center for
CHILDREN & YOUTH
JUSTICE | Better systems. Better lives.®

615 2nd Ave, Ste 275, Seattle, WA 98104
206.696.7503 | www.ccyj.org

CENTER FOR CHILDREN & YOUTH JUSTICE

'PROJECT RESPECT'

REVISED

Washington State Model Protocol For Commercially Sexually Exploited Children

March 2013

CCYJ Contributors
Justice Bobbe J. Bridge, (ret.), J.D., M.A., PhC
Terri Kimball, M.S.
Nicholas Oakley, J.D.

YouthCare Staff Contributor
Leslie Briner, M.S.W.

Consultant
Betsy Graef, M.A.

Prosecutor Contributors
Andy Miller, *Benton County Prosecutor*
Mark Roe, *Snohomish County Prosecutor*
Valiant Richey, *Senior Deputy Prosecutor, King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office*

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	**4**
Acknowledgements	**8**
Overview A. Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC) B. Terms and Acronyms	**16**
Development of the CSEC Model Protocol A. Background B. Stakeholder Feedback C. "Mini-Summit" Themes	**20**
The CSEC Model Protocol A. Foundation 1. Mission, Core Principles and Best Practices B. CSEC Model Protocol 1. Participants, Roles and Responsibilities and CSEC Training 2. CSEC Multi-Disciplinary Teams and CSEC Task Forces 3. CSEC Coordinating Committee 4. CSEC Screening Tool 5. CSEC Reception Centers	**25**
Data Collection and Analysis A. National and Washington State Data B. Planning for Data Collection and Analysis	**36**
Appendices	
1. "Mini-Summit" Themes	**39**
2. "Mini-Summit" Survey Results	**42**
3. Roles and Responsibilities of Key Responders	**44**
4. Training Curriculum for Key Responders	**53**
5. CSEC Multi-Disciplinary Team Memorandum of Understanding	**56**
6. Portland State University CSEC Screening Questionnaire	**61**
7. National and Washington State Data	**64**
8. Data Collection Goals and Elements	**73**

Executive Summary

In 2011 the Center for Children & Youth Justice (CCYJ), in partnership with YouthCare, received a two year grant from the Children's Justice Interdisciplinary Task Force to develop a Washington State Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking (DMST) Protocol for responding to cases of commercial sexual exploitation of children (CSEC), to provide technical assistance and training to communities in adapting the model protocol to localities throughout Washington state, and to establish structures for ensuring continuing improvements to the protocol.

The CSEC Model Protocol

A victim-centered response protocol for law enforcement, the courts, victim advocacy organizations, youth service agencies and other first responders will aid in identifying commercially sexually exploited children (CSEC) and those at risk of CSEC, in treating them as crime victims rather than criminals, and in providing these children the services they need.

In a series of five "mini-summits" around the state, and in-person or conference call meetings, CCYJ engaged approximately 200 stakeholders to obtain input and suggestions that informed the development of a CSEC model protocol. The CSEC model protocol identifies the mission, principles, and key response components that can help communities better identify, engage and respond to CSEC. The model CSEC protocol provides local jurisdictions and regions with a template to adapt to different capacities and circumstances.

The mission of the CSEC model protocol is to foster collaboration and coordination among agencies to improve the capacity to identify CSEC and provide safety and services for them and their families/caregivers, as appropriate, as they work to end their exploitation, and to hold their exploiters accountable. Those involved in this effort will use best practices and will rely on data and evidence to drive system improvements.

Core principles for ending the commercial sexual exploitation of children include:

- Viewing CSEC as victims, not criminals, and avoiding arrest and detention whenever possible;
- Providing CSEC with "victim-centered" services;
- Making CSEC safety a key concern;
- Treating CSEC with respect and taking into account their cultural and linguistic needs;
- Prosecuting those who exploit CSEC victims;
- Focusing on local, regional and statewide collaboration and coordination; and

- Relying on data and research, as well as experience, to improve system response and better outcomes for CSEC.

Best practices for creating and maintaining a coordinated response to commercially sexually exploited children and youth:

- Identify key responders in the community and explicitly define their roles and responsibilities;
- Provide the appropriate level of CSEC training to key responders and to other staff in agencies involved with CSEC and with youth in general;
- Establish a local/regional CSEC multi-disciplinary team (MDT) made up of representatives from a small core of agencies to meet shortly after a CSEC is identified and to continue to meet on an ongoing basis to share information and collaborate in the management of each CSEC case; a memorandum of understanding among those agencies that stipulates their roles and responsibilities can be effective in formalizing the MDT's function;
- Screen all vulnerable youth for sexual exploitation upon entry into any system (particularly juvenile justice and youth services) using a simple, standardized tool demonstrated effective in identifying risk factors for CSEC;
- Immediately upon identification, take the CSEC to a safe, comfortable location to meet with a community-based advocate who will assess the CSEC's needs and arrange for initial services. The advocate may remain with the CSEC throughout the child's involvement with the "system" if this is acceptable to the CSEC;
- Establish a policy and procedure on how to balance the best interests and input of the CSEC victim with the goal of prosecuting those who have exploited them.

The experience of local responders should inform the development of system improvements, including the adopting, over time, of consistent and standard practices throughout the state. The work of local/regional CSEC task forces and a statewide CSEC coordinating committee will foster understanding of effective practices, support their dissemination across the state, provide a forum for reviewing CSEC data and program evaluation, and identify areas where changes in state policy may be merited.

Data Collection

There is no comprehensive data available on the number of commercially sexually exploited children in Washington and much of the data that is available is problematic. It is vital that we find ways to improve CSEC data collection. In doing so, we will better understand the incidence and prevalence of CSEC; help first responders quickly recover CSEC and get them services;

support apprehension and prosecution of predators; target effective intervention and prevention efforts; and build cross-agency coordination and collaboration to combat CSEC.

Robust data will help us identify service and system gaps, and will be useful in crafting private and government grant applications to fund improvements in our approaches to CSEC. To move us in that direction, a small state-level team has been convened to develop a proposal for data collection and evaluation.

Acknowledgements

2012 Washington State Model Protocol for Commercially Sexually Exploited Children (CSEC)

Project Support: The creation of the CSEC protocol was made possible by a federal grant administered by the Washington State Children's Justice Interdisciplinary Task Force (2011-2013), and by generous support from the Lester M. Smith Foundation, the Medina Foundation, Carlene Gaudette, the Luke 12:48 Foundation, and Jim and Sheila Mallahan.

Project Input: The CSEC protocol was developed with the advice and input from many individuals from across Washington. The insights and recommendations of judges and judicial officers, juvenile court representatives, law enforcement representatives, Children's Administration representatives, service providers, grassroots community advocates and others concerned with CSEC were invaluable. Some provided information in interviews and conference calls, while others participated in regional "mini-summits".

We thank all of these individuals and organizations for their commitment to finding ways to end the commercial sexual exploitation of children.

Adams, Betty	*Community Volunteer, Benton and Franklin Counties*
Adams, Scott	*Intake Area Administrator, Region 3 Children's Administration, DSHS*
Alexander, Laurie	*Area Administrator, Bellingham Office, Children's Administration, DSHS*
Ausserer, Jared	*Deputy Prosecutor, Pierce County Prosecutor's Office*
Baldock, Matt	*Deputy Prosecutor, Snohomish County Prosecutor's Office*
Barbieri, Lt. Steve	*Spokane County Sheriff's Office*
Barnes, Jennifer	*Public Defender & Supervisor of Juvenile Unit, Yakima Juvenile Court*
Bart, Michelle	*Public Awareness Director, Soroptimist International NW Region, and Northwest Coalition Against Trafficking*
Baysinger, Mark	*Executive Director , Sunnyside's Promise, Yakima County*
Berliner, Lucy	*Director, Harborview Center for Sexual Assault & Traumatic Stress, King County*
Berndt, Robyn	*Juvenile Court Administrator, Yakima Juvenile Court*
Blanchette, Mary	*Director, Children's Justice Center, Clark County*
Bleeker, Wendy	*Director of Student Services, Spokane School District # 81*
Bogen, Officer John	*Bremerton Police Department*
Bohl, TJ	*Detention Manager, Pierce County Juvenile Court*

Borg, Brent	*Area Administrator, Colville, Newport, Spokane, Children's Administration, DSHS*
Boy, Ronald	*Deputy Prosecutor, Juvenile Division, Benton County Prosecutor's Office*
Briner, Leslie	*Sexual Exploitation Training and Policy Coordinator, YouthCare, King County*
Bruneau, Det. Megan	*Vice/High Risk Victims Unit - Human Trafficking, Seattle Police Department*
Buell, Det. Andy	*Spokane County Sheriff's Office*
Burdge, Launi	*Area Administrator, Spokane Office, Children's Administration, DSHS*
Bush, Bonnie	*Juvenile Court Administrator, Spokane County Juvenile Court*
Butkovich, Martin	*Region 1 Regional Administrator, Children's Administration, DSHS*
Butler, Tirsa	*Benton and Franklin Counties Soroptomists*
Callas, Det. Tom	*Lewis County Sheriff's Office*
Cannon, Bridget	*Youth Outreach Director, Volunteers of America, Spokane*
Carpino, Suzi	*DMST Case Manager, Sunnyside's Promise, Yakima County*
Carter, Dave	*Public Defender, Spokane County Public Defenders*
Caywood, Joan	*Executive Director, Human Response Network, Lewis County*
Chapman, Sgt. John	*Vancouver Police Department*
Chapman, Kari	*YouthREACH Project Coordinator, YFA Connections, Spokane*
Church, Tasha	*Executive Director, Sexual Assault Center of Pierce County*
Cole, Superintendent Rick	*Sunnyside School District*
Collier, Judge Scott	*Clark County Superior Court*
Cooper, Dawn	*Area Administrator, Pierce West, Children's Administration, DSHS*
Copeland, Rachell	*Founder, Center for Forensic Nursing Excellence, King County*
Crawford, Lana	*Program Manger, Spruce Street, King County*
Crocker, Lindsay	*Advocate, Cocoon House, Snohomish County*
Dearborn, Bethany	*Founding Director, Skagit Against Slavery Coalition*
Delia, Harold	*Court Consultant, Yakima Juvenile Court*
Delvin, Senator Jerome	*Washington State Senate*
Dickerson, Rep. Mary Lou	*Washington State House of Representatives*
Dixon-Wall, Michelle	*Specialized Services Coordinator, SafePlace Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault, Thurston County*
Donlin, Mike	*Program Supervisor – The Safety Center, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction*
Ellis, Judge Janice	*Snohomish County Superior Court*
Elsom, Mabel	*Anti-Human Trafficking Coordinator, Lutheran Community Services NW, Spokane*
Escamilla, Pat	*Juvenile Court Administrator, Clark County Juvenile Court*
Everson, Lynn	*Needle Exchange Coordinator, Spokane Regional Health District*
Fenton, Michael	*Juvenile Court Administrator, Thurston County Superior Court*

Ferreira, Det. Christopher	*Snohomish County Sheriff's Office*
Fish, A'nna	*Human Trafficking Coordinator, Community Youth Services, Thurston County*
Fisk, Hannah	*Housing Program Manager, NW Youth Services, Whatcom County*
Fjellman, Robin	*Juvenile Detention Manager, Whatcom County Juvenile Court*
Foley, Kim	*Program Director, Central Washington Community Mental Health Services, Yakima County*
Forsman, Shirley	*Social and Health Programs Consultant, Children's Administration, DSHS*
Fujii, Marie	*Area Administrator, Smokey Point and Sky Valley/Monroe Offices, Children's Administration, DSHS*
Garcia, Leticia	*Executive Director, Lower Valley Crisis and Support Services, Yakima County*
Geiger, Barb	*Deputy Region 1 Regional Administrator, Children's Administration, DSHS*
Geissinger-Rodarte, Dani	*Victim Specialist, Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)*
George, Sgt. Brenda	*Yakima Police Department*
Giovengo, Melinda	*Executive Director, YouthCare, King County*
Golik, Tony	*Prosecutor, Clark County*
Gomez, Noel	*CSEC Advocate, King County*
Gowen, Ernie	*Area Administrator, Yakima, Children's Administration, DSHS*
Grudic, Azra	*Advocate Specialist, Providence Intervention Center for Assault and Abuse, Snohomish County*
Gundersen, Rose	*Co-Founder/Executive Director, Washington Engage*
Hail, Shad	*Lead Probation Officer, Lewis County Juvenile Court*
Hale, Magan	*Assistant Director, Spruce Street CRC, King County*
Hancock, Darcey	*Area Administrator, Centralia (Lewis County) , Children's Administration, DSHS*
Hanson, Elaine	*Soroptimist, Snohomish County*
Hardcastle, Cindy	*Area Administrator, Vancouver - Columbia Office, Children's Administration, DSHS*
Hargrove, Senator Jim	*Washington State Senate*
Hart, Randy	*Area Administrator: Lynnwood office, Children's Administration, DSHS*
Hartelius, Lori	*Co-Chair Human Trafficking Task Force, Snohomish County*
Hauge, Russ	*Prosecutor, Kitsap County*
Helm, Jennifer	*Probation Officer, Lewis County Juvenile Court*
Hill, Kai	*Advocate, YWCA of Clark County*
Holloway, Marjorie	*Program Manager, Snohomish County Juvenile Court Detention Services*
Holly, Sue	*Lutheran Community Services NW, Spokane*
Hovard, Elysa	*Lead Advocate, Cocoon House, Snohomish County*
Hsu, Eric	*Public Defender Coordinator, Benton and Franklin Counties, Office of Public Defense*
Hung, Jimmy	*Senior Deputy Prosecutor, King County Prosecutor's Office*

