Victims and Offenders: A New UCR Supplement To Present
Incident-Based Data from Participating Agencies

Roland Chilton
University of Massachusetts at Amherst

Victoria Major and Sharon Propheter
Federal Bureau of Investigation

Abstract

This paper describes work done in the development of a new supplement to *Crime in the United States*. In it we present data for five cities as an illustration of the reporting possibilities of the new incident-based Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program. The new supplement will be called *Victims and Offenders: Incident-Based Uniform Crime Reports* and will fill an information gap produced by the conversion from the UCR summary statistics system to an incident-based UCR system. We present data for five cities in a new format to underscore the utility of the information produced by the incident-based approach. We examine some of the difficulties related to the conversion to the new approach, including counting rules, table titles, and the possibilities for confusion among recipients of the information. We discuss the importance of the new approach for the police, the general public, and criminologists. We conclude that, even without the participation of large city departments, the incident-based approach will provide a much better picture of the characteristics of victims and offenders in a variety of cities and towns. As more large cities make the conversion, the country will have a clearer national indication of the characteristics of victims and offenders and the relationships among them.

Victims and Offenders: A New UCR Supplement to Present
Incident-Based Data from Participating Agencies

Introduction

With the change to a new Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) system, a supplement to *Crime in the United States*, one presenting the FBI's new incident-based UCR data, is being developed. Eventually, a publication with the traditional title but presenting only incident-based data will replace the current volume. In the interim, however, there is a need for a small supplement containing some of the expanded UCR data for law enforcement agencies that have made the conversion to the incident-based system.

Although many police agencies are now experimenting with the new approach to crime reporting and analysis, complete conversion to the incident-based approach is years away. A supplement will recognize the contributions to the development of the new system being made by participating departments. These agencies are currently providing important and useful data that are not readily available because of conversion of the incident data to comparable summary statistics for publication. Preparing the incident-based data for publication in the new supplement will require dealing with the complexities of the incident-based data now, easing the development of the incident-based version of *Crime in the United States* later.

In general, the new supplement will fill an information gap until full implementation. It will address the needs of incident-based agencies that now see their detailed reports converted to the less detailed summary form and some who have no internal ability to see their data in any form. Perhaps most importantly, it will help clarify some of the mystery that surrounds the new incident-based system for most people in the United States, even criminologists. It will demonstrate some of the basic utility and potential of incident-based crime data.

The proposed new publication

For all of these reasons, we have worked with existing incident-based data to develop a proposed UCR supplement called *Victims and Offenders: Incident-Based Uniform Crime Reports*. Before presenting tables for five different agencies to illustrate the kind of publication we have in mind, some definition is necessary. In addition, we will justify our focus on victims and offenders.

An incident in the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS)[1] is defined as one or more offenses committed by the same offender or group of offenders acting in concert, at the same time and place.[2] An offense is generally some form of assault, theft, or crime against society. However, counting offenses in the new system is more complicated than it is in the summary statistics Program because NIBRS collects information about incidents[3], offenses[4], victims[5], offenders[6], the property involved[7], and arrests[8]. Counting is further complicated by the possibility of multiple offenses, multiple victims, multiple offenders, and multiple arrests within an incident.

For counting purposes, each crime against society is considered one offense. Each stolen vehicle can be counted as one offense. Each victim of a crime against a person represents one offense. Each distinct operation in a crime against property, other than a vehicle theft, is one offense. Beyond that, counting offenses is complicated by specific counting rules for some types of crimes. In general, however, most crimes against persons can be thought of as offenses while most crimes against property and society can be viewed as incidents.

We suggest that counting victims and offenders is as useful as counting offenses and incidents. Although some of the victim counts are offense counts, knowing how many people are victimized by larceny and burglary is often more relevant than knowing how many distinct larceny and burglary operations occurred or in how many incidents a burglary or larceny occurred. Presenting victim counts also makes possible the creation of victimization rates by age, sex, and race.

The offender counts, likewise, allow the creation of offender rates for offenses or types of offenses by age, sex, and race. In addition, year-to-year changes in the number of victims and offenders involved in specific types of offenses are equally as informative as year-to-year changes in the number of incidents or the number of offenses occurring in a given community.

Because we focus on victims and offenders, our discussion of the six NIBRS segments starts with the victim and offender segments. There can be up to 999 victim records in an incident. For each victim there may be as many as 10 offense codes and information on the age, sex, and race of each victim. There may be information on ethnicity, residential status, the relationship of the victim to an offender, and other information on the circumstances of the victimization.

