

Safe Harbor Bush Fellowship: Summary Report of State Site Visits

**Written by Beth Holger-Ambrose for the
Bush Fellowship Program, The Bush Foundation
November 2013**

Acknowledgements:

The work of this project was made possible with the generous support of the Bush Foundation through their Bush Fellow Program. A special thank you to the Bush Foundation, the 2012 Bush Fellow Cohort and Martha Lee for their on-going support of this work.

Another special thank you to the Women's Foundation of Minnesota who have been integral in supporting the advocacy, training, community awareness and this particular fellowship project focused on developing a new response for sexually exploited youth in Minnesota.

This work could not have been done without the support and time of all of the 65 agencies that site visits were conducted with across the country. These agencies took the time, contributed their knowledge and often times tools and/or reports and also helped edit the final report to ensure accuracy (for a full list of these agencies please see page 7).

Thank you to Dr. Lauren Martin for assisting with a final edit of this report.

Thank you to the following people for providing input and insight into the design of the questions to ask during the site visits with other states as well as input into Safe Harbor implementation and the work of this fellowship:

Amy Kenzie and Patty Wetterling, Minnesota Department of Health

Andrea Simonett, Catholic Charities-Hope Street

Artika Roller, The Family Partnership-PRIDE Program

Cathy tenBroeke, State of Minnesota Director to Prevent & End Homelessness

Cheree Langmade, University of Minnesota Doctorate of Nursing Program & St. Stephen's Human Services

Clint Miller, Bois Forte Human Services

Commissioner Gail Dorfman and Amy Stetzel, Office of Commissioner Dorfman

Cordelia Anderson, Sensibilities Prevention Services

Danette Buskovich, Minnesota Department of Public Safety

Jamie Cork, Hennepin County Attorney's Office

Jeff Bauer, The Family Partnership

Jennifer Ho, United States Interagency Council on Homelessness

Earlene Buffalo, Leech Lake Housing Authority

Judy Paul, Hennepin County

Kate Richtman, Ramsey County Attorney's Office

Laura Kadwell, the Metro Youth Systems Redesign Council

Laurel Edinburgh, Children's Hospital-Midwest Children's Resource Center

Dr. Lauren Martin, The University of Minnesota-UROC

Lee Roper-Batker, Kim Borton and Terry Williams, The Women's Foundation

Marcia Fink, The United Way

Pastor Alike Galloway, Northside Women's Space & Kwanza Church

Patrice O'Leary and Kirsten Anderson, Lutheran Social Service

Sargent Grant Snyder, the Minneapolis Police Department

Suzanne Koeplinger, Minnesota Indian Women's Resource Center

The Youth Moving Forward Coalition

The Support Systems for Rural Homeless Youth Advisory Council

Tony Lookingelk, The Otto Bremer Foundation

Vednita Carter, Joy Friedman, Noelle Volin and Nikki Beasley, Breaking Free

Wendy Nelson, Carlson Companies & Board of Trustees-Bush Foundation



Copyright 2013 Beth Holger-Ambrose

Author Contact Information: Beth Holger-Ambrose, bholger-ambrose@thelinkmn.org or 612-767-4467

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	5
Safe Harbor Law and Fellowship Background.....	12
Project Overview and Methodology.....	12
Minnesota’s Response.....	13
Summary of Site Visits Conducted.....	16
Highlights of Findings from Site Visits.....	19
Recommendations.....	34
Appendix A: Questions for Social Service, Health Care, Emergency Shelter and Housing Providers for Sexually Exploited Youth.....	37
Appendix B: Questions for Law Enforcement, Government, Child Welfare Systems, Juvenile Justice Systems and Court Systems for Sexually Exploited Youth.....	39
Appendix C: Summary of Feedback on Minnesota’s Safe Harbor Law.....	41
Appendix D: Summary of State and Local Responses for Sexually Exploited Youth.....	46
Appendix E: Website and Resource List.....	62

Executive Summary

Background and Methodology:

In 2011 the state of Minnesota passed a Safe Harbor Law modeled after New York state's law. This law decriminalizes "prostitution" charges for youth under the age of 18, increases the penalties for the buyers, added the term "sexual exploitation" into the state's child protection code and created a state-wide "Safe Harbor Committee" to develop a new multidisciplinary response for sexually exploited youth.

The state departments of Health, Human Services and Public Safety formed a "Safe Harbor Committee" made of many local stakeholders. Although the committee and the planning process were excellent there were some key pieces missing from the work mainly due to lack of resources and dedicated staff time and these were identified by Holger-Ambrose as:

- conducting site visits with other states, communities and cities that have already implemented multidisciplinary responses for sexually exploited youth and/or who have passed Safe Harbor Laws to determine how they implemented them (including law enforcement, court systems, health and social services, child welfare systems and/or juvenile justice systems and emergency shelter and housing programs);
- gain input from victim-survivor-leaders of sexual exploitation into how they believe a new response for sex trafficked minors be implemented;
- identify best practice assessment tools and training curriculums (for youth and staff);
- and a review of academic research and an implementation plans for operationalizing the new response developed by the Safe Harbor Committee.

In order to accomplish these things Holger-Ambrose applied for a Bush Foundation Leadership Fellowship and was awarded one for August 2012-August 2014. The first year of the fellowship involved conducting site visits with states and/or regions that had passed Safe Harbor legislation and/or who had established responses for sexually exploited youth. A total of 15 states were visited which included 22 cities/counties. The stakeholders were identified through research which identified responses for sexually exploited youth but it should be noted that although the majority of service, shelter and housing providers for sexually exploited youth were visited-not every single one could be visited due to the agency not responding to a request for a visit and/or the limits of financial resources and time constraints for the project. A set of consistent questions which were developed in collaboration with the list of local Minnesota stakeholders in the acknowledgement page was asked at each of the site visits. Upon completion of the site visits a qualitative analysis was conducted of the information gathered which is summarized in this report.

Summary of State and Regional Responses for Sexually Exploited Youth:

The first state that passed a Safe Harbor Law was New York in 2008. Since that time the states of Illinois, Minnesota, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Ohio, Vermont and Washington have passed complete Safe Harbor Laws as well. The states of Connecticut and Oregon, have passed similar laws that protect victims of sexual exploitation from prosecution. In Texas there was a Supreme Court ruling that found that

children involved in prostitution were not criminals of a crime but victims (TX. Supreme Court Rules in matter of B.W. 2010).

For the purposes of the Safe Harbor Bush Leadership Fellow research project site visits were made to the following states: New York, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Vermont, Washington State, Washington D.D., Connecticut, Florida, Texas, California, New Hampshire and Iowa. While they do not have Safe Harbor legislation, California, Iowa and Washington, D.C. were included in the list and visited because they have developed regionalized systems of response or established sets of services, shelter or housing for sexually exploited youth. Throughout the site visits it became apparent that there were multiple methods for implementing responses for sexually exploited youth. Types of responses included the following: multidisciplinary responses grounded out of community based non-profits; law enforcement and juvenile correctional responses and child welfare centered responses. The following summarizes examples of each of these approaches and how the regions and/or states have implemented their responses for sexually exploited youth.

The responses that other states and communities have for sexually exploited youth varied. Six of the states visited had multidisciplinary approaches that were grounded in a community based collaborative approach between non-profit service, shelter and housing providers for sexually exploited youth, law enforcement, health care services and juvenile justice and/or child welfare systems (when appropriate and circumstances require these systems to be involved). These states/communities include Multnomah County/Portland, Oregon; Washington State; State of Georgia; Illinois & Cook County; state of New York/New York City and New Jersey. Four of the counties and/or states were based out of the juvenile justice/corrections and law enforcement systems. These counties/states were Alameda County/Oakland, California; Harris County/Houston, Texas; Dallas, Texas and L.A. County/Los Angeles, California. Three of the states had responses based out of their state operated child welfare systems which were Connecticut, Florida and Massachusetts. Four of the states visited were in the process of working on developing and implementing their response for sexually exploited youth and those states included Vermont, New Hampshire, Iowa and Washington, D.C. For a full summary of all of these responses please see Appendix C.

Major Findings from Site Visits (for a detailed summary see page 19):

1. Drop in Centers for sexually exploited youth should be located within the inner city.
2. Emergency shelter and housing programs for sexually exploited youth ideally should be located 30-45 minutes outside of the inner city, however there is a recognition that these facilities often have to face the reality of where they can get a building and zoning.
3. There is a need for supportive services, emergency shelter and housing to be specific for sexually exploited youth and separated from other youth populations (juvenile justice, foster care and homeless youth) due to the high risk of peer recruitment among the sexually exploited youth population. Youth in these programs should have single rooms whenever possible.

4. The recruitment, screening, hiring and training of staff for programs for sexually exploited youth is critical. The staff need to be representative of the population of youth served (race, sexual orientation and gender identity), a mix of survivors and non-survivors and staff that can effectively build relationships with youth, maintain excellent boundaries, conflict resolution skills, ability to address aggressive behaviors in a positive way and ability to work from a trauma informed, positive youth development and victim-survivor-leader approach.
5. The training curriculums most often mentioned were My Life My Choice (for the prevention of sexual exploitation of youth), CSEC 101 by GEMS (aimed towards all stakeholders that come into contact with sexually exploited youth), Victim-Survivor-Leader training by GEMS (aimed at staff working with sexually exploited youth).
6. Many of the states and communities were still struggling on how to most effectively collect data and outcomes for this population. For a full list of data and outcomes that other states and communities track see page 21.
7. Examples of several assessment and intake tools were collected from the states and communities visited-these tools varied from each community and state but can be used to help Minnesota agencies develop their own assessment and intake tools.
8. The case management load for sexually exploited youth ranged from a staff ratio of 1:4 to 1:25.
9. The services identified most often as working well with sexually exploited youth were the following which were tailored to meet the needs of sexually exploited youth: life skills classes, survivor led mentoring programs, survivor led support groups, on-site educational programs and schools, legal services, drop-in centers, on-site medical care, field trips and activities, spiritual opportunities, yoga, holistic health care and time for rest without any programming. For a full list see page 23.
10. The best practices for mental health and chemical dependency services for sexually exploited youth were trauma informed therapy, trauma focused mental health services combined with cognitive behavioral treatment, art based mental health therapy, pet based mental health therapy, motivational interviewing, stages of change model for chemical dependency services and harm reduction. For a full list see page 25.
11. Best practices in delivery of services from #9 and 10 included hiring and having survivors involved, strong collaborations with law enforcement, allowing youth to come in and out of programs voluntarily, using incentive based programming v. punitive (i.e. paying youth to engage in services or not running from care and then paying youth for successful accomplishments of goals on their case plans, etc.) and have flexibility.

12. Most of the stakeholders stated that they would not release any information regarding a sexually exploited youth without a release of information signed by the youth (and their caregivers if they can be found) unless there was imminent danger of harm to self or others. However, if the circumstances met the law's requirements of mandating a report to law enforcement or the child protection system the providers did state they complied with these laws but were careful to explain these laws to the youth.
13. The majority (57/65 or 88%) of agencies stated that locked holds were not a good response for sexually exploited youth in any circumstance. Alternative such as specialized shelter and housing, mental health treatment centers (when needed) or transferring youth of the community/state are more appropriate responses than placing a youth on a locked hold whether it was perceived as being for their own safety by the courts or not.
14. All of the emergency shelter and housing programs for sexually exploited youth reported using heightened security measures which most often included low youth to staff ratios, security cameras, security gates/fences with buzzers to allow youth and staff in, coordinated security measures with local law enforcement and not allowing visitors or other general members of the public on-site.
15. All of the emergency shelter and housing programs for sexually exploited youth had rules around the use of cell phones and the internet. For the specific rules see page 36.
16. Incorporating youth survivor voice into the development and on-going oversight of programming for sexually exploited youth is critical to program success.
17. There are some special considerations for sexually exploited boys which include: being sure all language, brochures and programming is inclusive of boys and not just focused on girls and that boys may not be working for a pimp or trafficker they may be on their own.
18. There are special considerations for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth including use of appropriate language, creating a welcoming and safe place for LGBTQ youth within programs, appropriate health care and other services and treating youth by their identified gender v. what their birth certificate or ID might say. For a full list of considerations see page 31.
19. Do not assume a youth's sexual orientation based on who they have had sexual encounters with due to their experience of sexual exploitation or work in the sex trade.
20. It is critical to be culturally inclusive and welcoming to youth from all cultural and racial backgrounds. In order to do this it is critical for programs to hire staff from the cultural and racial communities that the youth are from, all programming is inclusive versus focused on the majority culture, specific outreach efforts should be conducted with specific cultural

communities and partnerships should be created with culturally specific programs serving mainstream youth populations.

21. Although the majority of agencies visited during the site visits reported that the youth they most often work with are domestic victims of sex trafficking v. international it is still important for providers to be prepared if they do encounter an international victim by having knowledge about their legal rights and having partnerships with agencies that can process T Visa's and other legal services for these youth.
22. Funding for services, shelter and housing for sexually exploited youth most often was reported to come from private foundations and individuals, faith based communities, state and local government (city and county) and the Federal Departments-Office of Juvenile Justice Programs and the Office of Victims of Crime.
23. Many of the other states and communities had an interest in partnering with Minnesota in various ways and some were open to transferring youth back and forth among services, shelter and housing for trafficked youth if there were safety concerns.
24. Many of the agencies visited stated that there have been increased and more positive relationships between community based providers of services, shelter and housing for trafficked youth and local law enforcement. There were several promising practices around these relationships-for further detail see page 34.

Recommendations:

1. The state of Minnesota should use the "No Wrong Door" framework that was developed by the Safe Harbor Committee-this concept and framework was very supported throughout all of the site visits. For a list of additional specific feedback please see Appendix C.
2. Use a multidisciplinary approach (health care provider, supportive services provider for sexually exploited youth, family reunification and/or emergency shelter and housing programs specific for sexually exploited youth, law enforcement, county attorney's office and the child welfare/juvenile justice systems-as needed) to provide a comprehensive response for sexually exploited youth.
3. Utilize a survivor led approach in terms of developing responses and programming, hire survivors to be staff in programs serving sexually exploited youth, have on-site survivor mentorship programs and/or survivor led support groups in programs, emergency shelter and/or housing programs for sexually exploited youth.

4. Regional navigators and other first responders for sexually exploited youth should have sweatshirts and sweatpants and food and beverages on-hand to give to sexually exploited youth.
5. Make sure to hire staff who are representative of the youth population served (i.e. race, sexual orientation and gender identity) and make sure that programs for sexually exploited youth are safe and welcoming for youth from all races, religions, sexual orientations, gender identities and immigration statuses.
6. Culturally specific outreach with sexually exploited youth should be conducted on-going.
7. Law enforcement and services (including health care), emergency shelter and housing programs for sexually exploited youth should be coordinated and collaborative when working with sexually exploited youth.
8. Respect for youth privacy should be a priority-only share information if it is a mandated report (and in these situations be sure to explain to the youth that you are a mandated reporter before they tell you anything and be honest and open with the youth about what you have to report and why) or if the youth has signed a release of information stating that it is okay with them to share information.
9. Drop-In Centers for sexually exploited youth should be located within the city or high traffic areas and emergency shelter and housing programs should be located outside of the city in suburban or more rural areas.
10. Emergency shelter and housing programs specific for sexually exploited youth should be located outside of the city if possible; separated from other youth populations and need to take security precautions that include things such as gated entrances, security cameras, lower youth to staff ratios, buzzers or alarms on windows and doors (to alert people of if someone is coming in as well as going out), ability to transport youth out to other locations if necessary and limiting the number of visitors and tours for the general public.
11. Supportive services, emergency shelter and housing programs for sexually exploited youth should all allow youth to come back into the program multiple times and understand that running away is common with this population. Staff within these programs should utilize positive relationship building with youth and incentives for not running away v. punitive approaches or attempting to “lock” youth into programs.

