



Department of Commerce
Innovation is in our nature.

Criminal Penalty Fines

*Related to Prostitution and Commercial Sexual Abuse of Minors
(Chapter 121, Laws of 2013)*

December 2015
Report to the Legislature
Brian Bonlender, Director

Acknowledgements

Washington State Department of Commerce

Diane Klontz, Assistant Director, Community Services and Housing Division

Rick Torrance, Managing Director, Office of Crime Victims Advocacy and Public Safety

Alice Zillah, Research Policy Manager, Research Services

Steve Salmi, Ph.D., Manager, Research Services

Rick Torrance, Managing Director

1-800-822-1067

ocva@commerce.wa.gov

Washington State Department of Commerce

Office of Crime Victims Advocacy

1011 Plum St. SE

P.O. Box 42525

Olympia, WA 98504-2525

www.commerce.wa.gov

For people with disabilities, this report is available on request in other formats. To submit a request, please call 360-725-4000 (TTY 360-586-0772).

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Introduction.....	4
Crime Rates and Fine Assessments.....	6
How Jurisdictions Reported Expending the Funds.....	11
Appendix A: Dispersal of Criminal Penalty Fines.....	16
Appendix B: Courts with Convictions for Applicable Charges	17

Executive Summary

In 2013, the Washington State Legislature levied additional fees on Commercial Sexual Abuse of a Minor (CSAM) and prostitution-related crimes. The fees are in addition to other criminal penalties, including statutory fines and/or jail time. The majority of the revenue from these fines is maintained by local jurisdictions, to be used for services for victims, preventative efforts, and law enforcement activities to reduce the commercial sale of sex. Some of the fines can be reduced by up to two-thirds if the judge finds, on the record, that an offender does not have the ability to pay. None of the fines can be waived entirely.

This report, for state fiscal year 2015 (SFY 2015), is the second annual report prepared by Commerce on the fee revenue and expenditures related to this set of crimes.

Key Findings

- In SFY 2015, 72 courts in Washington handed down convictions for the crimes that bear the additional criminal penalty. Of these, 27 courts levied the statutorily required fines. Of the 27 courts, 21 collected revenue towards payment of the fines.
- A total of \$249,449 was levied, and \$211,540 was collected during 2015. King County courts were responsible for 93 percent of the penalty fines collected during the year.
- The jurisdictions in which courts assessed and collected fines were surveyed to determine how the funds had been used. Responses were received from 13 jurisdictions.

Introduction

In 2013, the Washington State Legislature passed [ESHB 1291](#). The law, Chapter 121, Laws of 2013, concerned prostitution and the commercial sexual abuse of minors, and directed the Department of Commerce to:

...prepare and submit an annual report to the legislature on the amount of revenue collected by local jurisdictions under RCW 9.68A.105, 9A.88.120, or 9A.88.140 and the expenditure of that revenue. [RCW 43.280.100]

The three statutes – 9.68A.105, 9A.88.120, and 9A.88.140 – levy fees onto convictions related to prostitution and the commercial sexual exploitation of children. The fees are in addition to other penalties, including statutory fines and/or jail time. The fines are also levied on an offender who has entered into a statutory or non-statutory diversion agreement as a result of an arrest for one of the applicable crimes. Table 1 lists the statutes, the additional penalty, and the crimes to which the penalty applies.

