



2024 Patrol Staffing Report

In 2007, the Madison Police Department contracted with Etico Solutions, Inc. for the completion of a patrol staffing study. The Etico study was completed in mid-2008. Along with the final report, Etico provided the department with spreadsheets that captured the methodology used in the study, so that the department can replicate the process using updated data to analyze patrol workload and staffing needs. This process was repeated for several years (2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012); the results were used to estimate overall MPD patrol staffing needs and to allocate existing MPD patrol resources.

In 2012, MPD transitioned to a new records management system (LERMS). The following year the Dane County 911 Center transitioned to a new CAD (computer aided dispatch) system (Tri Tech). These transitions created some significant obstacles to performing this analysis, and the process was not completed for the years 2013 or 2014. The annual analysis resumed in 2016 (examining 2015 data), and in the subsequent years.

In 2021, MPD contracted again with Etico Solutions, Inc. to update the spreadsheets and areas of analysis for the annual workload and staffing needs study. Specifically, the spreadsheets were updated to capture a multi-year comparison of data, to better highlight details of the shift relief factor, and to better capture workload.

Summary

A summary of the 2024 patrol staffing analysis:

- Reactive workload decreased to **147,014** hours in 2024. This represents about a **9% decrease** from 2023.
- In 2024, the MPD patrol function spent an average of about **31** minutes per hour on reactive (or obligated) patrol work. This includes time spent on administrative tasks.

- During 2024, a member of the community calling for police assistance had about an 11% chance that MPD call response was limited.
- 2024 patrol workload and leave time data demonstrate that MPD patrol staffing should be **244** officers. Meeting this standard would require the addition of **12 officer** positions assigned to patrol.

Methodology

The Etico methodology seeks to accurately estimate appropriate patrol staffing needs based on actual patrol workload and leave information. This provides a much more accurate reflection of patrol staffing needs than other methodologies, such as officer-to-population ratios, benchmarking, crime rates, etc. This methodology is consistent with the Police Personnel Allocation Manual, developed by the Northwestern University Center for Public Safety. It is also consistent with police staffing formulas recommended by the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP). In fact, the Etico methodology is more accurate (though also more labor-intensive) than the IACP process. The process does not directly address staffing for positions other than patrol officers. However, some positions – particularly that of patrol sergeant – are directly related to patrol staffing levels.

The first portion of the Etico analysis entails determining total patrol workload. Most of this data is obtained from the Dane County Public Safety Communications Center's Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system. This data is supplemented by dictated report, field report, and Tracs crash report data so that an average total officer time required for each CAD incident type can be calculated. Then, once the total number of incidents is determined, the total officer workload is calculated. Time spent on administrative functions is also factored into this calculation.

The second portion of the process is an analysis of officer leave time. Officers assigned to patrol do not work 365 days a year (they have regular days off as well as leave time days, such as vacation), and not all workdays are assigned to the patrol function (officers attend training, have special assignments, etc.). An analysis of leave time will determine the shift relief factor (SRF), a number approximating how many total officers in patrol are required to field one officer daily.

The final component to determining patrol staffing needs is finding the proper balance between reactive and proactive work (also referred to as obligated and unobligated time). Most of the officer workload data captured through the CAD reflects reactive work (generally, officers responding to calls for police service). However, the community expects a certain amount of proactive work from officers. This proactive work can focus on crime reduction strategies, problem solving, community engagement, and building relationships. If too little time is allocated to proactive work, an adverse impact on reactive work will also be observed (reduced visibility, increased response times, etc).

Analysis of 2024 MPD Patrol Workload

MPD completed the 2024 workload analysis using the updated methodologic framework provided by Etico in 2021. The analysis began with a data output from the CAD for all calls involving MPD

units. Because MPD's record management system has completely different codes than Dane County's CAD system, a series of data conversions are required to process the information. This CAD data was then compared against LERMS data to generate the most accurate call record available. This comparison is beneficial because occasionally officers are initially assigned an inaccurate call type in the CAD. For example, an officer may be dispatched to a robbery, but further investigation reveals the crime should actually be categorized as a burglary. The additional step of cross-checking data between the CAD record and the LERMS record serves to create a more accurate call record for analysis. This data was then analyzed by call type, unit type, location, time, date, and duration. The workload was analyzed by call type, which allows for some perspective of the patrol workload that is performed by officers assigned outside of the patrol function.

