

Criminal Penalty Fees Related to Sexual Exploitation Crimes



Per RCW 43.280.100

January 7, 2020

REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE

Lisa Brown, Director

Acknowledgments

Washington State Department of Commerce

Diane Klontz, assistant director, Community Services and Housing Division

Rick Torrance, managing director, Office of Crime Victims Advocacy

Alice Zillah, section manager, Research Services, Community Assistance and Research Unit

Rick Torrance, managing director, 360-725-2059, richard.torrance@commerce.wa.gov

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.....	2
Introduction	3
Fee Assessments and Crime Rates.....	5
How Jurisdictions Reported Expending the Funds.....	11
Appendix A: Distribution of Criminal Penalty Fees.....	14
Appendix B: Courts with Convictions for Applicable Charges.....	15
Appendix C: King County's Approach	18

Executive Summary

Overview

In 2013, the Washington State Legislature levied additional fees on the crime of commercial sexual abuse of a minor (CSAM) and other sexual exploitation crimes. The fees, ordered on persons convicted of crimes, are in addition to other criminal penalties, including statutory fines and jail time. Local jurisdictions retain the majority of the revenue from these fees to fund preventative efforts, services for victims, and law enforcement activities to reduce the commercial sale of sex. Judges may reduce some of the fees by up to two-thirds if the judge finds, on the record, that an offender cannot pay. Courts may not entirely waive any of the fees.

This report, for state fiscal year 2019 (SFY 2019), is the sixth annual report prepared by the Washington State Department of Commerce (Commerce) on the fee revenue and expenditures related to this set of crimes. See the Introduction on page 6 for the full statutory requirement for this report.

Key Findings

In state fiscal year 2019:

- Ten courts reported \$100 or less collected during SFY 2019, and therefore they were not surveyed. Through email and phone contacts, researchers surveyed the 17 jurisdictions that collected greater amounts to find out how cities and counties used the funds. Fourteen courts responded.
- Law enforcement officers made 13% fewer arrests for sexual exploitation crimes compared to SFY 2018. The number of convictions, however, remained close to the same – 358 in SFY 2019, compared to 363 in SFY 2018.
- In SFY 2019, 68 courts in Washington handed down convictions for the crimes that bear the additional fee. Of these courts, 23 levied the statutorily required fees. Twenty-one courts collected revenue toward payment of the fees.
- On balance, Washington state courts levied 54% of the total amount of penalty fees possible for convictions of sexual exploitation crimes.
- If judges ordered persons convicted of crimes to pay the full fee amount for all crimes, potential revenue would total \$474,350. Instead, judges in superior, district and municipal courts ordered \$257,496. Out of the amount levied, courts collected a total of \$174,891.
- As in the prior five years, courts in King County both levied and collected the majority of the fees – 92% and 96% of the totals, respectively.

Conclusion

As in recent years, it does not appear that courts are ordering persons convicted of crimes to pay the amounts that statutes require for their crimes. It is beyond the scope of this report to investigate why many courts are not imposing these fees. Further research and judicial outreach could lead to a better understanding of the reasons courts do not consistently levy the fees.

Introduction

Background

In 2013, the Washington State Legislature passed Chapter 121, Laws of 2013 (ESHB 1291), concerning prostitution and the commercial sexual abuse of minors, and directed 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 listed above levy fees on convictions related to prostitution and the commercial sexual exploitation of children. The fees are in addition to other penalties, including statutory fines and jail time. Courts levy the fees on persons convicted of crimes who have entered into a statutory or non-statutory diversion agreement¹ because of arrests for one of the applicable crimes. Table 1 lists the statutes, the additional penalty, and the crimes to which the penalty applies.

