/2005	30	-	30
29	COTE	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/09/2005	30	-	30
30	COTE	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/10/2005	30	1	60
31	CHIN	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	06/10/2005	30	-	30
32	RAKOFF	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/13/2005	30	1	60
33	MCKENNA	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/16/2005	30	-	30
34	RAKOFF	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/23/2005	30	-	30
35	BERMAN	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/07/2005	30	1	60
36	SWAIN	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/08/2005	30	3	120
37	MCKENNA	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/11/2005	30	-	30
38	DANIELS	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/14/2005	30	-	30
39	ROBINSON	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/26/2005	30	-	30
40	ROBINSON	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/01/2005	30	1	60
41	KARAS	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/10/2005	30	-	30
42	STEIN	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/31/2005	30	-	30

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
										Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			
A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	G	D	P	Persons Convicted
NEW YORK, SOUTHERN (CONTINUED)													
13	46	38	27	1,769	137	48,604	3,000	16	-	-	-	-	-
14	113	129	842	14,540	4,580	185,139	8,600	2	-	-	-	-	-
15	60	10	30	597	196	67,159	3,260	4	-	-	-	-	-
16	90	106	11	9,506	7,812	118,974	6,650	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	106	71	55	7,500	3,000	99,151	37,100	28	-	-	-	-	-
18	120	92	351	11,036	691	185,074	10,500	RELATED TO NO. 3					
19	90	59	348	5,351	127	158,216	10,500	RELATED TO NO. 3					
20	10	6	5	60	38	7,720	2,600	RELATED TO NO. 15					
21	28	10	48	282	9	4,433	3,150	-	-	-	-	-	-
22	5	22	20	108	90	8,744	2,600	RELATED TO NO. 15					
23	16	29	17	468	45	11,626	2,750	1	-	-	-	-	-
24	90	201	22	18,072	2,350	52,939	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
25	30	134	38	4,012	793	19,301	4,000	9	-	-	-	-	-
26	11	-	2	1	NR	5,767	2,750	4	-	-	-	-	-
27	90	111	36	10,019	513	30,047	3,000	1	-	-	-	-	-
28	30	32	5	952	30	35,442	10,000	5	-	-	-	-	-
29	14	51	33	709	92	8,700	2,000	RELATED TO NO. 25					
30	60	6	8	363	79	47,049	2,450	9	-	-	-	-	-
31	30	20	20	598	365	33,320	2,600	RELATED TO NO. 15					
32	38	50	10	1,910	256	86,967	6,394	-	-	-	-	-	-
33	13	33	12	429	32	9,358	2,750	RELATED TO NO. 13					
34	17	31	52	521	65	11,850	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
35	60	67	30	4,023	437	32,133	3,550	RELATED TO NO. 27					
36	105	47	66	4,947	892	167,354	9,500	RELATED TO NO. 30					
37	30	83	31	2,497	423	5,749	2,750	RELATED TO NO. 13					
38	30	13	62	391	101	15,849	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
39	10	7	11	70	5	17,840	2,900	-	-	-	-	-	-
40	60	40	121	2,396	273	29,339	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
41	30	24	27	723	33	27,581	2,750	RELATED TO NO. 27					
42	18	82	22	1,479	192	10,988	1,000	22	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
NEW YORK, SOUTHERN (CONTINUED)									
43	SWAIN	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/02/2005	30	2	90
44	MCMAHON	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/06/2005	30	-	30
45	MUKASEY	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/30/2005	30	-	30
46	KOELTL	SWARTZ	GAMBLING	WS,WC	H,D	10/04/2005	30	1	60
47	JONES	KEENEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	10/12/2005	30	-	30
115*	JONES	WRAY	RACKETEERING	OM	B	09/03/2003	30	14	450
116*	CEDARBAUM	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/26/2004	30	-	30
117*	HELLERSTEIN	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/11/2004	30	-	30
118*	SWEET	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/28/2004	30	-	30
119*	MUKASEY	NAHMIAS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/02/2004	30	-	30
120*	BUCHWALD	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/01/2004	30	-	30
66**	SWEET	WARREN	EXTORTION	WC	D	04/09/2002	30	1	60
67**	BATTS	WARREN	EXTORTION	WC	D	06/19/2002	30	-	30
67**	MUKASEY	KEENEY	CONSPIRACY	OM	O	05/08/2003	30	-	30
NEW YORK, WESTERN									
1	SKRETNY	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/22/2004	30	3	120
2	SKRETNY	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/22/2005	30	1	60
3	SIRAGUSA	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/02/2005	30	-	30
4	SKRETNY	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/05/2005	30	-	30
5	SKRETNY	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/27/2005	30	-	30
6	SKRETNY	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/29/2005	30	1	60
7	SKRETNY	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/24/2005	30	-	30
8	SKRETNY	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/25/2005	30	1	60
17*	SKRETNY	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/19/2004	30	-	30
NORTH CAROLINA, MIDDLE									
1	TILLEY	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/24/2005	30	-	30
2	TILLEY	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/23/2005	30	-	30
3	TILLEY	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/30/2005	30	2	90

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
NEW YORK, SOUTHERN (CONTINUED)													
43	90	25	127	2,293	104	44,260	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
44	30	111	100	3,322	221	51,613	7,850	-	-	-	-	-	-
45	19	1	4,411	22	209	25,086	4,000	RELATED TO NO. 42					
46	59	212	159	12,533	450	65,994	2,484	-	-	-	-	-	-
47	30	33	25	1,000	150	37,047	3,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
115*	450	1	35	413	399	1,163,080	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
116*	30	5	1	155	44	18,660	2,750	-	-	-	-	-	-
117*	17	62	10	1,047	252	2,600	2,600	-	-	-	-	-	-
118*	27	3	6	73	NR	17,350	10,400	1	-	-	-	-	-
119*	29	162	70	4,711	708	17,011	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
120*	8	43	42	341	73	5,218	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
66**	60	37	58	2,226	241	59,595	8,400	-	-	-	-	-	-
67**	30	14	27	419	44	50,010	870	-	-	-	-	-	-
67**	1	1	4	1	1	3,131	100	-	-	-	-	-	-
NEW YORK, WESTERN													
1	90	22	40	2,010	598	431,160	11,475	25	-	-	-	-	-
2	60	60	177	3,598	259	73,300	7,300	20	-	-	-	-	-
3	22	23	10	514	15	23,568	1,600	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	22	155	14	3,411	362	20,509	4,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	30	10	32	293	64	RELATED TO NO. 2		RELATED TO NO. 2					
6	60	111	40	6,664	678	60,060	4,900	18	-	-	-	-	-
7	10	24	7	244	1	5,142	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	60	95	36	5,672	781	153,138	3,450	-	-	-	-	-	-
17*	30	8	7	241	22	101,391	3,875	RELATED TO NO. 1					
NORTH CAROLINA, MIDDLE													
1	16	38	25	615	204	12,337	8,704	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	30	21	25	623	24	23,586	16,320	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	82	17	20	1,392	426	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
NORTH CAROLINA, WESTERN									
1	MULLEN	WARREN	NARCOTICS	EE	H	01/03/2005	30	-	30
2	MULLEN	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/18/2005	30	-	30
3	MULLEN	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/02/2005	30	1	60
4	MULLEN	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/16/2005	30	-	30
5	VOORHEES	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/02/2005	30	-	30
6	CONRAD	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/15/2005	30	-	30
7	CONRAD	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/17/2005	30	-	30
OHIO, NORTHERN									
1	KATZ	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC,OM	D,B	10/04/2004	30	3	120
2	KATZ	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/29/2004	30	-	30
3	KATZ	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/13/2005	30	-	30
4	KATZ	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/23/2005	30	-	30
5	KATZ	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/25/2005	30	-	30
6	KATZ	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/27/2005	30	-	30
14*	SOLOMON	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/02/2004	30	-	30
15*	OLIVER	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/16/2004	30	2	90
16*	OLIVER	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/30/2004	30	1	60
17*	NUGENT	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/05/2004	30	1	60
18*	ADAMS	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/12/2004	30	-	30
19*	WELLS	NAHMIAS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/15/2004	30	-	30
OHIO, SOUTHERN									
1	FROST	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/25/2005	30	2	90
2	WATSON	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/16/2005	30	-	30
3	FROST	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/17/2005	30	-	30
4	BECKWITH	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/23/2005	30	1	60
5	BECKWITH	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/28/2005	30	-	30
OKLAHOMA, EASTERN									
1	WHITE	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/24/2005	30	-	30

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
										Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			
A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	G	D	P	Persons Convicted
NORTH CAROLINA, WESTERN													
1	29	166	36	4,819	3,216	23,616	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	29	69	17	2,011	207	27,867	1,625	23	-	-	-	-	-
3	51	120	25	6,110	1,329	51,770	1,870	RELATED TO NO. 2					
4	24	80	12	1,920	612	12,388	2,175	RELATED TO NO. 2					
5	19	94	168	1,780	198	64,201	9,026	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	30	28	31	834	118	25,840	8,200	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	10	1	3	11	-	19,000	4,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
OHIO, NORTHERN													
1	111	10	506	1,158	775	134,879	4,020	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	30	12	68	363	115	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
3	22	16	55	355	300	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
4	30	102	53	3,073	621	62,411	2,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	30	190	53	5,715	1,574	64,408	2,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	15	26	23	397	63	56,630	2,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
14*	29	215	98	6,244	417	23,454	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
15*	90	239	239	21,506	1,101	163,266	18,844	12	-	-	-	-	-
16*	42	14	36	568	144	RELATED TO NO. 15*		RELATED TO NO. 15*					
17*	45	31	22	1,392	416	RELATED TO NO. 15*		RELATED TO NO. 15*					
18*	30	19	31	583	105	16,400	606	-	-	-	-	-	-
19*	9	59	17	531	39	RELATED TO NO. 15*		RELATED TO NO. 15*					
OHIO, SOUTHERN													
1	90	24	58	2,163	510	202,767	12,500	14	-	-	-	-	-
2	30	60	145	1,793	152	57,381	7,250	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	30	7	48	215	100	50,693	3,250	4	-	-	-	-	-
4	50	228	101	11,422	2,545	136,940	9,500	17	-	-	-	-	10
5	15	50	22	754	148	RELATED TO NO. 4		RELATED TO NO. 4					
OKLAHOMA, EASTERN													
1	30	-	198	4	50	14,371	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE A-1
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
OKLAHOMA, WESTERN									
1	LEONARD	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/14/2005	30	1	60
2	LEONARD	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/28/2005	30	1	60
3	CAUTHRON	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/03/2005	30	1	60
4	FRIOT	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/14/2005	30	-	30
PENNSYLVANIA, EASTERN									
1	BAYLSON	KEENEY	INTIMIDATION	OM	O	10/26/2004	30	1	60
2	BAYLSON	KEENEY	INTIMIDATION	WS	B	02/18/2005	30	-	30
3	SAVAGE	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/11/2005	30	1	60
4	BAYLSON	KEENEY	INTIMIDATION	WC	D	04/12/2005	30	2	90
5	ROBRENO	BIANCO	RACKETEERING	WC	D	05/19/2005	30	2	90
6	SAVAGE	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/23/2005	30	1	60
7	JOYNER	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/15/2005	30	1	60
8	JOYNER	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/01/2005	30	-	30
9	GARDNER	KEENEY	OTHER	WS	H	11/10/2005	25	-	25
3*	KELLY	KEENEY	INTIMIDATION	OM	O	10/13/2004	30	1	60
10**	TUCKER	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/05/2001	30	4	150
11**	VAN ANTWERPEN	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/10/2001	30	2	90
12**	SCHILLER	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/22/2002	30	1	60
PENNSYLVANIA, MIDDLE									
1	VANASKIE	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/28/2005	30	-	30
2	VANASKIE	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/10/2005	30	-	30
3	VANASKIE	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/17/2005	30	-	30
2*	VANASKIE	MALCOLM	GAMBLING	WS	H	01/28/2004	30	-	30
4**	VANASKIE	MALCOLM	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/25/2003	30	-	30
PENNSYLVANIA, WESTERN									
1	AMBROSE	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/12/2005	30	-	30
2	MCLAUGHLIN	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/30/2005	30	1	60
PUERTO RICO									
1	DOMINGUEZ	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/09/2004	30	-	30
2	FUSTE	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/25/2005	30	-	30

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE A-1
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
										Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			
A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	G	D	P	Persons Convicted
OKLAHOMA, WESTERN													
1	48	32	25	1,520	347	15,911	-	5	-	-	-	-	-
2	59	51	18	3,019	180	21,787	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	60	24	35	1,423	330	32,969	5,305	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	30	52	48	1,568	390	19,166	5,305	4	-	-	-	-	-
PENNSYLVANIA, EASTERN													
1	60	20	5	1,182	304	93,437	600	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	3	1	7	3	3	4,220	160	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	60	106	13	6,388	296	47,626	6,000	13	-	-	-	-	-
4	90	22	39	2,003	137	82,646	3,750	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	82	294	150	24,085	240	290,000	20,000	8	1	-	-	-	1
6	60	49	15	2,937	264	45,126	3,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	37	161	31	5,958	353	153,433	8,560	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	21	185	15	3,890	168	75,788	4,280	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	25	12	22	307	35	48,500	4,000	2	-	-	-	-	-
3*	60	-	4	7	7	9,884	600	-	-	-	-	-	-
10**	150	176	81	26,463	6,349	113,219	800	17	-	-	1	-	-
11**	89	29	16	2,546	193	26,620	4,025	10	-	-	-	-	10
12**	60	35	24	2,076	783	62,971	14,647	4	-	-	-	-	4
PENNSYLVANIA, MIDDLE													
1	10	32	12	315	56	35,600	2,000	12	-	-	-	-	-
2	19	36	12	675	43	35,100	1,500	RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	29	52	20	1,520	226	35,600	2,000	RELATED TO NO. 1					
2*	9	32	22	288	55	16,293	1,344	-	-	-	-	-	-
4**	30	151	20	4,539	549	115,750	8,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
PENNSYLVANIA, WESTERN													
1	6	73	25	436	150	1,835	1,835	2	-	-	-	-	-
2	32	72	99	2,313	364	61,459	3,250	-	-	-	-	-	-
PUERTO RICO													
1	30	68	20	2,047	352	27,891	650	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	30	3	1	86	9	14,735	1,775	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
PUERTO RICO (CONTINUED)									
3	PEREZ-JIMENEZ	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/15/2005	30	1	40
4	FUSTE	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/04/2005	30	-	30
5	FUSTE	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/07/2005	30	-	30
6	FUSTE	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/16/2005	30	-	30
7	REDACTED								
8	REDACTED								
9	FUSTE	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/27/2005	30	1	60
10	REDACTED								
11	REDACTED								
12	DOMINGUEZ	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/04/2005	30	1	60
13	DOMINGUEZ	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/31/2005	30	-	30
RHODE ISLAND									
1	TORRES	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/12/2005	30	1	60
SOUTH CAROLINA									
1	SEYMOUR	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/10/2005	30	-	30
2	SEYMOUR	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/07/2005	30	1	60
3	GREER	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/04/2005	30	-	30
4	HERLONG	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/26/2005	30	1	60
5	FLOYD	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/15/2005	30	-	30
6	SEYMOUR	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/30/2005	30	1	60
7	BLATT	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/28/2005	30	-	30
TENNESSEE, EASTERN									
1	VARLAN	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/24/2005	30	-	30
2	GREER	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/02/2005	30	1	60
3	GREER	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/06/2005	30	-	30
TENNESSEE, MIDDLE									
1	CAMPBELL	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/08/2005	30	-	30
2	CAMPBELL	WARREN	CONSPIRACY	OM	O	05/27/2005	30	-	30

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
PUERTO RICO (CONTINUED)													
3	40	19	25	773	120	134,755	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	21	175	25	3,668	19	RELATED TO NO. 3		-	-	-	-	-	-
5	16	6	7	96	26	8,687	1,775	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	30	24	72	721	36	40,896	28,786	18	-	-	-	-	18
7	REDACTED												
8	REDACTED												
9	48	87	37	4,170	211	31,918	3,550	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	REDACTED												
11	REDACTED												
12	48	79	144	3,798	493	102,245	2,400	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	17	22	34	378	126	RELATED TO NO. 12		-	-	-	-	-	-
RHODE ISLAND													
1	48	130	89	6,236	696	38,934	1,250	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOUTH CAROLINA													
1	30	103	130	3,082	1,086	212,132	43,900	49	-	-	-	-	32
2	60	427	136	25,634	4,797	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	30	34	46	1,033	299	51,893	-	3	-	-	-	-	2
4	36	154	25	5,539	242	5,000	-	18	-	-	-	-	-
5	30	65	176	1,945	329	39,242	1,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	60	108	425	6,467	580	69,525	11,250	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	30	44	43	1,323	577	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TENNESSEE, EASTERN													
1	28	93	140	2,610	399	35,798	1,750	3	-	-	-	-	-
2	57	105	80	6,000	1,026	122,636	2,100	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	20	80	80	1,600	92	2,100	2,100	-	-	-	-	-	-
TENNESSEE, MIDDLE													
1	19	49	50	934	1,177	24,120	9,120	2	-	-	-	-	-
2	2	NR	6	NR	NR	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE A-1
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
TENNESSEE, WESTERN									
1	BREEN	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/03/2004	30	1	60
2	MCCALLA	KEENEY	BRIBERY	WC,OM	D,B	01/11/2005	30	1	60
3	MAYS	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/18/2005	30	-	30
4	MAYS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/25/2005	30	1	60
5	MAYS	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/23/2005	30	-	30
6	MAYS	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/01/2005	30	2	90
7	MCCALLA	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/16/2005	30	-	30
1*	MAYS	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/01/2004	30	-	30
TEXAS, EASTERN									
1	HEARTFIELD	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/02/2005	30	-	30
TEXAS, NORTHERN									
1	LYNN	KEENEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	11/10/2004	30	5	180
2	LYNN	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/16/2004	30	2	90
3	GODBEY	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/10/2004	30	2	90
4	KINKEADE	SWARTZ	RACKETEERING	WC	D	02/07/2005	30	-	30
5	KINKEADE	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/24/2005	30	1	60
6	FISH	SWARTZ	RACKETEERING	WC	D	03/17/2005	30	-	30
7	SANDERS	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/05/2005	30	2	90
8	SANDERS	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/30/2005	30	-	30
9	BUCHMEYER	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/05/2005	30	1	60
10	FISH	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/18/2005	30	-	30
11	BUCHMEYER	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/12/2005	30	-	30
12	BUCHMEYER	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/17/2005	30	1	60
TEXAS, SOUTHERN									
1	HANEN	BIANCO	SMUGGLING	WC	D	01/11/2005	30	-	30
2	HANEN	BIANCO	SMUGGLING	WC	D	01/18/2005	30	-	30
3	HINOJOSA	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/28/2005	30	-	30
4	ATLAS	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/10/2005	30	1	60
5	WERLEIN	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/30/2005	30	-	30
6	ALVAREZ	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/11/2005	30	-	30

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE A-1
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
										Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			
A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	G	D	P	Persons Convicted
TENNESSEE, WESTERN													
1	55	36	60	1,980	1,121	70,033	2,000	34	-	-	-	-	-
2	60	114	182	6,869	827	92,260	13,578	7	-	-	-	-	3
3	30	84	21	2,515	271	53,035	1,050	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	60	124	34	7,452	1,432	48,280	2,200	10	-	-	-	-	-
5	22	96	34	2,110	239	9,548	1,100	RELATED TO NO. 4					
6	66	119	41	7,882	1,357	54,306	2,850	RELATED TO NO. 4					
7	30	37	10	1,118	44	RELATED TO NO. 4		RELATED TO NO. 4					
1*	21	52	17	1,093	164	145,348	2,100	4	3	-	1	-	4
TEXAS, EASTERN													
1	30	214	222	6,429	400	91,000	6,000	9	-	-	-	-	-
TEXAS, NORTHERN													
1	169	252	1,080	42,628	7,053	442,111	42,000	5	-	-	-	-	-
2	90	48	25	4,282	740	102,000	4,000	11	-	-	-	-	-
3	51	39	7	2,000	400	31,000	2,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	30	62	66	1,872	829	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
5	60	39	25	2,362	175	72,924	4,000	11	-	-	-	-	-
6	30	61	81	1,825	657	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
7	72	37	10	2,664	741	35,600	5,000	19	-	-	-	-	-
8	11	51	5	557	250	10,500	5,000	RELATED TO NO. 7					
9	60	99	197	5,911	429	26,290	1,800	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	6	87	7	520	50	10,000	2,500	RELATED TO NO. 7					
11	30	113	220	3,377	260	17,831	6,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	54	92	266	4,948	587	32,836	3,400	1	-	-	-	-	-
TEXAS, SOUTHERN													
1	16	95	59	1,527	363	328,885	13,500	5	-	-	-	-	-
2	9	1	NR	13	NR	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
3	30	-	3	8	6	50,037	28,730	2	-	-	-	-	-
4	41	332	90	13,630	1,301	89,611	6,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	30	124	45	3,710	435	76,104	9,450	6	-	-	-	-	-
6	30	20	41	613	21	127,884	28,836	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
TEXAS, SOUTHERN (CONTINUED)									
7	HUGHES	SWARTZ	RACKETEERING	OM	O	05/16/2005	30	-	30
8	CRANE	RICHTER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/20/2005	30	1	60
9	GILMORE	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/24/2005	30	2	90
10	KAZEN	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/05/2005	30	1	60
11	ALVAREZ	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/05/2005	30	1	60
12	KAZEN	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/05/2005	30	-	30
13	ELLISON	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/03/2005	30	1	60
14	CRANE	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/11/2005	30	-	30
15	KAZEN	BIANCO	EXTORTION	WC	D	09/09/2005	30	1	60
16	ELLISON	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/13/2005	30	-	30
17	HUGHES	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/03/2005	30	-	30
18	KAZEN	WARREN	EXTORTION	WC	D	11/22/2005	30	-	30
1*	HINOJOSA	KEENEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	07/23/2004	30	1	60
2*	GILMORE	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/03/2004	30	-	30
3*	CRANE	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/19/2004	30	-	30
TEXAS, WESTERN									
1	YEAKEL	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/08/2005	30	-	30
2	MARTINEZ	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/24/2005	30	5	168
3	LUDLUM	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/11/2005	30	-	30
4	MARTINEZ	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/11/2005	30	-	30
5	BRIONES	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/25/2005	30	1	60
6	RODRIGUEZ	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/27/2005	30	-	30
7	CARDONE	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/13/2005	30	1	60
8	CARDONE	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/13/2005	30	-	30
9	CARDONE	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/15/2005	30	-	30
10	CARDONE	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/22/2005	30	-	30
39*	CARDONE	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/16/2004	30	-	30
40*	CARDONE	WARREN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/20/2004	30	-	30
41*	MARTINEZ	NAHMIAS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/09/2004	30	1	60
42*	MARTINEZ	NAHMIAS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/09/2004	30	-	30

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
TEXAS, SOUTHERN (CONTINUED)													
7	1	1	19	1	1	42,835	34,489	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	60	23	63	1,376	493	100,597	19,600	4	-	-	-	-	-
9	90	77	54	6,967	481	70,492	339	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	60	51	52	3,084	651	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
11	54	129	49	6,958	1,672	198,720	41,620	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	30	72	47	2,175	237	RELATED TO NO. 11		-	-	-	-	-	-
13	60	77	212	4,636	590	129,529	79,203	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	30	114	NR	3,410	363	68,500	3,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	60	135	112	8,109	617	266,524	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	10	33	9	331	11	RELATED TO NO. 13		-	-	-	-	-	-
17	17	136	43	2,314	526	RELATED TO NO. 13		-	-	-	-	-	-
18	30	228	85	6,832	17	136,730	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
1*	60	99	45	5,913	937	56,752	4,595	-	-	-	-	-	-
2*	10	131	14	1,308	143	39,070	8,368	21	-	-	-	-	-
3*	19	20	55	379	83	47,345	28,640	2	-	-	-	-	-
TEXAS, WESTERN													
1	30	39	48	1,157	817	70,230	5,000	9	-	-	-	-	-
2	168	10	388	1,613	3,263	155,156	24,775	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	30	8	20	245	45	60,269	11,660	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	14	-	-	-	-	11,213	1,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	53	46	142	2,464	148	179,676	77,000	4	-	-	-	-	-
6	30	15	15	459	154	35,845	10,789	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	60	24	68	1,443	264	44,493	800	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	30	12	1	348	1	14,939	1,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	21	351	53	7,361	514	46,965	1,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	24	61	18	1,468	150	17,039	1,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
39*	19	18	23	351	42	78,628	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
40*	30	21	44	617	112	32,720	2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
41*	60	92	48	5,521	283	53,604	3,500	1	-	-	-	-	-
42*	30	10	14	312	37	26,200	3,000	1	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
TEXAS, WESTERN (CONTINUED)									
43*	SPARKS	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/01/2004	30	-	30
44*	MARTINEZ	NAHMIAS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/04/2004	30	-	30
45*	HUDSPETH	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/22/2004	30	-	30
46*	YEAKEL	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/01/2004	30	-	30
UTAH									
1	BENSON	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/18/2005	30	-	30
VIRGIN ISLANDS									
1	FINCH	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC,EO	D	08/24/2005	30	2	90
2	FINCH	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/22/2005	30	1	60
VIRGINIA, EASTERN									
1	SMITH	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/07/2005	30	1	60
2	KELLEY	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WS	H	03/28/2005	30	-	30
3	JACKSON	BIANCO	SMUGGLING	WC	D	03/31/2005	30	1	60
4	FRIEDMAN	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/15/2005	30	-	30
5	ELLIS	KEENEY	BRIBERY	WC	D	06/08/2005	30	1	60
6	SMITH	PARSKY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/17/2005	30	-	30
WASHINGTON, WESTERN									
1	COUGHENOUR	WARREN	FIREARMS	WC	D	03/21/2005	30	1	60
2	COUGHENOUR	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/28/2005	30	1	60
3	COUGHENOUR	KEENEY	FIREARMS	WS	H	04/15/2005	30	-	30
4	COUGHENOUR	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/21/2005	30	-	30
5	COUGHENOUR	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/23/2005	30	-	30
WEST VIRGINIA, NORTHERN									
1	KEELEY	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WS	H,O	05/04/2005	30	1	60
WEST VIRGINIA, SOUTHERN									
1	FABER	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/26/2005	30	1	60

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
										Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			
A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	G	D	P	Persons Convicted
TEXAS, WESTERN (CONTINUED)													
43*	30	10	10	300	19	20,440	2,200	-	-	-	-	-	-
44*	30	82	59	2,450	211	35,640	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
45*	9	6	7	53	11	6,472	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
46*	30	60	86	1,805	596	35,721	1,245	-	-	-	-	-	-
UTAH													
1	10	200	18	2,002	283	15,405	7,600	-	-	-	-	-	-
VIRGIN ISLANDS													
1	82	140	100	11,447	920	232,500	4,500	25	-	-	-	-	-
2	52	87	100	4,506	583	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
VIRGINIA, EASTERN													
1	60	119	51	7,162	697	160,549	9,250	23	-	-	1	-	3
2	21	94	22	1,974	309	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	58	121	59	7,034	25	56,385	6,000	3	-	-	-	-	3
4	30	47	23	1,412	532	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
5	59	37	186	2,179	418	13,863	3,650	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	16	128	28	2,040	440	18,723	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
WASHINGTON, WESTERN													
1	47	64	45	3,001	235	250,556	98,078	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	54	70	274	3,805	584	82,801	4,000	4	-	-	-	-	-
3	30	65	27	1,962	45	125,278	49,039	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	30	52	106	1,573	216	47,778	4,000	RELATED TO NO. 2					
5	28	66	142	1,850	500	39,712	3,000	26	-	-	-	-	-
WEST VIRGINIA, NORTHERN													
1	60	96	114	5,743	271	155,097	4,441	7	-	-	-	-	-
WEST VIRGINIA, SOUTHERN													
1	59	47	26	2,771	503	49,561	23,358	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Attorney General[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
WISCONSIN, EASTERN									
1	ADELMAN	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/25/2005	30	1	60
2	ADELMAN	BIANCO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/14/2005	30	-	30
3	RANDA	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/25/2005	30	-	30
4	CLEVERT	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/17/2005	30	1	60
5	CLEVERT	SWARTZ	CONSPIRACY	WC	D	08/29/2005	30	-	30
6	CLEVERT	WARREN	CONSPIRACY	WC	D	10/06/2005	30	1	60
WYOMING									
1	DOWNES	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/10/2005	30	-	30
2	DOWNES	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WS	H	03/09/2005	30	1	60
3	DOWNES	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WS,WC	H,D	03/17/2005	30	3	120
4	DOWNES	KEENEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/12/2005	30	1	60
5	DOWNES	SWARTZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/03/2005	30	-	30

