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DMST IN WASHINGTON

The average age a child was charged with prostitution: 15

**Arresting Minors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benton/Franklin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**A Decade of Progress**

- **1995**: Becca Bill passed, allowing parents of at-risk youth to intervene for the protection of their children.
- **2000**: Federal Trafficking Victims Protection Act passed; qualifying minors used in commercial sex as victims of DMST.
- **2007**: The FBI Innocence Lost Task Force was created in Washington.
- **2008**: The City of Seattle funded research on DMST (author: Debra Boyer) which resulted in the fully-integrated system of care currently used in Seattle.
- **2010**: SB 6476 passed, outlining stricter penalties for buyers and better response to victims.

“*It was almost like they were just waiting for someone to ask them the right question — to open the door and take away the burden of them having to bring it up.*”

— Social Service Provider
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Domestic minor sex trafficking (DMST) is the commercial sexual exploitation of United States citizen or lawful permanent resident (LPR) children through prostitution, pornography or sexual performance for monetary or other compensation (shelter, food, drugs, etc.). Experts estimate at least 100,000 U.S. citizen/LPR minors are used in prostitution every year in the U.S., making DMST the single most under-reported, under-identified, and most severe form of commercial sexual exploitation children are facing today. The Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000, and subsequent reauthorizations, has defined all minors involved in commercial sex acts as victims of trafficking, including minors who are U.S. citizens or lawful permanent residents. However, the reality is that many domestic minor sex trafficking victims are detained in the criminal justice system under charges of prostitution instead of receiving the services they need and to which they are statutorily entitled.

Shared Hope International has researched the identification and proper response to domestic minor sex trafficking victims in Washington. The Rapid Assessment Methodology and Tool: Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking in the United States was developed by Shared Hope International, funded by the Department of Justice (DOJ), and implemented in Washington by Melissa Snow, Karen Redington, M.S., and Kelli Russell of Shared Hope International. This assessment includes information collected from September to November 2010 through a comprehensive survey of existing research and the completion of 105 interviews with representatives from over 55 organizations and agencies that interact with or advocate for victims of domestic minor sex trafficking.

Best practices are noted throughout the report, as well as the gaps and challenges that are present while working with this difficult population of victims. A motivated group of individuals, organizations, and agencies in Washington are wrestling with the task of identifying and responding to domestic minor sex trafficking victims. Nonetheless, countless victims remain hidden and those who are identified or self-disclose their involvement in prostitution are often placed in the juvenile justice system rather than treated as victims. This results in the failure to access available services for the restoration of victims.

The goal of this assessment is to provide Washington first responders and community members with information to advocate for improvements in the identification and proper response to DMST victims. This assessment will be provided to all stakeholders to inform the identification of victims and to help bring them services offered in accordance with the TVPA and its reauthorizations. This research offers qualitative data on the DMST issue in Washington; additional research to quantify the scope of the problem would support upcoming action in Washington.

Washington has emerged as a national leader for legislation and community care response to domestic minor sex trafficking. Inadequate funding and limited resources have restricted responders and service providers from implementing proper identification, investigation, prosecution, service response, and aftercare for victims of trafficking. However, dedicated actors around the state illustrate that Washington has the elements necessary to continue to grow as a national leader on the issue of domestic minor sex trafficking through continued collaboration and advocacy despite adverse economic conditions.

Key Findings:

1. **Prostituted youth are identified as victims but treated like delinquents.** Data obtained from the Washington State Office of the Courts reveal many confirmed DMST victims were referred to the courts on criminal charges of prostitution. Data was obtained from eight juvenile court locations including: King, Clark, Snohomish, Benton/Franklin, Pierce, Spokane, and Thurston. In 2009 and 2010, 153 youth were arrested and referred to detention on charges of prostitution. The youngest was just 12 years old.

2. **There is a high prevalence of familial and gang-involved DMST in Washington.** Interviewees reported significant levels of family members pimping children in the family (i.e. son, daughter, grandchildren, niece, nephew) for drugs, food, shelter, and money. Interviewees also highlighted a spike in juvenile and adult gang members targeting and recruiting female youth for prostitution. In fact, the first human trafficking case successfully prosecuted under the Washington state anti-trafficking law involved a Seattle-based gang prostituting several women and girls.

3. **Awareness and collaboration were high among actors in King and Clark County and limited in other assessed locations.** Stakeholders in King County reported multi-disciplinary collaboration and cooperation both formally and informally. These partnerships contribute to the notable success in the identification of victims and prosecution of those who buy and sell children. Although newer in its efforts, Clark County reported significant local support for its work to identify and respond to DMST. Interviewees in other areas demonstrated a sporadic yet growing awareness of the issue and desire for training but emphasized the lack of training opportunities.

4. **Strip clubs are being used by traffickers as a commercial sex venue to advertise and promote DMST.** Strip clubs were continuously referenced by youth advocates and service providers as a grooming tool in the recruitment phase of DMST. The use of “amateur nights” in strip clubs was a way to introduce youth to the commercial sex industry and prepare them for future victimization. Also, several service providers reported that youth were not only placed in strip clubs during the evening but also during the day for the business lunch crowd. Youth who were told they were only there to “dance” were quickly shown to backrooms were the victimization would escalate.

5. **Formalized DMST identification procedures are yielding results.** Collaboration between Portland State University, Clark County Juvenile Detention Center (CCJDC), and the YWCA of Vancouver in implementing a pilot of Shared Hope International’s (SHI) INTERVENE intake process at CCJDC has resulted in the successful identification of six DMST victims. During the three and half month pilot period, 535 youth were admitted to detention, 47 of which were flagged and referred to receive an additional level of questioning. Of the 47 originally flagged, 11 were identified as potential victims of DMST. Further interaction and assessment confirmed six of those 11 as victims of DMST. In addition to connecting the potential and confirmed DMST victims to services through the YWCA, youth were offered an opportunity to provide information to law enforcement, which has resulted in the investigation and prosecution of two traffickers. Additionally, Spruce Street Secure Crisis Residential Center has adapted a form of SHI’s INTERVENE tool, also resulting in DMST identification. In 2010, 633 individual youth were admitted to Spruce Street; 55 youth were confirmed as DMST victims. Proper identification has enhanced staff interaction with youth and increased referrals for additional DMST specific services, like those offered at YouthCare.

6. **Shelter placement options for DMST youth are severely limited in Washington.** YouthCare is the only DMST shelter in the state of Washington and is one of only several service providers across the nation that serves this population of victims. The successful trauma-informed model being implemented in Seattle is viewed as a mandatory resource for proper intervention into DMST and is necessary for victims of DMST to heal from the trauma of their exploitation. A majority of runaway shelters, state-run group homes and traditional foster homes are not equipped to provide the level of security and care necessary for a victim of DMST, placing youth at a higher risk of returning to their trafficker.
7. A multi-layered and multi-disciplinary team addressing DMST identification and response has been established in Seattle and larger King County. For nearly ten years, a collaboration of organizations, agencies, prosecutors, government officials, law enforcement, and criminal justice systems in King County has been aggressively working to establish a response system for DMST. As a result, this committed group of professionals has developed and established formal and informal information sharing tools and protocols, which have allowed for successful victim identification and investigations leading to significant prosecutions. While King County continues to work to formalize and improve this dynamic system, other areas in Washington should seek to replicate this community-wide response model.

8. Secure Crisis Residential Center (secure CRC) regulations need to be evaluated prior to implementation of mandatory procedures outlined in SB 6476. The recent passage of SB 6476 creates a structure for a CHINS petition application and protective response for sexually exploited youth on the first prostitution offense to a secure CRC, such as Oak Grove or Spruce Street. However, few interviewee were aware of SB 6476 or the new process for DMST youth. Training and continued resources to implement the new procedure are necessary to ensure streamlined application. Existing regulations for secure CRCs may need to be revisited to measure protective and safety standards within the facilities, specifically accounting for the unique provisions necessary to effectively respond to the DMST population. The unique bridged system that connects law enforcement intervention with child protection services establishes a foundation for further innovative solutions for DMST.

9. Prosecution of buyers is growing but needs significant state-wide prioritization to achieve demand deterrence. Since the passage of SB 6476 in April 2010, there have only been two DMST prosecutions of buyers. Based on data from the Washington State Office of the Courts, 55 youth were arrested for prostitution in seven counties in 2010. Interviewees who work with DMST victims reported that youth under pimp control are often required to fill a quote of five to 15 men per night. Based on these statistics, if the youth were exploited five nights a week and purchased five times a night conservative projections reveal that over 70,000 men bought children for sex acts in Washington in 2010. (55 youth x 5 men/night x 5 nights/week = 71,500)

10. The mandate for the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) and Child Protective Services (CPS) in Washington is broad enough to include investigations into allegations of familial and non-familial DMST. In nearly every county, interviewees acknowledged that DSHS, especially CPS, was missing from coalitions, task forces, working groups, and general involvement in cases of DMST. The Washington State Legislature specifically lists “prostitution” as a form of child exploitation that DSHS/CPS is mandated to investigate. This allows CPS to investigate cases of DMST and provide a victim-centered response as an alternative to detention. However, training is necessary for hotline staff and investigators to better understand the dynamics of DMST and to properly screen and assess for this level of commercial sexual exploitation.
Methodology

This project is a Rapid Assessment (RA) of the practices and procedures used to identify and deliver services to domestic trafficked minors (DTMs) in Washington. This report is based on qualitative and quantitative information provided during interviews with the diverse contributors who advocate for and/or interact with domestic trafficked minors at various stages of the minors’ exploitation, interaction with the criminal justice system, and recovery.

Melissa Snow, Karen Redington, M.S., and Kelli Russell conducted the research in Washington for Shared Hope International. Interviews were structured by The Rapid Assessment Methodology and Field Interview Tool: Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking in the United States, a research tool developed by Shared Hope International and funded by the Department of Justice (DOJ). It employs three factors commonly used as measures of response to combat sex trafficking worldwide: prevention, prosecution, and protection (three Ps). Established by the U.S. Department of State (DOS), Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, and used in the annual Trafficking in Persons Report, the “three Ps” is an effort to holistically evaluate a country’s actions to counter all forms of trafficking in persons. This approach has been recognized for its comprehensive assessment of human trafficking. Using this model, specific questions were created for seven professional populations that advocate for and/or come into contact with DMST victims: law enforcement, prosecutors, public defenders, juvenile court, juvenile detention, child protective services, and nongovernmental organizations/service providers. The Western Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved the protocol for this research (Protocol #20070540).

The assessment was based on research and 105 interviews conducted with over 55 agencies and organizations during an eight week period in September–November of 2010, with one or more representatives from the following agencies and organizations:

- Abuse Recovery Ministry Services
- Auburn Youth Services, Street Outreach
- Arthur D. Curtis Children’s Justice Center
- Benton Community Youth Services
- Benton County Sheriff’s Department
- Benton/Franklin County Juvenile Justice, Court
- Benton/Franklin County Juvenile Justice, Detention
- Benton/Franklin County Juvenile Justice, Mental Health
- Benton/Franklin County Juvenile Justice, Probation
- Benton/Franklin County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office
- Benton/Franklin County Defense Attorney’s Office
- Catholic Charities, Spokane
- Catholic Charities - Childbirth and Parenting Services, Spokane
- Clark County Juvenile Court, Commissioner
- Clark County Child Protective Services
- Clark County Juvenile Court, Detention
- Clark County Juvenile Court, Mental Health Unit
- Clark County Sheriff’s Office
- Cocoon House - Shelter
- Cocoon House - Transitional Living Program
- Cocoon House - U-Turn Drop-in Center
- Dawson Place Child Advocacy Center
- Daybreak Crisis Residential Center
- Division of Children & Family Services (DSHS)
- Everett Police Department
• Goodwill, Next Generation Zone
• Janus Youth Programs
• Kids Haven
• King County Juvenile Probation
• King County Prosecutor’s Office
• King County Sheriff’s Office
• Lutheran Services
• Mountlake Terrace Police Department
• New Horizons, Street Outreach
• Oak Bridge, Clark County Crisis Residential Center
• Oak Grove, Clark County secure Crisis Residential Center
• Odyssey Youth Center
• Office of the Attorney General, Criminal Division
• Olympia School Resource Counselor
• Rising Above Sexual Exploitation (R.A.S.E.)
• Richland Police Department
• Seattle Police Department, Vice/High Risk Victims Unit
• Sexual Assault Response Center, Benton/Franklin Counties
• Shared Hope International
• Snohomish County Guardian Ad Litem Volunteers
• Snohomish County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office
• Snohomish County Sheriff’s Office
• Snohomish Juvenile Services, Court
• Snohomish Juvenile Services, Detention
• Snohomish Juvenile Services, Probation
• Spokane County Sheriff’s Office
• Spokane County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office
• Spokane Juvenile Services, Court
• Spokane Juvenile Services, Detention
• Spokane Juvenile Services, Health
• Spokane Juvenile Services, Mental Health
• Spokane Juvenile Services, Probation
• Spokane Police Department
• Spokane Regional Health District – Needle Exchange Program
• Spruce Street secure Crisis Residential Center
• Treehouse Educational Advocacy Program
• The Genesis Project
• The United States Attorney’s Office, Western District of Washington
• Vancouver Police Department
• Vista Youth Center
• Volunteers of America
• Volunteers of America, Crosswalk
• YouthCare Orion Center
• YouthCare Shelter
• YouthCare, The Bridge
• YouthREACH
• YWCA, Clark County
• YWCA, Snohomish County
Participant interviews were generally conducted within a 1–3 hour time period with written informed consent given by the interviewee prior to the interview. If written informed consent was not attained, a Research Subject Information Sheet was presented to participants in accordance with IRB procedures.

The information collected during interviews has been synthesized to highlight best practices, gaps in current efforts, and challenges in the identification and protection of victims of domestic minor sex trafficking. The findings of the report are intended to assist, educate, and activate local professionals and the community at large regarding the identification and provision of services to DMST victims in accordance with the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 and subsequent reauthorizations.

Efforts were made to make the following assessment as comprehensive as possible. Unfortunately, several factors constrained both the field interviews and the interview process. A targeted timeframe of eight weeks for assessment data collection was necessary to maximize the relevancy and timeliness of the information. In order to provide a comprehensive baseline understanding of DMST in Washington, five research locations were specifically selected due to varying geographic locations, population, culture, and infrastructure. The selected locations include Benton/Franklin, Clark, King, Snohomish, and Spokane counties to represent southeastern, southwestern, central and northeastern Washington respectively. Additionally, some interviewees covered multiple jurisdictions and thus had information on neighboring counties such as Pierce, Richland, Yakima, and Skagit Counties. While the number of interviews obtained in these additional areas does not meet the research criteria to include it as a sufficiently targeted area, the information collected is included, where appropriate.

The researchers made diligent efforts to ensure the participation of as many professionals as possible. Some professionals expressed reluctance to participate; the most commonly stated reason for reluctance was the professional’s perceived lack of contact with or service to DMST victims. While this document is considered a statewide assessment the research team recognizes that domestic minor sex trafficking is not limited to these specific locations. The inability to include all counties in Washington is identified as a limitation in the Rapid Assessment findings.
# Glossary of Acronyms and Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARY</td>
<td>At-Risk Youth Petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCJDC</td>
<td>Clark County Juvenile Detention Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINS</td>
<td>Children in Need of Services/Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>Child Protective Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Crisis Residential Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEC</td>
<td>Commercially Sexually Exploited Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCFS</td>
<td>Division of Children and Family Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS</td>
<td>Department of Social and Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMST</td>
<td>Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOJ</td>
<td>Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOJ-CEOS</td>
<td>Department of Justice, Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOS</td>
<td>Department of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTM</td>
<td>Domestic Trafficked Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWOP</td>
<td>Dismissed Without Prejudice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI</td>
<td>Federal Bureau of Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRS</td>
<td>Family Reconciliation Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEMS</td>
<td>Girls Educational and Mentoring Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRV</td>
<td>High Risk Victim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICAC</td>
<td>Internet Crimes Against Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual, Transgender, Queer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB</td>
<td>Western Institutional Review Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPR</td>
<td>Lawful Permanent Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCMEC</td>
<td>National Center for Missing and Exploited Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPN</td>
<td>Prostitution Prevention Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Rapid Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.A.S.E.</td>
<td>Rising Above Sexual Exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCW</td>
<td>Revised Code of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secure CRC</td>
<td>Secure Crisis Residential Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHI</td>
<td>Shared Hope International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOAP</td>
<td>Stay Out of Area of Prostitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRO</td>
<td>School Resource Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Cities</td>
<td>Refers to Benton, Richland and Pasco counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVPA</td>
<td>Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAO</td>
<td>United States Attorney’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOA</td>
<td>Volunteers of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YFA</td>
<td>Youth, Family and Adult Connections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

On September 4, 2009, the *Seattle Times* reported that a program aimed at serving approximately 20 prostituted youth was grounded due to a budget cut. According to a report titled “Who Pays the Price? Assessment of Youth Involved in Prostitution in Seattle,” there are between 300 and 500 prostituted youth in King County alone. Through a partnership with King County and the United Way of King County, the Seattle city program would have created emergency shelter, transitional housing, and targeted social services for prostituted juveniles between the ages of 11 and 18. The pilot program, the fourth safe haven in the U.S., was decided on by the Seattle City Council as a part of the city’s Safer Streets Initiative and would be implemented by YouthCare, a Seattle nonprofit that serves runaway and homeless youth. Within six months, the *Seattle Times* reported that local donors saved the program—the city raised $1.2 million of the $1.5 million needed to fund the two-year pilot program. Media coverage by *Seattle Times* was credited as the catalyst that spurred local donors to provide 80 percent of the program’s funding, allowing YouthCare to open the doors on the Bridge Program, a program specifically developed and designed to restore victims of domestic minor sex trafficking (DMST).

This community care model being supported and implemented by the Seattle community serves as an example of the type of service that is possible for victims of DMST. This community collaboration elevates Washington state as a leader in the national fight against domestic minor sex trafficking.

The U.S. Government has identified human trafficking for commercial sexual exploitation as a major problem worldwide and nationally. Prostitution is a $14.5 billion dollar industry in the United States. At least 100,000 children are used in prostitution in America every year. The average age a child is first exploited through prostitution is between 12–14 years old.

According to the federal Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000, and subsequent reauthorizations, the term sex trafficking is defined as the “recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of a person for the purpose of a commercial sex act.” A “commercial sex act” is defined as any sex act on account of which anything of value is given to or received by any person.

“I believe most people understand these teenage girls aren’t doing this by choice,” said an investment adviser who got involved after reading the initial news story in September. “Anytime people become aware of an injustice and can do something about it, they’re moved to do so. We all do what we can do—that’s what makes Seattle such a great place.”

---

The term “severe forms of trafficking in persons” means:

(A) sex trafficking in which a commercial sex act is induced by force, fraud, or coercion, or in which the person induced to perform such act has not attained 18 years of age; or
(B) the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of a person for labor or services, through the use of force, fraud, or coercion for the purpose of subjection to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage, or slavery.\(^8\)

Therefore, in accordance with the federal TVPA 2000, DMST is the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of a U.S. citizen(s) or legal permanent resident(s) under the age of 18 for the purpose of prostitution, pornography or erotic dancing/stripping. “Payment” for the sex act can be anything of value given to or received by any person (e.g., drugs, food, accommodations, and cash).

It is important to note that there is no requirement of force to prove the crime of domestic minor sex trafficking. Additionally, movement is not necessary in the commission of sex trafficking.

