TCRP Web Document 18 (Project F-6A): Contractor's Final Report

Developing Useful Transit-Related Crime and Incident Data

Prepared for:

Transit Cooperative Research Program
Transportation Research Board
National Research Council

Submitted by:

H. N. Ketola and D. Chia
Technology & Management Systems, Inc.

April 2000

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was sponsored by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and was conducted through the Transit Cooperative Research Program (TCRP), which is administered by the Transportation Research Board (TRB) of the National Research Council.

Contents

Page

Acknowledgments

The research reported herein was performed under TCRP Project F-6A by Technology & Management Systems, Inc. (TMS) and Boyd, Maier & Associates. TMS was the prime contractor for this study.

H. Norman Ketola, Director of Technical Services at TMS, was the Principal Investigator and author of this report. David Chia, Senior Transportation Consultant at TMS, also participated as Co-Principal Investigator and author.

Major contributions to the work effort were provided by Annabelle Boyd and Patricia Maier of Boyd, Maier & Associates.

Abstract

Transit agencies have an obligation to provide a reasonably safe and secure system for their patrons and employees. Transit management must make decisions regarding the best use of police, security personnel, and other resources to reduce crime and increase the perception of a safe transportation system. This report presents findings about current methods for collecting, analyzing, and using data on transit-related crime to make decisions on personnel deployment and allocation of security resources. The findings are based on telephone interviews and information collected from 21 transit agencies. These transit agencies use three distinct organizational/management approaches to transit policing and security operations: dedicated transit police department; dedicated transit crime unit within local police force; and contracts with local law enforcement and/or private security companies.

This Final Report includes an assessment of the findings, leading to recommendations for improving the usefulness of transit crime data. The central recommendation of this project is a proposed change in the reporting of national crime statistics to the Federal Transit Administration. Detailed recommendations are presented in the form of a guidelines document—**Guidelines for Transit Crime Data Analysis and Reporting**.

Summary of Findings

An issue facing general managers, transit police chiefs, and security directors is how best to use police, security personnel, and other resources to reduce crime and increase the perception of a safe transportation system. This project was based upon the premise that many transit agencies need more accurate and useful information about the full range of crime-related events that have an effect on system security. The availability of complete and comprehensive information allows an agency to make the best possible decisions regarding personnel deployment and allocation of security resources.

There was also a concern that reported transit crime rates may be unreliable due to the "leakage" that occurs when transit police or security officers are not around to take reports and investigate crimes, i.e., there are a number of crimes affecting transit passengers that are not accounted for; therefore, data on those crimes is unavailable for analysis and decision making.

Another issue was the lack of a standard definition of a "transit-related" crime. Lacking this definition, local law enforcement personnel rarely specify that a crime is transit-related; therefore, the information about the crime is unavailable for analysis and decision making. This situation is compounded when there are multiple local jurisdictions in the transit system's service area.

Finally, there is a concern that data on many "quality of life" violations (that affect passenger perceptions of the overall security of the transit system) is not captured and processed, with the result that the data is not available for decisions affecting deployment of personnel and use of other resources.

Two major issues were addressed in the research:

- Identify the problems that transit agencies face in collecting transit-related crime and security incident data that are important in their security operations
- Establish the method(s) that transit agencies can use to improve the usefulness (utilization) of their crime and security incident data through improved data collection, analysis, and reporting

The work plan was divided into two major parts: **Phase I - Develop Operational Definition of Transit-Related Crime**, comprised of five tasks; and **Phase II - Improved Methods for Transit Crime Data Collection, Analysis, and Reporting**, consisting of five additional tasks.

The primary activity in Phase I was the collection of information and data from 21 transit agencies. Telephone interviews and follow-up data requests were conducted with the following types of transit policing and security management organizations:

- Dedicated Transit Police Department — 14 completed interviews
- Dedicated Transit Crime Unit within Local Police Force — 1 completed interview
- Contract with Local Law Enforcement/Private Security Companies — 7 completed interviews

The following paragraphs present an overall assessment of the research findings, leading to specific conclusions and recommendations for improving the usefulness of transit crime data. The topics of data collection, analysis, and reporting are discussed separately.

Transit Crime Data Collection

The overall conclusion that was drawn from an assessment of all the findings on transit crime data collection can be stated as follows:

Regardless of the transit policing and security arrangements used by transit agencies, there are no discernible problems in the collection of crime data.

All of the transit agencies interviewed indicated that their data collection methods provided the information necessary to manage police and security force resources. Data sources include incident reports submitted by transit police and security officers, reports/complaints called into the transit police/operations dispatching center, or information transmitted via crime reports from the local police/sheriff's department(s).

Each of the transit agencies has a unique approach to handling the data collection process based on its particular situation and needs. Therefore, the research team made the determination that no specific recommendations could be made that would lead to improvements in the transit crime data collection process.

Transit Crime Data Analysis

The transit crime data analysis process consists primarily of the compilation of data and statistics into categories and groups. The compiled data is used to identify specific problems

requiring short-range actions, and to define long-term trends that can be used for both internal planning and external communications.

The detailed findings indicated the existence of several problems that affect the transit crime data analysis process. The first of these problems was the lack of a definition for ***transit-related crime***. The conclusion that was drawn from an assessment of the findings on this topic was:

The lack of a generally accepted definition of transit-related crime makes it impractical to compare transit crime rates between agencies, or to obtain a consistent and accurate picture of transit crime trends at a national level.

Individual transit agencies are not affected by the lack of a definition, because they have defined their own terms for transit-related crime. In effect, each agency understands the implications of crime data recorded at its own system, including the meaning of transit-related crime (if it uses the term); however, transit agencies cannot communicate that information in a meaningful form to other transit agencies without an extensive explanation. This problem is compounded at the national level—particularly for FTA.

The second problem that affects transit crime data analysis is the lack of uniformity in the types of data collected about transit crime, and the names or terms used to describe different crimes. This problem is a natural outcome of the diversity of transit policing and security organizations, and the general lack of standard terminology in the industry. The only consistent use of defined terms is for the eight serious crimes (homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny/theft,

motor vehicle theft, arson) that are used for computing crime indices in the FBI/UCR reporting program. FTA has adopted these same terms in its National Transit Database (NTD) reporting program.

The FTA/NTD reporting program, based on the use of the FBI/UCR crime data structure, leads to the third problem affecting transit crime data analysis:

Under the current FTA/NTD reporting guidelines, there is the possibility of a significant undercount of a certain class of less serious crimes, sometimes known as "quality-of-life" crimes. This is due to the FTA's adoption of FBI/UCR reporting guidelines, which means that such crimes are only reported if there is an arrest associated with the crime.

Considering all of the above problems, it is clear that the process of analyzing (compiling) transit crime data will remain unique to each agency until there is a change in the FTA's reporting requirements.

Transit Crime Data Reporting

There are two major reasons for reporting transit crime data: meeting the internal needs of the transit agency; and communicating information to those outside the agency—particularly to passengers, the general public, and the media.

The transmission of a single year's crime data to the FTA represents a very narrow view of reporting. The broader context of reporting involves the effective presentation of crime data that is immediately useful for the task at hand—from a decision on deployment of police/security officers, to demonstrating that special efforts to combat crime at transit stations (or other locations) have paid off.

An assessment of the findings on transit crime data reporting leads to a conclusion similar to that for crime data analysis. Each transit agency has evolved its own specialized approach to the reporting and presentation of crime data. There is no consistency or uniformity in the graphics or data tables used by the agencies.

A number of the agencies have expended considerable time and effort to convert detailed crime data into readily understood and accessible combinations of graphs, charts, and tables. From the perspective of the research team, the effort involved in the development of specialized crime data presentation formats is worthwhile if it allows the agency to manage its resources, or communicate with patrons and the general public, more effectively.

It is also evident, based on information made available by participating transit agencies, that many police/security departments are able to operate with detailed logs or journals of crimes/security incidents and special computer runs set up to extract some narrowly defined events from a crime database. Therefore, one cannot assume that the adoption of a particular presentation format or style will automatically lead to more effective use of the underlying data.

The general conclusion reached on transit crime data reporting can be stated as:

There are a number of good "models" for the effective presentation of crime data that should be considered by transit agencies; however, the final decision to use any particular format/style must be made by those involved in the collection and use of the data — transit police and security managers.

This conclusion leads directly to the concept of developing **Guidelines** that can be used by transit agencies on a "voluntary" basis. The guidelines concept is at the heart of the recommendations that are presented next.

Recommendations

The research team formulated its recommendations in accordance with the major objective of the project — **increasing the usefulness of transit crime data**. The original approach, involving the proposed development of a new data collection methodology to reduce transit crime data leakage, was found to be unnecessary because agencies reported no discernible problems in the collection of crime data.

One of the key findings from the research was the incompatibility of the transit crime analysis and reporting systems used by the 21 agencies interviewed for this project. This should not be a surprise, since each agency has developed its own system of transit crime names and codes, methods for compiling and organizing data, and formats/styles for data presentation—all in the absence of any standards or written guidance.

The research team recognizes that the analysis and reporting systems developed by the agencies are not likely to be changed until there is a compelling reason to do so. The

recommendations do not require that agencies make such changes. Instead, the recommendations are directed to the reporting of transit and transit-related crime at the national level, under the FTA's NTD reporting system. The recommended approach calls for standardization in the compilation and aggregation of data reported to the FTA. In general, all agencies currently prepare their data reports for the FTA by extracting data from records or a crime database and compiling the data according to instructions presented in the NTD reporting manual. Therefore, the recommended changes will only affect the extraction and compilation process.