Jackson, Hermenia	*Area Administrator, Pierce South, Children's Administration, DSHS*
Jackson, Joe	*Deputy Prosecuting Attorney II, Thurston County Prosecutor's Office*
Jelcick, Det. Sgt. Aaron	*Olympia Police Department*
Johns, Roxanne	*Juvenile Probation Officer, Yakima Juvenile Court*
Johns-Brown, Lonnie	*Lobbyist, Washington Coalition of Sexual Assault Programs*
Johnson, Chris	*Policy Director, Washington State Attorney General's Office*
Johnson, Ph.D., Becca	*Licensed Psychologist, Independent Provider, Whatcom County*
Justice, Det. Kelly	*City of Airway Heights Police Department*
Karvia, Donna	*President, Soroptomist International, Centralia-Chehalis*
Kato, Ailey	*Law Student, Gonzaga University*
Kinney, Officer Don	*Edmonds Police Department*
Knezovich, Sheriff Ozzie	*Spokane County Sheriff's Office*
Knight, Jenny	*Juvenile Detention Manager, Yakima Juvenile Court*
Kohl-Welles, Senator Jeanne	*Washington State Senate*
Lambert-Eckel, Connie	*Deputy Region 1 Regional Administrator, Children's Administration, DSHS*
Larsen, Sara	*Victim Specialist, Federal Bureau of Investigation*
Laurie, Presiding Judge Anna	*Kitsap County Superior Court*
Lewis-Carter, Kira	*Social Worker - Unit Supervisor of Gatekeeper Project, Children's Administration, DSHS, Clark County*
Lichtenstadter, Rick	*Supervisor, Felony Division, The Defender Association, King County*
Linhart- Dow, Lisa	*Staff Attorney, Team Child, Yakima*
Long, Julie	*Deputy Prosecutor , Benton County Prosecutor's Office*
Lucas, Sheriff Gary	*Clark County Sheriff's Office*
Lydon, Lisa	*Assistant Attorney General/Senior Counsel, Washington State Attorney General's Office*
Mack, Judge Barbara	*King County Superior Court*
Mack, Commander Jim	*Lacey Police Department*
Magan, Laurie	*Private Attorney, Benton and Franklin Counties*
Makepeace, Ph.D., Tillie	*Director of WA programs, Janus Youth Programs, Clark County*
Maluo, Shelly	*Juvenile Court Administrator, Pierce County Juvenile Court*
Mangahas, Sasha	*Child Interviewer, Kitsap County Prosecutor's Office*
Marshall, Emily	*Mental Health Specialist, Catholic Community Services Western Washington, Bellingham*
McAlpine, Asst. Chief Kathy	*Tacoma Police Department*
McCurley, Ph.D., Carl	*Director, Washington State Center for Court Research*
McGovern, Dave	*Probation Manager, Pierce County Juvenile Court*
McGrath, Nicole	*Attorney, TeamChild, Snohomish*

McKenna, General Rob	*State Attorney General, Washington State Attorney General's Office*
Merrick, Tiffani	*Intake Supervisor, Children's Administration, DSHS*
Merringer, Michael	*Director of Services, Kitsap County Juvenile Court*
Metzger-Robillard, Det. Ashley	*Tacoma Police Department*
Meyer, Cameron	*Response Coordinator, Access Freedom, Whatcom County*
Meyer, Shannon	*Victim Witness Specialist, Federal Bureau of Investigation*
Meyer, Det. Tobin	*Skagit County Sheriff's Office*
Miller, Andy	*Prosecutor, Benton County*
Miller, Stacy	*STEP Grant Manager, Bellingham/Whatcom County Commission Against Domestic Violence*
Miller, Tim	*Clinical Director, Systems of Care, Yakima County*
Milton, Anya	*Executive Director and co-founder, Access Freedom, Whatcom County*
Moe, Commissioner Royce	*Spokane County Juvenile Court*
Mohandeson, Mike	*Deputy Prosecutor, King County Prosecutor's Office*
Moore, Joanne	*Director, Office of Public Defense*
Morgan, Det. Tim	*Everett Police Department*
Morris, Kathleen	*Program Manager, Washington Anti-Trafficking Response Network; (WARN)/International Rescue Committee*
Morris, Lorretta	*Director of Outreach Programs, Cocoon House, Snohomish County*
Nielsen, Jenn Davis	*Director of Outreach, Lutheran Community Services NW, Spokane*
Nelson, Toni	*Member, Youth Advocacy Center Advisory Board, Lewis County*
Newman- Skomski, Paula	*Human Trafficking Task Force Co Chair, Providence Intervention Center for Assault and Abuse, Snohomish County*
Nichols, Ken	*Area Administrator, Sunnyside, Children's Administration, DSHS*
Noriega, Rosalinda	*Violence Prevention Coordinator, Partners in Prevention Education, Thurston County*
Odimba, Joel	*Region 2 Regional Administrator, Children's Administration, DSHS*
O'Donnell, Sean	*Senior Deputy Prosecutor, King County Prosecutor's Office*
Oliver, Brenda	*Chair, Federal Way Coalition Against Trafficking (FWCAT), King County*
Orth, Peter	*Special Agent, Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)*
Otte, Jana	*Director of Aftercare, Scarlett Road, Kitsap County*
Perez, Doreen	*Area Administrator, Yakima, Children's Administration, DSHS*
Perez-Darby, Shannon	*Advocate, Northwest Network (LBGTQ), King County*
Petters, Ursula	*Area Administrator, Kitsap, Children's Administration, DSHS*
Pham, Lan	*Senior Planning and Development Specialist, Seattle Human Services Department*
Pratt, Stephanie	*Victims of Crime Program Coordinator, Office of Crime Victim's Advocacy*
Pugel, Asst. Chief Jim	*Seattle Police Department*

Quick, Det. Tyler	*Snohomish County Sheriff's Office*
Radder, Chief Ed	*Sunnyside Police Department*
Rasch, Mick	*ARIS Community Intervention Specialist, Skagit County Office of Juvenile Court*
Rasumssen, Christy	*Principal, New Horizons High School, Pasco School District*
Reeves, Bill	*Senior Attorney, Spokane County Prosecutor's Office*
Revels-Robinson, Denise	*Assistant Secretary, Children's Administration, DSHS*
Richardson, Dustin	*Deputy Prosecutor, Clark County Prosecutor's Office*
Richey, Valiant	*Senior Deputy Prosecutor, King County Prosecutor's Office*
Rodgers, Betsy	*Area Administrator, Pierce East, Children's Administration, DSHS*
Roe, Mark	*Prosecutor, Snohomish County*
Romine, Cyndi	*CEO, Called to Rescue Vancouver*
Runge, Det. Scott	*Benton County Sheriff's office*
Russell, Kelli	*CSEC Consultant/Trainer, Clark County*
Salisbury, Ph.D., Emily	*Assistant Professor, Portland State University*
Satterberg, Dan	*Prosecutor, King County Prosecutor's Office*
Schnepf, Coreen	*Deputy Prosecutor, Kitsap County Prosecutor's Office*
Scholts, Darcy	*Defense Attorney, Private Practice*
Sheeran, Beth	*Nursing Student, Washington State University*
Shoemaker, John	*Detention Manager, Clark County Juvenile Court*
Shogren, Dae	*Rosie's Place and Street Outreach Director, Community Youth Services, Thurston County*
Simmons, Deputy Damon	*Spokane County Sheriff's Office*
Simonsmeier, Christine	*Program Manager, Clark County Juvenile Court*
Stephens, Int. Chief Scott	*Spokane Police Department*
Stephens, Lara	*Care Coordination Supervisor, Skagit County Office of Juvenile Court*
Sutherlin, Georgiana	*Sheriff's Runaway Youth Services Coordinator, Spokane County Sheriff's Office*
Sutton, Nancy	*Region 3 Regional Administrator, Children's Administration, DSHS*
Tanner, Wendy	*Chief Operating Officer, Community Youth Services, Thurston County*
Taylor, Det. Brian	*King County Sheriff's Office*
Thompson, Shawn	*Detention Manager, Skagit County Office of Juvenile Court*
Thurman, Rosey	*Attorney, Team Child, Spokane*
Timbers, Karen	*Advocate, Kitsap Sexual Assault Center*
Toth, Patricia	*Child Abuse Program Manager, Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission*
Town, Randy	*Coordinator of School Safety and Security , ESD 105: Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission*
Tuininga, Heather	*Executive Director, Luke 12:48 Foundation*

Turner, Patty	*Area Administrator, Mt. Vernon and Oak Harbor, Children's Administration, DSHS*
Vail, Kay	*Probation Counselor, Clark County Juvenile Court*
VanWormer, Sgt. Dave	*Gang Unit, Spokane County Sheriff's Office*
Verge, Commissioner Tom	*Whatcom County Juvenile Court*
Villahermosa, Miguel	*Director of Security, Tacoma Public Schools*
Ward, Commander Chris	*Lacey Police Department*
Weiss, Det. Roland	*Thurston County Sheriff's Office*
Wheeler, David	*Community Supervision Services Manager, Benton County Juvenile Justice Center*
Wilson, Chief Brian	*Federal Way Police Department*
Wirschem, Mark	*Manager, Juvenile Treatment Services, King County Superior Court*
Wohl, Sgt. Steve	*Spokane Police Department*
Wright, Teresa	*Youth and Family Service Director, YFA Connections, Spokane*
Yamamoto, DeAnn	*Deputy Executive Director, King County Sexual Assault Response Center*
Young, Det. Brandon	*Innocence Lost Task Force Officer, Mt. Vernon Police Department*

Overview

A. Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children

Under current Washington state law, the commercial sexual exploitation of children (CSEC) is a crime in which a youth aged 17 years or younger is recruited, solicited, coerced and/or forced to engage in the exchange of sexual acts in return for money, basic needs or other material items. These acts may include direct sexual contact, pornography, stripping or other sexualized behaviors performed for the gratification of others.

Numerous factors contribute to the commercial sexual exploitation of children. Individual risk factors include histories of sexual and physical abuse and neglect, mental health issues, family dysfunction, substance abuse, homelessness, low IQ and—for gay, lesbian and trans-gendered youth—a lack of support and access to resources. Societal risk factors include poverty, the acceptance of violence towards women and children, glorification of the prostitution sub-culture and the adult sex industry, particularly when concentrated in low-income areas. Nevertheless, CSEC flourishes because of buyer demand and because pimps and traffickers stand to gain financially and in status when they recruit children and then groom, manipulate and induce them to prostitute.

> On average, children first become victims of sexual exploitation at 13 or 14 years of age. It is not a coincidence that the average age of runaways is within that range, since children who flee home often land in the path of a pimp or recruiter who poses as protector and caretaker. Identifying prospects is easy for a pimp. Bus stations, youth shelters, malls and even schools are often areas for recruitment. Many CSEC are in foster care and/or are runaways or have been kicked out by their guardian or family. Some CSEC may remain at home, but are exploited after affiliating with a gang.

As a result of what is often a lifetime of maltreatment and dysfunction, and of threatened or actual violence at home or at the hands of pimps, sexually exploited children exhibit a complex array of behaviors, responses and emotions. They commonly suffer from Post Traumatic Stress

Disorder (PTSD) with dissociative symptoms. Rates of PTSD among prostituted individuals range from 68%[1] to 77%[2]. In addition, they suffer horrific shame, especially due to the social stigma associated with commercial sex. The lives of these children are defined by violence, trauma and social isolation.

For CSEC, the normal, healthy developmental stages of growth from childhood to adolescence and adulthood are fundamentally upended.

While we know that interventions with this population should be trauma-informed, holistic and culturally sensitive, we do not yet fully understand what approaches will be the most effective. But while more research is needed, recent experience and emerging best practices recommend a multi-faceted response. Specialized services are needed including safe housing, case management and evidenced-based therapeutic interventions. Communities need coordinated and collaborative responses, broad-based training, awareness and prevention efforts as well as advanced training for service providers, first responders and members of our juvenile justice systems. These major areas of need are reflected in the CSEC model protocol.

B. Terms and Acronyms

A number of terms and acronyms are used in referring to the CSEC population or individual CSEC. This model protocol uses the term "commercially sexually exploited children" or "commercially sexually exploited child" (CSEC) because the language is explicit. Other terms that mean the same thing include "commercially sexually exploited youth" (CSEY), "domestic minor sex trafficking" (DMST), "victim(s)" and "prostituted youth".

This model protocol also uses "victim" and "survivor" interchangeably to refer to CSEC. "Victim" is a legal term used by the juvenile justice system, while "survivor" is primarily used by advocates who serve CSEC and by many CSEC who often do not see themselves as victims, but rather as survivors. The term "victim" may suggest an innocence and weakness that doesn't account for the strength, skills, savvy and resilience of those who have experienced CSEC. Additionally, "some youth may believe that they have in large part already 'saved' themselves

[1] Farley, Cotton, Lynne, Zumbeck, Spiwak, Reyes, Alvarez & Sezgin, "Prostitution and Trafficking in Nine Countries: An Update on Violence and Posttraumatic Stress Disorder", *Journal of Trauma* (2003): 33-74

[2] Hossain, Zimmernam, Abas, Light & Watts, "The Relationship of Trauma to Mental Disorders Among Trafficked and Sexually Exploited Girls and Women", *American Journal of Public Health* (December 2010)

simply by still being alive and this may explain why commercially sexually girls express resentment at being rescued."[3]

It is important to recognize that while their circumstances have made them victims/survivors of sexual exploitation, CSEC are first and foremost children. This mindset among professionals who work with them will better ensure that the youth do not continue to be marginalized and can instead recover from their CSEC experience.

