

Analysis of Law Enforcement Data Within Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Table of Contents

Section 1 Introduction

Section 2 Methodology

Appendix A Graphs of LE Data Analysis for All Incident Types Together

Appendix B Graphs of LE Report Analysis for All Dog Related Incidents

1 Introduction

The National Park Service is currently preparing a dog management plan and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Law enforcement (LE) data is being analyzed to provide a tool to aid in alternatives development and impacts analysis.

2 Methodology

This section describes the methods used to take existing data provided by GGNRA LE and analyze this data in order to gain a basic understanding of the types of incidents that have occurred.

For the purpose of this analysis, a distinction is made between the terms incident and violation. Incident refers to any occurrence that required a response by LE officers. These are associated with a specific case number. Violation refers to incidents for which LE officers issued either a citation or warning corresponding to a CFR violation.

For the years of 2000-2010, databases were provided by GGNRA which included columns for: Case #, Time, Date, Incident/Offense, Description of Location, Officer Name, CODE1, Reported In and DOW. The Case # corresponds to the number on the official incident report. The time indicates the time that the incident occurred. The date indicates the date that the incident occurred. The Incident/Offense indicates the general category that the incident falls under. Note that there is often more than one category listed here. The Description of Location provides the general area in which the incident occurred. The Officer Name indicates the LE officer responsible for writing the incident report. The CODE1 ... ??? The Reported In ... ??? The DOW ... ???

Section 2.1 below describes phase 1 of the analysis, which examined total incident by type in both GGNRA as a whole, and in each individual area. Section 2.2 below reviewed individual incident reports for dog related incidents only for the years of 2008-2011. Copies of incident reports for prior years were unavailable (disposed following NPS guidance for records disposal). Some of these reports indicated that there were multiple incidents per incident report. These are accounted for in the analysis. As a result, there are variations in the total number of incidents for the first (*section 2.1*) and second (*section 2.2*) parts of the analysis.

2.1 Analysis of All LE Data

(b) (5)

LE Incident databases for 2001-2005 and 2006-2010 were obtained (Incident reports for 2001-2006 were unavailable. Incident reports for 2007 were only partially available, so were not used). Incident entries were placed into simplified incident categories to reflect the overarching incident types occurring within GGNRA. Incidents were then sorted by these incident categories. A percentage for each incident category was obtained for GGNRA as a whole (# specified incident type/total incidents) for

(b) (5)

each of the 10 years of the analysis. Incident categories for which the percentage was <5% were lumped into the "Other" category for presentation. Graphs were produced to reflect this analysis for GGNRA as a whole. The total number of incidents is included on each graph for a better understanding of what the percentages represent. The graphs for all 10 years were compiled into one document to visualize the changes in incident occurrence in GGNRA over time.

Incidents were then sorted by the area within GGNRA where they occurred. A percentage for each incident category was obtained for each area within GGNRA (# specified incident type in a specified area/total incidents in that specified area) for each of the 10 years of analysis. Incident categories for which the percentage was <5% were lumped into the "Other" category for presentation. Graphs were produced to reflect this analysis for each area within GGNRA. The total number of incidents within each area is included on each graph for a better understanding of what the percentages represent. If the "Dog" category fell into the "Other" category for a given area for a given year, then the "Dog" incident percentage is included in the graph heading. If there were no "Dog" incidents for a given area for a given year, then this is specified in the graph heading. The graphs for each area for all 10 years were compiled into a document to visualize the changes in incident occurrence for each area over time.

2.2 Analysis of LE Data for Dog Related Incidents

The next phase of analysis began with a review of incident reports.

Note again that the number of incidents in this section of the analysis does not match the number of incidents in the analysis of overall LE data (which includes non-dog related incidents). This analysis is based on a closer review of LE reports for which there were often multiple incidents per incident report. This was not done for the overall LE data analysis because individual incident reports were not reviewed for non-dog related incidents.

Spreadsheets for the 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011 LE incident analysis (section 2.1) were copied into new databases. All non-dog incidents were deleted. A new column was created for "Violation/CFR Cite" with drop down menu options for each potential CFR violation. A new column was created for "Action Taken" which addressed whether the action taken was a "Citation," "Warning" or "Other." A new column was created to track additional notes pertinent to each case # relating to dogs. Spreadsheets were sorted by Case #.

