



Crime in the United States 2000



Crime in the United States

2000

Uniform Crime Reports



Printed Annually
Federal Bureau of Investigation
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20535

Advisory:
Criminal Justice Information Systems Committee,
International Association of Chiefs of Police;
Criminal Justice Information Services Committee,
National Sheriffs' Association;
Criminal Justice Information Services Advisory Policy Board

For sale by Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office, Mail Stop: SSOP, Washington, D.C. 20402-9328

ISBN 0-16-048756-0

FOREWORD

The incidence of serious crime in the United States, which has been following a downward spiral since 1992, may be reaching a plateau. Compared to the marked drops noted in recent years, the current slight decline in the Index crime estimate is certain to be viewed by many as no change at all from the previous year's. Only after publication of the next few issues of *Crime in the United States* will we know whether the figures for 2000 signaled an end to the current downward trend or were merely a bump in the road. What can be stated with certainty is that the opportunity to compare national crime totals and speculate upon their significance would not be available without the Uniform Crime Reporting Program, which has been compiling and publishing the Nation's crime statistics since 1930.

In the beginning, the Program was conceived, developed, and originally managed by the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP). The first *Uniform Crime Reports* monthly bulletin for January 1930 contained reports of offenses committed in 400 cities located in 43 states. It provided data from half of all cities over 30,000 in population and covered more than 20 million U.S. inhabitants. This initial response far exceeded the highest hopes of the IACP's Committee on Uniform Crime Records, which had been working for several years to develop the Program.

Throughout the developmental period, the goal of the police chiefs' association had been to transfer the management of the new UCR Program to the FBI (then called the Bureau of Investigation). To achieve this end, the IACP actively sought to amend the legislation that established the identification work of the FBI to include authorization to collect, compile, and distribute "other crime records." The bill was passed by Congress and then approved by President Herbert Hoover on June 11, 1930. The July issue of the *Uniform Crime Reports* announced that the Bureau of Investigation would assume responsibility for crime reporting the following fall. On August 24, 1930, a local Washington, D.C. newspaper, the *Sunday Star*, reported that "Uncle Sam beginning September 1 is going to put his finger on the pulse of crime in America. . . ." Uncle Sam has kept his finger firmly planted on the Nation's crime pulse ever since.

About the cover: The history of the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program is closely linked with the evolution of the FBI's fingerprint identification services. When the Bureau of Investigation assumed responsibility for the UCR Program in 1930, the Program was housed in the Southern Railway Building (top photo) along with approximately 2 million fingerprint cards. The crime reporting program and the fingerprint cards were moved into the new United States Department of Justice Building (top right) in 1934. Over the next 60 years, the UCR Program was located in several different buildings in the Nation's capitol, including the J. Edgar Hoover Building (center photo). In 1992, the Program was included in the reorganization of the FBI's identification services into the new Criminal Justice Information Services Division and was part of the Division's 1995 relocation from Washington, D.C. to the newly constructed, state-of-the art facility at Clarksburg, West Virginia (bottom photo).

CRIME FACTORS

Each year when *Crime in the United States* is published, many entities—news media, tourism agencies, and other groups with an interest in crime in our Nation—use reported Crime Index figures to compile rankings of cities and counties. These rankings lead to simplistic and/or incomplete analyses which often create misleading perceptions adversely affecting cities and counties, along with their residents. Assessing criminality and law enforcement's response from jurisdiction to jurisdiction must encompass many elements, some of which, while having significant impact, are not readily measurable nor applicable pervasively among all locales. Geographic and demographic factors specific to each jurisdiction must be considered and applied if crime assessment is to approach completeness and accuracy. There are several sources of information which may assist the responsible researcher. The U.S. Bureau of the Census data, for example, can be utilized to better understand the makeup of a locale's population. The transience of the population, its racial and ethnic makeup, its composition by age and gender, education levels, and prevalent family structures are all key factors in assessing and comprehending the crime issue.

Local chambers of commerce, planning offices, or similar entities provide information regarding the economic and cultural makeup of cities and counties. Understanding a jurisdiction's industrial/economic base, its dependence upon neighboring jurisdictions, its transportation system, its economic dependence on nonresidents (such as tourists and convention attendees), its proximity to military installations, correctional facilities, state penitentiaries, prisons, jails, etc., all contribute to accurately gauging and interpreting the crime known to and reported by law enforcement.

