County of Los Angeles
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 974-1101
http://ceo.lacounty.gov

SACHI A. HAMAI
Chief Executive Officer

Board of Supervisors
HILDA L. SOLIS
First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Second District

SHEILA KUEHL
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

October 16, 2015

To: Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich, Mayor
Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
Supervisor Sheila Kuehl
Supervisor Don Knabe

From Sachi A. Hamai
Chief Executive Officer

PROTECTING COMMERCIALLY SEXUALLY EXPLOITED CHILDREN: COUNTYWIDE SINGLE COORDINATED ENTITY, UNIFIED OPERATIONAL MODEL, AND SAFE HOUSE PROGRAM

On April 14, 2015, May 12, 2015, and June 16, 2015, this Board adopted five motions related to Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC). Each motion was directed towards the Chief Executive Office (CEO) and/or other relevant departments. The specifics of each motion are summarized in the table below.

Board Sponsor(s)	Motion Directives
Ridley-Thomas and Solis (adopted 4/14/15)	Report back during Budget Deliberations on the feasibility of using $6,738,000 of Healthier Communities, Stronger Families, Thriving Children (HST) funds from the CEO's Budget to the Provisional Financing uses Budget and report back on the following: • The feasibility of using the funds to offset $300,000 in ongoing net county costs related to the CSEC STAR Court; • Services, programming interventions, and recovery solutions for CSEC, including a CSEC court in the dependency court; and • Recommendations related to dedicated staffing and evaluation tools and resources that track the magnitude of sexually exploited children with the County.
Solis and Knabe (adopted 05/12/15)	• Assess the feasibility of developing a safe facility for CSEC.
Ridley-Thomas and Antonovich (adopted 6/16/15)	Analyze the feasibility of creating a single entity responsible for, among other things, all countywide efforts related to human trafficking. This coordinating body would be responsible for, among other things:

Board Sponsor(s)	Motion Directives
	• Developing and maintaining an informational and research database; • Developing a CSEC informational website; • Overseeing expansion of the County's First Responder Protocol; • Implementation of the County's SB 855 Plan; • Assessing training needs and recommend training solutions; • Assessing and evaluating County programs to determine if resources are appropriately allocated to avoid redundancy; • Reviewing and evaluating proposed initiatives; • Identifying funding streams; and • Developing a CSEC strategic plan.
Knabe and Solis (adopted 6/16/15)	• Assess the feasibility of creating a unified operational model to administer and oversee programs and services exclusively for victims of child sex trafficking.
Knabe (adopted 6/16/15)	Explore options to refresh, rebrand, and expand the Safe house program to additional County facilities and to include CSEC. Specifically, the motion directed the CEO with a plan and timeframe to: • Outreach to the public to educate them about the Safe House Program; • Train necessary employees to identify warning signs of CSEC and what should be done when a CSEC is identified; and • Implement expansion of the Safe House Program to include Sheriff's stations, hospitals, community health clinics, certain County offices and facilities.

With the exception of the May 12, 2015 motion related to a safe facility, each motion was referred back to its primary sponsor then consolidated and incorporated into a single motion introduced by Supervisors Ridley-Thomas and Antonovich and adopted by the Board on June 30, 2015. The June 30, 2015 motion directed the CEO to review all motions collectively and when appropriate issue recommendations on the feasibility, structure, implementation, planning, and necessary staffing levels. The report related to the Board's May 12, 2015 motion related to a safe facility for CSEC will be issued by the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) and other County Departments and is expected in mid-November 2015. This report addresses the motions originally introduced on June 16, 2015 and incorporated into the June 30, 2015 motion. Recommendations related to possible uses of the HST fund will be included in a companion report issued simultaneous to this report.

The CEO has worked closely with the Office of Child Protection (OCP), DCFS, Fire, Probation, Sheriff, and Public Health to develop recommendations responsive to these CSEC related motions. The recommendations are discussed in Attachment I and are summarized in the table below.

