



Sex Trafficking of Children in the United States: Overview and Issues for Congress

Kristin M. Finklea

Analyst in Domestic Security

Adrienne L. Fernandes-Alcantara

Specialist in Social Policy

Alison Siskin

Specialist in Immigration Policy

June 21, 2011

Congressional Research Service

7-5700

www.crs.gov

R41878

CRS Report for Congress

Prepared for Members and Committees of Congress

Summary

The trafficking of individuals within U.S. borders is commonly referred to as domestic human trafficking, and it occurs in every state of the nation. One form of domestic human trafficking is sex trafficking. Research indicates that most victims of sex trafficking into and within the United States are women and children, and the victims include U.S. citizens and noncitizens alike. Recently, Congress has focused attention on domestic sex trafficking, including the prostitution of children—which is the focus of this report.

Federal law does not define sex trafficking *per se*. However, the term “severe forms of trafficking in persons,” as defined in the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (TVPA, P.L. 106-386) encompasses sex trafficking. “Severe forms of trafficking in persons” refers, in part, to “[s]ex trafficking in which a commercial sex act is induced by force, fraud, or coercion, or in which the person induced to perform such act has not attained 18 years of age....” Experts generally agree that the trafficking term applies to minors whether the child’s actions were forced or appear to be voluntary.

The exact number of child victims of sex trafficking in the United States is unknown because comprehensive research and scientific data are lacking. Sex trafficking of children appears to be fueled by a variety of environmental and situational variables ranging from poverty or the use of prostitution by runaway and “thrown-away” children to provide for their subsistence needs to the recruitment of children by organized crime units for prostitution.

The TVPA has been the primary vehicle authorizing services to victims of trafficking. Several agencies have programs or administer grants to other entities to provide specific services to trafficking victims. Despite language that authorizes services for citizen, lawful permanent resident, and noncitizen victims, appropriations for trafficking victims’ services have primarily been used to serve noncitizen victims. U.S. citizen victims are also eligible for certain crime victim benefits and public benefit entitlement programs, though these services are not tailored to trafficking victims. Of note, specialized services and support for minor victims of sex trafficking are limited. Nationwide, organizations specializing in support for these victims collectively have fewer than 50 beds. Other facilities, such as runaway and homeless youth shelters and foster care homes, may not be able to adequately meet the needs of victims or keep them from pimps/traffickers and other abusers.

In addition, it has been suggested that minor victims of sex trafficking—while too young to consent to sexual activity with adults—may at times be labeled as prostitutes or juvenile delinquents and treated as criminals rather than being identified and treated as trafficking victims. These children who are arrested may be placed in juvenile detention facilities instead of environments where they can receive needed social and protective services.

Finally, experts widely agree that any efforts to reduce the prevalence of child sex trafficking—as well as other forms of trafficking—should address not only the supply, but also the *demand*. Congress may consider demand reduction strategies such as increasing public awareness and prevention as well as bolstering investigations and prosecutions of those who buy illegal commercial sex (“johns”). In addition, policy makers may deliberate enhancing services for victims of trafficking. The 112th Congress may address these and other issues if policy makers choose to take up the reauthorization of the TVPA, which expires at the end of FY2011.

Contents

Overview of Sex Trafficking of Children in the United States	1
Conceptualizing Sex Trafficking of Children	5
Sex Trafficking of Children: Vulnerable Populations	6
Traffickers and Buyers	7
Current Law	8
Federal Response to Sex Trafficking of Children	8
Investigations of Child Sex Trafficking Offenses	14
Department of Justice (DOJ)	16
Department of Homeland Security (DHS)	18
Human Smuggling and Trafficking Center	18
Services for Child Victims of Sex Trafficking	18
Selected Issues	21
Funding and Authority to Assist U.S. Citizen and LPR Victims of Trafficking	21
Resources for Trafficking Victims' Services	23
Lack of Adequate Shelter and Services	24
Limited Response by Child Protective Services (CPS)	26
Trafficking Victims Treated as Criminals or Delinquents	28
Reducing Demand for Minor Sex Trafficking in the United States	30
Data on Victims and Perpetrators	31

Tables

Table 1. Programs Authorized by the Trafficking Victims Protection Act, as Amended, That Could Address Sex Trafficking of Children within the United States	10
Table A-1. Number of Suspected Child Sex Trafficking Victims in Selected Locations	34

Appendixes

Appendix A. Selected Studies Measuring Sex Trafficking of Children	32
Appendix B. Trafficking Victim Services for Noncitizens	36
Appendix C. Other Possible Federal Responses to Sex Trafficking of Minors	40

Contacts

Author Contact Information	43
----------------------------------	----

Overview of Sex Trafficking of Children in the United States

Human trafficking involves the exploitation of individuals for forced labor or commercial sex. The trafficking of individuals within U.S. borders is commonly referred to as domestic human trafficking, and it occurs in every state in the nation.¹ Of those individuals who are victims of sex trafficking, research indicates that most victims coming into and within the United States are women and children, and the victims include U.S. citizens and noncitizens alike. This report focuses on the sex trafficking of children in the United States.

The investigation and prosecution of human trafficking has often been carried out by the states, and the majority of states outlaw human trafficking, including sex trafficking in children.² Congress has focused recent attention on domestic sex trafficking of children, which includes commercial sex acts involving children under the age of 18.³ Under the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (TVPA), the primary law that addresses trafficking, sex trafficking of children is a federal crime—even if a child is not removed from his or her community.⁴ Further, regardless of whether a child is believed to have consented to sex or whether the child represents himself/herself as an adult,⁵ the child is considered a trafficking victim under federal law.

The exact number of child victims of sex trafficking in the United States is unknown because comprehensive research and scientific data are lacking.⁶ According to the State Department's 2010 *Trafficking in Persons (TIP) Report*, more U.S. citizens—adults and children alike—are victims of sex trafficking than labor trafficking, and U.S. citizen child victims are often runaway

¹ For more information about trafficking generally, see U.S. Department of State, *Trafficking in Persons Report*, June 2010. See also CRS Report RL34317, *Trafficking in Persons: U.S. Policy and Issues for Congress*, by Alison Siskin and Liana Sun Wylar.

² See, for example, Ala. Code §13A-6-152; Ala. Code §13A-6-151(7); Alaska Stat. §§11-41-360 to 11-41-370; Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. §13-1307; Ark. Code Ann. §5-11-108; and Cal. Penal Code §§236.1 to 237.

³ In the 112th Congress, legislation on sex trafficking of minors in the United States (e.g., S. 596) has been introduced. Also, the Senate held a March 16, 2011, briefing on “Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking.” In the 111th Congress, policy makers convened briefings and hearings on the topic, including a December 14, 2009, Senate briefing and panel, “Understanding Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking Issues”; a February 16, 2010, House Human Trafficking Caucus briefing, “Child Sex Trafficking in America”; a February 24, 2010, hearing, “Child Prostitution and Sex Trafficking,” for the Senate Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on Human Rights and the Law; and a September 15, 2010, hearing, “Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking,” for the House Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security. In addition, two bills (H.R. 5575 and S. 2925) were introduced to address the topic.

⁴ P.L. 106-386. This act is also called the Trafficking Victims Protection Act. The TVPA is codified under 22 U.S.C. §7101 et seq., 42 U.S.C. §14044 et seq., and 18 U.S.C. §1591 et seq. (the criminal statute pertaining to sex trafficking of children). Of note, sex trafficking may encompass a range of activities including prostitution, pornography, and stripping. However, for purposes of this report, sex trafficking is discussed primarily in terms of prostitution. Further, federal agencies have recently discussed sex trafficking in the context of the prostitution of children. For instance, see U.S. Department of Justice, *The National Strategy for Child Exploitation Prevention and Interdiction: A Report to Congress*, August 2010, pp. 34-35, <http://www.justice.gov/ag/annualreports/tr2009/agreporhumantrafficking2009.pdf>. (Hereinafter, U.S. Department of Justice, *The National Strategy for Child Exploitation Prevention and Interdiction*.)

⁵ The law provides that in prosecutions involving a child victim, the government is not required to prove that the defendant knew that the person was under the age of 18. See 18 U.S.C. §1591(c).

⁶ U.S. Department of Justice, Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section, *Child Prostitution: Domestic Sex Trafficking of Minors*, <http://www.justice.gov/criminal/ceos/prostitution.html>.

and homeless youth.⁷ One snapshot of the child victim population, albeit incomplete, comes from the Department of Justice (DOJ)-funded Human Trafficking Reporting System (HTRS). Data in the HTRS come from investigations opened by federally funded human trafficking task forces, and do not represent all incidences of human trafficking nationwide. In January 2008, the task forces began entering data into HTRS. Between January 1, 2008, and June 1, 2010, the task forces opened 2,515 investigations of human trafficking; 82% of these were classified as sex trafficking.⁸ Of these sex trafficking cases, 83% involved U.S. citizen victims and 40% involved prostitution or sexual exploitation of a child.

Demand for prostitution (and other forms of commercial sexual exploitation) of children is steady, and profit to sex traffickers, or pimps, has increased.⁹ Together, these factors have helped fuel sex trafficking of children. Pimps/traffickers prey on vulnerable youth (primarily girls) and groom their victims to enter “the life” of prostitution.¹⁰ They manipulate and abuse—physically, mentally, and emotionally—their victims to maintain control. Additionally, technological advances such as cellular telephones and the Internet have facilitated the demand for child sex trafficking. These technologies can rapidly connect buyers of commercial sex with trafficking victims while simultaneously distancing the perpetrator from the criminal transactions.¹¹ The individuals who purchase sexual services from pimps/traffickers are known as clients or “johns.” The johns may or may not be aware that the individuals with whom they are engaging in sex are children or trafficking victims.

Commercial sexual exploitation of children appears to be fueled by a variety of environmental and situational variables. The scholarly literature has identified those factors as including

- the use of prostitution by runaway and “thrown-away”¹² children to provide for their subsistence needs;

⁷ U.S. Department of State, *Trafficking Persons Report*, 10th Edition, June 2010, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/142979.pdf>. Conversely, noncitizens are more likely to be victims of labor trafficking.

⁸ Duren Banks and Tracey Kyckelhahn, *Characteristics of Suspected Human Trafficking Incidents, 2008-2010*, Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report, Washington, DC, April 2011, <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/cshti0810.pdf>. Subject to appropriations, the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-164 §201) required the Attorney General to use available data to perform a comprehensive analysis of the incidence of sex trafficking and unlawful commercial sex acts within the United States. In response to this requirement, DOJ funded the creation of the HTRS.

⁹ U.S. Department of Justice, *The National Strategy for Child Exploitation Prevention and Interdiction*, pp. 32-33, <http://www.justice.gov/ag/annualreports/tr2009/agreporhumantrafficking2009.pdf>. For the purposes of this report, the terms “pimp” and “trafficker” are used interchangeably when referring to the sex trafficking of minors.

¹⁰ Richard J. Estes and Neil Alan Weiner, *Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children in the U.S., Canada and Mexico*, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, September 19, 2001 (revised February 20, 2002), p. 16. (Hereinafter, Estes and Weiner, *Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children in the U.S., Canada and Mexico*.) Still, boys appear to be just as likely to be victims of sex trafficking, even if they are not under the control of a pimp. See Taya Moxley-Goldsmith, “Boys in the Basement: Male Victims of Commercial Sexual Exploitation,” *Update*, vol. 2, no. 1, U.S. District Attorneys Association, American Prosecutors Research Institute, 2005. Traffickers may be part of a criminal network or ring or they may operate independently. They can be strangers, acquaintances, or family members.

¹¹ U.S. Department of Justice, *The National Strategy for Child Exploitation Prevention and Interdiction*. See also Shared Hope International, *DEMAND. A Comparative Examination of Sex Tourism and Trafficking in Jamaica, Japan, the Netherlands, and the United States*, Arlington, VA, July 2007. (Hereinafter, Shared Hope International, *DEMAND. A Comparative Examination of Sex Tourism and Trafficking in Jamaica, Japan, the Netherlands, and the United States*.) Note: The Shared Hope report was supported by a grant from the Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons. Shared Hope is a nonprofit advocacy and policy organization founded by former Congresswoman Linda Smith.

¹² A “thrown-away” child is a child who is asked or told to leave home by a parent or other adult in a household, no (continued...)

- the presence of pre-existing adult prostitution markets in the communities where large numbers of street youth are concentrated;
- prior history of child sexual abuse and child sexual assault;
- poverty;
- the presence of large numbers of unattached and transient males in communities—including military personnel, truckers, conventioners, and sex tourists, among others;
- for some girls, membership in gangs;
- the promotion of juvenile prostitution by parents, older siblings, and boyfriends;
- the recruitment of children by organized crime units for prostitution; and
- the illegal trafficking of children for sexual purposes to the United States from developing countries.¹³

Notably, studies have found that sex trafficking (and commercial sexual exploitation) is supply-driven as well as demand-driven.¹⁴ However, federal legislation has focused more extensively on penalizing the pimps/traffickers and has placed less emphasis on the buyers of commercial sex. Experts generally agree that any efforts to reduce the prevalence of sex trafficking—as well as other forms of trafficking—should address not only the supply, but also the demand.¹⁵

The TVPA, most recently amended and reauthorized in 2008, has been the primary legislative vehicle authorizing services to victims of trafficking. The TVPA historically focused on providing shelter and support services to victims within the United States—particularly noncitizens.¹⁶ This may have been, in part, because noncitizens were not eligible for those services—including healthcare, housing, education, and legal assistance—to which U.S. citizen and lawful permanent residents (LPR) victims had access.¹⁷ U.S. citizen victims are eligible for certain crime victim benefits and public benefit entitlement programs, though these services are not tailored to

(...continued)

adequate alternative care is arranged for the child, and the child is out of the household overnight; or a child who has run away and is prevented from returning home. Heather Hammer, David Finkelhor, and Andrea J. Sedlak, “Runaway/Thrownaway Children: National Estimates and Characteristics,” U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, OJJDP NISMART Bulletin, October 2002, http://www.missingkids.com/en_US/documents/nismart2_runaway.pdf.

¹³ Estes and Weiner, *Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children in the U.S., Canada and Mexico*, p. 1.

¹⁴ Polaris Project, *Why Trafficking Exists*, <http://www.polarisproject.org/human-trafficking/overview/why-trafficking-exists>. The Polaris Project is a nonprofit organization that works on human trafficking issues. See also Shared Hope International, *DEMAND. A Comparative Examination of Sex Tourism and Trafficking in Jamaica, Japan, the Netherlands, and the United States*.

¹⁵ Ibid. See also Iris Yen, “Of Vice and Men: A New Approach to Eradicating Sex Trafficking by Reducing Male Demand Through Educational Programs and Abolitionist Legislation,” *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, vol. 98, no. 2 (Winter 2008).

¹⁶ For more information on the history of the TVPA, see CRS Report RL34317, *Trafficking in Persons: U.S. Policy and Issues for Congress*, by Alison Siskin and Liana Sun Wyler. Services authorized by the TVPA are available to victims of both labor and sex trafficking.

¹⁷ H.Rept. 106-487 to accompany H.R. 3244 outlined these services as necessary for the “safe reintegration of domestic trafficking victims into the larger society.”

trafficking victims. Further, “there is currently little data to assess the extent to which U.S. citizen trafficking victims are accessing the benefits for which they are eligible.”¹⁸

Since its enactment in 2000, the TVPA has been reauthorized three times—in 2003 (P.L. 108-193), 2006 (P.L. 109-164), and 2008 (P.L. 110-457). Through reauthorizations in 2006 and 2008, Congress increased focus on U.S. citizen and LPR victims and authorized services specifically to address sex trafficking of children within the United States. In addition, Congress requested a report, through P.L. 110-457, detailing any differences in services provided to noncitizens and citizens.

