

**Comprehensive Study of the
Hawaii Uniform Crime Reporting Program
for the
Department of the Attorney General**

Final Report

January 1994

In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements of
Hawaii Contract No. 35311

David J. Roberts
Seth F. Jacobs

SEARCH

The National Consortium for
Justice Information and Statistics
7311 Greenhaven Drive, Suite 145
Sacramento, California 95831
916/392-2550

150160

SEP 20 1994

Contents**ACQUISITIONS**

Executive Summary	ii
Introduction.....	1
Section I: Background Report.....	2
Background of Study	2
Historical Background and Contemporary Context	4
The Uniform Crime Reporting Program.....	4
The National Incident-Based Reporting System	6
Current Status of Uniform Crime Reporting in Hawaii.....	10
Crime Prevention Division.....	10
Honolulu Police Department.....	11
Hawaii County Police Department.....	13
Kauai Police Department.....	14
Maui Police Department.....	14
Uniform Crime Reporting Status: Summary and Conclusion	15
Assessment of the Current Uniform Crime Reporting Program.....	16
Adequacy	16
Effectiveness	17
Efficiency	17
Section I Summary and Conclusions	18
Section II: Findings and Recommendations.....	19
Overview.....	19
Incident-Based Offense and Arrest Reporting as an Alternative to Uniform Crime Reporting.....	20
Benefits of Incident-Based Reporting.....	21
Hawaii Participation in the National Incident-Based Reporting System	22
Incident-Based Reporting in Hawaii: Summary.....	23
Planning for Incident-Based Offense and Arrest Reporting.....	24
Recommended Course of Action.....	25
Phase I: Development of the Hawaii Incident-Based Crime Reporting Program Data Specifications.....	26
Phase II: Development of an Implementation Plan for the Hawaii Incident-Based Crime Reporting Program	27
Estimated Budget	29
Section II Summary and Conclusions	30
Appendix: NIBRS Data Elements and Data Values	

150160

**U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice**

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Hawaii Office of the
Attorney General

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Executive Summary

This report represents work undertaken by SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics, to assess the adequacy, effectiveness and efficiency of the current Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program in Hawaii, and to recommend an appropriate course of action as needed for system improvements to satisfy the crime statistics and information needs of the State of Hawaii and its contributing law enforcement agencies. The work was undertaken for the Department of the Attorney General, State of Hawaii.

The project was organized in two phases. The first phase assessed the adequacy, effectiveness and efficiency of the existing UCR system and produced a *Background Report*, which is included in this report as Section I. The second phase of this project, which is reported in Section II: *Findings and Recommendations*, focused on formulating a strategy for implementation of an incident-based law enforcement reporting program that will 1) meet the needs of State and local agencies, 2) address the information needs of community groups and other consumers of the data, and 3) comply with the reporting requirements of the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS). In this phase, SEARCH explored alternatives to the current system, discussed implementation planning issues, recommended a course of action, and provided an estimate of the cost of implementing incident-based reporting.

Section I

SEARCH staff visited both State and local agencies responsible for the collection and analysis of UCR data in order to assess the level of automation at local police agencies and at the State level, to observe offense reporting practices, and to assess how UCR data are processed and reported by the State UCR program. The Crime Prevention Division (CPD), Department of the Attorney General, is responsible for UCR reporting for the State of Hawaii. The Division receives manual UCR reports monthly from each of the four participating police departments, representing five reporting jurisdictions. Although the Honolulu Police Department produces its UCR data from its automated records management system, the data are manually transcribed onto standard UCR reporting forms and forwarded to CPD, where they are re-keyed into an automated system for the compilation of statewide statistics. Each of the other three participating police departments compile UCR statistics manually, typically using extensive tally sheets that require a significant level of effort by local personnel.

The existing UCR program is inadequate to meet the growing information needs of the State of Hawaii. Moving to an incident-based reporting (IBR) program will significantly expand the range and scope of data available for analysis, enabling multivariate analyses of complex problems, identification of crime trends, and facilitating effective interventions and ongoing monitoring of program effectiveness. Moreover, by implementing an IBR system, the State may be able to link offense and arrest data to other available databases, such as geographic information systems, *modus operandi* files, and criminal justice processing data to effectively target resources and better understand the operational dynamics of the justice system.

The current UCR program does not generate statistics that accurately reflect the true nature of crime and criminality in the community, nor does it serve as a valid or reliable measure of law enforcement activity. The UCR program masks complex inter-relationships between key offense and offender attributes, and the aggregate reporting structure does not permit disaggregation for multivariate analyses. Moreover, the reporting structure does not enable law enforcement administrators to accurately monitor the activity of their officers or effectively measure the impact of their interventions.

Although the Honolulu Police Department is automated and incident-based, the monthly UCR statistics are transcribed to manual data collection forms for submission to CPD, where they are re-keyed into an automated database for compilation and analysis. Certainly some modifications can be made in the submission of data to enable automated reporting of UCR data from the Honolulu Police Department. CPD and the department should work collectively to identify what needs to be done in each agency to accommodate automated reporting.

In each of the other three reporting police departments, UCR data are collected in complex and detailed hand-tallied ledger sheets that consume substantial personnel resources to produce. Once created, these ledgers can be referred to by detectives or others within (or outside) the department for research or administrative purposes, but by their very nature they are extremely limited. As a general consequence, production of UCR reports by at least one of the agencies lags several months behind, which itself is a measure of the effectiveness of the existing UCR program both for the local agencies and for the State.

Notwithstanding these limitations, it should be noted that CPD is making excellent use of the UCR data that are available, both in terms of the annual *Crime in Hawaii* report and the *Time Series* reports it has initiated. Moreover, it should be noted that the existing UCR program represents an extraordinary commitment by both local law enforcement agencies and their personnel, and by State personnel. By its very nature, the UCR program does not provide sufficient data for effective management or administration, nor does it support effective crime analysis or intervention.

Section II

Implementation of incident-based reporting throughout the State of Hawaii should be carefully planned to ensure that the system will 1) meet the operational, management and research needs of the contributing law enforcement agencies; 2) meet the research, program assessment and general information needs of the legislature, executive branch agencies, and other users and consumers of the data; and 3) comply with reporting requirements of the NIBRS program. This report recommends that the State of Hawaii undertake a phased implementation of incident-based offense and arrest reporting, beginning with the development of State IBR data collection specifications and continuing with the development of a comprehensive plan for the operational testing and phased implementation of IBR statewide.

We recommend that the State implement incident-based reporting in three phases, the first two of which should occur over the next 12 months. Together, these phases establish a foundation upon which an effective and efficient incident-based offense and arrest reporting system can be built.

- 1) Phase I would be designed to identify and define the data elements, reporting requirements and data submission specifications for Hawaii IBR participation. This phase contemplates the development of standards that meet the reporting requirements of the NIBRS program, and will also effectively address the information needs of the contributing law enforcement agencies, State executive branch agencies, the State Legislature, community interest groups and the public at large. One of the objectives of this phase is building consensus among the data providers (i.e., local law enforcement contributors), and users and consumers of the data.
- 2) Phase II would be designed to develop a detailed implementation plan for the Hawaii IBR program, which will include identifying, defining and scheduling specific activities that must be undertaken by State agencies and local contributors to implement the program, and to estimate the costs associated with each activity. For example, data collection instruments used by law enforcement agencies will have to be modified to incorporate the Hawaii IBR data elements and coding schemes defined in the first phase, and existing computer programs within law enforcement agencies and at the State level may have to be modified or additional software purchased for Hawaii IBR reporting.
- 3) Phase III of Hawaii IBR implementation would be implementation testing, operational support and ongoing maintenance. The State may wish to implement IBR incrementally, testing each agency to ensure compliance with State and Federal reporting requirements. In addition, the State will want to provide operational support and some measure of ongoing maintenance necessary for successful statewide implementation. Another component of this phase will be the development and testing of analytic techniques, research methodologies and reporting formats for both State and local agencies, and for various consumers of the data.

We estimate the costs of conducting Phase I at \$100,000-\$120,000, assuming an outside consultant is used extensively. We estimate the costs of conducting Phase II at \$100,000-\$120,000, again assuming an outside consultant is used extensively.

Introduction

This report represents work undertaken by SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics, to conduct a comprehensive study of the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program for the Department of the Attorney General, State of Hawaii.¹ This project was designed to assess the adequacy, effectiveness and efficiency of the existing UCR system, and to recommend an appropriate course of action as needed for system improvements to satisfy the crime statistics and information needs of the State of Hawaii and its contributing law enforcement agencies.

The project was organized in two phases. The first phase assessed the adequacy, effectiveness and efficiency of the existing UCR system and produced a *Background Report*, which is included in this report as Section I. The second phase of this project, which is reported in Section II: *Findings and Recommendations*, focused on formulating a strategy for implementation of an incident-based law enforcement reporting program that will 1) meet the needs of State and local agencies, 2) address the information needs of community groups and other consumers of the data, and 3) comply with the reporting requirements of the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS).² In this phase, SEARCH explores alternatives to the current system, discusses implementation planning issues, recommends a course of action, and provides an estimate of the cost of implementing incident-based reporting.

¹IFB No. F-93-403-o, Contract No. 35311.

²It should be noted that this report focuses entirely on the UCR program which, as is discussed later in this report, is a statistical reporting program designed to capture limited data in an aggregate reporting format on crimes and arrests that are reported within a jurisdiction each month. This report *does not* address, nor should our comments be read in any way to reflect on, the Offender-Based Transaction Statistics (OBTS) program or the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) system in Hawaii, which are separate and distinct from the UCR program. OBTS and CCH are fingerprint-supported, operational databases designed to track individual offenders from the point of arrest through processing throughout the entire criminal justice system (i.e., final disposition, sentencing, correctional supervision and discharge).

Section I: Background Report

Background of Study

There is widespread recognition in Hawaii that the existing Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program is inadequate to meet the needs of policymakers, the criminal justice system and the public. This fact has been openly and consistently recognized by the State Legislature, the Attorney General, community leaders concerned with criminal justice issues, as well as local law enforcement officials.³

Recognizing the inherent limitations in the existing UCR program, the Hawaii State Legislature has considered several bills in recent years proposing enhancements in crime reporting. These bills have included proposals to implement incident-based offense reporting (adopting, and perhaps expanding, the National Incident-Based Reporting System standards) and to construct a model for the collection of data regarding the victims of hate crime, including cross-gender offenses.⁴

The proposals to enhance crime reporting stem from a concern that the existing UCR program 1) does not capture any information regarding bias motivation in criminal offenses; 2) does not provide sufficient data for effective management or administration, or for effective crime analysis; 3) cannot, in the current aggregate reporting format, provide crime and arrest data in sufficient detail to enable legislators and policymakers to chart crime trends over a period of time or within specific geographic locations, or to identify criminal justice and crime-related issues and priorities as they emerge; and 4) is not automated and requires significant effort both by local agencies and by the State to collect, process and report basic crime and arrest figures.

³Former Hawaii Attorney General Warren Price III testified on numerous occasions before the Hawaii House of Representatives and the Hawaii Senate on bills proposing an Appropriation for the Construction of A Model for the Collection of Data Regarding the Victims of Hate Crimes, and has noted "deficienc[ies] inherent in Hawaii's current data collection in the areas of crime and criminal justice issues." Testimony of the Attorney General on H.B. No. 2612, before the House Committee on Judiciary, Thursday, February 13, 1992, p. 5. *Also see* Testimony of the State Attorney General on H.B. No. 2612, H.D. 1, Making an Appropriation for the Construction of A Model for the Collection of Data Regarding the Victims of Hate Crimes, Before the House Committee on Finance, Thursday, February 20, 1992, p. 5; and Testimony of the State Attorney General on H.B. No. 2612, H.D. 2, Making an Appropriation for the Construction of A Model for the Collection of Data Regarding the Victims of Hate Crimes, Before the Senate Committee on Judiciary, Thursday, March 12, 1992, p. 1. In an earlier letter to State Senator Russell Blair, commenting on proposed legislation calling for an appropriation to study the impact of developing a plan to implement an incident-based or unit record reporting system, Attorney General Price acknowledged that "Hawaii's current data collection in the area of criminal justice, crime and crime prevention is limited and does not capture all the information needed to analyze today's complex issues. Under our current UCR program, while it is possible to chart fundamental crime trends over a period of time or within a specific geographical location, more refined analyses are impossible." Letter to State Senator Russell Blair from Attorney General Warren Price III, December 17, 1991. *Also see* S.B. No. 3153, A Bill for an Act Making an Appropriation to Study the Impact of and Develop a Plan to Implement an Incident-Based or Unit Record Reporting System, Hawaii Senate, 16th Legislature, 1992, January 24, 1992.

⁴See H.B. No. 2612, H.D. 1, Making an Appropriation for the Construction of A Model for the Collection of Data Regarding the Victims of Hate Crimes; H.B. No. 366, A Bill for an Act Relating to Hate Crimes Against Women, Hawaii House of Representatives, 16th Legislature, 1991; and Senate Concurrent Resolution Requesting the Development of Data Collection and Reporting Mechanisms on Information Relating to Cross-Gender Crime, Hawaii Senate, 16th Legislature, 1991.

The focus of the work presented in this section of the report is to assess whether the current UCR program in Hawaii is adequate, effective and efficient. In order to conduct the assessment, SEARCH project staff visited with the UCR program staff of the Crime Prevention Division (CPD), Department of the Attorney General, which is the office responsible for collection of UCR data for the State of Hawaii, and visited each of the four police departments that contribute UCR data to the State.⁵ The principal objective of these visits was to assess the level of automation in each of the local police reporting sites and at the State level to do the following: observe offense reporting practices within each of the local police departments; examine how UCR data are reported by local police departments; determine how UCR data are reported to the State from the local police departments; and assess how UCR data are processed and reported by the State UCR program. Work under this contract has been guided by a Project Advisory Committee comprised of representatives of CPD and each of the four contributing police departments.⁶

⁵SEARCH project staff met with representatives of the Crime Prevention Division on several occasions during the initial project site visit, which occurred September 13-16, 1993. SEARCH project staff also visited each of the four police departments that contribute UCR data to the State: Honolulu Police Department, Kauai Police Department, Maui Police Department, and Hawaii County Police Department (Hilo).

⁶The Project Advisory Committee is comprised of representatives of the Crime Prevention Division, Honolulu Police Department, Kauai Police Department, Maui Police Department, and Hawaii County Police Department. In addition, the Committee has been augmented with several other *ex officio* members representing other relevant criminal justice agencies, including the Hawaii Criminal Justice Data Center.

Historical Background and Contemporary Context

The way we count crime in the United States is currently undergoing significant changes. We are moving from aggregate monthly reporting, under the current UCR program, to incident-based reporting, which promises significant benefits.

• *The Uniform Crime Reporting Program*

The UCR program is a voluntary reporting program in which nearly 16,000 city, county and State law enforcement agencies report data monthly to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) on the number of Part 1, or Index, offenses⁷ and the number of Part 1 and Part 2 arrests that have occurred within their respective jurisdictions. In addition to simple monthly tallies of the number of offenses and arrests, additional data are captured on particular offenses,⁸ and data on the age, sex, race and ethnicity are captured on arrestees.⁹ In nearly all states, a State agency collects, reviews, edits and compiles the crime and arrest data for statewide UCR reporting, and then forwards the data to the FBI for inclusion in national statistical compilations.

⁷The original UCR program included seven Part 1 offenses: murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny and auto theft. In 1979, arson was added to the list, bringing the total number of Index offenses to eight. Federal Bureau of Investigation, *Crime in the United States, 1991* (Washington, D.C.: FBI, August 10, 1992) p. 1.

⁸For example, the Supplementary Homicide Report captures data on age, sex, race and ethnicity of both offender and victim, the weapon used, the relationship between the victim and the offender, and the circumstances of the offense. For rapes, the UCR Return A form also identifies the number of rapes by force and the number of attempts to commit rape. For robbery, the Return A counts the number of offenses by the type of weapon used and, in the Supplement to Return A, the location of the robbery (e.g., highway, commercial house, gas or service station, etc.). The type of weapon used is also captured in gross counts of offenses for assaults on the UCR Return A form, as is the distinction of simple assaults. For burglary, the UCR Return A counts the number of offenses by force used (i.e., forcible entry, unlawful entry/no force, and attempted forcible entry), and in the Supplement to Return A, counts by residence/nonresidence and gross time of occurrence (i.e., night, day, or unknown). For larcenies, the Supplement to Return A counts the number of offenses by general dollar loss value categories (i.e., \$200 and over, \$50-\$200, and under \$50) and by the nature of the larceny (i.e., pocket-picking, purse-snatching, shoplifting, etc.). The number of motor vehicle thefts are distinguished in the UCR Return A by the type of vehicle stolen (i.e., autos, trucks and buses, and other vehicles). In addition, the UCR Supplement to Return A also captures the dollar value of stolen and recovered property by the type of property (e.g., currency, jewelry and precious metals, clothing and furs, etc.) and additional information on the recovery of stolen motor vehicles (i.e., the number of locally stolen and recovered vehicles, those stolen and recovered in other jurisdictions, and those stolen in other jurisdictions and recovered locally). Although these additional data are captured in the existing UCR program, the data are tabulated monthly in aggregate form, rather than as incident-specific data. For a detailed discussion of UCR reporting requirements, definitions, classification, scoring and preparation of monthly reports, see Federal Bureau of Investigation, *Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook* (Washington, D.C.: FBI, 1991).

