

**ENDING COMMERCIAL SEXUAL EXPLOITATION:  
A Local Coordinated Response Assessment and Strategic Framework  
Addressing Sex Trafficking of Minors in Seattle – King County**

**-DRAFT-  
June 2012**

*Report Provided*

*By*

**Lan Pham**

**Planning and Development Specialist**

**Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Prevention**

**Seattle Human Services Department**



**City of Seattle  
Michael McGinn, Mayor  
Human Services Department  
Dannette R. Smith, Director  
700 – 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 5800  
P.O. Box 34215  
Seattle, WA 98124 – 4215  
[www.seattle.gov/humanservices](http://www.seattle.gov/humanservices)**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report could not have been completed without the participation of partner agencies, individuals, and community members who actively participated in the Seattle Human Services Department's 20-month community engagement process.

Central to this effort is the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Youth (CSEY) Coordinated Response Steering Committee (or CSEY Steering Committee). Committee members (**Appendix A**) met monthly from August 2010 through December 2011 to develop the regional mission, vision, and values (**Appendix B**); and based on these guiding principles worked collaboratively to provide a number of the recommendations highlighted in this report.

Thanks to other participants and supporters of our community engagement<sup>1</sup> process. This includes participants of the August 30, 2010, Stakeholders Forum, community-based agencies that coordinated focus groups, focus group facilitators and participants, participants in one-to-one interviews, and those who completed surveys. We appreciate your candid feedback and for trusting us with your stories and providing your perspectives "from the trenches". Your contributions are central to the development of a strategic framework to address commercial sexual exploitation in Seattle-King County.

A special "thank you" to our University of Washington – Master of Social Work Interns, Brittany Mars and Sothida Tan, who dedicated their full internship to research the issue, assisted with focus groups and interviews, and participated in our vetting of best and promising practices and recommendations.

Last but not least, a sincere thank you to the City of Seattle team from the Seattle Human Services Department, Seattle Police Department, Seattle Municipal Court, Councilmember Burgess' Office. City team members provided feedback and collaborative support across units, divisions, departments, boldly stepping outside of silos to work towards one common goal. Together, we will end commercial sexual exploitation in our community.

---

<sup>1</sup> The term "community engagement" is used to reference the process which the City of Seattle outreaches to and engages the local community and stakeholders in conversations about commercial sexual exploitation. This process is used to solicit feedback and inform the strategic response framework that is highlighted in this report.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|      |  |    |
|------|--|----|
| I.   | INTRODUCTION   | 1  |
| II.  | BACKGROUND INFORMATION   | 3  |
|      | a. Coordinated response planning                                     | 3  |
|      | b. Methodology   | 4  |
| III. | KEY FINDINGS   | 6  |
|      | a. Resources: Local efforts to combat commercial sexual exploitation | 6  |
|      | b. Target Populations: Survivors, pimps, buyers                      | 11 |
|      | c. Gaps: Service needs and response strategies                       | 16 |
| IV.  | COMMUNITY RESPONSE RECOMMENDATIONS                                   | 22 |
|      | a. Priority #1: Prevention   | 22 |
|      | b. Priority #2: Victim identification                                | 22 |
|      | c. Priority #3: Victim services                                      | 23 |
|      | d. Priority #4: Seattle-King County protocol                         | 24 |
|      | e. Priority #5: Offender accountability                              | 24 |
| V.   | CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS   | 25 |
| VI.  | APPENDICES   | 26 |

## I. INTRODUCTION

The coordinated response assessment and proposed strategic framework for addressing commercial sexual exploitation in Seattle – King County presented in this report are based on a comprehensive information-gathering process the City of Seattle Human Services Department (HSD) conducted over the period of 20 months. In addition, numerous hours of community engagement including facilitated stakeholders discussions, individual meetings and interviews, observations of coordinated response efforts, survivor groups, and youth focus groups, HSD also conducted document reviews and phone interviews with programs outside of Washington to identify the best and promising practices specific to victim/survivor support services, coordinated response protocols, programs addressing the demand, and prevention efforts.

This comprehensive, community-informed, data collection effort enabled HSD to map out existing resources and services, identify gaps in current response strategies (prevention, intervention, addressing the demand), and provide specific strategic recommendations.

This report is divided into four sections:

1. Background Information – Providing a crucial backdrop leading to the Seattle-King County coordinated response assessment process, and providing an overview of the assessment process and data collection methodologies.
2. Key Findings – Highlighting information discovered during the community engagement process and providing the context for the development of specific recommendations.
3. Recommendations – Offering key recommendations based on data collected from the community engagement process, literature reviews, and national best or promising practices.
4. Conclusion and Next Steps – Addressing the implications of this report and an outline of the City of Seattle’s future plans for implementation.

The primary intent of this report is to provide a strategic framework for the City of Seattle to improve its current response to commercial sexual exploitation, with a special focus on children and youth. It is meant to serve as a road map for HSD’s leading the effort to coordinate a systems response to prevent, intervene, provide sustaining support for victims/survivors of commercial sexual exploitation, and increased perpetrator (pimps and sex buyers) accountability. As a coordinated system response framework, the implementation phase will call for cross-system relationship-building, an effort for different local systems to interact, network, and form a regional alliance.

The secondary purpose for the report is to serve as a resource to local community groups, nonprofit organizations, government, systems, institutions, and funding entities, with the hope

that the information gathered may assist them in their planning, coordination, implementation and investment efforts addressing commercial sexual exploitation.

Lastly, it should be noted that this report has limitations. Since the Seattle Human Services Department's central focus is on social services delivery and response in Seattle-King County, this assessment is conducted from that perspective. Further evaluation the involves the legal and criminal justice, medical, and public health response systems with specific emphasis on prevention, intervention, and response strategies would further add richness to the strategic framework.

DRAFT

## II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In June 2008, the Seattle Human Services Department (HSD) released a special report conducted by Debra Boyer, Ph.D., entitled "Who Pays the Price? Youth Involvement in Prostitution in Seattle."<sup>2</sup> The report identified 238 youth in King County (in 2007) who were involved in prostitution, and noted that there are between 300 and 500 prostituted youth in King County, some as young as 11. The report provided four key recommendations:

1. Create a statewide network of safe housing programs which provide wrap-around services for commercially sexually exploited youth;
2. Create a community response plan involving a broad spectrum of responders and providers;
3. Provide ongoing, comprehensive trainings to increase provider and responder knowledge and skills about how to identify, engage and better serve commercially sexually exploited youth; and
4. Address the contradictory legal status of youth involved in prostitution.

In January 2010, HSD invested in The Bridge – a residential recovery program for prostituted youth (housed at YouthCare, a local nonprofit agency serving homeless youth). The doors to The Bridge opened in May 2010. The three-year pilot project provided intensive case management and wrap-around services for commercially sexually exploited youth between ages 14 and 17. Concurrently in summer of 2010, HSD also launched our quarterly (now bi-monthly) Commercially Sexually Exploited Youth 101 Trainings, held at the Seattle City Hall, for service providers and first responders. This is an effort to raise awareness and build skill for better victim identification, victim/survivor-centered response, and improve knowledge of existing resources and process for information and referrals.

### A. COORDINATED RESPONSE PLANNING

In August 2010, HSD in conjunction with the Seattle Police Department (SPD), initiated development of a coordinated community response planning to improve current community and system response to, and support for commercially sexually exploited youth, and increase accountability for exploiters.

This effort began with a one-day stakeholder's forum held in August 2010 at Seattle City Hall. The meeting was attended by more than 80 community members, representing a variety of sectors (government agencies, youth programs, domestic violence and sexual assault agencies, medical and mental health providers, criminal justice professionals, etc.). Forum participants provided rich information and recommendations for Seattle-King County and its neighbors

---

<sup>2</sup> Boyer, D. (2008) *Who pays the price? Assessment of youth involvement in prostitution in Seattle*. Seattle, WA: City of Seattle Human Services Department, Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Prevention Division.

