

STREET PROSTITUTION IN RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA

A Final Report to the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services on the Field Applications of the Problem- Oriented Guides for Police Project

DEBORAH LAMM WEISEL, NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

AUGUST 2004

This project was supported by cooperative agreement #2001CKWXXK051 by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions contained herein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official position of the U.S. Department of Justice. References to specific companies, products, or services should not be considered an endorsement of the product by the author or the U.S. Department of Justice. Rather, the references are illustrations to supplement discussion of the issues.

SUMMARY

The capital city of North Carolina, Raleigh enjoys a modest crime rate and widespread economic prosperity. The city is not free of public safety problems, however, and many crime problems addressed by the Raleigh Police Department are concentrated in low-income areas populated by minority groups. In 2002, police undertook a problem-solving effort to reduce street prostitution in one police district near the city's Central Business District. The problem had been one of long standing, relatively immune to routine enforcement efforts by police and revitalization efforts in the city. For many years, prostitution and street level drug dealing had been a source of community concern.

To learn more about prostitution in the area, police examined historic arrest data. Arrests were primarily of prostitutes rather than customers. Over ten years, a group of about 60 chronic offenders had been routinely arrested and rearrested by police for misdemeanor offenses ranging from worthless checks, drug paraphernalia and prostitution. In most cases, the women were adjudicated guilty and sentenced to "time served"; many were rearrested within a short period of time within the same geographic area.

As this project concluded, Raleigh police were developing a two-pronged approach to the prostitution problem: one focused on detecting and discouraging the male

customers of prostitutes; the other focused on assisting female prostitutes in leaving the business – either voluntarily or through conditional release from jail. The male customers were to be deterred through a publicity effort that placed photographs of arrested offenders on the department's website and cable television; further, customers who appeared to be seeking prostitutes in the neighborhood were identified through police and citizen surveillance and the department was preparing a cautionary letter to be sent to the residence of the licensed vehicle owner. Police were planning to assist female prostitutes by linking them with needed services, such as housing, drug and alcohol treatment and other services. For entrenched prostitutes, police were seeking court dispositions to restrict offenders from the areas of prostitution and require drug treatment, as appropriate.

The response phase of the project had not been fully implemented at the conclusion of the project but police were continuing their efforts and developing a unique way to measure their impact. Since arrests and calls for service do not provide reliable indicators of the extent of the prostitution problem, police were developing a procedure to assess how accessible the prostitution market was to customers. By recording start-and-stop times for undercover operations, police were measuring how long a customer might have to look for a prostitute and the amount of time a prostitute might have to wait for a customer. While the efforts may not completely eliminate prostitution, police believed that increasing the time and effort to negotiate sexual transactions would reduce the problem and improve the quality of life for citizens and provide a measure to police to monitor the problem over time.

THE PROJECT

In January 2002, a survey was conducted of sworn officers in the Raleigh Police Department. Personnel from patrol, investigations and special operations were asked to identify and rank order the problems of most concern on their beat and to rank the extent to which the problem could be improved through police effort. Nearly 450 people responded to the survey, approximately 70% of the Department's 640 sworn personnel. The respondents consisted primarily of line personnel from the Department's field operations division.

Survey results indicated that prostitution was not perceived as a citywide problem, but was viewed as particularly problematic in the Downtown District—one of six patrol districts and adjacent to the downtown area of Raleigh. In contrast to many other problems included in the survey, police respondents consistently ranked prostitution as a problem that could be substantially improved through a problem-solving effort. Among all the field operations personnel, a greater percentage of officers in the Downtown District than any other responded to the survey, and their interest prompted the Chief and command staff to address the problem of prostitution in this area.

Scope of the Problem

The scope and seriousness of prostitution in Raleigh was not immediately obvious, though a focus group with officers in the Downtown District indicated that it was a recurring problem, closely linked to crack drug markets. One patrol officer described the problem on his beat:

If you throw a rock on my beat, you will hit a drug dealer. If you don't hit a drug dealer, you will hit a prostitute.

While the description was somewhat of an exaggeration, the officers believed that the problem with prostitution was common, occurring 24 hours a day over seven days a week.

Police were not the alone in their concern about prostitution. In 2001, a survey of Raleigh citizens revealed similar concerns. Asked to list three top priorities for the Department, 34% of respondents urged police to “clear the streets of homeless, prostitution and drugs.” The citizen survey also indicated that many Raleigh citizens did not travel to the center city areas because of concern about their safety.

Some experienced police in Raleigh described the evolution of prostitution over time. For many years, problems had been concentrated in an area known as Moore Square, a park on the edge of the Central Business District in Raleigh, but redevelopment of the area in the early 1990s apparently displaced much of the of it to several predominately residential neighborhoods less than a mile away.

As well as being a problem in Raleigh because of its visibility and offensiveness to citizens, prostitution had also been associated with violence. In 1991, Raleigh police arrested a man for brutally killing a prostitute from Southeast Raleigh (North Carolina v. Taylor). Although it occurred more than 10 years ago, witnesses in that case described a pattern of open drug use and street prostitution in areas where the problem continues today. In fact, one of the witnesses in that murder case—Eva Marie Kelley, now 54 years old—remained an active prostitute and was even arrested by Raleigh police three times in 2002 on prostitution-related charges.

Violence associated with prostitution became a headline story again in 1996, when six poor black women, four of them prostitutes, were killed over the course of the year. As a result of a decoy operation, police arrested a suspect in February 1997 as he was assaulting a woman. Again, in May 2002, several prostitutes in Raleigh were assaulted and raped, and police were searching for a suspect.

Despite these periodic episodes of violence that generated newspaper headlines, most prostitution in Raleigh has been relatively cloaked from public view and geographically isolated. By 2002, prostitution in the city was described by police as consisting of four relatively discrete problems:

- homosexual prostitution, which clustered in several blocks downtown near gay bars and also occurred in one notorious state park
- street prostitution, a multi-ethnic problem occurring in several locations primarily in the Downtown District, and closely linked to drug markets. Street prostitution also included some transvestite prostitution, although this appeared to be part of street prostitution rather than a distinctly separate problem.
- houses of prostitution set up by an emerging Hispanic immigrant population, including Hondurans and El Salvadorans
- escort services.

Based on a preliminary discussion of the types of prostitution in Raleigh, police elected to focus on street prostitution near drug markets concentrated geographically in

areas near downtown and located in the Downtown District. They perceived the four types of prostitution as separate and necessitating different approaches.

The problem with street prostitution was not new to the Downtown District. This diverse geographic area encompassed the central business district of downtown Raleigh, a large state government complex including the state Capitol building and the Governor's mansion. Residentially, the district included an historic neighborhood of single-family homes, several public housing complexes and a wide variety of other single- and multi-family housing. Most of the prostitution appeared to concentrate in predominately residential neighborhoods, areas that were clearly low income but not desperately deteriorated.

Police were well aware of citizen concerns about prostitution in these residential areas, part of which had been targeted through a C.O.P.E. project—Citizen Oriented Police Enforcement—in late 2001. At that time, uniformed police had surveyed nearly 600 citizens, who reported a high level of concern about prostitution. The respondents' concerns about prostitution were exceeded only by their concerns about drug dealing in the area. In addition to conducting the survey during the COPE project, Raleigh officers provided their names and phone numbers to citizens, documented problems such as code violations, and made referrals to other city agencies.

Traditional Response

Notwithstanding the COPE project in 2001, Raleigh police had traditionally responded to prostitution primarily through undercover operations. These periodic enforcement efforts typically resulted in the arrest of female prostitutes. Occasionally, these

operations included reverse stings, in which female undercover officers were deployed to target the customers of prostitutes. It was not always easy for police to find female decoys, however, as few Raleigh officers could emulate the state of physical decline that often characterized the street prostitutes.

Undercover operations continued into 2001 and 2002. Over the course of a 10-month period (May 2001 through February 2002), police in Raleigh made 143 arrests (see Table 1) for varied prostitution-related charges including soliciting, crimes against nature, and felony charges for acts such as oral sex.