[1] The attorney general or designee authorized the filing of the reported applications under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2516.
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
A.O. Number	Number of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
WISCONSIN, EASTERN													
1	50	178	250	8,875	834	184,500	15,000	27	-	-	-	-	27
2	30	51	100	1,522	76	94,000	10,000	RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	21	48	15	1,002	556	136,100	18,500	13	-	-	-	-	-
4	59	44	510	2,581	211	145,404	109,532	16	-	-	-	-	-
5	30	283	50	8,482	333	9,760	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	56	187	93	10,495	362	6,796	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
WYOMING													
1	30	25	10	749	43	426,507	37,508	6	-	-	-	-	-
2	60	154	70	9,264	1,322	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	120	50	77	5,943	710	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
4	48	44	22	2,132	308	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
5	30	5	5	152	12	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 1996 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 1996 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
ILLINOIS, NORTHERN										
	213	05/28/1996	-	10	1	-	10	-	6	RACKETEERING

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 1997
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 1997 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
UTAH										
	557	10/27/1997	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 1998 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 1998 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
FLORIDA, SOUTHERN										
	174	10/09/1998	-	3	1	-	-	-	3	CONSPIRACY
NEW YORK, SOUTHERN										
	359	03/12/1998	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	KIDNAPPING
TENNESSEE, EASTERN										
	475	04/22/1998	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	CONSPIRACY

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 1999 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 1999 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
CALIFORNIA, EASTERN										
	42	01/26/1999	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	
MICHIGAN, EASTERN										
	296	06/16/1999	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	
	300)	09/21/1999	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
PENNSYLVANIA, EASTERN										
	467	05/04/1999	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2000 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 2000 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
CONNECTICUT										
	1	10/27/1999	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	GAMBLING
ILLINOIS, NORTHERN										
	17	05/11/2000	-	1	-	-	-	-	37	NARCOTICS
	640**	08/18/1999	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	
MICHIGAN, EASTERN										
	1	11/18/1999	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS
NEW YORK, SOUTHERN										
	4	11/30/1999	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	RACKETEERING
	18	07/19/2000	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	NARCOTICS
	19)	07/19/2000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	664**	04/16/1999	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS
NEW YORK, WESTERN										
	3	12/23/1999	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS
UTAH										
	2	03/16/2000	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	NARCOTICS
	3)	03/16/2000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	4)	04/25/2000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	5)	05/05/2000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2001
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 2001 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
CALIFORNIA, CENTRAL										
	35*	08/22/2000	-	17	17	-	-	-	17	CONSPIRACY
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA										
	3	02/22/2001	-	11	-	-	1	-	6	NARCOTICS
	5)	03/01/2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	9)	06/08/2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	10)	07/20/2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	11)	08/02/2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
FLORIDA, SOUTHERN										
	20	10/31/2001	-	2	1	-	1	-	1	CONSPIRACY
ILLINOIS, NORTHERN										
	15	05/24/2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	GAMBLING
INDIANA, NORTHERN										
	1	12/27/2000	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	
	2)	03/12/2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	3)	04/12/2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
MICHIGAN, EASTERN										
	3	03/23/2001	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	
	4)	03/28/2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	5)	03/28/2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	6)	03/28/2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	9	08/09/2001	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	
MISSOURI, EASTERN										
	13	09/14/2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	FRAUD
	14)	11/02/2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2001
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 2001 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
NEVADA										
	5	04/17/2001	-	3	-	-	-	-	3	NARCOTICS
NEW JERSEY										
	10	03/21/2001	-	15	-	-	-	-	5	$LAUNDERING
	12	04/02/2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	NARCOTICS
NEW YORK, WESTERN										
	2	02/21/2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	NARCOTICS
	5)	04/05/2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
PENNSYLVANIA, EASTERN										
	2	12/06/2000	-	7	-	-	-	-	7	NARCOTICS

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2002
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 2002 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
ALASKA										
	6	10/16/2002	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS
CALIFORNIA, CENTRAL										
	4	02/13/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	KIDNAPPING
	22)	07/26/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	24)	09/06/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	26	09/11/2002	-	3	-	-	-	-	3	GAMBLING
	28	09/25/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	CONSPIRACY
CONNECTICUT										
	13*	02/18/2001	-	2	-	-	-	-	5	BRIBERY
	14*)	03/26/2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA										
	4	05/04/2002	-	4	-	-	-	-	3	NARCOTICS
	8**	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
FLORIDA, SOUTHERN										
	5	02/12/2002	-	6	-	-	1	-	6	CONSPIRACY
ILLINOIS, NORTHERN										
	15	05/29/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	NARCOTICS
IOWA, NORTHERN										
	1	03/21/2002	-	-	-	-	1	-	7	GAMBLING
	2)	06/08/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
KANSAS										
	4	10/02/2002	-	11	-	-	-	-	24	NARCOTICS
MASSACHUSETTS										
	4	06/17/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	NARCOTICS
	5)	07/08/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	6)	07/16/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2002
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 2002 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
NEW YORK, EASTERN										
	2	12/07/2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	RACKETEERING
	20*	02/09/2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS
NEW YORK, SOUTHERN										
	36	05/07/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	RACKETEERING
	66**	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	67**	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
PENNSYLVANIA, EASTERN										
	10**	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	11**	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	12**	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
SOUTH CAROLINA										
	3	03/21/2002	-	2	-	-	-	-	3	NARCOTICS
TEXAS, SOUTHERN										
	12)	04/16/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	18	07/03/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2003 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 2003 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
ARIZONA										
	5	01/07/2003	-	11	-	-	-	-	4	NARCOTICS
CALIFORNIA, CENTRAL										
	1	10/23/2002	-	-	4	-	-	-	10	MURDER
	48**	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	49**	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	50**	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
CALIFORNIA, EASTERN										
	5	08/12/2003	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	
COLORADO										
	1	10/24/2002	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	CONSPIRACY
CONNECTICUT										
	2)	03/31/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	8	07/01/2003	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA										
	9**	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	10*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	11**	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	19**	08/23/2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
FLORIDA, MIDDLE										
	2	06/18/2003	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	
	3)	07/22/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
FLORIDA, SOUTHERN										
	4)	12/04/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	5	01/14/2003	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS
	20	09/29/2003	-	1	1	-	-	-	4	CONSPIRACY
	21	10/03/2003	-	16	1	-	-	-	16	NARCOTICS
	27*)	10/28/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2003
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 2003 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts**			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
HAWAII										
	1)	12/11/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	2	02/03/2003	-	9	2	-	2	-	16	NARCOTICS
ILLINOIS, NORTHERN										
	1	12/03/2002	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	
	51	12/08/2003	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	
INDIANA, NORTHERN										
	1	08/25/2003	-	4	1	-	-	-	3	$LAUNDERING
	2)	11/04/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
MASSACHUSETTS										
	5	03/24/2003	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	
	6)	04/10/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	7)	05/27/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	10	06/20/2003	-	1	-	-	3	1	10	NARCOTICS
MICHIGAN, EASTERN										
	3)	12/05/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	4)	01/27/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	5)	03/12/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	7	03/21/2003	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	
	9	03/26/2003	-	3	-	-	-	-	4	NARCOTICS
MISSOURI, EASTERN										
	2	11/01/2002	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS
	3)	12/23/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	4)	01/10/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2003
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 2003 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
MISSOURI, WESTERN										
	1	01/06/2003	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	FRAUD
NEVADA										
	1	12/20/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS
NEW JERSEY										
	16*	06/20/2002	-	14	-	-	-	-	10	NARCOTICS
NEW YORK, EASTERN										
	9	06/25/2003	-	3	1	-	2	-	15	NARCOTICS
	37*	09/18/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	THEFT
NEW YORK, NORTHERN										
	1	03/26/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	$LAUNDERING
	3	04/02/2003	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	FRAUD
	13*)	05/14/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	14*)	08/26/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
NEW YORK, SOUTHERN										
	37	08/12/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS
	43	09/16/2003	-	6	-	-	-	-	2	EXTORTION
	67**	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
OHIO, SOUTHERN										
	3	11/14/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	NARCOTICS
PENNSYLVANIA, MIDDLE										
	1)	07/07/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	2)	07/21/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	3	10/16/2003	-	28	-	-	-	-	27	CONSPIRACY
	4**	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
SOUTH CAROLINA										
	3)	06/17/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	4	08/18/2003	-	-	1	-	-	-	28	CONSPIRACY

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2003
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 2003 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
TENNESSEE, EASTERN										
	3	03/26/2003	-	1	-	-	-	-	5	NARCOTICS
TEXAS, SOUTHERN										
	1	12/06/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	CONSPIRACY
VIRGINIA, EASTERN										
	5)	06/04/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	6)	06/20/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	7	07/09/2003	-	16	-	-	-	-	12	NARCOTICS
WISCONSIN, EASTERN										
	1	10/21/2002	-	15	-	-	-	-	3	$LAUNDERING

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2004
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 2004 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
ARIZONA										
	18*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	19*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
CALIFORNIA, CENTRAL										
	14	03/31/2004	-	2	-	-	-	-	5	ROBBERY
	23)	05/06/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	45*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	46*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	47*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	48*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	49*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
CALIFORNIA, EASTERN										
	18*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
CALIFORNIA, NORTHERN										
	6	07/30/2004	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	
	9*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	10*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
CALIFORNIA, SOUTHERN										
	1)	11/25/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	4)	01/14/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	8)	03/05/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	12)	05/05/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	14	07/23/2004	-	4	-	-	-	-	8	CONSPIRACY
	15	08/13/2004	-	29	-	-	-	1	19	CONSPIRACY
COLORADO										
	18	08/27/2004	-	30	1	-	30	-	29	NARCOTICS
	20)	09/09/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2004
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 2004 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
COLORADO (CONTINUED)										
	24)	10/22/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	25*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	26*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	27*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	28*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	29*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	30*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	31*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	32*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	33*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
CONNECTICUT										
	3	12/03/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	NARCOTICS
	7	01/14/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	NARCOTICS
	8)	02/03/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	10	03/02/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	NARCOTICS
	11	04/02/2004	-	1	1	-	-	-	11	NARCOTICS
	12)	05/14/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	BRIBERY
	13)	07/14/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	14)	09/02/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	15	10/08/2004	-	41	-	-	-	-	33	NARCOTICS
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA										
	1)	12/19/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	2	01/09/2004	-	12	-	-	-	-	12	NARCOTICS
	4	02/23/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2004
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 2004 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
FLORIDA, MIDDLE										
	3*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
FLORIDA, NORTHERN										
	1	05/03/2004	-	3	-	-	-	-	2	FRAUD
	3*	10/10/2003	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	
FLORIDA, SOUTHERN										
	13	09/21/2004	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS
	14*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	15*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	16*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
GEORGIA, MIDDLE										
	1*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
GEORGIA, NORTHERN										
	13	04/22/2004	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	
	14	08/06/2004	-	30	-	-	-	-	-	
	15	08/19/2004	-	32	-	-	-	-	2	NARCOTICS
	18*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
HAWAII										
	1	01/15/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	19	NARCOTICS
	4	07/02/2004	-	2	-	-	-	-	3	NARCOTICS
	7*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	8*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	9*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
IDAHO										
	2	09/21/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	NARCOTICS

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2004
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 2004 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
ILLINOIS, CENTRAL										
	1	06/18/2004	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	NARCOTICS
	2)	07/20/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
ILLINOIS, NORTHERN										
	1	11/27/2002	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	
	11	01/30/2004	-	16	-	-	-	-	4	NARCOTICS
	13	02/06/2004	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	BOMBING
	20	03/10/2004	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	
	21	03/10/2004	-	-	1	-	-	-	8	NARCOTICS
	22	04/07/2004	-	2	-	-	-	1	3	CORRUPTION
	23	04/09/2004	-	6	-	-	-	-	5	FRAUD
	39	06/04/2004	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	
	51	08/12/2004	-	23	-	-	-	-	4	NARCOTICS
	56	09/15/2004	-	9	-	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS
	60*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	61*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	62*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	63*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
ILLINOIS, SOUTHERN										
	1	08/27/2004	-	19	-	-	-	-	3	NARCOTICS
INDIANA, NORTHERN										
	1)	01/26/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	2	02/26/2004	-	1	-	-	1	-	13	NARCOTICS
INDIANA, SOUTHERN										
	1)	01/12/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	2	02/04/2004	-	-	1	-	-	-	8	NARCOTICS
	3)	02/20/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2004
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 2004 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
INDIANA, SOUTHERN (CONTINUED)										
	4*)	12/05/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	4)	03/10/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
KANSAS										
	6*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
LOUISIANA, WESTERN										
	4*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
MAINE										
	1*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
MARYLAND										
	7	06/25/2004	-	8	-	-	-	1	1	NARCOTICS
	14	10/19/2004	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	NARCOTICS
MASSACHUSETTS										
	6)	05/11/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	10)	06/04/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	12)	07/26/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	13	10/01/2004	-	11	-	-	-	-	2	NARCOTICS
	14*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	15*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
MICHIGAN, EASTERN										
	1)	12/23/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	2)	01/17/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	3	01/23/2004	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	
	5)	03/03/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	7)	03/31/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	8	05/07/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	NARCOTICS

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2004
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 2004 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
MINNESOTA										
	1)	01/24/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	2)	02/26/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	3	03/16/2004	-	-	-	-	1	-	8	NARCOTICS
MISSOURI, EASTERN										
	1	11/20/2003	-	9	2	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS
	2	02/10/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS
MISSOURI, WESTERN										
	1)	05/06/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	NARCOTICS
	4	06/18/2004	-	5	1	-	-	-	41	NARCOTICS
NEVADA										
	3)	01/27/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	5)	02/26/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	8)	03/30/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	10)	04/27/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	12)	05/10/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	14	06/15/2004	-	1	-	-	-	-	9	NARCOTICS
NEW JERSEY										
	27*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	28*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	29*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
NEW YORK, EASTERN										
	1	10/03/2003	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	
	29*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	30*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	31*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	32*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2004
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 2004 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
NEW YORK, EASTERN (CONTINUED)										
	33*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	34*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	35*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
NEW YORK, SOUTHERN										
	59	04/23/2004	-	17	-	-	-	-	2	RACKETEERING
	100	07/29/2004	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	
	115*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	116*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	117*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	118*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	119*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	120*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
NEW YORK, WESTERN										
	1)	01/16/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	7	03/30/2004	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	NARCOTICS
	17*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
OHIO, NORTHERN										
	12	07/29/2004	-	9	-	-	-	-	9	NARCOTICS
	13)	08/27/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	14*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	15*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	16*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	17*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	18*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	19*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2004
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 2004 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
OKLAHOMA, WESTERN										
	1	11/25/2003	-	5	-	-	-	-	3	OTHER
OREGON										
	1	09/01/2004	-	-	-	-	2	-	6	NARCOTICS
PENNSYLVANIA, EASTERN										
	3*	See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
PENNSYLVANIA, MIDDLE										
	2*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
TENNESSEE, EASTERN										
	3	09/15/2004	-	2	-	-	-	-	10	NARCOTICS
	6	10/25/2004	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	
TENNESSEE, WESTERN										
	1*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
TEXAS, SOUTHERN										
	1*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	2)	10/31/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	2*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	3)	12/08/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	3*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	5	12/18/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	OTHER
	9	02/02/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	CONSPIRACY
	29	06/08/2004	-	9	-	-	-	-	6	NARCOTICS
	30	06/10/2004	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	
	42	10/04/2004	-	19	-	-	-	-	17	NARCOTICS

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2004
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 2004 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
TEXAS, WESTERN										
	18)	06/03/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	22)	06/18/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	23)	06/18/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	25	07/12/2004	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	
	30)	08/03/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31	08/16/2004	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	
	33	09/02/2004	-	6	-	-	-	-	6	NARCOTICS
	39*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	40*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	41*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	42*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	43*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	44*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	45*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								
	46*	(See Appendix Table A-1 in this year's report.)								

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

TABLE B-1
STATE ARIZONA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
MARICOPA									
1	WILKINSON	ROMLEY	NARCOTICS	WS,WC	B,D	12/10/2004	30	1	60
2	BALLINGER	THOMAS	MURDER	WC	D	04/04/2005	30	0	30
3	KEPPEL	THOMAS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/15/2005	30	0	30
4	KEPPEL	THOMAS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/26/2005	30	2	90
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL									
1	REINSTEIN	BARRICK	NARCOTICS	WS,WC	H,D	11/29/2004	30	1	60
2	KEPPEL	GODDARD	CONSPIRACY	WC	D	06/29/2005	30	2	90
3	KEPPEL	GODDARD	CONSPIRACY	WC	D	08/18/2005	30	2	90
4	O'TOOLE	GODDARD	MURDER	WS,WC	H,D	09/13/2005	30	0	30
5	CRUIKSHANK	GODDARD	RACKETEERING	WC	D	09/21/2005	30	1	60
6	CRUIKSHANK	GODDARD	RACKETEERING	WC	D	09/30/2005	30	1	60
7	KEPPEL	GODDARD	CONSPIRACY	WS,WC	H,D	10/26/2005	30	1	60
8	CRUIKSHANK	GODDARD	RACKETEERING	WC	D	11/01/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE ARIZONA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			Persons Convicted
										G	D	P	
MARICOPA													
1	60	48	75	2,910	761	79,385	16,675	10	-	-	-	-	5
2	14	18	11	250	-	20,628	2,510	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	24	45	45	1,091	192	19,684	4,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	80	64	60	5,135	2,504	83,919	21,775	3	-	-	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL													
1	44	199	545	8,751	2,347	575,000	50,000	37	-	-	-	-	6
2	90	14	18	1,219	159	109,575	9,315	5	-	-	-	-	-
3	90	73	7,020	6,550	1,856	69,900	11,300	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	6	28	8	166	62	64,424	6,546	1	-	-	-	-	-
5	44	158	325	6,964	2,799	53,856	8,800	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	44	135	125	5,947	1,208	22,320	4,400	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	49	102	200	4,988	2,420	546,000	80,000	12	-	-	-	-	-
8	24	64	78	1,546	535	14,488	2,200	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE B-1
STATE CALIFORNIA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
ALAMEDA									
1	ROLEFSON	ORLOFF	MURDER	WC	D	10/07/2005	30	0	30
FRESNO									
1	PUTNAM	EGAN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/12/2005	30	0	30
2	PUTNAM	EGAN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/01/2005	30	0	30
3	AUSTIN	EGAN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/30/2005	30	1	60
LOS ANGELES									
1	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/09/2004	30	0	30
2	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/04/2005	30	0	30
3	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/04/2005	30	2	90
4	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/07/2005	30	0	30
5	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/11/2005	30	1	60
6	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/14/2005	30	0	30
7	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	ED	D	01/14/2005	30	0	30
8	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/18/2005	30	0	30
9	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/20/2005	30	0	30
10	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/20/2005	30	0	30
11	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/21/2005	30	0	30
12	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/02/2005	30	1	60
13	FIDLER	COOLEY	MURDER	WS,WC	H,D	02/07/2005	30	0	30
14	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/10/2005	30	1	60
15	FIDLER	COOLEY	MURDER	WS,WC	H,D	02/15/2005	30	0	30
16	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/16/2005	30	0	30
17	FIDLER	COOLEY	MURDER	WS	H	02/18/2005	30	0	30
18	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/18/2005	30	0	30
19	FIDLER	COOLEY	MURDER	WS,WC	H,D	02/24/2005	30	0	30
20	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/24/2005	30	0	30
21	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/02/2005	30	0	30
22	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/07/2005	30	0	30
23	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/07/2005	30	0	30
24	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/08/2005	30	0	30
25	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/08/2005	30	1	60
26	FIDLER	COOLEY	MURDER	WC	D	03/09/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE CALIFORNIA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
ALAMEDA													
1	26	211	NR	5,479	NR	143,834	7,550	13	-	-	-	-	-
FRESNO													
1	29	78	2,260	2,260	186	31,000	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	13	17	217	217	29	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
3	40	31	1,244	1,244	219	33,775	3,775	-	-	-	-	-	-
LOS ANGELES													
1	30	27	99	817	490	24,360	9,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	30	14	63	413	117	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	30	22	52	646	211	23,044	6,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	29	22	9	649	333	19,310	3,000	2	-	-	-	-	-
5	60	48	1,401	2,871	361	34,000	10,000	RELATED TO NO. 4					
6	30	6	3	174	97	1,000	1,000	5	-	-	-	-	-
7	30	-	-	-	-	3,000	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	29	11	53	330	154	20,044	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	30	69	46	2,062	160	19,416	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	30	130	260	3,891	255	70,632	9,000	1	-	-	-	-	1
11	19	63	41	1,199	287	-	-	18	-	-	-	-	-
12	60	40	266	2,397	727	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 11					
13	30	122	3,580	3,648	206	58,630	1,630	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	60	11	74	650	495	37,832	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	30	47	221	1,404	637	41,088	7,000	1	-	-	-	-	1
19	30	90	266	2,693	123	76,922	22,666	3	1	-	-	-	2
20	30	44	94	1,306	438	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 11					
21	30	102	45	3,057	443	217,000	6,000	1	1	-	-	-	1
22	29	46	22	1,330	435	19,416	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
23	27	19	75	519	92	35,832	3,000	25	-	-	-	1	-
24	30	32	200	975	62	48,716	3,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
25	30	7	12	200	16	57,000	7,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
26	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
LOS ANGELES (CONTINUED)									
27	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/11/2005	30	0	30
28	FIDLER	COOLEY	MURDER	WS,WC	H,D	03/11/2005	30	1	60
29	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/15/2005	30	0	30
30	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/16/2005	30	0	30
31	FIDLER	COOLEY	MURDER	WS	H	03/17/2005	30	0	30
32	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/18/2005	30	0	30
33	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/18/2005	30	0	30
34	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/18/2005	30	0	30
35	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/21/2005	30	0	30
36	FIDLER	COOLEY	MURDER	WS,WC	H,D	03/23/2005	30	0	30
37	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/25/2005	30	0	30
38	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	ED	D	03/28/2005	30	0	30
39	FIDLER	COOLEY	MURDER	WC	D	04/01/2005	30	0	30
40	FIDLER	COOLEY	MURDER	WS,WC	H,D	04/01/2005	30	0	30
41	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/04/2005	30	1	60
42	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/05/2005	30	1	60
43	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/05/2005	30	0	30
44	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/07/2005	30	1	60
45	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/07/2005	30	1	60
46	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/11/2005	30	0	30
47	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/12/2005	30	0	30
48	FIDLER	COOLEY	MURDER	WS,WC,WO	H,D,O	04/12/2005	30	1	60
49	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/13/2005	30	0	30
50	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/13/2005	30	2	90
51	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/14/2005	30	0	30
52	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/19/2005	30	0	30
53	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/19/2005	30	0	30
54	FIDLER	COOLEY	MURDER	WS,WC	H,D	04/19/2005	30	0	30
55	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/19/2005	30	0	30
56	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/21/2005	30	2	90
57	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/22/2005	30	0	30
58	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/26/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE CALIFORNIA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
LOS ANGELES (CONTINUED)													
27	30	44	150	1,311	291	107,496	15,000	RELATED TO NO. 23					
28	42	71	191	2,971	421	210,950	12,250	11	-	-	-	-	-
29	30	21	29	625	18	20,044	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
30	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
31	8	363	51	2,904	33	RELATED TO NO. 19		RELATED TO NO. 19					
32	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
33	30	13	97	380	140	37,332	4,500	6	-	-	-	-	6
34	30	40	40	1,211	320	RELATED TO NO. 21		RELATED TO NO. 21					
35	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
36	6	35	8	212	23	RELATED TO NO. 19		RELATED TO NO. 19					
37	15	16	37	242	61	103,495	13,600	4	-	-	-	-	-
38	30	-	-	-	-	3,000	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
39	30	125	154	3,764	-	261,000	30,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
40	30	76	420	2,273	412	23,181	4,181	-	-	-	-	-	-
41	60	79	180	4,723	520	41,088	7,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
42	58	1	7	49	22	68,890	3,550	-	-	-	-	-	-
43	30	25	241	750	150	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 4					
44	60	20	112	1,210	403	46,362	8,362	-	-	-	-	-	-
45	60	16	89	940	129	114,000	15,000	7	-	-	-	-	-
46	30	46	78	1,381	487	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 11					
47	30	36	200	1,074	353	107,496	15,060	RELATED TO NO. 23					
48	60	262	141	15,727	234	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-
49	30	34	75	1,006	50	55,814	9,000	20	-	-	-	1	3
50	90	29	99	2,574	1,018	54,238	5,000	1	-	-	-	-	-
51	18	3	17	51	24	RELATED TO NO. 37		RELATED TO NO. 37					
52	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
53	30	56	125	1,667	511	113,496	15,000	RELATED TO NO. 23					
54	30	258	323	7,744	1,580	RELATED TO NO. 28		RELATED TO NO. 28					
55	30	52	40	1,553	600	RELATED TO NO. 21		RELATED TO NO. 21					
56	90	44	283	3,950	1,306	69,543	12,543	-	-	-	-	-	-
57	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
58	30	84	105	2,535	753	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 11					

