



Wisconsin Anti-Human Trafficking Task Force
Department of Children and Families and
Department of Justice
DCF GEF 1 Building
201 E. Washington Avenue, Madison, WI 53703
September 7, 2016
9:30-11:30 AM
Room D203



Meeting Record

Topic		Who	Notes
I.	Welcome and Introductions	AG Schimel	<p>Attorney General Schimel welcomed everyone in the room and introduced Karine Moreno-Taxman as a new member of the Task Force, representing the US Attorney's Office. She serves as chair of the federal Eastern Wisconsin District Task Force.</p> <p>Members were reminded to RSVP to Joy about their attendance to plan for space needs at future meetings.</p> <p>Task Force Members in the room and on the phone introduced themselves. Other individuals in the room also introduced themselves.</p>
II.	Presentation from Connecticut	Eloise Anderson	<p>Secretary Anderson introduced Tammy Sneed from the Connecticut Department of Children and Families. She was invited to share an overview of how Connecticut has developed its response to trafficking of minors and share thoughts on best practices and lessons learned. Secretary Anderson asked that Task Force members hold their questions until both speakers were finished presenting.</p> <p>Please see the attached PP slides for more information on Tammy Sneed's presentation.</p>
III.	Presentation from Minnesota	AG Schimel	<p>AG Schimel thanked Tammy for her presentation and introduced Lauren Ryan, the current director of Minnesota's Safe Harbor/No Wrong Door program. She was asked to share Minnesota's approach to serving youth who have experienced sex trafficking via its regional navigator system.</p> <p>Please see the attached PP slides for more information on Lauren Ryan's presentation.</p>
IV.	Discussion and Q&A with MN and CT	Eloise Anderson	<p>Secretary Anderson thanked the presenters and then opened up the meeting for question and answer.</p> <p>Dan Magnuson asked the MN provider about identification and vetting programs. Lauren said that there were a number of lessons learned for proceeding at a county-based level with state guidance and that a lot depended on the local agency structure. It was a big switch for those agencies who were already serving adults, but not children, as well as those agencies who work primarily with crime victims. She suggested that WI start talking to partner organizations now to see where they are at and then help build capacity through training. Then, post-training, we should establish checks for the agencies, so that if the competencies are not met, the agency can be held accountable. Core competencies should be built into these checks. She also said that using focus groups and having individual meetings with the agencies would provide us with more</p>

Topic	Who	Notes
		<p>information on their level of preparedness and/or meeting the competencies going forward.</p> <p>Hon. Ramona Gonzalez asked Tammy about credentialing the partners who would be applying the screening tool. Tammy said they developed an exam on trafficking with a certain number of questions, and that this exam was close to rolling out. They slowed down their process though because they received feedback that the exam is too easy to pass just by reviewing material online. They are now also looking at conducting interviews. These interviews hopefully will include survivor participation, perhaps not in the actual interview, but at least in the development of the questions that would be asked in the interviews. In addition, they plan initially to limit the number of people who can become credentialed, so that they are better able to control the process.</p> <p>Patti Seger asked about shelters. She observed that the law in Wisconsin prohibits housing a juvenile without a custodial parent's consent. How can we provide shelter if there is no parental consent? From MN, we were told that, at the beginning of their process, they had the same issue. The statute was ambiguous—maybe they could shelter without consent? The way the grants were structured there though, the facility had to be licensed by DCF. For us, it is most likely going to have to be a different kind of placement, which would include avoiding using DV shelters to place juveniles. MN has a placement authorization /parent exception: a juvenile can place himself/herself if he/she is over the age of 16 and if he/she is homeless and/or has had no contact with his/her parents. Using a DV shelter for a homeless 13 year old is not a best practice. It was noted that the age for services can be increased to age 24, and that there can be decriminalization up to age 18, which has occurred in MN. In CT., they are using licensed facilities to place juveniles. It is possible that a juvenile might, on their own, place themselves into DV shelters, but if the facility became aware of this, they would not allow the juvenile to remain sheltered there.</p> <p>Hon. Mike Dwyer asked about the funding each state used. Minnesota noted that there was funding of \$13 million that was phased in over 4 years. Connecticut has had little outside funding to support their initiative and has worked with partner agencies to incorporate more elements of their system that were shared. HART coordinators are volunteer positions folded into the work of existing employees from agencies already doing this type of work.</p> <p>Claudine O'Leary asked about the Safe Harbor provision, which both CT and MN have, but Wisconsin does not. She noted that, in WI, juveniles can be (and are) arrested and prosecuted for HT, as well as other reasons for conduct related to the HT. She wondered what advice these other states could give us on this issue. CT noted that Safe Harbor provisions started in 2008. Tammy wished that it originally prohibited arrests/charges for juveniles for sex-related offenses—it did not, but it has caught up to that now. There are still more crimes that should be added to the prohibition for children under age 18. The best law would provide a broad net of safe harbor protections for HT victims. Currently, CT has probation and parole juvenile placements. However, if the only charge is HT, that juvenile will not be sent to a detention facility. This is not the case</p>