The arrests in Table 1 were predominately generated by undercover operations. Traditionally, uniformed officers in Raleigh have not been involved in responding to prostitution; typically they discourage prostitutes by making individuals aware of police presence but make few arrests because the evidence necessary for the criminal charge of prostitution is difficult to obtain. Since officers would generally be unable to observe the actual solicitation, a case requires that officers observe the sexual act and obtain a statement from either the customer or the prostitute. It is difficult for police to obtain such statements, as they are inherently self-incriminating.

Instead of charging prostitutes with prostitution, including soliciting and crimes against nature, uniformed officers are more easily able to enforce a state statute prohibiting "loitering for the purpose of engaging in prostitution" adopted in 1979. This charge requires only that officers observe multiple efforts by prostitutes in public places to stop pedestrians or drivers by beckoning or other repeated efforts to engage in conversation. While the loitering

charge only required uniformed officers to observe the patterned behaviors and could be accomplished through surveillance, this task usually required a block of time free from calls or assistance from other beat officers. Despite the lower threshold of evidence, the loitering charge therefore appeared to be used infrequently.

The loitering statute did not provide police with assistance in apprehending the customers of prostitutes. In fact, case law appeared to specifically prohibit the application of the loitering statute to prostitution customers:

It is the organized and repeated provision of [prostitution] services, not their use by unorganized and casual individuals, that constitutes the most readily eradicable social evil. (*State v. Evans*, 1985).

Prior to analysis for this project, beat officers were very familiar with the problem of prostitution in the Downtown District. Although there was little empirical data about its extent or prevalence, many of the officers knew the prostitutes by name and routinely saw the women move throughout the geographic area. Officers described the problem as being quite visible and concentrated on and just off the major southern, northern and eastern thoroughfares into the city of Raleigh—Edenton Street, New Bern Avenue and Person Street (see Figure 1).

For the most part, police perceived the prostitutes as being quite blatant in soliciting and generally unconcerned about police actions. Police also had some ideas about the prostitution market, the prostitutes, and the criminal justice system. As a preliminary form of analysis, we developed

these ideas as hunches about the local problem and sought ways to gather information to verify or disconfirm these ideas.

The following perceptions shaped our initial hunches or working hypotheses about street prostitution:

- Some police believed that the Department's prior responses to prostitution had not been effective because enforcement efforts were not sustained over time or there was an insufficient amount of enforcement. In particular, some uniformed police officers perceived that more undercover enforcement was necessary since uniformed officers could do little about the problem.
- Police were aware that many citizens were very concerned about prostitution in the neighborhood; citizens routinely complained there was not enough police enforcement and were concerned about visible contact between prostitutes and customers, evidence of sexual activity such as used condoms and uninvolved women in the neighborhood often being approached for sex. Citizens were equally concerned about drug markets, however.
- Some of the police officers believed that many women had taken up prostitution because of drug addiction or the inability to find other sources of income. They described the prostitutes as being on the bottom rung of society and often virtually homeless. Police also believed

most of the women were frequent users of drug and alcohol.

- Police were aware that many of the prostitutes were physically victimized by their customers and were reluctant to report assaults to the police. Believing little could be done about their victimization, prostitutes seemed to treat violence as an occupational hazard and the evidence of such violence—broken teeth or bruises—was often apparent.
- Most police felt arrest was not an effective deterrent for prostitutes because many of the women served only a short period of time and returned to the streets almost as soon as they were released. They felt prostitutes perceived arrest and jail time as a cost of doing business and that arrests served only to temporarily incapacitate them.

Each of these hunches about the problem was addressed and generally supported in Street Prostitution, one of the Problem-Oriented Guides for Police. Even police perceptions about the need for more enforcement efforts against prostitution were supported by the Guide—although it noted that such strategies were expensive and that strong police presence could create or reinforce perceptions that the neighborhood was unsafe. From the outset of this project, most police appeared to support the premises of the Guide—namely that an effective strategy must do more than arrest prostitutes, and must give them an alternative, necessitating the involvement of service agencies; and that effective

strategies should also address the behavior of prostitution customers.

ANALYSIS OF THE PROSTITUTION PROBLEM

Preliminary problem analysis was undertaken to verify the prevailing wisdom about prostitution near downtown Raleigh. The analysis was organized to examine the characteristics of the environment and the prostitution market, to learn more about prostitutes and their customers, to assess the effectiveness of the criminal justice system in handling the problem, and to gauge perceptions of residents in neighborhoods where the problems were most severe.

Geographic Characteristics of Prostitution Market

Arrest data from 2001 and 2002 was used to determine the geographic areas in which prostitution occurred. While there was awareness that arrests might not reveal the entire picture of the prostitution market, police agreed that prostitution certainly was occurring where arrests were made. Spatial analysis of arrests showed that prostitution was primarily occurring in three distinct areas along and adjacent to the New Bern/Edenton and Person avenue corridors of the city (see Figure 3). These one-way surface streets carried much of the vehicular traffic into and out of the city each day. Despite the high volume of traffic on the roadways, the streets were not limited access, included numerous traffic signals, and the speed limit was posted at a modest 35 mph. Thus the streets gave potential customers in vehicles the ability to appraise the market and its risks by slowing down or stopping without fear of detection. The street configuration also provided potential customers immediate access into, and escape

routes out of, the residential areas along the major thoroughfares. In the Edenton Street market, most arrests occurred on or within one block of the thoroughfare (see Figure 1).

Spatial analysis of prostitution and drug arrests also revealed the close proximity of prostitution and drug markets (see Figure 2). While many drug arrests occurred away from the prostitution area, virtually all of the prostitution arrests occurred in the midst of the city's primary drug hot spots. The correlation between the two markets supported the police view of the close relationship between prostitution and drug markets.

Composition of the Prostitute Population

Although police were knowledgeable about individual prostitutes, prior to analysis there was no empirical information about the number of prostitutes, where they lived or their involvement in other crimes. Arrest data shed some light on the composition of the prostitute population.

1. Virtually all of the prostitutes for whom addresses were available lived close to the prostitution and drug markets, further highlighting the interrelationship between drugs and prostitution, and offenders were typically arrested within two to three blocks of their residence (see Figure 3).
2. They ranged in age from 18 to 54 years old, but most were not young women—the average suspect was 35 years old. Among 50 chronic prostitutes for whom age information was available, more than half were aged 30 to 39, while one-fourth were 40 years or older.
 - The prostitutes were ethnically diverse—about two-thirds were African American and one-third were Caucasian. Few Hispanic

prostitutes were detected, presumably because that market (as described previously) is typically manifested in houses of prostitution rather than street markets.

Arrest data from May 2001 to October 2002 was examined to determine the number of active prostitutes. Of 201 arrests for prostitution made by the Raleigh Police Department, most (109) were of offenders arrested only once during the time period, while 39 individuals were arrested more than once for prostitution during the period and generated 92 arrests. Thus, about one-fourth of offenders accounted for nearly half of the total arrests (see Table 2).

Relying only on arrest data underestimates the proportion of prostitutes who are repeat offenders or habitual prostitutes, however. When Raleigh police ran criminal histories on all 148 persons arrested for prostitution during the data period, the analysis revealed that an additional 21 of the suspects had been previously arrested for prostitution, resulting in a total of 60 repeat offenders. This analysis suggested that 40% of prostitution suspects (60 out of 148) were habitual prostitutes, accounting for 56 % (113) of the arrests for prostitution in about 18 months.

Although using arrest and criminal history together improved our understanding of chronic offenders, these data underestimated the criminal activity of prostitutes. A detailed analysis of criminal history provided greater insight into individuals' criminal careers. The 60 suspects accounted for 779 various charges—208 or 27% of all charges were prostitution-related. On average, each suspect had 13 charges in their criminal history (see Figure 4). In addition to

prostitution, charges included worthless checks, trespassing and public disturbance. Many of the charges—a total of 147—were drug- or alcohol-related, including paraphernalia, drug possession and DWI. The criminal histories showed little involvement in property or violent crime, although a few fraud and larceny charges were included in the total.