The offender records do not carry the offense information found in the victim records. These data must be obtained from the associated victim records. There may be up to 99 offender records in an incident. These records have information on the age, sex, and race of each offender involved whether or not there has been an arrest. Each offender is considered to have committed all the offenses in the incident.

Examples showing victim information

Tables 1, 2, and 3 present victim information for five cities: Boise, Idaho; Des Moines, Iowa; Worcester, Massachusetts; Grand Forks, North Dakota; and Greenville, South Carolina. In Table 1, counts by sex are shown for each agency. In Table 2, counts by race are shown. In Table 3, the counts are shown for juveniles and adults. No attempt has been made to present counts for the 46 crimes that can be reported in the Program. Instead, each table shows the city's population and counts of victims of some assaults and some thefts. There are no victim counts for crimes against society (drug offenses, gambling, prostitution, pornography, and weapon law violations) because the victim is always society.[9]

Examples showing offender information

       Tables 4, 5, and 6 present offender data for the same cities. In these tables, the counts are also presented by age, sex, and race. The offense categories are the same as those in the victim tables except that information on the characteristics of offenders involved in crimes against society are available.

Some problems encountered in the presentation of the data

       The titles we have given our tables need some clarification. As the first note to the tables indicates, the phrase "known to the police" refers to victims or offenders reported to the police or discovered by the police. The column totals also need additional explanation. The Murder column presents murder counts and counts of nonnegligent manslaughter. The Sexual Assault column presents the combined count of Forcible Rape, Sodomy, Sexual Assault with an Object, and Forcible Fondling victimizations. The Robbery column is shown as theft but involves an assault or a threat of assault as a way of taking property. Larcenies and Motor Vehicle Thefts are combined in the column called Larceny. Burglary includes Breaking and Entering. Drug Offenses include Narcotic Drug Law Violations and Drug Equipment Violations. Other Crimes against Society include Prostitution, Gambling, Weapons Law Violations, Pornography, and Obscene Materials offenses. In this way, the numbers presented in these tables are not limited to eight offenses. Together they represent reports of 20 different offenses.

       We have presented no column or row totals in these tables because the row totals at least would be misleading. Since an individual may be the victim of more than one offense in a single incident, he or she might be counted in more than one column. In the same way, an offender may have been reported as having committed more than one offense in an incident. Summing along the rows would produce a misleading number of victims or offenders, although the total would reflect the total number of victimizations. In most cases, adding down the columns would not inflate the number of victims or offenders because the number of people who are victims of the same offense within the year or are reported as offenders for the same offense within the year is probably small. Again, adding down to create the total number of victimizations would not mislead.

       There are at least two other possibilities for confusion in the presentation of victim and offender counts for the incident-based UCR data. The traditional UCR summary statistics Program refers to offenses known to the police, while the tables we propose talk about victims and offenders. Nevertheless, the results for both approaches are very similar. For example, the number of murder victims shown in Table 1 suggests there were 19 murders in Des Moines in 1995. This is the number of murders shown for Des Moines in the 1995 edition of *Crime in the United States*.

       There is no offense set in the traditional UCR Program that is comparable to the column called Sexual Assaults. Some confusion could be avoided in the new publication if the report would make it clear that the number of sexual assault victims shown for a city cannot be

compared to the number of rape offenses shown in the summary UCR tables. The Sexual Assault column includes reports of victimizations of both males and females of Forcible Sodomy, Sexual Assault with an Object, and Forcible Fondling in addition to Forcible Rape. However, when the number of rape victimizations is compared with the number of rape offenses in the traditional UCR Program, the counts are very close. In Boise, 53 rape offenses were known to the police. The incident-based victim count shows 55 rape victimizations.

In the summary statistics Program, a rape count will be lost if the victim is murdered. This is the effect of a counting rule requiring that when two offenses are committed in the same criminal event only the most serious offense is counted. The incident-based UCR Program does not have this hierarchy rule. All offenses against all victims are counted.

The hierarchy rule accounts for the small differences between the published summary reports of aggravated assaults and the number of victims of aggravated assault shown in Table 1. Both aggravated assault counts are identical for Grand Forks and differ by only one offense for Des Moines and by only two offenses for Boise. In Worcester, the victimization counts are 27 offenses higher in the incident-based Program than in the summary Program. In Greenville, this number is 28. These differences can occur because of multiple-offense or multiple-victim incidents. For example, if an incident in the summary Program involves two victims, one raped and one robbed, only the rape is counted, while in the incident-based Program both victimizations are counted.