⁹It is important to note that arrests are also tallied monthly and, while race, ethnicity and sex are captured specifically, age is captured partially as a categorical variable. That is, for juveniles, the UCR captures the following ages: under 10 years, 10-12, 13-14, 15, 16, 17, and under 18. For adults, the UCR captures ages 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45-49, 50-54, 55-59, 60-64, and 65 and over. Given the structure of the data collection form, arrestees are categorized by offense by sex and age or age category, by offense and race, and by offense and ethnicity. *Ibid.*, at pp. 212-278.

The UCR program was established in 1929 and was designed to provide a reliable source of data for law enforcement administration, operation and management. Over the years, UCR data has become a leading social indicator. The press and the public routinely look to UCR for information on crime trends, and researchers, legislators, and State and municipal planners use the data for a variety of planning and research purposes.

While the UCR program has remained virtually unchanged since 1929¹⁰ the criminal justice system has not. A revolution in data processing capacity, the development of powerful microcomputer hardware and software, and the proliferation of criminal justice information systems has resulted in an explosion of data available for analysis. At the same time, it has become clear that criminal justice initiatives and criminal justice information capabilities are interdependent. Virtually every new criminal justice initiative (e.g., hate crime, community-oriented policing, etc.) involves important information implications that can seriously affect the success of the program. In formulating new programs, policymakers and program administrators need current and accurate data about the incidence and prevalence of crime and the operation of the criminal justice system. They particularly need detailed data regarding the program or project they have initiated, in order to assess the efficacy of the program and the impact of their intervention. Additionally, decisionmakers have an ongoing need for data to monitor the progress of new programs and to make effective adjustments by remedial legislation, program enhancements or further policy initiatives.

These changes in the criminal justice environment have highlighted several problems with the UCR program. As an aggregate reporting program, UCR produces counts of specific types of offenses, but is incapable of permitting the examination of complex relationships among variables. Moreover, as a consequence of its aggregate reporting structure, there is no process by which an offense can be linked to its associated arrest. Consequently, it is not possible to track the processing of criminal justice events from offense, through arrest, adjudication and sentencing. In addition, detailed offense information is collected only on the eight Index offenses. Even with this detailed data, however, reporting provisions of the UCR program obscure or ignore what may be a substantial volume of crime. For example, the "Hierarchy Rule" limits the reporting of multiple offenses that have been committed within the course of a single criminal incident to the single most serious offense.¹¹ In a similar vein, the UCR program also uses a "Hotel Rule," in which the burglaries of multiple rooms within a single hotel are counted as a single offense.¹²

The National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) offers a crime reporting program that is more comprehensive, detailed, accurate, and flexible than the existing UCR program. NIBRS will dramatically enhance the capacity for crime analysis at the local, State and Federal levels, and law enforcement agencies will be in a better position to define their needs, justify expenditures, and allocate ex-

¹⁰With the exception of the addition of arson in 1979, the UCR program has changed very little over the years.

¹¹Offense seriousness is prescribed in the UCR program according to an ordinal ranking, as follows: criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft and arson. Federal Bureau of Investigation, *Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook* (Washington, D.C.: FBI, 1991) pp. 33-34.

¹²*Ibid.* at p. 20.

isting resources to maximum effectiveness and efficiency. Whether it will be possible to fully exploit the significant research potential inherent in NIBRS, however, will largely depend on the extent to which incident-based reporting systems can be seamlessly integrated into agency record management systems, the value to local agencies of the data collected, and the ease with which agencies can meet NIBRS data reporting standards.

Recognizing the need for changes in the UCR program, the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), U.S. Department of Justice, has taken several steps to support, encourage and guide development of a national incident-based reporting system. In 1982, BJS provided funding for an examination of the existing UCR program, its history, objectives, data elements and relationships with other systems. In 1984, the second phase of this BJS-funded project began, with the goal of identifying available options and recommending changes.¹³ In 1988, the third phase produced specifications for data collection and submission, and system implementation.¹⁴ From 1987 through 1991, BJS provided support to 40 State UCR programs in their implementation of changes required to participate in NIBRS.¹⁵

- ***The National Incident-Based Reporting System***

The fundamental difference between the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) and the existing UCR program is that in NIBRS individual records relating to each distinct crime incident and its associated arrest are captured by local law enforcement agencies and submitted to State and Federal reporting programs. This shift in reporting practice is indeed significant. Rather than simply capturing summary statistics and raw counts of the number of crimes reported within a jurisdiction, NIBRS promises a wealth of detailed offense, victim and offender data which properly reflect the inherently incident-based structure of law enforcement recordkeeping. By capturing this detailed data in an incident-based reporting format, practitioners and researchers alike will be able to undertake sophisticated, multivariate analyses of crime within a jurisdiction, and will be able to link specific incident and offense data to other relevant databases, such as census data, community demographic and economic data, and geographic mapping data.

¹³Eugene C. Poggio, Stephen D. Kennedy, Jan M. Chaiken and Kenneth E. Carlson, *Blueprint for the Future of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program: Final Report of the UCR Study* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, May 1985).

¹⁴Federal Bureau of Investigation, *National Incident-Based Reporting System: Volume 1: Data Collection Guidelines* (Washington, D.C.: FBI, July 1, 1988); Federal Bureau of Investigation, *National Incident-Based Reporting System: Volume 2: Data Submission Specifications* (Washington, D.C.: FBI, May, 1992); and, Federal Bureau of Investigation, *National Incident-Based Reporting System: Volume 3: Approaches to Implementing an Incident-Based Reporting (IBR) System* (Washington, D.C.: FBI, July 1, 1992).

¹⁵Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Bureau of Justice Statistics Application Information: Fiscal Year 1992 Programs* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, February 1992) p. 28.

In addition to changing the fundamental reporting structure underlying crime and arrest data, NIBRS also captures data on an expanded range of offenses, beyond the traditional eight Index offenses. There are 46 offenses for which both incident and arrest information will be collected in NIBRS (referred to as Group A offenses), and 11 offenses for which only arrest information will be collected (referred to as Group B offenses).¹⁶

NIBRS also incorporates changes in reporting practices, eliminating the "Hierarchy Rule," which masks offense reporting in the UCR program. As noted above, under the "Hierarchy Rule" only the most serious offense in a series of offenses committed during a single criminal incident is reported (e.g., if during a bank robbery the offender also assaulted a teller and stole an automobile, only the robbery would be reported). By contrast, the NIBRS system will enable reporting of all three offenses: robbery, assault and motor vehicle theft. More generally, if during a criminal episode more than one crime is committed by the same person or group of persons, all of the crimes will be reported as offenses within the same incident.¹⁷

¹⁶There are 22 Group A crime categories, which include 46 Group A offenses: 1) Arson; 2) Assault Offenses, including aggravated assault, simple assault, and intimidation; 3) Bribery; 4) Burglary/Breaking and Entering; 5) Counterfeiting/Forgery; 6) Destruction/Damage/Vandalism of Property; 7) Drug/Narcotic Offenses, including drug/narcotic violations and drug equipment violations; 8) Embezzlement; 9) Extortion/Blackmail; 10) Fraud Offenses, including false pretenses/swindle/confidence game, credit card/automatic teller machine fraud, impersonation, welfare fraud, and wire fraud; 11) Gambling Offenses, including betting/wagering, operating/promoting/assisting gambling, gambling equipment violations, and sports tampering; 12) Homicide Offenses, including murder and non-negligent manslaughter, negligent manslaughter, and justifiable homicide; 13) Kidnapping/Abduction; 14) Larceny/Theft Offenses, including pocket-picking, purse-snatching, shoplifting, theft from building, theft from coin-operated machine or device, theft from motor vehicle, theft of motor vehicle parts or accessories, and all other larceny; 15) Motor Vehicle Theft; 16) Pornography/Obscene Material; 17) Prostitution Offenses, including prostitution, and assisting or promoting prostitution; 18) Robbery; 19) Sex Offense, Forcible, including forcible rape, forcible sodomy, sexual assault with an object, and forcible fondling; 20) Sex Offenses, Non-Forcible, including incest and statutory rape; 21) Stolen Property Offenses; and 22) Weapon Law Violations.

There are 11 Group B crime categories, which include: 1) Bad Checks; 2) Curfew/Loitering/Vagrancy Violations; 3) Disorderly Conduct; 4) Driving Under the Influence; 5) Drunkenness; 6) Family Offenses; 7) Nonviolent; 8) Liquor Law Violations; 9) Peeping Tom; 10) Runaway; 11) Trespass of Real Property; and 12) All Other Offenses. Federal Bureau of Investigation, *National Incident-Based Reporting System: Volume 1, Data Collection Guidelines* (Washington, D.C.: FBI, 1988) pp. 10-11.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, at p. 13.

NIBRS also collects data on particular attributes involved in the commission of offenses, including whether the offender is suspected of using alcohol, drugs or narcotics, and/or a computer in the commission of the offense, and whether the arrestee was armed with a weapon.¹⁸ In response to the 1990 Hate Crime Statistics Act, which mandated the United States Attorney General to collect data "about crimes that manifest evidence of prejudice based on race, religion, sexual orientation, or ethnicity,"¹⁹ the FBI initiated a UCR Hate Crime Statistics Program. Both UCR and NIBRS capture information on bias motivation in the commission of criminal offenses, although the range of bias motivation is limited to racial, ethnic/national origin, religious, and sexual orientation.²⁰ For UCR and NIBRS reporting, bias motivation is defined as a "preformed negative opinion or attitude toward a group of persons based on their race, religion, ethnicity/national origin, or sexual orientation."²¹ UCR participating agencies can report bias motivation in crime to the FBI through a Quarterly Hate Crime Report, while agencies that are fully NIBRS compliant can simply incorporate the necessary data elements into their incident-based reporting format.²²

¹⁸In NIBRS reporting, variable number 8, "Offender(s) Suspected of Using," "is used to indicate whether any of the offenders in the incident were suspected of consuming alcohol or using drugs/narcotics during or shortly before the incident; or of using a computer, computer terminal, or other computer equipment to perpetrate the crime. Up to three (3) entries can be made." Federal Bureau of Investigation, *National Incident-Based Reporting System: Volume 1, Data Collection Guidelines* (Washington, D.C.: FBI, 1988) p. 76. Variable number 13, "Type of Weapon/Force Involved," captures information on the type of weapon or force used by an offender for selected offenses, including murder and non-negligent manslaughter, negligent homicide, justifiable homicide, kidnapping/abduction, forcible rape, forcible sodomy, sexual assault with an object, forcible fondling, robbery, aggravated assault, simple assault, extortion/blackmail, and weapon law violations. *Ibid*, at pp. 79-80.

¹⁹Hate Crime Statistics Act, Pub. L. No. 101-275, 104 Stat. 140 (1990), at (b) (1).

²⁰In particular, the UCR and NIBRS programs capture data regarding bias motivation in crime in the following categories: Racial Bias: Anti-White, Anti-Black, Anti-American Indian/Alaskan Native, Anti-Asian/Pacific Islander, Anti-Multi-Racial Group; Religious Bias: Anti-Jewish, Anti-Catholic, Anti-Protestant, Anti-Islamic (Moslem), Anti-Other Religion (Buddhism, Hinduism, Shintoism, etc.), Anti-Multi-Religious Group, Anti-Atheist/Agnostic; Ethnicity/National Origin Bias: Anti-Arab, Anti-Hispanic, Anti-Other Ethnicity/National Origin; and Sexual Orientation Bias: Anti-Male Homosexual (Gay), Anti-Female Homosexual (Lesbian), Anti-Homosexual (Gays and Lesbians), Anti-Heterosexual, and Anti-Bisexual. Federal Bureau of Investigation, *Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook: NIBRS Edition* (Washington, D.C.: FBI, 1992) pp. 38-39. The FBI notes that "There are, of course, many kinds of bias. Some of the more common kinds are those against race, religion, ethnicity/national origin, or sexual orientation. But, there are also biases against rich people, poor people, men who wear long hair and/or beards, people who dress oddly, smokers, drinkers, people with diseases such as AIDS, motorcycle gangs, 'rock' musicians, etc. The types of bias to be reported to the FBI's UCR Section are limited to those mandated by the enabling Act, i.e., bias based on 'race, religion, sexual orientation, or ethnicity.' Because, in the UCR program, 'ethnicity' has been limited to whether a person is or is not Hispanic, the term 'Ethnicity/National Origin' was adopted to denote a broader meaning." [Citation omitted] Federal Bureau of Investigation, *Summary Reporting System, National Incident-Based Reporting System: Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines* (Washington, D.C.: FBI, no date) p. 1.

²¹*Ibid*, at p. 4.

²²See *ibid*, and Federal Bureau of Investigation, *Summary Reporting System: Hate Crime Magnetic Media Specifications for Tapes and Diskettes* (Washington, D.C.: FBI, September 1992) for detailed information on the reporting of bias motivation in crime. For analyses of hate crime statistical reporting, See Brian Levin, "Hate Crimes Rise but Numbers Tell Only Part of the Story," *Journal of the Center for the Study of Ethnic and Racial Violence*, Volume II, Number I, 1993, pp 27-32; and Dan Bible, et. al., *Hate Crime Statistics, 1990: A Resource Book* (Washington, D.C.: FBI, December 1992).

There are several other differences as well between NIBRS and the UCR program, including the ability to distinguish between attempted and completed crimes, expanded victim-to-offender relationship data, and increased information on the circumstances of an offense.²³ These changes, taken as a whole, substantially increase the analytic potential of NIBRS data, and mean that the system will be considerably more accurate, complete and flexible than in the past.

Many states throughout the nation are at some stage of implementation of the NIBRS system,²⁴ and several states, in order to meet their individual and sometimes unique information needs, have decided to enhance their incident-based reporting systems beyond the NIBRS standards. For example, Arizona provides local agencies with the option of supplying data on solvability factors. North Dakota has added data elements on victim characteristics and has expanded the location, offense, injury and property description codes. New York's system will enable local agencies to provide victim/offender relationship data for a greater number of offenses.²⁵ While only the data required for national participation in NIBRS will be forwarded to the FBI, these states have decided to apply the advantages of incident-based reporting to their own systems.

One of the primary uses to which incident-based data will be put is to support crime analysis by local law enforcement agencies. An incident-based reporting system will provide the raw data needed by local agencies to identify "hot-spots" of criminal activity, target emerging crime trends, and guide patrol deployment decisions. These are just a few of the ways incident-based data could be used to support crime analysis.

²³Federal Bureau of Investigation, *National Incident-Based Reporting System: Volume 1, Data Collection Guidelines* (Washington, D.C.: FBI, 1988) pp. 13-16.

²⁴The FBI began accepting NIBRS data in January 1989. As of November 1992, law enforcement agencies in five states (Alabama, Idaho, Iowa, North Dakota and South Carolina) supplied NIBRS data to the FBI. The Bureau expected an additional 14 states to submit NIBRS test data in 1992 and they expect an additional seven states and the District of Columbia to submit NIBRS test data in 1993. Telephone conversation with Mr. Paul White, Program Manager, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, November 4, 1993.

²⁵Information regarding each state's implementation (or planned implementation) of the NIBRS program was obtained from a survey conducted in June 1992 by SEARCH. A letter was sent to the UCR Director of each state, requesting information on the status of NIBRS implementation and the extent to which the state's incident-based reporting standards exceed the national NIBRS standards. Of the 54 surveys sent out, 45 were returned, for a response rate of 83 percent.

Current Status of Uniform Crime Reporting in Hawaii

The Hawaii Criminal Justice Data Center (CJDC) was established by legislation in 1979 and was made responsible for the collection, storage, dissemination and analysis of all pertinent criminal justice data from all criminal justice agencies.²⁶ CJDC is responsible for the collection of data suitable for the study of the causes and prevention of crime and delinquency, the assessment of the efficacy of efforts made to detect or prevent crime and the apprehension and punishment of violators, and for examination of the administration of justice. To meet these responsibilities, the Attorney General was given the authority to prescribe the forms to be used by criminal justice agencies in submitting data to the CJDC.²⁷ In early 1980, the Data Center assumed responsibility for the State-level UCR program, and in August 1991, the UCR program was transferred to the Crime Prevention Division (CPD), Department of the Attorney General.

• Crime Prevention Division

The Research and Statistics Services branch of CPD is responsible for administering the State UCR program, and is staffed by three professionals. Each month CPD receives UCR reports from each of the four county police departments.²⁸ Each set of UCR reports includes the following forms: 1) Return A, Offenses and Clearances Known to Police; 2) Supplement to Return A, Value of Property Stolen/Recovered by Type; 3) Supplementary Homicide Report; 4) Arson Offenses, Clearances, and Value of Losses; 5) Law Enforcement Officers Killed or Assaulted; 6) Age, Sex, and Race of Juvenile Arrestees by Offense Classification; and 7) Age, Sex, and Race of Adult Arrestees by Offense Classification.²⁹

All four departments submit their UCR reports on manual forms. When the monthly UCR reports are received, CPD staff review them for statistical consistency, correct the data as needed, and automate the data. The automation entails manually entering the data into dBASE files through an IBM 3270 dumb terminal, and backing up the data to five diskettes (i.e., basically, one diskette per UCR report form, although data from two of the low-volume reports are stored on one diskette). After the data have been verified and corrected, if necessary, the reporting forms are duplicated and forwarded to the FBI for inclusion in national statistical compilations.³⁰

For its semiannual and annual data processing, CPD performs additional cross-checks for statistical consistency and then copies the dBASE files to an ASCII format. The data files are delivered to the Information and Communications Services Division, where the data are uploaded to the State's mainframe. Once on the mainframe, the data are analyzed using the SAS statistical software on terminals located in CPD, although the printout must be picked up at the Criminal Justice Data Center.³¹

²⁶HAW. REV. STAT. § 846-2 (1987).