Washington has exhibited awareness and active response to this issue for over a decade. In addition to the DMST community collaboration model in Seattle (see page 56), Washington has achieved great legislative success. In 1993, 13-year-old Rebecca “Becca” Hedman was clubbed to death by a 37-year-old man who wanted a refund after paying her for sex. Becca had been sexually abused since she was an infant. This trauma later manifested itself through Becca’s running away and experimentation with drugs. Though Becca’s adoptive parents sought to intervene, the law was not strong enough to provide adequate protection. After her death, Becca’s parents and other advocates worked to strengthen the laws to protect at-risk children. In 1995, Washington passed the Becca Bill allowing parents of at-risk youth, especially runaways, to intervene for the safety and protection of their children. This legislation foreshadowed the additional protective responses that arise in cases of sex trafficking. The issue garnered new attention with the passage of SB 6476,\(^9\) which significantly strengthens state anti-trafficking laws, DMST.

Recognizing the critical link between youth who have experienced abuse in the home, and subsequently begin to run away, with the issue of DMST is imperative to establishing a safety net that can protect and intervene in the lives of these children. Washington state has engaged in a battle against DMST for many years and has made significant advances in structural changes that bridge the juvenile justice and child protective systems. While there are still significant barriers to overcome, which were revealed through the many interviewees voices, it is important to understand the system that exists as a baseline to discussing the changes needed. Furthermore, it is important to note that this unique bridged system lays a foundation for some of the most innovative solutions in preventing and responding to DMST.

### Task Forces

The establishment of task forces targeting human trafficking has demonstrated significant success in both investigation of cases and rescue of victims. Participants who were interviewed often mentioned the critical importance of these multi-disciplinary task forces, working groups, and initiatives in working these complex and challenging cases. It became clear throughout the interview process that DMST awareness, identification and response was heightened in areas where task forces and coalition groups existed. Due to this emphasis by those interviewed, these groups are outlined below as a reference:


The Innocence Lost Task Force is a national initiative of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), U.S. Department of Justice Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section (DOJ-CEOS), and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC). The Innocence Lost Task Force in Washington was created in 2007, and includes King, Snohomish, Pierce, and Tacoma counties. Additionally, Clark County, due to its proximity to Portland, Oregon participates in the greater Portland Metro Innocence Lost Task Force. These task forces continue to create opportunities for increased information sharing as well as coordinated proactive investigations such as Operation Cross County.

The Prostitution Prevention Network (PPN) operates in Everett and includes leaders from Snohomish and King Counties. The PPN is a broad-based collaborative initiative striving to develop a program to assist young persons victimized through commercial sex. The goal of the PPN is to assist victims of DMST by providing direct linkages to a comprehensive resource network of existing programs and services that include housing, treatment programs, counseling, education, individual case management, medical care, legal advocacy, and other services.

Spokane's volunteer task force includes local service providers and retired law enforcement as well as concerned citizens who aim to increase awareness throughout the city and increase services for victims. Meetings are held each month, allowing key stakeholders to share information and issues within the area. They are a resource for anyone in the area seeking to be involved in the anti-trafficking issue.

Law Review

The Becca Bill: A History of Fighting DMST since 1993

The discussion and debate on how to best intervene in the lives of DMST victims has been taking place in Washington since 1993, with the murder in Spokane of 13-year-old Rebecca “Becca” Hedman. Becca’s story is reflective of the life stories of domestic minor sex trafficking victims documented in this report nearly twenty years later. Becca was removed from her home as an infant due to sexual abuse. After being placed in a foster home, she was abused by her older foster brother. When Becca entered middle school the impact of this sexual abuse began to surface manifesting in repeated running away and experimentation with drugs. Becca’s adoptive parents were desperate to protect her but the state laws allowed only for Becca’s voluntary placement at a Crisis Residential Center (CRC) and youth group home—Becca cycled through these placements quickly. Reports indicate that this is when Becca met a group of girls who introduced her to prostitution. When 13-year-old Becca was killed by a 37-year-old man who had bought sex with her, media coverage labeled her a “chronic runaway with a drug problem who was killed working as a prostitute.”

As a result of Becca’s tragic death and public outrage surrounding the failed systems, several amendments and bills were introduced based on recommendations proposed by the Governor’s Council on Families, Youth and Justice. In July 1995, following a series of public and political debates on the rights of children and the state’s ability and responsibility to protect children, the Becca Bill became law. The bill intended to assist parents of chronic child status offenders, runaways, and truant youth to intervene in the behavior by allowing parent-initiated court petitions, court intervention and detention of status offenders in secure CRCs, as well as involuntary commitment to drug, alcohol, and mental health treatment. CRCs and the secure CRCs established through the Becca Bill are operated by the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS), not juvenile detention. The bill recognized that chronic runaways put themselves at great risk and responded by mandating secure facilities be provided to help the

11 S.B. 5439, 54TH Leg., Reg. Sess. § 16 (Wash. 1995), signed into law on May 10, 1995. http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=c1c2fa36d358f82823bf1d6102d62947&srcv=lecidform=byCitation&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVW-zIkA&md5=5d579ed5011a6f30b6e0cd9127a2415ea, (last visited May 12, 2011).
parents protect their children. The Becca Bill has been amended twice, to address questions of constitutionality.\textsuperscript{12} The Becca Bill legislated a unique hybrid system to respond to child victims of sexual exploitation. Recognizing the importance of law enforcement identification and intervention, the Becca Bill allows law enforcement to take custody of youth reported missing or runaway. However, rather than a juvenile justice response, youth are placed within a secure CRC, which is operated by DSHS with the emphasis on stabilizing the youth and gaining an understanding of the dynamics in their life causing the endangering condition. Additionally, the Becca Bill provides parents, youth, and DSHS with tools, such as the children in need of services (CHINS) petition\textsuperscript{13}, which extends the role and services of DSHS to youth who have not been abused by family members—an eligibility requirement for DSHS intervention and services.

**DMST Legislation**

Commercial sexual abuse of a minor is a felony crime in Washington.\textsuperscript{14} This law makes it unlawful to solicit, offer, request, or actually pay a fee to a minor or a third person in exchange for engaging in sexual conduct with a minor. Sexual conduct is defined as intercourse or sexual contact, which includes touching sexual parts of a minor for sexual gratification. The promotion\textsuperscript{15} and permission\textsuperscript{16} of commercial sexual abuse of a minor are also felony offenses, capturing the full spectrum of commercial sexual exploitation through prostitution of a child. Child pornography and sexual performance of sexually explicit conduct by a child—the two other forms of domestic minor sex trafficking—are made felonies under the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) § 9.68A.040 (Use of a minor in a live performance).\textsuperscript{17} The following laws form a comprehensive foundation for the criminalization of domestic minor sex trafficking through prostitution, pornography and sexual performance.

- **RCW § 9.68A.100** (commercial sexual abuse of a minor) prohibits the payment of a fee to a minor or a third person as compensation for a minor engaging in sexual conduct with him or her, or the solicitation, offer, or request to engage in sexual conduct with a minor in return for a fee. “("S)exual conduct’ means sexual intercourse or sexual contact, both as defined in chapter 9A.44 RCW.” “Sexual contact” is defined as “any touching of the sexual or other intimate parts of a person done for the purpose of gratifying sexual desire of either party or a third party.” RCW § 9A.44.010. Commercial sexual abuse of a minor is a Class B felony sex offense, seriousness level VIII and a sentencing range of 21 months to 10 years based on the offender score. RCW § 9.94A.515; RCW § 9.94A.510. This offense requires sex offender registration once the defendant’s prison term is satisfied. RCW § 9A.44.130.

- **RCW § 9.68A.101** (Promoting commercial sexual abuse of a minor) makes it a crime to “knowingly advance[] commercial sexual abuse of a minor or profit[] from a minor engaged in sexual conduct” by “caus[ing] or aid[ing] a person to commit or engage in commercial sexual abuse of a minor, procur[ing] or solicit[ing] customers for commercial sexual abuse of a minor, provid[ing] persons or premises for the purposes of engaging in commercial sexual abuse of a minor, operat[ing] or assist[ing] in the operation of a house or enterprise for the purposes of engaging in commercial sexual abuse of a minor, or engage[ing] in any other conduct designed to institute, aid, cause, assist, or facilitate an act or enterprise of commercial sexual abuse of a minor” or “profit[] from a minor engaged in sexual conduct.” “("S)exual conduct’ means sexual intercourse or sexual contact . . . as defined in chapter 9A.44 RCW.” The provision specifically limits application to situations in which the offender is “acting other than as a minor receiving compensation for


\textsuperscript{13} Revised Code of Washington § 13.32A.030.

\textsuperscript{14} Revised Code of Washington § 9.68A.100.

\textsuperscript{15} Revised Code of Washington § 9.68A.101, 102.

\textsuperscript{16} Revised Code of Washington § 9.68A.103.

\textsuperscript{17} RCW § 9.68A.011 defines live performance as: “(6) ‘Live performance’ means any play, show, skit, dance, or other exhibition performed or presented to or before an audience of one or more, with or without consideration.”
personally rendered sexual conduct or as a person engaged in commercial sexual abuse of a minor. . .” The crime is a Class A felony sex offense, seriousness level XII, resulting in a sentence range of 93–318 months based on the offender score. RCW § 9.94A.515; RCW § 9.94A.510. This crime requires sex offender registration upon completion of the offender’s prison term. RCW § 9A.44.130.

- RCW § 9.68A.102 (Promoting travel for commercial sexual abuse of a minor) prohibits “knowingly sell[ing] or offer[ing] to sell travel services that include or facilitate travel for the purpose of engaging in what would be commercial sexual abuse of a minor or promoting commercial sexual abuse of a minor, if occurring in th[e] state.” It is a Class C felony, unranked on the sentencing grid, with a maximum sentence of 12 months. RCW § 9.94A.505(2)(b). This offense requires sex offender registration upon completion of the offender’s prison term. RCW § 9A.44.130.

- RCW § 9.68A.103 (Permitting commercial sexual abuse of a minor) states “[a] person is guilty of permitting commercial sexual abuse of a minor if, having possession or control of premises which he or she knows are being used for the purpose of commercial sexual abuse of a minor, he or she fails without lawful excuse to make reasonable effort to halt or abate such use and to make a reasonable effort to notify law enforcement of such use.” Permitting commercial sexual abuse of a minor is a gross misdemeanor and is unranked on the sentencing grid with a maximum sentence of 12 months. RCW § 9.94A.505(2)(b).

- RCW § 9.68A.040 (Sexual exploitation of a minor) makes it a crime to “[c]ompel[,] a minor by threat or force to engage in sexually explicit conduct, knowing that such conduct will be photographed or part of a live performance,” or to “[a]id[[]], invite[[]], employ[[]], authorize [][, or cause[]a minor to engage in sexually explicit conduct, knowing that such conduct will be photographed or part of a live performance.” It is also a crime for “a parent, legal guardian, or person having custody or control of a minor, to permit[] the minor to engage in sexually explicit conduct, knowing that the conduct will be photographed or part of a live performance.” Though this crime is not exclusively concerned with commercial exploitation, it is relevant to the crime of commercial sexual exploitation of a minor and could be applied in a prosecution for commercial sexual exploitation of a minor. It is a Class B felony with a seriousness level of IX resulting in a sentencing range of 31 months to 10 years and requiring sex offender registration upon completion of the offender’s prison term. RCW § 9.94A.515; RCW § 9.94A.510; RCW § 9A.44.130.

In addition, a number of sexual abuse and sexual offense laws may be employed to prosecute an offender of commercial sexual abuse of a minor. These include statutory rape of a child, child molestation, sexual misconduct with a child, and indecent liberties. However, use of these criminal laws to prosecute offenders of commercial sexual exploitation of children means that domestic minor sex trafficking cases are not being reported as trafficking cases and the victims may not be provided with the trafficking victims protections. This potential gap exists with the laws against commercial sexual abuse of a minor as well, though legislative amendments to several critical areas of the law, including the Becca Bill and the crime victim’s compensation fund, are intended to increase access to funds, services and shelter for victims of sexual exploitation. SB 6476, which was signed into law on April 1, 2010, amended RCW § 13.32A.030 (effective July 1, 2011) to add “sexually exploited child” to the definition of CHINS. It also added to this section a new definition of “sexually exploited child” and defines that term as “any person under the age of eighteen who is a victim of the crime of commercial sex abuse of a minor under RCW § 9.68A.100, promoting commercial sexual abuse of a minor under RCW § 9.68A.101, or promoting travel for commercial sexual abuse of a minor under RCW § 9.68A.102.”

---

18 Revised Code of Washington § 9A.44.073, et seq.
20 Revised Code of Washington § 13.32A.030
Full implementation of these amendments will take effect in July 2011 at which time secure CRCs will begin to receive sexually exploited children directly from first responders for assessment and protection through the CHINS provisions of the state code.21

The response protocol effective July 2011, permits sexually exploited children to be placed immediately in a secure CRC (where available), pending an assessment and decision by DSHS whether to pursue a CHINS petition. The diagrams below outline the current procedure and the new amended procedure.

**TABLE 1: Current Juvenile Arrest Response**

[Diagram showing the current juvenile arrest response process]

**TABLE 2: SB 6476 DMST Response**

[Diagram showing the SB 6476 DMST response process]

---

21 Id.
The protective response protocol in SB 6476 is modeled on principles of non-punitive, therapeutic systems for victims of DMST. This protocol puts Washington in a small group of states currently implementing such a change. The SB 6476 protocol is not mandatory however, and a prostituted youth may be prosecuted for prostitution under the law, particularly a youth identified as engaged in prostitution on more than one occasion by law enforcement. In this case, an alternative response that also keeps the minor out of a juvenile detention facility is diversion which not only keeps the child out of juvenile detention but also connects the child with services and treatment.22 There is no guarantee that a child will not be held in a juvenile detention facility for prostitution and related offenses after a first offense. Further legislative development to ensure children are not subject to prosecution for crimes they commit during the course of their trafficking is an important next step.

Furthermore, it is important to note that nearly every law enforcement officer interviewed for this assessment expressed frustration regarding the inability to expeditiously utilize wire-tapping in DMST investigations due to the need to obtain consent from both parties to a conversation. From law enforcement’s perspective this was a safety concern in addition to interfering with the ability to capture crucial intelligence during and following an operation. This also placed a significant and unnecessary burden on the victim in most cases. Although outside of the research phase of this report, on May 3, 2011 the Governor signed HB 1874 into law which allows law enforcement to record or intercept conversations when one party consents and probable cause exists that the conversation deals with “a party engaging in the commercial sexual abuse of a minor under RCW § 9.68A.100, or promoting commercial sexual abuse of a minor under RCW § 9.68A.101, or promoting travel for commercial sexual abuse of a minor under RCW § 9.68A.102.”23 A written report must be filed at the time of authorization for the recording that contains detailed information about the suspected crime. Additionally, the bill will allow for emergency recording in order to protect the safety of the consenting party. When enacted into law on August 1, 2011, this bill will give law enforcement more effective tools for investigating cases of domestic minor sex trafficking.

**Media Review**

A review of news articles and press releases from the Western District of Washington District Attorney’s Office was completed to determine whether there is an active movement against the crime of DMST in the state of Washington. Additionally, articles from the time period 2005–2011 were extracted from various Washington newspapers such as the Seattle Times, the Columbian, the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, the News Tribune, the Spokesman Review, and the Tri-City Herald. The reviewed media contained information regarding investigations, arrests, and prosecutions related to DMST. This review revealed that DMST is a problem throughout the state of Washington, focused in the areas of Vancouver (Southern Washington), Spokane (Eastern Washington), and Seattle and Tacoma (Western Washington). A key observation made through this review was that there has been an evolution in Washington, with respect to how the state is handling the issue of DMST. Research of the earlier years, 2005–2007, yielded limited media coverage on the issue; if there was coverage on child prostitution, it was commonly about international sex trafficking. However, from 2008 to the present an obvious shift occurred. Since 2008, there continues to be an increase of media coverage related to DMST including arrests, convictions, awareness campaigns, and more each year.

In 2007, the Department of Justice formed a Western Washington Innocence Lost task force “aimed at rescuing child prostitutes and prosecuting those who lure them into the lifestyle.” Also in 2007, lawmakers ensured that adults convicted of forcing minors into the sex trafficking industry would receive tougher penalties.24

---

22 Revised Code of Washington § 13.40.070 (Diversion); § 13.40.087 (Access to services and treatment mandated within available funding); §§ 74.14B.060, .070 (Services and treatment).


On March 19, 2007, William John Diehl of Aberdeen, Washington was sentenced to ten years in prison and a lifetime period of supervised release. After contacting a 15-year-old girl through the Internet, 44-year-old Diehl picked the child up from Washington D.C., traveled across the country, engaged in sexual activity with the girl, and produced and distributed pornographic images through the Internet. In this period of time, Diehl treated the child as a "sex slave" and ordered her to refer to him as her "master." A press release for the United States Attorney's Office states, "Diehl had written a detailed plan to kidnap two 7- to 9-year-old girls so he could mold them into perfectly submissive slaves." Diehl's brother reported him to the police after Diehl arrived home with a young teen he referred to as his fiancé. Diehl was arrested at his home on February 22, 2005. This case was investigated by the FBI and the Aberdeen Police Department (PD), tried by the U.S. District Court in Tacoma, and prosecuted as part of the Project Safe Childhood. Project Safe Childhood, a nationwide initiative, was launched in February 2006 and was "designed to protect children from online exploitation and abuse."25

The state of Washington is considered a source state for juvenile prostitution by many officials.26 “Police say that more than a third of juvenile sex workers in Portland are from Vancouver.”27 A 2008 report prepared by Debbie R. DuPey, for the Western Regional Institute for Community Public Safety, alarmed Washington residents of the DMST occurring in the Spokane area. According to DuPey, "Spokane has a significant teen prostitution problem and is considered an entry area for child prostitutes… [the children] are initiated here and then moved into larger metro areas.”28 The City of Seattle commissioned a study in 2008 that found 238 children involved in the sex trafficking industry in the city and 300 to 500 kids involved in the sex trafficking industry in the greater-Seattle area.29 In addition, the U.S. Department of Justice categorized Seattle as one of the 12 hub cities in the U.S. for child and teen sex trafficking.30

On July 22, 2008, the Seattle Post-Intelligencer highlighted the fact that though Washington was the first state to make human trafficking a crime, the law had failed to result in a conviction over a five year period. “Under the law, it's a serious felony to recruit, harbor, transport or obtain any person for labor or services using force, fraud or coercion. That includes sex trafficking and other forms of forced labor, from domestic servitude to sweatshop work.” The attorney general's policy director, Chris Johnson, stated that prosecutors were not getting referrals from the police, and the source of this problem was the inability of police and prosecutors to recognize victims of trafficking.31

In November 2008 an agreement was made between Craigslist.com and 40 states, including Washington, that helped police track pimps, buyers, and prostitutes using the site. Craigslist.com was named the new highway or "street" for prostitution and made sexual exploitation of children easier through online advertising. As a result, an agreement was struck that, “anyone advertising in Craigslist's "erotic services" section will have to provide a "street" for prostitution and made sexual exploitation of children easier through online advertising. As a result, an agreement was struck that, “anyone advertising in Craigslist's "erotic services" section will have to provide a working phone number and pay a fee using a traceable credit card number. Police will be able to easily subpoena the information.”32 Craigslist removed the “erotic services” section from their website in September 2010.

---


Andrew Douglas Franz, a Seattle University professor and a Special Forces captain for the Reserve Officer Training Corps from Kent, Washington, was arrested on May 9, 2008 for allegedly attempting to have sex with a child under 15. Franz flew to Denver after “prolonged conversations over the Internet with a woman he believed was arranging sexual encounters with her 13-year-old daughter.” This correspondence was part of a sting operation being carried out by the Fremont County Combined Investigative Response Team, a Colorado law enforcement unit that combats Internet crimes against children. The charges against Franz included criminal solicitation, enticement of a child, sexual assault on a child, trafficking in children, soliciting for child prostitution, pandering of a child, inducement of child prostitution and misdemeanor unlawful sexual contact. He was held at the Fremont County Detention Center on a $50,000 cash-only bond. Franz was convicted in January.