Finally, several terms are used for those who exploit CSEC including exploiters, offenders, perpetrators, predators, pimps (sellers), johns (buyers) and traffickers.

[3] Farley, M., Baral, I., Kiremire, M. and Sezgin, U. (1998), ' Prostitution in five countries: violence and post-traumatic stress disorder', Feminism and Psychology, 8, 4, 405-26.

Development of the CSEC Model Protocol

A. Background

Founded in 2006, the Center for Children & Youth Justice (CCYJ) is a nonprofit organization dedicated to reforming the state's juvenile justice and child welfare systems. In 2011 CCYJ, in partnership with YouthCare, received a two year grant from the Children's Justice Interdisciplinary Task Force to develop a Washington State Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking (DMST) Protocol for responding to cases of commercially sexually exploited children (CSEC). The grant also supports implementation of the protocol across the state and training of key agencies involved with CSEC. CCYJ will establish structures to ensure continuing improvements in the protocol, for monitoring emerging best practices, for collecting data, and for proposing needed statewide policies concerning CSEC.

While the greatest numbers of CSEC are concentrated in our larger metropolitan areas (Seattle, Tacoma and Everett – along the I-5 corridor) and the counties where these cities are located, these children are found in every community. They are also often moved around the state and the country by their traffickers. The majority of these young CSEC—some as young as 11—come from homes where they were physically or sexually abused. Vulnerable, alone and often homeless, they are lured and manipulated into prostitution by adults who promise them shelter and safety, and love and acceptance, but who prey on their neediness and naiveté.

Many CSEC who are arrested, convicted and incarcerated soon return to the streets where they are forced back into prostitution by abusive pimps and re-victimized. Many others never enter the juvenile justice system, remaining caught in a violent sub-culture from which it is difficult to escape.

To assist CSEC to end their exploitation, a "victim-centered" response protocol for law enforcement, the courts, victim advocacy organizations, youth service agencies and other first responders will aid in identifying CSEC and those at risk of CSEC, in treating them as crime victims rather than criminals, and in providing the services and support they, and, if appropriate, their families/caregivers need to recover and regain their lives. The coordination

of resources across jurisdictions and collaboration throughout the state will help provide consistency in our response and interrupt trafficking across political jurisdictions.

B. Stakeholder Feedback

The model statewide CSEC protocol is guided by emerging best practices, and identifies the mission, principles, and key response components that can help communities better identify, engage and respond to CSEC. It provides guidelines for first responders and other professionals in working together to understand and monitor the issue in their community, in tailoring their own local coordinated response, and in better serving victims of sexual exploitation.

The model statewide CSEC protocol is flexible in order to meet the varying needs of localities. Thus, it provides local jurisdictions and regions with a template to adapt to different capacities and circumstances.

In developing the protocol, CCYJ sought input from key stakeholders throughout the state. In advance of five four-hour "mini-summits" held in recent months, CCYJ conducted interviews with a wide range of individuals and obtained from them the names of others to invite to these regional sessions. Those interviewed in advance and attending the "mini-summits" included judges, Juvenile Court administrators, probation and detention managers, local and federal law enforcement agents, prosecutors, defense attorneys, Children's Administration managers and supervisors, community-based service providers, and school representatives.

THE FIVE "MINI-SUMMITS" WERE HELD AS FOLLOWS:

- February 17, 2012 in Sunnyside for Yakima, Benton and Franklin counties
- March 8, 2012 in Spokane for Spokane County
- April 13, 2012 in Mt. Vernon for Snohomish, Skagit and Whatcom counties
- June 22, 2012 in Kelso for Clark, Lewis and Thurston counties
- August 24, 2012 in Gig Harbor for Pierce and Kitsap counties

In addition, CCYJ hosted separate in-person or conference call meetings with community-based providers from around the state, court personnel, commercially sexually exploited youth, and adults who were prostituted as youth. While a "mini-summit" was not held in King County, a number of its key stakeholders participated in discussions with CCYJ prior to the development of a draft CSEC protocol and then offered feedback on the draft protocol in a meeting held October 26, 2012.

In total, CCYJ engaged approximately 150 individuals in meetings and conference calls, and the comments and suggestions from these individuals informed the CSEC model protocol.

C. "Mini-Summit" Themes

Details about the "mini-summit" themes are documented in Appendix 1. In each of the five four-hour "mini-summits", Project Respect posed three key questions.

- What is the "lay of the land" concerning CSEC in your region?
- What does "victim-centered" mean?
- What would the ideal response for a CSEC look like?

The "Lay of Land"

The common themes concerning the experience with CSEC in all of the regions included:

- **Need for Information:** There is insufficient information about the scope of CSEC and the demographics and characteristics of the children involved.
- **Need for Training:** Training is needed to help identify, engage and provide services for CSEC.
- **Continuum of Exploitation:** CSEC often come from abusive backgrounds.
- **Love, Belonging and Empowerment:** Pimps fill an emotional void experienced by abused children who seek love, belonging and empowerment.
- **Public Perception:** CSEC are often perceived as uncooperative, chronic runaways, gang members, or drug abusers who have brought their circumstances upon themselves.
- **Internet-Based Advertising:** While street prostitution continues, the Internet is increasingly the forum in which juvenile prostitution transactions occur.
- **Gangs:** A challenging new style of gang pimping involving the control of multiple juvenile prostitutes by the gang as a whole rather than by individual gang members is occurring in some regions.

What Does "Victim-Centered" Mean?

"Victim-centered" was defined, among other things, as responses that are attuned to the needs of the individual CSEC. Some "mini-summit" participants emphasized that such responses mean that the voices and unique experiences of CSEC should be heard, acknowledged and respected, and that CSEC need to be able to make decisions for themselves in order to build sufficient self-confidence and a capacity for trust that will enable them to permanently leave the life.

The focus of the discussions about "victim-centered" responses turned on the question of how the juvenile justice system should respond to CSEC, specifically the pros and cons of prosecuting or detaining CSEC, and whether they should be required to assist in prosecutions of their exploiters. The perspectives of participants varied widely. While everyone agreed that CSEC are victims, the ability to prosecute and detain is viewed by some as the only alternative available in some cases (especially when shelter, housing and services are not available in the community) to ensure the safety of the child and to make sure they get needed services. Others strongly argued that CSEC are further traumatized and their future options are limited if prosecuted; that their safety should take priority over efforts to convict their exploiters; and that detention may not be an effective tool for introducing needed services.

An Ideal Response

There was strong consensus among "mini-summit" participants about key components of an ideal response:

- **Housing** Safe places to house CSEC and provide essential services are needed.
- **Advocacy** CSEC should have access to a specific, preferably community-based, advocate as soon as possible after being identified. The advocate should be well-trained, ensure the child is connected to needed services and accompany the CSEC whenever needed and possible.
- **Collaboration** Differing agency cultures and priorities have sometimes prevented collaboration among CSEC responding agencies. Agencies need to communicate more and understand better their different perspectives and roles. Collaboration is a prerequisite to an effective community response.

- **Training** Personnel in all responding agencies who come in contact with children should be appropriately trained to recognize “red flags” for CSEC. Others in these agencies should receive more extensive CSEC training so they are prepared as “experts” to work with identified CSEC cases.
- **Consistency** All CSEC should be treated in the same manner and have access to needed services regardless of where they are located and how and by whom they were identified.

The CSEC Model Protocol

A. Foundation

Project Respect staff administered a survey to "mini-summit" participants to obtain ideas about the mission and values that should serve as the foundation of the protocol collaboration on CSEC in Washington state. The survey results are shown in Appendix 2.

CCYJ also contracted with Debra Boyer, PhD, to conduct a literature review and an assessment of national programs that address CSEC to identify best practices. While Dr. Boyer found there is no one set of research-based best practices for CSEC response, certain protocols and practices are emerging, the value of which are supported by experience.

In accord with the survey results, direct input from "mini-summit" participants, input from a meeting with CSEC providers from around the state, interviews with CSEC who have recently exited the life, and many of Dr. Boyer's findings, the following mission, principles and best practices serve as the foundation for the model CSEC protocol and any adaptations to it when tailored to local communities. Many of the principles and best practices cited below are reflected in the CSEC model protocol or in the plans for coordination and data collection referenced below.

Mission Statement for the Model Protocol

> The mission of the CSEC model protocol is to foster collaboration and coordination among agencies to improve the capacity to identify CSEC and provide safety and services for them and their families/caregivers, as appropriate, as they work to end their exploitation, and to hold their exploiters accountable. Those involved in this effort will use best practices and will rely on data and evidence to drive system improvements.

Core Principles

a) All CSEC should be viewed as victims/survivors, not criminals. To the extent possible, we should avoid arresting and holding CSEC in detention or otherwise treating them as criminals. Detention can increase juvenile recidivism, pull youth deeper into the juvenile justice system and slow or disrupt the natural process of "aging out of delinquency".[4] Additionally, understanding the unique needs of adolescent girls, which may differ

[4] The Dangers of Detention: The Impact of Incarcerating Youth in Detention and Other Secure Facilities. Justice Policy Institute Report, Barry Holman and Jason Ziedenberg.

considerably from boys, and how to effectively work with them, is critical in responding to female CSEC. [5]

b) All CSEC should receive "victim-centered" services, both those identified strictly as CSEC victims/survivors as well as to those who are "victim-offenders" (i.e. those arrested for crimes other than prostitution). CSEC should not be treated differently based on age, and services should be aligned with the developmental status of the child.

c) CSEC safety should be a key concern. CSEC may have a perspective about their particular safety needs that differs from the views of those who serve them; the CSEC should be asked what safety means to them and the professionals and others involved in the response should consider the child's point of view in developing a safety plan.

d) While CSEC are children, they should be treated with respect; they should be asked to share their views and be given choices as soon as and whenever possible. Allowing these children to make decisions, where consistent with safety, will empower and help them build healthy independence.

e) As appropriate, CSEC family members/caregivers should be included in service and planning efforts and their unique needs and issues should be identified and addressed as part of the response plan for individual CSEC.

f) In order to be effective, responders should demonstrate cultural competence in dealing with CSEC. Cultural competence is the integration and transformation of knowledge about individuals and groups of people from different backgrounds into specific standards, policies, practices, and attitudes used in appropriate cultural settings to increase the quality of services and produce better outcomes.

g) Efforts should be made to hold offenders accountable. This may include seeking cooperation of CSEC victims with the investigation and prosecution of those who pay to exploit them and those who profit from their exploitation. In seeking cooperation, the victim's input, safety, circumstances and wellbeing should be strongly considered.

h) Local, regional and statewide collaboration and coordination is needed to effectively respond to CSEC.

i) In addition to experience, data and research should drive system improvements over time to ensure the best possible outcomes for CSEC.

[5] Improving Law Enforcement Responses to Adolescent Girls: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Susan Yeres and Meg Holmberg.

Best Practices

a) Those working with CSEC and with youth in general should receive an appropriate level of training on the topic of commercial sexual exploitation of children.

b) Because CSEC often have abuse in their background, and as CSEC are victims of rape and child sexual abuse, those who work with CSEC will have in-depth training on CSEC trauma and other specific aspects of the CSEC experience. Services are trauma-informed and those who provide services demonstrate an appreciation of the particular vulnerabilities and triggers experienced by these traumatized children. (See: Creating Trauma-Informed Services 2012, Washington Coalition of Sexual Assault Programs.)

c) All vulnerable youth are screened for sexual exploitation upon entry into any system (particularly juvenile justice and youth services) using a simple, standardized tool demonstrated effective in identifying risk factors for CSEC. The advantages of a simple, standardized tool are that it will be easy to administer, will allow more children to be screened in a consistent manner, and will aid in identifying CSEC and those at risk of CSEC. This tool should only be used by staff that have been trained to use it.

d) Since the majority of prostituted children are runaways, local responders have a protocol in place to identify youth who have run multiple times in one year, and an active plan for locating and intervening with these youth.

e) Immediately upon identification, a CSEC is taken to a safe, comfortable location to meet with a community-based advocate who will carefully assess the youth's needs and arrange for initial housing and services. This advocate will remain with the CSEC throughout the child's involvement with the "system" including occasions when the child may testify in the prosecution of perpetrators, advocating for, and providing constancy and consistency to the child as multiple agencies engage in the case.

f) Important consideration is given to including CSEC family members and caregivers in service and planning efforts, and the unique needs of family members are identified and addressed.

g) In order to foster a coordinated response to CSEC, representatives from a local multi-disciplinary team made up of representatives from a small core of agencies meet shortly after a CSEC is identified and continue to meet on an ongoing basis to share information and collaborate in the management of individual CSEC cases.

h) All professionals and others who provide services, in whatever setting and at whatever stage in the process, focus on how their demeanor, words and actions may feel to the CSEC, taking care to be patient and respectful of the CSEC's personal dignity, while understanding they are working with a child who may in some circumstances demonstrate difficult and inappropriate behaviors.

i) Professionals and others involved in the response to a CSEC case clearly communicate to the child what they can and cannot offer; they maintain confidentiality to the extent allowed by law, including communicating with the child in private, and clearly explaining to the child mandatory reporting processes and requirements, and the child's privacy rights. Doing so will build trust and credibility with the child.

j) The experience of local responders informs the development of system improvements, including the adopting, over time, of consistent and standard practices throughout the state. Communication within and across systems is fostered in order to build strong relationships among the many agencies responsible for responding to CSEC.

k) Law enforcement agencies should establish a policy and procedure on how to balance the best interests and input of the CSEC victim with the goal of prosecuting those who have exploited them.