Motion	Summary of Recommendations
Single Coordinated Entity	1. Collapse the CSEC Steering Committee and the CSEC Action Team and fold both into the newly established CSEC Integrated Leadership Team responsible for implementing the objectives identified in the Board's June 16, 2015 motion. 2. Identify the following Departments as standing members of the newly established CSEC Integrated Leadership Team: DCFS, Probation, Sheriff, Mental Health, DPSS, Public Health, Health Services, District Attorney and Public Defender, Alternate Public Defender, and Panel Attorneys. 3. Designate DCFS, Probation, and Sheriff, as co-leads of the CSEC Integrated Leadership Team collectively responsible for ensuring that a Countywide, CSEC-focused strategic plan which encapsulates the Board's identified objectives, is developed, implemented and monitored. 4. Designate the OCP as the County's decision maker on operational CSEC issues when an impasse is reached that threatens efforts to impede progress on implementing the Countywide strategic plan for CSEC and/ or unify the Countywide CSEC operational model. 5. In order to ensure a sustained effort and follow-through, require DCFS, Sheriff and Probation to dedicate at least one full-time equivalent to work on operational CSEC issues with their respective Departments and an additional .5 FTE to the CSEC Integrated Leadership Team and other CSEC efforts (attend planning meetings, write reports, prepare presentations, track data, etc.). 6. If not otherwise prohibited by its grant, Sheriff should add both DCFS and Probation to its Task Force leadership team and should be added to the SB 855 Executive Committee. 7. For the first year of its existence of the CSEC Integrated Leadership Team, require the team to meet, at least monthly, with the initial meeting occurring no more than 30 days after the Board adopts these recommendations. 8. Further require the CSEC Leadership Team to jointly issue regular written reports (every four months) on its activities and progress on implementation of its strategic plan.
Unified Operational Model	1. Adopt the SB 855 plan as the County's foundational unified operational model. 2. Within 30 days of its initial meeting, require the CSEC Integrated Leadership Team to convene a meeting with relevant Departments and stakeholders to begin work on a Countywide CSEC strategic plan that addresses the entire continuum – from prevention to support - using the Action Team's plan as a foundation.
Safe House Program	1. Identify the population that the rebranded program should serve. 2. Rename the program the "Safe Place Program" and determine whether a new name and logo are desirable and appropriate. 3. Develop a public awareness campaign that uses public service announcements, signage, literature, posters, and social media (including a

Motion	Summary of Recommendations
	website). 4. Require all County Departments to post, on their website, a link to the County's informational CSEC site. 5. Conduct a readiness assessment of which County Departments should participate in early roll-out of the re-branded program.

If you have any questions or require any additional information, please contact Fesia Davenport at (213) 974-1186, or by email at fdavenport@ceo.lacounty.gov.

SAH:JJ:FD:ljp

Attachment

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
District Attorney
Sheriff
Alternate Public Defender
Children and Family Services
Health Services
Mental Health
Probation
Public Defender
Public Health
Public Social Services

Executive Summary

This report is divided into four sections. The first section discusses options for establishing a single, countywide, coordinating body to manage, coordinate, and monitor the County's many CSEC initiatives and conclude that no one County Department could effectively serve as the single coordinating entity. The second section discusses options for a unified operational model and recommends that the County's SB 855 plan serve as the foundation of the County's unified operational approach to serving CSEC. The third section discusses options for establishing a Countywide Safe House Program for CSEC and recommends that phased-in approach to the implementation of this initiative. The final section provides a general timeline for a single coordinating entity comprised of DCFS, Probation and Sheriff to begin the work of implementing the approaches and programs contemplated by the Board's CSEC motions.

Countywide CSEC Coordinating Body

The June 16th and June 30th motions both include the term "human trafficking." Human trafficking and child sex trafficking are different yet related concepts with the former definition being broader than the latter. Specifically, human trafficking includes, but is not limited to, child sex trafficking and is defined by the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement as:

> 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.