In June 2008, Joseph Olive, 22, and Tiromne Washington, 19, both from Seattle, were convicted of forcing two 17-year-old females into prostitution. They were the first in King County to be convicted of promoting commercial sexual abuse of a minor. Changes to the criminal provision in the previous legislative session resulted in tougher sentences and required registration as a sex offender. Furthermore, the term “commercial sexual abuse of a minor” in the range of laws addressing the prostitution of minors employs a more appropriate choice of words indicating the prostitution as sexual abuse. Senior Deputy King County Prosecutor Sean O’Donnell commented, “When you label someone a prostitute, you are demeaning people who are oftentimes outside the knowledge of life. You get a runaway who has been forced into prostitution.” The two men filed an appeal on August 23, 2010.

On February 23, 2009, the FBI announced the success Operation Cross County, a series of nationwide operations against child sex trafficking. The Seattle, Tacoma, and Kent police departments all took part in Operation Cross Country which resulted in the rescue of 48 children and the arrest of 571 suspects. Ten of those children were from the Seattle area; the youngest girl was 13 years old. Additionally, 35 adult prostitutes and two men and a woman, suspected of promoting child prostitution, were arrested. Special Agent Robbie Burroughs of the FBI’s Seattle office stated that the young victims were placed in safe housing with family members or with Child Protective Services, “somewhere safe and away from the street life.”

In October 2009, more arrests were made throughout the county by the FBI and local authorities. The Pacific Northwest Innocence Lost Task Force rescued nine children from Everett and Seattle, and arrested four pimps and 20 adult prostitutes. In order to gather intelligence on local teen trafficking victims, task-force detectives “used the Internet and went to motels and to local “tracks” [areas of prostitution where girls and women walk the streets] to recover unsuspecting juvenile prostitutes.” This nationwide sting was another Operation Cross Country activity, a part of the Innocence Lost National Initiative. The victims either were placed in family situations considered to be stable, or with state agencies.

On November 24, 2009, Deshawn “Cash Money” Clark was found guilty on two counts of commercial sexual abuse of a minor, one count of second-degree human trafficking, one count of first-degree promoting prostitution, one count of unlawful imprisonment and one count of conspiracy. Clark, a West Side Street Mobb gang member, prostituted two girls and a young woman. To keep his victims under his control, Clark used promises of love, threats, and violence. After the verdict, Senior Deputy King County Prosecutor Sean O’Donnell stated, “This was a case that I think really exposed the underbelly of a part of Seattle that people either ignore or don’t care about, or both. This is happening in West Seattle, a good neighborhood with a lot of good people. It’s happening here.”

This case was a part of the investigation into a prostitution ring, dubbed Operation Street Sweeper, in which at least 12 girls and women were victimized by the West Side Street Mobb. Deshawn Clark's brother, Shawn Clark was sentenced to nine years in prison, while Thomas "Mario" Foster was given a five and a half year prison term, and Gerald Jackson was sentenced to four years, all for trafficking-related offenses.38 In January 2010, 19-year-old Deshawn Clark was sentenced to 17 years in prison.39 By February 18, 2010, King County prosecutors had convicted six members of the West Seattle gang and were in the process of trying two more members charged with promoting commercial sexual abuse of a minor and conspiracy. On February 19, 2010, Donta Walters and Gamada Abdullahi were convicted on all charges.40

In 2009, Governor Chris Gregoire signed HB 1505 into law. This law gave juvenile court judges the option to send teen victims of prostitution to a diversion program that offered housing, education, and drug/mental health treatment for up to a year. The bill was sponsored by Rep. Mary Lou Dickerson, who said, “Throwing the girls into detention wasn’t working. I wanted to see if there was another way to approach this. Concurrently, there was interest from the county [King County] and the city [Seattle] in establishing wrap-around services.” The first shelter was set up outside of Seattle.41

Despite substantial progress, Washington took a step backwards when on January 27, 2009, the Department of Social and Health Services announced that several secure Crisis Residential Centers would be shut down in February and June of 2009 due to budget cuts. The cities affected by this were Everett, Bremerton, Port Angeles, Wenatchee, Yakima, Seattle, Vancouver, Kennewick, and Spokane. These nine centers provided 60 beds and assistance to 3,000 teens annually. The centers were created in 2000 as part of the Becca Bill. The Spruce Street secure CRC in Seattle assisted 5,971 kids since it opened in 2000. Before Spruce Street opened, local authorities would place youth found on the street in the King County Juvenile Detention Center. Detective Harry James, a veteran of the vice unit stated, “[those youths] just don’t rise to the level of the hardened criminal…They needed guidance. They didn’t need to be thrown in with a guy who just knifed somebody on the street.” The Spokesman for the State Office of Financial Management Glenn Kuper, stated the reasons for the closings included, “The program does not receive federal matching dollars and there are some good alternatives available.” Moreover, Randy Hart, interim assistant secretary of Children’s Administration, justified the situation by saying, “While the loss of the centers would be ‘unfortunate,’ these are very difficult times and tough decisions have to be made.”42 Thankfully, as of the time of this research, Spruce Street secure CRC had remained open.

In 2010, the movement against DMST in Washington gained more media coverage thanks to legislation that would further deter DMST and provide enhanced responses to this specific victim population. State Senator Val Stevens was the prime sponsor of SB 6476, which provided stronger penalties against sex traffickers and buyers, as well as mandated a victim-centered response for prostituted children. Stevens proclaimed, “Law enforcement will no longer focus on arresting the child prostitute. It will concentrate the arrests and severest penalties exactly where they belong—on the buyers and sellers of our children.” The bill unanimously passed both chambers in March. Shared Hope International founder Linda Smith, a former Washington legislator and U.S. Congresswoman also played a major role in the push for the bill’s passing, stating that this piece of legislation would be “the strongest of its kind in the nation.”43 The bill was signed by Governor Chris Gregoire in April 2010. With this law, promoting commercial sexual abuse of a minor is a Class A felony and leads to a maximum of 26 years in prison. Additionally, the pimp is ordered to pay a $5,000 fine—much higher than the previous $550 fine. For buyers, also called “johns,”...
a new fine of $5,000, along with jail time of up to 12 years, and the risk of vehicle impoundment increased financial penalties while a new requirement that buyers must prove a legitimate effort to determine the victim’s age was made increased the risk of conviction for buying sex with a minor. The fines collected flow into a new account for Prostitution Prevention and Intervention, which will provide training to intervention specialists to provide direct services for victims. DMST victims are assured access to victim compensation funds through clarification of their status.44

Since passage of the first criminal law against human trafficking in 2003, Washington has consistently improved the ways and means to combat DMST. One statistic clearly demonstrates the evolution taking place in Washington; “Last year [2010], detectives in Sano [Eric Sano of the Seattle PD Vice/High Risk Victims Unit (HRV)] and Long’s [Seattle PD Sgt. Ryan Long] unit recovered 80 prostituted youths, up from 40 in 2009, 30 in 2008 and 20 in 2007.”45

In late April 2010, Darius D. Yancey was the first person convicted for the promotion of commercial sexual abuse of a minor in Clark County. The Vancouver-Portland area resident was sentenced to 10 years and two months in prison; the sentence could have been much longer but it “did not reflect a new law passed in February, which boosted the sentencing range to 93 to 318 months for the promotion of commercial sexual abuse of a minor.” Yancey held hostage a 15-year-old girl and forced her into prostitution in Bellevue. The victim was able to escape and alert someone when the two returned to Vancouver. When on trial, Yancey held himself “40% responsible and blamed the other 60% on the girl.”46

On July 24, 2010, a Joint Base Lewis-McChord Army sergeant, Sterling Terrance Hospedales, pleaded guilty to sex trafficking of a child and attempted sex trafficking of a child. His arrest occurred in 2009 during a Pacific Northwest Federal Innocence Lost Task Force and Lakewood Police investigation. He exploited two runaways, a 16-year-old and a 17-year-old, by advertising them as prostitutes with nude photos of them on Craigslist.com. The older of the two girls worked out of his apartment in Lakewood. The 16-year-old was flown from Wyoming to Lakewood but had not made any money for Hospedales before he was arrested. The girls were moved to a safe location while Hospedales received a dishonorable discharge from the military, 11 years in prison, 7 years of supervised probation, and the requirement to register as a sex offender.47

One-third of the girls rescued during the November 2010 FBI Operation Cross Country V were found in the Puget Sound area. 23 prostituted girls were rescued and nine pimps and 26 adult prostitutes were arrested from King, Pierce, and Snohomish counties. Steven Dean, an assistant special agent who takes the lead in the Seattle field office noted, “We’re leading the nation for the third year in a row in the recovery of child prostitutes.” He commented that it does not mean that the region has a bigger problem than any other, but signifies local agencies’ dedication to combating the issue, “We’re attacking it. If you dig a little deeper, you tend to find more.”48 Of those arrested, six pimps and eight adult prostitutes were arrested, and two teen victims were rescued in Clark County. One of the young girls was returned to her home, which was evaluated as a safe environment, and the other girl was placed under protective custody. “Vancouver police Lt. John Chapman said this year’s operation led to the arrests of more pimps and adult prostitutes than last year, a sign of increasing awareness and work among law enforcement to uncover Vancouver’s underworld of sex trafficking.”49

After being lured into what she thought to be a loving relationship, 16-year-old Kelsey Collins was pressured into prostitution by her “boyfriend.” According to the Seattle Times, Kelsey continued to attend her high school but was exploited by her pimp at night in King County. In January 2008, Kelsey was found by the Portland police on the local track. She first confessed to a detective that her new 36-year-old pimp moved her back and forth from Seattle to Portland, and then, with some convincing, she testified against him to a federal grand jury. Weeks later, on Mother’s Day 2009, Kelsey was nowhere to be found. Even though Kelsey was a troubled child, her family is sure that her disappearance and the case are connected. The pimp was charged with the prostitution of a minor in June 2009 but, without Kelsey as the key witness, the case was dismissed shortly afterwards. However, in 2010 he was sentenced to more than 15 years in prison and forced to pay $21,600 in restitution for prostituting a 14-year-old girl from Seattle. The investigation of Kelsey Collin’s disappearance is ongoing.50

It is important to note that Washington has focused on combating international sex-trafficking as well. In 2006, Washington lawmakers outlawed the sale of overseas sex tours as a “pre-emptive stand.” Senator Karen Fraser was the main sponsor of the bill, which made such a sale a Class C felony with a prison term of up to five years and a fine up to $10,000. In 2002, a Spokane, Washington travel agency was shut down. Shortly before this, the 9th Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals upheld a two year old law and ruled that Americans can be prosecuted for taking part in underage overseas sex tours.51 In June 2006, the Seattle Post-Intelligencer published an article discussing the exploitation of young girls during the World Cup. This article also acknowledged that Washington was a prime destination state for traffickers, “With our 76 public ports and a long international border, Washington is too [a destination], as evidenced by the ring of 15 people indicted recently by federal agents for smuggling dozens of victims illegally into Seattle from India.”52 More recently, 59-year-old Craig Thomas Carr, a Kent native, was sentenced to 15 years in prison, received a lifetime supervised release, an $11,000 fine, an $8,000 fine in restitution for the sexual exploitation of a child, and is required to register as a sex offender after his release. Carr corresponded with and paid $8,000 to a person in Cambodia to set up the sexual encounters with girls around the age of 12 during his week-long stay in Cambodia. He was prosecuted under the Protect Safe Childhood Initiative by the U.S. Attorney’s Office for the Western District of Washington.53 These actions demonstrate that Washington is active on the international level, as well as the domestic, in combating the sexual exploitation of children.

**Law Enforcement Jurisdiction**

Each county sheriff’s department has jurisdiction throughout its entire county, but maintains patrols only in the unincorporated areas. City police departments maintain patrols and investigations within each city’s limits. County sheriff’s officers may volunteer to participate with city police on special projects including trafficking-related stings, but the jurisdiction remains that of the city police. While patrol officers are typically the first responders to encounter prostituted children, they are also generally the least experienced on the issue of domestic minor sex trafficking due to a lack of training. However, in some participating counties, it is the patrol officers that have the most experience with these victims, while higher-ranking officers report little awareness of the issue in their jurisdictions. Service providers in all jurisdictions confirmed the presence of commercially sexually exploited youth, thus contradicting the perception of certain law enforcement that this was not an issue in their jurisdiction. While no law enforcement agencies had a written protocol for dealing with these youth at the time of the interviews, all agencies are required under SB 6476 to create one. It is recommended that interagency cooperation be factored into these policies and procedures, as it is paramount in creating a comprehensive safety net for these victims.

---

Trafficker/ Pimp
Trafficker/ Pimp (Those Who Sell Children For Sexual Exploitation)

“These guys are at the pinnacle of child predators.
They’re hunters of children.”

– law enforcement officer

Successful identification, arrest, and prosecution of traffickers is critical to interrupting and deterring domestic minor sex trafficking (DMST). Washington recently amended the existing law promoting commercial sexual abuse of a minor that increases sentencing for traffickers to a Class A felony. Still, the resources needed to locate, investigate, charge, and prosecute traffickers remains high. Traffickers attempt to remain invisible through the use of untraceable prepaid phones, prepaid credit cards, and by living a transient lifestyle, often moving from hotel to hotel along any given circuit. Additionally, traffickers commonly assign a victim known as a “bottom” to recruit, train, and manage the other girls—disassociating themselves from the crime and subsequent identification with it. Within the West Coast trafficking circuit of Seattle, Portland, Los Angeles, Phoenix, and Las Vegas there exists a microcircuit that includes Tacoma, Seattle, and Everett. As areas heat up with increased law enforcement presence, traffickers move with their victims along these routes and often explore new areas of opportunity such as Spokane, Tri-Cities and Clark County.

Identification

Washington exhibits a substantial level of gang and familial trafficking. Due to the lack of awareness and training for law enforcement on the issue of DMST in Benton, Spokane, and Thurston counties, identification of victims is lacking, which precludes the ability to identify traffickers. Clark, King, and Snohomish counties have higher levels of both awareness and identification due to the establishment of task forces and coalition groups that have hosted training and heightened awareness.

Of the four research locations, King County, which includes the greater Seattle area, demonstrates the most advanced methods for successful identification of traffickers. The Seattle PD works proactively through its Vice/High Risk Victims Unit and collaborative efforts with the FBI to locate and investigate sex trafficking, with DMST being a priority. In fact, Seattle PD has participated in the last three FBI Operation Cross Country investigations. In 2010, nine of the 99 pimps arrested nationwide were in King County.

Simultaneously, Clark County Sheriff’s Office teamed up with the FBI Innocence Lost Initiative in Portland to participate in Cross Country efforts and recovered five traffickers. Clark County Sheriff’s Office and Vancouver PD are leading efforts in Southwest Washington to crack down on DMST. One interviewee from Vancouver PD credited Shared Hope International for raising awareness on the issue locally and providing training that shifted the way law enforcement and the community viewed this issue.

54 RCW § 9.68A.101.
An interviewee from Clark County Sheriff's Office highlighted three DMST cases they identified through proactive investigative work using online escort and networking sites. The interviewee specifically highlighted the case of a mother who was prostituting her 17-year-old daughter to make money, presumably for living expenses. The mother was arrested for compelling prostitution when she revealed that she cared for her daughter's child while her daughter engaged in sex acts with buyers for money. The daughter and mother split the earnings 50/50. This case expanded the understanding of the dynamics of sex trafficking and how family members, including women, can also be traffickers.

The Benton County Sheriff's Department has no history of charging traffickers. It was reported that women may occasionally be arrested for prostitution; however, deputies are unable to gain the necessary cooperation or information to pursue the buyers or pimps. The Benton County Sheriff's Department interviewee assumed this dynamic would also apply to DMST victims. Richland PD has no history of prosecutions of traffickers; however, there was one pending case against pimp, Jessien Malik Perry, at the time of the interview. Perry was charged with promoting prostitution and trafficking of a minor (see details in Prosecution section below).

Interview participants reported a few cases of mothers in the Tri-Cities who provided their daughters to boyfriends or other men in exchange for housing, financial support or drugs. Unfortunately, children do not typically disclose these abuses until after they acclimate to foster care placements, having been removed through dependency proceedings for other situations of familial abuse and/or neglect. The delay in disclosure, lack of specific details, and the inability to obtain identities of the abusers inhibits the collection of evidence. As a result of these investigative hurdles, there is no record of charges being brought against these mothers or the buyers. In one case, under investigation at the time of interview, an adolescent girl was given drugs in exchange for sex by her mother's boyfriend. Those interviewed were hopeful that the case would continue to move forward to prosecution.

Another example involves a ten-year-old Tri-City girl whose mother started trading her to various boyfriends in exchange for housing and financial security. The girl was briefly removed from her mother's custody when she gave birth to her first child at age eleven. The girl was returned to her mother's home and only one year later, at the age of twelve, was once again removed when it was discovered that she was pregnant again. Now living in foster care, paternity tests will be conducted to determine if her mother's current boyfriend is the father. Her situation was revealed when an Educational Advocate, provided through a DSHS funded grant with Treehouse, was brought in after the girl was expelled from school for possession of a knife. The advocate reported that, when questioned, the girl revealed she kept the weapon for protection against her mother's boyfriends. The girl was permanently removed from her grade school, which had no available support services, and moved up a grade to a middle school where she could receive supportive educational services. The interviewee was not able to confirm whether the mother or boyfriend has been charged.

Current provisions for termination of parental rights are very limited and do not apply to CSEC crimes where a family member is acting as the trafficker. RCW § 13.34.132 and 13.34.180 outline the grounds for termination of parental rights. Convictions for human trafficking, promoting commercial sex abuse of a minor, or sexual exploitation of a minor are not listed as grounds for termination of parental rights.

Numerous participants reported that girls in the Tri-Cities are routinely sexually victimized through gang involvement. Girls as young as ten are reported to be initiated into many of the region’s 21 gangs through group sex. Gangs’ growing involvement in DMST was also noted by Seattle PD. The “Cash Money” case shows the extensive organized network involved in the crime. Once the young girls are initiated into the gang, they are then unable to leave the gang and continue to be passed around as currency for drugs and status. They have no control over to whom they are traded or for what.

---

Gaining victim cooperation in these cases is extremely challenging due to the victim’s fears of repercussions by gang members. The embedded nature of these criminals within the community makes it difficult for victims and their families to believe that law enforcement can protect them from retaliation. One example of this fear involves an eleven-year-old girl who was pimped by her nineteen-year-old “boyfriend” for crack and heroin in Seattle. A Treehouse Educational Advocate was assigned to help with the girl’s chronic absences from school on Mondays. It was discovered that the absences were due to incontinence caused by injuries sustained over the weekend by repeated gang rapes. The trafficker was investigated but the investigation stalled due to a lack of cooperation by the girl and her family who feared retaliation from the gang-affiliated perpetrators. The school now works proactively with the family to ensure the girl’s whereabouts are known and 24-hour family preservation services have been accessed through the county.

A unique theme in Tri-Cities and Clark County was the prevalence of young girls being trafficked and sold during or immediately after school hours. In Clark County, law enforcement conducted a proactive sting to catch traffickers leading them to the recovery of a child victim found by police completing her math homework in the trafficker’s vehicle. In another case, a 13-year-old victim of DMST was forced to strip in numerous clubs and perform sex acts on club grounds. According to one non-profit interviewee working with the victim, the young girl said that the busiest time was the “lunch crowd” and “right after school let out.”

