

Crime in the United States

2002

Uniform Crime Reports



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

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

Foreword

The concept of collecting national crime statistics and using them to explore the complexion and scope of the country's crimes originated with discussions among law enforcement officials in the late 1800s. The topic continued to be of interest at national meetings of law enforcement, and the idea gained momentum as the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) took a leading role in promoting it. Finally, in January 1930, 400 cities from 43 of the 48 United States and the territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico submitted their data to the IACP. The association compiled the information into the first national database of crime statistics and subsequently published them in a nine-page report. The IACP published the statistics that they collected thereafter in a monthly pamphlet titled *Uniform Crime Reports for the United States and Its Possessions* and distributed it to participating agencies and other interested parties.

Later in 1930, the years of planning further culminated in the IACP's successful implementation of a data collection program that we now know as the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program. By August 1930, the Bureau of Investigation (renamed the Federal Bureau of Investigation [FBI] in 1935) had assumed oversight of the UCR Program. At the time the IACP transferred the responsibilities of collecting and publishing crime statistics to the FBI, participation in the Program had grown to include 786 cities. In September, the fledgling UCR Program compiled the data into the first monthly report under the auspice of the FBI.

Although the Program experienced many changes throughout the decades that followed, its primary objective has never changed—to provide reliable criminal statistics for use by law enforcement, criminologists, sociologists, legislators, municipal planners, the media, and the general public. As the UCR Program developed through the years, crime categories were added and additional information pertaining to particular crimes were included. Consequently, the resulting reports grew in magnitude and scope. Today, the original pamphlet-sized publication, now titled *Crime in the United States*, has evolved into the current document that exceeds 450 pages and provides crime information from over 17,000 local and state law enforcement agencies.

Despite its long, rich history, the UCR Program is in many ways still in its infancy, and more changes lie ahead as it continues its development. FBI executives are exploring additional ways that the Program's data can be used to support the Nation's law enforcement and other governmental agencies as they struggle to combat crime in a new global environment. Moreover, as the FBI's Criminal Justice Information Services Division joins the current movement to more efficiently use and share data, officials are focusing on the UCR Program's potential to enhance the Nation's criminal justice information network.



Robert S. Mueller, III
Director

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

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

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

Crime Factors

Each year when *Crime in the United States* is published, many entities—news media, tourism agencies, and other groups with an interest in crime in our Nation—use reported Crime Index figures to compile rankings of cities and counties. These rankings, however, are merely a quick choice made by the data user; they provide no insight into the many variables that mold the crime in a particular town, city, county, state, or region. Consequently, these rankings lead to simplistic and/or incomplete analyses that often create misleading perceptions adversely affecting cities and counties, along with their residents. To assess criminality and law enforcement's response from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, one must consider many variables, some of which, while having significant impact on crime, are not readily measurable nor applicable pervasively among all locales. Geographic and demographic factors specific to each jurisdiction must be considered and applied if one is going to make an accurate and complete assessment of crime in that jurisdiction. Several sources of information are available that may assist the responsible researcher in exploring the many variables that affect crime in a particular locale. The U.S. Bureau of the Census data, for example, can be used to better understand the makeup of a locale's population. The transience of the population, its racial and ethnic makeup, its composition by age and gender, education levels, and prevalent family structures are all key factors in assessing and comprehending the crime issue.

Local chambers of commerce, planning offices, or similar entities provide information regarding the economic and cultural makeup of cities and counties. Understanding a jurisdiction's industrial/economic base; its dependence upon neighboring jurisdictions; its transportation system; its economic dependence on nonresidents

(such as tourists and convention attendees); its proximity to military installations, correctional facilities, etc.; all contribute to accurately gauging and interpreting the crime known to and reported by law enforcement.

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

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

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

- Population density and degree of urbanization.
- Variations in composition of the population, particularly youth concentration.