Table 1: Statutes Modified by Chapter 121, Laws of 2013

Statute	Additional Penalty Amount	Crimes to Which Penalty Applies
9.68A.105	\$5,000	9.68A.100 – Commercial sexual abuse of a minor (CSAM) 9.68A.101 – Promoting CSAM 9.68A.102 – Promoting travel for CSAM
9A.88.120	\$50	9A.88.010 – Indecent exposure
	\$50	9A.88.030 – Prostitution
	\$1,500 for first offense \$2,500 for second offense \$5,000 for third or greater offense	9A.88.090 – Permitting prostitution 9A.88.110 – Patronizing a prostitute
	\$3,000 for first offense \$6,000 for second offense \$10,000 for third or greater offense	9A.88.070 – Promoting prostitution in the first degree 9A.88.080 – Promoting prostitution in the second degree
9A.88.140	\$500	9A.88.140 – Vehicle impoundment fine for: 9A.88.110 – Patronizing a prostitute 9A.88.070 – Promoting prostitution in the first degree 9A.88.080 – Promoting prostitution in the second degree 9A.88.085 – Promoting travel for prostitution
	\$2,500	9A.88.140 – Vehicle impoundment fine for: 9.68A.100 – CSAM 9.68A.101 – Promoting CSAM 9.68A.102 – Promoting travel for CSAM

The three statutes levying the additional fees establish how the revenue from the fines collected must be used by jurisdictions:

- At least 50 percent of the revenue must be spent on prevention, including education programs for offenders, such as “john school”; and rehabilitative services for victims, such as mental health and substance abuse counseling, parenting skills, training, housing relief, education, vocational training, drop-in centers, and employment counseling.
- Up to 48 percent must be used for local efforts to reduce the commercial sale of sex including, but not limited to, increasing enforcement of commercial sex laws.
- Two percent of the revenue shall be remitted quarterly to the Department of Commerce (Commerce), together with a report detailing the fines assessed, the revenue received, and how that revenue was spent.

Some of the fees can be reduced if the court finds, on the record, that the offender does not have the ability to pay the fee. In those cases the fee can only be reduced up to two-thirds.

The fees attached to vehicle impoundment may not be reduced at all. These fines are collected by the impounding agency if a law enforcement officer impounds a vehicle that was used in the commission of a CSAM or prostitution-related crime, or if other conditions are met. This fee is collected prior to the owner redeeming their vehicle. If the defendant is subsequently found not guilty of the crime, they are entitled to a refund of the fee.

Crime Rates and Fine Assessments

Many offenders do not pay fees all at once, but instead enter into a payment plan with the court. As penalty fines are paid off, they are coded into the Judicial Information System (JIS) used by most courts in Washington. Therefore, revenue from fines can be greater during a given year than the fines assessed, as penalties from past years are paid off.

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is responsible for establishing new codes in JIS and informing courts about which codes to use. Data in JIS is coded to the account to which funds are directed, rather than to the statute applicable to the crime. As a result, *it is not possible to separate the funds collected by the offense committed.*

Once the revenue is received and allocated to a code, the city or county treasurer is responsible for establishing an account for the monies. Some cities contract with their county to act as treasurer for the jurisdiction. Then, the jurisdiction must decide which department, office, or official is responsible for deciding how the funds should be spent, seeing that they are allocated according to the guidance established by the Legislature, and ensuring that the quarterly reports are sent to Commerce.

The Washington State Patrol (WSP) maintains data by county on the number of arrests and convictions for all crimes in Washington. Some cities, notably Seattle, have a municipal code that is used for misdemeanor offenses and which effectively replaces the applicable state statute for that crime in the city's data system. Therefore, data on arrests, cases, and convictions for crimes committed within the city of Seattle must be obtained from the Seattle Municipal Court.

Because the applicable crimes include both misdemeanors and felonies, the courts impacted include municipal and district courts (known as courts of limited jurisdiction, or CLJs), and superior courts, which hear serious felonies.

Certain courts, including the Seattle Municipal Court, do not utilize JIS. Additionally, some municipal courts contract with their county district court to collect fines on their behalf. For instance, King County District Court contracts with the cities of Beaux Arts, Bellevue, Burien, Carnation, Covington, Duvall, Kenmore, Redmond, Sammamish, Shoreline, Skykomish, and Woodinville. The information on fines collected and assessed by those cities is merged with the data for King County District Court.