The long term goal of this project is to use the FTA/NTD reporting system as the means of standardizing transit crime data industry-wide through **voluntary** means. This will lead to a situation where transit crime data will become more **useful** because it can be used in national studies of transit crime and for peer evaluations.

The research team decided to present detailed recommendations in the form of a guidelines document — **Guidelines for Transit Crime Data Analysis and Reporting**. The guidelines are designed to be distributed as a stand-alone document, using a newsletter or brochure format. A draft of the guidelines is presented in **Appendix D**. The key elements of the recommendations incorporated into the guidelines are summarized in the following paragraphs.

Recommended Changes in FTA's NTD Reporting Format

The central recommendation of this project is a proposed change in FTA's National Transit Database reporting format. The research team has modified the form (page 2 of Form 405) used by

transit agencies for reporting transit crime data to FTA. These modifications achieve the following major objectives:

1) The new form provides for the **voluntary** submission of data on **transit-related crime**, as a completely separate and distinct category. Voluntary reporting is recommended to accommodate those transit agencies/police chiefs who are reluctant or unable to provide data on incidents which take place in areas outside their jurisdiction (property not owned or leased by the transit agency). The reporting manual will contain definitions for **transit crime** and **transit-related crime**. This change will allow crime analysts and FTA to use the data knowing that it has been reported and compiled in a consistent manner.

2) The new form provides for a **complete decoupling of the FTA system from the FBI/UCR data reporting structure**, by removing the categories of Part I (crime index) and Part II offenses, and by requiring that all crimes and security incidents be reported to the FTA, whether or not an arrest was made. The form also provides for a reorganization of all crimes into three new analytical categories:

- **Violent Crimes**
- **Property Crimes**
- **Standard of Conduct Violations**

The guidelines contain detailed instructions on the assignment of specific crimes to each of the above categories. It should be noted that these changes do not require the collection of additional crime data; in most cases, agencies collect more data than required to complete the form.

Effective Presentation of Transit Crime Data

The second major objective of the guidelines is to encourage transit agencies to consider alternative methods for presentation of crime data and statistics. This is accomplished by way of examples of "best practices" showing some of the methods for effective presentation of transit crime data. Unlike the recommendations for changes in national level (FTA/NTD) reporting, these recommendations are intended for the benefit of individual agencies with an interest in making the best use of available crime data.

Transit police/security managers use data for a number of purposes, including tactical crime analysis (specific and immediate needs), strategic analysis (long-term crime trends), and administrative activities (presenting accomplishments to outside agencies and the public). The purpose that the data serves determines, in large part, the format for data presentation. The guidelines present examples of four ways that agencies can present crime data:

- Patterns and cycles
- Trends
- Comparisons
- Efficiency and effectiveness measures

Whenever applicable, the examples of graphs and tables presented in the guidelines incorporate the new crime categories and crime types as proposed for the new FTA/NTD reporting format.

Chapter 1
Introduction and Research Approach

1.1 PROBLEM STATEMENT AND RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

Transit agencies have an obligation to provide a reasonably safe and secure system for their patrons and employees. An issue facing general managers, transit police chiefs, and security directors is how best to use police, security personnel, and other resources to reduce crime and increase the perception of a safe transportation system. This project is based upon the premise that many transit agencies need more accurate and useful information about the full range of crime-related events that have an effect on system security. The availability of complete and comprehensive information will allow the agency to make the best possible decisions regarding personnel deployment and allocation of security resources.

Prior research undertaken by TCRP and others has shown that transit police and security managers have a major concern with their systems' inability to collect accurate crime data. It has been suggested that reported transit crime rates may be unreliable due to the "leakage" that occurs when transit police or security officers are not around to take reports and investigate crimes, i.e., there are a number of crimes affecting transit passengers that are not accounted for; therefore, data on those crimes is unavailable for analysis and decision making.

One problem facing transit police chiefs and security directors is the lack of a standard definition of a "transit-related" crime. Lacking this definition, local law enforcement personnel rarely specify that a crime is transit-related; therefore, the information about the crime is unavailable for analysis and decision making. This situation is compounded when there are multiple local jurisdictions in the transit system's service area.

Finally, there is a concern that data on many "quality of life" violations (that affect passenger perceptions of the overall security of the transit system) is not captured and processed, with the result that the data is not available for decisions affecting deployment of personnel and use of other resources.

There are three distinct organizational/management approaches to transit policing and security operations that are of interest in this project:

- **Transit systems using contract security**
- **Transit systems relying on local law enforcement**
- **Transit systems relying on a dedicated police department in combination with local enforcement and/or contract security**

The specific objectives of the original research plan were to:

1.) Develop an operational definition of "transit-related crime"

2.) Develop a method for capturing, processing, and reporting transit-related crime and incident data

3.) Test the effectiveness of the method in a variety of transit environments

4.) Develop a process to promote application of the method

1.2 SCOPE OF STUDY

There were two major issues addressed in the project:

- Identify the problems that transit agencies face in collecting transit-related crime and security incident data that are important in their security operations
- Establish the method(s) that transit agencies can use to improve the usefulness (utilization) of their crime and security incident data through improved data collection, analysis, and reporting

The concept of "usefulness" of data is central to the research in this project. Useful data is considered to be the data required by the responsible agencies/individuals to make (or support) decisions regarding the utilization of transit policing/security resources that result in the maximum security of passengers, employees, and the general public. One practical difficulty in developing improved data collection, analysis, and reporting methods is rooted in the diversity of transit policing and transit security organizations and their relationships with municipal police in various jurisdictions, and, when applicable, with private sector security companies. This diversity affects both the transit- related crime data collection process and the assessment of usefulness of specific data.

In order to ensure that this diversity was addressed, the scope of the study included a comprehensive data collection and information-gathering effort from a wide variety of transit agencies, including: those with their own transit police department; those that work with a dedicated transit crime unit from the local police force; and those that utilize contractual arrangements for

security services. The purpose of this activity was to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the methods that are currently being used by transit agencies to collect, analyze, and use transit-related crime/security incident data and any problems associated with their existing methodologies.

1.3 RESEARCH APPROACH

The work plan was divided into two major parts: **Phase I - Develop Operational Definition of Transit-Related Crime**, comprised of five tasks; and **Phase II - Improved Methods for Transit Crime Data Collection, Analysis, and Reporting**, consisting of five additional tasks.

Task 1 — Identify Candidate Systems. This task involved the development of a list of candidate transit systems for the interviews. The candidate systems were identified from a variety of sources, including those cited in TCRP Project F-6, "Guidelines for the Effective Use of Uniformed Transit Police and Security Personnel;" and from a list of transit police agencies that has been developed by project team members as part of ongoing transit security projects. The selection of candidate systems was based on available information regarding transit-policing structure, staffing levels, and related factors that would make the transit agency an attractive candidate for an interview.

Candidate transit systems were organized into three groups: those that rely on local law enforcement; those that contract with local law enforcement and/or a private security company; and those that have a dedicated transit police department. The research team developed three separate lists for the interview, consisting of a total of 38 candidate transit systems:

- Dedicated Transit Police Department — 20 interview candidates

- Dedicated Transit Crime Unit within Local Police Force — 4 interview candidates
- Contract with Local Law Enforcement/Private Security Companies — 14 interview candidates

Task 2 — Prepare Interview Guide. The research team prepared a *Structured Interview Guide* containing a list of topics and specific questions that team members covered during the interview. A draft interview guide was included as an attachment to the TCRP F-6A Work Plan, which was submitted to TCRP for distribution to project panel members. The interview guide was reviewed and approved by the project panel prior to its use. **Appendix A** includes a copy of the *Structured Interview Guide*.

Task 3 — Conduct Interviews involved the collection of information and data through telephone interviews. The interview process started with an introductory phone call to the transit police chief or the head of security at the selected transit agency. The purpose of the call was to provide a brief outline of the project objectives and to make a determination of the agency's interest and willingness to complete the interview process and provide information and data. Those agencies that were interested in participating received a letter providing further details about the project, a copy of the *Structured Interview Guide*, and a request for available information regarding their current methods for acquiring, analyzing, and using crime/incident data. **Appendix B** includes a sample of the letter sent to the transit agencies.

The goal of the project team was to complete telephone interviews with 20 transit systems, drawn from the list of 38 agencies that were identified as potential interview candidates. The research team contacted a total of 25 transit police/security agencies that either agreed to participate,

or would seriously consider participating after they had reviewed the interview guide and project description. These 25 agencies received the standard letter and enclosures as described above.

At the end of Phase I, the research team had exceeded the interview goal, with a total of 21 completed telephone interviews. **Appendix C** presents a list of the key individuals interviewed at each of the 21 participating transit agencies.

The research team was also able to construct some of the interview responses for the Transportation Bureau of the New York City Police Department based on recent information gathered for another project. The Transportation Bureau is responsible for security on the New York City Transit System. The partial information from this dedicated transit crime unit provided the project team with a total of 22 transit agencies on which to base its assessment of transit crime data collection and analysis procedures.

The following tables present the transit systems that participated in the interviews.

