

Who Pays the Price?
**Assessment of Youth Involvement
in Prostitution in Seattle**

Commissioned and funded by:

**City of Seattle
Human Services Department
Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Prevention Division**

**Report Provided
by
Debra Boyer, PhD
Boyer Research
2235 Fairview Ave. E.
Seattle, WA 98102**

June - 2008

Foreword

Tina, at 13, is a typical 8th grade Seattle middle school student: she enjoys her classes, plays flute in the school band, plays soccer on the weekends, and worries that she might not do well on her upcoming math test. She still takes comfort from sleeping at night with her old teddy bear, and “really likes” a cute 8th grade boy at school who is also in the band.

Erica is also 13 and attends 8th grade at a Seattle middle school. Erica was “sexualized” at an early age by her stepfather. Now Erica has a pimp. Her pimp is in a gang, and he is 19 years old. She believes he loves her, and he makes her feel important. He also makes her “work” and makes her give him all of her earnings. She works on Aurora Avenue and often has sex for money, with five or six adult men in one day. Erica loves her pimp, but she is also afraid of him. She knows that if she doesn’t obey him, he will beat her up, as he has in the past. She has been arrested for the crime of prostitution, but when she leaves juvenile detention, her pimp is waiting.

We can put a name to the 250 “Ericas” ages 13-18, who have engaged in prostitution in the Seattle - King County area over the past 12 months. Just like we could five, 10 and 15 years ago. In spite of raising this issue over the past decades in a variety of ways, and in spite of the many good people who work with and care about these kids, we cannot get ahead of this problem, and little, if anything has changed for most of these youth.

This report provides excellent information about youth, ages 13 to 18, who are involved in prostitution in our region, how they got involved, the trends, the gaps, the needs, and how we improve our response and prevent this in the first place. The report also poses a number of good questions that we, the concerned community, must address.

Here, now, we take this opportunity to pose two questions for all readers of this report: if we don’t do something about this issue now, then when? And if it’s not us, then who?

We invite you to read this report and to resolve to do something about it.

Together, we can. Thank you.

Terri Kimball
City of Seattle Human Services Department
Director, Division of Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Prevention

Melissa Fisher
City of Seattle Human Services Department
Sr. Grants and Contracts Specialist, Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Prevention

Assessment Limitations

The assessment was commissioned by the City of Seattle, Human Services Department's Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Prevention Division, to inform an upcoming Request for Investment, and to help facilitate a more coordinated community response to youth involvement in prostitution in Seattle. Many aspects of youth sexual exploitation were simply beyond the scope of this report, including a discussion of the cultural context of prostitution. In particular, the report focuses on female youth involved in prostitution. Sexual exploitation is historically gender-based; the prostitution of women and children defines and dominates the sex industry, but young boys and adolescent males are victims of commercial sexual exploitation as well. The research for this report identified 24 local male youths involved in prostitution, the majority of whom were connected to services. Understanding the motivating factors for this aspect of sexual exploitation requires additional lines of inquiry, but training and services should be inclusive of this group.

Please Note

Italicized quotations and passages presented throughout this report are from key stakeholders and service providers interviewed for the project. Descriptions of prostitution experiences are from case studies provided by social service staff and five female survivors of prostitution who agreed to interviews. I have taken care to protect their confidentiality and identity. Any inquiry around sexual exploitation is disturbing, yet the cooperation received for this project was extraordinary. Participants from all arenas were open about strengths and weaknesses in their systems and services. Their honesty was matched by the candor and sincerity of the women who shared their stories. The project itself has precipitated changes within some services and increased motivation to improve the community response to sexually exploited youth. The information presented in this report is intended to support these efforts.

Table of Contents

I.	Executive Summary -----	5
II.	Introduction -----	9
III.	Methodology -----	10
IV.	Local Estimates of Youth Involved in Prostitution ---	11
V.	Current Responses to Sexually Exploited Youth -----	19
	A. Juvenile Justice Response	
	B. Social Service Response	
VI.	Patterns in Local Youth Prostitution -----	25
VII.	Findings -----	29
VIII.	Assessment of Service Utilization and Gaps -----	30
IX.	Recommendations -----	32
X.	Final Thoughts-----	36
XI.	Appendices -----	38
	a. Key Stakeholders and Systems Interview Schedule and Guide	38
	b. Case Management Survey	39
	c. Ten Principles of the Wraparound Process	42
	d. Endnote	43
XII.	Acknowledgements-----	44

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

In 2007 a series of articles about a youth arrested for prostitution in King County appeared in a local publication. Concern about this arrest and the publication's report of the subsequent process caused a group of concerned providers, funders and criminal justice representatives to sit down together to share knowledge and information about these youth, and the community's response to their situation. The group agreed that an improved coordinated community response to assist youth in prostitution is needed and that the solutions involve many players and a strong political will to implement the needed change. The group posed a number of questions and in response, the City of Seattle's Human Services Department's Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Prevention Division commissioned this Assessment of Youth in Prostitution.

Components of the assessment include:

1. Estimates of the number of youth (18 and younger) involved in prostitution and other forms of commercial sexual exploitation in Seattle and the outlying areas,
2. Descriptions of trends and patterns in adolescent commercial sexual exploitation,
3. Assessment of service utilization and service gaps,
4. The degree to which the current system of community-based providers and criminal justice entities coordinate their response to these youth, and
5. Recommendations for service models and interventions.

Approach

The methodological approach utilized a Brief Ethnographic Assessment. Data collection methods included observations, key informant interviews, case studies, group interviews, and document and literature reviews. Ethnographic assessment methods generate data in a short time frame, provide a broad overview of a group or subculture, and focus analyses to inform policy and programs. For this assessment, 32 interviews were conducted with service providers, law enforcement, and public officials. Data were also gathered through group interviews, service provider surveys, case file checklists, and key informant interviews with five women who are survivors of prostitution.

Findings

Estimates of Youth Involvement

1. A planning estimate for the number of youth, ages 18 and under, involved in prostitution is **250** annually.
This estimate stems from a review of 1,528 case files from six agencies, which included Spruce Street Secure Crisis Residential Center and Juvenile Detention Case Management, and identified **238** prostitution-involved youth in 2007.
2. A prevalence estimate of youth involved in prostitution in the Seattle area is 300-500.
3. Law enforcement reports likely underreport youth involvement in prostitution.
4. Prostitution-involved youth are often arrested for other charges and prostitution histories may not be known.

5. There were only 50 juvenile arrests for prostitution statewide in 2006.
6. There were 82 juveniles arrested and referred to King County Juvenile Court for prostitution (Offering & Agreeing) and prostitution loitering in 2007, a significant increase from the past year.
7. Young women of color are overrepresented in samples of prostitution-involved youth.
8. Youth with prostitution convictions reoffend and are seen repeatedly in the court system; 31 youth with prostitution convictions from 2004-2006 had an average of seven additional court referrals.

Trends and Patterns in Local Youth Prostitution

1. Service providers reported increased incidents of youth ages 13 and 14 involved in prostitution.
2. Police report an increased use of the Internet, particularly craigslist.org, for sexual exploitation.
3. Service providers reported an increase in gang-affiliated prostitution.
4. Service providers reported an increase in prostitution-related violence including pimp kidnappings.
5. Service providers reported increased incidents of trafficking of youth across state lines and an increase in the number of youth moved to Las Vegas for prostitution.

Assessment of Service Gaps

1. Early intervention services, such as street outreach provided by several agencies, are understaffed and there is a lack of service coordination and collaboration.
2. Key services directed toward street youth and other youth populations at high risk for sexual exploitation readily acknowledge their need for training to be more effective with the sexually exploited youth population.
3. Safe and secure housing for youth in prostitution affiliated with pimps and gangs is not available in Seattle or in the state.
4. Youth in prostitution may be eligible for existing youth housing, but there are barriers to immediate placement at critical times.
5. Youth in prostitution who are released from juvenile detention facilities require dedicated housing with specialized support services. This housing and services are not available in Seattle.
6. Reintegration, aftercare, and intensive case management services necessary for prostitution recovery are not available.

Recommendations

A. Respond to Critical Needs and Establish Community-Based Treatment Resources

1. **Safe Housing is needed statewide.**
 - a. Convene a planning group to develop safe and secure housing with appropriate recovery support services available for statewide referrals.
 - b. Since a statewide safe housing program will take time and resources to establish, an alternative model for safe housing could be accomplished by providing incentives to current providers to establish housing exchanges across the state for up to 25 youth.

2. Local Housing

- a. Support up to 25 dedicated housing placements locally among youth housing providers.

3. Services and Training:

- a. Support additional case management by community providers for prostitution-involved youth released from juvenile facilities.
- b. Encourage implementation of the Wraparound Case Management Model developed at Portland State University, which is being implemented under a United Way Youth Homelessness Initiative in Seattle/King County. (This model has been used successfully with at-risk youth. The model is currently being implemented by an organization serving runaway and street-involved youth).
- c. Augment all community services with annual community training events to increase provider knowledge and assessment skills across agencies where sexually exploited youth present or are contacted.

B. Support Community Collaborations To Develop Community Based Support Services.

1. Support and expand the current community collaboration and coordination efforts focused on sexually exploited youth and maintain the inclusion of law enforcement in these efforts. Law enforcement has updated knowledge on street trends and they are often the first responders to youth in prostitution.
2. Encourage coordination and collaboration between existing outreach programs across the several agencies providing these services.
3. Explore and support expansion of counseling services for trauma and post-traumatic stress for young women of color in their communities.
4. Encourage development of survivor support groups utilizing survivors and peer workers within structured professional settings.
5. Support dedicated placements of youth with prostitution histories in youth employment programs.
6. Address pimping and prostitution aspects of gang-related behavior by encouraging inclusion of gender-specific programs in gang prevention efforts to address the behavior and attitudes of young men who engage in pimping and associated violence and exploitation of young women.
7. Develop an outcome evaluation plan based on Juvenile Justice data available through King County Office of Management and Budget to monitor and assess the impact of community-based treatment resources on entry and reentry into the juvenile justice system by prostitution-involved youth.

C. Address the Contradictory Legal Status of Youth involved in Prostitution

1. Arrest and conviction of youth under the age of 18 for prostitution or loitering contradicts the status extended to minors under the United Nations protocols on human trafficking, the United States' Trafficking Victims Protection Act, and the Washington State laws on trafficking and commercial sexual abuse of minors. Youth under the age of 18 involved in

prostitution should be considered victims. A working group should be convened to propose legislation to resolve the contradictions in local ordinances, state law, and the juvenile code, which outlines standard range sentencing. The working group could begin planning for alternative response policies and more effective services provided under the Becca Legislation.

2. Increase fines for those convicted of patronizing and other related offenses. The routine fine for those arrested for “patronizing” is \$500 although the maximum that can be imposed is \$1,000. Additional funds can be used to support victims of sexual exploitation.