Statutes 9.68A.105, 9A.88.120, and 9A.88.140 describe how jurisdictions must use the revenue from the fees collected:

- Cities and counties must spend at least 50% of the revenue on prevention and rehabilitation services for victims. Prevention includes education programs for persons convicted of crimes, such as "john school," which provides curriculum on the sexual exploitation of women, legal ramifications, and confronting and healing from sexual addiction. Rehabilitative services for victims include mental health and substance abuse counseling, parenting skills, housing relief, education, vocational training, drop-in centers, and employment counseling.
- Jurisdictions may use up to 48% for local efforts to reduce the commercial sale of sex, including, but not limited to, increasing enforcement of commercial sex laws.
- Two percent (2%) of the revenue must be remitted quarterly to Commerce, together with a report detailing the fees assessed, the revenue received, and how that revenue was spent.

Judges may reduce some of the fees if the court finds, on the record, that the offender does not have the ability to pay the fee. In those cases, judges may only reduce the fee by up to two-thirds.

Courts may not make any reductions to the fees attached to vehicle impoundment. Impounding agencies collect these fees if a law enforcement officer impounds a vehicle used in the commission of a commercial sexual abuse of a minor (CSAM) crime or prostitution-related crime, or if other conditions are met. The owner must pay the fee before redeeming the vehicle. If the defendant subsequently is found not guilty of the crime, the defendant is entitled to a refund of the fee.

¹ RCW 9A.88.120 defines statutory or non-statutory agreement as an agreement under RCW 13.40.080 or any written agreement between a person accused of an offense and a court, county, or city prosecutor, whereby the person agrees to fulfill certain conditions in lieu of prosecution.

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

Statute	Additional Penalty Amount	Crimes to Which Penalty Applies	Amount by Which Penalty Can be Reduced
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	The court may not reduce, waive, or suspend payment of all or part of the fee assessed unless it finds, on the record, that the adult offender does not have the ability to pay, in which case it may reduce the fee by an amount up to two-thirds of the maximum allowable fee.
9A.88.120	\$50	9A.88.010 – Indecent exposure	
	\$50	9A.88.030 – Prostitution	
	\$1,500 for a 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	
9A.88.140	\$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	
	\$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	May not be waived or reduced
\$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		

Source: Revised Code of Washington (RCW)

Fee Assessments and Crime Rates

In state fiscal year 2019, 68 courts in Washington handed down convictions for the crimes that bear the additional penalty fee. Of these, 23 courts – just 34% of the total – levied the statutorily required fees. This indicates that many courts in Washington are not assessing the fees, or are levying only a fraction of what they could.

- Kitsap County had 19 convictions for offenses ranging from indecent exposure to commercial sexual abuse of a minor (CSAM). If judges had levied all of the fees possible, it would have totaled \$46,450. However, only \$3,467 was imposed on persons convicted of crimes.
- King County Superior Court, which levies and collects far more than most courts, assessed only 23% of the total potential fees – \$58,339 levied out of a maximum possible of \$251,500.
- Pierce County Superior Court had seven convictions for the crime of CSAM, each of which carries a \$5,000 fee. However, the court only levied \$3,000, less than 10% of the maximum possible of \$35,000.
- Spokane County Superior Court had four convictions for CSAM, for a total of \$20,000 in possible fees, but did not levy any amount at all.
- Jefferson County Superior Court had three convictions for CSAM, for a total of \$15,000 possible, but levied only \$1,667.

Overall, courts assessed 54% of the total possible fee amount – \$257,496 out of a potential \$474,350. As in the previous five years, courts in King County both levied and collected the great majority of the fees. It is beyond the scope of this report to investigate why many courts are not imposing these fees.

Table 2 lists the number of arrests and convictions for the relevant crimes, the maximum possible amount of fees judges can assess for those crimes, the actual fees assessed, and the fees collected for each county in Washington. Appendix B 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 Fees by County - State Fiscal Year 2019

County	Arrests for Applicable Charges	Convictions for Applicable Charges	Fees Assessed	Fees Collected
Adams	1	0	\$0	\$0
Asotin	7	4	\$0	\$0
Benton	16	7	\$5,000	\$494
Chelan	5	2	\$0	\$727
Clallam	14	11	\$0	\$0