(South King County, Pierce, and Snohomish) to address the commercial sexual exploitation of youth. Recommendations covered a wide array of issues, including: prevention of initial exploitation and re-victimization, increasing community's awareness and improving victim identification, supportive wrap-around services for victims/survivors and their family, rehabilitative services survivors and young pimps, addressing the demand and increasing penalties for exploiters.

To vet this extensive list of recommendations, the CSEY Coordinated Response Steering Committee was convened. Members of this committee consisted of government entities, criminal justice professionals, law enforcement, non-profits, community mobilizing groups, and survivors of prostitution. Members came from Snohomish, King, and Pierce counties. They met on a monthly basis from August 2010 through December 2011, and worked in sub-groups (based on their professional expertise and background), to develop specific recommendations for the region.

From January – April 2012, the Committee's recommendations were vetted through series of community engagement discussions, which included: individual interviews, focus groups, and surveys with survivors, youth, domestic violence and sexual assault providers, system stakeholders, and City of Seattle professionals across HSD Divisions and City of Seattle departments.

## **B. METHODOLOGY**

The primary approach for this project was an ethnographic assessment. Methods for this approach include observations, group discussions (formal and informal), individual key informant interviews, surveys, and document and literature reviews. Below is a summary of methods used to collect data for this assessment:

### **PROVIDERS AND FIRST RESPONDERS**

- ❑ Structured, facilitated group dialogues were conducted with 80 stakeholders<sup>3</sup>.
- ❑ Semi-structured, in-person interviews were conducted with 36 stakeholders.
- ❑ Semi-structured phone interviews were conducted with 5 program administrators of 5 different residential recovery programs for survivors of commercial sexual exploitation (located in California, Georgia, Massachusetts, and New York); 4 of the programs served youth, 1 served adults.
- ❑ Surveys were collected from 54 Seattle-King County-based domestic violence, sexual assault, and systems providers<sup>4</sup>.
- ❑ Semi-structured, in-person interviews were conducted with 8 lead members of 3 local coordinated response efforts. Coalition meetings were also observed with notes taken.

---

<sup>3</sup> "Stakeholders" refers to community members, youth service providers, criminal justice and law enforcement professionals, government and foundation funders, medical and mental health service providers, social welfare and public health providers, victim advocates, and system response providers.

<sup>4</sup> "System providers" refers to government employees, both administrators and direct service providers.

#### CITY OF SEATTLE SYSTEM RESPONSE

- ❑ In-person and phone discussions were conducted with 9 City of Seattle professionals<sup>5</sup> across departments and divisions.

#### SURVIVORS OF PROSTITUTION

- ❑ Informal dialogues were conducted in 6 Sex Industry Workers classes.
- ❑ Surveys were collected from 42 survivors who are “in the life.”<sup>6</sup>
- ❑ Semi-structured, in-person interviews were conducted with 5 adult survivors who are out of “the life.”

#### YOUTH

- ❑ *(As of May 31, 2012)* Semi-structured facilitated focus groups were conducted with 20 youth participants. The populations recruited for the dialogues are homeless youth, GBLTIQ<sup>7</sup> youth, youth involved in the criminal justice system, and youth of color. *(NOTE: This portion of the data gathering is still in process. HSD hopes to complete the youth feedback portion by July 15, 2012, with a total of 100 youth participants from 4 agencies)*

#### BEST AND PROMISING PRACTICES

- ❑ Documents were obtained from and semi-structured phone interviews were conducted with 12 programs serving youth and women in the life located outside of Washington (Brooklyn, NY; Chicago, IL; Cincinnati, OH; Nashville, TN; Dallas, TX; and Phoenix, AZ)
- ❑ Documents were obtained from and semi-structured phone interviews were conducted with 14 “John School”<sup>8</sup> court diversion programs for sex buyers located outside of Seattle (Columbus, OH; Dallas, TX; Denver, CO; Portland, OR; Tacoma, WA; Salt Lake City, UT; and Tucson, AZ)
- ❑ Literature reviews were conducted on commercial sexual exploitation, victim/survivor support services, sex buyers, pimping, coordinated response models and protocols, sex industry workers classes and john school programs, and efforts to address the demand. Those used for this report are cited in the footnotes.

---

<sup>5</sup> This group included those working across City of Seattle Departments and Seattle Human Services Divisions (i.e. Seattle Municipal Court, Seattle Police Department, Seattle City Attorney Office, Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative.)

<sup>6</sup> “In the life” refers to individuals (men, women, transgender) who exchange sex for money, drugs, shelter or other resources. This does not refer to pimps, recruiters, or sex traffickers.

<sup>7</sup> “GBLTIQ” is an abbreviation of Gay, Bisexual, Lesbian, Transgender, Intersex, and Questioning.

<sup>8</sup> “John School” is a court diversion program for those arrested for buying sex or soliciting prostitution. The program provides information and resources to reduce health and safety risk, educate attendees on the negative impact and consequences of prostitution on individuals, families, and communities. It typically works to reduce recidivism.



### III. KEY FINDINGS

Findings presented in this section were gleaned through HSD's community engagement process. They are organized into the following categories:

- a. Resources: Local efforts to combat commercial sexual exploitation
- b. Target Population: Buyers, survivors, pimps
- c. Gaps: Service needs and response strategies

#### A. RESOURCES: LOCAL EFFORTS TO COMBAT COMMERCIAL SEXUAL EXPLOITATION

Given findings from Debra Boyer's 2008 report, HSD embarked on the process to develop a coordinated response for commercially sexually exploited youth in Seattle-King County, with the hope of linking this response to efforts in neighboring jurisdictions – Snohomish, Pierce, and South King counties.

It was evident early on in the process that a successful locally coordinated response needed to map out both local and regional resources and support, and build upon current coordinated response efforts and initiatives.

**Finding #1: There are numerous state legislation and local ordinances in place that address commercial sexual exploitation, specifically of minors.**

State and local government officials are aware of human trafficking, and are sympathetic to efforts to combat commercial sexual exploitation, specifically of minors. Washington was the one of the first states in the country to enact an anti-trafficking legislation that mirrored the federal law in 2000, by then State Representative Velma Veloria. Since then, other legislators such as State Senator Jeanne Kohl-Welles and Washington Attorney General Rob McKenna, have also championed the cause. Over past decade, there have been a number of anti-trafficking legislative measures passed at the state level. Moreover, there are many recently passed bills that address commercial sexual exploitation of minors and include increased penalties for pimps, increased fines for sex buyers, and designated funding for victim support services.

At the local level, the City of Seattle has long recognized the importance of addressing the demand and services for survivors of sex trafficking. In 1994, the City enacted Ordinance 117074, which mandated classes for "johns" and women involved in the sex trade industry<sup>9</sup>. In 2002, the City enacted Ordinance 12097, which imposed a fee for sex buyers and establishing the Sex Industry Victims Fund. In 2008, Ordinance 122800 was implemented to raise the fee for sex buyers, and in 2010, Ordinance 123184 established the Prostituted Children Rescue Sub-fund to be used solely for the purpose of supporting recovery programs for prostituted children that provide enhance shelter, transitional housing, support and therapeutic services, and other services to youth survivors and training of first responders. Local champions of the issue are

---

<sup>9</sup> Those "involved in the sex trade" refers to individuals who exchange sex for money, drugs, shelter or other resources. This does not refer to pimps, recruiters, or sex traffickers.

Seattle City Councilmember Tim Burgess and Seattle Mayor Mike McGinn. In 2011, Mayor McGinn publicly called for Backpage.com (an online adult advertising web site) and the Seattle Weekly to shut down their adult ads or prove that they are preventing minors from being exploited. This action led to a statewide and nationwide effort to confront online adult ads and prompted the Washington State Legislature to examine legislation regarding escort service web sites.

