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In July 1996, A.R.S. §13-2708, titled *Taking Identity of Another Person*, was enacted into law
- Included Name, Date of Birth, and Social Security Number
- Class 5 Felony

A.R.S. §13-2708 was renumbered to A.R.S. §13-2008 in 2000, and statute changes ensued:
- “Person” or “Entity”
- “Personal Identifying” and “Entity Identifying” Information
- Additions of “Purchases”, “Manufactures”, etc.
- “Electronic Data” Enhancements to Information Definitions
- “Aggravated” and “Trafficking” Statutes Created
- Use of Information for Employment Added
Identity Theft-Related Statute Charges in Arizona

- **A.R.S. §13-2008 Taking Identity of Another Person or Entity**
  - Class 4 Felony Charge

- **A.R.S. §13-2009 Aggravated Taking Identity of Another Person or Entity; Knowingly Accepting the Identity of Another Person**
  - Enacted in August 2005
  - Class 3 Felony Charge

- **A.R.S. §13-2010 Trafficking in the Identity of Another Person or Entity**
  - Enacted in August 2005
  - Class 2 Felony Charge
Fingerprints at arrest booking initiate the criminal history record process in the ACCH repository.

Fingerprintable arrest charges entered, per ARS §41-1750:
- Felony Offenses (incl. Identity Theft-Related)
- DUI Offenses
- Offenses Involving Domestic Violence
- Sexual Offenses

Subsequent case disposition information attached by law enforcement, prosecution, and/or the courts.
ACCH repository is maintained by the Arizona Department of Public Safety (DPS)

Arizona Statistical Analysis Center works in collaboration with DPS to receive semi-annual ACCH extracts

ACCH Data Limitations to Consider:

- 72.1% of CY 2012 arrest charges in the ACCH had subsequent case disposition information entered by the end of CY 2013. (Standardized Measure)
- Arrest charges from the most recent years may show reduced disposition completion due to significantly less time for disposition completion and entry in the ACCH.
According to the Arizona Crime Victimization Survey, 17.4% of 1,878 Arizona residents sampled in 2013 reported being a victim of identity theft during the previous year.

The Federal Trade Commission reported that a total of 7,032 identity theft complaints were made to the Consumer Sentinel Network in Arizona during CY 2012.
Arrest Charges for Identity Theft in the ACCH
FY 2001 - 2010
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Arrest Charges for Identity Trafficking in the ACCH
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Demographic Information for Identity Theft Arrestees
FY 2010

Gender
- Male: 64.1%
- Female: 35.9%

Race
- White/Caucasian: 87.9%
- Black: 8.1%
- American Indian/Alaskan Native: 0.7%
- Asian/Pacific Islander: 2.4%
- Unknown: 0.9%

Age at Arrest
- 24 and Under: 40.7%
- 25-34: 28.1%
- 35-44: 21.0%
- 45-59: 9.4%
- 60 and Older: 0.8%
Demographic Information for Aggravated Identity Theft Arrestees, FY 2010

Gender
- Male: 69.2%
- Female: 30.8%

Race
- White/Caucasian: 92.4%
- Black: 5.1%
- American Indian/Alaskan Native: 0.6%
- Asian/Pacific Islander: 0.3%
- Unknown: 0.6%

Age at Arrest
- 24 and Under: 14.9%
- 25-34: 46.7%
- 35-44: 27.9%
- 45-59: 9.8%
- 60 and Older: 0.6%
Demographic Information for Identity Trafficking Arrestees, FY 2010

**Gender**
- Male: 71.7%
- Female: 28.3%

**Race**
- White/Caucasian: 80.5%
- Black: 17.7%
- American Indian/Alaskan Native: 0.9%
- Asian/Pacific Islander: 0.9%

**Age at Arrest**
- 24 and Under: 31.9%
- 25-34: 34.5%
- 35-44: 12.4%
- 45-59: 21.2%
Identity Theft-Related Arrest Charges Missing Disposition Information in the ACCH, FY 2001 - 2010

The graph shows the percentage of Identity Theft, Aggravated Identity Theft, and Identity Trafficking cases over the years from 2001 to 2010. The y-axis represents the percentage, while the x-axis represents the years.
Percentage of Identity Theft-Related Arrest Charges Leading to Identity Theft-Related Convictions and A.R.S. Title 13, Ch. 18 Theft Arrest Charges Leading to Theft Convictions in the ACCH, FY 2001 - 2010
Percentage of Identity Theft Conviction Charges by Sentence Types, FY 2001 - 2010
Percentage of Aggravated Identity Theft Conviction Charges by Sentence Types, FY 2001 - 2010
Percentage of Identity Trafficking Conviction Charges by Sentence Types, FY 2001 - 2010