Conclusions

With every street cycle and prostitution episode, youth involved in prostitution face extreme threats to their physical and emotional well-being and lengthen their recovery process.

- There is a dedicated core of service providers committed to improving services and collaboration across agencies and institutions for sexually exploited youth.
- Seattle has the capacity to implement a successful community treatment model for youth in prostitution.
- At this time, specialized housing, case management, and prostitution recovery services are not available.
- Prostitution-involved youth are underserved and are often unrecognized in youth services to a surprising degree.
- Recidivism rates among youth in prostitution are apparently high and involve crimes that are more serious.

Although there is an infrastructure for youth services, Seattle does not have specialized housing and recovery services for an adequate community treatment model and referral source. The necessary commitments of will and resources should be made to help youth break out of the isolation, violence, fear, and danger of prostitution that is unimaginable for most of us.

All programs that promote positive youth development, increase awareness of child safety and protection, build social/emotional learning skills, and intervene with high-risk youth have protective effects. We are, however, placing the responsibility for prevention of prostitution on the shoulders of children and youth alone when we fail to address the cultural norms that shield the dynamics of demand and normalize the behavior of buying sex. There is no curriculum that can provide an abused and frightened 14-year-old girl with the cognitive ability and refusal skills to outthink a 26-year old offering love, money, and to take care of her. An honest effort to reduce the sexual exploitation of youth will address the demand for prostitution by increasing penalties, prioritizing enforcement strategies, and providing public education on the harm of prostitution.

II. Introduction

As this report was being written, there were two young women in the King County Juvenile Detention Center:

Jessie, age 15, is in detention awaiting trial for murder. She stabbed a “customer” in the neck. On a previous prostitution arrest, an individual assessment indicated she needed treatment for both substance abuse and a mental health disorder. She did not receive treatment for either.

Bella is 16 and back in detention. She has been arrested multiple times for prostitution and other crimes. She has told her social worker that her pimp makes her work 20 hours a day without food. She says he beats her, spits on her, and does not allow her to look up—ever. To cement his control, he forces her to walk naked in front of his friends. The pimp’s name is tattooed on her neck.

Prior sexual victimization and poverty are well-established antecedents to prostitution involvement in the scientific literature.ⁱ The sexual abuse of childhood continues on the street from pimps and exploiters, inane referred to as “customers.” Although the average age of first involvement in prostitution is 14, it is not always recognized as a form of child sexual exploitation. For many, it is simply more convenient to believe that a 14-, 15-, 16-, or 17-year-old has “chosen” to continue their victimization and sexual exploitation in prostitution.

Recent concern over global trafficking of women and children for commercial sexual exploitation has increased awareness and changed perceptions of adolescent prostitution domestically. Under the United States’ Trafficking Victims Protection Act, “severe forms of trafficking in persons” includes “sex trafficking in which a commercial sex act is induced by force, fraud, or coercion, **or in which the person induced to perform such acts has not attained 18 years of age.**”ⁱⁱ The Washington State law on Human Trafficking invokes similar language. It is important to note that a person does not have to be “trafficked” over country or state borders in order to be a victim of trafficking – indeed “domestic” trafficking is the largest trafficking category. The criminal status and lack of services for domestic youth under age 18 who are involved in prostitution is called into question by these laws.

Additionally, the national and global estimates of child trafficking raise concerns regarding the scope of adolescent prostitution in Seattle. Changes in patterns of prostitution such as “outcalls” and increased use of the internet and personal ads have all contributed to concealing commercial sexual exploitation of children locally. Reduced visibility resulting in fewer arrests has made it difficult to estimate the extent of adolescent prostitution in the Seattle area.

In 2007 a series of articles about a youth arrested for prostitution in King County appeared in a local publication. Concern about this arrest and the publication’s report of the subsequent process caused a group of concerned providers, funders and criminal justice representatives to sit down together to share knowledge and information about these youth, and the community’s response to their situation. The group agreed that there is a lack of a coordinated response to this unacceptable problem, and that the solution involves many players and a strong public and political will to change things. The group posed many questions and in response, the City of

Seattle's Human Services Department's Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Prevention Division commissioned this Assessment of Youth in Prostitution. Components of the assessment include:

- Estimates of the number of youth, ages 18 and under, involved in prostitution and other forms of commercial sexual exploitation,
- Descriptions of trends and patterns in adolescent commercial sexual exploitation,
- Assessment of service utilization and service gaps,
- The degree to which the current system of community-based providers and criminal justice entities coordinate their response to these youth, and
- Recommendations for service models and interventions.

III. Methodology

A Brief Ethnographic Assessment was the primary approach used for this project. Methods for this approach include intensive techniques of observation, key informant interviews, case studies, group discussions, and document and literature reviews. The Brief Ethnographic Assessment allows researchers to explore social conditions and issues in-depth and to identify factors and relationships that may not be elicited through other methods. Ethnographic assessment methods generate data in a short time frame, provide a broad overview of a group or subculture, and offer insights that can inform or modify policies and programs.

The following methods were used to collect data in this assessment:

- Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 32 stakeholders, service providers, juvenile justice personnel, police, and public officials.
- One group interview was held with nine members of the Prostitution Prevention Network, a collaboration of service providers who are attempting to form a response team across agencies for youth in prostitution.
- The author participated in a group meeting hosted by YouthCare and King County Juvenile Court, and this yielded data on the perspectives of more than 25 staff from social services, legal agencies, and juvenile justice.
- Sixteen individuals representing six agencies completed a structured survey. The survey included closed and open-ended questions and a case file checklist. The case file checklist yielded descriptive information on individuals in case management. The case file checklists include information for 1,528 clients. (See appendices for copy of survey.)
- Five interviews were conducted with female survivors of prostitution, their ages ranging from 23-45: three African-American, one Caucasian, and one Hispanic.
- Observation areas included parts of downtown Seattle, Aurora Avenue, and in three youth-serving agencies.

IV. Local Estimates of Youth Involved in Prostitution

- *We are seeing more girls on the street again and they are younger.*
- *They are starting younger, age 12 and 13.*
- *It (prostitution) is more prevalent again and the girls are younger.*
- *More youth are prostituted through craigslist.org.*
- *There are excessive amounts of juveniles on Aurora, an amazing number who are barely 18. They work a lot before they are ever arrested.*

(Observations of police, and social service outreach and service provider staff)

The numerous estimates of juveniles involved in prostitution in the United States range from 100,000 to 3 million.ⁱⁱⁱ The U.S. Department for Health and Human Services cites 300,000 as the number in the U.S. based on estimates of runaways who become involved in prostitution. Unfortunately, these estimates of juvenile prostitution generally do not have a scientifically-credible basis.^{iv} There is wide disparity between police reports, social service observations, and global estimates. Prostitution is illegal for all parties involved and is universally under-reported. Given the surreptitious and clandestine nature in which prostitution is conducted, it is impossible to arrive at an exact number of prostituted youth.

Despite the obstacles, estimates are necessary to understand the scope of the problem and to develop an adequate response. Two estimates were generated for this assessment. The first is a “planning” estimate of youth involved in prostitution, grounded in local statistics. A planning estimate can be used to develop target goals for services, determine trends, and evaluate programs. The second is a prevalence estimate based on existing known cases plus estimates of cumulative incidence of prostitution-involved youth. Assuming parameters of annual overlap and new cases, this estimate provides a conservative range for the number of youth potentially involved in prostitution at any given time. The data used to develop these estimates are described in the remainder of this section.

Estimated Number of Youth Involved in Prostitution in the Seattle Area

- **Planning Estimate** – 250 youth uniquely identified through law enforcement and social services annually.
- **Prevalence Estimate** – 300-500 youth involved in prostitution in the Seattle/King County area.

Law Enforcement Data

2006 – 50 Arrests Statewide.

In 2006, there were 50 juveniles arrested for prostitution statewide and 49 of these were from King County. Nineteen of those arrests were from the Seattle Police Department, and 30 arrests were from other police agencies in King County. Of those arrested, 72 percent (36) were Caucasian and 28 percent (14) were African-American. Although this is a small sample, it should be noted that it is consistent with a pattern of over-representation of African-Americans in juvenile justice populations.

2007 -- 82 referrals for prostitution-related charges to King County Juvenile Court.

Data provided by the King County Prosecutor’s office show a 40% increase from 2006 in the number of youth with initial prostitution-related charges referred to King County Juvenile Court in 2007. There were 82 referrals for prostitution (Offering & Agreeing) and Loitering in 2007. Of these 82 referrals, 46 were prostitution referrals and 36 were for loitering and included two males. Eighty percent (n=66) of these referrals were filed and the cases were prosecuted.

The mean age of youth referred was **15.5 years**, confirming observations of involvement of adolescents at younger ages; 11 youth aged 14 were referred in 2007. Table 1, below, shows the age distribution of the 82 youth referred.

Table 1: Age Distribution of Juvenile Prostitution Referrals -2007

Age	Age 14	Age 15	Age 16	Age 17	Age 18
% (N = 82)	13% (11)	37% (30)	31% (25)	18% (15)	1% (1)

Table 2 shows juvenile arrests for prostitution from 2000-2006 for Seattle, King County, and Washington State. The increased arrests for juvenile prostitution in 2007 for King County are a significant departure from past years. It is difficult to assess if the increase in juvenile arrests reflect an increase in youth involvement or a change in policing priorities and arrest patterns. Youth may be arrested but referred for charges other than prostitution, which is up to the discretion of officers if multiple crimes are involved. Youth who are involved in prostitution are often referred on drug or theft charges, for example. These arrests are not included in the prostitution category, and their involvement may or may not surface as a part of their social history. We do know that King County police agencies identified at least 82 youth in 2007. Surely, the 82 youth identified in 2007 more realistically reflect the local problem than arrest data from prior years suggest.

Table 2 Juvenile Prostitution Arrests 2000-2006

Juvenile arrests for "Prostitution and Commercial Vice":							Data Source: WASPC, WUCR Program		
	Statewide			King County			Seattle P.D.		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
2000	10	24	34	1	16	17	1	14	15
2001	8	31	39	4	15	19	1	11	12
2002	Data	not	available						
2003	9	26	35	2	14	16	1	11	12
2004	2	30	32	1	21	22	1	7	8
2005	6	32	38	0	23	23	0	17	17
2006	4	46	50	1	29	30	0	19	19

National Data on Juveniles in Prostitution

Washington state data are similar to national data regarding the low number of prostitution arrests involving juveniles. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention has supported studies to increase statistical and research information on the prostitution of juveniles. David Finkelhor and Richard Ormrod have analyzed data from 76 agencies in thirteen states on juvenile prostitution based on the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS).^v

Finkelhor and Ormrod found that prostitution offenses are scarce in police reports. The investigators reviewed 14,230 prostitution incidents recorded in NIBRS data from 1997 through 2000, which represents only 0.17 percent of all crime incidents known to police (2 out of every 1,000 incidents known to police involved prostitution). The NIBRS data for 1997–2000 identify only 241 prostitution incidents with juvenile offenders, juvenile victims, or both (five percent of incidents). Of these incidents, 229 individuals are identified as juvenile offenders and 61 as juvenile victims. Analyses of the small data set are complicated because prostitution arrest categories may combine categories including patronizing and promoting with offering and agreeing to prostitution. **It can be concluded that police reports are not reliable indicators of the scope of juvenile involvement in prostitution.** The scarcity of juvenile prostitution reports suggests it is a low-priority crime.