B. CSEC Model Protocol

The protocol recommends three layers of responsibility for responding to CSEC: two at the local/regional level and one at the statewide level.

The local/regional level includes:

- A multidisciplinary team (MDT) consisting of a small group of professionals responsible for immediate consultation on CSEC cases as they arise and for longer term follow-up as needed.

- A Task Force consisting of individuals who respond to, serve, or have oversight for or impact on prostituted children. The primary responsibility of the Task Force is to foster a coordinated community response to CSEC, and to adapt the model protocol to the local/regional area.

The statewide level includes: A Statewide CSEC Coordinating Committee consisting of statewide decision makers which will convene annually to receive reports from the local/regional CSEC Task Forces on the incidence of CSEC in their areas, on local coordinated community response practices and results, and their recommendations for policy and/or legislative changes that would improve the efficiency and effectiveness of local activities.

1. Participants, Roles and Responsibilities and CSEC Training

Each community should identify the key participants in its CSEC response activities, clearly define their roles and responsibilities and support engaged organizations and all appropriate staff and other individuals involved in obtaining appropriate CSEC training.

The appropriate level of CSEC training will differ among participating agencies and individuals. For example, MDT members will need an in-depth level of training while Task Force members will need a basic level of training. However, *all* local law enforcement officers should have minimal CSEC training so that they can identify risk factors for CSEC. Basic training is recommended for all others involved in the community response network. Drafts detailing the recommended roles and responsibilities of key participants and CSEC training curricula are outlined in Appendices 3 and 4 respectively. The primary elements include the following:

1. **Local Law Enforcement:** Local police and sheriff agencies should commit to having *all officers receive minimal CSEC training* and to having *at least 2 officers (detectives or sergeants) receive in-depth CSEC training*. The specially trained officers should be available to take charge at the scene of an incident upon request by patrol officers who initially respond to and suspect CSEC. Once it is determined that a CSEC is involved, police should ask a CSEC-trained community advocate to immediately meet with the CSEC.
2. **Advocates:** Local community-based advocacy agencies should commit to having *at least two domestic violence, sexual assault or other advocates receive in-depth CSEC training* so they can respond immediately, 24/7, to calls from law enforcement or other members of the community, meet with the CSEC promptly, assume responsibility for the youth, and provide the youth with initial and ongoing case management and support.
3. **Child Protective Services (CPS)**: CSEC may be State dependents, or they may—because of their CSEC status—need the protection of the State. *At a minimum, two locations within each DSHS region should have at least two CPS social workers and one CPS supervisor (four trained CPS social workers and two trained supervisors per region) who have received in-depth CSEC training*. CPS staff will be available 24/7 in person or by phone to assist and advise local first responders and others on immediate safety planning and placement options for CSEC cases and remain engaged in any given CSEC case as long as necessary to ensure the ongoing safety of the involved child.
4. **Service Providers:** Each community should have at least one youth serving agency that provides a full scope of services for runaway and homeless youth including outreach, case management and shelter. The agency should commit to having at least some staff members receive in-depth CSEC training. The service provider will screen for services needed by the CSEC and provide services directly or coordinate in referring the CSEC to an appropriate provider.

5. **Prosecutors:** *At least one deputy prosecutor in each county responsible for reviewing cases and filing on juveniles should have in-depth training on identifying, engaging and working with CSEC.* The prosecutor should use a collaborative approach to all cases involving CSEC, consulting with law enforcement, advocates and service providers to ensure service needs are met and cases disposed of appropriately.
6. **Defense Attorneys**: *At least one public defender in each county should have in-depth training on identifying and working with CSEC youth.* The public defender should have an understanding of the trauma experienced by CSEC and should be skilled in motivational interviewing to maximize their ability to develop a trusting client-attorney relationship with the CSEC. Defense counsel should also be familiar with local resources and services available to the CSEC so as to better advocate for them at each step of the legal process.
7. **Others:** The local Task Force should determine any other agencies and professionals, such as school representatives and health care providers, who should participate in its CSEC community response activities and who should therefore also receive basic or in-depth CSEC training.

2. CSEC Multi-Disciplinary Teams (MDT) and CSEC Task Forces

CSEC MDT's

The heart of the CSEC response—and critical to its success—is the coordinated and collaborative work of local/regional CSEC multi-disciplinary teams (MDTs) responsible for immediate response and ongoing problem solving on specific CSEC cases as they arise. These teams are small and capable of quick action.

CSEC Task Forces

Local/regional CSEC Task Forces have the responsibility for adapting the model protocol to the local/regional area, conducting a comprehensive assessment over time of the effectiveness of the coordinated response, and proposing improvements to it.

Membership in these groups will likely overlap since MDT members will serve on the Task Force, providing important background to the task force which will help inform its deliberations. The CSEC Task Forces are necessarily larger groups with more representatives providing differing perspectives on CSEC.

The geographic scope of each CSEC MDT and CSEC Task Force, and their membership, will be defined by local/regional jurisdictions. In some jurisdictions CSEC Task Forces will include only local stakeholders while others may have representatives from multiple cities or counties.

Possible participants include:

CSEC MDT	CSEC Task Force
• Local law enforcement, including gang specialists	• Local law enforcement, including gang specialists
• Community-based advocates	• Community-based advocates
• Child Protective Services social workers and supervisors	• Child Protective Services social workers and supervisors
• Youth service providers (social services, housing, homeless youth case workers/drop-in shelter workers, gang intervention workers)	• Youth service providers (social services, housing, homeless youth case workers/drop-in shelter workers, gang intervention workers)
Others, as needed on a case-by-case basis: • Prosecutors • Defense attorneys • Federal law enforcement • Detention/probation counselors • Health care providers (medical, community-based mental health, chemical dependency; forensic nurses) • School-based personnel	Others: • Prosecutors • Defense attorneys • Federal law enforcement • Detention/probation counselors • Health care providers (medical, community-based mental health, chemical dependency; forensic nurses) • School-based personnel • Adults who have CSEC in their background • Family members with experience of CSEC

In working on individual cases and in considering broad system questions, the members of CSEC MDTs and CSEC Task Forces will bring a host of distinct and sometimes conflicting perspectives to the table. There may be tension between the desire to provide safety to CSEC (perhaps through detention) and the desire to keep these individuals out of the juvenile justice system; there may be tension between adult views of what constitutes safety and the intention of respecting CSEC and their views and opinions; and there may be tension between the desire to hold perpetrators accountable and meeting the critical needs of individual CSEC.

These and other tensions/conflicts among the collaborating parties are legitimate and valuable. The members should recognize that each have specific, distinct responsibilities. Members work under different pressures and constraints and may not always have the same priorities. The

close professional collaboration among members with these differing perspectives—frequent, frank and respectful exchanges about the issues—will help identify, over time, innovative solutions to seemingly intractable problems. It is this working together on tough issues, and struggling with these tensions and conflicts that will lead to real progress in eliminating CSEC. This collaborative model for addressing diverse perspectives in the CSEC MDTs and CSEC Task Forces is critical to meeting the needs of these children.

Finally, it is critical that in the course of their work CSEC MDTs and CSEC Task Forces follow the principles and best practices outlined in the model CSEC protocol. An annual review and updating of roles and responsibilities and revisiting of principles and best practices can aid groups in ensuring they honor that commitment.

CSEC MDT Responsibility and Charge

The CSEC MDT is a small group of professionals with extensive and detailed knowledge about CSEC from diverse disciplines in the community and with direct responsibility for individual CSEC.

The CSEC MDT is expected to

1. Meet within 24 hours of the identification of a CSEC and work together to make sure the child's immediate needs are met, that the child is assessed for safety and placed accordingly, and that needed services are identified and offered.
2. Continue to meet regularly on each case, for as long as needed, to assess the child's situation, to address problems, barriers or other challenges as they arise, to offer support as the child and the child's family navigate complex systems, and to make other services available as needed.
3. Provide critical support to CSEC identified in the course of law enforcement recovery stings and operations.

In some areas, existing MDTs may assume responsibility for immediate response to CSEC cases.

The CSEC MDT will function best if all appropriate individuals from designated agencies participate. It also requires leadership, so the group should identify a chair responsible for convening the CSEC MDT and performing other tasks necessary for an effective and coordinated operation. In some instances, the community-based advocate may serve as the convener and facilitator of the CSEC MDT since the advocate is a linchpin of the community response. However, in some jurisdictions representatives from other agencies may be chosen as the chair. In some smaller CSEC MDTs, the chair may rotate.

The standing member agencies of the CSEC MDT should formally adopt a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) which codifies expectations about the roles and responsibilities of its members and how the CSEC MDT will function. An example of such an MOU is shown in Appendix 5.

CSEC Task Force Responsibility and Charge

Local/regional CSEC Task Forces are responsible for adapting the model protocol to the local area, reviewing the effectiveness of the coordinated community response to CSEC and adopting or recommending improvements to it.

In some areas the CSEC Task Force may be part of an existing special assault network that meets regularly and has a specific CSEC agenda, or it may be part of a Children's Advocacy Center meeting group, again with a specific CSEC agenda, or it may be an existing or newly formed CSEC Task Force.

The specific charge of each CSEC Task Force is to

1. Develop and oversee implementation of a local/regional version of the model CSEC protocol.
2. Monitor the extent to which CSEC exists in its jurisdiction by reviewing available data.
3. Ensure that both basic and in-depth CSEC training is available, year round, to professionals at all levels in its jurisdiction.
4. Conduct in-depth case reviews to determine how to improve community response to such cases. It is important to review both cases with successful interventions and outcomes and those that were unsuccessful or where there was a lack of clarity about the role of the involved agencies. These reviews will help identify systemic problems that can be addressed through changes to the protocol (communication, coordination, training or advocacy) or through policy and/or legislative changes pursued in cooperation with agencies and lawmakers.
5. Determine if current CSEC-related laws are being implemented and ensure that procedures are in place to meet the requirements of new policies and laws.
6. Arrange for resource sharing to support efficiencies and develop local resources where gaps exist.
7. Plan and implement public education and awareness campaigns and events to build community support and understanding that CSEC are victims not criminals.

3. CSEC Statewide Coordinating Committee

A group of statewide decision makers should convene annually to receive reports from the local/regional CSEC Task Forces on the incidence of CSEC in their areas, and on local coordinated community response practices and results. The CSEC Task Forces may recommend to the statewide CSEC Coordinating Committee policy and/or legislative changes that would improve the efficiency and effectiveness of local activities.

The statewide CSEC Coordinating Committee will review the status of CSEC data collection and analysis throughout the state and identify and assess the merit of proposed policy and/or legislative changes.

The statewide CSEC Coordinating Committee members will include interested law makers, and representatives from the Governor's office, the Attorney General's office, the Office of the Superintendent of Public Education (OSPI), the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WSAPC), the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission (WSCJTC, the regional CSEC task force chairs,) and others.

4. CSEC Screening Interview

Agencies in Washington should adopt as their standard CSEC screening tool the Commercially Sexually Exploited Children/Youth (CSEC) Screening Interview developed by Emily Salisbury, PhD, Assistant Professor, Division of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Portland State University. For youth entering the juvenile justice system, a number of screening tools are now used to identify a variety of presenting issues and if a youth is charged with a crime, a Washington Risk Needs Assessment is administered. But a simple, standardized tool that specifically screens for CSEC risk factors and that will be consistently applied by a variety of responders will allow CSEC cases to be better identified and more accurately accounted for throughout the state. Jurisdictions and agencies should make sure staff have been trained to use the tool before it is implemented. (Appendix 6.)

5. CSEC Reception Centers

Every community should provide a location where CSEC can be received at the time of identification. Ideally, CSEC identified by law enforcement, social service agencies, schools, medical providers, or concerned parents/caretakers should be taken to, evaluated and served at a child advocacy center, a community-based youth services center, a specially prepared drop-in center, a Family Justice Center or other location that is comfortable and welcoming. These sites should be places where the CSEC is not stigmatized, but feels safe and is treated as a victim not a criminal. If such a center does not exist in the community, it should be established.

The reception center should

- Be a location that is known and trusted by youth, advocates, law enforcement and others;
- Be open 24/7 or have the ability to open and staff up within a short time period;
- Have trained staff with expertise working with CSEC; and

- Provide basic services to CSEC, including advocacy, limited medical attention, food and drink, clothing, and a place to stay until shelter or housing is available.

Data Collection and Analysis

A. National and Washington State Data

There is no comprehensive data available on the number of commercially sexually exploited children in Washington. Since these children are rarely prosecuted for prostitution, many policy makers and youth service providers believe there are many more CSEC than criminal filings for prostitution demonstrate. The limited data that is available is also problematic. Data is reported using a variety of methods, based on variously specified populations of victims, and reported with non-standardized definitions. Caution is strongly recommended in drawing any generalized conclusions from it.

