



The author(s) shown below used Federal funding provided by the U.S. Department of Justice to prepare the following resource:

Document Title: Reporting & Investigating Missing Persons:
A Background Paper On How To Frame The
Issue

Author(s): Trisha Chakraborty, Ph.D.


Document Number: 255934

Date Received: December 2020

Award Number: 2016-R2-CX-0025

This resource has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. This resource is being made publically available through the Office of Justice Programs' National Criminal Justice Reference Service.

Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.



REPORTING & INVESTIGATING MISSING PERSONS: A BACKGROUND PAPER ON HOW TO FRAME THE ISSUE

The author shown below used Federal funding (NIJ Award Number 2016-R2-CX-0025) provided by the U.S. Department of Justice to prepare this paper. The author is Trisha Chakraborty (PhD), an American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) Science and Technology Policy Fellow (2018-2020), who was placed at the National Institute of Justice. This paper was officially submitted July 2019 and disseminated at the U.S. Department of Justice's 14th Annual Government-to-Government Violence Against Women Tribal Consultation in August 2019.

This paper has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. This resource is being made publically available through the Office of Justice Programs' National Criminal Justice Reference Service. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Reporting & Investigating Missing Persons: A Background Paper on How to Frame the Issue

INTRODUCTION

The number of missing persons, both reported and unreported, has been raised as a major concern among tribal nations and advocates across in the United States (U.S.). In 2018, 612,846 missing person record entries were submitted to the National Crime Information Center's (NCIC) Missing Persons File, a crime database managed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).¹ By December 31, 2018,¹ 553,065 entries (90 percent of total entries) were cleared or cancelled² from the system, leaving 85,459 active entries in the NCIC.¹ This means that, in a country of 327 million people, tens of thousands of people still have not been located.

Despite making up the smallest portion of the U.S. population, the second highest number of reported missing persons (9,914 in 2018)¹ are American Indians (AI), Alaska Natives (AN), Native Hawaiians (NH), or Pacific Islanders (PI), which are grouped together. As such, a discussion is required of federal, state, and local laws, policies, and protocols that guide reporting and investigating missing person cases.

Those Who Go Missing

A common misconception is that missing person cases are crimes and are a result of criminal activity. However, going missing is not a crime. Many missing persons are found alive and their absence has nothing to do with criminal activity. Although there are laws in place requiring the reporting of missing children, there are no federal laws that require reporting and investigation into missing adults, specifically individuals over the age of 21. Adults have the right to choose to leave their established community without reporting that they are leaving. 327

It is important to note that a person may go missing intentionally or unintentionally. Someone experiencing problems at home (e.g., domestic violence) or in their life (e.g., financial issues) may choose to leave intentionally. They may want to escape the situation and start over somewhere else without notifying anyone. In a few cases, missing persons have voluntarily entered into a witness protection program. Unfortunately, there have also been cases where the missing person intentionally left with the purpose of committing suicide.

Regardless, the right to go missing was established from a 1995 U.S. Supreme Court decision, *McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Commission*,³ which upheld the First Amendment right of “freedom of the press” by supporting the right of an individual to remain anonymous when writing. This concept of anonymity has been extended to those adults who prefer to remain anonymous by going “missing.”

¹ [Missing Persons Report](https://www.fbi.gov/file-repository/2018-ncic-missing-person-and-identified-person-statistics.pdf/view). (2018). National Crime Information Center. Retrieved June 17, 2019, from <https://www.fbi.gov/file-repository/2018-ncic-missing-person-and-identified-person-statistics.pdf/view>.

² Cleared cases are those cases that have been solved, likely because the missing person has been located (living or deceased). Cancelled cases are those cases that are removed from the system because of incomplete reports or invalid data.

³ [McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Commission, 1995](#).

Reporting & Investigating Missing Persons: A Background Paper on How to Frame the Issue

Some people disappear unintentionally. Reasons for these types of disappearances could include accidents in remote locations where they cannot be found (at sea or while hiking) or where no one knows who the person is, cannot make a formal identification, or notify someone. For example, a person on a cross-country motor vehicle trip may get into a fatal accident. Someone suffering from dementia or a mental health issue may disappear inadvertently. Some cases may result from foul play. However, cases involving kidnapping, homicide, trafficking, or some other criminal act are very small in proportion to all missing person cases.

