

SECTION VII Appendices



APPENDIX I – Methodology

Law enforcement agencies in 46 states and the District of Columbia voluntarily contribute crime data to the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program through their respective state UCR Program. For those states that do not have a state Program, local agencies 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 Programs collect data beyond those typically called for by the UCR Program to address crime problems specific to their particular jurisdiction. In most cases, these state Programs 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 operations.

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.

The FBI, in order to fulfill its responsibilities

in connection with the UCR Program, continues to edit and review individual agency reports for both completeness and quality. Members of the national Program's staff directly contact individual contributors within the state, as necessary, in connection with crime-reporting matters, and coordinate such contact with the UCR Program. On 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 three 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

Based on records of all reports of crime received from victims, officers who discover infractions, or other sources, law enforcement agencies tabulate the number of Part I offenses brought to their attention and submit them monthly to the FBI either directly or through their state UCR Program. Part I offenses include murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson.

Law enforcement's monthly submission to the FBI includes other important information. 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.

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

The UCR Program also requires law enforcement agencies to report data regarding law enforcement employees. In addition to reporting monthly data on law enforcement officers killed or assaulted, agencies report yearly on the number of full-time sworn and civilian law enforcement personnel employed as of October 31.

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-Base 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 that may indicate errors. The UCR staff members compare an agency's monthly reports with the agency's previous submissions and with those from similar agencies 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.

Data reliability is a high priority of the national UCR Program, which brings any deviations or arithmetical adjustments to the attention of state UCR Programs or the submitting agency. Typically, 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 UCR Program excludes the figures for specific crime categories or totals, if necessary, from the trend tabulations.

To assist contributors in complying with UCR standards, the national UCR Program provides training seminars and instructional materials on crime reporting procedures. 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.

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 and *UCR State Program Bulletins* 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

For the 2004 edition of *Crime in the United States*, the UCR Program obtained current population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau to estimate 2004 population counts for all contributing law enforcement agencies. The U.S. Census Bureau provided revised 2003 state/national population estimates and the 2004 state/national population estimates. Using these revised census data, the national UCR Program updated the 2003 U.S. Census Bureau city and county estimates and calculated the 2004 state growth rates. Subsequently, the Program updated the population figures for individual jurisdictions by applying the 2004 state growth rates to the updated 2003 U.S. Census Bureau data.

NIBRS Conversion

Several states 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

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

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 Program to estimate crime counts for certain contributors, the data are not comparable from year to year.

2004 Arrest Data

Because of changes in reporting practices, arrest data for Montana are not available for 2004. The 2004 arrest data contained in this publication for Arkansas and Maine are not comparable to previous years' data. Limited arrest data were received from Illinois, Kentucky, and South Carolina. No 2004 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 have no attributable population. Twelve months of arrest figures for the New York City Police Department and law enforcement agencies in Florida were not available to be included in the arrest tables in this book. However, arrest totals for these areas were estimated by the national UCR Program and were included in Table 29, "Estimated Number of Arrests, United States, 2004."

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 UCR Program includes estimated crime numbers in these presentations. The Program estimates offenses that occur within each of three areas: Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs), cities outside MSAs, and nonmetropolitan counties. The national Program computes estimates by using the known crime figures of similar areas within a state and assigning the same proportion of crime volumes to non-reporting agencies or agencies with missing data. The estimation process considers the following: population size of agency; type of jurisdiction, e.g., police department versus sheriff's office; and geographic location.

Various circumstances require the national Program to estimate offense totals for certain states. For example, some states do not provide forcible rape figures in accordance with UCR guidelines, or reporting problems at the state level have, at times, resulted in no usable data. In addition, the conversion of 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
1985	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.
1986	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.
1987	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.
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.

Year	State(s)	Reason for Estimation	Estimation Method
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	Kansas	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.

Year	State(s)	Reason for Estimation	Estimation Method
	Illinois	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	Valid Crime Index (Part I) 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) 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.	The Kansas state estimate was extrapolated from 1996 January-June state totals provided by the Kansas State UCR Program.
	Kentucky, Montana	The state UCR Programs were unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	The 1995 and 1996 percent changes within each geographic division were applied to valid 1995 state totals to generate 1996 state totals.

Year	State(s)	Reason for Estimation	Estimation Method
1997	Illinois	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	Valid Crime Index (Part I) 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.	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.
1998	Delaware	The state UCR Program was unable to provide forcible rape figures in accordance with national UCR guidelines.	The 1998 forcible rape total for Delaware was estimated by reducing the number of reported offenses by the proportion of male forcible rape victims statewide.
	Illinois	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	Valid Crime Index (Part I) 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 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.

Year	State(s)	Reason for Estimation	Estimation Method
1999	Illinois	The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	Valid Crime Index (Part I) 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 Programs were unable to provide complete offense figures or forcible rape figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	Valid Crime Index (Part I) 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.

Year	State(s)	Reason for Estimation	Estimation Method
2001	Illinois	The state UCR Program submitted complete data for only seven agencies within the state. Additionally, the state UCR Program was unable to provide forcible rape figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.	Valid Crime Index (Part I) counts were available for most of the largest cities (100,000 and over in population). For other agencies, the only available counts were generated without application of the UCR Hierarchy Rule. (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 total supplied by the Illinois State Program (which was inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) was reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the available NIBRS data. 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 estimate 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) counts were only 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 counts were available only 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.

Year	State(s)	Reason for Estimation	Estimation Method
	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 crime trend for the East South 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 counts were available only 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.

Table Methodology

The tables published 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 missing months of data for agencies with partial reports and then aggregates these estimates to determine the number of offenses for the total U.S. population. Tables 1–7 and 23 present these approximations. In addition, various circumstances require the FBI to estimate offense totals from time to time for some states. (For an explanation of the estimation procedures applied to particular states during

specific reporting years, see the Offense Estimation section of this appendix.)

To be included in Tables 8–11 and 21–22, which provide statistics for specific jurisdictions, 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). Each of the remaining tables provides the number of reporting agencies (data source) and the total population covered by their collective jurisdictions.

The tabular presentation that follows briefly describes the data sources and the methods used to construct Tables 1-69.