Social Service Data

- *Prostitution is on the down low.*
- *Youth do not bring it up and we only learn through gossip.*
- *Prostitution gets talked about last. I have a client that strips but does not admit to prostitution.*
- *We do not talk about it; there is a lot of shame.*
- *We see the signs of survival sex, sex for protection, or a new boyfriend every week.*
- *I had two clients involved in prostitution, but it was a caseworker from another agency that told me.*

(Responses from interviews with social services providers)

A review of 1,528 local youth case management files identified 15 percent (n=238) involved in prostitution.

A second strategy was used to estimate the number of youth involved in prostitution locally. Data from structured surveys and case file reviews were collected from 16 staff representing six social service agencies and institutions for youth. Staff were asked to extract information from their case files on youth who were involved in survival sex, prostitution, or other forms of commercial sexual exploitation. Staff provided anonymous information on clients if they met at least one of the following criteria:

1. Knowledge that youth were engaged in survival or barter sex for a place to stay, drugs, food, or other needs,
2. Knowledge that youth had exchanged sex for money,

3. Knowledge that youth had engaged in forms of commercial sexual exploitation such as street prostitution, escort services, dance clubs, internet contacts, gang- or pimp-involved prostitution, and/or
4. Knowledge that youth had been arrested on prostitution or prostitution-related charges.

Although the sample size of agencies is small (six), it included key agencies and institutions where youth in prostitution appear: King County Juvenile Detention, Spruce Street Secure Crisis Residential Center (CRC) for status offenders, and programs of agencies serving high-risk youth in the north end, downtown, and central areas of Seattle. A status offender is someone charged with an offense that would not be a crime if committed by an adult, such as running away from home, being truant from school, and being beyond parental control.

Agencies participating in the survey included University District Youth Center, YouthCare, YMCA Working Zone, Southeast Youth & Family Services, and representatives for Juvenile Detention and Spruce Street Secure CRC. YouthCare contracts with King County to provide case management in the detention center for young women. A review of this caseload provided information on nearly all of the female youth referred to detention in the past year. The Director of Spruce Street Secure CRC reviewed the case files of all youth entering the facility for 2007, which was 687 youth. Additional information was provided by agencies working with street populations who track data but do not maintain specific case files, such as New Horizons Ministries. Summary information from these sources helped confirm estimates.

We were able to estimate that duplication in the case file sample was likely less than five percent. The participating programs serve relatively discreet populations, which assists estimates within specific timeframes. The At-Risk/Runaway Youth Act enacted in 1995 authorized the creation of “Secure” Crisis Residential Centers (CRC). Known as the “Becca Bill” legislation, law enforcement officers can take runaway and at-risk youth, truants, and children in need of mental health and substance abuse treatment to the CRC, where they can be held for a maximum of five days. Youth may appear first at Spruce Street, but if there are repeated arrests, youth are taken to detention. Thus, in a short period, there would be little overlap with the detention population surveyed, although it is not uncommon for youth taken to the secure CRC to have had some prior involvement with law enforcement.^{vi} Duplication is also limited within agency programs. Youth in the Orion Drop-in Center for example, are not generally housed in the YouthCare Shelter due to age. Youth on the detention case manager’s caseload are, for the most part, a separate group of youth from those in YouthCare’s residential programs.

Table 3 below summarizes information gathered from the sample of agency case management files. In all, agency staff reviewed 1,528 case files. Staff reported that 15 percent (238) were involved in some form of prostitution in 2007.

Table 3 Frequency of Prostitution among Youth in Case Management

Agency / Program Case Manager	2007 Jan - Dec	2007 Jan -Dec
	Total # Caseload	# Youth Involved Prostitution
YC Juvenile Detention Case Manager	118	58
YC HIV Case Mgr.	23	9
YC Home of Hope	36	3
YC Orion Case Mgr. 1	34	4
YC Isis	30	4
YC Orion Case Mgr. 2	50	15
YC Pathways	25	1
YC Passages	35	6
UDYC Case Mgr. 1	45	8
UDYC Case Manager	75	24
YMCA WZ	35	4
SEYFS	150	13
Spruce St CRC	687	66
YC Straley	40	3
YC Casa/ORR	27	0
YC Shelter	118	20
TOTALS	1,528	238

Agency Key - YC=YouthCare, UDYC=University District Youth Center, YMCA WZ= YMCA Working Zone, SEYFS =Southeast Youth and Family Services

Of the 238 youth involved in prostitution in 2007, the specific ages of 166 youth were available in the social service sample above. The age range was 12-24 due to funding guidelines and definitions of “adolescent” by some funders. The mean age was 16 years for the whole group and 14.9 years for a subgroup of youth ages 12-18. Of the 166 youth for which data were available, 84 percent (139) were female, 14 percent (24) were male, and three were identified as transgender. The male and transgender youth were identified in transitional living programs, a YouthCare HIV case management program, and through Spruce Street Secure CRC. Case managers were asked to review their files for the past six months of 2007 in order to support a reliable estimate of youth in prostitution. Sixteen percent (146) of youth in case management in the past six months were involved and 77 percent of these were aged 18 or younger.

Of the 238 youth involved, 52 percent (124) were identified from the case files of Spruce Street CRC and the YouthCare Detention Case Manager. Thus, 48 percent of the sample were involved in community youth service programs. Based on staff knowledge of youth, they reported there were very few duplicated youth in these numbers. For the time examined for this assessment, staff agreed they were not identifying the same youth.

There are several indications that the number of youth in prostitution identified through case file reviews may also be under-reported. The number of youth involved in prostitution reported by the YouthCare Detention Case Manager, for example, approximates the number of police referrals for 2007. However, there is not a perfect correlation between youth arrested for prostitution and youth referred to the case manager as:

- Youth are not always held in detention, and are not always referred to the case manager,
- Youth are arrested for offenses other than prostitution,
- Prostitution involvement may only be known informally or ascertained through assessments, and
- Prostitution involvement may not become part of their formal record.

Finally, interviews with social service providers revealed a lack of training on prostitution and a hesitancy to approach youth about their involvement or risky behavior.

- *I do not know how to talk about this.*
- *We do not know how to have the conversation.*
- *We do not know how to find out.*
- *We are just unaware.*

(Interview responses with Social Service Providers)

As providers increase their competencies, it would be reasonable to anticipate that more youth would disclose involvement and more providers would recognize the signs of prostitution. Completing the case file checklist was an instructive experience for many social service staff. Surprisingly, many do not ask youth about prostitution experiences and they do not track these data. Spruce Street Secure CRC does track social history data, but staff were not expecting to find one in ten youth entering their facility had prostitution histories once they examined all of the case files.

Perspectives from Additional Agencies

The planning estimate of 250 is based on a purposive sample of key agencies serving the highest-risk youth and local juvenile justice institutions. This estimate also allows for some under-reporting. Information on youth involved in prostitution was gathered from several additional agencies that provide street outreach services in the Seattle/King County. These agencies provided their perspectives on the scope of the problem as well as an opportunity to evaluate the reliability of the estimates given in this assessment.

- New Horizons Ministries identifies individuals aged 23 and younger in their Late Night Outreach program. In 2006, they provided outreach to 249 women in two geographical areas: Pacific Highway South, and a specific area on Aurora Avenue North. They estimate that of 249 women who are 23 or younger, 30 percent (75) are under age 18.
- Teen Hope Outreach uses rotating volunteers and covers several areas in King and Snohomish counties. Outreach contacts approximately 170 unduplicated youth annually and provides early intervention services to runaways. They estimate about 10 percent of the youth they see annually are involved in prostitution.
- Auburn Youth Resources provides outreach two nights per week on Pacific Highway South. With limited staff and outreach coverage, they are only able to work with about

20 youth annually. This is a low number for an area known for a high volume of prostitution activity.

- A review of data collected for the Street Outreach Services HIV Prevention program from August 2006 through August 2007 included contacts with 51 juveniles in prostitution. These 51 represent 33 percent of 154 individuals seen in the program.^{vii} Data on ethnicity was available for only 21 of the cases. Of these, 57 percent (12) were Caucasian, 24 percent (5) African American., the remainder was Hispanic (2), one mixed ethnicity, and one Pacific Islander. Thirty-two youth (63 percent) were homeless, and 14 (27 percent) were in a transitional housing status. The average age of the 51 juveniles was 15.6, the age range was 13 -22. This sample included young women up to age 22 because of federal funding guidelines. There were two youth aged 13 years and 10 youth aged 14 in this street sample.

Table 4: Age Distribution of Street Outreach Services' Life Empowerment Program- Sample of Youth in Prostitution

Age	13	14	15	16	17	18-22
% (N=51)	4% (2)	20% (10)	27% (14)	24% (12)	22% (11)	4% (2)

Table 5 provides age data for all prostitution arrests statewide in 2006.

Table 5: Age at time of Prostitution Arrest Statewide – 2006

AGE	13-14	15	16	17	Total Juvenile	18	19	20	21	22-24	25-29	30-44	45-65+	Total
Female	6	9	17	14	46*	52	87	50	58	157	133	357	113	1,046

*Age data on four males arrested are not included in this table.

System Changes

Several agencies reported implementing systematic changes to improve their capacity to identify youth in prostitution:

- Youth with prostitution and prostitution-related offenses are now screened in to detention. Until about two years ago, prostitution cases were not included in criteria for detention admission.
- A system is currently being implemented in Juvenile Court to count prostitution involved youth via caseloads to obtain accurate information on youth.
- Youth held in detention are no longer released to “themselves.”
- Key service providers have moved forward providing training to staff on prostitution and trafficking during the course of this assessment.