PDF copies of LE Incident reports in order by Case # for 2008-2011 were obtained from GGNRA for each of the three years available for analysis (2008, 2009, 2010, 2011). Reports were reviewed individually to identify the CFR violation, if any, that occurred as well as the action, if any, that was taken. This was recorded in the databases in the appropriate columns (b) (5)

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] If a given report was not available, then columns were filled out as follows.
"Violation/CFR Cite" was labeled according to the "Incident/Offence" reported in the initial LE database.

(b) (5)

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

(b) (5) [REDACTED] For both of the above, "Action Taken" was listed as "Other." If a report included multiple incidents/violations, new rows were added to account for each individual incident. If a report detailed multiple incidents but did not enumerate, then 2 additional entries were created. All databases (2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011) were reviewed for consistency of classification.

Each of the databases (2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011) was copied into two new tabs: "ALL Areas Together" to analyze GGNRA as a whole, and "Sorted by Area" to analyze each area individually.

For the "ALL Areas Together" tab, data was sorted by "Violation/CFR Cite" then by "Action Taken." The total number of each type of "Violation/CFR Cite" was determined. The number of each "Action Taken" for each of the above "Violation/CFR Cite" was determined. Graphs were created showing CFR Violations for Dog Incidents in GGNRA. Graphs were created showing CFR Violations broken down by citation, warning, or other in GGNRA.

For the "Sorted by Area" tab, data was sorted by "Area," then by "Violation/CFR Cite" and then by "Action Taken." The number of each type of "Violation/CFR Cite" in each Area separately was determined. The number of each "Action Taken" for each of the above "Violation/CFR Cite" in each Area was determined separately. Graphs were created for each Area showing CFR violations and total overall violations. Graphs were created for each Area showing CFR violations broken down by citation, warning, or other.

Note that for 2008 data, where violations classified as Crissy Field WPA or Ocean Beach SPPA occurred prior to the September 19, 2008 special regulation promulgation, violations were classified or reclassified as 36 CFR 1.5 (f). Differences may be seen between 2008 and other years of analysis for the Crissy Field WPA and Ocean Beach SPPA violations since these rules were not promulgated until September 19, 2008.

Appendix A

Graphs of LE Data Analysis for All Incident Types Together

Appendix B

Graphs of LE Report Analysis for All Dog Related Incidents

(b) (5) [REDACTED]

Analysis of Law Enforcement Data Within Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Table of Contents

Section 1 Introduction

Section 2 Methodology

Appendix A Graphs of LE Data Analysis for All Incident Types Together

Appendix B Graphs of LE Report Analysis for All Dog Related Incidents

1 Introduction

The National Park Service is currently preparing a dog management plan and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Law enforcement (LE) data is being analyzed to provide a tool to aid in alternatives development and impacts analysis.

2 Methodology

This section describes the methods used to take existing data provided by GGNRA LE and analyze this data in order to gain a basic understanding of the types of incidents that have occurred.

For the purpose of this analysis, a distinction is made between the terms incident and violation. Incident refers to any occurrence that required a response by LE officers. These are associated with a specific case number. Violation refers to incidents for which LE officers issued either a citation or warning corresponding to a CFR violation.

For the years of 2000-2010, databases were provided by GGNRA which included columns for: Case #, Time, Date, Incident/Offence, Description of Location, Officer Name, CODE1, Reported In and DOW. The Case # corresponds to the number on the official incident report. The time indicates the time that the incident occurred. The date indicates the date that the incident occurred. The Incident/Offense indicates the general category that the incident falls under. Note that there is often more than one category listed here. The Description of Location provides the general area in which the incident occurred. The Officer Name indicates the LE officer responsible for writing the incident report. The CODE1 ... ??? The Reported In ... ??? The DOW ... ???

Section 2.1 below describes phase 1 of the analysis, which examined total incident by type in both GGNRA as a whole, and in each individual area. Section 2.2 below reviewed individual incident reports for dog related incidents only for the years of 2008-2011. Copies of incident reports for prior years were unavailable (disposed following NPS guidance for records disposal). Some of these reports indicated that there were multiple incidents per incident report. These are accounted for in the analysis. As a result, there are variations in the total number of incidents for the first (*section 2.1*) and second (*section 2.2*) parts of the analysis.