In practice, services authorized through the TVPA for trafficking victims, which are provided primarily by the Departments of Justice (DOJ) and Health and Human Services (HHS), continue to aid primarily the noncitizen victim population.¹⁹ This may be a result of several factors. For one, while Congress has expanded authorized funding to include victim services for trafficking victims in the United States—irrespective of immigration status—appropriations for trafficking victims services have simultaneously remained relatively stable since the TVPA passed in 2000. In other words, Congress has not appropriated additional funds for services that target a broader spectrum of victims that have been subsequently authorized.²⁰ Further, appropriations have not specified which services should be funded, and program funding has been an administrative decision within DOJ and HHS. Exploring the adequacy of victim services for *all* victims of sex trafficking in the United States may be of interest for Congress if policy makers choose to take up the reauthorization of the TVPA, which expires at the end of FY2011.

Another issue Congress may consider is the lack of specialized support for minor victims of sex trafficking in the United States. Organizations in the United States that specialize in serving child victims of prostitution and other forms of sex trafficking collectively have fewer than 50 beds.²¹ Other facilities, such as runaway and homeless youth shelters as well as foster care homes, do not appear to be adequate for meeting the needs of victims or keeping them secure from pimps/traffickers and other abusers.²² Further, victims of trafficking may come to the attention of child protective services (CPS), but CPS may not be able to adequately respond to the needs of sex trafficking victims if workers are not knowledgeable about human trafficking, the trafficking

¹⁸ U.S. Department of Justice, *Attorney General’s Annual Report to Congress on U.S. Government Activities to Combat Trafficking in Persons: Fiscal Year 2009*, p. 17, <http://www.justice.gov/ag/annualreports/tr2009/agreporhumantrafficking2009.pdf>.

¹⁹ It appears that one program, DOJ Grants for Victim Services, has used funding specifically to serve U.S. citizen and LPR victims. See **Appendix B** for further information about services for noncitizen victims. See also CRS Report RL34317, *Trafficking in Persons: U.S. Policy and Issues for Congress*, by Alison Siskin and Liana Sun Wyler. Other federal programs provide services to certain vulnerable populations such as children who have run away and/or are sexually exploited. These programs, described in **Appendix C**, do not target minor victims of sex trafficking per se but serve a broad population.

²⁰ For funding information, see CRS Report RL34317, *Trafficking in Persons: U.S. Policy and Issues for Congress*, by Alison Siskin and Liana Sun Wyler.

²¹ U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Human Rights and the Law, *Child Prostitution and Sex Trafficking*, testimony of Rachel Lloyd, Executive Director and Founder of Girls Educational & Mentoring Services (GEMS), 111th Cong., 2nd sess., February 24, 2010.

²² Heather J. Clawson and Lisa Goldblatt Grace, *Finding a Path to Recovery: Residential Facilities for Minor Victims of Domestic Sex Trafficking*, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, September 2007, <http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/07/humantrafficking/ResFac/ib.htm>. (Hereinafter, Clawson and Grace, *Finding a Path to Recovery: Residential Facilities for Minor Victims of Domestic Sex Trafficking*.)

laws, or how to handle cases involving child victims.²³ Child victims may also be arrested and placed in juvenile detention facilities because they are perceived to be responsible for prostitution (and other types of commercial sex acts) and/or because they often need protection from sex traffickers.²⁴

This report provides an overview of sex trafficking of children in the United States. It first conceptualizes the issue, discussing the victims and perpetrators involved. It then outlines the federal response to investigating and prosecuting perpetrators as well as providing services to victims. The report concludes with a discussion of select issues concerning the federal response to sex trafficking of minors in the United States.

Conceptualizing Sex Trafficking of Children

Federal law does not define sex trafficking per se. However, the term “severe forms of trafficking in persons,” as defined in the TVPA, includes sex trafficking. “Severe forms of trafficking in persons” refers to

(A) sex trafficking in which a commercial sex act is induced by force, fraud, or coercion, or in which the person induced to perform such act has not attained 18 years of age; or

(B) the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of a person for labor or services, through the use of force, fraud, or coercion for the purpose of subjection to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage, or slavery.²⁵

As part of this definition, a “commercial sex act” means “any sex act, on account of which anything of value is given to or received by any person.”²⁶ The commercial aspect of the sexual exploitation separates trafficking from other crimes such as molestation, sexual assault, and rape. There appears to be a consensus among experts that the prostitution of minors fits the definition of “severe forms of human trafficking.”²⁷ In the case of minors, there is general agreement in the United States and much of the international community that the trafficking term applies to children, regardless of whether the child’s actions are believed to be forced or voluntary.²⁸

²³ Loyola University Chicago, Center for the Human Rights of Children and the International Organization for Adolescents (IOFA), *Building Child Welfare Response to Child Trafficking*, 2011, http://www.luc.edu/chrc/pdfs/BCWR_Handbook_Final1_for_posting_1.pdf (hereinafter, Loyola University Chicago, Center for the Human Rights of Children and the International Organization for Adolescents (IOFA), *Building Child Welfare Response to Child Trafficking*).

²⁴ Clawson and Grace, *Finding a Path to Recovery: Residential Facilities for Minor Victims of Domestic Sex Trafficking*.

²⁵ Sec. 103(8) of Div. A of P.L. 106-386, Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000; approved October 28, 2000; 22 U.S.C. §7102. The remainder of the definition section relates to labor trafficking.

²⁶ Examples include money, drugs, shelter, and food. P.L. 106-386, §103(3); 22 U.S.C. §7102. The money or item of value given for the sex act does not need to be received by the child (i.e., can be received by a pimp/trafficker).

²⁷ Child pornography for profit and stripping also fall under the definition of severe forms of trafficking.

²⁸ Smith, Vardaman, and Snow, “The National Report on Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking: America’s Prostituted Children,” p. iv.

Sex Trafficking of Children: Vulnerable Populations

As mentioned, the exact number of children who are victims of sex trafficking does not exist because comprehensive research is lacking. However, several studies have attempted to measure the extent of the problem.²⁹ Notably, the studies are not comparable, do not measure the same populations, and do not use consistent terminology.³⁰ For a discussion of studies that aim to evaluate the scope of the commercial sexual exploitation and prostitution of children, see **Appendix A**.

Runaways are particularly vulnerable to becoming victims of sex trafficking. A federally funded study found that approximately 1.7 million youth had run away from home or were forced to leave their homes at some point in 1999.³¹ While away from home, an estimated 38,600 (2.2%) of these youth were sexually assaulted, were in the company of someone known to be sexually abusive, or were engaged in sexual activity in exchange for money, drugs, food, or shelter. Runaways may be perceived as easy targets for pimps/traffickers because they often cannot go home and have few resources. One study involving a nationally representative sample of shelter youth and interviews of street youth in multiple cities indicated that approximately 28% of street youth and 10% of youth in shelters reported selling sex to generate money for basic needs (often referred to as survival sex).³² Those youth under the age of 18 would be considered victims of sex trafficking if they had sex with an adult in exchange for basic provisions. The study also pointed out that the odds of engaging in survival sex increased for youth who had been victimized (emotionally or physically),³³ had participated in criminal behavior, had a history of substance abuse, had attempted suicide, had a sexually transmitted disease (STD), or had been pregnant.

The Dallas Police Department also found a strong correlation between sex trafficking and runaway status: the more times a child runs away, the greater the likelihood that he or she will be

²⁹ The U.S. Department of State *Trafficking in Persons Report* (June 2010) states that “[d]espite the mandates of the 2005 and 2008 amendments to the TVPA, uniform data collection for trafficking crimes or number of victims among federal, state and local law enforcement agencies did not occur....” P.L. 109-164 (§201) requires biennial reporting on human trafficking, using available data from state and local authorities. As previously mentioned, in response to this requirement, DOJ funded the creation of the Human Trafficking Reporting System (HTRS).

³⁰ Some have argued that the lack of reliable estimates is the result of (1) the hidden nature of the problem, (2) the questionable methodologies of the studies, and (3) the lack of sufficient attention to the issue. Michelle Stransky and David Finkelhor, *How Many Juveniles are Involved in Prostitution in the U.S.?*, Crimes Against Children Research Center, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH, 2008, http://www.unh.edu/ccrc/prostitution/Juvenile_Prostitution_factsheet.pdf. (Hereinafter, Stransky and Finkelhor, *How Many Juveniles are Involved in Prostitution in the U.S.?*)

³¹ Heather Hammer, David Finkelhor, and Andrea J. Sedlak, “Runaway/Throwaway Children: National Estimates and Characteristics,” U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, OJJDP NISMART Bulletin, October 2002, http://www.missingkids.com/en_US/documents/nismart2_runaway.pdf. These are the most recent survey data available. For purposes of this study, a runaway episode is one that meets any one of the following criteria: a child leaves home without permission and stays away overnight; a child 14 years old or younger (or older and mentally incompetent), who is away from home, chooses not to come home when expected to and stays away overnight; and a child 15 years old or older who is away from home, chooses not to come home, and stays away two nights. Nearly all (99%) of the children returned home, and most (58%) did so within one week.

³² Jody M. Greene, Susan T. Ennett, and Christopher Ringwalt, “Prevalence and Correlates of Survival Sex Among Runaway and Homeless Youth,” *American Journal of Public Health*, vol. 89, no. 9 (September 1999), p. 1406. These youth were ages 12 to 21 and spent at least one night in the previous year in a youth or adult shelter, an improvised shelter, or with a stranger. Youth under age 18 who had spent one night in the past year away from home without the permission of their parents or legal guardians were also sampled.

³³ This includes having been victims of assault or robbery.

victimized.³⁴ The department also found that other risk factors among child trafficking victims include their young ages, whether they had previously been sexually exploited, and whether they had previously been victims of prostitution. Other research, including studies examining the histories of prostitutes in Boston, Chicago, and San Francisco, has found that the majority of prostituted women were runaways.³⁵

According to a study funded by HHS, between 21% and 42% of runaway and homeless youth were victims of sexual abuse before they left their homes.³⁶ In the general youth population, this prevalence is 1% to 3%. The Letot Center, a juvenile justice facility in Dallas that cares for youth victims, has indicated that about nine out of 10 youth in the Center had previously been physically or sexually abused. Further, 10% of the youth had previously been involved with child protective services (CPS).³⁷ In addition to runaway and homeless youth, foster youth may also fall prey to traffickers. According to anecdotal reports, it appears that traffickers target group homes and other settings where foster youth congregate.³⁸

Traffickers and Buyers

Victims of sex trafficking are exploited by pimps/traffickers who may operate alone or as part of a criminal network. In the United States, traffickers range from teenage boys, young men, and men and women who work for older male pimps to organized criminal syndicates operating both within and across state and national lines.³⁹ Pimps/traffickers profit by receiving cash or other benefits in exchange for the sexual use of an individual by another person. It is more profitable for a trafficker to prostitute a child than to commit other crimes such as dealing in drugs.⁴⁰ For one, the commodity (child) is reusable. In addition, technological innovation has allowed traffickers to reach a wider client base and connect more quickly with buyers. Of note, when referring to the trafficking of *minors*, the terms “pimp” and “trafficker” are synonymous. This does not necessarily hold true when referring to the trafficking of adults. In the context of adults, a pimp who does not use force, fraud, or coercion to induce adults to prostitute themselves would

³⁴ Smith, Vardaman, and Snow, *The National Report on Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking: America's Prostituted Children*, p. 34.

³⁵ Heather J. Clawson and Lisa Goldblatt Grace, *Human Trafficking Into and Within the United States: Review of the Literature*, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, August 2009, <http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/07/HumanTrafficking/LitRev/index.shtml>.

³⁶ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth, and Families, Commissioner's Office of Research & Evaluation and the Family and Youth Services Bureau, “Sexual Abuse Among Homeless Adolescents: Prevalence, Correlates, and Sequelae,” November 2002, http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/fys/sex_abuse/reports/sexabuse_hmless/sex_abuse_hmless.pdf. (Hereinafter, HHS, “Sexual Abuse Among Homeless Adolescents: Prevalence, Correlates, and Sequelae.”)

³⁷ Smith, Vardaman, and Snow, *The National Report on Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking: America's Prostituted Children*, p. 35.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ See Federal Bureau of Investigation press releases regarding domestic minor sex trafficking cases involving individual perpetrators (e.g., <http://atlanta.fbi.gov/dojpressrel/pressrel10/at042110.htm>) and perpetrators acting within criminal organizations (e.g., <http://newyork.fbi.gov/dojpressrel/pressrel10/nyfo042010.htm>). For more information on organized crime in the United States, see CRS Report R41547, *Organized Crime: An Evolving Challenge for U.S. Law Enforcement*, by Jerome P. Bjelopera and Kristin M. Finklea. See also Shared Hope International, *DEMAND: A Comparative Examination of Sex Tourism and Trafficking in Jamaica, Japan, the Netherlands, and the United States*, p. 4.

⁴⁰ U.S. Department of Justice, *The National Strategy for Child Exploitation Prevention and Interdiction*, p. 33.

not be considered a trafficker. However, this distinction is moot when the prostituted individuals are minors, with whom a pimp need not use force, fraud, or coercion to be considered a trafficker.⁴¹

There is no single profile of a buyer of commercial sex with a minor, making buyers particularly difficult to identify. Research has suggested that these predators are often encouraged by online solicitations, temptations, and exploitation.⁴² In addition to those actively seeking out sex with minors, some buyers may engage in sex with minors unknowingly. The perpetrators may assume that a prostituted individual is an adult. Alternatively, they may or may not inquire about the age of that individual and may still decide to engage in a sex act even if she or he is a minor.⁴³

Current Law

Before 2000, U.S. laws were widely believed to be inadequate for dealing with trafficking in women and children or for protecting and assisting victims. Anti-trafficking legislation and programs have since been implemented with the goal of improving the situation. The Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (TVPA, P.L. 106-386) was enacted on October 28, 2000. The TVPA sought to punish traffickers and provide support for victims within U.S. borders.

Congress reauthorized the TVPA in 2003 (P.L. 108-193), in 2006 (P.L. 109-164), and most recently in 2008 (P.L. 110-457). Of note, the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-164), signed into law on January 10, 2006, sought to address the special needs of child victims, as well as the plight of American victims trafficked within the United States. The act sought to remedy a perceived inequality between the services available to foreign and domestic victims by creating grant programs specifically to address the needs of U.S. citizen and LPR victims.⁴⁴ The William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (P.L. 110-457)⁴⁵ created a new grant program for U.S. citizen and LPR victims, and it required a study identifying any gaps between services provided to U.S. citizen and noncitizen victims of trafficking. According to the Department of Justice, the TVPA is considered the seminal piece of legislation in the fight against the commercial sexual exploitation of children.⁴⁶

Federal Response to Sex Trafficking of Children

The federal government investigates and prosecutes trafficking crimes and provides services to victims, including those who are sex trafficked. While the State Department's 2010 *Trafficking in*

⁴¹ Human Smuggling and Trafficking Center, *Domestic Human Trafficking—An Internal Issue*, December 2008, p. 5, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/113612.pdf>.

⁴² Smith, Vardaman, and Snow, *The National Report on Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking: America's Prostituted Children*, p. 17.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ See U.S. Congress, *Report to Accompany H.R. 972*, 109th Cong., 1st sess., November 18, 2005, H.Rept. 109-317, p. 11.

⁴⁵ P.L. 110-457 was signed into law on December 23, 2008.

⁴⁶ William Adams, Colleen Owens, and Kevonne Small, *Effects of Federal Legislation on the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children*, U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Washington, DC, July 2010, p. 1.

Persons Report indicates that the U.S. government is in full compliance with minimum standards to eliminate trafficking, it also notes that “government services for trafficked U.S. citizen children were not well coordinated; they were dispersed through existing child protection and juvenile justice structures.”⁴⁷ As such, the State Department has recommended increasing government efforts to identify and assist U.S. citizen victims.