²⁷HAW. REV. STAT. § 846-2.5. (c) (1988).

²⁸The Hawaii County Police Department actually has two reporting units; one for the City of Hilo and one for the rural sections of the island, for a statewide total of five UCR reports submitted to CPD monthly.

²⁹Department of the Attorney General, Crime Prevention Division, "Hawaii Summary-Based UCR Data Processing," unpublished manuscript, p. 1.

³⁰*Ibid.*, at p. 2

³¹*Ibid.*, at pp. 3-4.

CPD publishes an annual report of UCR data titled *Crime in Hawaii*. This publication is a comprehensive report on the nature and extent of crime in Hawaii. The report provides narrative summaries and statistical tables for crimes and arrests for the State as a whole, as well as for each of the four counties. CPD also periodically publishes a *Crime Trend Series*, which investigates specific subjects in greater detail. A recent issue, for example, compared juvenile arrests in 1980 and 1992 and noted that, while the number of juveniles residing in the State of Hawaii increased only 1.6 percent from 1980 to 1990, the number of juveniles arrested statewide increased 86 percent.³² In addition to regularly scheduled publications, CPD also responds to a variety of *ad hoc* requests for UCR and other data from the media, the legislature and other agencies.

• **Honolulu Police Department**

The Honolulu Police Department, with 2,372 employees, serves as the primary law enforcement agency for the island of Oahu. The department is divided into seven geographic districts, and each district has implemented a variety of programs to respond to crime problems in the community. Programs include community-oriented policing, an anti-truancy program, Narcotic Bar Clean Up Program, special officer teams to combat DUI, a bicycle patrol unit, a repeat offender program, Neighborhood Security Watch, D.A.R.E., and several other programs. In addition, the department provides crime prevention and other information on regularly scheduled radio shows, and provides crime prevention tips on television in a program called "CRIMEWISE," which uses 30-second "infomercials" to highlight safety tips.³³

The department relies on the city's mainframe, an IBM 3090, as well as several hundred microcomputer workstations in order to automate and analyze the data. In each district the microcomputers are linked by a local area network (LAN), and most of the microcomputers can access the mainframe. The department has a computer-aided dispatch (CAD) system, which came on-line in 1989. In addition, the department also has an on-line booking system for adults. Many of the department's major information systems operate on the city's mainframe, which came on-line in 1989.

³²Thomas M. Green, James B. Richmond and JoAnn E. Taira, *Crime Trend Series: Juvenile Arrests 1980 and 1992* (Honolulu: Department of the Attorney General, Crime Prevention Division, Volume 1, Issue 3, June 1993). An earlier edition investigated victim and offender characteristics for the crime of murder in 1980 and 1991. See Thomas M. Green, James B. Richmond and JoAnn E. Taira, *Crime Trend Series: Murder Victim and Offender Characteristics, 1980-1991, State of Hawaii* (Honolulu: Department of the Attorney General, Crime Prevention Division, Volume 1, Issue 2, June 1993).

³³Honolulu Police Department, *1991 Annual Report and Statistics* (Honolulu: Honolulu Police Department, 1992).

The basic data input form for the UCR system is the incident report, which contains most of the NIBRS-required data elements.³⁴ Officers write the report, and the Records Unit enters the information, in an incident-based format, onto the city's mainframe computer. With the exception of the report narrative, virtually all of the other information in the incident report is automated by the Records Unit. The incident report does not, however, capture any information regarding bias motivation.

Although incident-based data are stored on the computer, the department produces aggregate monthly UCR reports for CPD. Each month the Records Unit prints a UCR summary from the computerized records management system (RMS) and transcribes the data onto the appropriate UCR reporting forms. This information is also used for monthly briefings and serves as the basis for the department's annual report.

The Research and Development division conducts crime analysis in response to requests. The department has a menu-driven crime analysis program, LRCR, which enables officers and research staff to conduct crime analysis. LRCR can produce summary reports of offenses dating back to 1989, and a variety of detailed incident listing reports for the past week, including a listing of offenses by district, beat, by report type within district, and report type within beat.³⁵ LRCR can also produce trend reports by district, beat, and by report (i.e., offense) type. These reports show the number of offenses by crime category weekly, monthly or annually.

Requests for information come from city council members, Neighborhood Board members, the public information officer and community officers. The department's menu-driven crime analysis program is used to respond to many of these requests. For more complicated analyses, staff can conduct custom research using a variety of statistical and database software packages (e.g., SAS, FOCUS, EasyTrieve).

All crime analysis is conducted on data drawn from the department's incident-based records management system. CAD data are considered to be too generalized, and offenses are classified differently for dispatching purposes than is necessary for recordkeeping and UCR reporting. Also, because of the volume of data and file limitations, only one month of CAD data are kept on-line at any one time, and this is insufficient for historical or trend analysis. Although the city has a geographic information system, the section accessible to the police department is not functioning at this time. Information can be reported by beat, but pin maps are not currently produced.

³⁴The form is not especially easy to use, however, since the coding scheme for six critical and frequently used variables (incident type and UCR codes, disposition for closed cases, relationship of victim to suspect, physical characteristics, M.O. or *modus operandi* factors, and property codes), each of which appear in the shaded portions on the front of the incident report, appears on the reverse side of the incident report. Consequently, the officer must repeatedly turn the report over to determine the proper code. Although with practice officers may become familiar with the general coding schemes used, some of the coded fields are rather complex and not entirely intuitive.

³⁵The extent of historical information available depends upon the type of report requested. For crime identification log reports, only seven days worth of data are available, whereas for trend summary reports, up to four years worth of data may be available.

The department publishes an Annual Report, which includes information about the department's goals and objectives, organizational structure, programs, crime problems and solutions, and counts of the number of adults and juveniles arrested for Part 1 and Part 2 offenses, as well as several other aggregate UCR-based statistics (e.g., value of property stolen and recovered).

Although the department produces monthly UCR data in an automated format from their automated records management system, these data are manually transcribed onto UCR reporting forms and submitted to CPD, where the data are rekeyed into a State computer for subsequent analysis.

- ***Hawaii County Police Department***

The Hawaii County Police Department (HCPD) has approximately 300 uniformed officers and 100 civilian personnel servicing eight substations. The department has several community-oriented policing programs in place, including Neighborhood Watch, D.A.R.E., HiPAL, as well as others. Unlike the other islands, Hawaii County has two UCR areas: one for the city of Hilo, and one for the rest of the island. From 1991 to 1992 the crime rate has declined among virtually all major crime categories.

The basic data input form for the UCR system is a manual incident report, which contains most of the NIBRS data elements (see Appendix).³⁶ A few key items from the report are automated and the report is filed. At a later date, UCR staff pull the reports, 100 at a time, and transfer UCR information to a ledger book.³⁷ The events are manually tallied, and summaries are recorded in a variety of ledger sheets (e.g., offenses, unfounded, actual, cleared, adult, and juvenile). Although HCPD collects victim information for the supplementary homicide report, they would like to collect victim characteristics on tourists and residents for a variety of offenses, and would like to collect information on hate crimes as well.

The department has plans (which are currently on hold) to automate the dispatch and record management functions with an EAI software system running on an HP-8000. In addition, a geographic information system is under consideration. Although the EAI/HP-8000 system is expected to produce the NIBRS reports eventually, for the short-term, the department may provide a stand-alone PC to the UCR unit in order to automate the processing of UCR data and to produce aggregate UCR reports.

³⁶The form is not especially easy to use because the coding scheme for six critical and frequently used variables (e.g., property codes) are on the *back* of the incident report. Consequently, the officer must repeatedly turn the report over to determine the proper code. Although with practice officers may become familiar with the general coding schemes used, some of the coded fields are rather complex and not entirely intuitive.

³⁷The Record Unit is able to detect missing reports because each day the dispatch unit circulates a list of report numbers issued.

• Kauai Police Department

The Kauai Police Department has approximately 170 employees and during 1992 the island had a total of 2,497 Index offenses. Although the population of the island has increased by 50 percent over the last 15 years, the Index crime rate has increased by only 3.8 percent, and in general the island's crime rate is much less than the rest of the State.

The department's incident report form contains many of the data items required for NIBRS (see Appendix). Officers manually enter the information for each incident, and the report is filed by report number within offense categories (i.e., all murders are filed together, all rapes are filed together, etc.). This filing system makes it easier for departmental staff to identify linkages among similar crimes.

The department provides statistical summaries to the public, media, Chamber of Commerce and local criminal justice officials. There is considerable interest regarding domestic violence on the island and the department frequently receives requests for statistical reports on that topic. The department also prepares a monthly report of crime activity for its own uses. The monthly report provides statistics on offenses by district, month and watch. In addition, UCR staff produce a report on the residence status of victims of murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault and burglary.³⁸ In addition to the data processing required to produce reports of interest to agencies on the island, each month UCR staff read each report, tally the results and prepare a UCR report for the State.

Although the department was not fully automated at the time of the site visit, the county Management Information Services (MIS) Department is actively reviewing automation options for the department. The department previously obtained the XCaliber system (an automated law enforcement records management system), but for technical reasons they have been unable to utilize it. The MIS Department has been discussing this issue with the company that supports XCaliber, and the vendor may provide the department with a new version of the XCaliber system that will be compatible with the planned upgrade in the department's computer equipment. If implemented as planned, the XCaliber system is expected to meet the NIBRS standards.

• Maui Police Department

The Maui Police Department has approximately 400 employees (divided among five districts) and during 1992 the island had approximately 8,000 Index offenses. The department recently created a domestic violence unit which is responsible for reviewing all reports related to domestic violence, conducting additional investigations, forwarding cases to the prosecutor, and working in conjunction with the Maui County Domestic Violence Coalition. The department has a community relations section which has implemented several programs, including Neighborhood Crime Watch, D.A.R.E., and Law and Justice Awareness Education. The Community Relations Unit includes a Chaplaincy Program, which is aimed at providing crisis intervention and counseling.

³⁸Residence status is captured by the NIBRS system but is not required for the aggregate-based UCR system.

The basic input form is a general case/incident report (see Appendix), which contains many of the data items required for NIBRS. Officers complete the non-narrative portion of the report manually, but have the option of telephoning the station to dictate the narrative portion of the report. The officer's voice is digitized and staff produce a typewritten copy for authentication and filing.

The department began automating much of its information system on September 22, 1992, when the record management system was automated. The vendor of the automated system is PRC (Planning Research Corporation). At this time, preparation of UCR reports is completely manual. Staff in the Records Unit read each report and record information in a ledger book. For each incident, information is recorded by offense, report number, district number, beat, time, residence, etc. Each month these data are reviewed and used to prepare the UCR Return A form. Although the department has automated its crime reporting system, and arrest reports are expected to go on-line in the near future, the focus of both of these automated systems is on State reporting categories and not on UCR categories. The department does plan to eventually incorporate UCR reporting categories into its on-line systems, thereby automating the production of UCR information.

The UCR data are used in the department's Annual Report, and January and February each year the UCR unit receives requests for statistical information about each district's crime and arrests during the previous year. Newspapers also frequently request statistical information, although the interest seems to be on general statistics for the district(s) included in the paper's circulation, as opposed to information about specific crime issues (e.g., hate crime). There is a recurrent interest in domestic violence, and each year the Records Unit provides a list of domestic violence report numbers so the arrest reports can be reviewed and a report prepared. At this time the department does not have a crime analysis unit, although a proposal to create such a unit has been drafted.

• Uniform Crime Reporting Status: Summary and Conclusion

The Crime Prevention Division (CPD), Department of the Attorney General, is responsible for UCR reporting for the State of Hawaii. The Division receives manual UCR reports monthly from each of the four participating police departments, representing five reporting jurisdictions. Although the Honolulu Police Department produces its UCR data from its automated records management system, the data are manually transcribed onto standard UCR reporting forms and forwarded to CPD, where they are re-keyed into an automated system for the compilation of statewide statistics.

Each of the other three participating police departments compile UCR statistics manually, typically using extensive tally sheets that require a significant level of effort by local personnel. The compilation of UCR statistics by local departments is an exhaustive and labor-intensive operation, which provides little direct benefits to the contributing police agencies. At least one of the participating departments is typically six to seven months behind in reporting UCR data to CPD.

Assessment of the Current Uniform Crime Reporting Program

The primary objective of this *Background Report* has been to assess whether the current UCR program in Hawaii is adequate, effective and efficient. We have operationalized these terms as follows: *Adequate* refers to whether the existing UCR program captures the "right" data in sufficient detail, i.e., whether it is sufficiently comprehensive to address the objectives of local law enforcement agencies, policymakers, the legislature and the State UCR program. *Effective* refers to whether the UCR program, as presently constituted, enables operational and policy-oriented research that aids decisionmaking at the State and local levels, and whether it accurately reflects the nature of crime and criminality in the community, and can serve as a valid and reliable measure of law enforcement activity. *Efficient* refers to whether UCR data are presently captured in a timely and cost-effective manner; whether the data are automated and, if so, whether the data pass from local agencies to the State in an automated format.

• Adequacy

The existing UCR program produces crime and arrest data for each of the contributing law enforcement agencies, which in turn are compiled for statewide analyses. While the data provide a gross measure of the volume of crime within a community and provide a uniform basis for comparison with other jurisdictions, the structure, format and policies of this monthly aggregate reporting program actually obscure our understanding of the true scope and character of crime and criminal activity.

Arcane reporting policies, such as the Hierarchy Rule and the Hotel Rule, conspire with the limitations inherent in the aggregate compilation of data, to hinder research aimed at understanding the complex dynamics of criminal behavior, crime causation, prevention and effective intervention. In contrast, incident-based data systems reflect the fundamental reporting practices of law enforcement agencies worldwide. Crimes occur as distinct events or as part of larger criminal episodes, and law enforcement agencies, policymakers, researchers and administrators need to have the ability to conduct complex research to assess the incidence and prevalence of crime, to identify emerging patterns and trends, and to evaluate the impact of intervention strategies.

The existing UCR program is inadequate to meet the growing information needs of the State of Hawaii. Moving to an incident-based reporting (IBR) program will significantly expand the range and scope of data available for analysis, enabling multivariate analyses of complex problems, identification of crime trends, and facilitating effective interventions and ongoing monitoring of program effectiveness. Moreover, by implementing an IBR system, the State may be able to link offense and arrest data to other available databases, such as geographic information systems, *modus operandi* files, and criminal justice processing data to effectively target resources and better understand the operational dynamics of the justice system.

- ***Effectiveness***

The current UCR program does not generate statistics that accurately reflect the true nature of crime and criminality in the community, nor does it serve as a valid or reliable measure of law enforcement activity. The UCR program masks complex inter-relationships between key offense and offender attributes, and the aggregate reporting structure does not permit disaggregation for multivariate analyses. Moreover, the reporting structure does not enable law enforcement administrators to accurately monitor the activity of their officers or effectively measure the impact of their interventions.

- ***Efficiency***

As noted above, in the descriptions of UCR reporting within the local police agencies throughout Hawaii, three of the four contributing agencies do not currently produce UCR statistics in an automated format. Although the Honolulu Police Department is automated and incident-based, the monthly UCR statistics are transcribed to manual data collection forms for submission to CPD, where they are re-keyed into an automated database for compilation and analysis. Certainly some modifications can be made in the submission of data to enable automated reporting of UCR data from Honolulu Police Department, and CPD and the department should work collectively to identify what needs to be done in each agency to accommodate automated reporting.

In each of the other three reporting police departments, UCR data are collected in complex and detailed hand-tallied ledger sheets that consume substantial personnel resources to produce. Once created, these ledgers can be referred to by detectives or others within (or outside) the department for research or administrative purposes, but by their very nature they are extremely limited. As a general consequence, production of UCR reports by at least one of the agencies lags several months behind, which itself is a measure of the effectiveness of the existing UCR program both for the local agencies and for the State.

Section I Summary and Conclusions

The existing UCR system in Hawaii is largely inadequate, ineffective and inefficient. Although the data produced represent an extraordinary commitment by both local law enforcement agencies and State personnel, and CPD is making excellent use of the data that are available, the system, by its very nature, does not provide sufficient data for effective management or administration, nor does it support effective crime analysis or intervention.

Given the current aggregate reporting format of the UCR program, the system does not provide crime and arrest data in sufficient detail to enable legislators and policymakers to chart crime trends over a period of time or within specific geographic locations, or to identify criminal justice and crime-related issues and priorities as they emerge. Moreover, UCR data are largely nonautomated and requires significant effort both by local agencies and by the State to collect, process and report basic crime and arrest figures. Finally, the existing UCR program simply does not capture all of the data that are necessary for effective research and intervention, particularly addressing such topics as bias motivation in criminal offenses.