Summary

1. King County Juvenile Detention, Spruce Street Secure CRC, and a sample of community agencies serving high-risk youth in 2007 saw approximately 238 prostitution-involved youth.
2. An annual planning estimate of youth involved in prostitution for service providers is 250.
3. A prevalence estimate of youth (age 18 and younger) involved in prostitution is 300-500.
4. The data available for this assessment indicates that girls as young as 13 and 14 are involved in prostitution.
5. Youth become involved at around ages 14-15 and many stay involved as is apparent in the age data through many decades.
6. Arrest data and social service data are likely to under-represent the number of youth involved in prostitution:
 - a. Arrests rates for juveniles are low compared to adults, although research indicates most women in prostitution began in their teens.
 - b. Many youth are arrested and detained for charges other than prostitution-related offenses. If drugs are found during the arrest, for example, they are much more likely to be charged with drug offenses.
 - c. Social service providers require more training and support to identify youth in prostitution and at risk for prostitution.
 - d. Youth involved in the more hidden forms of prostitution are even less likely to be arrested.
7. Estimates examined in this report likely underrepresented youth exploited in escort services, Internet and personal ads, or who are called out and managed by pimps and exploiters off the street. These youth avoid arrest and the attention of social services.

V. Current Responses to Sexually Exploited Youth

A. Juvenile Justice System Response

There are few trials. Most girls want to plea and get out. Often they have come in under other charges such as drug offenses or a stolen car and have previous arrests. If they are brought into detention, we would only learn about prostitution from their social history if it came up.
(Social Worker)

- Youth are no longer released to “themselves” and must have an address and person for release.
- I have seen youth released to “uncles” who were pimps.
- I have seen girls’ pimps in the courtroom.
- Youth are held “illegally” because they have no place to go.

(Responses from court social workers and defense attorneys)

A youth arrested for the crime of prostitution, like any other juvenile arrest without a warrant, must be brought to court by the next court day. The first day in court is for a judicial determination that there is reason to believe a crime was committed. The court may hold the youth in detention or release them on court-ordered conditions. They will be ordered to return to court for an arraignment. After the arraignment, negotiations often take place between attorneys to reduce or dismiss charges, or go to trial.

On a first prostitution charge, a youth would generally be released. If the case was filed, the result is low-level probation. If the youth is not “compliant,” they are terminated from probation because they will not accept services. New charges ignite a repeat of this process. If youth were deferred on the first charge and there is a new arrest, the deferred sentence is revoked and they will have two charges. Charges begin to stack up.

Once charges begin to stack up and youth are not compliant, there is talk of Manifest Injustice (a sentence imposed that is longer than the standard range.). It is an ethical dilemma because no one can guarantee the safety of prostitution involved youth in the community.

(Social Worker)

King County Juvenile Justice Data Disposition for Prostitution Offenses from 2004 -2006

An analysis of 31 youth responsible for 35 prostitution and prostitution loitering charges from 2004-2006 was provided for this report by the King County Office of Management and Budget.^{viii} This analysis provides the best tracking record of youth through the local juvenile court system and speaks to the need for community-based treatment. Of these 31 juvenile females, 58 percent (18) were Caucasian, 32 percent (10) were African-American, 6 percent (2) were Asian/Pacific Islander, and one was Native American.

The 31 youth were responsible for a total of 211 charges in Juvenile Court. The number of referrals ranged from two to 23 within the group. These youth were referred to Juvenile Court an average of seven times each.

Table 6: Study Group Referrals to Juvenile Court

# of Referrals	2	3	4	5	7	9	11	12	14	17	23
# of Individuals (N=31)	4	4	8	4	1	2	2	2	2	1	1

- Of the 93 prostitution/prostitution-loitering charges, 15 were dismissed, 41 were filed on, and 37 pled guilty.
- The total detention time for this group was 2,467 days, or about 80 days per youth. Depending on a risk assessment, some youth may await their trials in detention, or be sentenced to at-home detention with electronic monitoring. If youth are in the detention facility, basic services including medical services and schooling are required by law. Youth may also participate in programming offered in detention by community agencies such as Powerful Voices, and it is mandated that an attorney and a probation counselor contact them.
- Of the 211 charges, the primary arresting agency was Seattle (104) followed by Kent (26), Federal Way (25), and the King County Sheriff (24).
- The study group (N=31) were arrested on multiple offenses multiple times as shown in the chart below:

Table 7: Study Group Arresting Crimes


Arresting Offense	# of Charges Within Study Group *
Prostitution/Prostitution Loitering	102
Theft	31
Obstruction / Resisting / Escape / False Statement	27
Assault	23
VUCSA Controlled Substance Violation	21
Firearms/Weapon	8
Criminal Trespass	7
Kidnapping/Intimidating Witness	3
Robbery	2
Domestic Violence Call	2
Motor Vehicle Violations/Possession/Taking a Motor Vehicle / Stolen Property	21

*A filing may have multiple charges.

There is nowhere to send them.

(Interview responses from juvenile probation officers, attorneys, and social service providers)

Youth arrested for prostitution typically cycle through the court and probation system. Typically, arrests are made through police sting operations in which officers pose as potential customers and make the arrest once there is an offer and agreement to an act of prostitution. Youth may also be arrested for loitering if they have a previous arrest or for probation violations. Youth are arrested and given a penalty that may include a fine and/or community service hours. Repeat arrests will result in probation and detention time. Probation may be terminated if they do not comply with conditions imposed. A follow-up arrest will trigger more detention time and so on as the chart below illustrates.



Manifest Injustice - Juvenile Courts in Washington State have the authority to impose sentences outside of the Standard Range through a finding called Manifest Injustice (MI). The court may find the Standard Range sentence too lenient for the seriousness of the offense and order a longer term of confinement known as “Manifest Injustice **Up**.” Exact data are not available at this time, but Manifest Injustice has been imposed on approximately seven youth with prostitution histories in the past six to seven years. An “MI” may be sought because of the increasing seriousness of criminal involvement and/or combined with increasingly self-destructive and dangerous behavior engaged in by youth. This means that females with prostitution histories are sent to the Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration’s Echo Glen facility for up to a year. Although the legal ethics are in question, representatives from all sides concede this as a last resort and the result of a lack of alternative safe placements.

Manifest Injustice Example

A Caucasian female who is now 16 was first arrested at age 14 for prostitution. She has been arrested 12 times: five times for drug violations including intent or possession, three arrests for weapons charges, two escapes, and two prostitution charges. Her sentencing has included fines, community service hours, and probation with SOAP (Stay Out of Areas of Prostitution) and SODA (Stay Out of Drug Areas) orders. She has been in detention nine times.

There is genuine concern on the part of juvenile court and social service providers regarding youth arrested for prostitution. Probation officers, attorneys (both prosecutors and defenders), and social workers, all feel powerless in the face of the overwhelming and seemingly unmanageable problems and the behavior of youth in prostitution. The inadequacy of community services for the population of youth who have come to the attention of the juvenile justice system is nothing less than shocking. Many agree their safety cannot be guaranteed in the community, and long-term confinement is the only answer they have.

Tanya is described by the social worker as a “very bright” 12-year-old girl, who “presented as much older” when she first appeared in court. There were a series of CPS reports filed on the family; she was abused and very afraid of her father. Tanya’s first arrest was for domestic violence with her parents. She also had a truancy, was not going to school, and had a subsequent arrest on a drug possession charge. She started running away, and was prostituting by age 12. Soon Tanya was selling crack and prostituting on Pacific Highway South. Tanya was sent to Echo Glen on a manifest injustice sentence. According to the court social worker, her parents were “relieved” when she was locked up.

Tanya was out of Echo Glen in a few months and on three months parole. With nowhere to go, she disappeared and it was learned she was in Las Vegas being prostituted. She came back to Seattle and had contact with a court worker who was trying to find her a place to live. Tanya was afraid to stay in any housing program: “They will get me and take me back down there.” She was afraid there were many people looking for her and would kidnap her and take her back to Vegas.

(Case Study provided by juvenile court social worker)

B. Social Service Response

Laura told her family she was pregnant when she was 15 and her parents told her to leave. Unemployable at 15, she struggled with minimal help from the state and friends until, at age 17 she met a pimp:

“I was on the track for a lot of years. I was scared to death of him; I believed he would kill me. He beat me and burned me. Then one night I was almost killed by a trick; my last customer of the night. He was strangling me and I fought him off. I heard a dog bark and followed the sound. I ran to a house; my clothes were nearly all ripped off, but the people called the police for me. The police told me, ‘You are going to die out there.’ One day the pimp left for a while and I just left. I called an old customer who gave me money for a taxi and a plane ticket.”

Like many women, Laura left the “track” for dance clubs and escort services because she thought it would be safer and she would have a little more control. As she neared 25, she managed to get a job and has been “out of the life” for a year or so.

Laura did not ask for help or use services: *“I was so afraid, the pimp would say don’t tell anyone about me. Someone would have had to convince me they could keep me safe and I would never have to go back. Your self-esteem is ripped apart.”*

(Interview with Survivor of Prostitution)

Two subsets of youth involved in prostitution: The case file checklist, although based on an available sample, does allow for examination of two subsets of prostitution-involved youth.

- One group is characterized by their involvement with the juvenile justice system. Their behavior has drawn the attention of the police; they have prostitution arrests, escalated criminal involvement, drug addiction, and affiliation with pimps. Less is known about the subsequent system involvement of a subset of this group identified through the Spruce Street Secure CRC.
- The second group of youth is characterized by their current involvement with services including case management and housing services.

Although the correlations are not perfect, it may be helpful to look at these two groups as subsets of youth involved in prostitution for the purpose of understanding services needed based on levels of involvement in prostitution.

Youth In the Juvenile Justice System

Youth cycling through the juvenile justice system are more likely to be involved with a pimp or gang, and will need safe and secure housing when they are released. It is within this group that youth whose lives are in danger from pimps and gang affiliation are most likely to emerge. Youth with prostitution arrests are developing their identity based on their life in prostitution. They need more focused prostitution and trauma recovery services.

Youth are not released from detention if they do not have a place to go. Since there is seldom family to pick them up, youth, with the assistance of a probation counselor or case manager, may go to a DCFS group home, back to foster care, or to shelters if there are any of the few beds available such as YouthCare Shelter, Dove House, or Teen Hope. None of these are permanent placements; the only transitional independent living program for youth under age 18 is YouthCare’s eight-bed Pathways programs.

“Their families are just not there.”
(Social Worker)

“I believed I had to accept this life; this is what was dealt me. Someone would have to prove I could go somewhere he couldn’t get at me. Do you really have somewhere I could go?”
(Prostitution Survivor)

“Girls with pimps or with gangs need out of here!”
(Prostitution Survivor)

One has to conclude that the most severely underserved population are youth who have been brought to the attention of the juvenile justice system. There is no concerted intervention until youth are finally perceived as in extreme danger, but by then there is no other alternative to lock up.

Youth Currently in Community Services

Youth with histories of prostitution involvement appear in programs across the spectrum of youth services. It should be noted that 114 youth (48 percent of the 238 identified in prostitution) were involved with housing and case management services. Depending on their degree of involvement, many youth can be safely and effectively served within the community with an increased capacity in housing and support services.