12. Supportive services, emergency shelter and housing programs for sexually exploited youth should utilize an incentive based approach for engaging youth in services-i.e. pay youth a stipend or give them a gift card each time they meet with a mentor or counselor or make achievements on their goal plans.
13. Educational and on-site school opportunities should be made available within supportive services, emergency shelter and/or housing programs for sexually exploited youth.
14. Mental health therapies should not use the traditional “talk therapy” but utilize trauma informed care approaches and creative approaches to therapy such as art based therapy, pet therapy and/or equine therapy.
15. Medical health care services should be made available immediately and on-going for sexually exploited youth and include an array of options including non-traditional methods such as acupuncture and massage.
16. Training for staff working with sexually exploited youth is critical especially in terms of language used within the life, appropriate boundaries, crisis intervention, dealing with aggressive behavior, harm reduction, trauma informed care and victim-survivor-leadership approaches to working with sexually exploited youth.
17. Locked holds should not be used for sexually exploited youth-alternatives such as emergency shelter and housing programs specific for sexually exploited youth, relocating the youth to a safer region of the state (or out of state) or placements within mental health treatment centers (if appropriate place and youth requires this level of care) should be the preferred response v. placing a youth on a locked hold.
18. Court proceedings for the prosecution of traffickers should be closed to the public so that traffickers cannot send people in to intimidate witnesses.
19. Child welfare systems, hospitals, juvenile justice and corrections systems and homeless youth providers should be trained in the language of the life and trained on how traffickers can pose or send people to pose as relatives such as uncles, cousins, etc. when picking youth up from programs, etc.
20. Whenever possible programs need to be flexible and able to make changes based on what the needs of the youth are.

Safe Harbor Law and Fellowship Background

In 2011 the state of Minnesota passed a Safe Harbor Law modeled after New York state's law. This law decriminalizes "prostitution" charges for youth under the age of 18, increases the penalties for the buyers, added the term "sexual exploitation" into the state's child protection code and created a state-wide "Safe Harbor Committee" to develop a new multidisciplinary response for sexually exploited youth.

Beth Holger-Ambrose was designated by the Commissioners of Public Safety and Human Services as the Department of Human Services representative to help lead the development of a new response alongside Amy Kenzie from the Department of Health and Danette Buschovick from the Department of Public Safety. The three state staff worked across agencies to develop a committee of expert stakeholders to work together to develop the new response which included experts in the fields of health care, law enforcement (local and federal), county attorney office staff, probation officers, child welfare system, juvenile justice system, faith based communities, local philanthropy, homeless youth service providers, domestic violence providers and sexual assault services. The Safe Harbor Committee was facilitated by Buschovick with support from Kenzie and Holger-Ambrose and many other community stakeholders. Although the committee and the planning process were excellent there were some key pieces missing from the work mainly due to lack of resources and dedicated staff time and these were identified by Holger-Ambrose as:

- site visits with other states, communities and cities that have already implemented multidisciplinary responses for sexually exploited youth and/or who have passed Safe Harbor Laws to determine how they implemented them (including law enforcement, court systems, health and social services, child welfare systems and/or juvenile justice systems and emergency shelter and housing programs);
- input from youth victim-survivor-leaders of sexual exploitation, youth with direct experience of sexual exploitation, about how they believe a new response for sex trafficked minors should be implemented;
- identification of best practice assessment tools and training curriculums (for youth and staff);
- review of academic research and an implementation plans for operationalizing the new response developed by the Safe Harbor Committee;
- and implementation plans for operationalizing the new response developed by the Safe Harbor Committee.

In order to accomplish these things Holger-Ambrose applied for a Bush Foundation Fellowship and was awarded one for August 2012-August 2014.

Project Overview and Methodology

A total of 15 states were visited which included 22 cities/counties. A total of 65 stakeholders were visited during the site visits. The stakeholders were identified through research which identified responses for sexually exploited youth but it should be noted that although the majority of service, shelter and housing providers for sexually exploited youth were visited-not every single one could be visited due to the agency not responding to a request for a visit and/or the limits of financial resources

and time constraints for the project. A set of consistent questions which were developed in collaboration with the list of local Minnesota stakeholders in the acknowledgement page was asked at each of the site visits. Upon completion of the site visits a qualitative analysis was conducted of the information gathered which is summarized in this report.

The learnings from these site visits were incorporated into the development of the No Wrong Door Model and have proven to be critically useful as Minnesota works to implement their new response for sexually exploited youth. The states and communities were extremely helpful and open with information about what they feel works (and doesn't work) within responses for sexually exploited youth as well as providing additional documentation such as assessment and intake tools, training curriculum ideas and reports.

During first year of the fellowship the following was completed:

- Meetings with local experts and stakeholders on sex trafficking to gain input on fellowship work and also to gain input on the development of a set of questions for state site visits. (see Acknowledgements on page 2)
- Research into which states, communities and cities should be visited.
- Development of a set of questions for social service or health care providers, emergency shelter and housing programs as well as law enforcement and systems for site visits with other states. (see Appendix A and B)
- Site visits conducted with 65 stakeholders in states that have passed Safe Harbor Laws and/or have comprehensive responses for sexually exploited youth.

Language Used in this Report:

It is important to note the language used in this report. There are several terms that are used in reference to youth who have traded/been forced to trade sex or sexual acts for money or other items of value (including a safe place to sleep and food to eat). These terms include “commercially sexually exploited child or CSEC”, sexually exploited youth, youth involved in the sex trade, youth “in the life” and sex trafficked youth. For the purposes of this summary report all of the above mentioned terms are used and refer to youth who have traded sex or sexual acts for money or other items of value.

Minnesota's Response: A Comprehensive Approach to Safe Harbor for Minnesota's Sexually Exploited Youth

The framework for the implementation of Minnesota's Safe Harbor Law is titled “The No Wrong Door Approach”. The concept behind the model is that any youth who is identified as being sexually exploited can have access to a comprehensive set of supportive services, emergency shelter and housing options that are specifically designed for sexually exploited youth. It is predicated on the view that sexually exploited youth are victims and survivors not juvenile delinquents.

The new No Wrong Door response will be centered out of a public health response with a State Wide Safe Harbor Director position housed in the Minnesota Department of Health. For the full legislative report on the No Wrong Door Model please go to: [https://dps.mn.gov/divisions/ojp/forms-documents/Documents/!2012%20Safe%20Harbor%20Report%20\(FINAL\).pdf](https://dps.mn.gov/divisions/ojp/forms-documents/Documents/!2012%20Safe%20Harbor%20Report%20(FINAL).pdf)

The No Wrong Door Model includes the following:

1. Industries and fields that are more likely to encounter sexually exploited youth will be trained on protocols for how to identify a sexually exploited youth and what to do when a youth is identified.
2. Once a youth has been identified as sexually exploited the youth themselves or the person who has encountered them can call a state-wide hotline (Day 1) which will then route the caller to a “regional navigator”.
3. The state of Minnesota will have six regional navigators located throughout the state (one will be specific to tribal communities). The regional navigators will be specialized and trained to work intensively with sexually exploited youth. When a call is received, the regional navigator is expected to meet with the youth at a location where the youth feels safe. The regional navigator should then do a safety and needs assessment with the youth and also address any immediate needs the youth may have and help the youth with these immediate needs.
4. The regional navigator will then act as a mobile case manager and help the youth connect with the supportive services that they need (health care, legal services, education, employment, mental health care, chemical dependency services, etc.) as well as entering into specific emergency shelter and housing options for sexually exploited youth if the youth does not have the option of returning to their family or caregiver.
5. The child welfare system and juvenile justice system staff will receive this same training. A key change in policy is that if a youth is already in one of these systems for other reasons, and is subsequently identified as a victim of sex trafficking the youth will have the same access to the regional navigator and thus specific services, shelter and housing options for sexually exploited youth. The social worker and/or probation officer will be encouraged, if possible, to work jointly with the regional navigator to support the youth.
6. The No Wrong Door Model also includes hiring and expanding street outreach workers throughout the state with specific training and mandate to conduct outreach with sexually exploited youth. Street outreach workers would also call the state-wide hotline and work with regional navigators to connect youth to services, shelter and housing specific for sexually exploited youth.
7. The No Wrong Door approach recognizes the need both for specialized supportive services and emergency shelter and housing for sexually exploited youth. The model proposes to have funding to train supportive service providers as well as hiring additional staff that would be

specific to working with sexually exploited youth. The model also calls for the creation of 20 emergency shelter beds, 15 units of transitional housing, 5 units of longer term housing and 10 specialized foster care homes for sexually exploited youth—all of which will be above and beyond what current child welfare, domestic violence and sexual assault services and homeless youth service programs already provide. It bears repeating that the No Wrong Door Model specialized services and supports are designed to specifically tailored services, NOT replace or in any way erode the critical services that are already currently provided.

8. The entire model is grounded in trauma informed care, cultural competency and inclusion, inclusion of survivor and youth voice and positive youth development. It also recognizes the principles of, a youth's right to privacy and self-determination and the belief that the on-going work of the prevention of sexual exploitation is critical.

The No Wrong Door Model represents a new multidisciplinary community and public health based response in the state of Minnesota for sexually exploited youth. Although the state does have some existing service providers for sexually exploited youth as well as some law enforcement officers and county attorney offices that were already not charging youth with the crime of "prostitution" or were providing services to this population these were few and far between. The state of Minnesota as a whole has never had a consistent and comprehensive approach for responding to the sexual exploitation of children. The Safe Harbor Law and the resulting No Wrong Door Model response establishes a new and consistent state-wide response for all sexually exploited youth under the age of 18. It is historic in that it establishes for the first time that these youth are victims and survivors and should be treated with dignity, supportive services, shelter and housing options that meet their needs and have the right to self-determination in terms of their experience of sexual exploitation. It is also a unique approach in that it is not focused on a single metro area (i.e. Minneapolis-St. Paul) but is state-wide and inclusive of rural, metro, suburban and tribal communities. The Safe Harbor Law and No Wrong Door Model are currently in the process of being implemented and will go into effect fully on August 1, 2014.

Summary of Site Visits Conducted

The site visits were conducted between October 2012 and July 2013. Total Number of Site Visits Conducted: 65 (3 Federal Government, 1 State Government, 1 County Government, 5 National/Policy Experts, 18 Runaway and Homeless Youth Service Providers, 6 CSEC Emergency Shelter and Housing Programs, 9 CSEC Supportive Service Programs, 4 Child Welfare Systems, 2 Health Care Providers, 1 Judge and 7 Court System/Law Enforcement/Juvenile Justice Agencies. Survivors were also involved in many of the site visits as they were staff within the agencies visited.

Location	Site Visits Conducted	Types of Stakeholder
Washington, D.C. October 2012	Federal Department of Health & Human Services, Administration on Children & Families, Family & Youth Services Bureau	Federal Government
	Federal Department of Human Services-Office of Commissioner Samuels	Federal Government
	U.S. Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons	Federal Government
	National Center for Missing & Exploited Children	Policy Expert/National Stakeholder
	National Alliance to End Homelessness	Policy Expert/National Stakeholder
	United States Interagency Taskforce on Homelessness (USICH)	Policy Expert/National Stakeholder
	Covenant House Washington, D.C.	Runaway & Homeless Youth Service Provider
	The Polaris Project	Policy Expert/National Stakeholder
New York City January 2013	ECPAT U.S.A.	Policy Expert/National Stakeholder
	GEMS	CSEC Service/Housing Provider
	The True Colors Foundation	National LGBTQ Organization/Stakeholder
Newark, New Jersey January 2013	The Polaris Project	CSEC Service Provider
State of Connecticut January 2013	State of Connecticut- Department of Children & Families	Child Welfare System
L.A. County & Los Angeles, California January 2013	The Hollywood Homeless Youth Partnership	Runaway & Homeless Youth Service Provider
	L.A. Children's Hospital	Health Care Provider
	L.A. Gay & Lesbian Center	Runaway & Homeless Youth Service Provider
	Los Angeles Youth Network	Runaway & Homeless Youth Service Provider
	My Friend's Place	Runaway & Homeless Youth Service Provider

Location	Site Visits Conducted	Types of Stakeholder
	Covenant House California The Mary Magdalene Project Children of the Night L.A. Superior Court, Commissioner Pratt	Runaway & Homeless Youth Service Provider CSEC Service Provider CSEC Emergency Shelter Provider Judge
Orange County, California February 2013	Crittenton	Child Welfare System Facility
San Francisco, California February 2013	SAGE Larkin Street Center for Young Women's Development	CSEC Service Provider Homeless Youth Service Provider CSEC Service Provider
Alameda County & Oakland, California February 2013	Alameda County District Attorney's Office MISSEY West Coast Children's Clinic	County Attorney's Office/Court System CSEC Service Provider Health Care Provider
State of California February 2013	State of California, Department of Children & Family Services	Child Welfare System
Multnomah County & Portland, Oregon February 2013	Janus Youth Services Multnomah County, Department of Community Justice	Runaway & Homeless Youth & CSEC Emergency Shelter Provider County Government
King County & Seattle Area, Washington February 2013	YouthCare Seattle Police Department King County Attorney's Office Genesis Project The Center for Children & Youth Justice	Runaway & Homeless Youth & CSEC Emergency Shelter & Housing Provider Law Enforcement County Attorney's Office/Court Systems CSEC Service & Emergency Shelter Provider Legal & Policy Experts
Dade County & Miami, Florida February 2013	Kristi's House Stand up 4 Kids The Miami Bridge	CSEC Emergency Shelter Provider Runaway & Homeless Youth Service Provider Runaway & Homeless Youth Service Provider
Broward County & Ft. Lauderdale, Florida March 2013	Brower County Juvenile Corrections Covenant House Florida	Juvenile Justice System Runaway & Homeless Youth Service Provider
State of Florida March 2013	State of Florida-Department of Children & Families	Child Welfare System

Location	Site Visits Conducted	Types of Stakeholder
State of Georgia March 2013	State of Georgia Governor's Office for Children and Families	State Government
	The Georgia Care Connection	CSEC Service Provider
	Wellspring Living	CSEC Emergency Shelter & Housing Provider
Harris County & Houston, Texas April 2013	YMCA of Houston	CSEC Service Provider
	Freedom Place	CSEC Housing Provider
	Harris County Juvenile Corrections-GIRLS Court	Juvenile Justice System
	Beacon	Adult Homeless Service Provider
	Children at Risk	CSEC Legal & Policy Agency
	Covenant House of Texas	Runaway & Homeless Youth Service Provider
Dallas, Texas April 2013	Dallas Police Department	Law Enforcement
	Letot Center-Dallas County Juvenile Department	Juvenile Justice System (Assessment Center & Placement)
Cook County & Chicago, Illinois June 2013	Cook County State's Attorney Office	County Attorney's Office/Court System
	Salvation Army	CSEC Service Provider
	Teen Living Program	Runaway & Homeless Service Provider
	Chicago Coalition for the Homeless	Policy Expert
Boston, Massachusetts July 2013	New Pathways Emergency Shelter Program, Brookline Community Mental Health	Runaway & Homeless Youth Service Provider
	The Bridge Over Troubled Water	Runaway & Homeless Youth Service Provider
	Roxbury Youth Services-GIFT Program	CSEC Service Provider
	My Life My Choice	CSEC Service Provider
	Child Advocacy Center-SEEN Program	Legal & Policy Agency
State of Vermont July 2013	Vermont Coalition of Runaway and Homeless Youth Services	Runaway & Homeless Youth Service Provider
Manchester, New Hampshire July 2013	Child & Family Services	Runaway & Homeless Youth Service Provider
Gruver, Iowa July 2013	Forest Ridge	Emergency Shelter/Residential Treatment Facility (for CSEC and other youth populations)

Highlights of Findings from Site Visits

The following is a summary of the responses from the 65 stakeholders visited during the site visits to other states, regions and cities throughout the country. The stakeholders were made up of service providers for sexually exploited youth, emergency shelter and housing providers for sexually exploited youth, runaway and homeless youth service providers, county and district attorney offices, law enforcement agencies, survivors, health care providers, child welfare systems, juvenile justice systems and national and policy experts.