Table 2 lists the number of arrests and convictions for the relevant crimes, the fines assessed, and the fines collected for each county in Washington. Additional detail can be found in Appendix B, which contains a complete list of all courts that imposed convictions for the applicable crimes, and the amounts assessed and collected.

Table 2: Arrests, Convictions, and Fines by County – SFY 2015

County	Arrests for Applicable Charges	Convictions for Applicable Charges	Fines Assessed	Fines Collected
Adams County	3	1	-	-
Asotin County	2	0	-	-
Benton County	16	7	\$100	-
Chelan County	12	2	-	-
Clallam County	13	1	-	-
Clark County	43	20	\$50	\$100
Columbia County	0	0	-	-
Cowlitz County	11	5	-	-
Douglas County	0	2	-	-
Ferry County	0	0	-	-
Franklin County	16	8	-	-
Garfield County	0	0	-	-
Grant County	17	0	-	-
Grays Harbor County	25	9	\$1,300	\$700
Island County	6	0	-	-
Jefferson County	1	0	-	\$30
King County	642	237	\$220,132	\$196,563
Kitsap County	38	34	\$5,942	\$1,342
Kittitas County	11	2	-	-
Klickitat County	3	2	-	-
Lewis County	7	6	\$3,000	\$44
Lincoln County	0	0	-	-
Mason County	7	5	\$25	-
Okanogan County	1	0	-	-
Pacific County	0	0	-	-
Pend Oreille County	1	0	-	-
Pierce County	95	35	\$150	\$50
San Juan County	0	0	-	-
Skagit County	11	2	-	-
Skamania County	4	0	-	-
Snohomish County	90	22	\$3,200	\$621
Spokane County	46	15	-	-
Stevens County	6	1	-	-
Thurston County	28	9	-	-
Wahkiakum County	0	0	-	-
Walla Walla County	7	3	-	-
Whatcom County	34	13	\$9,100	\$5,372
Whitman County	1	0	-	-
Yakima County	46	14	\$6,450	\$6,718
TOTAL	1243	455	\$249,449	\$211,540

In 2015, 72 courts in Washington handed down convictions for the crimes that bear the additional penalty. Of these, 27 courts from 11 different counties levied the statutorily required fines. Of the 27 courts, 21 collected revenue towards payment of the fines.

A total of \$249,449 was levied, and \$211,540 was collected during 2015. King County courts were responsible for 93 percent of the penalty fines collected during the year.

Table 3 lists the number of arrests, cases, and convictions for the relevant crimes. It also includes the crime of trafficking, which carries an additional \$10,000 penalty fee. However, the fine for trafficking is not subject to the same dispersal as those specified under 9.68A.105, 9A.88.120, and 9A.88.140.

Table 3: Statewide Arrests and Convictions Per Crime – SFY 2015

Statute	Charge	Number of Arrests	Number of Cases	Number of Convictions
9.68A.100	Commercial Sexual Abuse of a Minor (CSAM)	88	93	6
9.68A.101	Promoting Commercial Sexual Abuse of a Minor	27	42	10
9.68A.102	Promoting Travel for Commercial Sexual Abuse of a Minor	2	1	0
9.68A.103	Permitting Commercial Sexual Abuse of a Minor	8	0	0
9A. 40.100	Trafficking	68	16	0
9A.88.010	Indecent Exposure	481	480	179
9A.88.030	Prostitution	255	153	86
9A.88.070	Promoting Prostitution in the First Degree	75	9	10
9A.88.080	Promoting Prostitution in the Second Degree	6	87	62
9A.88.085	Promoting Travel for Prostitution (Vehicle Impoundment)	1	0	0
9A.88.090	Permitting Prostitution	1	0	0
9A.88.110	Patronizing a Prostitute	231	258	102
TOTAL		1243	1139	455

Sources: The Washington State Patrol provided data on arrests and convictions, the Administrative Office of the Courts provided data on cases, and Seattle Municipal Court provided data on arrests, cases, and convictions within the city of Seattle.