**Finding #2: Local law enforcement has dedicated resources to respond to commercial sexual exploitation.**

The Seattle Police Department is a collaborative member of the federal Innocence Lost Task Force (ILTF)<sup>10</sup>. As a member of ILTF, Seattle Police works in partnership with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Kent and SeaTac police departments and South King County Sheriff's Office to provide a seamless and rapid law enforcement response, investigative effort, and cross training. Other ILTF partners in western Washington include Everett and Tacoma police departments.

As a grantee of the U.S. Department of Justice – Enhanced Collaborative Model to Combat Human Trafficking, Seattle Police has a designated Victim Advocate for commercially sexually exploited youth, and co-chairs the Washington Advisory Committee on Trafficking (WashACT)<sup>11</sup>, alongside the Washington Anti-Trafficking Response Network (WARN)<sup>12</sup> and the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Western District of Washington. The goals of the WashACT collaborative are to: (1) Increase identification of victims of human trafficking; (2) provide enhanced coordinated enforcement of human trafficking crimes; and (3) leverage existing and additional funding to provide comprehensive services to victims of human trafficking.

Seattle Police also established a crime unit, the Vice and High Risk Victims Unit<sup>13</sup>, specifically charged with investigating cases involving prostitution (with the focus on commercial sexual exploitation of minors), pimping, patronizing, and forced labor; working closely with the U.S. Attorney Western District of Washington and the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's Homeland Security Investigation Units.

**Finding #3: Local service providers are working collaboratively with each other, and law enforcement to enhance awareness, increase victim identification, provide support and resources for survivors, and collaborate with law enforcement to enhance safety.**

Three leading local coordinated response efforts were observed and their lead conveners or co-chairs were interviewed for this report. They are the Washington Anti-Trafficking Response

---

<sup>10</sup> The Innocence Lost Task Force is a national initiative, launched in 2003 aimed at addressing the problem of domestic minor sex trafficking. [http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/investigate/vc\\_majorthefts/cac/innocencelost](http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/investigate/vc_majorthefts/cac/innocencelost)

<sup>11</sup> The Washington Advisory Committee on Trafficking (WashACT) was originally convened by the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Western District of Washington and the U.S. Department of Justice. WashACT regularly convenes local service providers, law enforcement and government agencies.

[http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/region10/programs/region\\_10\\_trafficking\\_washact.html](http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/region10/programs/region_10_trafficking_washact.html)

<sup>12</sup> The Washington Anti-Trafficking Response Network (WARN) is a coalition of organizations in Washington State that provide direct assistance to victims of trafficking. <http://warn-trafficking.org/services/>

<sup>13</sup> Seattle Police Department – Vice and High Risk Victims Unit:  
<http://www.seattle.gov/police/units/investigations/vice.htm>

Network (WARN), the South County Coalition Against Sexual Exploitation, and the Sexual Exploitation Intervention Network (SEIN) of Snohomish County; respectively located in Seattle – King County, SeaTac – South King County, and Everett – Snohomish County. Although the three cities are within a 45-mile span of each other, each coordinated response effort has a different coordinating and leadership structure that is unique to each municipality.

The Washington Anti-Trafficking Response Network (WARN) is a coalition of nonprofit service providers in eastern and western Washington, providing immediate response and cross-referral and support services for victims of human trafficking, which includes commercially sexually exploited youth. WARN started as a collaborative partnership among five domestic violence, sexual assault organizations and agencies serving immigrants and refugees in 2004. Based in Seattle (western Washington), it has since expanded to include programs in eastern Washington, and provide victim advocacy and training statewide. In 2011 WARN included YouthCare<sup>14</sup>, a local nonprofit agency serving homeless and vulnerable youth and the home of The Bridge residential recovery program for prostituted youth (a three-year pilot project funded by the City of Seattle). Services provided consist of the following: 24-hour urgent response, intensive case management, access to food and safe housing, immigration advocacy and legal assistance, physical and mental health treatment, interpretation services, education and job readiness training. A couple of WARN member agencies, including YouthCare also has 24-hour phone lines. In addition to victim/survivor advocacy, WARN also provides training and education for service providers, law enforcement, stakeholders and community groups.

The South King County Coalition Against Sexual Exploitation is a coalition of community members, faith-based organizations, youth service providers, social and health service professionals, survivors, and law enforcement. Group membership varies and voluntary<sup>15</sup>, but the two consistent partnerships are those between The Genesis Project<sup>16</sup> (a community outreach nonprofit) and the South King County Sheriff's Office. This effort was prompted by a series of events in 2009, one of which was the arrests of 81 girls (under the age of 18) who were involved in prostitution in Sea-Tac; a need for additional support for women and "girls in the life" was identified. The Coalition's goals are linked with the Genesis Project: to provide coordinated community support in the form of a drop-in center, rehabilitation services, and long-term housing. In August 2011, the Genesis Project opened the doors to its 24-hour drop-in center. Services provided include: counseling, basic needs, food, hygiene, and clothing. The next phases of the coordinated response effort will include the development of an education and rehabilitation center to provide counseling, education, job and life skills training, medical services, and long-term safe housing.

---

<sup>14</sup> YouthCare: <http://www.youthcare.org>

<sup>15</sup> During the assessment period of 2010-2011, the South County Coalition Against Sexual Exploitation was co-facilitated by members affiliated with Auburn Youth Resources and NeighborCare – 45<sup>th</sup> Street Clinic, who also lead the coalition's nighttime outreach to exploited youth. Since January 2012, those members are no longer with the agencies or the coalition.

<sup>16</sup> The Genesis Project: <http://www.gpseattle.org/where.html>

The Sexual Exploitation Intervention Network (SEIN) of Snohomish County was developed in 2009 as a coordinated effort among medical, mental health, and sexual assault service providers, child advocates, state child welfare, criminal justice professionals, and law enforcement. Core members are co-located at the Dawson Place Child Advocacy Center<sup>17</sup>, providing a seamless system of response. The network has a 1-800, 24-hour phone line that is staffed by the Providence Intervention Center for Assault and Abuse. The group meets monthly to share resources and update information; the core team meets separately to triage cases.

Similar to anti-trafficking response networks in other cities such as Boston, Los Angeles, Phoenix, Portland, or San Diego, successful response efforts have three main ingredients:

1. **Natural Linkages:** Member organizations have pre-existing working relationships and rapport with one and other. Many have worked jointly on past initiatives or have similar organizational mission, vision, values.
2. **Partnership with Law Enforcement:** Though some networks developed out of a joint effort between law enforcement and nonprofit organizations, even those formed or led by social services providers have an established relationship with local enforcement for cross referrals and outreach.
3. **Second Tier of Providers:** The core or lead members of response networks are those with dedicated staff to provide training, advocacy, victim assistance on the issue. However, core members rely on a 2<sup>nd</sup> tier of providers (who they have established working relationships with) to refer, consult, and further provide victim assistance such as child welfare, criminal justice professionals, domestic violence shelters, sexual assault service programs, health care clinics and public health, legal services, immigrant and refugee assistance programs, and ethnic-based agencies/organizations. Thus it is important to recognize that these resources exist in the community, and that there are providers who have expertise in working with victims who might not have dedicated funding. It is important to include general community of service providers in trainings on trafficking and commercial sexual exploitation for improved identification, response, and supportive services.

---

<sup>17</sup> Dawson Place Child Advocacy Center: <http://dawsonplace.org>

**Finding #4: A number of initiatives are in place to address prevention, intervention, and support services for “at risk” youth and crime victims, a natural link to the prevention, intervention and support of commercially sexually exploited youth.**

Ending commercial sexual exploitation of adults and youth requires prevention of initial abuse and exploitation, intervention, and rehabilitation and integration services. Locally, there are three initiatives that address these and overlap with the effort to end commercial sexual exploitation of youth.

The Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative<sup>18</sup> is a City of Seattle effort that aims to: (1) help youth who have repeat offenses re-enter society from state and county detention programs, (2) provide alternatives for youth who are arrested for crimes that do not meet admission criteria for county detention, (3) help middle-school truants and students at risk of suspension stay in school and succeed, and (4) prevent victims of violence and their friends and relatives from continuing the cycle of violence through retaliation. The Initiative’s goals are coordinated through three neighborhood networks in southeast, southwest, and central Seattle, where indicators of future violent behaviors (i.e. discipline rates in schools) are highest. The lead agencies are Therapeutic Health Services<sup>19</sup>, Southwest Youth and Family Services<sup>20</sup>, and Rainier Vista Boys and Girls Club<sup>21</sup>, providing the following network of services: outreach, case management, family support, anger management, youth employment and pre-apprenticeships, recreation, school emphasis officers, emphasis patrols and community matching grant projects to engage youth in positive, pro-social activities.

The King County Uniting for Youth - Systems Integration Initiative<sup>22</sup> is a partnership of local and state youth serving systems and organizations that aims to improve integrated program development, policy development, service delivery for youth and families served by child welfare and juvenile justice systems; with the purpose of alleviating the often fragmented responses for families involved in multiple systems. Formed in 2004, coalition members include: juvenile justice, child welfare, mental health, and education systems. Products developed by the coalition include: an information sharing guide, protocols for coordinated management, cross-system training, detailed recommendations to improve access to mental health services, and a model for reporting juvenile justice youth who have dropped out of school or are at high drop-out risk. The Initiative is led by an Executive Steering Committee representing all major public systems working within King County with youth and families in the juvenile justice and child welfare systems.

The Washington State Office of Crime Victims Advocacy, under the Victims of Crime Act, provides funding and support for a network of statewide providers responding to general

---

<sup>18</sup> City of Seattle – Department of Neighborhood, Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative: <http://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/education/youthInitiative/>

<sup>19</sup> Therapeutic Health Services: <http://ths-wa.org/>

<sup>20</sup> Southwest Youth and Family Services: <http://swyfs.org/>

<sup>21</sup> Rainier Vista Boys and Girls Club: <http://rv.positiveplace.org/>

<sup>22</sup> King County Uniting for Youth – Systems Integration Initiative: <http://www.kingcounty.gov/exec/PSB/JuvenileJustice.aspx>

crimes<sup>23</sup>, which includes commercial sexual exploitation of youth. These specialized providers are members of respective regional Crime Victims Service Centers<sup>24</sup>, a network of programs providing victim/survivor advocacy. Services include: (1) Access to a victim advocate 24 hours a day, seven days a week; (2) information and referrals to community resources and assistance in accessing services; (3) support and assistance in healing and recovery; (4) Assistance with safety planning; (5) assistance and support with accessing medical care related to commercial sexual exploitation; and (6) assistance in navigating government and legal systems and services.

## **B. TARGET POPULATION: SEX BUYERS, SURVIVORS, PIMPS**

One consistent theme that was heard throughout interviews, group discussions, and research on national best practices is that services, whether they are prevention, intervention, or rehabilitation, need to be individualized, “client-centered”<sup>25</sup> and culturally relevant to the experience of the individual receiving the services.

For survivors, particularly, a client-centered model is based on empowerment and self-determination. As stated by a service provider, it means “meeting the client where they are” and that the services provided are “reflective of their needs.”

For rehabilitation programs, such client-centered approach might mean that, in addition to sanction, counseling is an option. Such system response would need to look into cost-effectiveness and leveraging of resources.

### **SEX BUYERS**

The findings below were revealed by a recent study, “Comparing Sex Buyers with Men who Don’t Buy Sex” by Melissa Farley, Emily Schuckman, Jacqueline M. Golding, Kristen Houser, Laura Jarret, Peter Qualliotine and Michelle Decker.<sup>26</sup> In-depth conversations were also conducted with one of the co-authors of the cited study.

Additionally, information was collected from individual and group dialogues with local john school facilitators, criminal justice administrators, and law enforcement.

---

<sup>23</sup> “General crimes” is defined by the Washington State Office of Crime Victims Advocacy as assault, robbery, child abuse, vehicular assault, vehicular homicide, property crime, human trafficking, hate crimes, kidnapping, and survivors of homicide victims.

<sup>24</sup> Washington State Office of Crime Victims Advocacy – Crime Victims Service Centers:  
<http://www.commerce.wa.gov/site/836/default.aspx>

<sup>25</sup> Interviews and group discussions with victim service providers and offender accountability programs alike, stated that a “client-centered” approach is the most effective in meeting successful outcomes. “Client-centered” is used interchangeably with “youth-centered”, “survivor-centered”, or “individualized services” and programs, describing services driven by and specific to the service recipient’s needs; and that the service plan or program plan is not based on the provider’s assumptions and take into account that culture (ethnic, street culture, youth culture, family upbringing) play a big role on outcomes for the individual.

<sup>26</sup> Farley, M., Schuckman, E., Golding, J.M., Houser, K., Jarret, L., Qualliotine, P., Decker, M. (July 15, 2011) *Comparing Sex Buyers with Men Who Don’t Buy Sex*. A paper presented at Psychologists for Social Responsibility Annual Meeting. San Francisco: Prostitution Research & Education.



## LOCAL DEMOGRAPHICS

The review of City of Seattle demographics collected of men arrested for solicitation from 2010-2011, reveal that offenders range in age, race, and ethnicity. The implication for such diversity is that rehabilitative efforts (i.e. john schools), prevention campaigns, and arrest stings need to also be diverse in strategies and implementation.

**Finding #1: Sex buyers vary in race and ethnicity.**

**Finding #2: Those arrested for patronizing range in age (<25-80 years old). Approximately 80% are 50 or younger.**

**Finding #3: Approximately 40% of those arrested for solicitation requires an interpreter.**

## BEHAVIORAL TRENDS

The findings highlighted below are derived from the above mentioned research.

**Finding #4: There is a positive correlation between sex buyers and criminal activity .**

According to research, sex buyers are “far more likely than non-sex buyers to commit felonies, misdemeanors, crimes related to violence against women, substance abuse-related crimes, assaults, crimes with weapons, and crimes against authority.” Further, “sex buyers acknowledged having committed significantly more sexually coercive acts against women (non-prostituting as well as prostituting) than non sex buyers.” It was also revealed in conversations with john school facilitators, that at times, the men would discuss their attendance in domestic violence batterer intervention programs.

The implication for this finding is the need for a risk assessment tool for men who are arrested for prostitution solicitation. The link to domestic violence and other forms of violence against women warrant that victim-service providers and violence against women prevention efforts need to also include a component that specifically addresses commercial sexual exploitation.

**Finding #5: Sex buyers are aware of the economic coercion and lack of alternatives for women’s entry into prostitution, yet there is a lack of empathy for women involved in the life.**

Research on sex buyers revealed that, even when “sex buyers acknowledged the harmful effects of prostitution on the women in it and on the community” including that “the women have been exploited, coerced, pimped, or trafficked,” it does not deter them from buying sex. This finding warrants that community education or information-centered approach on deterrence should be paired with other strategies for prevention and rehabilitation. Research on buyers also suggested that “efforts to deter sex buyers should expand their focus from men who buy sex to the general public’s attitudes that support prostitution.”

**Finding #6: There is a need for heavier sanctions against those who buy sex.**

In regards to sanctions for sex buyers, research found that, “both sex buyers and non-sex buyers agreed that the most effective deterrent to buying sex would be to be placed on a registry of sex offenders.” Additional sanctions included “public exposure techniques such as having their name or photo publicized on a billboard, newspaper, or the Internet” and jail time.