In addition to CAD / LERMS patrol workload data, a few additional sources are relevant. Time needed for report completion has a significant impact on patrol workload and is often not captured in CAD workload. A combination of actual report data (from the system server) and survey results are used to determine average report times (for field reports, dictated reports and Tracs crash reports). Survey data is utilized to obtain estimates of how often officers complete reports (both field and dictated) while still assigned to the incident on the CAD.

Also, officers spend time each day on a variety of administrative tasks. These include squad fueling, equipment maintenance, etc. To get an estimate of this time, a sample of patrol officers complete daily logs to estimate daily administrative time. The results are then entered into a multi-year weighted average. MPD is moving away from this survey process in favor of accounting for administrative time using CAD based status codes. In 2021, the department made the status codes available for officer use, but the data is not yet robust enough to draw conclusions. Resultantly, survey data was relied upon again for the 2024 report.

The final portion of the workload analysis is distinguishing between reactive and proactive work. The following call types generally capture proactive workload and are excluded from reactive workload analysis:

- Abatement-Chronic/Drug/General Public
- Foot Patrol
- Liquor Law/Bar Check
- On Duty Training
- Problem Solving Person
- Problem Solving Property
- Significant Exposure (Officer)
- Silent Case Number
- Special Event
- ST- Directed Patrol
- Stratified Policing

In the past, the call types "check person" and "check property" have likely contained a mixture of proactive work and reactive work. To address this, MPD has added new call types that better capture the proactive work that might have otherwise been captured under these call types.

Results of Workload Analysis

The data showed **131,659** reactive patrol incidents and **147,014** hours of reactive patrol workload in 2024.

It is important to recognize that this data is based on incidents as tracked in the CAD, and not on Incident Based Reporting (IBR) crime data. When a Public Safety Communications Center employee takes an initial call from a citizen requesting police assistance, a CAD incident – with an incident type – is created. Often, investigation will show that a crime other than that initial incident type was committed, or that no crime was committed at all. Sometimes the CAD is not changed to reflect this. So, the incident totals analyzed in this report will not match MPD's IBR data in all instances.

Priority Calls for Service

In 2024, there were **374** instances where MPD's patrol response was limited to emergency and priority calls (some of these instances did not impact citywide response but were limited to a particular district or area of the city). These 374 instances occurred on **249** dates (some days required limited call response multiple times) and accounted for **937.3** total hours of limited call response, an average of 2.5 hours per instance. This means that on **68%** of days MPD's patrol response was limited to emergency and priority calls for part of the day. As a function of total hours, MPD's response was limited approximately **11%** of the time during 2024. So, a member of the community calling for police assistance had a greater than one in ten chance that MPD call response was limited.

Regularly, the MPD Officer in Charge (OIC) will notify the 911 Center that MPD patrol officers are only able to respond to emergency or priority calls. This is typically a result of significant call volume or a single major incident. During these time periods, routine calls for police officers are not serviced, impacting the overall number of MPD patrol incidents. Instances where MPD limits officer response to emergency/priority calls impacts the overall number of patrol incidents

Shift Relief Factor

The second component of the Etico methodology is to determine the shift relief factor (SRF). Officers do not work every day of the year, and on some days, they work, they work in a non-patrol capacity (training, special assignments, etc.). Once calculated, the shift relief factor approximates the number of total officers required to staff one shift position every day of the year.

There are several components to the shift relief factor: regular days off; benefit leave time; non-patrol time; and overtime. Leave time includes regular workdays when an employee does not work (vacation, sick time, etc.). Non-patrol time includes workdays where the employee works in a non-patrol capacity (training, special assignment, etc.). Overtime is the amount of time spent working in addition to one's scheduled shift.