The criminal history data gave more insight into the involvement of prostitutes in drug-related activity and shed light on the proximity of offenders' residences to the drug and prostitution markets. The picture that emerged of prostitution was a lifestyle rotating between getting high and getting money to get high. The proximity of the prostitute's residence provided a place to take a break, get high, carry out the sexual transaction or clean up after the transaction.

The cycle of sex and drugs theory was reinforced by the close correlation between pricing for sexual transactions and pricing for drugs. Arrest data suggested that prostitutes offered sex for prices ranging from \$15 to \$50; the average price solicited was \$21, approximately one dollar more than the prevailing price for crack. The typical sexual transaction was for oral sex. The association between prices of sexual transactions and drugs cannot be considered causal because we do not know the direction of the relationship, but the similar pricing structuring and the brevity and ease associated with oral sex supported the contention that prostitutes offered a particular type of service (oral sex) and priced their service as low as possible in order to quickly generate enough money to get high and to perhaps purchase a small snack.

Police developed a survey to learn more about prostitutes, including their

business practices, customers, and social needs (see Appendix A.) During the course of this project, they completed approximately four surveys with prostitutes. But as it was difficult for police to get cooperation, the interviews were not generally productive. Even the four completed surveys included a number of refusals by the subjects on specific questions. Although we anticipated that we could gather additional information by finding someone else to carry out the surveys, we elected to focus our analysis efforts elsewhere. A few kernels of information from the completed surveys did, however, shed some light on our understanding of prostitution.

Among the prostitutes interviewed, one was 19, two were 37 years old and one was 52. All said they had engaged in prostitution for less than two years—one because of homelessness and the others because they needed money. Three were virtually homeless, and one reported living with her parents. Three of the prostitutes reported regular use of crack and alcohol. None of the prostitutes used a pimp and none routinely traded sex for drugs or shared their earnings with anyone else.

Three of the prostitutes reported having regular clients, and one reported having both regular customers and providing services to strangers. Three described their clients as arriving in vehicles and carrying out the sexual transaction in the vehicle. Two reported being victimized by customers—rape, robbery and assault—but neither had reported this to police.

Two of the prostitutes reported having no set schedule or routine working hours and claimed to work either day or night. However, three prostitutes estimated the length of their working day as,

respectively, three hours, four to eight hours, and eight hours each day. Two prostitutes estimated the number of customers as, respectively, three to four, and five per day. Two of the prostitutes said the prostitution market was not competitive and could be lucrative, while another, the oldest prostitute who worked the fewest hours, reported jealousy between prostitutes and said there was little money to be made.

Prostitution Customers and Market Operations

Since there were few arrests of prostitution customers and we gained little information from interviews with prostitutes, we realized we knew little about prostitution customers. Nonetheless, we made several assumptions about the prostitution market, based upon a reading of the prostitution literature, other observations, and common sense.

The prostitution markets were located near and just off major thoroughfares—a location that seemed attractive to “out of town” customers; and most sexual transactions appeared to occur in or near the market, where the prostitutes and their customers felt relatively safe. We believed it likely that the market included many repeat customers and that customers learned about it informally, from friends and associates. Although customers may have been coming to the area to purchase drugs, interviews with prostitutes did not support this view. Customers were exclusively male, but appeared to include a wide range of ethnic groups and ages.

Although the sexual transactions were relatively inexpensive, the custody of a vehicle suggested that these customers were wage earners, and thus could be deterred through informal social sanctions or shaming. It was hypothesized that a proportion of customers were also married,

making them further receptive to informal social sanctions.

The POP Guide on prostitution suggested that prostitutes often carried out three to five sexual transactions per day and worked five days per week, and the few interviews with prostitutes confirmed this. Using this formula, we hypothesized that approximately 60 chronic prostitutes, making 15 sexual transactions per week for 50 weeks per year, would result in approximately 45,000 sexual transactions. Over an 18-month period, the duration of this study, we can estimate that 67,500 sexual transactions occurred. Police involved in the study believed that these estimates were very conservative, however. To the extent they are accurate, police effectively clear only about 3/10 of 1% of offenses through arrest.

To learn more about the customers, we analyzed arrests of prostitution customers. In 2001-2002, Raleigh police arrested 56 males for prostitution¹. The suspects were ethnically diverse and included 34 African Americans, 16 Hispanics, five Caucasians and one Asian. Although the customers ranged in age from 19 to 58, age appeared to vary with ethnicity—for example, among the African American suspects, most (23, or 68%) were 30 years old or older; while among the Hispanic suspects, who ranged in age from 19 to 42, only two (13%) were 30 years old or older.

The geographic origin of suspects was more informative than their ethnicity and age. Among the suspects who reported addresses, 37 could be verified, geocoded and mapped. While 14 (39%) of these suspects resided relatively near the offense location, 61% lived three miles or more from the location of the arrest; 25% lived

more than nine miles away (see figure 5 and table 3).

Citizens in the area believed most of the customers came from outside the neighborhood, however. In a survey of citizens conducted by police in October 2002, 83% of respondents voiced this belief. Similarly, 81% of respondents indicated that customers and prostitutes hooked up via car rather than on foot, and this view appeared to be supported by the interviews from prostitutes.

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Total arrests with valid address information | 36 ² |
|--|-----------------|

Since the conclusions about the residence of prostitution customers were not fully supported by empirical data, we undertook further data collection to clarify this information. For two evenings in October, police conducted surveillance in the College Park neighborhood off Edenton Street for research purposes, observing vehicular traffic and recording the license tag numbers of vehicles that met a “research profile.” The profile included the following:

- vehicle occupied by a single individual
- male driver
- vehicle traveling at a low rate of speed
- vehicle circling the block two or more times.

Though it is possible that this research profile resulted in the over-detection of prostitution customers—such as persons looking for drugs or a specific address in the community—police felt it had a great deal of face validity and described many of the identified drivers as obviously looking at persons walking along the street.

Police identified 70 vehicles as fitting the profile of a prostitution customer. Among these:

- 13% were registered at addresses considered within five miles of the neighborhood
- 54% were registered at Raleigh addresses more than five miles away from the problem area
- 33% were registered at addresses outside the city of Raleigh.

More than 87% of “customers” fitting the profile thus did not live within five miles of the problem area and a third of the vehicles were registered to individuals outside the city limits, many from surrounding rural towns.

Offense Locations and Times

The street prostitution market in Raleigh did not appear to fit conventional ideas about offenses clustering in time and space. Observations of the area rarely revealed more than a single prostitute at any time and the women were generally in motion, appearing to be traveling on foot from one destination to another. There was no apparent hanging out on corners or specific locations.

Police analyzed arrest data to determine if there were particular locations in which prostitution might be clustered. Arrests were arrayed over 38 locations, identified by hundred block number, and involved 25 different streets, some with multiple blocks affected by the problem.

The 25 streets were the locations of more than 200 arrests and police evaluated these locations using an environmental survey instrument to rank the amount of traffic volume, proximity to a high traffic street and convenience store, as well as the

amount of street lighting, vegetation and general condition of the property. These measures provided a baseline to monitor over time. However as there turned out to be few distinctions between one location and another, a geographic pattern of offending within the problems areas—beyond proximity to drug markets, prostitute’s residence and major thoroughfares—could not be detected.

Similarly, we examined the time of day and day of week when prostitution occurred. Most arrests occurred between 10 p.m. and 2 a.m., but this temporal pattern appeared to reflect police operational practices rather than characteristics of the prostitution market. Citizens in the areas, police officers and prostitutes all suggested that the market was pretty much open around the clock, as it reflected patterns of individuals supporting their continued use of drugs and alcohol. This pattern did not reveal itself in clusters of numerous prostitutes or recurring times for prostitutes but reflected a more informal lifestyle and impromptu practices revolving around getting high, crashing and looking for quick money, purchasing drugs and getting high again.