County	Arrests for Applicable Charges	Convictions for Applicable Charges	Fees Assessed	Fees Collected
Clark	42	13	\$5,000	\$555
Cowlitz	15	4	\$0	\$0
Douglas	0	2	\$0	\$0
Ferry	1	0	\$0	\$0
Franklin	18	2	\$3,000	\$2,000
Grant	6	1	\$0	\$0
Grays Harbor	13	3	\$0	\$33
Island	1	0	\$0	\$6
Jefferson	4	4	\$1,667	\$0
King	526	159	\$235,738	\$168,112
Kitsap	21	19	\$3,467	\$550
Kittitas	5	0	\$0	\$0
Lewis	7	7	\$50	\$50
Mason	1	0	\$0	\$0
Okanogan	7	4	\$17	\$0
Pend Oreille	0	1	\$0	\$0
Pierce	117	57	\$3,142	\$1,234
San Juan	0	1	\$0	\$0
Skagit	35	4	\$0	\$0
Skamania	1	0	\$0	\$0
Snohomish	77	10	\$120	\$189
Spokane	87	9	\$0	\$796

County	Arrests for Applicable Charges	Convictions for Applicable Charges	Fees Assessed	Fees Collected
Stevens	2	0	\$0	\$0
Thurston	54	10	\$50	\$0
Walla Walla	6	2	\$0	\$0
Whatcom	16	11	\$0	\$0
Whitman	5	1	\$50	\$0
Yakima	21	10	\$195	\$145
Totals	1,131	358	\$257,496	\$174,891

Sources: the Administrative Office of the Courts, Washington State Patrol, King County Superior Court, and Seattle Municipal Court. Columbia, Garfield, Klickitat, Lincoln, Pacific, and Wahkiakum counties had no arrests, convictions, or fees collected during state fiscal year 2019 and are therefore not included.

The total amount of potential fees is determined by calculating the convictions for each crime category. Table 3 illustrates the total amount of potential fees compared to the actual amount courts levied.

Table 3: Amounts Levied as a Percentage of Total Potential Fees



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

Background on Fees and Payments

Many individuals convicted of crimes do not pay fees all at once but instead enter into a payment plan with the court. As they pay off the fees, court clerks code them into the Judicial Information System (JIS) and Odyssey system used by most courts in Washington. Therefore, revenue from fees can be greater during a given year than the amount of fees assessed, as offenders gradually pay off their penalties.

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is responsible for establishing new codes in JIS Odyssey and informing courts about which codes to use. AOC codes data in these systems to the fund account, 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 court clerks receive the revenue and allocate it 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 to spend the funds, allocating the amounts 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 municipal codes used for misdemeanor offenses and which effectively replace the applicable state statute for that crime in the city's data system. Therefore, the researchers for this report obtained data on arrests, cases, and convictions for crimes committed within the city of Seattle 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 use JIS or Odyssey. Additionally, some municipal courts contract with their county district courts to collect fees 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 fees collected and assessed by those cities is merged with the data for King County District Court.

Crime Rates

In SFY 2019, law enforcement officers made 13% fewer arrests for sexual exploitation crimes compared to SFY 2018. The number of convictions, however, remained close to the same - 358 in SFY 2019, compared to 363 in SFY 2018.

Table 4 lists the number of arrests, cases, and convictions for these crimes. The table also includes the crime of trafficking that carries an additional \$10,000 penalty fee. However, the fee for trafficking is not subject to the same dispersal as those specified under RCW 9.68A.105, RCW 9A.88.120, and RCW 9A.88.140.


Table 4: Statewide Arrests and Convictions Per-Crime - State Fiscal Year 2019

Statute	Charge	Number of Arrests	Number of Convictions
9.68A.100	Commercial Sexual Abuse of a Minor (CSAM)	60	30
9.68A.101	Promoting Commercial Sexual Abuse of a Minor	19	3
9.68A.102	Promoting Travel for Commercial Sexual Abuse of a Minor	5	1
9.68A.103	Permitting Commercial Sexual Abuse of a Minor	0	0
9A. 40.100	Trafficking	37	1
9A.88.010	Indecent Exposure	656	197
9A.88.030	Prostitution	67	20
9A.88.070	Promoting Prostitution in the First Degree	27	4
9A.88.080	Promoting Prostitution in the Second Degree	55	79
9A.88.085	Promoting Travel for Prostitution (Vehicle Impoundment)	0	0
9A.88.090	Permitting Prostitution	1	4
9A.88.110	Patronizing a Prostitute	204	19
TOTAL		1,131	358

Source: The Washington State Patrol provided data on statewide arrests and convictions, and Seattle Municipal Court provided data on arrests and convictions within the city of Seattle.