The definition of child sex trafficking is narrower and is generally used to describe a commercial enterprise where minor children are induced by coercion, fraud, duress, and/or deception to engage in and perform sexual acts in exchange for money or some other form of compensation.

The CEO sought clarification the primary sponsor's office to clarify that the intent of this motion was to focus on child sex trafficking and not human trafficking. As such, this memo focuses on child sex trafficking, the commercial sexual exploitation of children (CSEC) for purposes of providing options for a Countywide coordinating entity devoted to CSEC.

Discussion

Although it is feasible to create an entity to coordinate the County's activities related to CSEC it is not advisable to do so since there are several, existing, County-sponsored groups working on CSEC that could meet the Board's objectives. One of these groups could be repurposed and called the CSEC Integrated Leadership Team (Leadership Team). The existing CSEC initiatives include:

- The SB 855 Steering Committee;
- CSEC Task Force;
- The Los Angeles County Human Trafficking Task Force;
- The CSEC Action Team; and
- The District Attorney's Office (DAO) collaborative efforts related to diversion.

A profile of each collaborative is included in Table 1 below:

Table 1

County Effort	Date	Members	Purpose
SB 855 Steering Committee	2014	20 departments and partners including DCFS and Probation	To investigate suspected child abuse and make placement decisions when a child is suspected or identified as being sexually exploited.
CSEC Task Force	2012	7 departments including DCFS, Probation and Sheriff	To examine and track the CSEC population, make recommendations to address the needs of these youth and eliminate their recruitment into the abusive life of sex trafficking.
Human Trafficking Taskforce	2015	5 departments and partners including Sheriff, District Attorney, and DCFS, a community based network	To address and attack the problem of human trafficking (including sex trafficking) through a regionalized law enforcement, social services, and community-based organizational approach.
CSEC Action Team	2014	7 departments and stakeholders including DCFS, Probation, and the California Child Welfare Council CSEC Action Team managed by the CEO	To develop a comprehensive county-wide strategic plan to address CSEC, to implement the CSEC strategic plan (working with and through other departments and stakeholders), and implement the plan's objectives.
District Attorney's First Step Diversion Program	2014	5 County Departments and community based organizations including the DAO, Sheriff, Probation and DCFS	To provide girls and boys ages 12-17, who are arrested for sex-related crimes, with the opportunity to complete a year-long program (that provides counseling, medical and social services) in exchange for clearing original charges.

The Leadership Team should be comprised of a broad number of child serving County Departments and other CSEC serving entities, but not be so large as to render the group unwieldy and therefore ineffective. The Leadership Team would be responsible for, among other things:

- Accomplishing the deliverables identified in the Board's June 16, 2015 motion;
- Regularly convening the Leadership Team members to share information and learning;
- Track progress on County CSEC initiatives;
- Identify and remove policy and operational barriers to effective coordination and service delivery; and

- Keep the Board apprised of the effectiveness of the County's CSEC initiatives.

Because the Leadership Team would be tasked with accomplishing the specific deliverables identified in the June 16, 2015 motion, a designated decision-maker would be advisable in order to manage projects involving multiple departments, and make final decisions when an impasse among the departments, or differing approaches to problem solving threaten to impede progress.

Of the five collaborative groups identified above, three of them merit serious consideration for being designated as the single Countywide CSEC coordinating entity. Those three collaboratives are: The SB 855 Steering Committee (Steering Committee), The Los Angeles County Human Trafficking Taskforce (Task Force); and the Los Angeles County Action Team (Action Team). A description of the purpose and work of each group is listed below. These three stand out among all others because of the scope of their work and/or the breadth of their membership. The relative strengths and weaknesses of each of the three entities in terms of being designated as the County's coordinating entity are summarized in Table 3 below.