Note: Data from the Seattle Municipal Court includes the charge of Prostitution Loitering within the category of Prostitution.

The relatively high number of arrests for trafficking (68) compared to the low number of cases and the lack of convictions, suggests that many of these cases are instead prosecuted for the lesser charge of promoting prostitution. In addition, if an investigation reveals that the victim(s)

was underage, the prosecutor may elect to press a felony charge of CSAM instead of a trafficking charge.


The majority of the arrests and convictions for these crimes take place in King County. As shown in tables 4 and 5, law enforcement agencies in King County were responsible for 88 percent of the arrests for patronizing a prostitute in the state, and 82 percent of the convictions for these crimes were handed down in King County courts (including city municipal courts within the county). King County courts were also responsible for over two-thirds (67 percent) of the convictions for promoting prostitution statewide.

Table 4: Arrests and Convictions in King County for Prostitution-Related Crimes – SFY 2015



Sources: *The Washington State Patrol and Seattle Municipal Court.*

Table 5: Arrests and Convictions Outside King County for Prostitution-Related Crimes – SFY 2015




Sources: *The Washington State Patrol and Seattle Municipal Court.*

King County law enforcement agencies made 69 percent of the arrests in the state for CSAM crimes, and King County Superior Court was responsible for 33 percent of the convictions. According to AOC data, 71 out of 93 cases for CSAM were filed in King County Superior Court.

The CSAM crimes in Table 6 include CSAM, promoting CSAM, and promoting travel for CSAM.

Table 6: Commercial Sexual Abuse of a Minor Arrests and Convictions – SFY 2015



Source: The Washington State Patrol

How Jurisdictions Reported Expending the Funds

According to data from the AOC, 27 courts assessed and/or collected the relevant fines during SFY 2015. Commerce contacted each court by email and follow-up phone calls to inquire about how the funds were expended. As in 2014, jurisdictions were provided with a chart (Appendix A) showing the relevant statutes and the statutory dispersal formula for the funds.

In most cases, it was necessary to speak with another department (for instance, the city or county treasurer, the police department, or the prosecutor's office) to learn whether the funds had been allocated, and if so, what they had been spent on.

Less than half of the jurisdictions (13) responded with the required information. The following information lists how each jurisdiction described expending the funds.

City of Aberdeen

Aberdeen allocated 48 percent of the funds to a law enforcement officer's time on a prostitution sting, and 50 percent of the funds will be allocated to the nonprofit Beyond Survival. Beyond Survival supports, educates, and empowers all people impacted by sexual abuse.

City of Bellevue

Has not yet expended any of the funds.

City of Bellingham

Has not yet expended any of the funds.

City of Des Moines

Has not yet expended any of the funds.

City of Federal Way

Has not yet expended any of the funds.

City of Kent

The City of Kent has taken a proactive, dedicated approach to combatting trafficking and commercial sexual exploitation. The Kent Police Department utilizes online and hotel-based stings, resulting in over 60 cases within a two-month period. Kent is also notable for its careful reporting of the expenditures resulting from penalty fine revenue. Following is a listing of how funds were spent during SFY 2015.

- In October 2014, Kent provided \$10,000 from penalty fine revenue to Catholic Community Services for Katherine’s House. Katherine’s House is a transitional housing program for homeless adult women in recovery from substance abuse.
- Also in October 2014, costs for a “john sting” were \$180 for food, \$236 for three hotel rooms, \$48 for ads on Backpage.com, and \$777 on officer overtime. A john sting involves placing a fake advertisement online for commercial sex, and arresting the potential buyers when they arrive at the designated meeting spot and confirm they are there to pay for sex.
- In November, a john sting required \$73 for a motel room.
- To increase the efficiency of the unit conducting john stings, the Kent Police Department invested in four laptops (\$5,331) and two GoPro cameras (\$1,148).
- A john sting in February 2015 required \$130 for food, \$165 for three hotel rooms, \$96 for ads on Backpage.com, and \$6,480 on staff overtime.
- In March 2015, Kent donated \$15,000 from fine revenue to the Seattle nonprofit REST (Real Escape from the Sex Trade) for their work with victims of human trafficking.