For some youth, prostitution is episodic and has not become their primary identity. For another subset of youth who are street-wise, prostitution is for survival; they are less afraid to leave pimps if they are involved because they know it is **not** about love.

Although there are significant gaps in existing youth services, we should not overlook the strengths and potential building blocks of the successful aspects of the current service configurations. The current infrastructure of youth services in Seattle includes street outreach services, drop-in centers, youth employment programs, alternative schools, case management programs, and emergency shelter and housing programs.

Youth with prostitution histories are often successfully integrated with other at-risk and homeless youth and thus are not separated and further stigmatized by their sexual exploitation experience. Service integration provides youth with opportunities to form new social networks and connect with supportive adults, who model healthy relationships. There was a time in the history of Seattle youth services when youth with street and prostitution involvement were barred from shelters and service for fear they would corrupt and recruit others; this attitude should remain in the past.

Gina was adopted at around age nine from an eastern European country. The relationship between Gina and her adoptive parents did not thrive. The parents may not have been aware that their daughter was sexually abused in her biological family and had been on the streets in her home country at a very young age. Gina ran away from her home and started prostituting in Seattle to survive. She was first contacted by a faith-based outreach program under a bridge where she had set up a camp. The outreach staff connected her with a case management and employment program. She took advantage of all the services including transitional housing. She is now working, in college, and out of prostitution.

(Case study provided by youth service provider)

Although the young woman described above was from a different culture and may have had a very different perspective than other youth, she was found by outreach services, connected to housing and other support services, and is currently out of prostitution. Given her history, it would be safe to say that she could benefit from additional counseling for sexual trauma and abandonment for example, to reinforce her exit from prostitution now that she is in a stable and supportive environment.

Training Needs:

Staff from programs who participated in the survey identified the areas of training that would enhance their ability to locate and serve youth in prostitution:

- Prostitution and Street Subcultures to recognize and identify youth
- Sexual trauma and recovery
- Exit process from street life and prostitution
- Successful intervention approaches
- Providing safety and building trust
- Advocacy in the legal system
- Addressing the cultural context of prostitution and pimp culture

It is crucial that training prepare providers to assess the level of involvement of youth in prostitution and to recognize the characteristics of acculturation.

VI. Patterns in Local Youth Prostitution & Sexual Exploitation

- *“It seems like it is back to the old school of pimps. Girls do not work by themselves.”*
- *“Pimps do not like their girls to use drugs because the drug becomes the pimp. They want all the money to go to them.”*
- *“They look for the young ones, the naïve ones. They will do anything for love.”*

(Responses from service providers and survivors of prostitution)

Modes of Prostitution and Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Youth

Interview and survey participants were asked to list the most common modes of sexual exploitation they were aware of among their clients with prostitution involvement. Service providers reported street (“track” or “blade”) prostitution most frequently, followed by gang-affiliated prostitution and then prostitution via the Internet. Youth were also reportedly involved in escort service, massage parlors, personal ads, and dance clubs, and exchanging sex for basic survival needs and drugs. Youth tended to be involved in more than one type of sexual exploitation, but street prostitution was most prevalent. The combined factors of age and addiction likely drive the predominant mode of street prostitution. The data in Table 8 below is based on survey responses from 16 service providers in six social service agencies.

Table 8 Modes of Sexual Exploitation

Method of Exploitation	Survey Participants Reporting Mode (N=16)
Street	11
Gang	8
Internet	5
Escort	4
Dance clubs	4
Massage	2
Personal ads	1
Brothel	0
Other /Survival / Barter	5

The full range of sexual exploitation is apparently available to youth once they are involved at any level. Providers were aware of the various types of prostitution their clients were involved with as shown in the two responses below:

“I have clients who work for pimps, dance clubs, on the street with a pimp, for survival with a sugar daddy, escort service, survival for housing, and online.”
(Service Provider)

“Most of my clients are involved with gangs and work for gangs on the internet. Anyone can get on the Internet. Also for survival, for drugs, for shelter, food, and for protection from other gang members.”
(Service Provider)

Local trends observed in the sexual exploitation of youth over the past year.

“For a while, it seemed like girls were more independent and working for escort services. But it has changed; they seem to start working younger now, around age 14, especially if they are affiliated with a gang.”
(Court Social Worker)

Prostitution and commercial sexual exploitation patterns are historically well-established. With limited data, it is difficult to assess if the trends identified by service providers denote qualitative changes or are recognizable variations. Their observations are valuable descriptions of current local characteristics, raise questions for further study, and point to needed interventions.

Trend 1 – Age of involvement in prostitution is decreasing.

There is no way to verify downward trends in the age of youth in prostitution. Virtually everyone interviewed who works with youth directly brought up individual cases of youth aged 13 and 14 observed on the street and in services. There were 22 youth identified in the case file checklist between the ages of 12 and 14 (two 12-year-olds, six 13-year-olds, and 14 14-year-olds). Interviews with members of the Seattle Police Department generally confirmed the

observations of service providers. Police observe more youth ages 16-17 in prostitution, but acknowledge they may have been involved for a long time before they come to the attention of the police. The incidence of 12, 13, and 14-year-olds involved in prostitution should not have to be increasing to trigger an appropriate intervention.

Trend 2 – Increased observations of youth controlled by pimps and victims of pimp violence.

“They (pimps) hang out around Westlake and Nordstroms looking for the best-looking girls.”

“If a girl has no experience they will turn her out and she will stay with him. Kids with more street savvy will run from a pimp. They will get their nails done and their clothes and then move on to the next one.”

(Responses from prostitution survivors and social workers)

Social service and juvenile court staff reported additional trends:

- Increased incidents of pimp kidnappings and youth being drugged and held against their will by pimps,
- Increases in gang-related prostitution, youth having to “choose” a pimp for protection from other gang members, and more youth being recruited into gang life,
- Increases in youth using the Internet for prostitution,
- Observations of female youth recruiting other females for their pimp in more aggressive ways,
- Observations of more youth not involved in the “fast life” subculture resorting to prostitution for quick cash and survival needs, and
- Police enforcement has shifted its focus to include different patterns of juvenile involvement such as being promoted on craigslist.org, in escort services, and in personal ads, such as in “The Stranger.” It is their impression that fewer youth are on the street compared to those working from escort services and the Internet. Police believe juveniles are not in dance clubs because they are well regulated.

“Lots of escort services use juveniles in the Seattle area. There are a hundred or more.”

(Response from Seattle Police Officer)

Trend 3 – Domestic trafficking patterns are prevalent with prostituted youth.

Survey participants responded to several questions concerning international and domestic trafficking to gain an understanding of how services may be affected by these trends.

Participants reported the following trends:

- Of the 16 social service provider survey respondents, two reported cases of international trafficking. In both cases, staff were suspicious because youth were not open about how they arrived in this country and people who said they were family were apparently not.

Several providers realized they needed training on the signs of trafficking, and one agency moved forward quickly to provide training to staff.

- Interstate trafficking was quite prevalent; seven respondents described ten cases of youth being trafficked across state lines to work in Oregon, California, and Nevada. In four of these cases, youth were taken by force with a weapon. In six cases, the youth went with the pimp out of fear for their lives. Overall, youth were trafficked by pimps.
- Trafficking between cities is also common, with 12 survey participants responding that their clients were moved around the state. Two providers believed that one in every 10 of their prostitution-involved clients was moved from city to city or across state lines. Staff from one agency described a pattern in which youth were taken to other states to work, and when they returned to Washington, they did not have charges or a record here.
- Increase in trafficking of youth across state lines and an increase in the number of youth working the “track,” particularly being prostituted in Las Vegas.
- Police stated that the Snohomish/King County line is a major area of prostitution. They stated there was a large influx last summer of “well-dressed girls” on Aurora who had been tracked through California, Nevada, and through Oregon to Seattle, but most were over 18.

Trend 4 – Increased prostitution affiliated with gangs and controlled by gang members.

Goldie ran from home at age 13 because of a physically abusive father, who is now in jail. She first ran to the home of a friend from middle school, which was located in the central area of Seattle. Goldie is Native American and Caucasian and is “preyed on” by everyone according to her caseworker. At her first hearing in Juvenile Court, no one was aware of her prostitution involvement. She was held in detention for 30 days on another charge and then released on community supervision. Other youth in detention recognized her and knew she had affiliated with a gang and had a pimp. While in detention, she had to keep her head down as a sign that she was “not choosing” a pimp and was not making herself available to another pimp in detention. Goldie had started using drugs and was already addicted.

While in detention, she also made contact with a community social worker and enrolled herself in case management. She is out of detention and has tried living with her mother, but is overwhelmed by the demands of middle school and outpatient treatment. She has an STD and has started disappearing again. She told her caseworker she wanted a family.

(Case Study provided by Agency Staff)

Data from surveys and interviews indicated there was an increase in gang-affiliated prostitution, which may be related to the recent increase in gang activity in the Seattle area. Data were collected on 19 females whose case managers confirmed their gang affiliation. Of these, eight were African American, six were Caucasian, two were Asian/Pacific Islander, and the remaining three were Hispanic, Native American, and multi-ethnic. The mean age was 15.7. The group included three 13-year-olds and one 14-year-old. All of the gang-involved youth were prostituted on the street, with one also working in escort services. Case managers reported that nine of these young women were new to the streets and in the early stages of immersion in the lifestyle of street prostitution. Sixteen were reported as having substance abuse problems.

Gang-affiliated prostitution raises several issues for intervention. Gangs use women to increase individual members' status, to make money for the gang through prostitution, to commit crimes such as selling drugs, and girls are used in horrendous ways as part of gang initiation and loyalty rituals. The characteristic pimping of young girls within gangs is seldom integrated in gang intervention programs

The gang affiliations are a major obstacle to extricating youth from prostitution. When youth go into detention, for example, they often know other incarcerated youth. If they are gang-affiliated, they have to declare their gang so youth can be separated to prevent inter-gang violence. In addition, there are clear rules for girls whose pimps are gang members. As cited in the case study above, if girls raise their heads and establish eye contact it means they are available to a new pimp, they are "choosing." For their safety, girls usually keep their heads down to avoid violence not only from their pimp, but also from their pimp's friends when they are out of detention. Police, probation officers, and service providers must be convinced of the extreme threat gang involvement poses to prostituted girls. Gang interventions should integrate interventions regarding the treatment of women and prostitution.

VII. Findings

With every street cycle and prostitution episode, youth involved in prostitution face extreme threats to their physical and emotional well-being and lengthen their recovery process.

