



**Estimating the Number of Sex Trafficked Youth Using
Contacts with the Milwaukee Police Department**

A Report by Milwaukee Homicide Review Commission

May 3, 2013

This project was funded by the Bob and Linda Davis Family Fund

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Claudine O’Leary of Rethink Resources¹ for her expert consultation and effort completing this report.

¹ Rethink Resources offers training and technical assistance to community, academic, and systems partners looking to increase their knowledge, reach, and ability to improve outcomes for youth and adults impacted by sexual exploitation, sexual violence, and the commercial sex trade.

Executive Summary

The purpose of the study was to estimate the number of youth trafficked, create a demographic profile of trafficked youth, and obtain other descriptive information about the status of such youth at the time of contact with the Milwaukee Police Department (MPD). It includes an analysis of findings, potential research areas, and a discussion section on policy implications, particularly as they relate to BMCW services and processes and future research areas. For inclusion in the case review, the following case definitions were required: incident occurred in the City of Milwaukee with MPD contact between August 1, 2010 and August 1, 2012, individual was 17 years of age or younger, individual suspected or known to have been recruited, encouraged, or obtained for the purpose of a commercial sex act or sexually explicit performance as defined by Wisconsin statute.

During the two year period, 77 youth were identified as having been sex trafficked. These youth were primarily African American girls (12-17 years) residing on the north side of Milwaukee. The majority of the youth were 16-17 (68% or 52 youth). Almost a third of the youth were 12-15 years old (32% or 25) at the time of the trafficking incident. Nearly 70% were reported missing to the Milwaukee Police Department at least once during their lifetime. Over a quarter of the youth (29%) had reports of sexual assaults, most of these with non-caregivers. In almost a third of a sample of 36 incident reports, the youth independently or together with family members, sought out police assistance to report the trafficking. Most of the youth with reported involved families were 16-17 years old. BMCW was mentioned just a few times in the selected police reports. Where BMCW was mentioned, referrals were being made to BMCW or police were responding to a call from BMCW. Several organizations were mentioned as having involvement with youth. These organizations included the Sexual Assault Treatment Center, Homme House, St. Rose Center, Legal Aid Society, and several schools.

Examining the system-wide response to missing youth - particularly African American females - may be warranted given that almost 70% of the youth in this study had been reported missing at least once, some as often as 9 times. It may be important for all systems partners to review their BMCW referral and documentation policies.

Table of Contents

Introduction	5
Methodology	5
Findings	7
Trafficked Youth	7
Sex Traffickers and Other Persons	9
Incident/Circumstance Data	10
Conclusion and Recommendations	13
Appendix 1: Relevant Statutes	16
Appendix 2: Data Collection Tool (Word Version)	18

Introduction

Overview: In October 2012 the Bob and Linda Davis Family Fund in collaboration with the Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare (BMCW) funded the Milwaukee Homicide Review Commission (MHRC) to conduct a study on sex trafficked youth. The purpose of the study was to estimate the number of youth trafficked, create a demographic profile of trafficked youth, and obtain other descriptive information about the status of such youth at the time of contact with the Milwaukee Police Department (MPD). It includes an analysis of findings, potential research areas, and a discussion section on policy implications, particularly as they relate to BMCW services and processes and future research areas.

About MHRC: Founded in 2005, MHRC is an action research entity in Milwaukee. It works closely with criminal justice and other systems partners with an aim to prevent violence and known predictors of violence that place individuals, families, and communities at greater risk for violence and violent crime.

Methodology

Research Questions: The project has one primary research question: **How many sex trafficked youth come into contact with the Milwaukee Police Department (MPD)?** The project aims to answer the following related questions: 1) What is the **demographic profile** of these youth? 2) What are the **circumstances** of their contact with the MPD? 3) In addition to the MPD, what other systems or organizations are in contact with these youth? 4) What future **research studies** are needed to best respond to sex trafficked youth? 5) What implications do the findings have for **policy and practice**, specifically as it relates to BMCW?

Note: This project is not an evaluation of MPD's response to sex trafficked youth (i.e., individual officer conduct, quality of investigation).