Law enforcement in Snohomish County is becoming increasingly aware of the issue of DMST. Interviews revealed the generational and familial dynamic of the region’s traffickers, with brothers, cousins, fathers, and sons passing on the vocation. Everett PD is a member of the FBI Innocence Lost Task Force, increasing the department’s access to resources. However, the arrest of traffickers remains difficult, largely due to the lack of victim cooperation and officer’s generally low awareness of the dynamics of DMST. In one case, an Everett PD officer charged an alleged “boyfriend” with assault. The officer was later informed by a more experienced colleague of the true nature of the relationship between the girl and the assailant, who was actually her pimp. These dynamics are imperative to recognize in order to increase opportunities for investigation. Interviewees expressed hope that training and enforcement of the amendments to the promoting commercial sexual abuse of a minor legislation will increase victim cooperation, as victims may be assured that justice is more accessible due to the strengthened law.

In Everett, a woman known as Big Mama housed several teens in her home; in exchange, they had to “earn their keep.” The boys typically dealt drugs, while the girls were prostituted. Though this situation was common knowledge among street youth and staff at Cocoon House, a nonprofit that provides shelter and services for homeless youth, no charges were brought on Big Mama due to the lack of evidence or cooperation from the youth involved. The teens regarded Big Mama as a loving caretaker rather than their exploiter. After Big Mama died, the youth who stayed with her returned to the streets.

In Spokane, patrol officers commented on the frequency of seeing men approach vulnerable youth who congregate at the downtown Transit Authority. They noted that without probable cause, they are unable to legally intervene in what is likely the beginning of the DMST recruitment process. The patrol officers also reported frequently responding to calls from Crosswalk (VOA), where they assist staff in discouraging the persistent presence of men on the streets surrounding the shelter. Men often lurk on the blocks surrounding the facility, waiting to approach the youth as soon as they leave the shelter. Crosswalk shelter staff is proactively attempting to discourage sexual predators by increasing their presence in the community, becoming more territorial of the area surrounding the shelter, blatantly taking down license plate numbers of cars, and holding barbecues in the alley.

Seattle PD has the only vice squad and dedicated High Risk Victims Unit of the participating counties. The availability of officers designated to this specific issue allows for greater identification and investigation of traffickers. Additionally, the Seattle PD Vice/HRV Unit operates with a victim-centered mentality in approaching youth exploited through DMST. One Seattle PD interviewee stated this is the key to their success, “building rapport with victims is critical if you ever want to get to the trafficker.” This interviewee acknowledged the challenge in getting victims to cooperate but also mentioned these youth have often been labeled and blamed as the offender in many
cases, making it reasonable for youth to distrust law enforcement. This interviewee listed three critical components to combating DMST: a victim-centered approach from law enforcement; safe shelter for victims once they are recovered; and victim cooperation in the investigation. Currently, due to this dedicated team of law enforcement, victim identification is at an all-time high. However, despite the existence of YouthCare, Seattle’s most challenging component is access to enough appropriate and protective shelter, a situation which impedes victim safety and strong investigations.

Clark County is aggressively working to fight trafficking. Both county and city law enforcement agencies participate in proactive operations to identify and arrest traffickers. Trafficking in the city of Vancouver is conducted primarily through the use of the Internet and by phone. Victims are known to be brought in from the greater Portland metro area and areas along Interstate 5 just north of Clark County. This increases the difficulty in locating traffickers. Officers track websites known to advertise prostitution to locate victims and traffickers. The one trafficker prosecuted in Clark County was located when his victim escaped after returning to the area from a trip to Bellingham where she had been prostituted (see details in Prosecution section below). Traffickers from Seattle targeted a teen girl while she was working at a local restaurant. The traffickers spent months building a relationship with the young girl and, only days after she turned 18, convinced her to join them in Seattle. Thankfully, through the help of a friend, the teen managed to evade them once she was made aware of their intent. Clark and King county law enforcement continue to monitor these potential traffickers. Another victim recovery led to the investigation of her pimp, known to work within the Portland and Vancouver areas. This investigation was ongoing throughout the research process.

**Prosecution**

King County is a leader in trafficker prosecution. The effective work of the Seattle PD Vice/HRV Unit enabled the Prosecuting Attorney’s Office to begin seeking higher penalties by using a variety of statutes to charge traffickers. Deshawn “Cash Money” Clark was the first case the King County Prosecutor's Office successfully tried and convicted of two counts of commercial sexual abuse of a minor, one count of second-degree human trafficking and one count of first-degree promoting prostitution. Clark was arrested in 2009 after numerous interviews with a domestic violence victim revealed that she was entrenched in a ring of gang-related traffickers with multiple minor victims and her assault was from her pimp. Clark is now serving a 17-year sentence.

The King County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office was pursuing approximately six other cases against traffickers at the time of this report. One case is that of Anthony Terry who was arrested in 2010 for allegedly pimping a woman. Additional charges were filed when he instructed a 17-year-old girl to continue prostituting to raise his bail money while he was in custody at King County Jail. Andrew Lagerquist, 25, was charged in November 2010 with promoting the commercial sex abuse of a 16-year-old girl as well as repeatedly beating, drugging, and degrading her. Shacon Barbee, 31, arrested in December 2010, was charged with trafficking a 17-year-old girl and posting her services online. Timothy McMillon Jr., 38, is accused of trafficking a 17-year-old girl while serving an electronic home detention sentence for prior trafficking convictions and attempted theft. Sharmarke “Jamal” Abdilahi, 22, and Yusef “Prince”, 22, are accused of trafficking a 16-year-old girl. Both remain in custody, pending trial.

With equal vigor, the U.S. Attorney’s Office (USAO) of the Western District of Washington is prosecuting DMST. Since 2008, they have federally prosecuted at least five men with the crime of DMST. These successful federal convictions have resulted in sentences ranging from six to 26 years for their role in trafficking children in the state of Washington. One of the more recent cases involved former Army Sergeant Sterling Hospedales, 26, who recruited a juvenile from Wyoming and then placed her for sale through Internet escort websites. In October 2010, Hospedales was sentenced to 11 years in prison and seven years of supervised release. Additionally, he is required to register as a sex offender.

Another significant victory for the USAO of the Western District of Washington was the case of Juan Vianez, a violent pimp who brutally abused, isolated, and trafficked a 17-year old girl. He exploited her for four years in Portland, Las Vegas, and Arizona. Vianez was finally arrested in October 2008. Vianez was convicted September
23, 2009 of “sex trafficking, interstate transportation of a minor in furtherance of prostitution, interstate transportation in furtherance of prostitution and witness tampering.” Judge Robert J. Bryan, who presided over this case, sentenced Vianez to 20 years in prison, nearly double the term outlined in the sentencing guidelines. Furthermore, Vianez was ordered to five years of supervised release, was forced to pay over $1.3 million in restitution, and register as a sex offender. The FBI, the Lakewood Police, the Tacoma Police, and the Criminal Investigations Division of the Internal Revenue Service investigated this case, which was then prosecuted by the Assistant United States Attorneys Ye-Ting Woo and Matthew Thomas. Many interviewees applauded this bold statement of justice, indicating that the proper method for deterrence is the clear message that predators who traffic children are not welcome in Washington.

In 2009, Jessian Malik Perry, 20, of Benton County was charged with promoting prostitution in the first degree and was sentenced to 31 months in prison. Perry trafficked his girlfriend’s two underage friends, the younger of whom ultimately reported this to her parents who supported her in reporting the crime to Richland PD. Charges were brought prior to the recent amendments under RCW § 9A.40.100 (Human trafficking) and RCW § 9.68A.101 (Promoting commercial sexual abuse of a minor) which are Class A felonies, seriousness level XII (RCW 9.94A.515), resulting in a sentence range of 93 to 318 months based on the offender’s score (RCW § 9.94A.510).

During a forensic interview in Benton County, two young teenage female victims each disclosed being trafficked with other young girls by local women. Although this information was reported, it was unclear as to whether further action and subsequent charges were filed. A fifteen-year-old Benton County girl also disclosed to the interviewer and local police that she met two men at the mall and was taken to a house where she was drugged and repeatedly raped by the occupants in the house. When the traffickers attempted to transport her to Spokane for continued commercial sexual exploitation, she escaped by jumping out of their vehicle. The perpetrators were never identified, as the girl was unable to give specific details about them or the home she was taken to.

Interviewees were quick to mention that although traffickers were not charged under the trafficking or promoting commercial sexual abuse of a minor law, that does not mean they are allowing them to walk free. Law enforcement and prosecutors listed a variety of other applicable sexual offense and child abuse laws that can and should be used in trafficking cases. One specific case highlights how other appropriate laws are being used to successfully prosecute traffickers. A perpetrator befriended a fifteen-year-old Pennsylvania boy online, ultimately sending him a train ticket to join the man in Washington. When the boy arrived, the man began photographing him and sexually exploiting him. Through the young teenage boy’s cooperation with Richland PD, the perpetrator was successfully charged and prosecuted with attempted rape of a child and creation of child pornography. This case, however, was not identified as a case of trafficking despite the circumstances indicating trafficking. Law enforcement interviewed suggested that a lack of training on the dynamics of trafficking as well as unfamiliarity with existing and newly passed laws are likely the reason they are not being used.

Clark County’s first successful trafficker prosecution occurred in April 2010. Darius Yancey, 22, groomed and abducted a fifteen-year-old girl, taking her north to Bellevue where he forced her to have sex for money and then confiscated the money. He was convicted of commercial sexual abuse of a minor and sentenced to ten years and two months in prison.

At the time of this report, Spokane PD was investigating its first trafficking case and expected to bring the case to the County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office.

In Snohomish County, cases have been tried at the federal level in order to access tougher penalties and more resources. It is anticipated that cases will be tried at the state level now that stricter penalties are available. In anticipation of this, the Snohomish County Prosecuting Attorney now has a designated attorney working in Dawson Place Child Advocacy Center where most of these cases are investigated.

Victim Role in Trafficker Prosecution

The primary barrier stated by law enforcement and prosecutors to successful prosecution of traffickers is victim cooperation. Law enforcement in each participating county reported being aware that victims will not disclose information about their traffickers until a strong rapport has been built. As one detective noted, the whole story comes out over time and very rarely does it reflect what they are initially told by the youth when they’re first contacted. The detective observed that many of the girls view the pimp as their boyfriend and often feel very confused about this person’s role in their victimization. This contrasts the typical role of officers who are accustomed to acting in response to the requests of a victim, not assisting an individual in realizing their victimization. One detective noted that patrol officers, who are the typical first responders, do not have the time and resources available to cultivate and build a relationship with a victim in order to gain cooperation. Another noted that if officers had additional manpower and time to build relationships with victims, they could obtain the information needed to exponentially increase arrests and convictions. Seattle, the only location in Washington with a Vice/HRV Unit and dedicated officers, has investigated more cases than the other counties combined—demonstrating the success that is possible when a specific unit is dedicated to combatting this crime.

Currently, prosecutions often hinge on the willingness and availability of victims to testify against their traffickers. Service providers indicated their interest and willingness to support and prepare victims for this very traumatic event; however, to date, they have not often been included in this process. The interviewee from the USAO indicated that the victim must be present in federal court and alternate uses of technology, such as video-taped testimony, is not allowed to be used as direct evidence under the court rules.

In an effort to utilize resources that already exist for child abuse cases, the Clark County Sheriff’s Office is pursuing collaboration with the Children’s Justice Center to maximize available resources. The interviewee from the Clark County Sheriff’s Office hoped that engaging child forensic interview experts within the Children’s Justice Center would increase their ability to build rapport with youth and obtain actionable intelligence.

A significant hurdle in obtaining victim testimony is the inability to guarantee victim safety. In early 2010, Washington victim, Kelsey Collins testified before a grand jury in the federal case against her pimp in Portland, only to disappear shortly after. At the time of this report, she was still reported missing. One non-governmental organization (NGO) that works with street youth and DMST victims in Seattle mentioned that “consensus among street youth in Seattle, where she was often sold by her pimp, is that she was killed for this betrayal.”

According to the King County prosecutor who obtained the first conviction under the Washington State anti-trafficking law, the primary obstacle in trying a case against a trafficker is victim cooperation. When trying his landmark case against DeShawn “Cash Money” Clark (see Media Review for more information), one of his highest priorities was maintaining and building relationships with the victims. Seattle PD worked diligently to support youth who continued to return to their pimp, were emotionally entangled with their boyfriends/traffickers, and were frequently moved around by their traffickers before the trial.

Resources

A common theme reported by most interviewees was the lack of resources for the issue of domestic minor sex trafficking and the impact that has on identification, training, investigation, and prosecution. One law enforcement interviewee highlighted the importance of proactive investigative work such as stings, raids, and decoy operations in order to properly infiltrate the trafficking network. However, this type of police work is extremely time consuming and requires both additional manpower and finances. Law enforcement agencies reported commitment to combating trafficking and lamented that resources were often the barrier for more aggressive action on such an important issue.
Demand
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Demand Prosecution

While participants in all counties stated their commitment to the arrest and prosecution of buyers, statistics do not reflect this sentiment. Identification of those who purchase sex with minors remains low. Law enforcement primarily attributed the low level of identification to lack of resources. It was also noted that the lack of cooperation from victims is a significant barrier. One Everett PD officer observed the rapid speed in which transactions occur. While he was monitoring a local hot spot two young girls seemed to “just appear out of nowhere,” having apparently been dropped off undetected by either a trafficker or a buyer. Similarly, a Vancouver PD officer noted the speed with which girls were picked up in a parking lot that was being observed. Attempts to pursue the vehicles the girls entered were unsuccessful. Additionally, law enforcement reported that even if police witnessed a commercial sex transaction, obtained the buyer’s name and identification and documented the location, amount spent, and the victim’s identity, the burden to prove the act occurred still remains. This burden requires the victim to appear in court (potentially several months later), verify remembering the buyer, and confirm that during the encounter something of value was exchanged for a sexual act. While there are significant investigative hurdles to buyer prosecution, those interviewed recognized that demand drives the commercial sex industry.

In King County, the Seattle PD Vice/HRV Unit expressed the most interest in targeting buyers of sex with children. Recent law changes have strengthened criminal provisions for buyers, encouraging King County prosecutors to amplify efforts to combat demand. In August 2010, Michael Hayatsu, 44, was the first person in King County to be charged with commercial sex abuse of a minor under the enhanced law. Hayatsu was arrested after he was discovered having sex with a 17-year-old, who he had paid $140. If convicted, he must register as a sex offender for 15 years after his release. Shortly after this precedent setting arrest, Corey Guy Wight, was arrested for allegedly paying $400 to have sex with a 16-year-old girl. Wight has been charged with commercial sex abuse of a minor. Unfortunately, he only spent a day in King County Jail in January 2011 and was released after posting a $75,000 bond, pending trial.

Demand Legislation

Washington law specifically criminalizes purchasing sex with a minor under RCW § 9.68A.100. RCW § 9.68A.100 (commercial sexual abuse of a minor) creates a Class B felony when an individual pays a fee to a minor or a third person as compensation for a minor engaging in sexual conduct with him or her, or solicits, offers, or requests to engage in sexual conduct with a minor in return for a fee. Under this section, “sexual conduct” means sexual intercourse or sexual contact, both as defined in chapter 9A.44 RCW.” RCW § 9A.68A.100(4). “Sexual contact” is defined as “any touching of the sexual or other intimate parts of a person done for the purpose of gratifying sexual desire of either party or a third party.” RCW § 9A.44.010. Therefore, paying for or offering to pay for both intercourse or sexual contact is criminalized under RCW § 9.68A.100.
On June 10, 2010, the Washington state legislature increased the severity level of the crime from a Class C felony offense to a Class B felony offense. Now, commercial sexual abuse of a minor is a Class B felony sex offense, seriousness level VIII and a sentencing range of 21 months to 10 years based on the offender score. RCW § 9.94A.515; RCW § 9.94A.510. This offense requires sex offender registration once the defendant’s prison term is satisfied. RCW § 9A.44.130. Yet, these penalties for buyers of commercial sex are not as high as federal penalties for offenders of domestic minor sex trafficking prosecuted under the federal child sex trafficking law, 18 USC §1591 (requires mandatory minimum imprisonment of 10 years, maximum of life for minors over 14; mandatory minimum imprisonment of 15 years, maximum of life for minors under 14).

Buyers of commercial sex with minors also face financial penalties in Washington and could lose their vehicle through impoundment. Under RCW § 9.68A.105, a buyer of commercial sex with a minor will also be required to pay a fine of $5,000. Specifically, RCW § 9.68A.105 mandates a fine of $5,000 for “a person who is either convicted or given a deferred sentence or a deferred prosecution or who has entered into a statutory or nonstatutory diversion agreement” for certain crimes including RCW § 9.68A.100 (commercial sexual abuse of a minor) or a comparable county or municipal ordinance.” Additionally, the buyer may also lose his or her vehicle under RCW § 9A.88.140(2) which provides that “[u]pon an arrest for a suspected violation of commercial sexual abuse of a minor, promoting commercial sexual abuse of a minor, or promoting travel for commercial sexual abuse of a minor, the arresting law enforcement officer shall impound the person’s vehicle if (a) the motor vehicle was used in the commission of the crime; and (b) the person arrested is the owner of the vehicle or the vehicle is a rental car as defined in RCW § 46.04.465.” Subsection (4) sets a $2,500 fine to the impounding agency to redeem the vehicle.

In some instances, a court may require a buyer to forfeit any other property used in relation to the crime. RCW § 10.105.010(1) (Seizure and forfeiture) states in part, “[t]he following are subject to seizure and forfeiture and no property right exists in them: All personal property, including, but not limited to, any item, object, tool, substance, device, weapon, machine, vehicle of any kind, money, security, or negotiable instrument, which has been or was actually employed as an instrumentality in the commission of, or in aiding orabetting in the commission of any felony, or which was furnished or was intended to be furnished by any person in the commission of, as a result of, or as compensation for the commission of, any felony, or which was acquired in whole or in part with proceeds traceable to the commission of a felony...” This provision applies to all felonies, except contraband, narcotics, firearms, gambling devices, money laundering, fish and wildlife offenses, and human trafficking (RCW 10.105.900); thus, it could be applied in a case of commercial sexual abuse of a minor. Similarly, RCW § 9.68A.120 (Seizure and forfeiture of property) allows for the forfeiture of “[a]ll personal property, moneys, negotiable instruments, securities, or other tangible or intangible property furnished or intended to be furnished by any person in exchange for visual or printed matter depicting a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct, or constituting proceeds traceable to any violation of this chapter.” Chapter 9.68A includes commercial sexual abuse of a minor (RCW § 9.68A.100) bringing seizure and forfeiture of property to bear on this crime of buying commercial sex with minors.

Generally, buyers are not allowed to assert a mistake of age defense for the crime of commercial sexual abuse of a minor RCW § 9.68A.110(3). RCW § 9.68A.110(3) (Certain defenses barred, permitted) states that “it is not a defense that the defendant did not know the alleged victim’s age” for certain prosecutions including prosecutions under RCW § 9.68A.100 (commercial sexual abuse of a minor). However, “[i]t is a defense, which the defendant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence, that at the time of the offense, the defendant made a reasonable bona fide attempt to ascertain the true age of the minor by requiring production of a driver’s license, marriage license, birth certificate, or other governmental or educational identification card or paper and did not rely solely on the oral allegations or apparent age of the minor.” Therefore, if a buyer asks and receives such documents from the domestic minor sex trafficking victim, the buyer could use such evidence to assert a mistake of age defense.