Kitsap County

Kitsap County used the revenue from penalty fees to support the anti-trafficking activities of its prosecutor’s office, as well as advocacy and outreach efforts.

The Kitsap County Prosecutor’s Office Vice Unit handles all felony offenses involving human trafficking, drugs, and gang related offenses. The felony human trafficking offenses prosecuted by this unit include human trafficking, promoting commercial sexual abuse of minor, promoting prostitution in the first and second degree, and violent felonies that occur during the commission of trafficking-related offenses.

In addition to the four attorneys in the Vice Unit, Kitsap County has a full-time investigator whose focus is criminal occurrences related to human trafficking, drugs and gangs.

Kitsap County also supports advocacy services, which includes emotional support for both underage and adult victims of human trafficking. Lastly, community outreach and education activities include provide technical assistance and training to community and faith-based organizations, government, law enforcement officials, and others.

King County

In 2014 King County launched a new approach to reduce the demand for prostitution and change the attitudes and behaviors of men arrested for patronization. The Buyer Beware initiative is a partnership with eight police departments and city attorneys' offices across King County that are shifting their emphasis to pursue the buyers of commercial sex. The initiative is led by the Organization for Prostitution Survivors and the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office.

Buyer Beware brings together local prosecuting authorities with community service organizations and survivors to carry out a comprehensive strategy to reduce demand and facilitate exit from prostitution. Leaders of the initiative explain that past practice punished prostituted people instead of those who caused the harm: the sex buyers. As a result, the cycle of prostitution-related crime and sex trafficking persisted and victims continued to be harmed.

According to the Buyer Beware program, prostituted people are typically coerced into prostitution between the ages of 12 and 15, controlled by pimps, experience multiple traumas, and face many barriers to escaping the life of prostitution. Therefore, the new model emphasizes the prosecution of sex buyers and connecting prostituted people to services. The goal is to reduce demand for commercial sex by 20 percent in two years. Program leaders assert that a reduction in demand will decrease harm to prostituted persons, reduce self-destructive behaviors of buyers, and curb sex trafficking in our community.

Participating community organizations include Businesses Ending Slavery and Trafficking (BEST), Stolen Youth, and Seattle Against Slavery. Participating law enforcement agencies include the King County Sheriff's Office and the police departments of Seattle, Des Moines, Kent, Federal Way, Bellevue, and Renton.

Interventions of the Buyer Beware program include:

- Systematic law enforcement emphasis on arrests and prosecutions of sex buyers.
- Increased penalties to deter buyers.
- Referring sex buyers to "Stopping Sexual Exploitation," a comprehensive intervention program.
- Collection of fines to fund services for prostituted people.
- Reduce arrests and prosecutions of prostituted persons in favor of referral to services.
- Expansion of effective services to assist prostituted people in leaving the life.
- Forming an alliance of public and private employers committed to implementing policies and practices against sex buying.
- Engaging high school and college students on the harm of commercial sexual exploitation.
- Social media campaigns to engage young men on the harms of sex buying.

- Engaging a spectrum of community sectors, including public health, education, business, media and criminal justice to change cultural norms around buying sex.

City of Normandy Park

The three statutes levying the additional penalty direct court clerks to remit the fees collected to the treasurer of the city or county where the offense occurred. Normandy Park received \$4,900 from King County Superior Court because the offenses for those fines occurred within its boundaries. The Normandy Park Police Department used the funds to assist the King County Major Crimes Unit with 12 hours of john sting operations. In addition, Chief Chris Gaddis serves as the Law Enforcement Chair for the King County Coalition Against Human Trafficking.