The relatively high number of arrests for trafficking – 37 – compared to the sole conviction 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. Finally, an arrest made in one year can lead to a case that takes more than a year to prosecute and resolve, which explains why some charges have fewer arrests than convictions in SFY 2019.

Table 5: Statewide Totals of Arrests and Convictions - 2014 through 2019



Source: The Washington State Patrol provided data on statewide arrests and convictions, and Seattle Municipal Court provided data on arrests and convictions within the city of Seattle.

How Jurisdictions Reported Expending the Funds

Overview

In SFY 2019, 68 courts in Washington handed down convictions for the crimes that bear the additional fee. Of these courts, 23 levied the statutorily required fees. Twenty-one courts collected revenue towards payment of the fees. An additional eight courts collected revenue but did not assess fees, which indicates the revenue was from persons convicted of crimes paying off fees levied in past years.

Ten courts reported \$100 or less collected during SFY 2019, and therefore they were not surveyed. Researchers surveyed the 17 jurisdictions that collected greater amounts through email and phone contacts to determine how cities and counties used the funds.

As in previous years, 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, how they had been spent.

Of the 17 courts contacted, 14 responded to the survey. The following information lists how each jurisdiction described expending the funds.

Reports by Jurisdiction

Bellevue Municipal Court

Bellevue used the funds to pay for hotel lodging for several victims of suspected trafficking while their cases were under investigation, and they were being connected to services.

Benton County Superior Court

Benton County has not spent any of the funds. The county plans to wait until more money accumulates and then work with the community to decide how best to spend the funds.

Chelan County District Court

Chelan County has not yet expended the funds.

Clark County Superior Court

The Clark County Sheriff's Office uses the funds to supplement its work to address local prevention efforts, victims' services, and law enforcement.

Federal Way Municipal Court

Federal Way used the funds for the police department's enforcement of laws to prevent sex trafficking. The Federal Way Municipal Court also organized a meeting with the Coalition Against Sex Trafficking and the court's judges, probation staff, prosecutors, defense attorneys, and conflict attorneys. The same group is invited to participate in an upcoming two-day training on the EPIK Project, a "mobilization strategy designed to engage men in the fight to end the demand for prostituted kids in America."

King County (District and Superior Courts)

Please see Appendix C on page 22 for a discussion of King County's approach to prosecuting sexual exploitation crimes, and using the revenue from fees for prevention and victim rehabilitation.

Kitsap County District Court

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 Vice Unit within the Kitsap County Prosecutor's Office handles all felony offenses involving human trafficking, drugs and gang-related crimes. The felony human trafficking offenses prosecuted by this unit include human trafficking, promoting commercial sexual abuse of a minor, promoting prostitution in the first and second degrees, and violent felonies that occur during the commission of trafficking-related offenses. The Vice Unit also acts as a liaison between the Kitsap County Prosecutor's Office and the various drug and human trafficking enforcement agencies in Kitsap County.

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 include emotional support for both underage and adult victims of human trafficking. Lastly, community outreach and education activities include providing technical assistance and training to community and faith-based organizations, government, law enforcement officials, and others.

SeaTac Municipal Court

SeaTac has not yet expended the funds.

Seattle Municipal Court

In May 2018, the Seattle Human Services Department released a request for proposals for Gender-Violence Victim Support Services. Through the competitive process, Seattle identified medical support services for survivors as an unsupported gap in its funding process.