Dedicated Transit Police Departments

City	Transit Agency
Atlanta	MARTA
Boston	MBTA
Camden (NJ)	PATCO
Cleveland	GCRTA
Houston	MTA
Maplewood (NJ)	NJ Transit
Minneapolis	MCTO
New York (NY)	LIRR and Metro North (MTA Police)
Oakland	BART
Philadelphia	Amtrak
Philadelphia	SEPTA
Pittsburgh	PAT
Washington, D.C.	WMATA

Contracts With Local Law Enforcement or Private Security Companies

City	Transit Agency
Los Angeles	LACMTA
Miami	Miami-Dade TA
Milwaukee	Milwaukee County Transit
Oakland	AC Transit
Phoenix	Phoenix Transit
Salt Lake City	Utah Transit Authority
St. Louis	Bi-State Development Agency

Dedicated Transit Crime Units Within Local Police Force

City	Transit Agency	Police Department
Chicago	CTA	Chicago Police Department
Brooklyn	NYCT	New York City Police Department

Task 4 — Develop Definition of "Transit-Related Crime" was an integral part of the interview process. The *Structured Interview Guide* contained a proposed operational definition with a request for the transit agency's comments and recommendations regarding the definition. The results of the assessment of all of the responses to the issue of reporting and analyzing transit-related crime are presented as part of the findings in Chapter 2.

Task 5 — involved the preparation of an **Interim Report**. In addition to the findings from the research interviews, the Interim Report includes an assessment of potential improvements in data collection, analysis and reporting. The submission of the Interim Report completed all work activity for Phase I.

Task 6 — Develop Crime Reporting Method was the first task activity in Phase II. The research team used the findings from Phase I to define several potential improvements in transit-related crime data collection, analysis and reporting practices. The team met with the Project Panel for a presentation of the recommended improvements and a discussion of the findings contained in the Interim Report.

The panel discussion was very productive, leading to recommendations on improved crime reporting in two areas:

- Development of **new definitions** for "transit crime" and "transit-related" crime
- Development of a new approach to the organization of crime data, which will support both internal (within the transit agency) and industry-wide analyses of transit and transit-related crime

The research team took the recommendations on improved crime reporting and combined them with the findings and information presented in the Interim Report, in order to create a revised work plan for Phase II of the project. The revised work plan resulted in significant changes in several tasks, as described below.

Task 7 — Develop Test and Evaluation Plan was originally intended to provide the basis for testing of a new methodology which would reduce transit crime data leakage. One of the major findings of the research in Phase I was that the perceived need for a data collection methodology which would reduce transit crime data leakage is not a significant issue. Findings from the survey interviews with 21 transit police and transit security agencies indicated that these individual agencies did not consider transit crime data leakage to be a problem within their agencies.

In addition, the findings from Phase I clearly demonstrated that approaches to transit crime data collection and analysis are highly dependent upon the organizational configuration used to provide security. Consequently, methodologies and resources vary widely throughout the industry.

Based on the findings from Phase I, the **research team concluded that there would be little benefit to the industry from an experiment demonstrating the effectiveness of a single**

methodology for transit crime data collection and analysis at a single transit property. Instead, it was concluded that **the industry would receive greater benefit from a set of Guidelines that document the full range of approaches to transit crime data analysis and reporting.** The guidelines would be based on the actual experience of selected transit police and security agencies and would provide useful examples, sample forms, and other tools, explicitly derived from the successful experience of transit agencies.

These findings and recommendations were incorporated into the presentation made at the Panel meeting. At the conclusion of the meeting, the Panel concurred with the concept of the guidelines and expressed its interest in seeing the guidelines incorporated into the revised work plan for Phase II. Accordingly, the four remaining tasks from the original work plan were restructured into three tasks, as described in the following paragraphs.

Task 8 — Develop Guidelines for Transit Crime Data Organization, Analysis, and Reporting. The overall objective of this task was to provide guidance to the transit industry on "best practices" that can increase the "usefulness" of crime and security incident data through improved methods for data organization, analysis, and reporting. The guidelines cover three major topics:

- Definition of "transit crime" and "transit-related crime"
- Organization of transit and transit-related crimes into categories for use by transit agencies and the FTA/NTD reporting program
- Effective presentation of transit crime data for management of police/security resources (internal reports) and public communications (external reports)

Task 9 — Develop Dissemination Plan for Guidelines. The key to the effective distribution of the guidelines developed for this project is to define the primary audience and present the information in locations where they will be looking. The research team believes that for transit security management, the forums for reaching the target audience most effectively are selected meetings and publications. The following means of distribution and dissemination have been recommended:

- Written reports and articles
- Notification of ongoing research
- Presentations at meetings

Task 10 — involved the preparation of this **Final Report**. The report includes a summary of the research results and key findings, along with an assessment of current practices in transit crime reporting which led to the recommendation/preparation of the guidelines. The **Guidelines for Transit Crime Data Analysis and Reporting** has been prepared as a stand-alone document in order to facilitate the dissemination of information throughout the transit industry. The guidelines are also presented in **Appendix D** of this report in order to provide the reader with a complete picture of the project results.

Chapter 2
Findings

The cumulative amount of information and data collected from the 21 responding transit police departments and transit security directors is very extensive. There are significant differences in data collection issues and problems between those agencies that have their own transit police department and those that depend upon a dedicated transit crime unit in the local police department or some form of contractual arrangement for their transit security services.

One obvious difference is based on the fact that transit police management has direct control over the types of data collected by their personnel and how that data is used, whereas the transit security manager dealing with the local police or a private security company on a contractual basis is much more dependent on the working relationship with the local police and on the terms of the contract and monitoring of the data as a means of quality control.

The process issues that must be considered for dedicated transit police are considerably different from those involving a dedicated transit crime unit in the local police agency or contracts with local police or private security companies; therefore, the findings in each functional area, e.g., data capture/collection, analysis, reporting, etc., are described separately for the three different approaches to transit policing.

2.1 TRANSIT-RELATED CRIME

One of the major objectives of this research was to develop an operational definition of "transit-related crime." The need to develop such a definition was based on the perception that many transit agencies are not able to obtain a complete description and understanding of the full range of crime-related events that have an effect on both the actual security of their patrons and employees and on the general public's perception of a safe transportation system.

In order to provide a basis for comment and discussion, a proposed operational definition of transit-related crime was used as one of the interview topics. The proposed definition was based on distinguishing between the following two terms:

- **Transit crime:** Those criminal activities that occur on board transit vehicles or within the confines of the fixed transit system (e.g., in transit facilities, on the rail right of way)

- **Transit-related crime:** Those criminal activities that occur on or in an area that is not exclusively used for transit activities, e.g., a bus stop. A transit-related crime impacts a transit patron or the transit system, but occurs in a mixed-use area that cannot be removed from the context of the surrounding community-at-large.

This definition of transit-related crime is based on the concept of geographic proximity to transit facilities or spaces such as a rail station or a bus stop. Transit agencies are concerned when criminal activity or quality of life security incidents occur to individuals that are in the process of using the transit facilities or who are in close proximity. Several examples can help to illustrate this concept:

- A passenger walking from a rail station to a parking lot that is not owned or operated by the transit agency

- A passenger on the way to a bus stop and is within one block of the stop
- An individual, who is not a passenger, is waiting in a public space (e.g., open mall) adjacent to a transit terminal

In each of the above examples, a crime committed against the individual does not actually take place on the transit agency's property; however, the agency is definitely interested in finding out about the incident and collecting detailed information and data for purposed of tracking and analysis of crime trends. The transit agency will find out directly if the victim (or observer) reports the crime through the transit police/emergency communication system. If the crime is reported to the local police, the transit agency will only find out about the event if there is a good working relationship with the local police and there are some ground rules for cross-reporting and information sharing.

The actual responses from transit police and security agencies regarding the proposed definition of transit related crime are presented in the following subsections.

Dedicated Transit Police Departments

There were a total of 13 responding transit police departments. Six of these departments were in general agreement with the proposed definition. One department (Houston MTA) indicated that it only uses the term *transit-related crime,* which covers both categories of crime.

Of the seven transit police departments that did not agree with the proposed definitions, only one expressed strong disagreement, stating that the definition of transit-related crime was too broad. This position appeared to be based upon a concern that the transit police department would be perceived as being responsible and accountable for crimes for which it had no jurisdiction.

One transit police department had not formed a definitive opinion at the time of the interview. The other four departments offered other alternative approaches to defining transit-related crime. These alternative approaches can be summarized as follows:

- Definition should emphasize the effects of the external environment on the scope and extent of crime
- Definition should include anything that occurs on buses, in waiting areas, bus stop shelters, transit hubs, transit stores, facilities, or park & rides
- Definition should involve the decision-making process regarding the choice to use public transit, i.e., the impact on prospective passengers and the general public
- Proposed definitions are useful for theoretical guidance but of questionable utility in supporting data collection efforts. The victim's purpose in being in a particular location should be determined as one way to distinguish transit-related crimes from general criminal activity.

Contracts With Local Law Enforcement/Private Security Companies

There were a total of seven responding agencies in the category. Four were in general agreement with the definition of transit-related crime. The other three expressed either no opinion or needed further clarification. One of the transit agencies (St. Louis, BSDA) that was in general agreement pointed out it only uses the term *transit crime* and it would apply to both of the definitions presented. Conversely, another agency (Los Angeles, LACMTA) noted that the term *transit-related crime* is used to describe all crime and security incident data that is reported to them through the contracts with the local police department and county sheriffs department.

One of the agencies noted that both definitions constitute transit crime, but pointed out that it needs clear definitions of all terms, e.g., how do you define a bus stop?

Dedicated Transit Crime Unit Within Local Police Force

The one respondent transit agency in this category (CTA) did not agree with the need for a definition of transit-related crime. In this case, the local police department has a special designation (location code) for crimes that occur on a bus, train or platform (which includes the station and adjacent tunnels). This transit agency believes that this is adequate for its purposes because any crime occurring just outside these areas will still be captured by the local police department and become part of its overall database.