With these caveats in mind, some national and Washington state data (the latter particularly for counties that participated in the "mini-summits") concerning charges for juvenile prostitution, reported runaways, and involvement of children with the juvenile justice system is presented in Appendix 7. This particular data is shown because there is some evidence that children who have run away multiple times may be at greater risk of being, or are more likely to have been, commercially sexually exploited. In addition, CSEC often enter the criminal justice system for offenses other than prostitution, including status violations. Thus, identifying CSEC among runaways and children who have other contacts with juvenile justice may provide us with a better understanding on the real scope of the problem.

The critical data issue is that we remain uncertain about the incidence of CSEC in Washington, the characteristics and needs of the children affected, and in what parts of the state CSEC occurs most frequently. We don't know what resources and services are needed in specific areas to help the children involved. And we don't have a way to assess how well we are dealing with the commercial sexual exploitation of children and how well we are serving these children.

The need for better data is why better screening tools and practices are essential, and why mechanisms to capture information about victims and to evaluate our responses to them must be fundamental to Washington's CSEC protocol response plan.

B. Planning for Data Collection and Analysis

The prevalence of CSEC is not currently known. By collecting essential data, we will better understand the incidence in Washington; help first responders quickly recover victims and get them needed services; support apprehension and prosecution of predators; regionally target effective intervention and prevention efforts; and build cross-agency coordination and collaboration to combat CSEC. Robust data will help us identify service and system gaps, and will be useful in crafting private and government grant applications to fund improvements in our approaches to CSEC.

A small state-level team will be convened to develop a proposal for data collection and evaluation that confirms specific goals, critical data elements and their sources, mechanisms and sources of victim and at-risk youth identification and how this data will be collected, analyzed and reported. The team will also be responsible for identifying a research entity to help with the project. Certain proposed goals and potential data elements are outlined in Appendix 8.

Key goals identified to-date include:

- Understand the extent of incidence of CSEC – tracking the number of cases and where they are occurring;
- Understand the victims involved – the numbers of girls and boys, their ages, and racial/ethnic/tribal background;
- Track factors that may make children at-risk for CSEC – information about their living situations and they and their family's involvement with the child welfare system and with the criminal justice system;
- Support law enforcement and prosecutors in pursuing predators – information about gang/pimp involvement with CSEC and where it occurred; and
- Tailor services to meet the needs of individual victims – information about victim's service needs.

Appendices

APPENDIX 1

"Mini Summit" Themes

Perspectives on the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children

Approximately one hundred and fifty individuals from courts, law enforcement, prosecuting attorney's offices, public defender's offices, social service agencies, community advocacy groups and school districts participated in Project Respect's regional "mini" summits. In each of the five four-hour mini-summits, Project Respect essentially posed three key questions. What is the 'lay of the land' in your region? (i.e. the who-what-why-where of CSEC). What does victim-centered mean? What would the ideal response for a CSEC look like? Mini-summit participants provided invaluable insights and posed thought-provoking questions themselves. This section provides a summary of the perspectives on each question and highlights the points of general consensus as well as controversy.

KEY QUESTIONS
What Is the 'Lay of the Land'?
What Does Victim-Centered Mean?
What would the ideal response for a CSEC look like?

Lay of the Land?

Project Respect observed several common themes during its lay of the land discussions. The most common are as follows:

Need for Information: While the extent of data and awareness varied from region to region, there is not enough information on the scope of CSEC and demographics and other details on exploited children.

Need for Training: Along with the need for information, there is a need for training on topics ranging from how to identify "red flags" to how to talk to youth that are identified and meet their needs.

Continuum of Exploitation: Service providers, in particular, noted that CSEC is part of a continuum of exploitation. Prostituted teens often run away from abuse environments and continue prostitution into adulthood. Intra-familial exploitation appears to be prevalent in certain regions (i.e. a situation where a child's caretaker is the child's "pimp"). The general consensus was that girls as young as 13 are being prostituted.

Love, Belonging, and Empowerment: Coming from abusive backgrounds, exploited youth seek love and belonging. "Pimps" fulfill this void from the perspective of the youth. Some participants even noted that the youth may feel empowered by their sexual activity.

Public Perception: While prostituted youth have been continually exploited and are vulnerable, the public perception in many areas is that these same youth are uncooperative, chronic runaways who abuse drugs. The idea that exploited youth brought their circumstances upon themselves still persists.

Internet-Based Advertising: Some regions have physical locations in which "Johns" come to "buy" prostituted juveniles, but the Internet is overwhelmingly used for this purpose.

Gangs: Certain parts of Washington are facing tremendous challenges with "gang-pimping". This is a situation in which the gang as a unit, rather than an individual, prostitutes youth. The situation makes it exceptionally dangerous for a youth to leave and especially difficult for law enforcement to investigate.

Victim-Centered?

Differing viewpoints on the meaning of victim-centered elicited conflicting opinions at each mini summit.

The Juvenile Justice System: Victim-centered discussions keyed on the use of the juvenile justice system to house and treat exploited youth and raised the following pros and cons:

KEY CONTROVERSIES		
	Pro	**Con**
Whether youth should be required to assist in prosecutions.	Apprehension of pimps will ultimately reduce the prevalence of CSEC.	The safety and welfare of an exploited youth should take priority, even over the apprehension of a pimp.
Whether prosecutors should charge youth with presenting offenses.	Prosecutors should charge youth so that the court has jurisdiction and can order services.	Youth will be further traumatized and stigmatized and the juvenile offender record may preclude future educational and employment opportunities. Victims of other forms of sexual abuse would not be prosecuted.
Whether exploited youth should be housed in detention.	Youth will be safe and have basic needs met, staff can administer screenings and deliver services, and detention would provide a respite.	Youth may not perceive it as safe, detention provides an opportunity for recruiting of other youth, and it is extremely stressful and viewed as punishment.

The Youth Perspective: For at least a few participants at each mini-summit, victim-centered meant listening to the voices of the youth. These participants urged others to take a holistic approach, considering each youth's trauma history, and "meeting youth where they are." While adults' priorities are safety and apprehending "pimps," youth also need the ability to make decisions for themselves, to build relationships with adults they can trust, and experience a reason to leave their exploiters.

The Ideal Response?

Project Respect concluded mini-summits with a discussion of what an ideal response for a CSEC would look like. On this point, there was strong consensus. The following are the participants' desired response components:

Housing: The most frequently expressed desire among youth serving professionals was for a safe place to house commercially sexually exploited youth. Such a location would not only provide shelter, but a myriad of services like mental health and substance abuse treatment. While this is necessary to an ideal response, it is also costly and presents a number of challenges.

Advocacy: Exploited youth should have access to an advocate as soon as possible after being identified. The advocate should be well-trained and have a relationship with the various agencies with which youth are likely to come into contact. Advocates should help youth connect to services and make sure they are accompanied at all times. Ideally, one advocate should be partnered with a youth so that the youth has an opportunity to build a trusting relationship. Many participants felt that advocates should be community-based rather than system-based.

Collaboration: While effective advocates can assist youth in working with agencies, they cannot necessarily ensure agencies work together. Collaboration among these agencies is a prerequisite to an effective response. Yet, each of these agencies has its own "culture" and its own set of priorities. Historically, there have been barriers between agencies that prevented effective collaboration. Professionals within each agency will have to understand other agencies' cultures and priorities and develop effective systems of communication to overcome such barriers.

Training: Training is also very important. Each agency should have all of its employees who come into contact with youth (e.g. patrol officers or case workers) undergo minimum training. Such training would enable those employees to recognize red flags for CSEC. Once recognized, they could refer the youth to an "expert" within the agency. These experts would have undergone far more extensive training.

Consistency: A response should not differ based on the geographic location of a youth, the agency that identified the youth, nor even the individual within an agency. The response should be consistent; no matter how youth are identified, they should be treated in the same victim-centered manner and have access to the resources they need.

APPENDIX 2

"Mini Summit" Survey Results

What mission and values should provide the foundation for the Protocol?

To answer this question, Project Respect has surveyed all of its regional or "mini" summit participants. A total of 78 participants responded to the questions regarding mission and values, respectively. The survey asked participants to rate their preferences for sample mission and value statements or propose a statement of their own.

Mission

Two sample mission statements were listed in the survey. Participants were asked to choose the one that they thought best reflected the concept of a statewide protocol, or propose their own statement. Seventy-eight participants responded to this question, and 65% preferred this statement:

> Work together in a coordinated effort to improve the statewide response and capacity to identify and support commercially sexually exploited youth and hold accountable those who exploit them. (This statement has since been revised to reflect input from those who attended the Decision Makers Summit on September 28, 2012.)

Twenty-eight percent selected the other mission statement—*Work collaboratively as community partners to end the commercial sexual exploitation of children*—as their choice. The remaining six participants proposed their own statements.

Values

Thirteen sample value statements were listed in the survey. Participants were asked to select up to five statements that they though best reflected the concept of a statewide protocol, with the option of proposing their own statement. Eighty participants responded to this question. The following are the five most preferred statements:

1. Victim Centered Response and Services: We view sexually exploited youth as victims of crime, and do not view or treat them as criminals.

   65% (n=52)

2. Coordinated Response: Our response fosters regional coordination and relationship-building within and across systems; this is an intentional process for different systems to interact, network, and form a regional alliance.

56% (n=45)

3. Victim Centered Response and Services: We meet youth where they are with accessible services based on their individual needs.

41% (n=33)

4. Victim Safety: Individually and collectively our first, foremost and sustaining objective is victim safety.

41% (n=33)

5. Victim Centered Response and Services: All children deserve a safe, warm, nurturing environment, independent of their behavior.

41% (n=33)

A significant number of participants also selected value statements related to cultural proficiency and accountability.

APPENDIX 3

Roles and Responsibilities of Key Responders

Local Law Enforcement

Local law enforcement is often the first responder responsible for determining if an individual engaged in selling sex is a minor, identifying criminal suspects in the case (john and pimp predators), investigating and gathering forensic evidence, preparing cases for prosecution, and coordinating with and notifying others, including advocates, service providers, prosecutors and CPS, about cases, suspects and victims. Law enforcement follows its regular agency policies and procedures in responding to criminal cases involving CSEC.

Each law enforcement agency should provide minimal CSEC training to *all patrol officers* so that in possible CSEC situations they recognize red flags of sexual exploitation, immediately call officers with in-depth CSEC training to take control of the case and investigation, preserve all relevant evidence including cell phones, computers, photos, cash, diaries, etc., and identify any signs of gang involvement.

Each law enforcement agency should have *at least two officers* (detectives or sergeants) with in-depth CSEC training. These specially trained officers should:

1. Identify a CSEC youth or a youth at risk of CSEC exploitation, and provide the youth with information about their rights under state law;
2. Assess and document any evidence of psychological trauma, coercion, and physical or other abuse; determine if emergency medical evaluation or treatment is needed, and if so either 1) dispatch emergency medical response or 2) deliver the child to a healthcare emergency room for evaluation;
3. Contact directly, or through a local hotline, a community based advocate, who has been trained to respond to CSEC and request their presence (regardless of the day or time of day) at the designated CSEC reception center site;
4. Transport the CSEC to the designated CSEC reception center site and work with the advocate, as appropriate, to determine the best immediate response for the CSEC (evaluate safety risks to the child and whether the child requires protective custody);

5. Report the case to Child Protective Services or to the social worker who serves on the MDT;
6. Ensure that all forensic evidence, including signs of gang involvement, is collected and prepare and submit case reports to the appropriate prosecuting agency for review, or submit reports for additional investigation to supervising officers for assignment to detectives for follow-up, as necessary;
7. Besides responding to specific cases, these specially trained officers should also be available to provide CSEC training to other local law enforcement officers; and
8. Serve on the CSEC Task Force, if assigned and appropriate.

Community-Based Advocates

The organization and array of advocacy services available to CSEC varies by community throughout Washington. Advocates identify exploited children and those at risk for exploitation, provide adult support to these children at the point of initial contact and until they are under the care and supervision of another adult, coordinate with other agencies in ensuring the child's safety, and provide ongoing case management and support while the child is involved with the legal and social services systems. Advocates seek to ensure that the child's needs—including the need for safety—are met and provide children and youth with information and resources, including information about legal and court proceedings and their legal rights. In addition to support and safety planning, advocates refer children and youth to appropriate community service providers. State and federal laws set role, reporting and confidentiality requirements for the work of community-based advocates.

Each community should have a community-based agency that has *at least two domestic violence, sexual assault, or other victim advocates* who have received in-depth CSEC training. These specially trained advocates should:

1. Respond 24/7 to calls from law enforcement or other members of the community and arrive as quickly as possible to the location of the CSEC victim (a healthcare facility or designated CSEC reception center);
2. Identify a CSEC youth or a youth at risk of CSEC exploitation;
3. Establish immediate rapport with the youth:
    a. Provide food, drink, clothing, and other comforts
    b. Ask the youth about what happened to them
    c. Inquire about what the youth immediately wants and needs (medical care, help with addiction if in acute distress, etc.)

d. Explain what the advocate is and is not able to do or provide, including requirements for mandatory reporting and the extent to which shared information can be held confidentially; and
e. Explain the process and what next steps will likely occur.

