Methodology

Law enforcement agencies that participate in the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program forward crime data through their state UCR Programs in 46 states and the District of Columbia. Local agencies in those states that do not have a state Program submit crime statistics directly to the FBI, which provides continuous guidance and support to those participating agencies. The state UCR Programs function as liaisons between local agencies and the FBI. Many states have mandatory reporting requirements, and many state UCR Programs collect data beyond those typically called for by the national UCR Program to address crime problems specific to their particular jurisdictions. These state UCR Programs, in most cases, also provide direct and frequent service to their participating law enforcement agencies, make information readily available for statewide use, and help to streamline the national Program's (FBI's) operations.

Criteria for state UCR Programs

The criteria established for state Programs ensure consistency and comparability in the data submitted to the national Program, as well as regular and timely reporting. These criteria are:

- (1) The state Program must conform to the national UCR Program standards, definitions, and information required.
- (2) The state criminal justice agency must have a proven, effective, statewide Program and have instituted acceptable quality control procedures.
- (3) The state crime reporting must cover a percentage of the population at least equal to that covered by the national UCR Program through direct reporting.
- (4) The state Program must have adequate field staff assigned to conduct audits and to assist contributing agencies in record-keeping practices and crime-reporting procedures.

- (5) The state Program must furnish the FBI with all of the detailed data regularly collected by the FBI from individual agencies that report to the state Program in the form of duplicate returns, computer printouts, and/or appropriate electronic media.
- (6) The state Program must have the proven capability (tested over a period of time) to supply all the statistical data required in time to meet publication deadlines of the national UCR Program.

Data completeness and quality

In order to fulfill its responsibilities in connection with the UCR Program, the FBI continues to edit and review individual agency reports for both completeness and quality. Members of the national Program's staff contact the state UCR Program in connection with crime-reporting matters and, as necessary, when approved by the state, individual contributors. Upon request, staff members conduct training programs within the state on law enforcement record-keeping and crime-reporting procedures. Following audit standards established by the federal government, the FBI conducts an audit of each state's UCR data collection procedures once every 3 years. Should circumstances develop whereby the state Program does not comply with the aforementioned requirements, the national Program may institute a direct collection of Uniform Crime Reports from law enforcement agencies within the state.

Reporting procedures

Law enforcement agencies tabulate the number of Part I offenses (murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larcenytheft, motor vehicle theft, and arson) brought to their attention based on records of all reports of crime received from victims, officers who discover infractions, or other sources, and submit them each month to the FBI either directly or through their state UCR Programs.

Unfounded offenses, clearances, and value of property—When, through investigation, an agency determines that complaints of crimes are unfounded or false, the agency eliminates that offense from its crime tally through an entry on the monthly report. The report also provides the total number of actual Part I offenses, the number of offenses cleared, and the number of clearances that involve only offenders under the age

of 18. (Law enforcement can clear crimes in one of two ways: by the arrest of at least one person who is charged and turned over to the court for prosecution or by exceptional means—when some element beyond law enforcement's control precludes the arrest of a known offender.) Law enforcement agencies also submit monthly to the FBI the value of property stolen and recovered in connection with the offenses and detailed information pertaining to criminal homicide and arson.

Persons arrested—In addition to reporting Part I offenses, law enforcement agencies provide monthly to the UCR Program data on the age, sex, and race of persons arrested for Part I and Part II offenses. Part II offenses encompass all crimes, except traffic violations, that are not classified as Part I offenses.

Officers killed or assaulted—Law enforcement agencies also report monthly to the UCR Program information regarding law enforcement officers killed or assaulted, and yearly, the number of full-time sworn and civilian law enforcement personnel employed as of October 31.

Hate crimes—At the end of each quarter, law enforcement agencies report summarized data on hate crimes, i.e., specific offenses that were motivated by an offender's bias against the perceived race, religion, ethnic origin, sexual orientation, or physical or mental disability of the victim. Those agencies participating in the UCR Program's National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) submit hate crime data monthly.

Editing procedures

The UCR Program thoroughly examines each report it receives for arithmetical accuracy and for deviations in crime data from month to month and from present to past years' data that may indicate errors. The UCR staff members compare aggregated data from agencies of similar population size to identify any unusual fluctuations in an agency's crime count. Large variations in crime levels may indicate modified records procedures, incomplete reporting, or changes in the jurisdiction's geopolitical structure.

Evaluation of trends—Data reliability is a high priority of the FBI, which brings any deviations or arithmetical adjustments to the attention of state UCR Programs or the submitting agencies. Typically, FBI staff members study the monthly reports to evaluate periodic trends prepared for individual reporting units. Any significant increase or

decrease becomes the subject of a special inquiry. Changes in crime reporting procedures or annexations that affect an agency's jurisdiction can influence the level of reported crime. When this occurs, the FBI excludes the figures for specific crime categories or totals, if necessary, from the trend tabulations.

Training for contributors—In addition to the evaluation of trends, the FBI provides training seminars and instructional materials on crime reporting procedures to assist contributors in complying with UCR standards. Throughout the country, the national Program maintains liaison with state Programs and law enforcement personnel and holds training sessions to explain the purpose of the Program, the rules of uniform classification and scoring, and the methods of assembling the information for reporting. When an individual agency has specific problems in compiling its crime statistics and its remedial efforts are unsuccessful, personnel from the FBI's Criminal Justice Information Services Division may visit the contributor to aid in resolving the difficulties.

UCR Handbook—The national UCR Program publishes a *Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook* (revised 2004), which details procedures for classifying and scoring offenses and serves as the contributing agencies' basic resource for preparing reports. The national staff also produces letters to UCR contributors, *State Program Bulletins*, and *UCR Newsletters* as needed. These provide policy updates and new information, as well as clarification of reporting issues.

The final responsibility for data submissions rests with the individual contributing law enforcement agency. Although the FBI makes every effort through its editing procedures, training practices, and correspondence to ensure the validity of the data it receives, the accuracy of the statistics depends primarily on the adherence of each contributor to the established standards of reporting. Deviations from these established standards that cannot be resolved by the national UCR Program may be brought to the attention of the Criminal Justice Information Systems Committees of the International Association of Chiefs of Police and the National Sheriffs' Association.

Population estimation

For the 2007 population estimates used in this report, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census

Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.

Population estimates for 2003 are based on the percent change in the state population from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2002 revised estimates and 2003 provisional estimates. Estimates for 1998 are based on the percent change in the state population from the U.S. Census Bureau's 1997 revised estimates and 1998 provisional estimates.

NIBRS conversion

Thirty-one state Programs are certified to provide their UCR data in the expanded NIBRS format. For presentation in this book, the NIBRS data were converted to the historical Summary UCR data. The UCR Program staff constructed the NIBRS database to allow for such conversion so that UCR's long-running time series could continue.

Crime trends

By showing fluctuations from year to year, trend statistics offer the data user an added perspective from which to study crime. Percent change tabulations in this publication are computed only for reporting agencies that provided comparable data for the periods under consideration. The FBI excludes from the trend calculations all figures except those received for common months from common agencies. Also excluded are unusual fluctuations of data that the FBI determines are the result of such variables as improved records procedures, annexations, etc.

Caution to users

Data users should exercise care in making any direct comparison between data in this publication and those in prior issues of *Crime in the United States*. Because of differing levels of participation from year to year and reporting problems that require the FBI to estimate crime counts for certain contributors, some data may not be comparable from year to year. In addition, this publication may contain updates to data provided in prior years' publications. Therefore, for example, the 2006 data in last year's publication may not match the 2006 data in this publication.

2007 Arrest data considerations

- Because of changes in local agency reporting practices (updates to the NIBRS), figures are not comparable to previous years' data for Colorado (Denver).
- Limited arrest data were received from Illinois; i.e., only Chicago and Rockford provided statistics in accordance with UCR guidelines.
- Except for the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, the Minnesota State UCR
 Program's guidelines for reporting forcible rape arrest counts do not comply with
 the national UCR Program's guidelines; i.e., Minnesota data include arrests made
 for forcible rapes of male victims. Therefore, the state forcible rape counts that
 are published include only the totals received from Minneapolis and St. Paul.
- For 2007, only arrest totals (with no age or gender breakdowns) are available for Florida. Therefore, Florida arrest totals are included only in Table 69, "Arrests by State, 2007."
- No 2007 arrest data were received from the District of Columbia's Metropolitan Police Department. The only agency (Metro Transit Police) in the District of Columbia for which 12 months of arrest data were received has no attributable population.
- No 2007 arrest data were received from Hawaii. However, arrest totals for this state were estimated by the national UCR Program and were included in Table 29 "Estimated Number of Arrests, United States, 2007."
- No 2007 arrest data were received from the New York City Police Department.
 However, arrest totals for this area were estimated by the national UCR Program and were included in Table 29 "Estimated Number of Arrests, United States, 2007."

Offense estimation

Tables 1 through 5 and Table 7 of this publication contain statistics for the entire United States. Because not all law enforcement agencies provide data for complete reporting periods, the FBI includes estimated crime numbers in these presentations.

The FBI estimates data for three areas: Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs), cities outside MSAs, and nonmetropolitan counties. The FBI computes estimates for participating agencies not providing 12 months of complete data. For agencies supplying 3 to 11 months of data, the national UCR Program estimates for the missing data by following a standard estimation procedure using the data provided by the agency. If an agency has supplied less than 3 months of data, the FBI computes estimates by using the known crime figures of similar areas within a state and assigning the same proportion of crime volumes to nonreporting agencies. The estimation process considers the following: population size covered by the agency; type of jurisdiction, e.g., police department versus sheriff's office; and geographic location.

Estimation of state-level data

In response to various circumstances, the FBI calculates estimated offense totals for certain states. For example, some states do not provide forcible rape figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. In addition, problems at the state level have, at times, resulted in no useable data. Also, the conversion of the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) data to Summary data has contributed to the need for unique estimation procedures. A summary of state-specific and offense-specific estimation procedures follows.

Year	State(s)	Reason for Estimation	Estimation Method
1988	Illinois	The state UCR Program was unable to provide forcible rape figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	The rape totals were estimated using national rates per 100,000 inhabitants within the eight population groups and assigning the forcible rape volumes proportionally to the state.
	Florida, Kentucky	Reporting problems at the state level resulted in no usable data.	State totals were estimated by updating previous valid annual totals for individual jurisdictions, subdivided by population group.

			Percent changes for each offense within each population group of the geographic divisions in which the states reside were applied to the previous valid annual totals. The state totals were compiled from the sums of the population group estimates.
1989	Illinois	The state UCR Program was unable to provide forcible rape figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	The rape totals were estimated using national rates per 100,000 inhabitants within the eight population groups and assigning the forcible rape volumes proportionally to the state.
1990	Illinois	The state UCR Program was unable to provide forcible rape figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	The rape totals were estimated using national rates per 100,000 inhabitants within the eight population groups and assigning the forcible rape volumes proportionally to the state.
1991	Illinois	The state UCR Program was unable to provide forcible rape figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	The rape totals were estimated using national rates per 100,000 inhabitants within the eight population groups and assigning the forcible rape volumes proportionally to the state.
	Iowa	NIBRS conversion efforts resulted in estimation for Iowa.	State totals were estimated by updating previous valid annual totals for individual jurisdictions, subdivided by population group.

			Percent changes for each offense within each population group of the West North Central Division were applied to the previous valid annual totals. The state totals were compiled from the sums of the population group estimates.
1992	Illinois	The state UCR Program was unable to provide forcible rape figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	The rape totals were estimated using national rates per 100,000 inhabitants within the eight population groups and assigning the forcible rape volumes proportionally to the state.
1993	Illinois	NIBRS conversion efforts resulted in estimation for Illinois.	Since valid annual totals were available for approximately 60 Illinois agencies, those counts were maintained. The counts for the remaining jurisdictions were replaced with the most recent valid annual totals or were generated using standard estimation procedures. The results of all sources were then combined to arrive at the 1993 state total for Illinois.
		The state UCR Program was unable to provide forcible rape figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	The rape totals were estimated using national rates per 100,000 inhabitants within the eight population groups and assigning the forcible rape volumes proportionally to the state.

	Kansas	NIBRS conversion efforts resulted in estimation for Kansas.	State totals were estimated by updating previous valid annual totals for individual jurisdictions, subdivided by population group. Percent changes for each offense within each population group of the West North Central Division were applied to the previous valid annual totals. The state totals were compiled from the sums of the population group estimates.
	Michigan, Minnesota	The state UCR Programs were unable to provide forcible rape figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	The rape totals were estimated using national rates per 100,000 inhabitants within the eight population groups and assigning the forcible rape volumes proportionally to each state.
1994	Illinois	NIBRS conversion efforts resulted in estimation for Illinois.	Illinois totals were generated using only the valid crime rates for the East North Central Division. Within each population group, the state's offense totals were estimated based on the rate per 100,000 inhabitants within the remainder of the division.

	The state UCR Program was unable to provide forcible rape figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	The rape totals were estimated using national rates per 100,000 inhabitants within the eight population groups and assigning the forcible rape volumes proportionally to the state.
Kansas	NIBRS conversion efforts resulted in estimation for Kansas.	State totals were generated using only the valid crimes rates for the West North Central Division. Within each population group, the state's offense totals were estimated based on the rate per 100,000 inhabitants within the remainder of the division.
Montana	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete 1994 offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	State totals were estimated by updating previous valid annual totals for individual jurisdictions, subdivided by population group. Percent changes for each offense within each population group of the Mountain Division were applied to the previous valid annual totals. The state totals were compiled from the sums of the population group estimates.

1995 Ka	ansas	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	The state UCR Program was able to provide valid 1994 state totals which were then updated using 1995 crime trends for the West North Central Division.
	linois	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	Valid Crime Index (Part I) offense counts were available for most of the largest cities (100,000 and over in population). For other agencies, the only available counts generated by the Illinois State Program were state totals based upon an incident-level system without indication of multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary data. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals

			for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process.
	Montana	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	State estimates were computed by updating the previous valid annual totals using the 1994 versus 1995 percent changes for the Mountain Division.
1996	Florida	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	The state UCR Program was able to provide an aggregated state total; data received from 94 individual Florida agencies are shown in the 1996 jurisdictional figures presented in Tables 8 through 11.
	Illinois	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	Valid Crime Index (Part I) offense counts were available for most of the largest cities (100,000 and over in population). For other agencies, the only available counts generated by the Illinois State Program were state totals based upon an incident-level system without indication of multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a

			comparable state estimate to be
			included in national compilations,
			the Illinois State Program's state
			totals (which were inflated because
			of the nonapplication of the
			Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by
			the proportion of multiple offenses
			reported within single incidents in
			the NIBRS database. Valid totals
			for the large cities were excluded
			from the reduction process.
	Kansas	The state UCR Program was	The Kansas state estimate was
		unable to provide complete	extrapolated from 1996 January-
		offense figures in accordance	June state totals provided by the
		with UCR guidelines.	Kansas State UCR Program.
	Kentucky,	The state UCR Programs were	The 1995 and 1996 percent changes
	Montana	unable to provide complete	within each geographic division
		offense figures in accordance	were applied to valid 1995 state
		with UCR guidelines.	totals to generate 1996 state totals.
1997	Illinois	The state UCR Program was	Valid Crime Index (Part I) offense
		unable to provide complete	counts were available for most of
		offense figures in accordance	the largest cities (100,000 and over
		with UCR guidelines.	in population). For other agencies,
			the only available counts generated
			by the Illinois State Program were
			state totals based upon an
			incident-level system without
			indication of multiple offenses
			recorded within single incidents.
			Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule
			could not be applied in order to

		convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple- offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by
		the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process.
Kansas	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	The Kansas state estimate was extrapolated from 1996 January-June state totals provided by the Kansas State UCR Program.
Kentucky, Montana, New Hampshire, Vermont	The state UCR Programs were unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	The 1996 and 1997 percent changes registered for each geographic division in which the states of Kentucky, Montana, New Hampshire, and Vermont are categorized were applied to valid 1996 state totals to effect 1997 state totals.

1000	D.I.	ml Ison n	TI 1000 C 111
1998	Delaware	The state UCR Program was	The 1998 forcible rape total for
		unable to provide forcible rape	Delaware was estimated by
		figures in accordance with	reducing the number of reported
		national UCR guidelines.	offenses by the proportion of male
			forcible rape victims statewide.
	Illinois	The state UCR Program was	Valid Crime Index (Part I) offense
		unable to provide complete	counts were available for most of
		offense figures in accordance	the largest cities (100,000 and over
		with UCR guidelines.	in population). For other agencies,
			the only available counts generated
			by the Illinois State Program were
			state totals based upon an
			incident-level system without
			indication of multiple offenses
			recorded within single incidents.
			Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule
			could not be applied in order to
			convert the state's data to
			Summary format. (The Hierarchy
			Rule requires that only the most
			serious offense in a multiple-
			offense criminal incident is
			counted.) To arrive at a
			comparable state estimate to be
			included in national compilations,
			the Illinois State Program's state
			totals (which were inflated because
			of the nonapplication of the
			Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by
			the proportion of multiple offenses
			reported within single incidents in
			the NIBRS database. Valid totals

			for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process.
	Kansas	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	To arrive at 1998 estimates, 1997 state totals supplied by the Kansas State UCR Program were updated using 1998 crime trends for the West North Central Division.
	Kentucky, Montana, New Hampshire, Wisconsin	The state UCR Programs were unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	State totals were estimated by using 1997 figures for the nonreporting areas and applying 1997 versus 1998 percentage changes for the division in which each state is located. The estimates for the nonreporting areas were then increased by any actual 1998 crime counts received.
1999	Illinois	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	Valid Crime Index (Part I) offense counts were available for most of the largest cities (100,000 and over in population). For other agencies, the only available counts generated by the Illinois State Program were state totals based upon an incident-level system without indication of multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most

		serious offense in a multiple- offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process.
Kansas, Kentucky, Montana	The state UCR Programs were unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	To arrive at 1999 estimates for Kansas, Kentucky, and Montana, 1998 state totals supplied by each state's UCR Program were updated using 1999 crime trends for the divisions in which each state is located.
Maine	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	The Maine Department of Public Safety forwarded monthly January through October crime counts for each law enforcement contributor; since 12 months of data were not received, the national Program estimated for the missing data following standard estimation procedures to arrive at a 1999 state total.

	New Hampshire	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete 1999 offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	The state total for New Hampshire was estimated by using the 1998 figures for the 1999 nonreporting areas and applying the 2-year percent change for the New England Division.
2000	Illinois	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	Valid Crime Index (Part I) offense counts were available for most of the largest cities (100,000 and over in population). For other agencies, the only available counts generated by the Illinois State Program were state totals based upon an incident-level system without indication of multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in

			the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process.	
	Kansas	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	To arrive at 2000 estimates for Kansas, 1999 state estimates were updated using 2000 crime trends for the West North Central Division.	
	Kentucky, Montana	The state UCR Programs were unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	To arrive at 2000 estimates for Kentucky and Montana, 1999 state totals supplied by each state's UCR Program were updated using 2000 crime trends for the divisions in which each state is located.	
2001	Illinois	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	Valid Crime Index (Part I) offense counts were available for most of the largest cities (100,000 and over in population). For other agencies, the only available counts generated by the Illinois State Program were state totals based upon an incident-level system without indication of multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is	

			counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process.
	Kentucky	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	To arrive at the 2001 estimates for Kentucky, the 2000 state estimates were updated using 2001 crime trends reported for the East South Central Division.
2002	Illinois	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	Valid Crime Index (Part I) offense counts were available for most of the largest cities (100,000 and over in population). For other agencies, the only available counts generated by the Illinois State Program were state totals based upon an incident-level system without indication of multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most

			serious offense in a multiple- offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process.
	Kentucky	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	To obtain the 2002 state crime count, the FBI contacted the state UCR Program, and the state agency was able to provide their latest state total, 2000. Therefore, the 2001 state estimate was updated for inclusion in the 2002 edition of <i>Crime in the United States</i> by using the 2001 crime trends for the division in which the state is located. To derive the 2002 state estimate, the 2002 crime trends for the division were applied to the adjusted 2001 state estimate.
2003	Illinois	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	Valid Part I offense counts were available for most of the largest cities (100,000 and over in population). For other agencies,

by the Illinois State Program were state totals based upon an incident-level system without indication of multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. Kentucky The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. To obtain the 2003 estimate, the 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was reestimated by applying the 2002			the only available counts generated
incident-level system without indication of multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. Kentucky The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. To obtain the 2003 estimate, the 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was			by the Illinois State Program were
indication of multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple- offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. Kentucky The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. To obtain the 2003 estimate, the 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was			state totals based upon an
recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. Kentucky The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. To obtain the 2003 estimate, the 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was			incident-level system without
Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. Kentucky The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. To obtain the 2003 estimate, the 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was			indication of multiple offenses
could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. Kentucky The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. To obtain the 2003 estimate, the 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was			recorded within single incidents.
convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple- offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. Kentucky The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. To obtain the 2003 estimate, the 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was			Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule
Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. Kentucky The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. To obtain the 2003 estimate, the 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was			could not be applied in order to
Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. Kentucky The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. To obtain the 2003 estimate, the 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was			convert the state's data to
serious offense in a multiple- offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. Kentucky The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. To obtain the 2003 estimate, the 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was			Summary format. (The Hierarchy
offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. Kentucky The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. To obtain the 2003 estimate, the 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was			Rule requires that only the most
counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. Kentucky The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. To obtain the 2003 estimate, the 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was			serious offense in a multiple-
comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. Kentucky The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. To obtain the 2003 estimate, the 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was			offense criminal incident is
included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. Kentucky The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. To obtain the 2003 estimate, the 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was			counted.) To arrive at a
the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. Kentucky The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. To obtain the 2003 estimate, the 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was			comparable state estimate to be
totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. Kentucky The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. To obtain the 2003 estimate, the 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was			included in national compilations,
define the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. Kentucky The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. To obtain the 2003 estimate, the 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was			the Illinois State Program's state
Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. Kentucky The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. To obtain the 2003 estimate, the 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was			totals (which were inflated because
the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. Kentucky The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. To obtain the 2003 estimate, the 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was			of the nonapplication of the
reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. Kentucky The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. To obtain the 2003 estimate, the 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was			Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by
the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. Kentucky The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. To obtain the 2003 estimate, the 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was			the proportion of multiple offenses
for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. Kentucky The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. To obtain the 2003 estimate, the 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was			reported within single incidents in
Kentucky The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. To obtain the 2003 estimate, the 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was			the NIBRS database. Valid totals
Kentucky The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. To obtain the 2003 estimate, the 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was			for the large cities were excluded
unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was			from the reduction process.
unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was	Kentucky	The state UCR Program was	To obtain the 2003 estimate, the
offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was	,		
with UCR guidelines. to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was		•	South Central Division was applied
The 2002 state count was		o o	
reestimated by applying the 2002			The 2002 state count was
			reestimated by applying the 2002
crime trend for the East South			crime trend for the East South
Central Division using a more			Central Division using a more

			current figure, 2001 state totals, provided by the state UCR Program. The adjusted 2002 estimate differs from the figure published in the 2002 edition of <i>Crime in the United States</i> which was originally estimated using 2002 state totals.
2004	Illinois	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	Valid Part I offense counts were available for agencies in the cities 100,000 and over in population. For other agencies, the only available counts generated by the Illinois State Program were totals based upon an incident-level system without indication of multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in

			the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process.
2005	Illinois	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	Valid Part I offense counts were available for agencies in the cities 100,000 and over in population. For other agencies, the only available counts generated by the Illinois State Program were totals based upon an incident-level system without indication of multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process.

	Minnesota	The state UCR Program was unable to provide forcible rape offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	To arrive at a comparable state estimate for forcible rape offenses to be included in national compilations, Minnesota's forcible rape total was estimated by using the national rates per 100,000 inhabitants within the eight population groups and proportionally assigning forcible rape volumes to Minnesota's population groups.
2006	Illinois	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	Valid Part I offense counts were available for agencies in the cities 100,000 and over in population. For other agencies, the only available counts generated by the Illinois State Program were totals based upon an incident-level system without indication of multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's totals (which were inflated because of the

		nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process.
	The state UCR Program was unable to provide forcible rape figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	Forcible rape figures for Rockford include only the forcible rape offenses with female victims that were extracted from the agency's NIBRS data. The rest of the state's forcible rape totals were estimated using national rates per 100,000 inhabitants within the eight population groups and assigning the forcible rape volumes proportionally to the state.
Minnesota	The state UCR Program was unable to provide forcible rape offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	Valid forcible rape figures were available for Minneapolis and St. Paul. To arrive at a comparable state estimate for forcible rape offenses to be included in national compilations, the rest of Minnesota's forcible rape totals were estimated by using the national rates per 100,000 inhabitants within the eight population groups and

			proportionally assigning forcible rape volumes to Minnesota's population groups.
2007	Illinois	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	Valid Part I offense counts were available for agencies in the cities 100,000 and over in population. For other agencies, the only available counts generated by the Illinois State Program were totals based upon an incident-level system without indication of multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process.

	The state UCR Program was unable to provide forcible rape figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	Forcible rape figures for Rockford include only the forcible rape offenses with female victims that were extracted from the agency's NIBRS data. The rest of the state's forcible rape totals were estimated using national rates per 100,000 inhabitants within the eight
		population groups and assigning the forcible rape volumes proportionally to the state.
Minnesota	The state UCR Program was unable to provide forcible rape offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	Valid forcible rape figures were available for Minneapolis and St. Paul. To arrive at a comparable state estimate for forcible rape offenses to be included in national compilations, the rest of Minnesota's forcible rape totals were estimated by using the national rates per 100,000 inhabitants within the eight population groups and proportionally assigning forcible rape volumes to Minnesota's population groups.

Table methodology

The tables in this report are based upon varying levels of data submissions. For example, some participating agencies may submit data for some but not all months of the reporting year. Using well-established procedures, the FBI estimates for missing offense

data for agencies with partial reports and for nonreporting agencies and then aggregates these estimates with data reported to determine the number of offenses for each state and the Nation. Tables 1–5, 7, and 29 present these approximations. In addition, various circumstances require the FBI to estimate offense totals from time to time for some states. (An explanation of the estimation procedures applied to particular states during specific reporting years is provided in the Offense estimation section.)

To be included in Tables 8–11 and 21–22, which provide statistics for specific jurisdictions and states, agencies must submit 12 months of complete data prior to the FBI's established deadlines. To be included in Table 20, agencies must submit Supplementary Homicide Reports (SHRs). Tables 12–19, 23–28, 30–75, and 77 provide the number of reporting agencies (data source) and the total population covered by their collective jurisdictions. To be included in Tables 78–81, agencies must submit officer and civilian law enforcement employee counts as of October 31.

The tabular presentation that follows briefly describes the data sources and the methods used to construct Tables 1–81.

(1) Table	(2) Database	(3) Table Construction	(4) General Comments
1- 1A	The data used in creating these tables were from all law enforcement agencies participating in the UCR Program (including those submitting less than 12 months of data).	These tables provide the estimated number and rate (per 100,000 inhabitants) of reported crimes in the United States for 1988 through 2007, as well as the 2-, 5-, and 10-year trends for 2007 based on these estimates.	The UCR Program does not have sufficient data to estimate for arson.
	Crime statistics for the Nation include	The 2007 statistics in these tables are consistent with those	

estimated offense totals (except arson) for agencies submitting less than 12 months of offense reports for each year. published in Tables 2 and 4.

Prior to the release of this publication, the FBI may have reestimated state offense totals published in the previous edition of *Crime in the United States* to reflect more current data. Because of this, national totals for 2006 may have been adjusted.

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table. the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.

The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies participating in the UCR Program (including those submitting less than 12

months of data).

Crime statistics for the Nation and for community types include estimated offense totals (except arson) for agencies submitting less than 12 months of offense reports for each year.

This table provides estimated crime statistics for the Nation, Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs), cities outside metropolitan areas, and nonmetropolitan counties, and the rate (per 100,000 inhabitants) for each grouping, and their estimated populations. For MSAs, cities outside metropolitan areas, and nonmetropolitan areas, and nonmetropolitan counties, the table also includes crime statistics by area actually reporting.

The statistics under the heading "Area actually reporting" represent offense totals for agencies submitting 12 months of data and estimated totals for agencies submitting less than 12 but more than 2 months of data.

The statistics under the heading "Estimated total" represent the above "Area actually reporting" totals plus estimated totals for agencies submitting 2 months or less of data.

The UCR Program does not have sufficient data to estimate for arson.

The FBI derives national statistics for community types by using the community type estimates for individual states as shown in Table 5.

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.

The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies participating in the UCR Program (including those submitting less than 12

months of data).

This table provides the 2007 percent distribution of violent crime, property crime, murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft offenses by region.

The UCR Program does not have sufficient data to estimate for arson.

Crime statistics include estimated offense totals (except arson) for agencies submitting less than 12 months of offense reports for each year. The FBI computes regional offense distribution percentages using the volume estimates as shown in Table 4.

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.

The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies in the UCR Program (including those submitting less than 12

months of data).

This table provides estimated number and rate (per 100,000 inhabitants) of crime in each region, geographic division, and state in 2006 and 2007, and the percent change in each.

Crime statistics include estimated offense totals (except arson) for agencies submitting less than 12 months of offense reports for each year. The FBI derives state totals by estimating for nonreporting and partially reporting agencies within each state.
Using the state's individual agency data and estimates, the Program aggregates a state total.

State totals for 2006 were reestimated, if necessary, to reflect data received after the publication of the 2006 edition of *Crime in the United States*.

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts

For Illinois, valid counts for murder, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft were available only for agencies in cities 100,000 and over in population. For other agencies, the only available data generated by the Illinois State Program were totals based upon an incidentlevel system without indication of multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multipleoffense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's totals were reduced by the

and 2001 through 2006
population estimates from the
U.S. Census Bureau. Each
agency's rates of growth were
averaged; that average was
then applied and added to its
2006 Census population
estimate to derive the agency's
2007 population estimate.

proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the National Incident-Based Reporting System database. Data for cities 100,000 and over in population were excluded from the reduction process.

The data collection
methodology for the
offense of forcible rape
used by Illinois (with the
exception of Rockford,
Illinois) and Minnesota
(with the exception of
Minneapolis and St. Paul,
Minnesota) do not
comply with national
UCR Program guidelines.
Consequently, their
figures for forcible rape
were estimated for
inclusion in this table.

Any comparisons of crime among different locales should take into consideration relevant

			factors in addition to the area's crime statistics. Variables Affecting Crime provides more details concerning the proper use of UCR statistics.
			The UCR Program does not have sufficient data to estimate for arson.
5	The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies in the UCR Program (including those submitting less than 12 months of data). Crime statistics include estimated offense totals (except arson) for agencies submitting less than 12 months of offense reports for each year.	This table provides the estimated number of offenses and the rate of offenses per 100,000 inhabitants for each state. This table provides the estimated number of offenses and the actual number of offenses reported in Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs), cities outside metropolitan areas, and nonmetropolitan counties, and the rate (per 100,000 inhabitants) for each grouping, and the estimated population for each state.	For Illinois, valid counts for murder, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft were available only for agencies in cities 100,000 and over in population. For other agencies, the only available data generated by the Illinois State Program were totals based upon an incident-level system without indication of multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The

The statistics under the heading "Area actually reporting" represent offense totals for agencies submitting 12 months of data and estimated totals for agencies submitting less than 12 but more than 2 months of data.

The statistics in the table under the heading "Estimated total" represent the above "Area actually reporting" plus estimated totals for agencies submitting 2 months or less of data.

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's

Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multipleoffense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's totals were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the National Incident-Based Reporting System database. Data for cities 100.000 and over in population were excluded from the reduction process.

The data collection
methodology for the
offense of forcible rape
used by Illinois (with the
exception of Rockford,
Illinois) and Minnesota
(with the exception of
Minneapolis and St. Paul,
Minnesota) do not
comply with national
UCR Program guidelines.

		2007 population estimate.	Consequently, their figures for forcible rape were estimated for inclusion in this table. The UCR Program does not have sufficient data to estimate for arson.
			Any comparisons of crime among different locales should take into consideration relevant factors in addition to the area's crime statistics. Variables Affecting Crime provides more details concerning the proper use of UCR statistics.
6	The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies in the UCR Program (including those submitting less than 12 months of data).	This table provides actual and estimated crime data for Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) and their estimated populations, the counties included in each MSA, and estimated populations for principal cities in MSAs. The table also includes the rate (per 100,000 inhabitants) of offenses for each MSA.	The UCR Program does not have sufficient data to estimate for arson. Any comparisons of crime among different locales should take into consideration relevant factors in addition to the area's crime statistics.

Crime statistics include estimated offense totals (except arson) for agencies submitting less than 12 months of offense reports for each year.

This table provides crime statistics for the Metropolitan Divisions (MDs), which are subdivisions of MSAs that have a core population of at least 2.5 million people. The table also includes the rate (per 100,000 inhabitants) of offenses for each MD and estimated and actual offense totals.

Variables Affecting Crime provides more details concerning the proper use of UCR statistics.

This table includes all currently designated MSAs in which at least 75 percent of the agencies within the MSA reported data to the UCR Program and for which the principal city/cities submitted 12 months of complete data for 2007.

The statistics under the heading "Total area actually reporting" represent offense totals for agencies submitting 12 months of data and estimated totals for agencies submitting less than 12 but more than 2 months of data.

	T	1
	The statistics under the heading "Estimated total" represent the above "Total area actually reporting" plus estimated totals for agencies submitting 2 months or less of data.	
	For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's	
The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies participating in the UCR Program	This table provides the estimated number of offenses for the crimes of murder, forcible rape, robbery, burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft for the	The data source from which the FBI derives Table 7 does not include aggravated assault or arson data.
	creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies participating in the	heading "Estimated total" represent the above "Total area actually reporting" plus estimated totals for agencies submitting 2 months or less of data. For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate. The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies participating in the heading "Estimated total" represent the above "Total area actually reporting" plus estimates of growth stable, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.

	submitting less than 12 months of data). Crime statistics include estimated offense tables (except arson) for agencies submitting less than 12 months of offense reports for each year.	This table provides additional detail for the following offenses: Robbery by location (such as street/highway, bank, residence). Burglary by location (residence or nonresidence) and time of day (night, day, or unknown). Larceny-theft by type (such as pocket-picking, pursesnatching, and shoplifting). The FBI estimates the breakdowns for robbery, burglary, and larceny-theft by first calculating the proportion of the total offenses represented by the breakdowns as presented in Table 23 and applying those percentages to the estimated offense total as presented in Table 1.	
8	The data used in creating this table were from all city and town law enforcement	This table provides the volume of violent crime (murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, and	Readers should take into consideration relevant factors in addition to the areas' crime statistics

agencies submitting 12 months of complete offense data for 2007.

aggravated assault) and property crime (burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft) as reported by city and town law enforcement agencies (listed alphabetically by state) that contributed data to the UCR Program.

when making any valid comparisons of crime among different locales. Variables Affecting Crime provides more details concerning the proper use of UCR statistics.

The FBI does not publish arson data unless it receives data from either the agency or the state for all 12 months of the calendar year.

When the FBI determines that an agency's data collection methodology does not comply with national UCR guidelines, the figures for that agency's offense(s) will not be included in the table, and the discrepancy will be explained in a footnote.

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.

9 The data used in creating this table were from all university/college law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete offense

data for 2007.

This table provides the volume of violent crime (murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault) and property crime (burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft) as reported by those individual university/college law enforcement agencies (listed alphabetically by state) that contributed data to the UCR Program.

factors in addition to the areas' crime statistics when making any valid comparisons of crime among different locales. Variables Affecting Crime provides more details concerning the proper use of UCR statistics.

Readers should take into

consideration relevant

The student enrollment figures provided by the U.S. Department of Education are for 2006, the most recent available. They include full-and part-time students.

When the FBI determines that an agency's data collection methodology does not comply with national UCR guidelines, the figure for that agency's offense will not be included in the table, and the discrepancy will be explained in a footnote.

The FBI does not publish arson data unless it receives data from either the agency or the state for all 12 months of the calendar year.

The data used in creating this table were from all county law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete offense

data for 2007.

This table provides the volume of violent crime (murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault) and property crime (burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft) as reported by those individual law enforcement agencies (such as individual sheriffs' offices and/or county police departments) in metropolitan counties and nonmetropolitan counties (listed alphabetically by state) that contributed data to the UCR Program.

The Metropolitan Counties classification encompasses jurisdictions covered by noncity law enforcement agencies located within currently designated Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs). The Nonmetropolitan Counties classification encompasses jurisdictions covered by noncity agencies located outside currently designated MSAs.

These data do not represent county totals because they exclude crime counts for city agencies and other types of agencies that have jurisdiction within each county.

Readers should take into consideration relevant factors in addition to the areas' crime statistics when making any valid comparisons of crime among different locales. Variables Affecting Crime provides more details concerning the proper use of UCR statistics.

When the FBI determines that an agency's data collection methodology does not comply with national UCR guidelines, the figure for that agency's offense will not be included in the table, and the discrepancy will

		The FBI does not publish arson data unless it receives data from either the agency or the state for all 12 months of the calendar year.	be explained in a footnote.
11	The data used in creating this table were from all state and other law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete offense data for 2007.	This table provides the volume of violent crime (murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault) and property crime (burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft) as reported by state agencies and other agencies (listed alphabetically by state) that contributed data to the UCR Program.	These data represent reported crime from individual state or territorial law enforcement agencies (i.e., state police, highway patrol, and/or other law enforcement agencies managed by the state or territory) and any federally managed law enforcement agency participating in the UCR Program.
		State, federal, territorial, and other agencies are those agencies, regardless of jurisdiction, that are managed by their respective state, county, federal, or territorial governments or, in some cases, independently of those entities.	Readers should take into consideration relevant factors in addition to the areas' crime statistics when making any valid comparisons of crime among different locales. Variables Affecting Crime provides more details concerning the proper

			7
		The FBI does not publish arson data unless it receives data from either the agency or the state for all 12 months of the calendar year.	When the FBI determines that an agency's data collection methodology does not comply with national UCR guidelines, the figure for that agency's offense will not be included in the table, and the discrepancy will be explained in a footnote.
12	The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies submitting at least 6 common months of complete offense reports for 2006 and 2007.	This 2-year trend table provides the number of offenses for 2006 and 2007 and the percent change between these 2 years, listed by population group. In calculating trends, the UCR Program includes only common reported months for individual agencies.	
		Metropolitan counties include sheriffs and county law enforcement agencies	

associated with a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA).

The Nonmetropolitan Counties classification includes state police agencies that report aggregately for the entire state.

Suburban area includes law enforcement agencies in cities with less than 50,000 inhabitants and county law enforcement agencies that are within an MSA.

Suburban area excludes all metropolitan agencies associated with a principal city. The agencies associated with suburban areas also appear in other groups within this table.

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each

		agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.	
13	The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies submitting at least 6 common months of complete offense reports for 2006 and 2007.	This 2-year trend table provides the number of offenses for 2006 and 2007 and the percent change between these 2 years for suburban and nonsuburban cities.	
		In calculating trends, the UCR Program includes only common reported months for individual agencies.	
		Suburban cities include law enforcement agencies in cities with less than 50,000 inhabitants that are within a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) but exclude all metropolitan agencies associated with a principal city.	
		Nonsuburban cities include law enforcement agencies in cities with less than 50,000 in	

population that are not associated with an MSA. For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's

2007 population estimate.

The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies submitting at least 6 common months of complete offense reports for 2006 and 2007.

This 2-year trend table provides the number of offenses for 2006 and 2007 and the percent change between these 2 years for metropolitan counties and nonmetropolitan counties.

Offenses from state police agencies are not included in this table.

In calculating trends, the UCR Program includes only common reported months for individual agencies.

Metropolitan counties include sheriffs and county law enforcement agencies associated with a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA).

Nonmetropolitan counties include sheriffs and county law enforcement agencies that are not associated with an MSA.

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000

		decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.	
15	The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies submitting at least 6 common months of complete offense reports with breakdowns for 2006 and 2007.	This 2-year trend table provides the 2006 and 2007 breakdowns (such as weapons, type of entry, attempts, and property types for the offenses of forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, motor vehicle theft, and arson) and the percent change between these 2 years. In calculating trends, the UCR Program includes only common reported months for individual agencies.	

Suburban area includes law enforcement agencies in cities with less than 50,000 inhabitants and county law enforcement agencies that are within a Metropolitan Statistical Area.

Suburban area excludes all metropolitan agencies associated with a principal city. The agencies associated with suburban areas also appear in other groups within this table.

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.

The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete data (except arson) for

2007.

This table provides the rate per 100,000 inhabitants and the number of offenses known to law enforcement for violent crime (murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault) and property crime (burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft) nationally and by city and county groupings for law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete data (except arson) for 2007. In addition, the table furnishes the number of agencies meeting the criteria for inclusion in this table and provides the estimated population for each population group.

Nonmetropolitan counties include police agencies that report aggregately for the entire state.

Suburban area includes law enforcement agencies in cities with less than 50,000

The FBI publishes only data that conform to UCR data collection guidelines. For example, the data collection methodology for the offense of forcible rape used by the state **UCR Programs** administered by the Illinois State Police and the Minnesota Department of Public Safety do not comply with these guidelines, and, therefore, are not available for inclusion in this table. Instead, the FBI computes the rates by estimating forcible rape offenses for each population group for participating agencies in Illinois and Minnesota. The figures are estimated using the national rates for each population group applied to the population by group for Illinois and Minnesota agencies supplying 12 months of complete data.

inhabitants and county law enforcement agencies that are within a Metropolitan Statistical Area.

Suburban area excludes all metropolitan agencies associated with a principal city. The agencies associated with suburban areas also appear in other groups within this table.

The UCR Program does not have sufficient data to publish arson offenses in this table. Information about arson can be found in Arson Tables 1 and 2.

The FBI derived the offense rates by first dividing the total aggregated offense estimates by the aggregated populations covered by contributing agencies for which 12 months of complete data were supplied and then multiplying the resulting figure by 100,000.

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each

		agency's rates of growth were	
		averaged; that average was	
		then applied and added to its	
		2006 Census population	
		estimate to derive the agency's	
		2007 population estimate.	
17	The data used in	This table provides the rate per	The FBI publishes only
	creating this table were	100,000 inhabitants and the	data that conform to UCR
	from all law	number of offenses known to	data collection guidelines.
	enforcement agencies	law enforcement for violent	For example, the data
	submitting 12 months	crime (murder and	collection methodology
	of complete data	nonnegligent manslaughter,	for the offense of forcible
	(except arson) for	forcible rape, robbery, and	rape used by the state
	2007.	aggravated assault) and	UCR Programs
		property crime (burglary,	administered by the
		larceny-theft, and motor	Illinois State Police and
		vehicle theft) in suburban and	the Minnesota
		nonsuburban cities. In	Department of Public
		addition, the table furnishes	Safety do not comply with
		the number of agencies	these guidelines, and,
		meeting the criteria for	therefore, are not
		inclusion in this table and	available for inclusion in
		provides the estimated	this table. Instead, the
		population for each city group.	FBI computes the rates
			by estimating forcible
			rape offenses for each
		The suburban and	population group for
		nonsuburban cities	participating agencies in
		classifications in this table	Illinois and Minnesota.
		encompass all cities other than	The figures are estimated
		principal cities served by	using the national rates
		municipal law enforcement	for each population group
		agencies in Metropolitan	applied to the population

Statistical Areas (MSAs).

The FBI derived the offense rates by first dividing the total aggregated offense estimates by the aggregated populations covered by contributing agencies for which 12 months of complete data were supplied and then multiplying the resulting figure by 100,000.

by group for Illinois and Minnesota agencies supplying 12 months of complete data.

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's

2007 population estimate.

The UCR Program does not have sufficient data to publish arson offenses in this table. Information about arson can be found in Arson Tables 1 and 2.

The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete data (except arson) for

2007.

This table provides the rate per 100.000 inhabitants and the number of offenses known to law enforcement for violent crime (murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault) and property crime (burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft) for metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties. In addition, the table furnishes the number of agencies meeting the criteria for inclusion in this table and provides the estimated population for each population group.

Metropolitan counties include sheriffs' offices and county law enforcement agencies associated with a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA).

Nonmetropolitan counties include sheriffs' offices and county law enforcement agencies that are not associated with an MSA.

The FBI publishes only data that conform to UCR data collection guidelines. For example, the data collection methodology for the offense of forcible rape used by the state **UCR Programs** administered by the Illinois State Police and the Minnesota Department of Public Safety do not comply with these guidelines, and, therefore, are not available for inclusion in this table. Instead, the FBI computes the rates by estimating forcible rape offenses for each population group for participating agencies in Illinois and Minnesota. The figures are estimated using the national rates for each population group applied to the population by group for Illinois and Minnesota agencies supplying 12 months of complete data.

Offenses from state police agencies are not included in this presentation.

The UCR Program does not have sufficient data to publish arson offenses in this table. Information about arson can be found in Arson Tables 1 and 2.

The FBI derived the offense rates by first dividing the total aggregated offense estimates by the aggregated populations covered by contributing agencies for which 12 months of complete data were supplied and then multiplying the resulting figure by 100,000.

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.

The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete data (except arson) for

2007.

This table provides for each population group (both city and county groupings) the rate of offenses per 100,000 inhabitants and the number of offenses known to law enforcement for forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, and motor vehicle theft as well as the breakdowns associated with each type of offense. In addition, the table furnishes the number of agencies meeting the criteria for inclusion in this table and provides the estimated population for each population group.

Suburban area includes law enforcement agencies in cities with less than 50,000 inhabitants and county law enforcement agencies that are within a Metropolitan Statistical Area. Suburban area excludes all metropolitan agencies associated with a principal city. The agencies associated with suburban areas also appear in other groups within this table.

The UCR Program does not include murder or arson offenses in this table. Information about these offenses can be found in the respective sections of this report: Expanded Homicide Data and Arson.

The totals provided in this table reflect only those offenses for which law enforcement agencies provided additional information to the UCR Program; therefore, the totals will not match those shown in other rate tables.