City of Renton

The City of Renton received \$4,900 from King County Superior Court because the offenses for those fines occurred within its boundaries. Of this amount, the majority (79 percent) was spent on prevention activities conducted by the police department; in particular sting operations at hotels. The remainder was allocated for advocacy, education, and training.

City of SeaTac

Funds have not yet been expended. The funds are earmarked for the city's Probation Department to work with the City of Tukwila to establish a program to help educate and prevent the commercial sale of sex.

City of Seattle

Close to 42 percent of the arrests statewide for patronizing a prostitute were made in the city of Seattle (96 out of 231 arrests in SFY 2015). In comparison, the city has approximately 9 percent of the state's population. The high arrest rate is in part due to an expressed commitment from the Seattle Police Department to focus law enforcement efforts on arresting the buyers of commercial sex, rather than those being prostituted.

During the last five years, Seattle has instituted a number of programs to both curb commercial sexual exploitation and to assist victims and survivors. These programs, described below, are funded in part from the criminal penalty fines paid by those convicted of the crimes outlined in this report.

In 2009, the Seattle Human Services Department contracted with local providers to facilitate a Sex Industry Workers Class and a "john school" for those arrested for buying sex. These programs, each initially one day long, are funded from fines levied on those convicted for patronizing a prostitute. The curriculum of the Sex Industry Workers Class includes information about public health, domestic violence, sexual assault, chemical dependency, parenting support, and other resources supporting women who may be attempting to leave prostitution.

The john school provides curriculum on the sexual exploitation of women, legal ramifications, and confronting and healing from sexual addiction.

In 2014, the city implemented an improved model for the Sex Industry Worker's Class. Instead of a one-day class, the program now provides four two-hour sessions held weekly. The classes, in the form of a discussion and support group, take place at a YWCA. Each week a guest speaker is invited to address the participants for the second half of the class to discuss a specific topic, including violence against women, safer sex, and resources to recover from chemical dependency.

Also in 2014, following three years of research, planning, and engagement with community stakeholders, the city of Seattle implemented the Coordinated Effort Against Sexual Exploitation (CEASE), a multi-agency effort to identify survivors of commercial sexual exploitation. CEASE aims to provide these women and men with wraparound services within 24 to 48 hours after they have been identified. The support services provided by CEASE are funded in part by fines collected from the buyers of commercial sex. These services include emergency and transitional housing, counseling, employment assistance, mental health services, and the option of flexible dollars for clients to obtain safety, stability, and independence.

The funding for CEASE has been leveraged with other fund sources, including monies for the victims of domestic violence and sexual assault.

In July 2015, the Mayor's Office on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault of the City of Seattle Human Services Department asked for applications from agencies to provide services for adult and youth victims and survivors of commercial sexual exploitation. The new services will provide survivors with advocacy and support to navigate resources and systems, so that they experience less secondary trauma and are better able to recover, obtain safety and self-sufficiency, and are able to leave the life of prostitution.


Approximately \$350,000 is available for these services, which leverages monies from CSAM penalty fees, the Prostituted Children Rescue Fund, and the Sex Industry Victims Funds. Initial awards will be made for 2016 beginning in January.

City of Yakima

Yakima has not yet expended any of the funds, but plans to use them to benefit the community and combat trafficking, prostitution, and commercial sexual crimes.

Appendix A: Dispersal of Criminal Penalty Fines

Trafficking, Prostitution, and Commercial Sexual Exploitation Crimes: Dispersal of Penalty Fines and Revenue from Seized Property under Washington State Statutes