SB 855 Steering Committee

The SB 855 Steering Committee is focused on child sex trafficking or youth at risk of becoming CSEC. The steering committee was established in 2014 in response to the passage of Senate Bill 855 (SB 855) in 2014. This legislation:

- Clarified that CSEC fall under the jurisdiction of the child welfare system as victims of child abuse and neglect pursuant to State law;

- Created a statewide CSEC program to be led by each county's child welfare agency to serve CSEC through a multidisciplinary team approach; and

- Provided funding for various interventions and services (including training, data collection, protocol development, certain types of staffing, supplemental foster care rate payments).

As required by SB 855, the County formed a multi-disciplinary CSEC steering committee to create a plan to serve CSEC victims using a multidisciplinary team approach and to oversee the delivery of CSEC services. SB 855 requires that the team be led by the each county's human services department (in the case of Los Angeles County it is DCFS), and include representatives from county probation, county mental health, county public health, and the juvenile court. The legislation designates as optional participation from other organizations such as law enforcement, survivors, and advocates. The County's Steering Committee is comprised of the Departments and entities identified in Table 2 below. DCFS is the County's lead as required by SB 855.

Table 2

Law Enforcement/ Law Related	Law Enforcement/ Law Related	Social & Health Services	Education and Advocacy
County Sheriff	Probation	Children and Family Services	Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD)
Los Angeles Police Department	Alternate Public Defender	Public Health (DPH)	Educational Advocates
Long Beach Police Department	Public Defender	Public Social Services	Placement Representatives
Children's Law Center	District Attorney	Mental Health	Survivor Advocates
Los Angeles Dependency Lawyers	County Counsel		
Juvenile Court	Panel Attorneys		
Los Angeles City Attorney			

The purpose of the Steering Committee is to develop and implement a multi-disciplinary, County-wide protocol for delivering services to CSEC. A fuller discussion of this approach can be found in the next section of this report. The Steering Committee submitted a plan to the State outlining the County's approach to CSEC. The plan calls for an array of services and interventions, including:

- Increasing awareness and training;
- Advocacy Services;
- CSEC oriented Court Services;
- Specialized Placements; and
- Incidental Supports.

The appeal of the Steering Committee is its:

1. Exclusive focus on child sex trafficking victims;
2. The existence of an operational protocol ready for Countywide roll-out;
3. Existence of a screening protocol (see unified operational model discussion below); and
4. Multi-disciplinary approach born out of a social services model.

The limitations of the Steering Committee is the lack of a clear path outlining how all of the County's various CSEC efforts (not all are mentioned in this report) will be coordinated and will work together. Put another way, there is no single document that pulls together all components of County CSEC efforts clearly delineating roles, responsibilities, relationships and resources along the entire CSEC continuum (i.e. prevention, protection, integrated service delivery, post-intervention supports). To that end, the Steering Committee's approach appears to be deep in the area of integrated service delivery and supports and less so in the other areas of the continuum. Finally, as currently configured the Steering Committee is a committee of equals. There is no obvious protocol to resolve issues when they arise. These issues were raised by the Office of Child Protection (OCP) in a meeting with representatives from DCFS and Probation. While there was not uniform agreement on what the OCP sees as limitations

of the Steering Committee's approach, there was agreement that adequate resources are necessary and that having a third-party to decide issues would be helpful.

Los Angeles County Human Trafficking Taskforce

The Sheriff's Department is creating and building out a task force to combat human trafficking called the Los Angeles County Human Trafficking Task Force (Task Force). The Task Force is comprised of several agencies under the joint leadership of: the Sheriff's Department, CAST (Coalition To Abolish Slavery) - a community based organization experienced in servicing victims of sex trafficking, and the United States Attorney's Office. The Task Force has three major goals:

- Identify victims of human trafficking;
- Provide victim-centered services to identified victims; and
- Investigate cases of alleged human trafficking and supporting prosecution of traffickers.