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
LOS ANGELES (CONTINUED)									
59	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/29/2005	30	0	30
60	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/29/2005	30	0	30
61	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/02/2005	30	0	30
62	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/02/2005	30	1	60
63	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/05/2005	30	0	30
64	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/11/2005	30	0	30
65	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/11/2005	30	0	30
66	FIDLER	COOLEY	MURDER	WC	D	05/14/2005	30	0	30
67	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/17/2005	30	1	60
68	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/18/2005	30	0	30
69	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/18/2005	30	0	30
70	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/24/2005	30	0	30
71	FIDLER	COOLEY	MURDER	WC	D	05/29/2005	30	0	30
72	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/01/2005	30	0	30
73	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/01/2005	30	0	30
74	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/01/2005	30	1	60
75	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/02/2005	30	0	30
76	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/02/2005	30	1	60
77	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/06/2005	30	0	30
78	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/06/2005	30	0	30
79	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/07/2005	30	0	30
80	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/07/2005	30	0	30
81	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/08/2005	30	0	30
82	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/09/2005	30	0	30
83	FIDLER	COOLEY	MURDER	WS,WC	H,D	06/10/2005	30	1	60
84	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/10/2005	30	0	30
85	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WS,WC	H,D	06/10/2005	30	0	30
86	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/10/2005	30	0	30
87	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/13/2005	30	0	30
88	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/21/2005	30	0	30
89	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/27/2005	30	0	30
90	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/27/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE CALIFORNIA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
LOS ANGELES (CONTINUED)													
59	30	44	201	1,317	740	RELATED TO NO. 37		RELATED TO NO. 37					
60	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
61	18	15	35	271	4	21,049	2,600	-	-	-	-	-	-
62	60	17	30	1,018	562	37,332	4,500	6	-	-	-	-	-
63	30	-	2	2	2	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 11					
64	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
65	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
66	6	57	62	342	22	8,764	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
67	30	34	351	1,020	40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
68	30	7	12	200	16	RELATED TO NO. 69		-	-	-	-	-	-
69	30	69	90	2,074	134	57,000	7,500	5	-	-	-	-	-
70	30	179	200	5,363	940	116,496	18,000	RELATED TO NO. 23					
71	30	666	75	19,987	1,386	206,000	80,000	12	-	-	-	-	-
72	30	57	39	1,709	43	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
73	7	100	5	700	500	39,082	5,750	5	-	-	-	-	-
74	30	25	307	755	155	10,000	2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
75	30	89	293	2,671	1,400	RELATED TO NO. 37		RELATED TO NO. 37					
76	59	16	36	963	302	55,438	3,550	-	-	-	-	-	-
77	30	14	393	405	97	6,500	3,000	5	-	-	-	-	-
78	30	13	20	390	102	18,616	2,200	-	-	-	-	-	-
79	30	19	426	565	420	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
80	30	5	32	138	78	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 11					
81	30	1	1	38	20	55,348	6,100	RELATED TO NO. 62					
82	30	2	17	66	19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
83	60	230	23	13,793	200	RELATED TO NO. 71		RELATED TO NO. 71					
84	30	11	30	327	184	23,181	4,181	-	-	-	-	-	-
85	26	202	90	5,244	328	30,000	5,000	4	-	-	-	-	-
86	30	83	660	2,493	1,869	176,160	12,000	4	-	-	-	-	-
87	30	43	40	1,282	279	RELATED TO NO. 21		RELATED TO NO. 21					
88	30	25	75	761	312	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 11					
89	30	113	40	3,396	387	58,306	8,000	10	-	-	-	-	-
90	30	17	47	520	75	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
LOS ANGELES (CONTINUED)									
91	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/28/2005	30	0	30
92	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WS,WC	H,D	07/08/2005	30	3	120
93	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/13/2005	30	0	30
94	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/13/2005	30	0	30
95	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/28/2005	30	0	30
96	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/28/2005	30	1	60
97	FIDLER	COOLEY	MURDER	WS,WC	H,D	09/08/2005	30	0	30
98	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/09/2005	30	1	60
99	FIDLER	COOLEY	MURDER	WC	D	09/27/2005	30	0	30
100	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/06/2005	30	0	30
101	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/27/2005	30	0	30
102	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/21/2005	30	0	30
96*	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/17/2004	30	1	60
152**	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WS	H	11/20/2003	30	0	30
153**	FIDLER	COOLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/25/2003	30	0	30
MONTEREY									
1*	SILLMAN	BRANNON	MURDER	WS	D	09/27/2004	30	0	30
ORANGE									
1	CONLEY	RACKAUCKAS	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	01/14/2005	30	0	30
2	CONLEY	RACKAUCKAS	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	02/10/2005	30	0	30
3	CONLEY	RACKAUCKAS	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	02/10/2005	30	0	30
4	CONLEY	RACKAUCKAS	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	03/10/2005	30	0	30
5	CONLEY	RACKAUCKAS	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	03/14/2005	30	0	30
6	CONLEY	RACKAUCKAS	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	03/15/2005	30	0	30
7	CONLEY	RACKAUCKAS	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	04/19/2005	30	0	30
8	CONLEY	MIDDLETON	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	05/03/2005	30	0	30
9	CONLEY	RACKAUCKAS	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	05/17/2005	30	0	30
10	CONLEY	MIDDLETON	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	05/24/2005	30	0	30
11	CONLEY	RACKAUCKAS	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	06/16/2005	30	0	30
12	CONLEY	RACKAUCKAS	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	06/17/2005	30	0	30
13	PAER	MIDDLETON	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	06/23/2005	30	0	30
14	PAER	MIDDLETON	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	06/30/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE CALIFORNIA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
LOS ANGELES (CONTINUED)													
91	30	49	221	1,479	390	103,220	18,000	28	-	-	-	-	-
92	120	57	398	6,844	859	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
93	30	108	115	3,255	548	106,220	21,000	RELATED TO NO. 91					
94	30	3	12	78	37	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
95	30	52	84	1,571	432	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 11					
96	35	19	52	663	326	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-
97	30	151	3,576	4,541	-	RELATED TO NO. 99		-	-	-	-	-	-
98	60	32	44	1,908	407	41,752	7,000	6	-	-	-	-	-
99	20	144	2,252	2,873	1	69,383	5,343	1	-	-	-	-	-
100	30	45	28	1,354	175	20,826	3,500	RELATED TO NO. 98					
101	30	37	43	1,123	55	57,000	7,500	2	-	-	-	-	-
102	29	41	77	1,181	162	9,012	3,500	3	-	-	-	2	-
96*	60	11	74	650	495	37,832	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
152**	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
153**	29	41	77	1,181	162	9,012	3,500	3	-	-	-	2	-
MONTEREY													
1*	9	21	21	193	21	5,963	1,100	-	-	-	-	-	-
ORANGE													
1	30	7	71	208	26	16,460	3,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	30	3	61	91	17	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
3	30	45	67	1,348	390	29,420	3,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	30	-	-	-	-	14,960	2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	20	-	4	4	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-
7	30	11	64	324	127	12,960	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	30	9	54	258	62	13,530	2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	30	26	70	779	112	17,460	4,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	30	20	62	598	57	12,994	2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	30	-	8	8	-	10,351	2,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	30	-	-	-	-	12,960	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	30	19	46	579	38	10,956	2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	29	45	169	1,304	267	97,395	7,395	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE B-1
STATE CALIFORNIA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
ORANGE (CONTINUED)									
15	STOTLER	MIDDLETON	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	07/11/2005	30	0	30
16	STOTLER	RACKAUCKAS	CONSPIRACY	WC,ED	D	07/14/2005	30	0	30
17	STOTLER	RACKAUCKAS	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	07/15/2005	30	0	30
18	CONLEY	MIDDLETON	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	07/29/2005	30	0	30
19	STOTLER	MIDDLETON	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	07/29/2005	30	0	30
20	CONLEY	MIDDLETON	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	08/15/2005	30	0	30
21	CONLEY	RACKAUCKAS	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	08/15/2005	30	0	30
22	STOTLER	MIDDLETON	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	08/26/2005	30	0	30
23	STOTLER	MIDDLETON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/14/2005	30	0	30
24	STOTLER	MIDDLETON	MURDER	WC	D	09/16/2005	30	0	30
25	STOTLER	MIDDLETON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/23/2005	30	0	30
26	STOTLER	MIDDLETON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/04/2005	30	0	30
27	STOTLER	RACKAUCKAS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/12/2005	30	0	30
28	STOTLER	MIDDLETON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/13/2005	30	0	30
29	STOTLER	MIDDLETON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/20/2005	30	0	30
30	STOTLER	MIDDLETON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/27/2005	30	0	30
31	STOTLER	MIDDLETON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/09/2005	30	0	30
32	STOTLER	MIDDLETON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/18/2005	30	0	30
21*	PAER	RACKAUCKAS	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	02/25/2004	30	0	30
PLACER									
1	GARBOLINO	FENOCCHIO	MURDER	WS,WC	H,D	02/18/2005	30	0	30
2	GARBOLINO	FENOCCHIO	MURDER	WS,WC	H,D	03/04/2005	30	0	30
RIVERSIDE									
1	MAGERS	TRASK	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/17/2004	30	3	120
2	MAGERS	TRASK	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/16/2004	30	1	60
3	MORGAN	TRASK	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/04/2005	30	1	60
4	MORGAN	TRASK	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/15/2005	30	1	60
5	MORGAN	TRASK	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/06/2005	30	3	120
6	MORGAN	TRASK	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/29/2005	30	2	90
7	MORGAN	TRASK	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/22/2005	30	0	30
8	MORGAN	TRASK	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/13/2005	30	1	60
9	MORGAN	TRASK	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/16/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE CALIFORNIA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
										Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			
A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	G	D	P	Persons Convicted
ORANGE (CONTINUED)													
15	30	11	57	335	123	12,903	5,200	-	-	-	-	-	
16	12	149	113	1,793	11	11,678	2,531	1	-	-	-	-	-
17	28	47	68	1,305	166	13,096	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	30	9	47	278	79	10,790	2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
19	29	55	182	1,593	192	95,515	5,515	-	-	-	-	-	-
20	30	9	47	278	79	10,190	2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
21	23	-	-	-	-	9,936	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
22	29	64	207	1,861	217	178,015	7,015	-	-	-	-	-	-
23	30	31	74	939	205	16,697	7,200	-	-	-	-	-	-
24	23	84	236	1,935	25	18,750	4,750	-	-	-	-	-	-
25	29	70	199	2,028	270	166,850	6,350	-	-	-	-	-	-
26	NI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
27	30	75	372	2,244	219	18,933	1,557	2	-	-	-	-	-
28	30	25	73	744	202	18,029	4,600	-	-	-	-	-	-
29	29	61	211	1,778	198	130,150	4,150	-	-	-	-	-	-
30	30	2	9	60	28	15,846	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
31	30	27	51	810	170	19,010	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
32	30	77	236	2,300	180	139,950	3,950	-	-	-	-	-	-
21*	20	4	10	78	24	13,700	2,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
PLACER													
1	27	29	34	771	97	14,227	4,377	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	19	9	10	178	9	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
RIVERSIDE													
1	120	45	126	5,349	702	270,309	149,000	1	-	-	1	-	1
2	60	15	32	905	182	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	60	81	542	4,874	648	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
4	60	123	74	7,402	689	53,750	5,750	7	-	-	-	-	-
5	120	86	137	10,350	1,315	136,044	31,980	5	-	-	-	-	-
6	90	20	193	1,786	552	67,731	-	4	-	-	-	-	-
7	26	5	112	126	26	39,832	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
8	60	92	60	5,516	1,156	181,758	45,400	8	-	-	-	-	-
9	27	19	52	524	236	19,916	-	1	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE B-1
STATE CALIFORNIA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
RIVERSIDE (CONTINUED)									
10	MORGAN	TRASK	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/07/2005	30	0	30
11	MORGAN	TRASK	MURDER	WC	D	10/25/2005	30	0	30
12	MAGERS	TRASK	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/17/2005	30	0	30
SACRAMENTO									
1*	PARK	SCULLY	NARCOTICS	WS,WC	H,D	06/09/2004	30	0	30
2*	PARK	SCULLY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/01/2004	30	0	30
3*	SAPUNOR	SCULLY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/08/2004	30	0	30
4*	PARK	SCULLY	MURDER	WC	D	08/18/2004	30	0	30
5*	PARK	SCULLY	NARCOTICS	WS,WC	H,D	09/27/2004	30	0	30
6*	SAPUNOR	SCULLY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/08/2004	30	0	30
SAN BERNARDINO									
1	NAKATA	RAMOS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/31/2005	30	0	30
2	MCPETERS	RAMOS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/02/2005	30	0	30
3	MCPETERS	RAMOS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/04/2005	30	0	30
4	MCPETERS	RAMOS	NARCOTICS	WS,WC	H,D	03/16/2005	30	1	60
5	MCPETERS	RAMOS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/29/2005	30	0	30
6	MCPETERS	RAMOS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/08/2005	30	0	30
7	MCPETERS	RAMOS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/11/2005	30	0	30
8	MCPETERS	RAMOS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/20/2005	30	0	30
9	MCPETERS	RAMOS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/06/2005	30	0	30
10	MCPETERS	RAMOS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/13/2005	30	1	60
11	MCPETERS	RAMOS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/03/2005	30	0	30
12	MCPETERS	RAMOS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/10/2005	30	0	30
13	MCPETERS	RAMOS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/24/2005	30	0	30
14	MCPETERS	RAMOS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/08/2005	30	0	30
15	BARR	RAMOS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/21/2005	30	0	30
16	MCPETERS	RAMOS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/09/2005	30	0	30
17	MCPETERS	RAMOS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/10/2005	30	0	30
18	MCPETERS	RAMOS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/07/2005	30	0	30
SAN DIEGO									
1	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/27/2004	30	1	60
2	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/06/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE CALIFORNIA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
										Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			
A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	G	D	P	Persons Convicted
RIVERSIDE (CONTINUED)													
10	30	4	19	112	11	20,933	3,557	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	29	32	98	920	138	24,000	9,000	3	-	-	-	-	-
12	30	6	44	176	15	19,644	2,490	-	-	-	-	-	-
SACRAMENTO													
1*	30	18	82	534	75	155,800	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
2*	30	39	82	1,182	229	RELATED TO NO. 1*		11	-	-	-	-	11
3*	30	272	82	8,152	730	RELATED TO NO. 1*		-	-	-	-	-	-
4*	14	40	120	567	40	41,287	9,000	2	-	-	-	-	2
5*	30	70	204	2,090	274	73,710	4,600	-	-	-	-	-	-
6*	19	23	219	432	63	21,774	1,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAN BERNARDINO													
1	30	46	242	1,392	226	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
2	27	9	31	234	36	9,500	1,500	4	-	-	-	-	-
3	30	9	5	260	38	18,800	2,000	2	-	-	-	-	-
4	60	39	222	2,367	382	46,362	8,362	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	30	40	141	1,214	258	48,600	3,600	2	-	-	-	-	2
6	30	28	135	851	262	RELATED TO NO. 5		1	-	-	-	-	1
7	28	5	39	147	31	15,000	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	20	6	3	118	18	54,848	5,600	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	30	2	2	65	6	17,416	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	60	44	165	2,657	451	46,362	8,362	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	30	34	52	1,017	62	23,181	4,181	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	29	66	26	1,923	337	20,300	3,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	30	2	19	59	13	18,000	1,200	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	30	42	28	1,260	273	19,800	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	30	2	19	58	8	17,695	6,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	30	83	242	2,494	119	8,776	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	30	32	66	963	13	19,416	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	16	46	77	734	118	5,560	3,000	5	-	-	-	-	-
SAN DIEGO													
1	60	126	75	7,577	491	239,024	18,525	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	14	164	75	2,301	368	14,100	3,600	12	-	-	6	-	5

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
SAN DIEGO (CONTINUED)									
3	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	CONSPIRACY	WC	D	01/06/2005	30	0	30
4	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/21/2005	30	0	30
5	SO	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/28/2005	30	1	60
6	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/02/2005	30	0	30
7	WELLINGTON	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/07/2005	30	0	30
8	WELLINGTON	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/07/2005	30	0	30
9	WELLINGTON	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/07/2005	30	0	30
10	WELLINGTON	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/08/2005	30	7	240
11	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/14/2005	30	1	54
12	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/15/2005	30	3	120
13	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/21/2005	30	1	60
14	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/06/2005	30	0	30
15	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/07/2005	30	1	43
16	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/07/2005	30	1	60
17	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/12/2005	30	2	79
18	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/13/2005	30	0	30
19	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/18/2005	30	0	30
20	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/20/2005	30	1	41
21	ONEILL	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/21/2005	30	0	30
22	SO	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/25/2005	30	2	72
23	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/11/2005	30	1	60
24	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/11/2005	30	0	30
25	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/12/2005	30	0	30
26	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/23/2005	30	1	60
27	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/25/2005	30	2	90
28	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/27/2005	30	0	30
29	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/02/2005	30	0	30
30	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/02/2005	30	0	30
31	SO	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/10/2005	30	3	120
32	SO	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/10/2005	30	0	30
33	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/10/2005	30	0	30
34	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/20/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE CALIFORNIA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
										Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			
A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	G	D	P	Persons Convicted
SAN DIEGO (CONTINUED)													
3	30	28	36	841	250	87,958	4,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	29	152	46	4,410	560	84,298	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	60	106	409	6,380	2,961	59,351	2,525	19	-	-	1	-	19
6	18	74	66	1,326	59	71,000	3,800	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	30	62	286	1,848	394	29,788	9,800	18	-	-	-	2	6
9	1	-	-	-	-	3,932	3,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	227	80	93	18,117	1,937	104,564	6,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	54	NR	NR	NR	NR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	107	61	147	6,489	2,797	66,909	6,945	18	-	-	2	-	6
13	60	110	220	6,627	1,467	51,944	2,965	7	-	-	-	-	7
14	13	25	6	319	19	10,712	100	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	43	91	362	3,930	2,632	64,174	7,060	19	-	-	-	-	19
16	57	44	17	2,534	754	28,142	3,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	79	69	251	5,414	1,830	91,168	15,400	18	-	-	2	-	13
18	30	32	28	947	69	24,489	24,489	4	-	-	-	-	4
19	18	1	8	14	1	5,950	2,000	4	-	-	-	-	2
20	41	195	290	8,003	1,386	33,469	33,469	-	-	-	-	-	-
21	30	46	605	1,375	181	RELATED TO NO. 19		RELATED TO NO. 19					
22	72	18	131	1,265	410	42,685	2,125	-	-	-	-	-	-
23	50	105	123	5,266	2,184	69,214	9,250	-	-	-	-	-	-
24	30	149	87	4,469	1,975	16,460	3,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
25	7	66	53	460	235	6,200	1,000	4	-	-	-	-	2
26	30	112	71	3,355	247	RELATED TO NO. 34		RELATED TO NO. 34					
27	87	10	25	889	132	42,084	4,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
28	3	76	42	228	20	2,448	2,448	2	-	-	-	-	2
29	30	32	20	974	271	32,351	7,000	19	-	-	-	-	19
30	18	63	140	1,137	170	16,843	2,150	4	-	-	-	-	2
31	95	53	51	5,023	504	45,540	4,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
32	26	6	19	144	16	14,732	3,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
33	20	-	-	-	-	3,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
34	29	605	325	17,534	2,297	98,500	17,885	1	-	-	-	-	1

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
SAN DIEGO (CONTINUED)									
35	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/06/2005	30	1	60
36	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/06/2005	30	0	30
37	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/11/2005	30	0	30
38	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/21/2005	30	1	60
39	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/21/2005	30	0	30
40	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/29/2005	30	0	30
41	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/29/2005	30	0	30
42	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/02/2005	30	0	30
43	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/08/2005	30	0	30
44	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/23/2005	30	1	60
45	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/23/2005	30	0	30
46	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/12/2005	30	0	30
47	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/14/2005	30	1	60
48	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/19/2005	30	0	30
49	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/19/2005	30	0	30
50	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/19/2005	30	0	30
51	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/26/2005	30	1	60
52	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/29/2005	30	0	30
53	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/30/2005	30	1	60
54	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/14/2005	30	0	30
55	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/18/2005	30	0	30
56	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/24/2005	30	0	30
57	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/27/2005	30	1	60
58	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/07/2005	30	0	30
59	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/10/2005	30	0	30
60	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/10/2005	30	0	30
61	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/17/2005	30	0	30
62	DEDDEH	DUMANIS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/21/2005	30	0	30
SANTA BARBARA									
1	ANDERSON	SNEDDON	MURDER	WS,WC	H,D	12/23/2004	30	0	30
2	ANDERSON	SNEDDON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/22/2005	30	2	90
3	ANDERSON	SNEDDON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/25/2005	24	0	24

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE CALIFORNIA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
SAN DIEGO (CONTINUED)													
35	14	4	4	60	-	RELATED TO NO. 34		RELATED TO NO. 34					
36	30	13	87	381	25	8,980	3,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
37	10	17	31	171	10	8,518	500	7	-	-	-	-	5
38	60	39	72	2,313	527	81,097	17,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
39	28	25	95	690	338	RELATED TO NO. 37		RELATED TO NO. 37					
40	28	12	22	343	175	15,596	3,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
41	28	1	26	34	26	RELATED TO NO. 40		-	-	-	-	-	-
42	16	16	64	248	156	RELATED TO NO. 37		RELATED TO NO. 37					
43	17	12	75	200	101	21,649	7,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
44	59	131	94	7,722	3,929	28,988	3,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
45	15	18	26	263	108	9,980	3,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
46	30	21	75	634	44	50,410	12,665	-	-	-	-	-	-
47	60	28	47	1,654	145	25,888	6,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
48	30	30	9	904	52	16,460	3,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
49	8	31	22	249	55	6,956	3,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
50	30	13	12	383	53	RELATED TO NO. 48		-	-	-	-	-	-
51	60	88	32	5,284	599	28,888	9,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
52	26	30	50	769	55	11,862	1,250	-	-	-	-	-	-
53	42	207	40	8,686	1,139	41,645	3,900	-	-	-	-	-	-
54	26	8	7	196	94	RELATED TO NO. 32		-	-	-	-	-	-
55	24	63	128	1,515	158	51,291	10,755	-	-	-	-	-	-
56	16	68	94	1,086	523	10,412	3,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
57	55	195	50	10,742	1,561	46,279	10,945	-	-	-	-	-	-
58	30	8	24	242	85	RELATED TO NO. 48		-	-	-	-	-	-
59	30	32	16	950	-	15,644	6,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
60	30	29	125	856	97	44,280	10,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
61	30	41	44	1,219	11	16,511	3,585	-	-	-	-	-	-
62	30	81	93	2,436	216	40,950	7,170	-	-	-	-	-	-
SANTA BARBARA													
1	26	52	717	1,359	155	107,686	23,007	3	-	-	-	-	-
2	90	32	2,105	2,925	458	99,290	10,290	4	-	-	-	-	4
3	24	62	64	1,494	600	50,750	6,500	8	-	-	-	-	3

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE B-1
STATE CALIFORNIA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
SANTA BARBARA (CONTINUED)									
1*	CLIFFORD	SNEDDON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/29/2003	30	3	120
2*	CLIFFORD	SNEDDON	NARCOTICS	WS	H	05/19/2004	30	0	30
STANISLAUS									
1*	LADINE	MANGAR	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/24/2004	30	0	30
2*	BEAUCHESNE	GOOLD	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/26/2004	30	1	60
3*	LADINE	MANGAR	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/06/2004	30	0	30
4*	LADINE	MANGAR	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/25/2004	30	0	30
5*	LADINE	MANGAR	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/15/2004	30	0	30
6*	BEAUCHESNE	BRAZELTON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/15/2004	30	0	30
VENTURA									
1*	CLARK	TOTTEN	MURDER	WS,WC	H,D	04/27/2004	30	0	30
2*	CLARK	TOTTEN	MURDER	ED	D	05/05/2004	30	0	30
3*	CLARK	TOTTEN	MURDER	WS,WC	H,D	05/08/2004	30	0	30
4*	CLARK	TOTTEN	MURDER	WS,WC	H,D	10/15/2004	30	0	30
5*	CLARK	TOTTEN	MURDER	WC	D	10/21/2004	30	0	30
6*	CLARK	TOTTEN	NARCOTICS	WS,WC	H,D	10/28/2004	30	0	30
7*	CLARK	TOTTEN	NARCOTICS	WS,WC	H,D	11/02/2004	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE CALIFORNIA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
										Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			
A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	G	D	P	Persons Convicted
SANTA BARBARA (CONTINUED)													
1*	119	43	815	5,114	266	134,720	20,480	20	-	-	-	-	14
2*	30	1	60	17	17	20,360	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
STANISLAUS													
1*	4	21	25	85	11	5,500	2,500	18	-	-	-	-	-
2*	57	31	230	1,775	520	92,500	12,500	RELATED TO NO. 1*					
3*	10	62	55	615	241	RELATED TO NO. 2*		RELATED TO NO. 1*					
4*	27	49	171	1,334	441	RELATED TO NO. 2*		RELATED TO NO. 1*					
5*	19	12	57	237	61	RELATED TO NO. 2*		RELATED TO NO. 1*					
6*	29	33	NR	966	211	15,676	475	-	-	-	-	-	-
VENTURA													
1*	27	163	175	4,400	50	43,464	8,500	1	-	-	-	-	-
2*	14	314	175	4,400	50	RELATED TO NO. 1*		RELATED TO NO. 1*					
3*	17	259	175	4,400	50	RELATED TO NO. 1*		RELATED TO NO. 1*					
4*	12	101	NR	1,211	NR	56,600	10,000	1	-	-	-	-	-
5*	5	39	NR	195	NR	RELATED TO NO. 4*		RELATED TO NO. 4*					
6*	9	NR	NR	NR	NR	22,000	10,000	4	-	-	-	-	-
7*	5	NR	NR	NR	NR	RELATED TO NO. 6*		RELATED TO NO. 6*					

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE B-1
STATE COLORADO

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
2ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT (DENVER)									
1	BAYLESS	MORRISSEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/25/2005	30	0	30
4TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (EL PASO)									
1	MARTINEZ	NEWSOME	MURDER	WS,WC	H,D	05/03/2005	30	0	30
2	CISNEROS	NEWSOME	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/29/2005	30	1	60
3	CISNEROS	NEWSOME	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/30/2005	30	0	30
4	MARTINEZ	NEWSOME	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/15/2005	30	0	30
5	CISNEROS	NEWSOME	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/15/2005	30	0	30
6	MARTINEZ	NEWSOME	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/15/2005	30	1	60
7	CISNEROS	NEWSOME	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/16/2005	30	0	30
8	CISNEROS	NEWSOME	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/11/2005	30	0	30
9	CISNEROS	NEWSOME	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/11/2005	30	0	30
10	MARTINEZ	NEWSOME	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/21/2005	30	0	30
11	HUGHES	NEWSOME	KIDNAPPING	WC	D	11/27/2005	1	0	1

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE COLORADO

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			Persons Convicted
										G	D	P	
2ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT (DENVER)													
1	30	155	55	4,662	142	9,700	3,700	-	-	-	-	-	-
4TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (EL PASO)													
1	30	54	48	1,624	62	29,820	3,900	1	-	-	-	-	-
2	48	30	206	1,416	189	93,444	5,500	8	-	-	-	-	-
3	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	30	46	100	1,393	278	57,740	2,750	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	60	46	78	2,747	602	52,784	5,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	30	40	100	1,212	310	57,490	2,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	30	78	231	2,329	455	RELATED TO NO. 5		-	-	-	-	-	-
10	22	18	31	403	104	26,050	4,750	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	1	84	12	84	35	4,215	3,500	3	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE B-1

STATE CONNECTICUT

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
ANSONIA-MILFORD									
1*	MULLARKEY	GALVIN	RACKETEERING	WC	D	11/23/2004	15	0	15
NEW HAVEN									
1	MULLARKEY	DEARINGTON	RACKETEERING	WC	D	05/19/2005	15	0	15
2	MULLARKEY	DEARINGTON	RACKETEERING	WC	D	05/19/2005	15	0	15
3	MULLARKEY	DEARINGTON	RACKETEERING	WC	D	05/19/2005	15	0	15
NEW LONDON									
1	CORRADINO	KANE	CORRUPTION	WC	D	02/25/2005	15	1	30
2	CORRADINO	KANE	CORRUPTION	WS	A	03/16/2005	15	0	15
3	CORRADINO	KANE	CORRUPTION	WS	A	03/16/2005	15	0	15
4	MULLARKEY	KANE	CORRUPTION	WS	H	03/29/2005	15	0	15
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL									
1	SOLOMON	MORANO	RACKETEERING	WC	D	11/18/2005	15	0	15
2	SOLOMON	MORANO	RACKETEERING	WC	D	11/18/2005	15	0	15
3	SOLOMON	MORANO	RACKETEERING	WC	D	11/18/2005	15	0	15
4	SOLOMON	MORANO	RACKETEERING	WS	H	11/18/2005	15	0	15
WATERBURY									
1	SOLOMON	CONNELLY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/19/2005	15	1	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)

[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).