The grant award was contracted to the Harborview Center for Sexual Assault and Traumatic Stress to support sexual assault examination, therapeutic services, hotline support and other victim-support-related services from 2019 through 2022. Harborview is the only medical facility in King County certified as a Community Sexual Assault Center. Harborview provides emergency and continuing care for survivors of abuse and exploitation, many of whom are low income, homeless and chemically

dependent. Harborview is also a member of the city of Seattle Coordinated Effort Against Sexual Exploitation (CEASE) coalition.

The grant to supply medical services to survivors, as well as other programs to curb sexual exploitation, is funded in part from the criminal penalty fines paid by those convicted of the crimes outlined in this report.

In state fiscal year 2019, Seattle law enforcement officers made about 58% of the arrests statewide for patronizing a prostitute (the city is home to just under 10% of the state's population). The high arrest rate is partly because of the commitment from the Seattle Police Department (SPD) to focus law enforcement efforts on arresting buyers of commercial sex rather than those being prostituted.

Seattle splits the revenue from these fines between its Police and Human Services departments. In 2019, the Seattle Police Department used the fine revenue for salaries and overtime for officers conducting CSAM sting operations.

Spokane County Superior Court

The Spokane County Sheriff is a member of the Spokane Safe Streets Task Force. The Sheriff's Office additionally has one full-time detective assigned to the FBI Human Trafficking/Sexually Exploited Children Task Force, which includes prevention and intervention activities within its scope. Lastly, the Spokane County Juvenile Court and the Spokane City Police Department provide employees for Commercially Sexually Exploited Children Task Force.

Tukwila Municipal Court

Tukwila used the funds to conduct registered sex offender verification, an important element in preventing sex offenders from becoming noncompliant with registration requirements. Tukwila Police officers additionally participated in the FBI's Child Exploitation Task Force, as well as Operation Sweep and Keep, a regional effort to locate sex-trafficked individuals. Funding was further dedicated to training about ways to combat sex trafficking on social media, and for attendance at a conference on domestic violence. Officers conducted compliance checks to combat lewd events and indecent exposure at coffee stands. Finally, \$1,333 was provided to the local drug abuse resistance education (DARE) chapter to prevent the use of controlled drugs, membership in gangs, and violent behavior.

Yakima Municipal Court

Yakima has not yet expended the funds.

Appendix A: Distribution of Criminal Penalty Fees

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	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	\$5,000 (all deposited to PPIA)	9.68A.106	
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	\$50		
9A.88.030 – Prostitution	\$1,500 for 1 st offense		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.88.090 – Permitting prostitution	\$2,500 for 2 nd offense		
9A.88.110 – Patronizing a prostitute	\$5,000 for 3 rd or greater offense	9A.88.120	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.88.070 – Promoting prostitution in the 1 st degree	\$3,000 for 1 st offense		
9A.88.080 – Promoting prostitution in the 2 nd degree	\$6,000 for 2 nd offense		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.88.140 – Promoting prostitution in the 2 nd degree	\$10,000 for 3 rd or greater offense		
9A.88.140 – Vehicle impoundment fine: 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	\$500	9A.88.140	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.88.140 – Vehicle impoundment fine: 9.68A.100 – CSAM 9.68A.101 – Promoting CSAM 9.68A.102 – Promoting travel for CSAM	\$2,500		
Statute	How Proceeds Must Be Used (effective June 12, 2014)		
Proceeds from seized property: 9.68A.120 – Child pornography 9.68A.100 – CSAM 9.68A.101 – Promoting CSAM 9A.88.070 – Promoting prostitution in the 1 st degree	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.		