The Task Force has victim-centered, collaborative protocols and approaches to combat human trafficking including child sex trafficking. Training, community outreach, and raising awareness are critical components of the Task Force's plan. The Task Force has four subcommittees: Law Enforcement, Training and Outreach, Victim Service Providers, and Administration. The Task Force has also identified five objectives. They are:

1. Establish a sustainable and multidisciplinary, collaborative Task Force responding to victims of all forms of human trafficking;
2. Make data-driven decisions based on a shared understanding of human trafficking problem within Los Angeles County;
3. Identify victims of all forms of human trafficking through collaborative efforts supported by the Task Force training, investigation, and outreach;
4. Conduct effective trafficking investigations leading to successful prosecutions of cases at the state and federal level; and
5. Support a comprehensive array of victim services which meet the individualized needs of victims of all forms of human trafficking.

The Sheriff's Department has assigned dedicated staff to the Task Force and intends to add more regardless of whether it receives a federal grant to combat human trafficking. The Sheriff's Department plans to conduct an evaluation to measure the effectiveness of its proposed strategies, processes, performance and impact/outcomes.

The appeal of the Task Force is its:

1. Intent to use dedicated staff for both line operations and administration;
2. Focus on addressing the demand for CSEC; and
3. Decision to complete an evaluation by an independent party.

In terms of potentially designating the Task Force as the entity coordinating Countywide CSEC initiatives, other considerations must be addressed. The State Legislature and the California Department of Social Services has issued a clear mandate that CSEC are victims not criminals, should not be arrested, and should be provided the range of services offered by each county's child welfare agency. Cities and counties are slowly moving away from a law enforcement approach to serving this population.

By definition the Sheriff's Department is a law enforcement agency. As such, their status as a law enforcement agency seems to place them in conflict with the direction that the State is moving. Also, the Task Force will not focus exclusively on CSEC. Rather its efforts will be divided among other human trafficking populations. Finally, consideration must be given to the fact that the Task Force's efforts will be funded by a time-limited grant.

These issues were raised in a meeting between OCP, the Sheriff, and the Sheriff's staff working on the Task Force and merit further discussion. The Sheriff's Department does not believe that these considerations should prevent them from serving as the single coordinating entity as the Department has changed and continues to change its approach to CSEC. Should the Board elect to designate the Sheriff's Department as the County's coordinating entity for all CSEC initiatives, the Sheriff's Department has committed to taking all necessary steps to successfully carry out the charge and manage the perception issue raised by having a law enforcement agency serve as the face of the County when serving this vulnerable population.

Los Angeles County CSEC Action Team

The County's CSEC Action team was established after the State mandated that each County establish a team to develop a strategic plan to address CSEC and to implement those plans. The action team was assisted by a consultant procured by Probation and was comprised of DCFS, Probation, DPSS, DMH, District Attorney's Office, and CAST. DCFS and Probation co-led this action team and the CEO provided limited project management support. The Action Team developed a strategic plan consisting of four major focus areas:

1. Service Delivery;
2. Placement Resources;
3. Awareness and Outreach; and
4. Multi-System Data Collection and Sharing.

For each focus area goals and objectives were identified. One deliverable out of that strategic plan was the County's First Responder Protocol currently operational in two areas of the County. The Action Team still exists informally, but its focus has been diverted away from implementation of the strategic plan and towards Board motions specifically related to CSEC. The appeal of the Action Team is its comprehensive approach to CSEC and development of a framework for how CSEC objectives would be accomplished and sequenced. The appeal of the Action Team is:

1. Fairly comprehensive approach, from the victim's perspective, to address CSEC; and
2. Concrete and identified steps outlined to move the plan forward.

One challenge of the Action Team was the uneven levels of dedicated staffing resources from various County Departments. For example, DCFS was able to dedicate staff to the Action Team, but the dedicated staff was not full-time and was not at the appropriate level when considering the workload associated with CSEC. Probation's ability to dedicate staff to CSEC has been the driving force behind CSEC in the County. But as this population moves to child welfare, DCFS must dedicate adequate administrative resources.

The Office of Child Protection discussed the staffing resources issue with both DCFS and Probation. DCFS represented that the Department was in the process of designating a full-time Assistant Regional Administrator to coordinate the Department's work around CSEC. In addition, as caseloads have decreased, the Department is in a better position than it was previously. The Department intends to dedicate between 6 and 12 social workers to work on CSEC exclusively complementing the work of existing Children's Social Worker's.