Project Scope: To answer the above research questions and stay within the limits of the resources available we collected and analyzed data with the following parameters:

- **Jurisdiction:** Milwaukee, Wisconsin. All incidents occurred in the City of Milwaukee.
- **Timeframe:** MPD contacts between 8/1/2010 and 8/1/2012.
- **Youth Definition:** Any individual 17 and younger at the time of 8/1/2010 and 8/1/2012. Using this definition, the project reviewed the cases of 77 sex trafficked youth (unduplicated).
- **Sex Trafficking Criterion (operational definition):** Police contacts had to meet the following requirements to be considered in this project: an individual 17 and younger suspected or known to have been recruited, encouraged, or obtained for the purpose of a commercial sex act or sexually explicit performance as defined by Wisconsin statute. See *Appendix 1*.

Data Sources: MPD's record management system, Children's Court (JIPS and CHIPS data only), CCAP (circuit court data only), and US Attorney and District Attorney's recordkeeping system (case disposition data only; data still pending).

Data Storage and Analysis: Since the data were pulled from a variety of sources, an Access database was created to store the information. Such data included victim, offender, and witness/other persons demographic information (e.g., age, race, sex, if ever reported missing, if ever reported a sexual or physical abuse), incident information (e.g., time, location), and circumstance data (e.g., arrests made and statute, case disposition). Other systems related information was also tracked such as if referrals were made to BMCW. A snapshot of the database appears below and a list of fields is included as *Appendix 2*. Quantitative data were analyzed with SPSS 21.0 and qualitative data were analyzed using standard content analysis techniques (two coders).

The screenshot shows a web-based data entry form titled "Information About Trafficked Minor". The form is organized into several sections:

- MPD ID #:** A text field for the MPD ID and a red "ID: ##### Unique Identifier - Don't Delete" label.
- Personal Information:** Fields for LName, FName, MIName, DOB, ageFIRST, ageLAST, Race (dropdown), and Sex (dropdown).
- Home Address (last known):** Fields for Address, Hdir (dropdown), HStr, HStrType (dropdown), and Apt Unit.
- BMCW Narrative:** A large text area for the BMCW Narrative.
- Trafficked Cases:** Fields for OtherTraff (dropdown), OtherTraff1 (dropdown), and Add incident numbers.
- Sexual Assault History:** Checkboxes for "Was a SA report made (ever)?", "Was the perpetrator a caregiver?", and "Perpetrator status unknown".
- CHIPS/JIPS History:** Checkboxes for "Minor has CHIPS petition?", "Minor has JIPS petition?", and "Minor's sibling's have JIPS/CHIPS petition?".
- Child Abuse History:** A checkbox for "Child Abuse:" and sub-options for "Victim?" and "Offender?".
- Other Charges:** A checkbox for "DrugCharge:" and a "Total Missing Reports" field.

Methodology notes critical to understanding a particular finding are provided throughout the report in paragraph and as footnotes.

Limitations: The limitations of this study and of the data collected have implications for the findings presented and the conclusions and recommendations made. Some are common to these types of projects and others are not. Where possible we made efforts to minimize the limitations but in several instances this was not possible. We will remind the reader of the data's limitations throughout the report and as needed. The major limitations of this study include but are not limited to:

- **Completeness of Primary Data:** The data is limited to information obtained by the police and included in police reports. Such data is limited to law enforcement information needs and not necessarily the information needs of BMCW or the larger community responding to youth sex trafficking. As a result, information such as mental health status or family functioning was not consistently available.
- **Municipal (MUNI) violations versus incident records:** For some youth, we had in-depth incident reports to review but for youth with only MUNI citations, there was little information about the incident. In a few cases, MUNI records were not publicly listed online. In some cases booking reports had important information about loitering for prostitution citations that were issued to the minors.