Table 1 shows robbery as a theft offense because property may be taken from the victim. However, since force or the threat of force is used to obtain or try to obtain the property, robbery might just as logically be treated as an assault. Only rape and murder are considered more serious than robbery in the hierarchy listing of offenses. Therefore, incidents with some combination of murder, rape, and robbery will show more victimizations in the incident-based Program than they will show offenses in the summary statistics Program. Table 1 shows 80 robbery victimizations for Boise. Table 8 in *Crime in the United States* for 1995 shows 76 robbery offenses for Boise. If robberies where the victim is an organization such as a bank or business are included in the count of victims, the incident-based tables show 107 robbery victimizations for Boise—31 more than the summary UCR program shows.

It may be this feature of the incident-based approach—counting all offenses against all victims—that worries some police administrators. In a shift from the traditional summary UCR Program to an incident-based program, the number of victimizations might be larger than the number of offenses. However, as shown above, the numbers used to report murder, aggravated assault, and robbery victims are not much larger than the numbers used to report the same offenses in the traditional program. The situation for Burglary, Larceny, and Motor Vehicle Theft is more complicated, but the differences are not much larger.

For example, Table 1 shows 2,035 victims of burglary for Worcester for 1995, 1,036 men and 999 women. What it does not show are burglaries where the victim is not an individual but a company or organization. When these victimizations are added, there were 2,586 burglary victimizations known to the Worcester police in 1995. In comparison, the summary UCR report for burglaries for Worcester for the same year was 2,523 burglary offenses known to the police. This indicates that counting all offenses for all victims increases the offense count by 66—less than 3 percent. The third line in Table 1 could be changed to "Unknown/Not applicable." It could then show the counts for commercial and organizational victimizations, as well as those victimizations where the sex of the victim is not reported. While a higher victimization total would result, it would not be much larger than the currently published number of offenses known to the police. Moreover, the new tables would provide much more information than the tables in the summary statistics approach.

Advantages of a supplement to *Crime in the United States*

The most obvious advantage for participating police agencies of a supplement containing incident-based data would be that such agencies would be recognized as organizations with improved records management systems and as organizations helping to improve the quality of data available to assess the volume and nature of crime in our Nation. In addition, participating agencies would be able to compare their reports with those submitted by agencies in other states and regions of the country, allowing more in-depth evaluation of common problems than has been possible in the past. In some cases, they might discover aspects of their reports that needed improvement.

A major problem for the new incident-based UCR Program is the lack of participation of many large police departments. This situation may improve as some large departments convert NIBRS-like incident-based systems to the FBI's incident-based UCR system. Moreover, some state laws have mandated participation, and others may provide the financial support that large agencies need to make the change. A new publication might help the process along by showing that, in most cases, adopting the new approach will not increase crime rates by large amounts and that most changes in the statistics are explained by the different methodologies of the two systems. The new publication could also help demonstrate the advantages of having more extensive and more comparable data on crime in the United States.

The advantage of the new approach for the general public would be the availability of more and better information about crime. Even though only some assaults, some thefts, and some offenses against society are presented, the new approach and the new publication would provide a much better indication of the characteristics of those reported as offenders. Moreover, for the first time, the general public would have information about the victims of crime in local areas. Information on victims and offenders involved in a wide variety of offenses would provide the general public with a better picture of crime in the United States.

The new publication would also benefit researchers and policy analysts because the most pressing problem in criminology today is the paucity of good crime data. There has been and still is a desperate need for more and better crime information. Even the small supplement containing incident-based UCR data that is described here would provide increased knowledge about the frequency of a wide range of offenses. It would also provide badly needed details about offenses, victims, and offenders.

Moreover, the new publication would provide an additional advantage for anyone working with the basic NIBRS data files. The volume, complexity, and details of incident-based data require some benchmark statistics for those working with the complete file. When using incident-based data, basic tabulations can be checked against the published tables. Once an analyst is confident that the procedures he or she is using to examine the data are working for the compilation of valid and accurate victim and offender counts, additional tabulations could be made with greater confidence than would be possible without the published counts.