4. Strategize with law enforcement, and others, if appropriate, to determine next steps including how to keep the youth safe;
5. Accompany the youth until they are under the care or supervision of another adult;
6. Provide case management and advocacy for the youth throughout their involvement with the system, if applicable:
    a. Provide counseling to CSEC victims including support, information, referral to legal assistance and other resources and safety planning;
    b. Assist CSEC victims in accessing resources and services such as crisis and other counseling, support groups, housing, and health and social services;
    c. Refer to legal services and/or be legal advocates for CSEC victims and family/caregivers, providing information about rights under state law, and accompanying them to legal appointments and court appearances;
    d. Work with the youth's family/caregivers, if appropriate, to provide the information and services they need to understand what has happened, why, and what can be done moving forward.
7. Advocate may convene and facilitate the MDT within 24 hours of contact with the CSEC, and maintain the MDT functioning for any given case over time, as needed;
8. Serve on the CSEC Task Force if assigned and appropriate;
9. Besides providing case-specific support, victim advocates should also operate in a larger community-support context by
    a. Collaborating on an ongoing basis with agencies and other community organizations, including legal and criminal justice system entities;
    b. Participating on relevant task forces and committees concerned with CSEC issues; and
    c. Offering community education, outreach and professional trainings on CSEC.

Agencies Serving Youth

The organization and array of service providers available to CSEC varies by community throughout Washington. Services needed by CSEC may include crisis intervention, emergency

shelter, and safe/secure housing with a host of services (trauma recovery, mental/physical health, chemical dependency, educational, and life skills training). In areas without dedicated services for CSEC, the agency or agencies in the community that serve youth will need to develop CSEC specific capacities and coordinate with health, education and other community providers to meet the needs of CSEC youth.

Each community should have at least one local youth serving agency whose staff are CSEC knowledgeable. At least some of those staff should have in-depth CSEC training. This agency should:

1. Screen and assess CSEC referrals for immediate risks and safety needs, for physical and psychological health issues, and for appropriate readiness to receive social services;
2. Conduct screening of CSEC referrals and of their general population youth suspected of CSEC in order to confirm CSEC or identify red flags for CSEC. If CSEC is confirmed or suspected in a general population youth, one of the community's CSEC advocates should be notified;
3. Provide a full scope of culturally appropriate services for runaway and homeless youth including outreach, community based advocacy, case management and shelter. This includes having expertise working with and advocating on behalf of LBGTQ youth and providing services to family members of CSEC clients;
4. Provide CSEC-specific services directly or coordinate with the CSEC advocate in referring clients to appropriate providers, particularly those requiring health care, shelter/residential placement, or ongoing services. (Health care providers should document and report CSEC cases following their internal protocols for child abuse and/or neglect).

Child Protective Services

Child Protective Services (CPS) is a division within the Children's Administration of the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services that takes reports and investigates cases of alleged child abuse and/or neglect. CPS seeks to prevent or remedy child abuse and/or neglect, prevent or reduce the need for out-of-home placement and provide children with safe and permanent homes.

At a minimum, two locations within each DSHS region should have *at least two CPS workers and one CPS supervisor* (four trained CPS workers and 2 trained supervisors per region) with in-depth CSEC training. These CSEC trained CPS staff should:

1. Be available 24/7 in person or by phone to assist and advise local first responders and others on immediate safety planning and placement options for CSEC cases;
2. Remain engaged in any given CSEC case as long as necessary to ensure the ongoing safety of the involved child;
    a. Receive referrals and complete investigations of CSEC cases, assessing the risk of future abuse and/or neglect;
    b. File dependency petitions in juvenile court in CSEC cases where out-of-home placement is warranted and parents have not voluntarily agreed to it;
    c. Provide intervention information and referrals to resources to first responders and CSEC advocates, as well as to CSEC youth and their parents/family members, as appropriate;
3. Serve on the CSEC Task Force if assigned and appropriate.

Prosecutors

County prosecutors are responsible for the filing of charges and prosecution of all felony crimes within its specific county, all juvenile crimes, and misdemeanor offenses from unincorporated areas. The practice and approach of prosecuting attorneys differ from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.

A prosecutor will typically encounter CSEC in one of two ways: (1) as a victim of a john or pimp, or (2) as the subject of potential criminal charges. In some cases, the minor may meet both criteria. When working with CSEC in either situation, prosecutors should follow the best practices outlined in this protocol.

Prosecutors working with CSEC

As many first responders know, the participation of a victim as a witness in the criminal justice system is always complex, often placing additional pressure on the victim. CSEC may have undergone tremendous exposure to violence and psychological trauma. They often have suffered under conditions that have left them with a sense of hopelessness that is further complicated by the trafficker's success in convincing the victim that no one cares about the victim other than the trafficker.

Personal safety and self-preservation are the primary concerns of the victim. First responders who encounter reluctant victims can often be frustrated by the failure to remember this important fact. Despite the good intentions and expertise of the first responder, a CSEC is likely to be preoccupied with basic matters of self-protection and survival.

A law enforcement sting/recovery effort, for instance, does not automatically signal to the youth that all is well. CSEC need to feel safe and know that their traffickers are not nearby. They are usually fearful about facing their traffickers and testifying against them, and will require a great deal of support throughout the process.

Many victims, wanting to move on with their lives, become frustrated by the lengthy criminal justice system process. If victims disappear, in most instances the criminal justice system will be unable to hold the trafficker responsible.

Tips for prosecutors working with CSEC:

1. Approach CSEC with openness and try to understand that they have been through a very complex experience — physically, mentally, and emotionally.
2. Be patient when working with CSEC. Consider their mindset and experiences. Investigators, prosecutors, and first responders should expect a measure of inaccuracy or confusion in the victim's account of his/her experience. The first account often is dramatically different from the last account, and each account may contain a measure of truth, conditioned beliefs, confusion, or misleading embellishment.
3. The sooner CSEC achieve some physical security, emotional support, and feel less vulnerable, the better their capacity to cope with and relay their experiences. The ultimate goal is for the CSEC is to come to the realization that they will be safe and better off with authorities and service providers than they were with their traffickers.
4. Take precautions to be certain that the trafficker has been separated from the CSEC and that the trafficker is not pretending to be a victim before taking the youth to a shelter.
5. Find ways to minimize or eliminate contact between the CSEC and the trafficker or people affiliated with the trafficker.
6. Discuss constraints and timelines with victim service providers, advocates and law enforcement so that there is a consistent message when communicating with the victim.
7. Stay in close communication with the CSEC and his/her advocate, making certain that the CSEC remains informed about the process, the actions being taken on the CSEC's behalf, and the amount of time the CSEC should anticipate between actions.

The unfortunate reality is that the trafficker often has significant control over the victim, even when the victim has been removed to a place of safety. The trafficker knows what conditioning techniques were used against the victim, knows the victim's weaknesses, and is likely to have spent enough time with the victim for a measure of traumatic bonding to have occurred.

CSEC victims are frequently dependent on their traffickers and are likely to have or have had a personal or romantic relationship, and the CSEC may be in love with the pimp. This is a difficult bond to break and all responders need to understand this dynamic.

The trafficker may try to intervene or contact the victim. Following arrest, traffickers have swiftly intervened to bail victims out of law enforcement custody or bring in attorneys as representatives of the victims. In such cases, the victims will have been coached to anticipate the arrival of attorneys, and their cooperation with law enforcement may be delayed or nonexistent. In other instances, trafficker accomplices who are known to the victim may be posing as a victim.

Prosecutions involving CSEC as victim-witnesses

It is often the case that prosecutors can best attend to the long-term health and safety of CSEC victims by consistently and aggressively prosecuting those persons responsible for their exploitation. In doing so, prosecutors should attempt to build cases around CSEC victims by looking for evidence to corroborate allegations of their exploitation. Such evidence might include:

1. Cellular phone content (e.g., text messages, pictures, call history, contact lists, Internet browser history, etc.) and tower data (to track locations of suspects and/or victims);
2. Motel registry information;
3. Information from motel staff (e.g., regarding people coming and going to and from a particular room, observations by housekeeping staff, etc.);
4. Surveillance footage from motels and other businesses along the track;
5. Information from escort websites (e.g., victims' posts, payment information for those posts, email addresses associated with those posts, payment information, other posts using the same payment method, email address, or phone number, etc.);
6. Evidence relating to the sex trade (e.g., condoms, clothing, etc.);
7. Items used in pimping enterprises (e.g., computers, ledgers, credit cards, prepaid debit cards, cameras, etc.);
8. Medical records including documentation of injuries or any statements made by the victim for purposes of treatment and diagnosis;
9. Cash.

Other useful methods of building strong cases while reducing the involvement of CSEC include undercover officers posing as minors engaged in prostitution, using a tipped phone to overhear conversations between the minor and the pimp or john, and one-party consent recordings under RCW 9.73.230.

Depending on the facts and available evidence in a given case, the prosecution of pimps and/or johns will usually involve one or more of the following RCW sections:

- 9.68A.100, Commercial Sexual Abuse of a Minor
- 9.68A.101, Promoting Commercial Sexual Abuse of a Minor
- 9.68A.040, Sexual Exploitation of a Minor

- 9A.40.100, Trafficking

Each prosecutor's office should have *at least one deputy prosecutor* responsible for reviewing cases and filing on juveniles, and this prosecutor should have in-depth training on identifying, engaging and working with CSEC, including CSEC pimped by gang members or engaged in gang-related activity, and should be very knowledgeable about statewide laws that address this issue.

1. Prosecutors should use a collaborative approach to all cases involving CSEC. This approach includes consulting with law enforcement, advocates, and service providers to ensure that CSEC receive the full spectrum of services available in the community and to ensure an appropriate disposition of any criminal case involving CSEC. To the extent possible, prosecutors should ensure that advocacy services have been offered to the minor at the earliest possible stage, including any pre-arrest, investigative period.
2. For youth identified as CSEC either upon notification to the prosecuting attorney of contact/arrest, referral of a case to the prosecuting attorney, or on entry to detention or after they have been in detention, alternatives to incarceration should be considered and acted upon whenever possible.
3. When deciding whether to file charges of prostitution or prostitution loitering against a minor, the prosecuting attorney should, at a minimum, consider the following factors:
    a. Whether the case must be diverted because it is a first prostitution or prostitution loitering offense under RCW 13.40.070(7). Subsequent diversions should be considered depending on the services available in the community for CSEC.
    b. Whether the minor is entitled to an affirmative defense because the minor is a victim of trafficking or promoting prostitution in the first degree under RCW 9A.88.040.
    c. The services for CSEC available in the particular jurisdiction, including alternatives to confinement.
4. Regardless of whether a case against a minor is declined, diverted, or filed, the prosecutor should work with law enforcement to identify the buyers of sex and the trafficker/pimp connected with the minor, to determine whether the CSEC is a victim/witness in any other CSEC cases.
5. Serve on the CSEC Task Force if assigned and appropriate.

Defense Attorneys

Defense attorneys are critical players in ensuring CSEC receive the support they need. They represent the children and ensure their legal rights are honored and advocate for them, primarily in the area of their legal interests, but also more generally.

All juvenile criminal public defenders should have basic training in identifying and engaging CSEC youth and be aware of the services available for CSEC in their community. Further, each county should have *at least one public defender* with in-depth training in identifying and working with CSEC youth. The public defender should have an understanding of the trauma experienced by CSEC and should be skilled in motivational interviewing to maximize their ability to develop a trusting client-attorney relationship with the CSEC. This specially trained public defender should

1. Have knowledge of juvenile offender, BECCA and dependency law.
2. Be available 24/7 in person or by phone to the victim to answer any legal questions, if possible, for any and all youth stopped by law enforcement who have been identified as CSEC or at risk of CSEC. If the public defender is not immediately available, at a minimum the public defender should be available to meet with the CSEC within 24 hours after they are detained or placed in any other secure facility.
3. Provide the youth with legal advice and information about their rights under state law.
4. Immediately request—for any CSEC youth who is detained or charged with a crime—that the prosecuting attorney or the court consider diversion or some other alternative to detention and criminal prosecution.
5. Participate on and collaborate with other members of the MDT to advocate placement and services, particularly those specifically requested by the CSEC youth.
6. Serve on the CSEC Task Force if assigned and appropriate.

APPENDIX 4

Training Curricula for Key Responders

CSEC Trainers should have at least two years experience working with youth including youth at risk and sexually exploited youth, and should have received at least 40 hours of training on the topic. CSEC trainers should have strong relationships with first responders and local providers.

Specialized training should be provided by representatives from the field such as prosecutors, law enforcement, juvenile court staff, mental health providers and advocates.

The recommended training (see below) includes a 12 hour core curriculum and 4 additional hours of specialized training for particular professionals working with CSEC.

Advocates who are or will be MDT members have a primary responsibility to work with CSEC from identification through the provision of services. It is recommended that they have intensive training and expertise on the topic of sexually exploited children.

Domestic Violence or Sexual Assault advocates who work in agencies that receive funding through contracts with the State of Washington are required to have a proscribed amount and type of training before they can work with victims. In addition to this existing state-required training, it is recommended that advocates serving on the MDT receive an additional 16 hours of CSEC training as detailed in tables below.