(1) Table	(2) Database	(3) Table Construction	(4) General Comments
1 - 1A	All law enforcement agencies participating in the UCR Program (including those submitting less than 12 months of data). Crime statistics for the Nation include estimated offense totals (except arson) for agencies submitting less than 12 months of offense reports for each year.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2004 statistics are consistent with those published in Table 2. Prior to publication of this book, the FBI reestimated the state offense totals published in the previous edition of <i>Crime in the United States</i> to reflect data received after its publication. Because of this, the national totals for 2003 may have been adjusted. Population statistics represent the Census Bureau’s July 1 provisional estimations for each year except 1990 and 2000, which are the decennial census years. (See the Population section in this appendix.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Represents an estimation of reported crime for the Nation from 1985 to 2004. The UCR Program does not have sufficient data to estimate arson offenses.
2	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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FBI estimates statistics for community types by aggregating the individual state statistics as shown in Table 5. Population estimates for 2004 are based on the percent change in state population from the Census Bureau’s 2003 revised estimates and 2004 provisional estimates. (See the Population section in this appendix.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Represents an estimation of reported crime in 2004 for the: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Nation MSAs Cities outside metropolitan areas Nonmetropolitan counties The UCR Program does not have sufficient data to estimate arson offenses.
3	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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FBI computes regional offense distributions using the volume estimates as shown in Table 4. It bases population distributions on the Census Bureau’s provisional estimates for 2004. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Represents the 2004 geographical distribution of estimated offenses and population. The UCR Program does not have sufficient data to estimate arson offenses.
4	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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FBI derives state totals by estimating for nonreporting and partially reporting agencies within each state. Using the state’s individual agency estimates, the Program aggregates a state total. State totals for the prior year have been reestimated to reflect data received after the publication of the prior edition of <i>Crime in the United States</i>. Population statistics represent the Census Bureau’s 2003 revised estimates and 2004 provisional estimates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Represents an estimation of reported crime for the: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Nation Regions Divisions States The UCR Program does not have sufficient data to estimate arson offenses. The Offense Estimation section of this appendix supplies an explanation of the estimation procedures used for Illinois. Any comparisons of crime among different locales should take into consideration relevant factors in addition to the areas’ crime statistics. The essay Crime Factors (in this report) provides more details concerning the proper use of UCR statistics.

(1) Table	(2) Database	(3) Table Construction	(4) General Comments
5	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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population estimates for 2004 are based on the percent change in state population from the Census Bureau's 2003 revised estimates and 2004 provisional estimates. (See the Population section in this appendix.) Statistics under the heading Area Actually Reporting represent reported offense totals for agencies submitting 12 months of offense reports and estimated totals for agencies submitting less than 12 but more than 2 months of offense data. The statistics under the heading Estimated Totals represent the above plus estimated offense totals for agencies submitting 2 months or less of offense reports. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Represents an estimation of reported crime for states. The UCR Program does not have sufficient data to estimate arson offenses. The Offense Estimation section of this appendix supplies an explanation of the estimation procedures used for Illinois. Any comparisons of crime among different locales should take into consideration relevant factors in addition to the areas' crime statistics. The essay Crime Factors (in this report) provides more details concerning the proper use of UCR statistics.
6	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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table 6 includes all currently designated Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) in which at least 75 percent of the agencies within the MSA reported to the UCR Program and for which the principal city/cities submitted 12 months of complete data for 2004. Population estimates for 2004 are based on the percent change in state population from the Census Bureau's 2003 revised estimates and 2004 provisional estimates. (See the Population section in this appendix.) 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 plus estimated totals for agencies submitting 2 months or less of data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Represents an estimation of reported crime for MSAs. The UCR Program does not have sufficient data to estimate arson offenses. Any comparisons of crime among different locales should take into consideration relevant factors in addition to the areas' crime statistics. The essay Crime Factors (in this report) provides more details concerning the proper use of UCR statistics.
7	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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FBI estimates the breakdowns for robbery, burglary, and larceny-theft by first calculating the proportion of the total offense represented by each of the breakdowns as presented in Table 23 and applying those percentages to the estimated offense total as presented in Table 1. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Represents an estimation of reported crime for the Nation from 2000 to 2004. The data source from which the FBI derives Table 7 does not include aggravated assault or arson.
8	All law enforcement agencies serving cities and towns of 10,000 and over in population submitting 12 months of complete offense data for 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FBI estimated the 2004 population for each jurisdiction based on the percent change in the state population using the Census Bureau's 2003 revised estimates and 2004 provisional estimates. (See the Population section in this appendix.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any comparisons of crime among different locales should take into consideration relevant factors in addition to the areas' crime statistics. The essay Crime Factors (in this report) provides more details concerning the proper use of UCR statistics.
9	All university/college law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete offense data for 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2002 student enrollment figures provided by the U.S. Department of Education are the most recent available. They include full and part-time students. The FBI does not convert part-time enrollments into full-time equivalents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Represents reported crime from those individual college/university law enforcement agencies (listed alphabetically by state) contributing data to the UCR Program. Any comparison of crimes among colleges/universities should take into consideration size of enrollment, number of on-campus residents, and other demographic factors.

(1) Table	(2) Database	(3) Table Construction	(4) General Comments
10	All county law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete offense data for 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Metropolitan Counties classification encompasses jurisdictions covered by noncity law enforcement agencies located within currently designated MSAs. The Nonmetropolitan Counties classification encompasses jurisdictions covered by noncity agencies located outside currently designated MSAs. (See Appendix III.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Represents reported crime from individual law enforcement agencies in metropolitan counties and nonmetropolitan counties covering populations of 25,000 and over (i.e., the individual sheriff's office and/or county police department). These figures do not represent the county totals because they exclude city crime counts. The state of Illinois did not contribute data for any county law enforcement agency. Any comparisons of crime among different locales should take into consideration relevant factors in addition to the areas' crime statistics. The essay Crime Factors (in this report) provides more details concerning the proper use of UCR statistics.
11	All state, federal, and territorial law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete offense data for 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State, federal, and territorial agencies are those agencies, regardless of jurisdiction, that are managed by their respective state, federal, or territorial governments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Represents 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. Any comparisons of crime among different locales should take into consideration relevant factors in addition to the areas' crime statistics. The essay Crime Factors (in this report) provides more details concerning the proper use of UCR statistics.
12-15	All law enforcement agencies submitting at least 6 common months of complete offense reports for 2003 and 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The tables present 2-year comparisons based on 2003 and 2004 reported crime. In calculating trends, the UCR Program includes only common reported months for individual agencies. The FBI estimated the 2004 population for each jurisdiction based on the percent change in the state's population using the Census Bureau's 2003 revised estimates and 2004 provisional estimates. (See the Population section in this appendix.) The Suburban and Nonsuburban Cities classification encompasses all cities other than principal cities served by municipal law enforcement agencies within MSAs. 	
16-19	All law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete data (except arson) for 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FBI derived the offense rates by first dividing the total aggregated offense estimates by the aggregated populations covered by contributing agencies and then multiplying the resulting figure by 100,000. The FBI estimated the 2004 population based on the percent change in state population from the Census Bureau's 2003 revised estimates and 2004 provisional estimates. (See the Population section in this appendix.) UCR population breakdowns are furnished in Appendix III. The Suburban and Nonsuburban Cities classifications in Table 17 encompass all cities other than principal cities served by municipal law enforcement agencies in MSAs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The forcible rape figures furnished by the Illinois state UCR Program were not in accordance with national guidelines. For inclusion in these tables, the Illinois forcible rape figures were estimated using the national rates for each population group applied to the population by group for Illinois agencies supplying all 12 months of complete data. The UCR Program does not have sufficient data to estimate arson offenses. There is a slight decrease in national coverage for Table 19 as a result of the FBI's editing procedures and fewer submissions from reporting agencies.