The same set of questions were asked during the site visits and included the topics of the state or community's response for sexually exploited youth, outreach and referrals, location of programs, whether services/shelter/housing needs to be specific and separate for sexually exploited youth, where resistance to programming comes from, screening and hiring staff and volunteers, data collection methods and outcomes, assessment and intake tools, case management, best practices for supportive services, best mental health and chemical dependency services, health care services, staffing patterns for emergency shelter and housing programs for sexually exploited youth, confidentiality and mandated reporting, locked holds, security precautions and rules for emergency shelter and housing programs, incorporating survivor and youth voice, working with boys/young men, considerations for LGBTQ youth, considerations for culturally specific populations and foreign born youth, considerations for pregnant and parenting youth, funding, coordination with other states and law enforcement practices.

The states, communities and cities included in the site visits included a diverse representation of the country including the west coast (California, Oregon and Washington), the east coast (New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Vermont, Washington D.C., Connecticut and New Hampshire), the Midwest (Illinois and Iowa) and the south (Texas, Florida and Georgia).

Summary of State and Regional Responses for Sexually Exploited Youth

The responses that other states and communities have for sexually exploited youth varied. Six of the states visited had multidisciplinary approaches that were grounded in a community based collaborative approach between non-profit service, shelter and housing providers for sexually exploited youth, law enforcement, health care services and juvenile justice and/or child welfare systems (when appropriate and circumstances require these systems to be involved). These states/communities include Multnomah County/Portland, Oregon; Washington State; State of Georgia; Illinois & Cook County; state of New York/New York City and New Jersey. Four of the counties and/or states were based out of the juvenile justice/corrections and law enforcement systems. These counties/states were Alameda County/Oakland, California; Harris County/Houston, Texas; Dallas, Texas and L.A. County/Los Angeles, California. Three of the states had responses based out of their state operated child welfare systems which were Connecticut, Florida and Massachusetts. Four of the states visited were in the process of working on developing and implementing their response for sexually exploited youth and those states included Vermont, New Hampshire, Iowa and Washington, D.C. For a full summary of all of these responses please see Appendix C.

Summary of Findings on Best Practices in Working with Sexually Exploited Youth

Outreach and Referral Sources for Supportive Services, Emergency Shelter and Housing Programs for Sexually Exploited Youth:

The majority of the providers of social services, health care, emergency shelter and housing for sexually exploited youth take their referrals from anywhere including youth themselves, law enforcement, juvenile justice systems, child welfare systems, hotlines and legal aid programs.

One of the emergency shelter providers, Children of the Night in L.A., also has an add posted on back page targeting sexually exploited youth. This same emergency shelter can also take referrals from all over the country and is able to provide flights and transportation to their emergency shelter.

Location of Programs:

The majority of the organizations and systemic responses that were visited stated that the location of outreach and drop-in centers designated for sexually exploited youth should be located within the inner city areas or “high traffic” areas (100% of respondents) while 95% (62 out of 65) of the agencies stated that emergency shelter programs and housing programs specific for sexually exploited youth should be located outside of the city in either a suburban or rural location. Five percent (3 out of 65) said it “didn’t matter where emergency shelter or housing programs are located”. Respondents stated that emergency shelter and housing programs should be located in these locations due to safety reasons, these locations tend to be more difficult to run from and are further removed from triggers.

Specific Programming, Emergency Shelter and Housing for Sex Trafficking Victims:

Nearly all (64 out of 65) of the stakeholders consulted during the site visits stated that services, emergency shelter and housing programs should be specific for the complex trauma and needs of sexually exploited youth and that the sexually exploited youth population should not be mixed with other populations such as runaway and homeless youth, youth in the juvenile justice system and/or child welfare system group home youth. The main reasons for this were stated as being that youth who have been trafficked have a very unique and complex set of needs due to the specific trauma of being trafficked. They need a higher level of security and also there is a risk of peer recruitment of youth who are not in the life. Additionally, more than one respondent said that pimps recruit youth directly from group homes and homeless youth emergency shelter programs.

Resistance to Programming for Sexually Exploited Youth:

Surprisingly there was not much resistance to programming and services for sexually exploited youth reported during the site visits. There were three providers that reported resistance and these were identified as resistance from public defenders, resistance due to the issue of sex trafficking and resistance due to the certain stigma associated with one of the providers of social services (The Salvation Army).

Screening Staff and Volunteers:

The majority of providers stated that they use a combination of the following to screen staff and volunteers:

- Conduct multiple interviews (2 or 3).
- During one of the later interviews they typically have survivors involved.
- The interviews include situational questions, questions about boundaries and conflict resolution skills.
- They conduct initial interviews off site.
- Fingerprinting and Background checks. They cannot have any sexual crimes, domestic violent or crimes against children
- Hire staff who are not intimidated by the youth. This means they can deal with complex trauma, aggression and threats
- Screen staff for their own trauma and co-dependency tendencies. Explore the following questions: have they addressed it?, are they healthy enough to do this work?, etc.
- Hire culturally appropriate staff (staff that mirror the population of youth served)
- Hire staff who are survivors but should be out of the life for two years and have dealt with their trauma
- Psychological Evaluations
- Some providers do not use volunteers at all-others will but they have to go through the same background checks and training as staff

Training Curriculums:

The most commonly used training curriculums were My Life My Choice for prevention of sexual exploitation with youth (not recommended for youth who have already been sexually exploited) and the GEMS trainings on CSEC 101 and the Victim-Survivor-Leader approach.

The following training curriculums were recommended during the course of the site visits:

Name of Curriculum	Intended Audience
My Life My Choice	Prevention Curriculum for Youth
Portland, Oregon SARC Training	Social Service Providers
State of Connecticut	Child Welfare & Juvenile Justice System Staff, Law Enforcement
Children of the Night's WOW Program	Provides T.A. to other states/programs
GEMS Train the Trainer Trainings, CSEC 101 & Victim-Survivor-Leader Training	Staff working with sexually exploited youth (multiple sectors)

Data Collection Methods and Outcomes:

Many of the stakeholders and providers indicated that they were still working on developing data collection and outcome tracking methods. Some of the providers stated that outcomes for this particular population could take time in some cases years to see progress on. Some of the providers mentioned using pre and post tests as tools to track youth progress on outcomes.

Data suggested to be tracked were:

- Where the youth are from
- Family situation
- Substance use
- Experience with violence and exploitation
- How many hours each youth spends on which types of supports/services
- What areas in case management are identified as needs of youth
- Age of entry into the life
- How much it costs to help each youth

The most often mentioned outcomes that programs serving sexually exploited youth are currently tracking or suggest tracking were:

- Education-enrollment in school, GED
- Social resources/costs saved (cost benefit analysis)
- Increased knowledge of community resources and safety strategies
- Improved mental health (therapist does a pre and post test)
- Decrease in substance use
- Completion of case management or service plan goals
- Mixed reviews on tracking the decrease in “AWOLs” or times a youth goes on the run-other providers said this was not a good outcome to track
- Number of times a youth utilizes services
- Youth has a fundamental understanding of trauma (pre and post test)
- Utilize a tool that measures level of trauma symptoms-and report on improvements
- Number of youth that accept longer term care
- Stability-how many youth have moved into stable shelter or housing situations
- Employment status (older youth)
- Attainment of vital documents i.e. birth certificates
- Attainment of benefits youth are eligible for
- Improved physical health
- Increase in self esteem
- Number of unwanted pregnancies
- Increase in positive behaviors and decrease in negative behaviors
- Increase in healthy relationships
- Some programs track youth after they exit the program at specific time intervals such as 30, 90, 180, 360 day increments

Assessment & Intake Tools:

The following assessment and intake tools were identified during the site visits:

- Assessment Tool for determining how deep in the life a youth is-this is currently being developed by Alameda County
- The Genesis Project has developed basic intake and assessment tools.
- Shared Hope’s Assessment Tool
- Broward County’s Assessment Tool
- The Macey Tool combined with a Medical Checklist
- Salvation Army Chicago’s Safety Assessment Tool
- Arizona State University’s Assessment Tool
- State of Connecticut has an Assessment & Safety Tool
- Specialized Assessments & Intakes designed by the Polaris Project
- Specialized Assessments & Intakes designed by GEMS

Case Management:

Different models of case management were identified by providers in working with this population. The majority of providers state that case management with sexually exploited youth needs to be done through a model where case managers are “meeting youth where they are at”, harm reduction and trauma informed care approaches, use of incentives when youth are engaged and accomplishing their goals, involve high levels of flexibility and creativity, be youth driven and focused and done on a voluntary basis when possible. Some of the providers said that they provide case management services 24/7 while others had specific hours that they were able to provide case management. Case managers connected with youth mainly through drop-in centers, emergency shelter and housing programs specific to sexually exploited youth, cell phones and texting. Case management could be done in multiple settings including drop-in centers, emergency shelter and housing programs for sexually exploited youth or in mobile locations where the youth feels safe.

The case manager to client case loads were reported as anywhere from 1:4 to 1:25 and involved weekly or multi weekly meetings and a lot of time spent in between with help in getting to appointments and other needed assistance.

Best Practice Supportive Services & Therapy Methods:

The following charts list the responses from providers visited on what supportive services and therapy methods that they recommended as best practices and successful in working with sexually exploited youth. Practices that were identified as practices that do not work with sexually exploited youth are “talk therapy” and “0 tolerance policies for drugs and alcohol”.

Supportive Service Table

26 providers responded to this question

Type of Supportive Service	Number of Providers Recommending
Life Skills Classes	8
Survivor Led Mentoring Programs and Support Groups	6

On-Site School (youth can work at own pace, get caught up on credits, can be an on-line school model or teacher on-site)	6
On-Site Individual Tutoring	5
Legal Services	4
Drop-In Centers Specific to Sexually Exploited Youth	4
On-Site GED Prep	3
On-Site Medical Care	3
Field Trips, Outings, Cultural Activities	3
Religious/Spiritual Guidance	3
Yoga	3
Holistic Health Care-Acupuncture, etc.	3
Provide time for youth to just rest without any programming	2
Incentive Based Programming (youth are paid to engage in services and for accomplishments)	2
GEMS Victim-Survivor-Leader Model	2
On-Campus Jobs	2
Exercise Classes	2
Jewelry Making Activities	2
Leadership Programming	2
My Life My Choice Curriculum	2
Immigration Services, T-Visa's	2
Crittenton 12 Week Curriculum-Trauma Informed Care Specific to Sex Trafficked Youth, involves each youth having a reflection book in which survivors write back to the youth	1
Specialty groups on Domestic Violence, Gang Avoidance and Substance Use	1
Victim to Survivor Group (6-12 week course, youth do writing/art/activities, etc. and each group of youth create a book for the next group of youth)	1
Hair Salon Sink (so girls can do each other's hair)	1
Level System (1: Youth Identifies Problems in Life, 2: Youth Breaks Down Implications of Decisions, 3: Youth Learns how to Make Better Decisions, 4: Youth Transition Back into Community)	1
Sports Teams	1
Internship Programs	1
Prayer Garden	1
Ropes Course	1
Basketball Court	1
On-Site Dentists (come out weekly or monthly)	1
On-Site Boutique (youth get tokens for engaging in programming & accomplishing goals and then can spend them there, also can hire youth from	1

program)	
Internet Safety Training	1
Partnership with Community Based Health Clinic for Health Care Services	1
Peer Led Support Groups	1

Mental Health & Chemical Dependency Therapy/Service Methods:

26 providers responded to this question

Type of Service	Number of Providers Recommending
Trauma Informed Therapy/Counseling	6
Trauma Focused Mental Health Services combined with Cognitive Behavioral Treatment	3
Art Based Therapy	3
Pet Therapy	2
Motivational Interviewing	2
Chemical Dependency Treatment-Stages of Change Model	2
Mobile Mental Health Services (therapist meets youth wherever they feel safe)	1
On-site Psychiatrist (once per month) that meets with youth, youth can also make appointments off-site during the other times of the month	1
Anger Management Classes	1
Alcohol Abuse Support Groups	1
Utilize off-site Mental Health Therapist who specializes in working with Sexually Exploited Youth	1
Trauma Focused Child Behavior Therapy (Dr. Becca Johnson-Bellvue adapted an approach of this therapy specific for sexually exploited youth)	1
Alcoholics Anonymous & Alanon	1
On-site Youth Drug & Alcohol Support Groups	1
Use of U.A.'s when youth come back into program from time away/runs (emergency shelter & housing programs)	1
Random U.A.'s (emergency shelter and housing programs)	1
Combination of Individual & Group Therapy	1
Weekend Family Therapy (regardless of if youth will be reunified-helps with relationships and teaches youth to work on how they want to be parented and gives them the chance to tell their parents this)	1
EMDR Therapy	1

On-Site Residential Mental Health and Chemical Dependency Treatment	1
Equine Therapy	1
Dialectic Behavior Therapy	1
Harm Reduction Approaches (CD)	1

Health Care Best Practices with Sexually Exploited Youth:

Health care was mentioned as a critical service by many of the providers and agencies met with during the site visits. Many of the experts in the site visits stated that health care services were best provided to sexually exploited youth in mobile settings or on-site at drop-in centers, emergency shelter and/or housing programs for sexually exploited youth rather than a clinical setting. Health care providers working with sexually exploited youth should be trained on the complex trauma of human trafficking and understand how to interact appropriately with sexually exploited youth. Invasive questions or parts of exams should be avoided by health care providers whenever possible and health care should be comprehensive in terms of allowing youth the opportunity to not only have traditional health care methods available to them but holistic healing methods such as acupuncture, herbal and massage therapies as well.

Staffing Patterns of Emergency Shelter and Housing for Sexually Exploited Youth:

Examples of staffing patterns included:

Day Shift: 6:30 a.m.-2:30 p.m., Evening Shift: 2:30-10:30 p.m., Overnight Shift: 10:30 p.m.-6:30 a.m.

Combined Day/Evening Shift: 7:00 a.m.-8:00 p.m., Overnight: 7:00 p.m.-8:00 a.m.

Staffing Ratios:

The staffing ratios ranged from 2 youth to 1 staff to 8 youth to 1 staff.

Example of Schedule of One Emergency Shelter:

8:00 a.m.-Youth Wake Up

9:00 a.m.-Breakfast

10:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m. School (Monday through Thursday)

6:00 p.m.-Dinner

6:30-8:00 Activity

Field Trips on Fridays

Youth Confidentiality, Release of Information & Information Security:

The most common approaches that service providers, drop-in centers, emergency shelter and housing programs specific to sexually exploited youth were reported as:

- Will only release information with a signed release from the youth (most common answer)
- Will be very careful about what information is given to police and only give information to the police with youth’s approval through a release. (second most common answer)
- Will share information with referring agency (assuming release is already in place)
- Mandated to give information to police-but everything else is confidential and needs a release.
- Will not share client stories with anyone without permission.

More than one provider also stressed the importance of having good training for staff and volunteers on confidentiality and release of information.

Mandated Reporting:

Out of the six providers that were able to answer this question here were the responses:

- Reports are made to law enforcement for all minor victims of sex trafficking. Will fully explain to youth why they have to make the report and have the youth there while they are making it if possible. (3)
- If there is imminent harm a report is mandated to child protection and law enforcement. (2)
- No reports are made to law enforcement or child protection. (1)

Holds of Sex Trafficked Youth in Locked Settings:

There were very strong opinions on the issue of whether or not sexually exploited youth should be placed on locked holds (for their own safety or other reasons).