Statute	Additional Penalty Amount	Statute Providing Additional Penalty	How Fines Must Be Used
9A.40.100 – Trafficking	\$10,000 (not deposited into PPIA)	9A.40.100	Local Prevention Efforts and Victims' Services: At least 50 percent of the revenue must be spent on prevention, including education programs for offenders, such as job school, and rehabilitative services for victims, such as mental health and substance abuse counseling, parenting skills, training, housing relief, education, vocational training, drop-in centers, and employment counseling.
9.68A.100 – Commercial sexual abuse of a minor (CSAM)	\$5,000	9.68A.105	
9.68A.101 – Promoting CSAM	\$5,000 (all deposited to PPIA)	9.68A.106	Local Law Enforcement: Up to 48 percent must be used for local efforts to reduce the commercial sale of sex including, but not limited to, increasing enforcement of commercial sex laws.
9.68A.102 – Promoting travel for CSAM	\$50		
9.68A.106 – Internet advertisement related to CSAM	\$50		Prostitution Prevention and Intervention Account (PPIA): Two percent of the revenue shall be remitted quarterly to the Dept. of Commerce, together with a report detailing the fines assessed, the revenue received, and how that revenue was spent. (Does not apply to 9A.40.100, Trafficking.)
9A.88.010 – Indecent exposure	\$1,500 for 1 st offense		
9A.88.030 – Prostitution	\$2,500 for 2 nd offense	9A.88.120	How Proceeds Must Be Used (effective June 12, 2014) Dispersal of Proceeds from Seized Property: 90% shall be used by the seizing law enforcement agency for the expenses of the investigation and seizure. Remaining funds shall be used to enforce the provisions of 9A.88 RCW or 9.68A RCW. Prostitution Prevention and Intervention Account: By January 31st of each year, each seizing agency shall remit to the state treasurer 10% of the net proceeds of any property forfeited during the preceding calendar year. Money remitted shall be deposited in the Prostitution Prevention and Intervention Account, managed by the Dept. of Commerce.
9A.88.090 – Permitting prostitution	\$5,000 for 3 rd or greater offense		
9A.88.110 – Patronizing a prostitute	\$3,000 for 1 st offense		
9A.88.070 – Promoting prostitution in the 1 st degree	\$6,000 for 2 nd offense		
9A.88.080 – Promoting prostitution in the 2 nd degree	\$10,000 for 3 rd or greater offense		
9A.88.140 – Vehicle impoundment fine:	\$500		
9A.88.110 – Patronizing a prostitute			
9A.88.070 – Promoting Prostitution in the 1 st degree			
9A.88.080 – Promoting Prostitution in the 2 nd degree			
9A.88.085 – Promoting travel for prostitution			
9A.88.140 – Vehicle impoundment fine:			
9.68A.100 – CSAM	\$2,500		
9.68A.101 – Promoting CSAM			
9.68A.102 – Promoting travel for CSAM			

Appendix B: Courts with Convictions for Applicable Charges

Table 7: Courts with Convictions for Applicable Charges – SFY 2015

Court	County	Convictions for Applicable Charges	Fines Assessed	Fines Collected
Aberdeen Municipal Court	Grays Harbor County	6	\$1,300	\$700
Adams County Superior Court	Adams County	1	-	-
Airway Heights Municipal Court	Spokane County	1	-	-
Auburn Municipal Court	King County	2	\$1,900	\$215
Bellevue Municipal Court	King County	0	\$2,000	\$1,794
Bellingham Municipal Court	Whatcom County	10	\$9,100	\$5,372
Benton County District Court	Benton County	6	\$100	-
Benton County Superior Court	Benton County	1	-	-
Bothell Municipal Court	King County	0	\$50	\$50
Bremerton Municipal Court	Kitsap County	6	\$50	-
Camas Municipal Court	Clark County	1	-	-
Chehalis Municipal Court	Lewis County	3	-	-
Chelan County District Court	Chelan County	1	-	-
Chelan County Superior Court	Chelan County	1	-	-
Clallam County District Court No. 1	Clallam County	1	-	-
Clark County District Court	Clark County	10	\$50	\$100
Clark County Superior Court	Clark County	9	-	-
Cowlitz County District Court	Cowlitz County	4	-	-
Cowlitz County Superior Court	Cowlitz County	1	-	-
Des Moines Municipal Court	King County	2	\$7,500	\$4,524
East Klickitat District Court	Klickitat County	2	-	-
East Wenatchee Municipal Court	Douglas County	2	-	-
Everett Municipal Court	Snohomish County	8	-	-
Evergreen District Court	Snohomish County	1	-	-
Federal Way Municipal Court	King County	10	\$10,700	\$3,577
Ferndale Municipal Court	Whatcom County	1	-	-
Fife Municipal Court	Pierce County	5	\$150	\$50
Gig Harbor Municipal Court	Pierce County	1	-	-
Grays Harbor County Superior Court	Grays Harbor County	2	-	-
Issaquah Municipal Court	King County	5	-	-
Jefferson County Superior Court	Jefferson County	0	-	\$30
Kent Municipal Court	King County	14	\$41,700	\$25,804
King County District Court	King County	23	\$1,650	\$2,050