[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE CONNECTICUT

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			Persons Convicted
										G	D	P	
ANSONIA-MILFORD													
1*	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NEW HAVEN													
1	15	18	40	265	82	10,968	3,000	3	-	-	-	-	-
2	15	5	13	81	63	9,103	1,135	RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	15	4	27	66	1	8,324	356	RELATED TO NO. 1					
NEW LONDON													
1	30	22	23	664	644	60,021	3,070	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	15	2	5	36	36	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
3	15	-	-	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
4	8	3	16	25	3	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL													
1	NI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	15	11	NR	171	1	22,153	6,225	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	NI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	15	16	NR	244	NR	5,647	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
WATERBURY													
1	28	43	214	1,212	158	96,519	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE B-1
STATE FLORIDA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
4TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (DUVAL)									
1	STETSON	SHORSTEIN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/04/2004	30	1	60
2	STETSON	SHORSTEIN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/04/2004	30	1	60
3	STETSON	SHORSTEIN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/20/2004	30	2	90
4	SCHIEMER	SHORSTEIN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/10/2005	30	0	30
5	SCHIEMER	SHORSTEIN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/17/2005	30	0	30
6	SCHIEMER	SHORSTEIN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/17/2005	30	0	30
7	SCHIEMER	SHORSTEIN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/17/2005	30	0	30
8	SOUD	SHORSTEIN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/11/2005	30	1	60
9	SOUD	SHORSTEIN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/11/2005	30	0	30
10	SOUD	SHORSTEIN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/08/2005	30	1	60
11	SOUD	SHORSTEIN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/08/2005	30	1	60
12	SOUD	SHORSTEIN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/08/2005	30	1	60
13	SOUD	SHORSTEIN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/08/2005	30	1	60
14	SOUD	SHORSTEIN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/08/2005	30	1	60
15	SOUD	SHORSTEIN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/08/2005	30	1	60
16	SOUD	SHORSTEIN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/19/2005	30	0	30
17	SOUD	SHORSTEIN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/19/2005	30	0	30
15*	STETSON	SHORSTEIN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/02/2004	30	0	30
5TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (LAKE/MARION)									
1	SINGBUSH	KING	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/21/2005	30	0	30
9TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (ORANGE/OSCEOLA)									
1	LAWSON	LAMAR	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/27/2005	30	0	30
2	O'KANE	LAMAR	NARCOTICS	WS,WC,EO	H,D	07/19/2005	30	1	60
13TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (HILLSBOROUGH)									
1	LEVENS	OBER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/17/2005	30	0	30
2	BARBAS	OBER	RACKETEERING	WC	D	07/30/2005	30	0	30
3	BARBAS	OBER	RACKETEERING	WC	D	07/30/2005	30	0	30
4	BLACK	OBER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/02/2005	30	1	60
5	BARBAS	OBER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/12/2005	30	1	39
6	BLACK	OBER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/30/2005	30	0	30
7	BARBAS	OBER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/08/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE FLORIDA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
4TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (DUVAL)													
1	60	12	110	724	16	23,850	4,300	5	-	-	-	-	-
2	60	212	461	12,705	212	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	71	187	187	13,255	881	42,752	7,185	20	-	-	-	-	-
4	30	589	489	17,662	11,23	RELATED TO NO. 3		RELATED TO NO. 3					
5	30	204	330	6,127	308	RELATED TO NO. 3		RELATED TO NO. 3					
6	30	39	82	1,167	70	RELATED TO NO. 3		RELATED TO NO. 3					
7	30	26	60	795	157	RELATED TO NO. 3		RELATED TO NO. 3					
8	30	100	100	3,011	179	24,000	9,000	27	-	-	-	-	-
9	26	127	200	3,310	300	RELATED TO NO. 8		RELATED TO NO. 8					
10	49	202	600	9,890	300	RELATED TO NO. 8		RELATED TO NO. 8					
11	49	91	75	4,466	350	RELATED TO NO. 8		RELATED TO NO. 8					
12	49	77	75	3,793	300	RELATED TO NO. 8		RELATED TO NO. 8					
13	48	6	20	311	57	RELATED TO NO. 8		RELATED TO NO. 8					
14	49	19	30	913	63	RELATED TO NO. 8		RELATED TO NO. 8					
15	49	9	19	460	42	RELATED TO NO. 8		RELATED TO NO. 8					
16	8	66	39	525	63	RELATED TO NO. 8		RELATED TO NO. 8					
17	8	10	9	77	4	RELATED TO NO. 8		RELATED TO NO. 8					
15*	4	21	20	83	5	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
5TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (LAKE/MARION)													
1	18	309	331	5,559	401	43,000	7,000	12	-	-	-	-	-
9TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (ORANGE/OSCEOLA)													
1	17	64	1	1,087	50	34,718	9,167	25	-	-	-	-	1
2	58	98	1,887	5,693	489	105,000	15,000	10	-	-	-	1	-
13TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (HILLSBOROUGH)													
1	29	73	51	2,130	120	66,996	4,500	1	-	-	-	-	-
2	30	128	5	3,855	201	82,987	9,075	12	-	-	-	-	-
3	30	119	5	3,574	147	RELATED TO NO. 2		RELATED TO NO. 2					
4	58	89	26	5,162	261	154,619	11,375	16	-	-	-	-	-
5	39	57	13	2,221	41	168,669	13,669	11	-	-	-	-	-
6	30	73	26	2,185	107	RELATED TO NO. 4		RELATED TO NO. 4					
7	23	121	25	2,772	191	RELATED TO NO. 5		RELATED TO NO. 5					

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
13TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (HILLSBOROUGH) (CONTINUED)									
8	BARBAS	OBER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/08/2005	30	0	30
9	BARBAS	OBER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/20/2005	30	0	30
17TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (BROWARD)									
1	GREENE	SATZ	GAMBLING	WC	D	12/09/2004	30	1	60
2	GREENE	SATZ	GAMBLING	WC	D	02/28/2005	30	0	30
3	GREENE	SATZ	THEFT	WC	D	03/24/2005	30	1	60
4	GREENE	SATZ	THEFT	WC	D	04/20/2005	30	0	30
5	GREENE	SATZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/29/2005	30	2	90
6	GREENE	SATZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/13/2005	30	0	30
7	LYNCH	SATZ	GAMBLING	WC	D	07/14/2005	30	0	30
8	GREENE	SATZ	GAMBLING	WC	D	08/15/2005	30	1	60
19TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (SAINT LUCIE)									
1	LEVIN	COLTON	MURDER	WC	D	12/08/2004	30	0	30
2	LEVIN	COLTON	MURDER	WC	D	12/21/2004	30	0	30
3	LEVIN	COLTON	MURDER	WC	D	05/27/2005	30	0	30
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL									
1	MATHIS	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/23/2004	30	1	60
2	MATHIS	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/23/2004	30	1	60
3	LAWSON	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/11/2005	30	1	60
4	LAWSON	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/01/2005	30	0	30
5	WRIGHT	SIMS	MURDER	WS,WC	H,D	04/11/2005	30	0	30
6	WEATHERBY	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/18/2005	30	0	30
7	LAWSON	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/31/2005	30	0	30
8	TURNER	LEE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/23/2005	30	0	30
9	LESTER	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/06/2005	30	1	60
10	TURNER	LEE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/11/2005	30	0	30
11	LESTER	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/13/2005	30	0	30
12	MCINTOSH	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/28/2005	30	1	60
13	MCINTOSH	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/28/2005	30	0	30
14	TURNER	LEE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/01/2005	30	0	30
15	WEATHERBY	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/03/2005	30	3	120
16	WEATHERBY	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/03/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE FLORIDA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
13TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (HILLSBOROUGH) (CONTINUED)													
8	28	89	26	2,484	52	RELATED TO NO. 5		RELATED TO NO. 5					
9	8	36	8	286	24	RELATED TO NO. 5		RELATED TO NO. 5					
17TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (BROWARD)													
1	59	27	129	1,566	147	159,000	9,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	9	20	43	183	30	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
3	60	181	601	10,886	1,858	159,000	9,000	18	-	-	-	-	1
4	30	71	208	2,134	438	RELATED TO NO. 3		-	-	-	-	-	-
5	64	62	107	3,960	724	65,170	18,170	11	-	-	-	-	-
6	18	16	34	282	28	RELATED TO NO. 5		-	-	-	-	-	-
7	30	52	759	1,567	334	149,000	9,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	54	32	93	1,739	521	RELATED TO NO. 7		-	-	-	-	-	-
19TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (SAINT LUCIE)													
1	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	14	146	120	2,044	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL													
1	51	48	32	2,430	824	82,500	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	59	80	126	4,725	106	85,000	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	50	64	3	3,183	169	30,990	500	3	-	-	-	-	2
4	25	29	10	715	213	RELATED TO NO. 3		10	-	-	-	-	7
5	24	84	90	2,008	48	52,000	20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	15	127	18	1,905	179	33,000	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	15	35	1	520	7	23,534	3,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	30	110	33	3,304	1,194	54,166	4,500	6	-	-	-	-	-
9	58	298	400	17,281	2,012	243,000	14,500	6	-	-	-	-	-
10	14	24	14	342	59	45,520	3,500	RELATED TO NO. 8					
11	30	502	400	15,063	3,614	RELATED TO NO. 9		RELATED TO NO. 9					
12	60	83	100	4,986	269	RELATED TO NO. 9		3	-	-	-	-	-
13	30	95	100	2,850	122	RELATED TO NO. 9		RELATED TO NO. 9					
14	30	34	10	1,027	142	38,020	2,500	RELATED TO NO. 8					
15	110	103	2,576	11,367	392	283,000	78,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	30	62	133	1,873	201	RELATED TO NO. 15		-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL (CONTINUED)									
17	WEATHERBY	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/03/2005	30	0	30
18	LESTER	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/05/2005	30	0	30
19	WEATHERBY	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/12/2005	30	0	30
20	LESTER	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/19/2005	30	0	30
21	TURNER	LEE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/23/2005	30	1	60
22	WEATHERBY	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/26/2005	30	2	90
23	WEATHERBY	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/26/2005	30	1	60
24	LESTER	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/02/2005	30	1	60
25	LESTER	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/02/2005	30	0	30
26	TRAYNOR	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/26/2005	30	0	30
27	LESTER	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/30/2005	30	0	30
28	LESTER	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/30/2005	30	0	30
29	TRAYNOR	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/05/2005	30	0	30
30	WEATHERBY	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/13/2005	30	0	30
31	TURNER	LEE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/19/2005	30	1	60
32	TURNER	LEE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/03/2005	30	0	30
25*	MATHIS	WILLIAMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/23/2004	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE FLORIDA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL (CONTINUED)													
17	30	77	89	2,299	98	RELATED TO NO. 15		-	-	-	-	-	-
18	28	151	400	4,239	860	RELATED TO NO. 9		RELATED TO NO. 9					
19	17	-	1	7	-	RELATED TO NO. 15		-	-	-	-	-	-
20	30	151	193	4,538	1,10	RELATED TO NO. 9		5	-	-	-	-	-
21	60	36	21	2,149	211	98,310	10,500	RELATED TO NO. 8					
22	90	51	158	4,552	318	RELATED TO NO. 15		-	-	-	-	-	-
23	59	93	152	5,479	283	RELATED TO NO. 15		-	-	-	-	-	-
24	54	27	48	1,447	50	RELATED TO NO. 9		2	-	-	-	-	-
25	29	135	200	3,922	316	RELATED TO NO. 9		3	-	-	-	-	-
26	28	88	21	2,459	79	78,364	20,927	15	-	-	-	-	1
27	15	267	247	3,999	303	RELATED TO NO. 9		RELATED TO NO. 9					
28	26	22	13	580	37	RELATED TO NO. 9		RELATED TO NO. 9					
29	19	79	10	1,508	196	RELATED TO NO. 26		RELATED TO NO. 26					
30	27	43	96	1,159	69	RELATED TO NO. 15		-	-	-	-	-	-
31	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
32	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
25*	29	42	40	1,207	25	55,000	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE B-1
STATE GEORGIA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
AUGUSTA									
1	BROWN	CRAIG	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/10/2005	30	0	30
BIBB									
1	CHRISTIAN	SIMMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/12/2005	30	0	30
2	CHRISTIAN	SIMMS	NARCOTICS	WS	H	10/26/2005	30	0	30
3	CHRISTIAN	SIMMS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/26/2005	30	0	30
FULTON									
1	BARNES	HOWARD	MURDER	WS,WC	H,D	03/10/2005	30	0	30
2	BROADON	HOWARD	MURDER	WS,WC	H,D	04/14/2005	30	0	30
GWINNETT									
1	HUTCHINSON	PORTER	NARCOTICS	WS,WC	H,D	01/20/2005	30	0	30
2	HAMIL	PORTER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/25/2005	30	0	30
3	HAMIL	PORTER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/09/2005	30	0	30
4	HAMIL	PORTER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/18/2005	30	0	30
5	HAMIL	PORTER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/02/2005	30	0	30
6	TURNER	PORTER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/08/2005	30	0	30
7	TURNER	PORTER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/22/2005	30	0	30
HOUSTON									
1	LUKEMIRE	LUMSDEN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/16/2005	20	0	20
2	LUKEMIRE	LUMSDEN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/03/2005	30	0	30
3	LUKEMIRE	LUMSDEN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/08/2005	30	0	30
4	NUNN	BURKE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/06/2005	30	0	30
5	NUNN	LUMSDEN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/20/2005	30	0	30
6	LUKEMIRE	LUMSDEN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/09/2005	30	0	30
7	LUKEMIRE	LUMSDEN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/13/2005	30	0	30
8	LUKEMIRE	LUMSDEN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/01/2005	30	0	30
9	LUKEMIRE	LUMSDEN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/01/2005	30	0	30
10	LUKEMIRE	BURKE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/31/2005	30	0	30
11	NUNN	BURKE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/16/2005	30	0	30
12	NUNN	BURKE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/29/2005	30	0	30
13	NUNN	BURKE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/29/2005	30	0	30
14	LUKEMIRE	BURKE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/05/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE GEORGIA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			Persons Convicted
										G	D	P	
AUGUSTA													
1	20	156	67	3,129	176	21,100	3,500	8	-	-	-	-	-
BIBB													
1	27	82	50	2,226	465	22,000	2,000	37	-	-	-	-	-
2	24	124	25	2,973	152	12,500	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
3		25	83	20	2,078	531	9,500	2,000	10	-	-	-	-
FULTON													
1	NI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	11	118	134	1,294	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
GWINNETT													
1	20	101	245	2,028	230	239,000	42,000	12	1	-	1	11	1
2	20	32	43	641	65	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	14	56	81	788	41	RELATED TO NO. 1		4	-	-	-	2	-
4	20	29	70	571	58	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
5	8	40	15	318	-	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
6	25	65	148	1,622	185	RELATED TO NO. 1		11	-	-	-	-	-
7	11	3	10	29	1	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
HOUSTON													
1	20	17	20	340	115	57,000	7,000	29	-	1	5	-	6
2	16	28	20	446	209	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
3	11	45	10	500	233	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
4	25	50	25	1,253	272	16,700	1,700	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	14	71	15	989	143	RELATED TO NO. 4		-	-	-	-	-	-
6	8	56	15	447	137	25,340	1,340	1	-	-	-	-	1
7	5	3	NR	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	9	26	10	232	34	RELATED TO NO. 6		-	-	-	-	-	-
9	9	22	10	197	32	17,000	2,000	1	-	-	-	-	1
10	6	69	15	412	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	9	274	25	2,468	509	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	6	221	15	1,325	272	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	NI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	13	56	10	731	58	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE B-1
STATE ILLINOIS

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
CLARK									
1	RESCH	SIMONTON	NARCOTICS	WS	H	06/21/2005	30	0	30
DUPAGE									
1	KILANDER	BIRKETT	MURDER	WS,WC	H,D	08/25/2005	30	1	60
POPE									
1	LOWERY	PROCTOR	NARCOTICS	WS	H	04/14/2005	30	1	32

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE ILLINOIS

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			Persons Convicted
										G	D	P	
CLARK													
1	29	-	-	-	-	300	100	-	-	-	-	-	-
DUPAGE													
1	43	11	18	467	56	8,000	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
POPE													
1	32	-	1	4	4	1,167	15	2	1	-	-	-	1

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE B-1

STATE MARYLAND

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
BALTIMORE									
1	NORMAN	LEMANSKI	CONSPIRACY	WC	D	11/23/2004	30	1	60
2	NORMAN	LEMANSKI	CONSPIRACY	WC	D	12/07/2004	30	1	60
3	NORMAN	LEMANSKI	CONSPIRACY	OM	O	12/07/2004	30	0	30
4	NORMAN	LEMANSKI	CONSPIRACY	WC	D	12/21/2004	30	0	30
5	NORMAN	LEMANSKI	CONSPIRACY	WC	D	12/23/2004	30	0	30
BALTIMORE CITY									
1	CANNON	JESSAMY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/07/2005	30	0	30
2	PREVAS	JESSAMY	NARCOTICS	WS	H	10/17/2005	30	0	30
CECIL									
1	THOMPSON	EASTRIDGE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/29/2005	30	1	60
2	THOMPSON	EASTRIDGE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/09/2005	30	0	30
3	LIDUMS	EASTRIDGE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/28/2005	30	0	30
4	LIDUMS	EASTRIDGE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/28/2005	30	0	30
5	LIDUMS	EASTRIDGE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/08/2005	30	0	30
6	THOMPSON	EASTRIDGE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/17/2005	30	0	30
7	THOMPSON	EASTRIDGE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/20/2005	30	0	30
8	LIDUMS	EASTRIDGE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/03/2005	30	0	30
9	LIDUMS	EASTRIDGE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/08/2005	30	1	60
10	LIDUMS	EASTRIDGE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/22/2005	30	0	30
HARFORD									
1	MARSHALL	CASSILLY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/07/2005	30	0	30
2	MARSHALL	CASSILLY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/07/2005	30	0	30
3	MARSHALL	CASSILLY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/07/2005	30	0	30
4	MARSHALL	CASSILLY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/07/2005	30	0	30
5	MARSHALL	CASSILLY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/15/2005	30	0	30
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL									
1	TURNBULL	TRIMBLE	CONSPIRACY	WC	D	02/25/2005	20	0	20
2	TURNBULL	TRIMBLE	CONSPIRACY	WC	D	02/25/2005	20	0	20
3	DWYER	ROLLE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/28/2005	30	1	60
4	DWYER	ROLLE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/07/2005	30	0	30
5	DWYER	ROLLE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/30/2005	30	1	60
6	NORMAN	O'CONNOR	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/08/2005	30	1	60

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)

[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).

[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE MARYLAND

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
BALTIMORE													
1	53	105	543	5,574	1,531	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	35	71	178	2,469	268	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	23	54	159	1,233	268	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	19	16	74	307	113	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BALTIMORE CITY													
1	10	353	210	3,529	169	23,500	3,500	3	-	-	-	3	-
2	29	124	587	3,590	86	10,500	500	29	-	-	-	15	13
CECIL													
1	48	209	120	10,017	4,363	106,000	26,200	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	28	55	81	1,541	1,041	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
3	10	4	7	37	-	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
4	19	98	70	1,864	426	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
5	30	69	73	2,077	397	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
6	17	79	35	1,337	59	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
7	14	63	38	878	134	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
8	18	30	38	544	64	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
9	42	114	107	4,802	1,043	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
10	30	6	7	170	69	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
HARFORD													
1	21	61	61	1,275	142	293,733	25,400	20	-	-	1	-	13
2	21	22	42	468	300	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	21	10	43	212	26	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
4	21	-	4	5	1	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
5	14	3	5	42	34	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL													
1	20	28	70	556	78	107,500	1,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	20	33	104	661	80	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
3	60	83	35	4,970	380	112,000	6,400	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	13	70	25	908	159	30,400	4,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	60	69	17	4,134	217	113,400	7,800	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	53	34	163	1,791	569	444,494	3,500	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL (CONTINUED)									
7	NORMAN	O'CONNOR	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/04/2005	30	0	30
8	NORMAN	O'CONNOR	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/04/2005	30	0	30
9	NORMAN	O'CONNOR	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/04/2005	30	0	30
10	NORMAN	O'CONNOR	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/04/2005	30	0	30
11	DWYER	ROLLE	MURDER	WC	D	10/11/2005	30	0	30
12	NORMAN	O'CONNOR	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/11/2005	30	0	30
13	NORMAN	O'CONNOR	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/11/2005	30	0	30
14	NORMAN	O'CONNOR	NARCOTICS	WC	H	10/11/2005	30	0	30
15	NORMAN	O'CONNOR	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/11/2005	30	0	30
16	NORMAN	O'CONNOR	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/17/2005	30	0	30
17	NORMAN	O'CONNOR	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/17/2005	30	0	30
18	TURNBULL	O'CONNOR	MURDER	WC	D	10/28/2005	8	0	8
19	TURNBULL	O'CONNOR	MURDER	WC	D	10/28/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE MARYLAND

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL (CONTINUED)													
7	28	5	40	138	1	RELATED TO NO. 6		-	-	-	-	-	-
8	28	-	6	9	1	RELATED TO NO. 6		-	-	-	-	-	-
9	30	29	136	869	111	RELATED TO NO. 6		-	-	-	-	-	-
10	3	14	10	42	1	RELATED TO NO. 6		-	-	-	-	-	-
11	18	128	29	2,302	232	51,720	4,200	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	24	22	88	535	12	RELATED TO NO. 6		-	-	-	-	-	-
13	24	27	73	646	22	RELATED TO NO. 6		-	-	-	-	-	-
14	24	25	125	589	107	RELATED TO NO. 6		-	-	-	-	-	-
15	24	13	36	311	52	RELATED TO NO. 6		-	-	-	-	-	-
16	18	75	108	1,358	33	RELATED TO NO. 6		-	-	-	-	-	-
17	18	9	11	164	78	RELATED TO NO. 6		-	-	-	-	-	-
18	8	74	43	589	20	RELATED TO NO. 6		-	-	-	-	-	-
19	8	73	111	585	24	RELATED TO NO. 6		-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE B-1
STATE MASSACHUSETTS

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
HAMPDEN									
1*	CARHART	BENNETT	GAMBLING	WS	H	11/26/2004	15	1	30
HAMPSHIRE									
1	FORD	SCHEIBEL	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/13/2005	15	0	15
MIDDLESEX									
1	QUINLAN	COAKLEY	GAMBLING	WC	D	12/30/2004	15	1	30
2	QUINLAN	COAKLEY	GAMBLING	WS	H	01/14/2005	15	2	45
3	QUINLAN	COAKLEY	GAMBLING	WS	H	01/14/2005	15	1	30
4	QUINLAN	COAKLEY	GAMBLING	WS	B	01/27/2005	15	2	45
5	QUINLAN	COAKLEY	GAMBLING	WC	D	01/27/2005	15	1	30
6	QUINLAN	COAKLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/14/2005	15	0	15
7	QUINLAN	COAKLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/14/2005	15	1	30
8	QUINLAN	COAKLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/18/2005	15	1	30
9	QUINLAN	COAKLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/28/2005	15	0	15
10	QUINLAN	COAKLEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/28/2005	15	0	15

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE MASSACHUSETTS

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			Persons Convicted
										G	D	P	
HAMPDEN													
1*	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HAMPSHIRE													
1	15	17	25	260	234	45,600	600	16	-	-	-	-	-
MIDDLESEX													
1	30	19	8	558	52	139,611	17,204	1	-	-	-	-	-
2	39	103	40	4,007	1,475	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
3	22	29	25	628	242	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
4	37	74	60	2,750	1,252	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
5	21	34	30	721	30	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
6	15	17	25	252	18	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
7	30	73	70	2,194	310	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
8	30	110	15	3,287	316	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
9	13	11	20	143	35	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
10	12	57	15	689	36	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE B-1
STATE MINNESOTA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
HENNEPIN									
1	MABLEY	KLOBUCHAR	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/31/2005	30	1	60
2	MABLEY	KLOBUCHAR	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/15/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE MINNESOTA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			Persons Convicted
										G	D	P	
HENNEPIN													
1	30	165	458	4,961	1,160	44,800	7,800	10	-	-	-	-	2
2	28	56	139	1,561	568	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE B-1

STATE MISSISSIPPI

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
FORREST									
1	HELFRICH	WEATHERS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/11/2005	30	0	30
HINDS									
1	YERGER	MILES	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/03/2005	30	0	30
2	YERGER	MILES	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/05/2005	30	0	30
3	YERGER	MILES	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/16/2005	30	0	30
LAMAR									
1	EUBANKS	MCDONALD	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/28/2005	30	0	30
2	EUBANKS	MCDONALD	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/05/2005	30	0	30
LEFLORE									
1	SMITH	GORE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/10/2005	30	0	30
WASHINGTON									
1	SMITH	GORE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/11/2005	30	1	60

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)

[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).

[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE MISSISSIPPI

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
										Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			
A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	G	D	P	Persons Convicted
FORREST													
1	17	143	50	2,434	34	9,140	1,920	-	-	-	-	-	-
HINDS													
1	24	72	50	1,727	64	27,420	5,760	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	21	50	50	1,044	242	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
3	10	83	20	833	9	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
LAMAR													
1	30	45	50	1,362	60	28,800	7,200	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	10	2	1	20	-	9,140	1,920	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEFLORE													
1	17	67	20	1,143	131	9,140	1,920	-	-	-	-	-	-
WASHINGTON													
1	36	60	60	2,171	466	34,560	8,640	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEVADA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
CLARK									
1	BELL	ROGER	MURDER	WS,WC	H,B,D	04/25/2005	30	0	30
2	HARDCASTLE	ROGER	KIDNAPPING	WC	D	06/27/2005	1	0	1
ELKO									
1	MEMEO	WOODBURY	ROBBERY	WC	D	07/26/2005	3	0	3

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEVADA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			Persons Convicted
										G	D	P	
CLARK													
1	19	56	41	1,060	27	40,741	8,725	2	-	-	-	-	-
2	1	7	1	7	7	787	150	1	-	-	-	-	1
ELKO													
1	3	1	1	2	NR	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEW JERSEY

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
ATLANTIC									
1	GAROFOLO	BLITZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/22/2005	20	1	30
2	GAROFOLO	BLITZ	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/11/2005	20	0	20
BURLINGTON									
1	FEINBERG	BERNARDI	MURDER	WC	D	06/09/2005	20	0	20
2	FEINBERG	BERNARDI	MURDER	WC	D	06/09/2005	20	0	20
3	FIENBERG	BERNARDI	MURDER	WS,WO	H	10/07/2005	20	0	20
4	FEINBERG	BERNARDI	MURDER	WC,WO	D	10/07/2005	20	0	20
CAMDEN									
1	NATAL	SARUBBI	NARCOTICS	OO	O	03/22/2005	30	0	30
2	NATAL	SARUBBI	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/28/2005	30	0	30
3	NATAL	DALTON	OTHER	EO	D	08/17/2005	30	0	30
4	NATAL	SARUBBI	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/06/2005	30	1	60
CAPE MAY									
1	GAROFOLO	TAYLOR	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/10/2005	30	0	30
2	GAROFOLO	TAYLOR	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/13/2005	30	0	30
ESSEX									
1	BOZONELIS	DOW	ROBBERY	WS	O	05/12/2005	30	0	30
2	BOZONELIS	DOW	EXTORTION	WO	O	05/16/2005	30	0	30
3	BOZONELIS	DOW	MURDER	WS	O	10/13/2005	30	0	30
4	BOZONELIS	DOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/19/2005	20	0	20
5	BOZONELIS	DOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/31/2005	20	0	20
GLOUCESTER									
1	NATAL	DALTON	GAMBLING	EO	O	06/07/2005	20	0	20
HUDSON									
1	CALLAHAN	DEFAZIO	MURDER	WC	D	02/15/2005	20	0	20
2	CALLAHAN	DEFAZIO	MURDER	OM	O	02/18/2005	20	0	20
3	CALLAHAN	DEFAZIO	MURDER	WS	H	02/23/2005	20	0	20
4	GALLIPOLI	DEFAZIO	KIDNAPPING	WC	D	02/25/2005	20	0	20
5	GALLIPOLI	DEFAZIO	KIDNAPPING	WC	D	02/25/2005	20	0	20
6	CALLAHAN	DEFAZIO	MURDER	WC	D	03/03/2005	10	0	10
7	CALLAHAN	DEFAZIO	NARCOTICS	ED	D	03/24/2005	20	2	40
8	CALLAHAN	DEFAZIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/13/2005	20	1	50

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEW JERSEY

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			Persons Convicted
										G	D	P	
ATLANTIC													
1	21	240	52	5,040	341	51,000	3,000	16	-	-	-	-	-
2	6	123	29	739	88	49,000	1,000	4	-	-	-	-	-
BURLINGTON													
1	NI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	NI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	1	29	6	29	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	1	24	11	24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CAMDEN													
1	5	29	5	145	13	23,920	8,800	2	-	-	-	-	-
2	23	46	48	1,061	114	129,760	8,800	15	-	-	-	-	1
3	NI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	59	242	183	14,275	283	114,640	8,800	7	-	-	-	-	-
CAPE MAY													
1	12	66	36	797	328	29,000	2,000	14	-	-	-	-	3
2	16	147	32	2,351	413	36,870	1,500	6	-	-	-	-	-
ESSEX													
1	30	1	2	17	17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	1	22	2	22	21	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
3	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
GLOUCESTER													
1	NI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HUDSON													
1	19	28	37	539	26	27,544	5,000	4	-	-	-	-	-
2	1	-	-	-		RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
3	12	20	27	242	8	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
4	1	50	4	50	-	1,100	500	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	1	17	4	17	-	RELATED TO NO. 4		-	-	-	-	-	-
6	4	48	44	191	3	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
7	40	15	38	588	588	9,900	2,000	3	-	-	-	-	-
8	46	144	126	6,608	718	224,232	23,600	35	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEW JERSEY

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
HUDSON (CONTINUED)									
9	CALLAHAN	DEFAZIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/24/2005	20	1	50
10	CALLAHAN	DEFAZIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/24/2005	20	1	50
11	CALLAHAN	DEFAZIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/03/2005	30	0	30
12	CALLAHAN	DEFAZIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/03/2005	30	0	30
13	CALLAHAN	DEFAZIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/03/2005	30	0	30
14	CALLAHAN	DEFAZIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/17/2005	30	0	30
15	CALLAHAN	DEFAZIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/17/2005	30	0	30
16	CALLAHAN	DEFAZIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/17/2005	30	0	30
17	CALLAHAN	DEFAZIO	FRAUD	WC	D	10/07/2005	20	2	40
18	CALLAHAN	DEFAZIO	FRAUD	WC	D	10/07/2005	20	0	20
19	CALLAHAN	DEFAZIO	FRAUD	WC	D	10/17/2005	20	1	30
20	GALLIPOLI	DEFAZIO	MURDER	WC	D	10/19/2005	20	0	20
21	CALLAHAN	DEFAZIO	FRAUD	WC	D	10/25/2005	20	2	40
22	CALLAHAN	DEFAZIO	FRAUD	WC	D	10/25/2005	20	0	20
23	CALLAHAN	DEFAZIO	FRAUD	WC	D	10/28/2005	20	0	20
24	CALLAHAN	DEFAZIO	FRAUD	WC	D	11/04/2005	20	2	40
25	CALLAHAN	DEFAZIO	FRAUD	EE	O	11/04/2005	20	1	30
26	CALLAHAN	DEFAZIO	FRAUD	WC	D	11/09/2005	20	0	20
27	CALLAHAN	DEFAZIO	FRAUD	WC	D	11/18/2005	20	0	20
28	CALLAHAN	DEFAZIO	FRAUD	WC	D	11/21/2005	20	0	20
MIDDLESEX									
1	LONGHI	KAPLAN	MURDER	WS	O	12/23/2004	20	0	20
2	LONGHI	KAPLAN	MURDER	WS	O	12/23/2004	20	0	20
3	LONGHI	KAPLAN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/25/2005	20	0	20
4	LONGHI	KAPLAN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/04/2005	20	0	20
5	LONGHI	KAPLAN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/22/2005	20	0	20
MORRIS									
1	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	GAMBLING	WS	H	01/05/2005	20	2	40
2	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	GAMBLING	WC	D	01/25/2005	20	0	20
3	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/23/2005	30	1	60
4	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/06/2005	20	2	40
5	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/06/2005	20	0	20