Table 3

Existing CSEC Entity	Reasons Supporting Designation As Countywide Coordinating Entity	Reasons Supporting Non-Designation as Countywide Entity
SB 855 Steering Committee	• Exclusive focus on child sex trafficking victims, • Protocol in place and operational, • Multi-disciplinary approach borne out of a social services approach	• Approach is deep (for services) but not wide (e.g. does not address demand). • Lacks neutral decision maker
Trafficking Task Force	• Dedicated/ing staff focused on administration, and line operations; • Focus on addressing demand for CSEC; • Planned two-part evaluation	• Law enforcement agency as the face of County CSEC efforts results in inconsistent messaging, • Non-exclusive focus on CSEC, • Sustainability after grant expires, and • Lacks neutral decision maker.
CSEC Action Team	• Broader approach to addressing CSEC Countywide found in strategic plan • Inclusiveness of key County Departments	• Lack of dedicated staffing at appropriate level

Conclusion and Recommendations

Based on the foregoing analysis it appears that the no single CSEC focused entity is poised to adequately cover the entire continuum to combat CSEC – yet this is exactly what CSEC victims need and the County should be doing. The continuum incudes:

- Prevention;
- Protection;
- Placement;
- Treatment; and
- Support.

An approach that treats and supports victims without adequately addressing demand is less than ideal and the reverse is also true – a focus on the demand for CSEC without addressing treatment and support is equally undesirable. None of the entities identified above can adequately cover the entire continuum and there appears to be overlap and duplication between the planned or current activities of the Steering Committee, Task Force, and Action Team. Based on the foregoing, the CEO recommends that the Board take the following action:

1. Collapse the CSEC Steering Committee and the CSEC Action Team and fold both into the newly established CSEC Integrated Leadership Team responsible for implementing the objectives identified in the Board's June 16, 2015 motion.

2. Identify the following Departments as standing members of the newly established CSEC Integrated Leadership Team: DCFS, Probation, Sheriff, Mental Health, DPSS, Public Health, Health Services, District Attorney and Public Defender and the Alternate Public Defender.

3. Designate DCFS, Probation, and Sheriff, as co-leads of the CSEC Integrated Leadership Team collectively responsible for ensuring that a County-wide, CSEC-focused strategic plan which encapsulates the Board's identified objectives, is developed, implemented and monitored.

4. Designate the Office of Child Protection as the County's decision maker on operational CSEC issues when an impasse is reached that threatens efforts to impede progress on implementing the County-wide strategic plan for CSEC and/ or unify the County-wide CSEC operational model.

5. In order to ensure a sustained effort and follow-through, require DCFS, Sheriff and Probation to dedicate at least one FTE to work on operational CSEC issues with their respective Departments and an additional .5 FTE to the CSEC Integrated Leadership Team and other CSEC efforts (attend planning meetings, write reports, prepare presentations, etc.).

6. If not otherwise prohibited by its grant, Sheriff should add both DCFS and Probation to its Task Force leadership team.

7. For the first year of its existence of the CSEC Integrated Leadership Team, require the team to meet, at least monthly, with the initial meeting occurring no more than 30 days after the Board adopts these recommendations.

8. Further require the CSEC Leadership Team to jointly issue regular written reports (every four months) on its activities and progress on implementation of its strategic plan.

Unified Operational Model

Discussion

A unified operational model can take various forms. In a County the size of Los Angeles, appropriate levels of uniformity and coordination are essential components of any unified operational approach. County departments, partners, stakeholders, and others need a shared understanding of CSEC, and a clear understanding of everyone's role and responsibility in combatting CSEC. Essential components of a unified operational model include: 1) An agreed-upon, multi-departmental screening or assessment tool that will identify CSEC or youth at risk of CSEC; 2) A protocol that delineates the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder in the CSEC continuum; and 3) Standardized communication channels must be established.