**SURVIVORS**

Below is a summary of findings assembled from conversations with individuals and groups of adult survivors (both women who left and those currently in the life), substantiated by research and assessments conducted in two other cities. No interviews or group discussions were conducted with youth, male and transgender survivors.

**Finding #7: Most adult survivors of prostitution entered “the life” at 18 or younger.**

Consistent with a number of research findings<sup>27</sup>, many adult survivors of prostitution who participated in the community engagement process shared that they first entered the life (exchanged sex for money, drugs, shelter or other resources) at the age of 18 or younger. This, in conjunction with the City of Seattle’s 2008 Assessment of Youth Involvement in Prostitution in Seattle, underscores the need to focus intervention efforts on commercially sexually exploited youth.

**Finding #8: Reasons for how or why survivors enter “the life” are complex.**

Individual and group dialogues with adult survivors of prostitution painted a complex picture of recruitment and coercion into the life. Though the majority of the women shared a past history of sexual assault and abuse, their entrance to “the life” varied. Reasons for entering the life included: a progression from stripping to prostitution, a means to support drug addiction, forced into the life by intimate partner or family member, a way to survive and make money.

A number of the women shared that prostitution was “common in the neighborhood” or community where they grew up, and that prior to entering the life, they knew of people who were involved in either the pimping or prostitution. However, some also remarked that they came from middle class or working families with no prior connection to prostitution. This finding requires that prevention, reintegration and rehabilitation efforts target supporting families and communities, and that services need to be individualized and client-centered.

---

<sup>27</sup> Raphael, J., Shapiro, D.L. (August 2002) *Sisters speak out: The lives and needs of prostituted women in Chicago – A research study*. Center for Impact Research. Chicago, IL.

Raphael J., Ashley Jessica. (May 2008). *Domestic sex trafficking of Chicago women and girls*. DePaul University College of Law. Chicago. IL.

Sweet, E.M. (October 2006). *The intersystem assessment on prostitution in Chicago*. City of Chicago’s Mayor’s Office on Domestic Violence. Chicago, IL.

Valandra. (Summer 2007) *Reclaiming their lives and breaking free: An Afrocentric approach to recovery from prostitution*. Journal of Women and Social Work. 22(2):195-208. College of St. Catherine, St. Paul, MN.



**Finding #9: Survivors of prostitution are also survivors of other forms of violence.**

Most survivors shared that they are also survivors of other forms of violence, most commonly, child sexual abuse and domestic violence. This is consistent with research<sup>28</sup> data supporting that many youth and women involved in the life were also victims of child molestation or sexual abuse by a family member and/or someone outside of their family and experienced domestic violence in the household. As survivors, they endure violence from sex buyers, pimps, intimate partners, law enforcement, and neighbors including forced sex and physical violence.

**Finding #10: Survivors of prostitution are in need of a number of social and health services.**

In addition to exposure to ongoing threats of violence at the hands of buyers and pimps, survivors revealed that they also endure a number of other challenges of being in the life, such as being victims of crime, having felony convictions, lacking job skills, lacking housing options, and experiencing substance abuse addictions. These challenges make it difficult to make the transition out of the life.

When asked what services the women would be interested in receiving, they identified the following: peer support, medical and dental care, assistance with GED/high school completion, assistance with employment training or job searching, alcohol and chemical dependency support and treatment, housing assistance, and child care assistance. The highest priority needs were medical and dental care, employment training, support groups, housing assistance and chemical dependency.

Although chemical dependency was lower on the list in terms of survivor self-stated needs, most women discussed their use of substances. Some revealed that they were forced to use drugs when they were first “pimped out,” others disclosed that they entered the life to support their drug addiction. Studies have also shown that women in the life suffer from depression and other post-traumatic stress symptoms<sup>29</sup>.

This finding, consistent with other research<sup>30</sup>, support the need for intensive case management and wrap-around social and health services for all survivors, youth and adults.

---

<sup>28</sup> Raphael, J., Shapiro, D.L. (August 2002) *Sisters speak out: The lives and needs of prostituted women in Chicago – A research study*. Center for Impact Research. Chicago, IL.

Williamson, C., Prior, M. (2009). *Domestic minor sex trafficking: A network of underground players in the Midwest*. Journal of Child and Adolescent Trauma, 2:1-16.

<sup>29</sup> Hossain, M., Zimmerman, C., Abas, M., Light, M., Watts, C. (December 2010). *The relationship of trauma to mental health disorders among trafficked and sexually exploited girls and women*. American Journal of Public Health. 100(12):2442-2449.

Farley, M., Barkan, H. (1998). *Prostitution, violence, and post-traumatic stress disorder*. The Hawthorne Press, Inc. 27 (3):37-49.

<sup>30</sup> The Barton Child Law and Policy Clinic of Emory University School of Law. (July 23, 2008). *Commercial exploitation of children in Georgia*.

Burnett, M.L., Schneider, R., Timko, C., Ilgen, M.A. (January 2009). Impact of substance-use disorder treatment on women involved in prostitution: Substance use, mental health, and prostitution one year after treatment. J. Stud. Alcohol Drugs. 70(1):32-40.

**Finding # 11: Survivors of prostitution successfully leave “the life” when they are ready and has support.**

With the appropriate support and readiness, survivors do leave prostitution. In conversations with women who have successfully exited the life, it was revealed that the “readiness moment” is usually a personal low point in life. This is consistent with other assessments<sup>31</sup> regarding services for survivors. For example: needing to be “substance abuse free” and “starting over,” being incarcerated and was “tired of the life.”

When asked what has enabled the women to successfully turn their lives around and not relapse, many cited their faith, having support from a faith-based organization, and having peer support or maintaining connection with women who are in or have left the life.

This finding emphasizes the need for peer-support programs and survivor-lead interventions and prevention work. In addition, it underscores the need to provide youth and women in the life with wraparound and supportive services in order to stop on-going abuse and exploitation, and support the transition to leave the life without relapse.

**PIMPS**

**Finding #12: Reasons for how or why pimps engage in pimping are multi-layered.**

Recent research<sup>32</sup> has revealed that most individuals involved in pimping share a similar background, including: childhood experience of physical and sexual abuse, domestic violence in the home, drugs and alcohol abuse in the home, family members involved in prostitution, neighborhood members involved in prostitution, households had members who abused drugs or alcohol, regular self-use of drugs or alcohol as a child, committed to foster care, and ran away from home due to physical or sexual violence.

Similar to survivors of prostitution, pimps have a history of early exposure to sexual abuse, violence, drug use, and family or community connection to prostitution. This is evident in the local case of DeShawn “Cash Money” Clark<sup>33</sup>, a 19 year-old member of the West Side Street MOBB who was charged with a 17-year prison sentence for sex trafficking. His attorney noted that Clark is a “product of his environment,” as his mother was a drug-addict and his father was sent to prison when Clark was only 4.

Given this finding, it is important to consider investments in anti-violence programs and initiatives targeting youth, families, and communities with high risks for violence, drug use, and prostitution. With such strong connections to domestic violence, sexual assault, and substance abuse, there should also be considerations to link these subject specific prevention and

---

<sup>31</sup> Sweet, E.M. (October 2006). *The intersystem assessment on prostitution in Chicago*. City of Chicago’s Mayor’s Office on Domestic Violence. Chicago, IL.

<sup>32</sup> Raphael, J., Meyers-Powell, B. (September 2010). *From victims to victimizers: Interviews with 25 ex-pimps in Chicago*. A report from the Schiller DuCanto and Fleck Family Law Center of DePaul University College of Law.