Transaction Time

Raleigh police hypothesized that the extent or severity of a prostitution market might relate to how accessible or visible prostitutes were to potential customers. Police conducted two undercover operations on prostitution in 2001—one in October and a second in November. In the second operation, police noted that prostitutes had greater concerns about arrest and appeared to modify their business practices to lessen the risk. As part of the changes, savvy prostitutes declined to deal with strangers or required potential customers—decoy officers—to expose their genitalia. Since

officers are prohibited from exposing genitalia, they were able to make fewer arrests. While the first operation produced 46 arrests in four days, the second operation resulted in 42 arrests in eight days.

The experience of police in the prostitution market suggested that recording the search time necessary for a male undercover officer posing as a customer to pick up a prostitute might reflect changes in the accessibility of prostitutes. A short search time would indicate that the market was flourishing while a longer search time would indicate that a market was weakening or declining. To benchmark this measure, informally called “pick-up time,” police carried out three undercover operations, recording an officer’s starting point, search time, and time of day. All operations were conducted in the evening, between 5 p.m. and 1 a.m. Pick-up times ranged from three to 40 minutes, but averaged 10 minutes. Only three of 18 pick-up times exceeded 13 minutes. Eliminating these three outliers resulted in an average pick-up time of six minutes.

Criminal Justice Processing of Prostitutes

To learn more about the effectiveness of the criminal justice system in handling prostitution, police used two sources of data: court records to examine case disposition and the criminal histories of prostitutes. They obtained data on arrested prostitutes from the N.C. Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC). The paper reports from AOC included records for 92 defendants, of which 17 cases were dismissed, nine were pending and 66 resulted in guilty pleas.

Among the 66 convictions, the disposition of 38 cases was “credit for time served,” while others received sentences ranging from 21 to 120 days and/or fines,

usually of \$190. The most frequent sentences were for 30, 45 or 60 days. Eleven of the dispositions included probation, ranging from one to two years. One of the defendants, Eva Kelley, was sentenced to 120 days on 8/2/2001, with credit for 33 days served. Of note, Raleigh police rearrested Kelley again on 11/20/2001, less than a month after she would have been released from jail. Kelley was arrested again on 1/17/2002.

The criminal history of one of the prostitutes, Melissa Brantley, revealed nine prostitution-related charges in a two-year period from 2000 to 2001. Brantley had been arrested by Raleigh police in July, October and November 2001. The July 20 charge was adjudicated on August 8 and Brantley received credit for time served—20 days. The October charge was adjudicated on October 30 and resulted in a 120-day sentence, fine and supervised probation; however, Raleigh police records indicated she was arrested again on November 9, 2001, for prostitution and drug paraphernalia. Those charges were adjudicated guilty on December 6, 2001 and Brantley's one-year probation revoked.

Reviewing the disposition of charges, police concluded that prostitution cases were subject to varying responses by district court judges, and frequent re-arrest following release from custody suggested that jail was not an effective deterrent.

Citizen Perceptions of the Problem

Raleigh police have routinely recorded citizen complaints, but the method of recording such complaints did not provide a reliable source of data about the prostitution problem. For the period 2001-2002, police recorded and filed 31 Citizen Request Forms about prostitution in the Downtown District, generated through a variety of sources such as patrol officers, civilians and watch

commanders. These recorded complaints do not include all citizen complaints, as many are made informally to police or at community meetings and not routinely recorded. The spatial distribution of the 31 citizen complaints was analyzed and the problem was geographically consistent with the arrests made by police (see figures 2 and 6).

In October 2002, police conducted a survey of citizens in College Park area to learn more about the problem of prostitution. Specifically, police sought to determine residents' perceptions of the severity of the problem, frequency, times and specific locations and the link between drugs and prostitution. A total of 58 households responded to the door-to-door survey, with 68% saying prostitution was a major or big problem in the community (see table 4).

Many of the respondents said prostitution occurred 24 hours a day, consistent with observations of police and the interviews with prostitutes. Citizens also elaborated on the linkage between drugs and prostitution, describing both prostitutes and customers are users of drugs, the trading of sex for drugs and prostitutes buying drugs from dealers. The following comments are from residents:

[It's a] known fact—after [the prostitute] gets done with the job, they buy drugs.

[The] main reason [for prostitution] is for crack.

[The] prostitutes get out of the car [from having sex] and go get crack.

Summary of Analysis

In many ways, analysis of the street prostitution in Raleigh served to verify perceptions about the scope and nature of the problem. There were no surprise findings; rather analysis confirmed key elements of the problem:

- **Street prostitution was located near drug markets.** Although prostitution occurred on a number of streets, the markets were concentrated in three primary geographic areas near major thoroughfares that were easily accessible to customers. Prostitution markets were geographically located near drug markets, making drugs easily accessible to prostitutes.
- **Prostitutes were habitual misdemeanants.** A group of approximately 60 habitual prostitutes comprised most of the prostitution problem (see table 5). Most of the chronic prostitutes were not young, averaging 35 years old, and many of them had problems with drug or alcohol addiction. Many of the women appeared to be homeless or without a permanent residence but most stayed near the drug and prostitution markets. Many of these women had been victimized and many expressed that they were ready to get out of prostitution.
- **The criminal justice system was ineffective.** The criminal justice system had not been effective in deterring prostitutes from their behavior. Undercover operations could only be conducted periodically, but even when arrested,

many prostitutes were rearrested soon after release from custody.

- **Prostitution was primarily a drive-up business.** Reflecting a mobile society, prostitution attracted a great deal of vehicular traffic to residential neighborhoods. Police estimated that more than 45,000 sexual transactions per year were carried out by the 60 chronic prostitutes. Most of the customers came from outside the neighborhood, traveling by and carrying out transactions in their cars. Police suspected that customers felt protected by their anonymity in these areas distant from their residences.

PROBLEM RESPONSES AND ASSESSMENT

Findings from analysis confirmed many police hunches and also provided police with reliable information to develop a set of responses and involve other criminal justice and social service agencies. Consistent with recommendations from the Guidebook on Street Prostitution, police developed the following set of responses:

1. Focusing on prostitution customers
 - Police planned to use surveillance to routinely identify customers of prostitution based on driving behaviors associated with seeking prostitutes, and recording license tag numbers to identify registered owners.
 - Police were developing a letter to send to registered owners of vehicles that were identified in the problem areas as suspected customers. Upon validation by police, owners were to be sent a letter from the Police Chief,

notifying them that the vehicle had been seen in an area with prostitution problems and urging the vehicle owner to exercise caution in that area. The letter was intended to both shame individuals from re-offending and reduce their perception of anonymity. Police anticipated the benefits of such shaming would be magnified through informal mechanisms, as the recipients of letters related their experiences to friends. Similarly, the letter might be expected to reduce related problems in the area, such as drug sales.

- Police were developing a website to publicize photographs of individuals arrested for soliciting prostitution, and also planned to post the pictures on cable access television. The shaming practices were publicized through the local news media.

3. Improved handling of prostitution problem by criminal justice system

- Police met with the county's District Attorney, who assigned a single Assistant District Attorney (ADA) to review and handle prostitution cases. The ADA would attend quickly to the cases to offer probation to prostitutes; probation conditions could include drug treatment or restrict offenders from specific geographic areas.
- Police met with the Chief District Court Judge who agreed to provide consistent

dispositions for prostitution cases. Coordination through the District Attorney would generally direct these cases to a single courtroom for adjudication.

- Field operations captain and police attorney conducted an in-service training of beat officers about effectively using the loitering statute to respond to more consistently to prostitutes, providing a more effective police presence on a routine basis.
- Police met with Community Corrections (probation) personnel who agreed to assign two specific probation officers to prostitutes on probation, making it easier to detect violations of probation conditions such as geographic restrictions and link women with needed social services.

4. Identifying treatment and social service needs of prostitutes

- Concurrent with the police emphasis on reducing customers, police planned to steer prostitutes who needed social services to service providers such as Cornerstone and the Women's Center, who agreed to assist women with finding housing, drug treatment and other needed services.
- The judge for Wake County's Drug Court agreed to assess prostitutes for drug and alcohol problems and adjudicate them through this special program.