Out of the 65 site visits conducted 8 (12%) of the stakeholders felt that holds were a reasonable response and necessary in some or all situations of minor sex trafficking, 57 (88%) of the stakeholders felt like holds should never be used and that other alternatives should be used to provide safety for youth.

Rationale Against Holds	Rationale for Holds	Rationale for Holds in Certain Extreme Cases Only
It is doing the same thing that pimps/traffickers do-controlling the youth and telling them what they can and can’t do.	Youth should be held in a locked facility for up to 6 weeks and then enter into a step down program-services should be connected.	In extreme cases mental health facilities could be used for locked holds.
It is traumatizing to the youth.	If the hold is done right in coordination with services-it could provide the opportunity the youth needs to get connected to services.	It would be okay to hold youth for a few days for safety but a survivor mentor should be allowed in to work with them.
There is no evidence that shows	Safety reasons-do not want the	

that locking youth up keeps a youth any safer once their time is up.	youth to be killed or hurt.	
There are other alternatives that are more positive for the youth than locked holds.	Youth will run if we don't lock them up-have to spend time and resources to go and find them again.	
It is more cost effective for youth to be placed in community based services, shelter and housing than in locked settings.		
This "locked hold" could quickly be abused-prosecutors and others could use it as a way to get youth to testify. Emergency shelters should be used instead.		
Holds make youth even more angry and distrustful.		
We do not lock up any other victims of crimes-we don't lock up domestic violence victims or child abuse victims.		
It is still making the youth feel like criminals.		
If there are safety reasons it is better to move them to a community based program out of the city or state if necessary versus locking them up.		

Security Precautions for Emergency Shelter and Housing Programs for Sexually Exploited Youth:

All of the service providers, emergency shelter and housing programs specific to sexually exploited youth stated that they took additional security precautions for this particular population of youth.

One of the emergency shelter or housing programs visited was "locked" while the others were considered to be "semi-secure", "staff secure" or "unlocked". One of the programs is moving into a model where one side will be locked and the other not and the youth will have the opportunity to progress from the locked side of the facility to the unlocked side.

Type of Security Precaution	Number of Responses
Awake & Intensively Staffed	6
Security Cameras	5
Security Fence w/ Buzzer onto Property	3
Confidential Address/Location	3
Collaborations with Law Enforcement including	3

coordinated drive-bys	
Don't allow Tours, etc. of Campus	3
Alarms on Windows and Doors	2
No Locks on Bedrooms or Bathrooms	2
Listen to youth-be sure to pay attention they may give information on whether a pimp is planning to come after one of the youth	1
Keep Blinds & Windows Closed or have Windows you can See out but Can't see In	1
Flexiglass over Windows	1
Bed Checks Every 15 Minutes	1
Neighbors Help-if they see something they will call the police	1

Rules for Emergency Shelter and Housing Programs for Sexually Exploited Youth:

All of the emergency shelter and housing providers had rules around cell phones and use of the internet. The cell phone policies most commonly mentioned were policies that when a youth entered the shelter or housing program that they would turn in their cell phone to the staff and then they could get it back once they left the program. If a youth needed to use a phone they could use the house line within the program which was in the staff office. One program would give youth prepaid cell phones that had no ability to take pictures or access to the internet as a reward for achieving goals while in the program.

The most common internet policies were that youth could only use computers in a supervised setting such as a computer lab or staff office and some of the programs had rules around only using the internet for education or employment related purposes (i.e. no access to Facebook, etc.).

Two of the programs monitored TV and movies that the youth watched having rules such as no talk shows, no cop shows and no movies rated higher than a PG rating.

One of the programs also had a rule that youth could not talk about "street life" or use "language of the life" while in the program. None of the providers allowed guests on-site, however some of the programs would allow family on-site for therapy sessions. Some of the programs did allow youth to earn passes for a weekend out or certain periods of time out of the shelter or housing program while others allowed youth to come and go as they pleased. All of the programs also had rules around confidentiality for youth in the program regarding other youth in the program. Nearly all (6/7) of the programs had separate rooms for each of the youth and youth were not allowed in each other's rooms.

Incorporating Survivor and Youth Voice into Programming:

The voice of youth and survivors was a constant theme throughout the site visits and was identified as a key important factor in the development of services, shelter and housing for sexually exploited youth as well as on-going programming.

The following were ways in which supportive services, shelter and/or housing programs incorporated into the development and on-going service delivery:

1. Hired Survivors on Staff (who are stable & have been out of the life for at least 2 years)
2. Have survivor led support groups
3. Have survivor mentors for youth in the programs
4. Have survivors and/or youth participate in staff interviews
5. Have youth and survivors help evaluate programs
6. Have internship and work opportunities for youth in program to work on-site
7. Incorporate leadership programming for youth-teach them advocacy skills, ways to give back and have volunteer opportunities available.
8. Make sure to get input from youth and survivors on the development of all programming, shelter and housing for sexually exploited youth.

Considerations for Sexually Exploited Boys/Males:

Nearly all of the providers that site visits were conducted with said they were struggling and still trying to determine effective ways of reaching out and providing services to sexually exploited boys. A few of the providers stated that they were seeing more labor trafficking males than sex trafficked males.

Some of the providers stated that they did make modifications to programs, skills groups and other services to make them more specific for boys.

One of the main suggestions was to always be sure to talk about programs, services, shelter and housing inclusive of both males and females which will make boys feel more welcome. Create all outreach and marketing materials in an inclusive way of boys and young men-do not always refer to girls in program materials. Currently many in the trafficking field are only referring to girls and females when talking about sexual exploitation-this also needs to change to be inclusive of boys and men or they will not feel like they are welcomed into services.

Some of the providers mentioned that boys do not work for pimps or traffickers as often as girls do-that often times they were working on their own. It is important then for programming to reflect this and not assume that every sexually exploited youth has a trafficker.

Considerations for Sexually Exploited LGBTQ Youth:

Research has shown that lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and/or questioning youth are at a heightened risk for being sexually exploited. This population of youth also can be even more distrustful of adults, service providers and/or emergency shelter and housing programs. Therefore it is critical that supports for sexually exploited youth ensure safe and welcoming environments for all LGBTQ sexually exploited youth.

It is also important not to make assumptions about a youth's sexual orientation based on who they have been having sexual relations with while they were working in the sex trade or as a result of being sexually exploited.

Many of the providers stressed the importance of being inclusive to the needs of lesbian, gay, bisexual, questioning and/or transgender youth. This means that all programs, shelter and housing need to incorporate best practices of ensuring that appropriate language is used around sexual orientation and gender identity on all assessment and program forms, that youth are allowed to use the gender they identify with in all ways (bedroom and bathroom assignments, clothing, hair and make-up, use of preferred name, etc.). Programs also cannot assume that by segregating genders that sexual activity and/or assault will not happen-room checks and policies around sexual activity and assault should be inclusive of all sexual orientations and gender identities and not assume that this only happens between boys and girls.

All medical and health care providers, mental health therapy, chemical dependency treatment programs and other supportive services, shelter and housing need to be vetted to ensure they are appropriate and respectful of a lesbian, gay, bisexual and/or transgender youth before referring the youth to that program.

It may also be good to have specialized attention to this issues through Human Trafficking Taskforces or community workgroups. The Cook County Human Trafficking Taskforce is currently developing a specialized subcommittee for working with sexually exploited LGBTQ youth.

Considerations of Culturally Specific Populations:

Most of the providers during the site visit were not necessarily culturally specific to one particular population but were inclusive to all populations and were partnering with more mainstream culturally specific youth providers as well as hiring staff representative of the different cultural populations of youth served.

The providers stressed the importance of building relationships within culturally specific populations, having culturally specific outreach whenever possible and having program materials in different languages as being important.

Considerations for Foreign Born Youth:

The majority of the providers that site visits were conducted with reported that they were providing services mainly for domestic victims of sex trafficking, however there were some agencies that did provide specific supports for foreign born youth such as the YMCA in Houston. It is important for any provider of services for sexually exploited youth to be aware of rights that foreign born youth and have access to legal and immigration services as needed (i.e. T Visa's, etc.).

It is also important to realize that foreign born victims are often times even more distrustful of government and/or law enforcement if they are in the country illegally.

Considerations for Pregnant and/or Parenting Youth:

The majority of the service providers, emergency and housing programs for sexually exploited youth are open to providing services for pregnant youth. Some are also open for parenting youth-i.e. Kristi's House

in Miami will allow parenting youth into their emergency shelter program but will then reduce the number of youth they serve from 6 to 4 in order to accommodate the children of the parenting youth.

Providers stressed that it was important for providers and systems to realize the special considerations of parenting youth who have been sexually exploited. Sexually exploited youth who have children may have had them with their pimp/trafficker and the children may be held over the youth's head in order to keep them in the life or in fear. Additionally-on the other side having children may be what helps youth want to get out of the life.

Providers stated the importance of helping pregnant youth to receive the medical care they need for their pregnancies and some will provide services such as doulas (a type of labor/birth coach) to the youth. Some of the drop-in centers and supportive service programs stated that they have child care available while the youth are attending groups or other services, have specific parenting support groups and skills building training and specific supplies for parenting youth such as diapers and formula.

Funding of Services, Emergency Shelter and Housing for Sexually Exploited Youth:

The funding for services, emergency shelter and housing programs for sexually exploited youth ranged from federal, state, local government, grants through child welfare and/or juvenile justice systems, private foundations and contributions from faith based communities and individuals.

Some programs such as Children of the Night and The Mary Magdalene Project in Los Angeles are funded entirely from private funding sources. Janus Youth Programs is funded partially through city, county and private foundation funds. The Polaris Project in New Jersey gets some funding through the Northern Anti-Trafficking Consortium which is just for foreign nationals of human trafficking-it is based out of the Heartland Alliance in Chicago and for each client served out of this system the agency gets \$3,800-20% is for administrative costs and the rest can be used for rental assistance and services for the victims of human trafficking.

Many of the emergency shelter and housing programs also mentioned that they receive grants or per diem rates for youth referred from child protection or juvenile justice systems. Many of the programs also stated that they received funding through the Federal Office of Juvenile Justice Programs and/or Office of Victims of Crime. Some of the programs are able to bill Medicaid for therapy and other methods of funding included fundraising events, having stores that are owned by the program with proceeds going to program services, local faith based organizations and individual donors.

Coordination with other States:

Many of the programs were open to take referrals from anywhere while some were confined by funding restraints to only taking clients from certain counties and/or their state. Roxbury Youth Services-GIFT Program for example can only take referrals for sexually exploited youth from Boston through the Suffolk County Child Welfare System. On the opposite end of the spectrum-Children of the Night is willing to take referrals from anywhere in the country and has funding to pay for transportation for the youth to get to their emergency shelter.

Many of the service providers as well as court and juvenile justice systems were open to partnering with Minnesota in terms of utilizing their hotlines (Polaris, Children of the Night, National Center for Missing and Exploited Children), helping to provide trainings, providing assessment and intake tools and potentially taking in and passing on referrals of sexually exploited youth.

Promising Law Enforcement Practices:

Many of the providers indicated a stronger partnership with law enforcement than there has been in the past in providing services and case triage for cases of sexually exploited youth. There were many providers and law enforcement agencies reporting that it is critical for law enforcement to coordinate with community based service providers. Law enforcement often times would contact the community based provider for sexually exploited youth to give them a “heads up” when they were about to do a sting or raid, case managers/advocates from community based providers for sexually exploited so that they can connect with youth right away and provide support and services. There were also several providers and law enforcement agencies that talked about having strong referral relationships and partnerships in general.

The Genesis Project (in SeaTac, Washington) is unique in the fact that a police officer founded the organization based on what he discovered on the streets through thousands of interviews from girls who were the victims of sex trafficking. If a girl or woman is identified as a victim of sex trafficking they are brought to The Genesis Project’s drop-in center where they get a safe place to rest and receive supportive services. If the girl or the woman needs a place to stay for the night the program also offers emergency shelter on a temporary basis. There is a very close partnership with The Genesis Project and the police. The police officers and staff of The Genesis Project work closely together in providing services and helping to identify the traffickers and hold them accountable.

In Dallas, Texas Sargent Fassett created a “high risk victim list” in which each month he researches which youth have run away four or more times and who are currently on run. Best practice and research have shown that these youth are at some of the highest risk for being victims of sexual exploitation so he has chosen to be proactive and create this list and then actually goes and looks for these youth to try and prevent them from becoming sexually exploited or from being further exploited by locating them and connecting them with supportive services.

In Portland, Oregon the local police and FBI are taking all sexually exploited youth to Janus Youth Services where they receive an assessment, safe emergency shelter and supportive services (including physical and sexual health care).

Overall Best Practices-what has worked well in working with sexually exploited youth?

The following is a list of best practices identified in working with sexually exploited youth:

- Strong collaboration with law enforcement.
- Staff within service providers/emergency shelter/housing and court systems need to be well trained on language used by sexually exploited youth.

- Courts should be closed during sex trafficking cases so that pimp cannot come in or send people in.
- Use harm reduction-allow smoking, be flexible with bed times and curfews, meet youth where they are at.
- One of the emergency shelters stated it was important to have a structured program with rules such as no talk shows, cop shows, cell phones, internet, no talking about the life and not allowing youth to go anywhere by themselves.
- Use survivor mentors
- Never give up on a youth
- Don't have males on staff
- Allow youth to come in and out of the programs
- Pay youth an incentive not to run (in Florida there is a program that pays youth \$2 per day not to run from their specialized foster care homes).
- Have single rooms for youth in shelter and housing programs-the youth have a lot of trauma and need their own space.
- Utilize trauma informed care in every part of the system/programs.
- Have programming based on a level system in which youth are granted more privileges as they move up.
- Be flexible
- Hire people who are compassionate, can deal with difficult conversations and are able to be fluid and creative
- Don't do one size fits all approach to working with sexually exploited youth
- Pet therapy-youth love it especially the Chihuahuas and Maltese breeds
- Do not force youth to participate in anything
- Use incentive based programming it works-stipends for attending groups, GED, case management and for achieving goals.

Recommendations

1. The state of Minnesota should use the "No Wrong Door" framework that was developed by the Safe Harbor Committee-this concept and framework was very supported throughout all of the site visits. For a list of specific additional feedback please see Appendix C.
2. Use a multidisciplinary approach (health care provider, supportive services provider for sexually exploited youth, family reunification and/or emergency shelter and housing programs specific for sexually exploited youth, law enforcement, county attorney's office and the child welfare/juvenile justice systems-as needed) to provide a comprehensive response for sexually exploited youth.
3. Utilize a survivor led approach in terms of developing responses and programming, hire survivors to be staff in programs serving sexually exploited youth, have on-site survivor

mentorship programs and/or survivor led support groups in programs, emergency shelter and/or housing programs for sexually exploited youth.