<sup>33</sup> Green, S.J. (January 22, 2010). *19-year old man sentenced for promoting prostitution*. The Seattle Times. [http://seattletimes.nwsource.com/html/localnews/2010868511\\_mobbsentence23m.html](http://seattletimes.nwsource.com/html/localnews/2010868511_mobbsentence23m.html)

intervention efforts to prostitution and commercial sexual exploitation of youth, and programs with a strong focus on positive, pro-youth activities.

**Finding #13: There is a need for rehabilitative programs for young pimps.**

In conversations with survivors and service providers, it was noted that rehabilitation services, in addition to sanction, should be provided to young pimps. Many of the conversations, referred back to the trial of five local pimps and members of the West Side Street MOBB, who were charged with sex trafficking. Participants stated the need for rehabilitative services for young men involved in pimping, and discussed the options for positive role-modeling and mentoring while they are in jail. Participants also stated that jail time alone is not a true deterrence of re-offending since some pimps continue to operate while serving time. There also needs to be a way to track and provide services for first-time offenders.

**Finding #14: There is a positive correlation between pimping and other criminal activities.**

Fifteen years ago, gang activities were linked primarily with drug trafficking; now it is pimping or sex trafficking. The Seattle Police Department confirms that gangs are now operating prostitutes (both adults and minors), and that victims are forced to engage in a host of criminal activities, which brings in income for the gangs. The structure of the pimp-prostitute relationship contributes to patterns of crime such as petty theft, robbery, assault, and drug dealing.<sup>34</sup> This is a trend recently reported nationwide, and has implications for both criminal justice and social services response strategies.

### **C. GAPS: SERVICE NEEDS AND RESPONSE STRATEGIES**

With the acknowledgment that certain programs, initiatives, and systems are in place, the Seattle Human Services Department wanted to assess the local community's knowledge of these existing resources, get feedback on service utility and availability, identify gaps, and document recommendations on strategies for enhancing awareness, increasing victim identification, improving victim response and support, and addressing the demand and perpetrator accountability.

The findings below are based on facilitated meetings, interviews, group dialogues, and surveys with researchers, first responders<sup>35</sup>, service providers, and service recipients (i.e. youth, survivors) in the Seattle – King County area and its neighbors (Snohomish, Pierce, and South King counties).

The findings are categorized into five classifications: prevention, victim identification, victim services, and offender accountability.

---

<sup>34</sup> Statement was provided by City of Seattle Police Chief John Diaz in a 2010 dialogue regarding commercial sexual exploitation of youth.

<sup>35</sup> "First responders" include government department and social service providers including police officers, prosecutors, health care providers, correctional staff, and substance abuse treatment programs that come into contact with individuals involved in the sex trade.

## PREVENTION

### COMMUNITY

**Finding #15: There is a need for a community wide campaign and/or community organizing efforts to increase awareness regarding commercial sexual exploitation of youth.**

Although sex trafficking and commercial sexual exploitation has gained increased recognition and publicity in recent years, many service providers and community members still believe that there is a lack of awareness in the community regarding the breadth and depth of the issue.

Participants of the community engagement process shared that the community still views commercial sexual exploitation as an “issue that only happens abroad” and placed blame on victims. It is this lack of awareness that providers feel feeds into the “shame, blame, and guilt (which) prevent (victims) from coming forward to receive services.” Community members and service providers cite myths and the glorification of “pimp culture” as a social aspect that needs to be addressed, and recommended that any community wide campaigns would need to be culturally diverse and inclusive.

In addition, there is a lack of knowledge regarding anti-trafficking legislation and victim benefits (because minors involved in prostitution are crime victims they are eligible to receive crime victim compensation) is also true for general service providers. Thus, community members may be hesitant to act, not being certain on reporting laws or legal obligations. Participants of the community engagement process also link this need of awareness with the need for an awareness campaign to deter traffickers and buyers (i.e. “you do this, you go to jail”).

**Finding #16: Many businesses might be knowingly facilitating the commercial sexual exploitation of youth.**

Many businesses (e.g. hotels, IT companies, gas stations) might be indirectly encountering or facilitating the commercial sexual exploitation of youth. There was a suggestion was to engage the business communities to take action against exploitation and also take steps to apply pressure on businesses who facilitate trafficking.

**Finding #17: There need to be positive options and resources for all youth, but especially youth “at risk” of commercial sexual exploitation.**

It was shared that community-based intervention programs, which include job training and skills development for youth, would work to increase self-esteem, self-sufficiency and positive options and a positive prevention from victimization.

In addition, there also needs to be culturally relevant community-based programs that specifically work with high-risk boys (of being pimped) and girls (of being exploited).

### SCHOOL

**Finding #18: There is a lack of school-based curriculum and programs addressing commercial sexual exploitation of youth.**

It was suggested that schools implement and integrate sexual exploitation discussions into health, sex education, and safety classes. Topics may include: youth resources, healthy relationships, body image, bullying, self-esteem, risk factors for commercial sexual exploitation, gangs, recruitment tactics, and grooming behavior. In addition to education efforts, participants also mentioned the need for in-school peer support groups for boys and girls.

#### FAMILY

**Finding #19: There is a lack of resources for parents, especially parents of color, on how to better communicate with their child and ensure that the family is a safe place for modeling healthy behaviors.**

Community engagement participants also mentioned supporting foster parents and guardians, and increasing parents' awareness of commercial sexual exploitation.

#### INDIVIDUAL

**Finding #20: There is a lack of positive role models and mentorship for youth.**

Providers mentioned the need for youth to have a non-parent adult mentor; "someone to rely on, is a source of support," but that the relationship should be "organic, not forced." This was recommended for all youth (survivors and non-survivors of commercial sexual exploitation).

### VICTIM IDENTIFICATION

**Finding # 21: There are a number of local opportunities for community members, social/health service providers, criminal justice professionals, and law enforcement to obtain information and training on commercial sexual exploitation. However, more is needed to expand the providers' response network.**

The City of Seattle offers bi-monthly trainings for providers on commercial sexual exploitation. Other trainings are also offered locally and statewide on commercial sexual exploitation and sex trafficking by groups such as the Seattle Police Department, Washington Advisory Committee on Trafficking (WashACT), Washington Anti-Trafficking Response Network (WARN), Washington State Office of Crime Advocacy, Washington State Coalition of Sexual Programs, and nonprofit agencies such as New Horizons, NW Network for GLBT Survivors of Abuse, and YouthCare.

**Finding # 22: There are a number of local efforts to reach out to individuals who are in the life; However, funding for outreach is challenging, thus there is a need for additional support.**

A number of faith-based, victim-service, public health, and youth service agencies have a long history of providing detention-based and street-based outreach to survivors of commercial sexual exploitation. However, with the recession, some programs outreaching to commercially sexually exploited youth have been eliminated.

## VICTIM SERVICES

### **Finding # 23: Funding to support local specialized services for individuals involved in prostitution, it is limited.**

There are a limited number of programs offering specialized services for women involved in the life, and fewer are available for men, youth, and transgender individuals (**Appendix D**). Though network of services and coalitions exist, they need to be better linked and information needs to be shared to provide a more seamless better coordinated response. Limited availability of funding is a great challenge to the service delivery capacity for Seattle-King County and its neighbors. Thus a more coordinated, efficient, and creative effort is needed. This may require public-private partnerships, leveraging of existing resources, and a commitment and support from foundations and individuals.

## EMERGENCY RESPONSE

### **Finding # 24: There are a number of challenges for first responders in working with sex trafficking victims.**

In conversations with local victim-service providers and law enforcement, it was revealed that there are a number of challenges in service provision for victims of sex trafficking or commercial sexual exploitation. They include:

- Victim's lacking in trust of service providers and law enforcement due to personal history with the criminal justice system and misinformation provided by pimps or traffickers.
- Lack of after-hour resources and services for commercially sexually exploited minors, especially shelter beds.
- Lack of a coordinated or linked response efforts and 24-hour, in-person response.
- Lack of detailed protocol, especially for evenings, weekends, or after-hour interventions.
- Lack of available interpreter services for survivors from abroad who are trafficked.