Despite these largely negative findings, however, it should be noted that Hawaii has many of the components already in place to convert to a more effective incident-based reporting system. The local departments have well-trained, dedicated UCR staff; they are automating their information systems as opportunities arise; and there is an interest in incident-based reporting, particularly as it relates to crime analysis, community-based policing, and the opportunity to reduce the amount of time and effort needed for the production of department and statewide offense statistics.

Section II: Findings and Recommendations

Overview

Section I of this report concluded that the existing Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program in Hawaii is inadequate, ineffective and inefficient. It recommended that the State take immediate steps to implement an incident-based offense and arrest reporting system consistent with the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) administered by the FBI and being implemented by many states throughout the nation. Incident-based offense and arrest reporting (IBR) captures significantly more data than the existing UCR program in a format that reflects universal police reporting practices.

The focus of the work presented in this section of the report is to recommend an appropriate course of action as needed for system improvements to satisfy the crime statistics and information needs of the State of Hawaii and its contributing law enforcement agencies. This section explores incident-based offense and arrest reporting as an alternative to the current UCR system; discusses implementation planning issues; recommends a course of action for the State of Hawaii; and provides an estimate of the cost of implementing IBR.

As noted earlier, several recent legislative bills have proposed the development of data collection systems to gather information on the victims of hate crime, including cross-gender offenses.³⁹ The fact that these systems have been proposed in several different legislative initiatives demonstrates the importance of the topic and the critical need to generate accurate and timely data on these crimes. Developing entirely new and separate data collection efforts, however, is a costly and time-consuming activity, and places a heavy burden on local law enforcement agencies that already have substantial reporting responsibilities. Although it may be more effective to build hate crime reporting into existing data collection mechanisms, the limitations inherent in the current UCR program undermine any such effort. Incident-Based Reporting systems, however, are quite appropriate vehicles for such reporting initiatives, and the State may wish to investigate the potential of building a model hate crime reporting program into the State's IBR program. Indeed, hate crime reporting is a fundamental component of the national NIBRS program, and incorporating bias motivation into the Hawaii IBR should bring the State into compliance with the NIBRS program.

³⁹See H.B. No. 2612, H.D. 1, Making an Appropriation for the Construction of A Model for the Collection of Data Regarding the Victims of Hate Crimes; H.B. No. 366, A Bill for an Act Relating to Hate Crimes Against Women, Hawaii House of Representatives, 16th Legislature, 1991; and Senate Concurrent Resolution Requesting the Development of Data Collection and Reporting Mechanisms on Information Relating to Cross-Gender Crime, Hawaii Senate, 16th Legislature, 1991.

Implementation of IBR throughout the State of Hawaii should be carefully planned to ensure that the system will 1) meet the operational, management and research needs of the contributing law enforcement agencies; 2) meet the research, program assessment and general information needs of the legislature, executive branch agencies, and other users and consumers of the data; and 3) comply with reporting requirements of the NIBRS program.⁴⁰ This report recommends that the State of Hawaii undertake a phased implementation of incident-based offense and arrest reporting, beginning with the development of State IBR data collection specifications and continuing with the development of a comprehensive plan for the operational testing and phased implementation of incident-based reporting statewide.

Incident-Based Offense and Arrest Reporting as an Alternative to Uniform Crime Reporting

The fundamental difference between incident-based offense and arrest reporting (IBR) and the existing UCR program is that with IBR, individual records relating to each distinct crime incident and its associated arrest are captured by local law enforcement agencies and submitted to State and Federal reporting programs. This shift in reporting practice is indeed significant. Rather than simply capturing summary statistics and raw counts of the number of crimes reported within a jurisdiction, IBR promises a wealth of detailed offense, victim and offender data which properly reflect the inherently incident-based structure of law enforcement recordkeeping. By capturing these detailed data in an incident-based format, practitioners and researchers alike will be able to undertake sophisticated, multivariate analyses of crime within a jurisdiction, and will be able to link specific incident and offense data to other relevant databases, such as census data, community demographic and economic data, and geographic mapping data.

⁴⁰Although the IBR system that Hawaii implements should be capable of participating in the national NIBRS statistical reporting program, the State may well elect to expand the range of data captured by local contributors and reported to the State program, and even alter and further refine the coding of some existing data elements to better reflect local culture and information needs. Hawaii, for example, may wish to expand the data element values for race of the victim, suspect and arrestee beyond the NIBRS definitions of White, Black, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Unknown. See Federal Bureau of Investigation, *National Incident-Based Reporting System: Volume 1: Data Collection Guidelines* (Washington, D.C.: FBI, July 1, 1988); Federal Bureau of Investigation, *National Incident-Based Reporting System: Volume 2: Data Submission Specifications* (Washington, D.C.: FBI, May, 1992); and, Federal Bureau of Investigation, *National Incident-Based Reporting System: Volume 3: Approaches to Implementing an Incident-Based Reporting (IBR) System* (Washington, D.C.: FBI, July 1, 1992).

Although these values may be sufficient for many states throughout the nation, it will not adequately address the needs of Hawaii, which may wish to incorporate significantly more detail. The Crime Prevention Division has already begun to examine this issue and has drafted the following race classifications for consideration in NIBRS reporting: African-American, Caucasian, Chinese, Filipino, Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian, Japanese, Korean, Samoan, Other Pacific Islander (Tongan, Tahitian, Marshallese, Micronesian, Palauan, Chamorro, Carolinian, Fijian), Other Asian (Thai, Indonesian, Laotian, Vietnamese, Burmese, Cambodian, and Asian Indian), Other, and Unknown. (Draft document provided by Mr. Thomas Green, CPD, December 7, 1993). These additional classifications can be subsequently recoded and combined to meet national reporting standards during the compilation of data tapes for reporting to the FBI.

• Benefits of Incident-Based Reporting

Incident-based reporting promises data directly relevant to community-based policing initiatives. Local law enforcement agencies will be able to undertake sophisticated research on the nature, incidence and prevalence of a broad variety of crimes and criminal behaviors with the additional detail that IBR systems capture regarding the characteristics of the victim and the offender, the seriousness of injury, the type of weapon used, the relationship between the victim and offender, and the circumstances surrounding the offense.

The expanded capabilities of IBR are particularly useful in analyzing the incidence of specific offenses, such as domestic violence, and in formulating and evaluating the impact of intervention strategies. Local police departments are able to identify community characteristics associated with high rates of domestic violence, and respond, together with other community service organizations, by marshaling community resources in support of the family, disseminating educational information regarding resources that are available, and ensuring that the resources are centrally located and accessible to the victims and their families.

With the ability to link IBR data to demographic, economic and geographic databases, local law enforcement can vastly expand their research on the geographic distribution and shifting patterns of crime. The days in which crime within a jurisdiction is represented by pin maps that are manually produced by sworn and civilian personnel are quickly coming to an end. The IBR systems of today enable local law enforcement to build comprehensive and dynamic maps of their community which not only display the geographic location of particular offenses, but also overlay and enable investigation of the relationship between crime and other community characteristics, such as the location of abandoned buildings, vacant lots, liquor stores and bars, and low-income housing projects. Through this form of research, local law enforcement can investigate the prevalence of particular offenses throughout their jurisdiction, identify community attributes that are strongly associated with offenses, formulate intervention strategies and assess their impact on an ongoing basis. Law enforcement agencies are also better equipped to share pin maps and other offense and incident data with the community at large, further promoting community-based policing efforts.

One of the oldest community-police partnerships exists between law enforcement and local schools, and IBR makes possible an even greater degree of cooperation than heretofore possible. A shared concern for both law enforcement and educators, for example, is drug use in the vicinity of neighborhood schools. Several jurisdictions have established enhanced penalties or other provisions for drug offenses that occur within the immediate vicinity of a school, i.e., within a legislatively prescribed boundary surrounding the school.⁴¹ It can be difficult to know, however, whether a specific offense occurred within the boundary, which may, by way of example, be set at within 1,000 feet of a school, or to anticipate when a drug "hot spot" appears to be migrating toward a neighborhood school. IBR can be augmented with other information sources, such as geographic mapping, to enable local departments to identify targeted offenses, assess the emergence of crime trends and other problems, and anticipate and proactively respond to changes in crime patterns.

⁴¹ See, e.g., FLA. STAT. ANN. § 893.13 (1) (e) (1992) and WASH. REV. CODE § 10.66.090 (1991).

A recurrent management and administrative issue faced by all police chiefs is the effective deployment of their officers — geographically, temporally and functionally — to best respond to changing crime patterns. An automated IBR, with individual records for each offense and arrest, including offense type, time and location, provides the analytic specificity and flexibility necessary to enable Chiefs to determine how best to deploy their officers throughout their jurisdiction. Moreover, IBR enables law enforcement to evaluate the dynamic impact of their deployment strategy, modifying, expanding and contracting, or perhaps varying by shift the size and composition of patrol boundaries.

Although these benefits are direct and tangible at the local agency and community level, the State also benefits from IBR programs. With the additional data available through IBR, researchers and practitioners are better able to identify emerging crime trends, and at the State level, they are able to do so across jurisdictional boundaries. IBR also provides program administrators, policy decisionmakers and legislators with the level of detail necessary to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of intervention strategies undertaken statewide.

- ***Hawaii Participation in the National Incident-Based Reporting System***

Implementation of IBR in law enforcement agencies statewide will enable Hawaii to participate in the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) administered by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). The NIBRS program itself is comprised of 53 data elements, which are presented in Appendix A. The FBI has published comprehensive data element standards, reporting requirements, and data submission specifications for participation in NIBRS.⁴²

The NIBRS program captures detailed, incident-based data on a variety of factors, including the circumstances surrounding the offense; bias motivation; property involved in an incident, including the type, description and dollar value of property lost or damaged in an incident, and for offenses involving controlled substances, the type of drug, its quantity and measurement; victim data, including general demographic characteristics, seriousness of injury (in violent crime), circumstances surrounding certain violent offenses, and the relationship between the victim and offender; and demographic information and resident status on the offender and/or arrestee involved in the incident.

Many states throughout the nation are at some stage of implementation of NIBRS and most, in order to meet their individual and sometimes unique information needs, have elected to enhance their incident-based reporting systems beyond the strict NIBRS standards. Arkansas, for example, provides local agencies with the option of supplying data on several solvability factors associated with criminal offenses, while North Dakota has added data elements on victim characteristics

⁴²See Federal Bureau of Investigation, *National Incident-Based Reporting System: Volume 1: Data Collection Guidelines* (Washington, D.C.: FBI, July 1, 1988); Federal Bureau of Investigation, *National Incident-Based Reporting System: Volume 2: Data Submission Specifications* (Washington, D.C.: FBI, May 1992); and Federal Bureau of Investigation, *National Incident-Based Reporting System: Volume 3: Approaches to Implementing an Incident-Based Reporting (IBR) System* (Washington, D.C.: FBI, July 1, 1992). In addition, see Federal Bureau of Investigation, *Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines* (Washington, D.C.: FBI, no date); Federal Bureau of Investigation, *Hate Crime Magnetic Media Specifications for Tapes and Diskettes* (Washington, D.C.: FBI, September 1992); and Federal Bureau of Investigation, *Training Guide for Hate Crime Data Collection* (Washington, D.C.: FBI, no date).

and has expanded the location, offense, injury and property description codes. New York's IBR system will enable local agencies to provide victim/offender relationship data for a greater number of offenses than is required in NIBRS, facilitating more expansive research on domestic violence. While only the data required for national participation in NIBRS are forwarded to the FBI, these states are exploiting the advantages of IBR to address issues of particular interest within their jurisdictions.

• Incident-Based Reporting in Hawaii: Summary

Incident-based offense and arrest reporting by law enforcement agencies throughout Hawaii will provide direct and lasting benefits to State and local agencies, policy decisionmakers, program administrators, legislators and the general public. Hawaii may well desire to expand the range or further refine the nature of data captured in IBR in order to address issues of common concern throughout the user community, such as the incidence and prevalence of domestic violence and hate crimes.

Planning for Incident-Based Offense and Arrest Reporting

We recommend that Hawaii implement a statewide incident-based offense and arrest reporting system (Hawaii IBR). In order to implement IBR, the State must first define the data elements, coding structure, reporting procedures and data submission specifications for the Hawaii IBR program.

It is important to note that UCR is a voluntary reporting program in Hawaii, as it is throughout the nation. Law enforcement agencies spend considerable effort each month compiling UCR data for submission to the State, where the data are, in turn, compiled for statewide reporting and aggregated for submission to the FBI.

Since the program is entirely voluntary, every effort should be made to make compilation and reporting of UCR and IBR data as transparent to the basic recordkeeping practices of law enforcement agencies as possible. This principle serves the dual functions of encouraging participation in the program by easing the burden of reporting for local agencies, and certainly improves the quality of the data collected by designing the data specifications and reporting procedures to accurately reflect contemporary police recordkeeping practices. Moreover, by designing the Hawaii IBR program to address the information needs of the contributing law enforcement agencies, the program engenders a sense of ownership and commitment among users and contributors, and fosters reliance on the data for management and administrative decisionmaking, effective resource allocation, program assessment and identification of emerging crime trends.

The Hawaii IBR program must meet the needs of multiple users. First and foremost, the program must address the information needs of local contributing law enforcement agencies. In particular, the program must address the information needs of community-based policing, facilitate and enable expanded crime analysis, and expand the range of management and administrative data available to key decisionmakers within the local law enforcement agencies.

Hawaii IBR must also inform the legislature and executive branch agencies regarding emerging crime trends, enable research to assess the impact of particular programs and legislative/executive initiatives, help identify cross-jurisdictional crime trends, and empower both State and local agencies to better target their limited resources.

The Hawaii IBR program must also respond to the information needs of local community groups, such as the Japanese American Citizens League, Hawaii Women Lawyers, Hawaii Civil Rights Commission, and community groups and Neighborhood Watch programs.

In order to ensure that the Hawaii IBR program meets the information needs of this diverse group of users and consumers, we recommend that the State appoint an Hawaii IBR Advisory Committee to advise the Attorney General in the development of the Hawaii IBR data specifications. The Committee should be comprised of representatives of CPD, each of the contributing police agencies, the principal data users and consumers, and representatives of the community at large, and should be advisory in nature.

Once the data and reporting specifications have been defined and published, the State should begin planning implementation of the program, including conducting an assessment of the impact the program will have on local contributing law enforcement agencies and on the Attorney General's Crime Prevention Division. This detailed plan will identify modifications that must be made in the data collection, data entry, local automation and analysis of the data, and in the transmission of IBR data to the State program and analysis at the State level. Moreover, the plan should estimate the costs of implementation of incident-based reporting among each of the four contributing police departments and CPD.

Recommended Course of Action

We recommend that the State implement incident-based reporting in three phases, the first two of which are described in some detail in the following pages and which should occur over the next 12 months. Together, these phases establish a foundation upon which an effective and efficient incident-based offense and arrest reporting system can be built.

Phase I would be designed to identify and define the data elements, reporting requirements and data submission specifications for Hawaii IBR participation.⁴³ This phase contemplates the development of standards that meet the reporting requirements of the NIBRS program, and will also effectively address the information needs of the contributing law enforcement agencies, State executive branch agencies, the State Legislature, the judiciary, community interest groups and the public at large. One of the objectives of this phase is building consensus among the data providers (i.e., local law enforcement contributors), and users and consumers of the data.

Phase II would be designed to develop a detailed implementation plan for the Hawaii IBR program, which will include identifying, defining and scheduling specific activities that must be undertaken by State agencies and local contributors to implement the program, and to estimate the costs associated with each activity. For example, data collection instruments used by law enforcement agencies will, in all likelihood, have to be modified to incorporate the Hawaii IBR data elements and coding schemes defined in the first phase, and existing computer programs within law enforcement agencies and at the State level may have to be modified or additional software purchased for Hawaii IBR reporting.

Phase III of Hawaii IBR implementation would be implementation testing, operational support and ongoing maintenance. The State may wish to implement IBR incrementally, testing each agency to ensure compliance with State and Federal reporting requirements. In addition, the State will want to provide operational support and some measure of ongoing maintenance necessary for successful statewide implementation. Another component of this phase will be the development and testing of analytic techniques, research methodologies and reporting formats for both State and local agencies, and for various consumers of the data.

⁴³In system design terms familiar to Hawaii State personnel, this phase contemplates the development of the Hawaii IBR System Requirements Definition.

• Phase I: Development of the Hawaii Incident-Based Crime Reporting Program Data Specifications

The primary objective of this phase is the definition of data specifications (i.e., identify the data elements and their coding structure, recommend reporting procedures, and develop data submission specifications) for incident-based offense and arrest reporting for the State of Hawaii.

- Task 1:** Examine the existing National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) standards as the foundation for building the Hawaii IBR program. One of the objectives of implementing IBR in Hawaii will be continued participation in a national statistical reporting program. Accordingly, development of IBR standards for the State should begin with the NIBRS standards issued by the FBI in 1988 and updated in 1992. Beyond simply participating in the NIBRS system, however, Hawaii will almost certainly want to augment the national data standards and capture additional information. This step, then, includes an analysis and recommendation of additional data elements and reporting requirements to ensure that the Hawaii IBR Program captures the appropriate data in the necessary format to address the information needs of IBR data users.
- Task 2:** Examine other State IBR statistical reporting programs around the nation in an effort to determine if there are other data elements or reporting procedures that Hawaii may wish to adopt. Identify the range of data, above and beyond the NIBRS data element standards, that have been, or are being implemented by other State UCR programs to determine whether Hawaii should consider augmenting its program with the addition of these data elements, coding structures, reporting procedures, etc.
- Task 3:** Evaluate the information needs of the Hawaii IBR user-community. The IBR user-community must be broadly defined to include the local contributing police departments (e.g., in support of community-based policing, tactical and strategic crime analysis, management and administration), community crime prevention groups (e.g., Neighborhood Watch), special interest groups (e.g., Japanese American Citizens League, Hawaii Women Lawyers, the State Judiciary, Hawaii Civil Rights Commission), the State Legislature (i.e., in order to chart crime trends over time or within specific geographic locations, or to identify criminal justice and crime-related issues and priorities as they emerge), and executive branch agencies of the State of Hawaii (e.g., Crime Prevention Division, Resource Coordination Division, Criminal Justice Data Center). This task is designed to define and document the specific information needs of the users of these data, to ensure that Hawaii IBR properly addresses the information needs of the broad constituency of crime and arrest data users and consumers.
- Task 4:** Develop a formal draft of the IBR standards that incorporate NIBRS data reporting requirements and Hawaii reporting standards. These draft standards should be shared with representatives of the contributing law enforcement agencies, the State

Legislature, community interest groups, executive branch agencies, the State Judiciary and other IBR users. It is expected that the Hawaii IBR Advisory Committee will review these draft standards and comment on them, prompting revision and redrafting.

Task 5: Coincident with the development of these draft standards, also develop analytic models that demonstrate how IBR data can be used to address the information needs of IBR users. These analytic models will be described in a separate paper that demonstrates how IBR data can be used to address management and administrative issues, to expand the nature and scope of crime analysis, to support community-based policing efforts, to identify and target emerging crime trends, and to support program assessment and evaluation.

Task 6: Evaluate the impact that implementation of these draft standards will have on contributing law enforcement agencies and their ability to participate in statewide reporting. Local contributing law enforcement agencies may have to revise their reporting forms, revise their automated records management information systems, provide training to the field officers responsible for offense reporting or alter their recordkeeping and data entry practices.

Task 7: Finalize and publish the data elements and reporting requirements for the Hawaii IBR program. These final standards will serve as the foundation of the Hawaii IBR program and may, periodically, be revised to reflect the changing needs of the data providers, and State, local and community data users and consumers.

• ***Phase II: Development of an Implementation Plan for the Hawaii Incident-Based Crime Reporting Program***

The objective of this phase is to define and schedule the specific activities that must be undertaken by State agencies and local law enforcement contributors to implement the Hawaii IBR program, and to estimate the costs associated with each activity.

Task 1: Identify modifications (if any) that will have to be made to the incident, offense and arrest reports currently being used by local law enforcement contributors and/or by State agencies to bring them into compliance with Hawaii IBR and NIBRS reporting standards.

Task 2: Identify modifications (if any) that will have to be made to the computer programs currently being used by local law enforcement contributors and by State agencies to bring them into compliance with Hawaii IBR and NIBRS reporting standards.

- Local agencies may have to modify their existing records management systems in order to incorporate the necessary IBR data elements and to report IBR data to CPD;

- The Crime Prevention Division will have to modify its existing computer systems to receive the necessary IBR data from local agencies;
- Local agencies and CPD may also have to purchase additional hardware and software to enable reporting of IBR data;
- Local agencies and CPD will have to implement and test various communication protocols to enable electronic reporting of IBR data at the State level; and
- CPD will have to initiate a routine for production of a tape for the FBI to test submission specifications.

Task 3:

Identify modifications (if any) that will have to be made to the data entry procedures currently being used by local law enforcement contributors and by State agencies to bring them into compliance with Hawaii IBR and NIBRS reporting standards. Local agencies will have considerably more data entry to do with IBR, which captures additional data and detail on existing data. This may be attenuated to some extent, however, with modification of existing incident, offense and arrest reports. Users may want to examine a variety of potential solutions, such as redesign of the offense, incident and arrest reports using computer-readable forms (e.g., Scantron). CPD will also have to expend additional time and resources in editing and verifying IBR data submitted by local agencies, and in preparing the data for submission to the FBI and for State statistical compilations of the data.

Task 4:

Identify modifications (if any) that will have to be made to the training currently being provided to local law enforcement contributors and to State agencies to bring them into compliance with Hawaii IBR and NIBRS reporting standards, and to identify additional training resources that will be needed to incrementally implement Hawaii IBR statewide. Once the IBR data collection and reporting requirements are finalized, field officers within each of the contributing law enforcement agencies must be trained in the proper completion of incident, offense and arrest reports. Additional training should be provided by the State to State and local agencies in proper data manipulation techniques for effective crime analysis, management and administrative reporting, the efficient transfer of data from local agencies to the State, etc.

Task 5:

Estimate budget and project implementation schedule. The Implementation Plan should provide detailed estimates of the projected costs for the phased testing and implementation of IBR in Hawaii. In addition to estimating the costs of implementation (at both the State and local levels), the Plan should also propose a detailed schedule for implementation testing and production.

Estimated Budget

This report recommends that the State begin actively planning implementation of incident-based offense and arrest reporting at both the local and State levels. We have recommended that IBR be pursued in a phased implementation beginning first with development of data specifications, followed by detailed planning, implementation testing and operational support.

We believe that Phase I represents a significant planning and research effort, requiring an estimated three (3) months of senior-level staff effort and approximately five (5) months of mid-level staff effort. The work would involve researching the current status of IBR implementation at the Federal and State levels nationally, assessing the information needs of State, local and community interest groups, and developing draft standards, which are subsequently recommended for adoption by the Attorney General. The work would involve approximately three on-site visits for both of the staff members to meet with the Hawaii IBR Advisory Committee and to visit other data providers and consumers. We estimate that this level of effort will cost in the range of \$100,000-\$120,000.⁴⁴

We believe that Phase II also represents a significant planning and research effort, requiring an additional three (3) months of senior-level staff effort and approximately five (5) months of mid-level staff effort. The work would involve assessing the impact the Hawaii IBR standards will have on contributing law enforcement agencies, developing plans for the possible modification of State and local data collection instruments, as well as potential changes in both State and local computer systems. Moreover, this Phase contemplates planning implementation testing, operational support and ongoing maintenance for the Hawaii IBR program. The work would involve approximately three on-site visits for both staff members to meet with the Hawaii IBR Advisory Committee and to visit both data providers and consumers. We estimate that this level of effort will cost in the range of \$100,000-\$120,000.

We are not prepared at this point to estimate the costs of Phase III, given the fact that the data standards and reporting requirements for the Hawaii IBR program have not been defined. With phased implementation testing, operational support and ongoing maintenance of IBR, Hawaii will certainly want to build capacity within appropriate State agencies for the program and rely less on outside experts.

The figures we present above represent our estimates of the costs for a private consultant to undertake the work outlined in the previous section of this report. Our estimates are based on certain assumptions, including the expectation that the consultant would be responsible for the majority of the tasks outlined in the preceding section. Certainly that State may wish to play a more active role in undertaking these tasks and, in so doing, reduce the costs of the contract for an outside consultant. We have also assumed, for purposes of estimating this budget, travel expenses for a consultant from the western United States, and these figures may also need to be adjusted.

⁴⁴The estimated budgets presented in this section of the report cover personnel, travel and incidental expenses for a contractor.

Section II Summary and Conclusions

The existing UCR system in Hawaii is largely inadequate, ineffective and inefficient. Although the data produced represent an extraordinary commitment by both local law enforcement agencies and State personnel, and CPD is making excellent use of the data that are available, the system, by its very nature, does not provide sufficient data for effective management or administration, nor does it support effective crime analysis or intervention.

We recommend that the State take immediate steps to implement an incident-based offense and arrest reporting (IBR) system. Implementation of IBR throughout the State of Hawaii should be carefully planned to ensure that the system meets the operational, management and research needs of the contributing law enforcement agencies; meets the research, program assessment and general information needs of the legislature, executive branch agencies, the judiciary, and other users and consumers of the data; and complies with reporting requirements of the NIBRS program.

We believe that the phased implementation of IBR that is recommended in this report will empower data providers, users and consumers with the information necessary to effectively respond to the growing challenge of crime in American society. Effective action requires knowledge—about current conditions, available alternatives, and the impact of intervention strategies. Incident-based offense and arrest reporting provides the mechanism with which to build the foundation of knowledge that will guide our action.

Appendix

NIBRS Data Elements and Data Values

Source: Federal Bureau of Investigation, *National Incident-Based Reporting System: Volume 1, Data Collection Guidelines* (Washington, D.C.: FBI, 1988) pp. 71-103.

DATA ELEMENTS AND DATA VALUES

The "data elements" and "data values" set forth in this section represent those which are required to satisfy the National Incident-Based Reporting System's (NIBRS') reporting requirements. State and local agencies are encouraged to include additional data elements and values in their IBR systems to satisfy their own state and/or local needs, but to report only those set forth below to the National UCR Program.

A. Data Elements

"Data elements" are the data fields used in NIBRS to describe the victims, offenders, arrestees, and circumstances of criminal incidents and arrests. Examples are: "Incident Number," "UCR Offense Code," "Type of Victim," and "Age of Offender."

There are 52 data elements. Some are required to be reported, i.e., they are "Mandatory." Others may be reported at the option of the agency submitting the report to the FBI, i.e., they are "Optional." See Volume 2: Data Submission Specifications, Section IV, "Mandatories," for the designations of which data elements are "Mandatory" and which are "Optional." A description of each data element appears below under the caption, "C. Descriptions of the Data Elements and Data Values."

B. Data Values

"Data values" are the specific codes which are allowed to be entered into the data elements. Each code appears in bold print, followed by its underlined translation. Examples are: "**M**" = Male, "**F**" = Female, and "**U**" = Unknown, which are the data values allowed in the "Sex" data elements; and "**W**" = White, "**B**" = Black, "**I**" = American Indian/Alaskan Native, "**A**" = Asian/Pacific Islander, and "**U**" = Unknown allowed in the "Race" data elements. The data values for each data element appear below under the caption, "C. Descriptions of the Data Elements and Data Values."

There are many more data values than there are data elements. If more than one of the data values associated with a data element would apply to the situation, use the most specific one. For example, a 7-Eleven store could be described in Data Element 9 (Location Type) as a "**05**" = Commercial/Office Building, "**07**" = Convenience Store, or "**12**" = Grocery/Supermarket. However, since "**07**" = Convenience Store is the most specific description, it should be used.

Data Elements and Data Values

Furthermore, some data elements allow for the entry of more than one data value. For example, Data Element 12 (Type Criminal Activity) allows up to three (3) types of activity to be entered for each offense. If in a drug case, the offenders had grown marijuana and distributed it by having children sell it at school, the data values of "C" = Cultivating/Manufacturing/Publishing, "D" = Distributing/Selling, and "E" = Exploiting Children should be entered.

C. Descriptions of the Data Elements and Data Values

The following data elements and data values are used for reporting incidents and arrests involving Group "A" Offenses, and for reporting arrests involving Group "B" Offenses.

See Section II, "Offenses," for explanations of Group "A" and "B" Offenses. Also see Section V, "Reports," for explanations of the "Group 'A' Incident Report" and the "Group 'B' Arrest Report."

Whether a data element is used only in the Group "A" Incident Report or both the Group "A" Incident Report and the Group "B" Arrest Report is indicated by the following parenthetical indicators in each data element description:

<u>Used In</u>	<u>Indicator</u>
Group "A" Incident Report (only)	(A)
Group "A" and "B" Reports (both)	(A&B)

Caveat: The order of data values shown in this section is for data entry purposes. In a few instances the order is different from that appearing in Volume 2: Data Submission Specifications, which sets forth the order for magnetic tape submission purposes. For example, the order of data entry for Data Element 17 (Date Recovered) is shown herein as Month, Day, and Year (MM/DD/YYYY), while the order for magnetic tape submission is Year, Month, and Day (YYYY/MM/DD).

1 ORI Number - 9 characters (A&B): This is the 9-character NCIC Originating Agency Identifier (ORI) Number which has been assigned to your agency. It must be included in each Group "A" Incident Report segment or Group "B" Arrest Report.

Example: The ORI Number for the New York City Police Department is "NY0303000."

Data Elements and Data Values

2 Incident Number - 12 characters (A): This is the number assigned by your agency to each Group "A" Incident Report to identify it uniquely, e.g., the Originating Agency Case (OCA) Number. The number can be up to 12 characters in length. The Incident Number must be included in each "segment" of the Group "A" Incident Report. [Note: Data Element 41 (Arrest Transaction Number) is the number which uniquely identifies each Group "B" Arrest Report.]

If and when data from a Group "A" Incident Report is furnished to an authorized entity for research purposes, the Incident Number will be encrypted by the FBI prior to its dissemination to ensure that the recipient cannot identify the actual case. State and local agencies may also encrypt their Incident Numbers before sending them to the FBI.

3 Incident Date/Hour - 11 characters (A): This data element must be included in each Group "A" Incident Report. It is to be used to enter the Month, Day, Year, and Hour (MM/DD/YYYY/HH) when the incident occurred or started, or the beginning of the time period in which it occurred (as appropriate). "Military" 24-hour time is to be used. If the "Incident Date" is unknown, enter the date of the report with the indicator "R" = Report. If the "Incident Hour" is unknown, leave the hour blank.

If the incident occurred on or between midnight and 0059, enter "00"; if on or between 0100 and 0159, enter "01"; if on or between 2300 and 2359, enter "23"; etc. If the incident occurred at exactly midnight, it is to be considered to have occurred at the beginning of the next day. Therefore, "00" should be entered for the hour, along with the next day's date.

Example (1): If a robbery occurred at 9:30 p.m. on July 2, 1989, the entry should be "07/02/1989/21."

Example (2): If a kidnaping started at 11:30 p.m. on November 1, 1989, and ended at 6:00 p.m., on November 16, 1989, the entry should be "11/01/1989/23."

Example (3): If a burglary occurred sometime between 11:15 a.m. on June 24, 1989, and 4:30 p.m. on June 26, 1989, the entry should be "06/24/1989/11."

Example (4): If the incident occurred at midnight on December 31, 1989, the entry should be "01/01/1990/00."

Example (5): If the date and hour of the incident are unknown but the date of the report was March 15, 1989, the entry should be "03/15/1989/R/bb" (where "b" equals a blank).

Data Elements and Data Values

4 Cleared Exceptionally - 1 character (A): This data element must be included in each Group "A" Incident Report. It is used to indicate whether or not the incident was cleared exceptionally. If not, "N" = Not Applicable is to be entered. In a multiple-offense incident, the exceptional clearance of one offense, clears the entire incident. An incident cannot be cleared exceptionally if it was previously or at the same time cleared by an arrest, i.e., if an Arrestee Segment was or is being submitted.

In order to clear an offense by exceptional means, the following four conditions must be met: (1) the investigation must have clearly and definitely established the identity of at least one offender; (2) sufficient probable cause must have been developed to support the arrest, charging, and prosecution of the offender; (3) the exact location of the offender must be known so that an arrest could be made; and (4) there must be a reason outside the control of law enforcement which prevents the arrest, i.e., "A" through "E", below:

Allowed entries: (enter only one)

- A = Death of Offender
- B = Prosecution Declined (by the prosecutor for other than lack of probable cause)
- C = Extradition Denied
- D = Victim Refused to Cooperate (in the prosecution)
- E = Juvenile/No Custody (the handling of a juvenile without taking him/her into custody, but rather by oral or written notice given to the parents or legal guardian in a case involving a minor offense)
- N = Not Applicable (not cleared exceptionally)

Example (1): If an incident was not cleared by either an arrest or exceptional means by the time an initial Group "A" Incident Report was submitted regarding it, then "N" = Not Applicable should be entered.

Example (2): If, after a Group "A" Incident Report was submitted, an offender was arrested, the previously submitted report should be updated with an Arrestee Segment. The incident will be automatically cleared when the Arrestee Segment is received at the FBI. This data element should still contain "N" = Not Applicable.

Example (3): Suppose a Group "A" Incident Report was submitted and the offender was later arrested, but the victim refused to testify and there were no other witnesses. The previously submitted Group "A" Incident Report should be updated to change the contents of this data element from "N" = Not Applicable to "D" = Victim Refused to Cooperate.

Data Elements and Data Values

5 Exceptional Clearance Date - 8 characters (A): If an incident was cleared by exceptional means (i.e., a code other than "N" was entered into Data Element 4), the Month, Day, and Year (MM/DD/YYYY) when the incident was cleared is to be entered into this data element.

Example: The incident was cleared on the "books" of the reporting agency on May 27, 1989. It was entered into the local and/or state computer on June 6, 1989. The date "05/27/1989" should be entered into this data element.

6 UCR Offense Code - 3 characters (A): This data element is to be used to enter the UCR Offense Codes of the up to ten (10) most serious (as determined by the reporting agency) Group "A" Offenses involved in the incident. There are 46 possible Group "A" Offense Code entries. A separate "Offense Segment" containing Data Elements 6 through 13 is to be submitted for each reported Group "A" Offense Code involved in the incident. Only one Offense Segment is to be submitted for each reported UCR Offense Code even though there may have been more than one victim of the crime. At least one Offense Segment must be included in a Group "A" Incident Report.

Example (1): If an incident involved robbery and rape, two Offense Segments should be submitted -- one with UCR Offense Code "120" (Robbery) and the other with "11A" (Forcible Rape).

Example (2): Even if two females were raped in Example (1), only one Offense Segment should be submitted with "11A" = Forcible Rape entered into Data Element 6 (UCR Offense Code). [Note: Two Victim Segments should also be submitted which are linked to the Offense Segment by entering "11A" into Data Element 24 (Victim Connected to UCR Offense Codes).]

7 Offense Attempted/Completed - 1 character (A): This data element is to be used to indicate whether each offense in the incident was completed or merely attempted. If there was more than one occurrence of the same UCR Offense within an incident and one was completed, then "Completed" must be entered.

It should be noted that "Attempted Murder" is to be reported as Aggravated Assault, and all Assault Offenses are to be coded as "Completed."

Allowed Entries: (enter only one)

A = Attempted

C = Completed

Data Elements and Data Values

Example: During the same incident, Offender-01 raped Victim-001 and Offender-02 attempted to rape Victim-002 but had to leave the scene before the act was consummated because of arriving police. Since one rape was completed, "C" = Completed should be entered into the Offense Segment submitted for Forcible Rape.

8 Offender(s) Suspected of Using - 1 character (A): This data element is to be used to indicate whether any of the offenders in the incident were suspected of consuming alcohol or using drugs/narcotics during or shortly before the incident; or of using a computer, computer terminal, or other computer equipment to perpetrate the crime. Up to three (3) entries can be made.

While there is no requirement to indicate that none of the offender(s) was suspected of using alcohol, computer equipment, or drugs/narcotics, if the reporting officer did not indicate one of them, "N" = Not Applicable is to be entered.

Allowed entries: (enter up to 3)

A = Alcohol
C = Computer Equipment
D = Drugs/Narcotics
N = Not Applicable

Example (1): Witnesses to an assault reported that the victim and offender were in a bar drinking beer when an argument broke out and the offender attacked the victim with a knife.

"A" = Alcohol should be entered.

Example (2): A rape victim advised that her attacker bragged that he had been "freebasing" cocaine just prior to the incident.
"D" = Drugs/Narcotics should be entered.

Example (3): A medical supply warehouse was burglarized and large quantities of Methadone, Morphine, Benzedrine, and Valium were stolen. "D" = Drugs/Narcotics should not be entered because, while the drugs were the object of the crime, there was no indication that the offenders used drugs or narcotics before or during the incident.

Example (4): A computer "hacker" used his personal computer and a telephone modem to gain access to a company's computer and steal proprietary data. "C" = Computer Equipment should be entered.

Example (5): A private residence was burglarized and a personal computer was stolen, along with other items. "C" = Computer Equipment should not be entered because, while the computer was one of the fruits of the crime, it was not used to commit the crime.

8A Bias Motivation - 2 characters (A).

Allowed entries: (enter only one)

Anti-Racial

- 11 = White
- 12 = Black
- 13 = American Indian or Alaskan Native
- 14 = Asian/Pacific Islander
- 15 = Multi-Racial Group

Anti-Religious

- 21 = Jewish
- 22 = Catholic
- 23 = Protestant
- 24 = Islamic (Moslem)
- 25 = Other Religion
- 26 = Multi-Religious Group
- 27 = Atheism/Agnosticism

Anti-Ethnicity/National Origin

- 31 = Arab
- 32 = Hispanic
- 33 = Other Ethnicity/Natl. Origin

Anti-Sexual

- 41 = Male Homosexual (Gay)
- 42 = Female Homosexual (Lesbian)
- 43 = Homosexual (Gay and Lesbian)
- 44 = Heterosexual
- 45 = Bisexual

Non-Specific

- 88 = None
- 99 = Unknown

SOURCE: Federal Bureau of Investigation, *National Incident-Based Reporting System: Volume 3: Approaches to Implementing an Incident-Based Reporting (IBR) System* (Washington, D.C.: FBI, July 1, 1992, p. 13).

9 Location Type - 2 characters (A): This data element is to be used to report the type of location/premises where each offense took place. Only one (1) location can be entered for each offense.

Allowed entries: (enter only one)

- 01 = Air/Bus/Train Terminal
- 02 = Bank/Savings and Loan (includes other financial institutions)
- 03 = Bar/Night Club
- 04 = Church/Synagogue/Temple (includes other religious buildings)
- 05 = Commercial/Office Building
- 06 = Construction Site
- 07 = Convenience Store
- 08 = Department/Discount Store
- 09 = Drug Store/Doctor's Office/Hospital (includes medical supply building)
- 10 = Field/Woods
- 11 = Government/Public Building
- 12 = Grocery/Supermarket
- 13 = Highway/Road/Alley (includes street)
- 14 = Hotel/Motel/Etc. (includes other temporary lodgings)
- 15 = Jail/Prison (includes penitentiary)
- 16 = Lake/Waterway
- 17 = Liquor Store
- 18 = Parking Lot/Garage
- 19 = Rental Storage Facility (includes "Mini-Storage" and "Self-Storage" buildings)
- 20 = Residence/Home (includes apartment, condominium, and nursing home)
- 21 = Restaurant (includes cafeteria)
- 22 = School/College (includes university)
- 23 = Service/Gas Station
- 24 = Specialty Store (includes fur store, jewelry store, TV store, dress shop, etc.)
- 25 = Other/Unknown

Example: An assault started in a bar ("03"), continued into an adjoining parking lot ("18"), and ended in the street ("13"). As the bar was the location where the offense was initiated and best describes the circumstances of the crime, "03" = Bar/Night Club should be entered.

10 Number of Premises Entered - 2 characters (A): This data element is to be used only if the crime is 220 Burglary/B&E and the "Hotel Rule" is applicable. In such cases, the number of structures (premises) entered is to be reported.

Data Elements and Data Values

In the Summary Reporting System, the Hotel Rule is applied to only temporary lodgings. It states: If a number of dwelling units under a single manager are burglarized and the offenses are most likely to be reported to the police by the manager rather than the individual tenants, the burglary should be scored as one offense.

In NIBRS, the Hotel Rule has been expanded to include rental storage facilities, i.e., "Mini-Storage" and "Self-Storage" buildings. Therefore, this data element is to be used if the offense is 220 Burglary/B&E and either "14" = Hotel/Motel/Etc. or "19" = Rental Storage Facility is entered into Data Element 9 (Location Type). The total number (up to 99) of individual rooms, units, suites, storage compartments, etc., entered is to be reported in this data element.

Example (1): A "Self-Storage" building was burglarized and 11 rented storage compartments were forcibly entered. The owner/manager of the building reported the incident to the police. The code "220" = Burglary/B&E should be entered into Data Element 6 (UCR Offense Code), the code "19" = Rental Storage Facility should be entered into Data Element 9 (Location Type), and the number "11" (for 11 compartments) should be entered into this data element.

Example (2): A private residence was burglarized. The code "220" = Burglary/B&E should be entered into Data Element 6 (UCR Offense Code) and "20" = Residence/Home should be entered into Data Element 9 (Location Type). However, because the "Location Type" was not "14" = Hotel/Motel/Etc. or "19" = Rental Storage Facility, no entry should be made into this data element. It should be blank.

11 Method of Entry - 1 character (A): This data element is to be used only if the offense is 220 Burglary/B&E. It is for reporting whether "Force" or "No Force" was used by the burglar(s) to enter the structure. A forced entry is where force of any degree, or a mechanical contrivance of any kind (including a passkey or skeleton key), was used to unlawfully enter a building or other structure. An unforced entry is one where the unlawful entry was achieved without force through an unlocked door or window. If both forced and unforced entries were involved in the crime, the entry should be reported as having been accomplished through "Force."

Allowed entries: (enter one if Burglary/B&E)

F = Force

N = No Force

Example: Investigation of a burglary complaint disclosed that the offender(s) entered the building through an unlocked street door and then forced a locked door to an office and stole a typewriter. Since one door was forced, "F" = Force should be entered.

Data Elements and Data Values

12 Type Criminal Activity - 1 character (A): This data element is to be used to provide additional information on the criminal activity of the offender(s) in incidents involving:

- 250 Counterfeiting/Forgery
- 280 Stolen Property Offenses
- 35A Drugs/Narcotics Violations
- 35B Drug Equipment Violations
- 39C Gambling Equipment Violations
- 370 Pornography/Obscene Material
- 520 Weapon Law Violations

Up to three (3) types of activity can be entered for each of the offenses listed above.

Allowed entries: (enter up to 3)

- B = Buying/Receiving
- C = Cultivating/Manufacturing/Publishing (i.e., production of any type)
- D = Distributing/Selling
- E = Exploiting Children
- O = Operating/Promoting/Assisting
- P = Possessing/Concealing
- T = Transporting/Transmitting/Importing
- U = Using/Consuming

Example: The offenders published and sold pornographic photographs of children. Because up to three types of activity can be entered, "C" = Cultivating/Manufacturing/Publishing, "D" = Distributing/Selling, and "E" = Exploiting Children should be entered.

13 Type Weapon/Force Involved - 3 characters (A): This data element is to be used to enter the type(s) of weapon(s) or force used by the offender(s) in committing the following offenses:

- 09A Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter
- 09B Negligent Homicide
- 09C Justifiable Homicide
- 100 Kidnaping/Abduction
- 11A Forcible Rape
- 11B Forcible Sodomy
- 11C Sexual Assault With An Object
- 11D Forcible Fondling
- 120 Robbery
- 13A Aggravated Assault
- 13B Simple Assault
- 210 Extortion/Blackmail
- 520 Weapon Law Violations

Data Elements and Data Values

Up to three (3) types of weapons/force can be entered for each of the offenses listed above.

If the weapon was an "automatic" firearm, an "A" is to be added as a suffix to its code, e.g., "13A" = Automatic Rifle. An "Automatic Firearm" is defined as any firearm which shoots, or is designed to shoot, more than one shot at a time by a single pull of the trigger without manual reloading.

Allowed entries: (enter up to 3)

- 11 = Firearm (type not stated)
- 12 = Handgun
- 13 = Rifle
- 14 = Shotgun
- 15 = Other Firearm
- 20 = Knife/Cutting Instrument (e.g., ax, ice pick, screwdriver, switchblade, etc.)
- 30 = Blunt Object (e.g., club, hammer, etc.)
- 35 = Motor Vehicle (when used as a weapon)
- 40 = Personal Weapons (i.e., hands, feet, teeth, etc.)
- 50 = Poison (includes gas)
- 60 = Explosives
- 65 = Fire/Incendiary Device
- 70 = Drugs/Narcotics/Sleeping Pills
- 90 = Other
- 95 = Unknown
- 99 = None

Example: Three robbers held up a bank. One was armed with a revolver, the second had a sawed-off shotgun, and the third had an automatic machine gun. The entries should be: "12" = Handgun; "14" = Shotgun; and "15A" = Automatic Other Firearm.

14 Type Property Loss/Etc. - 1 character (A): This data element is to be used to describe the type(s) of property loss, recovery, seizure, etc., which occurred in an incident. A separate "Property Segment" containing Data Elements 14 through 22 is to be submitted for each type of loss/etc., when the incident involved one or more of the following offenses:

- 100 Kidnaping/Abduction
- 120 Robbery
- 200 Arson
- 210 Extortion/Blackmail
- 220 Burglary/B&E
- 23A Pocket-Picking
- 23B Purse-Snatching

Data Elements and Data Values

23C Shoplifting
23D Theft From Building
23E Theft From Coin-Operated Machine or Device
23F Theft From Motor Vehicle
23G Theft of Motor Vehicle Parts or Accessories
23H All Other Larceny
240 Motor Vehicle Theft
250 Counterfeiting/Forgery
26A False Pretenses/Swindle/Confidence Game
26B Credit Card/Automatic Teller Machine Fraud
26C Impersonation
26D Welfare Fraud
26E Wire Fraud
270 Embezzlement
280 Stolen Property Offenses (Receiving, etc.)
290 Destruction/Damage/Vandalism of Property
35A Drug/Narcotic Violations
35B Drug Equipment Violations
39A Betting/Wagering
39B Operating/Promoting/Assisting Gambling
39C Gambling Equipment Violations
39D Sports Tampering
510 Bribery

The types of offenses in the incident (i.e., Arson, Bribery, Burglary/B&E, Counterfeiting/Forgery, Larceny/Theft, etc.) determine which type(s) of loss/etc. and data elements apply. See Volume 2: Data Submission Specifications, Section IV, "Mandatories," for designations of the types of property loss/etc. and data elements applicable to individual Group "A" Offenses.

Allowed entries: (enter one per Property Segment)

- 1 = None
- 2 = Burned (includes damage caused in fighting the fire)
- 3 = Counterfeited/Forged
- 4 = Destroyed/Damaged/Vandalized
- 5 = Recovered (to impound property which was previously stolen)
- 6 = Seized (to impound property which was not previously stolen)
- 7 = Stolen/Etc. (includes bribed, defrauded, embezzled, extorted, ransomed, robbed, etc.)
- 8 = Unknown

Example (1): For Arson, the entries might be "1" = None (an attempt with no property burned), "2" = Burned (property burned), or "8" = Unknown (not known whether property burned).

Data Elements and Data Values

Example (2): For Burglary, the entries might be "1" = None (an attempted burglary, or the structure was entered but no property was taken), "7" = Stolen/Etc. (property was taken), "5" = Recovered (stolen property was recovered), "8" = Unknown (it is not known whether property was taken).

Example (3): If the same incident involved both Arson and Burglary, the choices of property loss/etc. codes shown in Examples (1) and (2) would be applicable, depending on the circumstances.

15 Property Description - 2 characters (A): This data element is to be used to enter descriptions of the property which was burned, counterfeited, destroyed/damaged/vandalized, etc., as a result of the incident.

Up to ten (10) property descriptions can be entered for each Property Segment (i.e., each type of property loss/etc.) involved in the incident. If more than ten types of property are involved, the nine (9) most valuable specifically codable types of property are to be entered and the remaining types of property are to be combined and entered as "77" = Other.

Allowed entries: (enter up to 10 per Property Segment)

- 01 = Aircraft (airplanes, dirigibles, gliders, etc.)
- 02 = Alcohol (alcoholic beverages, e.g., beer, wine, liquor, etc.)
- 03 = Automobiles (sedans, coupes, station wagons, convertibles, taxicabs, and other similar motor vehicles which serve the primary purpose of transporting people)
- 04 = Bicycles (includes tandem bicycles, unicycles, and tricycles)
- 05 = Buses (motor vehicles which are specifically designed, but not necessarily used, to transport groups of people on a commercial basis)
- 06 = Clothes/Furs (wearing apparel for human use, including accessories such as belts, shoes, scarves, ties, etc.)
- 07 = Computer Hardware/Software (computers, computer peripherals [e.g., tape and disk drives, printers, etc.], and storage media [e.g., magnetic tapes, magnetic and optical disks, etc.])
- 08 = Consumable Goods (expendable items used by humans for nutrition, enjoyment, or hygiene, e.g., food, beverages, grooming products, cigarettes, gasoline, firewood, etc.)