As part of the response to punishing traffickers, the Departments of Justice (DOJ) and Homeland Security (DHS) have primary responsibility for investigating and prosecuting trafficking cases. Multiple federal statutes, including those enacted and amended by the TVPA, outlaw sex trafficking of minors and include penalties for individuals who are found guilty. The federal government also funds services for victims of trafficking. The TVPA, as amended, is the major federal legislation that authorizes these services, which are provided primarily by DOJ and the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). There has been confusion regarding whether U.S. citizen, LPR, and noncitizen victims are equally eligible to receive these services. In practice, these services tend to be targeted to aiding noncitizen victims.⁴⁸ However, it appears that one program, DOJ Grants for Victim Services, has used funding specifically to serve U.S. citizen and LPR minor victims of sex trafficking. **Table 1** summarizes programs authorized by the TVPA to combat and respond to trafficking of children in the United States. The majority of programs appear to be able to address the trafficking of U.S. citizen, LPR, and noncitizen victims alike. The programs include grants to law enforcement for investigations and prosecutions as well as to social services and other providers of victims’ services. Only selected programs, including DOJ Grants for Victim Services and HHS’ Victims’ Assistance program, have actually been funded. While both of these programs have served noncitizen victims, only the DOJ Grants for Victim Services—and only in FY2009—has used money to serve U.S. citizen and LPR victims.

⁴⁷ U.S. Department of State, *Trafficking Persons Report*, 10th Edition, June 2010, p. 338, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/142979.pdf>.

⁴⁸ See **Appendix B** for further information about services for noncitizen victims. See also CRS Report RL34317, *Trafficking in Persons: U.S. Policy and Issues for Congress*, by Alison Siskin and Liana Sun Wyler. Other federal programs provide services to certain vulnerable populations such as children who have run away and/or are sexually exploited. These programs, described in **Appendix C**, do not target youth victims of sex trafficking per se.

Table I. Programs Authorized by the Trafficking Victims Protection Act, as Amended, That Could Address Sex Trafficking of Children within the United States

Agency, Program, and Authorizing Statute	Description	Authorization of Appropriations	Appropriations for FY2011 (P.L. 112-10) ^a	Population Served (Directly or Indirectly)
Grants for Law Enforcement				
Department of Justice (DOJ): Grants to State and Local Law Enforcement for Anti-trafficking Programs (P.L. 109-164, §204; 42 U.S.C. §14044c)	DOJ may award grants to state and local law enforcement for programs to investigate and prosecute the domestic trafficking of U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents (LPRs). Funds may also be used to investigate and prosecute those who purchase commercial sex and to educate those individuals who have been convicted of these and related offenses. Funds may be used to train law enforcement to work specifically with trafficking victims.	\$20.0 million for each of FY2008 through FY2011.	No funds appropriated.	U.S. citizen and LPR victims of trafficking.
DOJ: Grants for Law Enforcement Training Programs (P.L. 109-162 §111; 42 U.S.C. §14044f)	DOJ may award grants to state and local governments to assist law enforcement in identifying and protecting victims of trafficking. Funds may be used to train prosecutors to identify, investigate, or prosecute trafficking as well as to utilize and develop laws to prohibit trafficking.	\$10.0 million for each of FY2007 through FY2011.	No funds appropriated.	Victims of trafficking generally.

Agency, Program, and Authorizing Statute	Description	Authorization of Appropriations	Appropriations for FY2011 (P.L. 112-10) ^a	Population Served (Directly or Indirectly)
Grants for Victim Services				
DOJ: Grants for Victim Services (P.L. 106-386; 22 U.S.C. §7105(b)(2)(A)) ^c	DOJ may award grants to states, Indian tribes, local governments, and nonprofit, nongovernmental victims' services organizations to develop, expand, or strengthen service programs for victims of trafficking.	\$10.0 million for each of FY2008 through FY2011.	\$12.3 million	Victims of trafficking generally. ^b
DOJ and Department of Health and Human Services (HHS): Victims Assistance for U.S. Citizens and Lawful Permanent Residents (P.L. 110-457, §107); 22 U.S.C. §7105(f))	DOJ and HHS (in consultation with the Department of Labor) are to establish a grant program to assist U.S. citizens and LPRs who are victims of severe forms of trafficking. The program is to facilitate communication and coordination between assistance providers, provide a means to identify such providers, and provide a means to make referrals to programs for which victims are already eligible. HHS and DOJ may award grants to states, Indian tribes, local governments, and nonprofit, nongovernmental victims' services organizations.	\$2.5 million for FY2008, \$5.0 million for FY2009, \$7.0 million for FY2010, and \$7.0 million for FY0211 (for both DOJ and HHS).	No funds appropriated.	U.S. citizen and LPR victims of trafficking.
HHS: Victims' Assistance (P.L. 106-386, §107(b)(1); 22 U.S.C. §7105(b)) ^b	HHS is to expand benefits and services to certain victims of severe forms of trafficking in the United States. (The law also directs other federal agencies to expand services; however, Congress has not appropriated funds specifically for this purpose.)	\$12.5 million for each of FY2008 through FY2011; and additional amounts for each of these years: \$2.5 million for FY2008, \$5.0 million for FY2009, \$7.0 million for FY2010, and \$7.0 million for FY0211 (this funding is also available for other activities under 22 U.S.C. §7105(b), including certification and victim assistance to noncitizen victims).	\$9.6 million	Individuals under the age of 18 who are victims of trafficking or noncitizen adult victims who have been certified by HHS as eligible to receive services.

Agency, Program, and Authorizing Statute	Description	Authorization of Appropriations	Appropriations for FY2011 (P.L. 112-10) ^a	Population Served (Directly or Indirectly)
HHS: Grants to Assist U.S. Citizen or LPR Victims (P.L. 109-164, §202; 42 U.S.C. §14044a)	HHS may make grants to states, Indian tribes, local governments, and nonprofit, nongovernmental victims' services organizations for U.S. citizens or LPRs who are the subject of sex trafficking or severe forms of trafficking that occur, in whole, in the U.S. HHS is to give priority to applicants with experience in delivering services to victims of sexual abuse or commercial sexual exploitation and to applicants who would employ survivors of sexual abuse or commercial sexual exploitation.	\$8.0 million for each of FY2008 through FY2011.	No funds appropriated.	U.S. citizen and LPR victims of trafficking.
HHS: Pilot Program for Residential Treatment Facilities for Juveniles in the U.S. (P.L. 109-164, §203; 42 U.S.C. §14044b)	HHS is to establish and carry out a pilot program to establish residential treatment facilities in the U.S. for juveniles subject to trafficking. The program is to provide benefits and services to juveniles at facilities (and to assess the benefits and most efficient and cost-effective means of providing these facilities) that provide shelter, psychological counseling, and assistance in developing individual living skills; and to assess the need for and feasibility of establishing additional facilities. HHS is to provide grants to organizations that have relevant expertise in providing services to juveniles who have been subjected to sexual abuse or commercial sexual exploitation or have entered into partnerships with other organizations with this expertise.	\$5.0 million for each of FY2008 through FY2011.	No funds appropriated.	Individuals under the age of 18 who are victims of trafficking.

Source: Congressional Research Service.

- a. The Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 112-10) appropriated funding at the FY2010 level, with an across-the-board rescission of 0.2%.
- b. Funding appropriated to the department for trafficking has been used to carry out this program.
- c. Funding appropriated to the department for trafficking has been used to carry out this program. This program, Services for Domestic Minor Victims of Sex Trafficking, funds a grant for U.S. citizen and LPR victims of trafficking.

Investigations of Child Sex Trafficking Offenses⁴⁹

Investigations of human trafficking (including sex trafficking) are often complicated by language barriers and humanitarian issues (e.g., the victim has been traumatized and is unable to aid in the investigation), as well as logistical challenges and difficulties (e.g., transporting, housing, and processing the victims). Moreover, unlike drug trafficking cases where the contraband itself is proof of the illegal activity, the successful prosecution of trafficking in persons cases relies on the availability of witnesses who may refuse to testify for various reasons, including fear of retribution against themselves or their families.⁵⁰

As mentioned, the investigation and prosecution of child prostitution is most often a matter of state law. Every state outlaws the prostitution of children.⁵¹ The vast majority also outlaw human trafficking in terms sufficient to encompass sex trafficking in children.⁵² Within the federal government, DHS and DOJ have primary responsibility for investigating and prosecuting sex traffickers, including those who traffic children. The majority of the cases are investigated by agents in DHS's Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) or DOJ's Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), who coordinate as appropriate.⁵³ In addition, DOJ, through the Child Exploitation and Obscenities Section (CEOS), works with the U.S. Attorneys' Offices to prosecute individuals who violate federal laws relating not only to trafficking, but also to child pornography, child prostitution, obscenity, child sex tourism, and international parental kidnapping. CEOS prosecutes sex traffickers under the TVPA and other laws relating to child sexual exploitation. With specific respect to prosecuting the domestic sex trafficking of minors, perpetrators are often prosecuted for violations of the Mann Act,⁵⁴ the Racketeer Influenced and

⁴⁹ This section is based on information in the U.S. Department of State, *Trafficking in Persons Report*, June 2010; U.S. Department of Justice, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, U.S. Department of State, U.S. Department of Labor, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, and U.S. Agency of International Development, *Assessment of U.S. Government Efforts to Combat Trafficking in Persons*, September 2007; and U.S. Department of Justice, *Attorney General's Annual Report to Congress on U.S. Government Activities to Combat Trafficking in Persons: Fiscal Year 2009*.

⁵⁰ U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO), *Combating Alien Smuggling, Opportunities Exist to Improve the Federal Response*, GAO-05-305, May 2005, p. 10. (Hereinafter cited as GAO, *Combating Alien Smuggling, Opportunities Exist to Improve the Federal Response*.)

⁵¹ U.S. Department of State, *Trafficking in Persons Report*, June 2010.

⁵² For example, Ala. Code §13A-6-152 (“(a) A person commits the crime of human trafficking in the first degree if: (1) He or she knowingly subjects another person to ... sexual servitude through use of coercion or deception. (2) He or she knowingly obtains, recruits, entices, solicits, induces, threatens, isolates, harbors, holds, restrains, transports, provides, or maintains any minor for the purpose of causing a minor to engage in sexual servitude.... ”); Ala. Code §13A-6-151(7) (“Sexual servitude [is] ... any sexual conduct ... for which anything of value is directly or indirectly given, promised to, or received by any person, which conduct is induced or obtained by coercion or deception form a person.... ”); see also, Alaska Stat. §§11-41-360 to 11-41-370; Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. §13-1307; Ark. Code Ann. §5-11-108; Cal. Penal Code §§236.1 to 237.

⁵³ The division of responsibilities between these two agencies is not clearly delineated, which may lead to a lack of coordination between the agencies and possibly to some duplicative efforts. In addition, according to an ICE Office of Investigations (OI) official, the Border Patrol only has a minor role in alien smuggling and trafficking investigations and is required to coordinate with OI before initiating anti-smuggling investigations. U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Immigration Enforcement: DHS, GAO-05-66 Has Incorporated Immigration Enforcement Objectives and Is Addressing Future Planning Requirements (2004)*, p. 9.

⁵⁴ The Mann Act is codified at 18 U.S.C. § 2421 et seq. The Mann Act was enacted in 1910 to fight against forced prostitution. As currently written, the Mann Act makes it a felony to knowingly transport “an individual who has not attained the age of 18 years in interstate or foreign commerce, or in any Territory or Possession of the United States, with intent that such individual engage in prostitution, or in any sexual activity for which any person can be charged (continued...) ”

Corrupt Organization Act (RICO),⁵⁵ or the TVPA.⁵⁶ Specific statutes available to prosecute such crimes include, but are not limited to, the following:

- 18 U.S.C. §1591—Recruiting, enticing, or obtaining (including via force, fraud, or coercion) individuals to engage in commercial sex acts, or benefiting from such activities;
- 18 U.S.C. §2421—Transporting individuals across state or international lines for prostitution or other unlawful sexual activities;
- 18 U.S.C. §2422—Enticing or coercing an individual to cross a state or international line for prostitution or other unlawful sexual activities;
- 18 U.S.C. §2423—Transporting a minor across state or international lines for prostitution or other unlawful sexual activities;
- 18 U.S.C. §2424—Keeping an alien in a house or place of prostitution; and
- 18 U.S.C. §2241(c)—Engaging in interstate travel for sexual activities with a child under age 12, and sexual activities with a child under age 16.

Of these, only 18 U.S.C. §1591 is an anti-trafficking statute created in the TVPA. The provisions created in other federal laws often reference that the crime is prosecutable so long as the victim is brought across states lines; however, under the TVPA, victims do not have to be removed from their communities in order for the crime to be considered eligible for prosecution. Further, the majority of statutes used to prosecute trafficking offenses focus on prosecuting the traffickers, and not as much focus has been placed on prosecuting the clients or “johns.” Another difference between the prosecution of traffickers and the prosecution of buyers appears to be that traffickers can be prosecuted whether or not a victim is brought across state lines. On the other hand, federal statutes generally used to prosecute buyers appear to require that either the buyer crosses state lines or that she/he entices the victim to cross state lines. In short, there may be more flexibility and options for federal prosecutors to prosecute traffickers than to prosecute johns.

The following sections discuss efforts by DOJ and DHS to combat trafficking, including prostitution and other forms of child sex trafficking.

(...continued)

with a criminal offence.” The FBI investigates possible Mann Act violations and refers them to the U.S. Attorneys. CEOS supervises the prosecution of these cases. William Adams, Colleen Owens, and Kevonne Small, *Effects of Federal Legislation on the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children*, U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Washington, DC, July 2010, p. 3.

⁵⁵ RICO is codified at 18 U.S.C. §1961-1968 and is Title IX of the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-452). RICO allows for the prosecution of anyone who participates or conspires to participate in a criminal enterprise/organization through two acts of “racketeering activity” within a 10-year period of time. The predicate offenses for racketeering include various state and federal crimes listed in the U.S. Code. For more information on RICO, CRS Report 96-950, *RICO: A Brief Sketch*, by Charles Doyle.

⁵⁶ U.S. Department of Justice, *The National Strategy for Child Exploitation Prevention and Interdiction*, pp. 33-34.

Department of Justice (DOJ)

Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), Civil Rights Unit

The Civil Rights Unit (CRU) of the FBI is responsible for investigating cases of domestic minor sex trafficking as well as other trafficking offenses. The CRU coordinates with other FBI units, such as the Organized Crime and Crimes Against Children units to investigate these sex trafficking cases. In 2005, the FBI launched the Human Trafficking Initiative. This initiative employs the FBI field offices to use a threat assessment to determine the existence and scope of trafficking in their region, participate in an anti-trafficking task force (discussed below), and conduct investigations and report significant case developments to the CRU. According to the most recent data, in FY2009 the FBI opened 167 human trafficking cases, resulting in 93 convictions.⁵⁷ The data do not, however, identify the proportion of arrests that were made for violations related to minors or adults, the proportion of arrests for sex trafficking or labor trafficking, or the proportion of cases involving domestic or international victims. In FY2009, the FBI also reported rescuing 13 minor victims of trafficking and dismantling seven human trafficking organizations.⁵⁸

The FBI, along with the Child Exploitation and Obscenities Section of DOJ and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) (both discussed below), participates in the Innocence Lost Initiative, an initiative dedicated specifically to combating sex trafficking of minors within the United States. The FBI has established 39 Innocence Lost Task Forces around the country.⁵⁹ This has led to the conviction of 625 perpetrators as well as the rescue of 1,200 children.⁶⁰

Anti-Trafficking Task Forces

Through the Anti-Human Trafficking Task Force Initiative, DOJ (via the Bureau of Justice Assistance) funds 42 anti-trafficking task forces nationwide.⁶¹ These task forces are composed of federal, state, and local law enforcement investigators and prosecutors and NGO victims service providers. The task forces coordinate cases and conduct law enforcement training on the identification, investigation, and prosecution of human trafficking cases. Research has reportedly shown that locales with task forces are more likely to identify and prosecute trafficking cases.⁶²

⁵⁷ U.S. Department of Justice, *Attorney General's Annual Report to Congress on U.S. Government Activities to Combat Trafficking in Persons: Fiscal Year 2009*, pp. 41-43. The arrest, indictment, and conviction statistics are in trafficking cases. Not every arrest, indictment, or conviction is for a trafficking charge; rather, they occurred in a case opened based on an allegation of trafficking.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

⁶⁰ These data are current as of November 2010. For more information, see http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/investigate/vc_majorthefts/cac/innocencelost.