- Prison/Jail
- Probation
- Fine
- Restitution
- Suspended Sentence
### Percentage of Identity Theft-Related Arrest Events Involving Other Fraud Offense Types in the ACCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employment-Related Fraud</th>
<th>Government Documents/ Benefits Fraud</th>
<th>Utilities Fraud</th>
<th>Credit Card Fraud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009*</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ACJC identity theft report is currently available on the SAC Publications page at www.azcjc.gov.
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Advocacy Landscape

The good news:

• Emerging issue over past 10 years
• Greater prevention and outreach
• Attention and funding from federal agencies: OVC, CFPB, FTC
• Many online resources for victims and professionals
Advocacy Landscape

OV C Identity Theft Victim Assistance Online Training
Supporting Victims’ Financial and Emotional Recovery

Taking Action
An Advocate’s Guide to Assisting Victims of Financial Fraud

Guide for Assisting Identity Theft Victims

OV C’S NEWEST E-LEARNING TOOL

www.ovcttac.gov/identitytheft/

www.victimsofcrime.org

Ftc.gov/idtheftresources

www.idtheftnetwork.org

Ftc.gov/idtheft
Advocacy Landscape

The bad news:

• Advocacy silos, discipline silos
• Financial crimes “illiteracy”
• Lack of basic advocacy skills
• Many cases not charged
• Traditionally, trainings focus on “what” not “what now”
• Lack of capacity to provide long term assistance for repair and recovery
• Access to many resources dependent on access to computer
Advocacy Landscape

The bad news

- Challenges to serving victims: Language barriers, non-native victims; vulnerable populations (juveniles, elderly)
- Terms and process complicated, technical, confusing, overwhelming
- Problem may have been going on for some time before being discovered; there may be many fraudulent accounts
- High risk of re-victimization.
- Victims may need an attorney to take advantage of legal remedies available.
Law Enforcement Landscape

The good news:

• Greater attention to financial crimes, including identity theft
• Fraud and ID theft prevention is a key outreach topic for law enforcement agencies
• Useful state laws
• More law enforcement training on financial crimes
• “Pockets of expertise”
Law Enforcement Landscape

The bad news:

• “Pockets of expertise” – the zip code lottery
• Insufficient law enforcement training
• Cases are cross jurisdictional (intrastate, interstate, international)
• Complex investigations
• Inadequate resources—priority toward person crimes.
• Minor vs. major victimization—threshold to investigate may be very high.
MN OJP Motivation

Advocates

• Enhance advocates’ capacity to provide “basic advocacy” – *Building Basic Identity Theft Advocacy Skills* training
  – Understand this type of victimization
  – Overcome hesitancy and fear
  – Gain basic advocacy skills
  – Learn the lingo
  – Inspire them to learn more
MN OJP Motivation

Law enforcement

• Find out what is happening – *Law Enforcement Identity Theft Survey*
  – What do agencies know and do now
  – Find ways to promote available resources/info for agencies to provide to their victims
  – “Push poll” – ask about (and thereby remind) agencies about available OJP resources
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EXTENT OF FINANCIAL CRIMES/IDENTITY THEFT
Statistics

• 2010 Minnesota Crime Victimization Survey
  – 7% of respondents said they were a victim of a scam or fraud in 2010 *(81% did not report to police)*

• 2012 Victims of Identity Theft (USDOJ)
  – 7% of US Citizens 16 and older victims of ID theft *(9% did not report to police)*

• 2013 MN UCR
  – 18,262 reported frauds; 27% clearance rate
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PURPOSE & METHODOLOGY
Purpose

• Examine the extent of these crimes
• Understand law enforcement needs to address these crimes
• Determine how to improve OJP’s and other criminal justice professionals response to victims of these crimes
Methodology

• Survey designed with OJP’s Crime Victim Justice Unit

• On-line survey of Minnesota city police chiefs (N = 317) and county sheriffs (N = 87).