- **Accuracy:** It may also be that the information included in the police report or found on CCAP and other data sources may not be accurate or up-to-date. We are unable to independently verify the information obtained from the reports reviewed. Such data typically included the perspective of youth and the offender and not other actors (e.g., social workers).
- **Incidents include open cases, no-processed cases, and cases without a conviction:** Records of prior investigations were included that did not result in a suspect being charged or convicted. Additionally many ongoing investigations are not recorded in MPD's records management system. As a result, some MPD contacts with sex trafficked youth during the study period may not have been included.
- **No federal cases included at this time:** The data does not include any of the federally investigated or prosecuted sex trafficking cases involving minors during the study period or MPD investigations that were turned over to the U.S. Attorney's office. While the exact number is unknown, we do know there were sex trafficking cases involving Milwaukee youth during the study period that were prosecuted federally.
- **Solely MPD contacts:** No record of Milwaukee youth who were trafficked in other parts of Milwaukee County, the State of Wisconsin or other states, and then returned to Milwaukee were included in this research. No assumptions can be made about how many additional youth would be included in this number if the study included non-MPD contacts.
- **Solely recorded MPD contacts:** We did not have the ability to determine MPD contact with sex trafficked youth if those youth had no history of sex trafficking or prostitution related contact (i.e., arrested or given a citation under a different statute than the ones included in this study). It is entirely possible that trafficked youth may have been in contact with MPD if the incident fell under a different statute. It is also possible that there were a number of youth being sex trafficked during the specified time period that had no known or recorded contact with MPD. As a result, our estimate may be smaller than the actual number.

Findings

Demographic Data

Trafficked Youth

Summary of Trafficked Youth: During the two year period, 77 youth were identified as having been sex trafficked. These youth were primarily African American girls (12-17 years) residing on the north side of Milwaukee. Nearly 70% were reported missing to the Milwaukee Police Department at least once during their lifetime. Over a quarter of the youth (29%) had reports of sexual assaults, most of these with non-caregivers.

Sample Size: Using the research criterion for this project, 77 youth were considered sex trafficked during the 8/1/2010 and 8/1/2012 period. The greatest length of trafficking for each

youth ranged from 1 day² or less (52 youth), one month or less (15), six months or less (6), more than six months (2) and approximately 2 years (1).³ For the majority of youth observed, the trafficking experience was the first one and few had previous reported histories of trafficking.

Race: These youth were primarily African American (78% or 60 youth), followed by White (18%, 14), Indian (1%, 1) and Latino (3%, 2).

Gender: The overwhelming majority of youth were female (92% or 71); 8% (6) were male. No transgender youth were identified although the data was limited in capturing this information.

Age: The age of the minor at the time of police contact ranged from 12 to 17 years old. Two youth were twelve (3% or 2), one youth was thirteen (1% or 1), six youth were fourteen (8% or 6) and sixteen youth were fifteen (21% or 16), sixteen youth were sixteen years old (21% or 16), and thirty-six youth were seventeen (47% or 36) at the time of the incident. The majority of the youth were 16-17 (68% or 52 youth). Almost a third of the youth were 12-15 years old (32% or 25) at the time of the trafficking incident. The age of first contact with the police department for any reason ranged from 9 years old (1% of sample or 1) to 18⁴ (1% or 1) with 17% (13) of youth having a first contact at the age of 12 and 15 respectively. The range of the most recent age of contact was between 12 years old (1% or 1) and 20 (1% or 1).

Age at time of first reported trafficking incident	Total
Twelve	2
Thirteen	1
Fourteen	6
Fifteen	16
Sixteen	16
Seventeen	36

Residence (zip code): The youth resided in 28 different zip code areas, including several non-Milwaukee areas; the vast majority resided in the City of Milwaukee (79% or 61). The top five zip code areas accounted for 52% of the youth (40): 53209 (10% or 8), 53204 (10% or 8), 53206 (9% or 7), 53208 (9% or 7), 53216 (6% or 5), and 53225 (6% or 5). The non-Milwaukee areas included Brown Deer, WI (1% or 1), Chicago, IL (1% or 1), Cudahy, WI (1% or 1), Janesville, WI (1% or 1), Menomonee Falls, WI (3% or 2), Oak Creek, WI (3% or 2), Racine (3% or 2),

²Note in the case of municipal tickets, the length of trafficking would be recorded as one day. In some incident reports, the length of trafficking was noted as one day although the narrative indicated the time the youth had been trafficked in total was longer.

³The length of trafficking for one youth was unknown.

⁴One youth reported being trafficked after she turned 18. She was included in the sample since the events occurred during the time period of interest.

Sturtevant, WI, Waupaca, WI, West Allis, WI, and Wittenberg⁵, WI (each at 1% or 1 respectively). Two zip codes were unknown.