- Stability of population with respect to residents' mobility, commuting patterns, and transient factors.
- Modes of transportation and highway system.
- Economic conditions, including median income, poverty level, and job availability.
- Cultural factors and educational, recreational, and religious characteristics.
- Family conditions with respect to divorce and family cohesiveness.
- Climate.
- Effective strength of law enforcement agencies.
- Administrative and investigative emphases of law enforcement.
- Policies of other components of the criminal justice system (i.e., prosecutorial, judicial, correctional, and probational).
- Citizens' attitudes toward crime.
- Crime reporting practices of the citizenry.

Crime in the United States provides a nationwide view of crime based on statistics contributed by state and local law enforcement agencies. Population size is the only correlate of crime presented in this publication. Although many of the listed factors equally affect the crime of a particular area, the UCR Program makes no attempt to relate them to the data presented. The reader is, therefore, cautioned against comparing statistical data of individual reporting units from cities, counties, metropolitan areas, states, or colleges and universities solely on the basis of their population coverage or student enrollment. Until data users examine all the variables that affect crime in a town, city, county, state, region, or college or university, they can make no meaningful comparisons.



Contents

Section I—Summary of the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program	3
Section II—Crime Index Offenses Reported	7
Narrative comments:	
Crime Index	9
Violent Crime:	15
Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter	19
Forcible rape	29
Robbery	31
Aggravated assault	37
Property Crime:	41
Burglary	45
Larceny-theft	49
Motor vehicle theft	53
Arson	57
Hate Crime	61
Crime Index Tabulations	65
Figures:	
(2.1) Crime clock	6
(2.2) Crime Index, 1998-2002	9
(2.3) Crime Index offenses, percent distribution, 2002	11
(2.4) Regional violent and property crime rates, 2002	12
(2.5) Violent crime, 1998-2002	15
(2.6) Murder, 1998-2002	19
(2.7) Murder by relationship, 2002	25
(2.8) Forcible rape, 1998-2002	29
(2.9) Robbery, 1998-2002	31
(2.10) Robbery categories, 1998-2002	33
(2.11) Aggravated assault, 1998-2002	37
(2.12) Property crime, 1998-2002	41
(2.13) Burglary, 1998-2002	45
(2.14) Burglary residential/nonresidential, 1998-2002	47
(2.15) Larceny-theft, 1998-2002	49
(2.16) Larceny-theft categories, 1998-2002	51
(2.17) Larceny-theft analysis, 2002	52
(2.18) Motor vehicle theft, 1998-2002	53
(2.19) Bias-motivated offenses, 2002	61
Tables:	
(2.1) Crime Index by month, percent distribution, 1998-2002	10
(2.2) Violent crime by month, percent distribution, 1998-2002	16
Murder:	
(2.3) Month, percent distribution, 1998-2002	20
(2.4) Victims, by race and sex, 2002	20
(2.5) Victims, by age, sex, and race, 2002	21
(2.6) Offenders, by age, sex, and race, 2002	21

Tables—Continued

(2.7) Victim/offender relationship, by age, 2002	22
(2.8) Victim/offender relationship, by race and sex, 2002	22
(2.9) Types of weapons used, percent distribution by region, 2002	23
(2.10) Victims, by weapon, 1998-2002	23
(2.11) Victims by age, by weapon, 2002	23
(2.12) Circumstances, by relationship, 2002	24
(2.13) Circumstances, by weapon, 2002	26
(2.14) Circumstances, 1998-2002	27
(2.15) Circumstances, by victim's sex, 2002	27
Justifiable homicide by weapon, 1998-2002:	
(2.16) Law enforcement	28
(2.17) Private citizen	28
Forcible rape:	
(2.18) Month, percent distribution, 1998-2002	30
Robbery:	
(2.19) Month, percent distribution, 1998-2002	32
(2.20) Region, percent distribution, 2002	32
(2.21) Population group, percent distribution, 2002	34
(2.22) Types of weapons used, by region, percent distribution, 2002	35
Aggravated assault:	
(2.23) Month, percent distribution, 1998-2002	38
(2.24) Types of weapons used, by region, percent distribution, 2002	38
Property crime:	
(2.25) Month, percent distribution, 1998-2002	42
Burglary:	
(2.26) Month, percent distribution, 1998-2002	46
Larceny-theft:	
(2.27) Month, percent distribution, 1998-2002	50
(2.28) Percent distribution by region, 2002	50
Motor vehicle theft:	
(2.29) Month, percent distribution, 1998-2002	54
(2.30) Region, percent distribution, 2002	54
Arson:	
(2.31) Rate, by population group, 2002	57
(2.32) Type of property, 2002	58
Hate Crime:	
(2.33) Number of incidents, offenses, victims, and known offenders, by bias motivation, 2002	62
(2.34) Number of offenses, victims, and known offenders, by offense, 2002	62
(2.35) Number of known offenders, by race, 2002	63
(2.36) Agency hate crime reporting, by state, 2002	63
Index of crime:	
(1) United States, 1983-2002	66
(2) United States, 2002	67
(3) Offense and population distribution by region, 2002	67
(4) Region, geographic division, and state, 2001-2002	68
(5) State, 2002	78
(6) Metropolitan Statistical Area, 2002	89
(7) Offense analysis, United States, 1998-2002	119
Offenses known to law enforcement:	
(8) City 10,000 and over in population, 2002	120
(9) University and college, 2002	166