• Emails were sent from a LE officer at OJP to help increase response rate

• The survey could be forwarded to the appropriate person

• 191 completed surveys; 50% response rate
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AGENCY DEMOGRAPHICS
Demographics

• Most respondents were police departments in greater Minnesota
• 40% of agencies have 10 or fewer officers
• 71% do not have a specialized investigator or unit investigating financial crimes/identity theft
• 16% have one investigator working these crimes
On-site departmental training: 17% (All/most officers), 49% (Some officers), 3% (One officer), 12% (No officers), 19% (Don't know/missing)

Webinars or on-line training: 26% (All/most officers), 35% (Some officers), 8% (One officer), 7% (No officers), 24% (Don't know/missing)

Self-study: 33% (All/most officers), 27% (Some officers), 10% (One officer), 8% (No officers), 22% (Don't know/missing)

BCA training: 16% (All/most officers), 31% (Some officers), 7% (One officer), 5% (No officers), 41% (Don't know/missing)

Conference, seminar or other off-site training: 13% (All/most officers), 27% (Some officers), 16% (One officer), 6% (No officers), 38% (Don't know/missing)
Respondents' Ratings of Officer Knowledge of Financial Crimes/Identity Theft (N = 191)

- Knowledgeable: 30%
- Somewhat knowledgeable: 49%
- Not all knowledgeable: 13%
- Missing: 4%
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**TYPES & FREQUENCY OF FINANCIAL/IDENTITY THEFT CRIMES**
Number of Financial/Identity Thefts Reported Last Year
(N = 191)

- Zero: 22%
- 1 to 10: 13%
- 11 to 20: 13%
- 12 to 30: 8%
- 31 to 40: 8%
- 41 to 50: 6%
- 51 or more: 22%
- Don’t know: 3%
- Missing: 18%

Number: 46
### Reported Financial Crime in Minnesota

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Few times a month/ Monthly</th>
<th>Once every couple of months</th>
<th>Once or twice a year</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other scams (romance, Nigerian, lottery, etc.)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other financial crime</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATM card used without permission</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check overpayment scams</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim's name used in someone else's arrest</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim's name used to receive benefits (welfare/utilities, etc.)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment fraud/scams</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home improvement scams</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial exploitation of a vulnerable adult</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance fraud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embezzlement by employee or volunteer organization</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage fraud</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Most Serious Financial Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (N = 158)*</th>
<th>Most Serious Financial Crime Agencies Deal With</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>Exploitation of a vulnerable adult/Elderly adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Stolen credit cards/stolen ATM cards/credit card fraud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Scams/online scams/phone scams/phone scams of family member in jail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Identity theft to make purchases/identity theft for fraudulent accounts and transactions/identity theft for employment/stolen ID, SSN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Worthless checks/check fraud/counterfeit checks/stolen checks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Employee theft/embezzlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Overpayment scams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Lottery scams/lottery scams with a money transfer(western union)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Fraud/general fraud/fraudulent returns to stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Internet fraud where people wire money overseas/wire money to another state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>EBT/Welfare card fraud/government entitlement scams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Scams on Craigslist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Mortgage fraud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Home improvement scams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Family using money that should be going to services for another family member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Bank fraud/fraudulent banking transactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Everything is serious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## How Often Victims Report the Following Ways Their Personal Information was Stolen

*(N = 191)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Theft</th>
<th>Very Often/Often</th>
<th>Not Very Often/Never</th>
<th>Don't Know/Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stolen wallet, checkbook, purse, etc.</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim does not know how their information was obtained</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet scams</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email phishing</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen mail</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data breach during a credit card transaction</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend or family manipulated victim into releasing information</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer hacking</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data breach from employment records, health care records, etc.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen garbage</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INVESTIGATIVE CHALLENGES
Challenges Agencies Face in Investigating Financial Crimes/Identity Theft (N = 191)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>challenges</th>
<th>Always challenging</th>
<th>Often challenging</th>
<th>Sometimes challenging</th>
<th>Never challenging</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crimes cross jurisdictional boundaries</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of investigating financial crimes/identity theft</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty of identifying the perpetrator</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of expertise/experience on how to investigate financial crimes</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetrator is often related to the victim</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent (N = 58)*</td>
<td>Most Serious Challenges in Investigating Financial Crime &amp; Identity Theft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>Lack of time/time consuming/difficulty in prioritizing investigations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>Internet scams that occur outside the state/country/investigation leads to another country/distance of the suspect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Difficult to get information from ISPs, Internet based companies or stores/lack of cooperation from banks or other financial institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Lack of resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Young, inexperienced officers/lack of training for officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whether Agency has Worked with the Minn. Financial Crimes Task Force
(N = 191)