The shift relief factor calculation also factors in the impact of the staffing contingency plan on patrol staffing. The staffing contingency plan has been utilized for several years, and requires sergeants and officers assigned to non-patrol positions to work multiple patrol shifts a year. The

objective is twofold: to reduce overtime costs by filling patrol staffing shortages with non-patrol personnel, and to ensure the readiness of MPD personnel to perform the patrol function if needed. For simplicity, staffing contingency is figured into the overtime calculation. Only those staffing contingency shifts assigned to account for staffing shortages is included in the calculation.

Leave time in 2024 was analyzed for the pool of patrol personnel who were in patrol positions for the entire year. This was a pool of 175 officers. Benefit leave and Non-Patrol Work time was then calculated as an average number of days per year per officer:

Benefit Leave:

Category	Days
Administrative Leave	1.96
Bereavement Leave	0.50
Comp Time	14.24
Emergency Paid Leave	0.00
Family Leave	2.80
Unpaid Furlough	0.00
Holiday Leave	1.84
Sick Leave	3.8
MPPOA Earned Time Off	1.13
Vacation Leave	17.93
Workers Comp Time Off	1.65
Military Leave	7.51
Floating Wellness	1.03
Total	54.38

Non-Patrol Work Time:

Category	Days
Special Events	0.13
Light Duty	5.63
Special Assignment	8.21
Training	11.30
Jury Duty	0.0
Total	25.27

Overtime Added Back into Patrol:

Category	Overtime Worked for Comp (Days)	Overtime Worked for Pay (Days)
OT General	2.02	2.33
OT Call-In	0.24	0.77
OT Holdover	0.36	0.36
OT Extraordinary	0.95	1.27
OT Misc	0.04	0.04
Non-Patrol Call-In	0.14	0.00
Non-Patrol Holdover	0.16	0.00
Staffing Contingency	0.00	2.57
Total	3.91	7.34
		11.25

Patrol and Non-Patrol employees added patrol activities:

Time Off Category	Days
Regularly Scheduled work days	243
Benefit Leave	54.38
Exceptions (Non-Patrol) Leave	25.27
Overtime Added Back into Patrol	11.25
Totals	174.60

Most leave time is non-discretionary, being either contractual (vacation, compensatory time, etc.) or legally required (military leave, family leave, etc.). Some categories of non-patrol time are also non-discretionary (light duty, required training, etc.). In 2024, average patrol officer worked 174.60 days, or 1396.80 hours, in a patrol assignment. It requires 2920 hours to staff a patrol beat for a year. According to these calculations, the average MPD officer staffs one patrol beat 48% of the time. It requires **2.09** officers to staff one patrol beat for a year. The calculation is called the shift relief factor. The shift relief remains at its highest since this annual study began in 2008.

Note that the shift relief factor is an average reflecting actual non-patrol and leave time, which is not necessarily the *desired* level of non-patrol and leave time. For example, while reducing training time will clearly have an impact on the shift relief factor (and on the overall result of the patrol workload analysis) it does not reflect an ideal policy or best practice.

Workload Balance

The final component of the Etico methodology is to determine the proper balance between patrol officers' reactive work time and proactive work time. The analysis of patrol workload is used to

determine officers' reactive time. Once the balance between reactive and proactive time is determined, total patrol staffing needs can be calculated. The Etico report articulated the reasons for balancing reactive and proactive time:

Including an appropriate amount of proactive time provides benefits for the agency, the officer, and the citizens of the jurisdiction. In fact, a lack of sufficient proactive time can negatively impact the ability of an agency to provide optimal police services to the community.

Among the arguments for including proactive time is the need to avoid having officers running from call to call. Agencies that operate in such an environment report several drawbacks. The most obvious is the inevitable officer burn-out that can occur. Less obvious is the loss of information that may help to solve a crime. It is conventional wisdom for police investigations that the solvability of a case begins to deteriorate from the moment the incident occurs. If the initial responding officer is rushed to move on to the next call, there is a greater chance that important follow-up opportunities and information will not be collected, diminishing the solvability of the case.