Appendix B: Courts with Convictions for Applicable Charges

Court	County	Convictions for Applicable Charges	Fees Assessed	Fees Collected
Aberdeen Municipal Court	Grays Harbor County	1	\$-	\$33.45
Asotin County District Court	Asotin County	4		
Auburn Municipal Court	King County	0	\$1,950.00	\$1,712.22
Bellevue Municipal Court	King County	0	\$100.00	\$7,393.17
Bellingham Municipal Court	Whatcom County	5		
Benton County District Court	Benton County	4		
Benton County Superior Court	Benton County	3	\$5,000.00	\$493.90
Bonney Lake Municipal Court	Pierce County	0	\$50.00	\$15.28
Bothell Municipal Court	King County	1		
Bremerton Municipal Court	Kitsap County	2		
Camas Municipal Court	Clark County	2		
Centralia Municipal Court	Lewis County	3	\$50.00	\$50.00
Chehalis Municipal Court	Lewis County	1		
Chelan County District Court	Chelan County	1	\$-	\$726.91
Cheney Municipal Court	Spokane County	1		
Clallam County District Court	Clallam County	7		
Clallam County Superior Court	Clallam County	4		
Clark County District Court	Clark County	4		
Clark County Superior Court	Clark County	7	\$5,000.00	\$555.12
Cowlitz County District Court	Cowlitz County	2		
Cowlitz County Superior Court	Cowlitz County	2		
Des Moines Municipal Court	King County	3		
Douglas County Superior County	Douglas County	2		
Everett Municipal Court	Snohomish County	0	\$-	\$75.00
Evergreen District Court	Snohomish County	1		
Federal Way Municipal Court	King County	3	\$-	\$1,270.73
Fife Municipal Court	Pierce County	1	\$-	\$100.00
Franklin County Superior Court	Franklin County	2	\$3,000.00	\$2,000.00
Grant County District Court	Grant County	1		
Grays Harbor County Superior Court	Grays Harbor County	2		
Island County District Court	Island County	0	\$-	\$5.74

Court	County	Convictions for Applicable Charges	Fees Assessed	Fees Collected
Issaquah Municipal Court	King County	1		
Jefferson County District Court	Jefferson County	1		
Jefferson County Superior Court	Jefferson County	3	\$1,666.67	
Kenmore/Shoreline District Court	King County	1		
Kent Municipal Court	King County	12	\$18,750.00	\$14,011.45
King County District Court*	King County	14	\$250.00	\$4,592.26
King County Superior Court**	King County	92	\$58,338.68	\$15,482.79
Kirkland Municipal Court	King County	2		
Kitsap County District Court	Kitsap County	5	\$116.50	\$507.82
Kitsap County Superior Court	Kitsap County	12	\$3,350.17	\$42.59
Lakewood Municipal Court	Pierce County	8		
Lewis County Superior Court	Lewis County	3		
Lynnwood Municipal Court	Snohomish County	2		
Marysville Municipal Court	Snohomish County	2	\$120.00	\$100.00
Okanogan County District Court	Okanogan County	4	\$17.00	
Olympia Municipal Court	Thurston County	3		
Pend Oreille Superior Court	Pend Oreille	1		
Pierce County District Court	Pierce County	7		
Pierce County Superior Court	Pierce County	31	\$3,000.00	\$1,051.86
Puyallup Municipal Court	Pierce County	3	\$91.50	\$66.50
Renton Municipal Court	King County	4		
Sammamish Municipal Court	King County	0	\$50.00	\$50.00
San Juan County Juvenile Court	San Juan County	1		
SeaTac Municipal Court	King County	5	\$2,500.00	\$3,034.00
Seattle Municipal Court	King County	20	\$144,100.00	\$115,215.00
Skagit County Superior Court	Skagit County	4		
Snohomish County District Court Everett	Snohomish County	4		
Snohomish County Superior Court	Snohomish County	1		\$14.07
Spokane County District Court	Spokane County	1		
Spokane County Superior Court	Spokane County	7		\$795.86
Tacoma Municipal Court	Pierce County	7		
Thurston County District Court	Thurston County	1	\$50.00	\$-
Thurston County Superior Court	Thurston County	5		
Tukwila Municipal Court	King County	1	\$9,700.00	\$5,350.00

Court	County	Convictions for Applicable Charges	Fees Assessed	Fees Collected
Walla Walla County Superior Court	Walla Walla County	2		
Wapato Municipal Court	Yakima County	1		
Wenatchee Municipal Court	Chelan County	1		
Whatcom County Superior Court	Whatcom County	6		
Whitman County District Court	Whitman County	1	\$50.00	
Yakima County Superior Court	Yakima County	2		
Yakima Municipal Court	Yakima County	7	\$95.00	\$145.00
Yelm Municipal Court	Thurston County	1		
Totals		358	\$257,495.52	\$174,890.72

Appendix C: King County's Approach

Most of the arrests and convictions for the crime of patronizing a prostitute (RCW 9A.88.110) and commercial sexual abuse of a minor (RCW 9.68A.100) take place in King County. Several law enforcement agencies in King County, including the City of Seattle, Kent, Bellevue, Des Moines, and Renton police departments, have policies to actively pursue those who buy sexual encounters from adults or children.