4. Follow-up and involvement with community
 - Throughout the project, police met routinely with community groups to examine ways to involve citizens in reducing street prostitution. They developed a form and trained citizens to monitor their neighborhoods, collecting key information about suspected prostitution customers such as date, time, vehicle description and license tag numbers. Police planned to compare these data with data gathered through police surveillance.
 - Police determined that there should be routine monitoring of environmental conditions in problem areas, including nuisance abatement of abandoned or neglected properties.

There was no problem assessment in this study because the responses developed were not fully implemented during the course of the project period. However, police planned to employ several evaluation measures including calls for service, reported offenses (Part 1 and disorder offenses), citizen perceptions of problems, and transaction or “pick-up” times—employing both male and female undercover officers—and prices. While there are no reliable empirical measures to evaluate the impact of police efforts, police planned to continue to monitor activities of chronic prostitutes, including repeat offending; citizen attitudes and reports about the problem, and evaluate the visibility of the prostitution market. Much of the impact of the prostitution effort may result in improved and coordinated responses among

service providers, the District Attorney, district court judges, police, citizens and cable television.

THE PROBLEM-ORIENTED/ACTION RESEARCH PROCESS

The action research process described in this report took place over approximately 18 months, and reflected the efforts of a consultant collaborating with patrol personnel in the Downtown District of Raleigh. The following section of this report describes key events and their sequence of events to characterize progress in the project.

Major Influences on Course of Project

The progress and course of the problem-oriented project in the Raleigh Police Department was influenced in a major way by timing, as the project was launched during a period of major organizational change in the agency. A new Police Chief took the helm of the Raleigh Police Department in September 2002, shortly after the terrorist attacks of 9/11. As a new Chief, Jane Perlov undertook an ambitious reform agenda, focused on improving the technology, management and operations of the 600-officer agency. Some of the changes related to establishing a strong crime analysis unit to provide timely and accurate data for problem analysis and CompStat. The previous crime analysis unit had functioned primarily as a records unit. Other organizational changes early in Chief Perlov’s tenure included reorganizing the agency to establish new district boundaries headed by decentralized patrol commanders and establishing a new shift schedule.

The period of organizational change was also punctuated by a number of retirements, promotions and new

assignments. The problem-oriented project fit into this changing environment, providing an opportunity for police to invest critical thinking and creative ideas in a demonstration project. On the other hand, the project also occurred during a period in which police were unsure about the future of their organization, its direction and changing expectations.

Impact of Problem-Oriented Policing (POP) Guides

The Problem-Oriented Guide provided valuable information about the problem of prostitution and its various manifestations, information that provided an important foundation for focusing efforts of Raleigh police on the problem. The Guide did not provide much information about the specific characteristics of prostitution embedded in drug markets, except to suggest that such prostitution is difficult to address. Since the street prostitution problem was so intertwined with the drug markets in Raleigh, it was unclear to what extent the drug market could be ignored and the prostitution problem addressed separately. Given limited resources, we elected to focus only on the prostitution problem but anticipate that any success in reducing prostitution could also contribute to reductions in the drug market.

Perhaps the biggest limitation of the POP Guide was the limited number of ways it suggested to measure the effectiveness of police efforts. There were no reliable data about the extent of this problem prior to our efforts so we were not able to construct a valid baseline measure about it. For example, the Guide suggests measuring the arrests of repeat offenders, but none of our prostitution customers were ever rearrested, and among the chronic prostitutes, most were arrested only twice over an 18-month period. The low frequency of re-arrest

would make it difficult to infer any success related to our efforts. Similarly, the Guide recommended measuring the number of citizen complaints about prostitution, but we had very few; and it recommended measuring the number of prostitutes visible on the streets at various times, but visibility at specific times was not a characteristic of the problem examined. Similarly, there was little discarded prostitution-related paraphernalia or traffic congestion.

While police planned to evaluate calls for service and reported crime in the areas, these measures are relatively weak measures for assessing the amount of prostitution. The best measure of success may be the inability or difficulty of customers picking up prostitutes in the problem areas, and this data will be gathered by periodic routine undercover operations in which “pick-up” time is recorded.

The principal project participants working on prostitution appeared to have read the Guide and much of the project was shaped by advice contained in it. Much of this appeared to be consistent with ideas and experience among police and thus did not cause any conflict or disagreement for participants. While the material in the Guide was not often referenced directly during the project, it provided an agreed-upon foundation that kept participants working in a coordinated direction. While participants did not make any direct observations about the Guide, the information and advice fit well within the Department’s emerging paradigm of responding to citizen concerns and improving police effectiveness.

The Guide stated quite clearly, and police agreed, that enforcement efforts focused only on prostitutes were not effective, and served only to move the problem around. This point was reinforced

by the police experience in Raleigh, where focused and sustained enforcement efforts had simply displaced prostitution from a public park to less visible locations in residential neighborhoods.

While the Guide did not suggest abandoning enforcement, it provided evidence about the need for a more comprehensive approach that also focused on the customers of prostitution and the environmental conditions that brought prostitutes and customers together. This emphasis led police to seek more information about customers, including understanding the conditions that attracted customers to the areas, estimating the number of sexual transactions, and determining the residence, and hence travel distance, of customers. Recognizing that most customers arrived by motor vehicle and carried out the sexual transaction in their vehicle led police to use this as a primary means to deter customers.

The POP Guide suggested that “exposing clients to publicity” could be an effective strategy and provided ideas and methods for further developing this response. Police conducted additional research via the Internet and contacted other police departments about their experiences in sending letters to prostitution clients. As a result, it is planned that both citizens and police in Raleigh will aid in identifying customers; arrested customers will be exposed through cable television and the Police Department’s website; and letters urging recipients to exercise caution when in the area will be mailed to prostitution customers.

Despite their focus on customers, police also developed a better understanding of prostitutes and the critical need for services to help them get out of the business.

Although the Guide did not provide detailed guidance on evaluating the response of the criminal justice system, police examined the practices and outcomes of pretrial custody, adjudication and probation for prostitutes and recognized the need to coordinate the criminal justice system with services, such as drug treatment. Again, while it is not clear that improving the system’s handling of prostitutes will actually reduce the amount of prostitution, the analysis pointed to gaps in the system and the need to coordinate efforts.

Police felt that the Guide provided a wealth of ideas about improving the effectiveness of police efforts, including involving citizens in civil actions against customers. Although we gathered additional information about this response, we elected to incorporate this type of responses into probation conditions for chronic prostitutes. Prior arrest history and maps of offending locations would indicate the areas from which convicted prostitutes would be prohibited.

Thus, while not all the responses described by the Guide were adopted in the Raleigh effort, they influenced our thinking about responding to the problem. Collecting empirical information about prostitution—the number of prostitutes, criminal histories, court dispositions, geographic areas of problems—and estimating the number of sexual transactions occurring in small areas provided a valuable springboard for action. Armed with facts rather than general impressions, police were able arrange meetings with the Wake County District Attorney; Wake District Court Chief Judge and Drug Court Judge; Community Corrections (Probation); the Women’s Center and Interact, domestic violence providers; Cornerstone, a social services provider; and citizens.

Police were able to bring to these meetings empirical data about the problem, including visual aids such as maps and tables, that provided a way to make the case for working together.

Perhaps the most useful part of the Guide was the descriptions of responses used in other locations. There were a large number of these,—in some ways, almost too many to choose from. While many of the responses seemed appealing, we were able to examine some of the options and determine where we had evidence—weak or strong—that suggested a particular response would be appropriate. This paralleled the Guide’s tabular column: “Works best when...” If the evidence was weak but we felt that the response was appropriate and consistent with our perception of the problem, we would then collect additional data to justify the particular response. For example, police were concerned that prostitutes released from custody returned immediately to the same neighborhood to engage in prostitution. Analysis of arrest data and court processing records confirmed this pattern, as well as the proximity of prostitutes’ residences to arrests locations. This evidence suggested that a geographic restriction as part of a probation condition might interrupt the revolving door process, at least for specific areas.

Similarly, police felt that most of the prostitutes were drug addicted and needed treatment. We attempted to interview prostitutes to collect this information but the interviews were not very successful. Instead, we gathered information from citizen surveys about prostitutes and their use of drugs and examined criminal histories for a pattern of drug charges intermingled with prostitution charges. Drug arrests and prostitution arrests were found to be closely correlated, as was the pricing of sexual transactions and drugs. These findings offered evidence about the overall pattern of

drug use and prostitution and pointed to the need for getting these services to prostitutes.