- Yes - referred a case to the MN Financial Crimes Task Force: 18%
- Yes - worked together on a case with the MN Financial Crimes Task Force: 8%
- Yes - both referred and worked a case: 15%
- No: 35%
- Don't know what the MN Financial Crimes Task Force is: 6%
- Missing: 18%
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VICTIM ASSISTANCE
Whether Agencies Have a Checklist or Guide for Officers to Refer to When Responding to a Report of Financial Crimes or Identity Theft

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall (N = 191)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriffs (N = 35)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Departments (N = 156)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whether Agencies Have Assisted a Victim in Signing Up with the NCIC Identity Theft File

- **Overall (N = 191)**
  - Yes: 13%
  - No: 31%
  - Unsure: 20%
  - Don’t know what the Identity Theft File is: 17%
  - Missing: 5%

- **Sheriffs (N = 35)**
  - Yes: 14%
  - No: 29%
  - Unsure: 37%
  - Don’t know what the Identity Theft File is: 3%
  - Missing: 2%

- **Police Departments (N = 156)**
  - Yes: 12%
  - No: 32%
  - Unsure: 17%
  - Don’t know what the Identity Theft File is: 19%
  - Missing: 20%
Kinds of Written Materials Agencies Provide to Victims of Financial Crimes/Identity Theft 
(N = 191)

- Handout/materials specific to financial crimes/identity theft: 42%
- Agency's crime victim information card: 36%
- Other handouts/materials containing general crime victim information: 19%
- Don't know: 10%
VICTIM ASSISTANCE – CRIMINAL
IDENTITY THEFT
Whether Agencies Have a Process by Which Victims of Criminal Identity Theft can Correct Erroneous Data in a Police Report
(N = 191)
Whether Agencies are Aware of the Questioned Identity Process at the Bureau of Criminal Apprehension (N = 191)

- Yes: 10%
- No: 66%
- Missing: 24%
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COMMUNITY

EDUCATION/PREVENTION
Whether Agencies Provide General Information to Their Communities about Financial Crime/Identity Theft
(N = 191)

- Yes: 58%
- No: 17%
- Not sure: 1%
- Missing: 24%
How Agencies Provide Information to Their Communities on Financial Crime/Identity Theft
(N = 111)*

*Asked only of those law enforcement agencies that provide community education on financial crimes and identity theft.
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NEEDED RESOURCES & STRATEGIES TO IMPROVE RESPONSE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent (N = 134)*</th>
<th>Additional Resources and Strategies that Would Increase an Agency’s Ability to Help Victims of Financial Crime and Identity Theft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>49%</strong></td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10%</strong></td>
<td>Law enforcement resources/Website on who to contact for resources/knowing what resources are available/resources for officers/pamphlets and handouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10%</strong></td>
<td>Full time investigator/county-wide investigator/regional investigator /more personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9%</strong></td>
<td>Webinars/documents to give to victims/community wide hearing for victims so they know what to expect/coordinated message for victims/consistent information for victims across the state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5%</strong></td>
<td>Investigative materials/investigative checklist/investigative resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3%</strong></td>
<td>Clearing house to contact, share information and work cases jointly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3%</strong></td>
<td>Statewide task force to take over cases that involved multiple suspects and/or cities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identity Theft and Financial Crimes: Law Enforcement Capabilities and Victim Needs

RECOMMENDATIONS
Law Enforcement Recommendations

For enhancing investigative response:

• Provide local, cost-effective training on financial crimes and identity theft across Minnesota.

• Agencies need resources to properly investigate reports of financial crimes, including identity theft.

• Data needs
Law Enforcement Recommendations

For enhancing response to victims
Educate law enforcement agencies on basic response to ID theft victims
   – Stop the bleeding
   – Monitor
   – Prevent further harm
• Educate agencies on available state and federal resources – know where to refer
• Provide materials for distribution by agencies
• Data needs
Advocacy recommendations

• Enhance capacity of community-based and government-based advocates to respond to ID Theft victims
  – Training (OVC and others)
  – Everyone learns basic 4 steps
  – Designated expert in organization
  – Become familiar with state & national resources
  – Learn the lingo and the landscape

• Incorporate advocacy into organization’s activities
More Information

• **Financial Crimes and Identity Theft** article:
  – tp://tinyurl.com/oo4ujun

• Or Google:
  – MN Statistical Analysis Center → scroll down →
  *Financial Crimes and Identity Theft: Survey of Minnesota Law Enforcement Agencies*

• **Basic information for victims** – MN example:
  ojp.dps.mn.gov → “Identity Theft” page (left nav menu)
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