(1) Table	(2) Database	(3) Table Construction	(4) General Comments
20	All law enforcement agencies submitting SHR data for 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The offense totals for each weapon are the aggregate for each murder victim recorded on the SHRs for calendar year 2004. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SHR is the monthly law enforcement report to the UCR Program concerning homicides. It details victim and offender characteristics, circumstances, weapons used, etc. The SHR data submitted by Florida and Washington, D.C. did not meet UCR guidelines and were not included in this table.
21, 22	All law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete offense breakdown data for 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The weapon totals are aggregated from all robberies (Table 21) and aggravated assaults (Table 22) for which the FBI received weapon breakdowns. Jurisdictional population statistics represent 2004 UCR estimates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FBI did not receive weapon data from Illinois.
23, 24	All law enforcement agencies submitting at least 6 months of complete property/circumstance data for 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FBI computes offense total and value lost total for all Part I offenses other than aggravated assault and arson. The percent distribution statistics are based on the offense total for each Part I offense. The FBI derives trends by comparing statistics from agencies with at least 6 common months of complete data reports for 2003 and 2004. (Appendix II of this report defines the UCR Program's Part I offenses.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The offense of aggravated assault is not included in these tables. For UCR Program purposes, the taking of money or property in connection with an assault is reported as robbery. The data source from which the FBI derives Table 23 does not include arson.
25-28	All law enforcement agencies submitting at least 6 months of complete offense reports for 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FBI bases percent cleared statistics on aggregated offense and clearance totals. Population estimates for 2004 represent the percent change in state population from the Census Bureau's 2003 revised estimates and 2004 provisional estimates. (See the Population section in this appendix.) UCR population breakdowns are furnished in Appendix III. 	
29	All law enforcement agencies in the UCR Program (including those submitting less than 12 months of complete arrest data for 2004).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The arrest totals presented are national estimates based on the arrest statistics of all law enforcement agencies in the UCR Program (including those submitting less than 12 months of data). The estimated total number of arrests is the sum of estimated arrest volumes for each of the 28 offenses, not including suspicion. The arrest total for each of the individual offenses is the sum of the estimated volumes within each of the eight population groups. (See Appendix III.) The FBI calculated each group's estimate by dividing the reported 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 Program. (See the Population section in this appendix.) 	

(1) Table	(2) Database	(3) Table Construction	(4) General Comments
30, 31	All law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete arrest data for 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. The population estimates for 2004 represent the percent change in state population from the Census Bureau's 2003 revised estimates and 2004 provisional estimates. (See the Population section in this appendix.) Appendix III contains the UCR population and geographical configuration. 	
32, 33	All law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete arrest data for both 1995 and 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The arrest trends are the percent differences between 1995 and 2004 arrest volumes aggregated from all agencies that submitted 12 months of arrest data for both years. The population estimates for 2004 are based on the percent change in state population from the Census Bureau's 2003 revised estimates and 2004 provisional estimates. (See the Population section in this appendix.) Population statistics for 1995 are based on the percent change in state population from the Census Bureau's 1994 revised estimates and 1995 provisional estimates. 	
34, 35	All law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete arrest data for both 2000 and 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The arrest trends reflect the percent differences between 2000 and 2004 arrest volumes aggregated from all agencies that submitted 12 months of arrest data for both years. The population estimates for 2004 are based on the percent change in state population from the Census Bureau's 2003 revised estimates and 2004 provisional estimates. (See the Population section in this appendix.) The population counts used for 2000 are the Census Bureau's decennial census figures. 	
36, 37	All law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete arrest data for both 2003 and 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The arrest trends are 2-year comparisons between 2003 and 2004 arrest volumes aggregated from agencies that submitted 12 months of arrest data in both years. Population estimates for 2003 are based on the percent change in state population from the Census Bureau's 2002 revised estimates and 2003 provisional estimates. Population estimates for 2004 are based on the percent change in state population from the Census Bureau's 2003 revised estimates and 2004 provisional estimates. (See the Population section in this appendix.) 	
38-43	All law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete arrest data for 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population estimates for 2004 are based on the percent change in state population from the Census Bureau's 2003 revised estimates and 2004 provisional estimates. (See the Population section in this appendix.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a slight decrease in coverage for Table 43 as a result of the FBI's editing procedures and fewer submissions of race data from reporting agencies.

(1) Table	(2) Database	(3) Table Construction	(4) General Comments
44, 45	All city law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete arrest data for both 2003 and 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2004 city arrest trends represent the percent differences between 2003 and 2004 arrest volumes aggregated from all city agencies that submitted complete arrest data for both years. City agencies are all agencies within Population Groups I-VI. (See Appendix III.) Population estimates for 2003 are based on the percent change in state population from the Census Bureau's 2002 revised estimates and 2003 provisional estimates. Population estimates for 2004 are based on 2003 revised estimates and 2004 provisional estimates. (See the Population section in this appendix.) 	
46-49	All city law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete arrest data for 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City agencies are all agencies within Population Groups I-VI. (See Appendix III.) Population estimates for 2004 are based on the percent change in state population from the Census Bureau's 2003 revised estimates and 2004 provisional estimates. (See the Population section in this appendix.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a slight decrease in coverage for Table 49 as a result of the FBI's editing procedures and fewer submissions of race data from reporting agencies.
50, 51	All metropolitan county law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete arrest data for both 2003 and 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2004 metropolitan county arrest trends represent percent differences between 2003 and 2004 volumes aggregated from contributing agencies. The Metropolitan Counties classification encompasses jurisdictions covered by noncity law enforcement agencies located within currently designated MSAs. (See Appendix III.) Population estimates for 2003 are based on the percent change in state population from the Census Bureau's 2002 revised estimates and 2003 provisional estimates. Population estimates for 2004 are based on the percent change in state population from the Census Bureau's 2003 revised estimates and 2004 provisional estimates. (See the Population section in this appendix.) 	
52-55	All metropolitan county law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete arrest data for 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Metropolitan Counties classification encompasses jurisdictions covered by noncity law enforcement agencies located within currently designated MSAs. (See Appendix III.) Population estimates for 2004 are based on the percent change in state population from the Census Bureau's 2003 revised estimates and 2004 provisional estimates. (See the Population section in this appendix.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a slight decrease in coverage for Table 55 as a result of the FBI's editing procedures and fewer submissions of race data from reporting agencies.
56, 57	All nonmetropolitan county law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete arrest data for both 2003 and 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2004 nonmetropolitan county arrest trends represent percent differences between 2003 and 2004 arrest volumes aggregated from contributing agencies. The Nonmetropolitan Counties classification encompasses jurisdictions covered by noncity agencies located outside currently designated MSAs. (See Appendix III.) Population statistics for 2003 represent estimates based on the percent change in state population from the Census Bureau's 2002 revised estimates and 2003 provisional estimates. Population statistics for 2004 represent estimates based on the percent change in state population from the Census Bureau's 2003 revised estimates and 2004 provisional estimates. (See the Population section in this appendix.) 	