### **Finding # 25: Although there are a number of local 1-800, 24-hour hotlines in the Seattle-King County area for sexual assault, domestic violence, youth shelter, and human trafficking efforts, there isn't a dedicated phone number for commercial sexual exploitation.**

A coordinated response effort for Seattle-King County needs to take into account existing resources and leverage staffing of the 1-800 line and/or in-person response. Some resources to be considered include: 2-1-1, Teen Link, King County Sexual Assault Resource Center – Sexual Assault Hotline, YouthCare – Safe Place Hotline.

### **Finding #26: Lack of familiarity with existing resources.**

Many general community members and service providers are unfamiliar or unaware of services available to victims of commercial sexual exploitation. Likewise, providers who are linked with coordinated response efforts are also less familiar with social service agencies, programs, and initiatives aimed at prevention and decreases vulnerabilities of commercial sexual exploitation.

Research has shown that youth who are involved in the life come into contact with a myriad of service providers across systems (e.g. criminal justice, child welfare, schools) and provider specializations (healthcare, treatment programs, social services, housing/shelter programs, recreational centers). Thus, service providers who are not familiar with existing resources may be less able to identify, assess, or refer the youth to receive appropriate supportive services.

#### ONGOING SUPPORT

**Finding # 27: Housing was identified as a primary need of individuals involved in the life, yet affordable housing options are limited.**

There are a few specialized residential treatment and supportive housing programs for individuals involved in the sex trade, and the services that do exist are not available to men, youth, women who are pregnant, or women with children.

Individuals with criminal backgrounds, particularly those with felony convictions, experience additional barriers in securing affordable housing. Although such barriers exist, some resources are available in Seattle-King County.

In 2010, Seattle adopted the Continuum of Care strategic plan to end homelessness in 10 years. As part of this plan, various housing and shelter programs models were created and the city began to transition away from short-term emergency shelter programs and move to a “Housing First” philosophy, which provides for permanent housing with supportive services. This transition will ultimately affect individuals in the sex trade, since many are in need of immediate safe housing options. A housing model currently identified in the plan includes transitional subsidized housing with wrap-around support services, which is a model well suited for those in the sex trade.

Research has shown that homelessness increased the risk of commercial sexual exploitation, as survivors sometimes trade sex for a place to sleep.

**Finding # 28: There are few specialized substance abuse treatment services for individuals involved in the life.**

Although many of the participants reported a history of substance abuse and believed that prostitution and addiction often cannot be addressed separately, there are few substance abuse programs in Seattle-King County providing specialized services such as screening, referrals to other community-based services, and on-site Prostitution Anonymous groups for the clients in treatment facilities. It is also important to note that most housing, homeless, and domestic violence programs currently operating in Seattle-King County require individuals to be sober in order to be accepted as clients. Such policies create additional barriers to accessing services for those involved in the sex trade and further speak to the need for comprehensive substance abuse treatment options. Some women survivors have begun to offer peer support services for women dealing with addiction through peer group support and information and education.

## OFFENDER ACCOUNTABILITY

### BUYERS

**Finding # 29: There are local interventions and diversionary sentencing options for buyers of sex.**

The Seattle Human Services Department works in partnership with the Seattle Municipal Court and the Seattle Police Department to offer a monthly, education-based “john school” program for those arrested on charges of solicitation. Tacoma also has a john school diversion program.

**Finding #30: Improved strategies to address the demand.**

Community engagement participants stated that there needs to be stricter policies to address the demand and cited some of the options as: increasing fines, asset seizures, enforcement of sex offender registration, pictures on billboards, increased sentencing and jail time. Also suggestions were made to change legislation to shift accountability to offenders and not victims, making it illegal to buy sex, not to work in the sex trade industry.

**Finding #31: There is a need to address the disproportionate arrest and prosecution of buyers and exploiters who are people of color.**

Local data (Seattle and neighboring cities) shows a substantial percentage of men who are arrested for solicitation to be Limited English speakers and men of color, yet research on buyers reveal that men of all backgrounds and demographics buy sex. This warrants a criminal justice response to further look into the issue.

### PIMPS

**Finding #32: Opportunities should be presented for young pimps to rehabilitate.**

It was suggested that the sentencing guidelines be modified so that juvenile pimps may receive lesser sentences than adults and be available for rehabilitative services. Suggestions were made for intervention programs such as gang intervention and positive role-modeling from men who left the pimping life.



## IV. COMMUNITY RESPONSE RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings presented from our comprehensive assessment process, the Seattle Human Services Department is providing the following list of recommendations grounded in five priority areas: prevention, victim identification, victim services, Seattle-King County protocol, and offender accountability.

### PRIORITY 1: PREVENTION

**GOAL: To prevent initial abuse and exploitation, leading to commercial sexual exploitation of youth.**

Recommendation 1.1: Implement commercial sexual exploitation prevention, reintegration and rehabilitation efforts that target supporting families and communities.

Recommendation 1.2: Implement pimping and commercial sexual exploitation prevention programs that are linked with existing anti-violence programs and initiatives targeting youth, families, and communities with high risks for violence, drug use, and prostitution.

Recommendation 1.3: Implement a community wide campaign to increase awareness regarding commercial sexual exploitation.

Recommendation 1.4: Engage businesses to take action against commercial exploitation of youth.

Recommendation 1.5: Encourage schools to integrate information on commercial sexual exploitation in class discussions, educational programs and curricula.

Recommendation 1.6: Support parenting programs which build parent-child communication skills, parental support, and resources so they could better support their children.

Recommendation 1.7: Enhance opportunities for youth-adult mentorship.

### PRIORITY 2: VICTIM IDENTIFICATION

**GOAL: To increase victim identification for immediate connection to information and resources.**

Recommendation 2.1: Provide training and victim-identification skill building opportunities for providers to increase victim identification and expand the current network of responders.

Recommendation 2.2: Increase funding opportunities and support for services providing direct outreach to commercially sexually exploited youth.

Recommendation 2.3: Provide community-based assistance and peer support to survivors of commercial sexual exploitation.

### **PRIORITY 3: VICTIM SERVICES**

**GOAL: To improve emergency response efforts for identified youth survivors of commercial sexual exploitation, and linking survivors to rehabilitation/re-integration efforts; ensuring safety and success in leaving the life.**

Recommendation 3.1: Ensure quality services and support for survivors by implementing various models of program service delivery. Such models may include: focus on youth victims, focus on adult survivors, individualized, client-centered services, intensive case management and wrap-around services.

Recommendation 3.2: Increase funding support and options for specialized services targeting survivors of commercial sexual exploitation. Alternative options may include leveraging of various funding sources, enhanced collaboration, and implementing additional initiatives.

Recommendation 3.3: Increase housing options for youth and adult survivors of commercial sexual exploitation.

Recommendation 3.4: Implement specialized chemical dependency treatment program, specifically targeting youth and adult survivors of commercial sexual exploitation.

Recommendation 3.5: Include survivors' voices in the development and implementation of victim services programs and initiatives.

### **PRIORITY 4: SEATTLE-KING COUNTY PROTOCOL**

**GOAL: To develop and implement a Seattle-King County coordinated response protocol, linked with efforts in existing neighboring jurisdictions.**

Recommendation 4.1: Enhance and expand the current Seattle-King County coordinated response effort to include a local 24-hour, toll free, and confidential crisis hotline providing specialized support and information to survivors of commercial sexual exploitation. In addition, partners need to come to an agreement regarding new roles, expectations, and responsibilities, and sign a memorandum of understanding.

Recommendation 4.3: Once the Seattle-King County protocol is finalized, there will be a series of trainings implemented to familiarize community members to existing resources and protocol.