- There is a dedicated core of service providers committed to improving services and collaborations across agencies and institutions for sexually exploited youth.
- Seattle has the capacity to implement a successful community treatment model for youth in prostitution.
- At this time, specialized housing, case management, and prostitution recovery services are not available.
- Prostitution-involved youth are underserved and often unrecognized in youth services to a surprising degree.
- Recidivism rates among youth in prostitution are apparently high and involve crimes that are more serious.

Although there is an infrastructure for youth services, Seattle does not have specialized housing and recovery services for an adequate community treatment model and referral source for prostituted youth. A community-wide commitment is necessary to help youth break out of the isolation, violence, fear, and danger of prostitution that is unimaginable for most of us.

VIII. Assessment of Service Utilization and Service Gaps

- *“These kids don’t want help.” (Response from community service provider).*
- *“I did an MI and sent a prostitute to Echo Glen for a year because she begged me to.” (Response from probation counselor.)*

There are a few programs in the United States that offer comprehensive prostitution recovery services for youth. These programs include Children of the Night in Los Angeles and the SAGE program in San Francisco. There are many other programs nationally, such as the Paul and Lisa Program in Westbrook, Connecticut, which provide education and early intervention but do not include outreach and residential services, for example. The services provided by programs with comprehensive services have been used as the “baseline” for assessing local service gaps for this report. Comprehensive services for prostitution recovery generally need to include the following:

- **Outreach** – The trust and trauma issues of prostituted youth makes street outreach a cornerstone of service continuums,
- **Detention-based Services** – Detention services that include referrals for post-custody housing, case management, and other aftercare services, self-esteem/gender-based groups, life skills, and education,
- **Emergency Needs** – Shelter, personal needs/hygiene/clothing, transportation, medical care, and protection,
- **Housing** – Emergency shelter, safe housing, transitional and permanent housing,
- **Community Services** - Family reconciliation, education, health education, trauma recovery counseling, and case management,
- **Employment** training, vocational preparation, and job placement,
- **Legal advocacy** and assistance,
- **Survivor** support groups,
- **Substance**-abuse treatment,
- **Skill Building** and support groups that include topics on positive relationships, sexual exploitation, personal and neighborhood safety, anger management, recognizing perpetrators, communication skills, and recreation programs, and
- **Services Addressing Customers** including diversion schools that address HIV and STD prevention and education on the harm of prostitution.

The service provider community, including representatives from Juvenile Court, is in the process of developing a service grid for youth in prostitution. When the grid is completed, there will be an opportunity to examine all of the services available that could be enhanced to serve youth in prostitution more effectively. In this section, gaps in the most critical services for community treatment are discussed.

Seattle does have the capacity to develop a comprehensive community-wide response to juveniles in prostitution. There is interest and dedication to this issue on the part of many service providers and several task forces and groups are prepared to collaborate. In addition, there are many services available to juveniles in the Seattle area that fit the continuum of services needed

for prostitution recovery. Existing services could be significantly strengthened with training and collaboration, which could be facilitated and supported at minimal costs given the expertise in the city on the issue of prostitution.

Assessment of Service Gaps

1. Early intervention services, such as street outreach provided by several agencies, are understaffed and there is a lack of service coordination and collaboration.
2. Key services directed toward street youth and other youth populations at high risk for sexual exploitation readily acknowledge their need for training to be more effective with the sexually exploited youth population.
3. Safe and secure housing for youth in prostitution affiliated with pimps and gangs is not available in Seattle or in the state.
4. Youth in prostitution may be eligible for existing youth housing, but there are barriers to immediate placement at critical times.
5. Youth in prostitution who are released from juvenile detention facilities require dedicated housing with specialized support services. This housing and services are not available in Seattle.
6. Reintegration, aftercare, and intensive case management services necessary for prostitution recovery are not available.

Interview and survey participants identified the service gaps and needs for youth involved in prostitution displayed in the table below. The gaps fell into the categories of housing, treatment, wraparound support services, and system collaboration.

Table 9: Service Gaps and Needs As Stated by Interview and Survey Participants

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing specific to prostitution • Housing counseling support groups, Wraparound services, • Safe housing and food up to two years • Housing, counseling, community-based wrap around • Safe housing • Therapeutic housing and services for young men • Safe housing and employment, • Housing and job training • Children of the Night program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Viable income and employment • Concrete resource for needs/employment • Training for service providers • Support services in the juvenile justice system • Treatment and rehabilitation services • Employment and self-esteem • Counseling services • More court services for therapy and support groups • Coordination between systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sex health education • Support groups focus on prostitution • Safe way to report bad dates • More understanding among the police that they are victims and not offenders • Cohesive networks and wrap around team and immediate services • Peer survivor services
--	--	--

IX. Recommendations

Prostitution is a complex issue filled with internal contradictions and every solution seems to have a landmine attached to it. There are subsets of the youth population involved in prostitution that are in different phases of the experience and interpreting its value against their childhood histories. It is important not to confuse their street personae with what we, as adults, should recognize as their developmental needs and rights as a child. Adequate community services should be in place and we should not be confused by their means of defending themselves.

The recommendations generated from this report are intended to be pragmatic and based on what we understand about the issue locally. They are intended to help focus on the priority needs of youth who can be identified and who need to be given lifelines to people they can trust. Finally, they are intended to enhance and maximize the effectiveness of the existing service network that has been put in place for street-involved and sexually exploited youth.

Respond to Critical Needs and Establish Community-Based Treatment Resources

1. Safe Housing

- a. Convene a planning group to develop safe and secure housing with appropriate recovery support services available for statewide referrals.
- b. A safe housing program will take time and resources to establish. An alternative model for safe housing could be accomplished by providing incentives to establish housing exchange options between providers across the state for up to 25 youth.

2. Local Housing

- a. Support up to 25 dedicated housing placements locally among youth housing providers.

3. Services and training:

- a. Support additional case management by community providers for prostitution-involved youth released from juvenile facilities.
- b. Encourage implementation of the Wraparound Case Management Model developed at Portland State University, which is being implemented under a United Way Youth Homelessness Initiative in Seattle/King County. (This model has been used successfully with at-risk youth. The model is currently being implemented by an organization serving runaway and street-involved youth).
- c. Augment all community services with annual community training events to sustain provider knowledge and assessment skills across agencies where sexually exploited youth present or are contacted.

Support Community Collaborations to Develop Community-Based Support Services.

1. Support and expand the current community collaboration and coordination efforts focused on sexually exploited youth and maintain the inclusion of law enforcement in these efforts. Law enforcement has updated knowledge on street trends and they are often the first responders to youth in prostitution.
2. Encourage coordination and collaboration between existing outreach programs across the several agencies providing these services.
3. Explore and support expansion of counseling services for trauma and post-traumatic stress for young women of color in their communities.
4. Encourage development of survivor support groups utilizing survivors and peer workers within structured professional settings.
5. Support dedicated placements of youth with prostitution histories in youth employment programs.
6. Address pimping and prostitution aspects of gang-related behavior by encouraging inclusion of gender-specific programs in gang prevention efforts to address the behavior and attitudes of young men who engage in pimping and associated violence and exploitation of young women.
7. Develop an outcome evaluation plan based on Juvenile Justice data available through King County Office of Management and Budget to monitor and assess the impact of community-based treatment resources on entry and reentry into the juvenile justice system by prostitution-involved youth.

Address the Contradictory Legal Status of Youth involved in Prostitution

1. Arrest and conviction of youth under the age of 18 for prostitution or loitering contradicts the status extended to minors under the United Nations protocols on human trafficking, the United States' Trafficking Victims Protection Act, and the Washington State laws on trafficking and commercial sexual abuse of minors. Youth under the age of 18 involved in prostitution should be considered victims. A working group should be convened to propose legislation to resolve the contradiction in local ordinances, state law, and the juvenile code, which outlines standard range sentencing. The working group could begin planning for alternative response policies and more effective services provided under the Becca Legislation.
2. Increase fines for those convicted of patronizing and other related offenses. The routine fine for those arrested for "patronizing" is \$500 although the maximum that can be imposed is \$1,000. Additional funds can be used to support victims of sexual exploitation.

Discussion of Specific Recommendations

Housing

Youth involved in prostitution do not all require the same kind of housing or level of security. Based on what we know of the identifiable population, approximately 15-25 youth per year may need safe housing similar to domestic violence shelter models. These youth will most often be associated with a pimp or gang, clearly identify themselves as “in the life,” and refer to themselves with the language of the prostitution subculture.

Safe Housing and Prostitution Recovery – The most critical need is access to safe housing. The planning estimate of 250 youth, which should be an annual services goal, will not all require Safe Housing; approximately 15-25 youth per year are currently identified as needing secure housing in the Seattle area. For this group, safety may not be possible in Seattle; they can still be found by pimps, gang affiliates, and street acquaintances as they move through downtown, try to go to school, or take a bus. Kidnappings are not uncommon. Safe Housing is also a need in other cities in the state including Tacoma, Spokane, and Vancouver. The need may increase as services become more effective.

Safe housing is expensive and complicated, particularly for youth under age 18. Considerable planning will be required to develop an appropriate model with considerations for sustainable funding, licensing requirements, security options, programming, location, and potential statewide collaborations, partnerships, and cost-sharing. Until a fully developed Safe Housing Program can be established, an alternative plan to provide safe housing needs to be developed.

Safe Housing Alternatives Plan – There are youth housing programs across the state of Washington that could provide safe housing for youth from other counties who need out of their local area due to threats from pimps and gangs. Agencies with youth residential programs that have the infrastructure, including understanding of licensing requirements, should be given incentives and waivers to form collaborations with programs across the state for youth housing exchange programs. Exchange programs would need to provide up to 25 safe beds for sexually exploited youth across the state.

Dedicated Housing Placements for sexually exploited youth – “There is nowhere to send them” was heard repeatedly throughout this assessment. Youth housing is a complicated mix of programs from emergency shelter to long-term housing. Many have age, referral, gender, and time-limit restrictions and many are set up for specific populations such as pregnant and parenting teens, DSHS youth, and sexually-aggressive youth. In addition, there is a mix of emergency shelter beds across the county, some of which are closed during the day. Many of these programs are quite inflexible because of federal regulations and state licensing requirements. In fact, many “youth” programs actually serve the 18-24 years age group. There are fewer housing options for youth under age 18 than would first appear. The clear and critical housing need is for youth upon their release from detention who do not have anywhere to go or anywhere safe to go.

Wraparound Case Management

United Way of Seattle/King County has recently invested a considerable amount of money to address youth homelessness, which is a key factor in youth prostitution. Funds have been allocated to one agency, which serves high-risk youth, to implement the Wraparound Case Management Model. United Way has provided training open to all social services, and will most likely offer repeat trainings on this particular case management model. This evidenced-based practice offers a promising approach for working with sexually exploited youth. It differs from the traditional single case manager approach. Fidelity to the model requires a team-oriented approach with individualized services, identification of support networks, and cross-agency teams, and a unified plan for care. The Connections Program in Clark County Washington is using this program successfully with youth in the Juvenile Justice system. (See Appendix 3.)