Tables—Continued

(10) Suburban county, 2002	177
(11) Rural county 25,000 and over in population, 2002	192
Crime trends:	
(12) Population group, 2001-2002	200
(13) Suburban and nonsuburban cities, by population group, 2001-2002	202
(14) Suburban and nonsuburban counties, by population group, 2001-2002	204
(15) Breakdown of offenses known, by population group, 2001-2002	205
Rate: number of crimes per 100,000 inhabitants:	
(16) Population group, 2002	208
(17) Suburban and nonsuburban cities, by population group, 2002	210
(18) Suburban and nonsuburban counties, by population group, 2002	211
(19) Breakdown of offenses known, by population group, 2002	212
(20) Murder, by state, 2002, type of weapon	214
(21) Robbery, by state, 2002, type of weapon	215
(22) Aggravated assault, by state, 2002, type of weapon	216
(23) Offense analysis, number and percent change, 2001-2002	217
(24) Property stolen and recovered, by type and value, 2002	217
Section III—Crime Index Offenses Cleared	219
Narrative comments	221
Figure:	
(3.1) Crimes cleared by arrest, 2002	222
Tables:	
Percent of offenses cleared by arrest or exceptional means:	
(25) Population group, 2002	223
(26) Geographic region and division, 2002	225
(27) Breakdown of offenses known, by population group, 2002	227
(28) Number of offenses cleared by arrest, of persons under 18 years of age, by population group, 2002	229
Section IV—Persons Arrested	231
Narrative comments	232
(4.1) Arrests for drug abuse violations, by region, 2002	234
Tables:	
(29) Estimated arrests, United States, 2002	234
Number and rate of arrests:	
(30) Geographic region, 2002	235
(31) Population group, 2002	236
Ten-year arrest trends:	
(32) Totals, 1993-2002	238
(33) Sex, 1993-2002	239
Five-year arrest trends:	
(34) Totals, 1998-2002	240
(35) Sex, 1998-2002	241
Current year over previous year arrest trends:	
(36) Totals, 2001-2002	242
(37) Sex, 2001-2002	243