Reported Missing: Twenty-four youth (31%) were never reported missing at any point in their life. Over two-thirds of the youth (69% or 53 youth) were reported missing at any point to the Milwaukee Police Department. The number of times reported missing ranged from 1 (18% or 14 youth) to 9 (3% or 2 youth).

Other Trafficking Cases: 13 youth (17%) have more than one reported trafficking incident that meets the criteria specified in this report; including 5 who were issued a prostitution related municipal citation at some point in the study period in addition to being named as a victim in a trafficking incident and 11 who were named as victims in more than one incident report. 64 youth (83%) have one incident. In these other incidents, the youth were primarily victims although one was considered a trafficker/other person *and* a victim.

Sexual Assault: 22 (29%) youth reported sexual assaults. Sexual assaults were perpetrated by non-caregivers for 14 (18%) of the youth, caregivers (4% or 3), and by persons with unknown status (9% or 7). A small number of youth (3% or 2) were also offenders in sexual assaults.

Child Abuse: Reports indicated that 8 (10%) of the youth had police-related child abuse reports. None had reports as perpetrators of child abuse.

JIPS and CHIPS Data: Thirty-one youth (40%) had a CHIPS case (Child In Need of Protection and/or Services), JIPS case (Juvenile In Need of Protection and/or Services), or both at Milwaukee County Children's Court. In 20 (59%) of the 34 total CHIPS and JIPS cases, the cases occurred before any trafficking incident (anywhere from newborn children to 16 years old).

Drug Charges: A small number of youth (6% or 5) had formal drug charges. A review of the reports found that less than 10 youth indicated drug addiction. Drug use included marijuana, crack/cocaine, and ecstasy.

Other Charges: Thirty-five of the youth (45%) had municipal tickets for loitering; 4 (5%) for theft.

Sex Traffickers and Other Persons

(Includes witnesses, adult sex workers, and other trafficked minors)

Summary of Traffickers and Other Persons: 69 additional persons were identified, of which the vast majority (74%) were traffickers; the remaining persons were adult sex workers, other trafficked minors, and one witness was documented. Traffickers were primarily African American males (46) followed by White males (3). From what was observed, these individuals, in the context of the youth observed, run informal and often sporadic sex trafficking. Only a few of the traffickers appeared to be acting independently of other actors.

⁵The address in Wittenberg, WI was that of a residential treatment facility. The actual home address of the youth was not listed in the report.

Sample Size: Of the 77 youth identified, 69 additional persons were identified as having a connection to the case; the range included 1-7 other persons were identified. The persons included traffickers (e.g., pimps; 74% or 51), another trafficked minor (13% or 9), a trafficked adult (12% or 8), witness such as a friend or relative (1% or 1).

Race: These individuals were primarily African American (88% or 61 individuals), followed by White (10%, 7), and Latino (1%, 1).

Gender: The majority of traffickers/other persons were male (54% or 37) with 41% (32) females. Of the traffickers, 37 were male and 14 were female.

Residence (zip code): Other persons resided in 19 different zip code areas. The top zip codes were: 53210 (14% or 10), 53212 (13% or 9), and 53206 (12% or 8). Non-Milwaukee areas included Brookfield, WI (1% or 1), Cudahy (1% or 1), Menomonee Falls, WI (2% or 2), Racine, WI, West Allis, WI, and Wittenberg, WI (each 1% or 1 respectively).

Reported Missing: Eighteen of the traffickers or other persons had been reported missing in the past (data unavailable for two people). The range of times reported missing was between 1 and 7.

Other Trafficking Cases: Seventeen individuals (25%) had more than one sex trafficking case, including 12 of the traffickers.

Sexual Assault: Of the other persons, 9 (13%) had sexual assault reports in which they were named as the victim or offender.

Child Abuse: Seven of the other persons (10%) had child abuse reports. In four (6%) of the cases the person was a victim and in three (4%) the individual was an offender. Three traffickers had reports where they were named as the offender in a child abuse case and one had a report of being a child abuse victim.

Drug Charges: Fifteen of the 51 (29%) traffickers had drug charges.

Other Charges: No loitering municipal tickets were documented. Only one individual had a loitering ticket.