The prostitution problem experienced in Raleigh was similar in many ways to the more general problem described in the Guide. Consistent with the Guide, it had indeed moved over time, displaced by police enforcement efforts and redevelopment efforts; the neighborhoods in which prostitution occurred were poor areas, although not desperately dilapidated or crime ridden; the areas were located near major thoroughfares into the city; most of the prostitutes in Raleigh appeared to be drug involved if not addicted and were in a state of decline; and many were virtually homeless and had experienced abuse. In contrast to the Guide, most of the prostitutes in Raleigh did not appear to have entered prostitution at a young age; rather most of the women were 35 years or older and had not been involved in prostitution for very many years. It appeared that many became prostitutes following the onset of drug and alcohol problems.

Participation in Project

The principal participants in this project became engaged early and remained, to some extent, engaged from beginning to end, but the level of involvement ebbed and flowed. While the Police Department appeared interested, only two of its members were routinely involved in the project. One of these, a captain, had primary responsibility for the project, but other issues of commanding a patrol district competed for his time and attention. He was actively involved in the project throughout its duration, including arranging and participating in meetings with other agencies ranging from the District Attorney to the Chief District Court Judge. Although the Captain was able to quickly tap data and resources as needed, the Department had no

analytic staff when the project began, and it was necessary for him to coordinate much of the routine data collection such as finding citizen complaints, accessing court records and often delivering such data to the consultant! To some extent, other members of the Police Department not directly involved in the team were not engaged in the project and had limited awareness of its progress. Other Department members, however, were engaged on some occasions, such as when the Captain contacted the vice and narcotics unit regarding an undercover operation and enlisted their support in recording “pick-up” times.

The Chief played an important role throughout the life of this project by exhibiting a high degree of interest in its efforts and encouraging its personnel. She attended two conferences in which the project was highlighted and was vocal in her support for the work underway. She was knowledgeable about the progress of the project throughout and articulated concerns about alternative responses developed.

Data Quality and Availability

Prior to this project, it was clear that data acquisition or collection, analyses and the allocation of personnel to carry them out were not a routine part of police operations in the Raleigh Police Department. Some of the data collected from police were not in electronic form—for example, price of sexual transactions—but the small number of records permitted data entry and analysis without great difficulty.

In general, and consistent with the Guide, data about the problem of prostitution were quite limited. Of those which did exist, the following types were used:

- prostitution-related arrests
- drug-related arrests

- citizen complaints
- court processing data
- criminal histories of prostitutes.

Arrest data provided a limited and biased view of the prostitution and drug problems, but provided a basis for preliminary analyses, including spatial analyses and descriptive statistics about suspects. Overall, we had no way to determine the type or nature of biases inherent in the data. For example, we could not determine the temporal distribution of prostitution or drug problems, but could only examine the temporal distribution of police efforts related to prostitution and drugs. Similarly, as we were only able to detect patterns associated with police efforts, we did not know the accuracy of the spatial distribution of prostitution. We examined the relationship of arrests and citizen complaints, but the paucity of recorded citizen complaints made this data unreliable.

There were further limitations to the existing data. Arrest data contained an inherent validity problem, as all incidents were addressed to the 100-block or intersection of streets, which limited the precision of geocoding. These departmental coding practices limited our ability to distinguish between specific locations where prostitution offenses actually took place. Initial arrest data obtained from the Police Department consisted of an Excel spreadsheet maintained informally by a crime analysis clerk. These data did not clearly distinguish between prostitutes and their customers, generating some validity issues for analysis. As electronic data in the Department improved during the course of the project, arrest data also improved and this issue was resolved.

Since the existing data related to prostitution were quite limited, we developed a number of methods to gather additional information about prostitution. These data types and methods of collection are included in Table 6.

Some of the data-collection tasks were not very productive. For example, patrol officers were asked to record sightings of prostitutes to aid in determining boundaries of the geographic areas and the time frame in which prostitutes operated, but as only a few beats were affected and shift schedules were not conducive to data collection, we had difficulty getting officers routinely to collect these data.

Similarly, as mentioned previously, we had little success in interviewing prostitutes, completing only four interviews. We considered finding a civilian to conduct additional interviews but determined that our analysis needs could be handled through other data sources. We also considered interviewing customers of prostitutes but decided that such information was not critical for our project.

Some data that might have been useful were not analyzed. We elected not to analyze calls for service data or reported crime data for the affected areas, as police did not feel prostitutes were involved in much other crime. As well, because of the variety of crime-related problems in these areas, it would have been difficult to disentangle any effects related to before-and-after analysis of this data.

Police involved in this project were quite analytic—they were aware of the limitations of existing data (arrest data); were actively involved in developing instruments for data collection (such as the interviews instrument for prostitutes and the

environmental survey instrument); and reviewed all data findings. They were, however, predisposed to action and prepared to adopt responses suggested by the Guide before analyzing the problem completely. This appeared to reflect their acceptance of a different analytic standard from that traditionally associated with problem-oriented policing. It is important to note, however, that none of their responses were inconsistent with analysis findings that later emerged.

Police support of the analytic process improved during the course of the project following a rebuff during an initial and perhaps premature meeting with the Chief District Court Judge. Later, armed with evidence of the revolving door nature of criminal justice, police reprised the meeting and were able to marshal analysis findings to justify the need for a change in practices in the criminal justice system. As a result, they gained judicial support for the proposed change in adjudication of prostitutes.

Working Arrangements

Communication between consultants and project participants was primarily ad hoc, occurring as the need arose for meetings or sharing of information. During data-collection phases, we met perhaps once per week and used telephone calls and E-mail to communicate. The Department's shift schedule initially caused us some difficulty in communication as police personnel worked 12-hour shifts, and routinely had seven days off per month. A string of midnight shifts followed by a seven-day absence occasionally caused difficulty for the consultant in reaching police personnel. Although this problem could have been fixed by calling police at home, I did not feel comfortable taking this approach. During the course of the project, the police

work shift was changed and this improved communication.

As a consultant, I did not use office space in the Police Department but worked out of my university office, less than two miles from the police agency. I collected and maintained most of the data used in this project, although the Department maintained some data such as criminal histories and provided summary information to me for further analysis. Early on, most of the project meetings took place in police headquarters but many meetings occurred in my office, where police were relatively free from interruption.

Decisions about who would carry out specific tasks were made informally and rather naturally. Police carried out tasks that involved police effort (such as surveillance), for which data access was restricted (such as criminal histories), which required substantial resources (such as surveying residents), or reflected on the formal interactions of the police department (such as meeting with other agencies). I carried out tasks that involved organizing, analyzing or interpreting data. No apparent conflicts or challenges arose with respect to the division of labor, primarily because police tended to see the consultant as an analyst and they maintained responsibility for other project decisions.

During the course of this project, I found that I was reluctant—or felt that I needed to be very judicious—in asking the police to collect additional data about the problem. I was concerned that I would lose their interest or patience during the process, and that I needed to be very certain that the type of data would be very useful, and were thus necessary to collect. Point be told, I wanted to avoid going down any “dead ends” on analysis, which meant we did not

actually conduct an unencumbered collection of data. Instead, we focused on using data to confirm or disconfirm what police thought about the problem, and explored a few alternative hypotheses based on research studies or theoretical work. I developed a summary table of our progress in analysis to point out where there were weaknesses or limitations in the progression.

This working document of project progress was called the “analysis table” and consisted of four columns: what we think about a problem, how we know it (what data support), supplemental data needed, and implications for police response (see table 7). Much of the “what we think” column was originally derived from discussions with police about the when, where and who of prostitution. In some cases, there was not agreement on these “what we think” items; nonetheless, these hunches were included in the table until there was contradictory evidence. The table thus respected the differing opinions of police—and myself—until further information could be collected to test the validity of the idea. Indeed, one of my hunches—that prostitution was much more clustered in time and space than police reported—was eventually invalidated by several data sources. Police responded to this invalidation by saying, “We told you so!” and indeed they had.