Tables—Continued

Arrests:	
(38) Age, 2002	244
(39) Males, by age, 2002	246
(40) Females, by age, 2002	248
(41) Persons under 15, 18, 21, and 25 years of age, 2002	250
(42) Sex, 2002	251
(43) Race, 2002	252
City arrest trends:	
(44) 2001-2002	255
(45) Sex, 2001-2002	256
City arrests:	
(46) Age, 2002	257
(47) Persons under 15, 18, 21, and 25 years of age, 2002	259
(48) Sex, 2002	260
(49) Race, 2002	261
Suburban county arrest trends:	
(50) 2001-2002	264
(51) Sex, 2001-2002	265
Suburban county arrests:	
(52) Age, 2002	266
(53) Persons under 15, 18, 21, and 25 years of age, 2002	268
(54) Sex, 2002	269
(55) Race, 2002	270
Rural county arrest trends:	
(56) 2001-2002	273
(57) Sex, 2001-2002	274
Rural county arrests:	
(58) Age, 2002	275
(59) Persons under 15, 18, 21, and 25 years of age, 2002	277
(60) Sex, 2002	278
(61) Race, 2002	279
Suburban area arrest trends:	
(62) 2001-2002	282
(63) Sex, 2001-2002	283
Suburban area arrests:	
(64) Age, 2002	284
(65) Persons under 15, 18, 21, and 25 years of age, 2002	286
(66) Sex, 2002	287
(67) Race, 2002	288
(68) Police disposition of juvenile offenders taken into custody, 2002	291
(69) Arrests, by state, 2002	292
Section V—Special Reports	301
Bank Robbery in the United States	303
Figures:	
(5.1) Number of bank robbery incidents, 1990-2001	304
(5.2) Bank robbery incidents by day of the week, 1996-2000	306
(5.3) Time of day of occurrence of bank robbery incident, 1996-2000	306
(5.4) Race of bank robbers in percentage, 1996-2000	308
(5.5) Sex of bank robbers as percentages, 1996-2000	309
(5.6) Age and gender of offender, 1996-2000	310

Tables:	
(5.1) Number of bank robbery incidents reported in BCS database and the Summary UCR, 1990-2001	304
(5.2) Number of bank robbery incidents reported in BCS database and the Summary UCR, 1990-2001	305
(5.3) Bank robbery incidents by day of the week, 1996-2000	306
(5.4) Time of day of bank robbery incidents, 1996-2000	306
(5.5) BCS incidents involving shooting	307
(5.6) BCS incidents involving firearms, 1996-2000	307
(5.7) NIBRS incidents involving firearms, 1996-2000	307
(5.8) Percent of bank robbery incidents involving violence, injury, and other crimes, 1996-2000	308
(5.9) Percentage of offenders in NIBRS data and BCS, by sex, 1996-2000	309
(5.10) Age and gender of offender, NIBRS data, 1996-2000	310
(5.11) Age, race, and sex of offender, NIBRS data, 1996-2000	311
(5.12) Prior bank robbery convictions, BCS, 1996-2000	312
Reported Sniper Attacks, 1982-2001	315
Narrative comments	315
Tables:	
(5.13) Sniper-attack murder incidents, victims, and offenders, 1982-2001	315
(5.14) Sniper-attack murder incidents, by year and situation, 1982-2001	315
(5.15) Sniper-attack murder incidents, by year and firearm type, 1982-2001	316
(5.16) Sniper-attack murder incidents, by year and region, 1982-2001	316
(5.17) Sniper-attack murder incidents, by year and population group, 1982-2001	317
(5.18) Sniper-attack murder victims, by age, sex, and race, 1982-2001	318
(5.19) Sniper-attack murder offenders, by age, sex, and race, 1982-2001	318
(5.20) Sniper-attack murder victim/offender relationship, by year, 1982-2001	319
Section VI—Law Enforcement Personnel	321
Narrative comments	322
Tables:	
Full-time law enforcement employees as of October 31, 2002:	
(70) Employees, number and rate per 1,000 inhabitants, geographic region and division by population group	324
(71) Officers, number and rate per 1,000 inhabitants, geographic region and division by population group	325
(72) Employees, range in rate per 1,000 inhabitants by population group	326
(73) Officers, range in rate per 1,000 inhabitants by population group	327
(74) Employees, percent male and female by population group	328
(75) Civilian employees, percent of total by population group	329
(76) State law enforcement employees	330
(77) Law enforcement employees by state	332
(78) City by state	333
(79) University and college by state	407
(80) Suburban county by state	413
(81) Rural county by state	420
(82) Other agencies by state	437

Section VII—Appendices	441
Appendix I—Methodology	442
Appendix II—Offenses in Uniform Crime Reporting	454
Appendix III—Uniform Crime Reporting Area Definitions	456
Appendix IV—The Nation’s Two Crime Measures	459
Appendix V—Directory of State Uniform Crime Reporting Programs	462
Appendix VI—National Uniform Crime Reporting Program Directory	469
Appendix VII—Uniform Crime Reporting Publications List	470