The strength (personnel and other resources) and the aggressiveness of a jurisdiction's law enforcement agency are also key factors. While information pertaining to the number of sworn and civilian law enforcement employees can be found in this publication, assessment of the law enforcement emphases is, of course, much more difficult. For example, one city may report more crime than a comparable one, not because there is more crime, but rather because its law enforcement agency through proactive efforts identifies more offenses. Attitudes of the citizens toward crime and their crime reporting practices, especially concerning more minor offenses, have an impact on the volume of crimes known to police.

It is incumbent upon all data users to become as well educated as possible about how to categorize and quantify the nature and extent of crime in the United States and in any of the nearly 17,000 jurisdictions represented by law enforcement contributors to the Uniform Crime Reporting Program. Valid assessments are possible only with careful study and analysis of the various unique conditions affecting each local law enforcement jurisdiction.

Historically, the causes and origins of crime have been the subjects of investigation by varied disciplines. Some factors which are known to affect the volume and type of crime occurring from place to place are:

- Population density and degree of urbanization.
- Variations in composition of the population, particularly youth concentration.
- Stability of population with respect to residents' mobility, commuting patterns, and transient factors.
- Modes of transportation and highway system.
- Economic conditions, including median income, poverty level, and job availability.
- Cultural factors and educational, recreational, and religious characteristics.
- Family conditions with respect to divorce and family cohesiveness.
- Climate.
- Effective strength of law enforcement agencies.

Administrative and investigative emphases of law enforcement.
Policies of other components of the criminal justice system (i.e., prosecutorial, judicial, correctional, and probational).
Citizens' attitudes toward crime.
Crime reporting practices of the citizenry.

The Uniform Crime Reports give a nationwide view of crime based on statistics contributed by state and local law enforcement agencies. Population size is the only correlate of crime utilized in this publication. While the other factors listed above are of equal concern, no attempt is made to relate them to the data presented. *The reader is, therefore, cautioned against comparing statistical data of individual reporting units from cities, counties, metropolitan areas, states, or colleges and universities solely on the basis of their population coverage or student enrollment.*

Data users are cautioned against comparing crime trends presented in this report and those estimated by the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), administered by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. Because of differences in methodology and crime coverage, the two programs examine the Nation's crime problem from somewhat different perspectives, and their results are not strictly comparable. The definitional and procedural differences can account for many of the apparent discrepancies in results from the two programs.

The national Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program would like to hear from you.

The staff at the national UCR Program are continually striving to improve their publications. We would appreciate it if the primary user of this publication would complete the evaluation form at the end of this book and either mail it to us at the indicated address or fax it: 304-625-5394.

CONTENTS

	Page
Section I—Summary of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program	1
Section II—Crime Index Offenses Reported	5
Narrative comments:	
Crime Index Total	5
Violent Crime:	11
Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter	14
Forcible rape	25
Robbery	29
Aggravated assault	34
Property Crime:	38
Burglary	41
Larceny-theft	46
Motor vehicle theft	52
Arson	56
Hate Crime	59
Crime Index Tabulations	65
Figures:	
(2.1) Crime clock, 2000	4
(2.2) Crime Index total, 1996-2000	8
(2.3) Crime Index offenses, percent distribution, 2000	9
(2.4) Regional violent and property crime rates, 2000	10
(2.5) Violent crime, 1996-2000	13
(2.6) Murder, 1996-2000	16
(2.7) Murder by relationship, 2000	22
(2.8) Forcible rape, 1996-2000	28
(2.9) Robbery, 1996-2000	32
(2.10) Robbery analysis, 1996-2000	33
(2.11) Aggravated assault, 1996-2000	36
(2.12) Property crime, 1996-2000	40
(2.13) Burglary, 1996-2000	43
(2.14) Burglary analysis, 1996-2000	44
(2.15) Larceny-theft, 1996-2000	48
(2.16) Larceny analysis, 1996-2000	49
(2.17) Larceny analysis, 2000	50
(2.18) Motor vehicle theft, 1996-2000	54
(2.19) Bias-motivated offenses, 2000	62
Tables:	
(2.1) Crime Index total by month, percent distribution, 1996-2000	6
(2.2) Violent crime total by month, percent distribution, 1996-2000	12
Murder:	
(2.3) Month, percent distribution, 1996-2000	15
(2.4) Victims, by race and sex, 2000	15
(2.5) Victims, by age, sex, and race, 2000	17
(2.6) Offenders, by age, sex, and race, 2000	17