⁶¹ U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, *Report on the Tenth Anniversary of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act*, October 29, 2010, pp. 9-10, http://www.justice.gov/crt/about/crm/trafficking_newsletter/tvpaanniversaryreport.pdf. For more information on the Initiative, see <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/grant/http.html>.

⁶² The number of investigations and prosecutions among the task forces varies widely. More investigations are for sex trafficking than labor trafficking, which may be a result of law enforcement's ability to rely upon pre-existing vice units devoted to prosecution enforcement. U.S. Department of State, *Trafficking in Persons Report*, June 2010, p. 340.

Internet Crimes Against Children (ICAC) Task Force Program⁶³

The Internet Crimes Against Children (ICAC) Task Force program was first funded in 1998 to provide federal support for state and local law enforcement agencies to combat online enticement of children and the proliferation of pornography.⁶⁴ To date, 61 regional task forces have been created, each of which are comprised of multiple affiliated organizations (most of which are city and county law enforcement agencies).⁶⁵

In 2008, ICAC task forces processed 345 complaints related to child prostitution.⁶⁶ From 2004 through 2008, the number of child prostitution complaints that were processed increased by 914%. According to DOJ, this could be due to the increase in the number of ICAC task forces over this period. This increase could also be due to heightened awareness about child prostitution and the use of the Internet to facilitate child prostitution.

In FY2010, ICAC funding was awarded to four task forces to develop strategies to protect children from child prostitution and other forms of commercial sexual exploitation.⁶⁷ The funding was intended to (1) improve training and coordination activities; (2) develop policies and procedures to identify victims of commercial sexual exploitation; (3) investigate and prosecute cases against adults who sexually exploit children for commercial purposes; and (4) adopt best practices to intervene appropriately with and compassionately serve victims, including providing essential services in cases where technology is used to facilitate the child's exploitation. Grants will also be awarded in FY2011 for these same purposes.⁶⁸

⁶³ For more information on the task force program, see CRS Report RL34050, *Missing and Exploited Children: Background, Policies, and Issues*, by Adrienne L. Fernandes-Alcantara.

⁶⁴ The program was formally authorized by the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008 (P.L. 110-401). As outlined in the law, program purpose areas include (1) increasing investigative capabilities of state and local law enforcement officers in the detection, investigation, and apprehension of internet crimes against children offenses or offenders—including technology-facilitated child exploitation offenses; (2) conducting proactive and reactive internet crimes against children investigations; (3) providing training and technical assistance to ICAC task forces and other law enforcement agencies for investigations, forensics, prosecutions, community outreach, and capacity building, using recognized experts to assist in the development and delivery of training programs; (4) increasing investigations and prosecutions of internet crimes against children offenses; and (5) developing and delivering public awareness and prevention programs regarding internet crimes against children, among other purposes.

⁶⁵ U.S. Department of State, *Trafficking in Persons Report*, June 2010, p. 58.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. D-7.

⁶⁷ U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, *OJJDP FY2010 ICAC Program – Law Enforcement Strategies for Protecting Children from Commercial Sexual Exploitation*, <http://www.ojjdp.gov/grants/solicitations/FY2010/ICACCSEC.pdf>; and U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, *Office of Justice Programs Funding Resources*, <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/funding.htm>.

⁶⁸ U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, *OJJDP FY2011 ICAC Program – Law Enforcement Strategies for Protecting Children from Commercial Sexual Exploitation*, <http://www.ojjdp.gov/grants/solicitations/FY2011/LawEnforcement.pdf>.

Department of Homeland Security (DHS)

U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)

The Human Smuggling and Trafficking Unit (HSTU) in ICE is primarily responsible for sex trafficking investigations within DHS. HSTU coordinates with other units within ICE—such as the Cyber Crimes Center; the Law Enforcement Support Center; and the Financial, Narcotics, and Public Safety Division—and units in other agencies to combat this form of trafficking. In FY2009, ICE arrested 388 individuals for human trafficking offenses, more than double the 189 arrests in FY2008.⁶⁹ The data, however, do not distinguish the proportion of arrests for sex trafficking or labor trafficking, nor do they distinguish the proportion of cases involving domestic or international victims. They also do not distinguish the proportion of arrests that were made for violations related to minors or adults.

Human Smuggling and Trafficking Center

In July 2004, the Attorney General and the Secretaries of the Departments of State (DOS) and Homeland Security signed a charter to establish the Human Smuggling and Trafficking Center (HSTC). The Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Protection Act of 2004 (P.L. 108-458, §7202), signed into law on December 17, 2004, formalized the HSTC. The HSTC serves as the federal government's information clearinghouse and intelligence center for all federal agencies addressing human smuggling, human trafficking, and the potential use of smuggling routes by terrorists. It is unclear how much of the HSTC's resources are focused on minor victims of sex trafficking. While the HSTC is the information repository for matters including trafficking, there is no centralized database housing information on trafficking perpetrators, victims, outreach, and other matters—although Congress mandated the creation of such a database in the TVPA reauthorization of 2008.⁷⁰ In DOJ's 2010 report on the *National Strategy for Child Exploitation Prevention and Interdiction*, DOJ indicates that the creation of a database is currently underway.⁷¹

Services for Child Victims of Sex Trafficking

As referenced in **Table 1**, the TVPA, as amended, authorizes services (primarily through DOJ and HHS) to assist victims of trafficking within the United States. Some of these programs are aimed at child victims of trafficking, particularly sex trafficking.⁷² In practice, funds appropriated to HHS and DOJ for trafficking have been used to carry out those programs authorized under 22 U.S.C. §7105(b) and 22 U.S.C. §7105(b)(2). Under 22 U.S.C. §7105(b), it appears that HHS may provide assistance to two distinct categories of victims: (1) any victim under the age of 18 and (2)

⁶⁹ U.S. Department of Justice, *Attorney General's Annual Report to Congress on U.S. Government Activities to Combat Trafficking in Persons: Fiscal Year 2009*, pp. 43-44.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

⁷¹ U.S. Department of Justice, *The National Strategy for Child Exploitation Prevention and Interdiction: A Report to Congress*, August 2010, pp. 45-46, <http://www.justice.gov/ag/annualreports/tr2009/agreporhumantrafficking2009.pdf>. See also U.S. Department of Justice, *Attorney General's Annual Report to Congress on U.S. Government Activities to Combat Trafficking in Persons: Fiscal Year 2009*.

⁷² These statutes include 22 U.S.C. §7105(b), 22 U.S.C. §7105(f), 42 U.S.C. §14044a, 42 U.S.C. §14044b, 42 U.S.C. §14044c, and 42 U.S.C. §14044f.

any adult who HHS has certified⁷³ as a victim—a noncitizen adult victim.⁷⁴ The statute does not specify the citizenship of children. In practice, HHS provides services to noncitizen children. Although noncitizen trafficking victims under the age of 18 do not have to be certified to receive benefits and services, it is HHS policy to issue eligibility letters to such victims.

Because adult domestic victims do not go through the process of certification, there is some confusion over whether U.S. citizens are eligible for services provided by HHS and other federal agencies (including, as referenced under 22 U.S.C. §7105(b), the Department of Labor, the Legal Services Corporation, and other federal agencies). Adult U.S. citizen and LPR trafficking victims are not required to be certified by HHS, and indeed would not meet the criteria to be certified because certification applies only to foreign nationals who need an immigration status (e.g., T status or continued presence)⁷⁵ to remain in the United States. Nonetheless, a 2007 report by the Senior Policy Operating Group on Trafficking in Persons (SPOG) states, “there are not many differences in trafficking victims’ eligibility for the services we reviewed when one looks at the relevant statutes.” However, the report does note that U.S. citizen victims may have less intensive case management services compared to noncitizens.⁷⁶ In addition, only *noncitizen* trafficking victims are eligible for refugee-specific programs.⁷⁷

For services authorized under 22 U.S.C. §7105(b)(2), DOJ can use funds to provide services to “victims of trafficking,” which appears to include both citizens and noncitizens as well as both adults and minors. Of the money it has received to combat trafficking in persons, DOJ has targeted funds toward the Grants for Victim Services. These grants are used to provide emergency services to victims as soon as they have been identified, prior to certification by HHS (for more information, see **Appendix B**). Under the umbrella of this program, DOJ has used some funding to serve domestic minor victims of sex trafficking through a program called Services for Domestic Minor Victims of Human Trafficking.⁷⁸ In FY2009, DOJ’s Office for Victims of Crime awarded cooperative agreements, each for \$800,000, for a period of three years to three organizations that work with domestic minor victims of sex trafficking.⁷⁹ Three additional

⁷³ For more information on victim certification, see **Appendix B**. Certification of *adult* victims by HHS appears to be a necessary condition of receiving trafficking victims’ services from HHS under 22 U.S.C. §7105(b).

⁷⁴ 22 U.S.C. §7105(b)(1)(C). The statute specifies that HHS, Department of Labor (DOL), the Legal Services Corporation (LSC), and other federal agencies are to “expand benefits and services to victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons,” defined as individuals who are under the age of 18 and adults who are the subject of certification. For further information on services provided by DOL and LSC, see CRS Report RL34317, *Trafficking in Persons: U.S. Policy and Issues for Congress*, by Alison Siskin and Liana Sun Wyler.

⁷⁵ TVPA of 2000 created a new nonimmigrant category, known as T status or T-visa, for aliens who are victims of severe forms of human trafficking. Federal law enforcement officials who encounter victims of severe forms of trafficking and are potential witnesses to that trafficking may request that DHS grant the continued presence of the alien in the United States. Historically, the Attorney General has had the discretionary authority to use a variety of statutory and administrative mechanisms to ensure the alien’s continued presence. For more on immigration relief for trafficking victims, see CRS Report RL34317, *Trafficking in Persons: U.S. Policy and Issues for Congress*, by Alison Siskin and Liana Sun Wyler.

⁷⁶ Senior Policy Operating Group on Trafficking in Persons: Subcommittee on Domestic Trafficking, *Final Report and Recommendations*, Washington, DC, August 2007, <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/trafficking/SPOGReport-Final9-5-07.pdf>.

⁷⁷ CRS correspondence with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Congressional Affairs, April 2, 2007.

⁷⁸ The grant is authorized under 22 U.S.C. §7105(b)(2)(A), pertaining to grants made by the Attorney General to develop, expand, or strengthen victim service programs for victims of trafficking in the United States.

⁷⁹ The three organizations include Safe Horizon, a youth-service provider for runaway and homeless youth and other vulnerable youth in New York; Salvation Army in Chicago, which seeks to combat sex trafficking of children; and Standing Against Global Exploitation (SAGE), a provider of services to minor and adult victims of commercial sexual (continued...)

organizations have received DOJ support through other programs for these same purposes.⁸⁰ The purposes of the grant are to (1) provide a comprehensive array of timely and high-quality services, including intensive case management and shelter, to victims of sex and labor trafficking who are U.S. citizens or LPRs under the age of 18; (2) develop, enhance, or expand the community response to domestic minor victims of all forms of human trafficking; and (3) produce a final report about the implementation of the project so that OVC may disseminate lessons to the trafficking victims' services field.

While other HHS and DOJ programs authorized under TVPA (and referenced in **Table 1**) could provide services to minor victims of sex trafficking, it does not appear that these programs have received funding. For instance, the act directs the Secretary of HHS to carry out a grant program for states, tribal governments, local governments, and nonprofit nongovernmental victims' service organizations to establish, develop, expand, and strengthen assistance programs for U.S. citizens or LPRs who are the subject of sex trafficking or severe forms of trafficking in persons that occur, in whole or in part, within the United States.⁸¹ The act further directs the Secretary of HHS to establish a pilot program to establish residential treatment facilities in the United States for juveniles subjected to trafficking within the United States.⁸² The William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (P.L. 110-457) reauthorized the two programs through FY2011.⁸³ In addition, the act also created a new grant program to be administered jointly by the Secretary of HHS and the Attorney General to provide services to U.S. citizen victims of severe forms of trafficking.⁸⁴ These programs, however, have not received appropriations. Other programs, outside of the TVPA, that may provide assistance to minor victims of sex trafficking (but are not directed to do so in authorizing statute or elsewhere) in the United States are discussed in **Appendix C**.

(...continued)

exploitation in San Francisco. As part of their grant applications, the grantees demonstrated how comprehensive services will be provided to both male and female victims of sex and labor trafficking, and documented how the grantees will work collaboratively with juvenile justice system professionals, child welfare service providers, and other youth-serving organizations to ensure that a comprehensive array of services are provided to victims. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office for Victims of Crime, "Announcing the Awardees from OVC's Services for Domestic Minor Victims," press release, 2009; and U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office for Victims of Crime, *OVC FY09 Services for Domestic Minor Victims of Human Trafficking Funding Announcement*, 2009.

⁸⁰ See U.S. Department of Justice, Office for Victims of Crime, *Grants & Funding: OVC-Funded Grantee Programs To Help Victims of Trafficking*, <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ovc/grants/traffickingmatrix.html>.

⁸¹ §202, 42 U.S.C. §14044a. In authorizing this program, Congress emphasized the importance of serving U.S. citizen and LPR victims: "The Committee notes that, as a result of the TVPA, foreign victims of severe forms of trafficking in the United States are legally required to be treated as victims, rather than as criminals. The same should be true for American citizens. Nonetheless, a nongovernmental organization which advocates for exploited children, ECPAT-USA, issued a 2005 report (*Who Is There to Help Us? How the System Fails Sexually Exploited Girls in the United States*), which concluded, in relevant part, that 'the implementation of the TVPA to date, both in terms of services and prosecutions, has assisted girls from abroad while ignoring girls in similar situations from the U.S.'" *Ibid.*, p. 24.

⁸² §203, 42 U.S.C. §14044b. In authorizing this program, Congress emphasized the importance of serving U.S. citizen and LPR victims: "The Committee has learned from both governmental and nongovernmental sources who work with trafficked children in the United States that a lack of housing options for such children is a debilitating impediment to providing effective rehabilitative and restorative help to escape commercial sexual exploitation. This section [of the law] responds to that need."

⁸³ The current authorization levels for each year, FY2008 through FY2011, are \$8 million for HHS grants for victims' services for U.S. citizens and LPRs, \$5 million for the residential treatment pilot program, and \$20 million to DOJ grants for law enforcement.

⁸⁴ P.L. 110-457, §213, 22 U.S.C. §7105(f).

Selected Issues

Funding and Authority to Assist U.S. Citizen and LPR Victims of Trafficking

One overriding issue concerning minor victims of sex trafficking is the extent to which federal agencies can and do provide services to U.S. citizen and lawful permanent resident (LPR) trafficking victims. Originally, the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (TVPA, P.L. 106-386) primarily targeted services toward noncitizen victims because they were not eligible for existing federal human service programs for which U.S. citizen and LPR victims may have been eligible. As mentioned, U.S. citizen victims are eligible for certain crime victim benefits and public benefit entitlement programs, though these services are not tailored to trafficking victims. Further, the extent to which U.S. citizen victims rely upon these services is unknown.

There has been disagreement over whether the services and programs authorized by the TVPA are available to all victims, regardless of citizenship status. A recent U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) report noted that U.S. citizen and foreign national victims of trafficking are treated differently when they are identified, characterized, and offered services.⁸⁵ In addition, service providers and advocates report that federal legislation on commercial sexual exploitation often focuses on foreign victims; as a result, providers often have difficulty securing social services for U.S. citizen victims.⁸⁶ Contributing to this concern may be the limited response provided by agencies such as child protective services (CPS) that many may assume would be able to serve these U.S. victims—discussed in detail below.