More investigative tools related to demand will be available to law enforcement officers on August 1, 2011, when the recently passed HB 1874 becomes law. Under this bill, if one party consents, law enforcement will be able to record or intercept when probable cause exists that commercial sexual abuse of a minor (RCW § 9.68A.100) is occurring. When enacted, this bill will allow law enforcement to more effectively investigate demand.
Demand Reduction Efforts

Officers in Everett reported that youth who are encountered during the warmer peak months of activity are given Stay Out of Area of Prostitution (SOAP) Orders. This order is similar to a no trespass order in which it bans both youth and buyers from returning to areas known as high prostitution areas. New girls come into the area and the cycle continues until the level of prostitution activity dissipates and the intensity of officer patrol is no longer needed. Unfortunately, it was reported that the focus for SOAP ends up being on moving potential victims from the area rather than arresting buyers. This was a commonly reported practice throughout the participating regions. The Everett PD Internet Crimes Against Children (ICAC) division conducts sting operations targeted to buyers. Though buyers are routinely arrested, the cases rarely go to trial, even with blatant and substantial online and physical evidence. Typically, buyers only serve time in jail while charges are pending and they are waiting for arraignment. An ICAC detective suggested that the cases are dropped due to financial limitations and the lack of knowledge by newer prosecutors who are intimidated by strong defense attorneys. Historically, when victims are teenagers, juries will acquit the perpetrators based on preconceived attitudes about the teen victims’ lack of morality. In one notable case, the adult male perpetrator arrived at the sting operation location with the necessary implements to commit murder including a sleeping bag, rope, duct tape, a camera, and a hunting butcher knife; however, he was prosecuted only for the attempted rape of a child and served one year in prison.

The ICAC officer noted that when creating false online profiles for use during operations, 13-year-old girls were very vulnerable, generating the most responses; however, posting as an even younger boy generates exponential interest, instantly filling to capacity the designated email inbox.

Participants that deal with homeless youth populations report that street-dependent boys are sexually exploited at nearly the same rate as girls. They explained that boys are more likely to be taken in by an individual perpetrator for repeated personal sexual use in exchange for food and shelter, rather than being sold to a variety of buyers. Sometimes called “survival sex” by youth, these transactions still fall under the umbrella of domestic minor sex trafficking due to their commercial component. The private nature of these transactions makes it extremely difficult to identify and investigate the buyers who commercially sexually exploit these boys. Very few of these cases are prosecuted because of a lack of cooperation with law enforcement from the victims, often due to the significant shame and stigmatization experienced by the boys.

Prostitution Solicitation Diversion Program

Of the counties that participated in this study, only King County has a “John School,” an educational diversion program for buyers caught soliciting adults. Although the specific number of men diverted through this program or numbers supporting the effectiveness of this program were not able to be obtained, several interviewees indicated that the program has a reputation for being impactful.

Demand Awareness

There are currently no state-funded campaigns directed at raising awareness of the issue of demand for commercial sex. The lack of funding is one barrier to the creation of such a program. There is currently an emphasis on creating housing and programs for victims of sex trafficking, but several NGOs lamented the fact that without emphasis on reducing demand those efforts are inadequate.

Despite this lack of funding, one organization has made demand-reduction their primary mission. The Defenders USA, a project of Shared Hope International, has worked for years to mobilize men in the fight against the commercial sex industry and exploitation of America’s youth. They recognize that men are a crucial part of ending demand for prostituted children and work to raise awareness on a local and national level. The Defender’s motto is: Because men created the demand for prostituted kids, better men have to stop it. Defenders pledge to take a stand against the commercial sex industry—holding themselves and other men accountable to ending this form of child sexual exploitation.
There are approximately 1,100 Defenders ranging in age from 15–65 years. Defenders host events, fundraisers, and truck stop campaigns across the country to raise awareness. In Vancouver, a group of men meet on a weekly basis to maintain accountability with each other. One of their most successful tactics involves reaching out to the trucking industry, a leading player in the commercial victimization of children. Defenders in Washington hosted two truck stop campaigns, creating a buzz with their picket signs, shirts, and handouts. They hung small signs in restrooms that list the National Human Trafficking Resource Center Hotline. These efforts have paid off as truckers acknowledge that they had no idea the young girls were victims.

Another major success for the Defenders has been the addition of regional motorcycle rides to raise awareness. One Defender that owned a sign-making business donated a huge decal that covered the side of an 18-wheeler stating “Kids are NOT for Sale” to be used in the Washington Defenders Ride in 2010. The 18-wheeler hosting the sign was followed by a huge crowd of bikers with over 100 participants. Rides have been even more successful since then, making their way across the country one state at a time. By taking a stand and educating the public on the facts surrounding the sex trafficking of American children, these leading men are reducing demand every day and ensuring that a market for sex ceases to exist.

Supporters pose for a picture with the 18-wheeler that was used during the 2010 Washington Defenders Ride.
VICTIMS
Victims

Who Are The Victims?

Traffickers prey on the most vulnerable members of society and there are few more vulnerable than teen runaways. One study estimates that 70 percent of street youth are victims of commercial sexual exploitation. Additionally, field experts estimate that 33 percent of teen runaways and throwaways will be prostituted within the first 48 hours of leaving home.

Interview participants throughout all regions commented on the apparent societal ignorance of the fact that at least 100,000 minors are victimized through sex trafficking in the United States each year. The Seattle Homeless Adolescent Research Project interviewed 354 street youth between the ages of 13 and 21. The most frequent reasons given for leaving home included physical abuse and violence in the home—including sexual abuse and neglect. These factors significantly increase the risk of these youth becoming victims of domestic minor sex trafficking (DMST). This study substantiates interviewees’ responses from all participating counties about their homeless youth populations and the connection between these populations and DMST.

Every service provider interviewed was able to identify at least one case that would have met the criteria for DMST. While service providers in King County were more likely to label youth as victims of trafficking, participants in other locations were more likely to use a variety of other labels such as victim of prostitution, prostituted child, child abuse victim, prostitute, juvenile delinquent, at-risk youth, and/or commercially sexually exploited child. This lack of consistent identification and labeling can result in miscommunication and misidentification, which can ultimately disrupt access to services.

Participants further commented that the system of services in place for at-risk youth through the Department of Child and Family Services and Child Protective Services was failing, resulting in significant homeless youth populations left to fend for themselves and form street-families. Another noted gap was that reactive identification is failed prevention. Several NGOs in King County and Tri-Cities suggested that comprehensive preventative educational outreach programs be state-funded and mandated within schools to warn school-age children of the dangers of sex trafficking. Furthermore, since a significant number of the DMST cases in Washington involved family members as the abusers or the youth were recruited while on school grounds, service providers suggested that school counselors, teachers, and school resource officers receive in-service trainings on the warning signs and factors that increase risk of victimization.

“I also picked prostitutes as victims because they were easy to pick up without being noticed. I knew they would not be reported missing right away and might never be reported missing. I picked prostitutes because I thought I could kill as many of them as I wanted without getting caught.”

—Gary Ridgway

“The Green River Killer” confessed to killing over 50 women & girls.


60 Office of Crime Victims Advocacy, “No Wrong Door Entry to Services” (Office of Crime Victims Advocacy: Sep 2010).
Service providers identified the reluctance of youth to self-identify as victims as another barrier to identification and services. One interviewee in King County admitted that DMST victims were commonly misidentified until their staff received training from Shared Hope International and YouthCare on the dynamics of DMST. Now that staff has a more informed understanding of what these youth have experienced, they are prepared with appropriate assessment questions to help reveal DMST and are more aptly able to respond to the defense mechanisms these youth use for self-preservation. One DMST victim who was in protective custody commented to her probation officer:

You know I never told you, but I would be out at the bus stop and I would see these cars drive by and there would be like a mom, or dad, or both and there'd be a couple of kids in there, and I hated them. I just hated them because I wanted that. I wanted to be in the back of the car and I wanted to go to school and I wanted to go to dinner. I wanted to sit there and have dinner with my family. And I was out here. I had to be out here.

The probation officer mentioned that this youth was considered to be “very uncooperative” in the beginning but this comment shows “the reality of the hell they have been forced to endure. The victims might be tough but they are truly the most deserving of our time and energy.”

Though many DMST victims come from a history of abuse or homelessness, victims also come from stable home environments with no history of abuse. One such case involves a girl who met her trafficker at a party just before her thirteenth birthday. This first, seemingly innocuous encounter was actually a staged recruiting or “turn-out” party. The trafficker had recruited local high school students to help him “throw a party.” The local and trusted boys were instructed to invite a variety of young girls to the party. The young boys did so unaware that the individual was a trafficker and his intention for the party was to select new “product.” The girl the trafficker targeted was a good student and avid youth group and church attendee. She lived at home with her mom and siblings. Within months, what began as a romantic courtship with her adult “boyfriend”/trafficker devolved into first stripping and then prostitution. This DMST victim was held under the control of the trafficker for nearly two years before she escaped.

Another case that confronts standard expectations of the type of youth who are victimized is that of a high school honor roll student and athlete. Working with her sisters as a waitress in a local café, she was scouted for months by a recruiter, a middle-aged man she knew as one of her regular customers. He struck up conversations with her, learning about her hopes and aspirations as well as her frustrations with her “small town life.” Months later, two well-dressed young men arrived at the restaurant and sat at her section as she worked. A romantic relationship began with one of the men and soon she accepted his invitation to join him for a weekend in Seattle. The men offered to share their expansive home with her. Within days, they introduced her to stripping and confiscated all of her earnings. She was recovered by Vancouver PD before being trafficked when a friend coordinated an intervention with her family and local NGO, Shared Hope International.

As previously noted, most interviewees were unaware of the term DMST and often commented that they likely had never interacted with this population of victims. However, as the interview unfolded and the participant became more educated on the term DMST and its legal definition, many were able to recall current or past youth on their caseload who fit this definition. Below are a few examples of these recollections that surfaced during the interview process.

- Twelve and thirteen-year-old sisters in foster care disclosed that their mother had traded them to men in exchange for methamphetamine since the age of five and six.
- A young girl in foster care disclosed that her mother dressed her up in frilly dresses and let men have sex with her.
- A girl disclosed that between the ages of thirteen and fifteen, she was required by her father to engage in sexual acts online and in public in order to receive food and shelter and to earn privileges like going out with her friends.
• A seventeen-year-old boy ran away from drug rehab and was offered drugs and shelter by a man who held him for days in sex captivity before he was able to escape and return home.
• A minor boy was returned from Spokane on probation violation and disclosed trading oral sex for drugs.
• A mother used the cover of an escort business for prostituting herself, her minor son, and other underage boys and girls for parties. The boy disclosed this to his probation officer, showing a business card that he used. He had repeated arrests from the age of fifteen for unrelated misdemeanor charges.

Hidden Population Or Misidentified?
Levels of awareness in all professional populations interviewed varied greatly from county to county, and even sometimes within the county. Those counties with the highest levels of awareness typically attributed that to one or two key individuals or organizations in the region who worked to raise awareness among their colleagues and communities. Several Clark, King, Snohomish, and Spokane County participants were highly informed, but were also identified as the few key players in the region who had taken it upon themselves to find resources and educate themselves on the subject. Within each region there were also disparities between levels of awareness. The lack of systemic programming significantly hinders sustainability—if these key people leave their positions, the systems are severely impeded and the knowledge base reduced. Similarly, each region has varying access to training on the subject resulting in varying responses (see Community Response/NGOs below). To maximize cohesion and sustainability, it is imperative that systemic policies and procedures be established throughout the state.

King County, especially Seattle and Tacoma, has been working to address this issue for years. The county benefits from a federally funded Department of Justice Human Trafficking Task Force and the FBI Innocence Lost Initiative. The dedication of a small group of professionals who continued to prioritize this issue has established a community where fighting DMST is a core value shared by many. The model of care being implemented in Seattle was created by local professionals in the same way that many other countries are organically developing their efforts to combat DMST (see pg. 56 for more information). A collaborative mix of city and county funding, media, research, training, dedicated professionals, and informed responses has elevated Seattle’s response to this victim population, effectively taking this population from hidden to visible and from misidentified to identified as victims of sex trafficking.

Clark County is experiencing higher levels of informed response due to recent trainings. At the Clark County Juvenile Detention Center, one interviewee indicated that the training provided by Shared Hope International significantly impacted the way staff viewed and referred to youth involved in prostitution. The interviewee admitted that before the training, youth who were involved in prostitution would commonly be called “prosti-tots” by certain staff. Following the training, staff became more sensitive to the reality of what victims have experienced and use terms such as “trafficked youth” or “DMST victim.”

After being trained by Sgt. Byron Fassett on the Dallas PD High Risk Victims Model, the Vancouver PD Missing Persons Detective began implementing this model to help flag potential DMST victims. This program is still in its pilot stage and minor revisions have been made to support the unique characteristics of Clark County. This proactive approach to prevention and intervention in the lives of endangered runaways who are likely to be targeted by predators is a commendable foundation for progressive response.

Many participants in Benton County were unaware of the definition of sex trafficking as it applies to domestic minor victims, survival sex, and prostituted youth, and had only heard of trafficking through national news in reference to foreign victims. While most interview participants in Benton County believe that youth are being prostituted in the area, they were unable to identify local tracks for prostitution, though two locations for prostituted women were mentioned. Most suggested that the activity was not being identified by law enforcement and the community due to the use of the Internet for transactions. The homeless youth population is also relatively hidden as youth are known to couch-surf more often than live on the streets.
Male victims are typically even more hidden, as many live in private homes and are exploited as “sex toys” for older men. They are also less likely to disclose victimization due to greater issues of shame, confusion, and social judgment regarding their sexual identity. This was reported almost universally by interviewees who had encountered victimized boys, and particularly with Latino boys who deal with the additional cultural component of machismo. Some boys who are commercially sexually exploited are homosexual or transgender, many of whom have been rejected by their families due to their sexual orientation and resort to living on the streets or couch-surfing. It is believed that the lesbian, gay, bi-sexual, transgender, and questioning (LGBTQ) youth are disproportionately displaced from their homes, and therefore at higher risk for sexual predators due to increased isolation. Also, gay youth are coming out at younger and younger ages, further increasing their vulnerability. More than one respondent reported that underage gay bars are where older men frequently troll for their victims.

Data obtained from Washington State Office of the Courts reveals the reality of domestic minor sex trafficking in Washington. Data was obtained from eight juvenile court locations including: King, Clark, Snohomish, Benton/Franklin, Pierce, Spokane, and Thurston. In 2009 and 2010, 153 youth were referred to juvenile detention facilities on charges of prostitution. 150 of these youth were girls, 3 were boys. The youngest victim was a 12-year-old in King County. The charts below outline the ages and race of youth referred to juvenile court for prostitution.
Criminal Justice Response
Criminal Justice Response

Identification and Arrest – Law Enforcement

Training
Training is essential to enable law enforcement to recognize signs and patterns of victimized youth in their community. SB 6476 amendments mandate that all law enforcement agencies create policies and procedures on the handling of domestic minor sex trafficking (DMST) victims by December 1, 2010, with a training plan implemented by January 1, 2011.

The level of training received by law enforcement officers in Washington varied greatly between counties and jurisdictions. Both city and county law enforcement officers are mandated to complete eight hours of continuing education each year. Continuing education courses span the range of criminal charges. Some topics, such as forensic interview training, are complementary to working with commercially sexually exploited youth, though no techniques specific to this population are addressed.

In Snohomish County, members of the Innocence Lost Task Force trained 400 officers on DMST related issues over the last year through regular one-day, in-service training classes. Training content included the role of the task force, victim identification techniques, common indicators of DMST, and video of victims’ speaking about their experiences. This knowledge has increased identification. Law enforcement reported that the local culture toward serving these youth is improving. There are currently four officers within the county dedicated to respond to these victims.

Law enforcement in King County utilizes the YouthCare training program, enabling officers to provide more specialized response to victimized youth. Additionally, the services and support systems available for victims of DMST in Seattle provide resource options for Seattle PD Vice/HRV Unit officers to offer to victims. As a result, officers are becoming increasingly successful in building the necessary relationships with victims to obtain the information needed for investigation and prosecution.

Benton County Sheriff’s Office participants expressed a general lack of awareness of the presence of DMST victims in the region and have received no formal training on the topic. A detective who attended training in Seattle had informally shared the information with colleagues, indicating a need in the department for more formal training on the topic. Richland PD has not received any training on the issue of DMST, though the crime is believed to be prevalent in the area.

A Vancouver PD interviewee commented on the need for formalized internal training for all officers on how to identify and respond to victims. The interviewee noted that Vancouver PD has over 200 officers and more than 50 civilian staff, yet only 15–20 really understand the issue of DMST. Despite the relatively low level of training, Vancouver has experienced success. Officers reported that training provided by Dallas Crimes Against Children and Shared Hope International resulted in better identification, more effective response solutions for potential cases, and two prosecutions. Additionally, support within Vancouver PD has allowed DMST trained law enforcement officers to offer training to other units and respond when a victim of DMST is identified. Vancouver PD has also provided training to the School Resource Officers (SRO) in four Vancouver high schools. At the time of the interview, at least one lead had been generated from a SRO following the training.

In Spokane County, law enforcement agencies have received training from Lutheran Services—a leader in training and awareness in the area. Lutheran Service’s anti-trafficking specialist hosts informal meetings to inform officers on the dynamics of sex trafficking.
Identification

Recent legislation in Washington works to mitigate mislabeling youth exploited through commercial sex. SB 6476 amended RCW § 13.32A.030 (effective July 1, 2011) to add “sexually exploited child” to the definition of “child in need of services” (CHINS). It also added to this section a new definition of “sexually exploited child,” which defines that term as “any person under the age of eighteen who is a victim of the crime of commercial sex abuse of a minor under RCW § 9.68A.100., promoting commercial sexual abuse of a minor under RCW § 9.86A.101, or promoting travel for commercial sexual abuse of a minor under RCW § 9.68A.102.” This effectively puts into place a new procedure for responding to these children that is outside of the criminal justice response.

Upon identification, a sexually exploited child, as defined in RCW § 13.32A.030, may also be taken directly to a secure CRC or CRC and held for up to 15 days without criminal charges (RCW 74.13.034). RCW § 74.15.255 requires each CRC to have a staff member, or “access to a person, who has been trained to work with the needs of sexually exploited children.” If the secure CRC or CRC is unable to provide appropriate treatment, supervision, and the structure to the child, the victim is to be taken to an alternate location that does have these conditions in place. A CHINS petition must be filed within 72 hours by DSHS (RCW 13.23A.140). An alternative response that also keeps the minor out of a juvenile detention facility is diversion. RCW § 13.40.070 mandates diversion for a juvenile's first offense and RCW § 13.40.213 outlines a process for optional diversion of subsequent offenses based on the availability of a comprehensive program for the victim. This legislation provides law enforcement with a legal tool to intervene without apprehending the victim as a criminal.

Participants from all jurisdictions admitted that some youth are not identified as victims until after they are detained for other crimes. Despite significant strides taken in Washington to address the high level of runaways in the state through the Becca Bill, law enforcement expressed frustration with their limited ability to prevent runaways from becoming DMST victims. In Washington, running away is not legally a delinquent offense. This makes it difficult for law enforcement to investigate and rescue youth living on the streets who are particularly vulnerable to being trafficked. One officer recommended the creation of a high-risk victim category that would enable probable cause for subpoenas or search warrants in order to get cell phone records and locate the youth. This would facilitate proactive identification for victims of DMST.

Clark County law enforcement has not identified a prostitution track in the area. Law enforcement reported that girls typically arrive from the smaller, rural areas north of the city or from Portland for “dates” with buyers arranged by Internet or phone. This increases the secrecy of the issue in the region and inhibits identification. However, when victims are identified, Clark County and Vancouver law enforcement reported an informal policy of seeking alternative options before detaining a youth for prostitution. Greater awareness of the issue caused law enforcement officers to immediately seek services for victims rather than charging them with a crime. This response heeds to the intentional culture created to identify youth as victims not criminals. The smaller numbers of identified victims allows law enforcement to seek out alternate options within the community.