(2.7) Victim/offender relationship, by age, 2000	18
(2.8) Victim/offender relationship, by race and sex, 2000	18
(2.9) Types of weapons used, by region, percent distribution, 2000	19
(2.10) Victims, types of weapons used, 1996-2000	19
(2.11) Victims, by age, types of weapons used, 2000	19
(2.12) Circumstances, by relationship, 2000	20
(2.13) Circumstances, by weapon, 2000	22
(2.14) Circumstances, 1996-2000	23
(2.15) Circumstances, by victim sex, 2000	23
Justifiable homicide by weapon, 1996-2000:	
(2.16) Law enforcement	24
(2.17) Private citizen	24
Forcible rape:	
(2.18) Month, percent distribution, 1996-2000	26
Robbery:	
(2.19) Month, percent distribution, 1996-2000	30
(2.20) Region, percent distribution, 2000	30
(2.21) Population group, percent distribution, 2000	31
(2.22) Types of weapons used, by region, percent distribution, 2000	31
Aggravated assault:	
(2.23) Month, percent distribution, 1996-2000	35
(2.24) Types of weapons used, by region, percent distribution, 2000	35
(2.25) Property crime total by month, percent distribution, 1996-2000	39
Burglary:	
(2.26) Month, percent distribution, 1996-2000	42
Larceny-theft:	
(2.27) Month, percent distribution, 1996-2000	47
(2.28) Larceny analysis, by region, percent distribution, 2000	47
Motor vehicle theft:	
(2.29) Month, percent distribution, 1996-2000	53
(2.30) Region, percent distribution, 2000	53
Arson:	
(2.31) Rate, population group, 2000	57
(2.32) Type of property, 2000	58
Hate Crime:	
(2.33) Number of incidents, offenses, victims, and known offenders, by bias motivation, 2000	60
(2.34) Number of offenses, victims, and known offenders, by offense, 2000	61
(2.35) Number of known offenders, by race, 2000	61
(2.36) Agency hate crime reporting, by state, 2000	63
Index of crime:	
(1) United States, 1981-2000	66
(2) United States, 2000	67
(3) Regional offense and population distribution, 2000	67
(4) Region, geographic division, and state, 1999-2000	68
(5) State, 2000	76
(6) Metropolitan Statistical Area, 2000	85
(7) Offense analysis, United States, 1996-2000	114

Offenses known to the police:	
(8) Cities and towns 10,000 and over in population, 2000	115
(9) Universities and colleges, 2000	157
(10) Suburban counties, 2000	167
(11) Rural counties 25,000 and over in population, 2000	181
Crime trends:	
(12) Population group, 1999-2000	188
(13) Population group, suburban and nonsuburban cities, 1999-2000	190
(14) Population group, suburban and nonsuburban counties, 1999-2000	191
(15) Population group, breakdown of offenses known, 1999-2000	192
Rate, number of crimes per 100,000 inhabitants:	
(16) Population group, 2000	195
(17) Population group, suburban and nonsuburban cities, 2000	197
(18) Population group, suburban and nonsuburban counties, 2000	198
(19) Population group, breakdown of offenses known, 2000	199
(20) Murder, by state, 2000, type of weapon	201
(21) Robbery, by state, 2000, type of weapon	202
(22) Aggravated assault, by state, 2000, type of weapon	203
(23) Offense analysis, number and percent change, 1999-2000	204
(24) Property stolen and recovered, by type and value, 2000	204
Section III—Crime Index Offenses Cleared	205
Narrative comments	205
Figure:	
(3.1) Crimes cleared by arrest, 2000	206
Tables:	
Offenses known and percent cleared by arrest:	
(25) Population group, 2000	207
(26) Geographic region and division, 2000	209
(27) Population group, breakdown of offenses known, 2000	211
(28) Number of offenses, by population group, cleared by arrest, of persons under 18 years of age, 2000	213
Section IV—Persons Arrested	215
Narrative comments	215
(4.1) Arrests for drug abuse violations, by region, 2000	216
Tables:	
(29) Estimated arrests, United States, 2000	216
Number and rate of arrests:	
(30) Geographic region, 2000	217
(31) Population group, 2000	218
Ten-year arrest trends:	
(32) Totals, 1991-2000	220
(33) Sex, 1991-2000	221