(1) Table	(2) Database	(3) Table Construction	(4) General Comments
58-61	All nonmetropolitan county law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete arrest data for 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Nonmetropolitan Counties classification encompasses jurisdictions covered by noncity agencies located outside currently designated MSAs. (See Appendix III.) Population estimates for 2004 are based on the percent change in state population from the Census Bureau's 2003 revised estimates and 2004 provisional estimates. (See the Population section in this appendix.) 	
62, 63	All suburban area law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete arrest data for both 2003 and 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2004 suburban area arrest trends represent percent differences between 2003 and 2004 arrest volumes aggregated from contributing agencies. The classification Suburban Area includes all law enforcement agencies located within a currently designated MSA excluding those agencies that cover principal cities as defined by the U. S. Office of Management and Budget. (See Appendix III.) Population estimates for 2003 are based on the percent change in state population from the Census Bureau's 2002 revised estimates and 2003 provisional estimates. Population estimates for 2004 are based on the percent change in state population from the Census Bureau's 2003 revised estimate and 2004 provisional estimates. (See the Population section in this appendix.) 	
64-67	All suburban area law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete arrest data for 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The classification Suburban Area includes all law enforcement agencies located within a currently designated MSA excluding those agencies that cover principal cities as defined by the Office of Management and Budget. (See Appendix III.) Population estimates for 2004 are based on the percent change in state population from the Census Bureau's 2003 revised estimates and 2004 provisional estimates. (See the Population section in this appendix.) 	
68	All law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete arrest data for 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population estimates for 2004 are based on the percent change in state population from the Census Bureau's 2003 revised estimates and 2004 provisional estimates. (See the Population section in this appendix.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In constructing this table, the FBI accepts each individual state's age definition for juveniles.
69	All law enforcement agencies submitting 12 months of complete arrest data for 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arrest totals are aggregates of the totals reported by individual participating agencies within each state. Population estimates reflect the Census Bureau's provisional estimates for 2004. (See the Population section in this appendix.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any comparison of statistics should take into consideration variances in arrest practices, particularly for Part II crimes. (Appendix II of this report defines the UCR Program's Part II offenses.) There are no data available for Montana for 2004. The Arrest Data section of this appendix discusses issues affecting specific states in 2004.

APPENDIX II – Offenses in Uniform Crime Reporting

The Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program divides offenses into two groups, Part I and Part II crimes. Each month, contributing agencies submit information on the number of Part I offenses known to law enforcement; those offenses cleared by arrest or exceptional means; and the age, sex, and race of persons arrested for each of the offenses. Contributors provide only arrest data for Part II offenses.

The UCR Program collects data about **Part I** offenses in order to measure the level and scope of crime occurring throughout the Nation. The Program's founders chose these offenses because they are serious crimes, they occur with regularity in all areas of the country, and they are likely to be reported to police. The **Part I** offenses are:

Criminal homicide—a.) Murder and non-negligent manslaughter: the willful (nonnegligent) killing of one human being by another. Deaths caused by negligence, attempts to kill, assaults to kill, suicides, and accidental deaths are excluded. The Program classifies justifiable homicides separately and limits the definition to: (1) the killing of a felon by a law enforcement officer in the line of duty; or (2) the killing of a felon, during the commission of a felony, by a private citizen.

b.) Manslaughter by negligence: the killing of another person through gross negligence. Traffic fatalities are excluded.

Forcible rape—The carnal knowledge of a female forcibly and against her will. Rapes by force and attempts or assaults to rape, regardless of the age of the victim, are included. Statutory offenses (no force used—victim under age of consent) are excluded.

Robbery—The taking or attempted taking of anything of value from the care, custody, or control of a person or persons by force or threat of force or violence and/or by putting the victim in fear.

Aggravated assault—An unlawful attack by one person upon another for the purpose of inflicting severe or aggravated bodily injury. This type of assault usually is accompanied by the use of a weapon or by means likely to produce death or great bodily harm. Simple assaults are excluded.

Burglary (breaking or entering)—The unlawful entry of a structure to commit a felony or a theft. Attempted forcible entry is included.

Larceny-theft (except motor vehicle theft)—The unlawful taking, carrying, leading, or riding away of property from the possession or constructive possession of another. Examples are thefts of bicycles or automobile accessories, shoplifting, pocket-picking, or the stealing of any property or article that is not taken by force and violence or by fraud. Attempted larcenies are included. Embezzlement, confidence games, forgery, worthless checks, etc., are excluded.

Motor vehicle theft—The theft or attempted theft of a motor vehicle. A motor vehicle is self-propelled and runs on land surface and not on rails. Motorboats, construction equipment, airplanes, and farming equipment are specifically excluded from this category.

Arson—Any willful or malicious burning or attempt to burn, with or without intent to defraud, a dwelling house, public building, motor vehicle or aircraft, personal property of another, etc.

The **Part II** offenses, for which only arrest data are collected, are:

Other assaults (simple)—Assaults and attempted assaults which are not of an aggravated nature and do not result in serious injury to the victim.

Forgery and counterfeiting—The altering, copying, or imitating of something, without authority or right, with the intent to deceive or defraud by passing the copy or thing altered or imitated as that which is original or genuine; or the selling, buying, or possession of an altered, copied, or imitated thing with the intent to deceive or defraud. Attempts are included.

Fraud—The intentional perversion of the truth for the purpose of inducing another person or other entity in reliance upon it to part with something of value or to surrender a legal right. Fraudulent conversion and obtaining of money or property by false pretenses. Confidence games and bad checks, except forgeries and counterfeiting, are included.

Embezzlement—The unlawful misappropriation or misapplication by an offender to his/her own use or purpose of money, property, or some other thing of value entrusted to his/her care, custody, or control.

Stolen property; buying, receiving, possessing—Buying, receiving, possessing, selling, concealing, or transporting any property with the knowledge that it has been unlawfully taken, as by burglary, embezzlement, fraud, larceny, robbery, etc. Attempts are included.

Vandalism—To willfully or maliciously destroy, injure, disfigure, or deface any public or private property, real or personal, without the consent of the owner or person having custody or control by cutting, tearing, breaking, marking, painting, drawing, covering with filth, or any other such means as may be specified by local law. Attempts are included.

Weapons; carrying, possessing, etc.—The violation of laws or ordinances prohibiting the manufacture, sale, purchase, transportation, possession, concealment, or use of firearms, cutting instruments, explosives, incendiary devices, or other deadly weapons. Attempts are included.

Prostitution and commercialized vice—The unlawful promotion of or participation in sexual activities for profit, including attempts.

Sex offenses (except forcible rape, prostitution, and commercialized vice)—Statutory rape, offenses against chastity, common decency, morals, and the like. Attempts are included.

Drug abuse violations—The violation of laws prohibiting the production, distribution, and/or use of certain controlled substances. The unlawful cultivation, manufacture, distribution, sale, purchase, use, possession, transportation, or importation of any controlled drug or narcotic substance. Arrests for violations of state and local laws, specifically those relating to the unlawful possession, sale, use, growing, manufacturing, and making of narcotic drugs. The following drug categories are specified: opium or cocaine and their derivatives (morphine, heroin, codeine); marijuana; synthetic narcotics—manufactured narcotics that can cause true addiction (demerol, methadone); and dangerous nonnarcotic drugs (barbiturates, benzedrine).