Seattle PD Vice/HRV Unit shares the philosophy of approaching DMST as a victim-centered crime with the primary goal to permanently remove the victim from exploitation. However, the larger numbers of recovered youth and limited appropriate shelter options leave them with few options other than detention. In 2010, the Seattle PD Vice/HRV Unit recovered 80 prostituted youth, up from 40 in 2009, 30 in 2008, and 20 in 2007.61 Many of these initial charges were dropped so fewer numbers are reported through the King County Juvenile Detention facility.

Richland PD’s only arrest of a minor for prostitution occurred in 2009. The 16-year-old girl was given diversion. Within the larger Benton County, there was one prior case in 2006 in which the 16-year-old girl was adjudicated and sentenced to probation.

Spokane PD reported a total of six minors charged with prostitution since 2005. It is important to note that two of the victims had exceptionally high runaway reports, 22 runaway reports for one 17-year-old girl and 10 runaway reports for another 17-year-old girl. A 16-year-old male and a 16-year-old female each had five runaway reports prior to their arrest for prostitution.

Snohomish County records revealed 20 youth charged with prostitution since 2005. Seven of those cases, however, originated in King County and another case was transferred to King County, demonstrating the transient nature of these victims along the circuit.

Response

Law enforcement participants noted the population to officer ratio is staggering. In one county, a police officer commented that six officers were responsible for 32 square miles and 100,000 residents. While officers may be motivated to aggressively deal with the local sex trafficking issue, limited resources and manpower significantly hinders the ability for officers to respond proactively and commit dedicated hours to the issue. Law enforcement stated that if their jurisdictions wanted successful results the issue must be prioritized—requiring additional resources such as a dedicated detective or unit.

Additionally, shelter has been and continues to be a key barrier to effective response by law enforcement. Officers in all jurisdictions stated that they have or would arrest victims in order to remove the child from immediate danger. According to a detective, there are no grounds for detaining street youth unless there is a child endangerment issue. After a youth is arrested, officers in all jurisdictions reported that they attempt to contact family members and arrange for the child’s return home. In the case of runaways, unless the minor makes an allegation that abuse is occurring in the home, law enforcement must take the child home or to a CRC. In cases when families refuse to have their children returned home, the problem of shelter is more acute.

The closing of CRCs and secure CRCs throughout participating counties was described as a “critical loss.” Officers consistently reported the negative consequences of this systemic gap, admitting it forces officers to keep youth in their patrol cars or at the police station until Child Protective Services (CPS) can find an emergency placement for dependent youth. This creates a significant burden on officers who cannot complete other responsibilities while waiting for a placement to be obtained. While most youth are cooperative, officers commented on the negative effects of holding victims in a building that is not designed for comfort in an often extremely stressful situation.

Most participating officers remarked that the youth will likely be out on the streets within an hour of being returned home, or the next day at the latest. Youth typically live on the streets because of issues within the home. If the child is returned home without addressing the problems in the home, the cycle continues. Law enforcement also expressed that DSHS routinely returned youth back to potentially unsafe environments based on one or two interviews with family members who often blame the child for “acting out.” Law enforcement attributed this to DSHS working beyond capacity with limited resources. One officer in Snohomish County commented, “We bring ‘em in the front door and they’re out the back before we drive away.” Similarly, a Clark County officer remarked, “We’ll take the report, pick them up, take them home, within an hour, or I guarantee a day, we’re taking another report.” These dynamics hinder law enforcement’s ability for effective response and many felt limited in their ability to intervene until something more tragic has occurred. Without a more formalized and funded process to expand placement options for DMST victims, law enforcement stated that they will continue to treat DMST victims as victims but will be forced to continue to use juvenile detention facilities to provide secure placement for youth.

Collaboration

Officers reported the need for a specialized unit in each department, which would be linked with the missing persons unit, to properly address this crime. Division in response to DMST has been noted as the cause of broken links within the system. It was suggested that a trained, dedicated unit needed to facilitate information sharing and case management for increased effectiveness.
Prosecution - Prosecutors

Training
Training is sporadic and varied among Washington prosecutors. There appears to be a direct correlation between the level of reported training and prosecution activity for DMST. Now that the state law has been amended to reflect the stronger penalties, participants anticipated that more cases would be tried within county jurisdictions.

Prosecutors in King County are setting the standard for prosecuting trafficking cases. King County exhibits a record of successful prosecutions beginning with the 2009 conviction of Deshawn “Cash Money” Clark. The catalyst for these successes is a Senior Deputy King County Prosecuting Attorney who learned about the issue through research and training.

The goal of the Office of Public Defense for Benton/Franklin Counties is to increase expertise among a few attorneys who can be assigned to these cases, rather than assigning them through random rotation. In this way, the attorneys dedicated to this issue will obtain increased exposure and competence. The Office of Public Defense manager is acutely aware of the issue of DMST and is actively pursuing training opportunities for the attorneys in his office. It was noted that there is a culture in Benton's Prosecuting Attorneys Office of being a training ground. The relatively high turnover rate caused by lawyers going into private practice decreases the depth of experience.

Prosecution of Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking Victims
King County is prosecuting “bottom girls” for promoting prostitution. The “bottom girl” is appointed by the trafficker to supervise the stable (other prostituted girls in his control) in his absence, recruit and train new victims, and enforce rules. In certain situations, the “bottom girl” may have easier access to young female victims; therefore, she is often forced to help recruit for the trafficker. Often based in fear, “bottom girls,” develop extreme loyalty to the trafficker and may willingly accept trafficking charges in order to protect the trafficker. With increased attention on the issue of trafficking, pimps are using this method to avert detection and prosecution.

Legal Discrepancies
The state laws pertaining to statutory rape and prostitution are contradictory. Sexual activity between a minor under 18 and an adult could warrant victim services for the child and charges of rape for the adult. However, if that same minor receives compensation for the sexual activity, the child can still be taken into custody on charges of prostitution or loitering for prostitution. A significant step was taken in 2010 when RCW § 7.68.070 was amended to clarify that an applicant for crime victim’s compensation who is identified as the “minor” in the charge of commercial sexual abuse of a minor under RCW § 9.68A.100, promoting commercial sexual abuse of a minor under RCW § 9.68A.101, or promoting travel for commercial sexual abuse of a minor under RCW § 9.68A.102 is considered a victim of a criminal act for the purpose of the right to benefits under this chapter even if the person is also charged with prostitution under RCW § 9A.88.030. Prior to this clarification it was possible for DMST victim to not qualify for crime victim’s compensation if they were arrested for prostitution.

Additionally, while RCW § 13.40.219 (Arrest for prostitution or prostitution loitering) implicitly allowing juveniles to be arrested for prostitution specifies that “in any proceeding under this chapter [Juvenile Justice Act of 1977] related to an arrest for prostitution or prostitution loitering, there is a presumption that the alleged offender [the DMST victim] meets the criteria for a certification as a victim of a severe form of trafficking in persons as defined in section 7105 of Title 22 of the United States code [Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, as amended], and that the alleged offender is also a victim of commercial sex abuse of a minor.” Though the provision does not prohibit the arrest of a minor who is actually a victim, the presumption further defines a prostituted child as a victim of domestic minor sex trafficking.
Laying the foundation of strong legislation that recognizes the survivor of DMST as a victim is imperative for establishing a safety net for identification and services. State-wide training for first responders, including law enforcement, DCFS, all CRC and secure CRC staff as well as crime victim service agencies and organizations, is critical for ensuring that survivors of DMST receive proper victim status and first responders are aware of their option to utilize secure CRCs and CHINS petitions in an effort to engage youth and immediately access services. Development of protocols and institutionalized training will ensure practice follows policy.

**Collaboration**

One example of collaboration comes out of King County. A multidisciplinary team was assembled to create a new deferral system for youth with prostitution charges. The team included a prosecutor, defense attorney, probation counselors, detention case manager, and the director of Harborview Center for Sexual Assault and Trauma. This team worked collectively to determine what was both realistic to ask of youth and what was legally necessary for the program. This treatment-focused solution was implemented in August 2010. The collaboration is ongoing. Probation officers with more knowledge and experience of this issue work with other officers to help them find resources for the minors involved.

A probation officer in King County is using personal time to develop an informal database which will compile information obtained about the trafficking networks based on information collected from youth. Trends have already been identified and information about particular individuals, areas, and groups is growing. Law enforcement and prosecutors can use this information to build cases against perpetrators.

**Adjudication and Detention – Detention/ Probation**

Despite the victim-centered mentality toward DMST among detention staff, the justice system has yet to reflect this philosophy in establishing a formalized process for victims who often are identified informally as a victim but formally as a delinquent. The enactment of SB 6476 in April 2010 attempts to create a baseline structure through the use of CHINS/secure CRCs in a deferral process effective July 2011. Though secure CRCs and CRCs are available for DMST youth, who commonly meet the requirements for placement at one of these facilities, law enforcement more commonly relied on detention centers due to safety and security factors.
Data obtained from the Washington State Office of the Courts reveals how many confirmed DMST victims were referred to the court on “criminal charges” of prostitution. Data was obtained from eight juvenile court locations including: King, Clark, Snohomish, Benton/Franklin, Pierce, Spokane, and Thurston. Information provided below is from 2009–2010:

**Washington State Office of the Courts**  
**Prostitution Criminal Charges Data (2009–2010)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Referral Reasons</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton/Franklin</td>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurston</td>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An additional level of data was able to be obtained from the King County Juvenile Probation. From September 29, 2009 to November 30, 2010, 49 girls were admitted to detention on prostitution/loitering for prostitution charges.

Of those 49 girls, the 31 who had prostitution cases received the following outcomes:
- 13 placed on probation
- 1 sent for more information
- 1 Dismissed Without Prejudice (DWOP)
- 7 DWOP due to diversion completion
- 1 over 18
- 1 sentenced to immediate consequence and terminated due to age
- 1 given probation and had diversion revoked
- 1 still in investigation; no further info
- 2 sent for follow-up
- 2 in diversion process
- 1 on warrant status as investigative case-no further

The 16 girls charged with prostitution loitering charges had the following case outcomes:
- 7 placed on probation
- 2 sent for more information
- 1 DWOP
- 1 DWOP due to diversion completion
- 1 on probation—deferred revoked in end
- 1 still in investigation; no further info
- 3 insufficient information

A juvenile record of delinquency can cause future complications and impediments for youth seeking scholarships, college admittance or employment. Adolescents in Washington may file to have their juvenile records sealed when they turn eighteen, but only if they have had a clean record in the last two years. If a crime was committed during this time, depending on the class of felony, it may be three to five years before their record can be sealed. This predisposes victimized minors to a continued life of victimization with few alternatives available.
Training

While participating administrators each demonstrated a general awareness of the issue of domestic minor sex trafficking, no formal training is required in any of the participating counties for detention officers, probation counselors or juvenile court commissioners and judges. Participants had varying degrees of awareness of DMST. Consistent with other groups of participants, key individuals emerged who developed a personal interest in the issue and obtained information or experience through personal contact with victimized youth. Many others were aware of prostitution among detainees through informal conversations and occasional disclosures of significantly older boyfriends, but rarely had an understanding of the trafficking component. Without exception, all participants from adjudication and detention expressed significant interest in obtaining training on the subject.

Clark County Juvenile Detention Center (CCJDC) stands out in this category due to the intake protocol to identify DMST (see next section). Additionally, in order to properly implement this new procedural change, all staff was required to attend DMST training. The training included detention staff and law enforcement officers from Vancouver PD.

In King County, efforts have been made to train detention and probation staff through an internal process and by YouthCare staff. This has led to increased identification of victims in detention who have often been adjudicated on other charges related to their trafficking.

Identification

One detention officer in King County estimated that 20 to 30 percent of the girls in detention are exploited through prostitution and noted that the numbers had exponentially increased over the past few years.

One commonly noted trend for victimized youth is the frequency with which they come through the courts. They initially come into contact with the courts primarily in dependency trials and evolve to criminal hearings. One King County participant commented on the seemingly endless cycle of court appearances of victims who repeatedly refuse offers of help, denying that they are victims, but repeatedly appear to court beaten and bruised. Though the exploited minor is deemed a victim, the judge may have no other recourse but to put the youth in detention for his or her own safety.

Disclosures of involvement in commercial sex are often made while youth are in detention for other charges. While youth do not typically disclose current involvement in prostitution, they will more frequently disclose prior involvement or awareness of peers being involved. When disclosures or allegations occur through detention or probation, they are reported to law enforcement and CPS. Outside of King and Clark County no reported cases against traffickers or buyers have developed as a result of disclosure by a juvenile in detention. Charges are more commonly prosecuted when the perpetrator is a family member. For example, two cases of fathers sexually exploiting their daughters through Internet-based pornography resulted in more than fifty-year sentences for each man.

CCJDC is leading the way in establishing a more official protocol for DMST identification within its facility. This dynamic collaborative project includes Portland State University (PSU), Clark County Juvenile Detention Center, the YWCA of Vancouver and Shared Hope International. Using Shared Hope’s resource guide and intake tool titled INTERVENE: Identifying and Responding to America’s Prostituted Youth, PSU and CCJDC have launched a pilot project that starts during the youths’ initial intake and connects them with wrap-around community services to increase identification and disclosure. This entire system change and collaborative effort was sparked by a dedicated and passionate detention officer who recognized that DMST victims were coming through the system but were misidentified.
The pilot was officially launched in October 2010 and ran for three and a half months, through January 31, 2011. The first critical step was a mandatory training for all detention and probation staff at CCJDC to provide an understanding of DMST and train them on the pilot protocol. Based on the SHI INTERVENE Tier One Intake Tool, CCJDC and PSU developed a Pre-Screening Tool that was a shorter version to be added to the CCJDC Intake for all youth. This provided an initial opportunity to flag at-risk youth immediately as they entered the facility. 535 individual youth came through the intake process at CCJDC and 47 were flagged and referred onto a second level of assessment (more detailed, comprehensive questions related to DMST exploitation provided in the SHI INTERVENE Intake Tool). A specially trained internal response team took the 47 at-risk youth through the second phase of questions. Of the 47 youth who were asked a second set of questions relating to their potential exploitation through DMST, 11 either disclosed or were flagged as potential victims of domestic sex trafficking.

The next phase involving community response was reported as a crucial step in the process, as youth are often released fairly quickly and connecting them with a community victim advocate is key to providing ongoing care. Once youth are flagged during the phase two questions, detention staff would alert a victim advocate from the YWCA of Clark County. The YWCA would then respond, entering into the third phase of the pilot and asking the SHI INTERVENE Tier 2 questions. In addition to asking a heightened level of questions to confirm or encourage disclosure, the victim advocate was building a relationship with the youth and connecting them to ongoing services—regardless of their situation. In conclusion, six youth were confirmed as DMST victims. Additionally, several youth disclosed to detention staff and/or other persons about DMST victimization outside of the more formal question process. It can be inferred that asking these specific questions opened the door for youth to feel more comfortable sharing these details, even at a later time.

Another critical layer of this identification protocol has been collaboration with law enforcement. Although tracking the investigations and subsequent prosecutions as a result of the pilot was not an official process, juvenile detention staff indicated that building relationships with law enforcement and having access to informed law enforcement who understand dynamics of DMST is a vital resource. Once a youth was flagged as a potential victim, detention staff was able to encourage youth to talk with law enforcement about their situation. It was reported that the process of connecting the youth to law enforcement has resulted in several investigations, two of which led to prosecutions.

Finally, one interviewee from Clark County reported that general detention procedures warranted revision to meet the needs and challenges of this population. For example, youth in detention in Clark County have certain phone privileges allowing them phone access to call whomever they want. If a pimp has given the youth access to a calling card number, the youth could call the pimp from detention. At the time of the interview, staff at the detention facility were engaged in conversations on how to limit additional restrictions imposed on DMST-identified youth while still providing the level of security necessary for the minor's safety and well-being. Additionally, interviewees suggested that STD testing should be mandatory to facilitate increased identification of victims of trafficking and youth who were being sexually abused in other ways.
Child Protective Services
Child Protective Response

Legislation
The Washington State Legislature’s definition of child abuse and neglect includes domestic minor sex trafficking (DMST) victims. The Washington State Legislature defines “abuse and neglect” as “sexual abuse, sexual exploitation, or injury of a child by any person under circumstances which indicate that the child’s health, welfare, or safety, excluding conduct permitted under RCW § 9A.16.100; or the negligent treatment or maltreatment of a child by a person responsible for or providing care to the child. An abused child is a child who has been subjected to child abuse or neglect as defined in this section.” “Sexual exploitation,” is defined in RCW 26.44.020 as:

(a) allowing, permitting, compelling, encouraging, aiding, or otherwise causing a child to engage in prostitution by any person or (b); allowing, permitting, compelling, encouraging, aiding, or otherwise causing a child to engage in the obscene or pornographic activity to be photographed, filming, or depicting of a child by any person.

As a result of the inclusion of sexual exploitation, which covers prostitution, pornography, and sexual performances, DMST victims are considered abused or neglected for the purposes of Washington law and can receive a child protective response. While resource limitations may require CPS to prioritize younger children with greater threats of imminent danger, it is clear that the Washington law allows for CPS to intervene in the life of any child, under the age of 18 who is being sexually exploited by any adult—familial or non-familial.

Despite the law allowing for this CPS response, most interviewees indicated that CPS would only become involved if a family member was involved in the abuse.

Additionally, the Division of Children and Family Services (DCFS) interviewee from Clark County indicated that neglect charges could result if a parent had reason to believe that someone was trafficking his/her child and the parent did not file a police report or take other action.

According to the Clark County interviewee, a parent could also actively seek help for his/her child through the Family Reconciliation Services (FRS), a service offered by the DCFS. This unique program focuses on youth ages 13–17 and helps their families deal with problems such as a child running away, refusal to follow reasonable family rules, or serious problems between parents and their child. Since many DMST victims also display the problems FRS addresses, it is a potential service that parents could use to reach their child victims.

Training
CPS interviewees in Clark, King, and Benton County were not aware of any formalized training provided by their agency on DMST. The Clark County interviewee mentioned that Shared Hope International provided a training locally, which some CPS workers attended.

Systemic Structure and Interagency Collaboration
Research indicates that because the Tri-Cities are located within three adjoining counties, local agencies exhibit particularly collaborative interagency relationships and strong communication amongst groups. To foster the relationship between law enforcement and CPS, each law enforcement agency has a CPS worker embedded in its precinct, station, and/or department. This arrangement bridges a communication gap that previously existed and prevents cases and children from falling through the cracks as they had a tendency to do prior to this arrangement. To further facilitate the relationship between CPS and law enforcement, CPS Central Intake sends reports on cases simultaneously to both the jurisdictional CPS liaison and law enforcement agency. Moreover, working relationships are strengthened from the consistency of working with the same individuals over time.
An Everett service provider commented on the efforts to get CPS involved with the Prostitution Prevention Network to increase CPS’s awareness of the issue in Snohomish. The service provider indicated that it was always a struggle to gain the involvement of CPS in the issue. However, the interviewee expressed hope that continued mandated involvement would ultimately increase CPS’s investment in the problem.

The Clark County DCFS reported that local law enforcement contacted their department to request the inclusion of a CPS worker during Operation Cross Country activities. Both law enforcement and the DCFS worker indicated that this was a great step forward for future collaborative efforts.

The King County DCFS interviewee was aware of a Seattle-based task force on human trafficking, but had not attended a meeting to date.