Training

Staff in agencies who participated in this assessment willingly admitted they needed help working with sexually-exploited youth and some felt wholly unprepared. Many admitted they did not know what to say or what to do. Youth are not asked about prostitution experiences, it is generally not included as part of intake assessments, and youth do not feel safe bringing it up. At the same time, Seattle has many of the components in place for an adequate response to sexually exploited youth, which would allow them to be treated in the community. Training would improve effectiveness and confidence of staff across the board. Cross-agency training could also be directed toward establishing a “Treatment on Demand” Model with trained staff available wherever sexually exploited youth are likely to be contacted. Because of the high turnover rate of staff in social services, it is important that the training component have a permanent home and long-term commitment.

Increased access to trauma counseling for young women of color

Seattle is quite fortunate to have the expertise of the Harborview Center for Sexual Assault and Traumatic Stress. The prosecutor’s office has agreed to refer youth to the Center for counseling services from Juvenile Court. Youth who feel safe, are in housing, and have basic needs met are more likely to benefit from this resource. There is an extensive need for trauma counseling for survivors of prostitution and young women of color are dramatically underserved according to representatives of agencies serving women and youth of color who were interviewed for this assessment. Increasing access, providing cross-agency training, and extending this resource, particularly for youth of color, is a very critical need for youth whose basic requirements for safety have been met.

Gender specific programming to address pimping culture and gang-related prostitution

There is apparently a significant increase in gang activity in the Seattle area with an associated increase of gang violence toward girls including prostitution. A number of initiatives are under way to address the gang issues. This opportunity should be taken to include prostitution issues in these initiatives and interventions. There are no gender-specific programs to address the behavior and attitudes of young men who engage in pimping and associated violence and exploitation of young women. As one interviewee stated: “They are somebody’s sons.” This side of the equation should not be ignored.

Service Collaboration

A successful community approach to help sexually exploited youth will be predicated on agency collaboration and sharing of resources and expertise. The Prostitution Prevention Network has begun this process. In recent months, they have tried to focus more on the needs of individual youth and to develop a cross-system service approach. Agency agreements have been finalized among this group. It will be important to support community collaboration efforts.

Peer Support Groups

Survivors of prostitution and peer workers can offer the most effective interventions when they are provided with training, and a supportive and professional structure. Support groups can be initiated and supported through existing agencies and they should be encouraged to do so.

X. Final Thoughts: Addressing the Contradictions

All programs that promote positive youth development, increase awareness of child safety and protection, build social/emotional learning skills, and intervene with high-risk youth have preventative effects. We are however, placing the responsibility for prevention of prostitution on the shoulders of children and youth alone when we fail to address the cultural norms that shield the dynamics of demand and normalize the behavior of buying sex. There is no curriculum that can provide an abused and frightened fourteen-year-old with the cognitive ability and refusal skills to outthink a 26-year-old offering love, money, and to take care of them. A cultural backdrop that has mainstreamed prostitution only further confuses them.

An honest effort to reduce the sexual exploitation of youth means we must address the demand for prostitution by increasing penalties, prioritizing enforcement strategies, and providing public education on the harm of prostitution.

As individuals and as a community it is important to come together on how we “think” about prostitution. Whose problem is it when a 12-year-old is being prostituted? Should a 12-, 13-, or 14- year-old be held accountable in the same manner as a 16-year-old? What systems are failing children to the extent that the only “treatment response” comes from the juvenile justice system? What is our responsibility for early intervention? Who is served by the myth “they don’t want help” or “they choose to do this?” The developmental needs and phases of child development should be primary considerations in treatment and justice responses for this age group.

In 2000, Congress passed the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA), which provides a range of benefits for victims of a severe form of trafficking including sex trafficking where individuals are purchased, sold, and transported to perform acts of prostitution. Under TVPA, these acts are further defined as commercial sex acts induced by force, fraud, or coercion, or when the person is under age eighteen. Force, fraud, or coercion is defined as: 1. Threats of serious harm to or physical restraint against any person, 2. Any scheme, plan, or pattern intended

to cause a person to believe that failure to perform an act would result in serious harm, or physical restraint, and 3. Abuse or threaten abuse of law or the legal process.

Victims are eligible for benefits and services from both federal and state programs including “the right to rescue and shelter, social and economic assistance including job counseling, skills training, and education, the right to medical care both physical and psychological treatment, legal representation, mandatory restitution, and witness protection.” In addition, there are Trafficking in Persons phone help lines. The focus of the TVPA is on the “protection” of victims of trafficking and strengthens the prosecution and punishment of traffickers.^{ix} Under TVPA, victims of sexual trafficking are not characterized as offenders or prosecuted; there is no assumption of agency or choice in their participation in commercial sex. They are not inappropriately prosecuted or punished for surviving.

Prostitution poses many social and legal contradictions. The TVPA raises another: the differential treatment of victims of global exploitation and locally prostituted women and adolescent girls. Prostituted adolescents are also subject to violence, threats, and coercion of pimps. They are separated from families and support systems, moved to avoid law enforcement and often work on “prostitution tracks.” Global issues related to sex trafficking are also local human rights issues.^x

As a community, we are no less accountable for the sanctioning of sexual violence and exploitation of women and girls because they are prostituted locally. Women in prostitution are routinely victimized in the course of their crime, which intensifies their trauma and isolation and keeps them in prostitution. However, the dual status of victim and offender implies agency and choice, which continues to plague responses of social services and law enforcement. The question must be asked: “Who is served by continuing to adhere to a misconceived notion of 'choice' in adolescent prostitution?” If we believe they choose to be there, do we have less responsibility?

An initial law enforcement response to prostitution may be the best we can do, if for no other reason than the need for emergency responses to what are life-threatening situations for adolescents as exemplified by the Becca Bill legislation. If the template of resources, benefits, and understanding of sexual exploitation contained in the TVPA were extended to local victims of prostitution, legal and social responses may be more closely aligned and prove to be a more effective response for prostituted women and children, and the community.

XI. Appendices

1. Key Stakeholders and Systems Interview Schedule/Guide
2. Case Management Survey and Case File Checklist
3. Ten Principles of the Wraparound Process

Appendix 1 - Key Stakeholders and Systems Interview Schedule/Guide

Assessment of Youth Involvement in Prostitution
City of Seattle DVSAP Division

Key Stakeholders and Systems Interview Schedule/Guide

(Each interview tailored to individual position)

1. Date	Code
2. Name/s	Number interviewed
3. Agency	Position

4. What role does your agency have regarding juvenile prostitution and commercial sexual exploitation of youth?
5. What services do you offer that sexually exploited youth may use?
6. What specialized services do you offer for this population?
7. What services do you need to have in place to be more effective with this population?
8. What data on this topic do you track; what data are available?
 - a. Prevalence, Type of exploitation, JJ involvement
9. How many cases of juveniles involved in prostitution, sexual bartering/trading/ other sex work have you had over the past year, past 6 months, past month?
 Year _____ Past 6 months _____ Past Month ____
10. Please describe these cases:

- a. Type of activity
 - b. Age, length of involvement
 - c. Adults involved
 - d. Coercion issues
 - e. Gang association
 - f. Drug association
 - g. Foreign/Domestic
11. What is the general geographical where youth exploitation occurs?
12. What is your involvement, collaboration with police and juvenile justice agencies
 - a. Police involvement
 - b. Case disposition
 - c. Referrals
13. Reviewing your cases over the past year can you describe in general your knowledge in these areas:
 - a. Knowledge/info on background of youth
 - b. Path to involvement
 - c. Family history
 - d. Sexual abuse history
 - e. Trafficking
 - f. Response to services
 - g. Service involvement

14. What services were used/referred to for these clients?
15. What services were needed? Were they referred, did the services exist, did the services respond?
16. Do your staff have training on commercial sexual exploitation, trafficking, prostitution
17. How do your staff respond to this issue? Is there a protocol in place?
18. What are the current service needs for sexually exploited youth?
19. What services are in place but need more support/ what type of support is needed to make them more effective?
20. . Additional Comments

Appendix 2 – Case Management Survey

Assessment of Juvenile Involvement in Prostitution Case Management Survey and Case File Checklist 2008

Introduction

The City of Seattle Human Services Department, Domestic Violence, and Sexual Assault Prevention Division will be releasing an RFI for funding to agencies providing services to sex industry victims. DVSAP has contracted with Debra Boyer, PhD, to complete a community assessment of youth involvement in prostitution and sex work in the Seattle area to inform and guide the RFI process. This survey is part of the assessment process.

We are asking case managers, juvenile probation counselors, attorneys, law enforcement officials, and other knowledgeable individuals to complete the survey. We are attempting to generate an estimate of the number of youth involved in prostitution and other forms of commercial sexual exploitation and to understand patterns of recruitment and overall conditions. The information will be used to inform service needs.

Thank you for your help. Your agency will be included in dissemination of the final report and notified of any other activities related to this project.

Instructions

There are two parts to this survey; Part I asks general questions about your knowledge on sexually exploited youth and Part II is a case file checklist. Please complete both sections.

Please answer the questions on this survey for clients/youth who are assigned to your caseload or for whom you are the primary case manager or contact person in your agency.

Please fill out the questions below and the case file checklist that follows. Return surveys to your agency contact person. Contact Debra Boyer, PhD with any questions at 206.329.0381 or <mailto:boyerdebra@hotmail.com> . You may also return the survey via email to this address.

BEGIN SURVEY

1. Please give us your name
Name of agency you are representing:
2. Your position or title:
4. Date Completed:

PART I – CASELOAD INFORMATION

1. What was the **total** number of clients on your caseload in **2007**?
2. Of that number, how many would you say had been involved in prostitution or other form of commercial sexual exploitation?
(Exchanging sexual activity for money, drugs, or survival needs.)
What is the total number of individuals on your caseload for the past **6 months of 2007**?
3. Of these, how many have been involved with prostitution or other forms of commercial sexual exploitation?
4. Of these, (past 6 months) how many are age 18 or younger?
5. Of these, (past 6 months) how many are ages 19-24?
6. Has the overall number of commercially sexually exploited youth on your caseload changed over the past year?
 Increased Decreased Stayed about the same

7. What types of commercial sexual exploitation are youth involved in?

Please check all that apply?

- Street (track prostitution)
- Escort Services
- Massage Parlors
- Brothels
- Internet sites such as Craig's List
- Personal advertisement through papers/Message boards
- Gang affiliated
- Dance Clubs
- Other, please specify.

Please continue to next page.

8. Of the youth on your caseload over the past 6 months, how many were involved in each type of commercial sexual exploitation?