2.1 Analysis of All LE Data

The first phase of the analysis examined total incidents by type in both GGNRA as a whole, as well as in each individual area. Results are given as a percentage of total incidents (*Appendix A*).

LE Incident databases for 2001-2005 and 2006-2010 were obtained. Incident reports for 2001-2006 were unavailable. Incident reports for 2007 were only available for part of that year, so were not used). For all years, the annual incident databases were edited to remove all incidents that did not occur on GGNRA land or which were administrative in nature (e.g. reports documenting overtime, radio issues, alarm off, maintenance needed) rather than reports of incidents or injuries involving visitors or staff.

Incident entries were placed into simplified incident categories to reflect the overarching incident types occurring within GGNRA. Incidents were then sorted by these incident categories. A percentage for each incident category was obtained for GGNRA as a whole (# specified incident type/total incidents) for each of the 10 years of the analysis. Incident categories for which the percentage was <5% were lumped into the “Other” category for presentation. Graphs were produced to reflect this analysis for GGNRA as a whole. The total number of incidents is included on each graph for a better understanding of what the percentages represent. The graphs for all 10 years were compiled into one document to visualize the changes in incident occurrence in GGNRA over time.

Incidents were then sorted by the area within GGNRA where they occurred. A percentage for each incident category was obtained for each area within GGNRA (# specified incident type in a specified area/total incidents in that specified area) for each of the 10 years of analysis. Incident categories for which the percentage was <5% were lumped into the “Other” category for presentation. Graphs were produced to reflect this analysis for each area within GGNRA. The total number of incidents within each area is included on each graph for a better understanding of what the percentages represent. If the “Dog” category fell into the “Other” category for a given area for a given year, then the “Dog” incident percentage is included in the graph heading. If there were no “Dog” incidents for a given area for a given year, then this is specified in the graph heading. The graphs for each area for all 10 years were compiled into a document to visualize the changes in incident occurrence for each area over time.

2.2 Analysis of LE Data for Dog Related Incidents

The next phase of analysis began with a review of incident reports.

Note again that the number of incidents in this section of the analysis does not match the number of incidents in the analysis of overall LE data (which includes non-dog related incidents). This analysis is based on a closer review of LE reports for which there were often multiple incidents per incident report. This was not done for the overall LE data analysis because individual incident reports were not reviewed for non-dog related incidents.

Spreadsheets for the 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011 LE incident analysis (*section 2.1*) were copied into new databases. All non-dog incidents were deleted. A new column was created for “Violation/CFR Cite” with drop down menu options for each potential CFR violation. A new column was created for “Action Taken” which addressed whether the action taken was a “Citation,” “Warning” or “Other.” A new column was created to track additional notes pertinent to each case # relating to dogs. Spreadsheets were sorted by Case #.

PDF copies of LE Incident reports in order by Case # for 2008-2011 were obtained from GGNRA for each of the four years available for analysis (2008, 2009, 2010, 2011). Reports were reviewed individually to identify the CFR violations, if any, that occurred as well as the action, if any, that was taken. This was recorded in the databases in the appropriate columns. Notes were taken of other pertinent information

included in the report such as circumstances where multiple violations, citations or warnings occurred in an individual report. If a given report was not available, then columns were filled out as follows. "Violation/CFR Cite" was labeled according to the "Incident/Offence" type stated on the incident report and entered into the LE database. If "Incident/Offence" listed only as a "Class 2" then "Violation/CFR Cite" was listed as "Other." A Class 2 offence is an incident where the reporting or involved parties were not located, thus no report was taken. For both of the above, "Action Taken" was listed as "Other." If a report included multiple incidents/violations, new rows were added to account for each individual incident. If a report detailed multiple incidents but did not enumerate, then 2 additional entries were created. All databases (2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011) were reviewed for consistency of classification.

Each of the databases (2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011) was copied into two new tabs: "ALL Areas Together" to analyze GGNRA as a whole, and "Sorted by Area" to analyze each area individually.