Topic	Who	Notes
		<p>if the only charge is not a sex crime charge (e.g., robbery). They are re-evaluating what to do in situations where there is a combination of sex-crimes and non-sex crimes for a juvenile.</p> <p>In MN, there originally was diversion for juveniles ages 15-17 who are involved in HT. Now there is full decriminalization, which was achieved through a variety of means, including redirecting and training, understanding trauma, and seeing juveniles acting-out as part of trauma. Some in MN worry that juveniles thought to be involved with HT are now being charged with higher level crimes just so they can be kept/held in detention in order to protect them, but Lauren is not aware of any documented cases where this has happened.</p> <p>Hon. Ramona Gonzalez asked who battles the demand side. CT said it is not child welfare. They give information to law enforcement for training on this, but the penalties for the buyers are still weak and need to be addressed. They also need to get more data on both traffickers and buyers. She also noted that law enforcement still struggles with victim-blaming when there is no third party (like a pimp), and the child is engaging in survival-type sexual activities.</p> <p>Jan Miyasaki went back to the issue of shelter, noting that if it was transitional there was no need for placement authority, but rather this is a licensing requirement. If the child is placed outside the home, there needs to be placement authority for CPS. What about situations where the child is on the street, the parent does not want the child home, and the child is not on the CPS radar? Exceptions should be carved out for this circumstances so that CPS can place and provide services if the parents cannot be reached. Task Force members made a note of this.</p> <p>Another Task Force member asked whether there was any requirement to notify CPS in the situation described by Jan. In MN, they are still working on how to address the new federal legislation that will address this. Currently, non-familial traffickers do not result in mandated reports, but this will change next year sometime.</p> <p>The last question was from Steve Elliott, who wanted contact information for collaboration purposes with Lauren.</p> <p>There were no questions from attendees on the phone or the web.</p>
V. Updates	AG Schimel	<p>Attorney General Schimel provided a handout that included written updates from each of the workgroups. He thanked the Workgroups and their co-chairs for continuing to meet regularly and attending to their charged tasks.</p> <p>Dr. Joy Ippolito provided an update on the contract for the residential facility to provide services for youth who have been sex trafficked. She announced that a contract with Lutheran Social Services of Wisconsin and Upper Michigan (LSS) has been finalized. LSS will serve female youth up to age 21 who are under the jurisdiction of the child welfare system in balance of state counties (excluding Milwaukee County). This will be a 10-bed facility that is slated to open in early 2017.</p>

Topic	Who	Notes
		<p>Joy also noted that the Placement and Services Workgroup survey should have arrived in people's email inboxes and encouraged individuals to respond on behalf of their agencies.</p> <p>The Attorney General noted that the trafficking poster was released in late July. It is downloadable from the website. He said the DOJ is working on ways to get funds to print them, but for now asked members to download and distribute the posters. He also noted that the Crime Victim Council is still working on demand reduction strategies.</p>
VI. 2017 Meeting Dates	Eloise Anderson	<p>Secretary Anderson indicated that to complete the charges of the Task Force, the group would continue to meet into 2017. Workgroups will also continue to meet on a monthly basis.</p> <p>Secretary Anderson announced the <i>tentative</i> schedule for the Task Force meetings in 2017, including the following dates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thursday, March 16th • Thursday, June 15th • Thursday, September 14th • Thursday, December 14th <p>When timeframes that are more specific are available, they will be shared with Task Force members.</p>
VII. Public Comment	AG Schimel	<p>AG Schimel asked if any members of the public would like to comment, either in person or on the phone. There were no public comments.</p>
Adjournment	Eloise Anderson	<p>Secretary Anderson concluded the meeting by thanking the presenters from Minnesota and Connecticut as well as the workgroup members and community providers who are hard at work on this issue. She announced that the last meeting of the year will be December 7th from 2:00-4:00 PM. We will be back at the State Bar on the east side of Madison, which is the same location used for our June meeting.</p>

See next page for meeting attendance record.

Task Force Members Present:

Eloise Anderson
Brad Schmiel
Joy Ippolito
Tim Baack
Dawn Buchholz
Pamela Cotton
Megan Devore (by phone/adobe)
Jen Dunn (by phone/adobe)
Michael Dwyer
Steve Elliott
Jodi Emerson
Tony Evers
Steve Gilbertson
Ramona Gonzalez
Dan Magnuson
Georgia Maxwell
Tia Medley
Jan Miyasaki
Karine Moreno-Taxman
Claudine O'Leary
Angela Rabbitt
Diane Rondini-Harness
Patti Seger
Marlene Weisenbeck (phone)
Jennifer Yates

Penny Nevicosi
Amber Peterson
Shira Phelps
Susan Piazza
Kristi Pillom
Adrienne Roach
Julia Stark (by phone/adobe)
Robin Stuht (by phone/adobe)
Emily Tofte
Derek Veitenheimer
Lindsay Wood
Morgan Young

Others Present:

Mike Austin
Ashley Bilig
Kimber Blum
Fredri Bove
Julie Braun
Allison Budzinski
Nic Dibble
Emily Erickson
Miriam Falk
Tonya Fisher
Kari Hemmig
Wendy Henderson
Ron Hermes
Sarah Hutchings
Robin Joseph
Molly Leimontas
Jarrett Luckett