The FBI publishes only data that conform to UCR data collection guidelines. For example, the data collection methodology for the offense of forcible rape used by the state UCR Programs administered by the Illinois State Police and

		The FBI derived the offense rates by first dividing the total aggregated offense estimates by the aggregated populations covered by contributing agencies for which 12 months of complete data were supplied and then multiplying the resulting figure by 100,000. For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts	the Minnesota Department of Public Safety do not comply with these guidelines, and, therefore, are not available for inclusion in this table. Instead, the FBI computes the rates by estimating forcible rape offenses for each population group for participating agencies in Illinois and Minnesota. The figures are estimated using the national rates for each population group applied to the population by group for Illinois and Minnesota agencies supplying 12 months of
		and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.	The UCR Program does not have sufficient data to estimate arson. Information about arson can be found in Arson Tables 1 and 2.
20	The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies	This table provides the type of weapons used in murder offenses. The data are based on the aggregated data from	The data in this table were collected via the UCR Program's Supplementary Homicide

1	that submitted	agencies within each state for	Report (SHR), the
	supplemental homicide	which supplemental homicide	monthly law enforcement
	data for 2007.	data (i.e., weapon information)	report submitted by
	duta for 2007.	were reported to the FBI. The	agencies concerning
		table also includes a	homicides.
		breakdown of the types of	nometaes.
		firearms used in murders (i.e.,	
		handguns, rifles, shotguns, or firearms [type unknown]).	The SHR data submitted
		,	by Florida and Washington, D.C., did not
		The weapon totals are aggregated from all murders for which the FBI received	meet UCR guidelines and were not included in this table.
		supplemental homicide data for calendar year 2007.	The FBI received limited SHR data from Illinois.
21	The data used in	This table provides the type of	The FBI received limited
	creating this table were	weapons used in robbery	weapon data from
	from all law	offenses. The data are based	Illinois.
	enforcement agencies	on aggregated data from	
	that submitted		
	that submitted	agencies within each state for	
	complete reports for 12	which weapon information was	
		which weapon information was reported to the FBI. The table	
	complete reports for 12	which weapon information was reported to the FBI. The table includes the number of	
	complete reports for 12	which weapon information was reported to the FBI. The table includes the number of agencies that submitted data	
	complete reports for 12	which weapon information was reported to the FBI. The table includes the number of agencies that submitted data by state and the population	
	complete reports for 12	which weapon information was reported to the FBI. The table includes the number of agencies that submitted data	
	complete reports for 12	which weapon information was reported to the FBI. The table includes the number of agencies that submitted data by state and the population	
	complete reports for 12	which weapon information was reported to the FBI. The table includes the number of agencies that submitted data by state and the population	
	complete reports for 12	which weapon information was reported to the FBI. The table includes the number of agencies that submitted data by state and the population covered by those agencies.	

		received weapon breakdowns.	
		For the 2007 population	
		estimates used in this table,	
		the FBI computed individual	
		rates of growth from one year	
		to the next for every city/town	
		and county using 2000	
		decennial population counts	
		and 2001 through 2006	
		population estimates from the	
		U.S. Census Bureau. Each	
		agency's rates of growth were	
		averaged; that average was	
		then applied and added to its	
		2006 Census population	
		estimate to derive the agency's	
		2007 population estimate.	
22	The data used in	This table provides the type of	The FBI received limited
22	creating this table were	weapons used in aggravated	weapon data from
	from all law	assaults. The data are based	Illinois.
	enforcement agencies	on the aggregated data from	illilois.
	that submitted	agencies within each state for	
	complete reports for 12	which weapon information was	
	months in 2007.	reported to the FBI. The table	
	months in woor.	includes the number of	
		agencies that submitted data	
		by state and the population	
		covered by those agencies.	

The weapon totals are aggregated from all aggravated assault offense data for which the FBI received weapon breakdowns. For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate. 23 The data used in The FBI uses offense This table provides an analysis creating this table were of the crimes of murder, totals for the crimes of from all law forcible rape, robbery, murder and forcible rape, and then, based on enforcement agencies burglary, larceny-theft, and submitting at least 6 motor vehicle theft. The table supplemental data lists the number of these months of complete supplied by law property/circumstance offenses reported in 2007 and enforcement, the FBI data for 2007. the percentage change in the computes value lost totals number of these offenses when for the crimes of robbery,

compared with 2006 data.

burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft.

The data source from

This table provides additional details for the following offenses:

which the FBI derives the information for this table does not include arson.

Robbery and burglary (percent distribution by average dollar value by location).

Information regarding the average value of property damage due to arson can be found in Arson Table 2.

Larceny-theft (percent distribution and average dollar value by larceny type).

Motor vehicle theft (average dollar value of vehicles taken).

The offense of aggravated assault is not included in this table. In the UCR Program, the taking of money or property in connection with an assault is reported as robbery.

The percent distribution statistics are based on the offense totals for the crimes of robbery, burglary, and larcenytheft.

		The FBI derives trends by comparing statistics from	
		agencies with at least 6	
		common months of complete	
		data reports for 2006 and	
		2007.	
		For the 2007 population	
		estimates used in this table,	
		the FBI computed individual	
		rates of growth from one year	
		to the next for every city/town	
		and county using 2000	
		decennial population counts	
		and 2001 through 2006	
		population estimates from the	
		U.S. Census Bureau. Each	
		agency's rates of growth were	
		averaged; that average was	
		then applied and added to its	
		2006 Census population	
		estimate to derive the agency's	
		2007 population estimate.	
24	The data used in	This table provides property	
	creating this table were	types, the reported value of	
	from all law	stolen property, and the value	
	enforcement agencies	of recovered property. The	
	submitting at least 6	table also lists the percentage	
	months of complete	of recovered value of each	
	information regarding	property type.	
	the monetary value of		
	<u> </u>		

property stolen and recovered.

This table furnishes the number of law enforcement agencies that supplied supplemental data and the population represented by those agencies.

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.

25 The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies submitting at least 6 months of complete offense reports for

2007.

This table provides the number of violent crimes and property crimes with a breakdown of the offenses known to law enforcement and the percentage of those offenses that were cleared by arrest or exceptional means.

This table furnishes national clearance data and clearances broken down by six city population groups, two county population groups, and suburban area.

This table lists the number of agencies meeting the criteria for inclusion in this table and the 2007 estimated population for those agencies by city grouping, county grouping, and suburban area.

Not all agencies submit reports for arson to the FBI. As a result, the number of reports the FBI uses to compute the percent of offenses cleared for arson is less than the number it uses to compute the percent of offenses cleared for all other offenses.

The FBI bases percent cleared statistics on aggregated offense and clearance totals.

Suburban area includes law enforcement agencies in cities with less than 50,000 inhabitants and county law enforcement agencies that are within a Metropolitan Statistical Area.

Suburban area excludes all metropolitan agencies associated with a principal city. The agencies associated with suburban areas also appear in other groups within this table.

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts

		and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.	
26	The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies submitting at least 6 months of complete offense reports for 2007.	This table provides the number of violent crimes and property crimes with a breakdown of the offenses known to law enforcement and the percentage of those offenses cleared by arrest or exceptional means by geographic region and division.	
		This table furnishes national clearance data and clearance data broken down for the Nation's four regions. This table lists the number of agencies meeting the criteria for inclusion in this table and the 2007 estimated population for those agencies by region and division.	

		The FBI bases percent cleared statistics on aggregated offense	
		and clearance totals.	
		For the 2007 population	
		estimates used in this table,	
		the FBI computed individual	
		rates of growth from one year	
		to the next for every city/town	
		and county using 2000 decennial population counts	
		and 2001 through 2006	
		population estimates from the	
		U.S. Census Bureau. Each	
		agency's rates of growth were	
		averaged; that average was	
		then applied and added to its	
		2006 Census population	
		estimate to derive the agency's	
		2007 population estimate.	
27	The data used in	This table provides offense	
	creating this table were	breakdowns and the	
	from all law	percentages of those crimes	
	enforcement agencies	cleared by arrest or exceptional	
	submitting at least 6	means for the following	
	months of complete	offenses:	
	offense reports for	Forcible rape (by force and	
	2007.	assault to rape-attempts).	

Robbery and aggravated assault (weapon used).

Burglary (forcible entry, attempted forcible entry, and unlawful entry).

Motor vehicle theft (vehicle type).

Arson (property type).

These data are listed by six city population groups, two county groups, and suburban area.

Agencies must report clearances for specific offense breakdowns on either the Return A—Monthly Return of Offenses Known to the Police or the Monthly Return of Arson Offenses Known to Law Enforcement to be included in this table. However, not all agencies submit these supplemental data to the FBI; therefore, clearance data in this table may differ from those in other clearance tables.

Not all agencies submit reports for arson to the FBI. As a result, the number of reports the FBI uses to compute the percent of offenses cleared for arson is less than the number it uses to compute the percent of offenses cleared for all other offenses.

This table lists the number of agencies meeting the criteria for inclusion in this table and the 2007 estimated population for those agencies by city grouping, county grouping, and suburban area.

Suburban area includes law enforcement agencies in cities with less than 50,000 inhabitants and county law enforcement agencies that are within a Metropolitan Statistical Area.

Suburban area excludes all metropolitan agencies associated with a principal city. The agencies associated with suburban areas also appear in

		other groups within this table.	
		The FBI bases percent cleared	
		statistics on aggregated offense	
		and clearance totals.	
		For the 2007 population	
		estimates used in this table,	
		the FBI computed individual	
		rates of growth from one year	
		to the next for every city/town	
		and county using 2000	
		decennial population counts	
		and 2001 through 2006	
		population estimates from the	
		U.S. Census Bureau. Each	
		agency's rates of growth were	
		averaged; that average was	
		then applied and added to its	
		2006 Census population	
		estimate to derive the agency's	
		2007 population estimate.	
28	The data used in	This table apprides the total	When an offender and ar
40	creating this table were	This table provides the total number of clearances for	When an offender under the age of 18 is cited to
	from all law	violent crimes and property	appear in juvenile court
	enforcement agencies	crimes with a breakdown of	or before other juvenile
	submitting at least 6	clearances for those offenses as	authorities, the UCR
	months of complete	well as the percentage of those	Program considers the
	offense reports for	clearances that involved only	incident to be cleared by
	2007.	juveniles.	arrest, even though a

The data in this table are listed by six city population groups, two county population groups, and suburban area.

This table lists the number of agencies meeting the criteria for inclusion in this table and the 2007 estimated population for those agencies by city grouping, county grouping, and suburban area.

Suburban area includes law enforcement agencies in cities with less than 50,000 inhabitants and county law enforcement agencies that are within a Metropolitan Statistical Area.

Suburban area excludes all metropolitan agencies associated with a principal city. The agencies associated with suburban areas also appear in other groups within this table.

physical arrest may not have occurred.

Clearances for offenses that include both adult and juvenile offenders are classified as clearances for crimes committed by adults and are, therefore, not included in this table.

Because the clearance percentages for crimes committed by juveniles include only those clearances in which no adults were involved, the figures in this table should not be used to present a definitive picture of juvenile involvement in crime.

		The FBI bases percent cleared	
		statistics on aggregated offense	
		and clearance totals.	
		For the 2007 population	
		estimates used in this table,	
		the FBI computed individual	
		rates of growth from one year	
		to the next for every city/town	
		and county using 2000	
		decennial population counts	
		and 2001 through 2006	
		population estimates from the	
		U.S. Census Bureau. Each	
		agency's rates of growth were	
		averaged; that average was	
		then applied and added to its	
		2006 Census population	
		estimate to derive the agency's	
		2007 population estimate.	
29	The data used in	This table provides the	
	creating the estimates	estimated number of persons	
	for this table were from	arrested for 29 separate UCR	
	all law enforcement	offenses for the United States	
	agencies submitting 12	in 2007.	
	months of arrest data		
	for 2007.		
		The arrest totals presented are	
		national estimates based on	
		the arrest statistics of all law	
		enforcement agencies	
		one of the state o	

submitting 12 months of arrest data to the UCR Program.