Incident/Circumstance Data

Number of Incidents: The majority of minors, 64 or 83%, had one incident including citations issued for loitering-prostitution; 13 or 17% had 2-4 trafficking incidents ever (regardless of when it occurred). 53 incidents had enough reported data to document the following information.

Police District: The majority of police contacts occurred in Police District #3 (28% or 15) on the west side of Milwaukee, a known area for prostitution. Other districts included: Police District 1 (8% or 4), Police District 2 (11% or 6), Police District 4 (9% or 5), Police District 5 (11% or 6), Police District 6 (7% or 13), and Police District 7 (17% or 9). We believe, however, based on review of incident reports that a majority of the actual sex trafficking events occurred on

Milwaukee’s south side and in other known prostitution areas such as in hotels near Mitchell International Airport and in various houses and apartments throughout the city.

Type of Officer Present during Police Contact: Sensitive Crimes officers were present for 83% (44) of the incidents and district officers were present in 59% (28) of the incidents. Human Trafficking officers were present in 28 % (15) of the cases followed by Prostitution Unit (15% or 8) Fusion (9% or 5); seven (13% of cases) Detectives were also involved in incidents. Patrol officers located sex trafficked minors by initiating field interviews and responding to incidents of suspicious activity that were not initially described as prostitution or trafficking related. This was true in 5 of the reports, patrol stops by district officers resulted in enough information to determine possible trafficking. In 5 additional reports, district officers were conducting specialized prostitution investigations and located minors. Most of the youth came into contact with several types of MPD officers as patrol officers called upon the expertise of Sensitive Crimes or Human Trafficking detectives.

Trafficking Locations (cities): Locations where trafficking occurred were not limited to the City of Milwaukee (i.e., Manitowoc, Madison, Green Bay, Kenosha, Racine, Bay View, Port Washington) or Wisconsin (i.e., Chicago, IL, Council Bluffs, IA, Miami, FL, Fort Lauderdale, FL, and Omaha, NE). While other areas were noted in 8 incidents, the majority of the incidents included only acts that occurred in Milwaukee.

Type of Offense: The offense used in the police contacts varied for the 53 incidents with detailed information. The most often investigated offense was Soliciting a child for prostitution (36% or 19) followed by Trafficking of a child (30% or 16) and Pandering (28% or 15). There were two cases (4%) where human trafficking offenses were used. Multiple offenses were investigated at the same time for some incidents.

Type of Offense ⁶	#	%
948.08 Soliciting a child for prostitution	19	36
948.051 Trafficking of a child	16	30
944.33 Pandering	15	28
944.30 Prostitution	5	9
948.05 Sexual exploitation of a child	4	8
948.07 Child enticement	4	8
944.32 Soliciting prostitutes	3	6
944.34 Keeping a place of prostitution	2	4
940.302 Human Trafficking	2	4
948.12 Possession of child pornography	1	2
944.31 Patronizing prostitutes	0	0
106-31. Loitering – Soliciting prostitution	0	0

⁶ See appendix 1 for a brief definition of each offense
 Estimating the Number of Youth Trafficked Using Milwaukee Police Department Data
 Page11

Event: More than a third of the cases involved a single victim and single suspect (38% or 20); 25% involved a single victim and multiple suspects (13), 17% (9) involved multiple victims and multiple suspects, and 19% (10) involved multiple victims and a single suspect with one unknown. We observed several incidents where traffickers were working with other traffickers (informally and formally), creating a loose social network surrounding the youth. About a third of the victims were in contact with other victims of trafficking.

Case Status: The case status for half of the incidents was *closed* (74% or 39); 13% (10) were *pending*, and 4% (2) were issued municipal tickets; several case statuses are unknown.⁷

Charging: 49% (26) of the cases were *charged*, two (4%) were *charged* but are not documented in CCAP, 30% (16) cases were *pending*, and 8% (4) incidents were *not processed*. The reasons for no processed cases included insufficient evidence (4% or 2) and municipal ticket (4% or 2). Three minors were charged with prostitution related offenses but were not processed (2) or offered a deferred prosecution agreement (1). In court outcomes, four cases were dismissed (8%), in 20 cases (38%) the offender was found guilty and in 7 (13%) are still pending.