Conclusions

For all of the reasons presented above, early publication is practical and important. Information from hundreds of agencies has been submitted for 1995 and 1996. The first step in the process might be the distribution to each participating agency of unpublished tables containing 1995 and 1996 data. The first supplement could be compiled and published using data from the agencies where responses to this initial distribution were positive and enthusiastic. The experience gained in this way could be used to guide additional publication. Once gained, the experience would be invaluable as a basis for changes and revisions in the tables and expansion of the new reports.

Even without the participation of many large city departments, the publication of incident-based crime data would provide a much better picture of the characteristics and relationships of victims and offenders in a variety of cities and towns. However, as more large cities adopt an incident-based approach, a clearer national indication of crime in the United States would emerge.

[1] The National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) is the FBI's new version of Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR). With conversion to NIBRS, law enforcement agencies cease generation of monthly crime counts and instead forward data to the FBI concerning each single criminal occurrence coming to their attention.

[2] *Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook, NIBRS Edition,* 1992, page 25.

[3] The System collects data on each single incident and arrest within 22 offense categories made up of 46 specific crimes called Group A offenses. The Group A offenses are those designated in NIBRS as appropriate indicators of dimensions or trends in crime on a national scale and are those for which NIBRS participants send "Incident Reports."

[4] Offense data are reported for each of the up to 10 most serious Group A offenses in the incident. Information includes Offense Code; Offense Attempted/Completed; Offender Suspected of Using Alcohol, Computer, Drugs; Bias Motivation; Location; Number of Premises Entered and Method of Entry for Burglary; Type Criminal Activity; and Type Weapon/Force Involved.

[5] Information from an incident can be submitted for as many as 999 victims. The Data Elements for each victim record are Victim Sequence Number; Victim Connected to UCR Offense Code(s); Type of Victim, Age, Sex, Race, Ethnicity, and Resident Status of Victim; Aggravated Assault/Homicide Circumstances; Additional Justifiable Homicide Circumstances; Type of Injury; Offender Numbers to be Related; and Relationship of Victim to Offender.

[6] Offender data include characteristics of each offender involved in a crime incident whether or not an arrest has been made. Each offender is considered to have committed all of the offenses in the incident. The Data Elements are Offender (Sequence) Number and Age, Sex, and Race of Offender. A separate set of data is recorded for each offender. The object is to capture any information known to law enforcement concerning perpetrators even though they may not have been identified.

[7] Property information is reported for each type of property burned, counterfeited, forged, destroyed, recovered, seized, etc., for applicable offenses. Information includes Type Loss, etc.; Property Description; Value of Property; Recovery Date; Number of Stolen and Recovered Vehicles; Suspected Drug Type and Quantity.

[8] Arrestee data are reported for each person apprehended. Included are Arrest Date; Arrest Offense Code; Weapon Arrestee Possessed; Age, Sex, Race, Ethnicity, and Residence Status of Arrestee; and Disposition of Arrestee Under 18.

[9] In these tables, Murder includes Nonnegligent Manslaughter. Sexual Assault includes Forcible Rape, Forcible Sodomy, Forcible Sexual Assault with an Object, and Forcible Fondling. Robbery is shown as theft but involves an assault or a threat of assault as a way of taking property. Larceny includes Motor Vehicle Theft. Burglary includes Breaking and Entering. Drug Offenses include Drug/Narcotic Violations and Drug Equipment Violations. Other Crimes against Society include Prostitution, Gambling, Weapons Law Violations, Pornography, and Obscene Materials offenses.

Table 1. Sex of Victims Known to the Police in Five U.S. Cities, Selected Offenses, 1995[1]									
		Assaults[2]			Theft[2]			Crimes Against Society[3]	
Agency	Population	Murder	Sexual Assault	Aggravated Assault	Robbery	Larceny	Burglary	Drug Offenses	Other
Boise	149,856								
Male		1	39	305	55	2,763	581	-	-
Female		2	148	210	25	2,025	512	-	-
Unknown		0	0	0	0	6	0	-	-
Des Moines	194,654								
Male		15	33	362	222	4,346	727	-	-
Female		4	253	184	108	3,420	691	-	-
Unknown		0	1	2	8	189	12	-	-
Worcester	166,290								
Male		3	29	610	243	3,210	1,036	-	-
Female		2	137	681	125	2,537	999	-	-
Unknown		0	0	0	0	0	0		
Grand Forks	50,403								
Male		0	10	23	14	1,346	200	-	-
Female		0	25	7	5	769	116	-	-
Unknown		0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
Greenville	59,955								
Male		2	18	406	130	1,399	307	-	-
Female		2	74	305	77	1,197	357	-	-
Unknown		0	0	0	0	2	0		