For the "ALL Areas Together" tab, data was sorted by "Violation/CFR Cite" then by "Action Taken." The total number of each type of "Violation/CFR Cite" was determined. The number of each "Action Taken" for each of the above "Violation/CFR Cite" was determined. Graphs were created showing CFR Violations for Dog Incidents in GGNRA. Graphs were created showing CFR Violations broken down by citation, warning, or other in GGNRA.

For the "Sorted by Area" tab, data was sorted by "Area," then by "Violation/CFR Cite" and then by "Action Taken." The number of each type of "Violation/CFR Cite" in each Area separately was determined. The number of each "Action Taken" for each of the above "Violation/CFR Cite" in each Area was determined separately. Graphs were created for each Area showing CFR violations and total overall violations. Graphs were created for each Area showing CFR violations broken down by citation, warning, or other.

Note that for 2008 data, where violations classified as Crissy Field WPA or Ocean Beach SPPA occurred prior to the September 19, 2008 special regulation promulgation, violations were classified or reclassified as 36 CFR 1.5 (f). Differences may be seen between 2008 and other years of analysis for the Crissy Field WPA and Ocean Beach SPPA violations since these rules were not promulgated until September 19, 2008.

Appendix A

Graphs of LE Data Analysis for All Incident Types Together

Appendix B

Graphs of LE Report Analysis for All Dog Related Incidents

Analysis of Law Enforcement Data Within Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Table of Contents

Section 1 Introduction

Section 2 Methodology

Appendix A Graphs of LE Data Analysis for All Incident Types Together

Appendix B Graphs of LE Report Analysis for All Dog Related Incidents

1 Introduction

The National Park Service is currently preparing a dog management plan and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Law enforcement (LE) data is being analyzed to provide a tool to aid in alternatives development and impacts analysis.

2 Methodology

This section describes the methods used to take existing data provided by GGNRA LE and analyze this data in order to gain a basic understanding of the types of incidents that have occurred.

For the purpose of this analysis, a distinction is made between the terms incident and violation. Incident refers to any occurrence that required a response by LE officers. These are associated with a specific case number. Violation refers to incidents for which LE officers issued either a citation or warning corresponding to a CFR violation.

For the years of 2000-2010, databases were provided by GGNRA which included columns for: Case #, Time, Date, Incident/Offence, Description of Location, Officer Name, CODE1, Reported In and DOW. The Case # corresponds to the number on the official incident report. The time indicates the time that the incident occurred. The date indicates the date that the incident occurred. The Incident/Offense indicates the general category that the incident falls under. Note that there is often more than one category listed here. The Description of Location provides the general area in which the incident occurred. The Officer Name indicates the LE officer responsible for writing the incident report. The CODE1 ... ??? The Reported In ... ??? The DOW ... ???

Section 2.1 below describes phase 1 of the analysis, which examined total incident by type in both GGNRA as a whole, and in each individual area. Section 2.2 below reviewed individual incident reports for dog related incidents only for the years of 2008-2011. Copies of incident reports for prior years were unavailable (disposed following NPS guidance for records disposal). Some of these reports indicated that there were multiple incidents per incident report. These are accounted for in the analysis. As a result, there are variations in the total number of incidents for the first (*section 2.1*) and second (*section 2.2*) parts of the analysis.

2.1 Analysis of All LE Data

The first phase of the analysis examined total incidents by type in both GGNRA as a whole, as well as in each individual area. Results are given as a percentage of total incidents (*Appendix A*).

LE Incident databases for 2001-2005 and 2006-2010 were obtained. Incident reports for 2001-2006 were unavailable. Incident reports for 2007 were only available for part of that year, so were not used). For all years, the annual incident databases were edited to remove all incidents that did not occur on GGNRA land or which were administrative in nature (e.g. reports documenting overtime, radio issues, alarm off, maintenance needed) rather than reports of incidents or injuries involving visitors or staff.

Incident entries were placed into simplified incident categories to reflect the overarching incident types occurring within GGNRA. Incidents were then sorted by these incident categories. A percentage for each incident category was obtained for GGNRA as a whole (# specified incident type/total incidents) for each of the 10 years of the analysis. Incident categories for which the percentage was <5% were lumped into the “Other” category for presentation. Graphs were produced to reflect this analysis for GGNRA as a whole. The total number of incidents is included on each graph for a better understanding of what the percentages represent. The graphs for all 10 years were compiled into one document to visualize the changes in incident occurrence in GGNRA over time.