Basic Curriculum: 12 hours

Target Audience: All MDT and Task Force members, law enforcement and others as applicable.	**Foundation Topics (12 hours)**
	<u>Day 1: 8 hours</u> • Social and cultural context of prostitution • Oppression, power and privilege • Gender construction; how this sets the stage for "supply and demand" • Language and definitions • Vulnerable populations and risk factors (individual, environment and social) • Pathways into prostitution (runaways, homelessness, recruitment, etc.) • Sub-culture of prostitution • Types of exploitation (pimps, gangs, families, LGBTQI) • Identification and red flags • Recruitment, grooming and "turning out" • Laws (state, federal and Safe Harbor movement) **<u>First half of day 2: 4 hours</u>** • Mental health impacts and trauma bonding (cover briefly) • Medical issues and physical health • Engagement with sexually exploited youth • Understanding priorities of sexually exploited youth • Basic and on-going needs • Stages of change (how to use with this population) • How the MDT functions • Connecting to on-going services and building a support network for each youth

Specialized Curriculum: 4 hours

Specific Roles within the MDT and Coordinated Response (The larger group will be split into 2 groups. A member of law enforcement and a prosecutor will train group 2)	**Specialized Topics (4 hours)**
Group 1: Direct Service Providers (advocates, social services, DSHS, mental health providers)	**Second half of day 2: 4 hours** • Trauma responses (PTSD, aggression, learned helplessness, cognitive difficulties) • Identity and subculture issues (street persona vs. authentic self) • Trauma bonding • Cognitive issues (educational and intellectual deficits) • Assessments (CSEC , GAIN, PTSD, crosswalk) • Interventions (motivational interviewing, TF CBT, case management) • Legal Advocacy and detention based services • Employment/vocational services • Education and Life skills services • Residential services and considerations
Group 2: Judges, law enforcement serving on the MDT, prosecutors, probation and detention staff, and others.	**Second half of day 2: 4 hours** • Not a "typical" victim • Identifying sexual exploitation/prostitution in the field • Evidence collection • Interviewing sexually exploited youth and perpetrators • Trends (technology, where youth are taken to "work", gangs) • Working with other systems/providers to build cases • Laws and legal tools (one-part consent exception) • Diversions • Probation services with sexually exploited youth

APPENDIX 5

CSEC Multi-Disciplinary Team Memorandum of Understanding

(Template)

CSEC Multi-Disciplinary Team

Commercially sexually exploited children (CSEC) are victims of trauma who require the support and services of multiple and diverse agencies. Effective coordination and collaboration among the professionals at these agencies is foundational to ensuring that CSEC receive the immediate and ongoing care they need to reclaim and rebuild their lives.

This memorandum of understanding (MOU) defines the roles and responsibilities of each participating organization in a formally established local CSEC Multi-Disciplinary Team (CSEC MDT). The MOU identifies the key organizations involved in providing needed support and services to CSEC in (INSERT geographic or political locality).

Participants in the CSEC MDT are professionals representing diverse disciplines with direct responsibility to CSEC, who convene immediately following CSEC identification and who continue to meet regularly on each case, for as long as needed, continually assessing the youth's situation, addressing problems, barriers or other challenges as they arise, offering support as the youth and the youth's family navigate complex systems, and making other services available as needed. The MDT works together to ensure the youth's immediate needs are met, to assess the youth's safety needs and to arrange placement, and to identify and offer ongoing services and care.

Each member agency agrees to support the mission of the MDT to assist CSEC by coordinating their separate activities to meet the youth's needs. Specifically, the CSEC MDT member agencies agree to the following:

(Insert Local Law Enforcement Agency title)

- Local law enforcement is often the first responder responsible for determining if an individual engaged in selling sex is a minor, identifying criminal suspects in the case (john and pimp predators), investigating and gathering forensic evidence, preparing cases for

prosecution, and coordinating with and notifying others, including victim advocates, Child Protective Services and prosecutors about cases, victims and suspects.

- (Insert Local Law Enforcement Agency title) will provide basic CSEC training to *all patrol officers* and in-depth CSEC training to *at least two officers* (detectives or sergeants). An officer with in-depth CSEC training will be the lead investigator in CSEC cases and will participate as a member of the CSEC MDT. Besides engagement on specific cases, the specially trained officers provide CSEC training to other local law enforcement officers or law enforcement agencies.
- (Insert Local Law Enforcement Agency title) will
    - Identify a CSEC youth or a youth at risk of CSEC, and provide the youth with information about their rights under state law;
    - Assess and document any evidence of psychological trauma, coercion and/or physical or other abuse, determine if emergency medical evaluation or treatment is needed, and arrange for such evaluation and treatment;
    - Contact a CSEC-trained community-based victim advocate MDT team member and request the advocate's immediate involvement in the case. Work with the advocate as appropriate to determine the best immediate response for the CSEC to ensure the youth's safety, including whether the youth requires protective custody;
    - Report the case to the Child Protective Services MDT member;
    - Ensure that all forensic evidence, including signs of gang involvement, is collected and prepare and submit case reports to the appropriate prosecuting agency for review, or submit reports for additional investigation to supervising officers for assignment to detectives for follow-up, as necessary.

(Insert Community-Based Victim Advocate Agency title)

- Victim advocates identify exploited children and those at risk for exploitation, provide adult support to these children at the point of initial contact and until they are under the care and supervision of another adult, coordinate with other agencies in ensuring the child's safety, and provide ongoing case management and support while the child is involved with the legal and social services systems. Victim advocates seek to ensure that CSEC needs—including the need for safety—are met and provide CSEC with information and resources, including information about legal and court proceedings and their legal rights. In addition to support and safety planning, advocates refer CSEC to appropriate community service providers, and assess the needs of family/caregivers, if appropriate, and refer them to services.

- (Insert Community-Based Victim Advocate Agency title) will provide in-depth CSEC training to *at least two advocates* (domestic violence, sexual assault, or other). A victim advocate with in-depth CSEC training will participate as a member of the CSEC MDT, and may assume responsibility for convening and facilitating the work of the MDT within 24 hours of contact with the CSEC, and maintaining MDT activities related to any given case. Besides providing case-specific support, these specially trained victim advocates collaborate generally with relevant agencies and other community organizations, including legal and criminal justice system entities; participate on task forces and committees concerned with CSEC issues; and offer community education, outreach and professional trainings on CSEC.
- (Insert Community-Based Victim Advocate Agency title) will
    - Respond 24/7 to calls from law enforcement or other members of the community and arrive as quickly as possible to the location of the CSEC victim;
    - Identify a CSEC youth or a youth at risk of CSEC exploitation;
    - Establish immediate rapport with the youth:
        - Provide food, drink, clothing, and other comforts
        - Ask the youth about what happened to them
        - Inquire about what the youth immediately wants and needs (medical care, help with addiction if in acute distress, etc.)
        - Explain what the advocate is and is not able to do or provide, including requirements for mandatory reporting and the extent to which shared information can be held confidentially
        - Explain the process and what next steps will likely occur
    - Strategize with law enforcement, other MDT members, and others, as appropriate, to determine next steps including how to keep the youth safe;
    - Accompany the youth until they are under the care or supervision of another adult;
    - Provide information and counseling, case management and advocacy for the youth throughout their involvement with the system, if applicable:
        - Assist CSEC and their family, if appropriate, in accessing resources and services such as crisis and other counseling, support groups, housing, and health and social services;
        - Refer to legal services and/or be legal advocates for CSEC and family, providing information about rights under state law, and accompanying victims and family members to legal appointments and court hearings;

(Insert Service Provider Agency title)

- Services needed by CSEC may include crisis intervention, emergency shelter, and safe/secure housing with a host of services (trauma recovery, mental/physical health, chemical dependency, educational, and life skills training).

- (Insert Service Provider Agency title) will provide in-depth CSEC training to appropriate staff. At least one of these specially trained staff members may participate as a member of the CSEC MDT.

- (Insert Service Provider Agency title) will
    - Screen and assess CSEC referrals for immediate risks and safety needs, for physical and psychological health issues, and for appropriate readiness to receive social services.
    - Provide the full range of CSEC-specific services directly or coordinate with the CSEC victim advocate in referring clients to appropriate providers, particularly those requiring health care, shelter/residential placement, education or other ongoing services. (Insert Service Provider Agency title) will provide culturally appropriate services, including having expertise working with and advocating on behalf of LBGTQI youth and providing services to family members of CSEC clients.
    - Conduct screening among their general youth population to confirm CSEC or identify risk factors for CSEC using the Commercially Sexually Exploited Children/Youth (CSEC) Interview Instrument, after staff have been trained in its use.
    - If CSEC is confirmed or suspected in the general youth population, (insert Service Provider Agency title) will notify one of the MDT member CSEC victim advocates.

Child Protective Services

- Child Protective Services (CPS) is a division within the Children's Administration of the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services that takes reports and investigates cases of alleged child abuse and/or neglect. CPS seeks to prevent or remedy child abuse and/or neglect, prevent or reduce the need for out-of-home placement and provide children with safe and permanent homes. Some youth may be State dependent at the time they are identified as CSEC, while others may qualify for dependency based on their CSEC status.

- CPS will provide in-depth CSEC training to *at least two Child Protective Services (CPS) workers and one CPS supervisor*) at two locations per region (four trained CPS workers and 2 trained supervisors). In (insert geographic or political locality), CPS will provide in-depth

CSEC training to ___ CPS workers and ____ supervisors. CPS staff with in-depth CSEC training will participate as a member of the CSEC MDT.

- CPS will
  - Be available 24/7 in person or by phone to assist and advise local first responders and others on immediate safety planning and placement options for CSEC cases;
  - Remain engaged in any given CSEC case as long as necessary to ensure the ongoing safety of the involved child.
    - Receive referrals and complete investigations of CSEC cases, assessing the risk of future abuse and/or neglect;
    - File dependency petitions in juvenile court in CSEC cases where out-of-home placement is warranted and parents have not voluntarily agreed to it;
    - Provide intervention information and referrals to resources to first responders and CSEC advocates, as well as to CSEC youth and their parents/family members, as appropriate.

(Insert law enforcement agency title)	Date
(Insert CSEC victim advocate agency title)	Date
(Insert service provider agency title)	Date
Child Protective Services	Date
(Insert other agency title)	Date

APPENDIX 6

Portland State University CSEC Screening Interview

Important information for using the CSEC Screening Interview

This instrument identifies risk factors commonly associated with CSEC. It was developed by Emily Salisbury, PhD, Assistant Professor, Division of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Portland State University, with assistance from Kelli Russell, a CSEC consultant and trainer. Dr. Salisbury may be reached at [salisbej@pdx.edu] or at 503-725-5238.

1. The instrument was designed as an interview to be conducted by intake officers in juvenile detention for a population of youth in Clark County, Washington. Therefore, the tool may need to be revised for different populations and locations. It was intended for screening of both girls and boys.
2. Since the tool will need adjustment based on the setting in which it is implemented, it is imperative to assess the intake process at each setting prior to implementation, particularly a) staffing, b) where in the intake process the screening can most effectively be conducted, and c) whether advocates are available 24/7. Additionally, agencies adopting the tool should have protocols in place addressing the need of clients for sexual assault nurse exams (SANE) and/or general medical attention. (The need for SANE is not always disclosed by victims during intake but may present in conversations while the victim is in other stages of care or custody.)
3. In Clark County, there was often only one window of opportunity to gain trust with CSEC victims. Therefore, it is important that agencies that plan to administer the tool assess in advance their capabilities and take steps to strengthen their processes so as to reduce the risk of inadvertently breaking or failing to establish trust with the CSEC victims they serve.
4. The goal goes beyond simply identifying CSEC victims. The intent is to ensure a coordinated and sustained diversion of CSEC victims from the juvenile justice system to advocates and resources. Thus the screening tool is meant to be used in conjunction with an established referral process and any agency wanting to use it must have established relationships with community advocates and key stakeholders (presiding judges, prosecutors, youth service providers and others) in place before implementation.
5. The instrument should be implemented only by staff trained on CSEC generally and on trauma-informed interviewing; this is important to ensure that those administering the tool understand CSEC risk factors and how various responses to questions may be associated with such risk factors.
6. Support from the top of the agency is necessary to ensure success.
7. Agencies that implement the tool need to be prepared to triage victims of abuse and neglect who may not formally be defined as CSEC. Reports of victimization will likely increase after implementation of the tool.
8. The questionnaire is not a validated tool; research has not been conducted to determine its predictive ability or accuracy in identifying CSEC victims as opposed to victims of non-CSEC abuse or even non-abused youth.

The CSEC Screening Interview

This screening tool is the intellectual property of Portland State University. Prior to use, please contact the PSU's Office of Innovation and Intellectual Property <http://www.pdx.edu/research/innovation>. Thank You.

Interview Date:	Youth Sex:
Youth Name:	Interviewer Name:
Youth Date of Birth:	Interviewer Sex: M F
Youth Age:	Referrals Made:
Youth Race:	Comments regarding referrals:

Directions: Staff completing this tool should:

A. Ask each question in the interview and indicate 'NR' if the youth refuses to respond after prompting
B. Be aware of the attitude and demeanor of the youth during the interview and record observations at the end of the tool

Interview:

1. Where are you living right now?

   Is this where you are sleeping too?

2. Are you living with anyone? No Yes (Ask question 2a)

2a. Who are you living with?

3. Where are you from originally?

4. Have you ever run away from home? No Yes (Ask question 4a)

4a. About how many times have you run away?
(If youth has difficulty, ask if one time, 2-3 times, 4-6 times, 6-10 times, more than 10)

5. Have you ever been in foster care? No Yes

6. Does someone take care of you when you need help? No Yes (ask question 6a)

6a. Who takes care of you?

7. Have you had any contact with police before you came here? No Yes (ask question 7a-7c)

7a. About how many contacts with police have you had?
(if youth has difficulty, ask if one time, 2-3 times, 4-6 times, 6-10 times, more than 10)

7b. What cities did these police contacts take place in?