In response to perceived inequities between services provided to U.S. citizen and noncitizen trafficking victims,⁸⁷ the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-164) enacted policies to assist U.S. citizen and LPR victims.⁸⁸ In the conference report to accompany the law, Congress highlighted concerns with the commercial sexual exploitation of U.S. and LPR children in particular:

The United States not only faces an influx of international victims of sex and labor trafficking, but also has a problem of internal trafficking (also referred to as domestic trafficking), particularly of minors, for the purpose of commercial sexual exploitation. In consultation with the committees of jurisdiction over domestic programs, the Committee amended Title II of the bill, which addresses trafficking in persons that occurs within the

⁸⁵ William Adams, Colleen Owens, and Kevonne Small, *Effects of Federal Legislation on the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children*, Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Washington, DC, July 2010, p. 4. This information comes from DOJ meetings with commercial child sexual exploitation service providers.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁸⁷ See, for example, Sarah Ann Friedman, *Who Is There to Help Us? How the System Fails Sexually Exploited Girls in the United States*, ECPAT-USA, 2005, <http://ecpatusa.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/Who-Is-There-to-Help-Us.pdf>.

⁸⁸ The law also sought to encourage prosecutions of trafficking of U.S. citizens and LPRs. P.L. 109-164 directs the Attorney General (as described in Table 2) to make grants to state and local law enforcement agencies to establish, develop, expand, or strengthen programs to investigate and prosecute acts of severe forms of trafficking in persons that involve United States citizens, or LPRs, and that occur in the United States, including investigating and prosecuting persons who engage in the purchase of commercial sex acts. §204, 22 U.S.C. §7105(f).

borders of the United States and victimizes United States citizens or permanent residents.... Among youth living on the streets in the United States, involvement in commercial sex activity is a problem of epidemic proportion.... The Committee is concerned about U.S. persons who become subjects of trafficking for commercial sexual exploitation and encourages the law enforcement community at the State and local levels to focus efforts on prosecuting individuals who exploit others through prostitution and trafficking. New strategies and attention are needed to prevent the victimization of U.S. persons through domestic trafficking.⁸⁹

As mentioned, P.L. 109-164 authorized two programs specifically to provide services to minor victims, one of which targets U.S. citizen and LPR trafficking victims. Despite explicit language in the TVPA, as amended, regarding assistance to U.S. citizen and LPR victims, appropriations language has been unclear as to whether funds are available for this purpose. Each year since FY2008, Congress has appropriated between \$9.4 million and \$12.5 million to DOJ for programs for victims of trafficking and between \$9.8 million and \$10.0 million to the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to “carry out the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000.” DOJ funds have been used by the Office for Victims of Crime (OVC) to provide services to noncitizens before they are certified and, beginning in FY2009, to carry out the Services for Domestic Minor Victims of Human Trafficking program.⁹⁰ Funds have also been used to support the Anti-Human Trafficking Task Forces. HHS funds have been used by the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) to provide certification and victim services and to carry out a public awareness campaign about trafficking.⁹¹ ORR has said that services are not provided for U.S. citizens and LPRs because it believes that Congress has not provided funding specifically for this purpose. In fact, HHS funding to combat trafficking has remained stable at approximately \$10 million since FY2002: appropriated funding did not increase after Congress authorized additional programs for minor victims of sex trafficking, including U.S. citizens and LPRs.

Further, the *FY2009 Attorney General’s Annual Report to Congress on U.S. Government Activities to Combat Trafficking in Persons* states, “the funds provided under the TVPA by the federal government for direct services to victims are dedicated to assist non-U.S. citizen victims and may not currently be used to assist U.S. citizen victims.”⁹² However, it appears likely that the funding may be available for benefits and programs for U.S. citizens and LPRs, given that the TVPA authorizes services for these victims. In fact, DOJ began funding a three-year grant in FY2009, Services for Domestic Minor Victims of Human Trafficking,⁹³ for U.S. citizen and LPR victims.⁹⁴ According to DOJ, this grant is authorized under 22 U.S.C. §7105(b)(2)(A), which was

⁸⁹ U.S. Congress, House Committee on International Relations, *Trafficking Victims Protection Act Reauthorization of 2005*, committee print, 105th Cong., November 18, 2005, H.Rept. 109-317, p. 23.

⁹⁰ P.L. 112-10, P.L. 111-117, P.L. 111-8, P.L. 110-161. See **Appendix B** for further information about the pre-certification services.

⁹¹ See **Appendix B** for further information. ORR also provides services for victims of torture, certain U.S. citizens seeking to repatriate to the U, unaccompanied alien children, and unaccompanied refugee minors. For further information on the programs pertaining to children, see CRS Report RL33896, *Unaccompanied Alien Children: Policies and Issues*; and CRS Report RL34414, *Unaccompanied Refugee Minors*.

⁹² U.S. Department of Justice, *Attorney General’s Annual Report to Congress on U.S. Government Activities to Combat Trafficking in Persons: Fiscal Year 2009*, p. 17.

⁹³ DOJ also funded two projects for case management assistance to children found in prostitution, and one training and technical assistance project targeted at 10 youth service organizations assisting children found in prostitution. It is unclear if funding for these grant programs came from appropriations for the TVPA. U.S. Department of State, *Trafficking in Persons Report*, June 2010, p. 342.

⁹⁴ The grant is authorized under §22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(2)(A), which pertains to grants made by the Attorney General to (continued...)

included in the TVPA as enacted in 2000. The authorizing language of this grant program does not appear to differentiate between U.S. citizen and noncitizen victims:

IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Attorney General may make grants to States, Indian tribes, units of local government, and nonprofit, nongovernmental victims’ service organizations to develop, expand, or strengthen victim service programs for victims of trafficking.⁹⁵

Authorized funding for this grant appears to be inconsistent with the statement in the FY2008 Attorney General’s report that the funds appropriated under the TVPA can only be used for noncitizen victims. Due to the apparent confusion over the authority and funding available to provide services to U.S. citizen trafficking victims, Congress may choose to clarify the authorities to provide services to these victims under the TVPA.

Resources for Trafficking Victims’ Services

A corollary issue is the overall breadth of funding for victims’ services. It has been estimated that there are approximately 14,000 noncitizens trafficked into the United States each year.⁹⁶ And this estimate does not include U.S. citizen and LPR victims. In addition, it is estimated that the number of child victims of sex trafficking in the United States could be in the hundreds of thousands. As the focus on sex trafficking has broadened to include victims of child prostitution, funding has increasingly become an issue. In FY2011, Congress appropriated to HHS and DOJ approximately \$22.3 million for services to trafficking victims. For information on current authorizations and appropriations for trafficking victims’ services through HHS and DOJ, see **Table 1**.

This raises several questions. For one, are the resources for trafficking victims, both citizen and noncitizens, adequate? The State Department’s 2010 Trafficking in Persons Report recommends that the U.S. government “increase funding for victims services,” among other things, to more effectively combat trafficking in persons.⁹⁷ If funds were allocated based on estimated citizen populations and noncitizen populations, would certain victims have more difficulty obtaining services? To what extent are the needs of U.S. citizen and noncitizen victims similar, and to what extent do they differ? As mentioned U.S. citizen and LPRs are more likely to be victims of sex trafficking and noncitizens are more likely to be victims of labor trafficking. As such, should funding for victims of trafficking generally be targeted to serve specific populations based on immigration status, or should it be targeted to providing specialized services for victims of a particular form of trafficking (sex or labor trafficking) without regard to immigration status?

(...continued)

develop, expand, or strengthen victim service programs for victims of trafficking in the United States. It is a program that was in the TVPA as enacted in 2000. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office for Victims of Crime, “Announcing the Awardees from OVC’s Services for Domestic Minor Victims,” press release, 2009.

⁹⁵ 22 U.S.C §7105(b)(2)(A).

⁹⁶ U.S. Department of Justice, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, U.S. Department of State, U.S. Department of Labor, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, and U.S. Agency of International Development, *Assessment of U.S. Government Efforts to Combat Trafficking in Persons*, June 2004, p. 4. This is the most recent estimate of noncitizens trafficked into the United States.

⁹⁷ U.S. Department of State, *Trafficking Persons Report*, 10th Edition, June 2010, pp. 338-339, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/142979.pdf>.

Lack of Adequate Shelter and Services

At a 2010 hearing before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Human Rights and the Law, a social service provider for sex-trafficked youth stated that 12 organizations throughout the country specialize in providing services for minor victims of sex trafficking, and collectively they have fewer than 50 beds for victims.⁹⁸ In its 2009 report on domestic child sex trafficking, Shared Hope International identified five residential facilities nationwide that provide protective shelter, defined as a facility with the ability to separate a victim from a pimp/trafficker and provide the victim with a restorative home.⁹⁹ According to the report, the facilities are able to provide youth protection because they often are isolated from major transportation centers and common trafficking/pimping areas. They also have a high ratio of staff to minors that can help keep youth from being re-trafficked and/or from running away. Such facilities also have security systems, including outdoor and indoor cameras that can hinder outsiders from entering and can discourage youth from running away.

As part of HHS's work on sex trafficking of minors within the United States, contracted researchers have identified—based on discussions with shelter providers, law enforcement officials, case workers, and directors and staff of four residential facilities that serve minor victims of domestic sex trafficking—promising elements for residential facilities for victims:

- Residential facilities should be designed to serve homogenous populations of trafficking victims. Victims may benefit from smaller, more intimate settings so they can develop relationships more easily with staff and other victims.
- Facilities must be secure in order to establish physical and emotional safety, and should include an undisclosed location, security cameras and alarm systems, 24-hour staffing and presence of security guards, unannounced room searches and drug screens, and limited phone use.
- Services must be available to trafficking victims, including basic needs such as clothing, food, and shelter; intensive case management; mental health counseling and treatment; medical screenings and routine care; life skills and job training programs; youth development programming; educational programming; and services to assist youth in reunifying with their families or other appropriate support persons, as appropriate.¹⁰⁰

Other facilities, such as runaway and homeless youth shelters, child welfare group homes, and other foster care settings, do not appear to be able to adequately meet the needs of youth or keep them from pimps/traffickers and other abusers.¹⁰¹ In addition, these settings are often not

⁹⁸ U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Human Rights and the Law, *Child Prostitution and Sex Trafficking*, testimony of Rachel Lloyd, Executive Director and Founder of Girls Educational & Mentoring Services (GEMS), 111th Cong., 2nd sess., February 24, 2010.

⁹⁹ Smith, Vardaman, and Snow, "The National Report on Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking: America's Prostituted Children," p. 67.

¹⁰⁰ Clawson and Grace, *Finding a Path to Recovery: Residential Facilities for Minor Victims of Domestic Sex Trafficking*. At the time of the study in 2007, the researchers identified only four facilities specific to the population across the country: Girls Educational and Mentoring Services (GEMS) Transition to Independent Living (TIL) program in New York; Standing Against Global Exploitation (SAGE) Safe House in San Francisco; Children of the Night in Los Angeles County; and Angela's House in a rural community outside Atlanta.

¹⁰¹ Clawson and Grace, *Finding a Path to Recovery: Residential Facilities for Minor Victims of Domestic Sex Trafficking*, pp. 2-4, 9.

equipped to provide intensive services for victims or recognize the trauma they have experienced. Runaway shelters often have time restrictions on the length of stay imposed by funding sources, which, given their unique needs, makes serving victims of sex trafficking difficult. Runaway shelter providers and other providers may not recognize the signs of sex trafficking or that trafficking is a crime. Even if they do, youth may choose to leave, given that shelter providers are required to report suspected abuse and neglect, including sexual exploitation.¹⁰² In one HHS study, contractors with the department found that HHS-funded Runaway and Homeless Youth (RHY) providers tended to report that they served no sex trafficking victims, citizen or noncitizen, and often equated trafficking victims with being foreign born.¹⁰³

Congress may wish to consider explicitly designating trafficking or alternate funds for victims' services, or amending current law to further specify that funds under the existing (and unfunded) pilot program for residential facilities are available for these victims.¹⁰⁴ Historical examples appear to exist in which individuals were specifically classified as victims in order to receive shelter and other services. For example, before the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) was enacted, law enforcement officials generally did not know how to adequately respond to victims of domestic violence and often did not protect victims from their abusers. With VAWA, law enforcement officials received training on domestic violence, and the law authorized federal funding for domestic violence shelters. Similarly, prior to the enactment of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP), runaways were generally processed through the juvenile justice system instead of being referred for social services to address the reasons they ran away and to provide needed services.

Efforts are underway at the state level to provide unique responses to victims of sex trafficking, particularly prostitution. These responses seek to extend greater social service support to youth victims, in combination with assistance from other stakeholders, including law enforcement. At least one state, New York, has passed a law that would provide certain protections for child victims of prostitution. New York's Safe Harbor for Exploited Children Act requires that children under age 18 who engage in prostitution be considered *victims* of sexual exploitation.¹⁰⁵ This presumption permits the child to avoid criminal charges of prostitution and instead be considered a person in need of supervision by the state. The statute also provides support and services to sexually exploited youth. These services include safe houses, crisis intervention programs, community-based programs, and law enforcement training to help officers identify sexually exploited youth.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰² Heather J. Clawson et al., *Study of HHS Programs Serving Human Trafficking Victims*, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, December 2009, p. iv, <http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/07/HumanTrafficking/Final/index.pdf>.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁴ This program is authorized at 42 U.S.C. §14044b.

¹⁰⁵ Sections 447-a and 447-b of the New York State Social Services Law.

¹⁰⁶ Legislation has been introduced in the 112th Congress to assist states in providing services to minor victims of sex trafficking in the United States. For instance, S. 596 would authorize the Assistant Attorney General for DOJ's Office of Justice Programs, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary for Children and Families in HHS, to award one-year grants to six eligible entities in different regions of the United States to combat the sex trafficking of children in the United States. Under the bill, some of the grants would be allocated to non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to provide counseling, legal services, shelter, clothing and other social services to minor victims of sex trafficking. Funds could also be used for training for law enforcement; investigative and prosecution expenses; case management; salaries for law enforcement officers and state and local prosecutors; and outreach, education, and treatment programs, all related to cases involving the sex trafficking of children in the United States.

Limited Response by Child Protective Services (CPS)

Child victims of trafficking may come to the attention of child protective services (CPS). However, as discussed above, CPS may not be able to adequately respond to the needs of sex trafficking victims. Research of CPS workers in a small number of cities found that these workers are not familiar with human trafficking terms and laws or how to handle cases involving trafficking of children.¹⁰⁷

Reports of abuse and neglect can be screened in and referred for investigation by CPS only if they concern actions that meet the state statutory definition of abuse and neglect. States that receive state grant funds under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) must define “child abuse and neglect” to be consistent with this federal definition of abuse and neglect under CAPTA: “at a minimum, any recent act or failure to act on the part of a parent or caretaker, which results in death, serious physical or emotional harm, sexual abuse or exploitation, or an act or failure to act which presents an imminent risk of serious harm.”¹⁰⁸ The law also expands on the term “sexual abuse,” which refers to “the employment, use, persuasion, inducement, enticement, or coercion of any child to engage in, or assist any other person to engage in, any sexually explicit conduct or simulation of such conduct for the purpose of producing a visual depiction of such conduct; or the rape, and in cases of caretaker or inter-familial relationships, statutory rape, molestation, prostitution, or other forms of sexual exploitation of children, or incest with children.”¹⁰⁹ The law does not, however, define “parent” or “caretaker.”

While some states refer to sexual abuse in general terms, others refer to more specific types of abuse, including sexual exploitation.¹¹⁰ Forms of sexual exploitation include the production of child pornography or allowing a child to engage in prostitution. Several states also define persons who can be reported to CPS as perpetrators. These are individuals who have a relationship with or regular responsibility for the child and generally include parents, guardians, foster parents, relatives, or other caregivers responsible for the child’s welfare. It appears that in some cases, this could mean an adult over the age of 18 who is living with the child, but it is unclear whether a pimp/trafficker could be included in this definition.