[1]The phrase "known to the police" refers to victims or offenders reported to the police or discovered by the police. **Murder** includes Non-negligent Manslaughter. **Sexual Assault** includes Forcible Rape, Forcible Sodomy, Forcible Sexual Assault with an Object, and Forcible Fondling. **Robbery** is shown as theft but involves an assault or a threat of assault as a way of taking property. **Larceny** includes Motor Vehicle Theft. **Burglary** includes Breaking and Entering. **Drug Offenses** include Drug/Narcotic Violations and Drug Equipment Violations. **Other Crimes against Society** include Prostitution, Gambling, Weapons Law Violations, Pornography, and Obscene Materials offenses.

[2] An individual may be the victim of more than one offense in a single incident. An offender may have been reported as having committed more than one offense in an incident. For this reason summing along the rows will produce a misleading number of victims or offenders. In most cases, adding down the columns will not inflate the number of victims or offenders because the number of people who are victims of the same offense within the year or are reported as offenders for the same offense within the year is probably small.

[3] Victim information is not collected for Crimes Against Society.

Table 2. Race of Victims Known to the Police in Five U.S. Cities, Selected Offenses, 1995[1]									
		Assaults[2]			Theft[2]			Crimes Against Society[3]	
Agency	Population	Murder	Sexual Assault	Aggravated Assault	Robbery	Larceny	Burglary	Drug Offenses	Other
Boise	149,856								
White		3	186	501	76	4,688	1,072	-	-
Black		0	1	8	2	21	5	-	-
Amer.Ind		0	0	1	0	8	2	-	-
Asian		0	0	3	2	29	9	-	-
Unknown		0	0	2	0	48	5	-	-
Des Moines	194,654								
White		11	239	367	259	6,555	1,188	-	-
Black		7	40	149	47	668	182	-	-
Amer.Ind		0	0	0	2	16	0	-	-
Asian		1	6	20	9	137	29	-	-
Unknown		0	2	12	21	579	31	-	-
Worcester	166,290								
White		3	118	916	270	3,661	1,430	-	-
Black		1	16	168	41	263	111	-	-
Amer.Ind		0	0	2	0	0	1	-	-
Asian		0	0	30	6	152	45	-	-
Unknown		1	32	175	51	1,671	448	-	-
Grand Forks	50,403								
White		0	28	24	14	1,909	297	-	-
Black		0	0	3	0	31	0	-	-
Amer.Ind		0	6	3	5	44	5	-	-
Asian		0	1	0	0	8	1	-	-
Unknown		0	0	0	0	123	13	-	-
Greenville	59,955								
White		1	37	177	103	1,708	323	-	-
Black		3	55	530	102	864	333	-	-
Amer.Ind		0	0	0	0	1	1	-	-
Asian		0	0	2	0	5	2	-	-
Unknown		0	0	2	2	20	5	-	-

[1] See Note 1, Table 1.
[2] See Note 2, Table 1.
[3] See Note 3, Table 1.

Table 3. Age of Victims Known to the Police in Five U.S. Cities, Selected Offenses, 1995[1]									
		Assaults[2]			Theft[2]			Crimes Against Society[3]	
Agency	Population	Murder	Sexual Assault	Aggravated Assault	Robbery	Larceny	Burglary	Drug Offenses	Other
Boise	149,856								
Juvenile		1	141	116	18	469	39	-	-
Adult		2	40	382	59	4,068	998	-	-
Unknown		0	6	17	3	257	56	-	-
Des Moines	194,654								
Juvenile		4	182	81	30	502	17	-	-
Adult		15	103	425	251	6,125	1,268	-	-
Unknown		0	2	42	57	1,328	145	-	-
Worcester	166,290								
Juvenile		0	96	193	56	202	28	-	-
Adult		4	59	1,027	301	5,032	1,773	-	-
Unknown		1	11	71	11	513	234	-	-
Grand Forks	50,403								
Juvenile		0	18	9	2	251	15	-	-
Adult		0	17	21	17	1,819	288	-	-
Unknown		0	0	0	0	45	13	-	-
Greenville	59,955								
Juvenile		1	52	108	19	84	3	-	-
Adult		3	40	602	188	2,499	656	-	-
Unknown		0	0	1	0	17	5	-	-

[1] See Note 1, Table 1.
[2] See Note 2, Table 1
[3] See Note 3, Table 1.