Gambling—To unlawfully bet or wager money or something else of value; assist, promote, or operate a game of chance for money or some other stake; possess or transmit wagering information; manufacture, sell, purchase, possess, or

transport gambling equipment, devices, or goods; or tamper with the outcome of a sporting event or contest to gain a gambling advantage.

Offenses against the family and children—Unlawful nonviolent acts by a family member (or legal guardian) that threaten the physical, mental, or economic well-being or morals of another family member and that are not classifiable as other offenses, such as Assault or Sex Offenses. Attempts are included.

Driving under the influence—Driving or operating a motor vehicle or common carrier while mentally or physically impaired as the result of consuming an alcoholic beverage or using a drug or narcotic.

Liquor laws—The violation of state or local laws or ordinances prohibiting the manufacture, sale, purchase, transportation, possession, or use of alcoholic beverages, not including driving under the influence and drunkenness. Federal violations are excluded.

Drunkenness—To drink alcoholic beverages to the extent that one's mental faculties and physical coordination are substantially impaired. Excludes driving under the influence.

Disorderly conduct—Any behavior that tends to disturb the public peace or decorum, scandalize the community, or shock the public sense of morality.

Vagrancy—The violation of a court order, regulation, ordinance, or law requiring the withdrawal of persons from the streets or other specified areas; prohibiting persons from remaining in an area or place in an idle or aimless manner; or prohibiting persons from going from place to place without visible means of support.

All other offenses—All violations of state or local laws not specifically identified as Part I or Part II offenses, except traffic violations.

Suspicion—Arrested for no specific offense and released without formal charges being placed.

Curfew and loitering laws (persons under age 18)—Violations by juveniles of local curfew or loitering ordinances.

Runaways (persons under age 18)—Limited to juveniles taken into protective custody under the provisions of local statutes.

APPENDIX III – Uniform Crime Reporting Area Definitions

The Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program collects crime data and supplemental information that make it possible to generate a variety of statistical compilations, including data presented by reporting areas. These statistics provide data users with the opportunity to analyze local crime data in conjunction with those for areas of similar geographic location or population size. The reporting areas that the UCR Program uses in its data breakdowns include community types, population groups, and regions and divisions. For community types, the UCR Program considers proximity to metropolitan areas using the Office of Management and Budget’s (OMB) designations. (Generally, sheriffs, county police, and state police report crimes within counties but outside cities; local police report crimes within city limits.) The number of inhabitants living in a locale (based on the U.S. Census Bureau’s figures) determines the population group into which the Program places it. Finally, in its geographic breakdowns, the UCR Program divides the United States into regions, divisions, and states.

Community Types

In order to assist data users who wish to analyze and present uniform statistical data about metropolitan areas, the UCR Program uses reporting units that represent major population centers. The Program compiles data for these areas according to three types of communities:

1. Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs)—Each MSA contains a principal city or urbanized area with a population of at least 50,000 inhabitants. MSAs include the principal city; the county in which the city is located; and other adjacent counties that have, as defined by the OMB, a high degree of economic and social integration with the principal city and county as measured through commuting. In the UCR Program, counties within an MSA are considered metropolitan. In addition, MSAs may cross state boundaries.

In 2004, approximately 82.9 percent of the Nation’s population lived in MSAs. Some presentations in this publication refer to suburban areas, which are subdivisions of MSAs that exclude the

principal cities but include all the remaining cities (those having fewer than 50,000 inhabitants) and the unincorporated areas of the MSAs.

Note: Because the elements that comprise MSAs (particularly the geographic compositions), are subject to change, the Program discourages data users from making year-to-year comparisons of MSA data.

2. Cities Outside MSAs—Ordinarily, cities outside MSAs are incorporated areas. In 2004, cities outside MSAs made up 6.8 percent of the Nation’s population.

3. Nonmetropolitan Counties Outside MSAs—Most nonmetropolitan counties are composed of unincorporated areas. In 2004, 10.4 percent of the population resided in nonmetropolitan counties.

Community types are further illustrated in the following table:

Metropolitan	Nonmetropolitan
Principal Cities (50,000+ inhabitants)	Cities outside Metropolitan Areas
Suburban Cities	
Metropolitan Counties	Nonmetropolitan Counties

Population Groups

The UCR Program uses the following population group designations:

Population Group	Political Label	Population Range
I	City	250,000 and more
II	City	100,000 to 249,999
III	City	50,000 to 99,999
IV	City	25,000 to 49,999
V	City	10,000 to 24,999
VI	City ¹	Less than 10,000
VIII (Nonmetropolitan County)	County ²	N/A
IX (Metropolitan County)	County ²	N/A

¹Includes universities and colleges to which no population is attributed.

²Includes state police to which no population is attributed.

Individual law enforcement agencies are the source of UCR data. The number of agencies included in each population group may vary from year to year because of population growth, geopolitical consolidation, municipal incorporation, etc. In noncensus years, the UCR Program estimates population figures for individual jurisdictions. (A more comprehensive explanation of population estimations can be found in Appendix I of this publication.)

The table below shows the number of agencies contributing to the UCR Program within each population group for 2004.

<i>Population Group</i>	<i>Number of</i>	
	<i>Agencies</i>	<i>Population Covered</i>
I	71	53,606,547
II	181	26,997,995
III	439	30,187,431
IV	833	28,749,035
V	1,877	29,682,903
VI ¹	8,830	26,244,386
VIII (Nonmetropolitan County) ²	3,105	30,432,316
IX (Metropolitan County) ²	2,163	67,754,791
Total	17,499	293,655,404

¹Includes universities and colleges to which no population is attributed.
²Includes state police to which no population is attributed.

Regions and Divisions

The accompanying map illustrates the four regions of the United States along with their nine subdivisions as established by the U.S. Census Bureau. The UCR Program uses this widely recognized geographic organization when compiling the Nation's crime data. The following table lists the 50 states and the District of Columbia arranged according to the regions and divisions of the United States.

NORTHEASTERN STATES

Middle Atlantic	New England
New Jersey	Connecticut
New York	Maine
Pennsylvania	Massachusetts
	New Hampshire
	Rhode Island
	Vermont

MIDWESTERN STATES

East North Central	West North Central
Illinois	Iowa
Indiana	Kansas
Michigan	Minnesota
Ohio	Missouri
Wisconsin	Nebraska
	North Dakota
	South Dakota

SOUTHERN STATES

South Atlantic	East South Central
Delaware	Alabama
District of Columbia	Kentucky
Florida	Mississippi
Georgia	Tennessee
Maryland	West South Central
North Carolina	Arkansas
South Carolina	Louisiana
Virginia	Oklahoma
West Virginia	Texas

WESTERN STATES

Mountain	Pacific
Arizona	Alaska
Colorado	California
Idaho	Hawaii
Montana	Oregon
Nevada	Washington
New Mexico	
Utah	
Wyoming	

Regions and Divisions of the United States, 2004



APPENDIX IV – The Nation’s Two Crime Measures

The U.S. Department of Justice administers two statistical programs to measure the magnitude, nature, and impact of crime in the Nation: the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program and the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS). Each of these programs produces valuable information about aspects of the Nation’s crime problem. Because the UCR and NCVS programs are conducted for different purposes, use different methods, and focus on somewhat different aspects of crime, the information they produce together provides a more comprehensive panorama of the Nation’s crime problem than either could produce alone.