A recent analysis⁴ using National Missing and Unidentified Persons System (NamUs) data demonstrates the different outcomes seen in missing person cases. Seventy-five percent of resolved missing person cases involved a person recovered alive. Foul play was suspected in only 13 percent of active NamUs missing person cases. In addition, 25 percent of active unidentified person cases in NamUs indicate a manner of death that does not involve foul play (e.g., suicide, accident, or natural causes). Sixteen percent of the active unidentified person cases in NamUs were categorized as homicides.

Regardless of the reason for the disappearance, family and friends of the missing person experience trauma that can be overwhelming. They may have to navigate a complex environment without guidance to find resources to help report and resolve cases. For most people, needing to know the whereabouts of their loved one, regardless of the reason for their disappearance, is based on concerns for the person's safety and well-being.

Many missing person cases go unreported for various reasons. These include decisions by law enforcement (LE) not to upload cases to multiple data systems, LE's belief that the case will resolve itself, a lack of reporting in general, and undiscovered or unidentified decedents.⁵ As a result, the real number of missing adults in the U.S. is currently unknown and the scope of the problem is difficult to quantify. Greater standardization across all levels of government is necessary to ensure more accurate reporting of missing persons. The majority of missing person cases result in the person being located within a very short period of time. Sometimes the missing person is located by LE, but in many cases, the person returns on their own.

Missing person cases present a significant challenge to LE. This challenge is due, in part, to the high number of open cases and a lack of standardized protocols on reporting and investigating missing person cases. In addition, many of the nation's 17,000 LE agencies do not know about their state's missing person clearinghouse and federal databases, which are valuable tools for solving missing person cases. Investigating these cases is further complicated by that fact that many cities and counties bury unidentified remains without collecting DNA samples that could be used to help identify decedents.

⁴ The NamUs analysis, completed in early 2019, is an internal document.

⁵ As outlined in Fernandes-Alacantara, A. L. (Nov. 2017). *Missing Adults: Background, Federal Programs, and Issues for Congress*. *Congressional Research Service*, Washington, D.C.

Reporting & Investigating Missing Persons: A Background Paper on How to Frame the Issue

Resources to Help Find Missing Persons

Given significant improvements in the forensic sciences in the past decade, it is possible to make identifications by analyzing DNA (i.e., genetic material from relatives) in unidentified deceased person cases. DNA analysis and the collection of family reference samples has been a key component in resolving missing person cases where the individual has been found to be deceased. Family reference samples are DNA samples taken by swabbing the inside of the cheek with a cotton swab. These samples can only be taken from family members who volunteer their DNA and can only be used to identify missing persons. However, even when labs are willing to collect and analyze DNA, they may not be equipped to perform DNA analysis of human remains, especially when the samples are old or degraded.

To address the need for better forensic resources, the federal government has facilitated increased reporting and investigation of missing person cases in several arenas. In 1967, the FBI established NCIC to report and track crimes across the U.S. This database includes reports of all types of crime. It also collects missing person cases, which are not crimes. In 1975, the ‘Missing Persons File’ was added to the NCIC database. However, it was not until 1982, when Congress passed the Missing Children’s Act,⁶ that LE agents were required to upload every report of a missing child to NCIC’s “Missing Persons Report.” This act gave LE agencies across the U.S. access to case information that helped solve cases more efficiently. Then, in 1984, the Missing Children’s Assistance Act⁷ (MCAA) directed the U.S. Department of Justice to lead federal efforts to recover children who are missing. The act also funded the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC), which supports LE and the general public in their recovery efforts. Since that time, updates to the MCAA have continued to fund initiatives to report and solve missing children cases.