In 2014, King County launched a new approach to reduce the demand for prostitution by working to change the attitudes and behaviors of people arrested for patronization. Several law enforcement and prosecuting agencies within King County have changed their emphasis to both pursue the buyers of commercial sex and the people who facilitate sex trafficking. This approach is based on the reality that past practices of arresting and prosecuting people in prostitution was not making the community any safer. Rather, punishing prostituted people resulted in the cycle of prostitution-related crime and sex trafficking persisting. Presently, law enforcement and prosecuting agencies are instead focusing on punishing those who seek out and facilitate the illegal interaction – the sex buyers, promoters, and traffickers.

Sex trafficking is a crime that disproportionately targets vulnerable youth across Washington state, including victims of child sexual abuse or youth in the foster care system. The crime disproportionately harms youth from marginalized racial backgrounds and sexual identities. Human traffickers and sex buyers exploit the vulnerabilities of youth by involving them in the sex trade. Across the U.S., the typical age of entry of youth being coerced into the sex trade is between 13 and 15 years old. In 2018, almost 200 youth between the ages of 11 and 24 were referred to services for youth experiencing commercial sexual exploitation in King County, and 20% of the youth referred were between the ages of 11 and 14. These children and young adults experience repeated rapes, abuse, and other forms of violence at the hands of sex buyers and traffickers.

All through the process, these trafficking victims face many barriers to escaping the life of prostitution. Therefore, King County's approach emphasizes the prosecution of sex buyers and traffickers and connecting prostituted people to services. Program leaders assert that a reduction in demand will decrease harm to prostituted people, reduce self-destructive behaviors of buyers and curb sex trafficking.

Over the past four years, the Ending Exploitation Collaborative (EEC) in King County marshaled a cross-sector transformation toward diverting victims of sexual exploitation to services and holding sex buyers accountable. The EEC is a partnership of the Organization for Prostitution Survivors, the Washington State Attorney General's Office, the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office, Seattle Against Slavery, Businesses Ending Slavery and Trafficking, and the Center for Child and Youth Justice.


The EEC has changed norms and practices across sectors to confront the demand for commercial sex. For example, traffickers and sex buyers in King County are being arrested and prosecuted through pioneering approaches that have been recognized around the country. Following conviction, sex buyers in King County are required to complete an innovative and successful education program called "Stopping Sexual Exploitation." This program is based on principles of social justice and personal transformation and is designed to help men understand their behavior and promote their own decisions not to buy sex. A significant portion of the fees for the buyer education program, as well as the

statutorily mandated fines assessed from buyers, is directed to increase services that help victims of sex trafficking and sexual exploitation, including housing, treatment, and employment training.

The EEC also seeks to shift norms and practices by youth and adults through education and targeted interventions because of its belief that broader cultural and institutional norms influence the individual choice to buy sex. The EEC provides prevention education for youth in schools and adults at their place of work. Because research indicates that 13% of calls to solicit sex originate from local businesses, and a peak time to solicit sex online is 2 p.m., employers have played an important role in educating employees and preventing illegal activity through the workplace.


Tables 6 and 7 illustrate how King County's arrests and convictions, respectively, compare to the numbers in the rest of the state.

Table 6: Arrests for Patronization and Prostitution Crimes - SFY 2019



Source: The Washington State Patrol and Seattle Municipal Court

Table 7: Convictions for Patronization and Prostitution Crimes - SFY 2019



Source: The Washington State Patrol and Seattle Municipal Court