Data Elements and Data Values

- 09 = Credit/Debit Cards (includes Automatic Teller Machine cards)
- 10 = Drugs/Narcotics
- 11 = Drug/Narcotic Equipment
- 12 = Farm Equipment (tractors, combines, etc.)
- 13 = Firearms (weapons that fire a shot by force of an explosion, i.e., handguns, rifles, shotguns, etc., but not "BB," pellet, or gas-powered guns)
- 14 = Gambling Equipment (gambling paraphernalia)
- 15 = Heavy Construction/Industrial Equipment (cranes, bulldozers, steamrollers, oil-drilling rigs, etc.)
- 16 = Household Goods (beds, chairs, desks, sofas, tables, refrigerators, stoves, washer/dryers, air conditioning and heating equipment, etc.)
- 17 = Jewelry/Precious Metals (bracelets, necklaces, rings, watches, etc., and gold, silver, platinum, etc.)
- 18 = Livestock (living farm-type animals, e.g., cattle, chickens, hogs, horses, sheep, etc., but not household pets, such as dogs and cats)
- 19 = Merchandise (items held for sale)
- 20 = Money (legal tender, i.e., coins and paper currency)
- 21 = Negotiable Instruments (any document, other than currency, which is payable without restriction, e.g., endorsed checks, endorsed money orders, and endorsed traveler's checks; "bearer" checks and bonds; etc.)
- 22 = Nonnegotiable Instruments (documents requiring further action to become negotiable, e.g., unendorsed checks, unendorsed money orders, etc.; food stamps; stocks and bonds; etc.)
- 23 = Office-type Equipment (typewriters, adding machines, calculators, cash registers, copying machines, etc.)
- 24 = Other Motor Vehicles (any other motor vehicles, e.g., motorcycles, motor scooters, trail bikes, mopeds, snowmobiles, golf carts, etc.)
- 25 = Purses/Handbags/Wallets
- 26 = Radios/TVs/VCRs (includes radios, televisions, videotape recorders, high fidelity and stereo equipment, compact disk players, etc.)
- 27 = Recordings-Audio/Visual (phonograph records, compact disks, tape recordings, cassettes, etc.)
- 28 = Recreational Vehicles (motor vehicles which are specifically designed, but not necessarily used, to transport people and also provide them temporary lodging for recreational purposes)
- 29 = Structures-Single Occupancy Dwellings (houses, townhouses, duplexes, mobile homes, or other private dwellings which are occupied by a single person, family, housemates, or other group)

Data Elements and Data Values

- 30 = Structures-Other Dwellings (any other residential dwellings not meeting the definition of "Single Occupancy Dwellings," e.g., apartments, tenements, flats, boarding houses, dormitories, as well as temporary living quarters, such as hotels, motels, inns, etc.)
- 31 = Structures-Other Commercial/Business (stores, office buildings, restaurants, etc.)
- 32 = Structures-Industrial/Manufacturing (factories, plants, assembly lines, etc.)
- 33 = Structures-Public/Community (colleges, hospitals, jails, libraries, meeting halls, passenger terminals, religious buildings, schools, sports arenas, etc.)
- 34 = Structures-Storage (barns, garages, storehouses, warehouses, etc.)
- 35 = Structures-Other (any other structures not fitting the other "Structures" descriptions, e.g., outbuildings, monuments, buildings under construction, etc.)
- 36 = Tools (hand tools and power tools)
- 37 = Trucks (motor vehicles which are specifically designed, but not necessarily used, to transport cargo on a commercial basis)
- 38 = Vehicle Parts/Accessories (motor vehicle batteries, engines, transmissions, heaters, hubcaps, tires, manufacturers' emblems, license plates, sideview mirrors, radios, antennas, tape decks, etc.)
- 39 = Watercraft (motorboats, sailboats, houseboats, etc.)
- 77 = Other (all other property not fitting the above specific descriptions, including intangibles)
- 88 = Pending Inventory (property description unknown until an inventory is conducted)
- 99 = (blank) (Special category to be used by the National UCR Program to compile statistics on certain designated types of property, e.g., "CB" radios, which are the object of theft fads)

Example (1): The following property was stolen as the result of a burglary: (1) a \$10,000 stamp collection; (2) jewelry worth \$5,000; (3) an \$1,800 personal computer; (4) clothes worth \$1,500; (5) silverware worth \$800; (6) a \$650 TV; (7) a \$450 VCR; (8) a \$400 microwave oven; (9) \$350 in cash; (10) a \$250 typewriter; (11) a \$150 shotgun; (12) a \$100 bicycle; (13) two credit cards (no value); and (14) ten blank personal checks (no value).

Data Elements and Data Values

Item (1), the stamp collection, was the most expensive property; however, because it does not fit into any of the specifically coded property descriptions, it should be included in "77" = Other. Items (2) through (12) then become the nine most valuable codable properties as follows: the jewelry and silverware should be entered as code "17"; the personal computer as "07"; the clothes as "06"; the TV and VCR as "26"; the microwave oven as "16"; the cash as "20"; the typewriter as "23"; the shotgun as "13"; and the bicycle as "04." Items (13) and (14), i.e., the two credit cards and ten blank bank checks, should be combined with Item (1), the stamp collection, and entered as "77."

Example (2): If a house was destroyed by arson and the homeowners are away on an overseas trip making it impossible to determine the property loss until they return, enter "88" = Pending Inventory. [Note: An updated Property Segment with entries describing the type(s) of burned property should be submitted when the results of the inventory are subsequently learned.]

16 Value of Property - 9 characters (A): This data element is to be used to enter the total dollar values of the property which was burned (includes damage caused in fighting the fire), counterfeited, destroyed/damaged/vandalized, recovered, seized, stolen, etc., as a result of the incident.

See the Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook, Page 49, "Valuation of Stolen Property," for instructions on how to determine the value of stolen property. The value should be reported in whole dollars. The value entered for each property description should be the total value of the property loss/etc. for all of the victims in the incident. If the value is unknown, enter one dollar (\$1.00) which means unknown, i.e., "1" = Unknown.

Up to ten (10) values can be entered to match the up to ten property descriptions which are associated with each Property Segment (i.e., each type of property loss/etc.) in the incident. If more than ten types of property are involved, the values of the nine (9) most valuable properties are to be entered; then, the total value of the remaining properties which were coded as "77 = Other" are to be entered.

If drugs or narcotics were seized in a drug case, no value is to be entered into this data element, but the estimated quantity of the drugs/narcotics is to be reported. Therefore, when the offense is 35A Drug/Narcotic Violations, "6" = Seized was entered into Data Element 14 (Type Property Loss/Etc.), and "10" = Drugs/Narcotics was entered into Data Element 15 (Property Description), no value is to be entered into this data element and Data Elements 20 (Suspected Drug Type), 21 (Estimated Drug Quantity), and 22 (Type Drug Measurement) are to be used instead.

Data Elements and Data Values

However, when drugs or narcotics are involved in other types of crime (e.g., they were stolen through burglary, robbery, theft, etc., or destroyed by arson) their value is to be entered into this data element, and Data Elements 20, 21, and 22 are to be left blank.

Example (1): Two victims had their bicycles stolen at the same time and place -- one was worth \$300 and the other \$150. "04" = Bicycles should be entered into Data Element 15 (Property Description) and their total value "450" (\$300 + \$150 = \$450) into Data Element 16 (Value of Property).

Example (2): In Example (1) given for Data Element 15, above, the values for each specifically coded property should be entered as follows: \$5,800 for code "17" (the jewelry and silverware); \$1,800 for code "07" (the personal computer); \$1,500 for code "06" (the clothes); \$1,100 for code "26" (the TV and VCR); \$400 for code "16" (the microwave oven); \$350 for code "20" (the cash); \$250 for code "23" (the typewriter); \$150 for code "13" (the shotgun); \$100 for code "04" (the bicycle); and \$10,000 for code "77" (the stamp collection, the two credit cards, and the ten blank checks).

Example (3): In Example (2) given for Data Element 15, above, since a determination of the property loss must await an inventory, "1" (\$1.00) = Unknown should be entered into Data Element 16 (Value of Property). [Note: An updated Property Segment with appropriate property loss values should be submitted after the results of the inventory are learned.]

17 Date Recovered - 8 characters (A): If previously stolen property is recovered, the Month, Day, and Year (MM/DD/YYYY) of its recovery is to be entered into this data element. Accordingly, this data element is to be used only if "5" = Recovered is entered into Data Element 14 (Type Property Loss/Etc.).

Up to ten (10) dates of recovery can be entered to match each of the up to ten property descriptions which are associated with each Property Segment (i.e., each type of property loss/etc.) in the incident. If there is more than one date of recovery for the same "Property Description," enter the earliest date. If the recovery date is unknown, enter the date of the report.

Example: On March 28, 1989, three (3) cars were stolen from a used car lot. One of the cars was recovered on July 1, 1989. On July 24, 1989, a second car was recovered. The date entered into this data element should be "07/01/1989."

Data Elements and Data Values

18 Number of Stolen Motor Vehicles - 2 characters (A): This data element indicates how many motor vehicles were stolen in the incident. Therefore, it is to be used only if the offense is 240 Motor Vehicle Theft, "7" = Stolen was entered into Data Element 14 (Type Property Loss/Etc.), and "03" = Automobiles, "05" = Buses, "24" = Other Motor Vehicles, "28" = Recreational Vehicles, or "37" = Trucks) was entered into Data Element 15 (Property Description). If the number is unknown, enter "00."

Example: In the example given for Data Element 17, above, the entry should be "03" because three cars were stolen.

19 Number of Recovered Motor Vehicles - 2 characters (A): This data element indicates how many motor vehicles were recovered in the incident. Therefore, it is to be used only if the offense is 240 Motor Vehicle Theft, "5" = Recovered was entered into Data Element 14 (Type Property Loss/Etc.), and "03" = Automobiles, "05" = Buses, "24" = Other Motor Vehicles, "28" = Recreational Vehicles, or "37" = Trucks) was entered into Data Element 15 (Property Description). If the number is unknown, enter "00."

Example: In the example given for Data Element 17, above, the entry should be "02" because two of the cars were recovered.

20 Suspected Drug Type - 1 character (A): This data element is to be used to identify the types of drugs or narcotics that were seized in a drug case. Therefore, it is used only if one of the offenses in the incident was 35A Drug/Narcotic Violations, "6" = Seized was entered into Data Element 14 (Type Property Loss/Etc.), and "10" = Drugs/Narcotics was entered into Data Element 15 (Property Description).

This data element is not to be used when drugs or narcotics were burned, stolen, etc., in connection with other offenses, such as Arson, Burglary/B&E, Larceny/Theft, etc.

Up to three (3) types of drugs/narcotics can be entered. If more than three are involved, the two most important (as determined by the reporting agency taking into account the quantity, value, and deadliness of the drugs/narcotics) are to be reported under their applicable drug types and the remaining drugs/narcotics are to be entered as a single "X" = Over 3 Drug Types entry.

Allowed entries: (enter up to 3)

- A = "Crack" Cocaine
- B = Cocaine (all forms except "Crack")
- C = Hashish
- D = Heroin

Data Elements and Data Values

E = Marijuana
F = Morphine
G = Opium
H = Other Narcotics: Codeine; Demerol; Dihydromorphenone
or Dilaudid; Hydrocodone or Percodan; Methadone; etc.
I = LSD
J = PCP
K = Other Hallucinogens: BMDA or "White Acid"; DMT; MDA;
MDMA; Mescaline or Peyote; Psilocybin; STP; etc.
L = Aphetamines/Methaphphetamines
M = Other Stimulants: Adipex, Fastine, and Ionamin
(Derivatives of Phentermine); Benzedrine; Didrex;
Methylphenidate or Ritalin; Phenmetrazine or
Preludin; Tenuate; etc.
N = Barbiturates
O = Other Depressants: Glutethimide or Doriden;
Methaqualone or Quaalude; Pentazocine or Talwin; etc.
P = Other Drugs: Antidepressants (Elavil, Triavil,
Tofranil, etc.); Aromatic Hydrocarbons;
Propoxyphene or Darvon; Tranquilizers
(Chlordiazepoxide or Librium, Diazepam or
Valium, etc.); etc.
U = Unknown Type Drug
X = Over 3 Drug Types

Example: In a drug case, the following drugs were seized:

(1) 1.5 kilograms of "Crack"; (2) 2.125 pounds of Marijuana; (3) 2.0 liquid ounces of Morphine; and (4) 500 Valium capsules. The "Crack" was entered as "A" and the Marijuana as "E." The Morphine and Valium were coded as a single "X" entry because more than three types of drugs were seized.

21 Estimated Drug Quantity - 12 characters (A): This data element is to be used to indicate the quantity of drugs or narcotics seized in a drug case. Therefore, it is used only if one of the offenses in the incident was 35A Drug/Narcotic Violations, "6" = Seized was entered into Data Element 14 (Type Property Loss/Etc.), and "10" = Drugs/Narcotics was entered into Data Element 15 (Property Description).

This data element is not to be used when drugs or narcotics were burned, stolen, etc., in connection with other offenses, such as Arson, Burglary/B&E, Larceny/Theft, etc.

Nine (9) characters are available to enter the number of whole pounds, ounces, grams, etc., and three (3) more characters are available to enter the decimal amount. A decimal point must be entered to separate the whole and decimal amounts.

Data Elements and Data Values

Up to three (3) entries can be made to match the up to three "20 Suspected Drug Type" entries. If more than three drugs or narcotics are involved, the quantities of the two most important (as determined by the reporting agency taking into account their quantity, value, and deadliness) are to be entered. Do not enter the quantity of the remaining drugs/narcotics which are coded as "X" = Over 3 Drug Types; leave this data element blank for them.

Example: In the example given for Data Element 20, above, the entries should be "1.5" for the "Crack" and "2.125" for the Marijuana. No "quantity" entries should be made for the Morphine or Valium.

22 Type Drug Measurement - 2 characters (A): This data element is to be used to indicate the type of measurement used in quantifying drugs or narcotics seized in a drug case. Therefore, it is used only if one of the offenses in an incident was 35A Drug/Narcotic Violations, "6" = Seized was entered into Data Element 14 (Type Property Loss/Etc.), and "10" = Drugs/Narcotics was entered into Data Element 15 (Property Description).

This data element is not to be used when drugs or narcotics were stolen, burned, etc., in connection with other offenses, such as Arson, Burglary/B&E, and Larceny/Theft.

Up to three (3) entries can be made to match the up to three "20 Suspected Drug Type" entries. If more than three are involved, enter the types of measurement of the two most important drugs or narcotics (as determined by the reporting agency taking into account their quantity, value, and deadliness). Do not enter the type of measurement for the remaining drugs or narcotics which are coded as "X" = Over 3 Drug Types; leave this data element blank for them.

Allowed entries: (enter up to 3)

WEIGHT	CAPACITY	UNITS
GM = <u>Gram</u>	ML = <u>Milliliter</u>	DU = <u>Dosage Units/Items*</u>
KG = <u>Kilogram</u>	LT = <u>Liter</u>	NP = <u>Number of Plants**</u>
OZ = <u>Ounce</u>	FO = <u>Fluid Ounce</u>	
LB = <u>Pound</u>	GL = <u>Gallon</u>	

*Number of capsules, pills, tablets, etc.

**E.g., Marijuana plants (bushes), etc.

Example: In the example given for Data Element 20, the entries should be "KG" for the "Crack" and "LB" for the Marijuana. No entries should be made for the Morphine or Valium.

Data Elements and Data Values

23 Victim (Sequence) Number - 3 characters (A): Each victim in an incident is to be assigned a sequence number from "001" to "999." A separate "Victim Segment" containing Data Elements 23 through 35 is to be submitted for each numbered victim.

Example: If there were three (3) victims in the incident, three Victim Segments should be submitted -- one with Victim Sequence Number "001," another with "002," and the last with "003."

24 Victim Connected to UCR Offense Code(s) - 3 characters (A): This data element is to be used to link each victim to the up to ten (10) most serious (as determined by the reporting agency) Group "A" Offenses which were perpetrated against him/her during the incident.

Example: Two victims, Victim-001 and Victim-002, were robbed and Victim-001 was also raped. In the Victim Segment for Victim-001, both "120" (Robbery) and "11A" (Forcible Rape) should be entered. In the Victim Segment for Victim-002, only "120" should be entered.

25 Type of Victim - 1 character (A): The type of victim is to be entered into this data element. Only one code is to be entered for each victim.

Allowed entries: (enter only one)

- I = Individual
- B = Business
- F = Financial Institution
- G = Government
- R = Religious Organization
- S = Society/Public
- O = Other
- U = Unknown

Example: During a bank robbery, the offender pointed a gun at a teller and demanded and received money. The robber also pistol whipped a customer who stood in his way as he made his getaway from the bank. There were three (3) victims, i.e., the bank ("F" = Financial Institution), the teller ("I" = Individual), and the pistol-whipped customer ("I" = Individual). Therefore, their codes should be entered into their respective Victim Segments.

26 Age (of Victim) - 4 characters (A): If the victim was a person (i.e., "I" = Individual) was entered into "25 Type of Victim"), his/her age is to be entered into this data element either as an exact age, a range of days or years, or as unknown.

Data Elements and Data Values

Allowed entries: (enter only one)

NN = Under 24 hours (neonate)

NB = 1-6 Days Old

BB = 7-364 Days Old

01 to 98 = Years Old (exact age in years)

99 = Over 98 Years Old

00 = Unknown

Any combination of " " to " " years

Example: If the victim was a person 18 years old, enter "18."

27 Sex (of Victim) - 1 character (A): If the victim was a person (i.e., "I" = Individual was entered into "25 Type of Victim"), his/her sex is to be indicated in this data element.

Allowed entries: (enter only one)

M = Male

F = Female

U = Unknown

Example: If the victim was a male, enter "M" = Male.

28 Race (of Victim) - 1 character (A): If the victim was a person (i.e., "I" = Individual was entered into "25 Type of Victim"), his/her race is to be indicated in this data element.

Allowed entries: (enter only one)

W = White

B = Black

I = American Indian/Alaskan Native

A = Asian/Pacific Islander

U = Unknown

Example: If the victim was a white person, enter "W" = White.

29 Ethnicity (of Victim) - 1 Character (A): If the victim was a person (i.e., "I" = Individual was entered into "25 Type of Victim"), his/her ethnic origin is entered into this data element.

Allowed entries: (enter only one)

H = Hispanic Origin

N = Not of Hispanic Origin

U = Unknown

Data Elements and Data Values

Example: If the victim was not of Hispanic origin, enter "N" = Not of Hispanic Origin.

30 Resident Status (of Victim) - 1 character (A): If the victim was a person (i.e., "I" = Individual was entered into "25 Type of Victim"), whether he/she was a resident or nonresident is to be entered into this data element.

A "Resident" is a person who maintains his/her permanent home for legal purposes in the locality (i.e., town, city, or community) where the crime took place. [Note: State and county law enforcement agencies should base their determinations of residency on the town, city, or community where the crime occurred rather than their broader geographical jurisdictions.]

Allowed entries: (enter only one)

R = Resident

N = Nonresident

U = Unknown

Example (1): If the victim was robbed in San Diego, California, where he resides, enter "R" = Resident.

Example (2): If the victim was a business (i.e., "B" = Business was entered into "25 Type of Victim"), this data element should be left blank.