Another drawback is the loss of time for on-the-job training...when corrective action is needed by (a) supervisor, proactive time must be available. If officers are clearing calls and going directly to the next call throughout the shift, the supervisor will not have the training opportunities needed to help officers avoid future mistakes.

A lower level of reactive time per hour improves police service, professionalism, and responsiveness to the community. Ensuring adequate proactive time also has a direct effect on several patrol performance measures (such as visibility and response time), impacting the quality of police service delivered to the community. A fundamental component of providing police patrol services is that officers are available when calls are received. This is reflected in the goal of having a balance between obligated and unobligated time.

The original Etico report recommended that MPD strive to have officers spend 28 to 30 minutes of each hour on reactive activity. Since then, the Mayor, Common Council members, and MPD have generally recognized a 30/30 split (minutes per hour) between proactive and reactive time as being an appropriate goal for MPD patrol staffing. We believe this staffing is required to provide the level of service that the community expects. In 2024, the MPD patrol function spent an average of 31 minutes per hour on reactive (or obligated) work.

While the difference between 30 and 34 minutes (as an example) of reactive time per hour seems minor, it is important to recognize that these figures are all based averages, across all hours of the day and all days of the year. Having a lower reactive time per hour improves the ability of officers to engage in community policing. Officers have more time to engage in proactive activity and be responsive to community issues and concerns. In fact, if MPD patrol was staffed to allow 30 minutes per hour be spent on reactive work (compared to 32 minutes per hour), more than twenty-six (26) officer hours each day would be freed to engage in proactive activity. Visibility, efficiency and response time would also improve. A lower reactive time per hour also improves officer availability, resulting in better response times. The difference between 30 and 40 minutes per hour of reactive work reflects more than 130 officer hours per day. This results in less time for proactive patrol, problem solving and community engagement. It also leads to delayed

response times, and more frequent instances where MPD only responds to emergency/priority calls.

In 2024, 236 MPD positions were designated to patrol (as officers; this figure excludes sergeants). However, actual patrol staffing at any given time will vary and will typically be far less than this (primarily because of attrition). In 2023, the actual number of officers assigned to patrol was 212.

Utilizing the Etico methodology, 2024 patrol workload and leave time data demonstrate that MPD patrol staffing should be **243 officers**. This is based on an even split of proactive and reactive time. Meeting this standard would require the addition of **seven (7)** officer positions to patrol. The department should also add at least **one (1)** sergeant position to patrol (based on span of control).

Additional Staffing Metrics

In 2016, MPD and City Finance jointly prepared a report on police staffing (as required by Common Council resolution). The report looked at several measures (other than the Etico workload process) to provide context for police staffing. These metrics included:

- FBI personnel-to-population ratios
- Comparison with peer jurisdictions
- Comparison with other Wisconsin agencies

All these metrics have significant limitations. **These data points are intended to provide context when evaluating MPD staffing, not to suggest a particular result or staffing level.** The 2016 report was based on MPD having 1.9 sworn officers per 1,000 residents. This figure was based on MPD's authorized staffing in 2016, and Madison's 2015 estimated population per the U.S. Census (the 2016 estimate was not available at the time the report was completed). In 2024, MPD's current staffing ratio fell to **1.8** sworn officers per 1,000 residents (based on current authorized strength of 492 and Madison's 2024 estimated population of 280,300).

FBI – The FBI's annual crime reporting data includes information on full-time law enforcement employees. The data is broken down by region, with employee-to-population ratios provided for several categories of municipality size. The Group I category of agencies includes those serving populations of more than 250,000; the Group II category of agencies includes those serving populations between 100,000 and 249,999. Group I is broken down into further population subsets, and regional data is available for all groups.

The 2016 report included data points for both Group I and Group II, as Madison's 2015 population estimate was just under 250,000. Madison's population estimate is now clearly more than 250,000, so only Group I data will be included moving forward.

As indicated, FBI law enforcement employee data is also broken down by region and sub-region. Wisconsin is in the East/North/Central portion of the Midwest region.