The table could have been constructed in different ways. For example, columns could have been labeled “what research suggests about this problem” or “evidence that supports or disconfirms it.” The previous example described—anticipating temporal clustering of prostitution—emerged from research on routine activities, but local evidence suggested that any temporal patterns were washed out by the routine activity of drug use and its episodic ups and downs.

In examining prostitution, the analysis table helped us think about the rigor and validity of data supporting each “what we think” item, and also helped us to establish some priorities for guiding or directing police to gather supplemental data. In many ways, the table format allowed us to rank order analysis steps by focusing on each element in terms of the validity we perceived would be necessary to support any response indicated by the data. For example, police early on wanted to get drug treatment services for prostitutes. In light of that interest, we recognized that we had better have some evidence that prostitutes were at least using drugs, rather than just relying on officers’ opinions about drug and alcohol use of prostitutes. In other cases, we realized that some types of information—such as knowing the educational level of prostitutes or their original residence—while interesting, might not be as constructive in developing responses and gaining support of others for those responses.

As we obtained more information about the problem, the need for some types of data seemed to lose their importance. In other words, we rated the anticipated payoff in analysis findings compared to the investment of time necessary to obtain a particular type of data. In some cases, this meant we were willing to rely on less rigorous data because the precision of the data was not critical; in other cases, it was clear that we needed greater precision because it would be critical in selecting or justifying the response. Rigorous data, for example, about the revolving criminal justice door was critical for getting buy-in from the Department and other criminal justice agencies. In some cases, rigorous data was necessary because of the prospect of media attention. In other cases, data did not seem critical; for example, we

considered trying to learn more about the customers of prostitution—what types of customers, what kinds of jobs and so forth, but abandoned this line of inquiry. The final column in our table, “Implications for Response,” represented our asking ourselves “So what?” In other words, “so what?” if we knew that the clients of prostitutes were upstanding model citizens such as lawyers and doctors, or that clients were tradesmen such as painters and carpenters. We decided it was more important to know how customers got to the market, that they had the ability to pay, and that they seemed to be concerned about their physical safety and anonymity.

The analysis or research model we used is an integrated deductive-inductive model that combines techniques used in much social science. However, our model consisted of relatively compressed waves of induction and focused on multi-tasking to make our analysis more efficient. We wanted to use one data source—e.g., vehicle observations—to answer different questions or test different hypotheses rather than testing a single hypothesis; thus, a single tool could be used both to nullify one hypothesis and test another. The “analysis table” model thus incorporated a range of hypotheses that could be examined simultaneously. In this way, the model was not linear or iterative but one that, in the interest of time, involved simultaneously pursuing evidence about different elements of a problem.

In each case, we made some informal estimates about the “costs” associated with each type of data collection and focused police efforts on gathering the easiest data first—such as police opinions, arrests, citations, observations and interpreting each wave. The interpretation—filling out more cells in the table—was then

used to identify and prioritize the next wave of analysis tasks that were necessary and develop ways to execute them. This meant that the most “costly”, in terms of time or resources, could be as narrowly focused as possible.

Some of the data collection tools we employed were routine practices for police but had not been routinely used as analysis tools—for example, we recorded “pick-up time” or the amount of time necessary for an undercover officer to connect with a prostitute. Undercover officers clearly used this technique but had done so informally and had not recorded the data. Police readily agreed, however, that it provided evidence of the visibility and openness of street markets.

The table did not appear to rule out or limit response options that might have been under consideration. Instead, it formed an action or analysis plan that could be filled in or amended as we learned more about the problem. Some of the analyses did not prove useful. For example, we initially identified approximately 50 chronic prostitutes and provided the list to patrol officers, who were to keep it and note when and where they saw each prostitute. I thought this would help us frame the geographic area in which the prostitutes ranged and might be useful to justify “stay away” conditions in probation orders, but the data collection tool did not work out very well because workload and changing shifts resulted in incomplete data.

IMPACT OF PROJECT ON DEPARTMENT

The project commenced in January 2002 and continued through the summer of 2003. Its timeline was affected somewhat by organizational issues within the Police Department in that the reorganization and reassignments affected the chain of

command for the project. Most matters in this project were routinely followed-up by police. There was not a large investment of time and resources but the project required that the Department maintain its efforts over a period of time. While the project cannot take credit for it, the changes in organizational structure in the Raleigh Police Department during this period should facilitate the Department undertaking similar projects in the future. In particular, the Department’s move to decentralized police districts and improved data and analytic capability provides greater capacity for problem solving efforts. The Department also hired a civilian Problem-Oriented Policing Coordinator who is able to assist police with undertaking analytic projects that might exceed the skills or time available at the district level.

It is difficult to assess the long-term effects of this project, but it did give the Department some experience in working with outside consultants and in using and applying research. I believe that it showed police the value of investing in data collection and demonstrated that analytic tasks need not be overly complex or resource intensive to provide useful information. When the police were armed with empirical data, individuals within the Department and other agencies reacted positively to supporting their efforts. Although police efforts were still underway as the project concluded, police were proceeding in an experimental manner—that is, they were interested in exploring and developing new approaches to problems, were more rigorously assessing their effectiveness, and were reviewing lessons learned and developing evaluation measures before proceeding on new responses. In many cases in this project, police were surprised to learn how few data— such as the data recorded about citizen complaints— were available. As a result, they were

thinking of ways to record more routinely
citizen complaints about problems.

APPENDIX A

Confidential Questionnaire for Prostitutes

1: Background of Individual

- How old are you? _____
- How long have you been a prostitute? _____
- How old were you when you first prostituted? _____
 - Have you prostituted steadily since that time, or on-and-off?
- How did you get started in prostitution? (e.g., by family member?)
- Where did you grow up? _____
- Were you raised in a family? (Two- or single-parent, foster home, institution)
- Were you ever abused? (Describe briefly)
- How much schooling have you had? _____
- What's your legal work history? _____
- Do you have any children? (How many and ages.) _____
- Where do you live/stay? (Area sufficient. Temporary or permanent?)
- What's been your contact with the criminal justice system? (e.g., number of arrests, offense types, time served?)

II: Sex Business

- When do you usually prostitute?
 - Which days?
 - What time of day?
 - How many hours per day?
 - How many clients per day?
 - About how many hours a week?
- What kind of sex do you sell? Manual, oral, vaginal, anal, combination?
- How much do you charge for each?
- Do you ever trade sex for drugs? (Describe.)
- Do you share your earnings with anyone? (Describe.)
- How long does the sex act usually take?
- Is there plenty of business or is there competition between prostitutes?
 - Is prostitution lucrative?
- Do you have any other income source? (If so, what and how much? Probe also for other illegal activities in general. Ever steal from clients, clip clients)

III: Location

- Do you have a regular spot to pick up clients? Describe.
 - What makes this a good location? (Probe: Food, drink nearby; near dealer)
- What features make this a good location? (Good lighting, etc.)
- How much do you move around looking for clients? (Constantly, rarely)
- How far do you move around? (Two-three blocks...)
- Do you have sex where you pick up the client?
 - If not, how far away do you go?
- In what locations do you have sex? What makes these good locations? (Probe.)
 - Is sex act in car, outside or elsewhere?

- Do you feel fairly safe in this area? Why or why not?

IV: Clients

- Do you have regular clients? Or are your clients usually strangers?
- Describe them: age, neighborhood folks, working people, etc.
- How do clients know where to find you? (Probe: cab drivers, dealers, etc.)
- Are you clients in cars or on foot?
- Have you ever been abused by clients? (Describe, e.g. assault, rape? Did you report to police?)