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEW JERSEY

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
HUDSON (CONTINUED)													
9	37	73	68	2,711	509	RELATED TO NO. 8		RELATED TO NO. 8					
10	38	150	38	5,712	447	RELATED TO NO. 8		RELATED TO NO. 8					
11	27	43	37	1,148	63	RELATED TO NO. 8		RELATED TO NO. 8					
12	28	38	18	1,077	26	RELATED TO NO. 8		RELATED TO NO. 8					
13	27	34	22	924	17	RELATED TO NO. 8		RELATED TO NO. 8					
14	14	139	78	1,949	72	RELATED TO NO. 8		RELATED TO NO. 8					
15	14	19	17	269	12	RELATED TO NO. 8		RELATED TO NO. 8					
16	14	271	7	3,799	630	RELATED TO NO. 8		RELATED TO NO. 8					
17	40	110	147	4,384	343	138,678	22,000	13	-	-	-	-	-
18	13	2	13	25	-	RELATED TO NO. 17		-	-	-	-	-	-
19	30	41	40	1,241	150	RELATED TO NO. 17		RELATED TO NO. 17					
20	20	26	21	524	-	14,865	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
21	40	156	160	6,225	96	RELATED TO NO. 17		RELATED TO NO. 17					
22	12	51	40	617	98	RELATED TO NO. 17		RELATED TO NO. 17					
23	20	6	15	119	17	RELATED TO NO. 17		RELATED TO NO. 17					
24	34	25	60	858	120	RELATED TO NO. 17		RELATED TO NO. 17					
25	30	1	11	28	7	RELATED TO NO. 17		RELATED TO NO. 17					
26	12	60	47	720	72	RELATED TO NO. 17		RELATED TO NO. 17					
27	18	127	70	2,286	17	RELATED TO NO. 17		RELATED TO NO. 17					
28	16	35	37	554	74	RELATED TO NO. 17		RELATED TO NO. 17					
MIDDLESEX													
1	20	77	75	1,541	-	28,140	3,060	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	NI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	8	67	64	538	228	21,182	3,102	29	-	-	-	-	13
4	20	33	78	662	582	RELATED TO NO. 3		RELATED TO NO. 3					
5	15	317	510	4,761	4,279	12,163	3,083	31	-	-	-	-	4
MORRIS													
1	40	32	86	1,288	690	135,000	7,000	7	-	-	-	-	-
2	20	45	38	900	80	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	57	62	111	3,537	911	261,060	5,700	11	-	-	-	-	-
4	40	48	81	1,907	657	195,760	16,747	35	-	-	-	-	-
5	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
MORRIS (CONTINUED)									
6	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/06/2005	20	0	20
7	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/06/2005	20	0	20
8	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/06/2005	20	0	20
9	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/06/2005	20	0	20
10	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/06/2005	20	1	30
11	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/06/2005	20	2	40
12	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/06/2005	20	0	20
13	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/27/2005	20	1	30
14	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/27/2005	20	0	20
15	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/27/2005	20	1	30
16	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/29/2005	20	0	20
17	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/29/2005	20	0	20
18	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/29/2005	20	1	30
19	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/29/2005	20	0	20
20	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/07/2005	20	2	40
21	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/07/2005	20	2	40
22	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/07/2005	20	2	40
23	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/07/2005	20	2	40
24	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/02/2005	20	0	20
25	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/02/2005	20	0	20
26	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/02/2005	20	0	20
27	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/02/2005	20	0	20
28	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/02/2005	20	0	20
29	BOZONELIS	RUBBINACCIO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/02/2005	20	0	20
PASSAIC									
1	SOKALSKI	AVIGLIANO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/15/2004	20	0	20
2	CLARK	AVIGLIANO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/26/2005	20	1	50
3	CLARK	AVIGLIANO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/20/2005	20	1	50
4	CLARK	AVIGLIANO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/21/2005	20	1	50
5	CLARK	AVIGLIANO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/29/2005	20	0	20
6	CLARK	AVIGLIANO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/08/2005	20	0	20
7	CLARK	AVIGLIANO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/03/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEW JERSEY

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
MORRIS (CONTINUED)													
6	18	42	51	754	100	RELATED TO NO. 4		9	-	-	-	-	-
7	20	95	89	1,891	73	RELATED TO NO. 4		1	-	-	-	-	-
8	20	50	79	1,000	46	RELATED TO NO. 4		-	-	-	-	-	-
9	20	5	10	109	-	RELATED TO NO. 4		-	-	-	-	-	-
10	30	29	48	883	43	RELATED TO NO. 4		6	-	-	-	-	-
11	40	140	103	5,611	1,506	RELATED TO NO. 4		36	-	-	-	-	-
12	20	43	80	862	31	RELATED TO NO. 4		-	-	-	-	-	-
13	30	66	64	1,974	357	RELATED TO NO. 4		11	-	-	-	-	-
14	7	2	2	11	-	RELATED TO NO. 4		-	-	-	-	-	-
15	30	64	56	1,932	240	RELATED TO NO. 4		3	-	-	-	-	-
16	18	25	24	447	19	RELATED TO NO. 4		1	-	-	-	-	-
17	3	53	22	159	42	RELATED TO NO. 4		6	-	-	-	-	-
18	30	34	52	1,005	188	RELATED TO NO. 4		10	-	-	-	-	-
19	12	22	18	263	18	RELATED TO NO. 4		1	-	-	-	-	-
20	40	51	61	2,051	241	RELATED TO NO. 4		6	-	-	-	-	-
21	40	55	63	2,205	495	RELATED TO NO. 4		11	-	-	-	-	-
22	40	32	35	1,287	57	RELATED TO NO. 4		-	-	-	-	-	-
23	40	25	28	992	27	RELATED TO NO. 4		-	-	-	-	-	-
24	3	30	18	89	9	RELATED TO NO. 4		-	-	-	-	-	-
25	15	86	86	1,283	96	RELATED TO NO. 4		3	-	-	-	-	-
26	15	72	34	1,079	191	RELATED TO NO. 4		5	-	-	-	-	-
27	15	88	53	1,317	182	RELATED TO NO. 4		6	-	-	-	-	-
28	14	9	61	130	23	RELATED TO NO. 4		-	-	-	-	-	-
29	15	54	45	809	27	RELATED TO NO. 4		1	-	-	-	-	-
PASSAIC													
1	20	19	5	372	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	30	114	10	3,435	1,183	230,000	18,000	7	-	-	-	-	-
3	43	84	12	3,602	612	RELATED TO NO. 1		9	-	-	-	-	-
4	22	131	12	2,877	1,214	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
5	14	124	12	1,742	413	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
6	6	5	12	31	-	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
7	21	143	9	3,012	867	34,000	4,000	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
PASSAIC (CONTINUED)									
8	CLARK	AVIGLIANO	BURGLARY	WC	D	09/09/2005	20	0	20
9	CLARK	AVIGLIANO	BURGLARY	WC	D	09/09/2005	20	0	20
10	CLARK	AVIGLIANO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/11/2005	20	0	20
11	CLARK	AVIGLIANO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/11/2005	20	0	20
12	CLARK	AVIGLIANO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/13/2005	20	0	20
13	CLARK	AVIGLIANO	MURDER	WC	D	10/24/2005	10	0	10
14	CLARK	AVIGLIANO	MURDER	WC	D	10/24/2005	10	0	10
15	CLARK	AVIGLIANO	MURDER	WC	D	10/24/2005	10	0	10
16	CLARK	AVIGLIANO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/14/2005	20	1	40
SALEM									
1	GAROFOLO	LENAHAN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/08/2005	20	1	30
SOMERSET									
1	FEINBERG	FORREST	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/06/2005	20	1	30
2	FEINBERG	FORREST	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/20/2005	20	0	20
3	FEINBERG	FORREST	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/17/2005	20	2	40
4	FEINBERG	FORREST	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/17/2005	20	2	40
5	FEINBERG	FORREST	NARCOTICS	ED	D	02/17/2005	20	2	40
6	FEINBERG	FORREST	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/24/2005	20	2	40
7	FEINBERG	FORREST	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/02/2005	20	1	30
8	FEINBERG	FORREST	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/02/2005	20	1	30
9	FEINBERG	FORREST	NARCOTICS	WS	H	03/02/2005	20	1	30
10	FEINBERG	FORREST	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/10/2005	20	0	20
11	FEINBERG	FORREST	GAMBLING	WC	D	03/10/2005	20	0	20
12	FEINBERG	FORREST	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/19/2005	20	2	40
13	FEINBERG	FORREST	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/01/2005	20	2	40
14	FEINBERG	FORREST	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/01/2005	20	0	20
15	FEINBERG	FORREST	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/22/2005	20	2	40
16	FEINBERG	FORREST	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/22/2005	20	1	30
17	FEINBERG	FORREST	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/22/2005	20	3	70
18	FEINBERG	FORREST	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/06/2005	20	2	60
19	FEINBERG	FORREST	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/06/2005	20	2	60
20	FEINBERG	FORREST	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/06/2005	20	2	60

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEW JERSEY

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
PASSAIC (CONTINUED)													
8	19	7	9	134	1	23,500	4,000	3	-	-	-	-	-
9	19	10	15	185	10	RELATED TO NO. 8		RELATED TO NO. 8					
10	17	70	17	1,196	453	80,000	12,000	7	-	-	-	-	-
11	1	-	-	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 10		-	-	-	-	-	-
12	16	97	7	1,557	223	RELATED TO NO. 10		RELATED TO NO. 10					
13	8	22	5	174	3	17,000	5,500	3	-	-	-	-	-
14	8	47	4	375	30	RELATED TO NO. 13		RELATED TO NO. 13					
15	8	20	2	162	1	RELATED TO NO. 13		RELATED TO NO. 13					
16	21	57	9	1,203	117	34,000	4,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
SALEM													
1	30	124	49	3,720	360	9,200	3,200	27	-	-	-	-	-
SOMERSET													
1	24	48	150	1,151	800	40,000	3,000	17	-	-	-	-	-
2	9	34	40	304	250	RELATED TO NO. 1		5	-	-	-	-	-
3	30	1	10	30	15	102,000	12,000	54	-	-	-	-	-
4	33	92	220	3,034	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 3		RELATED TO NO. 3					
5	20	22	250	444	444	RELATED TO NO. 3		RELATED TO NO. 3					
6	26	81	200	2,104	2,000	RELATED TO NO. 3		RELATED TO NO. 3					
7	19	416	250	7,910	7,000	RELATED TO NO. 3		RELATED TO NO. 3					
8	19	37	110	710	600	RELATED TO NO. 3		RELATED TO NO. 3					
9	19	26	80	499	400	RELATED TO NO. 3		RELATED TO NO. 3					
10	11	32	60	354	300	RELATED TO NO. 3		RELATED TO NO. 3					
11	13	36	50	463	250	RELATED TO NO. 3		RELATED TO NO. 3					
12	40	180	150	7,190	5,500	70,000	10,000	22	-	-	-	-	-
13	30	49	100	1,475	1,000	RELATED TO NO. 12		RELATED TO NO. 12					
14	20	19	30	377	200	RELATED TO NO. 12		RELATED TO NO. 12					
15	40	65	230	2,587	2,054	70,000	10,000	62	-	-	-	-	-
16	20	1	10	26	21	RELATED TO NO. 15		RELATED TO NO. 15					
17	38	139	300	5,264	4,180	RELATED TO NO. 15		RELATED TO NO. 15					
18	14	55	80	773	614	RELATED TO NO. 15		RELATED TO NO. 15					
19	29	37	100	1,077	855	RELATED TO NO. 15		RELATED TO NO. 15					
20	29	99	250	2,863	2,273	RELATED TO NO. 15		RELATED TO NO. 15					

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEW JERSEY

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL									
1	GAROFOLO	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/18/2004	30	1	60
2	GAROFOLO	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/11/2005	20	1	50
3	BOZONELIS	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	01/12/2005	30	1	60
4	BOZONELIS	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	01/12/2005	30	1	60
5	LONGHI	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/04/2005	20	1	30
6	GAROFOLO	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	02/07/2005	30	0	30
7	GAROFOLO	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	02/07/2005	30	0	30
8	GAROFOLO	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/07/2005	30	0	30
9	GAROFOLO	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	02/08/2005	30	0	30
10	BOZONELIS	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	ED	D	02/08/2005	30	0	30
11	NATAL	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	03/07/2005	30	0	30
12	FEINBERG	HARVEY	MURDER	WC	D	03/07/2005	30	2	40
13	FEINBERG	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WS	H	03/07/2005	20	2	40
14	FEINBERG	HARVEY	MURDER	WS	H	03/07/2005	20	2	40
15	CALLAHAN	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	03/07/2005	20	2	80
16	LONGHI	DUGAN	NARCOTICS	EE	O	03/15/2005	20	0	20
17	LONGHI	DUGAN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/15/2005	20	0	20
18	FEINBERG	HARVEY	MURDER	WC	D	03/20/2005	20	1	30
19	GAROFOLO	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	03/29/2005	30	0	30
20	NATAL	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	03/30/2005	30	0	30
21	FEINBERG	HARVEY	MURDER	WS	H	04/06/2005	20	0	20
22	FEINBERG	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/13/2005	20	1	30
23	CALLAHAN	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	04/25/2005	30	0	30
24	GAROFOLO	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	04/28/2005	30	0	30
25	FEINBERG	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/29/2005	20	0	20
26	FEINBERG	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/04/2005	20	2	80
27	FEINBERG	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	05/04/2005	20	3	110
28	FEINBERG	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	05/04/2005	20	0	20
29	FEINBERG	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/12/2005	20	1	50
30	FEINBERG	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	05/12/2005	20	2	80
31	FEINBERG	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	05/12/2005	20	1	50
32	FEINBERG	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/12/2005	20	2	80

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEW JERSEY

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
										Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			
A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	G	D	P	Persons Convicted
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL													
1	49	15	58	736	98	433,577	7,150	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	20	3	8	58	-	82,876	12,924	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	30	102	75	3,074	32	144,370	9,600	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	17	36	39	611	97	32,374	999	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	18	57	79	1,029	12	34,224	2,849	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	6	16	3	95	15	31,624	249	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	30	17	66	505	49	43,742	1,400	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	30	116	94	3,485	607	101,418	2,750	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	34	29	17	994	57	36,736	4,550	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	34	5	14	164	31	28,829	300	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	40	15	10	598	62	30,335	300	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	71	187	398	13,274	873	131,101	525	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	1	16	14	16	-	133	4	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	3	88	23	264	8	7,825	3,350	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	28	5	7	138	15	21,210	4,600	-	-	-	-	-	-
19	30	32	15	968	62	46,167	2,750	-	-	-	-	-	-
20	11	7	14	80	17	136,822	5,150	-	-	-	-	-	-
21	20	6	7	119	17	13,331	250	-	-	-	-	-	-
22	30	NR	NR	NR	NR	RELATED TO NO. 27		-	-	-	-	-	-
23	21	55	65	1,164	140	31,523	525	-	-	-	-	-	-
24	18	53	60	960	190	142,894	5,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
25	NI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
26	42	27	53	1,126	147	546,336	4,554	-	-	-	-	-	-
27	75	48	13	3,577	746	383,598	9,700	-	-	-	-	-	-
28	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
29	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
30	60	43	68	2,555	419	92,585	1,792	-	-	-	-	-	-
31	50	55	55	2,754	305	75,120	1,625	-	-	-	-	-	-
32	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL (CONTINUED)									
33	FEINBERG	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	05/13/2005	30	1	60
34	FEINBERG	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	05/25/2005	20	1	50
35	BOZONELIS	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	ED	D	05/25/2005	30	0	30
36	FEINBERG	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/25/2005	20	1	50
37	BOZONELIS	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	06/02/2005	30	1	60
38	FEINBERG	HARVEY	MURDER	WC	R	06/10/2005	30	2	90
39	BOZONELIS	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	06/15/2005	30	0	30
40	BOZONELIS	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	06/15/2005	30	0	30
41	FEINBERG	DUGAN	RACKETEERING	WC	D	06/23/2005	30	0	30
42	FEINBERG	DUGAN	RACKETEERING	WC	D	06/23/2005	30	0	30
43	FEINBERG	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/23/2005	30	0	30
44	FEINBERG	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/23/2005	30	0	30
45	BOZONELIS	HARVEY	MURDER	WC	D	06/30/2005	20	1	50
46	BOZONELIS	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	06/30/2005	30	0	30
47	FEINBERG	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	07/06/2005	30	0	30
48	BOZONELIS	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	07/06/2005	30	0	30
49	FEINBERG	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/06/2005	30	0	30
50	BOZONELIS	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	R	07/06/2005	30	1	60
51	BOZONELIS	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/09/2005	30	2	90
52	BOZONELIS	HARVEY	MURDER	WC	D	08/17/2005	30	0	30
53	BOZONELIS	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/26/2005	30	1	60
54	MARINARI-SYPEK	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	10/05/2005	30	2	60
55	BOZONELIS	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/07/2005	30	0	30
56	BOZONELIS	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/07/2005	30	0	30
57	BOZONELIS	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/07/2005	30	0	30
58	BOZONELIS	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/07/2005	30	0	30
59	MARINARI-SYPEK	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	11/07/2005	30	0	30
60	BOZONELIS	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/17/2005	20	1	30
61	BOZONELIS	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/17/2005	30	0	30
62	BOZONELIS	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/17/2005	30	0	30
63	BOZONELIS	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/17/2005	30	0	30
64	BOZONELIS	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/17/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEW JERSEY

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
										Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			
A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	G	D	P	Persons Convicted
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL (CONTINUED)													
33	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
34	47	38	43	1,764	191	76,356	7,250	-	-	-	-	-	-
35	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
36	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
37	50	298	100	14,901	344	139,785	2,625	-	-	-	-	-	-
38	80	59	30	4,699	958	241,780	7,202	-	-	-	-	-	-
39	30	75	35	2,244	25	35,431	1,600	-	-	-	-	-	-
40	30	5	3	159	-	13,280	1,600	-	-	-	-	-	-
41	20	101	49	2,023	91	35,369	5,850	-	-	-	-	-	-
42	20	85	62	1,691	235	32,469	2,950	-	-	-	-	-	-
43	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
44	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
45	47	281	27	13,197	583	124,181	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
46	18	2	10	31	-	56,630	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
47	6	69	27	416	35	11,986	2,950	-	-	-	-	-	-
48	14	74	15	1,039	39	10,681	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
49	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50	52	288	60	15,000	746	64,383	13,100	-	-	-	-	-	-
51	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
52	12	355	27	4,263	285	32,524	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
53	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
54	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
55	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
56	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
57	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
58	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
59	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
60	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
61	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
62	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
63	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
64	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL (CONTINUED)									
65	MARINARI-SYPEK	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	11/25/2005	30	0	30
66	MARINARI-SYPEK	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	11/25/2005	30	0	30
67	BOZONELIS	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/20/2005	30	0	30
30*	FALCONE	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/30/2004	20	0	20
31*	FALCONE	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/19/2004	20	1	50
32*	LONGHI	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/14/2004	20	1	50
33*	LONGHI	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/14/2004	20	1	50
34*	LONGHI	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WS	H	08/03/2004	30	0	30
35*	BOZONELIS	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	08/16/2004	30	0	30
36*	GAROFOLO	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	09/30/2004	30	1	60
37*	GAROFOLO	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	10/07/2004	30	1	60
38*	CALLAHAN	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	OM	B	10/12/2004	20	0	20
39*	GAROFOLO	HARVEY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/01/2004	30	0	30
29**	FALCONE	SAMSON	$LAUNDERING	WC	D	06/24/2002	20	0	20
30**	FALCONE	SAMSON	$LAUNDERING	WC	D	06/24/2002	20	0	20
31**	FALCONE	SAMSON	CONSPIRACY	WC	D	07/03/2002	20	0	20
50**	CALLAHAN	SAMSON	RACKETEERING	WC	D	01/10/2003	30	1	60
51**	FALCONE	SAMSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/15/2003	20	0	20
52**	FALCONE	SAMSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/15/2003	20	0	20
53**	FALCONE	SAMSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/15/2003	20	0	20
54**	CALLAHAN	HARVEY	RACKETEERING	WC	D	05/29/2003	30	0	30
UNION									
1	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/02/2004	20	1	30
2	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/17/2004	20	0	20
3	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/21/2004	20	0	20
4	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/21/2004	20	0	20
5	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/28/2004	20	0	20
6	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	R	01/12/2005	30	3	120
7	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	R	01/12/2005	30	2	90
8	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/28/2005	30	2	90
9	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	$LAUNDERING	WC	R	02/02/2005	30	2	90
10	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/10/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEW JERSEY

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL (CONTINUED)													
65	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
66	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
67	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
30*	2	-	-	-	-	4,010	3,150	-	-	-	-	-	-
31*	50	8	73	406	29	73,711	3,400	-	-	-	-	-	-
32*	43	5	11	227	55	50,174	3,400	-	-	-	-	-	-
33*	43	90	55	3,852	91	50,149	2,300	-	-	-	-	-	-
34*	23	31	23	720	48	25,473	300	-	-	-	-	-	-
35*	29	66	100	1,903	43	45,640	171	-	-	-	-	-	-
36*	59	31	20	1,804	394	101,803	3,350	-	-	-	-	-	-
37*	46	31	115	1,410	345	111,644	3,725	-	-	-	-	-	-
38*	1	1	6	1	1	2,657	4	-	-	-	-	-	-
39*	28	60	96	1,675	396	104,347	10,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
29**	19	3	3	57	2	30,481	5,996	-	-	-	-	-	-
30**	19	10	15	190	59	30,126	4,034	-	-	-	-	-	-
31**	10	3	2	30	12	17,143	3,994	-	-	-	-	-	-
50**	60	18	40	1,071	244	73,257	5,723	-	-	-	-	-	-
51**	20	-	-	-	-	18,055	2,750	-	-	-	-	-	-
52**	20	13	7	269	32	94,578	2,750	-	-	-	-	-	-
53**	20	20	7	406	81	RELATED TO NO. 51**		-	-	-	-	-	-
54**	12	40	20	477	19	14,092	514	-	-	-	-	-	-
UNION													
1	30	94	45	2,830	593	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	20	22	25	436	117	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	16	22	20	346	60	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	16	37	40	597	158	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	9	3	8	31	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	91	114	175	10,329	1,204	2,147,500	160,000	19	-	-	-	-	-
7	90	87	75	7,835	214	RELATED TO NO. 6		RELATED TO NO. 6					
8	77	37	50	2,859	315	RELATED TO NO. 6		RELATED TO NO. 6					
9	71	44	20	3,131	198	RELATED TO NO. 6		RELATED TO NO. 6					
10	30	4	20	127	16	RELATED TO NO. 6		-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
UNION (CONTINUED)									
11	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/18/2005	30	1	60
12	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/18/2005	30	0	30
13	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	R	02/18/2005	30	1	60
14	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	R	02/25/2005	30	1	40
15	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/04/2005	30	0	30
16	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/04/2005	30	0	30
17	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/18/2005	30	0	30
18	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/21/2005	30	0	30
19	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/24/2005	30	0	30
20	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/04/2005	30	0	30
21	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/27/2005	20	0	20
22	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/03/2005	20	2	40
23	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/13/2005	20	0	20
24	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/18/2005	20	0	20
25	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/25/2005	20	0	20
26	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/17/2005	20	0	20
27	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/23/2005	20	1	30
28	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/02/2005	20	0	20
29	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/05/2005	20	0	20
30	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/05/2005	20	0	20
31	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/05/2005	20	0	20
32	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/05/2005	20	0	20
33	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/05/2005	20	0	20
34	BOZONELIS	ROMANKOW	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/05/2005	20	0	20

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEW JERSEY

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
UNION (CONTINUED)													
11	55	19	50	1,063	159	RELATED TO NO. 6		RELATED TO NO. 6					
12	30	-	-	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 6		-	-	-	-	-	-
13	60	52	20	3,142	455	RELATED TO NO. 6		RELATED TO NO. 6					
14	40	16	38	632	63	RELATED TO NO. 6		RELATED TO NO. 6					
15	30	3	3	91	6	RELATED TO NO. 6		RELATED TO NO. 6					
16	30	-	3	2	-	RELATED TO NO. 6		-	-	-	-	-	-
17	28	4	NR	123	NR	RELATED TO NO. 6		-	-	-	-	-	-
18	21	18	5	385	119	RELATED TO NO. 6		RELATED TO NO. 6					
19	21	202	20	4,247	57	RELATED TO NO. 6		RELATED TO NO. 6					
20	10	65	25	651	128	RELATED TO NO. 6		RELATED TO NO. 6					
21	20	4	20	79	36	631,762	3,000	32	-	-	-	-	-
22	33	62	35	2,033	492	RELATED TO NO. 21		RELATED TO NO. 21					
23	18	69	25	1,243	140	RELATED TO NO. 21		RELATED TO NO. 21					
24	19	145	25	2,749	332	RELATED TO NO. 21		RELATED TO NO. 21					
25	11	84	15	929	104	RELATED TO NO. 21		RELATED TO NO. 21					
26	20	26	15	514	140	610,500	3,000	9	-	-	-	-	-
27	25	92	15	2,307	717	RELATED TO NO. 26		RELATED TO NO. 26					
28	17	29	5	500	95	RELATED TO NO. 26		RELATED TO NO. 26					
29	13	64	15	838	143	RELATED TO NO. 26		RELATED TO NO. 26					
30	12	28	15	330	39	RELATED TO NO. 26		RELATED TO NO. 26					
31	13	44	10	577	217	RELATED TO NO. 26		RELATED TO NO. 26					
32	12	254	10	3,044	438	RELATED TO NO. 26		RELATED TO NO. 26					
33	13	65	10	850	399	RELATED TO NO. 26		RELATED TO NO. 26					
34	13	79	10	1,024	355	RELATED TO NO. 26		RELATED TO NO. 26					

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEW YORK

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
ALBANY									
1	TERESI	SOARES	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/08/2005	30	0	30
2	TERESI	SOARES	NARCOTICS	WS,WC	H,D	10/05/2005	29	0	29
4*	TERESI	CLYNE	GAMBLING	WS	D	09/28/2004	30	1	60
DUTCHESS									
1	BROWN	GRADY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/21/2005	30	3	120
2	BROWN	GRADY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/21/2005	30	0	30
3	BROWN	GRADY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/16/2005	30	0	30
FRANKLIN									
1	MAIN	CHAMPAGNE	$LAUNDERING	WS	H	06/02/2005	30	0	30
2	MAIN	CHAMPAGNE	MURDER	WS	H	06/12/2005	30	0	30
3	MAIN	CHAMPAGNE	$LAUNDERING	WC	D	06/13/2005	30	2	90
4	MAIN	CHAMPAGNE	$LAUNDERING	WC	D	06/13/2005	30	4	150
5	MAIN	CHAMPAGNE	$LAUNDERING	WC	D	06/30/2005	30	0	30
6	MAIN	CHAMPAGNE	$LAUNDERING	WS	H	06/30/2005	30	2	90
7	MAIN	CHAMPAGNE	$LAUNDERING	WS	H	07/28/2005	30	1	60
JEFFERSON									
1	MARTUSEWICZ	INTSCHERT	MURDER	WO	B	12/21/2004	30	0	30
KINGS									
1	FIRETOG	HYNES	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/09/2004	29	4	141
2	FIRETOG	HYNES	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/03/2005	28	2	84
3	MILLER	HYNES	LARCENY	WC	D	05/26/2005	30	4	150
MONTGOMERY									
1	SISE	CONBOY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/15/2005	30	0	30
2	SISE	CONBOY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/25/2005	30	0	30
3	SISE	CONBOY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/31/2005	30	0	30
4	SISE	CONBOY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/31/2005	30	0	30
5	SISE	CONBOY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/06/2005	30	0	30
NASSAU									
1	CARTER	DILLON	NARCOTICS	WC,EO	D	03/11/2005	30	1	60
2	CARTER	DILLON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/14/2005	30	1	60
3	WEINBERG	DILLON	MURDER	WC	D	07/26/2005	30	0	30
4	KASE	DILLON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/29/2005	30	1	60