DCFS, DPH, Probation, and the Children's Law Center have agreed to use a screening tool developed by a private, non-profit organization. Plans to train on this tool are currently underway. In addition both Health Services and Public Health have developed screening protocols and/or assessment protocols. The protocols remain in draft phase and have yet to be finalized.

In June 2015, DCFS submitted a plan to the California Department of Social Services (State) describing how Los Angeles County would operationalize its plan to address the needs of CSEC. DCFS submitted the plan, as opposed to Probation or Sheriff, because SB 855 requires that the County's human services agency be the lead on any plan to implement SB 855 and receive State funding. In Los Angeles County, and with regard to CSEC, DCFS is the County's health and human services agency. The plan describes the County's vision to provide comprehensive services to the CSEC. Highlights of the plan are summarized in Table 4 below. The State will use the plan to identify the amount of funding Los Angeles County will receive from the State's CSEC program. The plan was developed as a result of a collaborative process involving the stakeholders identified in Table 1 above.

The plan describes the County's current and future operational approaches to CSEC case management and service delivery. The future approach involves expanding and building upon the existing approach and has two major components: 1) Expansion of the County's existing First Responder Protocol; and 2) Establishing a CSEC court in the dependency court (currently CSEC court exists in the delinquency court only). A central component of these approaches is a focus on coordination and integration among County departments and partners emanating from a victim-centered orientation.

Table 4

	Partners	Goals and Deliverables
First Responder Protocol	DCFS, Probation, DHS, Survivors/Advocates, Law Enforcement	*A multi-disciplinary team is assembled within 90 minutes of receiving a call giving notice of the recovery of a CSEC youth.* • Avoid arrest and divert CSEC to child welfare system • Engage youth immediately and intensively • Connect youth with experienced CSEC advocate • Coordinate case planning at earliest possible point • Develop safety plan including housing options • Ensure comprehensive medical evaluation
Dependency CSEC Court	DCFS, DMH, DPH, Children's Law Center, survivor advocates, education advocates, and caregivers, and others as appropriate.	*Modeled on the existing CSEC court in delinquency. This court would monitor and direct each youth's case plan to ensure that coordinated services are provided timely, and appropriately.* • Case planning and case management • Ensure youth have 24/7 access to a member of their MDT • Monitor youth's progress and condition in placement to reduce run-away behavior • Increase gender sensitivity when necessary • Uncover and address underlying needs • Provide comprehensive mental health treatment • Assist with building self-esteem • Build upon existing resiliency factors

In addition to the screening/assessment tools and the operational protocols listed above, three other Departments are playing very important roles in the County's efforts to combat CSEC: Health Services, Public Social Services, and Mental Health. Table 5 below summarizes the efforts of each department.

Table 5

Department	CSEC Efforts	Purpose
Health Services	Developed a draft assessment and intervention protocol for DHS staff.	To identify children involved or at risk for CSEC and to provide comprehensive care including treatment of acute medical issues, pregnancy prevention and care, treatment and care of sexually transmitted infections, mental health services. Health Services' goal is to: prevent at risk children from entering CSEC, to prevent re-entry into CSEC for those involved, and to mitigate the mental, physical, and emotional impact of CSEC.

Health Services	Developed a proposal to provide Countywide 24/7 medical/mental health services to recovered CSEC	To provide comprehensive medical services to recovered CSEC.
Mental Health	Training of contracted providers	Mental health has identified mental health contracted providers in each SPA who have been trained to identify CSEC.
Public Health	Developed a draft protocol for improving identification of and response to CSEC	Increase awareness and identification of CSEC encountered by DPH Programs and provide guidance on screening, and appropriate treatment and referral.
Public Social Services	CSEC Awareness Campaign among hotels/motels providing emergency shelter services to County recipients of General Relief	Raise awareness among DPSS contracted providers regarding child sex trafficking sex; securing commitments from contracted providers to disallow usage of their facilities for sex trafficking; posting of anti-sex trafficking posters in visible areas of the contracted providers; agreement with contracted providers to allow local law enforcement to inspect their registers, and other activities.