A variety of federal databases provide additional support to LE agencies investigating missing person cases. The FBI established the Combined DNA Index System (CODIS) as a database for cases in which DNA evidence was found. CODIS collects DNA for both criminal and missing person cases.⁸ DNA records are kept confidential and discarded as soon as cases are closed. Family members of missing persons have the right to remove their DNA from the database at any time. Submission of DNA records for missing person cases are completely voluntary and must be submitted through an LE agency. Since the 1990s, LE agencies nationwide have submitted DNA records with the aim of using CODIS as a force multiplier to solve cases. CODIS is composed of local (LDIS), state (SDIS), and national (NDIS) databases that house DNA data related to all kinds of criminal cases and, separately, missing person cases. Other FBI

⁶ “S. 1701 — 97th Congress: Missing Children Act.” (1981). www.GovTrack.us. Retrieved June 11, 2019, from <<https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/97/s1701>>.

⁷ “S. 2014 — 98th Congress: Missing Children’s Assistance Act.” (1983). www.GovTrack.us. Retrieved June 11, 2019, from <<https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/98/s2014>>.

⁸ FBI Laboratory Services. CODIS and NDIS fact sheet. Retrieved June 19, 2019, from <<https://www.fbi.gov/services/laboratory/biometric-analysis/codis/codis-and-ndis-fact-sheet>>.

Reporting & Investigating Missing Persons: A Background Paper on How to Frame the Issue

programs include the Next Generation Identification System⁹ (NGI) and the Violent Criminal Apprehension Program (ViCAP).

In 2005, the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) directed the development of NamUs, which is a no-cost nationwide, centralized information clearinghouse and resource center on missing persons and on unidentified and unclaimed decedents. Currently managed by the University of North Texas Health Science Center, NamUs brings together LE, medical examiners, coroners, forensic experts, families, and the public to help resolve missing and unidentified person cases throughout the nation. NamUs also allows for greater cooperation between federal, state, local, and tribal government agencies and the public. Its focus is on solving missing person cases involving children, youth, and adults in equal measure. NamUs also collects voluntary DNA from family members to connect them with unidentified and unclaimed persons. However, it is important to note that these DNA samples are *only* used to identify missing persons and *never* used in criminal investigations. Collectively, these initiatives have demonstrated success in bringing greater attention to the plight of missing and unidentified person cases across the U.S.

In recent years, a call for action to address missing persons has resulted in some state and local governments passing laws requiring that missing persons be reported. Requiring reports results in more effective public safety responses to missing persons and more agency accountability. Still, because of disparities in federal, state, local, and tribal laws, there is persistent confusion about who should report, who should be reported missing, and when, where, and how to report. This paper compiles all published state and federal laws on reporting missing children, youth, and adults as of 2018.

II. DEFINITIONS

To understand how local and federal policies address the reporting and investigation of missing person cases, it is important to first understand terms used in the field and to discuss misunderstandings that lead to confusion about what these terms mean. To date, there is no official definition for a “missing person.” Examination of federal, state, and local laws provides a general understanding of a missing person to be an individual who, voluntarily or involuntarily, cannot be located because their whereabouts are unknown.^{10,11} The lack of a uniform definition stems from very little standardization nationally across policies, protocols, and practices governing how missing person cases are handled.

There is also controversy over the age at which a person is considered an adult. Generally, the federal government considers that anyone who is 17 years of age or younger is a child, and

⁹ NGI replaced the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System (IAFIS) and covers a range of biometrics, not just fingerprints.

¹⁰ [Maryland Silver Alert Law Definitions](#).

¹¹ [Missing Persons Report](#). (2018). National Crime Investigation Center. Retrieved June 17, 2019, from <https://www.fbi.gov/file-repository/2018-ncic-missing-person-and-unidentified-person-statistics.pdf/view>.

Reporting & Investigating Missing Persons: A Background Paper on How to Frame the Issue

anyone who is 21 years of age or older is an adult. In some jurisdictions, missing person cases of individuals between 18 and 20 years of age are classified as children and given priority. However, some states make further classifications by age. For example, North Dakota makes distinctions between children who are younger than 13 and those who are younger than 17.¹² Similar distinctions exist in the laws and ordinances of several other states and counties. Consideration of these definitions is necessary to understanding the manner in which federal, state, local, and tribal laws in the U.S. are written.

III. FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS

Laws Governing Children and Youths

Federal Laws

Several existing federal laws mandate reporting for missing children. The 1990 National Child Search Assistance Act¹³ requires reports of missing children to be uploaded to NCIC's Missing Persons File as soon as they are taken. The Act defines a child as anyone who is 17 years of age or younger. It also requires the Attorney General to publish an annual statistical summary of the Missing Persons File, known as the "Missing Persons Report." Suzanne's Law, passed in 2003 and packaged in the Prosecutorial Remedies and Other Tools to End the Exploitation of Children Today Act,¹⁴ expands upon this reporting by requiring LE officials to upload missing person cases for individuals between 18 and 21 years of age to NCIC as soon as reports are taken. These laws help prioritize cases of missing children, expand access to resources for LE officials and the public, and implement clear guidelines to facilitate faster and more efficient case processing. In addition to these resources, federal programs like NCMEC, NamUs, and CODIS also allow LE officials, medical examiners (ME), or coroners (C) — with the assistance of family members — to voluntarily upload case details. These programs act as force multipliers by bringing cases to the attention of a broader audience (i.e., federal, state, local, and tribal LE, ME/C offices, and the public) and provide more services and resources to resolve cases. Furthermore, for pressing cases, America's Missing: Broadcast Emergency Response (AMBER) Alert disseminates information to the general public about abducted children who are at immediate risk. Since its inception in 1956 to April 2019, the AMBER Alert System has safely recovered 957 children. These programs supplement existing policies and support families, LE, and service providers dedicated to bringing children home.

State Laws

State laws supplement federal laws. As of August 1, 2018, 49 states and the District of Columbia require the reporting of missing children. Forty-three states require the reporting of

¹² [North Dakota Century Code, Chapter 14-09: Parent and Child.](#)

¹³ "S. 2317 — 101st Congress: National Child Search Assistance Act." www.congress.us. 1990. June 11, 2019 <<https://www.congress.gov/bill/101st-congress/senate-bill/2317>>

¹⁴ "S. 151 — 101st Congress: Prosecutorial Remedies and Other Tools to End the Exploitation of Children Today Act." www.congress.us. 2003. June 11, 2019 <<https://www.congress.gov/bill/108th-congress/senate-bill/151>>

Reporting & Investigating Missing Persons: A Background Paper on How to Frame the Issue

located missing children. State laws vary widely in their requirements, as do their definitions of who constitutes a child, youth, or adult. Appendix 1 lists the laws that require the reporting of missing children, by state.

Laws Governing Adults

Federal Laws

There are no federal laws governing the reporting or investigation of missing person cases. However, the federal government, through the U.S. Department of Justice, has established several programs and resources to assist federal, state, local, and tribal LE in their efforts to locate missing adults. In general, adult missing person cases fall under state, local, and tribal jurisdictions who may have their own laws and ordinances that govern how these cases are reported and investigated.

LE agents have the option of entering adult missing persons' DNA and case details into a number of federally managed databases in addition to their own LE case management system. As with missing children cases, NCIC, CODIS, and NamUs accept reports on missing adults from federal, state, local, and tribal LE. In addition, NamUs allows members of the general public to review cases. Family members of missing persons can also enter data, which are then vetted by a LE agency. Any LE-sensitive data can only be reviewed by authorized LE personnel. Although LE is encouraged to upload missing person cases to these systems, very few states officially require agencies to do so. Exceptions include Arkansas, Illinois, Michigan, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, and Tennessee.

State Laws

More states are addressing the problem of missing adults by passing legislation that requires reporting of missing adults. Recognizing the need for expedited investigation, most states have abolished the mandatory minimum waiting period to report a missing adult. Some of these laws require LE to upload missing person data to local and federal databases, but there are no penalties for LE agencies that choose not to share case data, including when missing persons have been located.

In addition to codified laws, some states have also implemented a Silver Alert System. This Alert disseminates information about individuals over the age of 65 who exhibit signs of dementia and may be at risk of harm. As with other initiatives concerning missing adults, the Silver Alert System is not standardized across the U.S. However, there is ongoing support to implement such a law, both locally and federally.