Uniform Crime Reports

The FBI’s UCR Program, which began in 1929, collects information on the following crimes reported to law enforcement authorities: murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson. Law enforcement agencies report arrest data for 21 additional crime categories.

The UCR Program compiles data from monthly law enforcement reports or individual crime incident records transmitted directly to the FBI or to centralized state agencies that then report to the FBI. The Program thoroughly examines each report it receives for reasonableness, accuracy, and deviations that may indicate errors. Large variations in crime levels may indicate modified records procedures, incomplete reporting, or changes in a jurisdiction’s boundaries. To identify any unusual fluctuations in an agency’s crime counts, the Program compares monthly reports to previous submissions of the agency and with those for similar agencies.

In 2004, law enforcement agencies active in the UCR Program represented nearly 277 million United States inhabitants—94.2 percent of the total population.

The UCR Program presents crime counts for the Nation as a whole, as well as for regions,

states, counties, cities, towns, tribal law enforcement, and colleges and universities. This permits studies among neighboring jurisdictions and among those with similar populations and other common characteristics.

The UCR Program annually publishes its findings in a preliminary release in the spring of the following calendar year, followed by a detailed annual report, *Crime in the United States*, issued in the fall. In addition to crime counts and trends, this report includes data on crimes cleared, persons arrested (age, sex, and race), law enforcement personnel (including the number of sworn officers killed or assaulted), and the characteristics of homicides (including age, sex, and race of victims and offenders; victim-offender relationships; weapons used; and circumstances surrounding the homicides). Other periodic reports are also available from the UCR Program.

The UCR Program is continually converting to the more comprehensive and detailed National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS). The NIBRS provides detailed information about each criminal incident in 22 broad categories of offenses.

National Crime Victimization Survey

The Bureau of Justice Statistics’ (BJS) NCVS, which began in 1973, provides a detailed picture of crime incidents, victims, and trends. After a substantial period of research, the BJS completed an intensive methodological redesign of the survey in 1993. The BJS conducted the redesign to improve the questions used to uncover crime, update the survey methods, and broaden the scope of crimes measured. The redesigned survey collects detailed information on the frequency and nature of the crimes of rape, sexual assault, personal robbery, aggravated and simple assault, household burglary, theft, and motor vehicle theft. It does not measure homicide or commercial crimes (such as burglaries of stores).

Two times a year, U.S. Bureau of the Census personnel interview household members in a nationally representative sample of approximately 43,000

households (about 76,000 people). Approximately 150,000 interviews of persons age 12 or older are conducted annually. Households stay in the sample for 3 years. New households rotate into the sample on an ongoing basis.

The NCVS collects information on crimes suffered by individuals and households, whether or not those crimes were reported to law enforcement. It estimates the proportion of each crime type reported to law enforcement, and it summarizes the reasons that victims give for reporting or not reporting.

The survey provides information about victims (age, sex, race, ethnicity, marital status, income, and educational level), offenders (sex, race, approximate age, and victim-offender relationship), and the crimes (time and place of occurrence, use of weapons, nature of injury, and economic consequences). Questions also cover the experiences of victims with the criminal justice system, self-protective measures used by victims, and possible substance abuse by offenders. Supplements are added periodically to the survey to obtain detailed information on topics like school crime.

The BJS published the first data from the redesigned NCVS in a BJS bulletin in June 1995. BJS publication of NCVS data includes *Criminal Victimization in the United States*, an annual report that covers the broad range of detailed information collected by the NCVS. The BJS publishes detailed reports on topics such as crime against women, urban crime, and gun use in crime. The National Archive of Criminal Justice Data at the University of Michigan archives the NCVS data files to enable researchers to perform independent analyses.

Comparing UCR and NCVS

Because the BJS designed the NCVS to complement the UCR Program, the two programs share many similarities. As much as their different collection methods permit, the two measure the same subset of serious crimes, defined alike. Both programs cover rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, theft, and motor vehicle theft. Rape, robbery, theft, and motor vehicle theft are defined virtually identically by both the UCR and the NCVS.

(While rape is defined analogously, the UCR Program measures the crime against women only, and the NCVS measures it against both sexes.)

There are also significant differences between the two programs. First, the two programs were created to serve different purposes. The UCR Program's primary objective is to provide a reliable set of criminal justice statistics for law enforcement administration, operation, and management. The BJS established the NCVS to provide previously unavailable information about crime (including crime not reported to police), victims, and offenders.

Second, the two programs measure an overlapping but nonidentical set of crimes. The NCVS includes crimes both reported and not reported to law enforcement. The NCVS excludes, but the UCR includes, homicide, arson, commercial crimes, and crimes against children under age 12. The UCR captures crimes reported to law enforcement but collects only arrest data for simple assaults and sexual assaults other than forcible rape.

Third, because of methodology, the NCVS and UCR definitions of some crime differ. For example, the UCR defines burglary as the unlawful entry or attempted entry of a structure to commit a felony or theft. The NCVS, not wanting to ask victims to ascertain offender motives, defines burglary as the entry or attempted entry of a residence by a person who had no right to be there.

Fourth, for property crimes (burglary, theft, and motor vehicle theft), the two programs calculate crime rates using different bases. The UCR rates for these crimes are per capita (number of crimes per 100,000 persons), whereas the NCVS rates for these crimes are per household (number of crimes per 1,000 households). Because the number of households may not grow at the same rate each year as the total population, trend data for rates of property crimes measured by the two programs may not be comparable.

In addition, some differences in the data from the two programs may result from sampling variation in the NCVS and from estimating for nonresponse in the UCR. The BJS derives the NCVS estimates from interviewing a sample and are, therefore, subject to a margin of error. The BJS uses rigorous statistical methods to calculate

confidence intervals around all survey estimates. The BJS describes trend data in the NCVS reports as genuine only if there is at least a 90-percent certainty that the measured changes are not the result of sampling variation. The UCR Program bases its data on the actual counts of offenses reported by law enforcement agencies. In some circumstances, the UCR Program estimates its data for nonparticipating agencies or those reporting partial data.

Apparent discrepancies between statistics from the two programs can usually be accounted for by their definitional and procedural differences or resolved by comparing NCVS sampling variations (confidence intervals) of those crimes said to have been reported to police with UCR statistics.

For most types of crimes measured by both the UCR and NCVS, analysts familiar with the programs can exclude from analysis those aspects of crime not common to both. Resulting long-term trend lines can be brought into close concordance. The impact of such adjustments is most striking for robbery, burglary, and motor vehicle theft, whose definitions most closely coincide.

With robbery, the BJS bases the NCVS victimization rates only on robberies reported to the police. It is also possible to remove UCR robberies of commercial establishments such as gas stations,

convenience stores, and banks from analysis. When users compare the resulting NCVS police-reported robbery rates and the UCR noncommercial robbery rates, the results reveal closely corresponding long-term trends.