4. Regional navigators and other first responders for sexually exploited youth should have sweatshirts and sweatpants and food and beverages on-hand to give to sexually exploited youth.
5. Make sure to hire staff who are representative of the youth population served (i.e. race, sexual orientation and gender identity) and make sure that programs for sexually exploited youth are safe and welcoming for youth from all races, religions, sexual orientations, gender identities and immigration statuses.
6. Culturally specific outreach with sexually exploited youth should be conducted on-going.
7. Law enforcement and services (including health care), emergency shelter and housing programs for sexually exploited youth should be coordinated and collaborative when working with sexually exploited youth.
8. Respect for youth privacy should be a priority-only share information if it is a mandated report (and in these situations be sure to explain to the youth that you are a mandated reporter before they tell you anything and be honest and open with the youth about what you have to report and why) or if the youth has signed a release of information stating that it is okay with them to share information.
9. Drop-In Centers for sexually exploited youth should be located within the city or high traffic areas and emergency shelter and housing programs should be located outside of the city in suburban or more rural areas.
10. Emergency shelter and housing programs specific for sexually exploited youth should be located outside of the city when possible; be in separate facilities than other populations of youth and need to take security precautions that include things such as gated entrances, security cameras, lower youth to staff ratios, buzzers or alarms on windows and doors (to alert people of if someone is coming in as well as going out), ability to transport youth out to other locations if necessary and limiting the number of visitors and tours for the general public.
11. Supportive services, emergency shelter and housing programs for sexually exploited youth should all allow youth to come back into the program multiple times and understand that running away is common with this population. Staff within these programs should utilize positive relationship building with youth and incentives for not running away v. punitive approaches or attempting to “lock” youth into programs.
12. Supportive services, emergency shelter and housing programs for sexually exploited youth should utilize an incentive based approach for engaging youth in services-i.e. pay youth a stipend or give them a gift card each time they meet with a mentor or counselor or make achievements on their goal plans.

13. Educational and on-site school opportunities should be made available within supportive services, emergency shelter and/or housing programs for sexually exploited youth.
14. Mental health therapies should not use the traditional “talk therapy” but utilize trauma informed care approaches and creative approaches to therapy such as art based therapy, pet therapy and/or equine therapy.
15. Medical health care services should be made available immediately and on-going for sexually exploited youth and include an array of options including non-traditional methods such as acupuncture and massage.
16. Training for staff working with sexually exploited youth is critical especially in terms of language used within the life, appropriate boundaries, crisis intervention, dealing with aggressive behavior, harm reduction, trauma informed care and victim-survivor-leadership approaches to working with sexually exploited youth.
17. Locked holds should not be used for sexually exploited youth-alternatives such as emergency shelter and housing programs specific for sexually exploited youth, relocating the youth to a safer region of the state (or out of state) or placements within mental health treatment centers (if appropriate place and youth requires this level of care) should be the preferred response v. placing a youth on a locked hold.
18. Court proceedings for the prosecution of traffickers should be closed to the public so that traffickers cannot send people in to intimidate witnesses.
19. Child welfare systems, hospitals, juvenile justice and corrections systems and homeless youth providers should be trained in the language of the life and trained on how traffickers can pose or send people to pose as relatives such as uncles, cousins, etc. when picking youth up from programs, etc.
20. Whenever possible programs need to be flexible and able to make changes based on what the needs of the youth are.

Appendix A: Questions for Meetings with Social Service, Health Care, Emergency Shelter and Housing Providers for Sexually Exploited Youth

1. Review the draft model and legislative recommendations for Safe Harbor and get any initial feedback and suggestions on its strengths, what is missing or other best practices to incorporate into the Minnesota model.
2. What is the framework for your state's/region's Safe Harbor Law and/or response to sex trafficked minors? Does it come through a public health, child welfare, local non-profit or public safety/law enforcement sector?
3. If your state does have a Safe Harbor law-how does that influence/work with your program?
4. How do you get your local government, non-profits and law enforcement to work together on the issue of minor domestic sex trafficking in your community/state?
5. Could you give me an overview of the services that your program/agency provides to youth who have been trafficked?
6. How are youth referred to your program?
7. Where do you think is best to locate programs, shelter and/or housing for youth who have been trafficked? Rural, suburbs, inner city?
8. If you faced resistance to opening your program where did it come from?
9. What do you do to screen staff and volunteers?
10. How do you train your staff and volunteers?
11. Do you train wide-stream community industries (i.e. hotels, homeless youth services providers, law enforcement, etc.) and if so is there a particular curriculum or training method you think works well?
12. Does your program track information on the youth you serve in a particular type of database/computer system-if so which one do you think works the best?
13. What outcomes does your program track and how are they measured and reported on?
14. What kind of assessment and intake process/forms does your program use?
15. Does your program provide case management services-if so how many youth on are on each case manager's case load and how often do they meet with the youth, are there particular goal planning strategies or forms that you can recommend for this population?
16. What types of therapy and supportive services do you think trafficked youth need-what do you incorporate into your own program and what services do you refer youth out too in the community? (Does your program have an on-site therapist, CD counselor and/or school?)
17. If your program is on-site-what is the staffing pattern? How is the program licensed?
18. How does your program handle confidentiality of the youth and information security?
19. How does your program release (or not release) information to law enforcement, county/city child welfare, etc.?
20. How does your program handle mandated reporting? (law enforcement & child protection, etc.)
21. What is your opinion about "holds" in a locked setting if the youth's life may be in danger? How does your program handle these situations?

22. What did your program do that has worked best? What didn't work?
23. What security precautions does your program take?
24. Does your program limit internet and cell phone at all-what are your program's policies regarding this for youth in your program?
25. How did you get youth input into your services/program?
26. What do you feel like works well for working with boys? What works to identify them and provide intervention services?
27. What do you feel works well for working with the LGBTQ population?
28. Does your program work specifically with any particular cultural group-if so are there recommendations you'd make for serving that particular population?
29. Does your program serve foreign born youth who have been trafficked and if so-are there special considerations for working with these youth?
30. Is your program able to serve pregnant and/or parenting youth-if so how?
31. How are you able to get your shelter and housing program funded? Who are your biggest champions? Do you get any reparation funds?
32. How does your program coordinate with other states and/or countries?
33. After your state implemented Safe Harbor/programs for sexually exploited youth-what do the figures look like? Has there been an increase/decrease in the number of youth exploited?
34. I am planning on doing site visits with programs in New York City, L.A., San Francisco, Dallas, Seattle, Portland, Chicago, Boston and Atlanta-are there other places that you think I should go?

Appendix B: Questions for Meetings with Law Enforcement, Government, Child Welfare, Juvenile Justice and Court Systems Serving Sexually Exploited Youth

1. Review the draft model and legislative recommendations for Safe Harbor and get any initial feedback and suggestions on its strengths, what is missing or other best practices to incorporate into the Minnesota model.
2. Does your state have a Safe Harbor or similar law? What is the framework for your state's/region's Safe Harbor Law and/or response to sex trafficked minors? Does it come through a public health, child welfare, local non-profit or public safety/law enforcement sector?
 - How do you get your local government, non-profits and law enforcement to work together on the issue of minor domestic sex trafficking in your community/state?
3. Law Enforcement: What trends are you seeing around the issue of minor sex trafficking?
 - How are you seeing minor victims being treated by law enforcement & court systems currently?
 - What do you think is the best approach to working with a victim of trafficking?
 - What are the youth's immediate needs after being picked up by law enforcement?
 - Where do youth typically go after being picked up-what types of places have worked the best for youth you've picked up?
4. How do you think partnerships should be set up between local & federal law enforcement agencies and a system like Safe Harbor?
 - Court Systems
 - Child Welfare Systems
 - Juvenile Justice
 - Children's Mental Health
5. In your experience what types of systems/models have worked well for minor victims of sex trafficking? What models haven't worked well?
 - What types of referral systems/processes do you think would work well?
 - Are there particular types of assessment/intake that you would recommend?
 - What kinds of supportive services do you think are most critical in serving sexually exploited youth?
 - In terms of family reunification, shelter and housing-are there particular types or models that you think work better for sexually exploited youth?
6. I am planning on visiting the following communities-New York City, Connecticut, Boston, San Francisco/Bay Area, L.A., Atlanta, Portland, Seattle, Chicago and Dallas-are there other states or communities that you know of that have good models for providing services/supports for victims of sex trafficking?
7. What outcomes do you think a program model/system like Safe Harbor should track and how do you think they should be measured and reported out on?
8. What do you feel like works well for working with boys? What works to identify them and provide intervention services?
9. What do you feel works well for working with the LGBTQ population?
10. Do you have recommendations for working with other culturally specific sub-populations of exploited youth?
11. Do you have input on how best to serve foreign born youth who have been trafficked and if so-are there special considerations for working with these youth?

-
12. What are your thoughts on serving pregnant/parenting youth who've been exploited?
 13. We are currently pursuing state funds from the legislature as well as some funds from a few local foundations that are interested in the issue-are there suggestions you have in terms of best practices for funding programming/systems for sex trafficked youth?
 14. Are there ways that Minnesota can partner or coordinate with national/federal efforts that are going on around sex trafficking of minors?
 15. Do you have suggestions for how Minnesota could coordinate with other states and/or countries on the issue of sex trafficking of minors?

Appendix C: Summary of Feedback from Other States on Minnesota’s Safe Harbor Law and “No Wrong Door Response for Sexually Exploited Youth”

Summary of Feedback on the Minnesota Model: “No Wrong Door”

Type of Stakeholder	Feedback
<p>Court Systems County Attorney Offices Judges</p>	<p>Liked the No Wrong Door Model Lives the inclusion of Child Welfare & Juvenile Justice Systems as Partners Increase the mental health & chemical dependency services Be sure to include employment connections, culturally sensitive services & services that meet the needs for LGBTQ youth Aftercare & Placement-how do we support the youth when they go back into their home community? Regional navigators-have a public/private partnership on this because there are some things nonprofits can do that government can’t, especially when girls go awall. Make sure to have survivors involved. Recruiting is an issue to keep in mind. If a youth is being put on the stand-it’s often times the first time they see their pimp, may feel like they loved him, may get labeled as “snitches”, may have to see videotapes of incidents/rapes-youth shouldn’t be in anything they have to see. Prosecutors are afraid to put youth on the witness stand because they don’t make good witnesses if they’re coming from juvenile detention in jumpsuits and shackles. Put security in court houses. Have people ask the right questions throughout the system. Need to have a secure/safe emergency house. Get someone involved from state business licensing and city business inspectors. Really likes the emergency shelter and housing. Likes the revolving door policy-should be part of the training. Looks really great. Wire tapping has worked well because then the victim may not have to testify.</p>
<p>Law Enforcement Juvenile Justice Systems</p>	<p>Training is critical. Spell out the amount of experience a trainer has to have in the protocol. Law enforcement especially needs training, work with roll call meetings. New officers should get a more in depth training. Do not put a lot of faith in child protection working well with this population. Get public defenders on board. Keep really good information on these youth-types of exploitation, etc. Mental illness and substance abuse is a huge issue. Need to have resources within the juvenile justice system-needs to have trauma based mental health services and substance abuse services. Services could be contracted to come into the juvenile justice system or outside the system-but some of the youth will need to be in juvenile detention for other offenses. There should be a locked facility in a secure environment that has intensive therapy. Victims don’t want to be helped-be prepared for this. Have to have a place to hold the youth-it takes 60 days to even think about getting out of the life. Make sure there is established criteria for CSEC emergency shelters. Safe Harbor Laws make assumptions that youth see themselves as victims and want help. Placing youth in a walk away facility is crazy. There should be a therapeutic detention center with court oversight with an evaluation of whether or not the youth can go home (if so help them with family reunification), be placed in outpatient services or a less restrictive housing program. Law enforcement needs to be a big player. Regional navigators should be in law enforcement or a juvenile justice office.</p>

Type of Stakeholder	Feedback
	<p>Have an umbrella nonprofit organization that oversees the supportive services, emergency shelter and housing.</p>
<p>Emergency Shelter and Housing Programs for CSEC</p>	<p>Anywhere you can segregate population you should do this. Take youth referrals from anywhere. Cannot fund programs based on “census” funders need to buy capacity. Have to have programs specific for CSEC youth. Everyone needs to be trained. Add training for secure psychiatric staff. Have to have a base level of collaboration-these aren’t one program’s kids. Create a funding mechanism that meets their needs. We were empty (emergency shelter) for the first 6 months-these programs take time to get up and running. Get help from foundations-they had heavy involvement in opening up our response for CSEC youth. Huge need for services for 17 & 18 year olds. You could use Children of the Night’s Hotline for the Minnesota Safe Harbor’s hotline. Their hotline has 11 questions that they ask and has a database of names of FBI, law enforcement, etc. across the country. Be sure to do intakes/assessments in a safe place-emergency rooms. Use police officer to go out before regional navigators go. Ask right away-have you been raped in the last 72 hours. Each social worker should bring sweatpants, clothes, hygiene kit w/ them so youth can change. Go to hospitals right away, detox, etc. Therapists don’t have to be trained specific to “prostitution”. Have a home unification program-parents have to go through five sessions or more. Call Children of the Night-can refer youth there if we need extra beds. Look at existing hotlines and trainings. Expand the age. Have a runaway curriculum. Key to all of the work is building relationships with youth. Regional navigator positions need to be flexible. Regional navigators should not have more than 25 youth per case load. Regional navigators should be placed in nonprofits-youth won’t trust government employees. Love the specialized foster care idea. Youth need to have single rooms in emergency shelter and housing. Youth should be the only child in a foster care home. Survivor Model v. Runaway Homeless Youth Model-survivor engagement happens faster, survivors need to be stable and supported. Make sure survivors can get through background checks. Have as many survivors as possible in front line positions. A blended staff of survivors and youth workers is the best model. Would not advocate for a purely clinical model unless youth are suicidal. Train runaway and homeless youth service providers, schools and public health nurses. Provide culturally competent clinical services. Don’t use a faith based model-they come from a savior mentality and try to pray the youth back to healing. Build a training position into Safe Harbor. Should come out of a Child Advocacy Center. Do motel outreach. Regional navigators should be within Child Advocacy Centers. Getting training for judges is really important-i.e. don’t ask questions about sexual exploitation in public, etc. if you can’t train judges at least train their staff. It would be nice if the regional navigators would have a status from the state to have power</p>

Type of Stakeholder	Feedback
	to sign releases for up to 10 days, something described as temporary.
Homeless Youth Service Providers	<p>May not be apparent that youth have been exploited-make sure to be able to identify them</p> <p>Has to be youth friendly-work a lot on the engagement/services</p> <p>Have to have a specialized mental health care for the TAY (Transition Age Youth) population.</p> <p>Likes the comprehensive approach, provides a variety of services in an integrated way.</p> <p>It would be great to have services co-located in one location or area.</p> <p>A lot of effort should go into training, cultural differences and gender identity.</p> <p>Be sure to hire staff with very good boundaries-that can form positive relationships with youth.</p> <p>Do trauma informed care training for staff and bring in expert trainers to do this.</p> <p>Do not put homeless and trafficked youth in the same place.</p> <p>Help youth within the small window of availability you have and act immediately.</p> <p>Timing is huge-watch reaction time between identifying youth & meeting with regional navigators.</p> <p>Think of it like a suicide response.</p> <p>Provide services without ID or parental consent.</p> <p>Be sure to partner with law makers.</p> <p>Good legal representation for youth is critical.</p> <p>There really needs to be trauma informed treatment, non-judgmental doctors, chemical dependency services are a high need, funding for safe places to be, make sure to add aftercare, have wrap around services for youth if they are reunified with family, allow youth to come back into program and don't route cases directly through child welfare system.</p> <p>It is wise to use the health approach.</p> <p>Be careful about peer recruitment.</p> <p>There is a missing feedback loop from the supportive services, emergency shelter and housing back to the list of community industries that are being trained.</p> <p>Need staff involved to have really good relationship building skills.</p> <p>Allow youth to come back and forth.</p> <p>Don't have a requirement be to leave their pimp.</p> <p>Have regional navigator teams instead of a single person as a regional navigator.</p>
Federal, State or Local Units of Government	<p>Get the Governor's Office on board even if the response is not out of his or her office.</p> <p>Include police chiefs and local police in the development of the response so there will be buy in from them.</p> <p>House the regional navigators out of one entity.</p> <p>We have tried housing regional navigator staff/programs for sexually exploited youth out of Child Advocacy Centers and it hasn't worked because it was too much of a cultural shift for them.</p> <p>Get data collection from regional navigators.</p> <p>Include college campuses and universities.</p> <p>Our senator would be willing to talk to yours.</p>
Health Care Providers	<p>Like that both short and long term healthcare are included.</p> <p>Likes the intensive foster care idea and adding sexually exploited youth as a population that can be served.</p> <p>Mental health services staff need a lot of support due to vicarious trauma the model has to be different.</p> <p>Likes the No Wrong Door approach and training, likes the hotline.</p>
Child Welfare Systems	<p>Regional navigators should be funded & administered through the state but housed in the community-what if there is friction between state and county staff?</p> <p>Use methods so youth only has to tell their story once.</p> <p>Don't separate out CSEC from other girls.</p> <p>Use locked facilities for 6 weeks and then a step down approach for CSEC youth.</p> <p>Be sure to fulfill immediate needs-clothing, personal hygiene items, mental health counseling and substance abuse counseling.</p>