Conclusion and Recommendations

A unified operational model to CSEC requires uniformity, coordination of design and effort, and regular and ongoing communication. The County has many of the operational components in place for an operational model, but those components require coordination and ongoing communication to unify the Countywide operational model. Based on the foregoing, the CEO makes the following recommendations:

1. Adopt the SB 855 plan as the foundation for the County's unified operational model.

2. Within 30 days of its initial meeting, require the CSEC Integrated Leadership Team to convene a meeting with relevant Departments and stakeholders to begin work on a Countywide CSEC strategic plan that addresses the entire continuum – from prevention to support - using the Action Team's plan as a foundation.

Safe House Program

Discussion

In 1997, the current Safe House Program was implemented in Los Angeles County, mainly in Fire stations, as a way to provide a temporary haven for any child or adult facing a potentially threatening situation and needed a safe place. A few years later, the County implemented the Safe Surrender Program, which gave parents or guardians the choice to legally and safely surrender their babies at any hospital or fire station in Los Angeles County. While the Safe Surrender Baby Program has experienced high levels of success and visibility, the Safe House Program has not. It is feasible to refresh, rebrand, and expand the current Safe House Program to include CSEC. In order to successfully rebrand this program, the target population should be redirected to CSEC and other vulnerable youth. The term "Safe House" program has a specific meaning in the world of sex trafficking, therefore, the program should be named

something different while retaining the safety connotation. The CEO recommends that the program be renamed the "Safe Place Program." The conceptual design of a rebranded program should be operationalized by the CSEC Integrated Leadership Team as outlined below.

Phase I: Program Re-Design and Planning

1. Identify the population that the rebranded program should serve.

2. Determine whether a new name and logo are appropriate.

3. Develop a public awareness campaign that uses public service announcements, signage, literature, posters, and social media (including a website).

4. Require all County Departments to post, on their website, a link to the County's informational CSEC site.

5. Conduct a readiness assessment of which County Departments and/or community agencies should participate in early roll-out of the re-branded program.

Phase II: Roll-Out

Include the following departments in the initial roll-out of the rebranded Safe House Program: Fire Department, Children and Family Services, Probation, Public Social Services, and Sheriff. Early implementation would include the following actions for each Department:

- Prominently display the Safe Place logo, signage and literature;
- Include the safe house link on the Department's website;
- Train staff on signs of CSEC activity; and
- Train personnel on the steps to take when a CSEC seeks sanctuary in a Department's designated safe house facility.

After a reasonable implementation period, the CSEC Leadership Team should review the rebranded program, solicit feedback from each participating department, and make necessary adjustments before including other County departments or other entities such as: public libraries, hospitals, and clinics, and other non-county facilities.

Timeline for Early Efforts of Integrated Leadership Team

Below is a proposed timeline for the major activities under each of the three areas discussed above. These timelines are provided to show how the CSEC Integrated Leadership Team could spend its initial months:

Action Item	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr
Conduct the Inaugural Meeting of the CSEC Leadership Team Identify the current state of CSEC efforts: roles, responsibilities, relationships and resources from all CSEC related bodies. Identify and eliminate redundancy.	→					
Develop Strategic Plan Start work on a County-wide CSEC Strategic Plan which includes timelines for all deliverables identified in the Board's June 16, 2015 motion – including plan to roll out the SB 855 multi-disciplinary approach, and First Responder Protocol.			→	→	→	→
SB 855 Implementation Continue work of implementing SB 855. Compare services and interventions (actual and planned) with those of other initiatives, identify and eliminate redundancy when appropriate.						→
Human Trafficking Implementation Continue the work of the Human Trafficking Task Force. Compare services and interventions (actual and planned) with those of other initiatives, identify and eliminate redundancy when appropriate.	→	→	→	→	→	→
Safe Place Program Develop plan to rebrand and redesign the program.			→	→	→	→