Appendix 2 lists existing state laws on reporting and investigating missing adult cases. Together, states have implemented a patchwork of laws that cover missing person cases across the country. Improved standardization across state laws will produce a more cohesive strategy to tackle the

Reporting & Investigating Missing Persons: A Background Paper on How to Frame the Issue

issue. In addition, federal policymakers have introduced a number of pending statutes that are before the U.S. Congress.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The number of missing persons, both reported and unreported, is a “silent mass disaster”¹⁵ in need of attention all across the nation. Governments at all levels are examining current laws, drafting new legislation, and/or advocating for policies and practices that support missing person cases, families, and LE agencies. The issue of missing adults is especially salient, as the actual number of missing adults is currently unknown. Furthermore, laws requiring the reporting of missing adults are sparse and unstandardized. A first step to addressing this problem is to learn how communities manage cases of missing persons and how the federal government can increase support to families, LE, and communities.

V. QUESTIONS TO FRAME THE ISSUE

Challenges of Reporting and Investigating Missing Persons

Reporting, investigating, and resolving missing person cases remains a challenge for law enforcement (LE). This is partially due to the lack of standardized reporting protocols across jurisdictions. Answers to the following questions from key stakeholders, like tribal governments and LE, can help identify barriers to reporting and investigating missing person cases and produce viable and effective solutions:

- In communities with established tribal LE, what are the biggest obstacles faced when agencies encounter or try to report a missing person case? What are possible solutions?
- In those communities that do not have tribal LE, what are the largest obstacles encountered when reporting a missing person case? What are possible solutions?
- What can be done to improve the public safety response to missing person cases?
- In order to successfully report, investigate, and resolve missing person cases, what resources and assistance do tribal governments need?

Jurisdiction

A major challenge of LE in Indian country is navigating jurisdictional authority. Missing person cases, in which persons may migrate across state and tribal communities, can become especially complicated when LE must collaborate across jurisdictions to solve a case. Many factors determine when and how LE agencies collaborate on such cases. Some factors may include

¹⁵ Craig, E. (2016). The Role of the Anthropologist in the Application of NamUs. *Academic Forensic Pathology*, 6(3). Doi 10.23907/2016.043.

Reporting & Investigating Missing Persons: A Background Paper on How to Frame the Issue

whether a child or an adult is reported missing; the order in which local and federal agencies must be brought in on a case; who is responsible for taking a report, collecting evidence, and initiating an investigation; and where the crime occurs.

- What protocols should be enacted to respond to, investigate, and resolve missing person cases?
- What can tribal governments and/or family members of a missing person do if (or when) LE agencies are unwilling to take a report and/or investigate a missing person case?
- What can be done to address jurisdictional conflicts around reporting, investigating, and resolving missing person cases?
- What resources are needed to address jurisdictional conflicts around reporting, investigating, and resolving missing person cases?

Reporting & Investigating Missing Persons: A Background Paper on How to Frame the Issue

Appendix 1. Established State Laws Requiring the Reporting of Missing Children to NCIC