Type of Stakeholder	Feedback
	<p>Mental health and chemical dependency providers should have specialized training for CSEC. Invite foster homes who are good with tough youth to be trained deep on trafficking, pay a higher difficulty of care rate, put in home services in place and have a few foster families on hand to do respite care.</p>
<p>Supportive Service Programs (Drop-In Centers, Mentoring Programs, Life Skills Programs)</p>	<p>Working with law enforcement is key. Partner strongly with faith based community. Drop-in centers should have vans. Emergency shelter part is so important. Get agreements from your local law enforcement agencies. If a youth turns 18 be able to keep them in the program. Get a way to have other related charges dropped. Make sure to use survivors as mentors. Get Rachel Lloyd and/or Nola Brantley to do training. Make sure to provide opportunities Child protection system is not the right place for these youth. Do not just transition an existing youth group home, emergency shelter or housing program for one for sexually exploited youth-this failed in Boston-develop a new program with new staff and train them specifically on sexually exploited youth. Have to have great collaboration, work with victim specialists out of FBI/ICE, can be territory issues among law enforcement.</p>
<p>National Stakeholders/Policy Experts & Federal Government Agencies</p>	<p>Provide training for existing staff within supportive services-do a wide spread training (v. specialized people) Do overall training more in depth. Have state and county regional navigators. Have a track for parents. Determine what is the cost for handling one of the trafficking cases. Make sure to have something in law mandating that the three departments (human services, public safety & health) have to work together. Do collective report to legislature. Do not be overly prescriptive with regional navigators-what do you need them to do & why, let anyone apply v. specifying a particular sector i.e. nonprofit, county, child advocacy center, etc. Do not replace runaway and homeless youth funding/programs with trafficking programs-build additional programs. Be sure to use peer reviewed journals in designing model-this is what the feds use. Do not make detail level decisions with a state-wide model. Reservations about a public health approach. Get child welfare to identify runaway, homeless and trafficked youth. Good to have the mixture of housing approaches. Youth should have options that are less restrictive (shelter/housing). Be sure to be inclusive of LGBTQ youth. Street youth can have a difficult time adjusting to group homes, shelter rules, curfews, etc. Have an array of options for where youth can stay. Like the idea of specialized foster care. Model needs to be okay with youth coming in and out of a system of care. Regional navigators is a new concept but it could really work-they should be housed within service providers. Could use Polaris's hotline to connect youth directly to the regional navigators. Have a strong training program for regional navigators and there should be on-going support and training. Juvenile public defenders is a sector that really needs training.</p>
<p>Survivors (Adult-youth will be interviewed in phase 2 of fellowship)</p>	<p>Involve survivor with social worker. The biggest challenge will be finding placements for youth-safe places to live. Be sure to educate emergency room staff, hotel staff, etc.</p>

Type of Stakeholder	Feedback
	<p>Have a 24/7 response team. Have someone who can work with/follow the youth for a while. Like the individualized support and it being centered on comprehensive case management. Like regional navigators. Have a holistic approach to mental health-use things like yoga, acupuncture and massage. Use street outreach. Have one on one support, support groups and cultural healing options-let youth decide what works best for them. Utilize peer counselors who have been in the life-they are great opportunities for youth to get employed. Incarceration does more damage than good.</p>
<p>Legal & Policy Programs Working w/ Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking</p>	<p>Juvenile justice and child welfare systems are not equipped to work with sexually exploited youth. Critical to involve survivors, have them as our regional navigators out of service providers. Have quarterly and on-going meetings for people who've been trained. Have targeted services for transgender youth-it is really hard for them to find employment. Figure out how to partner with community based culturally specific organizations. Like the Tribal regional navigator idea. Likes the "No Wrong Door" concept. Put communities/providers out in front that are doing well as best practice examples-involve them in trainings. In an ideal world-have specialized staff and programming for the CSEC population, coordinated meetings, specialized staff in schools and do outreach in places where youth are hanging out. Spent a lot of time Multidisciplinary approach is good. Referring CSEC through child welfare system is good but doesn't catch all victims. It is important to build trust with providers/partners.</p>
<p>County Government</p>	<p>Regional navigators should come from the same place-nonprofits should house them not law enforcement (they are an agent of an investigation). Nonprofits should be pushing the envelope to work/equal w/ counties, have the authority to be the regional navigator. Use something you have across the state like public health nurses. Hold a group with survivors to see where they'd want the regional navigators to be placed. Amazing plan overall! Collaborate with Operation Cross County which is an effort with the FBI to try and rescue minor victims of trafficking. Have staff secure emergency shelter and housing-have a variety of placements.</p>

Appendix D: Summary of State and Local Responses for Sexually Exploited Youth

The following table describes the results and key learnings from the site visits with other states and communities providing comprehensive responses for sexually exploited youth.

Location	Type of Response	Key Features & Response Summary
<p>Multnomah County & City of Portland, Oregon</p>	<p>Multidisciplinary Community Based Response</p>	<p>Key Features: Community Non-Profit (Janus) provides assessment, services and emergency shelter for CSEC, youth identified as CSEC who are in child welfare or juvenile justice systems are also provided with CSEC specific supports and coordinate with Janus, law enforcement collaborates with Janus, health care/sexual assault services are provided as needed, multi-disciplinary steering committee and local political support.</p> <p>Response Summary: In 2008, Multnomah County had a County Commissioner, Dianne Keel, who acted as a leader in the effort to end the commercial sexual exploitation of children. In 2009 Commissioner McKeel took on the sex trafficking of minors as her mission and worked with the County to get a planning grant from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to create a new system of care for sex trafficked youth. A multi-disciplinary steering committee was created with subcommittees around the areas of health care, victim services (Janus was recruited to provide the staff coordination and support to this subcommittee), community education, legal laws, prosecution and education around ending the demand for prostitution.</p> <p>The Portland Police Department has a specific unit for human trafficking with four dedicated officers of which two are designated for youth. The response that was developed is one in which the local FBI and law enforcement have a 24/7 crisis response that instructs law enforcement to bring any CSEC youth (both girls and boys) to Janus. Once the youth has been dropped off at Janus they are provided with safe emergency shelter specific for sexually exploited youth and, if needed, are connected with health care services. The Sexual Assault Resource Center (SARC) is on-call 24/7 and will provide onsite confidential emotional support and advocacy for all CSEC identified youth. Janus also coordinates mental health care services for the youth through local mental health organizations like Life Works Northwest and Morrison Center.</p> <p>There is also specialized staff within Multnomah County’s Juvenile Services Division who works with CSEC youth (who are there for other charges). The Multnomah County Child Welfare System has a CSEC Unit with four case workers specifically trained to work with sexually</p>

Location	Type of Response	Key Features & Response Summary
		<p>exploited youth and who are available on weekends for youth who are in the child welfare system already and are also CSEC. The child welfare system also works in coordination with Janus. The police and the Multomah County District Attorney’s Office are seeing more successful prosecutions of sex traffickers due to the youth receiving supportive services and safe emergency shelter.</p>
<p>Washington State</p>	<p>Multidisciplinary Community Based Response</p>	<p>Key Features: Safe Place outreach and identification structure (within Seattle), community based non-profit providing assessment/emergency shelter/housing for CSEC, collaboration with law enforcement, multidisciplinary taskforce and state-wide hotline.</p> <p>Response Summary: During the course of the development of the protocol there was a merger of two groups into a Child Exploitation Taskforce. The taskforce identifies victims and is made up of investigators, community based providers and criminal justice staff. There are three dedicated taskforces-Tacoma, Seattle and Everett and each taskforce has a coordinator.</p> <p>In Washington State the Center for Children & Youth Justice (CCYJ) developed a state-wide protocol response for sexually exploited youth that broke the state up into regional multidisciplinary response groups. Each of the regions adapted a 24/7 response protocol for sex trafficked youth based on the CCYJ state-wide protocol. The protocol response has one central phone line and people call into it and are connected with an advocate. Regardless of where the sexually exploited youth is identified within King County they are engaged and entered into community based services-youth are no longer brought into juvenile detention unless they have a warrant for other outstanding criminal charges unrelated to the sexual exploitation. In Seattle the youth are brought to YouthCare and in SeaTac and surrounding areas the youth and women are brought to The Genesis Project.</p> <p>When a sexually exploited youth shows up at YouthCare an advocate meets the youth where they are at and explains what they can offer and their continuum of services and offers them a safe emergency shelter or housing program to stay in. YouthCare’s programs are based on the stages of change model. YouthCare does not force youth into emergency shelter instead they work on building relationships to hopefully get into services. Once youth are at YouthCare they receive an assessment, get back into school (they have a school on-site), receive intensive case management services, connections to health care and opportunities to gain employment skills. YouthCare’s program</p>

Location	Type of Response	Key Features & Response Summary
		<p>for sexually exploited youth, “The Bridge” includes a two bed emergency shelter and a 6 bed transitional living program. It was opened through a partnership with the city of Seattle, health care professionals, other service providers, the public schools, county attorney’s office, foundations and private donors. The Bridge provides sexually exploited youth with shelter and housing but supportive services as well including therapy, access to medical care, on-site chemical dependency supports, life skills and vocational training, art based field trips and activities and a paid youth employment program.</p> <p>The city of Seattle also has incorporated the “Safe Place Model” (based on the National Safe Place Model) in which a youth who is runaway, homeless or exploited can get connected to services through three different city wide industries (Seattle’s bus system, Starbucks coffee shops and local libraries). Additional sites such as hospitals are currently being developed. The model’s process is that when/if a youth discloses to a bus driver (for example) that they are homeless or exploited that driver then calls their transit authority office who routes a call to YouthCare. YouthCare then arranges for a youth street outreach worker to meet the youth at the next bus stop to connect the youth to services.</p> <p>In SeaTac youth and women are referred to The Genesis Project by police officers and law enforcement agencies or any other referral source including the youth or women themselves. The Genesis Project is a faith based non-profit operated by nine staff members, hundreds of volunteers and led by their Founder and Executive Deputy Andy Conner. He is the King County Sheriff’s Deputy that decided to open a program for sexually exploited women and girls. The program is open six days a week and open at night when necessary with on-call volunteers. The center itself has an array of supportive services such as education (high school & GED classes), life skills training, vocational training and job placement, music and arts classes, counseling and connections to longer term housing.</p>
State of Georgia	Multidisciplinary Community Based Response based out of the Governor’s Office for Children & Families	<p>Key Features: Governor’s Office involvement, community based response with non-profit service providers, state-wide hotline (through Georgia Care Connection), collaboration with law enforcement and state human trafficking taskforce.</p> <p>Summary of Response: The state of Georgia’s response for sexually exploited youth comes out of their Governor’s Office for Children & Families and is a state-wide response. The response involves the Department of Human Services,</p>

Location	Type of Response	Key Features & Response Summary
		<p>Bureau of Investigations and the State Attorney General’s Office. The Governor’s Office has three main responsibilities which are to oversee the state’s Human Trafficking Taskforce, overseeing the funding and model of care for sexually exploited youth which is operated out of the Georgia Care Connection and to oversee and conduct training on sexually exploited youth throughout the state.</p> <p>The state of Georgia’s Human Trafficking Taskforce has a full time coordinator and operates out of the collective impact model. The Taskforce has three different levels of membership and also has a memorandum of understanding (MOU) for partner level members to sign onto. The three levels are a partner level which is for those organizations who work directly with sexually exploited youth, sign onto an MOU and offer a larger time commitment; an affiliate level which is people with passion about the issue but don’t actually work with sexually exploited youth and an at large/public level which are people who just want to stay informed through newsletters and resources. Members on the taskforce self-select which level of membership makes the most sense for them. The Taskforce has multiple workgroups which are headed by child protection services, juvenile justice services, children’s hospital, the Georgia Care Connection, Department of Education, Street Grace and the Georgia Bureau of Investigations. These workgroups created a work plan for developing a response for sexually exploited youth with outcomes and measurements.</p> <p>A sexually exploited youth can be identified and referred to services by anyone and at anytime. There is one state-wide hotline that routes callers to the Georgia Care Connection. The Georgia Care Connection is the single point of access for sexually exploited youth there have been 686 referrals since June of 2009 and the average age of the youth is 14.8. Georgia has a state run child protection system but cases of sexual exploitation don’t get routed through child protection-but through the Georgia Care Connection. The Georgia Care Connection does, however, let the child protection system know when they get a minor case of sex trafficking. The Georgia Care Connection has two licensed social workers. Any sexually exploited child in Georgia under the age of 18 calls the Georgia Care Connection and the youth’s case is screened and then a decision is made about their care. If they can’t go home then the youth is referred to Wellspring Living which is a nonprofit provider of specialized emergency shelter and housing for sexually exploited youth located 30 minutes outside of Atlanta. The payment for placements for youth at Wellspring Living comes from the child protection system if the youth is already a part of this system or if</p>

Location	Type of Response	Key Features & Response Summary
		<p>not it comes from the Georgia Care Connection (which is paid for with state funds designated for sexually exploited youth). The police drop off youth at Children’s Hospitals where they receive an interview and medical exam (if appropriate). Children’s Hospital has a child friendly sexual assault team which was created by Dr. Greenbaum. If the youth has a higher charge for a different crime the youth is taken to the Juvenile Detention Center but ideally they also get these youth to a hospital instead of detention. If the youth’s case involves sex trafficking but they are in for a different crime-their case has to be heard within three days and the judge can either decide to send the youth home or to a program like Wellspring Living. Wellspring Living is a partially secure facility (emergency shelter) and semi secure facility (transitional housing program) located 30 minutes outside the city of Atlanta in a fairly remote area. The shelter and housing program provide the girls with counseling, a variety of types of therapy (which includes family members, art and pet based therapy) and educational programming. During the time they are held in juvenile detention they go into Wellspring or community programs v. a correctional setting. The state is still working on further developing this piece of the response. The Georgia Care Connection has two survivors on staff who work with the youth-they need to be out of the life for at least five years and have gone through counseling. They also have a staff position who is a person who had a niece who was sexually exploited and who’s primary focus of work is to help support the parents of children who’ve been exploited. They are currently working on building an assessment center or additional hospitals to take the youth too.</p> <p>The Governor’s Office has trained in law enforcement and other industries and have established training curriculums for the medical, law enforcement, mental health and prosecutor fields. CSEC 101 is for general audiences and is a forensic interviewing training. They are currently working on developing training with the Department of Education for schools.</p>
Cook County & City of Chicago, Illinois	Multidisciplinary Community Based Response	<p>Key Features: Human Trafficking Taskforce, specialized victim service coordination within court systems, coordination between court system, community based service providers (the STOP Program) and law enforcement.</p> <p>Summary Response: The Safe Children’s Act was passed in August of 2010 which eliminated juvenile prostitution from the criminal code for anyone under the age of 18. It also allowed for wire tapes on traffickers and increased fines and penalties for solicitors. A Human Trafficking Unit was created within the Cook County State Attorney’s Office-three full time state’s</p>