Despite challenges with involving CPS in these types of cases, some states have recently taken steps to track commercial sexual exploitation and/or prostitution cases under the broader category of sexual abuse.¹¹¹ Further, some states and localities have begun to provide specialized foster

¹⁰⁷ Smith, Vardaman, and Snow, “The National Report on Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking: America’s Prostituted Children;” Loyola University Chicago, Center for the Human Rights of Children and the International Organization for Adolescents (IOFA), *Building Child Welfare Response to Child Trafficking*, 2011, http://www.luc.edu/chrc/pdfs/BCWR_Handbook_Final1_for_posting_1.pdf (hereinafter, Loyola University Chicago, Center for the Human Rights of Children and the International Organization for Adolescents (IOFA), *Building Child Welfare Response to Child Trafficking*).

¹⁰⁸ Section 111(2) of CAPTA, 42 U.S.C. §65101 et seq.

¹⁰⁹ Section 111(4) of CAPTA, 42 U.S.C. §5106g. All states receive CAPTA state grants. For further information about CAPTA, see CRS Report R40899, *The Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA): Background, Programs, and Funding*, by Emilie Stoltzfus.

¹¹⁰ For further information about state definitions of abuse and neglect and procedures for screening abuse and neglect, see Child Welfare Information Gateway, *Definitions of Child Abuse and Neglect: Summary of State Laws* (current through July 2009), http://www.childwelfare.gov/systemwide/laws_policies/statutes/define.pdf; and Child Welfare Information Gateway, *Making and Screening Reports of Child Abuse and Neglect: Summary of State Laws* (current through January 2009, http://www.childwelfare.gov/systemwide/laws_policies/statutes/repproc.pdf).

¹¹¹ Smith, Vardaman, and Snow, *The National Report on Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking: America’s Prostituted* (continued...)

care services for victims of sex trafficking. For example, in August 2010 the Illinois Safe Children Act was enacted, which makes all children (under the age of 18) in Illinois immune from prosecution for prostitution, under any circumstances, and requires these children to be considered “abused” for purposes of being screened in by the state child welfare agency. In Georgia, the Governor’s Office for Children and Families provides case management, referrals, and funding for all children identified as victims of commercial sexual exploitation.¹¹² Leveraging funds from private organizations, the office also helps to place children in residential facilities that are equipped to address sex trafficking. In addition, the office provides training to law enforcement officials and others (e.g., mental health providers) about sex trafficking of children.

One policy response could be to encourage or require state child welfare agencies to screen in reports of commercial sex trafficking, including child prostitution, as a form of sexual abuse, regardless of whether this abuse is perpetrated or facilitated by a parent or guardian. This would enable states to track cases involving commercial sex trafficking. States could additionally be required to have in place policies to respond to children who are victims of child prostitution, including while they are in care. The federal government could compel states to make these changes through amendments to federal child welfare programs (under Titles IV-B and IV-E of the Social Security Act or CAPTA), which provide funding for state child welfare programs.

Requiring state child welfare agencies to respond to child victims of commercial sexual exploitation would raise questions about how to fund this response and how best to prepare child welfare workers to meet the needs of these children. Federal law does not appear to prohibit the use of federal foster care dollars for specialized services for victims of commercial sexual exploitation who have contact with CPS, including foster care placements. However, Congress may consider clarifying that foster care funding could be used specifically for this purpose. Alternatively, Congress could provide funding through other sources that may not restrict services to a specific population, such as select programs under Title IV-B of the Social Security Act (notably, the Title IV-E federal foster care program is available only for children who meet certain family income and other criteria). Regardless of whether the federal government provides additional funding, states may face challenges in collecting data on victims of commercial sexual exploitation who are under the control of a pimp/trafficker. States could also have difficulties in placing children in specialized foster or group homes, given that few facilities exist for victims generally.

Further, given the lack of awareness in the child welfare field about trafficking, the federal government could compel or require states to provide training to CPS workers on this topic. Loyola University Chicago’s Center for the Human Rights for Children and the International Organization for Adolescents issued a publication in 2011 that provides guidance to the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, the state child welfare agency, on trafficking. Specifically, the publication seeks to increase identification of trafficking cases overall; ensure that victims receive full access to protections and services, including foster care, public benefits, assistance in the criminal justice system, and restitution; and prevent further child trafficking.¹¹³

(...continued)

Children, pp. 72-73.

¹¹² For further information, see Georgia Governor’s Office for Children and Families, Georgia Care Connection Office, <http://www.georgiacareconnection.com/Index.html>.

¹¹³ Loyola University Chicago, Center for the Human Rights of Children and the International Organization for Adolescents (IOFA), *Building Child Welfare Response to Child Trafficking*, http://www.luc.edu/chrc/pdfs/BCWR_Handbook_Final1_for_posting_1.pdf.

The publication provides guidance on procedures for identifying and investigating cases of trafficking, providing case management, addressing criminal justice procedures and issues, and referring children to other resources.

Trafficking Victims Treated as Criminals or Delinquents

Through the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, Congress legislated, essentially, that juveniles who are involved in commercial sexual crimes are to be considered the *victims* of these crimes.¹¹⁴ However, researchers have cited disparities in the ways that exploited children are labeled at the state and local levels. It has been suggested that victims of child sexual exploitation—even though these children are too young to consent to sexual activity with adults—may at times be labeled as child prostitutes or juvenile delinquents and treated as criminals rather than being labeled and treated as victims. These children who are arrested may then be placed in juvenile detention facilities with juveniles who have committed serious crimes instead of in environments where they can receive needed social and protective services.¹¹⁵ As Shared Hope International observes, “while this sometimes is viewed as the only option available to arresting officers, it is a practice that pulls the victim deeper into the juvenile justice system, re-victimizes [the young person], and hinders access to service.”¹¹⁶ Like runaway and homeless youth shelters, juvenile detention facilities provide treatment and services (in this instance, services aligned with a youth’s pending charges) that are often unrelated to sex trafficking. Consequently, these services may be ineffective at addressing the deeper issues facing victims.¹¹⁷

Further, victims may enter into the juvenile justice system in situations where law enforcement does not know that the juvenile is a trafficking victim as well as in situations where law enforcement *is* aware that the juvenile is a victim. For instance, a law enforcement officer who has not been trained in identifying children as victims of commercial sexual exploitation may mistakenly charge these children with a crime. Children may hide their identities by using fake identification cards to protect the pimp, further reducing the likelihood that the children will be identified as victims or that the pimp will be prosecuted. On the other hand, an officer who recognizes that an individual is a victim may charge the individual with a crime so as to place the victim into one of the only available safe and secure environments—a detention facility within the juvenile justice system. As mentioned previously, there are few safe facilities for child victims of sex trafficking.

Results from the 2009 study conducted by Shared Hope International suggest that, in nine out of 10 U.S. cities evaluated with respect to prostitution and other forms of commercial sexual exploitation, victims had been placed in juvenile detention centers.¹¹⁸ There are no comprehensive data, however, that address the number of prostituted or otherwise sexually trafficked juveniles who are treated as offenders. Two studies do provide some insight into this number and how law

¹¹⁴ See remarks by Senator Richard Durbin, Hearing before the U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Human Rights and the Law, *In Our Own Backyard: Child Prostitution and Sex Trafficking in the United States*, 111th Cong., 1st sess., February 24, 2010.

¹¹⁵ Smith, Vardaman, and Snow, “The National Report on Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking: America’s Prostituted Children.”

¹¹⁶ Clawson and Grace, *Finding a Path to Recovery: Residential Facilities for Minor Victims of Domestic Sex Trafficking*.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

enforcement agencies process children who are prostituted. One of the only studies that has attempted to gather this data relies on National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS)¹¹⁹ data from 76 law enforcement agencies in 13 states. Findings from this study, conducted by the Department of Justice, reveal that 229 juveniles were implicated as offenders in prostitution incidents, and arrests were made in about 74% of those cases between 1997 and 2000.¹²⁰ Although the percentage of juveniles involved in prostitution who were arrested is lower than the percentage of adult prostitutes arrested (90%),¹²¹ this nonetheless suggests that in the sample examined, juveniles were more likely to be treated as offenders than as victims.

In addition, as part of the National Juvenile Prostitution Study,¹²² juveniles were categorized as victims, as delinquents, or as both victims and delinquents based on how they were treated by police. Juveniles were categorized as being treated as victims if (1) only the exploiter was arrested or (2) the juvenile and exploiter were arrested but the charge against the juvenile was not a prostitution-related charge (e.g., disturbing the peace or a drug charge). Juveniles were categorized as being treated as delinquents if they were the only ones arrested or detained. They were categorized as being treated as both victims and delinquents if the exploiter was arrested on a charge specific to a sexual assault against a minor and the juvenile was also arrested on a prostitution-related charge. Based on this classification, 53% of juveniles were classified as victims, 31% as delinquents, and 16% as both victims and delinquents. For the cases where a child was classified as both a victim and delinquent, researchers examined the case summaries more carefully to see whether they could be classified more accurately as victims or as delinquents. In all cases, researchers were prompted to change the status to victim only because either (1) the initial charges were dropped or (2) there was a specific comment from the investigator that the only reason the juvenile was charged was so they could get needed services. Overall, 69% of juveniles were ultimately classified as victims and 31% as delinquents.

The study found a strong and significant association between how the case came to the police's attention and how the juvenile was treated by law enforcement. Cases that began through a police report (i.e., a report by the juvenile, a family member, a social service provider, or others) were almost eight times more likely to result in the juvenile being treated as a victim than those cases that began through action taken by the police (i.e., surveillance or undercover operations). Juveniles were also more likely to be treated as victims if they were younger, female, frightened, or were dirty or had body odor at the time of the initial encounter with police.

Congress provides grants to states for juvenile justice through several avenues such as grants within the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP) and the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant (JABG) program.¹²³ These grant programs provide funding for an

¹¹⁹ NIBRS is part of the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program. Although both NIBRS and UCR are incident-based reporting systems, NIBRS presents more detailed information about crime incidents than does the UCR. NIBRS does not have as widespread of participation from state and local police, and the FBI has indicated that the data are not sufficiently robust to make broad generalizations about crime in the United States. See the FBI's website at <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucr.htm#nibrs>. For more information about UCR and NIBRS, see archived CRS Report RL34309, *How Crime in the United States Is Measured*, by Nathan James and Logan Rishard Council.

¹²⁰ David Finkelhor and Richard Ormrod, *Prostitution of Juveniles: Patterns From NIBRS*, U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, June 2004, p. 5.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*

¹²² Mitchell, Finklehor, and Wolak, "Conceptualizing Juvenile Prostitution as Child Maltreatment: Findings from the National Juvenile Prostitution Study."

¹²³ The JJDP was enacted by P.L. 90-415 and was most recently reauthorized by P.L. 107-273. JABG was codified (continued...)

array of purposes including counseling, mentoring, and training programs; community-based programs and services; after school programs; education programs; substance and drug abuse prevention programs; mental health services; gang-involvement prevention programs; and coordinating local service delivery among the different agencies involved, among other purposes. However, none of the purposes directly specify services for victims of trafficking or commercial sexual exploitation. As such, if victims of trafficking continue to be placed into the juvenile justice systems, policy makers may consider whether to expand or specify the list of purpose areas for which states may utilize juvenile justice grant funding.

Several policy options exist to address the issues in labeling victims of trafficking as perpetrators of crimes. For example, Congress may consider whether to provide grant money for the purposes of researching or establishing alternatives to detention for victims of child sex trafficking. A related question that may arise is whether these alternatives should be available for domestic victims and/or international victims, or whether this distinction should be made at all. Another option Congress may consider is whether to provide funding for programs to train law enforcement and social service providers to recognize possible indicators of trafficking and subsequently identify the victims. If Congress decided to appropriate funds for these types of programs, research would be needed to assess the reliability and validity of any trainings utilized.¹²⁴

Reducing Demand for Minor Sex Trafficking in the United States

It is widely agreed upon that any efforts to reduce the prevalence of child sex trafficking—as well as other forms of trafficking—must include efforts to reduce not only the supply, but also the *demand*.¹²⁵ Research has identified various factors that contribute to the demand for commercial sex. One such factor contributing to the demand for younger girls is that buyers believe they are less likely to contract a sexually transmitted disease from a younger girl.¹²⁶ Another factor influencing the demand for commercial sex is the technology boom; commercial sex is advertised extensively on the Internet, and buyers are connected with victims through cell phones—allowing traffickers to conduct business quickly and anonymously over the phone rather than face-to-face.

Experts have provided recommendations for demand reduction strategies that involve increasing public awareness and prevention as well as bolstering investigations and prosecutions of those buying illegal commercial sex. The federal government has already taken steps to address

(...continued)

within the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796ee); as such it resides outside the immediate purview of the JJDP Act despite the fact that it is administered by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. For more information on these programs, see CRS Report RL33947, *Juvenile Justice: Legislative History and Current Legislative Issues*, by Kristin M. Finklea.

¹²⁴ For instance, according to Shared Hope International, after receiving training on identifiers of domestic minor sex trafficking, one runaway youth shelter in Louisiana identified 57% of the youth in the shelter as trafficking victims. Smith, Vardaman, and Snow, “The National Report on Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking: America’s Prostituted Children,” p. 50. It is unknown, however, how these results may generalize to other social service and law enforcement agencies that may receive such training.

¹²⁵ One grant program under the TVPA (P.L. 109-164, 42 U.S.C. 14044c) includes strengthening demand reduction as one of the allowable activities. This program would assist state and law enforcement to enhance their anti-trafficking efforts, but the program has not been funded.

¹²⁶ Shared Hope International, *Demand: A Comparative Examination of Sex Tourism and Trafficking in Jamaica, Japan, the Netherlands, and the United States*, p. 5.

demand reduction. For example, in FY2009 DOJ's Office of Justice Programs funded a national assessment of sex trafficking reduction efforts. This program plans to assess over 435 national sites that have engaged in some form of demand reduction programs in order to assess their effectiveness and inform future programs.¹²⁷

Policy makers may consider other policy options to reduce the demand for commercial sex with minors. For instance, Congress may consider whether to provide further grant money designated specifically for campaigns to increase public awareness of the issue. Also, some researchers have suggested that increasing the age of consent in all commercial sex activities would be an effective means of reducing the risk of misidentifying a minor as an adult.¹²⁸ Congress may debate whether this would also decrease the rate at which johns seek out minors for commercial sex or whether it would only decrease the genuine misidentification of a minor as an adult. Yet another option that Congress may consider is whether strengthening the federal anti-trafficking laws, particularly with respect to the investigation and prosecution of buyers of commercial sex with minors. As mentioned, one distinction between the prosecution of traffickers and the prosecution of buyers appears to be that traffickers can be prosecuted whether or not a victim is brought across state lines. On the other hand, federal statutes generally used to prosecute the buyers of commercial sex appear to require that either the buyer crosses state lines or that he entices the victim to cross state lines. Congress may also consider whether encouraging states to strengthen their laws to provide harsher penalties for engaging in commercial sex activities with minors would deter individuals from doing so. Policy makers may also debate whether providing funding to assist states with investigations and prosecutions of these crimes would in turn reduce the prevalence of buyers who are willing to engage in commercial sex with minors.