State	Does state law require reporting of missing children?	Does state law require reporting of located missing children?	State law codes
Alabama	Yes	Yes	Ala. Code §§ 26-19-1 et seq.
Alaska	Yes	Yes	Alaska Stat. § 47.10.141
Arizona	Yes	Yes	Ariz. Rev. Stat. § 15-829(D)(2)
Arkansas	Yes	Yes	Ark. Code Ann. § 12-12-205.
California	Yes	Yes	Cal. Penal Code § 14205 et seq.
Colorado	Yes	Yes	Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-33.5-415.1
Connecticut	Yes	Yes	Conn. Gen. Stat. §§ 7-282c; 29-1e
Delaware	Yes	Yes	Del. Code Ann. tit. 11, § 8542 et seq.
DC	Yes	No	§ 4-1323.01
Florida	Yes	Yes	Fla. Stat. Ann. § 937.021 et seq.
Georgia	Yes	No	Ga. Code Ann. § 35-3-80
Hawaii	Yes	No	Haw. Rev. Stat. § 577-27
Idaho	Yes	Yes	Idaho Code § 18-4508 et seq.
Illinois	Yes	Yes	325 Ill. Comp. Stat. 40/2
Indiana	Yes	Yes	Ind. Code §§ 10-13-5-35; 10-13-5-4
Iowa	Yes	Yes	Iowa Code §§ 694.1; 694.10
Kansas	Yes	Yes	Kan. Stat. Ann. § 75-712c
Kentucky	Yes	Yes	Ky. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 17.450 et seq.
Louisiana	Yes	Yes	La. Rev. Stat. Ann. §§ 40:2521; 46:1431
Maine	Yes	Yes	Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. tit. 25, § 2153 et seq.
Maryland	Yes	Yes	Md. Code Ann., Fam. Law § 9-401 et seq.
Massachusetts	Yes	Yes	Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 22A, § 1
Michigan	Yes	Yes	Mich. Comp. Laws § 28.258
Minnesota	Yes	Yes	Minn. Stat. § 299C.52 et seq.
Mississippi	Yes	Yes	None found
Missouri	Yes	Yes	Mo. Rev. Stat. § 43.400 et seq.
Montana	Yes	Yes	Mont. Code Ann. § 44-2-502 et seq.
Nebraska	Yes	Yes	Neb. Rev. Stat. § 43-2003
Nevada	Yes	Yes	Nev. Rev. Stat. § 432.150
New Hampshire	Yes	Yes	N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 169-E:1 et seq.
New Jersey	Yes	Yes	N.J. Stat. § 52:17B-9.8a
New Mexico	Yes	Yes	N.M. Stat. Ann. § 32A-14-2 et seq.
New York	Yes	Yes	New York State Executive Law § 837-e
North Carolina	Yes	Yes	N.C. Gen. Stat. § 143B-1010 et seq.
North Dakota	Yes	Yes	N/A
Ohio	Yes	Yes	Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 2901.30
Oklahoma	Yes	No	Okla. Stat. tit. 74, § 150.12A
Oregon	Yes	No	N/A
Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes	N/A

Reporting & Investigating Missing Persons: A Background Paper on How to Frame the Issue

State	Does state law require reporting of missing children?	Does state law require reporting of located missing children?	State law codes
Rhode Island	Yes	No	R.I. Gen. Laws § 42-28.8-3, et seq.
South Carolina	Yes	Yes	S.C. Code Ann. § 23-3-210
South Dakota	Yes	Yes	S.D. Codified Laws § 22-19-14
Tennessee	Yes	Yes	Tenn. Code Ann. § 37-10-201
Texas	Yes	Yes	Tex. Code Crim. Proc. Ann. art. 63.001
Utah	Yes	Yes	Utah Code Ann. §§ 26-2-27; 53-10-203
Vermont	Yes	Yes	Vt. Stat. Ann. tit. 20, § 1820
Virginia	Yes	Yes	Va. Code Ann. §§ 52-32; 15.2-1718
Washington	Yes	Yes	N/A
West Virginia	Yes	Yes	W. Va. Code §§ 49-9-2 et seq.
Wisconsin	Yes	No	N/A
Wyoming	No	No	N/A
Totals	49 states & D.C. require reporting of missing children	43 states require reporting of located missing children	

A child is defined by NCIC as individuals under the age of 17. For reporting purposes, individuals between the ages of 18 and 20 are treated similarly to individuals under 18 years old. (Adapted from Protected Innocence Challenge, 2018 National State Law Survey: Missing Child Reporting. Data procured on June 11, 2019.)