Summary of Findings — Transit-Related Crime

The mixed response to the proposed definition of transit-related crime and the number of alternative definitions suggested by the respondents indicates that it will be very difficult to obtain consensus on a precise definition. It should be noted that the original reason for seeking a precise definition was to improve the accuracy and completeness of all crime data that has impact on transit agencies and their patrons. In fact, as discussed in the next section on **Transit Crime Data Collection**, there are very few problems with the underreporting of transit crime, and those few problems have no connection to the lack of a definition. Therefore, from the perspective of the transit agencies, there is no reason to change their own terminology or definitions.

There is, however, a very good reason to press for general acceptance of a uniform definition of transit-related crime. Such action will lead to a significant improvement in the measurement of transit crime at the national level, through FTA's NTD reporting system.

The lack of a consistent definition of transit-related crime leads to significant problems in the reporting of transit crime data to the FTA. These problems and their potential solutions are presented in **Chapter 3 — Assessment and Recommendations.**

2.2 TRANSIT CRIME DATA COLLECTION

One of the questions in the *Structured Interview Guide* dealt with the types of data that are collected on transit crimes and security incidents and the sources of the data. The objective of the question was to determine the extent and range of transit crime information available to the transit agency. A second question in the interview was focused on specific problems in the reporting of transit crime data to the transit agency.

The findings on transit crime data collection are presented in accordance with the different transit policing structures, followed by summary findings on common data collection trends and issues that cut across all policing structures.

Dedicated Transit Police Departments

Each of the **13 dedicated transit police departments interviewed** maintains the responsibility for collecting and processing transit crime and security incident data. The data typically comes directly from incident reports submitted by transit police officers and from incident reports/complaints called into the police dispatching center and/or operations dispatching center. Additional transit crime data is usually received from the local police departments in the major metropolitan area served by the transit system. This data is transmitted via crime reports (case

information) or as the result of an immediate referral by the local police dispatcher to the transit police dispatcher/communications center whenever the caller makes a reference to the transit system.

One of the impediments to transferring transit crime data from local police to transit police is the lack of a location code identifying transit property, facilities, and vehicles. Only one of the transit police departments (MCTO) cited its local (Minneapolis) police department offense/incident/arrest report form that specifically provided for identification of the following transit crime locations: Bus, Property, and Stop/Shelter. There was also the general category of "transit-related" to identify crime locations that did not fit into any of the location categories.

The transit police departments in the major cities with the largest populations were more likely to indicate that there was a problem in obtaining accurate data from local police agencies. These problems included the lack of transit-related location codes that would make it simpler to automatically extract transit crime and security incidents from the large database of crimes captured in the typical crime MIS maintained by major city police departments. Another problem in the major cities can be classified as a "turf problem" where the dedicated transit police department believes that some crimes (particularly unsolved Part I serious crimes) are classified as transit or transit-related crimes simply because they occur near a transit facility, rail line, or bus route (or as explained in one case, if the crime occurs within line of sight of a transit station or facility).

Aside from the lack of location codes and the occasional misclassification of a crime, **most of the transit police departments interviewed indicated that they had no problem in obtaining transit-related crime data from the local police agencies.** This is based on the establishment of good working relationships and cooperation between the police agencies. There were numerous

instances where these cooperative relationships extended to the formation of special anti-crime teams, made up of both transit and local police officers, to deal with transit-related crimes and security incidents.

There were also several examples of joint working agreements between transit and local police dealing with a broad range of issues including the handling of crime data. In Cleveland, the **Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority (GCRTA)** has established guidelines for transit police officers under terms of the authorizing agreement between the City of Cleveland and the GCRTA. One of these guidelines (General Police Order 98-001) provides transit police officers with the same authority as Cleveland police officers while outside GCRTA property but within Cleveland as follows:

- When transit police officers are within the downtown area known as "Public Square" (an area consisting of several city blocks) at times when bus and/or train service is being provided to this area
- When transit police officers are within Cleveland and en route to or from GCRTA property
- When transit police officers are participating in a properly approved, cooperative enforcement effort with Cleveland police

A companion guidelines document (General Police Order 98-002) provides specific policy and instructions on GCRTA police department response to calls for service, follow-up investigation procedures, report generation, arrest procedures and evidence handling procedures. The example information from Cleveland provides a clear picture of a comprehensive cooperative effort between transit police and local police.

Another example of a cooperative arrangement between transit police and local police came from the **Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA).** A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Metro Transit Police (MTP) and the Prince Georges County Police Department (PGPD) provides for the patrol of WMATA facilities through the joint policing concept. The MTP and the PGPD have concurrent jurisdiction on all WMATA facilities within the county, with MTP having primary responsibility and both agencies sharing responsibility for handling incidents that occur in parking lots.

The MOU provides specific instructions for the reporting of incidents. The first officer on the scene will generally be responsible for filing the requisite police reports; however, regardless of which agency handles the call for service, there is to be an exchange of all information and reports between the two agencies. There is also a provision for the cross-referencing of case number/control number between the two agencies for purposes of tracking and MIS.

The jurisdiction of the MTP is limited to all the transit facilities (including bus stops) owned, controlled, or operated by WMATA. The WMATA authorizing legislation also includes a definition of a bus stop as "that area within 150 feet of a Metrobus bus stop sign, excluding the interior of any building not owned, controlled, or operated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority."

A transit police department's expectation of receiving data from its local police departments appears to diminish as one moves away from the city center out to the suburban areas, particularly those served by commuter rail only. In some locations, the transit police would have to set up

reporting relationships with more than 50 local law enforcement agencies in order to obtain data on transit-related crimes in the areas outside the central city.

The transit police departments generally believe that the informal working relationships with local law enforcement agencies, which are developed over time through regional meetings, training programs and other coordinated activities, provide them with ample contacts and opportunities to find out about specific crime and security problems at their various rail stations, bus terminals and other facilities.

Quality of Life Crimes

One of the major research issues addressed in the data collection process is the ability of transit agencies to obtain accurate data on quality of life crimes and security incidents. Prior research by the project team and others has made it clear that transit crimes falling under the broad category of quality of life issues — including disorderly conduct, graffiti/vandalism, homelessness/vagrancy, fare evasion, objects thrown at vehicle, etc. — require the largest commitment of police/security resources. Therefore, it was important to determine through the interview process the extent of data collected on quality of life crimes and any problems associated with the reporting of the data.

Virtually all of the transit police departments interviewed capture a very wide range of crime data, including all of the crimes/incidents that are considered to be quality of life issues. There is no standard or uniform approach to categorizing these crimes for purposes of internal reporting. In most cases, the transit police department also captures data on many other non-criminal incidents such as aided cases (medical or police assistance, confused person, disoriented, courtesy ride, hospital trip, etc.).

Based on the information provided, it is evident that **all of the dedicated transit police departments have the capability to capture data on all possible types of quality of life issues.** It is also evident that the vast majority of the quality of life incident data is derived directly from transit police reports, transit system dispatcher logs and customer complaints calls — not from other local law enforcement agencies. The only exceptions are in those cases where there is concurrent jurisdiction and joint policing arrangements between the transit police and the local police. Local police agencies generally give low priority to collecting data on quality of life crimes, unless it is a part of their mandate under a community policing strategy.

Effects of External Reporting Requirements

One of the issues to be addressed in the research is the impact that external reporting requirements have on the transit crime data collection process. There are two external reporting requirements which have an impact on transit police departments: the **Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR)** system administered by the FBI; and the **Federal Transit Administration's (FTA's) National Transit Database (NTD)** reporting system, which requires submission of transit security data based, for the most part, on the standardized UCR definitions.

None of the transit police departments indicated that the external reporting requirements had any effect on their collection of crime/incident data. Typically the transit police extracted the data required by the UCR and provided it to the local police agency, regional crime information agency, or the state agency responsible for submitting it directly to the FBI. The transit agencies with a transit crime MIS had the capability to automatically generate the required UCR data files.

One transit police department (GCRTA) indicated that its regional crime information agency was compiling and reporting data under the newer National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS). The biggest difference between NIBRS and the traditional UCR system is the degree of detail in reporting. In the traditional system, law enforcement agencies tally the number of occurrences of Part I offenses, as well as arrest data for both Part I and Part II offenses, and submit aggregate counts of the collected data in monthly summary reports either directly to the FBI or indirectly through the state UCR programs. There is no requirement to link arrests and exceptional clearances back to previously submitted incident reports.

In NIBRS, law enforcement agencies collect detailed data regarding individual crime incidents and arrests and submit them in separate "reports" using prescribed data elements and data values to describe each incident and arrest. Therefore, NIBRS involves incident-based reporting, where incident reports are submitted for a broad range of crimes identified as Group "A" offenses. There are a total of 46 Group "A" offense codes. Incident reports are made up of the following six segments:

- Administrative Segment
- Offense Segment
- Property Segment
- Victim Segment
- Offender Segment
- Arrestee Segment

These segments are linked together by means of an Originating Agency Identifier (OAI) number and an incident number assigned by the agency to each Group "A" incident report to create a unique Originating Agency Case (OAC) number.