Identification

A variety of interviewees noted that DCFS/CPS seems to have a lack of organizational impetus to proactively identify DMST. Additionally, interviewees were concerned by the lack of institutional training on DMST. All DCFS/CPS interviewees were acutely aware that family members who sold their children for sexual activity qualified as child abusers. However, this allegation of child abuse would need to arise during an investigation in order for CPS to take action. Additionally, as mentioned previously, CPS interviewees possessed less of an understanding of DCFS/CPS’s role in a DMST case if the offender was not a caretaker or family member.

In 2009, the Spruce Street Secure Crisis Residential Center took initiative to add questions into their intake document to better screen for youths’ involvement in prostitution. As a result, Spruce Street developed six questions to help flag DMST. To create the questions Spruce Street utilized institutional knowledge of the youth they serve and the intake tool provided in the resource INTERVENE: Identifying and Responding to America’s Prostituted Youth by Shared Hope International. These questions are:

- How do you take care of yourself while away from home?
- While you were away from home did anything keep you from going back?
- Has anyone asked you to do anything sexually that made you feel uncomfortable?
- Does this person give you money, drugs, clothes, shelter?
- Did you have a way to make money while on the run? How?
- Are you in control of your money or has someone offered to manage it for you?

To supplement the information from these questions, staff utilizes information provided by law enforcement officers including the location where the youth was taken into custody, whether the youth was involved in a sting, and who the youth was found with. The law enforcement information combined with information from the intake questionnaire helps staff determine whether youth are involved in prostitution.

Spruce Street collected data on the DMST victims they served in 2009 and 2010 to measure the result of the revised identification process. The results are displayed in the tables below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Data on DMST Victims Served</th>
<th>2010 Data on DMST Victims Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Youth Served: <strong>541</strong></td>
<td>Individual Youth Served: <strong>633</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Involved in Prostitution: <strong>68</strong></td>
<td>Number Involved in Prostitution: <strong>55</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-15 yrs old</td>
<td>43 Female</td>
<td>12-15 yrs old</td>
<td>22 Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18 yrs old</td>
<td>25 Male</td>
<td>16-18 yrs old</td>
<td>33 Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18 yrs old</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16-18 yrs old</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Several locations were also exploring the availability of Children’s Justice and Advocacy Centers for DMST victims. Children’s Justice and Advocacy Centers provide multi-disciplinary, victim-centered child abuse investigation teams. For example, in Benton County, all victims are referred to the Prosecuting Attorney’s Child Haven forensic interviewer. This procedure allows for a more thorough, less traumatic interview of victims. Despite this approach, youth are often reluctant to reveal the identity of their trafficker due to the intense trauma bonding that occurs between the victim and the trafficker who the victim considers to be their boyfriend.

Dawson Place Children’s Advocacy Center in Everett serves youth throughout Snohomish County. Through this program, a forensic interviewer interviews victims in an environment designed to increase feelings of safety and security for traumatized youth. Though youth frequently refuse to divulge the identity of their trafficker during these interviews, they are still able to utilize mental health and case management services at Dawson Place Children’s Advocacy Center. Occasionally, this continued support results in the eventual disclosure of the trafficker’s identity.

Additionally, the Children’s Justice Center in Clark County has acknowledged that since DMST always involves criminal child abuse, the Center can serve as a central location for both identification and response to DMST. On location, this accredited center has a child forensic interviewer, law enforcement, victim advocacy, medical, CPS, and prosecutors who are trained to work with children who have experienced abuse. Additionally, one interviewee from the Center helped several other organizations and agencies provide training to social service providers on DMST issues.

**Investigations**

Participants in all jurisdictions repeatedly commented both directly and discreetly that CPS does not appear to focus much attention on older teens (15–17 year olds). This lack of attention was most often attributed to overwhelming caseloads and limited resources, which are first directed to the younger victims. CPS’s involvement may also be limited because of the belief that the role of CPS is focused only on abuse specifically in the home or by a parent/guardian. CPS involvement also requires detailed identifying information such as a name and address where the victim can be reached for an interview, which can be difficult due to the frequency that traffickers move their victims.

A participant in King County reported that CPS clearly has not received training and CPS does not appear to know what to do with the information it is given in these cases. Additionally, in several counties law enforcement expressed concerned that those working at the CPS placement facility do not receive training on DMST. This lack of training at placement facilities increases the likelihood that the youth will run away. When workers at a placement facility are untrained and the facility is non-secure, and a youth runs, it stalls law enforcement’s ability to build a case. As one law enforcement officer stated:

> **When a DMST victim does not feel safe or understood, they run back to what is familiar – even if that is a situation of abuse. Additionally, the trafficker has often told them that if you don’t come back, I’ll find you or your family and hurt them. If a young person thinks they or their family are unsafe, they’ll do whatever the trafficker says to try and protect them. These are not idle threats.**

Service providers and law enforcement alike mentioned that once CPS became involved in a case, it was nearly impossible to remain in contact with that youth. To begin to improve this situation, Clark County law enforcement brought CPS on-site for a proactive sting operation, just in case they recovered a minor. Since agencies were involved from the beginning, this procedure began to establish a working relationship and allows for more information sharing. However, this arrangement is not always possible. Regardless, nearly every NGO and law enforcement agency identified that DSHS/CPS lacked a presence at most trainings and meetings regarding DMST in the state of Washington.
Protection/Services

The Becca Bill, passed in 1995 provided both law enforcement and DSHS with additional tools to improve their ability to intervene in the lives of youth at-risk for DMST. Most importantly, the Becca Bill created and funded the establishment of the Family Reconciliation Services, a service available when a parent files an At-Risk Youth (ARY) petition.

Washington state law defines an At-Risk Youth (ARY) as a juvenile:

(a) who is absent from home for at least 72 consecutive hours without consent of the youth’s parent;
(b) who is beyond the control of the youth’s parent such that the youth’s behavior endangers the health, safety, or welfare of the youth or any other person; or
(c) who has a substance abuse problem for which there are no pending criminal charges related to the substance abuse.

An At-Risk Youth petition allows custodial parents to ask for a juvenile court’s help in keeping their adolescent at home and setting reasonable conditions that the youth must follow, such as going to school, following family rules, or attending counseling sessions. If the youth disobeys a court order, the youth may be held in contempt of court and placed in a detention facility for up to seven days. If a parent requests an ARY petition, the parent still retains legal custody of the youth. While parents are not required to pay for the FRS assessment and counseling, the parents may be required to pay for other services. Prior to filing an ARY petition, parents must complete a family assessment with the local DCFS office.

Additionally, SB 6476, which passed in 2010, started to legislatively outline that DMST youth identified by law enforcement could utilize a CHINS petition to gain access to the DSHS-run secure CRCs, like other at-risk youth. Under this law, when all efforts to resolve at-risk youth behavior have been exhausted and the parents or DSHS are concerned about the safety and well-being of a youth, the parents and/or youth can file a CHINS petition for that youth to be placed outside the home.

Washington state law defines a child in need of services as a juvenile:

(a) who is beyond the control of the youth’s parent, such that the youth’s behavior endangers the health, safety, or welfare of the youth or other person;
(b) who has been reported to law enforcement as absent without consent for at least 24 consecutive hours on two or more separate occasions from the home of either parent, a CRC, an out-of-home placement, or a court-ordered placement; and
(i) has exhibited a serious substance abuse problem; or
(ii) has exhibited behaviors that create a serious risk of harm to the health, safety, or welfare of the child or any other person; or
(c) (i) who is in need of necessary services, including food, shelter, health care, clothing, or education; or services designed to maintain or reunite the family;
(ii) who lacks access to, or has declined to utilize, these services; and
(iii) whose parents have evidenced continuing but unsuccessful efforts to maintain the family structure or are unable or unwilling to continue efforts to maintain the family structure.

64 Ibid.
Recognizing that youth exploited in commercial sex are victims in need of care and services rather than arrest, SB 6476 outlined a process for law enforcement to direct youth involved in prostitution to a secure CRC, if such a facility exists and resources are available. This law provides a substantial shift in the status of youth involved in prostitution who have historically been labeled as delinquents and sent to detention, instead of receiving social services.

DSHS funds secure CRCs, which are specifically designed as protective residential centers for runaway youth. The secure CRCs are physically secure, short-term residential facilities. Interviewees indicated that runaways stay for a minimum of 24 hours and maximum of five consecutive days. In contrast, according to SB 6476, DMST-diverted youth can stay for a maximum of 15 days. Interviewees indicated that they can and have transferred youth between secure CRCs and CRCs if they had concern about returning youth to a specific living situation or significant concern about the particular youth. Secure CRC counselors work with families to resolve the immediate conflict, facilitate reconciliation between parents and the youth, and provide referral to additional services.

Oak Grove is the secure CRC in Clark County. It is a modest facility that is bright and comfortable inside. Despite the term “secure” it does not feel detention-like inside Oak Grove, though the facility requires all windows and doors to be locked. One exception to the level of security secure CRCs provide is caused by the fire code, which requires the posting of instructions of how to unlock the doors “in case of emergency.” Therefore, while the main door of every secure CRC remains locked from the outside, the inside has instructions on how to unlock the door “in case of emergency.” As a result, the youth have the ability to run from this “secure” facility. Oak Grove erected a tall fence outside the facility to deter youth from running from the facility. Unfortunately, shortly after Oak Grove constructed the fence, another code required that they build a handrail along the walkway. This handrail now provides youth who run with the platform to hoist themselves over the fence. This problem has been extremely discouraging and frustrating to Oak Grove staff who attempt to keep youth in the facility and safe.

Spruce Street, the secure CRC and CRC in Seattle expressed similar frustration in trying to keep youth from running away. However, Spruce Street also expressed frustration about the short time they have with the youth. One interviewee mentioned that trust takes time to build and it seems that as soon as they are making progress, the youth is returned home or moved to another facility.

Other options for DMST victims funded by DSHS are CRCs which are short-term, semi-secure facilities for runaway youth and adolescents in conflict with their families. CRCs also have a five day maximum stay.

Counselors at the CRC (typically, in collaboration with an FRS social worker) work with the family and youth to resolve the immediate conflict. Counselors will also work with the youth and family to develop better ways of dealing with conflict in the future. This procedure opens the door for the family to receive referrals for additional services if other needs are identified. However, DSHS does not pay for all of these additional services.

**Funding**

Although DCFS/CPS staff referenced the DCFS FRS program numerous times, staff also mentioned that in times of budgetary difficulties, this program was often one of the first programs to receive cut-backs. DSHS runs an online Client Services Database that outlines program expenses and the number of clients served.

In Clark County in 2008, the FRS program served 750 youth at a total cost of $403,205 or approximately $538/youth. No data for the cost of the program exists in the system for 2009 or 2010, although the program is listed in the system. The Client Service Database has data for all other programs. Due to this lack of data, it is unclear whether FRS was cut altogether or just realigned under a different line item in the computer system.

King County reflects the same trend. In King County in 2008, the FRS program served 2,467 youth at a total cost of $950,878 or approximately $385/youth. As with Clark County, although the program is listed for 2009 and 2010, the system has no data for this program.
Additionally, secure CRC staff in King and Clark Counties was not familiar with the newly passed legislation diverting DMST youth directly into their facilities. While the staff expressed excitement about their ability to more directly assist these youth, they were discouraged to hear that this legislation was passed without any additional funding to these facilities. Secure CRC staff also expressed interest in the bill because they recently heard that secure CRCs were going to receive budget cuts in the next fiscal year.
Non-Governmental Organizations

Community Response
Community Response/ NGO

“This community needs to know we have a problem and it’s getting worse.”

— service provider

Training

Service and shelter providers play a critical role in rebuilding lives that have been broken from domestic minor sex trafficking. Several interviewees commented on how dynamic and complex domestic minor sex trafficking (DMST) victims are due to their experiences with early-onset and chronic trauma. All staff in first responder, service provider roles should be trained on the dynamics of DMST. Furthermore, it was noted that well-intentioned but untrained service providers may inadvertently cause harm to the victim.

Washington does not mandate DMST training for service providers. However, training has been provided by Shared Hope International (SHI) and YouthCare, both of which have been identified as training leaders in the state. The organizations have developed a variety of training programs and resources that interviewees referenced throughout the interview process.

Shared Hope International, based in Southwest Washington, is responsible for training over 500 first responders throughout Washington. SHI developed two training resources, Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking: Identifying and Responding to America’s Trafficked Youth and INTERVENE: Identifying and Responding to America’s Prostituted Youth, to facilitate increased identification and more effective response. The INTERVENE training is targeted to social service providers and juvenile detention and probation officers. It aims to equip these individuals to recognize indicators of trafficking, create intake tools that assist in victim identification, use trauma-informed techniques in dealing with victims, and access appropriate resources for victims. SHI works with state legislators to develop and then advocate for the passage of legislation to combat domestic minor sex trafficking and protect victims. Additionally, using the Protected Innocence Legislative Framework, SHI grades state law and provides recommendations on the policy principles required to create a safe environment for children and combat domestic minor sex trafficking. In early 2011, Shared Hope International evaluated Washington’s laws and the state received a grade of C.

YouthCare, based in Seattle, developed a variety of dynamic training programs addressing DMST. YouthCare’s most comprehensive training is a 40-hour training that the City of Seattle contracted YouthCare to provide to first responders. In an effort to provide shorter training options to first responders, YouthCare also developed two sequential courses entitled Commercial Sexual Exploitation 101 and Commercial Sexual Exploitation 102. In addition to internal training, YouthCare offers the courses to law enforcement, service providers, and community members. Because YouthCare provides services for DMST victims, training also informs first responders on the resources available to DMST victims.

Lutheran Services in Spokane conducts training for law enforcement, service providers, churches, schools, and community groups. In response to the need in the community, the organization has created the unique role of Anti-Trafficking Specialist. The implementation of this position, community awareness, and law enforcement training resulted in the first case against a trafficker being built by Spokane PD at the time of this report.

Several NGO interviewees noted that they attended a training hosted by GEMS (Girls Educational and Mentoring Services). Although GEMS is based in New York, it is nationally recognized as a leader in providing services to commercially sexually exploited girls. The City of Seattle funded GEMS to conduct training in Seattle for first responders, including service providers.
Identification

Nearly every service provider interviewed was able to recall at least several current or past clients who exhibited indicators of DMST. The process for identification is inconsistent and victims are receiving a variety of labels that further confuse their proper identification as victims. However, significant progress was reported from organizations that received training and subsequently added questions to the intake process to foster greater disclosure and identification. Two secure CRCs, Spruce Street in Seattle and Oak Grove in Vancouver, have seen a marked spike in disclosure since adding these questions to both the intake and informal conversations.

“It was almost like they were just waiting for someone to ask them the right question – to open the door and take away the burden of them having to bring it up.”

– service provider

Recognizing the intersections between at-risk runaway, homeless, and abused youth and DMST is critical to establishing an identification and response process for this victim population. Additionally, youth drop-in center and shelter staff were often told by youth that their pimps knew the rules for the different shelters—they knew which ones they could run away from and which ones were more difficult to leave.

Nearly all service providers identified funding and a lack of resources as a challenge to providing DMST youth with the intensive case management and complex services needed. Additionally, while secure CRCs are an initial basis for intervention, many providers indicated that maximum length of stay, five days, was too short to effectively serve youth. Recent closures of the majority of these sites throughout the state have further impeded the ability to develop the necessary comprehensive services.

Outlined below are some of the service providers who were interviewed and a summary of the types of service and shelter they provide that could assist in the identification and restoration of DMST victims.

Outreach

Street outreach programs provide a critical bridge to youth entrapped by pimps. Successful outreach workers indicated that doing outreach in areas of high prostitution and to potential victims of DMST requires in-depth training and knowledge of the victim population, especially the dynamics of pimp-control. Outreach workers in nearly every location indicated that uninformed outreach can do more harm than good and potentially cause pimps to hurt the girls or move the girls further underground if the pimps perceive outreach workers as a threat.

Groups that conduct successful outreach services typically provide youth with items they need on the streets, such as food, water, condoms, hygiene kits or clean needles. Additionally, outreach workers often distribute cards or other items that discretely list a hotline number so youth know where to call should they need additional services. The goal of outreach is to begin building relationships between youth and safe adults to foster additional options for youth who often feel they have no alternative.
New Horizons Ministry has been conducting outreach to homeless youth and commercially sexually exploited women and children in Seattle for twelve years. The weekly Late Night Outreach is conducted from 10:30pm to 2:30am and encounters youth twelve and older, though the number of individuals is kept confidential. Their philosophy is a “ministry of presence.” Instead of removing victims from the streets, volunteers provide outreach services from a neutral street corner by building relationships, supporting victims, and providing condoms, hot chocolate, and coffee. New Horizons Ministry also has two mobile outreach vehicles that provide the same services. They are currently developing a strategy for pimps who often get into the life because they were raised in it or believe they have few legal means for making money.

Auburn Youth Resources in South King County also has an outreach program for street youth ages twelve and older. Volunteers perform outreach at state parks, community centers, transit centers, and bus stops. One to two days a week they focus on the commercially sexually exploited youth on Pacific Highway. Volunteers distribute safe sex kits, hygiene kits, and clean needle kits. The goal of the program is to engage youth through building relationships to support youth when they are ready to seek help.

Genesis Project in Seattle conducts outreach with Rising Above Sexual Exploitation (R.A.S.E.) twice a week on the Pacific Highway track. R.A.S.E. distributes condoms, hygiene supplies, and clean needles, with the intent to build relationships with youth so that victims have a support resource when they want to exit the life.

Additionally, Washington offers several needle exchange outreach programs. Though interviewees from these programs were keenly aware that their service population overlapped in vulnerabilities with DMST youth, the programs did not have a process of formal identification for DMST victims or refer them to appropriate resources.

Drop-in Centers & DMST Services

Drop-in facilities provide youth with the ability to engage with service providers and case managers in a more youth-friendly, informal environment.

In Everett, Cocoon House operates U-Turn, a drop-in center for street-dependent youth. U-Turn is open four days a week for four hours each afternoon. Funded partially by the Violence Intervention Program grant, U-Turn provides youth ages 13 and older with mentoring, bus tickets, condoms, food, hygiene supplies, and biweekly access to a nurse. Youth can access more support through Project Safe and a variety of other wrap-around services in the community. Cocoon House also operates a 16-bed shelter for youth ages 13–17. The shelter is voluntary and youth must have parental or DSHS permission. Shelter stays can range from a few months to several years depending on the placing agency and type of bed available for the youth. Different funding sources allow varying levels of time for youth to occupy a bed. For example, youth occupying a hope bed may only stay 30 days. However, staff is usually able to coordinate ways for youth to stay longer if they are interested in continuing to receive assistance.

Daybreak is a five-bed CRC in Spokane that can provide emergency shelter and services for up to 15 days. Because of its position as a funded mandate of DSHS it has reported the most response and interaction with CPS. Daybreak has a drug dependency program on site along with other therapeutic and case management options.

In Clark County, Shared Hope International’s WIN training program is designed to help women develop vocational skills and gain practical job experience. Typically the women have histories of domestic abuse, drug addiction, and/or time in a correctional facility, which is often a result of their exploitation through sex trafficking as a youth. The nine-month WIN training program offers women vocational training and experience to foster employment and sustainable financial security. Women in the program commit 20–25 hours a week to train on-site and are provided a stipend.

Oak Bridge is a crisis intervention and temporary shelter in Clark County for homeless, abused, and at-risk youth. Oak Bridge has four CRC beds, four hope beds, two community beds, and one federally funded bed. Due to the
variety of funding sources, Oak Bridge can serve both state-dependent and non-state involved youth ages 9 to 17. Utilizing 24-hour access, family reunification and mediation services, and aftercare support, this shelter is designed to be home-like and youth-friendly. Depending on the minor’s specific situation, as well as the beds available, youth can stay from five days (CRC bed) to 90 days (hope bed); the average stay is 3 to 15 days. Additionally, in Clark County there is a secure CRC facility called Oak Grove. This provides a built-in network between facilities to get additional time, resources, and differing levels of intervention for potential DMST victims. Oak Grove has added specific questions to its intake process regarding DMST. Oak Bridge was working to incorporate additional questions at the time of the interview.