Incidents were then sorted by the area within GGNRA where they occurred. A percentage for each incident category was obtained for each area within GGNRA (# specified incident type in a specified area/total incidents in that specified area) for each of the 10 years of analysis. Incident categories for which the percentage was <5% were lumped into the “Other” category for presentation. Graphs were produced to reflect this analysis for each area within GGNRA. The total number of incidents within each area is included on each graph for a better understanding of what the percentages represent. If the “Dog” category fell into the “Other” category for a given area for a given year, then the “Dog” incident percentage is included in the graph heading. If there were no “Dog” incidents for a given area for a given year, then this is specified in the graph heading. The graphs for each area for all 10 years were compiled into a document to visualize the changes in incident occurrence for each area over time.

2.2 Analysis of LE Data for Dog Related Incidents

The next phase of analysis began with a review of incident reports.

Note again that the number of incidents in this section of the analysis does not match the number of incidents in the analysis of overall LE data (which includes non-dog related incidents). This analysis is based on a closer review of LE reports for which there were often multiple incidents per incident report. This was not done for the overall LE data analysis because individual incident reports were not reviewed for non-dog related incidents.

Spreadsheets for the 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011 LE incident analysis (*section 2.1*) were copied into new databases. All non-dog incidents were deleted. A new column was created for “Violation/CFR Cite” with drop down menu options for each potential CFR violation. A new column was created for “Action Taken” which addressed whether the action taken was a “Citation,” “Warning” or “Other.” A new column was created to track additional notes pertinent to each case # relating to dogs. Spreadsheets were sorted by Case #.

PDF copies of LE Incident reports in order by Case # for 2008-2011 were obtained from GGNRA for each of the four years available for analysis (2008, 2009, 2010, 2011). Reports were reviewed individually to identify the CFR violations, if any, that occurred as well as the action, if any, that was taken. This was recorded in the databases in the appropriate columns. Notes were taken of other pertinent information

included in the report such as circumstances where multiple violations, citations or warnings occurred in an individual report. If a given report was not available, then columns were filled out as follows. "Violation/CFR Cite" was labeled according to the "Incident/Offence" type stated on the incident report and entered into the LE database. If "Incident/Offence" listed only as a "Class 2" then "Violation/CFR Cite" was listed as "Other." A Class 2 offence is an incident where the reporting or involved parties were not located, thus no report was taken. For both of the above, "Action Taken" was listed as "Other." If a report included multiple incidents/violations, new rows were added to account for each individual incident. If a report detailed multiple incidents but did not enumerate, then 2 additional entries were created. All databases (2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011) were reviewed for consistency of classification.

Each of the databases (2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011) was copied into two new tabs: "ALL Areas Together" to analyze GGNRA as a whole, and "Sorted by Area" to analyze each area individually.

For the "ALL Areas Together" tab, data was sorted by "Violation/CFR Cite" then by "Action Taken." The total number of each type of "Violation/CFR Cite" was determined. The number of each "Action Taken" for each of the above "Violation/CFR Cite" was determined. Graphs were created showing CFR Violations for Dog Incidents in GGNRA. Graphs were created showing CFR Violations broken down by citation, warning, or other in GGNRA.

For the "Sorted by Area" tab, data was sorted by "Area," then by "Violation/CFR Cite" and then by "Action Taken." The number of each type of "Violation/CFR Cite" in each Area separately was determined. The number of each "Action Taken" for each of the above "Violation/CFR Cite" in each Area was determined separately. Graphs were created for each Area showing CFR violations and total overall violations. Graphs were created for each Area showing CFR violations broken down by citation, warning, or other.

Note that for 2008 data, where violations classified as Crissy Field WPA or Ocean Beach SPPA occurred prior to the September 19, 2008 special regulation promulgation, violations were classified or reclassified as 36 CFR 1.5 (f). Differences may be seen between 2008 and other years of analysis for the Crissy Field WPA and Ocean Beach SPPA violations since these rules were not promulgated until September 19, 2008.

Appendix A

Graphs of LE Data Analysis for All Incident Types Together

Appendix B

Graphs of LE Report Analysis for All Dog Related Incidents