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEW YORK

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
ALBANY													
1	29	54	-	1,567	143	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	29	54	-	1,578	94	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4*	36	71	3	2,565	1,249	52,500	4,500	3	-	-	-	-	-
DUTCHESS													
1	114	46	50	5,199	839	367,000	12,000	8	-	-	-	4	-
2	28	2	6	49	-	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
3	30	37	25	1,097	277	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
FRANKLIN													
1	21	116	47	2,434	6	332,128	15,128	21	-	-	-	-	-
2	3	12	5	35	1	16,200	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
3	88	7	23	630	28	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
4	127	58	181	7,356	136	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
5	22	26	38	565	120	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
6	89	103	131	9,199	188	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
7	60	558	56	33,460	110	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
JEFFERSON													
1	NI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KINGS													
1	140	136	400	18,971	15,177	203,040	-	15	-	-	-	-	-
2	84	68	200	5,683	4,262	120,960	-	RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	150	64	100	9,528	675	167,400	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MONTGOMERY													
1	15	53	17	801	141	35,000	7,000	2	-	-	2	-	2
2	NI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	13	73	20	948	168	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
4	4	50	NR	200	-	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
5	7	68	11	477	31	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
NASSAU													
1	45	72	50	3,220	351	224,545	8,545	6	-	-	-	-	3
2	59	65	92	3,833	1,576	50,700	8,700	4	-	-	-	-	1
3	3	3	3	8	-	2,850	1,050	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	46	129	130	5,946	616	136,009	35,900	5	-	-	-	-	1

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
NASSAU (CONTINUED)									
5	WEINBERG	DILLON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/22/2005	30	1	60
6	ORT	DILLON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/06/2005	30	0	30
7	AYRES	DILLON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/10/2005	30	1	60
NEW YORK									
1	NARDELLI	MORGENTHAU	GAMBLING	WC,ED	D	09/29/2004	30	5	180
2	BUCHTER	MORGENTHAU	GAMBLING	OM	O	08/26/2005	30	0	30
3	BUCHTER	MORGENTHAU	GAMBLING	ED	D	08/26/2005	30	0	30
4	SKELOS	MORGENTHAU	EXTORTION	WC	D	12/02/2005	30	0	30
NY ORGANIZED CRIME TASK FORCE									
1	MILLER	PRATHER	NARCOTICS	WS,WC	H,D	04/13/2004	30	12	390
2	MATTHEWS	PRATHER	GAMBLING	WS,WC	H,D	11/09/2004	30	2	90
3	MILLER	PRATHER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/20/2005	30	2	90
4	ALOI	PRATHER	NARCOTICS	WS,WC	H,D	03/08/2005	30	3	120
5	WALSH	PRATHER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/26/2005	30	3	120
6	DRURY	PRATHER	CONSPIRACY	WC	D	04/28/2005	30	2	90
7	BRUNETTI	PRATHER	NARCOTICS	WS,WC	H,D	05/31/2005	30	6	210
8	MILLER	PRATHER	LARCENY	WS,WC,EF	H,D,B	06/07/2005	30	6	210
9	MARKS	PRATHER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/21/2005	30	0	30
NYC SPECIAL NARCOTICS BUREAU									
1	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/30/2004	30	4	150
2	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/28/2004	30	2	90
3	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/28/2004	30	3	120
4	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/01/2004	30	2	90
5	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/09/2004	30	2	90
6	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/15/2004	30	2	90
7	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/15/2004	30	2	90
8	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/04/2004	30	0	30
9	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/06/2004	30	0	30
10	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WS	H	12/06/2004	30	0	30
11	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/08/2004	30	2	90
12	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/08/2004	30	0	30
13	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/27/2004	30	1	60

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEW YORK

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			Persons Convicted
										G	D	P	
NASSAU (CONTINUED)													
5	57	65	101	3,722	340	276,580	12,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	21	91	221	1,909	400	84,162	6,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	35	181	435	6,328	1,207	125,615	11,000	5	-	-	-	-	-
NEW YORK													
1	180	100	50	18,000	360	333,000	31,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	3	73	15	219	200	13,400	2,900	3	-	-	-	3	-
NY ORGANIZED CRIME TASK FORCE													
1	309	92	143	28,404	22,700	623,777	129,377	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	81	85	135	6,854	2,053	166,575	87,075	8	-	-	-	-	8
3	84	64	121	5,380	1,678	101,148	18,648	12	-	-	2	-	12
4	86	227	193	19,499	3,113	227,715	21,315	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	114	69	37	7,863	391	240,654	12,654	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	85	73	393	6,164	2,569	173,151	23,151	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	168	131	56	21,973	1,387	385,145	55,145	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	168	260	310	43,690	17,182	848,141	98,641	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	14	10	15	144	44	65,154	1,554	-	-	-	-	-	-
NYC SPECIAL NARCOTICS BUREAU													
1	123	1	23	143	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	84	21	13	1,793	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	118	32	55	3,783	366	62,193	-	2	-	-	-	-	2
4	87	2	6	147	21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	85	30	29	2,530	34	RELATED TO NO. 8		RELATED TO NO. 8					
6	79	15	85	1,212	397	RELATED TO NO. 8		RELATED TO NO. 8					
7	79	28	23	2,206	38	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	23	9	17	196	32	47,470	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
9	6	32	35	192	35	RELATED TO NO. 49		-	-	-	-	-	-
10	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	71	4	7	312	96	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	28	34	25	964	17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	57	6	19	355	114	31,587	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
NYC SPECIAL NARCOTICS BUREAU (CONTINUED)									
14	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/27/2004	30	0	30
15	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/06/2005	30	1	60
16	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	ED	D	01/06/2005	30	4	150
17	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/10/2005	30	2	90
18	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/10/2005	30	0	30
19	WETZEL	KINDLER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/28/2005	30	0	30
20	ALLEN	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/02/2005	30	0	30
21	ALLEN	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/02/2005	30	0	30
22	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/07/2005	30	1	60
23	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WS	H	02/08/2005	30	1	60
24	ALLEN	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/08/2005	30	0	30
25	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/09/2005	30	0	30
26	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/09/2005	30	0	30
27	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/09/2005	30	0	30
28	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/14/2005	30	0	30
29	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/17/2005	30	2	90
30	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	OM	O	02/17/2005	30	2	90
31	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/17/2005	30	1	60
32	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/23/2005	30	0	30
33	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/23/2005	30	0	30
34	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/23/2005	30	3	120
35	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/23/2005	30	2	90
36	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/23/2005	30	0	30
37	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/28/2005	30	0	30
38	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/01/2005	30	0	30
39	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/01/2005	30	0	30
40	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/02/2005	30	0	30
41	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/08/2005	30	1	60
42	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/08/2005	30	1	60
43	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/14/2005	30	0	30
44	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	ED	D	03/14/2005	30	3	120
45	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	ED	D	03/14/2005	30	1	60

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEW YORK

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
NYC SPECIAL NARCOTICS BUREAU (CONTINUED)													
14	28	57	42	1,585	113	RELATED TO NO. 13		-	-	-	-	-	-
15	40	18	11	705	53	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	130	1	NR	179	179	RELATED TO NO. 49		-	-	-	-	-	-
17	87	27	310	2,368	375	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	2
18	30	7	6	203	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
19	16	3	4	46	12	12,465	-	8	-	-	-	-	8
20	20	1	NR	19	NR	RELATED TO NO. 115		-	-	-	-	-	-
21	I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
22	60	58	38	3,478	729	RELATED TO NO. 50		RELATED TO NO. 50					
23	59	-	-	2	-	52,130	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
24	13	40	11	525	185	RELATED TO NO. 115		RELATED TO NO. 115					
25	29	2	8	70	1	RELATED TO NO. 133		RELATED TO NO. 133					
26	29	5	12	148	8	RELATED TO NO. 133		RELATED TO NO. 133					
27	29	-	2	6	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
28	20	23	19	454	92	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 71					
29	88	1	6	64	33	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 132					
30	78	11	19	870	32	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 132					
31	57	80	90	4,565	633	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
32	I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
33	29	48	44	1,391	538	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 132					
34	111	10	31	1,080	277	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 132					
35	87	32	45	2,792	322	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 132					
36	NI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
37	29	30	30	880	149	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
38	I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
39	7	2	3	16	1	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 132					
40	29	1	2	24	4	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 132					
41	59	2	8	131	33	-		RELATED TO NO. 132					
42	59	7	11	423	60	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 132					
43	16	4	5	58	1	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 132					
44	113	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
45	34	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
NYC SPECIAL NARCOTICS BUREAU (CONTINUED)									
46	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/14/2005	30	0	30
47	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	OM	O	03/14/2005	30	0	30
48	ALLEN	KINDLER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/15/2005	30	0	30
49	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/17/2005	30	0	30
50	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/24/2005	30	0	30
51	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/25/2005	30	1	60
52	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/25/2005	30	0	30
53	ALLEN	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/01/2005	30	0	30
54	ALLEN	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/01/2005	30	0	30
55	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/06/2005	30	1	60
56	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	ED	D	04/06/2005	30	0	30
57	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/06/2005	30	0	30
58	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/06/2005	30	0	30
59	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/08/2005	30	0	30
60	ALLEN	KINDLER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/14/2005	30	0	30
61	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/15/2005	30	0	30
62	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	ED	D	04/15/2005	30	0	30
63	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/18/2005	30	0	30
64	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/26/2005	30	0	30
65	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/27/2005	30	0	30
66	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/29/2005	30	0	30
67	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/02/2005	30	0	30
68	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/04/2005	30	3	120
69	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/04/2005	30	0	30
70	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/04/2005	30	0	30
71	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/04/2005	30	0	30
72	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/04/2005	30	0	30
73	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/06/2005	30	0	30
74	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/11/2005	30	0	30
75	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/13/2005	30	0	30
76	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/20/2005	30	1	60
77	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/24/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEW YORK

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
NYC SPECIAL NARCOTICS BUREAU (CONTINUED)													
46	30	52	24	1,560	153	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
47	13	5	5	64	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
48	30	5	6	140	25	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 132					
49	27	6	8	163	9	42,976	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50	18	5	4	95	7	31,791	-	2	-	-	-	-	2
51	57	77	51	4,383	306	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
52	27	3	11	75	33	RELATED TO NO. 97		-	-	-	-	-	-
53	29	123	53	3,569	304	RELATED TO NO. 115		RELATED TO NO. 115					
54	17	18	9	310	53	RELATED TO NO. 115		RELATED TO NO. 115					
55	55	84	68	4,606	604	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
56	29	2	-	67	67	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
57	I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
58	30	2	3	54	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
59	11	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
60	27	107	84	2,882	336	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
61	28	-	1	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
62	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
63	24	6	19	150	15	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 132					
64	7	5	8	32	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
65	23	5	18	121	54	31,132	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
66	I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
67	19	24	10	447	70	RELATED TO NO. 97		-	-	-	-	-	-
68	109	120	89	13,061	1,382	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
69	13	49	28	642	108	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
70	29	45	28	1,308	334	RELATED TO NO. 115		RELATED TO NO. 115					
71	29	1	4	18	9	36,330	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
72	13	80	15	1,045	130	RELATED TO NO. 107		-	-	-	-	-	-
73	20	14	9	290	96	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
74	30	5	11	156	50	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 132					
75	11	12	15	135	29	RELATED TO NO. 65		-	-	-	-	-	-
76	35	21	24	749	549	RELATED TO NO. 96		-	-	-	-	-	-
77	29	17	24	495	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEW YORK

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
NYC SPECIAL NARCOTICS BUREAU (CONTINUED)									
78	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/26/2005	30	0	30
79	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/27/2005	30	0	30
80	ALLEN	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/31/2005	30	0	30
81	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/01/2005	30	0	30
82	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/02/2005	30	1	60
83	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/03/2005	30	0	30
84	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/03/2005	30	0	30
85	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/03/2005	30	0	30
86	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/03/2005	30	0	30
87	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/03/2005	30	0	30
88	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/03/2005	30	0	30
89	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/03/2005	30	0	30
90	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/09/2005	30	2	90
91	ALLEN	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/11/2005	30	1	60
92	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/13/2005	30	3	120
93	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/17/2005	30	4	150
94	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/17/2005	30	3	120
95	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/17/2005	30	1	60
96	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/17/2005	30	0	30
97	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/21/2005	30	0	30
98	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/22/2005	30	0	30
99	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/22/2005	30	0	30
100	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/24/2005	30	0	30
101	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/30/2005	30	0	30
102	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/30/2005	30	0	30
103	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/01/2005	30	1	60
104	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/08/2005	30	1	60
105	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/15/2005	30	2	90
106	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	EE	H	07/15/2005	30	0	30
107	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/15/2005	30	0	30
108	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/15/2005	30	1	60
109	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	EE	H	07/18/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEW YORK

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
NYC SPECIAL NARCOTICS BUREAU (CONTINUED)													
78	15	9	7	130	38	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 132					
79	I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
80	NI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
81	29	33	31	943	36	RELATED TO NO. 115		RELATED TO NO. 115					
82	48	34	24	1,620	372	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
83	7	3	NR	18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
84	27	5	8	126	22	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 132					
85	27	-	7	13	1	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 132					
86	I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
87	27	8	NR	221	-	RELATED TO NO. 139		-	-	-	-	-	-
88	I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
89	27	53	23	1,443	346	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
90	62	8	14	482	90	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 132					
91	44	44	36	1,954	463	RELATED TO NO. 115		RELATED TO NO. 115					
92	115	88	74	10,141	1,206	RELATED TO NO. 142		RELATED TO NO. 142					
93	132	35	47	4,628	176	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 132					
94	118	6	19	685	110	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 132					
95	30	109	23	3,277	188	106,030	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
96	14	12	10	164	19	30,380	-	7	-	-	-	-	6
97	30	169	45	5,068	615	29,703	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
98	21	41	55	868	125	10,644	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
99	29	110	20	3,186	740	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100	17	28	36	469	16	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 132					
101	30	35	20	1,054	162	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
102	30	13	8	387	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
103	50	92	38	4,581	379	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
104	23	64	24	1,477	302	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
105	74	29	41	2,179	87	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 132					
106	26	-	NR	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
107	29	24	19	695	164	21,570	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
108	59	70	31	4,158	556	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
109	NI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
NYC SPECIAL NARCOTICS BUREAU (CONTINUED)									
110	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	EE	H	07/18/2005	30	0	30
111	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/21/2005	30	0	30
112	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/21/2005	30	0	30
113	ALLEN	KINDLER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/22/2005	30	0	30
114	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/22/2005	30	1	60
115	ALLEN	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/02/2005	30	0	30
116	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/04/2005	30	0	30
117	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/08/2005	30	0	30
118	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/11/2005	30	2	90
119	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/16/2005	30	0	30
120	WETZEL	KINDLER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/16/2005	30	0	30
121	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/18/2005	30	1	60
122	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/19/2005	30	0	30
123	WETZEL	KINDLER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/22/2005	30	2	90
124	WETZEL	KINDLER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/22/2005	30	3	120
125	WETZEL	KINDLER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/22/2005	30	2	90
126	WETZEL	KINDLER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/22/2005	30	2	90
127	WETZEL	KINDLER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/22/2005	30	0	30
128	WITTNER	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/01/2005	30	1	60
129	WITTNER	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/02/2005	30	0	30
130	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	OO	O	09/09/2005	30	1	60
131	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	OM	O	09/09/2005	30	0	30
132	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WS	H	09/09/2005	30	1	60
133	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/13/2005	30	0	30
134	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/14/2005	30	1	60
135	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/16/2005	30	0	30
136	ALLEN	KINDLER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/21/2005	30	0	30
137	ALLEN	KINDLER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/23/2005	30	0	30
138	ALLEN	KINDLER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/26/2005	30	0	30
139	ALLEN	KINDLER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/30/2005	30	0	30
140	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/07/2005	30	0	30
141	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/07/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEW YORK

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
NYC SPECIAL NARCOTICS BUREAU (CONTINUED)													
110	15	-	NR	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
111	29	79	17	2,287	223	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
112	29	6	2	175	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
113	27	1	3	15	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
114	49	41	22	2,026	382	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
115	2	67	16	134	36	47,470	-	7	-	-	-	-	6
116	29	24	38	683	110	16,022	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
117	30	101	22	3,016	569	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
118	72	25	36	1,811	233	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 132					
119	NI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
120	30	52	41	1,554	74	30,380	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
121	59	47	25	2,800	243	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
122	27	66	12	1,794	293	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
123	61	10	20	592	80	RELATED TO NO. 148		-	-	-	-	-	-
124	116	116	82	13,446	943	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
125	32	131	67	4,197	168	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
126	90	40	39	3,618	598	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
127	I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
128	48	10	20	467	94	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
129	13	35	9	450	54	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
130	25	3	2	81	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
131	22	2	5	34	2	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 132					
132	32	20	28	644	18	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	4
133	29	57	8	1,666	23	207,196	-	5	-	-	-	-	4
134	59	180	81	10,625	836	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
135	21	13	7	264	37	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
136	30	14	11	406	86	RELATED TO NO. 147		-	-	-	-	-	-
137	28	40	32	1,119	163	15,623	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
138	29	3	6	77	1	1,769	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
139	28	66	220	1,843	273	108,080	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
140	17	7	4	115	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
141	11	43	30	476	104	13,750	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
NYC SPECIAL NARCOTICS BUREAU (CONTINUED)									
142	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/07/2005	30	0	30
143	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/12/2005	30	0	30
144	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/18/2005	30	0	30
145	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/27/2005	30	0	30
146	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/28/2005	30	1	60
147	ALLEN	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/02/2005	30	0	30
148	WETZEL	MORGENTHAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/17/2005	30	0	30
ONEIDA									
1	DALEY	ARCURI	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/04/2005	30	2	64
2	DALEY	ARCURI	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/03/2005	10	1	34
3	DALEY	ARCURI	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/01/2005	24	0	24
4	DALEY	ARCURI	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/10/2005	14	0	14
QUEENS									
1	RIVERA	BROWN	GAMBLING	WC	D	10/09/2003	30	19	600
2	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/17/2003	30	16	510
3	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/14/2003	30	11	360
4	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/18/2003	30	14	450
5	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/09/2004	30	13	420
6	RIVERA	BROWN	GAMBLING	EE	H	04/14/2004	9	13	399
7	RIVERA	BROWN	GAMBLING	EE	O	05/20/2004	30	10	330
8	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/21/2004	30	12	360
9	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/05/2004	20	13	380
10	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/05/2004	30	13	380
11	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/12/2004	14	11	314
12	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	08/18/2004	29	8	269
13	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/19/2004	30	4	150
14	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/25/2004	30	7	240
15	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/25/2004	30	7	240
16	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WS	H	09/10/2004	30	4	150
17	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	09/13/2004	30	4	150
18	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/15/2004	30	4	150
19	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/23/2004	30	5	180

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEW YORK

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
NYC SPECIAL NARCOTICS BUREAU (CONTINUED)													
142	18	75	23	1,344	191	63,416	-	13	-	-	-	-	-
143	NI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
144	15	24	19	360	78	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
145	21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
146	52	17	35	876	75	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
147	30	5	7	162	27	31,132	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
148	30	61	45	1,837	106	172,174	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ONEIDA													
1	64	7	21	443	120	50,148	4,500	12	-	-	-	-	12
2	34	8	17	258	136	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	24	23	36	561	413	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
4	14	20	17	276	185	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
QUEENS													
1	559	70	232	39,104	29,328	111,800	55,900	36	-	-	-	-	31
2	485	68	150	33,000	11,000	97,000	48,500	17	-	-	-	-	15
3	337	41	150	13,932	4,644	67,400	33,700	RELATED TO NO. 2					
4	427	69	150	29,375	9,781	85,400	42,700	RELATED TO NO. 2					
5	397	63	150	25,129	8,373	79,400	39,700	RELATED TO NO. 2					
6	372	66	120	24,696	20,991	74,400	37,200	RELATED TO NO. 1					
7	306	61	450	18,755	18,755	61,200	30,600	RELATED TO NO. 1					
8	332	11	92	3,630	2,900	66,000	33,000	26	-	-	-	-	19
9	378	9	43	3,402	2,720	75,600	37,800	RELATED TO NO. 8					
10	378	13	86	4,914	3,930	75,600	37,800	RELATED TO NO. 8					
11	292	22	212	6,424	6,344	58,400	29,200	RELATED TO NO. 8					
12	214	11	57	2,278	2,000	42,800	21,400	10	-	-	-	-	4
13	149	37	150	5,448	1,779	29,800	14,900	RELATED TO NO. 2					
14	219	5	19	1,095	876	43,800	21,900	RELATED TO NO. 8					
15	219	8	38	1,752	1,400	43,800	21,900	RELATED TO NO. 8					
16	130	11	37	1,475	1,032	26,000	13,000	RELATED TO NO. 27					
17	132	10	32	1,340	1,207	26,400	13,200	RELATED TO NO. 12					
18	127	26	150	3,330	1,112	25,400	12,700	RELATED TO NO. 2					
19	179	11	42	1,969	1,575	35,800	17,900	RELATED TO NO. 8					

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
QUEENS (CONTINUED)									
20	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/05/2004	18	4	138
21	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/05/2004	18	4	138
22	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/13/2004	30	3	120
23	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/22/2004	30	2	90
24	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/22/2004	30	10	330
25	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/26/2004	10	3	100
26	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	ED	D	10/26/2004	10	3	100
27	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WS	H	11/05/2004	30	4	150
28	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/05/2004	30	2	90
29	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	ED	D	11/05/2004	30	4	150
30	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/10/2004	30	2	90
31	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/10/2004	30	2	90
32	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/10/2004	30	2	90
33	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/12/2004	30	1	60
34	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/12/2004	30	6	210
35	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	ED	D	11/12/2004	28	2	88
36	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/22/2004	30	9	270
37	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/02/2004	30	1	60
38	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/02/2004	30	1	60
39	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/03/2004	30	1	60
40	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/07/2004	30	1	60
41	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/10/2004	30	2	90
42	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/10/2004	30	0	30
43	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/10/2004	30	3	120
44	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	OM	B	12/12/2004	30	8	270
45	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/16/2004	22	1	52
46	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/23/2004	30	2	90
47	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/23/2004	30	0	30
48	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/23/2004	30	0	30
49	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/03/2005	30	0	30
50	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/03/2005	30	0	30
51	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/03/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEW YORK

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
QUEENS (CONTINUED)													
20	121	12	29	1,452	1,150	24,200	12,100	RELATED TO NO. 8					
21	121	3	6	363	290	24,200	12,100	RELATED TO NO. 8					
22	97	3	25	300	99	19,400	9,700	RELATED TO NO. 2					
23	78	3	6	234	187	15,600	7,800	RELATED TO NO. 8					
24	300	10	32	3,000	2,400	60,000	30,000	RELATED TO NO. 8					
25	80	4	14	321	290	16,000	8,000	RELATED TO NO. 12					
26	80	5	29	415	360	16,000	8,000	RELATED TO NO. 12					
27	144	13	189	1,831	1,363	28,800	14,400	3	-	-	-	-	3
28	81	6	49	507	285	16,200	8,100	RELATED TO NO. 27					
29	133	9	38	1,218	1,190	26,600	13,300	RELATED TO NO. 12					
30	67	138	150	9,241	3,080	13,400	6,700	RELATED TO NO. 2					
31	67	78	150	5,235	1,745	13,400	6,700	RELATED TO NO. 2					
32	67	131	150	8,802	2,934	13,400	6,700	RELATED TO NO. 2					
33	56	5	14	280	224	11,200	5,600	RELATED TO NO. 8					
34	204	7	42	1,428	1,142	40,800	20,400	RELATED TO NO. 8					
35	71	7	22	510	430	14,200	7,100	RELATED TO NO. 12					
36	269	12	19	3,230	2,580	53,800	26,900	RELATED TO NO. 8					
37	60	13	122	782	471	16,600	8,300	RELATED TO NO. 27					
38	60	11	91	647	417	16,600	8,300	RELATED TO NO. 27					
39	49	10	19	467	380	9,800	4,900	RELATED TO NO. 12					
40	59	86	150	5,093	1,697	11,800	5,900	7	-	-	-	-	-
41	84	4	16	336	269	16,800	8,400	RELATED TO NO. 8					
42	29	2	4	58	46	5,800	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 8					
43	115	7	26	805	68	23,000	11,500	RELATED TO NO. 8					
44	265	2	12	600	480	53,000	26,500	RELATED TO NO. 8					
45	35	44	100	1,539	513	7,000	3,500	RELATED TO NO. 2					
46	85	14	31	1,208	1,017	17,000	8,500	RELATED TO NO. 12					
47	29	12	17	336	220	5,800	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 12					
48	29	7	16	208	150	5,800	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 12					
49	NI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50	17	211	150	3,582	1,194	3,400	1,700	RELATED TO NO. 40					
51	29	3	10	100	33	5,800	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 40					

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
QUEENS (CONTINUED)									
52	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/07/2005	30	0	30
53	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/10/2005	11	1	41
54	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/10/2005	11	1	41
55	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/10/2005	11	3	101
56	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	01/10/2005	11	3	101
57	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/20/2005	11	1	41
58	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/27/2005	23	0	23
59	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/01/2005	30	0	30
60	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/01/2005	30	6	210
61	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/02/2005	30	2	60
62	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/02/2005	30	4	150
63	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/07/2005	11	1	41
64	MCGANN	BROWN	FORGERY	WC	D	02/14/2005	30	1	60
65	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/17/2005	30	0	30
66	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/17/2005	30	1	60
67	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/17/2005	30	0	30
68	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/01/2005	17	0	17
69	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/01/2005	17	0	17
70	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/01/2005	17	0	17
71	MCGANN	BROWN	FORGERY	WC	D	03/01/2005	15	0	15
72	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/02/2005	30	7	240
73	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/10/2005	8	0	8
74	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/10/2005	8	0	8
75	MCGANN	BROWN	FORGERY	WC	D	03/15/2005	30	0	30
76	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/17/2005	30	0	30
77	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/17/2005	30	0	30
78	BUTCHER	BROWN	MURDER	WC	D	03/28/2005	30	0	30
79	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/31/2005	30	2	90
80	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WS	H	03/31/2005	30	0	30
81	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/31/2005	30	2	90
82	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/31/2005	30	3	120
83	MCDONALD	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/31/2005	30	1	60

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
QUEENS (CONTINUED)													
52	27	3	7	81	65	5,400	2,700	RELATED TO NO. 8					
53	39	6	9	248	181	7,800	3,900	RELATED TO NO. 12					
54	39	12	13	487	350	7,800	3,900	RELATED TO NO. 12					
55	95	8	24	720	582	19,000	9,500	RELATED TO NO. 12					
56	95	9	28	901	870	19,000	9,500	RELATED TO NO. 12					
57	40	107	150	4,280	1,426	8,000	4,000	RELATED TO NO. 40					
58	23	5	9	118	95	4,600	2,300	RELATED TO NO. 12					
59	29	10	10	290	80	5,800	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 40					
60	209	61	150	12,652	4,217	41,800	20,900	RELATED TO NO. 40					
61	59	15	23	885	708	11,800	5,900	RELATED TO NO. 8					
62	141	14	67	1,974	1,579	28,200	14,100	RELATED TO NO. 8					
63	39	12	12	487	408	7,800	3,900	RELATED TO NO. 12					
64	57	52	43	2,986	2,687	11,400	5,700	-	-	-	-	-	-
65	29	10	22	302	285	5,800	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 12					
66	58	12	37	712	510	11,600	5,800	RELATED TO NO. 12					
67	29	12	14	348	301	5,800	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 12					
68	16	17	11	278	200	3,200	1,600	RELATED TO NO. 12					
69	16	15	8	241	160	3,200	1,600	RELATED TO NO. 12					
70	16	7	7	108	82	3,200	1,600	RELATED TO NO. 12					
71	I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
72	216	144	150	31,088	10,496	43,200	21,600	RELATED TO NO. 40					
73	8	8	6	62	48	1,600	800	RELATED TO NO. 12					
74	8	20	11	158	93	1,600	800	RELATED TO NO. 12					
75	16	57	23	912	788	3,200	1,600	-	-	-	-	-	-
76	29	17	22	489	407	5,800	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 12					
77	29	14	17	397	309	5,800	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 12					
78	29	-	2	6	-	6,000	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
79	89	89	150	7,960	2,653	17,800	8,900	RELATED TO NO. 40					
80	29	148	830	4,290	35	5,800	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 40					
81	85	26	12	2,249	16	17,000	8,500	1	-	-	-	-	1
82	114	22	14	2,531	22	22,800	11,400	RELATED TO NO. 81					
83	55	19	10	1,072	10	1,100	550	1	-	-	-	-	1