Table 4. Sex of Offenders Known to the Police in Five U.S. Cities, Selected Offenses, 1995[1]									
		Assaults			Theft			Crimes Against Society	
Agency	Population	Murder	Sexual Assault	Aggravated Assault	Robbery	Larceny	Burglary	Drug Offenses	Other
Boise	149,856								
Male		2	185	441	112	2,321	353	2,166	377
Female		1	10	96	1	1,004	62	719	40
Unknown		0	1	9	0	9	2	1	2
Des Moines	194,654								
Male		18	295	476	411	5,081	534	1,632	423
Female		2	8	98	39	1,818	95	342	106
Unknown		2	4	7	8	50	6	2	0
Worcester	166,290								
Male		3	127	875	186	1,322	455	1,297	217
Female		0	3	218	14	459	68	252	205
Unknown		0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Forks	50,403								
Male		0	38	24	32	1,128	90	125	31
Female		0	3	11	0	383	17	24	1
Unknown		0	0	1	3	2	0	1	0
Greenville	59,955								
Male		6	93	578	337	1,684	442	1,071	361
Female		0	8	222	21	675	53	245	67
Unknown		0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0

[1] See Notes 1 and 2, Table 1.

Table 5. Race of Offenders Known to the Police in Five U.S. Cities, Selected Offenses, 1995[1]									
		Assaults			Theft			Crimes Against Society	
Agency	Population	Murder	Sexual Assault	Aggravated Assault	Robbery	Larceny	Burglary	Drug Offenses	Other
Boise	149,856								
White		3	176	489	97	3,170	356	2,794	392
Black		0	6	35	10	63	8	60	17
Amer.Ind		0	1	2	2	12	2	15	1
Asian		0	4	8	0	30	28	14	5
Unknown		0	9	12	4	59	23	3	4
Des Moines	194,654								
White		11	225	347	138	4,849	475	1,527	369
Black		7	70	201	296	1,813	140	437	143
Amer.Ind		0	1	2	1	10	2	2	1
Asian		2	6	21	12	130	5	8	16
Unknown		2	5	10	11	147	13	2	0
Worcester	166,290								
White		3	95	789	124	1,294	410	1,236	337
Black		0	17	245	72	300	77	293	70
Amer.Ind		0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1
Asian		0	6	28	2	50	4	14	13
Unknown		0	15	31	2	135	32	5	1
Grand Forks	50,403								
White		0	34	27	19	1,207	82	121	29
Black		0	3	4	3	35	5	5	0
Amer.Ind		0	3	2	3	146	12	23	0
Asian		0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0
Unknown		0	1	3	10	122	10	0	3
Greenville	59,955								
White		2	29	140	48	778	111	321	124
Black		4	72	657	308	1,555	374	994	303
Amer.Ind		0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
Asian		0	0	1	0	16	5	0	1
Unknown		0	0	2	1	10	7	1	0

[1] See Notes 1 and 2, Table 1.

Table 6. Age of Offenders Known to the Police in Five U.S. Cities, Selected Offenses, 1995[1]									
		Assaults			Theft			Crimes Against Society	
Agency	Population	Murder	Sexual Assault	Aggravated Assault	Robbery	Larceny	Burglary	Drug Offenses	Other
Boise	149,856								
Juvenile		0	38	115	30	1,435	120	423	88
Adult		3	140	394	74	1,729	250	2,458	322
Unknown		0	18	37	9	170	47	5	9
Des Moines	194,654								
Juvenile		0	64	90	62	1,612	116	148	55
Adult		19	237	478	385	4,687	468	1,825	474
Unknown		3	6	13	11	650	51	3	0
Worcester	166,290								
Juvenile		0	12	145	50	412	115	134	34
Adult		3	94	902	141	1,242	366	1,415	388
Unknown		0	27	46	9	127	42	0	0
Grand Forks	50,403								
Juvenile		0	10	13	5	617	36	42	18
Adult		0	31	18	21	825	60	104	14
Unknown		0	0	5	9	71	11	3	0
Greenville	59,955								
Juvenile		0	22	131	45	565	60	107	63
Adult		6	78	635	286	1,622	423	1,194	365
Unknown		0	1	35	27	173	14	15	0

[1] See Notes 1 and 2, Table 1.