## **PRIORITY 5: OFFENDER ACCOUNTABILITY**

**GOAL: To hold buyers and exploiters accountable and prevent future offense.**

Recommendation 5.1: Develop a risk assessment tool for men who are arrested for prostitution solicitation.

Recommendation 5.2: Explore other options for buyers' intervention programs which combine education and counseling with sanction-based deterrence strategies. Sanctions may include: increasing fines, asset seizures, sex registry listing, name and photo publicized, and jail time.

Recommendation 5.3: Develop and implement rehabilitative programs for young pimps.

Recommendation 5.4: Examine the disproportionate arrests and prosecution of buyers and exploiters who are people of color.

Recommendation 5.5: Conduct targeted public outreach and education campaigns focusing on "the demand". Such campaigns would inform potential recruiters, buyers and pimps of the penalties if they were caught soliciting in Seattle – King County.

Recommendation 5.6: Develop a community-based, culturally relevant approach to addressing the demand in Seattle – King County.

## V. CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

The cited recommendations in this report will work as a road map for the City of Seattle to develop a coordinated response plan to address commercial sexual exploitation in Seattle – King County. It will work to improve current investments and build upon existing initiatives, strengthen and expand partnerships, and guide the Seattle Human Services (HSD) in its efforts to better coordinate an intra- and inter-system response planning to address commercial sexual exploitation for 2013-2015.

Our next steps in 2012 beginning June 15, 2012, will include (but not limited to) the following:

1. The City of Seattle Human Services Department works in collaboration with the Washington Advisory Committee on Trafficking to facilitate the process for protocol development in Seattle – King County. A series of meetings starting in June 2012 will focus on developing and finalizing a written Memorandum of Understanding among all agreed partners, many of whom are members of existing victim-response efforts addressing commercial sexual exploitation youth. The group will decide and set regular meetings to check in on the response effort.
2. A community-wide presentation and discussion of the report tentatively scheduled for July 31, 2012.
3. In August 2012, an internal City of Seattle Human Services (HSD) Team, consisting of representatives across divisions and relevant city-wide initiatives, will meet to provide feedback and discuss plans and timeline for integration and implementation into existing efforts. Certain recommendations may feed into the Request for Investment process for some upcoming Seattle Human Services funding opportunities. These may take place as early as Fall of 2012, for implementation of 2013 contracts.
4. In August 2012, Seattle Human Services Department representatives will meet with an external stakeholder's team, consisting of local, county and state systems and funders, to discuss findings and implications of the report. The goal of the meeting will be to assess and build partnerships across systems for an improved coordinated response effort. A working group will form out of this coalition and will meet regularly to monitor progress.
5. The Seattle Human Services Department will continue to seek feedback from the community (youth, survivors, providers, systems representatives, and best/promising practices research) to inform the implementation process of the plan.

## IV. APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A: CSEY COORDINATED RESPONSE STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND AFFILIATIONS

#### CORE MEMBERS

Deana Berg, Washington Engage  
Bobbe Bridge, Center for Children and Youth Justice  
Debra Boyer, Boyer Research  
Tim Candela, Auburn Youth Resources  
Tasha Church, Sexual Assault Center of Pierce County  
Darryl Cook, City of Seattle – Human Services Department  
Rachel Copeland, Center for Forensic Nursing  
Eileen Corcoran, Rising Above Exploitation  
Kathy Crane, King County – Mental Health and Drug Dependency Program  
Lana Crawford, Spruce Street  
Elinor Cromwell, Society of Counsel Representing Accused Persons  
Josephine Ensign, University of Washington – School of Nursing  
Laura Escalano-Flores, Harborview Medical Center for Sexual Assault and Traumatic Stress  
Melinda Giovengo, YouthCare  
Betsy Graef, City of Seattle – Office of Councilmember Tim Burgess  
Amanda Hightower, Mars Hill Church  
Sheila Houston, New Horizon Ministries  
Katalin Hausback, NeighborCare  
Terri Kimball, City of Seattle – Human Services Department  
Seth Kirby, Pierce County AIDS Foundation – Oasis Project  
Sara Larsen, Federal Bureau of Investigation – Seattle Office  
Rick Lichenstadter, Defender Association  
Det. Ryan Long, Seattle Police Department  
Leesa Manion, King County – Prosecuting Attorney’s Office  
Kathleen Morris, Washington Anti-Trafficking Response Network  
Lacie Morrison, Seattle Against Slavery  
LeAnn Moss, Women’s Funding Alliance  
Ann Munro, Powerful Voices  
Dusty Olson, Providence Intervention Center for Assault and Abuse of Snohomish County  
Shannon Perez-Darby, NW Network of Bisexual, Trans, Lesbian and Gay Survivors of Abuse  
Lan Pham, City of Seattle – Human Services Department  
Stephanie Pratt, Washington State – Office of Crime Victims Advocacy  
Lt. Eric Sano, City of Seattle – Police Department  
Marcus Stubblefield, King County - Executive Office  
Det. Brian Taylor, King County - Sheriff’s Office  
Jim Theofelis, Mockingbird Society  
Christie Thomas, Genesis Project and Compassion 2 One  
Derek Wentorf, United Way of King County  
Liletha Williams, Neighborhood House – Project Handle  
DeAnn Yamamoto, King County Sexual Assault Resource Center  
Ye-Ting Woo, United States Attorney’s Office

**APPENDIX A:**  
**CSEY COORDINATED RESPONSE STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND AFFILIATIONS (CONT.)**

WORKGROUP PARTICIPANTS

Leslie Briner, YouthCare  
Marie Hoffman, Washington Anti-Trafficking Response Network  
Tricia Lapitan, Seattle Municipal Court  
Valarie Mitchell, Defender Association  
Erin McCready, Pierce County AIDS Foundation – Oasis Project  
Sara Poulisse, Spruce Street

FACILITATORS

Kelly Guy, City of Seattle – Human Services Department  
Tanya Kim, City of Seattle – Human Services Department  
Marie Kurose, City of Seattle – Human Services Department  
Catherine Lester, City of Seattle – Human Services  
Dannette R. Smith, City of Seattle – Human Services Department  
Tan Mei Teo, City of Seattle – Human Services Department

## **APPENDIX B: CSEY COORDINATED RESPONSE STEERING COMMITTEE GUIDING PRINCIPLES**

### **VISION**

All children and youth live free of sexual exploitation and are supported in reaching their full potential.

### **MISSION**

To facilitate a coordinated planning effort that will improve the regional response and capacity to support commercially sexually exploited youth and will hold accountable those who exploit them.

### **VALUES**

#### **Victim Safety**

- Victim safety is the underpinning of the coordinated response.
- Individually and collectively, the first, foremost, and sustaining objective is victim safety.

#### **Accountability**

- The community at-large is accountable for sexually exploited youth and those who exploit them.
- Providers and responders are accountable to each other and the youth that are served.
- It is crucial that adult interactions do not re-victimize or traumatize the youth.

#### **Cultural Relevancy**

- All sexually exploited youth and youth at risk of sexual exploitation must be treated respectfully and in accord with their culture and beliefs.
- It is important to consider the strengths and challenges faced by the youth and his/her family, community, and culture.
- It is essential that providers seek to gain knowledge and understanding of youth culture and diversity to inform the work.

#### **Victim-Centered Response and Services**

- Sexually exploited youth should be viewed as victims of crime and should not be viewed or treated as criminals.
- All youth deserve a safe, warm, nurturing environment, independent of their behavior.
- Providers meet youth where they are at, with accessible services based on their individual needs.
- The CSEY Response Steering Committee's actions and plans are guided by input from the youth we seek to support and serve.

#### **Collaboration**

- The response effort 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.
- Youth receive quality services at multiple entry points without stigma.
- Barriers are eliminated and egos do not impede our progress.