Each program has unique strengths. The UCR provides a measure of the number of crimes reported to law enforcement agencies throughout the country. The UCR's Supplementary Homicide Reports provide the most reliable, timely data on the extent and nature of homicides in the Nation. The NCVS is the primary source of information on the characteristics of criminal victimization and on the number and types of crimes not reported to law enforcement authorities.

By understanding the strengths and limitations of each program, it is possible to use the UCR and NCVS to achieve a greater understanding of crime trends and the nature of crime in the United States. For example, changes in police procedures, shifting attitudes towards crime and police, and other societal changes can affect the extent to which people report and law enforcement agencies record crime. NCVS and UCR data can be used in concert to explore why trends in reported and police recorded crime may differ.

APPENDIX V – Directory of State Uniform Crime Reporting Programs

Alabama	Alabama Criminal Justice Information Center Suite 350 770 Washington Avenue Montgomery, Alabama 36104 (334) 242-4900 www.acjic.state.al.us
Alaska	Alaska Department of Public Safety Criminal Records and Identification Bureau 5700 East Tudor Road Anchorage, Alaska 99507 (907) 269-5765
American Samoa	Department of Public Safety Post Office Box 1086 Pago Pago American Samoa 96799 (684) 633-1111
Arizona	Access Integrity Unit Uniform Crime Reporting Program Arizona Department of Public Safety Mail Drop 1190 Post Office Box 6638 Phoenix, Arizona 85005-6638 (602) 223-2239 www.dps.state.az.us
Arkansas	Arkansas Crime Information Center One Capitol Mall, 4D-200 Little Rock, Arkansas 72201 (501) 682-2222 www.acic.state.ar.us
California	Criminal Justice Statistics Center Department of Justice Post Office Box 903427 Sacramento, California 94203-4270 (916) 227-3515

Colorado	Uniform Crime Reporting Colorado Bureau of Investigation Suite 3000 690 Kipling Street Denver, Colorado 80215 (303) 239-4222 www.cbi.state.co.us
Connecticut	Uniform Crime Reporting Program 1111 Country Club Road Middletown, Connecticut 06457-9294 (860) 685-8030 www.state.ct.us/dps/crime_analysis/crime_analysis.asp
Delaware	Delaware State Bureau of Identification Post Office Box 430 Dover, Delaware 19903-0430 (302) 739-5901
District of Columbia	Research and Resource Development Metropolitan Police Department 300 Indiana Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001 (202) 727-4174 www.mpdc.dc.gov
Florida	Criminal Justice Information Services Uniform Crime Reports Florida Department of Law Enforcement Post Office Box 1489 Tallahassee, Florida 32302-1489 (850) 410-7121
Georgia	Georgia Crime Information Center Georgia Bureau of Investigation Post Office Box 370748 Decatur, Georgia 30037-0748 (404) 270-8467 www.ganet.org/gbi/
Guam	Guam Police Department Planning, Research and Development Building #233 Central Avenue Tiyan, Guam 96913 (671) 475-8422

Hawaii	Crime Prevention and Justice Assistance Division Department of the Attorney General Suite 401 235 South Beretania Street Honolulu, Hawaii 96813 (808) 586-1150 cpja.ag.state.hi.us/rs
Idaho	Bureau of Criminal Identification Idaho State Police Post Office Box 700 Meridian, Idaho 83680-0700 (208) 884-7156 www.isp.state.id.us/identification/ucr/
Illinois	Uniform Crime Reporting Program Illinois State Police 2 nd Floor 500 Iles Park Place Springfield, Illinois 62703 (217) 782-5794 www.isp.state.il.us
Iowa	Iowa Department of Public Safety Wallace State Office Building East Ninth and Grand Des Moines, Iowa 50319 (515) 281-8494 www.state.ia.us/government/dps/asd/stats.htm
Kansas	Kansas Bureau of Investigation Information Services Division Incident Based Reporting Section 1620 Southwest Tyler Street Topeka, Kansas 66612 (785) 296-8279 www.accesskansas.org/kbi/
Kentucky	Criminal Identification and Records Branch Kentucky State Police 1250 Louisville Road Frankfort, Kentucky 40601 (502) 227-8790 www.kentuckystatepolice.org

Louisiana	Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement Uniform Crime Reporting 12 th Floor 1885 Wooddale Boulevard Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70806 (225) 925-4440 www.cole.state.la.us/lucr.htm
Maine	Records Management Services Uniform Crime Reporting Division Maine Department of Public Safety Maine State Police Suite 1 45 Commerce Drive Augusta, Maine 04333-0042 (207) 624-7276 www.maine.gov/dps/
Maryland	Central Records Division Incident Reporting Section Maryland State Police 1711 Belmont Avenue Baltimore, Maryland 21244 (410) 298-3883
Massachusetts	Crime Reporting Unit Uniform Crime Reports Massachusetts State Police 470 Worcester Road Framingham, Massachusetts 01702 (508) 820-2111
Michigan	Uniform Crime Reporting Unit Criminal Justice Information Center Michigan State Police 7150 Harris Drive Lansing, Michigan 48913 (517) 322-1424 www.michigan.gov/msp
Minnesota	Criminal Justice Information Systems Bureau of Criminal Apprehension Minnesota Department of Public Safety 1430 Maryland Avenue East St. Paul, Minnesota 55106 (651) 793-2400 www.bca.state.mn.us/

Missouri	Missouri State Highway Patrol Criminal Records & Identification Division CJIS Section – UCR Program Office 1510 East Elm Street Post Office Box 9500 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-9500 (573) 526-6278 www.mshp.state.mo.us/ucr/ucrhome.nsf/
Montana	Montana Board of Crime Control Post Office Box 201408 Helena, Montana 59620-1408 (406) 444-4298 www.mbcc.state.mt.us
Nebraska	Uniform Crime Reporting Section The Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Post Office Box 94946 Lincoln, Nebraska 68509-4946 (402) 471-3982 www.nol.org/home/crimecom/
Nevada	Uniform Crime Reporting Program Records and Identification Bureau 808 West Nye Lane Carson City, Nevada 89703 (775) 687-1600 x235 www.nvrepository.state.nv.us
New Hampshire	Uniform Crime Reporting Unit New Hampshire State Police New Hampshire Department of Public Safety 33 Hazen Drive Concord, New Hampshire 03305 (603) 271-2509
New Jersey	Uniform Crime Reporting Unit New Jersey State Police Post Office Box 7068 West Trenton, New Jersey 08628-0068 (609) 882-2000 x2392 www.njsp.org