So, the most applicable comparison points from FBI staffing data are the Midwest region (East/North/Central subsection) from Group I, and the national Group I 250,000 – 499,999 population subsets (the Group I population subsets are not broken down by geographic region).

However, other data points will be included for comparison. Two notes about FBI police employee data:

- Staffing levels reflect actual personnel at the time the agency reports to the FBI, not authorized strength. Many agencies are not able to fill vacancies with qualified personnel, so the FBI employee data will not reflect those agencies' authorized strength.
- The FBI data will typically be calculated before the US Census population estimates have been released. The FBI does a population estimate for the purposes of reporting police employee data, but the population figures used will typically vary slightly from the US Census estimates.

2019 FBI Police Employee Data (commissioned staff)

Category	Officer to Population Ratio	Adjustment to MPD Sworn Staffing to Meet Average*
Group I (East North Central section of Midwest Region)	3.8	Add 559 - 584 officers
Group I (Midwest Region)	3.3	Add 419 - 430 officers
Group I (National)	2.6	Add 223 - 248 officers
Group I (250,000 – 499,999 national subset)	2.3	Add 139 - 164 officers

*Note that FBI officer to population data is provided rounded to the nearest tenth. For example, anything between 1.95 and 2.04 will be reported as 2.0. This rounding can reflect a significant variation in actual staffing numbers. Figures in this column reflect this range.

Note that in 2003, an MPD staffing study was performed, with the involvement of Alders, MPD command staff and representatives from the Madison Professional Police Officers Association (MPPOA). That report recommended that MPD reach a staffing level of 1.9 officers per 1,000 residents by 2008 and maintain a staffing level of 2.0 officers per 1,000 residents in 2010 and beyond. In 2024, for MPD to reach a staffing level of 2.0 officers per 1,000 residents an additional **69** officers would need to be added.

Peer Jurisdictions – the 2016 Etico report identified five peer cities for comparison: St. Paul, MN; Greensboro, NC; Baton Rouge, LA; Boise, ID; and Des Moines, IA. In 2019 (the most recent data available), these agencies had an average of **2.0** sworn officers per 1,000 residents.

Peer City	Population	Commissioned Staff	Population Ratio
St. Paul	310,263	649	2.1
Greensboro	298,025	637	2.1
Baton Rouge	220,648	616	2.8
Boise	231,314	298	1.3
Des Moines	218,384	351	1.6
Average	255,727	510	2.0
Adjustment to MPD Sworn Staffing to Meet Average			Add 55-80 officers

Wisconsin agencies – the five largest cities in Wisconsin (excluding Madison) are Milwaukee, Green Bay, Kenosha, Racine and Appleton. In 2019 (the most recent data available), these jurisdictions had an average of 2.2 sworn officers per 1,000 residents. In 2024, MPD would have needed an additional **125** officers to meet the average of the other five largest cities in Wisconsin of 2.2 officers per 1,000 residents.

The 2019 figures for peer jurisdictions and other Wisconsin agencies (from FBI data):

	Population	Sworn Officers	Ratio
Milwaukee	590,923	1,850	3.2
Appleton	74,757	110	1.5
Green Bay	104,992	181	1.7
Racine	77,269	196	2.5
Kenosha	100,255	206	2.1
Average	189,578	508	2.2
Adjustment to MPD Sworn Staffing to Meet Average			Add 111 to 136 officers