31 Aggravated Assault/Homicide Circumstances - 2 characters (A): This data element is used to describe the circumstances of either an aggravated assault or a homicide. Therefore, it is to be used only with 13A Aggravated Assault and 09A-09C Homicide Offenses.

Allowed entries:

For: 13A Aggravated Assault (enter up to 2)

09A Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter (enter up to 2)

01 = Argument

02 = Assault on Law Enforcement Officer(s)

03 = Drug Dealing

04 = Gangland

05 = Juvenile Gang

06 = Lovers' Quarrel

07 = Mercy Killing (Not applicable to Aggravated Assault)

08 = Other Felony Involved

09 = Other Circumstances

10 = Unknown Circumstances

Data Elements and Data Values

For: 09B Negligent Manslaughter (enter only one)

- 30 = Child Playing With Weapon
- 31 = Gun-Cleaning Accident
- 32 = Hunting Accident
- 33 = Other Negligent Weapon Handling
- 34 = Other Negligent Killings

For: 09C Justifiable Homicide (enter only one)

- 20 = Criminal Killed by Private Citizen
- 21 = Criminal Killed by Police Officer

Example (1): Two rival juvenile street gangs rumble over "turf" rights to sell drugs and one of the gang members is killed. Possible entries are "01" = Argument, "03" = Drug Dealing, and "05" = Juvenile Gang. While all three would apply, there is a limit of two entries. Therefore, the two most descriptive codes (as determined by the reporting agency) should be used. In this case, the reporting agency entered "03" and "05."

Example (2): In resisting arrest, a fugitive pulled a gun and fired two times in the direction of two police officers who were attempting to take him into custody. Neither officer was hit but both drew their weapons and returned the fire, killing the fugitive. As this was a Justifiable Homicide, "21" = Criminal Killed by Police Officer should be entered.

32 Additional Justifiable Homicide Circumstances - 1 character
(A): This data element is to be used to further describe the circumstances of a justifiable homicide. Therefore, it is used only for 09C Justifiable Homicide (i.e., when either "20" = Criminal Killed by Private Citizen or "21" = Criminal Killed by Police Officer was entered into Data Element 31). Only one code can be entered.

Allowed entries: (enter only one)

- A = Criminal Attacked Police Officer and That Officer Killed Criminal
- B = Criminal Attacked Police Officer and Criminal Killed by Another Police Officer
- C = Criminal Attacked a Civilian
- D = Criminal Attempted Flight From a Crime
- E = Criminal Killed in Commission of a Crime
- F = Criminal Resisted Arrest
- G = Unable to Determine/Not Enough Information

Data Elements and Data Values

Example: Assuming the same facts as in Example (2) for Data Element 31, the possible entries are: "A" = Criminal Attacked Police Officer and That Officer Killed Criminal; "B" = Criminal Attacked Police Officer and Criminal Killed by Another Police Officer; and "F" = Criminal Resisted Arrest. As only one code can be entered, the most descriptive code (as determined by the reporting agency) should be used. In this case, the reporting agency entered "A."

33 Type Injury - 1 character (A): This data element is to be used to describe the type(s) of bodily injury suffered by a person (i.e., "I" = Individual was entered into "25 Type of Victim") who was the victim of one or more of the following offenses:

- 100 Kidnapping/Abduction
- 11A Forcible Rape
- 11B Forcible Sodomy
- 11C Sexual Assault With An Object
- 11D Forcible Fondling
- 120 Robbery
- 13A Aggravated Assault
- 13B Simple Assault
- 210 Extortion/Blackmail

Up to five (5) entries can be made for each victim.

Allowed entries: (enter up to 5)

- N = None
- B = Apparent Broken Bones
- I = Possible Internal Injury
- L = Severe Laceration
- M = Apparent Minor Injury
- O = Other Major Injury
- T = Loss of Teeth
- U = Unconsciousness

Example (1): The offender assaulted the victim with a tire iron, breaking the victim's arm and opening up a cut about three inches long and one inch deep on his back. The entries should be "B" = Apparent Broken Bones and "L" = Severe Laceration.

Example (2): The victim, a respected religious figure, is blackmailed regarding his sexual activities. As he suffered no physical injury, the entry should be "N" = None.

Data Elements and Data Values

34 Offender Number(s) to be Related - 2 characters (A):
This data element is to be used, along with Data Element 35 (Relationships of Victim to Offenders), to report the relationships of the victim to offenders who have perpetrated a "Crime Against Person" or a Robbery against the victim. Therefore, this data element is to be used only if one or more of the following UCR Offense Codes was entered into Data Element 24 (Victim Connected to UCR Offense Codes):

- 09A Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter
- 09B Negligent Homicide
- 09C Justifiable Homicide
- 100 Kidnaping/Abduction
- 11A Forcible Rape
- 11B Forcible Sodomy
- 11C Sexual Assault With An Object
- 11D Forcible Fondling
- 120 Robbery
- 13A Aggravated Assault
- 13B Simple Assault
- 13C Intimidation
- 36A Incest
- 36B Statutory Rape

Enter the Offender Sequence Numbers (Data Element 36) of the up to ten (10) offenders for whom victim-to-offender relationships are going to be reported in Data Element 35.

Example: If Victim-001's relationship to Offender-04 is to be reported, enter "04."

35 Relationship(s) of Victim to Offender(s) - 2 characters (A): This data element is to be used, along with Data Element 34 (Offender Numbers to be Related), to report the relationship of the victim to offenders who have perpetrated a "Crime Against Person" or a Robbery against the victim. Therefore, this data element is to be used only if one or more of the following UCR Offense Codes was entered into Data Element 24 (Victim Connected to UCR Offense Codes):

- 09A Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter
- 09B Negligent Homicide
- 09C Justifiable Homicide
- 100 Kidnaping/Abduction
- 11A Forcible Rape
- 11B Forcible Sodomy
- 11C Sexual Assault With An Object
- 11D Forcible Fondling

Data Elements and Data Values

120 Robbery
13A Aggravated Assault
13B Simple Assault
13C Intimidation
36A Incest
36B Statutory Rape

This data element is to be used to indicate the victim's relationship with up to ten (10) offenders involved in the incident.

Allowed entries: (enter up to 10)

WITHIN FAMILY:

SE = Victim Was Spouse
CS = Victim Was Common-Law Spouse
PA = Victim Was Parent
SB = Victim Was Sibling (brother or sister)
CH = Victim Was Child
GP = Victim Was Grandparent
GC = Victim Was Grandchild
IL = Victim Was In-law
SP = Victim Was Stepparent
SC = Victim Was Stepchild
SS = Victim Was Stepsibling (stepbrother or stepsister)
OF = Victim Was Other Family Member

OUTSIDE FAMILY BUT KNOWN TO VICTIM:

AQ = Victim was Acquaintance
FR = Victim was Friend
NE = Victim was Neighbor
BE = Victim was Babysittee (the baby)
BG = Victim was Boyfriend/Girlfriend
CF = Victim was Child of Boyfriend or Girlfriend
HR = Homosexual Relationship
XS = Victim was Ex-Spouse
EE = Victim was Employee
ER = Victim was Employer
OK = Victim was Otherwise Known

NOT KNOWN BY VICTIM:

RU = Relationship Unknown
ST = Victim was Stranger

Example (1): An employee assaulted his employer (a person) with his fists. "ER" = Victim Was Employer should be entered.

Data Elements and Data Values

Example (2): Two unknown subjects rob a male and female couple. "ST" = Victim Was Stranger should be entered to indicate the relationship of each victim to each offender.

36 Offender (Sequence) Number - 2 characters (A): Each offender in the incident is to be assigned a sequence number from "01" to "99." A separate "Offender Segment" containing Data Elements 36 through 39 is to be submitted for each numbered offender. If nothing is known about the offender(s), enter "00" into this data element and leave Data Elements 37 through 39 blank.

Example (1): A corpse with five bullet holes in it was found in an abandoned warehouse. There were no witnesses to the crime or suspects. A single Offender Segment should be submitted with "00" entered into Data Element 36 (Offender Sequence Number) and with no entries in Data Elements 37 through 39.

Example (2): Two offenders were seen fleeing the scene of a burglary, but because they were wearing ski masks, their age, sex and race could not be determined. Two Offender Segments should be submitted -- one with Offender Sequence Number "01" and the other with "02." Applicable "unknown" codes should be entered into Data Elements 37, 38, and 39.

37 Age (of Offender) - 4 characters (A): The age of the offender is to be entered either as an exact number of years, a range of years, or as unknown.

Allowed entries: (enter only one)

01 to 98 = Years Old (enter exact age in years)

99 = Over 98 Years Old

00 = Unknown

Any combination of "—" to "—" years

Example: If the victim or a witness reported the offender's age as between 25 and 30 years old, "2530" (i.e., 25 to 30 years old) should be entered.

38 Sex (of Offender) - 1 character (A): The sex of the offender is to be indicated in this data element.

Allowed entries: (enter only one)

M = Male

F = Female

U = Unknown

Data Elements and Data Values

Example: The witness caught only a fleeting glance of the offender and, therefore, was unable to report the offender's sex. The entry should be "U" = Unknown.

39 Race (of Offender) - 1 character (A): The race of the offender is to be indicated in this data element.

Allowed entries: (enter only one)

W = White

B = Black

I = American Indian/Alaskan Native

A = Asian/Pacific Islander

U = Unknown

Example: If the offender was oriental, the entry should be "A" = Asian/Pacific Islander.

40 Arrestee (Sequence) Number - 2 characters (A&B): Each arrestee reported in a Group "A" Incident Report or Group "B" Arrest Report is to be assigned a sequence number from "01" to "99." In Group "A" Incident Reports, a separate "Arrestee Segment" containing Data Elements 40 through 52 is to be submitted for each numbered arrestee. A separate Group "B" Arrest Report is to be submitted for each person arrested for a Group "B" Offense.

Example: If two persons were arrested in connection with a previously submitted Group "A" Incident Report, two Arrestee Segments should be submitted -- one with Arrestee Sequence Number "01" and the other with "02."

41 Arrest (Transaction) Number - 12 characters (A&B): This is the number assigned by your agency to an arrest report to identify it uniquely. It may be the "Incident Number" of the previously reported incident relating to the arrest or a separate arrest transaction number.

If and when data about the arrest is furnished to an authorized entity for research purposes, the Arrest (Transaction) Number will be encrypted by the FBI prior to its dissemination to ensure that the recipient cannot identify the actual case. State and local agencies may also encrypt their Arrest (Transaction) Numbers before submitting them to the FBI.

Data Elements and Data Values

42 Arrest Date - 8 characters (A&B): This data element is to be used to enter the Month, Day, and Year (MM/DD/YYYY) when the arrest took place.

Example: If the subject was arrested on July 23, 1989, the entry should be "07/23/1989."

43 Type of Arrest - 1 character (A&B): This data element is to be used to indicate the type of apprehension.

Allowed entries: (enter only one)

O = On-View Arrest (taken into custody without a warrant or previous incident report)

S = Summoned/Cited (not taken into custody)

T = Taken Into Custody (based on warrant and/or previously submitted incident report)

Example (1): The subject was arrested without a warrant while in the act of soliciting for prostitution on a street corner. The entry should be "O" = On-View Arrest.

Example (2): The subject was served with a subpoena summoning him to appear in court. The entry should be "S" = Summoned/Cited.

Example (3): The subject was taken into custody as the result of a complaint being filed, an investigation being conducted, and a warrant being issued. The entry should be "T" = Taken Into Custody.

44 Multiple Clearance Indicator - 1 character (A): This data element is to be used to indicate whether or not the apprehension of the arrestee resulted in the clearance of more than one previously reported incident within the jurisdiction served by the reporting agency. If so, it is important to indicate that there was only one arrestee responsible for the multiple clearances.

This is done by entering "M" = Multiple into all but one of the Arrestee Segments used to update the affected Group "A" Incident Reports, and by entering "C" = Count Arrestee into the remaining Arrestee Segment. If the arrest did not result in multiple clearances, enter "N" = Not Applicable.

Allowed entries: (enter one per Arrestee Segment)

M = Multiple

C = Count Arrestee

N = Not Applicable

Data Elements and Data Values

Example (1): After the subject's apprehension for robbery, it was learned that he was also responsible for five additional robberies within the jurisdiction. One Arrestee Segment was keyed into the local computer, along with the Incident Numbers of the six incidents. The local computer then generated six Arrestee Segments which were duplicates except for their Incident Numbers. Five (5) of the Arrestee Segments had "M" = Multiple and one (1) had "C" = Count Arrestee entered into Data Element 44.

Example (2): If the subject's arrest did not clear additional incidents, the entry should be "N" = Not Applicable.

45 UCR Arrest Offense Code - 3 characters (A&B): The three-digit UCR Offense Code of the offense for which the arrestee was apprehended is to be entered into this data element. There are 57 possible code entries as the subject may have been arrested for any of the 46 Group "A" Offenses or any of the 11 Group "B" crime categories. If the arrestee was apprehended for more than one offense, the reporting agency is to determine which was the most serious offense and enter it as the arrest offense.

Example: If Arrestee-01 was arrested for both robbery and murder, the entry should be "09A" (Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter).

46 Arrestee Was Armed With - 3 characters (A&B): This data element is to be used to indicate whether the arrestee was armed with a commonly known weapon at the time of his/her apprehension. Up to two (2) entries can be made.

If the weapon was an "automatic" firearm, an "A" is to be added as a suffix to its code, e.g., "13A" = Rifle Automatic. An "Automatic Firearm" is defined as any firearm which shoots, or is designed to shoot, more than one shot at a time by a single pull of the trigger without manual reloading.

Allowed entries: (enter up to 2)

- 01 = Unarmed
- 11 = Firearm (type not stated)
- 12 = Handgun
- 13 = Rifle
- 14 = Shotgun
- 15 = Other Firearm
- 16 = Lethal Cutting Instrument (e.g., switchblade knife, martial arts "stars," etc.)
- 17 = Club/Blackjack/Brass Knuckles

Data Elements and Data Values

Example (1): When the subject was arrested, he had in his possession a .357 Magnum handgun and a penknife. The entry should be "12" = Handgun. Because a small pocket knife is not generally considered to be a "weapon," it does not qualify for reporting.

Example (2): The subject resisted arrest using a liquor bottle and a chair as weapons before being subdued. The entry should be "01" = Unarmed. Although the subject used items as weapons, they were not commonly known weapons.

47 Age (of Arrestee) - 4 characters (A&B): The age of the arrestee is to be entered either as an exact number of years, a range of years, or as unknown.

Allowed entries: (enter only one)

01 to 98 = Years Old

99 = Over 98 Years Old

00 = Unknown

Any combination of "__" to "__" years

Example: The arrestee refused to give his date of birth, but he appeared to be 35 to 40 years old. Possible entries would be "00" = Unknown or "3540" (i.e., 35 to 40 years old). The reporting agency in this case entered the latter.

48 Sex (of Arrestee) - 1 character (A&B): The sex of the arrestee is to be indicated in this data element.

Allowed entries: (enter only one)

M = Male

F = Female

Example: If the arrestee was a female, the entry should be "F" = Female.

49 Race (of Arrestee) - 1 character (A&B): The race of the arrestee is to be indicated in this data element.

Allowed entries: (enter only one)

W = White

B = Black

I = American Indian/Alaskan Native

A = Asian/Pacific Islander

U = Unknown

Data Elements and Data Values

Example: If the arrestee was a white person, the entry should be "W" = White.

50 Ethnicity (of Arrestee) - 1 Character (A&B): The ethnic origin of the arrestee is to be entered into this data element.

Allowed entries: (enter only one)

H = Hispanic Origin
N = Not of Hispanic Origin
U = Unknown

Example: If the arrestee was Hispanic, the entry should be "H" = Hispanic Origin.

51 Resident Status (of Arrestee) - 1 character (A&B): Whether the arrestee was a resident or nonresident is to be entered into this data element.

A "Resident" is a person who maintains his/her permanent home for legal purposes in the locality (i.e., town, city, or community) where the crime took place. [Note: State and county law enforcement agencies should base their determinations of residency on the town, city, or community where the crime occurred rather than their broader geographical jurisdictions.]

Allowed entries: (enter only one)

R = Resident
N = Nonresident
U = Unknown

Example (1): The crime occurred in Phoenix, Arizona, and the arrestee maintained his legal residence in that city. The entry would be "R" = Resident.

Example (2): The crime occurred in Washington, D.C., but the arrestee maintained his legal residence in Alexandria, Virginia. The entry would be "N" = Nonresident.

52 Disposition of Arrestee Under 18 - 1 character (A&B): This data element is to be used only if the arrestee was 17 years of age or younger at the time of the arrest.

Data Elements and Data Values

Allowed entries: (enter only one)

H = Handled Within Department (e.g., released to parents,
released with warning, etc.)

R = Referred to Other Authorities (e.g., turned over to
juvenile court, probation department, welfare
agency, other police agency, criminal or adult
court, etc.)

Example (1): The arrestee, age 13, who was arrested for
vandalizing a school, was released to his parents with a warning.
The entry would be "H" = Handled Within Department.

Example (2): The arrestee, age 17, who was arrested for
murder, was turned over to the Adult Court to be tried as an adult.
The entry would be "R" = Referred to Other Authorities.