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
QUEENS (CONTINUED)									
84	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/01/2005	30	4	150
85	BUCHTER	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/07/2005	30	4	150
86	BUCHTER	BROWN	LARCENY	WC	D	04/13/2005	30	0	30
87	MCDONALD	BROWN	FORGERY	OM	B	04/14/2005	30	0	30
88	MCDONALD	BROWN	FORGERY	WC	D	04/21/2005	23	8	263
89	MCDONALD	BROWN	FORGERY	WC	D	05/02/2005	12	2	72
90	BUCHTER	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/05/2005	30	2	90
91	BUCHTER	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/05/2005	11	2	71
92	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/16/2005	30	1	60
93	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/26/2005	30	0	30
94	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/26/2005	30	1	60
95	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/26/2005	30	0	30
96	BUCHTER	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/02/2005	30	2	90
97	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/06/2005	30	0	30
98	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/06/2005	30	0	30
99	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/06/2005	30	0	30
100	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/23/2005	30	0	30
101	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/23/2005	30	0	30
102	MCDONALD	BROWN	FORGERY	WC	D	06/23/2005	16	6	196
103	BUCHTER	BROWN	LARCENY	WC	D	06/23/2005	30	0	30
104	BUCHTER	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/30/2005	30	1	60
105	BUCHTER	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/30/2005	30	1	60
106	ROSENGARTEN	BROWN	MURDER	WC	D	07/06/2005	30	0	30
107	BUCHTER	BROWN	LARCENY	WC	D	07/11/2005	12	4	132
108	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/21/2005	30	0	30
109	BUCHTER	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/27/2005	30	0	30
110	BUCHTER	BROWN	LARCENY	WC	D	08/10/2005	10	1	40
111	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/18/2005	30	0	30
112	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/18/2005	30	0	30
113	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/30/2005	30	0	30
114	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	O	08/30/2005	30	2	90
115	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/15/2005	30	1	60

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
QUEENS (CONTINUED)													
84	139	11	73	1,529	1,223	27,800	13,900	RELATED TO NO. 8					
85	140	7	10	1,000	707	28,000	14,000	3	-	-	-	-	1
86	21	15	27	314	31	4,200	2,100	-	-	-	-	-	-
87	29	-	-	-	-	5,800	2,900	-	-	-	-	-	-
88	229	230	47	52,726	47,453	45,800	22,900	17	-	-	-	-	-
89	47	127	12	5,964	5,268	9,400	4,700	RELATED TO NO. 88					
90	58	7	15	425	108	11,600	5,800	RELATED TO NO. 85					
91	58	7	10	430	150	11,600	5,800	RELATED TO NO. 85					
92	50	12	23	581	501	10,000	5,000	2	-	-	-	-	-
93	29	11	13	320	256	5,800	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 8					
94	57	19	8	1,095	7	11,400	5,700	RELATED TO NO. 81					
95	29	19	5	542	6	5,800	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 81					
96	77	3	10	255	201	15,400	7,700	RELATED TO NO. 85					
97	29	13	17	386	301	5,800	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 92					
98	29	15	21	426	371	5,800	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 92					
99	29	7	7	210	156	5,800	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 92					
100	29	18	4	531	4	5,800	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 81					
101	29	19	5	538	5	5,800	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 81					
102	166	97	24	16,136	14,422	33,200	16,600	RELATED TO NO. 88					
103	28	62	15	1,736	35	5,600	2,800	-	-	-	-	-	-
104	58	7	10	425	283	11,600	5,800	RELATED TO NO. 85					
105	58	7	10	425	200	11,600	5,800	RELATED TO NO. 85					
106	2	2	2	4	-	400	200	-	-	-	-	-	-
107	100	82	100	8,248	314	20,000	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
108	28	10	11	280	224	5,600	2,800	RELATED TO NO. 8					
109	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
110	37	73	15	2,711	26	7,400	3,700	-	-	-	-	-	-
111	29	18	5	527	6	5,800	2,900	1	-	-	-	-	1
112	29	18	5	531	6	5,800	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 111					
113	17	17	3	281	4	3,400	1,700	RELATED TO NO. 111					
114	73	21	13	1,551	15	14,600	7,300	RELATED TO NO. 111					
115	57	19	9	1,074	10	11,400	5,700	1	-	-	-	-	1

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
QUEENS (CONTINUED)									
116	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/15/2005	30	0	30
117	BUCHTER	BROWN	LARCENY	WC	D	09/15/2005	30	1	60
118	BUCHTER	BROWN	LARCENY	WC	D	09/27/2005	18	1	48
137*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/02/2003	30	15	480
138*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/22/2003	30	10	330
139*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/17/2003	30	8	270
140*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/17/2003	30	6	210
141*	RIVERA	BROWN	GAMBLING	WS	H	11/06/2003	30	2	90
142*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/14/2003	30	4	120
143*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/12/2003	30	0	30
144*	RIVERA	BROWN	GAMBLING	WC	D	01/27/2004	30	0	30
145*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/06/2004	30	4	150
146*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/24/2004	30	6	210
147*	RIVERA	BROWN	GAMBLING	WC	D	02/25/2004	30	0	30
148*	RIVERA	BROWN	GAMBLING	WC	D	02/25/2004	30	0	30
149*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/05/2004	30	0	30
150*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/05/2004	30	1	60
151*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	ED	D	03/15/2004	30	6	210
152*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/15/2004	30	1	60
153*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/15/2004	30	2	60
154*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/24/2004	30	1	60
155*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/30/2004	4	1	34
156*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/03/2004	30	1	60
157*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/22/2004	30	4	150
158*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/22/2004	30	0	30
159*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/22/2004	8	7	218
160*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/30/2004	30	0	30
161*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/12/2004	30	2	90
162*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/18/2004	9	0	9
163*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/20/2004	30	2	90
164*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/20/2004	30	6	210
165*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/26/2004	30	5	180

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
QUEENS (CONTINUED)													
116	9	14	4	125	3	1,800	900	RELATED TO NO. 111					
117	56	32	15	1,784	165	11,200	5,600	-	-	-	-	-	-
118	44	55	10	2,436	13	8,800	4,400	-	-	-	-	-	-
137*	461	17	2,100	8,065	5,000	92,200	46,100	RELATED TO NO. 2					
138*	329	29	150	9,551	3,163	65,800	32,900	RELATED TO NO. 2					
139*	269	45	150	12,080	4,025	53,800	26,900	RELATED TO NO. 2					
140*	209	170	150	35,479	11,823	41,800	20,900	RELATED TO NO. 2					
141*	82	22	412	1,788	1,609	16,400	8,200	RELATED TO NO. 1					
142*	115	54	150	6,241	2,080	23,000	11,500	RELATED TO NO. 2					
143*	29	3	5	100	33	5,800	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 2					
144*	21	-	-	-	-	4,200	2,100	-	-	-	-	-	-
145*	149	54	150	8,046	2,682	29,800	14,900	RELATED TO NO. 2					
146*	206	2	8	349	38	41,200	20,600	RELATED TO NO. 27					
147*	27	12	152	335	103	5,400	2,700	RELATED TO NO. 1					
148*	27	8	37	214	22	5,400	2,700	RELATED TO NO. 1					
149*	29	3	15	100	33	5,800	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 2					
150*	59	13	35	750	250	11,800	5,900	RELATED TO NO. 2					
151*	178	4	132	647	434	35,600	17,800	RELATED TO NO. 27					
152*	38	3	7	123	32	7,600	3,800	RELATED TO NO. 27					
153*	50	15	72	743	207	10,000	5,000	RELATED TO NO. 27					
154*	56	276	832	15,437	9,783	11,200	5,600	RELATED TO NO. 27					
155*	33	5	15	175	58	6,600	3,300	RELATED TO NO. 2					
156*	59	1	5	50	10	11,800	5,900	RELATED TO NO. 2					
157*	139	70	113	9,763	7,322	27,800	13,900	RELATED TO NO. 27					
158*	29	11	12	329	48	5,800	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 27					
159*	217	79	150	17,169	5,723	43,400	21,700	RELATED TO NO. 2					
160*	18	11	15	200	66	3,600	1,800	RELATED TO NO. 2					
161*	42	32	123	1,347	528	8,400	4,200	RELATED TO NO. 27					
162*	8	6	5	50	15	1,600	800	RELATED TO NO. 2					
163*	83	33	56	2,749	2,061	16,600	8,300	RELATED TO NO. 27					
164*	199	11	182	2,130	1,597	39,800	19,900	RELATED TO NO. 27					
165*	179	143	150	25,621	8,540	35,800	17,900	RELATED TO NO. 2					

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
QUEENS (CONTINUED)									
166*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/04/2004	20	0	20
167*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/24/2004	30	0	30
168*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/24/2004	30	2	90
169*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/24/2004	30	2	90
170*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/24/2004	30	1	60
171*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/15/2004	30	4	150
172*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/15/2004	30	2	90
173*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/21/2004	30	0	30
174*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	07/22/2004	30	1	60
175*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/22/2004	30	1	60
176*	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/05/2004	21	2	81
177*	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/12/2004	14	0	14
178*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/17/2004	30	0	30
179*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	08/18/2004	29	2	89
180*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/18/2004	29	1	59
181*	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/25/2004	30	2	90
182*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/25/2004	22	3	112
183*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/10/2004	30	0	30
184*	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/10/2004	13	0	13
185*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/13/2004	30	1	60
186*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/15/2004	30	1	60
187*	KOHM	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/23/2004	30	0	30
188*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/07/2004	30	2	90
189*	RIVERA	BROWN	GAMBLING	WC	D	10/07/2004	30	0	30
190*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/07/2004	30	0	30
191*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/07/2004	30	0	30
192*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/13/2004	30	0	30
193*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/26/2004	10	0	10
194*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/26/2004	10	2	70
195*	RIVERA	BROWN	GAMBLING	WS	H	11/04/2004	30	0	30
196*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/05/2004	30	0	30
197*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC,ED	D	11/12/2004	20	0	20

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
QUEENS (CONTINUED)													
166*	19	16	30	300	100	3,800	1,900	RELATED TO NO. 2					
167*	29	3	10	100	33	5,800	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 2					
168*	89	360	150	32,000	10,000	17,800	8,900	RELATED TO NO. 2					
169*	89	8	50	689	246	17,800	8,900	RELATED TO NO. 2					
170*	59	1	10	59	23	11,800	5,900	RELATED TO NO. 2					
171*	146	13	108	1,873	1,404	29,200	14,600	RELATED TO NO. 27					
172*	83	10	47	842	631	168,400	84,200	RELATED TO NO. 27					
173*	29	5	10	150	30	5,800	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 2					
174*	52	17	47	901	810	10,400	5,200	RELATED TO NO. 12					
175*	52	23	37	1,182	980	10,400	5,200	RELATED TO NO. 12					
176*	79	11	32	869	695	15,800	7,900	RELATED TO NO. 8					
177*	14	10	23	140	112	2,800	1,400	RELATED TO NO. 8					
178*	27	15	15	410	252	5,400	2,700	RELATED TO NO. 12					
179*	88	8	38	720	681	17,600	8,800	RELATED TO NO. 12					
180*	39	6	14	216	172	7,800	3,900	RELATED TO NO. 12					
181*	80	5	26	400	320	16,000	8,000	RELATED TO NO. 8					
182*	100	8	21	791	610	20,000	10,000	RELATED TO NO. 12					
183*	26	5	8	132	68	5,200	2,600	RELATED TO NO. 27					
184*	13	-	2	4	1	2,600	1,300	RELATED TO NO. 8					
185*	54	6	15	320	274	10,800	5,400	RELATED TO NO. 12					
186*	59	2	20	100	33	11,800	5,900	RELATED TO NO. 2					
187*	30	-	4	14	11	6,000	3,000	RELATED TO NO. 8					
188*	72	7	14	510	480	14,400	7,200	RELATED TO NO. 12					
189*	14	10	44	143	16	2,800	1,400	RELATED TO NO. 1					
190*	29	6	11	176	137	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 12					
191*	29	14	18	417	352	5,800	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 12					
192*	29	3	25	100	33	5,800	2,900	RELATED TO NO. 2					
193*	10	6	5	62	42	2,000	1,000	RELATED TO NO. 12					
194*	59	5	12	314	240	11,800	5,900	RELATED TO NO. 12					
195*	NI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
196*	30	10	28	310	219	6,000	3,000	RELATED TO NO. 12					
197*	20	15	18	297	222	4,600	2,300	RELATED TO NO. 12					

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
QUEENS (CONTINUED)									
198*	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/09/2004	30	0	30
169**	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/02/2003	30	2	90
170**	RIVERA	BROWN	GAMBLING	WC	D	04/24/2003	30	6	210
171**	RIVERA	BROWN	GAMBLING	WS	B	04/24/2003	30	1	60
172**	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/30/2003	30	6	210
173**	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/30/2003	30	5	180
174**	RIVERA	BROWN	GAMBLING	WC	D	06/19/2003	30	3	120
175**	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/27/2003	30	4	150
176**	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/19/2003	30	0	30
177**	MCGANN	BROWN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/24/2003	24	1	54
RICHMOND									
1	MASTRO	DONOVAN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/15/2005	30	1	60
2	MASTRO	DONOVAN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/28/2005	30	0	30
3	MASTRO	DONOVAN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/06/2005	30	0	30
4	MASTRO	DONOVAN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/06/2005	30	0	30
ROCKLAND									
1	KELLY	BONGIORNO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/14/2004	30	3	120
2	KELLY	BONGIORNO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/18/2005	30	0	30
3	KELLY	BONGIORNO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/22/2005	30	1	60
4	KELLY	BONGIORNO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/24/2005	30	0	30
5	KELLY	BONGIORNO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/31/2005	30	1	60
6	KELLY	BONGIORNO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/08/2005	30	1	60
7	KELLY	BONGIORNO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/08/2005	30	0	30
8	KELLY	BONGIORNO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/08/2005	30	0	30
9	KELLY	BONGIORNO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/04/2005	30	0	30
10	KELLY	BONGIORNO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/04/2005	30	0	30
SARATOGA									
1	SCARANO	MURPHY	KIDNAPPING	WC	D	02/15/2005	10	0	10
SCHENECTADY									
1	REILLY	CARNEY	GAMBLING	WS,WC	H,D	11/03/2005	30	1	51
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL									
1	FLORIO	SPITZER	LARCENY	WC	D	04/07/2005	30	9	235

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEW YORK

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
QUEENS (CONTINUED)													
198*	7	10	10	70	23	1,400	70	RELATED TO NO. 2					
169**	89	9	52	767	592	17,800	8,900	RELATED TO NO. 2					
170**	195	24	206	4,731	2,379	39,000	19,500	RELATED TO NO. 1					
171**	NI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
172**	209	56	1,250	11,652	6,250	41,800	20,900	RELATED TO NO. 2					
173**	153	70	150	10,732	3,250	30,600	15,300	RELATED TO NO. 2					
174**	112	28	187	3,086	925	22,400	11,200	RELATED TO NO. 1					
175**	123	53	190	6,487	2,162	24,600	12,300	RELATED TO NO. 2					
176**	NI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
177**	27	219	150	5,913	1,904	5,400	2,700	RELATED TO NO. 2					
RICHMOND													
1	46	205	157	9,447	2,923	381,000	38,000	15	-	-	2	-	5
2	8	231	61	1,845	320	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	2	106	6	212	76	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
4	2	166	16	331	66	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
ROCKLAND													
1	120	333	53	39,977	4,181	440,233	41,483	40	1	-	8	-	39
2	11	119	43	1,314	508	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	36	21	31	767	163	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
4	21	123	61	2,586	258	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
5	52	6	24	293	137	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
6	48	17	39	799	240	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
7	20	16	23	326	94	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
8	20	25	11	500	98	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
9	26	45	30	1,159	193	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
10	26	21	18	552	134	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
SARATOGA													
1	10	1	8	8	NR	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-
SCHENECTADY													
1	41	97	110	3,962	1,400	45,000	10,000	3	-	-	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL													
1	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
SUFFOLK									
1	LIFSON	SPOTA	GAMBLING	WS	B	11/18/2004	30	2	90
2	LIFSON	SPOTA	GAMBLING	WS	B	11/18/2004	30	1	60
3	LIFSON	SPOTA	GAMBLING	WS	B	11/18/2004	30	1	60
4	LIFSON	SPOTA	GAMBLING	WS	B	11/18/2004	30	1	60
5	LIFSON	SPOTA	GAMBLING	WS	B	11/18/2004	30	1	60
6	LIFSON	SPOTA	GAMBLING	WS	B	11/18/2004	30	1	60
7	LIFSON	SPOTA	GAMBLING	WS	B	11/18/2004	30	1	60
8	LIFSON	SPOTA	GAMBLING	WS	B	11/18/2004	30	1	60
9	LIFSON	SPOTA	GAMBLING	WS,EF	B	11/18/2004	30	2	90
10	LIFSON	SPOTA	GAMBLING	WS,EF	B	11/18/2004	30	2	90
11	HUDSON	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/08/2004	30	1	60
12	HUDSON	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/08/2004	30	0	30
13	LIFSON	SPOTA	GAMBLING	WC	D	12/16/2004	30	1	60
14	LIFSON	SPOTA	GAMBLING	WC	D	12/16/2004	30	1	60
15	HUDSON	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/05/2005	30	0	30
16	HUDSON	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/05/2005	30	1	60
17	LIFSON	SPOTA	GAMBLING	WC	D	01/13/2005	30	0	30
18	HUDSON	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/26/2005	30	0	30
19	HUDSON	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/10/2005	30	1	60
20	HUDSON	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/22/2005	30	1	60
21	HUDSON	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	ED	D	02/22/2005	30	1	60
22	BRASLOW	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/25/2005	30	0	30
23	BRASLOW	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/25/2005	30	0	30
24	BRASLOW	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	ED	D	02/25/2005	30	0	30
25	BRASLOW	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/15/2005	30	1	60
26	BRASLOW	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/15/2005	30	2	90
27	BRASLOW	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/18/2005	30	1	60
28	BRASLOW	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/27/2005	30	1	60
29	BRASLOW	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/10/2005	30	1	60
30	BRASLOW	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/26/2005	30	0	30
31	BRASLOW	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/26/2005	30	0	30
32	BRASLOW	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/26/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEW YORK

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
SUFFOLK													
1	77	134	310	10,344	10,344	49,384	21,544	23	-	-	-	-	17
2	56	15	26	826	826	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	56	27	50	1,489	1,489	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
4	56	18	35	1,032	1,032	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
5	56	15	45	827	827	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
6	56	77	165	4,332	4,332	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
7	56	52	116	2,899	2,899	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
8	56	36	125	2,005	2,005	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
9	77	17	NR	1,308	1,308	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
10	77	25	NR	1,916	1,916	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
11	58	30	1,626	1,727	436	100,000	5,000	23	-	-	-	-	7
12	30	22	1,626	665	235	53,000	5,000	RELATED TO NO. 11					
13	60	37	32	2,239	500	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
14	60	13	15	807	154	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
15	6	28	6	165	8	22,600	3,000	RELATED TO NO. 11					
16	35	225	1,626	7,879	1,216	61,000	5,000	RELATED TO NO. 11					
17	24	41	20	989	10	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
18	30	88	1,626	2,633	262	76,000	5,000	RELATED TO NO. 11					
19	14	8	150	113	66	34,000	4,000	RELATED TO NO. 11					
20	30	40	150	1,203	116	68,300	5,000	RELATED TO NO. 11					
21	27	13	362	362	312	7,200	1,000	RELATED TO NO. 11					
22	24	-	-	-	-	7,400	2,600	-	-	-	-	-	-
23	24	-	-	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 22		-	-	-	-	-	-
24	24	-	-	-	-	RELATED TO NO. 22		-	-	-	-	-	-
25	19	111	56	2,106	151	523,358	45,000	12	-	-	-	-	1
26	63	16	31	984	68	RELATED TO NO. 25		RELATED TO NO. 25					
27	31	6	12	190	1	RELATED TO NO. 25		RELATED TO NO. 25					
28	52	47	49	2,442	394	RELATED TO NO. 25		RELATED TO NO. 25					
29	39	69	56	2,710	198	RELATED TO NO. 25		RELATED TO NO. 25					
30	22	92	15	2,020	65	RELATED TO NO. 25		RELATED TO NO. 25					
31	-	-	-	-		RELATED TO NO. 25		-	-	-	-	-	-
32	I	-	-	-		RELATED TO NO. 25		-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
SUFFOLK (CONTINUED)									
33	GAZZILLO	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/09/2005	30	0	30
34	GAZZILLO	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WS	H	06/09/2005	30	0	30
35	GAZZILLO	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/16/2005	30	0	30
36	BRASLOW	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/15/2005	30	2	90
37	BRASLOW	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/01/2005	30	1	60
38	BRASLOW	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/18/2005	30	0	30
39	BRASLOW	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/18/2005	30	0	30
40	BRASLOW	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/18/2005	30	0	30
41	BRASLOW	SPOTA	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/29/2005	30	0	30
WAYNE									
1	SIRKIN	HEALY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/27/2005	30	1	60
2	SIRKIN	HEALY	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/24/2005	24	0	24
WESTCHESTER									
1	DIFIORE	PIRRO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/18/2004	30	3	120
2	DIFIORE	PIRRO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/18/2004	30	3	120
3	DIFIORE	PIRRO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/16/2004	30	2	90
4	DIFIORE	PIRRO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/13/2005	30	0	30
5	DIFIORE	PIRRO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/28/2005	15	0	15
6	DIFIORE	PIRRO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/28/2005	15	0	15
7	MOLEA	PIRRO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/31/2005	30	3	120
8	DIFIORE	PIRRO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/31/2005	30	0	30
9	DIFIORE	PIRRO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/08/2005	30	1	60
10	DIFIORE	PIRRO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/23/2005	8	1	38
11	DIFIORE	PIRRO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/08/2005	30	0	30
12	MOLEA	PIRRO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/13/2005	28	4	142
13	MOLEA	PIRRO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/09/2005	30	6	201
14	MOLEA	PIRRO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/08/2005	28	2	85
15	MOLEA	PIRRO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/26/2005	10	2	67
16	MOLEA	PIRRO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/26/2005	29	0	29
17	MOLEA	PIRRO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/06/2005	30	2	90
18	MOLEA	PIRRO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/16/2005	14	3	99
19	MOLEA	PIRRO	NARCOTICS	ED	D	09/29/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEW YORK

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5] Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Costs Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Number of Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
SUFFOLK (CONTINUED)													
33	28	55	23	1,534	836	297,400	13,400	21	-	-	-	-	21
34	28	19	15	521	147	RELATED TO NO. 33		RELATED TO NO. 33					
35	21	7	8	141	53	RELATED TO NO. 33		RELATED TO NO. 33					
36	56	32	54	1,810	554	117,420	1,500	13	-	-	-	-	1
37	39	35	39	1,347	183	82,230	1,500	RELATED TO NO. 36					
38	26	28	26	741	99	55,320	1,500	RELATED TO NO. 36					
39	20	7	18	146	9	42,900	1,500	RELATED TO NO. 36					
40	21	14	12	301	81	44,970	1,500	RELATED TO NO. 36					
41	17	47	27	800	166	36,690	1,500	RELATED TO NO. 36					
WAYNE													
1	47	44	25	2,062	442	247,327	12,104	7	-	-	-	-	-
2	24	42	25	1,010	148	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
WESTCHESTER													
1	116	85	258	9,907	4,856	84,878	8,228	17	-	-	-	-	16
2	102	72	433	7,349	6,553	71,357	4,037	RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	87	43	198	3,703	1,849	61,216	6,796	RELATED TO NO. 1					
4	28	38	58	1,070	505	20,876	2,396	RELATED TO NO. 1					
5	14	101	53	1,411	1,293	13,172	3,932	RELATED TO NO. 1					
6	14	8	8	106	15	12,240	3,000	RELATED TO NO. 1					
7	115	90	415	10,374	904	79,900	4,000	3	-	-	-	-	-
8	1	3	3	3	-	33,356	6,296	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	47	92	16	4,308	3,166	31,962	3,000	7	-	-	-	-	7
10	37	44	91	1,625	624	RELATED TO NO. 8		5	-	-	-	-	-
11	20	316	18	6,329	4,411	1,700	1,700	RELATED TO NO. 9					
12	140	84	71	11,749	4,443	100,358	9,278	25	-	-	-	-	-
13	182	71	88	12,859	6,877	116,038	16,378	RELATED TO NO. 12					
14	84	12	57	982	378	61,072	6,952	RELATED TO NO. 12					
15	66	76	40	4,992	4,048	49,533	6,633	RELATED TO NO. 12					
16	15	-	-	-	-	4,651	3,651	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	70	14	98	965	865	53,074	6,874	2	-	-	-	-	-
18	84	84	61	7,052	3,002	32,713	4,333	RELATED TO NO. 12					
19	5	15	35	77	77	1,000	1,000	RELATED TO NO. 17					

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS
PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
WESTCHESTER (CONTINUED)									
20	MOLEA	PIRRO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/28/2005	27	1	55
26*	DIFIORE	PIRRO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/18/2004	30	0	30
27*	DIFIORE	PIRRO	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/16/2004	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE NEW YORK

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			Persons Convicted
										G	D	P	
WESTCHESTER (CONTINUED)													
20	41	55	47	2,255	393	31,331	4,271	RELATED TO NO. 12					
26*	8	44	32	354	85	7,843	3,223	RELATED TO NO. 1					
27*	29	25	46	711	208	22,146	3,006	RELATED TO NO. 1					

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE B-1

STATE NORTH CAROLINA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL									
1	MANNING	COOPER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/27/2005	30	1	45
2	MANNING	COOPER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/31/2005	30	0	30
3	MANNING	COOPER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/18/2005	30	0	30
4	MANNING	COOPER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/23/2005	30	0	30
5	MANNING	COOPER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/09/2005	30	0	30
6	MANNING	COOPER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/08/2005	30	0	30
7	MANNING	COOPER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/08/2005	30	3	75
8	MANNING	COOPER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/21/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)

[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).