The estimated total number of arrests in this table is the sum of estimated arrest volumes for 28 offenses, not including suspicion.

The arrest data for each of the individual offenses in this table is the sum of the estimated volume for that offense within each of the eight population groups. (See Area Definitions).

The FBI calculated each of the eight population group's arrest estimates by dividing the reported 12-month volume figures (as shown in Table 31) by the contributing agencies' jurisdictional populations. The resulting figure was then multiplied by the total population for each population group as estimated by the UCR Program.

		For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population	
		estimate to derive the agency's	
		2007 population estimate.	
30	The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data for 2007.	This table provides the number of persons arrested and the arrest rate per 100,000 inhabitants for the four regions of the United States and for the Nation as a whole in 2007. The FBI derived the arrest rates by first dividing the total	These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.
		number of arrests by the	
		aggregated populations	
		covered by contributing	The FBI publishes only
		agencies and then multiplying	data that conform to UCR
		the resulting figure by	data collection guidelines.

from all law of persons arrested and the number of persons arrested; however, some onforcement agencies inhabitants for the eight LICE persons may be arrested.	31 The data used in	For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.	The data collection methodology for arrests for forcible rape used by the state Program administered by the Minnesota Department of Public Safety (with the exception of Minneapolis and St. Paul) does not comply with these guidelines. Therefore, arrests for forcible rape for Minnesota are not available for inclusion in this table. Instead, the FBI computed the number and the rate by estimating the forcible rape arrests for each population group for participating agencies in Minnesota. The figures were estimated using the national forcible rape numbers for each population group applied to the population by group for Minnesota agencies. These data represent the
T CHIVI CHICH ARCHUES THIMADHAMIS IOI THE EIRIH OUR. T DEISONS HAV DE AFTESTEN		_	_

submitting 12 months of arrest data for 2007.

population groups, U.S. cities as a whole, and for the Nation in 2007.

The FBI derived the arrest rates by first dividing the total aggregated arrests by the aggregated populations covered by contributing agencies and then multiplying the resulting figure by 100,000.

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.

more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.

The FBI publishes only data that conform to UCR data collection guidelines. The data collection methodology for arrests for forcible rape used by the state Program administered by the Minnesota Department of Public Safety (with the exception of Minneapolis and St. Paul) does not comply with these guidelines. Therefore, arrests for forcible rape for Minnesota are not available for inclusion in this table. Instead, the FBI computed the number and the rate by estimating the forcible rape arrests for each population group for participating agencies in Minnesota. The figures were estimated using the

			national forcible rape numbers for each population group applied to the population by group for Minnesota agencies.
32	The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data for both 1998 and 2007.	This 10-year trend table provides the number of persons arrested in 1998 and 2007 and the percent change when the data for these 2 years are compared. The table furnishes a breakdown of these data by juveniles (persons under age 18) and adults.	These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.
		For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's	

		2007 population estimate.	
		Population estimates for 1998 are based on the percent change in the state population from the U.S. Census Bureau's 1997 revised estimates and 1998 provisional estimates.	
33	The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data for both 1998 and 2007.	This 10-year trend table provides the number of males and females arrested in 1998 and 2007 and the percent change when the data for these 2 years are compared. The table furnishes a breakdown of these data by gender for juveniles (persons under age 18) and adults.	These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.
		For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its	

		2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate. Population estimates for 1998 are based on the percent change in the state population from the U.S. Census Bureau's 1997 revised estimates and 1998 provisional estimates.	
34	The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data for both 2003 and 2007.	This 5-year trend table provides the number of persons arrested in 2003 and 2007 and the percent change when the data for these 2 years are compared. The table furnishes a breakdown of these data by juveniles (persons under age 18) and adults.	These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.
		For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was	

		then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate. Population estimates for 2003 are based on the percent change in the state population from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2002 revised estimates and 2003 provisional estimates.	
35	The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data for both 2003 and 2007.	This 5-year trend table provides the number of males and females arrested in 2003 and 2007 and the percent change when the data for these 2 years are compared. The table furnishes a breakdown of these data by gender for juveniles (persons under age 18).	These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.
		For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each	

		agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate. Population estimates for 2003 are based on the percent change in the state population from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2002 revised estimates and 2003 provisional estimates.	
36	The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data for both 2006 and 2007.	This 2-year trend table provides the number of persons arrested in 2006 and 2007 and the percent change when the data for these 2 years are compared. The table furnishes a breakdown of these data by juveniles (persons under age 18) and adults.	These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.
		For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the	

		U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimates. Population estimates for 2006 are based on the percent change in the state population from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2005 revised estimates and 2006 provisional estimates.	
37	The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data for both 2006 and 2007.	This 2-year trend table provides the number of males and females arrested in 2006 and 2007 and the percent change when the data for these 2 years are compared. The table furnishes a breakdown of these data by gender for juveniles (persons under age 18). For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts	These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.

		and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate. Population estimates for 2006 are based on the percent change in the state population from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2005 revised estimates and 2006 provisional estimates.	
38	The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data for 2007.	This table provides the number of persons arrested nationwide in 2007 for the 29 offenses for which the UCR Program collects arrest data. These data are broken down by age of the arrestee and include the percent distribution of arrests by offense type. For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000	These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.

		decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.	
39	The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data for 2007.	This table provides the number of males arrested nationwide in 2007 for the 29 offenses for which the UCR Program collects arrest data. These data are broken down by age of the arrestees and include the percent distribution of arrests by offense type.	These data represent the number of males arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same male.
		For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was	

		then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.	
40	The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data for 2007.	This table provides the number of females arrested nationwide in 2007 for the 29 offenses for which the UCR Program collects arrest data. These data are broken down by age of the arrestee and include the percent distribution of arrests by offense type.	These data represent the number of females arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same female.
		For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.	

The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data for 2007.

This table provides the number of persons arrested nationwide in 2007 and, of those persons, the number arrested within the following age groups: Under 15, Under 18, Under 21, and Under 25 years. In addition, the table shows the percentage that each age group comprises of the total number of persons arrested for each offense.

These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.

The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data for 2007.

This table provides the number of males and females arrested nationwide in 2007. The table furnishes breakdowns of these data for each offense and supplies a percent distribution of males and females arrested among all offense types.

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.

These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.

The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data, including race

information, for 2007.

This table provides the number of persons arrested nationwide in 2007 broken down by race of the arrestee. In addition, the table shows the percent distribution of arrests by race for each offense. The table also furnishes a breakdown of these data by juveniles (persons under age 18) and adults.

These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table. the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.

The totals provided in this table reflect only those persons arrested by law enforcement agencies that provided race information to the UCR Program; therefore, the totals may not match those shown in other arrest tables for the Nation.

The data used in creating this table were from all city law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data for both 2006 and 2007.

This 2-year trend table provides the number of persons arrested in cities in 2006 and 2007 and the percent change when the data for these 2 years are compared. The table furnishes a breakdown of these data by juveniles (persons under age 18) and adults.

These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.

City law enforcement agencies are defined as all agencies within Population Groups I–VI. (See Area Definitions.)

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population

		estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate. Population estimates for 2006 are based on the percent change in the state population from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2005 revised estimates and 2006 provisional estimates.	
45	The data used in creating this table were from all city law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data for both 2006 and 2007.	This 2-year trend table provides the number of males and females arrested in cities in 2006 and 2007 and the percent change when the data for these 2 years are compared. The table furnishes a breakdown of these data by gender for juveniles (persons under age 18).	These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.
		City law enforcement agencies are defined as all agencies within Population Groups I–VI. (See Area Definitions.) For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual	
		rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000	

		decennial population counts	
		and 2001 through 2006	
		population estimates from the	
		U.S. Census Bureau. Each	
		agency's rates of growth were	
		averaged; that average was	
		then applied and added to its	
		2006 Census population	
		estimate to derive the agency's	
		2007 population estimate.	
		Population estimates for 2006	
		are based on the percent	
		change in the state population	
		from the U.S. Census Bureau's	
		2005 revised estimates and	
		2006 provisional estimates.	
		Parameter Control	
46	The data used in	This table provides the number	These data represent the
	creating this table were	of persons arrested in cities in	number of persons
	from all city law	2007 for the 29 offenses for	arrested; however, some
	enforcement agencies	which the UCR Program	persons may be arrested
	submitting 12 months	collects arrest data. These data	more than once during a
	of arrest data for 2007.	are broken down by the age of	year. Therefore, the
		the arrestee and include the	statistics in this table
		percent distribution of arrests	could, in some cases,
		by offense type.	represent multiple arrests
			of the same person.
			_
		City law enforcement agencies	
		are defined as all agencies	
		within Population Groups	
		I–VI. (See Area Definitions.)	

		For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.	
47	The data used in creating this table were from all city law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data for 2007.	This table provides the number of persons arrested in cities in 2007 and, of those persons, the number arrested within the following age groups: Under 15, Under 18, Under 21, and Under 25 years. In addition, the table shows the percentage that each age group comprises of the total number of persons arrested for each offense. City law enforcement agencies are defined as all agencies	These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.

		within Population Groups	
		I–VI. (See Area Definitions.)	
		For the 2007 population	
		estimates used in this table,	
		the FBI computed individual	
		rates of growth from one year	
		to the next for every city/town	
		and county using 2000	
		decennial population counts	
		and 2001 through 2006	
		population estimates from the	
		U.S. Census Bureau. Each	
		agency's rates of growth were	
		averaged; that average was	
		then applied and added to its	
		2006 Census population	
		estimate to derive the agency's	
		2007 population estimate.	
48	The data used in	This table provides the number	These data represent the
10	creating this table were	of males and females arrested	number of persons
	from all city law	in cities in 2007. The table	arrested; however, some
	enforcement agencies	furnishes breakdowns of these	persons may be arrested
	submitting 12 months	data for each offense and	more than once during a
	of arrest data for 2007.	supplies a percent distribution	year. Therefore, the
		of males and females arrested	statistics in this table
		among all offense types.	could, in some cases,
			represent multiple arrests
			of the same person.
		City law enforcement agencies	
		are defined as all agencies	

		within Population Groups	
		I–VI. (See Area Definitions.)	
		1 VI. (See Thea Bernmelons.)	
		For the 2007 population	
		estimates used in this table,	
		the FBI computed individual	
		rates of growth from one year	
		to the next for every city/town	
		and county using 2000	
		decennial population counts	
		and 2001 through 2006	
		population estimates from the	
		U.S. Census Bureau. Each	
		agency's rates of growth were	
		averaged; that average was	
		then applied and added to its	
		2006 Census population	
		estimate to derive the agency's	
		2007 population estimate.	
49	The data used in	This table provides the number	These data represent the
	creating this table were	of persons arrested in cities in	number of persons
	from all city law	2007 broken down by the race	_
	enforcement agencies	of the arrestee. In addition,	persons may be arrested
		the table shows the percent	1
	submitting 12 months	•	more than once during a
	of arrest data,	distribution of arrests by race	year. Therefore, the
	including race	for each offense. The table also	statistics in this table
	information, for 2007.	furnishes a breakdown of these	could, in some cases,
		data by juveniles (persons	represent multiple arrests
		under age 18) and adults.	of the same person.

		_	
		City law enforcement agencies are defined as all agencies within Population Groups I–VI. (See Area Definitions.) For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its	The totals provided in this table reflect only those persons arrested by law enforcement agencies that provided race information to the UCR Program; therefore, the totals may not match those shown in other arrest tables for cities.
50	The data used in creating this table were from all metropolitan	This 2-year trend table provides the number of persons arrested in	These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some
	county law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data for both 2006 and 2007.	metropolitan counties in 2006 and 2007 and the percent change when the data for these 2 years are compared. The table furnishes a breakdown of these data by juveniles (under age 18) and adults.	persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.

