



## 2022 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 a number of 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 2022 patrol staffing analysis:

- Reactive workload increased to **156,952** hours in 2022. This represents about a **7.5% increase** from 2021

- In 2021, the MPD patrol function spent an average of about **32.5** minutes per hour on reactive (or obligated) patrol work. This includes time spent on administrative tasks.
- During 2021, a member of the community calling for police assistance had about a **12%** chance that MPD call response was limited.
- 2022 patrol workload and leave time data demonstrate that MPD patrol staffing should be **256** officers. Meeting this standard would require the addition of **20 officer** positions assigned to patrol. *(Note: On October 30, 2022, the Town of Madison dissolved, and the City of Madison gained an additional 5,000 residents, 2,335 new housing units, 1,400 parcels on 600 acres of land, 4 parks, and 38 miles of streets. To meet these additional service needs, MPD's authorized strength was increased by eight positions (6 patrol officers, 1 detective, and 1 sergeant).*

## 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 in to 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 work days 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 2022 MPD Patrol Workload**

MPD completed the 2022 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 2022 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 Strategic Plan

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

### **Results of Workload Analysis**

The data showed **132,336** reactive patrol incidents and **156,952** hours of reactive patrol workload in 2022.

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 2022, there were **390** 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 390 instances occurred on **250** dates (some days required limited call response multiple times), and accounted for **771.5** total hours of limited call response. This means that on **69%** 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 **12%** of the time during 2022. So, a member of the community calling for police assistance had a greater than one in nine 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 work days that an employee does not

work (vacation, sick time, etc.). Non-patrol time includes work days 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 a number of 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 2022 was analyzed for the pool of patrol personnel who were in patrol positions for the entire year. This was a pool of 180 officers. Benefit leave and Non-Patrol Work time was then calculated as an average number of days per year per officer:

**Benefit Leave:**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Days</b>
Administrative Leave	2.66
Bereavement Leave	0.37
Comp Time	14.25
Emergency Paid Leave	1.88
Family Leave	4.38
Unpaid Furlough	0.00
Holiday Leave	2.28
Sick Leave	5.84
MPPOA Earned Time Off	1.07
Vacation Leave	15.32
Workers Comp Time Off	1.36
Military Leave	5.14
<b>Total</b>	<b>54.55</b>

**Non-Patrol Work Time:**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Days</b>
Special Events	0.34
Light Duty	5.66
Special Assignment	6.49
Training	10.61
Jury Duty	0.01
<b>Total</b>	<b>23.12</b>

Category	Days
Special Events	0.34
Light Duty	5.66
Special Assignment	6.49
Training	10.61
Jury Duty	0.01
<b>Total</b>	<b>23.12</b>

**Overtime Added Back into Patrol:**

Category	Overtime Worked for Comp (Days)	Overtime Worked for Pay (Days)
OT General	2.54	2.36
OT Call-In	0.37	0.94
OT Holdover	0.42	0.55
OT Extraordinary	0.50	0.69
OT Misc	0.04	0.03
Non-Patrol Call-In	0.13	0.55
Non-Patrol Holdover	0.10	0.18
Staffing Contingency	0.00	2.99
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.10</b>	<b>8.29</b>
		<b>12.39</b>

**Patrol and Non-Patrol employees added to patrol activities:**

Time Off Category	Days
Regularly Scheduled work days	243
Benefit Leave	54.55
Exceptions (Non-Patrol) Leave	23.12
Overtime Added Back into Patrol	12.39
<b>Totals</b>	<b>177.72</b>

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 2022, average patrol officer worked 177.72 days, or 1421.76 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 **2.06** officers to staff one patrol beat for a year. The calculation is called the shift relief factor. The shift relief is now 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 a number of 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 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 2021, the MPD patrol function spent an average of 32 minutes per hour on reactive (or obligated) work.

While the difference between 30 and 32 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 that 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 2022, 229 MPD positions were designated to patrol (as officers; this figure excludes sergeants) until mid-October when, to assume the additional workload generated by the absorption of the Town of Madison, 236 were assigned to patrol. However, actual patrol staffing at any given time will vary and will typically be far less than this (primarily as a result of attrition). In 2022, the actual number of officers assigned to patrol was 218.

Utilizing the Etico methodology, 2021 patrol workload and leave time data demonstrate that MPD patrol staffing should be **256 officers**. This is based on an even split of proactive and reactive time. Meeting this standard would require the addition of **twenty (20)** officer positions to patrol. The department should also add at least **three** sergeant positions 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 of 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 2022, MPD's current staffing ratio has fallen to **1.8** sworn officers per 1,000 residents (based on current authorized strength of 486 and Madison's 2022 estimated population of 272,903).



**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 subset (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)**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Officer to Population Ratio</b>	<b>Adjustment to MPD Sworn Staffing to Meet Average*</b>
Group I (East North Central section of Midwest Region)	3.8	Add 530 - 555 officers
Group I (Midwest Region)	3.3	Add 395 - 406 officers
Group I (National)	2.6	Add 207 - 231 officers
Group I (250,000 – 499,999 national subset)	2.3	Add 140 - 151 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.