New York	<p>Statistical Services New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services 8th Floor, Mail Room 4 Tower Place Albany, New York 12203 (518) 457-8381 criminaljustice.state.ny.us</p>
North Carolina	<p>Crime Reporting and Criminal Statistics State Bureau of Investigation Post Office Box 29500 Raleigh, North Carolina 27626-0500 (919) 662-4509 sbi2.jus.state.nc.us/crp/public/Default.htm</p>
North Dakota	<p>Information Services Section Bureau of Criminal Investigation Attorney General's Office Post Office Box 1054 Bismarck, North Dakota 58502 (701) 328-5500 www.ag.state.nd.us</p>
Ohio*	<p>Office of Criminal Justice Services 14th Floor 140 East Town Street Columbus, Ohio 43215 (614) 466-7782</p>
Oklahoma	<p>Uniform Crime Reporting Section Oklahoma State Bureau of Investigation 6600 North Harvey Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73116 (405) 879-2533 www.osbi.state.ok.us</p>
Oregon	<p>Law Enforcement Data System Division Oregon State Police Post Office Box 14360 Salem, Oregon 97309 (503) 378-3055 x55002</p>

*National Incident-Based Reporting System Only

Pennsylvania	Bureau of Research and Development Pennsylvania State Police 1800 Elmerton Avenue Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17110 (717) 783-5536 ucr.psp.state.pa.us
Puerto Rico	Statistics Division Puerto Rico Police Post Office Box 70166 San Juan, Puerto Rico 00936-8166 (787) 793-1234 x3113 www.policia.gobierno.pr
Rhode Island	Rhode Island State Police 311 Danielson Pike North Scituate, Rhode Island 02857 (401) 444-1156 www.risp.ri.gov/
South Carolina	South Carolina Law Enforcement Division Post Office Box 21398 Columbia, South Carolina 29221-1398 (803) 896-7016 www.sled.state.sc.us
South Dakota	South Dakota Statistical Analysis Center 3444 East Highway 34 Pierre, South Dakota 57501-5070 (605) 773-6312 www.dci.sd.gov
Tennessee*	Tennessee Bureau of Investigation 901 R.S. Gass Boulevard Nashville, Tennessee 37216 (615) 744-4000 www.tbi.state.tn.us
Texas	Uniform Crime Reporting Crime Information Bureau Texas Department of Public Safety Post Office Box 4143 Austin, Texas 78765-9968 (512) 424-2091 www.txdps.state.tx.us/crimereports/citindex.htm

*National Incident-Based Reporting System Only

Utah	Data Collection and Analysis Uniform Crime Reporting Bureau of Criminal Identification Utah Department of Public Safety Post Office Box 148280 Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-8280 (801) 965-4812 www.bci.utah.gov
Vermont	Vermont Crime Information Center 103 South Main Street Waterbury, Vermont 05671 (802) 244-8727 www.dps.state.vt.us/cjs/vcic.htm
Virginia	Criminal Justice Information Services Division Virginia State Police Post Office Box 27472 Richmond, Virginia 23261-7472 (804) 674-2143 www.vsp.state.va.us/crimestatistics.htm
Virgin Islands	Virgin Islands Police Department Alexander Farrelly Justice Complex Saint Thomas, Virgin Islands 00802 (340) 774-2211
Washington	Uniform Crime Reporting Program Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs Suite 200 3060 Willamette Drive, Northeast Lacey, Washington 98516 (360) 486-2380 www.waspc.org
West Virginia	Uniform Crime Reporting Program West Virginia State Police 725 Jefferson Road South Charleston, West Virginia 25309 (304) 746-2237 www.wvstatepolice.com

Wisconsin

Wisconsin Office of Justice Assistance
Suite 610
131 West Wilson Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53702-0001
(608) 266-3323
oja.state.wi.us/

Wyoming

Uniform Crime Reporting
Criminal Records Section
Division of Criminal Investigation
316 West 22nd Street
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002
(307) 777-7625
attorneygeneral.state.wy.us/dci/

APPENDIX VI – National Uniform Crime Reporting Directory

Administration

Program administration; management; policy

Telephone: (304) 625-3691

Crime Analysis, Research and Development

Statistical models; special studies and analyses; crime forecasting

Telephone: (304) 625-3600

Facsimile: (304) 625-2868

E-mail: <sberhanu@leo.gov>

Information Dissemination

Requests for published and unpublished data; printouts, electronic media, books, and UCR information

Telephone: (304) 625-4995

Facsimile: (304) 625-5394

E-mail: <cjis_comm@leo.gov>

National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS)

Information for law enforcement agencies regarding the NIBRS certification process; federal funding for NIBRS-compliant records management systems; and data submission specifications

Telephone: (304) 625-2998

Facsimile: (304) 625-3458

E-mail: <gswanson@leo.gov>

Quality Assurance

Assistance for law enforcement agencies in confirming statistical validity and ensuring reporting integrity

Telephone: (304) 625-2941

Facsimile: (304) 625-3457

E-mail: <acjis@leo.gov>

Statistical Processing

Processing of summary and incident-based reports from data contributors; reporting problems; requests for reporting forms; data processing; data quality

Telephone: (304) 625-4830

Facsimile: (304) 625-3455

E-mail: <ucrstat@leo.gov>

Training/Education

Requests for training of law enforcement personnel; information on police reporting systems; technical assistance.

Telephone: 1-(888) UCR-NIBR
[827-6427]

Send correspondence to:

Federal Bureau of Investigation
Criminal Justice Information Services Division
Attention: Uniform Crime Reports
1000 Custer Hollow Road
Clarksburg, West Virginia 26306

APPENDIX VII – Publications Provided by the UCR Program

Annual Books

*Crime in the United States**
*Hate Crime Statistics**
*Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted**

Brochures

National Incident-Based Reporting System
Uniform Crime Reporting Statistics: Their Proper Use

Historical Data

*Age-Specific Arrest Rates and Race-Specific Arrest Rates
for Selected Offenses, 1965-1992*
*Age-Specific Arrest Rates and Race-Specific Arrest Rates
for Selected Offenses, 1993-2001**

Preliminary Reports

Preliminary Annual Uniform Crime Report*
Preliminary Semiannual Uniform Crime Report, January–June*

Special Reports

*In the Line of Fire: Violence Against Law Enforcement—A Study of Felonious
Assaults on Law Enforcement Officers*
*Killed in the Line of Duty: A Study of Selected Felonious Killings of Law
Enforcement Officers*

Training Guides and User Manuals

Hate Crime
*Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines**
Hate Crime Magnetic Media Specifications for Tapes & Diskettes
Hate Crime Statistics, 1990: A Resource Book
*Training Guide for Hate Crime Data Collection**
Manual of Law Enforcement Records
National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS)
*Addendum to the NIBRS Volumes**
*Conversion of NIBRS Data to Summary Data**
*Data Collection Guidelines** (NIBRS Volume 1)
Data Submission Specifications (NIBRS Volume 2; Web exclusive)
Developments in the NIBRS (Web exclusive)
*Error Message Manual** (NIBRS Volume 4)
*Handbook for Acquiring an RMS [Records Management System] That Is
Compatible with the NIBRS* (Web exclusive)
*NIBRS Addendum for Submitting LEOKA Data**
Supplemental Guidelines for Federal Participation
Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook: NIBRS Edition
Uniform Crime Reporting
*Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook** (for the Summary system;
for NIBRS edition, see above)

* These publications are available in print and on the FBI's Web site at <www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucr.htm>.