Location	Type of Response	Key Features & Response Summary
		<p>attorneys and a human trafficking services specialist (who acts as a liaison between the attorney and victim). The trafficking cases used to be handed over to the feds but are now prosecuted at the state level.</p> <p>Cook County has a human trafficking initiative which was developed by the Cook County Human Trafficking Taskforce and includes the U.S. Attorney’s Office, the State’s Attorney’s Office and service providers for sexually exploited youth. The Taskforce meets quarterly. There are subcommittees on training, victim services committees, law enforcement (which is a working group that meets monthly to do case coordination & intelligence). The Taskforce is trying to develop a labor & immigration & LGBTQ subcommittees. There are currently no good emergency shelter or housing options for sexually exploited youth which is really challenging. The Taskforce is working to develop a housing summit and pull in homeless youth providers and others to develop ideas around specific shelter and housing options for CSEC youth.</p> <p>If a youth is identified as a victim of sexual exploitation the police take the youth into the police station and then call The Salvation Army’s STOP Program (main provider of services for sexually exploited youth in Chicago) which offers intensive case management to victims of trafficking and supportive services. At the police station the youth is either connected with child protection services or are reunified with their family or put into a child protection placement (which does not necessarily happen). Youth who are in need of a mental health exam or services are taken into a mental health facility (Hartgrove).</p>
<p>State of New York & New York City</p>	<p>Multidisciplinary Community Based Response</p>	<p>Key Features: Non-profit service and housing provider (GEMS), survivor led, collaboration with local law enforcement and continued work to improve laws.</p> <p>Response Summary: The state of New York passed their Safe Harbor Law in 2008 but does not have the law fully implemented. There is not a state-wide protocol and no emergency shelter funded through the state. There is also a conflicting law within juvenile justice stating that 16 and 17 year olds are still criminally responsible-there are currently some stakeholders working on a new legislative proposal to change this. In New York it has been hard to implement the law due to the lack of funding for services and emergency shelter along with the issue with the conflicting juvenile justice law. New York’s child welfare system does not take in cases of CSEC that are non-family abuse cases. There is a New York City Trafficking Taskforce made up of law enforcement and service</p>

Location	Type of Response	Key Features & Response Summary
		<p>providers-the state of New York also has one.</p> <p>Currently in New York City if there if a sexually exploited youth is identified by the police or the court system they refer the youth to GEMS (Girls Educational Mentoring Services) for services which is a nationally known model for providing supports for sexually exploited girls ages 12 to 24. The organization was founded by Rachel Lloyd and works with youth through a survivor and empowerment model called the “victim-survivor-leader” model. The organization has several supportive services including but not limited to mentoring, support groups, an internship program, leadership training and supports for education and employment skills. GEMS uses an incentive based program philosophy v. punitive and girls are financially rewarded for participating in groups and activities and achieving educational or other goals. The organization also provides housing for girls through two programs, a Transitional Living Program (for girls between the ages of 16 and 21 for up to 18 months) and the Imani House (for girls 18-23 as well as young mothers).</p>
State of New Jersey	Multidisciplinary Community Based Response	<p>Key Features: State-wide hotline, non-profit community based services, collaboration with child welfare system and specialized foster homes.</p> <p>Summary Response: The state of New Jersey is working on fully implementing their Safe Harbor Law but there are many stakeholders there that are advocating for their law to be operated out of a public health model. The state of New Jersey has a state-wide hotline for human trafficking that is run by law enforcement-but it is limited to the state of New Jersey and does not include resources from other states. The hotline number is posted in clubs, the backs of bathroom doors and rest stops. Additionally, the service provider for trafficking victims in Newark (the Polaris Project) does targeted outreach with hygiene or beauty supplies that have the hotline and their contact information on them.</p> <p>The state of New Jersey does not place youth in the juvenile justice system or correctional settings if they are identified as victims of sex trafficking-the cases are routed either through the child welfare system or through non-profit service providers such as Polaris. The state has a county run child welfare system so the responses for sexually exploited youth vary by county but one of the counties does utilize specialized foster care homes which are trained in how to work with sexually exploited youth and receive a higher monthly per diem rate. These foster parents also have to sign a contract stating that they will allow the youth to come back into their home if they run away-even if there</p>

Location	Type of Response	Key Features & Response Summary
Alameda County & City of Oakland, California	Juvenile Justice & Court System Response operated out of the Alameda County District Attorney's Office	<p>are multiple runs.</p> <p>Key Features: County District Attorney's Office, specialized court process for CSEC, safety and locked placement holds and coordination with local community based non-profit service and health care providers.</p> <p>Response Summary: The Oakland Police Department has a special unit for commercially sexually exploited children (CSEC), and the Alameda County District Attorney's Office has a special prosecution unit called the Human Exploitation & Trafficking (H.E.A.T.) Unit. In addition to the H.E.A.T. Unit, the Alameda County DA expanded the H.E.A.T. Unit to include a comprehensive response called H.E.A.T. Watch for victims, law enforcement training, policy development and community engagement. H.E.A.T. Watch leads a weekly, multi-disciplinary case review of CSEC called SafetyNet, a 12-week intervention & education course for CSEC called the Young Women's Saturday Program (YWSP), and is a partner in a special juvenile court for young women called "Girls Court". The community has several emergency shelter and housing units for CSEC youth, including Dreamcatchers and Covenant House, and in some circumstances, they place girls out of state in group homes like Mingus Mountain in Arizona. When a CSEC is identified by law enforcement in Alameda County, an advocate from Bay Area Women Against Rape (BAWAR) connects with the minor before they are put on a "safety hold" at the Juvenile Justice Center. During the time they are held, they are referred to Safety Net, connected with services and aftercare, and assigned to Girls court, which has the same District Attorney, Judge, and Public Defender. If a minor is referred to the YWSP, they receive further case management, advocacy, life skills training, and educational and employment assistance. There is also a specialized drop-in center and case management program for sexually exploited youth in Oakland called MISSEY, and the West Coast Children's Clinic which does intensive mental health services for sexually exploited youth. At the adult prosecution level, DA's Office H.E.A.T. Unit has two District Attorney's, an inspector, and a victim witness advocate who ensure the safety of the victim</p>

Location	Type of Response	Key Features & Response Summary
<p>Harris County & the city of Houston, Texas</p>	<p>Juvenile Justice & Court System Response operated out of the Harris County's GIRLS Court</p>	<p>witness throughout the trial against their trafficker.</p> <p>Key Features: Specialized court response, coordination with child welfare system, system orientated response, utilizes detention placements and some non-detention and the area also has a community based non-profit provider (Freedom Place).</p> <p>Response Summary: Harris County utilizes a specialized court system for many areas such as sexually exploited and at-risk girls, gangs, drugs and mental health. In Harris County there is a specialized court called "The GIRLS (Growing Independence Restoring Lives) Court" which is made up of a multidisciplinary team which process cases of sex trafficking. The judge is very involved in the process and there is also a defense attorney, representative from the District Attorney's Office, a probation officer, a psychologist, educational specialist, parent partner, YMCA international worker and a child protection social worker involved-all are women. The judge meets with the parents of the youth to determine a service plan rather than criminalizing the youth, the probation officer works with the home and upon successful completion of the program the charges are dropped. The court works very intensively with the girls-most of the girls are involved in the program for 8-12 months. They also have just started a Human Trafficking Initiative Program that will assist both boys and girls that present with a history of sex trafficking because the GIRL'S Court is a small and new program and this new initiative will help to address the needs of other sex trafficked youth that are not appropriate fits for the GIRL'S Court.</p> <p>Girls see the judge at minimum once a month. Anyone under the age of 14 can't consent to sex in Texas so they cannot be charged with "prostitution"-youth over the age of 14 are sometimes charged with "prostitution". The child protection system can take the youth, however, they tend to run from child welfare placements as the child welfare system as no secure facilities so this leaves the juvenile justice system to respond and in order to serve these youth they have to be charged with an offense. If the youth successfully completes the program and the youth has not been adjudicated then the charges can be dismissed-however if the youth has been adjudicated then the record is sealed.</p> <p>The police pick up the girls-if the child protection system doesn't take the case the police will arrest them and bring to the detention center. In detention all the youth receive a psychological screening within 48 hours (including sexually exploited youth). If a youth is identified as sex</p>

Location	Type of Response	Key Features & Response Summary
		<p>trafficked the staff member who discovered this refers this youth to the Human Trafficking supervisor who looks at the case for either the GIRL's Court or other services (like our new Human Trafficking Initiative.) Once a youth is referred to GIRL's Court the psychologist interviews the youth and family to determine history and appropriateness for the program. Girls can be accepted pre-adjudication or post-adjudication. The judge decides if this youth will return to the community or go to placement. The psychologist often shares with the judge their thoughts about the case and the youth's needs. If youth is placed in GIRL's Court the psychologist creates an individual treatment plan for her. Then there is an adjudication hearing where the judge can place the youth in juvenile detention or a child welfare placement. There are cases where child protection services and juvenile probation have joint custody of a youth and arrangements are made between the two systems to support the youth. In these cases the juvenile justice and child welfare systems work together-but often times juvenile justice is the system held responsible for these youth. Youth can be placed through a few private placements in which youth can get intense psychological services-some are in Houston and some are outside of Houston.</p> <p>There is also another housing option for sex trafficked youth in the Houston area-Freedom Place which located 45 minutes outside of Houston in a rural area environment. Freedom Place is operated out of Arrow Child & Family Ministries and is a faith based organization, however, religion is not forced into the programming of the youth who are in housing. Youth who are staying at Freedom Place receive education and trauma informed therapy on-site, equine therapy, pet assisted therapy, an on-site prayer garden, on-site recreational and exercise activities such as a basketball court, and opportunities for youth to learn employment skills through an on-site boutique. There is incentive based programming in which youth can earn tokens for achieving goals and participating in services and then they can spend these tokens in the boutique.</p> <p>Houston is home to one of the Federal Human Trafficking Taskforces which brings together law enforcement and social service providers for victims of sex trafficking. The response is very regionalized in Texas and data sharing doesn't happen. They are working to create a database of everyone who is working on trafficking. There is a human trafficking training in the police academy which every newly licensed police officer and any officer advancing in ranking must take (it is a minimum of four hours). Additionally, there is a more advanced training curriculum offered on human trafficking that are available for law enforcement</p>

Location	Type of Response	Key Features & Response Summary
<p>Dallas County & the city of Dallas, Texas</p>	<p>Law Enforcement Based Response operated out of the Dallas Police Department's Child Exploitation/High Risk Victims and Trafficking Unit and the E.S.T.E.E.M. Court</p>	<p>when they are selecting their continuing education courses.</p> <p>Key Features: Proactive law enforcement response, coordination with juvenile justice service provider and placement facility and specialized court system response.</p> <p>Response Summary: The Dallas Police Department has a Child Exploitation/High Risk Victims Unit and Trafficking Unit (which is made up of 3 people and headed by Sargent Fasset). Sargent Fasset is proactive and creates a list each month of the chronic runways (meaning they have run at least 4 times). These youth often times are victims of crimes and are at a high risk of being victimized and/or recruited into sex trafficking. If a youth has run away more than four times and is currently on run they are put on the high risk victims list and officers from the high risk victims unit actively look for these youth. If a youth gets picked up for another crime and they are on this high risk victims list a stamp comes up in the system and the officer has to call the high risk victims unit 24/7. Twenty to thirty girls each month get maximum efforts-others may not need as much. They developed a new interview model (that is not forensic) and methods for finding the youth.</p> <p>Dallas County also has a specialized court called the "E.S.T.E.E.M." court which stands for "Experiencing Success Through Empowerment, Encouragement and Mentoring". The court's target population are the youth that Sargent Fasset's unit locates-the high risk victims who have committed a CINS (child in need of supervision) offense or who have misdemeanor charges. They also have be a sexually exploited youth and have run away at least 4 times in a 12 month period. The court's goals are to provide wraparound services by utilizing community based and Department resources, provide an exit plan for success after diversion and to decrease further entry into the juvenile justice system. The E.S.T.E.E.M. court process includes an intake with the family, an assessment for the needs of the youth and family, development of a case plan, referrals to the family for services, girls and parent groups after court proceedings to debrief and a treatment group called HOPE which is offered specifically for sexually exploited youth by the staff at the Letot Center.</p> <p>If a sexually exploited youth has nowhere safe to go they are placed at the Letot Center which is a juvenile corrections assessment and residential facility. Although it is a juvenile corrections facility it is not locked and youth cannot be held there against their will-youth can leave. While at the facility the youth receive supportive services and</p>

Location	Type of Response	Key Features & Response Summary
L.A. County & the city of Los Angeles, California	Juvenile Justice & Court System Response operated out of the Harris County's GIRLS Court	<p>attend an on-site school.</p> <p>Key Features: Specialized court, places youth in locked detention with integrated CSEC services, incorporates survivor based supportive services and also has an emergency shelter that operates outside of the system (Children of the Night).</p> <p>Summary Response: In L.A. County there is a county Judge/Commissioner, Commissioner Pratt, that created a specialized court and response for CSEC with the juvenile justice tools that were available to her. When a youth is picked up and is identified as a victim of sexual exploitation they typically spend two to three weeks in custody at juvenile hall before trial and disposition. While they are at juvenile hall, probation officers who are trained to work with CSEC youth meet with the victims to explain the services and placements available. Advocates from local sex trafficking support services programs (including Mary Magdalene and Saving Innocence) also come to juvenile hall to work with the youth. Juvenile hall staff are also trained in how to work with sexually exploited youth and will counsel any girls who disclose that exploitation is an issue, regardless of the crime she is charged with. The goal is to engage the youth and try to get them to a place where they will accept the help. If the youth is likely to go to placement, the court will have potential placements meet with the youth at juvenile hall to allow the youth to have some input into their placement and to try to build a relationship with placement staff as early as possible. The court uses a handful of group homes where staff have been trained to work with CSEC youth and to recognize recruiting and other references to exploitation. The court expects the group homes to accept the youth back in placement even if the youth AWOL's or relapses. The group homes they use for placements are Crittenton in Orange County, Children Are Our Future, Maryvale and David & Margaret in LA County. In cases where the youth's safety is paramount, the court also uses Forest Ridge in Gruver, Iowa, a specialized CSEC group home for 100 girls from throughout the country. The court sees many youth who run multiple times or relapse and then come back; these girls are allowed to re-join the program if they want to. L.A. County is hoping to develop specialized foster care homes with specialized CSEC training and higher monthly foster care payment rates. All of the youth receive intensified court supervision-once every 3 to 4 weeks and have found mentoring to be useful. LA County Probation also has a grant to provide supportive services to their youth. They fund survivor mentorship for girls entrenched in the life. The survivors are from the Mary Magdalene Project, a domestic trafficking/prostitution recovery</p>