There are a total of 11 Group "B" offenses that are reported only when an arrest is involved and then only when an arrest report is submitted. The Group "B" arrest report is uniquely identified by the OAI number and the arrest transaction number. The Group "B" offenses are identified as follows in NIBRS:

- Bad Checks
- Curfew/Loitering/Vagrancy Violations
- Disorderly Conduct
- Driving Under the Influence
- Drunkenness
- Family Offenses, Non-violent
- Liquor Law Violations
- Peeping Tom
- Runaway
- Trespass of Real Property
- All Other Offenses

The NIBRS system goals are to enhance the quantity, quality and timeliness of the data; and improve the methodology used for compiling, analyzing, auditing, and publishing the collected crime

data. However, the **NIBRS still has the same limitation as UCR for transit agencies, i.e., there is no requirement to report the number of incidents involving quality of life crimes, unless there is an arrest involved.** In either case, whether UCR or NIBRS is used, the external reporting requirements do not have any major impact on the data collection practices of the dedicated transit police departments.

Contracts With Local Law Enforcement/Private Security Companies

There were a total of **seven transit agencies interviewed** in this category. The organizational arrangements for data collection and reporting were so varied that it is difficult to generalize the findings. The following presents a brief summary of the findings regarding crime data collection for each of the transit agencies.

Los Angeles County MTA. The MTA's Office of Safety and Security receives all of its transit-related crime data in a processed format from the Los Angeles Police Department (within the city limits) and from the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (outside the city limits). The Office of Safety and Security compiles the data into a consolidated transit crime/security incident report.

Miami-Dade Transit Authority. The MDTA's Office of Safety & Security uses a transit crime reporting system developed by their private security company (Wackenhut) for crime statistics on the Metrorail (heavy rail) and Metromover (automated guideway system). The Transit Bureau of the Miami-Dade Police Department provides crime data on Metrobus.

Milwaukee County Transit. A contractor (Wackenhut) has the responsibility for recording and processing crime data using software that was custom-designed by an off-duty Milwaukee police officer. Local police departments generally handle Part I crimes and do a consistent job of reporting the disposition of any transit-related crimes to the Security Director (Wackenhut employee).

AC Transit (Oakland). The Chief of Security reviews daily reports from the two county sheriffs departments that are under contract, as well as the bus operations central dispatch records, as part of his ongoing assessment of crime trends and issues. There is no formal crime data processing and analysis system within AC Transit. The Chief of Security believes that his good working relationships with local law enforcement, such as the Oakland Police Department, leads to rapid notification of transit-related crime issues.

Phoenix Transit System. This bus system, including the security function, is managed and operated by a subsidiary of a private company (ATC/VanComm). It does not have a crime/security MIS. Crime and security incident data is entered into a spreadsheet for current analysis and for future input into a more complete MIS. The Security Office works proactively with local law enforcement agencies to obtain police reports for each transit-related incident.

Utah Transit Authority. The Public Safety Department has the responsibility for collecting crime/incident data using 15 sworn "peace officers" from Wackenhut. The Public Safety Department also exchanges crime/incident data (case numbers) with local law enforcement agencies. The Risk Management Department maintains an MIS that incorporates the security incident data. The monthly report to UTA's general manager includes two pages (color graphics) devoted to transit security incidents.

Bi-State Development Agency (St. Louis). The Security Department has the sole responsibility for processing transit crime and security incident data. The data is provided under contract arrangements with the St. Louis City and St. Louis County Police Departments (trains, stations, parking lots, and undercover at bus stops and buses), and with two security companies providing general security on light rail vehicles and stations.

Despite the wide range of transit crime data collection practices, **there was a general consensus that the transit agencies were receiving and processing all of the relevant security incident information.** For example, no transit agency indicated that it had a problem of underreporting of transit crime because transit police or security officers are not available. They either stated that there was an extensive presence of security personnel on the system, or that crimes/incidents were reported directly to a bus operator (or other operating personnel) who calls in the incident to central dispatch and completes an incident form.

For the most part, these transit agencies did not indicate that they had incomplete statistics as the result of local law enforcement agencies that were unable or unwilling to provide data on transit-related crimes. The agencies that did cite some problems included Miami-Dade TA and Phoenix Transit; both found that some local police departments were unable to separate transit-related crimes, making it impossible to retrieve them for MIS purposes. Also, Bi-State in St. Louis had some communication problems with local police departments that were providing bus patrols.

There were no significant problems with regard to reporting on quality of life crimes. Most of the systems have a very complete record of all types of incidents, including those that are considered to be non-security related. For example, Milwaukee County Transit believes that it has

good data on quality of life crimes because of diligent bus operators, undercover security officers, and video cameras on buses. Bi-State in St. Louis reports that they have no problems on their light rail system due to extensive coverage by its own contract security personnel, and that the patrons of the bus system are very vigilant and call the police whenever there is any type of problem.

External reporting requirements (UCR and NTD) had little, if any, impact on these agencies. For the most part, local police departments under contract to the transit agency include transit crime data as part of their overall reporting under UCR. The transit agencies handle the NTD reporting to the FTA by using the crime data provided by their private security companies and any local police department that was under contract.

Dedicated Transit Crime Unit Within Local Police Force

There were four transit agencies identified as interview candidates in this category. After repeated attempts (including assistance from a TCRP panel member), **one transit agency participated in the interview process — the Chicago Transit Authority**. The research team was also able to synthesize information about the transit crime data collection practices of New York City Transit based on prior project experience and knowledge. The following provides a brief summary of the transit crime data collection process at both of these major transit agencies.

The **Chicago Transit Authority (CTA)** depends primarily upon the Public Transportation Section of the Chicago Police Department (CPD) for its transit crime data collection and processing. This section provides patrol security for the CTA Rapid Transit System and other CTA vehicles and

facilities within city limits. The CTA also receives crime reports and summary statistics from the Evanston and Oak Park Police Departments.

The Chicago Police Department reports to CTA via computer-generated reports from a transit crime MIS — RAMIS. The reporting codes used by the CPD include location codes that identify various CTA sites such as bus, platform, station, and train. They also encode the address and the level at which the crime took place in the rapid transit line, e.g., subway, surface, elevated. The RAMIS reports provided to the CTA are very detailed in that they provide data on each case tabulated in numerous ways such as: by bus route name or rapid transit line; by offense; by day of week and time of day; by address; by offense; by site (location). However, the RAMIS reports only provide information on Part I (index) crimes. Similarly, the Evanston and Oak Park (towns north of Chicago) Police Departments also report only on Part I crimes.

Data on quality of life crimes is not part of the formal reporting system. Information on such incidents has to be derived from incident and complaint reports filed by CTA operating personnel.

The General Manager of Security at CTA does not believe that there are any significant problems in CTA transit crime data reporting. Among the factors he cited were an extensive police and security guard presence throughout the rail and bus system including 24 hour per day coverage at rail stations, and well established communications and good working relationships with all of the local police departments. The General Manager of Security at the CTA was formerly a commander in the Public Transportation Section of the CPD. He also noted that the CTA receives copies of individual incident reports from local police agencies, which CTA can then review and analyze to obtain more in-depth information on particular crimes and security incidents.

New York City Transit (NYCT). NYCT maintained a separate transit police department up to April 1995, when the more than 4,500 members of that department were merged into the New York City Police Department (NYPD). As was the case before the merger, policing of the city's 3,500 buses and bus routes is the duty of the NYPD. Prior to the merger, the transit police, except for a small surface crime unit, were responsible only for policing the subway system: a 24-hour, 7 days per week operation involving 468 subway stations and some 5,800 subway cars. Currently, the Transit Bureau of NYPD patrols the entire subway and bus system, which carries 3.5 million passengers per day.

The above description has been provided as a means of indicating the sheer size of NYCT's transit policing operation and the commensurate scope and volume of transit crime data collection and reporting. Transit crime data is integrated with all other crime data and processed in a specialized analysis and reporting program — NYPD's Compstat (Computer Statistics) program. The current process involves the recording of crime data (arrests and complaints) on the computer network at each of the city's 76 precincts. At the end of each week, the precincts send the data via diskette to headquarters for incorporation into a citywide database. Efforts are underway to eliminate the use of diskettes and capture the data on a daily basis using NYPD's new on-line complaint system. This would provide commanders with crime information in 24 hours, rather than weekly.

The Compstat program converts crime statistics into charts, graphs, and maps that allow commanders to quickly see how certain crimes are affecting their precincts. NYPD holds twice-weekly Compstat meetings that last for three hours and focus on one of the city's five boroughs. All precinct commanders are expected to attend at least one of the meetings each month. The system

provides up to 26 weeks of crime data displayed on large screens in the meeting room as a means of helping precinct commanders to identify problem areas.

In the absence of a specific interview with staff of either NYCT or the Transit Bureau of the NYPD, it is not possible to cite any problems that exist in the reporting of transit crime. Based on prior research and documentation available to the project team, regarding an earlier version of their transit crime MIS — the NYCTA Transit Police On-Line Transit Police System (OLTPS) — it is likely that the NYPD continues to use an extensive set of crime codes and location codes that would enable it to pinpoint the types of crimes in a particular location anywhere within the NYCT system. For example, the location codes in OLTPS were categorized into precise locations such as northbound platform, turnstile, booth, and escalator.

NYPD has reduced crime occurrences in recent years, with a major factor being its aggressive pursuit of quality of life offenses. Therefore, it is certain that NYPD has placed an emphasis on quality of life crime data, including all such crimes that are transit-related.

Summary of Findings — Transit Crime Data Collection

The overall findings on transit crime data collection indicates that, while there are major differences in the ways that transit agencies collect data, there are no substantive problems in the accuracy and completeness of the crime data. This finding is based upon the interview responses from the 21 transit agencies, particularly their comments about the potential underreporting of transit crime data.