- Street (track prostitution)
- Escort Services
- Massage Parlors
- Brothels
- Internet sites such as Craig's List
- Personal advertisement through papers/Message boards
- Gang affiliated
- Dance Clubs
- Other, please specify.

9. What are the most frequent types of commercial sexual exploitation that you see among your clients?

10. What trends have you observed regarding the sexual exploitation of youth over the past year?

11. Have you served youth who were involved in international trafficking for sexual purposes?

No Yes If yes, how many in total?

If yes, what time period does this cover?

Please describe this case/s briefly.

12. Have you served youth involved in interstate trafficking as clients?

No Yes

If yes, how many in total? If yes, what time period does this cover?

Please describe this situation/s briefly.

13. Have many of your clients moved from city to city or state to state to work?

No Yes If yes, how many in the past year?

Please describe these situations briefly.

14. Have you had youth involved in prostitution who were refugees?

No Yes If yes, how many over the past year?

15. Who are sexually exploited youth associating with or/working for in prostitution? Please check all that apply.

1. Gang related prostitution
2. Pimp involvement
3. Parents/Other Relatives
4. Working alone
5. Working with friend
6. Other promoter Please describe

16. What are the most frequent types of associates?

Services for Youth Involved in Prostitution

17. What services does your agency provide to youth involved in prostitution? Please list and describe any services specific to this group provided.

18. What services do you refer youth to who are involved in prostitution?

19. What services are needed that are not available in this area for youth involved in prostitution?

20. Is your agency collaborating with any other agencies or groups to provide services to sexually exploited youth? If yes, please describe.

21. Does your agency receive any funding that is specifically identified to serve sexually exploited youth? If yes, please describe the source of funding and the program.

22. What changes in the system response to youth arrested for prostitution or who are known to be involved in prostitution would you recommend?
 23. What are the current strengths of the system and social service response to juveniles involved in prostitution?

24. Please add any other comments, recommendations, or information you would like to contribute to this project.

Thank you very much for your help!
 Please continue to Part II - Caseload Checklist

PART II - CASE FILE CHECKLIST

The purpose of this form is to extract information from case files on youth who are involved in survival sex, prostitution, or other forms of commercial sexual exploitation.

Instructions: Please review your **current and open cases** and fill out the following chart for each case that meets **at least one** of the following criteria:

- You have knowledge that the youth is engaged in survival or barter sex for a place to stay drugs, food, or other needs.
- You have knowledge that the youth has exchanged sex for money.
- You have knowledge that the youth has engaged in other forms of commercial sexual exploitation work such as street prostitution, escort services, dance clubs, internet contacts, gang or pimp coercive sex, etc.
- Youth has been arrested on prostitution or prostitution related charges

Please begin by answering these questions:

1. What is the total number of clients on your current caseload?
2. What number of cases will you report on in this survey?

Now, please fill in the chart information for each client, checking all boxes that apply. Make additional copies of the chart if necessary.

3. Do not use names of youth.

Please note the key for the ethnicity column 2: AI-Native/American Indian, B-African American, C- Caucasian, H-Hispanic/Latino/a, AP-Asian/Pacific Island, M-Multi ethnic identify, O-Other, please state.

CASE REVIEW CHART Agency Name

Client #	AI B C H AP M O	Gender M- Male Female T- Trans gender	Age	Youth has engaged in Survival Sex. Yes/No	Youth has exchanged sex for money Yes/No	Youth involved in prostitution or other commercial sex work. Yes/No	List types of sex work involvement	Youth works: A= alone F=friends G=Gang P=pimp/promoter	Where do they work; street, escort etc. Please list.	Level of Involvement 1=Professional 2.= Immersion 3=Novice 4=Occasional/Survival	Addi tion Issue Yes/ No
1.											
2.											
3.											
4.											
5.											
6.											
7.											
8.											
9.											
10											

Appendix 3 --Ten Principles of the Wraparound Process

Description of Wraparound, from California Evidence Based Clearinghouse:
<http://www.cachildwelfareclearinghouse.org/program/68/detailed>

Target Population: Designed for children and youth with severe emotional, behavioral, or mental health difficulties and their families. Most often these are young people who are in, or at risk for, out of home, institutional, or restrictive placements; and who are involved in multiple child and family-serving systems (e.g. child welfare, mental health, juvenile justice, special education, etc.) Wraparound is widely implemented in each of these various settings; however, because the youth have multi-system involvement, wraparound participants have many similarities across settings.

Brief Description:

Wraparound has been rated by the CEBC in the area of Placement Stabilization. *Wraparound* is a team-based planning process intended to provide individualized and coordinated family-driven care. *Wraparound* is designed to meet the complex needs of children who are involved with several child and family-serving systems (e.g. mental health, child welfare, juvenile justice, special education, etc.); who are at risk of placement in institutional settings; and who experience emotional, behavioral, or mental health difficulties. The *Wraparound* process requires that families, providers, and key members of the family's social support network collaborate to build a creative plan that responds to the particular needs of the child and family. Team members then implement the plan and continue to meet regularly to monitor progress and make adjustments to the plan as necessary. The team continues its work until members reach a consensus that a formal *Wraparound* process is no longer needed.

The values associated with *Wraparound* require that the planning process itself, as well as the services and supports provided, should be individualized, family driven, culturally competent and community-based. Additionally, the *Wraparound* process should increase the "natural support" available to a family by strengthening interpersonal relationships and utilizing other resources that are available in the family's network of social and community relationships. Finally, *Wraparound* should be "strengths-based," helping the child and family recognize, utilize, and build talents, assets, and positive capacities.

Link to the full article, Ten Principles to the Wraparound Process:

<http://www.rtc.pdx.edu/PDF/TenPrincWAProcess.pdf>

Suggested citation: Burns, E.J., Walker, J.S., Adams, J., Miles, P., Osher, T.W., Rast, J., VanDenBerg, J.D. & National Wraparound Initiative Advisory Group (2004). *Ten principles of the wraparound process*. Portland, OR: National Wraparound Initiative, Research and Training Center on Family Support and Children's Mental Health, Portland State University.

Endnotes

- ⁱ Boyer, D. & James, J. (1983). Sex and social order: The prostitute as victim. In D. MacNamara and A. Camen (Eds.), *Deviance and victimology*. Sage Annual Review of Studies in Deviance Vol. 7. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Boyer, D. (1982). Easy money: Adolescent involvement in prostitution. In S. Davidson, (Ed.), *Justice for young women: Close up on critical issues*, Tucson, Arizona: New Directions for Young Women.
- Boyer, D. & James, J. (1982). Juvenile prostitution. In C. Griffith and M. Nance (Eds.), *The female offender, Selected papers from an international symposium*. Vancouver, Canada: Simon Fraser University Criminology Research Center.
- Nandon, S.M., Koverola, C. & Schludermann, E.H. (1998). Antecedents of prostitution: Childhood victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 13, 206-221
- Silbert, M.H. & Pines, A.M. (1983). Early sexual exploitation as an influence in prostitution. *Social Work*, 28, 285-28
- Weisberg, D.K. (1985). *Children of the Night: A Study of Adolescent Prostitution*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- ⁱⁱ Center for Women Policy Studies (2004) *Fact Sheet from the National Institute on State Policy on Trafficking of Women and Girls*,
- ⁱⁱⁱ Barnitz, L.A. (1998). Children for sale: Youth involved in prostitution, pornography and sex trafficking. *Youth Advocate Program International Report*, 3(2) 1-3.
- ECPTAT (1996). *End child prostitution, Child pornography, and the trafficking of children for sexual exploitation, Europe and North America regional profile*. Issued by the World Congress Against Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children. Stockholm: Sweden.
- ^{iv} Stransky, M and Finkelhor, D. (2008). *How many juveniles are involved in prostitution in the U.S.?*, Fact sheet. Crimes against Children Research Center, University of New Hampshire, 126 Horton Social Science Center, Durham, NH 03824, Available online at: www.unh.edu/ccrc.
- ^v Finkelhor, D. & Ormrod, R. (2004). Prostitution of juveniles: Patterns from NIBRS. OJJDP. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*. June. Available online at 222.ojp.usdoj.gov/ojjdp
- ^{vi} McCausland, S.G. & Griffin, R.L. (2003) *Washington's Runaway Youth Placed in Secure Facilities*. Merit Research.
- ^{vii} LPP Program, Administered by SOS. Funding from Seattle King County Dept of Public Health. Nature Carter-Gooding, Project Coordinator.
- ^{viii} Data provided by Ed Vukich, Juvenile Justice Research and Data Analyst, Management Analysis and Planning Section, King County Office of Management and Budget.
- ^{ix} *Training service providers on effective methods to provide services to victims of a severe form of trafficking*. (2003). The Protection Project of the Johns Hopkins University, School of Advanced International Studies.
- ^x Leidholdt, D.A. (2004) *Demand and the debate*. Coalition against Trafficking in Women. Online: http://action.web.ca/home/catw/readingroom.shtml?x=53793&AA_EX_Session=9a8295287250cf63459acf67554e8008

XII. Acknowledgements

The City of Seattle, Human Services Department's Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Prevention Division and Dr. Boyer would like to offer our sincere thanks and gratitude to the organizations and individuals who contributed their time, information and expertise to this report. Without your assistance, this project would not have been possible.

Community Representatives

Auburn Youth Resources - Katalin Hausbeck
Communities Against Rape and Abuse - Ebony Colbert, Theryn Kigvamasud' Vashti
Harborview - Lucy Berliner, Cecilia Oritz
Lambert House - Ken Schulman
Society of Council Representing Accused Persons - Elinor Cromwell, Ben Kaplan
Spruce Street Secure Crisis Residential Center - Maggie Faust
New Horizons - Sheila Houston
Nature Carter-Gooding - Changes and Empowerment Program
Rising Above Sexual Exploitation - Eileen Corcoran
South East Youth and Family Services - Jerry White
Teen Hope Washington - Henry DelleChiaie
United States Attorney's Office, Western District of Washington -Ye-Ting Woo
University District Youth Center - Yuka Hayashi
UW Homeless Youth Clinic - Mavis Bonner
Washington Asian Pacific Islander Families Against Substance Abuse - Noel Gomez
Washington State Office of Crime Victim Advocacy - Katharine Egan
YMCA Working Zone - John Faust
YouthCare - Ruth Blau, Melinda Giovengo, Joanna Ward

City of Seattle

City Councilmember Tim Burgess
City Councilmember Nick Licata, and Staff Member Lisa Herbold
Seattle Police Department – Detectives Harry James and Harvey Sloan
Youth Development and Achievement Division- Terry Hayes, Marci Curtin

King County

Juvenile Probation - Amy Montgomery, Deb Stuckman
Juvenile Court -Susie Bridges Weber, Leanetta Jessie
Office of Management and Budget - Ed Vukich