V: Drug Use and Health

- Do you use drugs or alcohol? What drugs?
- When did you start to use these?
- How often do you use drugs (crack)?
 - How many days of the week? How many rocks per day?
 - How much do you usually buy at one time?
 - How much do you pay?
 - Do you pay cash, buy on credit, or swap sex?
 - Do you get good quality drugs?
 - Do you ever inject drugs?
- How often do you use drink alcohol?
 - What kind? How much? Where do you get it?
- Do you get drugs nearby? How far must you go to get drugs?
- How long does it take you to find drugs?
 - Do you go to one dealer or different ones?
- Do you use drugs alone? With clients? With others?
- Are you in good health? (If not, describe, especially HIV positive)
 - Do you routinely practice safe sex? (Or occasionally, never)
 - If injector, do you ever share needles?
- Have you ever gotten drug treatment?

VI: Future

- What is your attitude about prostitution?
- Are there services that you want or need but do not have access to?
- What would it take to get you out of prostitution?

APPENDIX B

Raleigh Police Department Citizen Survey

1. How much of a problem is prostitution in this neighborhood now? Rank on a scale of 1 – 10, with 10 being the highest. (Circle one.)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

2. Exactly where would you say prostitution is the biggest problem around here? (May name more than one location. Write street name and 100 block number or intersection)

a. _____
b. _____
c. _____

Is this the place where...

a. _____ Prostitutes hang out and try to hook up with customers?
b. _____ Where they engage in sex acts?
c. _____ Or something else? (_____)

3. What specific time of day would you say prostitution is the biggest problem there?

Between _____ (a.m./p.m.) and _____ (a.m./p.m.)

4. What day (or days) of week would you say prostitution is the biggest problem there?

_____ Mon _____ Tues _____ Wed _____ Thurs _____ Fri _____ Sat _____ Sun

5. Do you think there is any relationship between drug dealing and prostitution?

a. _____ Yes
b. _____ No
c. _____ Don't know

If yes, describe as specifically as possible. (For example, if drug buyers are customers.)

6. I don't need to know names, but where would you say most of the prostitutes live?

a. _____ In this neighborhood
b. _____ Not in this neighborhood
c. _____ Some in this neighborhood and some not
d. _____ Don't know

7. If you know anything about the people who hire prostitutes around here, where are they mostly from? (check one)

a. _____ Mostly from this neighborhood
b. _____ Mostly from somewhere elsewhere? (Where? _____)
c. _____ Don't know

8. How do most of the customers seem to hook up with prostitutes?

a. _____ Car
b. _____ On foot
c. _____ Both on foot and cars
d. _____ Don't know

9. Do you think most of the sex acts between customers and prostitutes occur ...

a. _____ In cars?
b. _____ Or elsewhere? (Where? _____)

10. What part of the problem with prostitution bothers you the most? (Don't read aloud; check all that apply or fill in blank.)

a. _____ It attracts a lot of car traffic

- b. It contributes to other crime to the area
 - c. You see sex in progress or evidence of sex acts (condoms, etc.)
 - d. It's a bad influence on kids in neighborhood
 - e. Prostitutes do other crimes too
 - f. Prostitutes make the neighborhood look bad
 - g. These women need some help
 - h. Other (What? _____)
11. Do you think the prostitution problem has changed in the last year or so?
- a. It's gotten worse
 - b. It's gotten better
 - c. It's gotten worse then better, or vice versa
 - d. It's about the same as always
12. Can you think of anything that seems to make the problem get worse or better?
- a. Weather
 - b. Police visibility
 - c. Other police actions (What? _____)
 - d. Other (_____)
13. What would help reduce prostitution in this neighborhood for the long term?
14. Would you be willing to keep a record of exactly when and where you see prostitutes in this neighborhood? This information would be kept confidential, but will be used to help us develop more effective responses to the problem.
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Maybe
- If yes, we will provide a recording form. Get respondent name and phone number.

Survey date _____ Respondent address _____ Officer _____

Table I: Types of Prostitution Arrests in Raleigh, May 2001-February 2002

| | Prostitution | Crime against nature | Operating house of prostitution | Loitering for prostitution | Total |
|---------|--------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|-------|
| 5/2001 | | 9 | | | 9 |
| 6/2001 | 15 | 2 | | | 17 |
| 7/2001 | 40 | | 9 | | 49 |
| 8/2001 | 1 | 2 | | | 3 |
| 9/2001 | 5 | | | | 5 |
| 10/2001 | 33 | 3 | | | 36 |
| 11/2001 | 30 | | | 9 | 39 |
| 12/2001 | 10 | 2 | | | 12 |
| 1/2002 | 5 | 2 | | | 1 |
| 2/2002 | 4 | 6 | | | 10 |
| | 143 | 26 | 9 | 9 | 147 |

Figure 1: Prostitution Arrests, New Bern Avenue Corridor, 2001-2002

Figure 2: Proximity of Prostitution and Drug Arrests

Figure 3: Proximity of Offender's Residence and Offense Location

Table 2: Prostitution Suspects and Arrests

| Number | Arrest data only | | Arrest data & criminal history | |
|---------------------------------|------------------|---------|--------------------------------|---------|
| | Suspects | Arrests | Suspects | Arrests |
| Suspects with 2 or more arrests | 39 | 92 | 60 | 113 |
| Suspects with one arrest | 109 | 109 | 88 | 88 |
| Total | 148 | 201 | 148 | 201 |

Figure 4: Career Charges against Habitual Prostitutes
Criminal History of 60 Offenders
n=770 charges

Figure 5: Distance of Customer's Residence from Offense Location

Table 3: Prostitution Customers—Proximity of Residence to Offense Location

| Distance from arrest location | Suspects (with valid addresses) |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Less than three miles | 39% (14) |
| 3-6 miles | 11% (4) |
| 6-9 miles | 25% (9) |
| More than 9 miles away | 25% (9) |

Figure 6: Citizen Complaints about Prostitution

Table 4: Citizen Ranking of Prostitution Problem, College Park Area
“How much of a problem is prostitution in this neighborhood now?”

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------|
| Major problem | 45% (30) |
| Big problem | 23% (10) |
| Somewhat of a problem | 17% (9) |
| Not a problem | 15% (7) |
| Total | 100% (56) |

Table 5: Calculation of Prostitution Problem in Raleigh, 18-month Period

| | |
|--|--------|
| Complaints to police | 31 |
| Arrests | 201 |
| Suspects | 148 |
| Chronic offenders | 60 |
| Estimated sexual transactions ³ | 67 500 |

Table 6: Primary Data Collection Tools

| Data | Method of collection |
|------------------------|--|
| Sightings by officers | Officers were provided sheets with names of chronic prostitutes and asked to record where and when they were seen |
| Offender interviews | Interviews of prostitutes |
| Environmental survey | A survey to document environmental conditions at common arrest locations |
| Pick-up time | Amount of time necessary for an undercover officer to find and pick up a prostitute |
| Surveillance operation | Undercover surveillance to identify behaviors of prostitution customers and collect license tag numbers for analysis |
| Citizen survey | Door-to-door survey of citizens in areas affected by prostitution |

Table 7: Analysis Table–Sample Rows

| What we think | How we know it (Data source) | More data needed? | Implications for response |
|---|---|---|--|
| Prostitution occurs around the clock; not clustered by day or time | Police officer opinion Citizen survey Arrests clustered in time but data not representative | Offender interviews Possibly direct observation scheme (show migration pattern) | Dispersed patterns more difficult to detect and discourage |
| Prostitutes are primarily older women | Arrest data | Offender interviews | Women may be ready to get out of the business but need assistance |
| Prostitution markets located near major thoroughfares providing ingress/egress to city (e.g., New Bern, Person) | Mapped arrest locations Proximity to thoroughfares | Determine where are customers coming from Can do license plate surveillance on vehicles meeting research profile; offender (customer interviews) | Spatial data not necessarily representative but seems solid and consistent with literature Disrupting vehicular traffic could affect markets—traffic checkpoints, street closing, traffic diversion Customers from “common areas” may clarify response |

¹ It was not clear that all of these arrests were of prostitution customers, but all were male; some of the arrests may have been of male prostitutes but we could not detect this from the arrest database.

² An additional 20 addresses could not be mapped; 8 suspects provided no physical address; and 12 other addresses could not be matched.

³ The number of sexual transactions is projected based upon each chronic prostitute participating in three sexual transactions per day for each of five days per week over 50 weeks per year.