The anticipated problem associated with obtaining transit crime data from local law enforcement agencies did not turn out to be a significant issue. Transit police departments in the

largest metropolitan areas indicated that they encountered some problems with misclassification of transit crimes and no use of transit location codes by local police departments; however, these agencies did not believe that such problems had a significant impact on the accuracy and completeness of their crime statistics. Transit agencies contracting with local law enforcement agencies and/or private security companies also indicated that they were receiving all of the relevant transit crime data, even in two instances where there were some MIS data retrieval problems and some lack of communication problems with local police departments.

Data on quality of life crimes was also a focal point of the research. Both transit police departments and those transit agencies contracting for security services collected a very wide range of crime and security incident data, including all types of quality of life crimes. A number of transit agencies noted that they had good data on quality of life crimes due to a combination of extensive police/security force presence, diligent operating personnel, vigilant transit patrons, and increasing use of CCTV surveillance technology.

External reporting requirements (UCR and NTD) had no discernible impact or effect on transit crime data collection. Transit police departments extract the data required by UCR and NTD from their transit crime information systems. Transit agencies contracting for security services depend upon the local police departments to report UCR data; and they construct the NTD reports to the FTA using crime data provided by private security companies and local police departments under contract.

2.3 ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION, AND USES OF TRANSIT CRIME DATA

This section of the report presents findings regarding the various ways that transit police/security departments analyze, present, and use their transit crime data. The approach used to present and discuss the findings is to focus on the various ways in which the departments use transit crime data. The interview form had one question dealing with the uses of transit crime and incident data for the following purposes:

- Tactical deployment of uniformed and plainclothes police/security officers
- Strategic planning and budgeting for personnel/equipment
- Evaluation of the effectiveness of crime countermeasures

The findings are presented for each of the three different policing structures, followed by a summary of the general findings.

Dedicated Transit Police Departments

The transit police departments in the larger metropolitan areas use daily or weekly reports on transit crime and security incidents to make **decisions about deployment of uniformed and plainclothes personnel.** The essential information contained in these reports includes specific types of crimes and incidents by location. The information is tabulated by mode, e.g., rail lines, bus routes, making it easy to identify a specific location where a particular type of crime is being committed more frequently than expected.

The individual(s) studying the data and making the deployment decision is typically very aware of the transit crime patterns in the overall system (or a sector/precinct if it is a very large system). Therefore, it is not necessary for them to refer to crime trend data in order to identify an unusually high frequency of crimes in one particular location.

Some of the transit police agencies made it clear that while they used the transit crime data statistics in their decision making, they also relied on their own background and experience with security problems at the transit agency. It was also clear that, for most of these agencies, the number of serious crimes against persons and against property was relatively small; therefore, supervisory and management personnel would be likely to be very aware of the location and frequency of all serious crimes.

The number of quality of life crimes is much higher; therefore, it is more necessary to analyze incident data to make determinations of trends and patterns which can be used in tactical decision making. A number of the transit police departments have placed special emphasis on the reduction of quality of life crimes and the maintenance of order on their transit systems as a means of promoting quality service for their passengers. Several examples will help to illustrate this point and how they use data to support their actions.

The **MARTA (Atlanta) Police Department** formed a new specialized unit, the Crime Suppression Team (CST) to deal with juvenile crime, disorder and other issues of concern that had been identified by MARTA riders. These issues include: eating, drinking, and smoking on trains and buses and in stations; fare evasion; littering; vandalism and graffiti; panhandling or solicitation; and playing loud electronic devices without earphones.

The CST had some difficulty with uniform, even-handed enforcement because of the different legal status of some of these offenses, e.g., smoking on a train was a violation of the law, but eating on a train was only a policy violation. In 1998, the Georgia legislature resolved the problem by amending and expanding the statutes to make all quality of life offenses into misdemeanors. CST officers are now able to issue citations to offenders, who must then appear in court.

MARTA has been able to use its crime data reporting system to demonstrate that the campaign to reduce quality of life crime has been very successful. Violations on the system have decreased and court cases have declined steadily as the public becomes more aware of the prohibitions.

The **MBTA (Boston) Police Department** collects data on all criminal activity, as well as non-criminal or suspicious activity occurring within its jurisdiction. Its data reporting system is very flexible, allowing the crime analyst to develop a wide range of *ad hoc* reports, which are distributed to the command staff and the investigative section. The MBTA points out that emerging crime trends can be identified through a review of the crime reports, but they are normally detected more quickly by field personnel (beat officers) who are responding to and investigating the crimes. On the other hand, the review of the monthly crime statistics by command staff is an effective method of identifying significant reductions in criminal activity which may not be as quickly recognized by field personnel. Identification of reduced criminal activity at specific locations during particular times of the day makes it possible to consider redeployment of resources.

The **GCRTA (Cleveland) Transit Police Department** has been very proactive in its focus on disorder on the transit system. Its patrol/police operations philosophy calls for the transit police to initiate actions to remove persons and conditions that breed disorder, because disorder creates the fertile conditions that allow crime to flourish. The police department's monthly reports that track crimes against persons, crimes against property, and incidents by location cover the gamut of quality of life crimes and provide a basis for measuring the effectiveness of its policing strategy.

The GCRTA police have also carried out a detailed evaluation of their policing strategy as part of a special effort (Quality Improvement Team) on one rail line (Red Line). The pilot program targeting the Red Line involved eight officers who were assigned to platform, station, parking lot patrols and train duties. GCRTA police conducted "before and after" surveys of passengers as a means of evaluating the effectiveness of the targeted line program. They have also conducted a similar evaluation of the target route program on a bus route where passenger surveys were conducted on both the target and non-target (control) bus routes. In both cases, this proactive policing strategy resulted in improvements in passenger ratings of safety and in increased recognition of a transit police presence. This is one example of an approach to determining the effectiveness of a particular policing strategy by using quantitative data on reported crimes and incidents, combined with surveys measuring passenger perception of safety.

Transit crime and incident data and statistics are used as part of **strategic planning and budgeting efforts** by many of the dedicated transit police departments. Several transit police agencies stated that crime data and crime rates are factored directly into the department's strategic plan/goal or into the overall strategic business plan of the entire transit agency. The **BART**

(Oakland) Police Department indicated that its Board of Directors requests routine and specialized crime data reports to review for trends and particular problem areas. In certain instances, the Board has used the data to allocate special funding for personnel and equipment to address specific issues, such as changing to zone policing or for anti-vandalism programs.

The **SEPTA (Philadelphia) Police Department** has recently begun providing crime data to the SEPTA Engineering and Construction Department to support ongoing capital projects involving procurement of telecommunications, radio, and closed circuit television equipment. This activity provides the SEPTA police with a new means of participating in the upgrades of the transit system security.

The typical **reporting mechanism for internal use** within a transit agency is the **monthly management report**. The report generally includes summary statistics on transit crimes and security incidents by mode and line, along with descriptions of police activities for the month. For example, the **MBTA's monthly report** includes Part I crime statistics (monthly and year-to-date comparisons with prior year crime data) and a listing of significant occurrences during the month. The listing includes descriptions of various transit police activities and a series of activity measures such as the number of:

- Station checks
- Bus checks
- Homeless persons transported to shelters
- Directed patrols (a.m. and p.m.)
- Overtime hours for school breaks/special events

- Arrests made
- Calls for service
- Number of patrol hours on trains and in stations

One different type of monthly report is *Transit Blue* published by the **Minneapolis Metro Transit Police**. The report is published exclusively for the purpose of keeping transit employees informed, and is not for public distribution. The report is in newsletter form with a brief table of crime incidents (total reported incidents, violent incidents, physical assault on drivers, transit police arrests) comparing current month and year-to-date with last year. The report also contains descriptions of typical criminal incidents with attention-catching headlines ("Robber captured on video, captured by cops," "Fare evader can't evade his warrants," "Vandal tailed and jailed," "Dopes deal dope in front of cops"); and information sidebars such as "FYI: No one rides for free," noting that when transit police officers remove a troublemaker from a bus, they check to see if he or she has any outstanding warrants — and that more often than not the suspect has a warrant or two — resulting in an arrest and booking.

A transit police department with an automated transit crime MIS can produce a wide variety of reports for internal use on a daily, weekly or monthly basis. As one example, it is interesting to note how a large transit system such as WMATA (Washington, D.C.) chooses to present its top-level reports. **WMATA** produces a **monthly crime statistics report** that contains the following information:

- Part I offenses by category of offense

- Part I offenses by location (bus, rail, parking lots)
- Part II offenses by location
- Number of arrests, citations/summons issued, calls for service and fare evasion

The above data is presented in current month vs. same-month-last-year comparisons and year-to-date vs. last year-to-date tabulations. The data tables also indicate how many of the current year's offenses have been closed.

The WMATA crime statistics report also includes a breakdown of Part I and Part II offenses into crimes against person, crimes against property, and for Part II only — crimes against society. Month-to-month and year-to-date comparisons are provided for the following locations:

- Trains
- Buses
- Stations
- Bus Stops
- Parking Lots
- Facilities

The final part of the report provides a graphic (bar chart) illustrating the number of total (Part I plus Part II) offenses and the total number of cases closed for the current month vs. the same month last year. There is a separate bar chart for each of the six locations identified above.

The WMATA monthly report presents a large amount of crime data in a very compact and efficient format.

One final example of the different methods for presenting crime data is the monthly crime statistic report produced by the **New York MTA Police Department**. The MTA's Crime Analysis Unit compiles a consolidated monthly report from two distinct and independent transit crime data

systems: the Eastern Region (formerly the Long Island Railroad Police) and the Northern Region (formerly the Metro-North Railroad Police). The Crime Analysis Unit is faced with the complex task of trying to reconcile crime data processed through two different systems and present the data in a consistent and uniform consolidated format.

The MTA's monthly report is more analytical than the other monthly reports described earlier since it provides explanations for significant shifts in transit crimes. One other notable feature of the report is a "Glossary of Terms" that provides the MTA's definitions for all of the offenses and incidents described in the report. The major focus of the report is on changes in the number of felony and misdemeanor incidents, with detailed breakdowns for the following major offenses: homicides, forcible rape/sodomy, other sex offenses, robberies, felony assaults, and grand larcenies. This report also provides a summary of all incidents, including felonies, misdemeanors, violations, and non-criminal. The number of aided cases, a subset of the non-criminal category, is presented as a separate tabulation.

Due to the size and geographical extent of the MTA's commuter railroad systems, both the Eastern and Northern Regions are subdivided into four districts. Crime statistics are presented separately for each of the eight districts. Some of the crime data reporting issues that the Crime Analysis Unit (CAU) has encountered provide insight into the issue of classification of crimes for analysis and reporting purposes. For example, prior to a quality control audit by the CAU, the category of Explosive Device/Suspicious Package was classified as a felony in the Northern Region. The audit resulted in a reclassification of a number of these felonies into misdemeanors and non-criminal events.

In another example, the standardization of reporting practices at the MTA, consistent with uniform crime reporting standards, led to a situation where many incidents that had previously been classified as grand larceny (a major offense), were now classified as lost property (a non-criminal event). Therefore, comparisons of prior year to current year monthly crime statistics reflected substantial changes in these categories.

Contracts With Local Law Enforcement/Private Security Companies

The transit agencies in this category are generally dependent upon their contractors to process and analyze crime data. This is particularly true for the larger agencies, such as the Los Angeles County MTA, which have to deal with a large volume of crime data and statistics. The smaller agencies are in a better position to keep track of all crimes and security incidents on their own computers using a simple spreadsheet or database format and standard commercial software. The transit agencies use the crime data for both tactical deployment and strategic planning purposes, as illustrated in some of the examples cited below.

Los Angeles MTA. The Security Department compiles crime data provided by the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD). The MTA Manager of Security meets with the LAPD and LASD on a regular basis to discuss specific crime trends and appropriate responses. The MTA has been involved in the development of a compliance-monitoring guide that will be used for assessing compliance in accordance with their contractual agreements with LAPD and LASD. The draft guide includes: assessment of staffing

levels and personnel allocation; foot and marked radio car patrol deployments; provision of saturation patrols on high profile bus routes, stations, and known problem areas with uniform and plainclothes patrols, as appropriate; and the provision of special patrols targeted to graffiti/vandalism and fare evasion, e.g., the plainclothes Graffiti Habitual Offenders Suppression Team (GHOST) deployed on the bus system.

Miami-Dade Transit Authority. MDTA has a contract with the Wackenhut Corporation to provide more than 100 armed non-sworn Custom Protection Officers (CPOs) on the Metrorail and Metromover systems. Wackenhut maintains a Metrorail / Metromover MIS that provides statistical data and crime summaries. Monthly crime statistics are compared to prior month and year to identify crime trends and locations. The CPO security staff is allocated in accordance with the crime data that indicates increasing or decreasing levels of crime at particular stations or locations.

The Transit Bureau of the Miami-Dade Police Department is responsible for the arrest and apprehension of criminals on Metrorail, Metromover, and Metrobus. The transit bureau's primary role is to provide security for Metrobus by providing undercover operations, incident response, and bus vehicle tails. These assignments are coordinated with the MDTA's Office of Safety and Security.

Milwaukee County Transit System (MCTS). The contractor (Wackenhut) has the responsibility for processing and reporting crime data to the MCTS Director of Operations. The MIS was custom designed by an off-duty Milwaukee police officer to meet the needs of MCTS. The system was specifically developed to provide better data (type of crime, time of day, location, etc.) which could then be used to design strategies for personnel deployment. For example, shift hours of security officers were recently changed to reflect the lack of crimes (as reported from the MIS) late at

night. MCTS security has also been able to use the reported data to design outreach programs that are directed at specific schools where students riding MCTS buses have become of particular concern. Approximately 10,000 school children ride MCTS daily and account for a number of quality of life crimes.

AC Transit (Oakland). The Chief of Security at AC Transit makes decisions on deployment in conjunction with the two county sheriff's departments (Alameda, Contra Costa) that are under contract with AC Transit. There is no transit crime data processing and analysis within AC Transit. The Chief of Security reviews all police incident reports submitted by the sheriffs departments and the daily reports of all security incidents recorded on the central dispatch sheets. This review occurs on a daily basis such that the chief is in a position to develop immediate action plans, including joint operations with the Oakland Police Department.

Phoenix Transit System. This transit system is operated under contract by a private transit management company. The security function is part of the operational services provided. The crime data system consists of a spreadsheet listing of all security incidents. Most of the data is reported by the bus operators using a special Blue Card incident form. Their deployment strategy is based on this incident data, i.e., security personnel assignments are based on preventing repetitive incidents (same time of day and location).

Utah Transit Authority (UTA). The Security Manager makes decisions regarding the deployment of 15 sworn "peace officers" working under UTA's contract with Wackenhut. The Security Manager examines all crime and incident data to identify those that occur within

geographical clusters. The UTA's focus is on quality of life crimes involving intoxicated passengers, homeless persons, and juvenile riders.

Bi-State Development Agency (St. Louis). This transit agency maintains contracts with both local law enforcement and private security companies. Bi-State has contracts with the St. Louis City Police Department (7 officers) and the St. Louis County Police Department (12 officers) to provide security for trains, stations and parking lots. Off-duty police officers are used for plainclothes assignments at bus stops and on buses. Bi-State contracts with two security companies to provide general security on the light rail vehicles and stations. All security officers, except those assigned to fare enforcement, are armed and have powers of arrest.

The Security Director maintains all crime and incident statistics on his computer. Due to the low number of security incidents on the system, the Security Director makes tactical deployment decisions on the basis of rider complaints and the daily reports filed by security and police officers.

When queried about the use of transit crime and incident data in **strategic planning and budgeting**, only Los Angeles, Miami and St. Louis responded affirmatively. The crime data trends are used to support requests for personnel and resources to deal with specific types of security problems. Bi-State (St. Louis) provided an example where crime data was used to identify a park-and-ride lot with an unusually high level of auto burglary and theft. As a result, funds were allocated to construct a tower and install CCTV cameras for surveillance of the lot.

For the transit agencies in this category, reports on crime statistics and trends are used only for internal purposes, primarily for advising senior management on the overall status of security efforts and the impact on crime. In general, the data was not used to conduct evaluations of the

effectiveness of new policing strategies; however, three out of the seven systems interviewed made specific reference to using the data to evaluate the effectiveness of CCTV cameras on buses.

Dedicated Transit Crime Unit Within Local Police Force

As noted earlier in this section, the only transit agency interviewed in this category was the **Chicago Transit Authority (CTA).** The CTA depends upon crime reports prepared by the Public Transportation Section (PTS) of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). The General Manager of Security Services at CTA works in very close coordination with the PTS in making tactical decisions on deployment based on the detailed monthly crime reports (RAMIS). The General Manager was previously with the CPD as a former commander in the PTS; therefore, he has the background and experience that facilitates communication and cooperation with the PTS on both tactical deployment and strategic planning issues.

The emphasis at CTA is on Part I (index) crimes since the monthly crime reports from the CPD, as well as the Evanston and Oak Park Police Departments, only provide data on Part I crimes. The CTA does use the detailed monthly crime reports to evaluate the effectiveness of special policing initiatives; however, there is no formal incorporation of transit crime data into strategic planning and budgeting.

The information compiled on **New York City Transit (NYCT)** without the benefit of a direct interview is quite limited when it comes to the use of transit crime data. The Transit Bureau of the NYPD has the responsibility for preparing crime data reports. As cited earlier, transit crime data is integrated with all other crime data and process in a specialized analysis and reporting program —

NYPD's Compstat Program. The Compstat Program converts crime statistics into charts, graphs and maps which are used in very frequent and intensive meetings which are specifically designed to identify problem areas and to develop effective policing strategies to deal with those problems.

Summary of Findings — Analysis, Presentation, and Uses of Transit Crime Data

One of the most striking findings from the research team's interviews is the diversity of transit crime analysis systems and presentation formats used by transit agencies. They range from an agency where there is no formal analysis and presentation of crime data (AC Transit) to the very extensive Compstat program used by the NYPD. There is no commonality in the descriptions of types of crime and the codes assigned to crime types, or the methods for presenting crime statistics in tabular or graphic formats.

Despite this diversity, there was no indication that any of the transit agencies perceived that there was any problem in using their transit crime data as part of the decision making process for the tactical deployment of uniformed and plainclothes police/security officers. This is attributable to the capabilities of the decision makers, many with an extensive record of policing experience, to analyze crime data in a variety of formats and combine it with other information gathered through internal/external communications. In the case of a smaller transit agency (with no rail operations), such as AC Transit, it is clear that the decision maker (Chief of Security) can function effectively by simply reviewing police incident reports and central dispatch incident reports on a daily basis, rather than depending upon a formal transit crime information system.

The use of transit crime data for strategic planning and budgeting was very limited. Only two transit systems (BART and SEPTA) were able to identify specific uses of crime data to support personnel and equipment funding requests.

Most of the transit agencies indicated that they use transit crime data analysis to evaluate the effectiveness of crime countermeasures. One transit agency (GCRTA) submitted a detailed evaluation report on the effectiveness of a particular transit policing strategy that used quantitative crime statistics combined with survey data measuring passenger perception of safety. This approach to analysis and evaluation could become a model for future use.

Chapter 3
Assessment and Recommendations

3.1 ASSESSMENT OF FINDINGS

The previous chapter presents a series of detailed findings regarding transit crime data collection, analysis, and reporting, based on the experience of a variety of transit agencies with different organizational approaches to transit policing and security management. This chapter presents an overall assessment of these findings, leading to specific conclusions and recommendations for improving the usefulness of transit crime data. The topics of data collection, analysis, and reporting are discussed separately.

Transit Crime Data Collection

The overall conclusion that was drawn from an assessment of all the findings on transit crime data collection can be stated as follows:

Regardless of the transit policing and security arrangements used by transit agencies, there are no discernible problems in the collection of crime data.

All of the transit agencies interviewed indicated that their data collection methods provided the information necessary to manage police and security force resources. Data sources include incident reports submitted by transit police and security officers, reports/complaints called into the

transit police/operations dispatching center, or information transmitted via crime reports from the local police/sheriff's department(s).

Each of the transit agencies has a unique approach to handling the data collection process based on its particular situation and needs. Therefore, the research team made the determination that no specific recommendations could be made that would lead to improvements in the transit crime data collection process.

Transit Crime Data Analysis

The transit crime data analysis process consists primarily of the compilation of data and statistics into categories and groups. The compiled data is used to identify specific problems requiring short-range actions, and to define long-term trends that can be used for both internal planning and external communications.

The detailed findings in Chapter 2 clearly indicate the existence of several problems that affect the transit crime data analysis process. The first of these problems was the lack of a definition for ***transit-related crime***. The conclusion that was drawn from an assessment of the findings on this topic was:

The lack of a generally accepted definition of transit-related crime makes it impractical to compare transit crime rates between agencies, or to obtain a consistent and accurate picture of transit crime trends at a national level.

Individual transit agencies are not affected by the lack of a definition, because they have defined their own terms for transit-related crime. In effect, each agency understands the implications of crime data recorded at its own system, including the meaning of transit-related crime (if it uses the

term); however, transit agencies cannot communicate that information in a meaningful form to other transit agencies without an extensive explanation. This problem is compounded at the national level—particularly for FTA.

The second problem that affects transit crime data analysis is the lack of uniformity in the types of data collected about transit crime, and the names or terms used to describe different crimes. This problem is a natural outcome of the diversity of transit policing and security organizations, and the general lack of standard terminology in the industry. The only use of defined terms is for the eight serious crimes (homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny/theft, motor vehicle theft, arson) that are used for computing crime indices in the FBI/UCR reporting program. FTA has adopted these same terms in its NTD reporting program.

The FTA/NTD reporting program, based on the use of the FBI/UCR crime data structure, leads to the third problem affecting transit crime data analysis:

Under the current FTA/NTD reporting guidelines, there is the possibility of a significant undercount of a certain class of less serious crimes, sometimes known as "quality-of-life" crimes. This is due to the FTA's adoption of FBI/UCR reporting guidelines, which means that such crimes are only reported if there is an arrest associated with the crime.

Considering all of the above problems, it is clear that the process of analyzing (compiling) transit crime data will remain unique to each agency until there is a change in the FTA's reporting requirements. The recommendations of the research team, which include a decoupling of the FTA/NTD reporting system from the FBI/UCR data reporting structure, are presented at the end of this section.

Transit Crime Data Reporting

There are two major reasons for reporting transit crime data: meeting the internal needs of the transit agency; and communicating information to those outside the agency—particularly to passengers, the general public, and the media.

The transmission of a single year's crime data to the FTA represents a very narrow view of reporting. The broader context of reporting involves the effective presentation of crime data that is immediately useful for the task at hand—from a decision on deployment of police/security officers, to demonstrating that special efforts to combat crime at transit stations (or other locations) have paid off.

An assessment of the findings on transit crime data reporting leads to a conclusion similar to that for crime data analysis. Each transit agency has evolved its own specialized approach to the reporting and presentation of crime data. There is no consistency or uniformity in the graphics or data tables used by the agencies.

A number of the agencies have expended considerable time and effort to convert detailed crime data into readily understood and accessible combinations of graphs, charts, and tables. From the perspective of the research team, the effort involved in the development of specialized crime data presentation formats is worthwhile if it allows the agency to manage its resources, or communicate with patrons and the general public, more effectively.

It is also evident, based on information made available by participating transit agencies, that many police/security departments are able to operate with detailed logs or journals of crimes/security incidents and special computer runs set up to extract some narrowly defined events from a crime

database. Therefore, one cannot assume that the adoption of a particular presentation format or style will automatically lead to more effective use of the underlying data.

The general conclusion reached on transit crime data reporting can be stated as:

There are a number of good "models" for the effective presentation of crime data that should be considered by transit agencies; however, the final decision to use any particular format/style must be made by those involved in the collection and use of the data — transit police and security managers.

This conclusion leads directly to the concept of developing **Guidelines** that can be used by transit agencies on a "voluntary" basis. The guidelines concept is at the heart of the recommendations that are presented in the next section.

3.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

The research team formulated its recommendations in accordance with the major objective of the project — **increasing the usefulness of transit crime data**. The original approach, involving the proposed development of a new data collection methodology to reduce transit crime data leakage, was found to be unnecessary because agencies reported no discernible problems in the collection of crime data.

One of the key findings from the research was the total incompatibility of the transit crime analysis and reporting systems used by the 21 agencies interviewed for this project. This should not be a surprise, since each agency has developed its own system of transit crime names and codes, methods for compiling and organizing data, and formats/styles for data presentation — all in the absence of any standards or written guidance.

The research team recognizes that the analysis and reporting systems developed by the agencies are not likely to be changed until there is a compelling reason to do so. The recommendations do not require that agencies make such changes. Instead, the recommendations are directed to the reporting of transit and transit-related crime at the national level, under the FTA's NTD reporting system. The recommended approach calls for standardization in the compilation and aggregation of data reported to the FTA. In general, all agencies currently prepare their data reports for the FTA by extracting data from records or a crime database and compiling the data according to instructions presented in the NTD reporting manual. Therefore, the recommended changes will only affect the extraction and compilation process.

The long term goal of this project is to use the FTA/NTD reporting system as the means of accomplishing standardization of transit crime data industry-wide through **voluntary** means. This will lead to a situation where transit crime data will become more **useful** because it can be used in national studies of transit crime and for peer evaluations.

The research team decided to present detailed recommendations in the form of a guidelines document — **Guidelines for Transit Crime Data Analysis and Reporting**. The guidelines are designed to be distributed as a stand-alone document, using a newsletter or brochure format. A draft of the guidelines is presented in **Appendix D**. The key elements of the recommendations incorporated into the guidelines are summarized in the following paragraphs.

Recommended Changes in FTA's NTD Reporting Format

The central recommendation of this project is a proposed change in FTA's National Transit Database reporting format. The research team has modified the form (page 2 of Form 405) used by

transit agencies for reporting transit crime data to FTA. These modifications achieve the following major objectives:

1) The new form provides for the **voluntary** submission of data on **transit-related crime**, as a completely separate and distinct category. Voluntary reporting is recommended to accommodate those transit agencies/police chiefs who are reluctant or unable to provide data on incidents which take place in areas outside their jurisdiction (property not owned or leased by the transit agency). The reporting manual will contain definitions for **transit crime** and **transit-related crime**. This change will allow crime analysts and FTA to use the data knowing that it has been reported and compiled in a consistent manner.

2) The new form provides for a **complete decoupling of the FTA system from the FBI/UCR data reporting structure**, by removing the categories of Part I (crime index) and Part II offenses, and by requiring that all crimes and security incidents be reported to the FTA, whether or not an arrest was made. The form also provides for a reorganization of all crimes into three new analytical categories:

- **Violent Crimes**
- **Property Crimes**
- **Standard of Conduct Violations**

The guidelines contain detailed instructions on the assignment of specific crimes to each of the above categories. It should be noted that these changes do not require the collection of additional crime data; in most cases, agencies collect more data than required to complete the form.

Effective Presentation of Transit Crime Data

The second major objective of the guidelines is to encourage transit agencies to consider alternative methods for presentation of crime data and statistics. This is accomplished by way of examples of "best practices" showing some of the methods for effective presentation of transit crime data. Unlike the recommendations for changes in national level (FTA/NTD) reporting, these recommendations are intended for the benefit of individual agencies with an interest in making the best use of available crime data.

Transit police/security managers use data for a number of purposes, including tactical crime analysis (specific and immediate needs), strategic analysis (long-term crime trends), and administrative activities (presenting accomplishments to outside agencies and the public). The purpose that the data serves determines, in large part, the format for data presentation. The guidelines present examples of four ways that agencies can present crime data:

- Patterns and cycles
- Trends
- Comparisons
- Efficiency and effectiveness measures

Whenever applicable, the examples of graphs and tables presented in the guidelines incorporate the new crime categories and crime types as proposed for the new FTA/NTD reporting format.

The reader is advised to proceed to **Appendix D** for a complete presentation of the Recommended **Changes in FTA's NTD Reporting Format** and the **Effective Presentation of Transit Crime Data**.

Appendixes A, B, and C of the contractor's final report are not being published, but copies are available upon request from NCHRP.

Appendix D of the contractor's final report has been published as *TCRP Research Results Digest 41,* "Guidelines for Collecting, Analyzing, and Reporting Transit Crime Data."