The Metropolitan Counties classification encompasses jurisdictions covered by noncity law enforcement agencies located within currently designated Metropolitan Statistical Areas. (See Area Definitions.)

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.

Population estimates for 2006 are based on the percent change in the state population from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2005 revised estimates and

		2006 provisional estimates.	
51	The data used in creating this table were from all metropolitan county law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data for both 2006 and 2007.	This 2-year trend table provides the number of males and females arrested in metropolitan counties in 2006 and 2007 and the percent change when the data for these 2 years are compared. The table furnishes a breakdown of these data by gender for juveniles (persons under age 18).	These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.
		The Metropolitan Counties classification encompasses jurisdictions covered by noncity law enforcement agencies located within currently designated Metropolitan Statistical Areas. (See Area Definitions.)	
		For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006	

		arrestee and include the percent distribution of arrests by offense type. The Metropolitan Counties classification encompasses jurisdictions covered by noncity law enforcement agencies located within currently designated	could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.
52	The data used in creating this table were from all metropolitan county law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data for 2007.	This table provides the number of persons arrested in metropolitan counties in 2007 for the 29 offenses for which the UCR Program collects arrest data. These data are broken down by age of the	These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table
		population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimates. Population estimates for 2006 are based on the percent change in the state population from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2005 revised estimates and 2006 provisional estimates.	

		Metropolitan Statistical Areas.	
		(See Area Definitions.)	
		For the 2007 population	
		estimates used in this table,	
		the FBI computed individual	
		rates of growth from one year	
		to the next for every city/town	
		and county using 2000	
		decennial population counts	
		and 2001 through 2006	
		population estimates from the	
		U.S. Census Bureau. Each	
		agency's rates of growth were	
		averaged; that average was	
		then applied and added to its	
		2006 Census population	
		estimate to derive the agency's	
		2007 population estimate.	
53	The data used in	This table provides the number	These data represent the
	creating this table were	of persons arrested in	number of persons
	from all metropolitan	metropolitan counties in 2007	arrested; however, some
	county law	and, of those persons, the	persons may be arrested
	enforcement agencies	number arrested within the	more than once during a
	submitting 12 months	following age groups: Under	year. Therefore, the
	of arrest data for 2007.	15, Under 18, Under 21, and	statistics in this table
		Under 25 years. In addition,	could, in some cases,
		the table shows the percentage	represent multiple arrests
		that each age group comprises	of the same person.
		of the total number of persons	
		arrested for each offense.	

		The Metropolitan Counties	
		classification encompasses	
		jurisdictions covered by	
		noncity law enforcement	
		agencies located within	
		currently designated	
		Metropolitan Statistical Areas.	
		(See Area Definitions.)	
		For the 2007 population	
		estimates used in this table,	
		the FBI computed individual	
		rates of growth from one year	
		to the next for every city/town	
		and county using 2000	
		decennial population counts	
		and 2001 through 2006	
		population estimates from the	
		U.S. Census Bureau. Each	
		agency's rates of growth were	
		averaged; that average was	
		then applied and added to its	
		2006 Census population	
		estimate to derive the agency's	
		2007 population estimate.	
54	The data used in	This table provides the number	These data represent the
	creating this table were	of males and females arrested	number of persons
	from all metropolitan	in metropolitan counties in	arrested; however, some
	county law	2007. The table furnishes	persons may be arrested
	enforcement agencies	breakdowns of these data for	more than once during a

submitting 12 months of arrest data for 2007.

each offense and supplies a percent distribution of males and females arrested among all offense types. year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.

The Metropolitan Counties classification encompasses jurisdictions covered by noncity law enforcement agencies located within currently designated Metropolitan Statistical Areas. (See Area Definitions.)

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.

The data used in creating this table were from all metropolitan county law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data, including race

information, for 2007.

This table provides the number of persons arrested in metropolitan counties in 2007 broken down by race of the arrestee. In addition, the table shows the percent distribution of arrests by race for each offense. The table also furnishes a breakdown of these data by juveniles (persons under age 18) and adults.

These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.

The Metropolitan Counties classification encompasses jurisdictions covered by noncity law enforcement agencies located within currently designated Metropolitan Statistical Areas. (See Area Definitions.)

The totals provided in this table reflect only those persons arrested by law enforcement agencies that provided race information to the UCR Program; therefore, the totals may not match those shown in other arrest tables for metropolitan counties.

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each

		agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.	
56	The data used in creating this table were from all nonmetropolitan county law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data for both 2006 and 2007.	This 2-year trend table provides the number of persons arrested in nonmetropolitan counties in 2006 and 2007 and the percent change when the data for these 2 years are compared. The table furnishes a breakdown of these data by juveniles (persons under age 18) and adults. The Nonmetropolitan Counties classification encompasses jurisdictions covered by noncity law enforcement agencies located outside currently designated Metropolitan Statistical Areas. (See Area Definitions.)	These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.
		For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual	

		rates of growth from one year	
		to the next for every city/town	
		and county using 2000	
		decennial population counts	
		and 2001 through 2006	
		population estimates from the	
		U.S. Census Bureau. Each	
		agency's rates of growth were	
		averaged; that average was	
		then applied and added to its	
		2006 Census population	
		estimate to derive the agency's	
		2007 population estimate.	
		Population estimates for 2006	
		are based on the percent	
		change in the state population	
		from the U.S. Census Bureau's	
		2005 revised estimates and	
		2006 provisional estimates.	
57	The data used in	This 2-year trend table	These data represent the
	creating this table were	provides the number of males	number of persons
	from all	and females arrested in	arrested; however, some
	nonmetropolitan	nonmetropolitan counties in	persons may be arrested
	county law	2006 and 2007 and the	more than once during a
	enforcement agencies	percent change when the data	year. Therefore, the
	submitting 12 months	for these 2 years are compared.	statistics in this table
	of arrest data for both	The table also furnishes a	could, in some cases,
	2006 and 2007.	breakdown of these data by	represent multiple arrests
		gender for juveniles (persons	of the same person.
		under age 18).	

The Nonmetropolitan Counties classification encompasses jurisdictions covered by noncity law enforcement agencies located outside currently designated Metropolitan Statistical Areas. (See Area Definitions.)

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.

Population estimates for 2006 are based on the percent change in the state population from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2005 revised estimates and 2006 provisional estimates.

The data used in creating this table were from all nonmetropolitan county law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months

of arrest data for 2007.

This table provides the number of persons arrested in nonmetropolitan counties in 2007 for the 29 offenses for which the UCR Program collects arrest data. These data are broken down by age of the arrestee and include the percent distribution of arrests by offense type.

These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.

The Nonmetropolitan Counties classification encompasses jurisdictions covered by noncity law enforcement agencies located outside currently designated Metropolitan Statistical Areas. (See Area Definitions.)

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were

		averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.	
59	The data used in creating this table were from all nonmetropolitan county law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data for 2007.	This table provides the number of persons arrested in nonmetropolitan counties in 2007 and, of those persons, the number arrested within the following age groups: Under 15, Under 18, Under 21, and Under 25 years. In addition, the table shows the percentage that each age group comprises of the total number of persons arrested for each offense. The Nonmetropolitan Counties classification encompasses jurisdictions covered by noncity law enforcement agencies located outside currently designated Metropolitan Statistical Areas. (See Area Definitions.)	These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.
		estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual	

		rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.	
60	The data used in creating this table were from all nonmetropolitan county law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data for 2007.	This table provides the number of males and females arrested in nonmetropolitan counties in 2007. The table furnishes breakdowns of these data for each offense and supplies a percent distribution of males and females arrested among all offense types.	These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.
		The Nonmetropolitan Counties classification encompasses jurisdictions covered by noncity law enforcement agencies located outside currently designated Metropolitan Statistical Areas. (See Area Definitions.)	

		For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.	
61	The data used in creating this table were from nonmetropolitan county law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data, including race information, for 2007.	This table provides the number of persons arrested in nonmetropolitan counties in 2007 broken down by race of the arrestee. In addition, the table shows the percent distribution of arrests by race for each offense. The table also furnishes a breakdown of these data by juveniles (persons under age 18) and adults.	These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.
		The Nonmetropolitan Counties classification encompasses	The totals provided in this table reflect only those persons arrested by

jurisdictions covered by law enforcement agencies noncity law enforcement that provided race agencies located outside information to the UCR currently designated Program; therefore, the Metropolitan Statistical Areas. totals may not match (See Area Definitions.) those shown in other arrest tables for nonmetropolitan counties. For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate. 62 The data used in This 2-year trend table These data represent the creating this table were provides the number of number of persons from all suburban area persons arrested in suburban arrested; however, some law enforcement areas for 2006 and 2007 and persons may be arrested agencies submitting 12 the percent change when the more than once during a months of arrest data data for these 2 years are year. Therefore, the for both 2006 and compared. The table furnishes statistics in this table 2007. a breakdown of these data by could, in some cases, juveniles (persons under age represent multiple arrests 18) and adults. of the same person.

Suburban area law
enforcement agencies are
defined as all agencies within a
currently designated
Metropolitan Statistical Area,
excluding those agencies that
cover principal cities as
defined by the U.S. Office of
Management and Budget.
(See Area Definitions.)

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.

Population estimates for 2006 are based on the percent

		change in the state population from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2005 revised estimates and 2006 provisional estimates.	
63	The data used in creating this table were from all suburban area law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data for both 2006 and 2007.	This 2-year trend table provides the number of males and females arrested in suburban areas in 2006 and 2007 and the percent change when the data for these 2 years are compared. The table also furnishes a breakdown of those data by gender for juveniles (persons under age 18).	These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.
		Suburban area law enforcement agencies are defined as all agencies within a currently designated Metropolitan Statistical Area, excluding those agencies that cover principal cities as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget. (See Area Definitions.)	

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate. Population estimates for 2006 are based on the percent change in the state population from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2005 revised estimates and 2006 provisional estimates. 64 The data used in This table provides the number These data represent the creating this table were of arrests in suburban areas in number of persons from all suburban area 2007 for the 29 offenses for arrested; however, some law enforcement which the UCR Program persons may be arrested agencies submitting 12 collects arrest data. These data more than once during a months of arrest data are broken down by age of the year. Therefore, the for 2007. arrestee and include the statistics in this table percent distribution of arrests could, in some cases, by offense type. represent multiple arrests of the same person.

Suburban area law
enforcement agencies are
defined as all agencies within a
currently designated
Metropolitan Statistical Area,
excluding those agencies that
cover principal cities as
defined by the U.S. Office of
Management and Budget.
(See Area Definitions.)

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.

The data used in creating this table were from all suburban area law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data for 2007.

This table provides the number of persons arrested in suburban areas in 2007 and, of those persons, the number arrested within the following age groups: Under 15, Under 18, Under 21, and Under 25 years. In addition, the table shows the percentage that each age group comprises of the total number of persons arrested for each offense.

These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.

Suburban area law
enforcement agencies are
defined as all agencies within a
currently designated
Metropolitan Statistical Area,
excluding those agencies that
cover principal cities as
defined by the U.S. Office of
Management and Budget.
(See Area Definitions.)

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000

		decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.	
66	The data used in creating this table were from all suburban area law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data for 2007.	This table provides the number of males and females arrested in suburban areas in 2007. The table furnishes breakdowns for each offense and supplies a percent distribution of males and females arrested among all offense types.	These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.
		Suburban area law enforcement agencies are defined as all agencies within a currently designated Metropolitan Statistical Area, excluding those agencies that cover principal cities as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget. (See Area Definitions.)	