Patrol Incidents by Incident Type by Year

CAD Categories	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
911 Abandoned Call	2256	2314	2273	2606	3023
911 Call Playing w/Telephone	305	283	249	241	275
911 Call Question	24	37	32	21	47
911 Call Silent	3296	3375	2920	4632	2980
911 Call Unintentional	8384	10074	7553	9389	6693
911 Disconnect	2864	2780	2802	3227	2303
911 Misdial Call	1000	936	620	740	693
911 Multiple/Nuisance Calls	2	1	104	20	18
Abatement-Chronic/Drug/General Public	0	3	22	24	27
Accident Citizen Report	3	4	6	12	17
Accident Hit and Run	1200	1626	1492	1497	1543
Accident Mv/Deer	45	45	33	46	54
Accident Private Property	266	211	166	166	186
Accident Property Damage	2232	2113	2102	2207	2390
Accident Unknown Injuries	417	391	506	524	583
Accident w/Injuries	620	698	733	800	801
Active Shooter	0	0	0	0	0*
Adult Arrested Person	594	875	583	599	831
Alarm	2746	2533	2644	2553	2312
Alarm Broadcast/File	165	130	154	150	146
Ambulance Only	0	0	0	0	0
Animal Bite	10	14	11	15	15

Animal Complaint/Disturbance	188	401	501	495	491
Animal Found	10	10	16	13	26
Animal Lost	11	3	13	12	9
Animal Stray	231	239	190	226	349
Annoying/Obscene Phone Call	63	46	37	40	30
Arson	19	12	14	7	11
Assist Citizen	5407	6875	6817	6886	6918
Assist Citizen Lake	2	0	3	4	3
Assist Citizen Vehicle Lockout	0	1	0	0	0
Assist Community Policing	2	1	3	1	0
Assist Court	140	94	154	105	83
Assist EMS/Fire	3473	3659	3808	4131	3980
Assist Green County Sheriff	0	0	0	0	0
Assist Guard Duty	0	0	4	2	1
Assist K9	110	114	131	131	177
Assist Police	2785	2963	3009	2889	2864
Assist Translate	4	8	9	15	7
ATL Person	1065	1116	1310	1325	1475
Attempted Homicide	3	4	2	4	0
Attempted Suicide	11	4	5	4	2
Battery	473	535	566	605	591
Battery Agg/Substantial	0	1	2	0	0
Bicycle Accident	4	2	4	1	15
Bomb Incident	0	0	0	0	0
Bomb Threat	2	4	13	4	8
Burglary Non-Residential	413	245	346	255	168
Burglary Residential	796	656	531	463	289
CARES Response	0	0	229	371	483
Check Parking Postings	1	0	2	1	1
Check Person	10468	11140	11012	10473	10008
Check Person Weapon	0	0	0	0	0
Check Property	9222	11706	9697	8097	7242
Child Abuse	105	130	142	117	120
Child Neglect	30	35	37	36	39
Civil Dispute	942	983	911	847	870
Community Outreach	0	0	0	976	1565
Conveyance	678	577	586	370	407
Conveyance Alcohol (Detox)	60	47	36	32	45
Conveyance Mental Health	47	23	28	19	29
CPS Info	0	5	5	9	33
Damage to Property	905	738	805	787	769

Damage to Property Graffiti	73	40	67	39	46
Death Investigation	318	334	308	286	352
Disorderly Conduct	0	0	1	0	1
Disturbance	4737	4422	4928	5454	5049
Disturbance Unwanted Person	2232	2158	2420	2984	2996
Domestic Disturbance	2901	2856	2845	2989	2643
Drug Incident Overdose	142	117	66	49	36
Drug Incident/Investigation	892	707	753	666	672
Emergency	0	0	0	0	2
Enticement/Kidnapping	13	12	11	14	10
Explosives Investigation	0	0	5	9	2
Exposure	41	32	34	44	57
Extortion	40	35	82	104	80
Fight Call	145	167	213	202	210
Fire Investigation	0	1	1	1	1
Follow-Up	4902	5571	5286	5755	4969
Foot Patrol	545	1274	514	323	141
Forgery	2	1	2	10	3
Found Person	62	81	86	99	128
Fraud	666	776	737	810	730
Fraud/Identity Theft	1	0	0	0	0
Homicide	5	5	2	2	3
Human Trafficking	2	0	3	2	14
Info/Escapee	0	0	0	0	0
Information	6144	5840	6402	6179	6613
Information MHU	297	331	262	137	137
Injured Person	17	21	14	11	11
Intoxicated Person	173	150	137	151	114
Juvenile Arrest	19	18	24	13	27
Juvenile Complaint	362	335	455	548	472
Landlord Tenant Trouble	91	127	103	118	162
Liquor Law Violation	18	76	104	125	113
Liquor Law/Bar Check	44	40	64	60	47
Local Ordinance Violation	0	0	9	31	46
Medical Examiner	2	4	0	2	6
Missing Adult	184	175	244	249	297
Missing Juvenile/Runaway	321	270	358	368	320
Neighbor Trouble	532	548	536	545	504
Noise Complaint	3771	3082	2759	2821	2915
Non-Urgent Notifications	17	20	21	13	33
Odor/Smoke Complaint	0	1	0	1	3