Arrest Statute: The statutes used in the arrests for these 53 incidents varied and included misdemeanor (misd.) and felony statutes. The top statutes used in this study were Trafficking of a Child: Felony C (19% or 10) and 2nd Sexual Assault: Felony C (19% or 10) followed by Solicitation of a Child for Prostitution: Felony D (15% or 8). Other miscellaneous charges were also made.

Arrest Statute (Offender)	#	%
Battery: Misd. A	1	2
Child Abuse: Felony H	4	8
Child Enticement-Expose Sex Organ: Felony D	3	6
Child Enticement-Prostitution: Felony D	2	4
Child Sexploitation-Employ, Use, Induce: Felony C	2	4
Human Trafficking: Felony D	1	2
Keeping a Place of Prostitution: Felony H	1	2
Pandering/Pimping: Felony F	5	9
Pandering-Solicitation: Misd. A	4	8
Prostitution-Nonmarital Sex. Intercourse: Misd. A	2	4
1st Sexual Assault: Felony B	1	2
2nd Sexual Assault: Felony C	10	19
3rd Sexual Assault: Felony D	0	0
4th Sexual Assault: Misd. A	1	2
Solicitation a Child for Prostitution: Felony D	8	15
Solicitation of Prostitutes: Felony H	2	4
Strangulation and Suffocation: Felony H	2	4
Trafficking of a Child: Felony C	10	19

Other observations: The follow were observed:

⁷Note: Case status may not be up to date or may reflect municipal citations issued.
Estimating the Number of Youth Trafficked Using Milwaukee Police Department Data

- **Family involvement:** In almost a third of a sample of 36 incident reports, the youth independently or together with family members, sought out police assistance to report the trafficking. Most of the youth with reported involved families were 16-17 years old.
- **Engagement with BMCW:** BMCW was mentioned just a few times in the selected police reports. Where BMCW was mentioned, referrals were being made to BMCW or police were responding to a call from BMCW.
- **Engagement with organizations:** Several organizations were mentioned as having involvement with youth. These organizations included the Sexual Assault Treatment Center, Homme House, St. Rose Center, Legal Aid Society, and several schools. The staff at these organizations played a variety of roles; they mostly made referrals or initiated the missing report.
- **Abilities:** Five youth self-reported serious physical and mental health disorders including bipolar disorder, depression, suicidal ideation and seizures (diagnosed and undiagnosed). Some of the youth involved had cognitive disabilities and learning delays.
- **Commercial Sex Acts:** Youth were involved in sexual contact in addition to stripping and child pornography.
- **Coercion:** Many of the youth met the trafficker through an intermediary including other juveniles. Traffickers used manipulation and force, although the majority of reports did not indicate ongoing physical force.
- **Trends:** While this data cannot be used to assess trends in the rate of trafficking, one district officer documented an increase during the study period in the number of self-identified pimps attempting to recruit undercover female police officers in District 2 to work for them.

Conclusion and Recommendations

1. **Between 8/1/2010 and 8/1/2012, 77 trafficked youth had police contacts and 51 traffickers were identified.** These youth were primarily African American females aged 12-17 living on the north side of Milwaukee. The study revealed that traffickers were mostly male and African American.
2. **The reported duration of exploitation and degrees of violence and harm varied with each case.** While a small number of youth were named in multiple trafficking incidents, the majority of the youth was only a part of one incident and may have been able to successfully avoid further exploitation through services and family support.
3. **In 17 of a sample of 36 detailed incident reports youth, family members of trafficked youth or both expressed an interest for resources and/or assistance.** Four of those seventeen reports involved fifteen year old youth and thirteen involved older teens (16-17) with involved family members who assisted in seeking medical care for the children, expressed an interest in community resources and actively supported their children in

making police reports and attending charging conferences called for by prosecutors. In almost half of the detailed incident reports teens stated clear interest in getting away from the trafficker and wanting them to be held accountable. Detailed incident reports were not available for all youth identified in the study. Reports of parent involvement were incidental to the main investigative narrative. Therefore it's unclear how many youth had involved parents. Many youth reported resisting the violence of traffickers and pimps, including refusing to follow rules and running at the first opportunity. In a few cases, family members were threatened and experienced violence from traffickers or people connected to traffickers. Any comprehensive community intervention on trafficking of youth should incorporate services for parents and guardians. In addition to social services, these youth may need medical care (e.g., pregnancy testing, and testing for sexually transmitted diseases). In several cases, biological sisters of trafficked youth were targeted for recruitment by pimps. Comprehensive family intervention services should include all family members of trafficked children.