Data on Victims and Perpetrators

Studies of sex trafficking, including those involving sex trafficking of children in the United States, are scarce. Those studies that do provide insight into the number of victims of child sexual exploitation, such as those conducted by Estes and Weiner and Shared Hope International (see **Appendix A**), provide estimates based on the number of youth who are at risk of trafficking or were identified as victims in a small number of cities. Given the nature of sex trafficking, estimating the number and characteristics of victims, pimps/traffickers, and johns is difficult. Nonetheless, the TVPA requires that the Department of Justice provide demographic and other information related to sex trafficking in reports to Congress.¹²⁹ Specifically, the act requires "review and analysis of sex trafficking and unlawful commercial sex acts in the United States" in two reports. One of the two reports is to address severe forms of trafficking in persons, including the estimated number and demographic characteristics of persons engaged in severe forms of trafficking. The other report is to address sex trafficking, including the number and demographic characteristics of persons engaged in sex trafficking and those who purchase sex acts; the estimated value in dollars of the "commercial sex economy," and the number of investigations, arrests, and incarcerations of persons engaged in sex trafficking, including purchasers of sex trafficking. The TVPA authorizes up to \$1.5 million annually for the studies.

¹²⁷ U.S. Department of Justice, *Attorney General's Annual Report to Congress on U.S. Government Activities to Combat Trafficking in Persons: Fiscal Year 2009*, p. 97.

¹²⁸ Shared Hope International, *Demand: A Comparative Examination of Sex Tourism and Trafficking in Jamaica, Japan, the Netherlands, and the United States*, p. 148.

¹²⁹ 42 U.S.C §14044(a)(1).

Appendix A. Selected Studies Measuring Sex Trafficking of Children

Estes-Weiner Study

Richard J. Estes and Neil Alan Weiner estimated in their 2001 study that more than 244,000 youth in the United States were at risk of becoming victims of prostitution and other forms of trafficking.¹³⁰ Importantly, the authors noted that this number did not reflect the *actual* number of child exploitation cases. The study noted that the majority of victims tended to be runaway or thrown-away youth who lived on the streets and became victims of prostitution. Generally, these children came from homes where they had been abused or abandoned and often became involved in prostitution as a way to support themselves.¹³¹

Estes and Weiner found that approximately 55% of girls living on the streets in the United States engaged in formal prostitution, and of these girls, approximately 75% worked for a pimp/trafficker.¹³² The average age at which girls first entered into prostitution was between 12 and 14 years, and the average age of entry into prostitution for boys was between 11 and 13 years. The researchers also estimated that in the United States, approximately 156,200 homeless youth were at risk of commercial sexual exploitation.¹³³

National Juvenile Prostitution Study

The National Juvenile Prostitution Study surveyed nearly 2,600 law enforcement agencies regarding individuals involved in juvenile prostitution in 2005. Data were collected on whether agencies arrested or detained—in conjunction with a juvenile prostitution case—(1) youth under age 18 or (2) adults ages 18 and older.¹³⁴ In total, the study calculated 1,450 arrests and detentions

¹³⁰ The study was revised in 2002. The researchers use the term commercial sexual exploitation. Their definition of commercial sexual exploitation of children includes child pornography, juvenile prostitution, and trafficking in children. Estes and Weiner estimated that 244,000 children in the United States are at risk of becoming victims of sex trafficking, but then reduced the estimate by 25% to minimize duplications in the counts of runaway and thrown-away youth. Estes and Weiner, *Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children in the U.S., Canada and Mexico*, pp. 10, 144-151. This study has been criticized because, among other issues, the authors lack any evidence on how many of the “at risk” youth actually become involved in prostitution. In addition, some have noted that there is duplication among the counts of “at risk” youth. Michelle Stansky and David Finkelhor, *How Many Juveniles are Involved in Prostitution in the U.S.?*, Crimes Against Children Research Center, University of New Hampshire, 2008, http://www.unh.edu/ccrc/prostitution/Juvenile_Prostitution_factsheet.pdf. (Hereinafter, Stansky and Finkelhor, *How Many Juveniles are Involved in Prostitution in the U.S.?*)

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 2-4.

¹³² *Ibid.*, p. 60.

¹³³ To calculate this estimate, the researchers used findings from their field research that 30% of shelter youth and 70% of homeless youth are victims of commercial sexual exploitation. This study has been criticized because, among other issues, the authors lack any evidence on how many of the “at risk” youth actually become involved in prostitution. In addition, some have noted that there is duplication among the counts of “at risk” youth. Stansky and Finkelhor, *How Many Juveniles are Involved in Prostitution in the U.S.?*

¹³⁴ Kimberly J. Mitchell, David Finkelhor, and Janis Wolak, “Conceptualizing Juvenile Prostitution as Child Maltreatment: Findings from the National Juvenile Prostitution Study,” *Child Maltreatment*, vol. 15, no. 1 (February 2010), <http://www.unh.edu/ccrc/pdf/Mitchell%202010%20conceptualizing.pdf>. (Hereinafter, Mitchell, Finkelhor, and Wolak, “Conceptualizing Juvenile Prostitution as Child Maltreatment: Findings from the National Juvenile Prostitution (continued...)”)

for crimes related to juvenile prostitution that year, including crimes committed by adults. The study further found that 95% of the law enforcement agencies sampled made no arrests in cases involving juvenile prostitution; in large jurisdictions where researchers assumed such cases would be most likely, 56% of agencies reported no arrests or detentions. Based on these findings, the researchers suggested that, at least in larger communities, police were not doing enough to address the problem of child prostitution in particular.¹³⁵

To gather more information and data on victim characteristics, researchers followed up with law enforcement officials from agencies that had reported arrests or detentions in juvenile prostitution cases. They randomly sampled these agencies and spoke with case investigators for 138 cases. Cases were classified under three categories: third-party exploiters, solo juveniles, and child sexual abuse (CSA) cases with payment. Most of the cases (57%) were classified as third-party exploiters. This category involved pimps or others who profit financially from selling juveniles for sex, and included small-time or less formal operations and well-organized criminal and commercial enterprises, such as massage parlors. The solo juvenile category, which involved 31% of the cases, encompassed juveniles who offered themselves for sexual services (including pornography production), typically to people they did not know, for money or other items of monetary value.¹³⁶ This group included juveniles who lacked a stable residence and juveniles living in a home or institution, such as a foster home. Finally, the remaining 12% of youth were engaged in CSA with payment cases, whereby children were sexually abused by family members, acquaintances, and caretakers and who were paid money as inducements to engage in or continue these sexual acts. Researchers found that of the entire sample, nine out of 10 youth were female and more than half (55%) were ages 16 or 17. Most (60%) had a history of running away; in 12% of the cases, officials did not know about the runaway history.

Shared Hope International Study

In 2006, Shared Hope International, a nonprofit organization that seeks to prevent and eradicate sex trafficking, began working with 10 Department of Justice-funded human trafficking task forces¹³⁷ to assess the scope of sex trafficking of children. The study defined domestic minor sex trafficking (DMST) as the commercial sexual exploitation of American children within U.S. borders, which includes prostitution, pornography, and/or stripping.¹³⁸ While the study used a broad definition of DMST, it focused primarily on the prostitution of children.¹³⁹ Researchers requested that the 10 task forces identify the number of minors who qualified as DMST victims.

(...continued)

Study.”)

¹³⁵ The fact that many police agencies are not actively arresting juveniles for prostitution means data related to prostitution arrests cannot fully characterize the problem of juvenile prostitution. For a detailed discussion of this argument, see Stansky and Finkelhor, *How Many Juveniles are Involved in Prostitution in the U.S.?*

¹³⁶ Although police did not find evidence for a third-party exploiter, some of these youth may have been exploited by a commercial operator.

¹³⁷ There are 42 task forces in total. The Department of Justice makes awards to law enforcement agencies to form these victim-centered human trafficking task forces. Department of Justice, *Attorney General's Annual Report to Congress on U.S. Government Activities to Combat Trafficking in Persons: Fiscal Year 2009*, June 2010.

¹³⁸ In other words, foreign children are not included in their definition of DMST victims. Smith, Vardaman, and Snow, *The National Report on Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking: America's Prostituted Children*, p. iv.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 11. Focusing on other aspects of DMST, such as pornography, may increase the number of suspected victims in a given area.

No further information was provided about how victims were identified, except to say that an accurate count of the number of victims was not available due to many factors, including a lack of protocols to track victims and misidentification of victims. **Table A-1** presents the findings from the 10 study sites. Notably, the data collected are not uniform and represent different time periods.

Table A-1. Number of Suspected Child Sex Trafficking Victims in Selected Locations
Shared Hope International Study

Research Site	State/Territory	Number of Suspected DMST ^a Victims	Time Period
Dallas	Texas	150	2007
San Antonio/Bexar County	Texas	3-4	2005-2008
Fort Worth/Tarrant County	Texas	29	2000-2008
Las Vegas	Nevada	5,122	1994-2007
Independence/Kansas City area	Missouri	227	2000-2008
Baton Rouge/New Orleans area	Louisiana	105	2000-2007
Saipan/Rota/Tinian	Northern Mariana Islands	1	2008
Salt Lake City	Utah	83	1996-2008
Buffalo/Erie County	New York	74-84	2000-2008
Clearwater/Tampa Bay area	Florida	36	2000-2008

Source: Linda A. Smith, Samantha Healy Vardaman, and Melissa A. Snow, “The National Report on Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking: America’s Prostituted Children,” Shared Hope International, May 2009, p. 11.

Notes: Due to a lack of formal tracking protocols, some DMST victims may be duplicated within a city and some may not have been included in the counts. These numbers were obtained through an interview process in addition to official government records.

a. Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking (DMST)

Ohio Trafficking in Persons Study Commission

In 2009, Ohio Attorney General Richard Cordray tasked the Ohio Trafficking in Persons Study Commission to explore the scope of human trafficking within Ohio. Using methodologies developed in other studies—including the Estes and Weiner study discussed above—the Commission estimated that of the American-born youth in Ohio, nearly 3,000 (2,879) were at risk for sex trafficking, or prostitution. Further, 1,078 Ohio youth were estimated to have been victims of sex trafficking over the course of one year.¹⁴⁰ The researchers also estimated that 3,437 foreign-born persons (adults and juveniles) in Ohio were at risk for sex or labor trafficking, of which 783 were estimated to be trafficking victims.¹⁴¹ Additionally, they estimated that 945

¹⁴⁰ Celia Williamson, Sharvari Karandikar-Chheda, and Jeff Barrows, et al., *Report on the Prevalence of Human Trafficking in Ohio To Attorney General Richard Cordray*, Ohio Trafficking in Persons Study Commission, Research and Analysis Sub-Committee, Toledo, OH, February 10, 2010, <http://www.ohioattorneygeneral.gov/TraffickingReport>.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 5. The researchers identified four factors that may increase a child’s risk of becoming a victim of sex trafficking in the United States: (1) Ohio’s weak response to trafficking victims; (2) evidence that first responders to sex trafficking incidents in Ohio are unaware and unprepared; (3) customers who purchase services from youth receive (continued...)

homeless youth in Ohio may be at risk for trafficking.¹⁴² Importantly, the report states, “due to the very nature of human trafficking, it is virtually impossible to determine the exact number of victims in Ohio at any given time and with any degree of certainty.”¹⁴³

Prostitution of Juveniles: Patterns from the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS)

In 2004, DOJ’s Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention published a report examining characteristics of juvenile prostitution incidents that had come to the attention of law enforcement.¹⁴⁴ Data referenced in the report are from the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS), years 1997–2000. With the caveat that the data included in this study were limited,¹⁴⁵ findings suggest that juvenile prostitution and adult prostitution are distinctive. Compared to adult prostitution, the prostitution of juveniles was more likely to occur indoors, to occur in large cities, and to involve multiple offenders. Within the category of juvenile prostitution, the study also noted differences between boys and girls. Male juvenile prostitutes were often older than female juvenile prostitutes, and they were more likely to operate outdoors. When arresting juveniles for prostitution, law enforcement more often arrested males than females. Researchers also found that police were more likely to characterize juveniles engaged in prostitution as offenders rather than as victims of crime. However, those characterized as victims were more likely to be younger and female.

(...continued)

minimal charges and are rarely prosecuted, and traffickers suffer minimal consequences; and (4) the high rates of vulnerable youth in Ohio.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 42.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

¹⁴⁴ David Finkelhor and Richard Ormrod, *Prostitution of Juveniles: Patterns from NIBRS*, U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Juvenile Justice Bulletin, Washington, DC, June 2004, <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/203946.pdf>.

¹⁴⁵ The data in this study are from a limited number of cases (13,814 prostitution incidents involving identified offenders—both adults and juveniles) and from only 76 agencies in 13 states. The NIBRS collects data, including data on offense(s), offender(s), victim(s), arrestee(s), and any property involved in an offense, for 46 different Group A offenses (those that include data on victims, offenders, circumstances, etc.) and 11 different Group B offenses (those that include data only on the arrestee). Despite the detailed crime data that the NIBRS can provide, nationwide implementation of the program has been slow, for a variety of reasons, including cost considerations. For more information, see archived CRS Report RL34309, *How Crime in the United States Is Measured*, by Nathan James and Logan Rishard Council. See also http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/frequently-asked-questions/nibrs_faqs.

Appendix B. Trafficking Victim Services for Noncitizens

The TVPA, as amended, is the major federal legislation that authorizes these services, which are provided primarily by the Departments of Justice (DOJ) and Health and Human Services (HHS). In practice, these services tend to be targeted to *noncitizen victims*.

Department of Justice (DOJ)

Office for Victims of Crime (OVC)

The TVPA of 2000 created a grant program administered by the Attorney General to provide grants to states, Indian tribes, local governments, and nonprofit victims' services organizations to develop, expand, or strengthen victims' service programs for trafficking victims.¹⁴⁶ This grant program, known as the Services for Victims of Human Trafficking Program, is administered through DOJ's Office for Victims of Crime (OVC) and provides emergency services—including temporary housing, medical care, crisis counseling, and legal assistance—to victims as soon as they have been identified, prior to certification by HHS. According to DOJ, OVC awards grants to non-governmental organizations to provide trafficking victims with comprehensive or specialized services and provide training and technical assistance to grantees for program support and enhancement.¹⁴⁷ According to the *Attorney General's Annual Report to Congress on U.S. Government Activities to Combat Trafficking in Persons: Fiscal Year 2009*, one of the goals of this program is to “provide timely, high-quality direct services to pre-certified foreign national victims of severe forms of human trafficking...”¹⁴⁸ This goal would imply that only *noncitizens* are eligible for this grant program. However, since certification is not a requirement to receive services through DOJ, U.S. citizens, LPRs, and noncitizens may all be eligible for services. In fact, using the same authority provided for the Trafficking Victims Discretionary Grant Program (22 U.S.C §7105(b)(2)(A)), DOJ has funded a grant for child victims of sex trafficking—Services for Domestic Minor Victims of Human Trafficking.¹⁴⁹ Additionally, U.S. citizen and LPR trafficking victims may be eligible for victims' assistance and compensation from OVC through the Crime Victims Fund.¹⁵⁰ This fund provides a direct reimbursement on behalf of a crime for crime-related expenses, including medical costs, mental health counseling, lost wages or loss of support, and funeral or burial costs.

In addition, as of the end of December 2009 OVC had 37 active grants to victims' services organizations working in collaboration with human trafficking task forces to coordinate services

¹⁴⁶ P.L. 106-386, §107(b)(2); 22 U.S.C §7105(b)(2)(A).

¹⁴⁷ U.S. Department of Justice, *Attorney General's Annual Report to Congress on U.S. Government Activities to Combat Trafficking in Persons: Fiscal Year 2009*, p. 26.

¹⁴⁸ U.S. Department of Justice, *Attorney General's Annual Report to Congress on U.S. Government Activities to Combat Trafficking in Persons: Fiscal Year 2009*, p. 6.

¹⁴⁹ The grant is authorized under 22 U.S.C. §7105(b)(2)(A), pertaining to grants made by the Attorney General to develop, expand, or strengthen victim service programs for victims of trafficking in the United States.

¹⁵⁰ For a description of services offered by OVC, see archived CRS Report RL32579, *Victims of Crime Compensation and Assistance: Background and Funding*, by Celinda Franco.

on behalf of the victims. These task forces are funded through DOJ's Bureau of Justice Assistance.

Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)

In practice, HHS administers grant programs to nonprofit and other organizations that directly serve *noncitizen* trafficking victims and provides information to the public about trafficking. The grants for victims' services, as well as certain benefits solely for noncitizen victims, are provided by the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) in the Administration of Children and Families. According to ORR, the office does not provide any services to U.S. citizen victims of trafficking even though such services are authorized under TVPA. ORR notes that this is because Congress has not appropriated any money specifically for these services.¹⁵¹

Certification

To receive benefits and services through HHS under the TVPA (22 U.S.C. §7105(b)), victims of severe forms of trafficking who are at least 18 years of age must be certified by the Secretary of HHS, after consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security.¹⁵² Certified victims must be willing to assist in every reasonable way in the investigation and prosecution of severe forms of trafficking. They must have made a bona fide application for a T-visa (that has not been denied). Further, they must have been granted continued presence in the United States in order to effectuate the prosecution of traffickers in persons.¹⁵³ ORR provides certification and eligibility letters for victims.

Under the law, noncitizen trafficking victims under the age of 18 do not have to be certified to receive benefits and services, but it is HHS policy to issue eligibility letters to such victims. As discussed in this report, the concept of certification does not apply to U.S. citizen and LPR victims.

Victims' Services Through the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR)

Once trafficking victims are certified, they may be eligible for certain victims' services through ORR.¹⁵⁴ ORR funds and facilitates a variety of programs to help refugees achieve "economic and social self-sufficiency in their new homes in the United States." These programs are intended to

¹⁵¹ CRS correspondence with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Refugee Resettlement, June 17, 2011.

¹⁵² The Homeland Security Act of 2002 (HSA; P.L. 107-296) abolished the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and transferred most of its functions to various bureaus in the newly created Department of Homeland Security (DHS) effective March 1, 2003. In addition, due to HSA much of the Attorney General's authority in immigration law is currently vested in or shared with the Secretary of Homeland Security. For more information on the role of the Attorney General and Secretary of Homeland Security in immigration law, see archived CRS Report RL31997, *Authority to Enforce the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) in the Wake of the Homeland Security Act: Legal Issues*, by Stephen R. Vina.

¹⁵³ TVPA §107(b)(1)(E); 22 U.S.C. §7105(b)(1)(E).

¹⁵⁴ For more information, see CRS Report R41570, *U.S. Refugee Resettlement Assistance*, by Andorra Bruno.

help needy refugees who are ineligible to receive benefits under two federal programs available to U.S. citizens: Temporary Aid for Needy Families (TANF) and Medicaid.¹⁵⁵

For trafficking victims, ORR also provides grants to organizations that render assistance specific to the needs of these victims, such as temporary housing, independent living skills, cultural orientation, transportation needs, access to appropriate educational programs, and legal assistance and referrals. ORR may also supply trafficking victims with intensive case management programs to help the victim find housing and employment, and provide mental health counseling and specialized foster care programs for children. These services are not currently available to U.S. citizen trafficking victims.

In addition, ORR provides grants to organizations to provide street outreach services to help identify victims of trafficking among populations they already service. In FY2008, these grantees made contact with approximately 1,660 victims or suspected victims: 1,209 U.S. citizens, 373 foreign citizens, and 78 persons whose citizenship could not be determined.¹⁵⁶ ORR piloted a program in which community outreach workers who located a citizen/LPR child or adult victim of sex trafficking were given a letter from ORR stating that the individual may be a victim of human trafficking and might qualify for services as such. Nonetheless, ORR does not provide any services to U.S. citizen or LPR child victims of trafficking.¹⁵⁷

Rescue and Restore Victims of Human Trafficking Campaign

HHS, through ORR, also conducts outreach to inform victims of available services and to educate the public about trafficking.¹⁵⁸ HHS established the Rescue and Restore Victims of Human Trafficking public awareness campaign, which promotes public awareness about trafficking and the protections available for trafficking victims. The goal of the campaign is to help communities identify and serve victims of trafficking and support them in coming forward to receive services and aid law enforcement. HHS funds three contracts to “intermediary” organizations to foster connections between the Rescue and Restore campaign and local service providers. These intermediaries serve as the focal points for regional public awareness campaign activities and aid in victim identification.

In addition to promoting public awareness about trafficking, HHS, through the Rescue and Restore campaign, has established anti-trafficking coalitions in 25 areas.¹⁵⁹ These coalitions are intended to increase the number of trafficking victims who are identified and assisted. Coalition members include social service providers, local government officials, health care professionals,

¹⁵⁵ For a discussion of the eligibility of trafficking victims for state and federal means-tested benefits, see CRS Report RL33809, *Noncitizen Eligibility for Federal Public Assistance: Policy Overview and Trends*, by Ruth Ellen Wasem.

¹⁵⁶ U.S. Department of Justice, *Attorney General's Annual Report to Congress on U.S. Government Activities to Combat Trafficking in Persons: Fiscal Year 2008*, p. 19.

¹⁵⁷ CRS correspondence with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Refugee Resettlement, June 17, 2011.

¹⁵⁸ U.S. Department of Justice, *Attorney General's Annual Report to Congress on U.S. Government Activities to Combat Trafficking in Persons: Fiscal Year 2008*, June 2009, p. 10.

¹⁵⁹ These areas are Houston, TX; Las Vegas, NV; New York, NY; Milwaukee, WI; Newark, NJ; Philadelphia, PA; Phoenix, AZ; Portland, OR; St. Louis, MO; San Francisco, CA; Sacramento, CA; Louisville, KY; Nashville, TN; Columbus, OH; Cincinnati, OH; San Diego, Los Angeles, and Orange Counties in California; and statewide in Colorado, Idaho, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Minnesota, and North Carolina. DOJ, *Attorney General's Annual Report to Congress on U.S. Government Activities to Combat Trafficking in Persons: Fiscal Year 2008*, p. 14.

leaders of faith-based and ethnic organizations, and law enforcement personnel. Along with identifying and assisting victims, coalition members use the Rescue and Restore campaign messages to educate the general public about human trafficking.

Another component of the campaign is the creation of a toll-free National Human Trafficking Resource Center (NHTRC) available for advice and victim-care referrals 24-hours a day.¹⁶⁰ In FY2009, the NHTRC received 7,257 phone calls. These calls included 1,019 tips, of which approximately 300 were referred to law enforcement, and 697 requests for victim-care referrals. It is unknown how many of the calls to NHTRC were related to situations involving child prostitution or other forms of sex trafficking.¹⁶¹

¹⁶⁰ The NHTRC is carried out by the Polaris Project, a nonprofit organization that works on human trafficking issues.

¹⁶¹ U.S. Department of State, *Trafficking in Persons Report*, June 2010, p. 343.

Appendix C. Other Possible Federal Responses to Sex Trafficking of Minors

Policy makers and researchers have begun viewing commercial child sexual exploitation as a form of human trafficking. Nonetheless, while anti-trafficking statutes are fairly new, having first been enacted in 2000, the issue of commercial child sexual exploitation is not. Thus, there are other laws and programs that attempt to address the issues surrounding the commercial sexual exploitation of children, some of which have been in existence for several decades. While these laws and programs target exploited children, they do not focus exclusively on trafficking victims. This Appendix contains a discussion of selected programs.

Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)

Runaway and Homeless Youth Program¹⁶²

As discussed, runaway youth are particularly at risk of becoming victims of sex trafficking. The Runaway and Homeless Youth (RHY) program, administered by the Family and Youth Services Bureau (FYSB) of HHS, includes three programs to assist runaway and homeless youth. For FY2011, Congress appropriated \$115.7 million for the program. Two of the programs—the Basic Center program (BCP) and Transitional Living program (TLP)—provide shelter, counseling, and related services to youth.¹⁶³ While the BCP and TLP generally do not specialize in services for runaway and homeless victims of prostitution and other forms of sexual exploitation, a small number of BCP and TLP grantees provide services for these victims. For example, YouthCare, a TLP grantee in Seattle, provides beds and services specifically for runaway and homeless youth who are victims of commercial sexual exploitation.¹⁶⁴

The third RHY program, the Street Outreach program (SOP), provides street-based outreach and education, including treatment, counseling, provision of information, and referrals for runaway, homeless, and street youth who have been subjected to or are at risk of being subjected to sexual abuse and exploitation. Trained workers, some of whom are employed by BCPs and TLPs (and other runaway and homeless youth shelters that are not federally funded), visit youth on the street to provide these services and referrals.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶² For further information, see CRS Report RL33785, *Runaway and Homeless Youth: Demographics and Programs*, by Adrienne L. Fernandes-Alcantara.

¹⁶³ Congress appropriated \$97.7 million for the two programs in FY2010, which funded 364 BCP shelters and 216 TLPs in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, and Puerto Rico. That same year, nearly 45,000 youth received BCP services and approximately 4,000 received TLP services. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, *Children and Families Services Program Justification of Estimates for Appropriations Committees*, pp. 106, 112.

¹⁶⁴ CRS correspondence with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth, and Families, Family and Youth Services Bureau, March 2010.

¹⁶⁵ Approximately \$18.0 million was appropriated to fund 160 grantees in FY2010, many of which operate in coordination with the two shelter programs. In FY2010, street workers with the grantee organizations made 838,414 contacts with street youth. Most of these received written materials about referral services, health and hygiene products, and food and drink items. No other information is collected about the youth who receive assistance through SOP. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, *Children and Families Services Program Justification of Estimates for Appropriations Committees*, p. 111.

The RHY program also funds the National Runaway Switchboard (NRS), which serves as the national communication system for runaway and homeless youth. The NRS mission is to keep runaway and at-risk youth safe and off the streets. NRS operates a 24-hour hotline to provide crisis intervention, referrals to community resources, and family reunification. NRS staff are trained on issues involving child sexual exploitation and provide training to RHY and other grantees about the forms of sexual exploitation among runaway and homeless youth.¹⁶⁶

Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) and Family and Youth Services Bureau (FYSB) Coordination

In 2008, staff from the Family and Youth Services Bureau and Office of Refugee Resettlement provided training to five RHY grantee sites.¹⁶⁷ The grantees were funded under the BCP, TLP, and/or SOP. According to HHS, the training familiarized ORR staff with the work of FYSB grantees. Further, the training developed and tested a training module for new ORR and FYSB grantees on ORR procedures in processing or certifying trafficked youth. The training highlighted the differences between domestic and foreign trafficking victims, the different services they can receive, and emerging issues related to providing services to these youth—including the labeling of youth as victims or offenders as well as defining trafficking.

Department of Justice (DOJ)

Missing and Exploited Children's Program¹⁶⁸

The Missing Children's Assistance Act (P.L. 98-473), as amended, authorizes funding for the Missing and Exploited Children's (MEC) program. The act is the centerpiece of federal efforts to prevent the abduction and sexual exploitation of children, and to recover those children who go missing.¹⁶⁹ Since 1984, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) has served as a national resource center and has carried out many of the objectives of the act in collaboration with OJJDP. NCMEC operates the CyberTipline, which allows the public and electronic communication service providers (e.g., search engines and email providers) to report child victims of prostitution, enticement of children for sexual acts, child sexual molestation occurring outside the family, child pornography, and sex tourism involving children. NCMEC analysts from the Exploited Children's Unit send verified reports to the appropriate Internet Crimes Against Children Task Forces (see discussion elsewhere in this report) or, when appropriate, the local police agencies. The CyberTipline also accepts reports of misleading domain names and unsolicited materials sent to children, which are then referred to the Child

¹⁶⁶ CRS correspondence with the National Runaway Switchboard, April 2010.

¹⁶⁷ The sites were in San Diego, CA; and Austin, Galveston, and San Antonio in Texas. CRS correspondence with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth, and Families, Family and Youth Services Bureau, March 2010.

¹⁶⁸ For further information, see CRS Report RL34050, *Missing and Exploited Children: Background, Policies, and Issues*, by Adrienne L. Fernandes-Alcantara.

¹⁶⁹ The act directed DOJ's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to establish both a toll-free number to report missing and exploited children and a national resource center for missing and exploited children; coordinate public and private missing and exploited children's programs; provide training and technical assistance to recover missing children; and assist law enforcement entities in combating child exploitation. For FY2011, Congress appropriated \$70 million for the MEC program.

Exploitation and Obscenities Section (CEOS) of DOJ. Federal law enforcement agents and analysts co-located at NCMEC prepare and serve subpoenas based on leads from the CyberTipline, and reported leads are referred to field offices.¹⁷⁰ The FBI uses CyberTipline reports to gain leads for their Innocence Lost Project on domestic child trafficking. Between March 1998 (when the CyberTipline began) and December 2010, nearly one million (995,493) reports were received, of which 9,343 (0.9%) were for child prostitution.¹⁷¹ The majority of reports were for child pornography.

The MEC program also supports the Internet Crimes Against Children (ICAC) Task Force program to assist state and local law enforcement cyber units in investigating possible incidents of online child sexual exploitation (discussed above). The MEC also provides technical assistance for the AMBER Alert system, which coordinates state efforts to broadcast bulletins in the most serious child abduction cases. In some years, the MEC program supports, or has supported, additional activities. For example, in FY2009 the program funded grants for researching and combating child sexual exploitation and promoting child safety in general.

In addition to funding its major components (the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, the ICAC Task Force Program, etc.), the Missing and Exploited Children's program provides funding for smaller grant programs, some of which have targeted victims of commercial sexual exploitation. According to the funding announcement for the grants, commercial sexual exploitation describes a range of crimes of a sexual nature committed against victims younger than age 18, primarily or entirely for financial or other economic reasons, including trafficking for sexual purposes, prostitution, sex tourism, mail-order bride trades and early marriage, pornography, stripping, and performances in sexual venues such as peep shows or clubs.¹⁷²

In FY2009, DOJ allocated funding for two competitive grant programs that address commercial sexual exploitation. One of the grants provided funding to three communities to assist in developing policies and procedures for identifying victims of commercial sexual exploitation.¹⁷³ Another grant, Research on the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children, is used to support research on the scope and consequence of the commercial sexual exploitation of children and youth.¹⁷⁴ For FY2011, the MEC program is providing funding through a grant, the Technical Assistance Program to Address Commercial Sexual Exploitation/Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking. The program will fund a grantee to provide training and technical assistance to OJJDP grantee organizations and other entities to implement or enhance efforts to identify youth at risk of commercial sexual exploitation (defined above) and domestic minor sex trafficking (not defined); develop or enhance mentoring service models for youth at risk; provide an array of

¹⁷⁰ Federal law enforcement officials from five agencies (FBI, U.S. Postal Inspection Service, U.S. Marshals Service, Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency, and the State Department) work full- or part-time at NCMEC investigating missing and exploited children cases, as they pertain to their federal jurisdiction.

¹⁷¹ National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, *NCMEC Quarterly Progress Report Covering Activity Through December 2010*, January 26, 2011, p. 34.

¹⁷² See, for example, U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, *FY 09 Improving Community Response to the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children and Research on the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children, Funding Announcements*, 2009.

¹⁷³ The grantees are Multnomah County, OR; Alameda County, CA; and Kristi House, a child advocacy center for sexually abused children, in Miami, FL. An FY2009 technical assistance grant through the ICAC program awarded funds to the Girls Education and Mentoring Services (GEMS) to provide technical assistance to the grantees.

¹⁷⁴ The grantee is the Fund for the City of New York, a nonprofit organization that funds projects to advance the "functioning of government and nonprofit organizations in New York and beyond."

services for youth victims; and develop and deliver prevention programming in a variety of community settings.

Author Contact Information

Kristin M. Finklea
Analyst in Domestic Security
kfinklea@crs.loc.gov, 7-6259

Adrienne L. Fernandes-Alcantara
Specialist in Social Policy
afernandes@crs.loc.gov, 7-9005

Alison Siskin
Specialist in Immigration Policy
asiskin@crs.loc.gov, 7-0260