Location	Type of Response	Key Features & Response Summary
		<p>program. Probation also funds a prevention program, My Life My Choice, which is co-facilitated by Mary Magdalene Project survivors and offered throughout the county.</p> <p>Los Angeles is also home to an emergency shelter for sexually exploited youth that was opened by Dr. Lois Lee in the 1970's, Children of the Night. The shelter is located in an urban setting and is one of the few shelter programs in the country that serves both boys and girls (between the ages of 11 and 17). The shelter program is very structured and rule oriented and youth are provided with on-site schooling, counseling (off site as well), connected with physical health care and other supportive services and weekly field trips. It is a privately operated and funded program and is not licensed which is why the court and county programs cannot refer to them. However, Children of the Night is also home to a nation wide hotline for sexually exploited youth and can take referrals from anywhere in the country as well as has the resources to provide transportation for the youth to get to Children of the Night.</p>
State of Florida	State Child Welfare System Based Response	<p>Key Features: State child welfare system with regionalized implementation, emergency shelter and foster care homes specific to CSEC and coordination with law enforcement and juvenile justice.</p> <p>Response Summary: Since January 1, 2013 with the implementation of the Safe Harbor Law the state of Florida's child welfare system has a state-wide human trafficking advocate as well as one in each of the state's six regions.</p> <p>The Department of Human Services in Florida has a state-run child welfare system and has a hotline which all cases of CSEC need to be reported into. Once a case is reported it triggers an investigation within the child welfare system. These investigations are coordinated with law enforcement. An initial assessment is done by child welfare and if sexual exploitation is found then a specialized trafficking unit staff is assigned to work with the youth. Before any CSEC case is closed the child protection investigator has to give an update on the case first. The state is working on implementing services-they try and keep the youth in their home if possible. They are developing multidisciplinary teams at the Child Advocacy Centers which are made up of legal service providers, counselors and law enforcement-this team then creates a plan for the youth. The state is also working on training resource officers at schools.</p> <p>In Miami children are taken to the juvenile assessment center and if it's</p>

Location	Type of Response	Key Features & Response Summary
		<p>a CSEC case the child can go to Kristi’s House (a nonprofit emergency shelter specific for sexually exploited youth) for up to 30 days. Within 24 hours of a youth entering Kristi’s House they have a hearing in which a judge decides if the youth can stay there longer term. Youth can also self-refer into the shelter as well. There are also some therapeutic foster homes that specialize in working with sexually exploited youth that children can be placed in within the state of Florida. Kristi’s House is a new emergency shelter as of the spring of 2013 and has faced challenges within its opening both from the issue itself and the process of getting licensed.</p> <p>Broward County has a “Broward County Human Trafficking Taskforce” that includes the STARS (Stop Trafficking & Rescue the Survivors) Program-this is a subcommittee of the taskforce that works specifically with CSEC youth who are under 18. If a youth is identified as being sexually exploited they are dropped off at the Juvenile Assessment Center. Within the Juvenile Assessment Center there are counselors and psychotherapeutic services specifically designed to work with sexually exploited youth.</p>
<p>Suffolk County & the City of Boston, Massachusetts</p>	<p>Multidisciplinary Response based in the Child Welfare System</p>	<p>Key Features: Child welfare system coordinating with community based non-profits to provide services, trafficking steering committee and advisory committee (SEEN), survivor led programming (My Life My Choice) and view sexual exploitation as a mandated report to child protection.</p> <p>Response Summary: In Suffolk County there is a multidisciplinary response for sex trafficked youth that relies largely on the child welfare system and local non-profit service providers. The response was developed by the SEEN (Support to End Exploitation Now) Steering Committee which is based out of the Children’s Advocacy Center of Suffolk County. This committee has responsibilities of the overall strategic direction and operations of SEEN’s multidisciplinary intervention guidelines and team.</p> <p>In Suffolk County-CSEC is seen as a form of child abuse and has to be reported any to child protection. Once the report is made to child protection the report is screened and then a referral is made to the District Attorney and the SEEN Case Coordinator is notified. The SEEN Case Coordinator is the person responsible for bringing together the multidisciplinary team to coordinate a response for the youth. The multidisciplinary team develops a plan that involves health care, supportive services, placements if necessary (although this is difficult because Boston/Suffolk County have no emergency shelter or housing</p>

Location	Type of Response	Key Features & Response Summary
		<p>programs specific to CSEC), psychological treatment and an investigative interview. The state statute allows for information sharing between law enforcement and child protection. The Department for Children & Families (DCF which is Suffolk County’s child protection system) refers children to Roxbury Youth Services-GIFT Program (Gaining Independence for Tomorrow). Roxbury Youth Services-GIFT is a non-profit community based program that provides intensive case management, mentoring, life skills and other supportive services for sexually exploited youth. If the youth is in their parent’s custody, or in the custody of the departments of mental health or youth services or is in the child welfare system but outside the city of Boston (but still in Suffolk County) they are referred to My Life My Choice. The services are voluntary but most of the youth referred to these programs do participate in them.</p> <p>Some of the unique features of this response is that DCF has been addressing sexually exploited youth since 2001 and has funded mentoring by adult survivors, street outreach, the My Life My Choice training and the GIFT program. The Boston Police Human Trafficking Unit was created in 2005 and has specially trained detectives and a victim advocate. The unit finds and supports victims, investigates human traffickers and provides training to law enforcement.</p>
State of Connecticut	State Child Welfare System Based Response	<p>Key Features: Child welfare system response and services, view sexual exploitation as a mandated reported and use of a state-wide hotline.</p> <p>Response Summary: In 2004 the state of Connecticut allocated funds to develop a Human Trafficking Taskforce which was made up of law enforcement, service providers for trafficking victims and prosecutors. The state of Connecticut’s Safe Harbor Law requires law enforcement to call child protection whenever they have a case of minor sex trafficking and assumes coercion if youth is under 18 although if a youth is 16 or older they can still be arrested (there are legislative proposals to try and changes this piece of the law).</p> <p>The state of Connecticut has a state-run child welfare and juvenile justice system in which both systems are operated out of the same department. The state’s response for sex trafficked youth under their Safe Harbor Law is operated out of this state department. Anyone that identifies a minor victim of sex trafficking calls the state’s care line. All cases of sex trafficking are accepted into the child welfare system and are referred to the anti-trafficking response team which is made up of two state staff-any case of minor sex trafficking has to be responded to</p>

Location	Type of Response	Key Features & Response Summary
		<p>within two hours. The anti-trafficking response team works with all regions of the state (there are six regions) as well as local and federal law enforcement. Law enforcement will call the anti-trafficking team prior to conducting stings or raids. Once a youth has been identified as a victim of sex trafficking the Regional HART's anti-trafficking response team works with the youth to develop a service plan. Regions utilize the Practice Guide on how to respond to victims ensuring the youth's voice is primary through the TDM (Team Decision Making) process. That state will place sexually exploited youth in a PRTF (psychiatric residential treatment facility) placement if the youth requires this level of care and the state is working to develop specialized foster care homes.</p> <p>The state has provided training for community service providers, law enforcement (700 officers state-wide and is on-going) and emergency room staff. They are in the process of training all child welfare system social workers as well as training specialized foster care parents who will be willing to allow sexually exploited youth to come back if they run away.</p>
State of Vermont	Response for Sexually Exploited Youth Currently in Development	<p>The state of Vermont recently passed their Safe Harbor Law (in 2013) and is currently working on strategies to implement their law. There is also a working group developing a statewide resource directory for distribution to law enforcement, social service agencies and other stakeholders. The law states that law enforcement has to be trained in viewing sexually exploited youth as victims and goes up to age 24.</p>
State of New Hampshire	Response for Sexually Exploited Youth Currently in Development	<p>The state passed its Safe Harbor Law in 2011 and it goes up to age 18. As a result of the law passing the Attorney General developed a taskforce on human trafficking. The taskforce is looking at best practices with the media and is working on a state-wide protocol but hasn't developed one yet. The taskforce is large but is broken up into smaller committees and includes people from the media, education system, community readiness and law enforcement. The goal is to develop a state-wide response and to have one person in each law enforcement agency throughout the state be specialized in working with CSEC. The only services provided throughout the state for CSEC youth are through the only state's homeless youth service provider (Child & Family Services) but they do not have any specific services for CSEC youth and see very low numbers of them.</p>

Appendix E: Website and Resource List

National Stakeholders:

ECPAT (Ending Child Prostitution and Trafficking), www.ecpat.net

Federal Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Children & Families, Family Youth Services Bureau, <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/fysb/>

National Alliance to End Homelessness, <http://www.endhomelessness.org/>

National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, <http://www.missingkids.com/home>

The Polaris Project, www.polarisproject.org

The True Colors Foundation, www.truecolorsfund.org

U.S. Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, <http://www.state.gov/j/tip/>

United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, <http://usich.gov/>

Supportive Service and Health Care Services for Sexually Exploited Youth:

Children at Risk, <http://childrenatrisk.org/>

GEMS, <http://www.gems-girls.org/>

Los Angeles Children's Hospital, http://www.chla.org/site/c.ipINKTOAJsG/b.5207559/k.3E23/Childrens_Hospital_Los_Angeles_LA82_17s_first_and_largest_hospital_dedicated_specifically_to_treating_children_throughout_Southern_California.htm

MISSEY, Inc., <http://missey.org/>

My Life My Choice, <http://www.jri.org/services/behavioral-health-and-trauma-services/community-based-behavioral-health-services/my-life-my-choice>

Roxbury Youth Services-GIFT Program, <http://www.roxburyyouthworks.org/pages/giftprogram.html>

SAGE, <http://www.sagesf.org/>

The Child Advocacy Center-SEEN Program, <http://www.suffolkcac.org/programs/seen/>

The Genesis Project, <http://gpseattle.net/>

The Georgia Care Connection, www.georgiacareconnection.org

The Mary Magdalene Project, <http://mmp.org/>

The Salvation Army-Chicago, <http://www.salarmychicago.org/>

West Coast Children's Clinic, <http://westcoastcc.org/>

YMCA of Houston, www.ymcahouston.org

Young Women's Development Center, <http://cywd.org/>

Emergency Shelter and Housing Programs for Sexually Exploited Youth:

Children of the Night, <http://www.childrenofthenight.org>

Freedom Place, <http://www.freedomplaceus.org/>

GEMS

Kristi's House, <http://www.kristihouse.org/>

Janus Youth Services, www.janusyouth.org

The Genesis Project

Wellspring Living, <http://wellspringliving.org/>

YouthCare, www.youthcare.org

Residential Treatment/Government Placement Facilities:

Crittenton, <http://crittentonsocal.org/>

Forest Ridge, <http://www.yfrs.org/>

Law Enforcement, Court System, Child Welfare System and Government Programs:

Alameda County H.E.A.T. Program, <http://www.heat-watch.org/>

Broward County Juvenile Corrections, <http://www.djj.state.fl.us/programs-facilities>

Cook County District Attorney's Office, <http://www.statesattorney.org/victimservices.html>

Dallas Police Department-High Risk Victims Unit, <http://www.dallaspolice.net/>

Harris County Juvenile Corrections-GIRLS Court, <http://www.ccl.hctx.net/>

King County Attorney's Office, <http://www.kingcounty.gov/Prosecutor.aspx>

L.A. County STAR Court, www.lasuperiorcourt.org

Letot-Dallas County Juvenile Corrections,
<http://www.dallascounty.org/department/juvenile/letotcenter.php>

Multnomah County Department of Community Justice, <http://web.multco.us/dcj>

Seattle Police Department, <http://www.seattle.gov/police/>

State of Connecticut-Department of Children & Families-Anti Trafficking Response Team,
<http://www.ct.gov/dcf/site/default.asp>

State of California-Department of Children & Family Services, <http://dcfs.co.la.ca.us/>

State of Florida-Department of Children & Families, <http://www.myflorida.com/accessflorida/>

State of Georgia-Governor's Office on Children and Families,
<http://children.georgia.gov/>

Runaway and Homeless Youth Service Providers:

Children & Family Services of New Hampshire, <http://www.cfsnh.org/>

Covenant House California, <http://www.covenanthouse.org/homeless-charity/california>

Covenant House Florida, <http://www.covenanthousefl.org/>

Covenant House Texas, www.covenanthousetx.org

Covenant House, Washington D.C., <http://www.covenanthousedc.org/>

Janus Youth Services

L.A. Gay & Lesbian Center, http://www.lagaycenter.org/site/PageServer?pagename=YW_Youth_Services

L.A. Youth Network, http://hhyp.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/LAYN-Logo_bw12.jpg

Larkin Street, www.larkinstreetyouth.org

Los Angeles Children's Hospital,
http://www.chla.org/site/c.ipINKTOAJsG/b.4452451/k.9734/HighRisk_Youth.htm#.Unxd_KjnbmQ

Stand Up 4 Kids, <http://standupforkidsmiami.blogspot.com/>

My Friend's Place, <http://myfriendsplace.org/>

New Pathways Emergency Shelter Program, Brookline Community Mental Health Services, http://www.brooklinecenter.org/residential_programs

Teen Living Program, <http://www.teenliving.org/3.0/home.html>

The Bridge Over Troubled Water, <http://bridgeotw.org/about-bridge.html>

The Hollywood Homeless Youth Partnership, <http://hhyp.org/>

The Miami Bridge, <http://www.miamibridge.org/home.html>

Vermont Coalition of Runaway and Homeless Youth Services, <http://vcrhyp.org/>

YouthCare

Reports and Studies Produced by the Agencies that received Site Visits

Children At Risk, 83rd Texas Legislature: Report on Human Trafficking Legislation. August 2013.

Children at Risk, *The Texas Safe House Movement: An Examination of Restorative Shelter Core Components and Recommendations*. Texas Bar Foundation. www.childrenatrisk.org

Clawson, H. & Goldblatt Grace, L. *Finding a Path to Recovery: Residential Facilities for Minor Victims of Sex Trafficking*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation. 2007 <http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/07/HumanTrafficking/>

Department of Children & Families Northeast Region, *Children to Be Located Best Practice Guide*. September 2008.

Finklea, K.; Fernandes-Alcantara, A.; Siskin, A. *Sex Trafficking of Children in the United States: Overview and Issues for Congress*. Congressional Research Service, www.crs.gov

Larkin Street, *Youth Homelessness in San Francisco: 2011 Report on Incidence and Needs*. www.larkinstreetyouth.org

Lissone, M. *In From the Night*. Privilege: Celebrating Philanthropy. October 2005.

Minnesota Department of Public Safety-Office of Justice Programs, *No Wrong Door: A Comprehensive Approach to Safe Harbor for Minnesota's Sexually Exploited Youth*. January 2013. [https://dps.mn.gov/divisions/ojp/forms-documents/Documents/!2012%20Safe%20Harbor%20Report%20\(FINAL\).pdf](https://dps.mn.gov/divisions/ojp/forms-documents/Documents/!2012%20Safe%20Harbor%20Report%20(FINAL).pdf)

Piening, S. & Cross, T. *From "The Life" to My Life: Sexually Exploited Children Reclaiming their Futures, Suffolk County Massachusetts' Response to Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC)*. The Children's Advocacy Center of Suffolk County. 2012. www.suffolkcac.org

Schneir, A.; Stefanidis, N.; Mounier, C.; Ballin, D.; Gailey, D.; Carmicheal, H. and Battle, T. *Culture and Trauma Brief: Trauma Among Homeless Youth*. The National Child Traumatic Stress Network, V2 n1 2007.

The Hollywood Homeless Youth Partnership, *10 Reasons for Integrating Trauma Informed Approaches in Programs for Runaway and Homeless Youth*. www.hhyp.org

The Hollywood Homeless Youth Partnership, *A Guide to Suicide Assessment and Prevention for Youth Experiencing Homelessness*.

The Hollywood Homeless Youth Partnership, *No Way Home: Understanding the Needs and Experiences of Homeless Youth in Hollywood*. November 2010.

The Hollywood Homeless Youth Partnership, *Psychological First Aid for Youth Experiencing Homelessness*.

The Hollywood Homeless Youth Partnership, *The ARC (Attachment, Self-Regulation, Competency) Framework for Runaway and Homeless Youth Serving Agencies*.

The Hollywood Homeless Youth Partnership, *Trauma Informed Consequences for Homeless Youth*.

The Polaris Project, *New Jersey State Report State Ratings 2012*. www.polarisproject.org

The Salvation Army, *Overview of Efforts to Abolish Human Trafficking*.
www.salvationarmyusa.org/trafficking

West Coast Children's Clinic. *Research to Action: Sexually Exploited Minors (SEM) Needs and Strengths*. 2012 www.westcoastcc.org