[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE NORTH CAROLINA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL													
1	45	28	9	1,238	109	304,548	140,893	14	-	-	-	-	6
2	22	5	4	109	7	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	29	44	9	1,267	85	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
4	29	23	9	668	140	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
5	13	59	7	773	133	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
6	20	83	4	1,658	11	32,300	3,500	3	-	-	-	-	3
7	66	167	18	11,043	776	152,330	9,285	18	-	-	-	-	18
8	21	168	18	3,521	663	RELATED TO NO. 7		RELATED TO NO. 7					

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
GARFIELD									
1	JOHNSON	STOCKER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/09/2004	30	1	60
2	JOHNSON	STOCKER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/19/2005	30	0	30
OKLAHOMA									
1	JOHNSON	LANE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/09/2004	30	0	30
2	CHAPEL	LANE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/15/2005	30	0	30
3	CHAPEL	LANE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/16/2005	30	0	30
4	CHAPEL	LANE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/21/2005	30	0	30
5	LUMPKIN	LANE	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/02/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE OKLAHOMA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			Persons Convicted
										G	D	P	
GARFIELD													
1	25	56	125	1,389	441	81,064	2,500	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	28	56	125	1,579	488	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
OKLAHOMA													
1	30	NR	NR	NR	NR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	30	175	275	5,250	1,155	34,500	2,500	17	-	-	1	-	-
3	29	203	360	5,892	1,147	42,400	400	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	30	5	28	161	29	44,000	2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	30	30	12	911	112	170,000	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
LANE									
1	MITCHELL	WARNISHER	MURDER	OM	O	12/17/2005	5	0	5
MARION									
1	RHOADES	BEGLAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/10/2005	30	0	30
2	RHOADES	BEGLAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/21/2005	30	0	30
3	RHOADES	BEGLAU	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/29/2005	30	0	30
MULTNOMAH									
1	KOCH	SCHRUNK	MURDER	WC	D	10/13/2005	30	0	30
2	KOCH	SCHRUNK	MURDER	OM	B	10/21/2005	2	0	2

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE OREGON

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			Persons Convicted
										G	D	P	
LANE													
1	1	-	-	-	-	2,400	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MARION													
1	24	76	183	1,833	1,194	128,400	24,000	37	-	-	-	-	-
2	14	73	147	1,021	340	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	7	11	7	80	18	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
MULTNOMAH													
1	5	52	90	258	8	46,800	800	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	NI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
MCKEAN									
1	JOYCE	PAVLOCK	MURDER	OM	O	09/12/2005	30	0	30
MONTGOMERY									
1	GANTMAN	FERMAN	MURDER	WC	D	01/21/2005	30	0	30
2	GANTMAN	CASTOR	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/02/2005	30	0	30
3	GANTMAN	CASTOR	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/22/2005	30	0	30
4	GANTMAN	CASTOR	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/06/2005	30	0	30
5	GANTMAN	CASTOR	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/06/2005	30	0	30
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL									
1	MCCAFFERY	PAPPERT	GAMBLING	WC	D	12/21/2004	30	1	60
2	MCCAFFERY	PAPPERT	GAMBLING	WS	H	12/21/2004	30	0	30
3	MCCAFFERY	PAPPERT	GAMBLING	WS	H	12/21/2004	30	0	30
4	MCCAFFERY	PAPPERT	GAMBLING	WS	H	12/21/2004	30	0	30
5	MCCAFFERY	PAPPERT	GAMBLING	WC	D	01/12/2005	30	1	60
6	MCEWEN	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/25/2005	30	1	60
7	MCEWEN	RYAN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/25/2005	30	0	30
8	MCEWEN	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	01/25/2005	30	1	60
9	STEVENS	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/03/2005	30	0	30
10	MCCAFFERY	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/09/2005	30	0	30
11	MCCAFFERY	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/09/2005	30	0	30
12	STEVENS	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/22/2005	30	0	30
13	MCCAFFERY	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	02/23/2005	30	1	60
14	MCCAFFERY	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/17/2005	30	0	30
15	PANELLA	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/23/2005	30	1	60
16	MCCAFFERY	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	03/30/2005	30	0	30
17	MCCAFFERY	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/05/2005	30	0	30
18	PANELLA	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WS	H	04/18/2005	30	0	30
19	MCCAFFERY	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/18/2005	30	0	30
20	MCCAFFERY	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/18/2005	30	0	30
21	GANTMAN	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/06/2005	30	2	90
22	BENDER	CORBETT	CORRUPTION	WC	D	06/15/2005	30	0	30
23	BENDER	CORBETT	CORRUPTION	WC	D	06/17/2005	30	0	30
24	GANTMAN	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/29/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE PENNSYLVANIA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
										Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			
A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	G	D	P	Persons Convicted
MCKEAN													
1	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MONTGOMERY													
1	7	41	37	290	84	16,166	800	4	2	-	2	-	2
2	4	6	1	23	NR	28,696	1,696	3	-	-	-	2	1
3	6	118	41	709	109	5,291	372	RELATED TO NO. 2					
4	22	40	48	886	239	33,772	2,396	11	-	-	-	-	-
5	22	2	4	46	13	RELATED TO NO. 4		RELATED TO NO. 4					
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL													
1	60	127	49	7,610	1,470	241,647	12,677	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	15	93	66	1,389	1,389	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	15	34	53	512	512	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
4	15	23	60	340	340	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
5	60	63	24	3,761	872	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
6	60	76	32	4,571	598	740,858	23,800	51	-	-	-	15	-
7	14	131	57	1,829	240	RELATED TO NO. 6		RELATED TO NO. 6					
8	37	120	31	4,446	683	RELATED TO NO. 6		RELATED TO NO. 6					
9	27	104	77	2,811	431	86,560	6,460	11	-	-	-	-	-
10	11	1	4	14	-	RELATED TO NO. 6		-	-	-	-	-	-
11	28	99	17	2,771	204	RELATED TO NO. 6		RELATED TO NO. 6					
12	11	144	77	1,579	287	RELATED TO NO. 9		RELATED TO NO. 9					
13	57	25	5	1,421	187	RELATED TO NO. 6		RELATED TO NO. 6					
14	17	17	3	285	12	RELATED TO NO. 6		RELATED TO NO. 6					
15	36	351	174	12,637	1,493	248,582	5,220	18	-	-	-	1	16
16	27	58	36	1,557	456	RELATED TO NO. 6		RELATED TO NO. 6					
17	14	7	2	101	8	RELATED TO NO. 6		RELATED TO NO. 6					
18	13	28	37	358	69	RELATED TO NO. 15		RELATED TO NO. 15					
19	8	7	2	59	7	RELATED TO NO. 6		RELATED TO NO. 6					
20	8	-	1	3	2	RELATED TO NO. 6		RELATED TO NO. 6					
21	81	122	84	9,904	1,279	511,071	20,123	-	-	-	-	-	-
22	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
23	15	21	19	318	71	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
24	30	120	98	3,591	229	RELATED TO NO. 21		-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL (CONTINUED)									
25	GANTMAN	RYAN	NARCOTICS	WC	D	07/19/2005	30	0	30
26	PANELLA	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/16/2005	30	0	30
27	STEVENS	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/08/2005	30	0	30
28	STEVENS	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/16/2005	30	0	30
29	JOHNSON	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/07/2005	30	0	30
30	FORD-ELLIOTT	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/14/2005	30	0	30
31	JOHNSON	CORBETT	CORRUPTION	WC	D	10/14/2005	30	0	30
32	JOHNSON	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/21/2005	30	0	30
33	JOHNSON	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/21/2005	30	0	30
34	FORD-ELLIOTT	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	10/26/2005	30	0	30
35	BENDER	CORBETT	CORRUPTION	WC	D	11/04/2005	30	0	30
36	BENDER	CORBETT	CORRUPTION	WC	D	11/04/2005	30	0	30
37	ELLIOTT	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/08/2005	30	0	30
38	JOHNSON	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/09/2005	30	0	30
39	BENDER	CORBETT	MURDER	WC	D	11/25/2005	30	0	30
40	BENDER	CORBETT	MURDER	WS	H	11/25/2005	30	0	30
41	FORD-ELLIOTT	CORBETT	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/28/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1
STATE PENNSYLVANIA

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL (CONTINUED)													
25	30	57	68	1,724	97	RELATED TO NO. 21		-	-	-	-	-	-
26	15	-	-	-	-	12,823	2,180	-	-	-	-	-	-
27	28	108	307	3,023	1,157	100,186	6,286	23	-	-	-	-	-
28	29	112	210	3,261	1,240	RELATED TO NO. 27		RELATED TO NO. 27					
29	27	64	77	1,728	458	97,300	7,400	-	-	-	-	-	-
30	27	129	276	3,487	733	225,043	15,220	4	-	-	-	-	-
31	22	96	62	2,114	273	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
32	20	80	67	1,596	520	RELATED TO NO. 29		-	-	-	-	-	-
33	26	104	66	2,708	691	RELATED TO NO. 29		-	-	-	-	-	-
34	6	136	33	819	78	RELATED TO NO. 30		RELATED TO NO. 30					
35	11	18	11	196	34	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
36	29	148	84	4,305	2,004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
37	12	72	40	867	132	RELATED TO NO. 30		RELATED TO NO. 30					
38	9	108	15	975	30	22,300	680	-	-	-	-	-	-
39	9	2	3	22	7	RELATED TO NO. 40		-	-	-	-	-	-
40	9	6	6	54	5	12,000	2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
41	15	253	123	3,796	667	RELATED TO NO. 30		RELATED TO NO. 30					

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE B-1

STATE RHODE ISLAND

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL									
1	RODGERS	LYNCH	GAMBLING	WC	D	11/26/2004	30	2	90
2	RODGERS	LYNCH	GAMBLING	WC	D	12/10/2004	30	2	90
3	RODGERS	LYNCH	ASSAULT	WC	D	12/31/2004	30	1	60

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)

[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).

[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1

STATE RHODE ISLAND

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6] G	D	P	Persons Convicted
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL													
1	72	34	110	2,445	859	50,000	25,000	15	-	-	-	-	2
2	58	21	25	1,232	825	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					
3	37	47	73	1,745	481	RELATED TO NO. 1		RELATED TO NO. 1					

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.
[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.
[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.
* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.
** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE B-1
STATE TENNESSEE

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
DAVIDSON									
1	WATKINS	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	06/18/2004	30	6	210
2	WATKINS	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/05/2004	30	1	60
3	WATKINS	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/05/2004	30	1	60
4	WATKINS	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	12/07/2004	30	0	30
5	WATKINS	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/04/2005	30	0	30
6	WATKINS	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/04/2005	30	0	30
7	WATKINS	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/11/2005	30	0	30
8	WATKINS	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/18/2005	30	4	150
9	WATKINS	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/26/2005	30	0	30
10	WATKINS	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/28/2005	30	1	60
11	WATKINS	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/29/2005	30	0	30
12	WATKINS	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	04/30/2005	30	4	150
13	WATKINS	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/05/2005	30	1	60
14	WATKINS	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	05/06/2005	30	0	30
15	WATKINS	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/17/2005	30	0	30
16	WATKINS	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/18/2005	30	0	30
17	WATKINS	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/30/2005	30	0	30
18	WATKINS	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/09/2005	30	0	30
19	BLACKBURN	JOHNSON	MURDER	WS	O	10/20/2005	30	0	30
20	WATKINS	JOHNSON	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/29/2005	30	0	30
SHELBY									
1	CRAFT	GIBBONS	NARCOTICS	WC	D	11/05/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)
[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).
[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1

STATE TENNESSEE

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			Persons Convicted
										G	D	P	
DAVIDSON													
1	201	112	NR	22,505	4,276	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	60	26	NR	1,570	255	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	60	37	NR	2,221	315	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	30	24	NR	729	185	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	30	6	24	182	17	647,740	167,000	14	-	-	-	-	-
6	NI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	16	65	33	1,037	148	RELATED TO NO. 5		RELATED TO NO. 5					
8	150	109	466	16,279	1,094	RELATED TO NO. 5		-	-	-	-	-	-
9	2	14	5	29	4	RELATED TO NO. 5		RELATED TO NO. 5					
10	52	43	82	2,257	416	RELATED TO NO. 5		RELATED TO NO. 5					
11	30	129	176	3,878	292	RELATED TO NO. 5		-	-	-	-	-	-
12	126	5	4	601	6	RELATED TO NO. 5		-	-	-	-	-	-
13	33	50	141	1,640	336	RELATED TO NO. 5		RELATED TO NO. 5					
14	30	76	165	2,279	368	RELATED TO NO. 5		-	-	-	-	-	-
15	20	30	54	610	72	RELATED TO NO. 5		-	-	-	-	-	-
16	21	6	12	129	1	RELATED TO NO. 5		-	-	-	-	-	-
17	15	13	22	192	67	RELATED TO NO. 5		-	-	-	-	-	-
18	5	17	19	85	15	RELATED TO NO. 5		-	-	-	-	-	-
19	3	1	2	3	3	RELATED TO NO. 5		2	-	-	-	-	-
20	30	27	108	815	82	RELATED TO NO. 5		-	-	-	-	-	-
SHELBY													
1	15	221	53	3,315	7	10,000	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.

[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.

[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE B-1

STATE TEXAS

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
BURLESON									
1	STRICKLIN	MUELLER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/12/2005	30	0	30
2	STRICKLIN	MUELLER	NARCOTICS	WC	D	09/06/2005	30	0	30
FORT BEND									
1	STRICKLIN	HEALEY	MURDER	WC	D	08/18/2005	30	0	30
STARR									
1	GABERT	SILVA	KIDNAPPING	WC	D	06/15/2005	2	0	2

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)

[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).

[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1

STATE TEXAS

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			Persons Convicted
										G	D	P	
BURLESON													
1	29	7	22	204	3	118,777	6,630	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	28	140	11	3,930	275	RELATED TO NO. 1		-	-	-	-	-	-
FORT BEND													
1	23	81	85	1,870	97	112,299	6,990	3	-	-	-	-	-
STARR													
1	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.

[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.

[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE B-1

STATE UTAH

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL									
1*	BARRETT	COEBERGH	NARCOTICS	WC	D	08/17/2004	30	2	90

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)

[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).

[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1

STATE UTAH

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

			Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
										Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			
A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	G	D	P	Persons Convicted
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL													
1*	72	39	17	2,789	369	99,802	36,352	11	-	-	-	-	-

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.

[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.

[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

TABLE B-1

STATE WISCONSIN

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY JUDGES OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

	Authorizing Official			Intercept			Authorized Length		
A.O. Number	Judge	Prosecutor[1]	Offense Specified	Type[2]	Location[3]	Date of Application	Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL									
1	BRUNNER	LAUTENSCHLAGER	MURDER	WS	H	02/25/2005	10	0	10
2	BRUNNER	LAUTENSCHLAGER	MURDER	WS	H	02/25/2005	10	0	10
3	BRUNNER	LAUTENSCHLAGER	MURDER	WS	H	03/22/2005	30	0	30
4	BRUNNER	LAUTENSCHLAGER	MURDER	WS	H	03/22/2005	30	0	30
5	BRUNNER	LAUTENSCHLAGER	MURDER	WC	D	03/22/2005	30	0	30

[1] The prosecuting official authorized the filing of the application under provisions of the state's statute. (See Table 1 for this state's statutory citation.)

[2] Type: WS = Standard Telephone (Wire), WC = Cellular or Mobile Telephone (Wire), WO = Other (Wire), OM = Microphone (Oral), OO = Other (Oral), ED = Digital Pager (Electronic), EE = Computer or E-Mail (Electronic), EF = Fax Machine (Electronic), EO = Other (Electronic).

[3] Location: H = Personal Residence, B = Business, A = Public Area, D = Portable Device, O = Other Location, R = Roving (Relaxed Specification Order), N = Not Specified.

TABLE B-1

STATE WISCONSIN

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

REPORT BY PROSECUTORS OF COURT-AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE, ORAL, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 2519

A.O. Number	Number Of Days in Operation[4]	Average Intercepts per Day	Number of [5]			Costs		Number of					
			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total Cost in $	Other Than Manpower in $	Arrests	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[6]			Persons Convicted
										G	D	P	
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL													
1	2	1	5	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	12	7	88	87	NR	14,290	14,290	2	-	-	-	-	-
4	12	23	138	271	NR	RELATED TO NO. 3		RELATED TO NO. 3					
5	12	4	28	43	NR	RELATED TO NO. 3		RELATED TO NO. 3					

[4] NI indicates never installed. I indicates installed but never used. NP indicates no prosecutor's report.

[5] NR indicates not reported or could not be determined.

[6] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

* This wiretap was terminated during 2004, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

** This wiretap was terminated during 2003 or earlier, but was not reported at that time because it was part of an ongoing investigation.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 1997 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005

State, County	A.O. Report Number in 1997 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Total Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
ARIZONA										
MARICOPA										
	5	09/05/1997	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 1998 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005

State, County	A.O. Report Number in 1998 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Total Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
ARIZONA										
MARICOPA										
	2	02/13/1998	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	
	4	08/20/1998	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	NARCOTICS
FLORIDA										
9TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (ORANGE/OSCEOLA)										
	2	08/14/1998	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 1999 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005

State, County	A.O. Report Number in 1999 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Total Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
TEXAS										
TOM GREEN										
	1	10/07/1999	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	
	2)	10/07/1999	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	3)	10/28/1999	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2000 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005

State, County	A.O. Report Number in 2000 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Total Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
ARIZONA										
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL										
	2	12/20/1999	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2001 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005

State, County	A.O. Report Number in 2001 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Total Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
ARIZONA										
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL										
	3	05/16/2001	-	4	-	-	-	-	34	NARCOTICS
FLORIDA										
19TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (SAINT LUCIE)										
	12	09/17/2001	-	3	-	-	2	-	1	NARCOTICS
	13	11/01/2001	-	16	-	-	-	-	16	NARCOTICS
	14)	11/01/2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	15)	11/23/2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	16)	11/26/2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	17)	12/20/2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	18)	12/22/2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2002 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005

State, County	A.O. Report Number in 2002 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Total Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
ARIZONA										
MARICOPA										
	3	07/15/2002	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	NARCOTICS
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL										
	1	02/26/2002	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	NARCOTICS
	3	09/24/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS
CALIFORNIA										
SAN BERNARDINO										
	1	07/27/2001	-	4	-	-	-	-	4	NARCOTICS
MARYLAND										
BALTIMORE CITY										
	16	06/27/2002	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	NARCOTICS
	17)	06/27/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	18)	06/27/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	21)	07/16/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	25)	07/25/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	26)	07/25/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
NEW JERSEY										
CAMDEN										
	2	04/09/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	NARCOTICS
MORRIS										
	1	07/09/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	NARCOTICS
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL										
	1	10/26/2001	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	RACKETEERING
	29**	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	30**	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	31**	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
NEW YORK										
NEW YORK										
	3	07/19/2002	557,000	9	-	-	9	-	1	CORRUPTION

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2002 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

State, County	A.O. Report Number in 2002 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Total Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
PENNSYLVANIA										
BERKS										
	1	12/17/2001	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS
	12	11/18/2002	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS
	13)	11/25/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL										
	19	11/12/2002	-	23	4	-	-	-	23	NARCOTICS

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2003 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005

State, County	A.O. Report Number in 2003 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Total Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
ARIZONA										
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL										
	2	02/18/2003	-	2	1	-	-	-	3	NARCOTICS
	3	04/11/2003	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	
	4	06/18/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	16	NARCOTICS
	5	07/29/2003	-	7	-	-	-	-	7	NARCOTICS
	7	09/23/2003	-	3	-	-	-	-	3	NARCOTICS
	8	10/20/2003	-	1	-	-	-	-	15	NARCOTICS
CALIFORNIA										
LOS ANGELES										
	153**	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
SAN DIEGO										
	4)	06/04/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	6)	08/01/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	12)	11/04/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	13	11/04/2003	-	22	-	-	-	-	16	NARCOTICS
CONNECTICUT										
NEW HAVEN										
	2	09/10/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	NARCOTICS
FLORIDA										
6TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (PINELLAS)										
	2	11/05/2003	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	NARCOTICS
	3)	12/05/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (DADE)										
	1	04/11/2003	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	NARCOTICS

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2003 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

State, County	A.O. Report Number in 2003 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Total Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
FLORIDA (CONTINUED)										
19TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (SAINT LUCIE)										
	3	01/15/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS
	5	05/07/2003	-	3	-	-	-	-	14	NARCOTICS
	6)	10/01/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	7)	10/07/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	8	10/28/2003	-	13	1	-	-	-	13	NARCOTICS
MARYLAND										
BALTIMORE CITY										
	5	07/16/2003	-	-	-	-	9	-	9	NARCOTICS
	6)	08/04/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
MISSISSIPPI										
HINDS										
	2	07/18/2003	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	
	3	09/24/2003	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	NARCOTICS
NEW JERSEY										
BURLINGTON										
	3	06/17/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	CONSPIRACY
	4)	07/08/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	5)	08/07/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	6)	08/07/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
CAMDEN										
	3	09/04/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	NARCOTICS
	4	09/12/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	NARCOTICS
MORRIS										
	1	04/28/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	GAMBLING
	2)	04/28/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	3)	05/16/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	4)	05/27/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2003 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

State, County	A.O. Report Number in 2003 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Total Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
NEW JERSEY (CONTINUED)										
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL										
	1	12/31/2002	23,660	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	2	01/10/2003	16,092	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	4	02/28/2003	69,281	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	5)	02/28/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	8	04/03/2003	64,137	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	9	05/29/2003	13,963	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	50**	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	51**	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	52**	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	53**	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	54**	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
NEW YORK										
NASSAU										
	4	07/31/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	RACKETEERING
QUEENS										
	8	08/13/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	FRAUD
	11	09/24/2002	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	FRAUD
	55	03/19/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	27	RACKETEERING
	70	06/12/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	LARCENY
	169**	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	170**	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	172**	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	173**	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	174**	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	175**	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	177**	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2003 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

State, County	A.O. Report Number in 2003 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Total Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
PENNSYLVANIA										
BERKS										
	2	07/22/2003	-	-	-	-	-	6	1	NARCOTICS
	3)	08/07/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	4)	09/11/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL										
	1	01/02/2003	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	
	2)	01/02/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	3)	01/28/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	4	03/06/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	NARCOTICS
	8)	04/08/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	9)	04/08/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	18)	09/12/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	19	09/26/2003	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS
	20	10/01/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	NARCOTICS
	23	10/16/2003	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS
	25)	10/17/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	26)	10/17/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
TEXAS										
HARRIS										
	1	03/05/2003	-	1	2	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2004 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005

State, County	A.O. Report Number in 2004 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Total Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
ARIZONA										
PIMA										
	1	06/08/2004	-	2	-	-	1	1	13	NARCOTICS
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL										
	1	10/27/2003	-	3	-	-	-	-	3	NARCOTICS
	2	02/04/2004	-	3	-	-	-	-	10	NARCOTICS
	3	04/14/2004	-	2	-	-	-	-	6	OTHER
	4)	04/29/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	5	05/12/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	FRAUD
	6	05/28/2004	-	3	1	-	-	-	13	NARCOTICS
	8	08/13/2004	-	3	-	-	-	-	2	NARCOTICS
CALIFORNIA										
FRESNO										
	1	08/12/2004	-	-	-	-	1	1	25	NARCOTICS
LOS ANGELES										
	66	09/16/2004	63,000	2	-	-	-	-	-	
	68	09/17/2004	53,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	77)	09/30/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	96*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
MONTEREY	1*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
ORANGE										
	2	01/26/2004	19,300	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	4	01/29/2004	14,820	1	-	-	-	-	-	
	5	03/11/2004	10,540	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	8	04/28/2004	38,492	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	10	06/07/2004	40,858	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	15	10/07/2004	39,858	-	-	-	-	-	-	

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2004 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

State, County	A.O. Report Number in 2004 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Total Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
CALIFORNIA (CONTINUED)										
ORANGE (CONTINUED)										
	20	12/13/2004	42,500	2	-	-	-	-	-	
	21*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
SACRAMENTO										
	1*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	2*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	3*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	4*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	5*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	6*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
SAN BERNARDINO										
	11	04/23/2004	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	
	12*	08/12/2003	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	MURDER
	15*	10/29/2003	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	MURDER
	17*	11/26/2003	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	MURDER
	20	08/27/2004	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS
SAN DIEGO										
	10)	08/27/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	11	08/31/2004	-	10	-	-	-	-	2	CONSPIRACY
SANTA BARBARA										
	1*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	2*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
STANISLAUS										
	1*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	2*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2004 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

State, County	A.O. Report Number in 2004 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Total Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
CALIFORNIA (CONTINUED)										
STANISLAUS (CONTINUED)										
	3*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	4*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	5*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	6*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
VENTURA										
	1*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	2*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	3*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	4*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	5*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	6*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	7*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
FLORIDA										
4TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (DUVAL)										
	1	11/06/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	RACKETEERING
	6	04/29/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	RACKETEERING
	14	11/04/2004	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	
	15*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
9TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (ORANGE/OSCEOLA)										
	1	02/16/2004	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS
17TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (BROWARD)										
	1	11/12/2003	-	10	-	-	-	-	4	GAMBLING
	4	07/28/2004	-	25	-	-	-	-	2	GAMBLING

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2004 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

State, County	A.O. Report Number in 2004 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Total Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
FLORIDA (CONTINUED)										
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL										
	4	03/16/2004	-	-	2	-	1	1	25	NARCOTICS
	22	07/19/2004	-	-	-	-	1	-	12	NARCOTICS
	23	09/23/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	NARCOTICS
	25*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
GEORGIA										
AUGUSTA										
	1)	01/26/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	2	02/05/2004	-	7	1	-	-	6	1	NARCOTICS
BIBB										
	1	02/23/2004	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS
CHATHAM										
	2	08/26/2004	-	29	-	-	-	1	15	NARCOTICS
HOUSTON										
	2	03/29/2004	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	
	3	06/02/2004	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	
	6	08/20/2004	-	17	-	-	-	-	-	
	9	11/22/2004	-	13	-	-	-	-	-	
MARYLAND										
BALTIMORE										
	15	10/12/2004	207,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	16)	10/12/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	17)	10/19/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	18)	10/26/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	19)	10/28/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	20)	11/09/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2004 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

State, County	A.O. Report Number in 2004 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Total Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
MARYLAND (CONTINUED)										
CECIL										
	1	12/10/2003	-	14	14	-	1	-	14	NARCOTICS
	2	12/10/2003	-	4	3	-	-	1	3	CONSPIRACY
NEVADA										
CLARK										
	2	03/22/2004	212,451	16	-	-	-	-	14	NARCOTICS
	3)	03/24/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	4)	04/20/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	5)	05/05/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	6)	05/05/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
NEW JERSEY										
CAMDEN										
	1	03/05/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS
GLOUCESTER										
	1	03/29/2004	34,347	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	2)	03/29/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	3)	04/01/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
HUDSON										
	3	09/24/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	19	THEFT
	7	10/26/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	OTHER
MIDDLESEX										
	1	01/07/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	CONSPIRACY
	2)	01/23/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL										
	1	01/26/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	RACKETEERING
	8	04/26/2004	95,067	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	9)	04/26/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2004 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

State, County	A.O. Report Number in 2004 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Total Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
NEW JERSEY (CONTINUED)										
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL (CONTINUED)										
	11	05/11/2004	39,907	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	12	05/20/2004	24,687	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	19	08/16/2004	41,593	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	21	08/16/2004	64,636	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	24*	05/16/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	RACKETEERING
	25*	06/02/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	RACKETEERING
	26	11/03/2004	24,823	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	28	11/09/2004	27,217	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	29)	11/09/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	31*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	32*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	33*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	34*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	35*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	36*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	37*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	38*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	39*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	47*	10/30/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	GAMBLING
NEW YORK										
ALBANY										
	4*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
FRANKLIN										
	1	01/23/2004	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	CONSPIRACY

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2004 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

State, County	A.O. Report Number in 2004 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Total Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
NEW YORK (CONTINUED)										
NASSAU										
	1	11/26/2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	NARCOTICS
	2	03/05/2004	-	1	-	-	-	-	9	BRIBERY
	3	03/25/2004	-	5	-	1	1	-	10	GAMBLING
NEW YORK										
	11	07/22/2004	-	8	-	-	-	2	3	BRIBERY
NY ORGANIZED CRIME TASK FORCE										
	3	11/18/2003	-	4	-	-	5	3	11	NARCOTICS
	4	01/20/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	LARCENY
	6	03/11/2004	-	7	-	-	2	-	7	NARCOTICS
	9	07/15/2004	-	12	-	-	1	-	12	NARCOTICS
	11	08/04/2004	-	11	-	-	-	-	11	NARCOTICS
	13	09/30/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	NARCOTICS
	16	10/14/2004	-	13	-	-	-	-	12	NARCOTICS
QUEENS										
	88	04/30/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	RACKETEERING
	97*	03/28/2003	-	12	-	-	-	-	7	GAMBLING
	111	07/07/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	RACKETEERING
	116*	06/03/2003	-	17	-	-	-	-	14	GAMBLING
	137*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	138*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	139*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	140*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	141*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	142*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	143*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2004 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

State, County	A.O. Report Number in 2004 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Total Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
NEW YORK (CONTINUED)										
QUEENS (CONTINUED)	144*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	145*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	146*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	147*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	148*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	149*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	150*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	151*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	152*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	153*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	154*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	155*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	156*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	157*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	158*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	159*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	160*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	161*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	162*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	163*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	164*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	165*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	166*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	167*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	168*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	169*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2004 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

State, County	A.O. Report Number in 2004 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Total Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
NEW YORK (CONTINUED)										
QUEENS (CONTINUED)	170*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	171*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	172*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	173*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	174*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	175*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	176*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	177*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	178*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	179*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	180*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	181*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	182*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	183*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	184*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	185*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	186*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	187*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	188*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	189*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	190*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	191*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	192*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	193*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	194*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2004 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005 (CONTINUED)

State, County	A.O. Report Number in 2004 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Total Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
NEW YORK (CONTINUED)										
QUEENS (CONTINUED)	196*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	197*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	198*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
SUFFOLK										
	29	10/28/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	NARCOTICS
	30)	10/28/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31)	11/19/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	32)	11/19/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
WESTCHESTER										
	26*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
	27*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
OKLAHOMA										
LINCOLN										
	1	06/16/2004	-	-	3	-	9	-	15	NARCOTICS
OKLAHOMA										
	1	01/21/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	NARCOTICS
	5	04/23/2004	-	13	-	-	-	-	-	NARCOTICS
	6	05/13/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	NARCOTICS
	12	09/16/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	NARCOTICS
PENNSYLVANIA										
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL										
	2	03/12/2004	-	3	-	-	-	1	2	ROBBERY
	6	07/22/2004	-	11	-	-	-	-	8	NARCOTICS
	8	08/05/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	NARCOTICS
	9	08/18/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	NARCOTICS
	10)	08/18/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2004 AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2005

State, County	A.O. Report Number in 2004 Report[1]	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 2005							
			Total Cost in $	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts[2]			Persons Con-victed	Offense for Which Convicted
						G	D	P		
UTAH										
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL										
	1*	(See Appendix Table B-1 in this year's report.)								
WISCONSIN										
MILWAUKEE										
	1	03/12/2004	-	-	3	-	1	-	26	NARCOTICS
	2)	04/29/2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

[1] Report numbers followed by parentheses indicate reports linked to other wiretaps involving the same investigation.
[2] Motions: G = Granted, D = Denied, P = Pending.