Court	County	Convictions for Applicable Charges	Fines Assessed	Fines Collected
King County Southwest District Court	King County	1	-	-
King County Superior Court	King County	83	\$53,782	\$108,340
Kirkland Municipal Court	King County	3	\$50	-
Kitsap County District Court	Kitsap County	11	\$5,225	\$1,342
Kitsap County Superior Court	Kitsap County	18	\$667	-
Lake Forest Park Municipal Court	King County	2	-	-
Lakewood Municipal Court	Pierce County	1	-	-
Lewis County Superior Court	Lewis County	3	\$3,000	\$44
Lower Kittitas County District Court	Kittitas County	2	-	-
Lynnwood Municipal Court	Snohomish County	2	-	-
Marysville Municipal Court	Snohomish County	2	-	-
Mason County District Court	Mason County	4	\$25	-
Ocean Shores Municipal Court	Grays Harbor County	1	-	-
Olympia Municipal Court	Thurston County	6	-	-
Pasco Municipal Court	Franklin County	8	-	-
Pierce County District Court No. 1	Pierce County	6	-	-
Pierce County Superior Court	Pierce County	10	-	-
Renton Municipal Court	King County	10	-	-
SeaTac Municipal Court	King County	6	\$5,750	\$1,499
Seattle Municipal Court	King County	0	\$94,850	\$48,560
Shelton Municipal Court	Mason County	1	-	-
Shoreline Municipal Court	King County	0	\$50	-
Skagit County District Court	Skagit County	1	-	-
Skagit County Superior Court	Skagit County	1	-	-
Snohomish County District Court	Snohomish County	3	-	-
Snohomish County South District Court	Snohomish County	3	\$3,000	\$621
Snohomish County South District Court Evergreen Division	Snohomish County	0	\$200	-
Snohomish County Superior Court	Snohomish County	3	-	-
Spokane County District Court	Spokane County	1	-	-
Spokane County Superior Court	Spokane County	8	-	-
Spokane Municipal Court	Spokane County	5	-	-
Stevens County Superior Court	Stevens County	1	-	-
Sumner Municipal Court	Pierce County	1	-	-
Sunnyside Municipal Court	Yakima County	1	-	-
Tacoma Municipal Court	Pierce County	11	-	-

Court	County	Convictions for Applicable Charges	Fines Assessed	Fines Collected
Thurston County Superior Court	Thurston County	3	-	-
Tukwila Municipal Court	King County	2	\$150	\$150
Walla Walla County District Court	Walla Walla County	2	-	-
Walla Walla County Superior Court	Walla Walla County	1	-	-
Whatcom County District Court	Whatcom County	1	-	-
Whatcom County Superior Court	Whatcom County	1	-	-
Yakima County District Court	Yakima County	2	-	-
Yakima County Superior Court	Yakima County	2	-	-
Yakima Municipal Court	Yakima County	9	\$6,450	\$6,718
TOTAL		382	\$ 249,449	\$ 211,540

Sources: *The Washington State Patrol, Administrative Office of the Courts, King County Superior Court, and Seattle Municipal Court.*