		T	
		For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000	
		decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.	
67	The data used in creating this table were from all suburban area law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of arrest data, including race information, for 2007.	This table provides the number of arrests in suburban areas in 2007 broken down by race of the arrestee. In addition, the table shows the percent distribution of arrests by race for each offense. The table also furnishes a breakdown of these data by juveniles (persons under age 18) and adults.	These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.
		Suburban area law enforcement agencies are defined as all agencies within a currently designated	The totals provided in this table reflect only those persons arrested by law enforcement agencies

Metropolitan Statistical Area, that provided race excluding those agencies that information to the UCR cover principal cities as Program; therefore, the defined by the U.S. Office of totals may not match Management and Budget. those shown in other (See Area Definitions.) arrest tables for surburan areas. For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate. 68 The data used in The totals in this table These data represent the creating this table were represent the reported number reported number of from all law of juvenile offenders taken into juvenile offenders taken custody, aggregated by into custody; however, enforcement agencies submitting 12 months population group. In addition, some juveniles may be of arrest data for 2007 this table provides the number taken into custody more and providing juvenile of juveniles handled within five than once during a year. disposition different disposition Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some categories. The percent

	information.	distribution within these categories for each population	cases, represent multiple detentions of the same
		group is also included.	person.
		For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.	In constructing this table, the FBI accepted each individual state's age definition for juveniles.
69	The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies that submitted 12 months of arrest data for 2007.	This table provides arrest data for 29 separate UCR offenses for each state for 2007. The table provides both total arrests and arrests of juveniles (persons under the age of 18). Arrest totals are aggregates of the totals reported by agencies providing data to the UCR	These data represent the number of persons arrested; however, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this table could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person.

		For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.	Any comparison of statistics in this table should take into consideration variances in arrest practices, particularly for Part II crimes. (Offenses in Uniform Crime Reporting defines the UCR Program's Part II offenses.)
70	The information in this table is derived from law enforcement employee counts (as of October 31, 2007) submitted by participating agencies.	This table provides the number and rate of law enforcement employees broken down by geographic region, division, and population group. The totals for full-time law enforcement employees in metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties are combined in this table.	The UCR Program defines law enforcement officers as individuals who ordinarily carry a firearm and a badge, have full arrest powers, and are paid from governmental funds set aside specifically to pay sworn law enforcement. Civilian employees include full-time agency personnel such as clerks,

Suburban area includes law enforcement agencies in cities with less than 50,000 inhabitants and county law enforcement agencies that are within a Metropolitan Statistical Area.

radio dispatchers, meter attendants, stenographers, jailers, correctional officers, and mechanics.

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.

71 The information in this table is derived from law enforcement officer counts (as of October 31, 2007) submitted by participating agencies.

This table provides the number and rate of sworn law enforcement officers broken down by geographic region, division, and population group. The UCR Program
defines law enforcement
officers as individuals
who ordinarily carry a
firearm and a badge, have
full arrest powers, and
are paid from
governmental funds set
aside specifically to pay
sworn law enforcement.

For the data presentation in this table, the totals for full-time law enforcement officers in metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties are combined.

Suburban area includes law enforcement agencies in cities with less than 50,000 inhabitants and county law enforcement agencies that are within a Metropolitan Statistical Area.

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts

		and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.	
72	The information in this table is derived from law enforcement employee counts (as of October 31, 2007) submitted by participating agencies.	This table includes the number of agencies that fall within specified rate ranges of employment by population group for law enforcement personnel, both sworn officers and civilian employees. The FBI derived the rate of full-time law enforcement employees per population group by first dividing the aggregated total of personnel for the group by the aggregated estimated populations covered by the contributing agencies within the group and then multiplying the resulting figure by 1,000.	The UCR Program defines law enforcement officers as individuals who ordinarily carry a firearm and a badge, have full arrest powers, and are paid from governmental funds set aside specifically to pay sworn law enforcement. Civilian employees include full-time agency personnel such as clerks, radio dispatchers, meter attendants, stenographers, jailers, correctional officers, and mechanics.
		For the 2007 population	Agencies with no resident population; i.e., those associated with

		estimates used in this table,	universities and colleges
		the FBI computed individual	(see Table 79), other
		rates of growth from one year	agencies (see Table 81),
		to the next for every city/town	and some state agencies;
		and county using 2000	are excluded from this
		decennial population counts	table. Therefore, the total
		and 2001 through 2006	number of agencies used
		population estimates from the	in this table differs from
		U.S. Census Bureau. Each	that provided in other law
		agency's rates of growth were	enforcement employee
		averaged; that average was	tables.
		then applied and added to its	
		2006 Census population	
		estimate to derive the agency's	
		2007 population estimate.	
73	The information in this	This table includes the number	The UCR Program
	table is derived from	of agencies that fall within	defines law enforcement
	law enforcement officer	specified rate ranges of	officers as individuals
	counts (as of October	employment by population	who ordinarily carry a
	31, 2007) submitted by	group for law enforcement	firearm and a badge, have
	participating agencies.	officers.	full arrest powers, and
			are paid from
			governmental funds set
		The FBI derived the rate of	aside specifically to pay
		full-time law enforcement	sworn law enforcement.
		officers per population group	
		by first dividing the aggregated	
		total of officers for the group	Agencies with no resident
		by the aggregated estimated	population; i.e., those
		populations covered by the	associated with
		contributing agencies within	universities and colleges
		the group and then multiplying	(see Table 79), other
			agencies (see Table 81),
			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,

		For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.	and some state agencies; are excluded from this table. Therefore, the total number of agencies used in this table differs from that provided in other law enforcement officer tables.
74	The information in this table is derived from law enforcement employee counts (as of October 31, 2007) submitted by participating agencies.	This table includes the number of reported sworn law enforcement officers and civilian employees broken down by population group. The totals are also broken down by percent male and percent female. Suburban area includes law enforcement agencies in cities with less than 50,000	The UCR Program defines law enforcement officers as individuals who ordinarily carry a firearm and a badge, have full arrest powers, and are paid from governmental funds set aside specifically to pay sworn law enforcement. Civilian employees include full-time agency personnel such as clerks,

inhabitants and county law enforcement agencies that are within a Metropolitan Statistical Area.

Suburban area excludes all metropolitan agencies associated with a principal city. The agencies associated with suburban areas also appear in other groups within this table.

radio dispatchers, meter attendants, stenographers, jailers, correctional officers, and mechanics.

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.

75 The information in this table is derived from civilian law enforcement counts (as of October 31, 2007) submitted by

participating agencies.

This table includes data about civilian law enforcement employees by population group.

Suburban area includes law enforcement agencies in cities with less than 50,000 inhabitants and county law enforcement agencies that are within a Metropolitan Statistical Area.

Suburban area excludes all metropolitan agencies associated with a principal city. The agencies associated with suburban areas also appear in other groups within this table.

For the 2007 population estimates used in this table, the FBI computed individual rates of growth from one year to the next for every city/town and county using 2000 decennial population counts and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each

Civilian employees include full-time agency personnel such as clerks, radio dispatchers, meter attendants, stenographers, jailers, correctional officers, and mechanics.

The information in this table is derived from law enforcement employee counts (as of October 31, 2007) submitted by participating agencies. This table provides the number of male civilian employees, the number of female officers, the number of female civilian employees listed alphabetically by state. The UCR Program defines law enforcement officers as individuals who ordinarily carry a firearm and a badge, have full arrest powers, and are paid from governmental funds set aside specifically to pay sworn law enforcement. Civilian employees include full-time agency personnel such as clerks, radio dispatchers, meter attendants, stenographers, jailers, correctional officers, and mechanics. Caution should be used when comparing data from one state to that of another. The			agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.	
responsibilities of the	76	table is derived from law enforcement employee counts (as of October 31, 2007) submitted by	of state law enforcement employees, the number of male officers, the number of female officers, the number of male civilian employees, and the number of female civilian employees listed alphabetically	defines law enforcement officers as individuals who ordinarily carry a firearm and a badge, have full arrest powers, and are paid from governmental funds set aside specifically to pay sworn law enforcement. Civilian employees include full-time agency personnel such as clerks, radio dispatchers, meter attendants, stenographers, jailers, correctional officers, and mechanics. Caution should be used when comparing data from one state to that of

			highway patrol, and
			department of public
			safety agencies range
			from full law enforcement
			duties to only traffic
			patrol, which can impact
			both the level of
			employment for agencies
			as well as the ratio of
			sworn officers to civilians
			employed. Any valid
			comparison must take
			these factors and the
			other identified variables
			affecting crime into
			consideration.
77	The information in this	This table provides the number	The UCR Program
, ,	table is derived from	of law enforcement employees,	defines law enforcement
	law enforcement	the number of male officers,	officers as individuals
	employee counts (as of	the number of female officers,	who ordinarily carry a
	October 31, 2007)	the number of male civilian	firearm and a badge, have
	submitted by	employees, and the number of	full arrest powers, and
	participating agencies.	female civilian employees	are paid from
		listed alphabetically by state.	governmental funds set
			aside specifically to pay
			sworn law enforcement.
		For the 2007 population	Civilian amplayees
		estimates used in this table,	Civilian employees
		the FBI computed individual	include full-time agency personnel such as clerks,
		rates of growth from one year	radio dispatchers, meter
		to the next for every city/town	attendants,
		and county using 2000	stenographers, jailers,
		decennial population counts	steriographers, janers,
	1	I .	

		and 2001 through 2006 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. Each agency's rates of growth were averaged; that average was then applied and added to its 2006 Census population estimate to derive the agency's 2007 population estimate.	correctional officers, and mechanics.
78	The information in this table is derived from law enforcement employee counts (as of October 31, 2007) submitted by participating agencies.	This table provides the number of law enforcement officers and civilians employed by city/town law enforcement agencies listed alphabetically by state.	The UCR Program defines law enforcement officers as individuals who ordinarily carry a firearm and a badge, have full arrest powers, and are paid from governmental funds set aside specifically to pay sworn law enforcement. Civilian employees include full-time agency personnel such as clerks, radio dispatchers, meter attendants, stenographers, jailers, correctional officers, and mechanics.

The information in this table is derived from law enforcement employee counts (as of October 31, 2007) submitted by participating agencies.	This table provides the number of law enforcement officers and civilians employed by universities and colleges listed alphabetically by state. The student enrollment figures provided by the United States Department of Education are for the 2006 school year, the most recent year for which the data are available. The figures include full-time and part-time students.	The UCR Program defines law enforcement officers as individuals who ordinarily carry a firearm and a badge, have full arrest powers, and are paid from governmental funds set aside specifically to pay sworn law enforcement. Civilian employees include full-time agency personnel such as clerks, radio dispatchers, meter attendants, stenographers, jailers, correctional officers, and mechanics.
The information in this table is derived from law enforcement employee counts (as of October 31, 2007) submitted by participating agencies.	This table provides the number of law enforcement officers and civilians employed by agencies in metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties listed alphabetically by state.	The UCR Program defines law enforcement officers as individuals who ordinarily carry a firearm and a badge, have full arrest powers, and are paid from governmental funds set aside specifically to pay sworn law enforcement. Civilian employees include full-time agency

			personnel such as clerks, radio dispatchers, meter attendants, stenographers, jailers, correctional officers, and mechanics.
81	The information in this table is derived from law enforcement employee counts (as of October 31, 2007) submitted by participating agencies.	This table provides the number of law enforcement officers and civilians employed by state agencies and other agencies listed alphabetically by state. The table also includes the number of law enforcement officers and civilians employed by a participating federal agency, the National Institutes of Health.	The UCR Program defines law enforcement officers as individuals who ordinarily carry a firearm and a badge, have full arrest powers, and are paid from governmental funds set aside specifically to pay sworn law enforcement. Civilian employees include full-time agency personnel such as clerks, radio dispatchers, meter attendants, stenographers, jailers, correctional officers, and mechanics.