Reporting & Investigating Missing Persons: A Background Paper on How to Frame the Issue

Appendix 2. Established State Laws Requiring Taking Reports of Missing Adults and Reporting Them to State and Federal Missing Person (MP) Databases

State	Does state law require reporting of missing adults?	Required databases to upload to	State law codes
Alabama	Yes	NCIC via ACMEC	Ala. Code §§ 26-19-7
Alaska	Yes	NCIC via AK MPC	18.65.620
Arizona	None found	Not specified	HB 2169, CHAPTER 51
Arkansas	Yes	NamUs MPUP; NCIC via ACIC & MPIC	HOUSE BILL 1881; Ark. Code Ann. § 12-12-205
California	Yes	NCIC via CA MPC	Cal. Penal Code § 14205 et seq.
Colorado	Yes	Not specified	Colo. Rev. Stat. § 16-2.7-101 et seq.
Connecticut	Yes	NCIC	Public Act 11-102; CT Gen Stat § 29-1f, et seq.
Delaware	Yes	Not specified	Del. Code Ann. tit. 11, § 8531, et seq.
DC	None found	Not specified	N/A
Florida	Yes	FCIC & NCIC; FL MEPIC	Fla. Stat. Ann. § 937.0201 et seq.
Georgia	None found	Not specified	Ga. Code § 35-1-18
Hawaii	None found	Not specified	N/A
Idaho	Yes	NCIC via ID MPC	§ 18-4512.1, et seq.
Illinois	Yes	NamUs MPUP; to CODIS	Public Act 100-0901; § 50-722/5, et seq.
Indiana	Yes	ViCAP, NCIC	Code § 5-2-17-1, et seq.
Iowa	Yes	IO MPC	Iowa § 694.1, et seq.
Kansas	Yes	Not specified	Kan. Stat. § 75-712c
Kentucky	None found	Not specified	N/A
Louisiana	None found	Not specified	N/A
Maine	None found	NCIC	None found
Maryland	Yes	None specified	Md. Code § 3-601, et seq.
Massachusetts	Yes	Not specified	Mass. Code § 22a-1, et seq.
Michigan	Yes	NamUs MPUP; UCR via MPC	1968 Penn. 319; Mi. Code § 28-258, et seq.
Minnesota	Yes	NCIC	Minn. Stat. § 299C.52 et seq.
Mississippi	None found	Not specified	N/A
Missouri	Yes	NCIC & MULES	§ 3 Ch 4.D; § 43.401, et seq.
Montana	None found	MMPC	
Nebraska	Yes	NCIC via NE MPIC	Neb. Code § 29-212, et seq.
Nevada	None found	Not specified	N/A
New Hampshire	Yes	NCIC	N.H. Code § VII- 106-6, et seq.
New Jersey	Yes	ViCAP, NJ Forensic DNA Lab	N.J. Code §52:17B-212, et seq.
New Mexico	Yes	NCIC via MPIC	N.M. Code §29-15-1, et seq.
New York	Yes	NamUs MPUP	Bill A10278- Amd § 838, Exec L; NY CPLR § 4527 (2012)
North Carolina	Yes	NC CMP/ NCIC	§ 143B-1010

Reporting & Investigating Missing Persons: A Background Paper on How to Frame the Issue

State	Does state law require reporting of missing adults?	Required databases to upload to	State law codes
North Dakota	Yes	Not specified	N.D. CH 12-68.01, et seq.
Ohio	None found	Not specified	N/A
Oklahoma	Yes	NamUs MPUP; NCIC via ACIC & MPIC	HB2640; Okla. Stat §74-150.12A
Oregon	Yes	NCIC via MPC	Ore. Code §181A.300, et seq.
Pennsylvania	None found	Not specified	N/A
Rhode Island	None found	Not specified	N/A
South Carolina	Yes	NCIC via MPIC	S.C. Code §23-3-200, et seq.
South Dakota	Yes	Not specified	None found
Tennessee	Yes	NamUs MPUP; NCIC	HB0044; Tenn. Code § 38-6-121
Texas	Yes	NCIC	Tex. Code § 63.001
Utah	Yes	NCIC	Utah Code § 53-10-203
Vermont	Yes	Not specified	20 V.S.A. § 1820, et seq.
Virginia	Yes	NCIC; VACIN	Va. Code § 15.2-1718.2
Washington	Yes	Not specified	RCW 68.50.320
West Virginia	Yes	NamUs MPUP; CODIS; VICAP, NCIC	Senate Bill 237
Wisconsin	Yes	Not specified	Wisc. Stat § 175.51, et seq.
Wyoming	None found	Not specified	N/A

Adult is defined as an individual 21 years of age and older. Data procured on June 11, 2019.