Spruce Street in Seattle has 16 secure CRC beds and 3 CRC beds on shared grounds. Youth may be referred by law enforcement or service providers. Because of additional community funding, Spruce Street is able to provide ongoing case management until the youth turns 24. Spruce Street has also implemented a specific intake process to help identify DMST youth, which has assisted with providing referrals and informing placement decisions.

Crosswalk (VOA) Spokane provides a drop-in center, emergency shelter, and school for youth. It serves approximately 1,000 youth each year ages 13–17. Emergency shelter is available 365 days a year and all services are free for youth. Those interviewed from Crosswalk were aware of DMST youth accessing its services, including both boys and girls. Youth regularly come in to get the most recent copy of the “Bad Trick” list, a descriptive compilation of buyers who are reported to be abusive or threatening, as a means of protection. Additionally, Crosswalk communicates with Seattle PD and YouthCare regarding DMST youth who return to Spokane after being trafficked to Seattle or youth who are picked up by pimps in Spokane with Seattle as their expected destination.

Also in Spokane, Odyssey Youth Center operates a drop-in center for LGBTQ youth in the area. It was noted that there is a distinct separation of youth who frequent Crosswalk and those who attend Odyssey. This did not, however, preclude the possibility of DMST victims, but the new director was, as yet, unaware of the commercial sexual exploitation among his participants. Conversely, Vista Youth Center in Benton/Franklin Counties, a drop-in center for LGBTQ youth, was acutely aware of the increased incidence of DMST among their participants, usually in the form of “sugar daddies” for the males. Providing direct service, counseling, and social services, staff focuses on education, disease prevention, and safety issues.

YouthREACH is a collaborative partnership between Youth Family and Adult Connections (YFA) and Volunteers of America (VOA) to provide street outreach, access to shelter services, referrals, and other necessary support to runaway and homeless youth living on the streets of Spokane County and northern Idaho. Outreach teams engage with street youth to establish trust, foster support, and build opportunities for youth to leave the streets and access services and safe housing. YouthREACH also offers immediate access to emergency shelter, including housing, food, clothing, medical care, and financial assistance; individualized assessment and service plan development; individual, group, and family counseling; and case management focusing on accessing necessary community services and finding safe living situations. A particularly effective tool is the YouthREACH Resource Book, a pocket-sized booklet including emergency and crisis lines, health care providers, drug and alcohol rehab resources, education and employment services, as well as shelter, transportation, and food providers.

While designed to provide education supports and advocacy for foster children, Treehouse for Kids, a division of DCFS in Benton and Franklin Counties is on the frontlines of identifying DMST victims in grade school. In several cases, truancy and educational issues stemmed from commercial sexual exploitation. Educational advocates, upon discovery of this link, work with local law enforcement, NGOs, and school staff to create service plans that not only support the educational needs of these youth, but the issues in the family of origin that created vulnerability for these young victims.

Catholic Charities Childbirth and Parenting Services program in Spokane provides supportive services and education to pregnant women. Though not intentionally designed to do so, victims or survivors of DMST are sometimes identified. Staff work within the network of area NGOs to create collaborative service plans to support their
psychological, physical, and medical needs. The YWCA of Spokane and Abuse Recovery Ministries are additional NGOs that, while designed to support victims of domestic violence, became aware through the interview process of the potential of DMST among their cases.

YWCA Vancouver has a variety of groups where DMST youth could become involved. YWCA's victim advocates are involved in completing trafficking intakes at the CCJDC and providing ongoing case management and services to youth who are identified as victims of domestic sex trafficking. The YWCA in Vancouver has an in-depth understanding of DMST and is considered a substantial resource for victims as identification increases through the area.

See below for more comprehensive information on YouthCare.

Additionally, several needle exchange outreach programs were interviewed for this research. These programs were keenly aware that their population overlapped in vulnerabilities with DMST youth. However, the programs did not have anything in place to formally identify DMST victims or refer them to appropriate resources. One notable program is the Spokane Regional Health District's Needle Exchange Program, which consistently encountered Becca in the months before her murder. This program also compiles the “Bad Trick” list, a descriptive compilation of buyers who are reported to be abusive or threatening.

Cooperative Relationships

The level of cooperation between law enforcement and service providers varies greatly between counties, agencies, and even individuals. Some jurisdictions have NGOs actively providing services to sexually exploited youth while law enforcement maintains that the issue is not prevalent in their jurisdiction. In contrast, other counties have significant awareness and investment in identifying the DMST victim population, but either have no resources or are unaware of what resources are available within the community. These counties depend on the knowledge of key individuals to advocate for victimized youth rather than a designated program or system. Clark, King, and Snohomish Counties each have strong alliances between a variety of service providers and law enforcement agencies that raise awareness and change the cultures in their communities. Spokane has a highly proactive coalition of NGOs and service providers. The Tri-Cities of Kennewick, Pasco, and Richland have the added dimension of being in two counties, Benton and Franklin. These cities and counties share some resources, including the juvenile court. Rather than being a hindrance, this unique situation, by all reports of interviewees, appears to have necessitated and enhanced inter-jurisdictional and interagency communication.

The Children's Justice Center in Clark County and Child Advocacy Center in Snohomish County are leading multi-disciplinary models for comprehensively identifying and responding to child abuse. Social workers, law enforcement, prosecutors, victim advocates, child forensic interviewers, medical, and mental health professionals work together in a victim-centered environment to investigate and build cases. This multi-disciplinary approach significantly reduces the negative impact of building cases against offender by providing an entire team trained on how to approach and work with victims of trauma. Since victims of DMST are victims of childhood sexual exploitation it would be appropriate for these teams to be future trained on the dynamics specific to DMST so that this system could be empowered to engage this victim population as well.

One NGO participant commented that there are community services available, such as Department of Children and Family Services, which are not adequately utilized for this population. This participant stated:

*I think all of the services that we need to have, have stakeholders, like those agencies exist. Maybe the partnerships don’t exist, maybe the resources and the public awareness don’t necessarily exist, but the system that’s supposed to help support all kids exists. We just have to figure out how to make that safety net actually include these kids.*

-Service provider
Most service providers indicated that CPS provided very little support for this population. Service providers did acknowledge that many of the mandated reports did not provide the information (i.e. names and addresses of abusers) CPS needed to intervene on behalf of the victims. Service providers held the general presumption that CPS workers lacked knowledge and training about the DMST population. In addition service providers believed CPS workers were overwhelmed with unmanageable caseloads that necessitated focusing on the younger and even more vulnerable children in the community.

The Sexual Exploitation Intervention Network in King County includes representatives from YouthCare, Orion Center, Spruce Street, The Bridge, and a probation officer. This group provides awareness and networking opportunities for area professionals.

**Shelter**

In King County, YouthCare developed and currently operates the only shelter facility that specifically serves DMST victims. The program is described in detail in the section below, Model Community Collaboration Program.

Cocoon House in Everett also operates a 16-bed shelter for youth ages 13–17. The shelter is voluntary and youth must have parental or DSHS permission. Shelter stays can range from a few months to several years depending on the placing agency and type of bed available for the youth. Different funding streams provide varying levels of time for youth to occupy a bed. For example, a Hope bed has a 30-day stay limit attached to it. However, staff are usually able to coordinate ways for youth to stay longer if they are interested in continuing to receive assistance.

Daybreak is a five-bed CRC in Spokane that can provide emergency shelter and services for up to 15 days. Because of their position as a funded mandate of DSHS they have reported the most response and interaction with CPS. They have a drug dependency program on-site along with other therapeutic and case management options.

As described above, Crosswalk has emergency shelter services, and while designed for short-term stays, one youth lived there from age 12 until her emancipation, due to the lack of other available options.

**Model Community Collaboration Program**

Seattle displays a progressive systems structure to identify and respond to youth who have been or are at risk of being exploited through sex trafficking. The comprehensive knowledge of the issue and significant experience with victims has enabled a select group of first responders in Seattle to develop, and continually hone, an informed response solution.

In a majority of locations around the U.S., the variable education, awareness, and response methods of law enforcement, prosecutors, detention centers, and social service providers has left significant gaps in the level and consistency of service offered to exploited youth. The community of professionals in Seattle has developed an integrated system of care to seal the gaps that many communities find negligible. The following provides a summary of the Seattle and larger King County’s model response and promising practices as noted in assessment interviews.

This model is informed by research commissioned and funded by the City of Seattle Human Services Department Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Prevention Division and implemented by Debra Boyer of Boyer Research. In 2008, when Boyer’s report “Who Pays the Price? Assessment of Youth Involvement in Prostitution in Seattle” was released it launched the issue of DMST to the forefront. The commission of research on this issue is a message of priority from the city. The research provided a baseline understanding of the issue and enabled key stakeholders to develop a plan of action for addressing DMST in Seattle.
Several shelters and detention centers are available for emergency DMST placement including Spruce Street, a secure CRC; the YouthCare short-term emergency shelter; and the county detention center. To alleviate the disparity in training and awareness among these various shelters, YouthCare can provide case management to youth in all of these facilities. YouthCare is a local service provider in the Seattle area that offers a continuum of services, primarily for runaway and homeless youth, that include outreach, emergency shelter, services, housing, counseling, education, and employment training.

Recognizing the importance of integrating these two systems and connecting potential and confirmed victims of DMST with a continuum of community-based services, YouthCare case managers receive referrals from detention centers and probation officers when a youth is identified as being commercially sexually exploited or at risk for becoming commercially sexually exploited. YouthCare case managers also meet with a majority of females entering detention to provide a more comprehensive and informed intake assessment to increase DMST identification. Through a grant from King County, case managers assist females 12 to 19 years old with the juvenile justice system, housing, employment, school, and provide referrals for treatment. Intensive case management is provided for 50 girls a year and low level case management is provided for 120 youth a year. Providing youth with a consistent case manager allows them to develop rapport and trust with the adult, which ultimately helps to facilitate increased disclosure, identification, accountability, assistance, and support.

Mandatory diversion is applicable to youth who receive a charge of prostitution. Other offenses allow a youth to be diverted twice before entering into the juvenile justice system. Youth charged with prostitution, however, are allowed to enter the diversion program seven times before entering the juvenile justice system. Additional diversion opportunities account for a dynamic unique to this population as they are often forced to commit crimes and have increased exposure to law enforcement on the street.

Youth who enter diversion for prostitution are mandated to attend four hours of counseling at Harborview Center for Sexual Assault and Traumatic Stress and four hours with YouthCare. Previously, the diversion program required youth to attend eight hours of counseling at Harborview. Professionals found that many youth were unable to complete eight hours at Harborview because the youth did not have the skills to understand the paperwork and make an appointment for treatment, the time management skills to attend the appointment or transportation to the facility. By requiring youth to complete four hours of counseling at Harborview and four hours with YouthCare, they are still guaranteed to receive a professional mental health assessment but now receive the assistance of a community advocate to help them make the appointment, transport them to the facility and debrief with them after their appointment. This solution also provides an opportunity for the child to develop trust and rapport with the community advocate who may continue to provide support and accountability after diversion is complete and the child returns to their community.

Seattle also provides youth with emergency services through YouthCare's Orion Drop-In Center. The Orion Center is located in downtown Seattle and provides youth with a variety of services including meals, case management, showers, lockers, laundry, and food and hygiene banks. The Orion Center is often the initial point of entry for youth into YouthCare’s other services. The Orion Center offers an interagency school for youth who reside in YouthCare shelters. Additionally, the Orion Center houses YouthCare’s employment training programs which include YWCA's Working Zone Tile Project; the Barista Training and Education Program; and YouthTech. Youth enrolled in the training programs receive minimum wage in addition to internship opportunities and job development, placement, and retention services.

Youth are also offered emergency services by several organizations that conduct street outreach. New Horizons provides food, clothing, case management, relational counseling, and other emergency services to Seattle street youth. Additionally, YouthCare offers outreach services at least five nights a week, educating youth on shelter options and community resources, transporting youth to health clinics, providing food, clothes, hygiene packs, and first aid care. Both of these programs are designed to facilitate trust and rapport between street youth and a caring, supportive adult. Taking the program out of the walls of a building and going to where youth are congregating on the streets is a critical bridge to identifying and responding to their specific needs.
YouthCare offers a unique shelter system, specifically designed to work within the parameters necessary to effectively serve victimized youth. Two shelter facilities, the Shelter and Bridge, offer short-term, emergency placement and long-term, therapeutic placement, respectively. The Shelter offers 12 beds for youth aged 12 to 17 years old. Under the Becca legislation, secure CRCs are instructed to receive law enforcement referrals. Because the Shelter is a short-term, emergency placement facility and not a secure CRC, it was barred from receiving law enforcement referrals. However, joint funding from the United Way and a city grant opened two unrestricted beds specifically designated for victimized youth which are able to accept law enforcement referrals. The Bridge is a six-bed residential recovery program in an undisclosed location for victims of DMST ages 13 to 17. The Bridge is open to all youth who have been victimized through DMST, including males and transgendered youth. Victims of DMST often make multiple attempts to exit the life and are extremely vulnerable during their initial exit since their traffickers are likely to exert violence and threats to make the victim return. Successful removal of a victim from DMST requires they be placed in a safe and protective shelter environment that offers therapeutic programming specific to their traumatization. To avoid compromising the confidentiality of the location, the Shelter serves as a transitional placement working to stabilize youth before they are moved into the Bridge. The Bridge offers an in-house mental health therapist and chemical dependency specialist, group programming such as a young women empowerment group and writing group, a life skills program that requires youth complete a designated number of productive hours that may include school, internships, employment, and a community service learning project. Youth in the program are also required to participate in physical activity and open a bank account.

Spruce Street Shelter is a secure CRC that offers 16 secure beds and three non-secure beds. Law enforcement may refer youth to Spruce Street for placement in a secure bed or social service providers may refer youth to a non-secure bed. The beds are primarily used as a respite but may also be used as a temporary placement for youth dealing with abuse issues in the home. Spruce Street also offers a program that provides aftercare for youth until they reach 24 years old. The program includes intensive case management for drug and alcohol issues, mental health, education, and employment. Residency at Spruce Street may not exceed 15 days; however, there is not a limit to how many times a youth may return to the shelter.

The Bridge program at YouthCare is funded through a unique public-private partnership. The program was initially slated to be funded by the county; however, the decline of the economy in 2008 caused the county to cut funding for the program. The Seattle Times published a story about the issue and the need for the program shortly after funding was cut. Upon reading the article in the Seattle Times, several local people initiated a fundraising campaign which generated funding for three years of programming. Contractually, the program is funded by the City of Seattle; however, 80 percent of program funding is derived from public dollars. This model of public-private partnership contributes to the program’s flexibility but impedes the program’s sustainability. Commonly, county grants are designated to serve county citizens. The transient nature of this population often bars them from receiving services since they do not commonly reside in their country of origin. The use of private funding allows the Bridge to serve youth from any county and provides an incentive for the state to place children in the program since it does not pay for the youth’s placement. However, private funding is not seen as a long-term sustainable solution and the program will likely shift to county funding to maintain sustainability though it reduces the flexibility of placement since the beds will be designated for state-dependent youth.

In efforts to facilitate effective information sharing, professionals utilize the PPN and Bento, a Macintosh database application. The PPN is a network of core professionals who interact with victims or vulnerable youth including law enforcement, prosecutors, detention center staff, and social service providers. The PPN serves to provide members with the platform to collaborate with information and resources. Bento is the database system used to target and track at-risk and exploited children. This database system allows a closed message group to enter and distribute information to the group to help build cases by identifying key individuals and track trends.

Seattle’s progressive service structure is largely attributed to the community of professionals that continually develop the response solution based on informed best practices and procedures.
Conclusions

Domestic minor sex trafficking is receiving growing attention in Washington. Three of Washington’s greatest assets in the fight against DMST are its comprehensive legislation targeting buyers (SB 6476) and providing intervention provisions for at-risk youth (Becca Bill) and the progressive community care model implemented in Seattle. Though SB 6476 provides a comprehensive response for victim identification, it is not being fully implemented because of the lack of awareness and training on the provisions outlined in the bill. To maximize the effectiveness of the provisions defined in SB 6476, it is imperative to incorporate the legislative changes in field training on the topic and distribute the information widely for public access; otherwise, the system of response prior to SB 6476 will continue to be implemented.

Additionally, the Seattle PD Vice/HRV Unit is making significant progress in combating DMST through their aggressive rescue of victims and investigation of traffickers. This dedicated unit has trained hundreds of law enforcement across the state as well as being recognized nationally for their successful efforts. It is clear that SPDs prioritization of this unit is paying off by saving the lives of countless children who otherwise would continue living a nightmare.

There is a high prevalence of familial and gang-related DMST in Washington. Strip clubs are being used by traffickers as a commercial sex venue to advertise and sell minors for sex. DMST victims reported being used in strip clubs during school hours to serve the lunchtime crowd.

DMST specific training varies greatly between jurisdictions and occupations. Law enforcement and social service providers reported the highest level of training while other professionals who regularly come into contact with at-risk or exploited youth, like CPS, appear to have limited or no training on the issue.

Because of training and awareness among law enforcement, prostituted youth are commonly identified as victims. Unfortunately, the system used to protect children is not as developed and, subsequently, victimized minors often enter the system as delinquents. In 2009 and 2010, 153 youth were arrested and referred to detention on charges of prostitution from King, Clark, Snohomish, Benton/Franklin, Pierce, Spokane, and Thurston Counties. Law enforcement attributed lack of secure placement as the primary reason for referring a juvenile to detention on a prostitution charge. Though many youth are arrested for prostitution each year, Washington’s diversion program has minimized the number of youth actually prosecuted for a charge of prostitution.

Formalized DMST identification procedures are yielding results. Portland State University, Clark County Juvenile Detention Center, and the YWCA of Clark County are implementing a pilot of Shared Hope International’s INTERVENE intake process at CCJDC. This has resulted in the successful identification of six DMST victims. In a collaborative effort by organizations, agencies, prosecutors, government officials, law enforcement, and criminal justice systems in King County, DMST educated case workers are connecting with youth in juvenile detention centers and youth shelters to increase the level of DMST identification in these facilities. Additionally, Spruce Street secure CRC has adapted a form of SHI’s INTERVENE tool, resulting in the identification of 68 DMST victims.

YouthCare is the only youth shelter in Washington that is specifically designed for DMST victims. Runaway shelters, state-run group homes or traditional foster homes are inappropriate shelter options for DMST victims because they are often ill-equipped to provide the specialized level of security and response necessary, placing youth at a higher risk of returning to their trafficker. Specialized response and security may be incorporated at existing facilities through systemic training on victim identification, trauma bonds, and other dynamics of DMST.

Seattle has developed a highly effective model of community care for DMST victims that should be viewed as a model for replication. This model is informed by research commissioned and funded by the City of Seattle and implemented by Debra Boyer, in addition to the experience of local field experts. The model provides a
comprehensive response to victims of DMST, accounting for the various ways youth may come in contact with the system and level of response necessary. Several of the many services included in this model are: case management for at-risk youth, safe shelter specifically designed for victims of DMST, professional, specialized trauma therapy, and education, vocation, and life skills courses.

Overall, Washington state exhibits progressive levels of training, awareness, and response. The apparent level of collaboration, specifically in Seattle, exemplifies how a comprehensive community approach can bridge gaps in prevention, prosecution, protection, and partnership for more effective response. Based on these conclusions and the key findings listed in the Executive Summary, community actors should continue to work in collaborative response to combat DMST in Washington.