7c. How many of these contacts resulted in your arrest?
(if youth has difficulty, ask if one time, 2-3 times, 4-6 times, 6-10 times, more than 10)

READ to youth if appropriate, such as if youth is in a detention facility:

"Another staff member is going to review the answers you give me after I put this sheet in a place that only the staff person has access to. If the staff person needs more clarification on some of your answers, he or she might ask to talk with you a little more. At that point, you can decide whether you want to talk with him or her – ok?"

INTERVIEWER OBSERVATIONS:

Does youth have current address/contact information? NO YES
Personal Items: (hotel keys, large amounts of cash, Viagra pills, condoms, etc.
Visual evidence of brands/tattoos? NO YES Description?
Suspected or disclosed gang affiliation? NO YES Name of gang, if known:
Evidence of abuse? (ligature marks, burns, bruises?) NO YES Description?
Is CPS/DSHS involved? NO YES Name and location of caseworker if applicable _____
General observations: Be specific and include any information from presenting agencies, attitude of the youth, if youth came in with an adult other than parent or guardian, etc.
Did youth: Self Disclosed CSEC? Non-Disclosed Suspected CSEC? Non-Disclosed, not suspected CSEC?

APPENDIX 7

National and Washington State Data

King County Data

Project Respect did not collect data on runaways and children otherwise involved in the juvenile justice system in King County, although the number charged with prostitution offenses is included. Instead, the primary source of data for King County is from a report issued in 2008 which found a significant number of children in this county having been forced into prostitution.[6] This report identified 238 specific juveniles involved in prostitution from a review of agency case files. At that time, the report estimated a prevalence rate in the county of between 300 and 500 CSEC. The report found that the ages of the juvenile victims varied, but some are as young as 12 or 13.

Prostitution Charges Against Juveniles in Washington[7]

In Washington, juveniles may be charged with the crime of prostitution. The data below shows that the number of juveniles charged with prostitution and who were diverted is very low. There were a total of 33 charges from 2000 through 2010, although three were lewd contact charges which may have been prostitution-related but were not confirmed as such. Many more were arrested for prostitution offenses, but not charged.

[6] Boyer, Debra (2008). Who Pays The Price? Assessment of Youth Involved in Prostitution in Seattle, Seattle Human Services Department, Division of Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Prevention.

[7] Dr. Sarah Veele-Brice of the Washington State Center for Court Research provided the data summary which is derived from information collected by Washington superior, juvenile, district, and municipal courts between 2000 and through 2010. This data is only for those cases that were diverted.

- Only 9 of the 33 counties filed prostitution charges against juveniles. King and Pierce Counties filed the most, 9 and 8 respectively.
- Seventy-five percent (75%) of those charged were female.
- The average age at the time of filing was 16 years.
- White youth accounted for 48% of the charges and Latinos 9%. The race of all others charged was not available.
- Every charge resulted in a diversion.

Runaway and Homeless Data

Available research shows a strong correlation between running away/youth homelessness and engaging in sexual activity for money, shelter, or goods. Runaways are at greater risk of being, or are more likely to have been, commercially sexually exploited.

- More than a third of homeless youth engage in survival sex.[8]
- According to at least one study, 90% of runaways become part of the sex trade industry.[9]
- Once on the street, 1 out of 3 teens will be lured toward prostitution within 48 hours of leaving home.[10]

Data on repeat runaways shows a striking correlation to prostitution. In Dallas, changes in how the city's police department responds to repeat runaways has lead to substantially greater numbers of juveniles being identified as prostitutes. Sergeant Byron Fassett leads that agency's effort to recover prostituted youth. Several years ago, dissatisfied with the department's handling of these cases,

> . . . Sergeant Fassett started combing through old case files, looking for patterns. One stuck out: 80 percent of the prostituted children the department had handled had run away from home at least four or more times a year. "It dawned on me, if you want to effectively deal with teen prostitutes, you need to look for repeat runaways," he said. [The department now] flags any juvenile in the city who runs away from home four or more times in a given

---

[8] Ray, N. (2006). Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Youth: An Epidemic of Homelessness. National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Policy Institute. Washington, DC: National Coalition for Homeless.

[9] Goodman, M. (July 2005). You Ain't Been Down My Street. *Atlanta Magazine*.

[10] Ibid.

year . . . If one of those children is picked up by the police anywhere in the country, the child is directed back to Sergeant Fassett's unit, which immediately begins investigating the juvenile's background.[11]

Participants at Project Respect's "mini-summits" also noted that many children who leave home were never reported as runaways, and many others were kicked-out. The latter are often called "throwaways." This observation seems to be confirmed in a study that found over 50 percent of youth in shelters and on the streets reported that their parents told them to leave or knew they were leaving and did not care.[12]

Runaway Data by County in Washington

For the counties that participated in the "mini-summits", the following tables identify the number of female juveniles reported by law enforcement agencies as runaways (although not all law enforcement agencies in each county reported). The data is for 2011 unless otherwise noted.

Because many children are not reported by their families as runaways and because some law enforcement agencies did not report, the numbers below likely under represent the actual runaway experience in these areas.

Benton County (The data from Benton, Franklin and Yakima counties is complicated because reporting was based on counts from a particular street address, so the number of runaways in these counties may be either over or under represented due to this reporting methodology.)

(Data for 2010)	Kennewick Police	Richland Police	Total
How many girls were reported runaway four or more times in 2011?	20	5	25
What is the greatest number of times a girl has been reported runaway in 2011?	not reported	not reported	
How many runaway reports do (4+) repeat runaways account for?	not reported	not reported	
How many total female runaway reports were there in 2011?	not reported	not reported	

[11] Urbina, Ian. "Running in the Shadows", New York Times, October 26, 2009.

[12] Green, J.M. et al. (1995). Youth with Runaway, Throwaway, and Homeless Experiences: Prevalence, Drug Use, and Other At-Risk Behaviors. Final report under Contract No. 105-090-1703 from the Administration on Children Youth, and Families. Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute.

Clark County

	Vancouver Police	Clark County Sheriff	Total
How many girls were reported runaway four or more times in 2011?	9	9	18
What is the greatest number of times a girl has been reported runaway in 2011?	5 times	8 times	
How many runaway reports do (4+) repeat runaways account for?	38	53	91
How many total female runaway reports were there in 2011?	154	136	290

Franklin County

(Data for 2010)	Franklin County Sheriff
How many girls were reported runaway four or more times in 2011?	0
What is the greatest number of times a girl has been reported runaway in 2011?	3
How many runaway reports do (4+) repeat runaways account for?	n/a
How many total female runaway reports were there in 2011?	not reported

Kitsap County

	Bremerton Police
How many girls were reported runaway four or more times in 2011?	0
What is the greatest number of times a girl has been reported runaway in 2011?	3
How many runaway reports do (4+) repeat runaways account for?	0
How many total female runaway reports were there in 2011?	19

Lewis County

	All Law Enforcement Agencies in Lewis County (reported by Lewis County Sheriff)
How many girls were reported runaway four or more times in 2011?	3
What is the greatest number of times a girl has been reported runaway in 2011?	5 times
How many runaway reports do (4+) repeat runaways account for?	13
How many total female runaway reports were there in 2011?	70

Pierce County

	Lakewood Police	Pierce Co Sheriff	Puyallup Police	Tacoma Police[13]	Total
How many girls were reported runaway four or more times in 2011?	5 (3 or more times)	52 (3 or more times)	1	33	34 (4+) 91 (3+)
What is the greatest number of times a girl has been reported runaway in 2011?	not reported	not reported	4 times	8 times	
How many runaway reports do (4+) repeat runaways account for?	not reported	not reported	4	165	169
How many total female runaway reports were there in 2011?	not reported	not reported	39	501	540

Skagit County

	Sedro Woolley Police
How many girls were reported runaway four or more times in 2011?	2
What is the greatest number of times a girl has been reported runaway in 2011?	not reported
How many runaway reports do (4+) repeat runaways account for?	8
How many total female runaway reports were there in 2011?	not reported

Snohomish County

	Snohomish County Sheriff
How many girls were reported runaway four or more times in 2011?	7
What is the greatest number of times a girl has been reported runaway in 2011?	8 times
How many runaway reports do (4+) repeat runaways account for?	36
How many total female runaway reports were there in 2011?	not reported

[13] Tacoma Police reported female runaways between the ages of 12 and 17.

Spokane County

	All Law Enforcement Agencies in Spokane County Except City of Cheney (reported by Spokane County Sheriff)
How many girls were reported runaway four or more times in 2011?	131
What is the greatest number of times a girl has been reported runaway in 2011?	56 times
How many runaway reports do (4+) repeat runaways account for?	994
How many total female runaway reports were there in 2011?	1,590

Thurston County

	Thurston County Sheriff
How many girls were reported runaway four or more times in 2011?	3
What is the greatest number of times a girl has been reported runaway in 2011?	7 times
How many runaway reports do (4+) repeat runaways account for?	16
How many total female runaway reports were there in 2011?	114

Whatcom County

	Bellingham Police
How many girls were reported runaway four or more times in 2011?	6
What is the greatest number of times a girl has been reported runaway in 2011?	17 times
How many runaway reports do (4+) repeat runaways account for?	39
How many total female runaway reports were there in 2011?	not reported

Yakima County (data for 2010)

	Yakima Police	Sunnyside Police	Total
How many girls were reported runaway four or more times in 2011?	29	4	33
What is the greatest number of times a girl has been reported runaway in 2011?	not reported	not reported	
How many runaway reports do (4+) repeat runaways account for?	not reported	not reported	
How many total female runaway reports were there in 2011?	not reported	not reported	

Juvenile Justice System Involvement Data

Data on juvenile justice system involvement by females may also provide important information about commercially sexually exploited children. Many prostituted children are involved in the court system due to dependency, other offenses or to status violations (truancy, etc.). Many youth-serving professionals in Washington know or suspect this, and a California study concluded that it was true for Los Angeles and Alameda Counties.[14] According to this study, in Alameda County

- 95% of youth identified as commercially sexually exploited by law enforcement had prior involvement with the dependency and/or delinquency systems, and
- 67% of young girls in the jurisdiction who were at risk for or involved in sex trafficking were already on probation at the time they were identified as commercially sexually exploited.

The study also reported the following from a focus group of young women on probation with prostitution histories:

- 59% had been detained more than once
- 46% had at least four prior arrests
- 27% had been detained for probation violations
- 22% had been detained for bench warrants

[14] Guzman, J. P., JPG Consultants (Sept. 30, 2011). Report on Creating a Continuum of Care of CSEC in Los Angeles County (to Judge Donna Growman, Los Angeles County Superior Court).

Juvenile Justice System Involvement by County in Washington

The following tables summarize the number of female juvenile referrals, filings, and detention episodes in 2011 in selected counties. These numbers do not represent the number of unique females who were the subject of a referral or filing, or who were detained. The number of unique females is virtually always lower as many girls are the subject of multiple referrals and or filings, and are detained multiple times in one year. The office of each county's Juvenile Court Administrator/Director provided the data.

County	Female Referrals	Female Filings	Female Detention Episodes
Benton/Franklin[15]	1,091	243	not reported
Clark	1,190	638	677
Kitsap	409	170	368
Lewis	255	139	91
Pierce	4,549	3,631	615
Skagit	693	n/r	142
Spokane	791	202	435
Thurston	n/r	307	373
Whatcom	n/r	221	230
Yakima	587	245	304
TOTAL REPORTED	9,565	5,796	3,235

[15] Separate data for each county is not available.

APPENDIX 8

Data Collection Goals and Elements

Goals

- Understand the extent of incidence of CSEC – tracking the number of cases and where they are occurring
- Understand the victims involved – the numbers of girls and boys, their ages, and racial/ethnic/tribal background
- Track factors that may make children at-risk for CSEC – information about their living situations and they and their family's involvement with the child welfare system and with the criminal justice system
- Support law enforcement and prosecutors in pursuing predators – information about gang/pimp involvement with CSEC and where it occurred
- Tailor services to meet the needs of individual victims – information about victim's service needs

Data Elements

1. Determining the extent of the CSEC problem in Washington State and the victims involved
   a. CSEC cases by region
   b. CSEC cases by age, gender, race/ethnicity, tribal affiliation
   c. CSEC background of victims (prostitution history)

2. Establishing victim's social background
   a. Victim's guardian
   b. Status of victim's parents (whatever is known about the parents)
   c. Victim's family involvement with child welfare system (# of interactions, dates and reasons)
   d. Victim's family involvement with law enforcement (# of interactions, dates and reasons)
   e. Victim's living situation (with parents, with pimp, in foster care, homeless/street involved)
   f. Victim's involvement with a pimp or gang; regions where victim has been pimped

3. Establishing victim's involvement with juvenile justice system
    a. Number of arrests and for what
    b. Age at first arrest
    c. Number of times detained and for what
    d. Was victim on probation at time youth was identified as CSEC and if so, for what?
    e. Is the youth a federal material witness?

4. Determining victim's service needs
    a. Youth's safety status
    b. Is youth attending school and if so, which school and at what grade level?
    c. Does the youth have an Individualized Educational Plan (IEP)?
    d. Has youth been referred to or received CSEC specific services in past?
    e. Is youth currently receiving CSEC specific services?
    f. Is youth receiving or participating in any services/programs and, if so, which services/programs?
    g. Does youth have substance abuse or mental health issues?
    h. Does youth have any disabilities?
    i. Is or has the youth ever been pregnant? Is the youth parenting a child?

center for
CHILDREN & YOUTH
JUSTICE | Better systems. Better lives.®

615 2nd Ave, Ste 275, Seattle, WA 98104
206.696.7503 | **www.ccyj.org**