OMVWI Arrest/Intoxicated Driver	359	357	346	366	465
On Duty Training	225	162	100	148	143
Panhandling Complaint	9	187	136	160	119
Parking Complaint On Street	553	339	306	298	210
Parking Complaint Pvt Prop	0	0	1	2	1
Parking Street Storage	0	0	0	0	0
Person Down	6	4	10	5	4
Phone	4916	5262	5069	4787	4519
PNB/AED Response	135	103	204	191	111
Preserve the Peace	1091	1193	1156	1159	1121
Probation/Parole	0	1	0	0	0
Problem Solving Person	26	102	72	109	89
Problem Solving Property	848	3514	2950	3510	2322
Property Found	1220	1304	1182	1144	1198
Property Lost	48	71	60	78	71
Prostitution/Soliciting	13	6	3	3	4
Prowler	9	18	9	5	3
Public Health Order	8	5	0	0	0
Recovered/Stolen Outside Agency	424	495	353	224	151
Repo	559	538	747	987	1048
Road Rage	156	207	191	228	203
Robbery Armed	86	76	57	40	32
Robbery Strong Armed	85	59	56	75	62
Safety Hazard	3534	3771	4259	4239	4765
Serving Legal Papers	124	89	50	72	74
Sex Offense Miscellaneous	118	138	170	134	231
Sexual Assault	194	215	211	180	168
Sexual Assault of a Child	109	161	161	138	160
Significant Exposure (Officer)	107	16	11	13	14
Silent Case Number	59	123	100	143	142
Solicitors Complaint	37	21	39	28	16
Special Event	321	433	464	276	232
ST- Directed Patrol	0	0	0	0	0
Stalking Complaint	113	138	143	134	134
Stolen Auto	664	647	554	439	341
Stolen Bicycle	13	20	26	40	64
Stolen Other Vehicle Cycle	28	49	43	68	35
Storm	0	0	0	0	0
Stratified Policing	0	0	3707	8091	24968
Suspicious Person	1466	1251	1353	1406	1319
Suspicious Vehicle	2270	1998	2163	1821	1417

Test 911 Call	6	8	3	2	5
Theft	1145	1248	1345	1307	1366
Theft from Auto	539	713	447	324	294
Theft Gas Drive Off	0	0	0	0	0
Theft Retail	716	574	701	689	788
Threats Complaint	1460	1517	1706	1779	1773
Towed Vehicle	46	33	61	39	70
Towed Vehicle/Abandonment	2	2	0	2	1
Traffic Arrest	6	22	24	9	21
Traffic Complaint/Investigation	1293	2993	2846	2165	2264
Traffic Incident	154	187	194	181	211
Traffic Stop	3278	4563	6007	8754	8014
Trespass	1052	956	929	1270	1469
Unknown	15	18	11	0	1
Violation of Court Order	456	506	506	477	518
Voided Case/Incident Number	0	0	0	0	0
Weapons Offense	497	441	485	402	341
Weapons Offense Person w/Gun	90	85	96	80	61
Weapons Offense Shots Fired	1	0	0	3	6
Worthless Checks	4	5	1	4	4
Totals	124,503	137,391	137,663	148,664	157,173

*Active Shooter is a call type not utilized in MPD categorizing of incident data. Any "active shooter" incidents in the City of Madison will be captured under the category Weapons Offense Shots Fired.