4. **The Milwaukee Police Department has contact with some segment of the population of trafficked minor children. The system should ensure that police officers are equipped with information about available and reliable community resources designed to assist trafficked minor children.** A common perception among practitioners and laypeople alike is that trafficked youth are "hidden" and unknown to our systems and services. While we cannot accurately define the population of trafficked minor children, we do know that the Milwaukee Police Department - and likely other area law enforcement agencies - has contact with some segment of that population and is in a position to direct valid and reliable non-police resources to these children. Available and reliable non-police, non-prosecutorial service options need to be identified and made known to specialized investigators and general patrol staff.
5. **The youth that were cited for loitering for the purposes of prostitution, a municipal offense, may represent untapped opportunity to connect youth with services.** While approximately 47 youth were identified as victims in trafficking-related cases, 30 youth were only cited for the municipal loitering-prostitution offense and it is unknown if they received any referrals for services. In 5 additional cases, youth were both cited for the municipal loitering offense and also named as victims in trafficking cases involving adult traffickers. This report cannot assess whether citations should or should not be used for such youth, however, when trafficked youth receive citations, it is unclear how, if at all, they are linked to care.
6. **Examining the system-wide response to missing youth - particularly African American females - may be warranted** given that almost 70% of the youth in this study had been reported missing at least once, some as often as 9 times. In a couple of incident reports, MPD officers actively looked for and located trafficked children and potentially intervened before greater harm. Numerous incident reports noted serious violence occurring within the first 1-2 days of being on the street, suggesting a more immediate response would make a critical difference.

7. **It may be important for all systems partners to review their BMCW referral and documentation policies.** For example, referrals made to BMCW were not consistently documented in police reports. Systematic documentation will help MPD and other partners ensure that the protocol in place to make referrals to BMCW in instances where the child is a victim of abuse or neglect is being followed. It was also unclear if other organizations mentioned in the reports were making referrals to BMCW or if they were under the assumption that the referral would be made by MPD.
8. **To supplement, confirm, and expand the conclusions in this report additional research is needed.** Future research should include:
 - **A careful, qualitative review of the narrative data found in the police reports.** The timeline of the project did not allow for a rich exploration of the qualitative data found in the police reports, which has important information about the trafficking recruitment strategies used and manipulation techniques. It also has information that may be important to the design and implementation of prevention strategies, since themes regarding the role of poverty and the role of youth development were present in the reports. It appeared that trafficking was a main source of income for these men and that such traffickers did not fulfill common perceptions of traffickers, in that they did not provide reliable transportation or remain close by while youth engaged in sex acts for money (in all cases).
 - **Interviews with trafficked youth and other key informants such as staff at Milwaukee Police Department, Children's Court, BMCW, and other responders.** Such interviews can be used to supplement, corroborate, and expand or clarify the findings in this report. These institutions are also embarking on their own surveillance studies and internal assessments of how to respond to trafficked youth via prevention and intervention strategies and may have additional, useful data. This report also revealed a number of other organizations that encounter trafficked youth and become involved in police contacts. Interviews with key informants would increase the information available on the other systems that encounter trafficked youth, and could perhaps provide services to such youth and their families.

We further recommend that this report be shared with relevant partners that are also working on trafficking, such as the US Attorney's Eastern District Task Force on Human Trafficking, the Milwaukee Police Department and the Commission on Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence, which recently began administering Human Trafficking Task Force of Greater Milwaukee.