**Peer Jurisdictions** – the 2016 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
<b>Average</b>	<b>255,727</b>	<b>510</b>	<b>2.0</b>
<b>Adjustment to MPD Sworn Staffing to Meet Average</b>			<b>Add 98-125 officers</b>

**Wisconsin agencies** – the five largest cities in Wisconsin (excluding Madison) are Milwaukee, Green Bay, Kenosha, Racine and Appleton. In 2018 (the most recent data available), these jurisdictions had an average of 2.7 sworn officers per 1,000 residents.

The 2018 figures for peer jurisdictions and other Wisconsin agencies (from FBI data):

	Population	Sworn Officers	Ratio
<b>Milwaukee</b>	590,619	1,850	3.1
<b>Appleton</b>	74,757	110	1.5
<b>Green Bay</b>	104,992	181	1.7
<b>Racine</b>	77,269	196	2.5
<b>Kenosha</b>	100,255	206	2.1
<b>Average</b>	<b>189,578</b>	<b>508</b>	<b>2.2</b>
<b>Adjustment to MPD Sworn Staffing to Meet Average</b>			<b>Add 113 to 123 officers</b>

**Patrol Incidents by Incident Type by Year**

CAD Categories	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
911 Abandoned Call	1319	1924	2256	2314	2252
911 Call Playing w/Telephone	321	384	305	283	265
911 Call Question	25	22	24	37	32
911 Call Silent	3657	3681	3296	3375	2936
911 Call Unintentional	5133	7295	8384	10074	7554

911 Disconnect	2914	3221	2864	2780	2806
911 Misdialed Call	1202	1034	1000	936	620
911 Multiple/Nuisance Calls	0	0	2	1	1
Abatement-Chronic/Drug/General Public	0	0	0	3	22
Accident Citizen Report	2	8	3	4	6
Accident Hit and Run	1706	1688	1200	1626	1496
Accident Mv/Deer	63	63	45	45	33
Accident Private Property	841	810	266	211	167
Accident Property Damage	5255	5179	2232	2113	2107
Accident Unknown Injuries	445	481	417	391	506
Accident w/Injuries	807	838	620	698	733
Active Shooter	0	0	0	0	0
Adult Arrested Person	609	817	594	875	588
Alarm	3117	3296	2746	2533	2642
Alarm Broadcast/File	129	161	165	130	154
Ambulance Only	0	0	0	0	0
Animal Bite	8	12	10	14	11
Animal Complaint/Disturbance	244	216	188	401	501
Animal Found	9	16	10	10	16
Animal Lost	7	8	11	3	13
Animal Stray	288	303	231	239	190
Annoying/Obscene Phone Call	79	77	63	46	38
Arson	10	15	19	12	14
Assist Citizen	5277	5407	5407	6875	6832
Assist Citizen Lake	8	4	2	0	3
Assist Citizen Vehicle Lockout	0	0	0	1	0
Assist Community Policing	0	2	2	1	3
Assist Court	312	331	140	94	154
Assist EMS/Fire	3784	3743	3473	3659	3827
Assist Green County Sheriff	0	0	0	0	0
Assist Guard Duty	0	0	0	0	4
Assist K9	147	158	110	114	131
Assist Police	4407	4026	2785	2963	3029
Assist Translate	5	6	4	8	9
ATL Person	1461	1885	1065	1116	1312
Attempted Homicide	3	0	3	4	2
Attempted Suicide	24	13	11	4	5
Battery	557	580	473	535	570
Battery Agg/Substantial	0	4	0	1	2
Bicycle Accident	5	5	4	2	4
Bomb Incident	0	0	0	0	0

Bomb Threat	9	1	2	4	13
Burglary Non-Residential	232	248	413	245	347
Burglary Residential	855	828	796	656	531
CARES Response	0	0	0	0	203
Check Parking Postings	4	2	1	0	332
Check Person	12378	12604	10468	10026	11046
Check Person Weapon	0	0	0	0	0
Check Property	8922	9605	9222	10535	9716
Child Abuse	195	137	105	130	144
Child Neglect	43	46	30	35	38
Civil Dispute	958	989	942	983	913
Conveyance	716	796	678	577	589
Conveyance Alcohol (Detox)	49	66	60	47	36
Conveyance Mental Health	11	24	47	23	28
CPS Info	0	0	0	5	37
Damage to Property	1017	940	905	738	807
Damage to Property Graffiti	116	120	73	40	67
Death Investigation	247	249	318	334	308
Disorderly Conduct	2	0	0	0	1
Disturbance	5716	5383	4737	4422	4937
Disturbance Unwanted Person	2308	2427	2232	2158	2421
Domestic Disturbance	2893	2901	2901	2856	2845
Drug Incident Overdose	155	162	142	117	66
Drug Incident/Investigation	1304	1242	892	707	823
Emergency	0	3	0	0	0
Enticement/Kidnapping	13	10	13	12	11
Explosives Investigation	1	1	0	0	5
Exposure	23	31	41	32	34
Extortion	17	15	40	35	82
Fight Call	343	385	145	167	215
Fire Investigation	1	4	0	1	1
Follow-Up	6793	6474	4902	5571	5685
Foot Patrol	1776	1032	545	1274	513
Forgery	5	13	2	1	2
Found Person	96	137	62	81	87
Fraud	1094	902	666	776	755
Fraud/Identity Theft	1	0	1	0	1
Homicide	3	2	5	5	2
Human Trafficking	0	0	2	0	6
Info/Escapee	0	0	0	0	0
Information	4907	5321	6144	5840	6461


Information MHU	0	367	297	331	262
Injured Person	22	21	17	21	14
Intoxicated Person	344	317	173	150	137
Juvenile Arrest	43	62	19	18	24
Juvenile Complaint	594	561	362	335	456
Landlord Tenant Trouble	114	123	91	127	103
Liquor Law Violation	172	136	18	76	107
Liquor Law/Bar Check	196	235	44	40	70
Medical Examiner	4	1	2	4	0
Missing Adult	291	233	184	175	245
Missing Juvenile/Runaway	543	512	321	270	358
Neighbor Trouble	423	496	532	548	536
Noise Complaint	2580	2914	3771	3082	2767
Non-Urgent Notifications	21	13	17	20	21
Odor/Smoke Complaint	2	1	0	1	0
OMVWI Arrest/Intoxicated Driver	299	459	359	357	346
On Duty Training	184	163	225	162	100
Panhandling Complaint	0	0	9	187	137
Parking Complaint On Street	663	892	553	339	1400
Parking Complaint Pvt Prop	2	0	0	0	1
Parking Street Storage	0	0	0	0	0
Person Down	18	9	6	4	10
Phone	5046	5087	4916	5262	5095
PNB/AED Response	109	133	135	103	205
Preserve the Peace	1321	1301	1091	1193	1157
Probation/Parole	0	3	0	1	0
Problem Solving Person	26	10	26	102	72
Problem Solving Property	186	103	848	3514	2951
Property Found	1728	1634	1220	1304	1386
Property Lost	102	91	48	71	74
Prostitution/Soliciting	20	24	13	6	3
Prowler	7	10	9	18	9
Public Health Order	0	0	8	5	0
Recovered/Stolen Outside Agency	351	312	424	495	354
Repo	5	325	559	538	747
Road Rage	182	189	156	207	191
Robbery Armed	154	120	86	76	57
Robbery Strong Armed	106	119	85	59	56
Safety Hazard	5090	5111	3534	3771	4266
Serving Legal Papers	350	289	124	89	50
Sex Offense Miscellaneous	177	150	118	138	258

Sexual Assault	202	225	194	215	213
Sexual Assault of a Child	179	154	109	161	164
Significant Exposure (Officer)	11	22	107	16	11
Silent Case Number	138	127	59	123	101
Solicitors Complaint	62	37	37	21	39
Special Event	1049	821	321	433	483
ST- Directed Patrol	0	0	0	0	0
Stalking Complaint	130	124	113	138	143
Stolen Auto	795	798	664	647	553
Stolen Bicycle	20	20	13	20	26
Stolen Other Vehicle Cycle	28	11	28	49	43
Storm	0	0	0	0	0
Strategic Plan	0	0	0	0	3711
Suspicious Person	1772	1797	1466	1251	1354
Suspicious Vehicle	2184	2170	2270	1998	2165
Test 911 Call	3	12	6	8	3
Theft	1818	1609	1145	1248	1359
Theft from Auto	485	434	539	713	453
Theft Gas Drive Off	0	0	0	0	0
Theft Retail	1287	1042	716	574	704
Threats Complaint	1677	1724	1460	1517	1707
Towed Vehicle	34	47	46	33	269
Towed Vehicle/Abandonment	2	5	2	2	12
Traffic Arrest	15	18	6	22	24
Traffic Complaint/Investigation	1880	1718	1293	2993	2848
Traffic Incident	220	245	154	187	195
Traffic Stop	6279	6195	3278	4563	6045
Trespass	1142	1039	1052	956	930
Unknown	20	17	15	18	11
Violation of Court Order	494	525	456	506	508
Voided Case/Incident Number	0	0	0	0	0
Weapons Offense	464	398	497	441	486
Weapons Offense Person w/Gun	58	73	90	85	96
Weapons Offense Shots Fired	0	0	1	0	0
Worthless Checks	2	4	4	5	2
	<b>141,308</b>	<b>144,750</b>	<b>124,503</b>	<b>135,106</b>	<b>140,381</b>


### Workload Overview

The following charts are based on CAD data only, and generally include all patrol CAD workload (reactive and proactive), including Downtown Safety Initiative (DSI) and light duty work contributing to the patrol mission.


This daily workload curve (workload by hour of the day throughout the year) has remained very consistent:




The daily workload curve was also fairly consistent across all districts (with the Central District as the exception):



2022 hours of CAD patrol work by district:




CAD workload by month:






CAD workload by day of week:



A historical overview of patrol incidents and workload:



Note: 2018 -2020 were calculated using unit type, not call type as the primary metric.