Five-year arrest trends:	
(34) Totals, 1996-2000	222
(35) Sex, 1996-2000	223
Current year over previous year arrest trends:	
(36) Totals, 1999-2000	224
(37) Sex, 1999-2000	225
Arrests:	
(38) By age, 2000	226
(39) Males, by age, 2000	228
(40) Females, by age, 2000	230
(41) Persons under 15, 18, 21, and 25 years of age, 2000	232
(42) By sex, 2000	233
(43) By race, 2000	234
City arrest trends:	
(44) 1999-2000	237
(45) Sex, 1999-2000	238
City arrests:	
(46) Distribution by age, 2000	239
(47) Persons under 15, 18, 21, and 25 years of age, 2000	241
(48) Distribution by sex, 2000	242
(49) Distribution by race, 2000	243
Suburban county arrest trends:	
(50) 1999-2000	246
(51) Sex, 1999-2000	247
Suburban county arrests:	
(52) Distribution by age, 2000	248
(53) Persons under 15, 18, 21, and 25 years of age, 2000	250
(54) Distribution by sex, 2000	251
(55) Distribution by race, 2000	252
Rural county arrest trends:	
(56) 1999-2000	255
(57) Sex, 1999-2000	256
Rural county arrests:	
(58) Distribution by age, 2000	257
(59) Persons under 15, 18, 21, and 25 years of age, 2000	259
(60) Distribution by sex, 2000	260
(61) Distribution by race, 2000	261
Suburban area arrest trends:	
(62) 1999-2000	264
(63) Sex, 1999-2000	265
Suburban area arrests:	
(64) Distribution by age, 2000	266
(65) Persons under 15, 18, 21, and 25 years of age, 2000	268
(66) Distribution by sex, 2000	269
(67) Distribution by race, 2000	270
(68) Police disposition of juvenile offenders taken into custody, 2000	273
(69) Arrests, by state, 2000	274

	Page
Section V—Analysis of Motor Vehicle Theft Using Survival Model	283
Narrative comments	283
Figures	
(5.1) Motor Vehicle Theft, 1960-1999	283
(5.2) Recovery Pattern of Stolen and Recovered Vehicles	288
Tables:	
(5.1) Percent Distribution of Motor Vehicle Theft Incidents by Day of Week	285
(5.2) Percent Distribution of Motor Vehicle Theft Incidents by Month	285
(5.3) Percent Distribution of Motor Vehicle Theft Incidents by Location	285
(5.4) Recovery of Stolen Motor Vehicles by Day of the Week	286
(5.5) Recovery of Stolen Motor Vehicles by Month	286
(5.6) Percent of Clearances for Motor Vehicle Thefts by Recovery Status	286
(5.7) Age, Sex, and Race Composition of Motor Vehicle Theft Arrestees	287
(5.8) Recovery Pattern of Stolen Motor Vehicles	287
(5.9) Cumulative Recovery Pattern of Recovered Vehicles	287
(5.10) The Recovery Pattern of Stolen Vehicles, Out of 70,196 Stolen Vehicles	288
(5.11) Chance of Future Recovery After a Specified Number of Days	288
Section VI—Law Enforcement Personnel	291
Narrative comments	291
Tables:	
Full-time law enforcement employees, October 31, 2000:	
(70) Employees, number and rate per 1,000 inhabitants, geographic region and division by population group	292
(71) Officers, number and rate per 1,000 inhabitants, geographic region and division by population group	293
(72) Employees, range in rate per 1,000 inhabitants	294
(73) Officers, range in rate per 1,000 inhabitants	295
(74) Employees, percent male and female	296
(75) Civilian employees, percent of total, population group	297
(76) State law enforcement agencies	298
(77) State	299
(78) Cities	300
(79) Universities and colleges	368
(80) Suburban counties	374
(81) Rural counties	381
Section VII—Appendices	397
Appendix I—Methodology	397
Appendix II—Offenses in Uniform Crime Reporting	407
Appendix III—Uniform Crime Reporting Area Definitions	409
Appendix IV—The Nation’s Two Crime Measures	412
Appendix V—Directory of State Uniform Crime Reporting Programs	415
Appendix VI—National Uniform Crime Reporting Program Directory	422
Appendix VII—Uniform Crime Reporting Publications List	423