Appendix 1: Relevant Statutes

Summary of each of the eleven (11) Wisconsin statutes and one (1) Milwaukee Municipal offense included in the study and reviewed for minor victims:

1. 948.05 Sexual exploitation of a child Sec. (1) (a) (a) “employs, uses, persuades, induces, entices, or coerces any child to engage in sexually explicit conduct for the purposes of recording or displaying in any way” and Sec (1m) (1m) “intent to sell or distribute, any recording of a child engaging in sexually explicit conduct”⁸
2. 948.051 Trafficking of a child “Whoever knowingly recruits, entices, provides, obtains, or harbors or attempts to..., any child for the purposes of commercial sex acts...or sexually explicit performance”
3. 948.07 Child enticement Sec (2) (2) “Causing the child to engage in prostitution”
4. 948.08 Soliciting a child for prostitution “Whoever intentionally solicits or causes any child or causes any child to engage in an act of prostitution or establishes any child in a place of prostitution”
5. 948.12 Possession of child pornography “Possesses recording of a child engaged in sexually explicit conduct”
6. 944.30 Prostitution “has or offers to have or requests to have nonmarital sexual intercourse...sexual gratification...masturbation...sexual contact for anything of value”
7. 944.31 Patronizing prostitutes “enters or remains in any place of prostitution with intent to have nonmarital sexual intercourse or to commit an act of sexual gratification, in public or private...masturbation, or sexual contact with a prostitute”
8. 944.32 Soliciting prostitutes “intentionally solicits or causes any person to practice prostitution”
9. 944.33 Pandering “solicits another to have nonmarital sexual intercourse...with a person the solicitor knows is a prostitute; (b) or with intent to facilitate another...directs or transports the person to a prostitute...(2) received compensation from the earnings of the prostitute”
10. 944.34 Keeping a place of prostitution “keeps a place of prostitution or grants the use or allows the continued use of a place as a place of prostitution”
11. 940.302 Human Trafficking “trafficking for the purposes of labor or services...(or) for the purposes of a commercial sex act”
12. Milwaukee Municipal Code 106-31. Loitering or Prowling “7. SOLICITING, ETC. To loiter in or near any thoroughfare or place open to the public in a manner and under circumstances manifesting the purpose of inducing, enticing, soliciting or procuring another to commit an

⁸ Ten cases involving this statute were removed from the study because they lacked a commercial aspect to the sexual exploitation. Two additional cases were removed because they involved seventeen year old males charged with offering an undercover female officer money for sex.

act of prostitution. Among the circumstances which may be considered in determining whether such purpose is manifested: that such person is a known prostitute or panderer, repeatedly beckons to stop or attempts to stop, or engages male or female passersby in conversation, or repeatedly stops or attempts to stop motor vehicle operators by hailing, waving of arms or any other bodily gesture. The violator's conduct must be such as to demonstrate a specific intent to induce, entice, solicit or procure another to commit an act of prostitution.”

Appendix 2: Data Collection Tool (Word Version)

For each trafficked minor, suspected trafficker, and person related to the case including witnesses, trafficked adults, and others

Person Information

Unique Identifier:
MPD ID number (if any)
Last Name:
First Name:
Middle initial:
Date of Birth:
Race:
Sex (male, female, transgender):
Reported home address:
Age at first MPD contact:
Age at last MPD contact:
BMCW Narrative (for any mention of BMCW):
Any additional trafficking related report (incident numbers):
If they were named as victim or offender: [y/n]
Was a SA (sexual abuse/assault) report made (ever)? [y/n]
Was the perpetrator a caregiver? [y/n]
Perpetrator status unknown [y/n]
Was the perpetrator a non-caregiver? [y/n]
Was the minor ever a victim, offender or both of SA? [y/n]
Minor has CHIPS petition? [y/n]
Age at 1st CHIPS petition?
Minor has JIPS petition? [y/n]
Age at 1st JIPS petition?
Minor's siblings have JIPS/CHIPS petition?
Child abuse related report? [y/n]
Victim or Offender? [y/n]
Total Missing Reports:
Charged in drug related report:
Loitering municipal violation:

Theft related municipal violation:
Other offenses not noted – narrative:

Incident Information

Incident #:
Minor ID connected to incident:
Incident Police District:
Incident date reported:
Date range of incident:
Age of minor at the time of the incident:
Incident address:
Other cities/states visited:
Types of officers encountered:
Precipitating Event:
Was there any trauma reported?:
Was there any mention of BMCW? Any referrals made?:
Offense list of each of the statutes tracked:

Court Outcomes

Case number:
Was the minor charged?:
Muni ticket paid:
Muni ticket unpaid:
Next court date:
Court outcome:
Case status:
Disposition:
Reason for no process:
Event summary (single victim, multiple victims, single trafficker, multiple traffickers):
Charges made: